GOTHIC SPACE IN DAPHNE DU MAURIER'S *JAMAICA INN*, *REBECCA* AND *MY COUSIN RACHEL*

A THESIS SUBMITTED TO
THE GRADUATE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES
OF
MIDDLE EAST TECHNICAL UNIVERSITY

BY

ÖZGE ERDEM

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR
THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY
IN
THE DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH LITERATURE

FEBRUARY 2022

Approval of the thesis:

GOTHIC SPACE IN DAPHNE DU MAURIER'S *JAMAICA INN, REBECCA* AND *MY COUSIN RACHEL*

submitted by **ÖZGE ERDEM** in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of **Doctor of Philosophy in English Literature, the Graduate School of Social Sciences of Middle East Technical University** by,

Prof. Dr. Yaşar KONDAKÇI
Dean
Graduate School of Social Sciences _____

Prof. Dr. Çiğdem SAĞIN ŞİMŞEK
Head of Department
Department of Foreign Language Education _____

Prof. Dr. Nurten BİRLİK
Supervisor
Department of Foreign Language Education _____

Examining Committee Members:

Prof. Dr. Feryal ÇUBUKÇU (Head of the Examining Committee)
Dokuz Eylül University
Department of Foreign Language Education _____

Prof. Dr. Nurten BİRLİK (Supervisor)
Middle East Technical University
Department of Foreign Language Education _____

Assist. Prof. Dr. Kuğu TEKİN
Atılım University
Department of English Language and Literature _____

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Margaret SÖNMEZ
Middle East Technical University
Department of Foreign Language Education _____

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Nil Korkut
Middle East Technical University
Department of Foreign Language Education _____

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

Name, Last Name: Özge ERDEM

Signature:

ABSTRACT

GOTHIC SPACE IN DAPHNE DU MAURIER'S *JAMAICA INN*, *REBECCA* AND *MY COUSIN RACHEL*

ERDEM, Özge
Ph.D., The Department of English Literature
Supervisor: Prof. Dr. Nurten BİRLİK

February 2022, 233 pages

This dissertation argues that the gothic space in Daphne du Maurier's novels *Jamaica Inn*, *Rebecca*, and *My Cousin Rachel* displays non-Cartesian and non-Newtonian qualities, which makes it possible to adopt a Thirdspace epistemology to read the novels and discuss the spatial experiences that destabilise Firstspace and Secondspace epistemologies that underlie traditional conceptions of space. This dissertation treats the Gothic as a mode of writing which dealt with the repressed material in the discourse and claims that the repressed in du Maurier's novels can be addressed by an analysis of space, which can open them to a subversive reading. Therefore, this study will focus on the domestic spaces in the novels, and the outside spaces that surround them, and discuss the role of space in the constitution of subjectivity. It will attempt to show that the psychic and social spaces intrude on one another, and space is built as relational, heterogeneous, spontaneous, and porous in *Jamaica Inn*, *Rebecca* and *My Cousin*

Rachel, which will also lead to a different understanding of subjectivity and temporality. It is claimed that her use of the Gothic allows du Maurier to critique the patriarchal discourse and the constitution of patriarchal space and subjectivity through the repression of the feminine. Therefore, the novels will be discussed against the background of spatial and psychoanalytic theories and Gothic criticism, with an aim to create a hermeneutical frame through which du Maurier's novels can be read based on the analysis of space.

Keywords: Daphne du Maurier, Gothic, Space, Subjectivity, Novel

ÖZ

DAPHNE DU MAURIER'İN JAMAICA INN, REBECCA VE MY COUSIN RACHEL ROMANLARINDA GOTİK MEKÂNIN ÜRETİMİ

ERDEM, Özge
Doktora, İngiliz Edebiyatı Bölümü
Tez Yöneticisi: Prof. Dr. Nurten BİRLİK

Şubat 2022, 233 sayfa

Bu tez Daphne du Maurier'nin *Jamaica Inn*, *Rebecca* ve *My Cousin Rachel* romanlarında gotik mekânın Kartezyen ve Newtoncu uzam anlayışından uzak biçimde yapılandırıldığını ve bu yüzden Üçüncüuzam epistemolojisi çerçevesinde ele alındığında, geleneksel mekân kavramlarının ardında yatan Birinciuzam ve İkinciuzam anlayışlarını istikrarsızlaştıran mekânsal deneyimleri tartışmak için uygun bir ortam sunduğunu savunmaktadır. Bu çalışma gotik yazın türünü üretildiği diskurda ve kültürde bastırılmış olan içeriğin ifade edildiği bir yazın türü olarak ele almakta ve du Maurier'in romanlarının mekân açısından incelendiklerinde egemen diskura karşıt söylemler üreten metinler haline geldiklerini savunmaktadır. Bu amaçla, romanlarda bulunan ev ve evi çevreleyen açık mekânlar incelenerek, mekânsal deneyimin öznelliğin oluşmasındaki biçimlendirici işlevi tartışılacaktır. Bu incelemeyle, romanlarda psişik ve sosyal mekanların birbirine müdahale eder biçimde iç içe

geçmişliği ortaya konularak mekânın ilişkilerle ve eşzamanlılıkla düzenlenen, heterojen ve geçirgen bir kavram olarak yeniden tanımlanması ile du Maurier'in erkek egemen diskura, ve ataerkil mekân ve öznelliğin kadının bastırılmasıyla biçimlenmesine yaptığı bir eleştiri olarak ele alınması amaçlanmaktadır. Romanlar psikoanalitik ve mekânsal teorilerle Gotik yazın eleştirisi bağlamında tartışılacaktır. Bu çalışmayla du Maurier'in romanlarını mekân açısından tartışmayı sağlayacak hermeneutik bir çerçeve oluşturulması amaçlanmaktadır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Daphne du Maurier, Gotik, Mekân, Öznellik, Roman

To my father, who will always be missed.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This dissertation took a long time, which was full of losses, some of which have created cracks in my life that will not be repaired. For a long while, it became the centre of my life and, in a way, forced me to pass through a dark and grim period of life. While writing this study, I have also learned to live with the cracks and ruptures in my own reality and use them in productive ways. As it is coming to an end, I feel peaceful with the knowledge that I am finally ready to complete this stage of my life and move on.

I would like to express my gratitude to my supervisor Prof. Dr. Nurten Birlik, who has always been patient with me and offered me valuable guidance and feedback whenever I needed. I am very grateful for all the time and energy she spent on my work, knowing that without her support and encouragement, I may not have found the strength to complete this study.

I would also like to thank Assoc. Prof. Dr. Margaret Sönmez and Assist. Prof. Dr. Kuğu Tekin. I am deeply grateful for all the meticulous feedback and comments which have always been helpful in improving this study and for their understanding and positive attitude during our committee meetings. I also owe thanks to Prof. Dr. Feryal Çubukçu and Assoc. Prof. Dr. Nil Korkut Naykı for their constructive feedback and valuable comments during my final jury, which has had a very important effect on this dissertation.

I am very lucky to have met a few people who make life more meaningful, its burdens more bearable, and its joys far greater. My dear friends, I thank you all for the time, energy and support you have spent on me throughout this long journey. Dear Gamze

Cilbir Musayev and Gizem Güngör, thank you very much for listening to me without getting tired and providing me all the love, support, patience and space that I needed. Dear Esma Çetinkaya and Hande Şakıyan, I am grateful for all the times you were there when I needed to clear my head. Dear Süheyde Çaputcu, thank you for sharing my good and bad moments.

I am deeply grateful for the support and love I have received from my parents and my elder sisters, who planted a deep love of reading in me and respected my interest in the strange, absurd and fantastic aspects of life and everything since early childhood. Their acceptance and encouragement have found expression in this study. I am very happy to have a father who believed in the empowerment of knowledge and encouraged me to follow my passion. I am also very happy to have a mother, a great example of a woman who refuses to be defined by the traditional gender roles. I am very lucky that I have two sisters who have taught me to be stay strong no matter what.

Thank you all! Without you, this dissertation would not have been completed.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1. Aim of the Study

Daphne du Maurier's novels *Jamaica Inn* (1936), *Rebecca* (1938) and *My Cousin Rachel* (1951) can be considered as twentieth century gothic novels. In many ways, du Maurier reworks and refines the traditional gothic themes like haunting, intellectual uncertainty and dark gloomy atmosphere, along with the gothic preoccupation with the return of the repressed and the unconscious on psychic, social and cultural levels. This dissertation claims that the use of the Gothic enables du Maurier to enter into an active and critical dialogue with the history of patriarchy, modernity and Enlightenment epistemology and ontology. It can be seen that in the novels, she constructs a gothic space in order to give voice to the repressed material in her texts. This enables her to construct a spatiality which is a lot more dynamic, simultaneous and fluid than is understood in the Enlightenment conception of space. Furthermore, it can be argued that her writing reflects a non-Cartesian tendency with regard to the construction of subjectivity and space, and the interaction between the subject and the space that s/he inhabits. This can also be found in the way the writer refuses space and time dichotomy by building hetero-spatiotemporal entities and in her return to the pre-modern conceptions of space and time as a reaction to modernity. In this respect, this study claims that in the novels, gothic space is constructed as a Thirdspace[1], a concept

[1] Although the term is theorised and spelled differently by various thinkers, in this dissertation, I use Edward Soja's concept of Thirdspace, which can be shortly defined as an understanding of space that emerges out of the complications of spatial dichotomies and through a blurring of the boundaries between spatial categorisations and epistemologies that underlie those categorisations. This concept will be explored in detail in the third chapter.

which refers to the inseparability of the real, imagined and social dimensions of space in the lived experience. In my analysis of this Thirdspace of the Gothic, I have used the conceptual tools of the uncanny, the liminal, the abject and the sublime. I have attempted to provide a use of these concepts on spatial terms so as to explore the symbiosis between subjectivity and spatiality as constructed in the writer's work.

Each novel, on its own, can be used to discuss how the Gothic, despite being a dynamic and fluid literary category, has remained distinctive as a mode of writing since its first acknowledged employment in fiction in the eighteenth century. It is possible to argue that one dominant aspect that helps to distinguish the Gothic is the use of space. Indeed, in *Jamaica Inn*, *Rebecca* and *My Cousin Rachel*, space is a significant component which facilitates the operation of Gothic mechanisms while producing and communicating the repressed material in the narrative. It can be claimed that du Maurier's use of the Gothic provides her with a literary space where she can communicate transgression and excess[2]. The repressed material which is not expressed on the level of ordinary language, regarding the issues of sexuality, gender roles and identity, can be grasped through a careful analysis of space and spatiality in the novels. Gothic space, in this respect, becomes one where the boundary between the dominant and the repressed in discourse becomes permeable. It is the kind of social and psychic space wherein these different layers of reality are located together side by side, which is something that works against the social and cultural categorisation and classification inherent within the spatial discourse. In the three novels, du Maurier takes actual monumental spaces, architectural landmarks of Cornwall as her models for spaces of fiction. *Jamaica Inn* is inspired by the actual inn with the same name in Bodmin[3]. Manderley in *Rebecca* and the Ashley family estate in *My Cousin Rachel* are based on her life-long obsession Menabilly (Horner and Zlosnik 100, 131). These are traditional

[2] Fred Botting asserts that transgression and excess are the two organizing principles of the Gothic (*Gothic* [1st ed.] 2).

[3] Du Maurier informs the reader about this in an opening note to the novel:

> Jamaica Inn stands today, hospitable and kindly, a temperance house on the twenty-mile road between Bodmin and Launceston. . . . I have pictured it as it might have been over a hundred and twenty years ago; and although existing place-names figure in the pages, the characters and events described are entirely imaginary. (*Jamaica Inn*)

places with a long history. Du Maurier builds her literary spaces by exploiting the history of these lived spaces, and at the end of each novel, the central architectural space is destroyed, either physically or symbolically. However, in a manner that cannot be reduced to a nostalgia over the loss of a sense of place, du Maurier evokes the dark side of space; she brings to light the repressed in these spatiotemporal entities not as phenomena or experiences that were discarded and cast aside by the everyday organisation and practices of space, but as their accompanying shadow. Thus, du Maurier's gothic space is one where conscious and unconscious elements meet on the same surface. Her fiction in this sense can be seen as an exploration and production of ways to scrutinise what Kristeva refers to as "a mankind whose solidarity is founded on the consciousness of its unconscious –desiring, destructive, fearful, empty, impossible" (*Strangers to Ourselves* 192). The characters' interaction with space largely takes place on an unconscious level, and since the unconscious material is dispersed in space, the social dynamics and the relationships in the novels are both conscious and unconscious products. The repressed material is transferred through this interaction. In this respect, space becomes an intermediary of communication, expressing the inexpressible.

In my discussion of the novels, I have borrowed concepts from not only Gothic criticism but also psychoanalytic theory because a Thirdspace perspective cannot be achieved without a discussion of the unconscious when it is considered that a greater part of our spatial experience is unconscious. I use the concepts of monstrosity, abjection, masquerade, gaze, intrasubjectivity and intersubjectivity, extimacy, repression and repetition in order to open to discussion the intricate relationship between the subject and space, which is, as found in the novels, irreducible to subject/object, interiority/exteriority, psychic/social and private/public dichotomies. This being said, these dichotomies can be found in the core of the Gothic.

Gothic fiction takes up as its subject matter the division of binary oppositions on the one hand, and, on the other hand, insistently deals with the violation of the boundaries that ensure the division of those oppositions. This is done through the use of a number of aesthetic and phenomenological categories like the liminal, the uncanny and the

sublime. Therefore, in this study, Thirdspace of the Gothic is analysed by using these as conceptual tools. Each of these concepts, in various ways, signifies experiences that threaten the position of the subject as the agent of knowledge, attack its integrity, and complicate the relationship between the subject and the space it inhabits.

The discussion of the novels is based on a set of arguments about space and the Gothic made by the postmodern and post-structural theories of space and the twenty-first century Gothic criticism. Since the spatial turn in the nineties, which has greatly influenced the ways we conceptualise space and spatiality in social and cultural studies, it has been the dominant tendency to consider space not as a homogenous and passive surface upon which the human beings inscribe meanings, or as a void and an empty container as viewed by positive sciences. On the contrary, space is understood as a production of complex social relations and cultural mechanisms, itself having a constituent role in the production and reinforcement of those very relations and mechanisms. Space, in this account, is a social construct and a constitutive dimension of reality. Second, there is a symbiotic relationship between the subject and space. That is, space is both constituted by and constitutive of the subject. Since it challenges any efforts to derive fixed and stable meaning through space and gain a sense of continuity, the gothic space in the novels is experienced as uncanny. Such uncanny experience of space underlies a certain gothic subjectivity, one that is constantly produced and reproduced through spatial mechanisms, such as concealment, surveillance, confinement, classification, intrusion and infiltration.

The production of space and subjectivity as interrelated allows us to question the views that space exists either as opaque in its materiality or as totally transparent in its abstraction, and that it is empty, passive and open to the inscription of human subjectivity. In this respect, it is possible to maintain that an analysis of du Maurier's use of gothic space reveals a crisis of representation regarding the stabilised representation of space, the location and boundaries of human 'nature' and the attainability of unified and totalising truth.

1.2. Significance of the Study

Until recently, work on du Maurier remained limited and the early studies mostly focused on the parallelisms between the writer's life and her fiction, with the exception of Avril Horner and Sue Zlosnik's detailed discussion of du Maurier's work in the context of her identity crisis as a writer and as a woman, and her turn to more speculative modes of writing like the Gothic. Nina Auerbach in *Daphne du Maurier: the Haunted Heiress*, to give an example, reads du Maurier's novels from this perspective. In most accounts, du Maurier is listed among other popular romance writers of the 1930s and 40s. She is depicted as a conservative escapist by Alison Light in "Daphne du Maurier's Romance with the Past" (158). Light's view exemplifies the prevalent view on the writer's work. However, in the twenty-first century, there has been a renewed interest in du Maurier, resulting in a change in the reception of the writer's work. As David Ian Paddy writes, "For someone typically pegged as a romance writer, du Maurier wrote a great deal of work about the ways dreams come crashing down" (112). This has been acknowledged by many critics, so the more recent work on du Maurier explores the issues of subjectivity, gender and sexuality and the re-workings and film adaptations of her work with the aim of addressing the complexity of the writer's work.

In 2007, Helen Taylor edited *The Daphne du Maurier Companion*, which brought together various works that focused on du Maurier's life and work. Like Paddy, Taylor notes that "du Maurier deployed -indeed transformed- the romance genre . . . Aware it was used demeaningly, implying a form of writing for women readers of limited intelligence, she fiercely repudiated it" (xiii). The first part of this book includes interviews with du Maurier's children and articles by her editor. Part two focuses on *Rebecca*. Part three is a compilation of the introductions to the Virago editions of du Maurier's books but also offers three new articles that focus on family, Cornwall and religion. Melanie Heeley's article on the tension between Christianity and paganism in *Jamaica Inn* and in some of du Maurier's poetry leaves room for the discussion of the conflicts between the patriarchal social space and the gothic space in the novel. This book offers a comprehensive overview of du Maurier's work, and the articles

provide some fresh insights. Furthermore, in 2021, an issue of *Revue LISA* e-journal focusing on Daphne du Maurier was published. The articles in this journal give place to *Rebecca* and discuss its long-lasting popularity with a focus on the film adaptations and literary rewritings of the novel, but they also concentrate on other novels like *The Flight of the Falcon*, *Hungry Hill* and *The Glass-Blowers*, her play *The Years Between* and her short stories. These articles centre on issues ranging from myths, the echoes of the current issues in the writer's work, the relationship between the self and the world and the loss of security in the everyday life of the characters. This journal is also important in that it provides a thorough critical bibliography of du Maurier's work.

Despite the increasing critical interest in du Maurier, *Rebecca* is still the most widely studied novel, and it has been read from a variety of perspectives. The studies on subjectivity and gender roles help to understand the writer's ambivalent relationship with patriarchy and to discuss the destabilising effect of her fiction on the reader. In this account, psychoanalytic and feminist interpretations of the novel have been the most common. In "Daphne du Maurier's *Rebecca*: The Shadow and the Substance," Teresa Petersen focuses on the gothic motifs of the double and mirror-imaging in *Rebecca* to explore the repressed issues of incest and lesbian desire. In a similar vein, in "Did Mrs. Danvers Warm Rebecca's Pearls? Significant Exchanges and the Extension of Lesbian Space and Time in Literature," Nicky Hallett traces the repressed lesbian desire through the relationship between the female subjects and the objects, which has an unsettling effect on the patriarchal domestic space. Moreover, Auba Llompart Pons focuses on gender roles and villainy in *Rebecca* and argues that "rather than any specific character, the ultimate gothic villain . . . is the haunting presence of an old-fashioned, strict patriarchal system, represented by Maxim's mansion, Manderley, and understood as a hierarchical system," which results in "the characters' inability to fulfil the highly demanding gender roles imposed by this system, which leads them towards hypocrisy, hysteria and crime" (71). Pons sees patriarchy as "the ultimate corruptive force which negatively affects all the characters in the novel" (78) and notes that "*all* the characters in the novel -including both Mrs. de Winters- are willing to commit acts of villainy regardless of their gender, as a means to maintain their powerful positions within patriarchy" (75). She asserts that the narrator's final

incorporation into the patriarchal order is shown in her exercising of her newly found power on the ones whom she sees as her inferior. "However, in order for her to exercise this power, she needs a man and she needs to be in a powerful position within patriarchy. And this is why she has to become Bluebeard's ally and protect him" (79). Departing from her interpretation, this study argues that rather than protecting the patriarchy, the female characters in the novel implement spatial strategies and bend the patriarchal order to situate themselves. In addition, haunting has also been explored from psychoanalytic and post-structuralist perspectives, especially in *Rebecca*. Allan Lloyd Smith offers a comparative discussion of du Maurier and Charles Dickens in "The Phantoms of *Drood* and *Rebecca*: The Uncanny Reencountered through Abraham and Torok's 'Cryptonymy'" and suggests that Rebecca's haunting effect can be traced through the gaps and fissures in the text. Sheila Teahan similarly explores the unhomeliness of home through the return of the repressed in *Rebecca* and discusses it also by using Abraham and Torok's concept of the phantom. Teahan turns to Bachelard's understanding of home and its undermining in du Maurier's narratives. Furthermore, in "A Hauntological Reading of Daphne du Maurier's *Rebecca*," Nil Korkut Naykı discusses the spectrality in the novel with reference to Derrida's revenant and Abraham and Torok's phantom, and sees Rebecca and her haunting as elements that cannot be easily dismissed: "It can be argued . . . that Rebecca emerges as a specter in the novel in a Derridean sense. Her memory and the secret surrounding both her personality and her death are potential sources of trauma for both the narrator and her husband, Maxim" (28). From this perspective, Maxim de Winter and the narrator cannot break free from Rebecca because they do not properly deal with her.

Departing slightly from these readings of du Maurier's work, in "'Beautiful Creatures': The Ethics of Female Beauty in Daphne du Maurier's Fiction" Margaret E. Mitchell focuses on beauty and investigates its function in *Rebecca*, *My Cousin Rachel* and *King's General*. According to Mitchell, beauty is a (re)productive concept in these novels, and it is closely related with the sense of justice. In Mitchell's reading, the beauty of Rebecca and Rachel functions as a haunting element. Mitchell provides an appropriate perspective from which the ways Rebecca and Rachel surpass the borders of the narrative can be explored. Furthermore, her article shows how du

Maurier first builds and then breaks away from the conventions of romantic fiction. In this account, it can also be said that questions of genre have continued to be a focus of the critics. In "Dangerous Borders: Daphne du Maurier's *Rebecca*: Shaking the foundations of the romance of privilege, partying and place," for example, Gina Wisker looks into the way du Maurier uses conventional genres in a subversive way so as to communicate "the unease at the configurations of power and gender relations of her time" (84). Wisker's article exemplifies the relatively recent appreciation of the complexity of du Maurier's work, marking a departure from the view of her as a writer of romances.

Interpretations of space and Cornwall in du Maurier's fiction have been helpful in building the arguments of this study. In this field, Cornwall's marginal location and its history of wrecking have been explored in connection to du Maurier's novels and short stories. Ella Westland's "The Passionate Periphery" calls attention to the historical, cultural and literary factors which have contributed to the construction of Cornwall as a locus of gothic horror in literature. In "The Inverse Gothic Invasion Motif in Daphne du Maurier's *Jamaica Inn*: The National Body and Smuggling as Disease," Dianne Armstrong explores the historical background of smuggling in relation to *Jamaica Inn*. Gemma Goodman focuses on the issues of gender and sailing within a Cornish context in "Women at Sea: Locating and Escaping Gender on the Cornish Coast in Daphne du Maurier's *The Loving Spirit* and *Frenchman's Creek*." Also, Michael Titlestad discusses wrecking in *Jamaica Inn* in one chapter of his book *Shipwreck Narratives: Out of Our Depths*.

In relation to spatial studies, one article that bears close parallelisms with the discussion of *Rebecca* in this dissertation is Stanka Radović's "Outside Within: Natural Environment and Social Place in Daphne du Maurier's *Rebecca,*" which focuses on Manderley not as "a haunted space" but as "space that haunts" (142). Radović brings spatial criticism and ecocriticism together and discusses "how the social hierarchy that the house represents at the same time expels the unwanted social categories and behaviors into the environment only to find itself threatened by nature itself" (140-41). Her interpretation centres on the nature surrounding Manderley and

how it is associated with Rebecca. Radović suggests that "*Rebecca* is about the invasion of orderly interior space by an unpredictable natural exteriority, which—although shut out and forgotten—makes its reappearance as the perpetual shadow upon the settled middle-class environment" (146). Thus, Radović concentrates on the tension and conflicts between the hegemonic abstract spaces of rule and power and differential spaces that are associated with Rebecca: "Space . . . becomes a battlefield of norm and deviation, revealing the constitutive antagonism between Lefebvrian 'abstract space' of sociopolitical control and other, 'differential' spaces, where exiled bodies and denied forms of living lurk on the uncertain edge between darkness and light" (146). In this sense, "Manderley is precisely this kind of abstract space as it enacts the power of the ruling class" (149) while "Rebecca is the presence haunting the house from the outside, threatening to enter and invade it. She is the disturbing inappropriate nature that fails to occupy its proper, that is, exterior and marginal, place" (150). Although Radović's focus is on the representation of nature in the novel, and she does not discuss the psychic dimension of space, her arguments regarding the return of the repressed and the excessive nature of Rebecca that transgresses the patriarchal social space are in line with the arguments of this study.

Another significant work on the representation of space in du Maurier's fiction is Stephanie Derisi's article on *Rebecca*. Derisi focuses on the feminine spaces in the novel and discusses the ways these gendered spaces offer a possibility of escape from the intrusion of patriarchy by using Yi Fu Tuan's notion of escapism and Bachelard's conceptualisation of house as the home of its inhabitants' memory and imagination. In this escape, the domestic objects become the centre of the female subject's attention. Her arguments are in alignment with my discussion of space and gender, private space and the gendered organisation of patriarchal domestic space in *Rebecca*. Derisi takes the novel as signalling the writer's female version of the passage from traditional domestic space to modern life and notes, "Women writers, like du Maurier, have manipulated and manoeuvred within the symbolic order to rewrite women's history" (194-5). Derisi's understanding of spatiality and spatial experience in relation to patriarchy helps her to focus on the limitations that domestic life offered women.

Apart from Radović and Derisi, David Ian Paddy also explores the intersection of spatiality and the fantastic, and suggests that the idea of home is constantly undermined in du Maurier's work as what is homely turns into the uncanny. Paddy claims that du Maurier's representation of space does not fit Yi Fu Tuan's identification of place with security and space with freedom. He writes, "Where a home should be regarded as a place (familiar and comforting), and heading out from home could open up an experience of space (the positive potential of the unknown, with promises of change and renewal), disturbing events *within* the place and space undermine the positive traits *of* place and space" (96-7). This also runs against Bachelard's sense of home and intimacy, Paddy argues, because the fantastic undermines such an intimate experience. According to Paddy, home in du Maurier does not provide comfort, and movement does not provide escape from the discomforting atmosphere of home. He turns to du Maurier's short stories and novels like *Jamaica Inn*, *Rebecca* and *Scapegoat* to look into the connection between spatiality and the fantastic, and employs Tzvetan Todorov's notion of the fantastic: "The fantastic occupies the space of hesitation between the uncanny and the marvelous, when a stabilizing interpretation cannot yet be offered" (98). He argues that "the fantastic produces a fundamental change in the relationship between the characters and the settings they occupy. Place and space become unfamiliar, threatening, destabilizing" (100). Paddy also emphasises the psychological aspect of the interaction between characters and space.

This dissertation aims to provide a fresh analysis of what has been mostly regarded as Daphne du Maurier's two most persistent preoccupations, which are space and subjectivity. Despite the fact that these two preoccupations are very often acknowledged but left, with a few exceptions, without an analysis by using a theoretical frame except for psychoanalysis points to a gap in the literature on the writer's work. This study will attempt to fill this gap by consulting the postmodern and post-structural spatial theories and offering their intersections with psychoanalytic theory and Gothic criticism. By doing so, the aim is to address the polysemic spaces and spatial-subjectivities that the writer constructs in her fiction. In this way, this dissertation departs from the previous studies. I have also found that the Gothic is an

appropriate mode of writing to analyse from this theoretical frame because due to its point of origin, it signifies a departure from the Cartesian and Euclidean logic of space and subjectivity. Moreover, although *Rebecca* has attracted the attention of many critics, *Jamaica Inn* and *My Cousin Rachel* have remained relatively unexplored. This dissertation will hopefully contribute to the critical work on these novels. Furthermore, although the spatial turn and the new conceptualisation of space have been effectively used in various disciplines such as geography, architecture and cultural studies, its implications for literary criticism have remained relatively unexplored. Therefore, I believe this dissertation can contribute to the field in a more general sense by providing a theoretical pathway and conceptual tools to use in the analysis of space in literature.

This study is comprised of six chapters. The first chapter is the introduction, where I have provided the aim and significance of the study with reference to the previous work on du Maurier, and shortly introduced the theoretical frame which I will use in my discussion of the novels. In the second chapter, I will discuss Daphne du Maurier as a twentieth century British writer. Since du Maurier's family history and upbringing have great influence on the writer's work and especially on her gothic imagination, I will trace these influences on the writer's work. Then, with the purpose of situating du Maurier in the literary and cultural context, I will look into her interaction with the main literary and cultural scene in England at her time. I will also focus on Cornwall as the locus of du Maurier's literary imagination and as a spatial construct.

In the "Theoretical Framework" chapter, I will first focus on the rise and development of the Gothic with its changing definition and connotations since the eighteenth century. I will explore the Gothic as a mode of writing which deals with what is usually conceived of as taboo in the culture and the society it is produced in, as a kind of literary discourse which communicates epistemologically and ontologically problematic issues such as death, crime, guilt and sexuality. Secondly, I will trace the Gothic's relationship to the Enlightenment, arguing that the Gothic is a production of the Enlightenment.

In the theoretical overview, I will discuss the theories of space that criticise the Cartesian and Euclidian conceptions of space, along with the Kantian space, and lay out the theories that view space as a social construct, a complex phenomenon that is constituted through physical, imagined and social dimensions of experience. I will mainly focus on the conceptualisations of Henri Lefebvre, Edward Soja and Doreen Massey. For both Lefebvre and Soja, each way of thinking about space and each field of human spatiality – the physical, the mental and the social – are seen as simultaneously real and imagined, concrete and abstract, material and metaphorical. No one mode of spatial thinking is inherently privileged or intrinsically better than others as long as each remains open to the re-combinations and simultaneous character of the real-and-imagined. In a similar vein to Lefebvre and Soja, Massey also understands space as a social construct, a product of social relations and power geometries that take place in it. She also calls attention to the symbiotic relationship between the subject and space. In addition, Massey also explores the complex relationship between gender and space. After laying out the theories that conceive of space as a social construct, I will discuss the spatial dichotomies that are inherent in the Gothic and the ways which these dichotomies are complicated by drawing parallelisms between the concerns of the Gothic and those of spatial critics.

From this, I will move on to the Thirdspace of the Gothic, which emerges as a result of the blurring of the boundaries between such dichotomies as familiar/unfamiliar, inside/outside, public/private, self/other and man/woman. I will focus on the different ways that Thirdspace is evoked, and the various meanings that it can gain through a discussion of the liminal and the uncanny. I will discuss the different interpretations of the liminal by a variety of theorists. Then, I will give an account of the uncanny and its different conceptualisations mainly by Freud, Terry Castle, Anthony Vidler, Helene Cixous, Jacques Lacan and Nicholas Royle, and form my own conception of the term and reach a definition of spatial uncanny, or uncanny as a spatial experience.

In the "Domestic Space" chapter, I will provide an analysis of the domestic space in the novels *Jamaica Inn*, *Rebecca* and *My Cousin Rachel* and explore the symbiosis between spaces/places and the individuals who inhabit them. Moreover, I will focus

on the different ways male and female characters experience space and the strategies they implement to situate themselves in space in order to illustrate that space and gender simultaneously produce and reinforce one another and explore the repressed female in the construction of home.

In the fifth chapter, I will focus on subjectivity in the context of the extimate relation that the subject sets with the gothic landscapes, and encounters otherness, which is embodied by Cornwall. The liminality that Cornwall evokes on both social and psychic levels will form the main concern of that chapter. I will discuss how *My Cousin Rachel* differs from the other two novels in terms of the depiction of Cornwall. Then, I will concentrate on Mary Yellan's uncanny flight into Bodmin Moor and her encounter with the repressed extra-linguistic space that shatters the symmetries of her social and psychic space irreparably. Finally, I will discuss the sea and the coastline as the margins of the Cornish gothic space in *Jamaica Inn* and *Rebecca*.

CHAPTER 2

DAPHNE DU MAURIER

This section aims to provide a contextual background on Daphne du Maurier by using autobiographical, biographical and literary work written by and about her in order to place the writer in the context of twentieth century British literature and culture. This will be helpful in grounding the writer's work on the larger literary scene and connecting her to the social, cultural and epistemological concerns of the twentieth century. With this aim, I will concentrate on du Maurier's main concerns as a twentieth century woman writer and explain the motives in her adoption of the Gothic in the context of the twentieth century Britain.

2.1. The Influence of Early Life and Family

Du Maurier was born at the beginning of the twentieth century (1907) and lived a long life that lasted eighty-two years. She wrote for almost her entire life, and the years she produced most of her fiction covered four decades from the thirties, until the end of the sixties. Each of these decades is marked by significant cultural and historical events. During the first half of the twentieth century, the order of the nineteenth century was challenged and overturned while new economic and political organisations, along with new ways of individual and cultural expression, emerged. The second half of the century was marked by the formation of the new social, political and economic systems. Those were the years of drastic change in every aspect of life. It is possible to trace in du Maurier's fictional and autobiographical work that she had ambivalent responses to those changes and a complicated relationship with modernity. To begin

with, the influence of the du Maurier family background and the writer's early family life on her work cannot be ignored. Du Maurier was born into an artistic family and grew up with an awareness of her parents' expectations from their daughters to pursue at least one art form professionally. Her grandfather George du Maurier was the writer of *Trilby* (1895) and a celebrated cartoonist. Her aunt Sylvia's sons were the source of inspiration for *Peter Pan* (1904) by J. M. Barrie, who was a close friend of the family. Her father Gerald du Maurier was an acclaimed actor and director, and her mother Muriel was an actress who did not stop performing on stage until the birth of her third child. From a very early age, Daphne du Maurier and her two sisters, Angela and Jeanne du Maurier, spent a lot of time at the theatre watching their parents' performances. On the other hand, acting for the du Mauriers was not limited to the stage. Du Maurier sisters grew up seeing their parents and other actor family friends getting in and out of various roles anytime outside the theatre. Therefore, acting was a part of their everyday lives, and their most favourite activity as children was enacting scenes from history and literary works. Such a family environment entangled with the theatrical had a great influence on du Maurier's imagination, personality and work, as noted by her biographer Jane Dunn: "These evocative childhood experiences brought the sisters not only the comfort of familiarity – 'routes' in du Maurier code – but nostalgia too for the past they had so variously shared" (20).

Despite the artistic and light bohemian life the family had, Gerald du Maurier "loathed practically everything that was modern. He hated modern music, modern painting, modern architecture and the modern way of living" (Dunn 13), and he tried to do whatever he could to keep his daughters away from it. He even took them from school, fearing that formal education would ruin their innocence. This negative attitude towards modern art and life seems to have left a deep impact on Daphne du Maurier. Dunn claims, she, too, "never came to appreciate twentieth-century art" (13). Moreover, because the parents did not let their children get formal education at school, Daphne and her sisters grew up away from their peers and the influence of the modern life. Their formal education included going to school and then dropping after a couple of semesters a few times. At times, they had no one to tutor them at home, so they chose their own subjects of study. When that was the case, Daphne du Maurier read

about Western history, Greek and Roman mythology and du Maurier family history, all of which later became sources of inspiration. Not having any contemporary works to read at home, she read Dante, Shakespeare, Flaubert, Tolstoy, Hardy and most of all the Brontës. Her interest in the Brontës was not restricted to their literary work, but also extended to their life, and this helped shape her artistic imagination and develop her own fictional lore. For someone who grew up in a family in which art and life were so mixed, the literary production and the personal life of the artist herself were inseparable. Dunn writes, "For Daphne, the fantasy world she inhabited was created by her own imagination, a refuge from a world in which she felt alien and adrift" (28).

Such an early childhood, along with the informal education she had, can partly explain du Maurier's turn to more imaginative modes of writing, such as the Gothic, fantasy and historical fiction. In addition, according to Horner and Zlosnik, du Maurier's use of such modes of writing, particularly the Gothic, allowed her to work through her own unresolved identity issues: "the use of Gothic conventions in du Maurier's work enables her to explore the anxieties of identity at their deepest level" (15). Du Maurier's own accounts in relation to her perception of her identity as a writer and as a woman, and the main themes of her novels prove them right. She expressed anxieties regarding her sexuality and gender.

Daphne du Maurier's writing also reflects women's changing perception of themselves and their place in the society. In the years before the First World War, the British society still preserved their Victorian views of men and women. Du Maurier grew up at a time when men were identified with mobility, freedom and activeness while women were identified in return with passiveness and submissiveness, and they were seen to belong to the domestic sphere. Despite the light bohemian life they had, du Maurier's parents particularly favoured and instructed Victorian values, and for du Maurier, qualities that mattered, namely, mobility, freedom, power and autonomy, were all identified with the masculine. As a result, Dunn states, her perception of herself conflicted with the traditional roles of men and women:

> From very young, feelings of powerlessness and being misunderstood made her long to be a boy and therefore stronger, braver, and more important – not this outer, more vulnerable, female self. She discovered that she, like her parents, could dress up and pretend to be someone else, but for her it was a private thing, a protection from a real world in which she was a stranger. (28)

Du Maurier's traditional way of thinking about the roles of men and women and her related gender conflict was only strengthened by her father's views of her. Biographical and autobiographical data show that Gerald du Maurier favoured Daphne the most among her daughters and valued her opinions and her free spirit, yet he could not see these qualities fitting a woman. On the other hand, becoming gradually aware of her daughter's awakening sexuality and her interest in love affairs, he could not see her as a boy either. He put this conflict in a poem which he wrote for her as a birthday present. In this poem, recognising his daughter's adventurous imagination and her wish to be a boy so that she could actually live the adventures she dreams of, he writes,

> And sometimes in the silence of the night
> I wake and think perhaps my darling's right
> And that she should have been,
> And, if I'd had my way,
> She would have been, a boy (qtd in Dunn 64)

However, he immediately recalls her feminine qualities, saying that she is "so full of fun and womanly deceit," that she is "tender," "dainty," "and loves to be admired," only "because she has been born a girl," a fact that he accepts rather regretfully (64):

> And sometimes in the turmoil of the day
> I pause, and think my darling may
> Be one of those who will
> For good or ill
> Remain a girl for ever and be still
> A Girl (64)

At a time when women risked their lives in wars abroad and won the first concessions in their fight for the right to vote at home, Gerald du Maurier's view of the roles of men and women sounds old-fashioned (Dunn 64). In the poem, Daphne du Maurier as a boy is full of action, a heroic figure. On the other hand, her place in the world as a

girl is passive, her looks and the effects she has on others are "so fresh and sweet", prone to "womanly deceit", "dainty" and "well attired" (64). Her mother was the role model for this kind of a woman, and Daphne du Maurier had mixed opinions about her. She writes, "She was not an easy person to understand, and both as a child and as a growing adolescent I could never feel quite sure of her, sensing some sort of disapproval in her attitude towards me" (*Myself When Young* 74). Growing up, du Maurier wore boys' clothes and hated the special occasions which required proper dressing while she enjoyed a great variety of outdoor activities, all of which she associated with boy in the stories she read: "Why wasn't I born a boy? They did all the brave things. Fought all the battles" (34). She even created an idealised masculine alter ego called Eric Avon. This character was drawn from boys' adventure fiction which she read: "There were no psychological depths to Eric Avon. He just shone at everything" (66). Daphne du Maurier seems to have internalised the binary logic of her father regarding femininity and masculinity, which resulted in an identity conflict and a sense of displacement from the gender roles of both women and men, which she expresses when she refers to her writing self as a "disembodied spirit," "who was neither girl nor boy" (qtd in Horner and Zlosnik 5). It is also possible to understand from her letters that she had conflicts about her own identity as a modern woman and as a professional woman writer. In a letter to Ellen Moers in 1948, she writes, "I mean, really, women should not have careers. It's people like me who have careers who really bitched up the old relationship between men and women. Women ought to be soft and gentle and dependent. Disembodied spirits like myself are all wrong" (qtd in Horner and Zlosnik 5). It is apparent that she could not locate herself within traditional binaries, and she saw this as a problematic divergence. Her fiction reflects these ambivalent views regarding gender and sexual identity.

In the feminist movement and the liberation of women, du Maurier saw a danger to the family, which can be destructive for society:

> Society, as we know it, must disintegrate once the family dissolves. Nothing but the family bond will hold men and women together. Already women, emerging from centuries of submission, fret against their more passive role, demanding equality in all things as their right, but in achieving this they lose

> their first purpose in life, which is to preserve, to maintain the family. Women have not yet learnt how to serve their families and their own ambitions without conflict, and until they do so husband and children suffer, as well as they themselves. This is the greatest problem of our time. Our own and succeeding generations must learn to adjust to the ever changing status of women in our modern civilisation, for without a home, without a centre, we become disoriented, lost orphans without shelter, faith and confidence collapsing about us like a house of cards. Chaos reigns. (*Rebecca Notebook* 96)

It is clear that du Maurier had strong views on the family as the backbone of society and viewed its dissolution as a sign of corruption. In order to prevent such corruption, she argues for the conservation of the traditional role of men and women. Yet, it is the institution of family and marriage that she most insistently problematises and whose dissolution she addresses in her fiction. In her novels, she voiced women's perspective and problems. She created unconventional female characters like Rebecca and Rachel, and wilful women like Mary Yellan, and she did not condemn them. Although Rebecca is killed by her husband for her social and sexual transgression, she is celebrated by Mrs Danvers, and it is Rebecca that the narrator ultimately identifies with, though only in her dreams. *Jamaica Inn* also ends with Mary Yellan's choice to lead an unconventional life on the margins of the patriarchal social space. Therefore, in this study, it is argued that du Maurier cannot be considered a feminist in any ideological or intellectual sense, but an analysis of gothic space and subjectivity can provide access to the repressed in her discourse and reveal the subversive content. As Gina Wisker notes:

> Du Maurier's Gothic horror is fundamental and springs from the ostensibly everyday which it undermines at the same time. Its key feature is that it destabilises the ordinary, the unquestioned, the securities of familiar behaviour, context and action while simultaneously disturbing our inner narratives used to overcome adversity, such as romance, order and strength. Its basis in realism misleads the trusting reader who finds the familiar relationships, people, places, trajectories of time and fixities of space insidiously dislodged, leaving them disorientated and unsettled. The comforts of recognisable locations – whether the streets of London, country lanes, small towns and beaches of Cornwall or the waterways of Venice – and of consistent behaviours, particularly homely, often complacent, married relationships, are all revealed as façades or dangerous delusions. ("Undermining the Everyday")

2.2. Fiction and Myth-making

Du Maurier published her first works in the 1930s, during the interwar period. This period was characterised with attempts at redefining the meaning and the borders of Englishness after the loss of a large part of land before and during the First World War. The working class was making its voice heard, and the Aristocracy was losing its privileged status. Ina Habermann remarks,

> The interwar period was a time of massive change, characterized by the trauma of the 'Great War', the crumbling of the British Empire, the Slump, by changing class and gender relations as well as by the emergence of an increasingly Americanized mass culture oriented towards consumption and entertainment and disseminated through the new media of radio and film. These changes entailed a negotiation and reconfiguration of national identity in the 1930s and 1940s. (6)

Building a national identity, as Habermann asserts, is an intricate process which also involves a process of myth-making: "To speak about Englishness is always to tell stories about collective identity, and thus in a way to engage in a process of mythmaking – a process which crucially involves the interaction between individual, communicative, collective and cultural memory" (29). In the first half of the twentieth century, in the face of the gradual decolonisation of the Empire and secularisation of the society, the English needed to resort to different sources for building myths:

> Following a nineteenth-century crisis of the Christian faith, metaphysical thinking in Britain during the early twentieth century was in a state of flux. Many people turned away from traditional faith, at the same time still in need of a metaphysical dimension to their lives. There was an interest in occultism and spiritualism, in Indian theology and philosophy, in theosophy as expounded by Madame Blavatsky, in the mysticism taught by the Russian intellectual P. D. Ouspensky, who had come to England in 1924 and was disseminating the ideas of his teacher G. I. Gurdjieff, in J. W. Dunne's serial theory of time coupled with other popular notions of science inspired by impressionist notions of Einstein's theory of Relativity, Quantum Theory and Heisenberg's Uncertainty Principle, in a new type of Christianity promoted by the Oxford Group, and, because of a growing conviction that the conscious, rational mind has its limits, in Freudian and Jungian psychology. (10)

Furthermore, some people actively created their own mythology. Among them were writers such as Katherine Mansfield, D.H. Lawrence and William Butler Yeats. Both with her gothic and historical romances, Daphne du Maurier also contributed to the reconfiguration of English national identity throughout the thirties and the forties, and participated in the process of myth-making. However, she made this contribution not from a central but from a more marginal position. One reason for such a marginal position was her French family origins, which made her half-foreigner. Another reason was because she was a woman; she was already located in the margins of the male-dominated English nation. Third, geographically, she was writing from the margins as well, from the south-west coast of Cornwall, from the borders of the country. In the process of myth-making, du Maurier turned to the pagan roots of Britain and Cornish folk tales. These were voices long suppressed by Christianity and rationalism. Against the alienation of human beings from nature in modern life, these times suggested a more direct connection between human and nature. This can be given as another reason for her turn to the Gothic. The Gothic was first fully evoked in eighteenth-century politics and aesthetics as the result of an attempt to establish more authentic and native roots for the proud rising British nation against the Roman influence. Terry Castle suggests that in the cultural and political context of the eighteenth century, "the Gothic revival in architecture and the politics, as well as the birth of A Gothic Literature, must be seen as part of a larger ideological 'myth-making' process" ("Gothic Novel" 682). Thus, it can be argued, employing the Gothic offered a connection to a more native cultural heritage and finding a more authentic way of expression.

The effect of the World War I was not only on the national identity and the idea of one's native country as home, but on the perception of the idea of home itself. James J. Gindin considers the changing perception of home as a place of security and shelter as a quality of the interwar period literature: "Both socially and psychologically, the writers of the thirties, almost universally, convey a fear of invasion" (14). The implications and representations of such a fear varied, yet one concern they shared was that home did not offer safety and security anymore:

> [T]he definition of the 'home' was threatened by invasion. In pre-1914 popular fiction, home was literal, the Englishman's castle and the repository of virtue. But the serious fiction of the thirties extended the signification of home. The fear of encirclement or invasion, as well as of the socially or politically static, led writers to want, both metaphorically and physically in so far as they were able, to keep moving. (15)

In this respect, Gindin writes that most novels of the age give accounts of travel, "gestures against the fears of both insularity and destruction that home represents. Settings are often outside Britain, or, when within Britain, far from the point of origin" (15). In du Maurier's fiction, it can be seen that a constant search for home and problems regarding the ownership of the found home emerge as recurring motifs. A tension can be found between yearning for a sense of place and choosing the life of an exile or a drifter who spends life in impersonal hotel rooms, restaurants and inns, finding comfort in the anonymity that such places offer and in the immediacy of experience that is not shaped by the memory of the past. In accordance with Gindin's account of the literature of the 1930s, it can be said that du Maurier's novels reflect the conflict between the search for a place to stay still in peace and the urge to keep moving, or, between the concepts of mobility and stability. Nevertheless, as will be discussed in the following chapters, in du Maurier's novels these concepts are destabilised, and the implications of home are questioned.

The significance of geography in the literature of the 1930s is another quality underlined by Gindin: "The fiction is full of landscapes and provinces as settings, facts and metaphors. . . Geography was an important part of literary consciousness, and its use expressed the restlessness, lack of security, curiosity, sense of imminent change, and fears of destruction that characterised the literary decade" (15). Landscapes and nature play an essential role in building subjectivity in du Maurier's fiction. Natural world is depicted to be full of psychic energy. Such a representation of nature links du Maurier perhaps more to the nineteenth century novels of Brontës, but then again, as Gindin explains, returning to earlier forms of novel is a shared characteristic of the 1930s (18). This return to the past is a result, according to Gindin, of a sense of insecurity dominant throughout the decade: "Writers were sceptical about any

contemporary coherence and needed to recall or invent stable pasts" (21). This can be seen especially in du Maurier's return to and reinvention of the Gothic.

Daphne du Maurier's binary way of thinking about man and woman, and her sense of herself in conflict with such thinking can be given as the main reason behind her employment of the Gothic because it opens up a space for discussing such problematic issues. Furthermore, the unorthodox familial relations that she had in her own life seems to have led du Maurier to explore and question the institution of family and the dynamics of family relationships throughout her fiction, leading her to insistently write about domestic space. Moreover, her reaching out for mythic and folkloric pasts led her to contribute to the contemporary efforts to reconfigure the meaning of Englishness, from the periphery, if not from the centre. All these are brought together in the centrality of space in her fiction.

2.3. Du Maurier's Cornwall

In *Enchanted Cornwall*, du Maurier writes, "Cornwall became my text" (7). The Cornish landscape is imbued with a potential that makes it appropriate for gothic imagination. Horner and Zlosnik claim that "du Maurier draws upon a cultural construct of Cornwall as historically unruly and ungovernable, far from the centres of national power: a transgressive space" (68) and see du Maurier's choice to settle in Cornwall and set a number of her novels there as

> a deliberate decision to strike into a new space that she believed she could make, imaginatively, her own. Cornwall as it appears in her novels is exactly that imaginative space in which the complex identity matrix of daughter, sister, mother, woman and writer can be explored. (66)

From this statement, it can be understood that du Maurier was in search of a new space where she could accommodate her subjectivity and use as a source of imagination. Horner and Zlosnik mainly claim that for du Maurier, Cornwall, with its history, mythology and centrifugal position, has a great potential for activating her gothic imagination, but that it has ambivalent meanings: "Cornwall offers more than just

spatial freedom for the writer; the 'Cornish' novels also display a preoccupation with the past . . . the landscape is represented as embodying the past" (67). Because of this evocation of the past in her novels, du Maurier has often been regarded as nostalgic, and her novels have been seen as romantic historical fiction. Alison Light, for example, argues that du Maurier romanticizes the past, displaying nostalgia for "a noble loftier place where it was possible to live a more expansive and exciting life" (158); therefore, she ends up categorising du Maurier as conservative. Light's analysis simplifies the intricate representation of space and time in du Maurier's work. Arguing against this, Horner and Zlosnik claim, "Du Maurier's fictional excursions into the Cornwall of the past may be seen not only as popular historical fiction but also as explorations of the complex relationship between place, time, gender and identity" (68), and this dissertation also puts forth a similar argument about du Maurier's representation of space and time. Du Maurier's depiction of and relation to Cornwall and its past are far more complicated than being romantic escapades done with a sense of nostalgia, and they point at a different kind of connection between space and time. Du Maurier integrates different temporalities and spatialities. In that, she goes against the traditional views that see time and space as separate entities.

CHAPTER 3

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

3.1. Gothic

In this part, I will provide a historical and theoretical background for the Gothic as a mode of writing and give a working definition of the Gothic and gothic space. In this respect, starting with a focus on the eighteenth-century evolution of the Gothic in political, aesthetic and literary contexts, I will move on to the twentieth and twenty first century conceptions of the term. Next, I will discuss the relationship between Enlightenment epistemology and the Gothic. In this context, I will reconsider the Gothic as a literary heterotopia in its relation to other modes of writing, consulting Michel Foucault's theorisation of the term.

Gothic is a concept that was transferred to literature and other forms of art from history, politics and architecture. Today, it is used as a cultural and aesthetic category, bringing together scholars from a range of different fields like literary criticism, cultural studies and film studies. As David Punter suggests, any study that addresses the issues of the Gothic and explores the "Gothic perspective," inevitably discusses the question what Gothic is ("Apparitions" 3). Therefore, the aim of this section is to give a working definition of the Gothic and to outline a set of characteristics which will provide a frame to analyse the novels.

Historically, the terms "Goth" and "Gothic" were used to refer to the Germanic tribes who raided Europe during the Middle Ages. These tribes played an important role in

the collapse of the Roman Empire (Punter, "Civilization" 3). Punter writes, "In the absence of early written records . . . the myths that developed around them, and the varying aesthetic and political agendas that these myths were subsequently appropriated to serve" played an important a role in the use of the term Gothic in the aesthetic and political discourses (3). In its use, the term evolved in opposite directions. Largely due to the renowned interest in classical antiquity during the Italian Renaissance, the Gothic gained negative meanings and became "a byword for savagery and destructiveness" which lingered "even as it developed new meanings" (Castle, "Gothic Novel" 679). Although the Goths had established their own aesthetic values, they were so different from those of Romans and Greeks, the values which were accepted as the standard in art, literature, architecture and philosophy, that the gothic aesthetics was found irrational, unruly and disorganised. Castle notes that the foundations of the highly rationalised architecture of Greece and Rome were based on "the . . . system of 'orders', codified by Vitruvius in his *De Architectura* in the first century BC. Balance, symmetry and a strict mathematical adherence to decorum were the defining features of the classical style" (680). In time, the word started to be used in opposition to everything that represented the ideals of the Enlightenment. This negative perception continued in English literary and cultural scene up to the eighteenth century. As Castle explains, "Humanist poets and philosophers regularly deprecated the Goths as crude barbarians who by obliterating the brilliant legacy of Greco-Roman culture had plunged Europe into centuries of moral and intellectual darkness" (679). The term was first applied to literature by Horace Walpole in the preface to the second edition of his novel *The Castle of Otranto* (1764). Walpole applied it to this work claiming that in it he blended romance and novel. By combining these two forms of writing, Walpole aimed to achieve a harmony of ancient and modern, native and foreign, as well as reason and imagination. Thus, he claimed,

> It was an attempt to blend the two kinds of romance, the ancient and the modern. In the former all was imagination and improbability: in the latter, nature is always intended to be, and sometimes has been, copied with success. Invention has not been wanting; but the great resources of fancy have been dammed up, by a strict adherence to common life. But if in the latter species Nature has cramped imagination, she did but take her revenge, having been

> totally excluded from old romances. The actions, sentiments, conversations, of the heroes and heroines of ancient days are as unnatural as the machines employed to put them in motion. (50)

Walpole's adoption of the term Gothic exemplifies the continuation of what Tom Duggett calls "cultural Gothicism" (342). The Gothic, at the time, was received differently by various critics and readers. It was, as can be found in Walpole, sometimes celebrated for saving imagination from the tyranny of reason and was seen both as a revolutionary form and the true English literary tradition as opposed to the Neo-Classical appreciation of and loyalty to Ancient Greek and Roman aesthetic principles. Occasionally, however, it was condemned for being nostalgic in its attempt to reconnect to a lost past and thus found reactionary. It was also found immoral for its content, which seemed to reflect, directly or suggestively, a preoccupation with transgressive acts like rape, murder, incest and so forth. In the nineteenth century, its focus shifted from the outside to the psychological disturbances of the interior of the psyche.

Botting claims, "In the twentieth century the Gothic is everywhere and nowhere" (*Gothic* [1st ed.] 98). Although modernism and the Gothic seem to be incompatible, being both a crisis of representation and representation of crisis, the Gothic is a mode of writing that is actually not at odds with modernism. Indeed, as shown by Catherine Spooner, the Gothic can be traced even in some of the key texts of high modernism which "invoke familiar gothic concerns in a new register" (40). However, Spooner notes, "Gothic becomes, rather than the determining feature of the texts, one tool among many employed in the service of conjuring up interior terrors. These texts contain Gothic incidents, episodes, imagery, moments, traces: Gothic, we might say, haunts them" (40). In this respect, it can be said that haunting becomes the true gothic mode of writing and existence in the twentieth and twenty-first centuries.

More recently, the most common critical tendency has been to discuss the ambivalences of the Gothic in connection with Enlightenment epistemology. Healey and Yang emphasise that the "characteristic diffuseness" and the "emphasis on the

ineffable of Gothic" is a "reaction against the eighteenth-century Enlightenment views of the world as possible to be organized and defined by reason, logic, and categorization" (3). The Gothic is understood as a literary space of resistance, working within the discourse which it works against. Valdine Clemens argues, "Early Gothic fiction revealed the one-sidedness of the Age of Reason and tended to unsettle prevailing assumptions about civilized superiority, the march of progress, and the powers of the rational mind" (4–5), so that "when Reason and Science usurped God, Gothic rushed in to fill the resulting vacuum with the daemonic" (3). In a similar vein, Kelly Hurley characterises the Gothic as "a cyclical genre that reemerges in times of cultural stress in order to negotiate anxieties for its readership by working through them in displaced (sometimes supernatural) form" (194). Thus, the Gothic can be understood as a genre that emerges as part of an attempt to close the gap opened in the discourse due to a crisis of representation.

In this dissertation, the Gothic is treated as a mode of writing which deals with what is usually conceived of as taboo in the culture and the society it is produced in. It is understood as a kind of literary discourse which communicates epistemologically and ontologically problematic issues such as death, crime, guilt and sexuality. That which is excluded from the present discourse and its insistence on refusing to remain outside, dead and forgotten, constitutes the main occupation of the Gothic. This tension between the dominant and the repressed is communicated in the Gothic as the anxiety felt against the blurred lines between a set of oppositions such as inside and outside, life and death, past and present, or self and other. In this sense, the concept of boundary, the function of which is to define, contain and protect against what is improper gains importance in the analysis of the Gothic.

3.2. Gothic Space

While it can be argued that space, beyond its value for providing background to a literary work or the writer, has seldom been treated as a serious object of study in literary criticism until recently, it is important to acknowledge that literary genre and

space are intricately related. This is what Lisa Fletcher emphasises when she states that "[i]n broad terms, geography and genre are mutually constitutive" (1). It can be added that it is possible to trace different conceptualisations of space in different literary genres. As Ian Watt demonstrates in *The Rise of the Novel*, Newton's and Locke's concepts of time and space influenced the advent of realism (12-37). Following Watt's argument, Elena Gomel notes, "The complex topography of the realistic novel is the subject of innumerable studies that map out the boundaries" between different places from private to public and from native to foreign, suggesting that space in realistic novel is Newtonian and mimetic (10). Gomel claims that realist novels

> all share absolute space, linear time, and continuous causality . . . Newtonian absolute and homogenous space implies an equally absolute linear time, whose uniform passage underpins the progressive view of history. The teleology and causality of progress is inscribed in the goal oriented plot of the psychological *bildungsroman*. (11)

Yet, she also argues that such ideas about progress can never hold entirely, for "progress is a fragile concept, challenged by sudden and catastrophic transformations of history, by wrenching cataclysms or revolutionary leaps and bounds" (11). These transformations, revolutions and catastrophes find expression in the Gothic.

The "negative aesthetics" of the Gothic, as defined by Botting (*Gothic* [2nd ed.] 1), puts it questionably in an antithetical position to Realism. In relation to the representation of space in the two genres, Gomel states, "In the Gothic, space is not Newtonian: it is twisted into claustrophobic mazes, inescapable dungeons, and haunted castles where the past collides with the present. The brooding landscapes of the Gothic express the fears, foreboding, and insights that have no voice in realism" (11). By giving voice to the repressed of Realism, gothic works "decentre the epistemological alignment between perception and topology" (11). It is possible to suggest, then, that although it relies on the same oppositions through which Realism is defined, by giving voice to the repressed side of those oppositions, the Gothic shows an anti-Newtonian and anti-Cartesian tendency, and this tendency shapes its representation of space. Thus, as shown by Gomel, the Gothic uses "a spatial vocabulary radically at odds with

mimetic space" (6). Indeed, it can be proposed that in the Gothic, space is treated in ways that open it up to the postmodern and post-structural theories of space that problematise the Newtonian and Cartesian conceptions of space.

Despite the tendency to overlook space merely as backdrop in literary studies, its importance in the interpretation of gothic novels has never been entirely neglected. It is possible to find lists of gothic settings and places in most studies that focus on this mode of writing. It is not surprising, perhaps, since Gothic was a term that belonged to architecture long before it belonged to literature. Horace Walpole was the first to establish a link between the two aesthetic fields. Walpole's interest in the medieval gothic architecture and medieval romance, along with his political search for alternative national and cultural origins were all reflected in his miniature castle at Strawberry Hill, which became a source of inspiration for *The Castle of Otranto*. Since Walpole, enclosed, labyrinthine and claustrophobic space isolated from civilisation and surrounded by inaccessible mountains, forests or moors has been associated with gothic fiction.

Most typically found in early gothic novels were old castles, convents or monasteries in ruins, located in the Catholic European countries such as Italy and Spain. After the eighteenth century, however, geographical borders of the Gothic have expanded, and what emerged as a formulaic genre has turned into a mode of writing which can be employed in any kind of fictional work and mixed with any other mode of writing. A result of this is the multiplicity and heterogeneity of space. On the one hand, the Gothic has been located in the farthest British colonies, which have been represented as dark, obscure, strange and malevolent. On the other hand, it has moved increasingly closer to the most familiar spaces of everyday life. Labyrinthine structures of big cities have long replaced the subterranean passages of the eighteenth-century Gothic. Rather than Walpole and Radcliffe's medieval castles, representation of London and the urban domestic space as gothic in the works of Robert Louis Stevenson, Charles Dickens and Oscar Wilde, and Brontës' Gothicisation of English country house have been the depictions revisited and revised in later works. Heterogeneous spaces like the urban

house, maze-like structures of the big cities with their dark, criminal back alleys, asylums, prisons and other institutionally confined places have repeatedly turned gothic. With this, the Gothic has evolved into a mode of writing which perhaps most overtly acknowledges the simultaneity and heterogeneity of space by revealing that the seemingly contradictory phenomena can coexist and form the subject's experience of space, resulting in an irreducible multiplicity that cannot be grasped by adopting the traditional conceptualisations of space. It has been shown, again and again by various writers, that the most secure places can become hostile and alienating.

Despite the variety in the representation of space in the Gothic, several attempts to formulate the topology of gothic space can be found. To give an example, Manuel Aguirre attempts to provide a cognitive map of gothic space:

> The Gothic universe is . . . one of spaces, and of doors opening (often in spite of its occupants) to other spaces . . . Gothic can be said to postulate two zones: on the one hand, the human domain of rationality and intelligible events; on the other hand, the world of the sublime, terrifying, chaotic Numinous which transcends human reason (but which need not be the supernatural). These are separated by some manner of threshold, and plots invariably involve movement from one site to the other – a movement which, most often, is presented as a transgression, a violation of boundaries. (2-3)

Although this structuralist approach to Gothic space can prove practical and useful especially in discussing the blurring of the inside/outside binaries in the Gothic, it is nevertheless simplistic in its conception of the spatial complexities and the function of liminality within the genre. Still, it can be an appropriate starting point to understand how the boundaries between any kinds of space can become permeable in the Gothic. This permeability, accompanied by what can be called an anxiety of boundaries or an anxiety of space, can be considered in two ways. On one level, it can be linked to an attempt at re-establishing a world order which is assumed to have pre-existed but disrupted through a set of transgressions and violations, and ensuring a spatial organisation the boundaries of which are well-defined. In this respect, it is possible to think of this spatial disturbance inherent in the Gothic in relation to the Enlightenment. Thus, it can be argued further that repairing what can be called a rupture opened by

the Enlightenment and modernity in the social and epistemological discourse and a yearning for more organically built social relations can be given as the undercurrents of the Gothic. Nonetheless, this is not to say that the Gothic simply suggests that a return to the past order, an earlier state of things would put everything in its place and would make the universe or the society whole again. Rather, the past is demonised as opposed to the enlightened present. In accordance with this, Ridenhour states, "A brief look at any of the established examples of the mode demonstrates the Gothic's primary narrative as the story of the ignorant, violent past being subdued and banished by modernity" (9). Hence, it can be claimed that the Gothic belongs, along with other novelistic forms, to Enlightenment epistemology.

Botting asserts that "the Enlightenment, besides producing the maxims and models of modern culture, also invented the Gothic" ("Gothic Darkly" 13). In this sense, the Gothic, in addition to giving voice to what is repressed by Enlightenment epistemology, is itself also a product of this epistemology, coming into being as a symptom or effect of the return of the repressed: "the definition of Enlightenment and reason, it seems, requires carefully constructed antitheses, the obscurity of figures of feudal darkness and barbarism providing the negative against which it can assume positive value" (Botting, *Gothic* [2nd ed.] 3). This was put into action through a form of division within language; in scientific, aesthetic and cultural discourses. One outcome of the Enlightenment can be regarded as a kind of purification of literary language in parallelism with the objective and reasoning voice of the scientific discourse. As a reaction to such purification, in poetry, Romanticism gave expression to imagination, subjectivity and emotive language. In prose fiction, this reaction took the form of the Gothic. In this way, two supposedly opposing forms of language found expression in literary discourse, leading to two different forms of expression. However, it was the so-called act of purification that produced such a division in the first place. Such a view of the Gothic can provide a clearer understanding of the genre's engagement with the repressed/unconscious/unrealistic/irrational and make it possible to indicate that the Gothic gives voice to the repressed material in the dominant discourse because it is designed to do so.

In *The Order of Things: An Archeology of the Human Sciences*, Foucault analyses the shift from Classical epistemology, which was based on a "reciprocal kinship between knowledge and language" to a new relationship established by modernity: "the nineteenth century was to dissolve that link, and to leave behind it, in confrontation, a knowledge closed in upon itself and a pure language that had become, in nature and function, enigmatic – something that has been called, since that time, *Literature*" (98). Foucault notes that language, reduced to the status of an object, was neutralised and polished in scientific usage so that "it could become the exact reflection, the perfect double, the unmisted mirror of a non-verbal knowledge," and thus transparent to thought (323). It can be added that literature also followed the same route, and mimesis became the dominant form of representation. However, in compensation for the reduction of language, a different kind of literature, which was reconstituted "in an independent form, difficult of access, folded back upon the enigma of its own origin and existing wholly in reference to the pure act of writing" appeared (Foucault 327). Another significant compensation, Foucault argues, was the "critical elevation" of language as something closer "both to an act of knowing, pure of all words, and to the unconscious element in our discourse" (326). A double process was at work in this reconstitution of language:

> It had to be either made transparent to the forms of knowledge, or thrust down into the contents of the unconscious. This certainly explains the nineteenth century's double advance, on the one hand, towards formalism in thought and on the other towards the discovery of the unconscious – towards Russell and Freud. (326)

In this manner, a two-partite model of language which served to communicate two different kinds of knowledge came into being. Furthermore, discussing the discursive shift that transformed notions of language and literature in the eighteenth century, Foucault says that this new form of literature, which he exemplifies with the work of Sade and novels of terror, "only speaks as a supplement starting from a displacement" and, shedding "all ontological weight," leads language to reproduce itself in the "virtual space . . . of the mirror," (*Language* 65–6). In other words, the language as it was used in this new form of literature was self-referential, as opposed to the more

mimetic forms of aesthetics. In the light of this reconfiguration of language through division for the sake of so-called purification, gothic fiction can be seen as a kind of other space in literature[4], which can be understood as what Foucault calls a "heterotopia":

> There are . . . probably in every culture, in every civilization, real places – places that do exist and that are formed in the very founding of society—which are something like counter-sites, a kind of effectively enacted utopia in which the real sites, all the other real sites that can be found within the culture, are simultaneously represented, contested, and inverted. Places of this kind are outside of all places, even though it may be possible to indicate their location in reality. Because these places are absolutely different from all the sites that they reflect and speak about, I shall call them, by way of contrast to utopias, heterotopias. ("Other Spaces" 24)

Heterotopias work on certain principles. The first principle is that every culture has them. They can take different forms, but there are basically two categories: crisis heterotopias and heterotopias of deviation. Crisis heterotopias are "privileged or sacred or forbidden places, reserved for individuals who are, in relation to society and the human environment in which they live, in a state of crisis" (24). Foucault claims that in modern societies, crisis heterotopias have largely left their places to heterotopias of deviation. Heterotopias of deviation are places "in which individuals whose behaviour is deviant in relation to the required mean or norm are placed" (25). Examples of such places are retirement homes and psychiatric hospitals, along with prisons. The Gothic can be understood both as a crisis heterotopia and a heterotopia of deviation. As expressed in its definition, the gothic mode of writing communicates the repressed material in the dominant discourse. Hence, very often, it is symptomatic of a crisis of representation. At the same time, gothic fiction itself can be viewed as a representation

[4] The idea of the Gothic as a heterotopia is introduced by Fred Botting, who sees the Gothic as the "heterotopic mirror" of realism and uses it as a concept to explore how the Gothic constitutes a negative aesthetics, claiming that "the wild landscapes, the ruined castles and abbeys, the dark, dank labyrinths, the marvelous, supernatural events, distant times and customs are not only excluded from the Augustan social world but introduce the passions, desires, and excitements it suppressed" ("In Gothic Darkly" 19). In that, the gothic heterotopic mirror, as opposed to mimetic literature, inverts and distorts reality. Here, I have attempted to extend the parallelisms between the Gothic and heterotopias to explore and problematise the Gothic's antithetical relation to the mimetic literary genres.

of crisis. Furthermore, gothic fiction is engaged with deviation: it gives voice to all kinds of deviation from social, cultural, psychological or moral norms. It can be argued that the deviations the Gothic communicates reveal the ruptures in the dominant discourse. This makes the genre a literary heterotopia where these crises can be dealt with.

The second principle is related with the social fluidity of heterotopias: "a society, as its history unfolds, can make an existing heterotopia function in a very different fashion" (Foucault, "Other Spaces" 25). As the structure of a society changes, so does the meaning and function of a heterotopia. A parallelism can also be drawn between this principle of heterotopia and the Gothic. With the transformations that take place in a given society, the meaning and function of the Gothic may change, like those of heterotopia. Moreover, like heterotopia, the Gothic is culturally specific and historically contextual. Its subject material and the anxieties it voices change in accordance with the shifts in the dominant cultural, ideological and philosophical discourses.

The third and the fourth principles underline the multiplicity of heterotopias both spatially and temporally: "The heterotopia is capable of juxtaposing in a single place several spaces, several sites that are in themselves incomplete" (Foucault 25). The fourth principle points out the potential of heterotopias to contain in themselves the fragments of different times: "Heterotopias are most often linked to slices in time – which is to say that they open onto what might be termed . . . heterochronies. The heterotopia begins to function at full capacity when men arrive at a sort of absolute break with their traditional time" (26). There are also "heterotopias of indefinitely accumulating time" (26). Two examples of such heterotopias are museums and libraries. Contrary to these heterotopias, there are "those linked . . . to time in its most flowing, transitory, precarious aspect . . . These heterotopias are not oriented toward the eternal, they are rather absolutely temporal" (26). The quality of heterotopia to include slices of time or accumulate different times within itself is also inherent in the Gothic. As will be discussed later, gothic space is one in which here and there, as well

as now and then juxtapose in very unsettling ways, and it can house multi-temporalities, which hints at a radical divergence from linear temporality and history as progress.

The fifth principle regards the accessibility of heterotopias. According to Foucault, heterotopias "always presuppose a system of opening and closing that both isolates them and makes them penetrable," which makes them "not freely accessible like a public place" (26):

> Either the entry is compulsory, or else the individual has to submit to rites and purifications. To get in one must have a certain permission and make certain gestures ... There are others, on the contrary, that seem to be pure and simple openings, but that generally hide curious exclusions. Everyone can enter into the heterotopic sites, but in fact that is only an illusion—we think we enter where we are, by the very fact that we enter, excluded. (26)

This principle can be reconsidered in relation to the formulaic structure and accessibility of the gothic narrative, which makes gothic novels easily recognisable. As in other speculative modes of writing, to get into the gothic narrative the reader must be familiar with common gothic tropes. However, more often than not, the easily noticeable gothic monstrosities, the elements of the Gothic which have been ridiculed and parodied, are the surface stage props under which lie deeper anxieties and alienations. These anxieties and alienations, as can be seen in the context of du Maurier's Gothic, resist the easy explanations and closures that are very often found in gothic novels. What is more, the recurrent gothic tropes are in fact very fluid and dynamic in terms of meaning and function in that each time they make appearance in a certain text, the reader must revise what s/he knows about them. More importantly, this principle of heterotopia can be thought with respect to the representation of space in the Gothic. This principle ascertains that the existence of heterotopias helps to move beyond the Secondspace perspective with its emphasis on their social dimension. With the last principle, this emphasis becomes clearer. The last principle relates heterotopias to the outside. Foucault states that heterotopias have a function which signifies two extreme poles:

> Either their role is to create a space of illusion that exposes every real space, all the sites inside of which human life is partitioned, as still more illusory … Or else, their role is to create a space that is other, another real space, as perfect, as meticulous, as well arranged as ours is messy, ill constructed, and jumbled. This latter type would be the heterotopia, not of illusion, but of compensation. (27)

By looking at the principles of heterotopias, it can be suggested that gothic novels are literary heterotopias, products of complex social and ideological relations. Most gothic novels include their utopian double within themselves. A glimpse of the ideal, showing how things must be, or, how they could have been, is given within the novel. This ideal does not have to be a utopia; it can be the ordinary everyday world that is supposedly marked with the absence of the uncanny, strangeness and otherness. As such, in du Maurier's Gothic, the proper is portrayed as the ordinary everyday life, from which the characters are isolated due to their interaction with the gothic space.

It is possible to claim that the Gothic has helped to define and contain the taboo concepts that it is said to give voice to. By giving way to transgression, it helps set the very boundaries that it is assumed to be questioning. Therefore, the Gothic can be called the dark double of the novel proper exactly because its function is to identify, contain the improper and make sure that it is warded off. In its play of setting and violating boundaries, it identifies what is excluded. By giving voice to the repressed material in the discourse, the Gothic contributes to the establishment of the standards for what is to be repressed. In this respect, as Botting suggests, it gives shape and content to the "darkened spaces" of the dominant discourse, producing rather than exploring knowledge, and making sure that the margins of the society are well-defined ("Gothic Production" 26). In other words, the Gothic produces knowledge by working through a different kind of epistemology, one that has been created by the Enlightenment epistemology's division of itself, and thus serves to cover the rupture caused by this division. In that sense, gothic space is a heterotopic space which allows deviation and crises to be dealt with, but it also keeps them within a safe space. It mimics this exclusion/inclusion, safe/threatening, good/evil binary logic by producing

seemingly polarised interior and exterior spaces and letting them interact through a process of border defining and violating.

In this dissertation, Gothic space is understood to be constructed topologically, as a network of intricate relations which may be social, cultural and/or political. This kind of space is unmappable and un-measurable in its quantity and quality. The boundary between the 'internal' space of the subject and that of the 'external' world is rendered permeable as the unconscious of the subject is dispersed in the space, which makes it very difficult to determine the boundaries between psychic and social space. All of these give a quality of fluidity to space, which sometimes leads it to be associated with monstrosity and/or abjection. This space is ex-centric; it demolishes the distance between the subject and the object, and does not depend on the inside/outside dichotomy. In this account, while gothic space can be seen in part as the psychical extension of the subject, it does problematise an understanding of subjectivity as interiority, as an agency of knowledge that can give meaning to the outside world by making sense of it from a certain perspective. Instead, the creation of a simultaneity of conscious and unconscious, psychic and social, past and present elements can be found in gothic spatiality. Such simultaneity makes it possible to suggest that the uncanny does not emerge from the return of what was repressed long ago. Instead, both repression and resistance, or the return of the repressed on which the gothic plot is based, can be understood as activities that are constantly repeated and happen simultaneously in the search for a stabilised meaning through binary oppositions. By giving voice to the repressed, the Gothic makes the boundaries between those oppositions permeable and destabilises the representation process.

3.3. Theories of Space

In this part, I will discuss the theories of space that problematize the two-partite understanding of space, and focus on the spatial theories that view space as a complex phenomenon that is simultaneously constructed through physical, imagined and social dimensions of experience. This shift in the understanding and theorisation of space

also signifies a turn from the topographical to the topological view of space. In Enlightenment epistemology, space is understood as an object that can be measured in size and shape, and categorised through mappable boundaries. This has indeed become the main task of topography. The theories of space that are explored in this section, however, see space as relational and dynamic, and show a tendency to understand spatiality as is conceived of by topology. As discussed in the previous part, in the Gothic, there is a non-Cartesian tendency. This tendency is reflected in the construction and representation of space. Thus, parallelisms can be found between gothic space and the concerns of spatial theories discussed in this section. In this respect, this theoretical framework is selective. Through such parallelisms, a theoretical framework will be built to discuss the gothic space in du Maurier's novels.

3.3.1. Space as a Social Construct

One of the key concepts which form the theoretical ground of this study is social space. In this section, I will trace the theoretical arguments and discussions that have led to the conceptualisation of space as a social construct in relation to the work of Henri Lefebvre, who introduced the concept of social space, Edward Soja and Doreen Massey. I will begin by explaining the traditional views of space and continue by exploring how they have been challenged by various geographers and thinkers who contributed to the conceptualisation of space as a social construct.

When the history of space is overviewed, it is possible to find two trajectories of thought that have dominated the traditional conceptualisation of space. One is a tendency to see space as a void, lacking any inherent meaning or significance. This understanding of space has been prevalent in positive sciences, and it can be seen as a direct outcome of Enlightenment epistemology. On the other hand, in the philosophies of Plato, Leibniz and Kant, it is possible to find an understanding of space as a pure abstraction. This two-partite model of space, remained, for a long time, uncontested.

In the second part of the twentieth century, however, owing to the Spatial Turn[5] in the West, the theorisation of space as produced and regulated by social, power and gender relations has been the prevalent approach.

One thinker influential in the conceptualisation of space as a more fluid, mobile and social phenomenon is Henri Lefebvre. In *The Production of Space* (1974), Lefebvre dismisses the traditional idea of space as "a pre-existing void, endowed with formal properties alone ... a container waiting to be filled by a content –i.e. matter, or bodies" (170). He also diverges from phenomenology and structuralism, which display a tendency to view space as a singularity mainly through the categories of space and place, while focusing on either the objective space or the subjective place. In his three-partite theory of space, he tries to move beyond space/place duality (Wegner 182).

Edward Soja, with a similar mindset to Lefebvre's, develops Lefebvre's critique of the traditional conception of space and asserts, "Spatiality cannot be completely separated from physical and psychological spaces" (*Postmodern Geographies* 120). Soja claims that western epistemology has misplaced spatiality, in what he, following Lefebvre, refers to as the illusions of either opaqueness or transparency. This has caused a marked division between two different understandings of spatiality. In this division, while the first view cannot see beyond the physical surface of space, the second sees far through the materiality of space by giving it meaning only as an ideational abstraction. According to Soja, both views fail in capturing the socially constructed nature of space (122-3). The first view is based on an understanding of space as a void to be filled. Therefore, it "focuses on the immediate surface appearance without being able to see them. Spatiality is accordingly interpreted and theorized only as a collection of things, as substantive appearances which may ultimately be linked to social causation but are unknowable as things-in-themselves" (122). Thus, space becomes an

[5] Soja defines the spatial turn "as a response to a long-standing if often unperceived ontological and epistemological bias in all the human sciences, including such spatial disciplines as geography and architecture," and notes, "Reflecting the uneven development of historical versus spatial discourse, the Spatial Turn is fundamentally an attempt to develop a more creative and critically effective balancing of the spatial/geographical and the temporal/historical imaginations" ("Taking Space Personally" 12).

opaque surface. Soja claims that the evolution of this conception of space can be traced in the philosophies of Hume and Locke, Cartesian mathematical-geometric abstractions, and post-Newtonian social physics or post-Darwinian socio-biology (122). It can also be found in the French philosophical and scientific tradition. Especially Henri Bergson's philosophy of time led space to be conceptualised as its secondary, inferior opposite. For Bergson, time as the realm of duration was "the carrier of creativity, spirit, meaning, feeling, the 'true reality' of our world and our consciousness," in contrast to space which, as the categorising intellect, was understood as "orienting the mind to quantity (versus quality), measurement (versus meaning)" (Soja 123). Space was thus seen as a kind of obstacle before the fluidity of time, "[p]ulverizing the fluid flow of duration into meaningless pieces" (123).

The Bergsonian view deprives space of any meaning, and creates a clear-cut division between space and time, which is, according to Soja, related with other dichotomies of "science versus philosophy, form versus life, a vindictive dichotomization that would influence Lukács and so many other historicizers throughout the twentieth century" (123). Hence, according to Soja, "spatiality is reduced to physical objects and forms, and naturalized back to a first nature" so as to become subject to "prevailing scientific explanation in the form of orderly, reproducible description and the discovery of empirical regularities" (123). Although this approach provides accuracy for geographical information, it is insufficient, Soja claims, "when geographical appearances are asserted as the source of an epistemology of spatiality" (123). Theories of space based on this view mask social conflict and social agency,

> reducing them to little more than the aggregate expression of individual preferences which are typically assumed to be (naturally? organically?) given. Lost from view are the deeper social origins of spatiality, its problematic production and reproduction, its contextualization of politics, power, and ideology. (124)

The second misplacement of spatiality results in an illusion of transparency: "Whereas the empiricist myopia cannot see the social production of space behind the opacity of objective appearances," for Soja, "a hypermetropic illusion of transparency sees right

through the concrete spatiality of social life by projecting its production into an intuitive realm of purposeful idealism and immaterialized reflexive thought" (124). Soja calls such a view of space "blurred" because it tries to place the meaning of space far beyond its materiality:

> Spatiality is reduced to a mental construct alone, a way of thinking … in which the image of reality takes epistemological precedence over the tangible substance and appearance of the real world. Social space folds into mental space, into diaphanous concepts of spatiality which all too often take us away from materialized social realities. (125)

Hence, the complexity of spatiality is again reduced to the objective/subjective distinction. The philosophical origins of such conceptualisation of space lie in the Platonic duality, and later found in Leibniz's assertion of the relativism of physical space, its existence as an idea rather than a thing. According to Soja, its greatest source is Kant, who gave ontological place to geography and spatial analysis in his philosophy. Soja calls this the "Kantian legacy of transcendental spatial idealism" (125), which dominated geographical analysis of space: "The vision of human geography that it induces is one which the organization of space is projected from mental phenomena, either intuitively given, or relativized into many different ways of thinking" (125). Thus, it relies upon an "illusive subjectivity," which leads us to ignore the heterogeneity of space:

> These ideas about space are then typically allocated to categorical structures of cognition such as human nature or culture at its most general, or biographical experience at its most specific or alternatively to 'science', to the Hegelian 'spirit', to the structuralist Marxist 'ideological-cultural domain', to an almost infinite variety of possible ideational compartments and sources of consciousness in-between. (Soja 127)

For Soja, both views are reductionist in their own ways, and in many ways, they reinforce and reproduce the dichotomies inherent in western thought. In literature, these two trajectories of thought can be observed in the mimetic representation of space on the one hand and in the use of space as a metaphor on the other.

Lefebvre conceptualises social space as a third term that complicates the perceived/conceived and concrete/abstract dichotomies which are, as discussed above, prevalent in the traditional views of space. Rather than simply accepting various spatialities as separate realms of experience, his spatial theory attempts to both comprehend and bridge such a divide: "(Social) space," Lefebvre maintains, is "not a thing among other things, nor a product among other products: rather, it subsumes things produced, and encompasses their interrelationships in their coexistence and simultaneity –their (relative) order and/or (relative) disorder" (73).

Soja reformulates Lefebvre's trialectics of space into Firstspace (spaces of representations), Secondspace (representation of space) and Thirdspace (social space) epistemologies. A Thirdspace perspective foregrounds

> an epistemological and theoretical critique that revolves around disruptions and disorderings: of difference, of confidently centred identities, and of all forms of binary categorization. It seeks instead a multiplicitous 'alterity,' a transgressive 'third way' that is more than just the sum or combination of an originary dualism. (*Thirdspace* 107)

Soja proposes the concept of Thirdspace as a way of producing spatial knowledge that complicates the distinctions and categorisations on which the other two spatial epistemologies are based, through what he calls Thirding-as-Othering (5).

Like Soja and Lefebvre, Doreen Massey also argues that many of the misconceptions about space in social critical theory are based on the assumption that "space is opposed to time and lacking in temporality" (*For Space* 38). Such an assumption leads to the conceptualisation of space as "the realm of closure," which "in turn would render it the realm of the impossibility of the new and therefore of the political" (38). Even when space is prioritised against time as in structuralist theories, as long as its definition is based on this assumption, it is impossible to form a theory of space that allows for change, mobility and openness (38-9). Therefore, Massey claims that space is seen as "a residual category whose definition is derived without much serious thought" (47). She attempts to change this by suggesting

> the interconnectedness of conceptualisations of space and conceptualisations of time. Imagining one in a particular way should, at least 'logically', imply a particular way of thinking about the other. This is not to argue that they are the same, in some easy four-dimensionality. It is to argue that they are integral to each other, which is quite a different proposition. (47)

Massey's proposition, the integrity of space and time, is crucial in understanding the postmodern and post-structuralist spatial theories, and the ways temporality and spatiality are intermingled in the Gothic. Focusing on the implications of Enlightenment conception of space, she claims that "the way we imagine space has effects ... Conceiving of space as something to be crossed and may be conquered, has particular ramifications" (1). According to Massey, this conception causes space to be reduced to surface or a phenomenon that is external to but surrounds people: "Implicitly, it equates space with the land and sea, with the earth which stretches out around us. It also makes space seem like a surface; continuous and given" (1). This conception is not limited to space in its effects as it also shapes the way we conceive people and social relations: "It differentiates . . . so easily this way of imagining space can lead us to conceive of other places, peoples, cultures simply as phenomena 'on' this surface" (1). Against such a conceptualisation of spatiality, Massey argues that space must be understood "not as smooth surface but as the sphere of coexistence of a multiplicity of trajectories" (63).

The insights of these geographers and thinkers have important implications for a study of space in literature. For one thing, as in the lived experience of space, in literary works, it is not always possible to distinguish between the mimetic and metaphorical, as well as the representations of physical, social and psychic space. Furthermore, the literary representation of space, as well as the way space is experienced in life, may not be reducible to these categories. In gothic fiction, representations of spatiality are seemingly organised around certain spatial dichotomies, yet these dichotomies are repeatedly overturned, and the boundaries between them are blurred, creating liminality on different levels.

3.3.2. Spatial Dichotomies of the Gothic

One fundamental aspect of the Gothic both as an aesthetic category and as a mode of writing is that meaning is produced through a variety of binary oppositions and a play of blurring and redefining the borders between them. This is also reflected in the construction of gothic space. Therefore, in this part, I will go over these dichotomies in the Gothic and the theories of space that concentrate on them, with the aim of building a strategy to approach spatiality in du Maurier's novels. In *Jamaica Inn*, *Rebecca* and *My Cousin Rachel*, the inside/outside dichotomy is reproduced on different levels and imprinted on different spatial entities. At the same time, the inside/outside opposition and a set of other binaries are contested in various ways. In this respect, this section focuses on the spatial theories and Gothic criticism that discuss the inside/outside category and other related spatial dichotomies.

In spatial studies, the inside/outside dichotomy arises mainly in the discussions concerning the separate categories of space and place. In humanistic geography and positive sciences, while space is viewed as the physical, natural and universal void that is out there for objective inquiry, place is used to refer to the particular, social, and local counterpart which is open to subjective interpretations. Thus, place, rather than space, is seen as the sphere/site/locus of human experience. Yi Fu Tuan emphasises this in his spatial theory in a way that links space/place opposition with the inside/outside dichotomy. He sees space as a cultural and experiential construct and concentrates on human beings' experience of two different kinds of spatiality in *Space and Place: the Perspective of Experience* (1977). Here, Tuan claims that human beings' experience of space becomes their reality of it as they construct a "network of places" in which to exist (12). Therefore, space is organised around areas of pause, which they experience as place; places become meaningful due to those moments of pause (12). As such, Tuan links space with movement and place with pause. According to Tuan, then, experience is stabilised and codified as human beings organise their surrounding space with fixed and stable places, which in turn demarcate who or what is inside and outside of the place and community through their physical form: "When

space feels thoroughly familiar to us, it has become place" (73), and familiarity gives us a sense of security. In contrast, the openness of space, while offering the experience of freedom as it is experienced through motion, can evoke isolation and helplessness due to its lack of accumulated meaning and value. Thus, Tuan sets space and place in dynamic opposition: "To be open and free is to be exposed and vulnerable. Open space has no trodden paths and signposts. It has no fixed pattern or established human meaning; it is like a blank sheet on which meaning may be imposed. Enclosed and humanized space is place" (54). The individual imposes patterns on space by constructing a network of places, and this "built environment clarifies social roles and relations" (102).

Tuan's opposition between place and open space can be helpful in thinking of the inside in relation to all socially regulated and knowable space while leading to an understanding of open space as the unknowable, ungraspable and unmappable. Open space, as evoked by Tuan, makes it possible to think about the spatial anxieties that the Gothic communicates. However, in the Gothic, familiarity and intimacy do not always provide meaning and security. As claimed earlier, underlying the divide between space and place is a tendency to reduce space to void, having nothing to do with human experience or to the position of the static counterpart of human experience as opposed to time, which is associated with the more fluid and mobile aspects of experience. Both must be avoided so as to conceptualise space and spatiality in all its dimensions and constructed-ness. Massey sees the dichotomous conceptualisations of space and place as "attempts to fix the meaning of particular spaces, to enclose them, endow them with fixed identities and to claim them for one's own" (*Space, Place and Gender* 4). Therefore, for Massey, they imply "a view of place as bounded, as in various ways a site of an authenticity, as singular, fixed and unproblematic in its identity. It is a view of place which rests in part on the view of space as stasis" (5). In accordance with this, this dissertation attempts to investigate the ways spatial organisations and geometries are repeatedly complicated in Daphne du Maurier's novels in particular and in gothic fiction in general.

Another view of space which connects the inside with familiarity, intimacy and subjectivity relates the sense of place to the idea of home. In its most basic sense, when it is inhabited, a house becomes home, and this presumably gives meaning to what previously exists merely as objective materiality. Home can gain certain associations through psychological and social processes. Gaston Bachelard, in *The Poetics of Space* (1964), looks into these processes. Bachelard does a "systematic psychological study of the sites of our intimate lives" (8). He locates this site as home and claims that home gains its protective value in the imagination of its inhabitants. According to Bachelard, inhabited space has practical value because of its ability to shelter and protect, but only in imagination it turns into a home, which is the space "of the non-I that protects the I" (5). This hints at a symbiotic relationship between home and its residents since people return to their family home in their dreams, which is described as a felicitous experience. Bachelard's is at once a psychological and phenomenal space, both lived and imagined. For him, home is charged with psychic energy. In line with this, household objects are part of the imaginative may be "awakened" and "produce a new reality of being" (68). This psychic energy, though Bachelard chooses not to focus on it, can allow a house to terrorise just as it allows it to comfort. At an instant, topophilia may turn into topophobia, that is, the fear and/or anxiety of space in a general sense. This kind of shift can be found in the Gothic, and it is possible to suggest that the transfer from one spatial experience to the other is not a fixed process, which points out a far more unstable relationship between home and its inhabitants. As Massey states, "that place called home was never an unmediated experience" (*Space, Place and Gender* 164).

Massey's critique and re-conceptualisation of space/place division in western philosophy, geography and politics offer valuable insights for building a more fluid understanding of these concepts. In a way that challenges any static definition of place, she suggests that both place and identity are results of "a particular moment in . . . networks of social relations and understandings" (5) that constructs the spatial reality. These are networks that cannot be contained or bounded, and they inevitably extend beyond the particular place identified; therefore, they link this place to the outside. In

this account, there cannot be such thing as an enclosed space. Massey asserts that "space does not exist prior to identities/ entities and their relations. More generally . . . identities/entities, the relations 'between' them, and the spatiality which is part of them, are all constitutive" (*For Space* 10). Hence, she reconfigures place in relation to her definition of space as simultaneity, and claims,

> to escape from an imagination of space as a surface is to abandon also that view of place. If space is rather a simultaneity of stories-so-far, then places are collections of those stories, articulations of wider power-geometries of space. Their character will be a product of these intersections within that wider setting, and of what is made of them. And, too, of the non-meetings-up, the disconnections and the relations not established, the exclusions. All this contributes to the specificity of place. (130)

In this regard, the binary conceptualisation of space and place, as exemplified through the work of Tuan and Bachelard, cannot address their complexity. Returning to the inside/outside dichotomy, however, it is important to remember that it works through perspective and proximity. Massey argues that "it is not simple spatial proximity but the relations of power in which that proximity is embedded are crucial" (*Space, Place and Gender* 167). In both Bachelard and Tuan, the inside is associated with familiarity, intimacy and subjectivity. It is also expected to provide stability and homogeneity in the face of an otherwise incomprehensible and heterogeneous open space. The interpretation of places "as bounded enclosed spaces defined through counterposition against the Other who is outside" (Massey 168) can be seen to be at work in the Gothic.

The outside can take different forms in the Gothic. It can signify various spatial entities and gain physical, imaginary or symbolic meanings. It can be depicted as the wild, uninhabited landscape. Healey and Yang underline that

> the power and sensory obfuscation of storms, fogs, dark forests, and night leave characters unable to orient themselves, unable to assert human power to perceive a shifting, even hostile, nature, let alone to control or define it. Further, fierce personifications of nature, such as storms, cataracts, mountains, or roaring oceans may mirror or reinforce the passion, ferocity, and obsession of

> a character, while the shadowed depths of caves, forests, or tarns may perform the same task in terms of a character's dark and hidden thoughts or past. (5-6)

Here, it is obvious that Healey and Yang approach gothic space metaphorically, but there is one important point that they make: the outside, with its openness, heterogeneity and incomprehensibility is associated with otherness, yet this otherness is not necessarily a quality of the outside in itself. As Eve Kosofsky Sedgwick puts forward, "In many instances, conditions outside the imprisoning wall simply duplicate the conditions within" (21). This points out the relational construction of gothic spaces: "the real terrors of the Unspeakable had to do, not with any special content of the thing that could not be said, but with the violence greeting any attempt to pass an originally arbitrary barrier" (22). Thus, it can be argued that what Sedgwick refers to as "the divisive power of unspeakable-ness" (19) creates spaces which are not necessarily topographically differentiated.

The inside/outside opposition makes room for another dichotomy, the one between the self and the other. Indeed, self/other dichotomy has been a recurring motif in the Gothic from the very beginning. Benjamin A. Brabon claims that gothic texts written in the late eighteenth century England "are often concerned with a questioning of the location of the Other, and its relationship to a sense of English national identity" (98). The threat of otherness is dealt in the Gothic on multiple levels like social, national, cultural or psychological.

That space is a gendered construct is an argument that is inherent to the understanding of space as a social construct. In her formulation of social space, Massey focuses on the gendered connotations of space and place and a set of dualities which accompany their definition:

> In the pair space/place it is place which represents Being, and to it are attached a range of epithets and connotations: local, specific, concrete, descriptive. Each of these carries a different burden of meaning and each relates to different oppositions. The contrary to these classically designated characteristics of place are terms such as: general, universal, theoretical/abstract/conceptual . . .

> The universal, the theoretical, the conceptual are, in current western ways of thinking, coded masculine. They are the terms of a disembodied, free-floating, generalizing science. (*Space, Place and Gender* 9)

In such a way of conceptualising space/place and considering space as the universal and general counterpart, according to Massey, a persistence of "the association between place and a culturally constructed version of 'Woman'" can be detected (10): "The first is an association between place and 'Home' and the second imbues place with inevitable characteristics of nostalgia;" consequently, "[i]n the first case place is longed for and romanticized, in the second . . . a longing for place is interpreted as a form of nostalgia and aestheticism" (10). For Massey, in the centre of this nostalgia and aestheticism, the woman is located:

> [T]he versions of place which see it as an unproblematical 'home', as a site of indulgence in nostalgia, are relying on a very different concept and it is one which is very tied in with gender. . . . Woman stands as metaphor for nature (in another characteristic dualism), for what has been lost (left behind), and that place called home is frequently personified by, and partakes of the same characteristics as those assigned to, Woman/Mother/lover. . . . This is a view of place which searches after a non-existent lost authenticity, which lends itself to reactionary politics, and which is bound up with a particular reading of something called Woman. (10-1)

In line with this, Massey protests the discourses of space which treat the issue of the Other and otherness as a new problem, only recently occurring in relation to the globalisation and mobilisation of the world:

> Much of the current disorientation . . . is put down to the arrival in one form or another of the 'Other'. Yet some 'Others' of the dominant definers in First World society have always been there -women. It is interesting to note how frequently the characterization of place as home comes from those who have left, and it would be fascinating to explore how often this characterization is framed around those who - perforce - stayed behind; and how often the former was male, setting out to discover and change the world, and the latter female, most particularly a mother, assigned the role of personifying a place which did not change. (166-7)

The association that Massey makes with woman and the idea of an unchanging home brings forth an appreciation of the homely space as a restorative, anchoring, protective and insulating shell, which clearly offers a significant connection between home and the maternal body. Bachelard's view of home as a womb, a place recalled in dreams, "giving access to the initial shell which shelters the being" (7) exemplifies the close association, the overlapping of the idea of home -the house as dwelling- with the maternal body. Indeed, as Elizabeth Grosz points out, "The very concept of dwelling is irresolvably bound up with the first dwelling, itself a space enclosed within another space, and its materials—wood, metal, concrete, glass—are residues or aftereffects of the placental and bodily membranes" (164). The early symbiosis between the mother and the infant is referred to as primary narcissism in psychoanalysis, and it is a state of bliss, from which the child must depart in order to become a subject in language and to be represented in the symbolic. Kristeva notes, ''For man and for woman the loss of the mother is a biological and psychic necessity, the first step on the way to becoming autonomous. Matricide is our vital necessity, the *sine qua non* of our individuation'' (*Black Sun* 27-8). It is possible to argue that the cultural constitution of home is a way to compensate for leaving the maternal space behind and entering the symbolic register. Home, or homely, understood this way, is constituted through a compensatory identification. In this respect, it is not surprising that Freud evokes the body of the mother and the womb in the phantasies of live-burial while developing the concept of the uncanny (244). This notion can also be found in Kristeva's concept of abjection. Kristeva writes, "Fear of the archaic mother turns out to be essentially fear of her generative power. It is this power, a dreaded one, that patrilineal filiation has the burden of subduing" (*Powers of Horror* 77). The maternal space of the primordial relationship between the mother and the child is a psychic, pre-cultural, and non-linguistic space characterised by intra-subjectivity. Thus, it can be claimed that within the constitution of the domestic space there are psychic residues of this repressed maternal body and the maternal space that appear in estranged forms. It is possible to find this maternal space in the Gothic as a residual category.

In this account, the construction of spatiality based on inside/outside and self/other dichotomies is closely related to the discussions of gender as can be found in the arguments of both feminist geographers and literary critics of the Gothic. Taking into consideration the constitution of gothic space through a repetitive play of repression and the return of the repressed, it is possible to argue that domestic Gothic offers a look at what is underneath the ideas of home and woman as existing in a frozen state and destabilises these concepts. In Gothic criticism, one such reading of the Gothic is Sandra Gilbert and Susan Gubar's *Mad Woman in the Attic* (1979). Gilbert and Gubar criticise Bachelard's views on topophilia, claiming that it ironically involves a gendering process while overlooking other key intersections between gender and space:

> What is significant from our point of view . . . is the extraordinary discrepancy between the almost consistently 'felicitous space' he discusses and the negative space we have found. Clearly, for Bachelard the protective asylum of the house is closely associated with its maternal features, and to this extent he is following the work done on dream symbolism by Freud and on female inner space by Erikson. It seems clear too, however, that such symbolism must inevitably have very different implications for male critics and for female authors. (87-8)

The house, bearing maternal qualities, is close enough to provide intimacy and security for the male subject, but it is also different enough not to threaten its boundaries and to be forgotten through repression. In other words, as discussed earlier, from Gilbert and Gubar's perspective, too, home signifies the maternal body without reminding one of the mother's body. This economy, which depends on the repression of the woman, works unproblematically only for the male subject who can organise his psychic and social space accordingly while for the female subject, no relief from the physical or symbolical boundaries of the house is possible.

Following this train of thought, in Gothic criticism, Kate Ferguson Ellis in *The Contested Castle* (1989), Eugenia DeLamotte in *Perils of the Night* (1990), and Maggie Kilgour in *Rise of the Gothic Novel* (1995) have invariably argued that gothic space is identified with the symbolic representation of patriarchal power and mirrors

the subjugation women faced in their daily lives. Paul Morrison uses the term "domestic carceral" to describe these gothic spaces' uncanny resemblance to ''a fully recognizable picture of eighteenth-century domestic life" (6). Such criticism helps reveal the social construction of space, be it the most intimate spaces of the individual or the institutional public spaces. Having analysed over fifty texts written by women in the 1790s, William Stafford reaches the conclusion that ''castles are standard places where women are imprisoned, and 'gothic' is almost invariably a pejorative term'' (310). This discursive strain that views the Gothic as an exposé of the violence of patriarchy has become the standard interpretation of especially female gothic. Critics who are discussed here are convinced that the enclosed spaces of patriarchy are only safe for the male subject. For the female subject, it is linked with imprisonment, entrapment and subordination. Similarly, the male-centred conceptualisation of space inherent in the earlier theories is criticised, and the ways such a conceptualisation is naturalised is shown in the work of many feminist critics like Doreen Massey, Beatriz Colomina, Kathleen Kirby, and Elizabeth Grosz. The subjectivity and intimacy of home assumed in Bachelard's topophilia and in Yi Fu Tuan's enclosed space reflect a male-centred perspective, or at their best, work by fixing the meaning of both space and place.

Nancy J. M. Hartsock focuses on the different relations male and female children have with space while growing up and relates it to patriarchal family: "the boy's love for the mother is an extension of mother-infant unity and thus essentially threatening to his ego and independence. Male ego-formation necessarily requires repressing this first relation and negating the mother" whereas "girls, because of female parenting, are less differentiated from others than boys, more continuous with and related to the external object world" (295). This leads Hartsock to conclude,

> Women and men . . . grow up with personalities affected by different boundary experiences, differently constructed and experienced inner and outer worlds, and preoccupations with different relational issues. This early experience forms an important ground for the female sense of self as connected to the world and the male sense of self as separate, distinct and even disconnected . . . Masculinity is idealized by boys whereas femininity is concrete for girls. (295)

This has also been emphasised by Kathleen Kirby with a reference to the fact that the boundaries between women's psychic space and social space are defined and blurred in ways which are a lot more intricate than men's:

> Men can separate themselves from their environments, live in a space that somebody else creates and maintains, 'tune out', see in the space only what it pleases them to look at. Women, the working class, and people of the Third World create the environment *for* Western men, so they are able to expel it from their consciousness. A woman's consciousness is more immersed in her surroundings, which she—more than a man—is likely to be monitoring for danger or for dust. (53)

This difference calls for an approach to space distinct from topography since not all spatial experience and meaning are produced between a subject and objects in space and through a subject's navigation among these objects.

In the light of these discussions regarding home, space and gender, it is possible to maintain that the inside as home is constructed through a process determined directly and indirectly by social relations and cultural codes, and it plays a formative role in the constitution of those relations and codes in return. In relation to this, the private/public dichotomy, which plays a great role in the constitution of the meaning of home, has been questioned by feminist and postmodern theorists of space, and critiqued for being a division that works in ways that (re)produces patriarchal discourse.

It is within this frame of mind that Mark Wigley explores the constitution of home in the architectural history and claims that the historical emergence and evolution of the house is linked with the gradual division of everyday life and practices into public and private spheres. For Wigley, the historical reconfigurations of sexuality, privacy and body are closely related to the evolution of the house. He traces the construction of the house in ancient Greek and Renaissance theories of architecture and argues that building a house is an ideological practice which produces and reproduces the patriarchal order: "Marriage is the reason for building a house. The house appears to

make a space for the institution. But marriage is already spatial. It cannot be thought outside the house that is its condition of possibility before its space" (356). In other words, the institution of marriage is only possible with a space which can make its implementation and continuation possible. The purpose of this institution is first and foremost the protection of the patriarchal line. The house makes this protection possible:

> While the house protects the children from the elements, its primary role is to protect the father's genealogical claims by isolating women from other men. Reproduction is understood as reproduction of the father. The law of the house is undoubtedly no more than the law of the father. The physical house is the possibility of the patriarchal order that appears to be applied to it. (336)

Moreover, Wigley connects the conception of the house as a fixed and stable spatial entity with a desire to immobilise the woman, whose body and social status are seen as essentially mobile. This immobilisation can in turn stabilise the status of the man:

> In fact, it is the man that is immobile, fixed to the house –in the sense of both family and building. The woman is mobile. Her 'natural' immobility in the interior is enforced in the face of her mobility between houses. The apparent mobility of the man is produced by the confinement of the woman, who is . . . at once necessary to the maintenance of the house and the greatest threat to it. (337)

The physical confinement of the woman to the interior, which is necessary to ensure man's stability and continuity, can function at a social level only through the woman's identification with the private space, and as the wife, through her association with the nurturing and sheltering qualities of the house, which will lead her to be identified as the mother, and result in the immobilisation of her primarily mobile and fluid social status. Also, this social and ideological process is naturalised in the dominant discourses of space and architecture, and internalised as such by women as part of the subject formation process. Massey, similarly, sees a connection between the spatial control and the construction of gender and identity:

> From the symbolic meaning of spaces/places and the clearly gendered messages which they transmit, to straightforward exclusion by violence, spaces and places are not themselves gendered but, in their being so, they both reflect and affect the ways in which gender is constructed and understood. The limitation of women's mobility, in terms of both identity and space, has been in some cultural contexts a crucial means of subordination. Moreover the two things –the limitation on mobility in space, the attempted consignment/ confinement to particular places on the one hand, and the limitation on identity on the other –have been crucially related. (*Space, Place and Gender* 179)

Thus, women's mobility is seen as a threat to patriarchy, and their leaving "the spatial confines of the home is in itself a threat" (179). Massey explains this with reference to the cultural moments when women had to leave home to work for the first time: their mobility was perceived as "a threat in two ways: that it might subvert the willingness of women to perform their domestic roles and that it gave them entry into another, public, world – 'a life not defined by family and husband'" (198). It is clear that Massey views the private/public division as one that reinforces the patriarchal discourse and female subordination. In a similar vein, Laura Mulvey focuses on the making of woman as wife and mother through marriage with an emphasis on class, and claims,

> [T]he private sphere, the domestic, is an essential adjunct to bourgeois marriage and is thus associated with woman, not simply as female, but as wife and mother. It is the mother who guarantees the privacy of the home by maintaining its respectability, as essential a defence against outside incursion or curiosity as the encompassing walls of the home itself. (69)

Mulvey's account of the construction of home as private space can be found in the work of various feminist thinkers, critics and geographers, and it is not limited to the bourgeois concept of home. For many of these thinkers, the privacy of home closets women and their oppression by erasing them and their influence, along with their chances in life, from the public and by making it a space that gives its male inhabitants relative relief from the effect and interruption of the society and law. Such relief is denied to women, whose subjection to violence and isolation from the public increase in private space. In addition, it is possible to claim that this violent economy of private/public division has a psychic dimension. In their being hidden away in the

privacy of the house, their identity being reduced to its function, women are also rendered uncanny, whether they gain physical/social/sexual mobility and transgress the borders of the domestic space or not. Transgressing the confines of the domestic space means the transgression of the boundaries of patriarchy; therefore, it can be said that the idea of woman as uncanny works in a way that protects these borders. Woman's uncanniness is naturalised by reference to her anatomy: the fluidity of her bodily boundaries is often given as proof for both her monstrosity and transgressive nature. It is also possible to argue, then, confining and defining women, home as the domestic/private space works in a way that (re)produces the uncanny repressed femininity. Uncanny is, as Freud puts it, almost always experienced in private space, so there must be a kind of parallelism and/or connection between the experience of the uncanny and female experience. In this way, "[t]he virtuous woman becomes woman-plus-house or, rather, woman-as-housed, such that her virtue cannot be separated from the physical space" (Wigley 337). The confinement of the woman to the inside and her identification with the interior is a spatial process, yet it is not simply physical. It also occurs through a spatial classification that becomes part of the female psyche:

> Boundaries are only established by the intersection between a walled space and a system of surveillance which monitors all the openings in the walls. . . . But this surveillance is not simply carried out by the eye, and the spaces it controls are not simply physical. The capacity of the house to resist the displacing effects of sexuality is embedded within a number of systems of control - mythological, juridical codes, forms of address, dress codes, writing styles, superstitions, manners, etc.- each of which takes the form of surveillance over a particular space, whether it be the dinner table, the threshold, the church, the fingertips, the bath, the face, the street. These apparently physical spaces requiring supplementary control in turn participate in a broader ideological field. . . There is a 'natural' relationship between the system of classification, the spaces, and that which is being classified. The wife learns her 'natural' place by learning the place of things. She is 'domesticated' by internalizing the very spatial order that confines her. (Wigley 338-40)

In the Gothic, it is this kind of spatial order that the woman is threatened by and threatens to disrupt, at the same time. A certain female agency is produced: one that not only suffers from some form of confinement and a violation of domestic

boundaries, but at the same time threatens to dissolve the boundaries upon which the stability of the dominant discourse depends.

Hock Soon Ng notes, "Throughout its tradition, the Gothic has consistently recognized a quality invested in domestic space that has the power to unnerve, fragment, and even destroy its inhabitant unless something is done to arrest it and restore order and normalcy back to the house" (1). The disruption of normalcy can actually be given as the main preoccupation of the Gothic as a mode of writing. Indeed, Royle suggests that "the Gothic deals with, if nothing else, the disruption of the ordinary, a violation of the natural, a failure to conduct an ordinary and/or normal life" (*Uncanny* 23). Similarly, anxiety over the stability of identity, Eugenia DeLamotte argues, is one of the main issues that the gothic narrative gives voice to. "In the world of Gothic romance," she writes, "the physical and metaphorical boundaries that one ordinarily depends on prove unstable, elusive, ineffective, nonexistent" (22). The sense of fear, suspense and peculiar unease with which the Gothic is usually identified derives chiefly from the ambivalence it set between the necessity and fragility of borders. In this account, what is at play in gothic fiction is a disruption of the mechanisms of spatial exclusion, inclusion and also classification, which function to construct the meaning of a given space. This disruption, even momentarily, gives way to the possibility of questioning those mechanisms and exposes the ways that such meaning is discursively constructed.

In the context of Daphne du Maurier, boundaries and the gendered identifications of inside and outside matter because as a woman, du Maurier writes from the position of the other who is located on the margins of the dominant discourse. Her female characters enter the houses as strangers to the inner social dynamics and also as intruders who, in different ways, disrupt the existing order. Again, in different and contradictory ways, they are both entrapped inside and excluded from the very space that facilitates their entrapment, which is made even more complicated through a set of complex social and spatial mechanisms.

3.3.3. The Space of the Individual

A discussion of the production of space in any context is not complete as long as it does not address the unconscious for most of spatial experience takes place on the level of the unconscious. The dichotomies of the Gothic discussed here work through a view of the subject as interiority but also constantly undermine this view. A study of such undermining of subjectivity as interiority makes it necessary to clarify another key concept that this dissertation uses, namely, psychic space, which can be defined as the space that contains and interacts with the conscious and unconscious of the individual subject. This space is intermingled with social space, and in the Gothic, the boundary between the two is rendered permeable. Hence, locating psychic space is important in order to understand gothic space. In this account, this part first explores the concept of psychic space from a topological perspective in relation to the psychoanalytic theories of Freud and Lacan along with the spatial experience of the individual as represented in phenomenology and phenomenal psychology. Later, this concept will be further developed from a Thirdspace perspective, and the concepts of the liminal and the uncanny will be introduced as conceptual tools that will help to analyse gothic space.

The first issue regarding psychic space, the individual conscious and unconscious, is its location and its nature. Freud, who in his early work attempted to locate the psychic apparatuses anatomically in the cerebral cortex, later resolved that the space of the psyche must be read as no more than metaphorical. Regarding this, Virginia Blum and Anna Secor argue that Freud faced difficulty in locating the psyche because he depended on a topographical model of space:

> Freud is both compelled by the idea of mapping the psyche and frustrated by the geometric, material limitations that such a model imposes. Confronted with this double impasse, Freud chooses to abandon the first topographical model and to emphasize the *metaphorical* role of spatial representations of the mind. (1032)

Blum and Secor emphasise that "[t]he psyche is spatial, just not in topographical terms" (1045). Therefore, they underline "the usefulness of topology over Euclidean

space for building an understanding of space that is at once psychic and material" (1030). They name this space "psychotypology" to address the inseparability of material and psychic space (1031). To understand it, instead of Freud's metaphorical mapping, Blum and Secor turn to Lacan, stating that Lacan's employment of topological models to account for psychic mechanisms points out the complexity of psychic space "in which the subject is formed through internal exclusions and external inclusions" (1031). This approach is also suitable for an analysis of space and subjectivity for in gothic fiction, psychic space is merged with the physical and social dimensions of space, and subjectivity is constructed ex-centrically. Thus, in this study it is claimed that psychic space, the conscious and the unconscious of the subject, is not located inside the subject; it does not constitute some interiority. On the contrary, it is dispersed in space. Gothic fiction is built on this incoherence between the conception of subjectivity as interiority and subjectivity as dispersal. The gothic subject is one that finds bits and pieces of herself/himself where s/he assumes to be external to herself/himself.

3.3.4. Thirdspace of the Gothic

As discussed in the previous section, gothic space is (re)produced through an exploration and depiction of the ambivalent and at times violent economy between spatial dichotomies. As such, it opens up as Thirdspace. In this dissertation, Thirdspace is used as a term that refers to a spatial epistemology underneath spatial production which emerges as an effect of the conflicting relations between spatial dichotomies. It exists as part of those categorisations, but as that which cannot be contained either inside or outside. Therefore, it helps to question the functionality of the binary thinking that lies behind our conception of space. Thirdspace has been explored through and given way to the theorisation of a variety of concepts, in both spatial studies and literary theory. In this account, in this part, those conceptualisations of Thirdspace and their implications for a literary analysis of gothic space will be discussed. After that, the concepts of the liminal and the uncanny will be introduced and explored in relation

to the experience of space and as conceptual tools that can be used to investigate the Thirdspace of the Gothic.

Thirdspace has been theorised from various perspectives and named differently. Indeed, Bertrand Westphal points out that the changing terminology reflects its dynamism: "This space is anything but homogeneous; it allows for the synthesis of all differences, the reduction of certain fractures. Its name has constantly been changing over the last 15 or 20 years, perhaps because it is not in its nature to remain stable" (69). What those views share is that it is a concept that complicates and surpasses spatial dichotomies such as inside and outside, personal and social or public and private.

In this study, I consult Soja's conceptualisation of the term Thirdspace. As discussed before, Soja identifies three spatial dimensions as Firstspace, Secondspace and Thirdspace. Thirdspace is built upon Firstspace and Secondspace perspectives as a recombination and extension of them. According to this model, in the Firstspace perspective and epistemology, space is limited to the material world and "fixed on things that can be empirically mapped" (*Thirdspace* 10). It corresponds to the perceived space of Lefebvre and apparent in the concrete geographies of the world. In Firstspace epistemologies, "[s]patiality . . . takes on the qualities of a substantial text to be carefully read, digested, and understood in all its details" (Soja 75). In the case of Secondspace, Soja claims, reality is understood through "thoughtful representations of human spatiality in mental or cognitive forms" (10). Soja notes that epistemologies based on Secondspace perspective tend to overlook the materiality of space and seek "to capture the meanings of spatial form in abstract mental concepts" (79). In the Firstspace/Secondspace division, the social reality of space is reduced to mental space, and, according to Soja, the complex and heterogeneous phenomenal dimension of space is overlooked. In order to break down the material/mental space dichotomy and reach a perspective of space that can comprehend such complexity and heterogeneity, Soja looks into more marginal experiences and representations of space in the work of a range of thinkers and develops the concept of Thirdspace:

> [A]ll social relations become real and concrete, a part of our lived social existence, only when they are spatially 'inscribed', -that is, *concretely represented*- in the social production of social space. Social reality is not just coincidentally spatial, existing 'in' space, it is presuppositionally and ontologically spatial. *There is no unspatialized social reality*. There are no aspatial social processes. Even in the realm of pure abstraction, ideology, and representation, there is a pervasive and pertinent, if often hidden, spatial dimension. (46)

For Soja, this dimension is associated with the notions of marginality and radical otherness, and it is a space of resistance. A Thirdspace epistemology is one that recognises that "the great modernist narratives that connected 'fixed' community. . . with emancipation (if not revolution) are shattered," which requires thinking "[a]nother spatiality" that, Soja claims, "cannot be so neatly categorized and mapped, where the very distinction . . . between who is inside and outside the boundaries of community" becomes "obliterated and diffracted in a new and different cultural politics of real-and-imagined everyday life" (116). To address Thirdspace, Soja proposes a "critical thirding-as Othering," which "introduces a critical 'other than' choice that speaks and critiques through its otherness" (60-1). In this respect, it can be argued that in the Gothic, such thirding-as-Othering can be found in the representation of space and spatial experience. This will be analysed in relation to two concepts: the liminal and the uncanny.

3.3.4.1. The Liminal

Most basically, a liminal space refers to a threshold. It can refer to the dividing point of two places, but it can also mean much more. That the liminal is a transitory, in-between state or space has led it to be characterised by indeterminacy, ambiguity and hybridity, loaded with a potential for subversion and change. Liminal spaces can be those on the physical, political or cultural margins. In spatial terms, the position of the in-between implies a middle location between inside and outside, here and there, this and that. On the one hand, the border is part of the inside, defining it by setting its limit. On the other hand, marked with transgression, the liminal space is already identified with the outside, the limitless, and the uncontrolled. Still, it cannot be

reduced to either the inside or the outside; it is in-between. The liminal serves both to define the proper and improper by dividing them, keeping them apart, but also works against its function by being already contaminated by the improper.

Liminality was first introduced as a concept by the anthropologist Arnold van Gennep in *The Rites of Passage* (1909). Van Gennep offers a three-staged process for acts or rites of passage, which, according to him, is found in all societies. His model is comprised of separation, transition and incorporation stages (11). Separation stage includes "symbolic behaviour signifying the detachment of the individual or group either from an earlier fixed point in the social structure, from a set of cultural conditions (a 'state')" (Turner 94). The transition stage is characterised with liminality: This is "the period in which the ritual subject crosses a threshold and enters an unknown realm in order to be tested. Because this is the phase in which the neophyte has to prove his or her mettle, the attributes of *liminality* and the condition of the *liminal persona* are necessarily ambiguous or uncertain" (Gómez Reus and Gifford 5). The third stage, reassimilation, marks the end of the passage by the ritual subject who now re-enters society, having gone through a kind of trial. Later, Victor Turner took up van Gennep's theory and developed the idea of liminality, identifying it with marginality. In his view, transition is "a process, a becoming, and . . . even a transformation" (94). His development and expansion of the concept became a model for many later theorisations.

A variety of spatial entities from doors to tunnels, stairs, windows, bridges, water currents, gardens, driveways and so forth can identified with liminality. Liminality promises mobility, transition, transformation, change and progress while suspending all these for a while within its transitory nature. In gothic fiction, the liminal space can gain uncanny qualities for it delays or suspends motion and reality, not leading to any change or transformation at all. In this account, it can be claimed that the liminal space in the Gothic operates in a manner that undermines the ideas of change, progress and development, and helps construct a plot which can be called an anti-*bildungsroman*. More often than not, going against its given meanings, the liminal space becomes a

symbolic limbo, one which Bjørn Thomassen warns against, saying "without a proper re-integration, liminality is pure danger" (30).

The liminal can also be thought as a space of physical transition and mobility (Gifford and Goméz-Reus 3). In this respect, hotels, trains, ships, inns or cars can be grouped under the category of the liminal. Unlike the direct and intimate relation that is established between the subject and the domestic space or the domestic interior, liminal space is marked by anonymity and suspension. It complicates the divisions of personal and social space (Gifford and Goméz-Reus 6). In the liminal space, identity and meaning are suspended. Moreover, in certain situations, it is possible to claim that reality is suspended. Since Turner, liminality has gained additional meanings in various academic fields. The spatial definition of the concept and its identification with marginality also make it possible to consider it from a Thirdspace understanding. Although it may be termed differently, traces of liminality can be found in the work of a variety of thinkers and writers, and can be distinguished with an emphasis on marginality, resistance, hybridity and a realisation of the spatial organisation of social and cultural phenomena. In this sense, it is often found to be adept with productive possibilities, opening up as a space capable of thirding-as-othering.

In the writings of Gloria Anzaldúa liminality appears as *la frontera*, and it is the space of the artist. For Anzaldúa, *la frontera*, the borderland, is not a place of opposition between the one and the other; it is not even the place of their addition. It is rather the product of their multiplication: "Living in a state of psychic unrest, in a Borderland, is what makes poets write and artists create . . . transforms living in the Borderlands from a nightmare into a numinous experience. It is always a path/state to something else" (73). Anzaldúa's borderland is marked with unrest and uncertainty, and thus fluidity, all of which are, for Anzaldúa, required for artistic creativity. Hence, inhabiting the borderland can be a traumatic or illuminating experience. A similar tendency to identify liminality with creativity can be seen in bell hooks. With the purpose of maintaining a position of marginality, bell hooks is interested in creating a Thirdspace as "a space of radical openness . . . the site of radical possibility, a space of resistance"

(151). Therefore, she turns her attention to spatial and social margins. For hooks, being on the margins enables the subject to have a superior position, both ontologically and epistemologically, for the subject on the margins can gain insight and knowledge of both the inside and the outside without belonging to neither. Thus, she can be liberated by being detached from both. Derrida also often drew attention to the necessity of focusing on the liminal. He even pointed out the necessity of a science that would examine and deconstruct margins, limits and liminality. This science, which he calls "limitrophy," would deal with "what sprouts or grows at the limit, around the limit, by maintaining the limit, but also what *feeds the limit*, generates it, raises it, and complicates it" ("Animal" 398).

In Daphne du Maurier's novels liminality plays many roles, one of which is delaying change and motion, and it contributes to the repetitive patterns in the novel. In *Rebecca*, for example, the narrator passes through the driveway which leads to Manderley, but she never really manages to enter the social space of the house. The only time when she is ready to change and enter Manderley as the lady of the house, she only finds that Manderley is on fire. In *Jamaica Inn*, more than once Mary travels on the road which links Jamaica Inn to the town and to the sea, yet she manages to escape only after the murders of her uncle and her aunt, which signifies the collapse of the house's symbolic power. In *My Cousin Rachel*, Rachel is killed on a bridge, shifting only to a permanent state of motionlessness. The liminal spaces with positive meanings in the novels are mostly transitory spaces like hotels, bars, restaurants as they allow for a limited liberty from the oppression in the house. In their anonymity, they offer a lighter version of life in which names and identities do not really matter.

3.3.4.2. The Uncanny

While Soja finds a multidimensional and more dynamic conception of space promising in terms of political and social change, another implication of this multidimensionality is the experience of spatial uncanny. Such experience is evoked in gothic space. Although the physical/real/perceived, abstract/imagined/conceived and lived/social

dimensions of space are all inherent in subjects' everyday experience of space, these dimensions may or may not overlap. At times, one dimension can be more dominant in the construction of a space's meaning. That meaning is the product of a constant interaction between the subject and space, processed through the medium of culture and language. In this account, the uncanny experience of space can emerge when one dimension suddenly becomes dominant over the other dimensions that are prevalent in the meaning of that space. Alternatively, the different dimensions of a space may not overlap and therefore cause alienation, resulting in a crisis of meaning and thus require a renegotiation. As a result, it can be suggested that the spatial uncanny comes into being through the interaction between the subject and space. Thus, the uncanny may emerge as a questioning of what George Perec calls "the infra-ordinary"; that is, "the banal, the quotidian, the obvious, the common, the ordinary, the infra-ordinary, the background noise, the habitual" (177):

> To question the habitual. But that's just it, we're habituated to it. We don't question it, it doesn't question us, it doesn't seem to pose a problem, we live it without thinking, as if it carried within it neither questions nor answers, as if it weren't the bearer of any information. This is no longer even conditioning, it's anaesthesia. We sleep through our lives in a dreamless sleep. But where is our life? Where is our body? Where is our space? (177)

In blurring the borders between the real and imagined, or physical and mental dimensions of space, Thirdspace can also evoke the uncanny, which can be understood as a kind of liminal experience. Therefore, in this section, the uncanny will be conceptualised as a tool to explore that sense of the spatial and ontological ambiguity and displacement felt in the three novels through a certain experience of space.

In the broadest sense, the uncanny can be described as the kind of fear that is experienced when something familiar suddenly becomes unfamiliar, or when something strange suddenly becomes familiar. This is indeed the definition made by Freud, in his essay "The Uncanny" (1919): "the uncanny is that class of the frightening which leads back to what is known of old and long familiar" (220). This essay remains an effective starting point. Freud starts with an attempt to refute the connection made

by Jentsch between the uncanny and intellectual uncertainty and replace it with the repression mechanisms of the psyche. He traces different dictionary definitions and uses of the German word *heimlich* and its antonym *unheimlich*. *Heimlich* means belonging to the house, familiar, tame, intimate, not strange, and so forth. On the other hand, through its association with privacy and intimacy, it can also mean something that is concealed, kept from sight, or withheld from others. This association leads Freud to accept Schelling's definition of the uncanny as "the name for everything that ought to have remained . . . secret and hidden but has come to light" (225). Freud investigates the double, repetition, *déjà vu*, silence, darkness and isolation, and uses the uncanny incidents as a way of approaching the concepts of repetition compulsion and castration anxiety, moving towards a theorisation of the death drive.

Freud's conclusion is that the uncanny manifests itself when the repressed fears, desires and memories buried in the unconscious suddenly return. That is, it is produced by the return or recurrence of something that was once familiar but has been repressed (238). For Freud, that something familiar can be anything that we once acknowledged as part of our reality: "the frightening element can be shown to be something repressed which recurs," which also leads Freud to conclude: "this uncanny is in reality nothing new or alien, but something which is familiar and old-established in the mind and which has become alienated from it only through the process of repression." (241). The fact that such infantilising situations cause the return of the repressed marks, it can be argued, the uncanny experience as an interruption in the developmental history of the subject and something in the psychic apparatuses that goes against the Enlightenment conception of subjectivity. In addition to this, the situations listed by Freud as preconditions of the uncanny can emerge due to certain qualities of space, or, because of a certain interpretation of spatial experience. Nevertheless, although he acknowledges it, Freud does not investigate this connection. Instead, he attempts to theorise the uncanny entirely in relation to the psychic mechanisms, and his interpretation assumes a psychic space that is exclusively private.

Freud's negligence of the social and political aspects of the uncanny has been seen by several thinkers as a weakness of his conceptualisation of the uncanny. Therefore, a number of theorists have attempted to investigate this concept beyond Freud's definition and read it in a larger cultural and historical context. By doing so, they have connected the emergence of the uncanny in literary, aesthetic and philosophical discourses with the advent of modernity. Terry Castle, in *The Female Thermometer*, finds a link between the uncanny and Enlightenment epistemology:

> [T]he eighteenth century in a sense 'invented the uncanny:' that the very psychic and cultural transformations that led to the subsequent glorification of the period as an age of reason or enlightenment- the aggressively rationalist imperatives of the epoch –also produced, like a kind of toxic side effect, a new human experience of strangeness, anxiety, bafflement, and intellectual impasse. (7-8)

Terry Castle sees the uncanny as an "integral part of modernity" (9). Furthermore, the emergence of the uncanny seems to mirror a conception of the private self, a self that is understood to have interiority, or, more properly, the self as interiority, the development of which requires a division of public and private spheres. The uncanny, in this sense, seems to be a toxic side effect of the modern individual. A similar remark is made by Mark Wigley, who observes that "[i]nteriority is not simply physical. It is a social effect marked on the newly constituted body of the individual" (369). This is, according to Wigley, a product of modernity. The uncanny, it can be said, comes into being as an effect of this private space. Its emergence points at a certain construction and representation of the private self as interiority. In the gothic fiction of Daphne du Maurier, however, the unconscious does not constitute an interiority but extends over space.

In accordance with Castle, Anthony Vidler adopts an understanding of the uncanny as a symptom of modernity and traces the term back to German and English Romanticism, tracing how the uncanny diverged from the sublime, "the master category of aspiration, nostalgia and the unattainable" (*Architectural* 20), as a category

which provoked terror through obscurity and became the indication of "that mental space where temporality and spatiality collapse" (39).

Vidler attempts to read the uncanny in relation to various aspects of modern culture. For him, a significant component of the uncanny is a sense of "homelessness" (39). In this respect, he claims that the emergence of Freud's essay at a time when "the territorial security that had fostered the notion of a unified culture was broken" was not a coincidence (Vidler 7). According to Vidler, Freud intentionally focused on the dictionary definitions of the German word *unheimlich* because it "served at once to clarify the operations of the uncanny as a systematic principle as well as to situate its domain firmly in the domestic and the homely thence to permit its decipherment in individual experience as the unconscious product of a family romance" (23). This romance of the atomic family itself gained shape with modernity. Moreover, what is undercurrent in Freud's example of the uncanniness of live burial as a reversal of the infantile fantasy of the womb is, Vidler argues, the "historical and archaeological self-consciousness of the nineteenth century" (xi). One emblematic example of the effects of such self-consciousness is the archaeological explorations of the ancient Roman city of Pompeii:

> Of all sites, that of Pompeii seemed to many writers to exhibit the conditions of unhomeliness to the most extreme degree. This was a result of its literal 'burial alive' and almost complete state of preservation, but also of its peculiarly distinct character as a 'domestic' city of houses and shops. The circumstances of its burial had allowed the traces of everyday life to survive with startling immediacy. . . . *L'étrange*, *l'inquiétant*, *das Unheimliche*, all found their natural place in stories that centered on the idea of history suspended, the dream come to life, the past restored in the present. . . . The special characteristic of this retrospective vision was its unsettling merging of past and present, its insistence on the rights of the unburied dead, its pervasive force over the fates of its subjects. (45-7)

The preservation of everyday life found in Pompeii was not only uncanny because it displayed unique immediacy which remained unchanged for thousands of years. It was also an incident of mass live burial, and in that, it was a nightmare, rather than a dream,

which came true. What is more, with an undeniable authority, this preserved ancient city revealed the darker side of civilisation and showed the errors of historical records:

> The paintings, sculptures, and religious artefacts . . . were far from the Neoplatonic forms of neoclassical imagination . . . Archaeology, by revealing what should have remained invisible, had irredeemably confirmed the existence of a 'dark side' of classicism, thus betraying not only the high sublime but a slowly and carefully constructed world of modern mythology. (48)

The unearthing of Pompeii has an unsettling effect on the foundations of western civilisation. In this account, the uncanny can best be connected to a crisis of representation due to the emergence of a rupture in the authentication and ordering of knowledge when the well-established epistemological categories lose validity. Therefore, it can be claimed that it is a fundamental constituent of gothic fiction, which is, after all, the representation of a crisis.

A number of thinkers conceptualised the uncanny in relation to language and the signification process. In her analysis of Freud's "The Uncanny," Hélène Cixous undermines Freud's attempts to explain away the uncanny through the repression mechanisms of the psyche. She focuses on the various examples Freud provides to show how the uncanny is always an indication of a repressed anxiety in one way or another. Yet Freud fails to go beyond repetition and give a working definition of the uncanny. Therefore, Cixous suggests, rather than the repressed unconscious, the return of the repressed is associated with the incessant movement of signifiers:

> It is this *no-other-meaning* (*Keine andere Bedeutung*) which presents itself anew (despite our wish to outplay it) in the infinite game of substitutions, through which what constitutes the elusive moment of fear returns and eclipses itself again. This dodging from fear to fear, the unthinkable secret since it does not open on any other meaning: its 'agitation' . . . is its affirmation. Even here, isn't everything a repercussion, a discontinuous spreading of the echo, but of the echo as a displacement, and not in any way as a referrent to some transcendental meaning? The effect of uncanniness reverberates (rather than emerges), for the word is a relational signifier. *Unheimliche* is in fact a

> composite that infiltrates the interstices of the narrative and points to gaps we need to explain. (536)

Similar to Cixous, Lacan also underlines the gap that the uncanny signifies and thus becomes an irreducible concept. He argues that the uncanny marks the decomposition of the fantasy which forms the basis of an imaginary subjective integrity and the assumption of symbolic consistency. For Lacan, the uncanny is "what appears at the place where the minus *phi* should be. Indeed, everything starts with imaginary castration, because there is no image of lack, and with good reason. When something does appear there, it is . . . because the lack happens to be lacking" (*Seminar X* 42). He approaches the uncanny from the other side, through the sudden appearance of anxiety that occurs when the strange and unhomely things become homely. When the subject reaches the familiar void within, she is in the realm of the uncanny. In anxiety, an unbridgeable gap opens within the subject. In this account, in the uncanny, there is a distortion of both the subject-ness of the subject and the object-ness of the object (Lacan 47-8).

Like Cixous and Lacan, for Derrida, the uncanny manifests the mobility of meaning and the operations of metaphorical substitution unanchored by any final ground or meaning: "The crisis of literature takes place when nothing takes place but the place, in the instance where no one is there to know" (*Dissemination* 285). The movement, the play of metaphors suggests that the uncanny is more than an objectified wish returning from an unconscious identified as a container of instincts. It is, as Royle argues, a "crisis of the proper" (*Uncanny* 1): "It is a crisis of the natural, touching upon everything that one might have thought was 'part of nature': one's own nature, human nature, the nature of reality and the world" (1). According to Royle, the very possibility of the uncanny problematises our conception of the proper, and enables us to recognise the discursive constructed-ness of our condition in the world: "The uncanny is never simply a question of a statement, description or definition, but always engages a performative dimension, a maddening supplement, *something unpredictable* and additionally strange happening in and to what is being stated, described or defined" (15-6). For Royle, as for Cixous and Derrida, the uncanny is intricately interrelated

with language, “with how we conceive and represent what is happening within ourselves, to ourselves, to the world, when uncanny strangeness is at issue” (3). Royle also sees the uncanny as signifying itself, without ever leading to a transcendent signified.

In this study, the uncanny is understood as a textual moment of crisis which is experienced in the face of uncertainty. It occurs when deciding between the familiar and unfamiliar, the inside and outside, the natural and supernatural is not possible. It is the point where one loses coordination. This study aims to trace and analyse the spatial uncanny or uncanny as a spatial experience. The uncanny may emerge as a certain experience of space when the division between space as the object and the subject gets blurred. It is evoked when the subject feels disoriented in relation to his or her surroundings and her psychic/bodily borders. In this respect, the uncanny is associated with being disoriented, displaced, misplaced and dislocated. There are some spatial conditions which precede the experience of the uncanny such as isolation, darkness and silence. Thus, it can emerge as an experience of space and come into being due to the disruption of a presupposed meaning imposed on space. The uncanny involves everything that the mind cannot categorise. It is an unsettling merging of past and present, reason and unreason, mind and body. It creates an unsettling effect which ordinary language cannot categorise. Topology provides this language. Unlike topography, which entails a Cartesian/Euclidian perception of space, in topology, there are no more coordinates; all spaces can fold into each other. The relations between things, what holds them together, what organises them is what is important in the topological view rather than their location of distance or shape or size. In this respect, it can be said that the uncanny is a representation of crisis while at the same time it expresses a crisis of representation. It disrupts the border between the internal and external spaces, which are viewed as distinct categories in the Cartesian topographic space.

CHAPTER 4

DOMESTIC SPACE

4.1. The House as a Gothic Thirdspace

This chapter takes as its departure point the idea that space constitutes and is constituted by its inhabitants and discusses this symbiosis in the context of domestic space in *Jamaica Inn*, *Rebecca* and *My Cousin Rachel* to investigate how the house is constructed as an intricate psycho-topological and spatiotemporal entity through a set of social and psychic relations, trajectories and intersections that operate on both conscious and unconscious levels. In this respect, the house as represented in the novels is conceptualised as a Gothic Thirdspace where the system of signification that organises different dimensions of space, its inhabitants and their symbiosis is destabilised through a return of the repressed material in the unconscious, which is externalised and dispersed over space.

In this discussion of domestic space, the gendered spatial experiences and practices of different characters will be explored in order to illustrate that space and gender simultaneously produce and reinforce one another. It can be argued that du Maurier's Gothicisation of domestic space allows for an exploration of the social and discursive constructed-ness of such categories because, using the Gothic and by giving voice to the repressed, the novels allow for an exploration of the conditions of its repression. This is not to claim that du Maurier wrote from a position of radical openness or with revolutionary tendencies. However, since she gave voice to spatial and social conflicts

and the anxieties they arouse, it becomes possible to analyse the discursive mechanisms that lie beneath her text. Indeed, it can be put forward that in all the three novels, while a very nostalgic sense of place is traceable, this sense of place is also problematised through the spatial experiences of the characters. In this account, a sense of place and mobility are strongly opposed. Place is deeply associated with an understanding of identity as stable, coherent and self-identical. In relation to this, there is an assumed distinction between the house and place as physical external realities, and home and space as mental abstractions. Home is imbued with the capacity for providing continuity and stability. This conceptualisation facilitates the idea that no matter how far one travels, one can always come back, and that one is not threatened by mobility and change as long as one knows where one belongs and on the condition that where they belong is crystallised in time, immune to any change, an idea that resonates with the phenomenological views of Heidegger and Bachelard. Nevertheless, the homely experience that such a sense of place provides is not accessible to women.

In the novels, place/space and house/home provide comfort to male characters while the physical specificity of the house and place is shown to be confining for the female characters. While identified with the domestic space, women cannot experience the stability and coherence that it offers the male subject. Hence, for women, such a space/place is constructed at the expense of their mobility, and they therefore implement different social and spatial strategies from those used by men, and they have a problematic relationship with space. This makes domestic space doubly uncanny for women. Ironically, on the one hand, these women function as stabilisers for the other characters through their affiliation with the domestic space. The domestic system works on the ground of women's repression; however, on the other hand, the bits and pieces of the repressed female are scattered all over the space.

As discussed in the previous chapter, repression in the domestic spatial construction is always partly a repression of the maternal body and the maternal space since the house carries, as part of its constitution, the residues of this space the loss of which is compensated by the protective and comforting qualities of the house. Repression, in

this sense, works through dispersal and dissolution, and the return of the repressed is, rather than being merely historical, simultaneous with repression; thus, it is a process that can be better understood if its spatial dimension is considered. The repression mechanism at work in the construction of the proper place based on a principle of inclusion/exclusion and the resistance of the repressed material create an uncanny economy in the house, which calls for a discussion of the permeable boundaries between the homely and the unhomely.

As my starting point, I take Colomina's argument that "[a]rchitecture is not simply a platform that accommodates the viewing subject. It is a viewing mechanism that produces the subject. It precedes and frames its occupant" (83), and understand the house as a construction which functions as a mechanism that reproduces many of those social, cultural and ideological principles that are undercurrent in its construction. In this respect, its implications go beyond the divisions of physical and mental space. The house as such can be understood as a Thirdspace in Soja's terms. As we have seen, Soja coins the term to refer to the new spatial awareness in the theories of many thinkers which has led them to move away from the physical and mental space dualism towards a more complicated understanding that takes into account physical, mental and lived dimensions of space not as separate categories but as functioning together simultaneously, constituted by and in turn constitutive of complex social relations. For Soja, it is "a product of a 'thirding' of the spatial imagination, the creation of another mode of thinking about space of the traditional dualism but extends well beyond them in scope, substance, and meaning" (*Thirdspace* 11). Thirdspace comprehends both physical and imagined aspects, yet it may not reconcile them. In that, it is not a third term which synthesises two dialectical terms. On the contrary, it comprehends them, but in its comprehension, it also complicates their division. Such an understanding is also in alignment with Massey's reconceptualization of space as "an open ongoing production" and recognition that "space itself is an event" (*For Space* 55). In this account, I use the term house as Thirdspace and do not accept clear divisions between physical, imagined and experienced dimensions of space. As will be seen in the analysis of the novels, these different dimensions constantly overlap, and the distinction between them is repeatedly blurred.

Massey emphasises "the existence in the lived world of a simultaneous multiplicity of spaces: cross-cutting, intersecting, aligning with one another, or existing in relations of paradox or antagonism," and explains "this is so because the social relations of space are experienced differently, and variously interpreted, by those holding different positions as part of it" (*Space, Place and Gender* 3). This stress on the symbiosis between subject and space, along with the emphasis on multiple subject positions opens her theory of space to a Lacanian understanding of subjectivity. Therefore, to discuss the different layers of social and spatial interactions and relations in the novel, I will make use of the Lacanian concepts of intersubjectivity and intrasubjectivity. Lacan distinguishes between "the signifying social structure in itself, as the inter-subjective shared language, and the structure for each structural individual position, as the intra-subjective unconscious language" (Cuéllar 172). As Cuéllar indicates, in intrasubjectivity "the Other is neither materialized by *the* language nor personified by another subject. Instead, *he* is embodied by *myself* and materialized by a language, my language, which expresses itself through my thought and my speech" (172).

4.2. *Jamaica Inn*: The Liminal House

The aim of this section is to discuss Jamaica Inn as a liminal space in order to show how du Maurier extends and multiplies spatial liminality from being a boundary or in-between space to a kind of porosity and fluidity that can be part of the constitution of a space of inhabitation. *Jamaica Inn* centres on the possibility and danger of transgression and questions whether transgression can be a permanent social space to be inhabited. By doing this, the writer creates a domestic space that goes against the implications of domestic ideology and undermines its ideals. In order to analyse this un-domestic space, I will use liminality as my conceptual tool. Although the liminal is present in all the three novels, it is in *Jamaica Inn* that du Maurier explores it in the context of the domestic space most consistently. Both the inn and Bodmin Moor are liminal spaces. However, they are very different in the implications of their liminality.

In this part, I will focus on Jamaica Inn as a liminal space from three different angles. First, the inn is liminal in that it is an intersection of public and private spaces, and is

a site for the cancellation of the meanings of both at the same time. Second, it is liminal since inhabiting it means a transgression of social norms, cultural codes and laws, and it entails a kind of transgression which cannot be returned from. By inhabiting Jamaica Inn, the main character Mary Yellan transgresses the accepted legal and social norms, though involuntarily, and she is transformed by this space in a way that makes her transgression irreversible. Her initial unintentional transgression causes her to negotiate her view of both the norms and taboos of her society, leading her to finally construct an alternative space. Third, the inn is a psychic limbo for its inhabitants and guests since it deprives them of any possibilities of change, mobility and reincorporation into the society. It is also a space of repression since each inhabitant can continue to live in the inn only by repressing some part of themselves that would integrate them into the symbolic order. The inn both produces the repressed material and initiates repression. In other words, these feelings or personality traits appear in the novel only in the form of repression: Joss Merlyn represses his guilt and humanity, Mary represses her awakening sexuality, and Patience Merlyn represses her autonomy and free will. Through the construction of this psychic limbo, the novel also raises ontological questions regarding the possibility of free will and authentic individuality free from the effects of society.

4.2.1. Jamaica Inn as a Liminal Space of Transgression

In *Jamaica Inn*, du Maurier builds the narrative on the Cornish tales of smuggling and shipwrecking with the aim of creating a gothic narrative of transgression, crime and evil. The novel explores the rural space of Cornwall in terms of the conception and exercise of culture, power and law. Located away from the centre of power and legislation, Cornwall is depicted as a space on the margins of society and civilisation. The transgression of Joss Merlyn and his chain of ship-wreckers, and the extent to which the community tolerates or overlooks these acts of transgression mark the limits, or the boundaries of the society. Du Maurier takes the actual Jamaica Inn in Bodmin

as her model[6]. Looking at the ways the novel echoes Emily Brontë's *Wuthering Heights*, Horner and Zlosnik write that both novels are "concerned above all with boundaries: boundaries in the landscape give metaphorical expression to boundaries in the psyche and generic boundaries are destabilized as the novel conflates several literary traditions, the most dominant of which is the Gothic" (71). Du Maurier shows how the isolation of the Cornish land enables Joss Merlyn and Francis Davey to break free of the law, manipulate the inhabitants of the area and build their own system. This system gives them the freedom to wreck ships and murder their crews and passengers for financial gain.

The novel raises questions regarding what Punter calls "the relation in the Gothic between the force of transgression and the force that returns us to the status quo" ("Apparitions" 7). Centring on transgression, du Maurier communicates a liminal space since transgression implies the interaction, or confrontation, with another space, facing a horizon beyond which lies "the new trajectory, the unexpected, and the unpredictable" (Westphal 47). As Thomassen states, "[l]iminality implicates the existence of a boundary, a *limes*, the Latin word for threshold from which the concept of liminality derives. The limit is not simply there: it is there to be confronted" (21). Thus, the liminal emerges as a space in which the limit and transgression are always implied. Beyond the transgressive activities of the ship wreckers, however, the novel also explores repression, transgression and taboos regarding sexuality, gender and identity more intricately, without allowing them to reach the surface entirely.

One way that du Maurier constructs uncanniness in the text is through silence: she repeatedly shows that silence and what is kept unspoken is much more dangerous than what is spoken out and done openly. Silence in the text is very productive since its

[6] Du Maurier notes her first encounter with Bodmin Moor and Jamaica Inn as follows: "Like Mary Yellan who, in the novel, comes to Bodmin moor from the tranquil hills and valleys of Helford, I came unprepared for its dark, diabolic beauty. People say that my fictional characters seem to emerge from the places where my stories are set, and certainly when I first set eyes on the old granite-faced Inn itself it made me think that there was a story there, peopled with moorland folk in strange harmony with their background" (*Enchanted Cornwall* 69).

unhinging effect can also be taken as a call to the reader to pay attention to the silences of the text itself as deeper transgressions are censored and replaced with silence, drawn away from the symbolic and social realm of language. Thus, the silences in the text are just as important in the construction of meaning. Silenced in the text, the transgressive material is imprinted on space. In this way, du Maurier builds a multi-layered and polysemic space that never loses its liminality through the unfolding and complication of a set of boundaries in succession.

Victor Turner, who took up Arnold van Gennep's original scheme of rites of passage and specifically focused on liminality, notes that liminality can refer to a state in which an individual is going through a transition, being neither this nor that, and therefore simultaneously being both and neither. In his understanding, liminal entities are ones who are "neither here nor there; they are betwixt and between the positions assigned and arrayed by law, custom, convention, and ceremony" (95). Thus, they are identified with indeterminacy. In alignment with this, it is fitting to claim that *Jamaica Inn* starts in a liminal space, and Mary Yellan is a liminal subject. She is on the threshold between the world as she knows it and a new reality which will challenge her boundaries. Her journey from Helford to Jamaica Inn signals her passage from the known to the unknown, from childhood to adulthood and from the world of civilised Christian Helford to that of primitive and barbaric Bodmin Moor in which the traces of the pre-Christian pagan world are still sensible. The novel, thus, starts at a point of crisis, at a time when Mary experiences ontological and intellectual ambiguity due to her displacement. With her changing surroundings, she finds herself in a space that becomes increasingly other, and she feels threatened by this otherness: "her heart was heavy and distressed at the thought of a future so insecure and changed, with all that she had known and loved gone from her, and not even the comfort of familiar trodden ground to help her through the bad days when they came" (du Maurier, *Jamaica* 7). Such crisis is, according to Julian Wolfreys, one of the fundamental elements of the gothic subject in English literature:

> Gothic . . . presents us with narratives of both individual and by extension, implicitly, collective and national subjectivities in imminent threat or crisis.

> Theirs is an identity, the limits of which are felt (by themselves) to be at risk of some form of transgressive manifestation –material, cultural, phantasmic, spectral and ideological- from without. Something other arriving in or from the externalized space of the subject's material existence promises to invade the space of English individual and collective identity. (98)

The threat that Mary feels due to the unknown circumstances of her life is intensified by the barren and socially unmapped land that she enters. As Mary moves in space, she gets away from her past. Her translocation is both spatial and temporal. The irretrievability of the life she knows and the uncertainty of her present and future is projected onto the new space and makes it monstrous. She is transposed from the familiar certainties of her past, displaced from a social space the parameters of which are well-established to an unmapped space which bears within itself unruly time-spaces.

This unruliness can also be seen in the representation of nature. Botting notes that in gothic fiction, "[n]ature is . . . divided between domesticated and dangerous forms" (*Gothic* [2nd ed.] 4). In *Jamaica Inn*, du Maurier creates this division between the nature in Helford and the nature in Bodmin. Throughout the novel, the writer develops the otherness of Bodmin Moor and Jamaica Inn by using Mary Yellan's memories of Helford to set a contrast on both the level of nature and the landscape and the level of people and social relations. In doing so, she draws on the physical, psychic and social dimensions of the two places by using several binary oppositions. The first of these oppositions is between a civilised patriarchal order along with a land and domestic space which are imbued with traditional feminine qualities and one that is controlled by an unruly masculinity. Mary is forced to leave Helford upon the death of her mother, whose dying wish is that she should go to live with her aunt Patience, who "was as pretty as a fairy" in her youth (du Maurier, *Jamaica* 7). Mary remembers Helford as a safe haven in harmony with nature, which is depicted as benevolent:

> How remote now and hidden perhaps for ever were the shining waters of Helford, the green hills and the sloping valleys, the white cluster of cottages at the water's edge. It was a gentle rain that fell at Helford, a rain that pattered in the many trees and lost itself in the lush grass, formed into brooks and rivulets

> that emptied into the broad river, sank into the grateful soil which gave back flowers in payment. (3)

The gentle rain and the grateful soil of Helford form a contrast with the hostile Bodmin Moor. Rain loses itself in the landscape in Helford, submitting to the land. Nature is submissive to human needs and human oppression. On the other hand, with all its protective and sheltering qualities, Helford is, for Mary, a lost paradise, a utopia, which cannot be retrieved. In this sense, the link she has made between herself and the land of her childhood is gone. At the end of the narrative, she also understands that it does not exist anymore for she is irreversibly changed, which points out the symbiotic relationship between the subject and space. When Mary moves to Jamaica Inn, she moves into a new site of being that changes her and makes it finally impossible to find the lost connection with the space of her childhood. This separation from the space of her childhood can be read as a separation from the mother's space. Associated with the mother and bearing the traditional feminine qualities of protection, safety and benevolence, Helford, it can be argued, symbolises the motherly space governed by patriarchy. In this respect, by losing her farm, Mary is displaced from the patriarchal social space. The benevolent nature with which she felt in harmony can be taken as a significant clue of spatialisation of the mother within the patriarchal space. At the same time, in her insistence on keeping her promise to her mother and not leaving her aunt Patience, it can be argued that she tries to keep a symbolic connection with the maternal. When Mary finds out about Joss Merlyn's crimes, the symmetry between the psychic and social space in the novel is broken, and she is torn between her responsibility to her mother and to society and legal and religious authority. In other words, on one level, her liminal status is one that is in-between the social space of Helford as organised by patriarchal order and the socially unmapped Bodmin. In Bodmin, the patriarchal order cannot establish itself. Squire Bassat is the metonymic extension through whom that order penetrates Bodmin, but his control is weak as shown by the fact that Bodmin is populated by criminals.

Set in contrast with the patriarchal homeliness of Helford, Jamaica Inn can be seen as a male space of transgression. As she arrives at the inn, Mary first notices the tall

chimneys of Jamaica Inn: “Ahead of her . . . was some sort of a building, standing back from the road. She could see tall chimneys, murky dim in the darkness” (14). These tall chimneys can be seen as the phallic symbols of unruly masculine energy, which is represented at its extreme by Joss Merlyn, a gothic villain who has barbaric qualities that link him with Bodmin Moor, where the residues of the Pre-Christian pagan past still linger.

Jamaica Inn is constructed as an anisotropic space in that although on physical terms it is clearly mapped and described, when regarded as a social space, there is a discrepancy between its inside and outside qualities. Though it is an inn, Jamaica is a private space isolated from the rest of the society. However, its privacy and isolation do not create a homely feeling. On the contrary, the main function of the inn is to disguise Joss Merlyn’s crimes. Hence, it is a gothic space of transgression and excess. Set on the borders of the two towns and the moor, literally on the crossroads, Jamaica Inn is on the margins of patriarchal social space. Its name is also a signifier of transgression: it resonates with both the expansion of the empire and the resulting changes in trade, and thus evokes foreignness. The name is ironic, too, when the inn’s position as a centre of smuggling, which was historically a local reaction to colonial trade, is considered. Horner and Zlosnik point out the name’s significance as well: “Its very name suggests transgression: its exotic connotations link it with the folklore of what was euphemistically known in Cornwall as 'fair trading', with a history of smuggling and wrecking” (72).

The inhabitants of Jamaica Inn are depicted as something different from, if not less than, human. Without the mores and sanctions of Christianity or the society that regulate gender relations, in the inn, the patriarchal roles of men and women are pushed to the extreme. The relationship between the husband and the wife resembles a master and slave symbiosis. Joss Merlyn is monstrous, in both body and personality:

> He looked as if he had the strength of a horse. . . . His frame was so big that in a sense his head was dwarfed, and sunk between his shoulders, giving that half-stooping impression of a giant gorilla . . . But for all his long limbs and mighty frame there was nothing of the ape about his features. . . . The best things left

> to him were his teeth, which were all good still, and very white, so that when he smiled they showed up clearly against the tan of his face, giving him the lean and hungry appearance of a wolf. (du Maurier, *Jamaica* 16)

Patience Merlyn is, in contrast to her husband, a trembling, pale, and ghostly creature who has "a dog-like devotion for her husband" (51): "for the most part the poor woman existed in a dream, pottering about her household duties in a mechanical fashion and seldom uttering" (64). She is "like a whimpering dog that has been trained by constant cruelty to implicit obedience, and who, in spite of kicks and curses, will fight like a tiger for its master" (19). The couple reveals a grotesque excess of the patriarchal oppositions of male virility, aggressiveness and physical strength and female spirituality, devotion and fragility.

In an ironic contrast to its function and its once hospitable atmosphere, now, as a site of crime and defilement, Jamaica Inn is isolated from the society. It is, in a sense, the spatial extension of its owner Joss Merlyn. Once built for providing shelter to travellers, it now accommodates Joss Merlyn's smuggling and shipwrecking activities; its lights set forth a false welcome for no common traveller would find shelter under its roofs anymore. Just like the ship wreckers who lure ships with false lights and cause them to have accidents, Jamaica Inn's cover is dangerous for a passer-by who is unaware of its bad reputation. The inn bears semblance to its present owner physically as well. Like its owner, the signs of its previous glory are traceable. Like Joss Merlyn, though, it is now old, crumbling and corrupted: "Nothing but a poor battered board, that had once known prouder days in its first erection, but whose white lettering was now blurred and grey, and whose message was at the mercy of the four winds –Jamaica Inn – Jamaica Inn" (27). Its guestrooms are "waiting for those travellers who never came nowadays, nor sought shelter beneath the roof of Jamaica Inn" (26), and this once hospitable place is corrupted by Joss Merlyn and turned into a malevolent one. That is pointed out by Squire Bassat as well: "the place smells like a tomb. What in the world have you done to it? Jamaica Inn was always a rough-cast and plain, and the fare homely, but this is a positive disgrace" (82-3). Just like Joss Merlyn, Jamaica Inn is described in corporeal terms. It arouses "disgust" in Squire Bassat (82); he calls the place "rotten" (83). The similarity that Squire Bassat makes between a tomb and the

inn helps to increase the association of Joss Merlyn with a beastly existence without any spiritual substance. Jamaica Inn is a place in which soft feelings and humanitarianism, identified with woman in patriarchy, are silenced. On her first night, Mary confuses the sound of the signboard with that of an animal:

> A noise came from the far end of the yard, a curious groaning sound like an animal in pain. It was too dark to see clearly, but she could make out a dark shape swinging gently to and fro. For one nightmare of a moment, her imagination on fire with the tales Joss Merlyn had told her, she thought it was a gibbet, and a dead man hanging. And then she realised it was the signboard of the inn, that somehow or other, through neglect, had become insecure upon its nails and now swung backwards, forwards, with the slightest breeze. (27)

Lack of stability in the sign of the inn reflects the inn's elusive nature, its being neither here nor there in cultural and social terms. Despite the corporeality with which the inn is identified, it is not the materiality of the inn that causes anxiety or fear in Mary Yellan. The transgression that she associates with the inn is a social one. It is social exclusion or identification with the Merlyn family that is frustrating for Mary. In that, crossing beyond the social borders makes Jamaica Inn a fixed place, causing what Dylan Trigg calls "topophobia", which "refers to the way in which the boundary line demarcating one place from another loses its porousness and becomes fixed. This fixing of boundaries serves not only to define but also to restrict the character of place" (22). Her experience of boundedness is not rooted on physical but social confinement. There is a symmetry between the social and spatial positionings of a woman, one that has an immobilising effect on her, in a way that never affects a man. Put very simply, entering a bad place is enough for a woman to be degraded. That is why everyone she meets on her way to the inn warns her that Jamaica is not suitable for a young girl. Their warnings and offers for help show the existence of patriarchal order outside Bodmin. As Anne Williams notes, the attack on the virtues of the female is an important crisis that must be resolved before the heroine is reintegrated to the patriarchal symbolic: "After all, 'virtue' is a patriarchal standard" (105). This reflects the threat perceived in the social mobility of women and how that threat is prevented by ensuring social order through spatial control. This results in a distinction of boundary perceptions and relation to space for men and women. It is closely related

with the private/public spatial dichotomy and its being a gendered construction in which power relations are implicated. In both spheres, a woman's mobility is limited. If she transgresses, and if it is publicly seen, she cannot go back to her former position in the patriarchal order. She is marginalised as a transgressor, or she is punished. In each case, she is confined. If the woman does not transgress the social limits, she is confined to the private space. In both cases, women's social status is defined in more spatial terms than men.

The fact that the Merlyns live in the inn blurs the boundaries between the private and the public. It is home to the Merlyns, but a transitory place to others. With its dark rooms and corridors, and its association with death and violence, the inn resembles the old castles, monasteries and convents of eighteenth-century gothic fiction, all of which

> signify a space for the sovereign exercise of selfish, vicious and illegitimate desires: remote, inaccessible and gloomy, their malevolence impersonates that of the villain. The absence of symbolic and legal restraints in these zones outside the bounds of a paternalistic order confers absolute freedom and complete sovereignty, a return to the power of feudal lordship. (Botting, "Gothic Production" 29)

Like Maxim de Winter in *Rebecca*, Joss Merlyn appears as a dominant male character who wants to keep his position as the sole owner of knowledge and power, and suppresses the women of the house. He enjoys his omnipotence in the domestic sphere. Unlike Maxim, Joss controls the women in the house through direct psychological, physical or sexual violence, not through manipulation. Although he threatens to control Mary through sexual abuse, he never materialises his threats. Joss Merlyn threatens her openly by expressing that he has the power to take all her autonomy and will away:

> 'I tell you what it is, Mary Yellan,' he shouted. 'I'm master in this house, and I'll have you know it. You'll do as you're told, and help in the house and serve my customers, and I'll not lay a finger on you. But, by God, if you open your mouth and squark, I'll break you until you eat out of my hand the same as your aunt yonder.' (du Maurier, *Jamaica* 22)

The threat that Joss directs at his niece is implicitly sexual, and it implies that men can dominate women through sexual aggression. He imprints his will on Mary's body in order to feel in control and mastery of his property. Outside Jamaica, he is subject to the power of the Vicar, but Jamaica is his universe. The idea that men can gain such control over women is also adopted by Mary, who tries to avoid any romantic/sexual affair with Jem Merlyn for fear that she may lose her autonomy. Joss Merlyn's threats to Mary also reveal that he controls Patience Merlyn in this way too. Joss Merlyn's sexual threat functions as an exposé of the power structures of the domestic patriarchal ideology. As made clear by Maxim de Winter in *Rebecca* as well, the husband/father and wife/daughter analogy, besides underlining an incestuous economy of relationships at the heart of patriarchal family, shows how female bodies are spatialised as blank surfaces or containers through which patriarchal authority is justified and inscribed.

Unlike the houses in *Rebecca* and *My Cousin Rachel*, the domestic comfort of Jamaica Inn is limited to the kitchen, a place that provides food and fire. The fire and the smoke coming from the burning turf give the kitchen an air of unreality. This can be taken as an implication of how illusory and fragile its peaceful atmosphere can be. It can be disrupted at any minute by Joss Merlyn's drunken fits of rage or by a sudden visit by Squire Bassat, who tries to catch Joss Merlyn in the act. During his periods of drunken delirium, the kitchen is entirely occupied by Joss Merlyn. From time to time, Mary catches glimpses of the inn's previous hospitable atmosphere, but it is now perverted by his uncle in a total opposition:

> [T]he draught from the door she had forgotten to close ruffled a long torn strip of paper on the wall. There had once been a rose pattern, but it was now faded and grey, and the walls themselves were stained deep brown where the damp had turned them. Mary turned away from the window; and the cold, dead atmosphere of Jamaica Inn closed in upon her. (76)

The rose pattern of the wallpaper carries the traces of a traditional domestic atmosphere that the inn once had. While the traces of a past organised by patriarchal domestic ideology are present, the inn is not a part of that order anymore.

Prior to Mary's arrival, between the husband and the wife, there is an intrasubjective relationship that, not being linguistically differentiated, oscillates between master/slave and mother/infant relationships. Mary enters the inn as a third element and complicates the symmetries of the house. Since the inn is not organised by the patriarchal symbolic, there is no public/private differentiation although Mary's arrival probably reminds Patience of her previous life in the patriarchal space since she tries to arrange a bedroom which would provide Mary some privacy. The inn's privacy facilitates only Joss Merlyn's autonomy, while the private space of women merely functions to keep them away for Joss' business to go on without intervention. In this relationship, Patience is silenced. When she speaks, her language does not make sense to other people. Her will has been totally broken by her husband over the years. Her feelings are completely closeted. She is restricted to a space of intrasubjectivity. She does not have any connection with the outside world, and she does not have any social relations until Mary arrives. Even then, she fails to have any real communication:

> [T]he very fluency of her words was in itself suspicious. She spoke much as a child does who tells herself a story and has a talent for invention. It hurt Mary to see her act this part, and she longed for her to be done with it, or be silent, for the flow of words was, in its way, more appalling than her tears had been. (20)

Patience's inability to communicate is likened by Joss to the sounds made by a turkey: "I heard you, you blathering fool -gobble, gobble, gobble, like a turkey-hen" (20). She is almost entirely withdrawn from the symbolic order to the pre-cultural realm of childhood before linguistic mastery. Her most meaningful reactions are not her words, but her cries and moans. Sharing her bedroom with Joss Merlyn, she only has her pillow as a possession, under which she hides her cries and screams every night. Her psychic space is limited to that pillow. Patience is able to live in this unhomely house by giving up all her autonomy and going through her everyday chores as if she is in a constant dream state. She leads a shadow life, reduced to being an extension of husband's domestic space. For her, living in Jamaica Inn means living in a social and psychic limbo where she only exists for her husband's comfort.

To understand the spatial experience that the inn's liminality incites, it is important to see it not only as an oppressive place that confines Mary to the margins of the society, but also as a space that is open to negotiation. It provides Mary with freedom and mobility in spatial and social terms, bringing about new possibilities: "However grim and hateful was this new country, however barren and untilled, with Jamaica Inn standing alone upon the hill as a buffer to the four winds, there was a challenge in the air that spurred Mary Yellan to adventure" (32). As an outsider and a stranger to the land and the house, her liminal situation calls for active agency. To construct her personal space free from the oppression of Joss Merlyn, she goes outside. Bodmin Moor, as a space not entirely controlled by the patriarchal order, offers her a spatial experience that would normally be beyond her patriarchally defined gender role. Thus, she can socially and psychically transgress. Especially her ventures into the socially unmapped and physically treacherous moor evoke a transgressive psychic space that is almost preternatural. Most of Mary's activities take place in the moor or happen due to her encounters with other people there. She secretly follows Joss Merlyn. She becomes friends with Jem Merlyn, Joss's horse thief brother, and she travels to Launceston with him. Moreover, she cooperates with the Vicar of Altarnun, Francis Davey, and acts as an informer for him. Being an inhabitant of Jamaica Inn makes Mary an outsider in the society. Also, being a young woman gives her some invisibility on the part of Joss Merlyn as he does not think she can cause any harm. This invisibility gives her a pass and allows her a great amount of mobility. Also, since the inn is not regulated by the patriarchal order, no one monitors where she goes. Joss Merlyn is not interested in her morality or public reputation. He does not interfere with her everyday activities as long as she does not interfere with his business. Being a woman in Jamaica Inn puts Mary in several dangerous situations ranging from acting as a forced accomplice to being subjected to physical and sexual violence. However, it also gives her a physical mobility that she would not have in Helford though she does not have mobility in the patriarchal social space. This ambivalence in the construction of space both giving way to a sense of freedom on the one hand and being threatening and dangerous on the other is constitutive of the gothic space in du Maurier's fiction. Safety and continuity can turn into imprisonment and immobility; however, freedom and mobility can also become dangerous. It is also a persistent quality of Cornwall in

du Maurier's work. According to Horner and Zlosnik, "[d]u Maurier's novels, which appear to portray Cornwall positively as a place of freedom, space and authenticity, simultaneously portray that very freedom as dangerous in its evocation of an 'other' self that threatens the main character with psychic fragmentation" (66-7). In this account, Cornwall becomes a liminal space that, being socially unmapped and ungoverned, does not allow the inhabitant's signifiers to be fixed, which can provide liberation but also endanger the fragmentation of the un-fixed subject.

The inn is found by many people as particularly inappropriate for a young woman. The driver of the coach that brings Mary to Jamaica Inn says that it is "no place for a girl" (du Maurier, *Jamaica* 10). In the beginning, on her journey to Bodmin, people warn Mary, thinking that she is a stranger and does not know anything: "Maybe you don't understand, being a stranger up here. It's not the twenty-odd mile of moor I'm thinking of, though that'd scare most women" (10). The woman from Bodmin also warns her that she does not understand what kind of a place she is going to: "It's a wild, rough place up there . . . They don't like strangers on the moors" (10). However, when Mary tells them that her uncle is the landlord, they are afraid to speak further:

> There was a long silence. In the grey light of the coach Mary could see that the woman and the man were staring at her. She felt chilled suddenly, anxious; she wanted some word of reassurance from the woman, but it did not come. Then the woman drew back from the window. 'I'm sorry,' she said slowly. 'It's none of my business, of course. Good night.' (10)

Later, Jem Merlyn warns Mary that it is not a suitable place for a woman: "Jamaica Inn is no place for a maid - nor for any woman, if it comes to that" (74). He also hints at her aunt: "Why does your aunt look like a living ghost – can you tell me that? Ask her, next time the wind blows from the north-west" (120). Squire Bassat also states the inappropriateness of Jamaica Inn for a woman: "I'd rather see any daughter of mine in her grave than living in Jamaica Inn with a man like Joss Merlyn" (86). All these warnings add to the meaning of Jamaica Inn as a space governed by masculinity unrestricted by civilisation. It also implies that the threat that being in Jamaica Inn

poses for a woman is not merely a physical one, but that it hints at a moral and social degradation.

The overemphasis on Jamaica's inappropriateness for the female subject underlines in a way Mary Yellan's strong will as a gothic heroine, which results in her triumphant resistance to male oppression and makes her different from the heroines of many traditional female gothic works. Another detail that not only helps to see Jamaica Inn as a male space but also puts Mary to a gothic quest of attaining an autonomous identity rather than reincorporating with the society is that before she reaches Jamaica Inn, all the potential opportunities that can save Mary from Jamaica are offered by other women. First, the woman in Bodmin who warns Mary against Jamaica Inn offers her work in Bodmin. Furthermore, Mary contemplates on the possibility of following another woman passenger who gets off the coach before herself:

> Mary made a little story to herself of how she might have followed her from the coach, and prayed her company, and asked her for a home. Nor would she have been refused, she was certain of that. There would have been a smile for her, and a friendly hand, and a bed for her. She would have served the woman, and grown to love her, shared something of her life, become acquainted with her people. (12)

Mary turns these suggestions down and stays in Jamaica Inn in order to keep her promise to her mother, and despite the violence she is exposed to, she stays so as to protect another woman, her aunt. Although Mary wants to do what is right and what is best for herself, her inability to separate herself from her promise to her mother puts her in constant danger. Nevertheless, Mary's experience pushes her to renegotiate her assumptions about her life as a woman. Later, when the opportunity presents itself to live with the Bassats and have a life very similar to the one she dreamed on the coach, Mary does not accept it, for she is now transformed by the inn irreversibly and cannot reintegrate into the patriarchal social space.

The unspeakably horrible crime that has turned Patience Merlyn into a ghost-like being over the years is shipwrecking. Mary remembers rumours about the murderous activities of ship wreckers from her childhood, but the subject of wrecking is a taboo

and any talk of it has to be suppressed: "One of the men would bring back some wild tale after a visit to the north coast, and he would be silenced at once; such talk was forbidden by the older men; it was an outrage to decency" (167). In Helford, even to voice the word "wreckers" is to speak "blasphemy" (167). Du Maurier suggests that part of the reason for this fear of wrecking lay in a concern that the dead sailors would not receive a proper "Christian burial" and hence their "ghost would always haunt the scene of death, forever restless" (*Vanishing Cornwall* 69). Intertwined with this Christian notion, though, are the remnants of a barely acknowledged pagan superstition, as du Maurier writes, "Here is very ancient myth at work again, the belief of primitive peoples that the dead are to be feared unless, with due ritual, their bones are burnt or buried" (69). Thus, this transgressive activity, beyond being a crime against the state laws, is a transgression of a taboo, and this places Joss Merlyn and his group in the position of the abject.

Mary gradually becomes aware of the secret social relations that extend to a large part of Cornwall and include not only criminals but also men of law. Although the ordinary local people suspect that Joss Merlyn's crimes stretch beyond common smuggling and therefore never visit Jamaica Inn, no one openly talks about it because none knows its full scale for sure. "Dead men tell no tales, Mary," Joss Merlyn says (du Maurier, *Jamaica* 131). That is why they kill all the passengers and the crew of the ships they wreck. They leave no survivors, and their crime remains a secret. Knowing this secret puts one on an irreversible path, and after Mary learns about it, she changes forever. Her first reaction is to be shocked in fear. She loses appetite, and she cannot sleep. When she looks in the mirror, she sees that she looks like her aunt now: "For the first time in her life she saw a resemblance between herself and her Aunt Patience" (133). Now that she knows their secret, Mary understands why her aunt looks like a ghost:

> They shared a secret now, a secret that must never be spoken between them. Mary wondered how many years Aunt Patience had kept that knowledge to herself in an agony of silence. No one would ever know how greatly she had suffered. Wherever she should go in the future, the pain of that knowledge would go with her. It could never leave her alone. At last Mary was able to understand the pale, twitching face, the hands that plucked at the dress, the wide, staring eyes. The evidence screamed at her now that she knew. (134)

Sharing this secret finally lets Mary into the same psychic space as her aunt and her uncle. She too enters the same limbo, passing beyond the barrier of the unspeakable secret that is the divisive spatialisation mechanism according to Sedgwick (19). Knowing the secret, she enters in the intrasubjective space of the inn. However, now that she knows the truth, she also feels that she can free herself from her obligation to her aunt since she blames Patience as well for keeping silent about her husband's crimes for years and helping him to cover: "In her own way Aunt Patience was a murderer too. She had killed them by her silence. Her guilt was as great as Joss Merlyn's himself, for she was a woman and he was a monster. He was bound to her flesh and she let him remain" (134). Once more, silence is portrayed as much more dangerous than what is spoken out loud. On the other hand, Mary does not blame the common folk in Helford who, just like her aunt, remained silent and denied the existence of ship wreckers:

> In the old days at Helford, there had been whispers of these things: little snatches of gossip overheard in the village lanes, a fragment of story, a denial, a shake of the head, but men did not talk much, and the stories were discouraged. Twenty, fifty years ago, perhaps, but not now, not in the light of the new century. (134-5)

In Mary's perception, unlike the violent, primitive and monstrous people of Bodmin Moor, people in Helford are modern; they are enlightened: they believe that ship wrecking is an activity belonging to a darker past. Once again, Mary sets a contrast between the two places. She does not realise that people in Helford can continue living in peace as long as they turn a blind eye to the crimes of Joss Merlyn and the like. While learning Joss Merlyn's secret scares Mary, it also gives her a sense of power over her uncle: "His secret was split; and Mary held his future in her hands. She had not yet determined what use to make of her knowledge, but she would not save him again" (137). Later, when Joss takes Mary to the coast to witness his crime, he makes her watch his violence in order to retain the power he has over her.

In contrast to the unnamed narrator in *Rebecca*, who wants to become part of the domestic space and the family, Mary wants to separate herself from the household.

She is appalled even at the thought of being associated with the name "Merlyn": "she realised with a rather helpless sense of futility that so far as other people were concerned she must be considered in the same light as her uncle, and that if she tried to walk to Bodmin or Launceston no one would receive her, and the doors would be shut in her face" (64). By inhabiting the inn, Mary at once becomes a part of her uncle's transgression and his accomplice in keeping it a secret, long before she learns its full scale. Her involuntary accommodation in this space of transgression leads to her exclusion from the society. In the end, Mary is left with no trust in any kind of social structure; therefore, she chooses to live in the liminal space offered to her by Jem Merlyn. On the surface, her uncle's death and the revelation of Francis Davey's role in the crimes assure her belief in justice. In the end, the enforcement of the law ensures that social or legal transgression is corrected and that the social boundaries are re-established. Mary's psychic transgression, which happens through her flight to the moor with Francis Davey, however, does not allow her to return to the banalities of rural domestic life.

4.2.2. Jamaica Inn as a Psychic and Social Limbo

Jamaica Inn can be understood as a liminal space of negation, a psychic and social limbo for its inhabitants, who live in a symbolic life-in-death state. It is a space of transgression. However, the transgressions that it allows for do not lead to liberation: it leads to immobility, isolation/exclusion from society, and a suspension of life. Man and woman relationships, social transgression and marginalisation that isolate the inhabitants of the inn from the society and everyday flow of life are the main factors that contribute to its liminality. It is a kind of liminality which goes against the positive connotations of the concept of the liminal as a space that initiates mobility, change and subversive otherness. The inn's negative liminality makes it a gothic space that is marked with death, isolation and confinement. This can be seen in its constant association with death. It is described as having a "cold, dead atmosphere" (76). Mary likens its signboard to a gibbet, with "a dead man hanging" (27). She sleeps like "a dead thing" on her first night (28). The whole inn is "morne and drear" (30). It becomes more obvious that the inn imprisons not only Mary and Patience but also Joss Merlyn

when the Merlyns get trapped inside after Joss Merlyn leads a reckless shipwrecking activity without the permission of Francis Davey.

The inn can be understood as a limbo in the sense that any possibility of change and improvement is suspended. It is located on the margins of civilisation and society, where the social outcasts, the liminal hosts and visitors live in a constant state of in-betweenness. They cannot reintegrate into the society, nor can they stop their criminal activities. They cannot move forward and change their lives, but they cannot move back and repent either. In both directions, there is death. If they surrender to the law, they will be punished by death. If they feel and reveal any guilt, they cannot continue wrecking ships and killing people. If they stop, they will be killed as well, this time by the other men in the chain. This leaves them in the liminal space between life and death, human and non-human, inside and outside on psychic, moral and social levels.

The guests of Jamaica Inn are, like Joss and Patience Merlyn, liminal characters. They are outcasts. They are "the people of the moors" who move "swiftly and silently, as though they had no wish to be seen" (42):

> They lacked substance, in the dim light, and seemed no more than shadows as they skirted the wall and passed under the shelter of the porch to knock upon the door of the bar and gain admittance . . . They were dirty for the most part, ragged, ill-kept, with matted hair and broken nails; tramps, vagrants, poachers, thieves, cattle-stealers, and gypsies . . . There were men who lived near by, under the very shadow of the tors, who had known no other country but the moorland, marsh and granite . . . (42-3)

These outcasts of the society make up the regular visitors of Jamaica Inn. Their actions put them into a state of liminality, on the borders of the patriarchal symbolic, where they are rendered abject. In her theory of abjection, Kristeva underlines the link between criminality and the abject:

> It is [. . .] not lack of cleanliness or health that causes abjection but what disturbs identity, system, order. What does not respect borders, positions, rules. The inbetween, the ambiguous, the composite. The traitor, the liar, the criminal with a good conscience, the shameless rapist, the killer who claims he is a

> saviour. . . . Any crime, because it draws attention to the fragility of the law, is abject [. . .] (*Powers of Horror* 4)

In opposition to their spectral presence outside the inn, the men gain material reality in the bar, and their corporeality makes Mary sick. Even before the crimes of Joss Merlyn and his men are discovered, they are signified as abject through Mary Yellan's physical reactions to their presence. Through their status as abject, they are made tangible:

> [W]hat with the stale drink smell, and the reek of tobacco, and the foul atmosphere of the crowded, unwashed bodies, she felt a physical disgust rise up in her, and she knew she would give way to it if she stayed there long. . . . The evening seemed interminable, and Mary longed for release. The air was so thick with smoke and breath that it was hard to see across the room, and to her weary, half-closed eyes, the faces of the men loomed shapeless and distorted, all hair and teeth, their mouths much too large for their bodies . . . (du Maurier, *Jamaica* 43-4)

Without knowing anything about their crimes, Mary is disgusted by their dirtiness and coarseness, which are paralleled with their moral and social degradation. The depiction of their outlook and manners gives them palpability that dominates the narrative. The inn is the constituent of this state with its palpability. It is a liminal space that is also abject, a status which reduces both the men and the inn to one dimensional materiality. Nevertheless, the people of the moor and their description as abject bodies cannot be only seen as a sign of their moral degenerateness. Their dehumanisation is a result of deprivation of basic comforts that are needed to remain human. Thus, Bodmin is depicted as a place where the power of the state is weak, not just in terms of legal control and governance over its citizens but also in terms of providing them with protection and service, in short, giving them what must be theirs by their right as citizens:

> Lawful work was also scarce in such a desolate, austere, rural area. Or, if it was available, it was also dangerous. Tin mining is a case in point. Its wages were meager. Fines were exacted . . . Miners also suffered regular layoffs because of precarious mine conditions, making the prospect of starvation a reality. In such an environment, smuggling was a boon. (Armstrong 32)

Despite his efforts to be seen as an omnipotent master in the house, Joss Merlyn is weak and afraid of the patriarchal order. He is afraid that one day he will get caught by the law. He is also afraid on a deeper level of some higher law and some form of spiritual punishment for his crime. Furthermore, he is not the actual leader of the smuggling and wrecking chain. He does not act on his own will. He is used by Francis Davey as a cover. With his confession to Mary, Joss Merlyn destroys the imaginary space of the house, which can be seen as one giant mirror, and enters the symbolic realm, or rather, the symbolic enters the house. When he hears about Squire Bassat's visit to the inn, he shouts and swears with rage, but Mary is not fooled: "Mary did not fear him like this; the whole thing was bluster and show; it was when he lowered his voice and whispered that she knew him to be deadly. For all his thunder he was frightened; she could see that; and his confidence was rudely shaken" (du Maurier, *Jamaica* 89). Joss Merlyn lies to show himself fearless but feared by everyone: "Squire Bassat's too mortal scared to shove his nose in here. If he saw me in the road he'd cross his heart and spur his horse" (24). He also tries to show Jamaica Inn as evil and feared as himself, hosting evil guests who are powerful men:

> There's some who come to Jamaica Saturday night, and there's some who turn the key of their door and sleep with their fingers in their ears. There are nights when every cottage on the moors is dark and silent, and the only miles are the blazing windows of Jamaica Inn. They say the shouting and singing can be heard as far down as the farms below Roughtor. (24-5)

In spite of his show of being potent, powerful and frightening, Joss Merlyn is a pawn in his criminal business: "there's no money working in a small way; you've got to do it big, and you've got to take your orders" (128). He commits murders as part of wrecking and is constantly tormented by his own conscience. He cannot leave his criminal path, nor can he live in peace. He is tortured by his inadequacy to change his liminal state of existence. In return, he tortures people around him. When he is sober, he pretends to be the fearsome landlord of the inn who is not scared of anything and who does not feel guilty of his crimes. He boasts about them. However, with the effect of alcohol, he reveals his fear and guilt. Joss is haunted by his crimes. Before he speaks to Mary, he spends days in the kitchen drinking and having fits of delirium while

Patience looks after him. Mary's presence as the third party to his dyadic relationship with Patience introduces the symbolic back into the dual space of the inn, and Mary impersonates the Lacanian Other for Joss Merlyn, bringing out in him a desire to confess:

> It's this cursed drink that makes a fool of me [. . .] I'm as weak as a rat when it has hold of me, you can see that. And I have dreams, nightmares; I see things that never scare me when I'm sober. Damn it, Mary, I've killed men with my own hands, trampled them under water, beaten them with rocks and stones; and I've never thought no more about it; I've slept in my bed like a child. But when I'm drunk, I see them in my dreams; I see their white-green faces staring at me, with their eyes eaten by fish; and some of them are torn, with the flesh hanging on their bones in ribbons, and some of them have seaweed in their hair . . . (129)

For him, his sense of guilt is a sign of his weakness and failure as the sign that shows his recess to the imaginary in the inn and that he is not entirely free from the control of the paternal metaphor, which stands in his way toward what he considers a more successful career in crime. Therefore, a repressed conscience is the only way of existence. Still, his compulsion to repeat drinking alcohol signifies his need to fuel his relapses into the imaginary and silence the Other, language, that is speaking through him. His drunken periods are the times when he regresses into an infantile state, in need of being looked after by Patience, who then provides him with a maternal space. Joss' rampage on the Christmas Eve can be understood as the peak of his effort to remain in this undifferentiated psychic space that is not part of the symbolic and celebrate his monstrosity, when he takes Mary with his crew to the coast. There, Mary is beaten and forced to watch their murders. His challenge to Mary can be understood as his revolt against the paternal metaphor and his total rejection of integration into the social space of Cornwall. This results in his having to lock himself inside the inn as his actions make shipwrecking recognised in social space. He regresses behind the walls of the inn due to his fear of punishment by both Squire Bassat, who stands for the patriarchal authority and Francis Davey, who represents a demonic version of that authority.

The liminal space of the inn separates Mary from the flow of her everyday reality, and she cannot move forward and construct a new life before she leaves. In this sense, another place that is set in opposition to Jamaica Inn is Launceston. In contrast to the desolate and dark atmosphere of Jamaica Inn, Launceston on Christmas Eve is depicted as colourful and lively:

> This was a gay and happy world to Mary. The town was set on the bosom of a hill, with a castle framed in the centre, like a tale from old history. There were trees clustered here, and sloping fields, and water gleamed in the valley below. The moors were remote; they stretched away out of sight behind the town, and were forgotten. Launceston had reality; these people were alive. (146)

The festive atmosphere of Launceston represents the everyday real life. It is this carnivalesque festivity that leads Jem to kiss Mary and her to let him do so. This social space allows Mary to forget about Jamaica Inn and her problems for a while, and saves her from isolation and puts her into a "careless, irresponsible mood" (156). The burden of the oppressive world of Jamaica is lifted. On the other hand, when people empty the streets, the town changes: "the lights and the people had vanished. Launceston had lost all its glamour" (155). Although Launceston is different from Jamaica Inn, its surroundings prove that it carries similar dangers for a lonely young woman. The attitudes of men in the inn whom she asks about Jem Merlyn are not very different from those of the men in Jamaica Inn. The violence that Mary witnesses later that night paradoxically draws both parallelism and contrast between the festive carnivalesque atmosphere in Launceston and the grotesque monstrosity in Jamaica Inn. When Mary reaches Jamaica that night, she finds it all in light: "Jamaica Inn was ablaze with light; the doors were open, and the windows were unbarred. The house gaped out of the night like a living thing" (175). Joss Merlyn and his men, drunk and "in a state of wild excitement" (177), form a strange parallelism with the liveliness of people in Launceston: "the presence of a woman amongst them brought a vicious tang to their enjoyment, her weakness and distress acting pleasurably on them" (177). This inversion is intensified with the pedlar's attempted rape. The pedlar's violent attempt to rape Mary is not very different from the sexual offers of men in the inn. With "all

the pretence of gentle persuasion gone," male aggression reaches at its peak in the pedlar's attack (182).

Abject masculinity is a recurrent motif in the novel. Characters like Joss Merlyn and his men, along with Patience Merlyn are depicted as less than human and on negative terms. Through them, du Maurier implicitly questions what a human being must be like. However, beneath her contempt for the men of the moor, Mary is fascinated by them, particularly by Joss Merlyn. Though never expressed openly, a fascination with the unruly, barbaric, uncivilised and monstrous masculinity can be found in the novel. Throughout the narrative, Mary's response to her sexuality moves between aversion and fascination. The inn becomes for her a space of repressed sexuality as she starts to become aware of her sexual desire for Jem Merlyn and her attraction to Joss Merlyn. Indeed, Horner and Zlosnik state that "the text makes clear that for the female subject the boundary between abjection and desire is intrinsically unstable" (78). On the surface, Mary is attracted to Jem Merlyn, who functions as the unspoilt and yet uncorrupted younger double of Joss Merlyn. He possesses, as his name suggests, rarely found qualities in the bleak space of Bodmin Moor. Jem is Joss's carefree and light-hearted version, and although Mary finds him physically attractive, she cannot but realise the resemblances between the two brothers and feels uneasy. She tries to naturalise her feelings about Jem Merlyn by explaining it away with the law of attraction:

> Nature cared nothing for prejudice. Men and women were like the animals on the farm at Helford . . . there was a common law of attraction for all living things, some similarity of skin and touch, and they would go to one another. This was no choice made with the mind . . . Mary was no hypocrite; she was bred to the soil, and she had lived too long with birds and beasts, had watched them mate, and bear their young, and die. There was precious little romance in nature, and she would not look for it in her own life. . . . No, Mary had no illusions about romance. Falling in love was a pretty name for it, that was all. Jem Merlyn was a man, and she was a woman, and whether it was his hands or his skin or his smile she did not know, but something inside her responded to him, and the very thought of him was an irritant and a stimulant at the same time. It nagged at her and would not let her be. (du Maurier, *Jamaica* 136-7)

Joss Merlyn's view of female sexuality as a means of men's domination of women is also shared by Mary. Mary tries to avoid Jem not only because he reminds her of her uncle and has the potential to turn her into her aunt Patience in the future: "A few kisses had made a fool of her already. She thought of Aunt Patience, trailing like a ghost in the shadow of her master, and she shuddered. That would be Mary Yellan too, but for the grace of God and her own strength of will" (155). She sees the attraction between Jem and herself as a threat and resists temptation. Her resistance is not based on any moral principle. She sees any romantic involvement as a distraction from her goal and a loss of her autonomy:

> Once she departed from the line of conduct she had laid down for herself, there would be no returning. There would be no privacy of mind, no independence. She had given too much away as it was, and she would never be entirely free of him again. This weakness would be a drag on her and make the four walls of Jamaica Inn more hateful than they were already. It was better to bear solitude alone. (155)

It is obvious that Mary sees this weakness as an innate quality of women, not as something that she can control and change. This is one of the reasons why she wishes to be a boy. This is also the reason why her mother sent her to live with her aunt, claiming that a girl must not live alone; otherwise, she will go crazy (6). The resemblance between Joss and Jem Merlyn and Mary's growing realisation of the similarities between the two men and her feelings of repulsion against and attraction to Jem at the same time are suggestive of attraction between Mary and Joss Merlyn. When she looks at Jem's hands, Mary realises their resemblance to Joss':

> These attracted her; the other repelled her. She realised for the first time that aversion and attraction ran side by side; that the boundary-line was thin between them. The thought was an unpleasant one, and she shrank from it. Supposing this had been Joss beside her, ten, twenty years ago? She shuttered the comparison at the back of her mind, fearing the picture it conjured. She knew now why she hated her uncle. (140)

Although such a relationship never goes further from a possibility, it is, nevertheless, suggested by Joss Merlyn as well:

> Why, you poor weak thing, you know as well as I do I could have had you your first week at Jamaica Inn if I'd wanted you. You're a woman after all. Yes, by heaven, and you'd be lying at my feet now, like your Aunt Patience, crushed and contented and clinging, another God-damn bloody fool. (197)

Joss Merlyn sees sexual intercourse between men and women as an apparatus of control through which women lose their individuality and autonomy. On the other hand, just as Jem functions as Joss's more desirable double for Mary, Mary is also Patience Merlyn's younger, stronger and smarter double. Though Joss Merlyn does not openly utter his wish to have Mary as his equal partner, he still expresses that he wishes that she was a boy so that she could then be his companion. His taking her to the coast with him is suggestive of his desire to include her in his life. As he also accepts, if he were younger, he would have an affair with her: "I've a soft spot for you, Mary . . . you've got spirit still, and pluck, for all the knocks I've given you . . . If I'd been a younger man I'd have courted you Mary –aye, and won you too, and ridden away with you to glory. You know that, don't you?" (211). Mary does not consider the possibility consciously, but her hand that holds the candlestick trembles "without her knowledge" and she notices the resemblance between her uncle and Jem once again as when Joss smiles "the curve of his mouth painfully familiar to her, and known, like an echo from the past" (211-2). Although she interprets her feelings as a reminder of what she feels for Jem, it is Joss' touch on her lips that excites her:

> [F]or some reason for ever unexplained, thrust away from her later and forgotten, side by side with the old sins of childhood and those dreams never acknowledged to the sturdy day, she put her fingers to her lips as he had done, and let them stray thence to her cheek and back again.
>
> And she began to cry, softly and secretly, the tears tasting bitter as they fell upon her hand. (212)

Thus, Jamaica Inn creates the ambivalent effects of transgression and repression at the same time and remains a liminal space. Mary's attraction to both men can be taken as a sign of her divided sexuality. She has difficulty in fixing her signifiers in the absence of anyone who can function as the metonymic extension of the paternal metaphor, except for Francis Davey, and in the absence of a social space that can regulate her

sexual signifiers, her sexuality stays within the confines of her intrasubjective psychic space until the very end.

In *Jamaica Inn*, to a certain extent, du Maurier follows what Maggie Kilgour, among many critics, calls the Female Gothic plot (32); however, she gives it a twist in the end. Kilgour notes that this kind of plot is modelled on Ann Radcliffe's fiction and follows an initial separation from family, an entrance into a space of crisis and the final reincorporation into the society, generally through marriage (32). Although the first two steps are followed in *Jamaica Inn*, in the final step, the main female character chooses not to belong anywhere and embraces a nomadic life of anonymity. Mary's transgression through her experiences in Jamaica Inn, the Cornish coastline and Bodmin Moor changes her, and makes it impossible for her to reduce her reality to the everyday life and accommodate her subjectivity in an ordinary country farmhouse. The gothic spaces of death, violence, repression and resistance, with their haunting effects, undo her social reincorporation. She finally accepts Jem's opinion that living in a village is like "living in a box" (du Maurier, *Jamaica* 298) for it requires living very close to other people and means having no privacy or social mobility. Mary chooses flight, a female gothic motif, as an alternative form of existence. Although the gothic heroine's flight from male tyranny is usually connected to her victimisation, in *Jamaica Inn*, it takes the form of an escape from social boundaries and restrictions of living with other people.

4.3. Manderley in *Rebecca*

In this part, I will discuss Manderley in *Rebecca* as a Gothic house which haunts, alienates and threatens yet does not possess any supernatural qualities. A polysemic space where psychic and social dimensions intersect, Manderley can be seen "as an ever-shifting social geometry of power and signification" (Massey, *Space, Place and Gender* 3). Through these complex relations, the house operates as a haunting mechanism. The house and the unnamed narrator can be found in a symbiotic relationship, but rather than constituting the narrator's subjectivity and enabling her to constitute it on a conscious level, the house haunts the narrator. That is, it constitutes

the narrator's subjectivity in a way that disrupts her sense of reality instead of assuring it. Where the narrator expects to find safety, stability, and a shelter, she finds a menacing gothic space which she cannot accommodate and/or change to confirm her subjectivity. Nevertheless, there is a different kind of interaction and mutual constitution between the narrator and space. In Lacanian terms, the narrator's spatial experience is shaped by her confinement to the imaginary register, which can be understood in relation to her failure to constitute the social space of the house through intersubjective relations.

4.3.1. Geometries of the Patriarchal Social Space

Rebecca tells the story of an unnamed narrator who, while working as a hired companion for Mrs. Van Hopper, meets the recently widowed aristocrat Maxim de Winter and falls in love with him. They get married in a short time. When she starts to live in Manderley, the narrator becomes obsessed with the late wife Rebecca, and her obsession is fed by Mrs. Danvers, her husband's melancholy, comments made about the differences between her and Rebecca by everybody she meets, and, most importantly, by her own feelings of insufficiency. In the course of the narrative, three big revelations about the death of Rebecca are made. First, her boat is discovered by chance, and her body is found, locked in the cabin. Then, Maxim confesses to the narrator that he murdered Rebecca. Finally, the police investigation reveals that Rebecca had cancer, and that she manipulated Maxim into murdering her. In the end, Manderley burns down. The novel is written in retrospect. In the framing chapters, the couple lives in exile.

Like *Jamaica Inn, Rebecca* is a gothic version of female *bildungsroman.* In the process of the narrator's entry into adulthood, her marriage to Maxim de Winter and her life in Manderley are the central events in the novel. The narrator's marriage promises to give her a home and a chance to construct her social space, but when she moves to Manderley, she encounters a geometry of social relations formed long before her. It is revealed in the narrative, however, that although the house is the spatialisation of patriarchal family, it is also a space of deviation from its norms. In other words, as the

intersection of the public and the private, the house makes both the patriarchal family and deviation from it possible. Unable to accommodate herself in the house, the narrator cannot integrate into the patriarchal symbolic and constitute her own social space without leaving Manderley behind.

From the beginning, the narrator has difficulty in constituting her social space actively. Before meeting Maxim de Winter, she accompanies Mrs. Van Hopper in her travels as a hired companion and is used to being left out of conversations by Mrs. Van Hopper as "a youthful thing and unimportant" (du Maurier, *Rebecca* 11). Maxim is the first person who acknowledges the narrator as a social agent, and thus invites her from her intrasubjective space to intersubjective interaction. She understands that invitation, but she does not know how to respond: "This including me in the conversation found me at my worst, the raw ex-schoolgirl, red-elbowed and lanky-haired, and I said something obvious and idiotic about the place being artificial" (14). When he directly addresses the narrator, Maxim raises the possibility for her to build a new social space, different from the one in which she was dismissed as unimportant. Indeed, aware of a shift in the social dynamics that she is used to, Mrs. Van Hopper later scolds the narrator for getting involved where she was supposed to remain silent and passive: "don't think I mean to be unkind, but you put yourself just a teeny bit forward this afternoon. Your efforts to monopolize the conversation quite embarrassed me, and I'm sure it did him. Man loathe that sort of thing" (16). Maxim continues addressing the narrator as his equal, which raises an expectation that she would be an active constituent of her space and gain social mobility.

The narrator has difficulty in coping with the social relations and occasions that she has to endure as part of her job, as her constant embarrassment when with Mrs. Van Hopper and her extreme disgust due to the tailor's attempt to pay her commission exemplify:

> Somehow, I don't know why, I had been aware of that sick, unhealthy feeling I had experienced as a child when turning the pages of a forbidden book. The vision of the consumptive son faded, and in its stead arose the picture of myself

> had I been different, pocketing the greasy note with an understanding smile, and perhaps . . . coming away with a frock I had not paid for. (23)

Despite her repulsion at the financial exchanges that her job requires, the narrator is already in a space that has a destabilising effect on her reality as the distinction between financially and emotionally regulated social relations is ambiguous. She works at a job the title of which she can make no sense even after she checks it at a dictionary: "I looked up the word companion once in the dictionary . . . and it said 'a companion is a friend of the bosom'" (20). She even confuses Maxim's marriage proposal with a job proposal and asks, "Do you mean you want a secretary or something?" while Maxim replies, "No, I'm asking you to marry me, you little fool" (46). Her marriage offers her a passage from a space of financially organised relations to a space of relations and interactions based on ties of love and affections. In psychoanalytic terms, as an antidote to all the conditions that the narrator finds debasing, Maxim de Winter comes in her life as an imaginary father who has the capacity to be the metonymic extension of the paternal metaphor. He makes her socially visible to the hotel staff simply by speaking to her.

With her marriage, the narrator expects to enter the patriarchal social space of Manderley, but this is a space the parameters of which have long been established. Also, although the narrator is unaware of it, its symmetries are broken, in a deep contrast to the architectural symmetry of the house. After the couple moves to Manderley, while the narrator struggles with her feelings of disorientation in the house, Maxim immediately returns to his own domestic position, to his everyday life; "a life which must be taken up again, continued as before, making vanished weeks a brief discarded holiday" (61). His marriage does not change his domestic routine. The narrator observes his most mundane activities and, finding comfort in familiarity, wishes for her own routines. For instance, Maxim lights a cigarette, and the narrator thinks: "This is his routine . . . this is what he always does; this has been his custom now for years. . . . he went on reading his paper, contented, comfortable, having assumed his way of living, the master of his house (69). As the master of the house, Maxim occupies the paternal space. The narrator feels at home when she is included

in this space: “My footsteps no longer sounded foolish on the stone flags of the hall, for Maxim’s nailed shoes made far more noise than mine” (69). However, Maxim does not share his psychic space with her and does not reorganise the house so as to help his wife position herself as Mrs. de Winter. Apart from having Mrs. Danvers prepare a new bedroom, he does not change anything.

The narrator’s incorporation into the social space of the house is prevented since the gendered spaces that would accommodate her subjectivity are already occupied by Mrs. Danvers and Rebecca, and she is unable to construct a new social space until she leaves Manderley. Feeling disoriented and dislocated, she is silenced most of the time. Her meaningful intersubjective interaction is limited to her relationship with her new maid who is at the same age as her and from a similar social background, and Maxim’s secretary, whom she considers to be as dull as herself (113). This silencing often leads the narrator to regress to her intrasubjective psychic space.

The power and gender geometries of the domestic space determine the organisation of the physical space. The library can be regarded as the centre of the patriarchal social space in the house. It is depicted as a male space, “with books lining the walls to the ceiling, the sort of room a man would move from never, did he live alone” (60). In this depiction, women are positioned, among other things, as a distraction that stand in the way between men and pursuit of knowledge. It is not organised for female pastime activities. This room monumentalises, in both scale and status, the traditions of the patriarchal man by negating any effect that time can impose on it: “Whatever air came to this room, whether coming from the garden or from the sea, would lose its first freshness, becoming part of the unchanging room itself, one with the books, musty and never read, one with the scrolled ceiling, the dark panelling, the heavy curtains” (60). Associated with access to knowledge, the library spatialises the patriarchal domain of laws, rules, interrogation, confession and punishment. As the occupier of the paternal position, Maxim controls the distribution of knowledge and acts as the agent of other patriarchal deeds. Many times in the novel, these deeds are executed in the library. Maxim prohibits his wife from pursuing sexual knowledge in this room:

> ‘I don’t want you to look like you did just now. You had a twist to your mouth and a flash of knowledge in your eyes. Not the right sort of knowledge.’
>
> I felt very curious, rather excited. ‘What do you mean, Maxim? What isn’t the right sort of knowledge?
>
> . . . ‘Listen my sweet. When you were a little girl, were you ever forbidden to read certain books, and did your father put those books under lock and key?’
>
> ‘Yes,’ I said.
>
> ‘Well, then. A husband is not so very different from a father after all. There is a certain type of knowledge I prefer you not to have. It’s better kept under lock and key.’ (182-3)

The library here spatialises how the circulation of knowledge is regulated in symmetry with the power geometries of patriarchal society. Maxim de Winter as the patriarchal husband and father does not allow the narrator to occupy the same space with him. The symmetry set between men and access to knowledge illustrates the gendered division of social and personal spaces, and this division functions as an instrument of control and education.

Two confessions bring about a change in the relationship between Maxim and the narrator. In the first confession scene, the narrator feels obliged to reveal that she broke a figurine of Cupid in the morning room and hid it in a drawer so as to save Robert from getting fired by Mrs. Danvers, who noticed that the figurine was missing. Here, Maxim preserves his fatherly space and keeps his distance from the trivial matters of the house that belong to the motherly space, which is controlled by Mrs. Danvers. He “impatiently” wants to get over with the whole incident and listens to the servants’ accounts in “amusement and exasperation,” making fun of the narrator and Mrs. Danvers, both of whom are very serious about the matter: “It looks as though Mrs. de Winter thought you would put her in prison, doesn’t it, Mrs. Danvers?” (127). Later, he consoles the narrator saying “[m]y sweet child, forget it” (128) and is surprised when the narrator says that she is afraid of Mrs. Danvers:

> ‘You do such extraordinary things,’ . . . ‘fancy not getting hold of her when you broke the thing and saying ‘Here, Mrs. Danvers, get this mended.’ She’d understand that. Instead of which you scrape up the remains in an envelope and hide’em at the back of a drawer. Just like a between-maid, as I said, and not the mistress of the house.’ (128)

As the master, Maxim does not inhabit Mrs. Danvers' motherly space and does not recognise her authority. He does not share a psychic space with Mrs. Danvers. Mrs. Danvers works for him. On the other hand, it is his ambivalent message that distorts the narrator's reality and prevents her from constituting her social space.

The second confession changes the power geometries in the relationship between Maxim and the narrator. In the library, Maxim confesses to the narrator that he murdered Rebecca. The confession breaks the father-daughter hierarchy between the couple and by revealing the secret, erases the intellectual uncertainty -on conscious level-, which enables the narrator to rebuild their relationship on equal grounds. This confession, however, signifies the end of the existing patriarchal order. That Manderley burns down soon after Maxim's confession and trial marks the loss of his capacity to be the metonymic extension of the paternal metaphor. Hence, Maxim is symbolically crippled through the loss of his privileged social and national/cultural status. He becomes an emblem for the fall of aristocracy. In the current present of the novel the hierarchy has again changed, this time into a mother-son relationship, and now it is the narrator who takes care of Maxim.

Compared to the library, the narrator identifies the morning room as a woman's space. There is not the old musty smell in this room as there was in the library, nor are there magazines or newspapers laid on the table just because it is the custom. The narrator provides an inventory of the objects found in this room:

> This was a woman's room, graceful, fragile, the room of someone who had chosen every particle of furniture with great care, so that each chair, each vase, each small, infinitesimal thing should be in harmony with one another, and with her own personality. It was as though she who had arranged this room had said: 'This I will have, and this, and this,' taking piece by piece from the treasures of Manderley each object that pleased her best, ignoring the second-rate, the mediocre, laying her hand with sure and certain instinct only upon the best. There was no intermingling of style, no confusing of period, and the result was perfection in a strange and startling way, not coldly formal like the drawing-room shown to the public, but vividly alive, having something of the

> same glow and brilliance that the rhododendrons had, massed there, beneath the window. (74-5)

The room is seen by the narrator as reflecting the style and self-assertiveness of the person who decorated it. Despite the elegant decoration, the room is also highly functional, indicating that the woman to whom the room belonged is not interested in trivial things:

> [T]his writing table, beautiful as it was, was no pretty toy where a woman would scribble little notes, nibbling the end of a pen, leaving it, day after day, in carelessness, the blotter a little askew. The pigeon-holes were docketed, 'letters unanswered,' 'letters-to-keep,' 'household,' 'estate,' 'menus,' 'miscellaneous,' 'addresses;' each ticket written in the same scrawling pointed hand that I knew already. (75)

In the middle of this business-like and purposeful room, monstrous crimson rhododendrons and a naked faun statue stand, which challenges the narrator's view of beauty, perfection and Rebecca. On the one hand, she seems to be located in the modern world. On the other hand, the "blood-red and luscious" rhododendrons (74), and the statue of a naked faun evoke grotesque forms of sexuality and ungoverned sexual and psychic energy that is not controlled by patriarchy and Christianity. Two aesthetic categories, the beautiful and the grotesque, and the real and fantasy come together in ways that challenge the narrator's understanding of and expectation from the female organisation of domestic space. This also challenges the boundaries of the patriarchal domestic space, where the woman, immobilised within the borders of home, comes to be defined as part of and responsible for the domestic comfort that constitutes and is constituted by the patriarchal family. The description of the morning room both evokes and transgresses such a closed-circuit relationship between woman and domestic space.

The narrator cannot occupy the domestic space of the house without complication. The house, for her, never becomes home, and she cannot repair the ruptures in her reality as long as she cannot close the gap between her assumptions about home and marriage and her experience of them. On the one hand, she incessantly comes across barriers,

rules and prohibitions that prevent her from constituting a domestic space as a wife or move beyond her position as predetermined by patriarchy. Her lack of knowledge of or familiarity with the conventions of aristocracy causes her to perceive the house as intimidating and forbidding, as if she were a child in the presence of adults. When she walks in the hall, the narrator feels the terrifying effect of the house: "How vast the great hall looked now that it was empty. My feet rang on the flagged stones, echoing to the ceiling, and I felt guilty at the sound, as one does in church, self-conscious, aware of the same constraint" (62-3). She feels as if she were violating strict rules in a space of some high order.

Living in Manderley indeed requires attending some unchanging rituals and strict obedience to everyday conventions. The narrator feels threatened especially by the servants, who are responsible for maintaining that order. They become the incarnation of the barrier between her and the social space. Her social disorientation is paralleled by physical disorientation and clumsiness. On her first morning, after the breakfast, her inability to establish proper communication with Frith, the servant, is followed by her losing balance. The narrator feels guilty about staying later than expected at the breakfast table and therefore breaking a convention and apologises. This surprises Frith, which causes more shame: "Perhaps it did not do to apologise. Perhaps it lowered me in his estimation" (71). The social awkwardness of the situation culminates in her bodily clumsiness:

> As it was, leaving the room, I stumbled, not looking where I was going, catching my foot on the step by the door, and Frith came forward to help me, picking up my handkerchief, while Robert, the young footman, who was standing behind the screen, turned away to hide his smile.
>
> I heard the murmur of their voices as I crossed the hall, and one of them laughed –Robert, I supposed. Perhaps they were laughing about me. (72)

She wanders and stumbles around the house, like a guest who does not know what to do in the absence of the host. She cannot even shelter in the privacy of her bedroom because of the maids:

> I went upstairs again, to the privacy of my bedroom, but when I opened the door I found the housemaids in there doing the room; one was sweeping the floor, the other dusting the dressing-table. They looked at me in surprise. I quickly went out again. It could not be right, then, for me to go to my room at that hour in the morning. It was not expected of me. It broke the household routine. (72)

Manderley is a place with established spatial parameters and power geometries. Thus, when the narrator attempts to constitute the domestic space of the everyday in the house, its social economy pushes her to the peripheries of the social space and consciousness. As the narrator is not able to become a constituent of her social space, her relationship to the house is constructed on intrasubjective level and thus in the unconscious, which is the realm of the uncanny.

In the depiction of the triangle of relationships between Maxim, Rebecca and the narrator, a certain power geometry is present, and this geometry contributes to the construction of a domestic space where the symmetries of the patriarchal family are shattered. Du Maurier obviously draws parallelisms with the story of Adam, his disobedient first wife Lilith and the obedient yet curious second wife Eve. Maxim, who stands for Adam, first marries Rebecca, who, obviously, stands for Lilith. Rebecca, whose sexuality is described in monstrous terms and who sees herself as superior to Maxim, does not obey Maxim, so, for Maxim, she must die. After Rebecca, Maxim, who is now wise enough to choose himself an obedient wife, marries the narrator, whom he sees as his inferior in every possible way. The narrator clearly embodies Eve. In this respect, Manderley, and particularly the Happy Valley, stands for heaven. On the surface, the serpent that infiltrates into this heavenly place can be seen as Mrs. Danvers. The forbidden knowledge is the repressed psychic material that cannot find expression in language. When the narrator shifts to the Lilith/Rebecca mode, Maxim immediately stops her. As the paternal authority, he sees her as a threat to the patriarchal order. Thus, what is more important than what happened to Rebecca and who Rebecca was is the knowledge about female sexuality that is represented by Rebecca, and the serpent in this account is the house, which tempts the narrator to find out about Rebecca against all odds and offers alternative and marginal ways other than books to reach forbidden knowledge. Rebecca as the serpent, then, signifies the fluidity

of female sexuality. On the other hand, Rebecca is not only associated with Lilith but also Medusa, whose gaze the narrator meets in the mirror in her dream. On a conscious level, the narrator perceives the dream as a threat to Maxim and acts with the aim of protecting him from danger. On an unconscious level, however, she identifies with Rebecca in the imaginary space of the mirror. In this respect, *Rebecca* is the story of the return of the repressed.

Everyone avoids talking about Maxim and Rebecca's marriage and Rebecca's death, which creates two ambivalent desires in the narrator: to learn more about Rebecca and to forget about her. When, for instance, Beatrice, Maxim's sister, comes very close to revealing some information about Rebecca, the narrator cannot decide whether she wants to hear it or not: "Part of me wanted her to continue her train of thought, to tell me more of the past, naturally and easily like this, and something else, way back in my mind, did not want to know, did not want to hear" (88). Rebecca comes to name the rift that is open in the narrator's reality. From time to time, in a conversation, she spots a train of thought which, if continued, would tell her something about Rebecca: "Sometimes I would glean little snatches of information to add to my secret store. A word dropped here at random, a question, a passing phrase. And, if Maxim was not with me, the hearing of them would be a furtive, rather painful pleasure, guilty knowledge, learnt in the dark" (109). Since the narrator cannot fully integrate into the patriarchal symbolic, she cannot fix her flying signifiers at some anchoring point. This in turn allows her to interact with the repressed material in the language of patriarchal domesticity, regarding family, gender, marriage and sexuality. This repressed material is inscribed on space. Thus, she classifies knowledge about Rebecca as guilty knowledge, learned in the dark, which can be opposed to the enlightened/proper knowledge, learned from books.

It can be argued that Rebecca's ability to shape her social space in ways to fit her reality through her mastery of the patriarchal symbolic discourse has a castrating effect on Maxim. Rebecca transgresses the subjective and social positions defined by traditional marriage by using the tools of patriarchy. Indeed, one way that Rebecca repeatedly appears in the narrative is through her handwriting, even before the

narrator's arrival at Manderley. In Monte Carlo, the narrator finds a book of poetry -a gift from Rebecca to Maxim- with Rebecca's handwriting:

> I picked up the book again and this time it opened at the title-page, and I read the dedication. 'Max –from Rebecca. May 17th,' written in a curious, slanting hand. A little blob of ink marred the white page opposite, as though the writer, in impatience, had shaken her pen to make the ink flow freely. And then as it bubbled through the nib, it came a little thick, so that the name Rebecca stood out black and strong, the tall and sloping R dwarfing the other letters. (29)

The initial letter that dwarves all the others is a peculiar quality of Rebecca's signature, a quality that is later repeatedly referred to. It can be seen as a sign of active agency in the symbolic register and control over social space. Rebecca's name stands black and strong against the hypocorism -Max- that she used instead of Maxim's full name. That the first name is emphasised over the surname can be linked to Rebecca's ability to constitute her own social space and bend the power and cultural geometries of patriarchy. The use of the hypocorism instead of Maxim's full name, on the other hand, can be understood as a sign of her castrating power over her husband, which underlies his association of Rebecca with monstrosity. At this point, however, the narrator sees it as a sign of the intimate relationship between Rebecca and Maxim, and she gets jealous:

> Max. She called him Max. It was familiar, gay, and easy on the tongue. The family could call him Maxim if they liked. Grandmothers and aunts. And people like myself, quiet, and dull and youthful, who did not matter. Max was her choice, the word was her possession; she had written it with so great a confidence on the fly-leaf of that book. That bold, slanting hand, stabbing the white paper, the symbol of herself, so certain, so assured . . . And I had to call him Maxim. (38-9)

The message, though not addressed to the narrator originally, speaks to her. The image of the slanting hand, stabbing the white paper which is the symbol of herself intensifies Rebecca's castrating power and her ability to integrate into the symbolic. Besides, the narrator here blurs the distinction between the symbol and the image, the signifier and the signified, by focusing on the graphic qualities of the handwriting. Thus, the handwriting helps to build a fluid character whose ambiguity cannot be reduced even

after Maxim depicts her as an evil monster. Rebecca's association with snakes can also be understood as part of a flexibility which provides her mobility.

In *Monstrous Feminine: Film, Feminism, Psychoanalysis*, Barbara Creed notes that "[a]ll human societies have a conception of the monstrous-feminine, of what it is about woman that is shocking, terrifying, horrific, abject" (1). She traces the female as a terrifying element in horror films in parallelism with the representation of woman in psychoanalysis as a threat to the masculine subject. Creed challenges the Freudian view that woman terrifies because she is castrated by arguing that woman most essentially terrifies because of the fear that she might castrate (7). From a feminist and psychoanalytic perspective, Creed claims that basically seven faces of the monstrous-feminine can be found in literature and film. Namely, these are, woman as archaic mother, monstrous womb, vampire, witch, possessed body, monstrous mother and castrator. She argues that the representation of woman as monstrous is linked with her reproductive power and/or her sexual desire (7). All these representations put woman as a threat to the unity and safety of the masculine identity in the phallogocentric discourse. In *Rebecca*, female sexuality and autonomy is represented as monstrous, as a kind of threat to the patriarchal order. Therefore, it is possible to argue that Rebecca is depicted as the monstrous-feminine. She can be called a phallic woman, who has playfully and subversively integrated herself into the patriarchal system. There is a direct relationship between power and woman in her case. She has agency and can create her own space.

After his failure to keep one wife under control, Maxim infantilises the other. That is, he does not recognise her sexual difference and prevents her from reaching sexual maturity. He tries to keep the narrator in the space of fantasy, dream and imagination, which is most overtly signified through his wish to see her dressed as Alice in *Alice in Wonderland* for the ball. This prevents the narrator from integrating into the symbolic. It is clear in Maxim's confession scene. When he finally says that he loves her and kisses her, the narrator notes that it is the first time that he kisses her like this (du Maurier, *Rebecca* 242). Yet, the house, due to its construction in a way that privatises sexuality, teaches the narrator more than Maxim would allow.

In the narrator's reluctant but at the same time fascinated search for forbidden knowledge, the house becomes her text. The west wing and especially Rebecca's bedroom become sites of fear and attraction. Indeed, the west wing turns into a locus of female sexuality but suggests ambivalent implications about it. The narrator's first entry to the west wing is accidental, and it ironically happens when she actually tries to get to her own room: "I must have lost my bearings, for passing through a door at the head of the stairs I came to a long corridor that I had not seen before, similar in some ways to the one in the east wing, but broader and darker –dark owing to the panelling of the walls" (79). The invitation for further discovery is made by Mrs. Danvers, who insists on showing the narrator the rooms in the west wing:

> 'Any time, when you have nothing to do, you have only to ask me, and I will show you the rooms in the west wing,' she persisted, making me vaguely uncomfortable. I knew not why. Her insistence struck a chord in my memory, reminding me of a visit to a friend's house, as a child, when the daughter of the house, older than me, took my arm and whispered in my ear, 'I know where there is a book, locked in a cupboard, in my mother's bedroom. Shall we go and look at it?' I remembered her white, excited face, and her small, beady eyes, and the way she kept pinching my arm. (81)

Mrs. Danvers' offer to show her the rooms in the west wing evokes in the narrator's mind a childhood memory. Mrs. Danvers offers to give her the key to unlock some forbidden knowledge. The narrator's discomfort and excitement, and the location of the secret lead the reader to assume that the content of this hidden knowledge is sexual. That the strangeness of this incident reminds her of something long forgotten arouses the uncanny. By learning further about Rebecca, the narrator also disobeys her husband, which brings her closer to the transgressive first wife.

4.3.2. Haunting and the Uncanny as a Psychic Space of Topology

In *Rebecca*, du Maurier sets up a fantasy world where the borders between the conscious and unconscious and the reality and fantasy are thin and permeable. The novel produces liminality by establishing a space that is ever shifting its status. Indeed, Horner and Zlosnik note that "Manderley figures as both a 'real' house and the stuff of

dreams" (101), and suggest that a kind of unmapping is apparent in the geographical blurring of Manderley's location:

> *Rebecca* communicates no sense of where Manderley is in Cornwall, although most readers assume its site to be that of Menabilly, on the Gribben peninsula, with 'Lanyon' and 'Kerrith' representing Lostwithiel and Fowey respectively. … [A]s she knew Cornwall well by 1938, its geographical vagueness in the novel seems deliberate and suggestive of a desire to create a 'dream' text rather than a realist one. (100-1)

In addition to this geographical vagueness, the novel is generically liminal since "references in the novel to myth and fairytale continue to dislocate expectations of realism that the text seems to set up elsewhere" (Horner and Zlosnik 101). This liminality allows du Maurier to evoke the uncanny by spatial warping[7] and opening cuts, riffs and faults in the traditional ways of understanding the relation between space and subject.

The first two chapters of the novel build ambiguity and ambivalence around Manderley and the narrator's relationship to it. The book opens with an evocation of the return of the repressed: "Last night I dreamed I went to Manderley again" (du Maurier, *Rebecca* 1). The narrator dreams of Manderley in its present state. She sees herself in front of the gates, just on the borders of the house. Throughout her dream, she shifts between different states, such as the past and the present or dream and reality. She also shifts shape. At times she becomes spectral while, at other times, she possesses some corporeal qualities. At the beginning of her dream, the narrator stands at the outside gates of the house and calls for the lodge-keeper, only to realise that the lodge is empty. After that, "like all dreamers" she is "possessed of a sudden with supernatural powers" and passes "like a spirit through the barrier before" her (1). Soon, however, the physical barriers affect her as she has to bend her "head to avoid the low

[7] Anthony Vidler uses the term "spatial warping" to refer to artistic practices which, as a result of the emphasis on the subjective nature of space since the late nineteenth century, "depict . . . subject/object disturbances, themselves distorting the conventional ways in which space has been described since the Renaissance" and also to artistic practices that break "the boundaries of genre and art in response to the need to depict space in new and unparalleled ways" (*Warped Space* viii). I think this term applies to du Maurier's construction of space in the novels.

swinging branch of a tree," which leads her to understand "what had happened" (1). As she approaches the house, she can also feel her "heart thumping" and "the strange prick of tears behind [her] eyes" (2), all of which are corporeal reactions. Throughout this chapter, with the switching of the house back and forth between its past and present conditions, an opposition is drawn between its two states, depicting the house on the one hand in its former glory:

> There was Manderley, our Manderley, secretive and silent as it had always been, the grey stone shining in the moonlight of my dream, the mullioned windows reflecting the green lawns and the terrace. Time could not wreck the perfect symmetry of those walls, nor the site itself, a jewel in the hollow of a hand. (2)

On the other hand, even in her dream, the narrator sees the house in what she imagines to be its current state: "I looked upon a desolate shell, soulless at last, unhaunted, with no whisper of the past about its staring walls. . . . The house was a sepulchre, our fear and suffering lay buried in the ruins. There would be no resurrection" (3). Finally, the house stands outside history, enclosing on itself in complete isolation from the rest of the world. She calls the house "our Manderley," talks about the drive as "our drive" and refers to the time she lived there as "our time" (1-2). The first-person plural pronoun implies togetherness and mutuality. Her tone is nostalgic, which gives the impression that she is dreaming of a house where she once felt at home. Nevertheless, she distinguishes between two different versions of Manderley: One is the image of a homely house, a glimpse of what her life would be there if she had not left:

> When I thought of Manderley in my waking hours I would not be bitter. I should think of it as it might have been, could I have lived there without fear. I should remember the rose-garden in summer, and the birds that sang at dawn. Tea under the chestnut tree, and the murmur of the sea coming up to us from the lawns below.
>
> I would think of brown lilac, and the Happy Valley. These things were permanent, they could not be dissolved. They were memories that cannot hurt. (3)

Here she lists the domestic comforts of a country house, things she could have enjoyed if she had had the chance. Yet, she accepts: "All this resolved in my dream . . ." (3).

The other Manderley, the one that is repressed but repeatedly returns in her dream, is Manderley as associated and even merged with Rebecca:

> But your timid fellow, your nervous poacher -the woods of Manderley are not for him. He might stumble upon the little cottage in the cove and he would not be happy beneath its tumbled roof, the thin rain beating a tattoo. There might linger there still a certain atmosphere of stress. . . . That corner in the drive, too, where the trees encroach upon the gravel, is not a place in which to pause, not after the sun has set. When the leaves rustle, they sound very much like the stealthy movement of a woman in evening dress, and when they shiver suddenly, and fall, and scatter away along the ground, they might be the patter, patter, of a woman's hurrying footstep, and the mark in the gravel the imprint of a high-heeled satin shoe.
>
> It is when I remember these things that I turn with relief to the prospect from our balcony. (7-8)

The distinction that the narrator makes between the homely and unhomely versions of the house is an ambivalent one since the domestic comfort that she allows herself to remember during daytime is haunted, in her dream, by the residue of Rebecca:

> Light came from the windows, the curtains blew softly in the night air, and there, in the library, the door would stand open as we had left it, with my handkerchief on the table beside the autumn roses.
>
> The room would bear witness to our presence. The little heap of library books marked ready to return, and the discarded copy of *The Times*. Ashtrays, with the stub of a cigarette; cushions, with the imprint of our heads upon them, lolling in the chairs; the charred embers of our log fire still smouldering against the morning. (3)

This vision reflects the narrator's ideal of marriage: man and woman sharing the idle domestic comforts as equal companions. The library, different from her later depiction, bears both male –ashtrays with the stub of a cigarette, a copy of *The Times*- and female – the handkerchief and the autumn roses- qualities. On the other hand, the handkerchief that she calls hers echoes the one that belongs to Rebecca, which the narrator finds in the pocket of a mackintosh. This chapter ends with a clear distinction between dream and reality, and past and present since the narrator acknowledges that "[i]n reality I lay many hundred miles away in an alien land . . . We would not talk of Manderley, I would not tell my dream. For Manderley was ours no longer. Manderley was no more"

(3-4). This contrast creates an illusion of a nostalgic longing for a place which was once home but is now lost.

In the second chapter, with the interruption of Mrs. Danvers into her memory, the narrator introduces the social dimension of the house and complicates her relation to the house further as she remembers her suffering there at the hands of Mrs. Danvers. She repeats once more, but this time as if to assure herself: "Manderley is no more. It lies like an empty shell amidst the tangle of the deep woods, even as I saw it in my dream" (7). On a conscious level, the narrator is free from Manderley: "I ride no more tormented, and both of us are free" (7). Thus, that Manderley is no more is a relief. Her narrative, however, points out that she is not entirely free of the house and the influence of Rebecca.

At the centre of the uncanniness of a house lies the distinction between the public and private, personal and social spaces and the blurring of that distinction. The first encounter between the narrator and Maxim hints at the narrator's aversion to the blurring of the boundaries between public and private, social and personal spaces. She depicts Mrs. Van Hopper as a coarse woman who interferes with other people's privacy with her speech that knows no boundaries and her devouring gaze, intensified by her lorgnette, and Maxim, a secretive man who seemingly has no tolerance for such action. Mrs. Van Hopper trespasses the boundaries of Maxim's private space by bringing Manderley forth in a conversation: "she ran on like a clumsy goat, trampling and trespassing on land that was preserved, and I felt the colour flood my face, dragged with her as I was into humiliation" (13). This conversation marks the beginning of the narrator's romanticisation of Maxim and Manderley and her association of the homely with privacy, which later results in her building a mystery: "I was aware . . . of that feeling of discomfort, as though I had trespassed on forbidden ground. I wondered why it was that this home of his, known to so many people by hearsay, even to me, should so inevitably silence him, making as it were a barrier between him and others" (19). When Mrs Van Hopper asks Maxim de Winter about Manderley insistently, the narrator realises a change in his mood: "I noticed the subtle change in his eyes, the indefinable something that lingered there, momentarily, and I felt I had looked upon

something personal to himself with which I had no concern" (14). This country house that he owns gives Maxim a kind of distance, and superiority, due to a certain kind of privacy that other people do not possess: "Maybe there was something inviolate about Manderley that made it a place apart; it would not bear discussion" (20). Maxim's silence provokes in the narrator a fantasy of a space as an impenetrable interiority which offers utmost privacy, an appealing alternative to the space that she shares with Mrs. Van Hopper. Throughout the novel, the narrator tries to produce the content for that indefinable something while trying to avoid the taboo words. She tries to pass beyond the barrier and accommodate this forbidden ground by building an intrasubjective relationship with her husband, where there are no secrets between the husband and wife -which is the main principle of an ideal marriage according to the narrator. Instead, their marriage is built around a gap through which the residue of the repressed psychic material is revived and operates. Indeed, "[t]he crucial fact about this woman," as Smith notes, "is that she has no identity: her achievement of identity depends upon her discovering the secret on which her existence as Max de Winter's wife, as Mrs. de Winter, is conditioned" (304).

The unconscious in *Rebecca* is not built as a kind of internal private space; it is externalised and dispersed all over the house. In this sense, it resonates with the unconscious as formulized in Lacanian psychoanalysis. Cuéllar notes that "the intra-subjective exteriority would be explained . . . by the internal alienation of the subject in the exteriority of language and the ensuing formation, as the unconscious, of a particularized Other" (176). Therefore,

> The unconscious is everywhere outside the mental interiority of the subject. And yet, it is in the subject. It is even what thinks in him. It is his body as the intra-subjective thinking workplace of the unconscious. As the corporeal structure that subjects and subjectifies the subject, the unconscious is the structure *of* its effect of subjectivity. (Cuéllar 176)

Lacan argues that the unconscious is structured like a language because "we only grasp the unconscious finally when it is explicated, in that part of it which is articulated by

passing into words" (*Seminar VII* 32). Thus, according to Lacan, intrasubjectivity differs from intersubjectivity, for the formation of which

> the subject has to arise from the given state of the signifiers that cover him [*le recouvrent*] in an Other which is their transcendental locus; he thus constitutes himself in an existence in which the manifestly constitutive vector of the Freudian field of experience—that is, what is known as desire—is possible. (*Écrits* 549)

The narrator's inability to accommodate the social space of Manderley confines her to the psychic space of intrasubjectivity, where the symbiosis between her and the house takes the form of haunting. Therefore, she resists the restrictive and immobilising environment of the domestic space, but not on conscious level. Here, she is haunted by the residue of the repressed psychic material from Maxim's, de Winter family's and Mrs. Danvers' unconscious. In short, the whole house, acting as an extension of the unconscious of its -past and present- inhabitants constitutes the narrator's intrasubjective space. This multiplicity and asymmetry make Manderley an anisotropic space. In this account, the whole narrative, which is written in retrospect, can be read as the narrator's attempt to write herself into the social space, reconciling with the symbolic, and her effort to release the repressed psychic material. That her name is left out of the narrative prevents the reader from positioning the narrator linguistically and culturally, and reinforces the uncanniness of her text.

Haunting in *Rebecca* is a gothic version of the symbiosis between space and the subject. It works through the transgenerational transfer of knowledge, and it can be understood as a mechanism of the unconscious. Such conceptualisation of haunting can be found in Nicolas Abraham and Maria Torok's psychoanalytic theory of the phantom and haunting. They write, "The image of the phantom . . . points to an occasion of torment for patients. . . -a memory they *buried without legal burial place*," which results in "the establishment of a sealed-off psychic place, a crypt in the ego" ("'Lost Object-Me'" 140-1). This crypt points at the existence of something incommunicable: "In all cases, the goal of this type of construction is to disguise the wound because it is unspeakable" (142). Abraham notes that "what haunts are not the

dead, but the gaps left within us by the secrets of others" ("Notes" 171). Abraham breaks the connection between the ghostly and mourning, and claims, "What comes back to haunt are the tombs of others" (172). From this vantage point, the uncanny haunting can be understood as a silent transmission. In *Rebecca*, since the narrator is unable to articulate her experience in linguistic and cultural codes, what is repressed returns in the form of haunting. This is also the space of the uncanny, which has its roots in the unconscious.

Linking private/public space distinction that is at work in the Freudian uncanny to the mechanism of repression that is at work in our intimate spaces, Alexandra Kokoli states, "Since the private sphere, inextricably mapped onto domesticity, is thus systematically repressed, if not disavowed, the figure of woman becomes marginalized and edited out alongside it" (36). In the haunted/haunting space of Manderley, the narrator is haunted by the repressed female of phallogocentric discourse, whose repression assures the construction and continuation of the patriarchy. The residue and psychic impressions are scattered all over the house, and they infiltrate the narrator's consciousness through the ruptures they create and lead her to find herself in a strange asymmetry. This resonates with Abraham and Torok's notion of haunting. The phantom "holds the individual within a group dynamic constituted by a specific familial (and sometimes extrafamilial) topology that prevents the individual from living life as her or his own" (Rashkin 27). The narrator repetitively finds herself tortured and paralysed by the ghost of Rebecca about whom she wants to forget:

> Little things, meaningless and stupid in themselves, but they were there for me to see, for me to hear, for me to feel. Dear God, I did not want to think about Rebecca. I wanted to be happy, to make Maxim happy, and I wanted us to be together. There was no other wish in my heart but that. I could not help it if she came to me in thoughts, in dreams. I could not help it if I felt like a guest at Manderley, my home, walking where she had trodden, resting where she had lain. I was like a guest, biding my time, waiting for the return of the hostess. Little sentences, little reproofs reminding me every hour, every day. (du Maurier, *Rebecca* 123)

The narrator's emphasis on the lack of control and that Rebecca came to her against her will in thoughts and dreams points at an intrasubjective interaction that addresses

the unconscious psychic mechanisms. This gothic space, in its connection to the social space which the narrator cannot inhabit as an active agent, can be understood in relation to Anne Williams' argument that the Gothic defamiliarizes the symbolic and thus creates the uncanny, which she reads as "a kind of disruption of signifiers" (72):

> Repression, and the consequent division between 'the real' of consciousness and the 'not real' of the unconscious, analogous in structure to that of signifier and signified, is thus a precondition for the uncanny. One might say that 'the uncanny' is like the radioactive energy given off when the atom of signifier and signified is split. (72)

At this point, Abraham and Torok's notion of the phantom requires reconfiguration. In their theory, the secret can be eventually found out by a careful interpretation of the "cryptonyms," which are "words that hide" in the subject's language (*Wolfman's Magic Word* 18). Rather than pursuing the chain of signification, however, they suggest a theory of readability. Esther Rashkin writes, "In a cryptonymic reading we may stop at a signifier if we can determine what it hides, how it hides it, and what drama might be linked to its process of hiding" (36). This study diverges from such a reading by arguing that haunting in *Rebecca* resists any final determination and that this resistance makes it a gothic narrative. On the contrary, it can be understood more in line with the post-structuralist concepts of deferral and undecidability. Drawing on Derrida's understanding of the spectral, Bennett and Royle note that "the ghost is the revenant, that which uncannily returns without ever being properly present in the first place" (*Introduction to Literature* 138). This allows for a rethinking of the return of the repressed as well.

The repressed material is revived through the narrator's intrasubjective relationship with Rebecca, whose absence is filled with the residues of this repressed material and the domestic space, which is constituted as her supplement by Mrs. Danvers. Mrs. Danvers organises and maintains the domestic household chores and, in Rebecca's absence, occupies the maternal space in the house. She lives in an intrasubjective psychic space in which the house functions as Rebecca's metonymic extension.

The ordinary and the uncanny, or the homely and the unhomely, experiences often overlap in the novel. On the one hand, domestic objects and banalities serve as shields against fear and the uncanny, supporting the narrator's idea that "boredom is a pleasing antidote to fear" (du Maurier, *Rebecca* 5). For example, when the narrator feels that she is being watched by Mrs. Danvers, she tries to take comfort in the ordinariness of her domestic surroundings: "I went and sat down with a book and *The Times* and my knitting in the rose garden, domestic as a matron, yawning in the warm sun while the bees hummed amongst the flowers" (157). On the other hand, more often than not, the same objects function as the very source of disturbance. Indeed, the narrator's confinement to her intrasubjective psychic space directs her attention to the objects around the house. In time, the objects start looking back at and, in a way, talking to her. Although any talk about Rebecca is silenced by Maxim, the objects she left behind, the leftovers of her life, function as psychic residues that come to fill the gap that has opened up due to the fissure formed in the intersubjective space shared by the husband and wife. These residues make up a warped space that haunts the narrator.

The limitations that the domestic life imposes on women are hinted at through frequent moments of *déjà vu* and repetition. To fend off the threatening intrusions of the repressed material, the narrator conjures the memory of the postcard from her childhood. This postcard comes to represent the imaginary ideal domestic life that she wants to build in Manderley. In her first evening, she uses that image to close the gap between imagination and reality so that she can convince herself that she is here and now, putting herself once again in an antithetical position with Rebecca, who is there and then:

> I leant back in my chair, glancing about the room, trying to instil into myself some measure of confidence, some genuine realisation that I was here, at Manderley, the house of the picture post-card, the Manderley that was famous. I had to teach myself that all this was mine now, mine as much as his, the deep chair I was sitting in, that mass of books stretching to the ceiling, the pictures on the walls, the gardens, the woods, the Manderley I had read about, all of this was mine now because I was married to Maxim. (61-2)

This legal right to the house does not ensure the narrator's accommodation of the domestic space without complicating her reality but points out the asymmetry between the symbolic and the imaginary in her narrative. She has to teach herself to own this place; that is, she needs to close the gap between the intersubjective space -where she is now Mrs. de Winter- and the intrasubjective space -where she does not feel like she is really here. She goes on to dream herself as the mother of two boys, which would add her to the genealogy of the house, ensure her integration to the patriarchal social space and accommodate the motherly space. Yet, her fragile sense of security lasts short since she quickly comes to the realisation that someone else had these dreams and experiences before and enters the realm of the uncanny.

Experienced in the novel in strange reversals, moments of *déjà vu*, for Royle, are essential to a theory of the double and the ghost (*Uncanny* 182). *Déjà vu* involves "the impression that the present reality has a *double. Déjà vu* is the experience of the double *par excellence*: it is the experience of experience as double" (183). It involves an experience of "duplicity without an original" (Derrida, *Post Card* 270). The narrator's experiences of *déjà vu* are strangely reversed because she feels that she re-lives someone else's experience. In the middle of her most peaceful thoughts, she finds herself as a double, repeating the things that someone else did before her. Her domestic comfort is interrupted with the experience of the uncanny:

> And as I sat there, brooding, my chin in my hands, fondling the soft ears of one of the spaniels, it came to me that I was not the first one to lounge there in possession of the chair; someone had been before me, had surely left an imprint of her person on the cushions, and on the arm where her hand had rested. Another one had poured the coffee from that same silver coffee pot, had placed the cup to her lips, had bent down to the dog, even as I was doing.
>
> Unconsciously, I shivered as though someone had opened the door behind me and let a draught into the room. I was sitting in Rebecca's chair, I was leaning against Rebecca's cushion, and the dog had come to me and laid his head upon my knee because that had been his custom, and he remembered, in the past, she had given sugar to him there. (du Maurier, *Rebecca* 69-70)

The unconscious element resurfaces like the opening of a door, but it is already there, imprinted on space, traceable on the objects. The narrator suddenly realises that the

position she tries to take as Mrs. de Winter was occupied by somebody else before her. This moment of realisation can be understood as an implication of the fact that Rebecca's death and replacement remind the narrator of her own mortality and replaceability. More importantly, doubling and *déjà vu* hint at the impossibility of an active agency that can be used to constitute one's social space within the patriarchal discourse. In this uncanny experience, now and then clash in here, in the same place. She feels that her experience is a replica of somebody else's original experience. Imagining that she is repeating someone else's private moment, the narrator feels like an intruder, which blurs the border that separates the self from the other as the narrator relates her experience and the other's experience in the same space. She, being the second wife, the successor of Rebecca, inherits from her this psychic space, too, from where the uncanny impressions arise.

The absent-presence that acts, or haunts, through objects causes the narrator to experience spatial uncanny, an experience of disorientation and spatial estrangement. From this perspective, the novel offers a gothic version of Massey's conception of place. The identity of a place, Massey claims, is related to "something which might be called there and then is implicated in the here and now. 'Here' is an intertwining of histories in which the spatiality of those histories (their then as well as their here) is inescapably entangled. The interconnections themselves are part of the construction of identity" (*For Space* 139). Therefore, "[w]hat is special about a place is precisely that throwntogetherness, the unavoidable, challenge of negotiating a here-and-now . . . and a negotiation which must take place within and between both human and nonhuman . . . This is the event of place" (139). It is possible to argue that gothic space cannot be thought of without a recognition of such interconnections and conflicts between here and there as well as now and then. Indeed, it might be suggested that a constituent quality of gothic space is that it does not allow its inhabitants to release from the realisation of such interconnectedness. While assigning place a constitutive and relational quality, Massey writes, "Place . . . does . . . change us . . . through the *practising* of place, the negotiation of intersecting trajectories; place as an arena where negotiation is forced upon us" (154). In the novel, this throwntogetherness creates the uncanny, and the event of place is haunting as it constitutes the subject through

unconscious negotiations. For the narrator, then, as the practice of place takes the form of haunting, it does not give her a chance for conscious negotiation. Thus, she repeatedly finds herself in the disorienting and dislocating gothic space.

The domestic objects, through which the narrator constructs her homely space, precede her and bear the traces of the past residents. She perceives the house as such a seamless surface -the indication of which is its architectural symmetry- that she cannot experience its homely qualities without feeling like an intruder or a trespasser, which also results in her spatial experience being interrupted by the uncanny residues. In other words, this seamless surface has a pacifying effect on the narrator since it makes her an audience to rather than a participant in her own spatiality. The first time the narrator is in the morning room can be given as an example to this displacing experience. Sitting at the writing table, looking inside the drawers, the narrator feels like a trespasser in someone else's personal space, but also derives voyeuristic pleasure from secretly going through someone else's possessions. This is right where she comes across Rebecca's handwriting: "each ticket written in that same scrawling pointed hand that I knew already. And it shocked me, even startled me, to recognise it again, for I had not seen it since I had destroyed the page from the book of poems, and I had not thought to see it again" (du Maurier, *Rebecca* 75). This is a haunting interaction between the subject and the object since the narrator's reality is, for a moment, suspended; the objects look back at her, even talk to her, diminishing the subject-object distinction:

> I took one out and looked at it, unwrapped it from its thin tissue of paper. 'Mrs. M. de Winter' it said, and in the corner 'Manderley.' I put it back in the box again, and shut the drawer, feeling guilty suddenly, and deceitful, as though I were staying in somebody else's house and my hostess had said to me, 'Yes, of course, write letters at my desk,' and I had unforgivably, in a stealthy manner, peeped at her correspondence. At any moment she might come back into the room, and she would see me there, sitting before her open drawer, which I had no right to touch. (76)

The voyeuristic look of the narrator is soon caught up by the Lacanian gaze, which is different from the eye: "In our relation to things, in so far as this relation is constituted by the way of vision, and ordered in the figures of representation, something slips,

passes, is transmitted, from stage to stage, and is always to some degree eluded in it—that is what we call the gaze" (*Seminar XI* 73). That feeling of displacement and disorientation reaches its peak when the telephone rings, and the narrator is caught unprepared in the middle of a private moment:

> And when the telephone rang, suddenly, alarmingly, on the desk in front of me, my heart leaped and I started up in terror, thinking I had been discovered. I took the receiver off with trembling hands, and 'Who is it?' I said, 'who do you want?' There was a strange buzzing at the end of the line, and then a voice came, low and rather harsh, whether that of a woman or a man I could not tell, and 'Mrs. de Winter?' it said, 'Mrs. de Winter?'
>
> 'I'm afraid you have made a mistake,' I said; 'Mrs. de Winter has been dead for over a year.' I sat there, waiting, staring stupidly into the mouthpiece, and it was not until the name was repeated again, the voice incredulous slightly raised, that I became aware, with a rush of colour to my face, that I had blundered irretrievably, and could not take back my words. (du Maurier, *Rebecca* 76)

With the sudden ringing of the phone, an interruption from the physical reality, the narrator uncannily feels that the objects she is looking at look back at her, which shortly causes the loss of control over her reality. The encounter with the Other and the entry into the Other's space cause the narrator's total loss of capacity to signify meaning in language. The distinction between the eye and the gaze becomes the distinction between the conscious and the unconscious. It is only because the gaze is veiled and screened by the eye that consciousness and subjectivity can come into being. The gaze can be figured as an external point from which an anxiety provoking look assails the subject. However, the point in question is not an eye that looks back at the subject, nor a mirror in which the subject sees himself/herself looking (Lacan, *Seminar XI* 73-5). Rather, "it is a product of . . . an intimate exchange in which the surface fills and overflows the eye, such that the viewer cannot be detached from the surface" (Wigley 382). The gaze evokes anxiety, which transforms the viewer's look into a self-directed, passive being looked at: "That which is gaze is always a play of light and opacity. It is always that gleam of light . . . which prevents me, at each point, from being a screen" (Lacan, *Seminar XI* 96). As Lacan remarks, it "is presented to us only in the form of a strange contingency, symbolic of . . . the lack that constitutes castration anxiety" (72-3). Lacan notes that the gaze surprises the subject, "disturbs

him and reduces him to a feeling of shame" (84). Thus, the viewer is not looking at the phallus, but its absence:

> The gaze is this object lost and suddenly refound in the conflagration of shame, by the introduction of the other. Up to that point, what is the subject trying to see? What he is trying to see … is the object as absence. What the voyeur is looking for and finds is merely a shadow, a shadow behind the curtain. There he will phantasize any magic of presence. (182)

In this manner, the gaze functions as an object around which the exhibitionistic and voyeuristic impulses that constitute the scopic drive revolve. It is a force encountering the subject from the object's point of view. However, it can be understood in the narrator's encounter with the Real that it is the impossible space that lies outside language, resists all symbolisation and is thus beyond her constructed reality. Thus, the encounter opens a crack in the narrator's reality. Not being able to confront this crack on conscious level, the narrator places Rebecca or Mrs. Danvers and at times other servants in this position of the object, from which the gaze looks at her.

Mrs. Danvers, with her skull face, black dress and cold manners, becomes the incarnation of the deadly void. By manipulating the domestic space and disorienting the narrator, Mrs. Danvers intrudes into the narrator's psychic space and reveals the gaps in her reality. For the great part in the narrative, for the narrator, Mrs. Danvers and Manderley are not entirely separated from one another since Mrs. Danvers represents the motherly space of the house and becomes the greatest barrier between the narrator and the house. She occupies the motherly space and does not allow the narrator into it:

> There were so many windows in Manderley, so many rooms that were never used by Maxim and myself that were empty now; dust sheeted, silent, rooms that had been occupied in the old days when his father and his grandfather had been alive, when there had been much entertaining, many servants. It would be easy for Mrs. Danvers to open those doors softly and close them again, and then steal quietly across the shrouded room and look down upon me from behind the drawn curtains. (du Maurier, *Rebecca* 157)

For the narrator, Mrs. Danvers is the gaze behind the windows, always watching. She is the ear on the other end of the door, always listening, peeping through the keyholes. Therefore, the narrator feels like an intruder who trespasses someone else's private space. She is thus alienated from her own spatial experience. Mrs. Danvers wants to be watched and haunted by Rebecca for in this way she can maintain her symbiotic relationship with her. She also wants the narrator to be watched and haunted. Rebecca's bedroom is a stage, set by Mrs. Danvers, who gains voyeuristic pleasure from watching the narrator stare at Rebecca's belongings: "Then I heard a step behind me and turning round I saw Mrs. Danvers. I shall never forget the expression on her face. Triumphant, gloating, excited in a strange unhealthy way. I felt very frightened" (150). She asks, "Do you think she can see us, talking to one another now? . . . Do you think the dead come back and watch the living? . . . Sometimes I wonder if she comes back here to Manderley and watches you and Mr. de Winter together" (155). Her question begs for affirmation. For Mrs. Danvers, a lifelong servant who controls the domestic space for its inhabitants without being seen and/or noticed, haunting is the only way of occupying the same space with Rebecca. When the narrator listens to Mrs. Danvers talk about Rebecca, as if hypnotised, she cannot help but listen:

> I wanted to run away, but I could not move. I went on watching her eyes . . . her voice ingratiating and sweet as honey, horrible, false. 'I know you want to see it all, you've wanted to for a long time, and you were too shy to ask. It's a lovely room, isn't it? The loveliest room you have ever seen.'
>
> She took hold of my arm, and walked me towards the bed. I could not resist her, I was like a dumb thing. The touch of her hand made me shudder. And her voice was low and intimate, a voice I hated and feared. (150-1)

Mrs. Danvers' signification as the Lacanian gaze is more obvious with the narrator's reference to the light: "the daylight made the room vivid and alive. . . . I was a guest again. An uninvited guest. I had strolled into my hostess's bedroom by mistake" (148-9). Mrs. Danvers arouses the uncanny by being the death drive incarnate.

Mrs. Danvers occupies the motherly space as regulated by the patriarchy; she is the Mother as merged with the house. This is, as Massey claims, very much related to "the construction of 'home' as a woman's place" based on "those views of place itself as a

source of stability, reliability and authenticity. Such views of place, which reverberate with nostalgia for something lost, are coded female. Home is . . . where the woman (mother, lover-to-whom-you-will-one-day-return) is . . .” (*Space, Place and Gender* 180). In such a way of seeing the identities of the house and woman as bounded, woman is conceived of “not as herself a living person . . . engaged in her own and others’ history, but a stable symbolic centre –functioning as an anchor for others” (180). In the case of Mrs. Danvers, such a position is assumed through a double articulation: It is not possible to learn if Rebecca and Mrs. Danvers had a mother-daughter relationship. However, it is possible to trace a sexual investment in Mrs. Danvers’ enduring obsession with Rebecca. Thus, Mrs. Danvers’ positioning herself in the motherly space of the patriarchal domestic house can be read as her way of reconstructing her relation to Rebecca within the acceptable limits of the dominant patriarchal discourse and hence make it communicable to herself and to others. Still, the incommunicable love that she feels for Rebecca finds expression in her attachment to the objects belonging to Rebecca, which are all linked to her corporeality.

Mrs. Danvers activates Rebecca’s gaze in the house and focuses this evanescent gaze on the narrator. She still lives in synchrony with Rebecca. The narrator’s presence causes a disruption in the relation between the house and Mrs. Danvers. She does not want to see the narrator take Rebecca’s place because the narrator, unlike the powerful Rebecca, is very submissive. Not being able to oppose Maxim de Winter, the patriarch, she has to negotiate with the new Mrs. de Winter over the psychic and social spaces of the house. Thus, she finds ways to destabilise the narrator’s unconscious through uncanny implications. This psychic intrusion, which can happen due to Mrs. Danvers’ extensive knowledge and control of the routines and objects in the house, takes the form of haunting since it does not reach the level of the conscious, not being signified in language, until very late in the novel. In her opponent, Mrs. Danvers finds a new accomplice who can participate in this game as the haunted second wife. Mrs. Danvers in her position as a servant gives ambivalent messages to the narrator. She is inferior to the narrator but is more familiar with the ways of this segment of the society. Being everywhere and nowhere, she is the uncanny incarnate:

> Mrs. Danvers never obtruded herself, but I was aware of her continually. It was her voice I heard . . . it was she who gave directions . . . Whenever I came upon the scene she had always just disappeared; I would catch a glimpse of her skirt brushing the door, or hear the sound of her footsteps on the stairs. (du Maurier, *Rebecca* 183-4)

Mrs. Danvers is supposed to be submissive to the narrator; however, she manipulates the narrator's psychology through hysterical games, and moves her onto a slippery and uncanny space and existence. It is also significant that the pre-symbolic maternal space is evoked by Mrs. Danvers, who can be seen as a devouring or demonic mother who occupies the motherly space of Manderley. The maternal space originates in the dyad the mother shares before the child enters the mirror stage and develops a sense of subjectivity separate from the mother. It is a dyadic narcissistic space in which mother and child share an ego which demands the non-existence of the phallus: "Narcissism is predicated on the existence of the *ego* but not of an *external object*. . . . [O]ne has to admit that such a narcissistic topology has no other underpinning in psychosomatic reality than the mother-child dyad' (Kristeva, *Powers of Horror* 62). On the basis of this relationship, Alina M. Luna focuses on this dyad from the mother's perspective and develops the idea of the maternal gaze, which "is characterised by a desire to re-possess a child whose existence is no longer physically bound to that of the mother," and links it to the trauma of giving birth and a sense of fragmentation (13-4). According to Luna, the visual register serves as a form of compensation:

> Prior to [the] sudden separation, the mother has only known union with her child. Existence within the womb blocks the mother's realisation of the child as an other. Its survival becomes completely conditional upon the well-being and desires of the mother, and it is here that maternal power is first established and exerted. The child develops and gestates within a constant state of subjugation during which the mother retains control over its life. (41-2)

Hence, Luna claims, "In the look of the mother, the child's own gaze becomes absorbed, appropriated, and turned back upon the child, causing him to see himself as an object, as a thing. In turn this has a splitting or alienating effect upon the child for he occupies two spaces at once: that of subject (seeing) and object (being seen)" (18). Towards the climax of the novel, in the confrontation scene between the narrator and

Mrs. Danvers, Mrs. Danvers speaks as if she is possessed by Rebecca, who speaks through her:

> You'll never get the better of her. She's still mistress here, even if she is dead. She's the real Mrs. de Winter, not you. It's you that's the shadow and the ghost. It's you that's forgotten and not wanted and pushed aside. Well, why don't you leave Manderley to her? Why don't you go? . . . Why don't you go? . . . We none of us want you. He doesn't want you, he never did. He can't forget her. He wants to be alone in the house again, with her. It's you that ought to be lying there in the church crypt, not her. It's you who ought to be dead, not Mrs. de Winter. (du Maurier, *Rebecca* 222)

Mrs. Danvers' use of the first-person plural creates the effect that hers is the voice of a collective consciousness. She believes she speaks for herself, Rebecca and Maxim at the same time. The narrator believes that, too. For the narrator, it even functions as the voice of the house, blaming her for her inability to construct her space. That is why, when Mrs. Danvers suggests the narrator that she must go, she sounds like the voice of Manderley. The suggestion "[w]hy don't you go" quickly turns to "[w]hy don't you kill yourself" as Mrs. Danvers takes the narrator to the window so that she can throw herself (222). It is as if Mrs. Danvers speaks out the will of the house. While Mrs. Danvers tries to convince the narrator to throw herself out of the window and go away, she manages to enter the narrator's intrasubjective space and put her under a hypnotic state by addressing her unconscious:

> Look down there . . . It's easy, isn't it? Why don't you jump? It wouldn't hurt, not to break your neck. It's a quick, kind way. It's not like drowning. Why don't you try it? Why don't you go?'. . . Don't be afraid . . . I won't push you. I won't stand by you. You can jump of your own accord. What's the use of your staying here at Manderley? You're not happy. Mr. de Winter doesn't love you. There's not much for you to live for, is there? Why don't you jump now and have done with it? Then you won't be unhappy any more. (222)

In a trance, the narrator almost agrees. In her agreement, she calculates the distance of the window from the ground. She looks at the flowers and the paved stones and decides that they are not that far away: "It was the fog that made them so far away. They were not far really, the window was not so very high" (223):

> The fog came thicker than before and the terrace was hidden from me. I could not see the flower tubs any more, nor the smooth paved stones. There was nothing but the white mist about me, smelling of sea-weed, dank and chill. The only reality was the window-sill beneath my hands and the grip of Mrs. Danvers on my left arm. If I jumped I should not see the stones rise up to meet me, the fog would hide them from me. The pain would be sharp and sudden as she said. The fall would break my neck. It would not be slow, like drowning. It would soon be over. And Maxim did not love me. Maxim wanted to be alone again, with Rebecca. . . The mist entered my nostrils and lay upon my lips rank and sour. It was stifling, like a blanket, like an anaesthetic. I was beginning to forget about being unhappy, and about loving Maxim. I was beginning to forget Rebecca. Soon I would not have to think about Rebecca any more. (223)

Her experience is uncanny, marked by the loss of her coordinates on the threshold of the window, where her reality is suspended with Mrs. Danvers' grip of her arm being her only link to the material reality while outside the window, an unmappable space arises: The mist obscures her vision and breaks the symmetry between the signifier and the signified. As a fluid, infiltrating and all surrounding body, the mist calls her to an undifferentiated space in its embrace. This can be understood as the lure of the pre-symbolic maternal space. All of a sudden, the window stops being a threshold between the inside and the outside, but arbitrarily turns into a boundary between two distinct but overlapping spaces. This space is evoked by the alienating effect of Mrs. Danvers, who plays a sinister game that addresses the narrator's unconscious.

The image and the effect of Rebecca multiplied with a play of *mise en abyme*, create uncanny repetition. Such uncanny *mise en abyme* is also produced through the blurring of the distinction between the textual space of the narrator's story and the architectural space of Manderley. The narrator reads Manderley to learn about Rebecca, whose imprint on the house is kept alive by Mrs. Danvers. She imagines a woman, Rebecca, sitting in the gallery reading a book. As the narrator reads, she is watched by Mrs. Danvers. On the other hand, the novel frames the reader as well. As we read the book, titled *Rebecca*, we participate in the narrator's reading of Manderley to learn about Rebecca. We follow her lead, only to learn through the end that Mrs. Danvers, who in a way wrote her own version of Rebecca, was only a reader who partly misinterpreted Rebecca's story. Frustrated, she burns down Manderley, the book, which was never decorated, or written, by Rebecca as an expression of her personality but only as part

of her marriage pact with Maxim. It is not coincidental in this respect that the fire at the end of the narrative is foreshadowed by the narrator's burning the page of the book which has Rebecca's hand-writing after Maxim's marriage proposal. Each character reads Rebecca and interprets her in their own discourse. However, Rebecca resists each version.

4.3.3. Masquerade

Rebecca's strategy of locating herself in the domestic space and identity production in the context of gender/power/social symmetries can be understood as a kind of masquerade. As is the case with the other ways of thinking about, being in and obtaining knowledge from space, masquerade first appears as a kind of recurrent motif. In this case, it is aroused as reminiscent of the carnivalesque. Not being able to stand against the insistence of one of the guests, in order to celebrate their marriage, the narrator and Maxim decide to organise a fancy ball, which was a tradition in the history of Manderley, but was dropped after Rebecca's death. In this event, it is possible to see the post-Enlightenment fascination with masquerade. Castle suggests that it was "the Enlightenment rigidification of conceptual hierarchies and atomized view of personal identity" that made masquerade so popular in – and so unsettling to – eighteenth-century England (*Female* 17). She writes,

> With its shocking travesties and mad, Dionysiac couplings, the masquerade represented a kind of 'uncanny space' at the heart of eighteenth- century urban culture: a dream-like zone where identities became fluid and cherished distinctions – between self and other, subject and object, real and unreal – temporarily blurred. (17)

As distinctions are suspended, the masquerade, for the narrator, works in a way that exposes the constructed-ness of ordinary social roles. The idea of a fancy ball arouses excitement in everyone. Beatrice and Giles admit to having a small party at Christmas Eve in which everyone dressed up in costumes. The narrator, excited about the idea of being someone else even for a short time, starts to look for ideas for her costume. Maxim, on the other hand, does not wear any costumes and is reluctant to join in the

carnivalesque entertainment. His suggestion that his wife should dress like Alice implies how he wants to see her in a constant child-like, ignorant and innocent state.

Manipulated by Mrs. Danvers, the narrator decides to dress like Caroline de Winter, whose portrait is hung in the gallery. She prepares for the ball in great secrecy, and does not tell anyone anything about her costume. At the night of the ball, however, when she walks down the stairs triumphantly in her fancy dress, she shocks Maxim, Beatrice, Giles and Frank. Everyone looks at her as if they saw a ghost. Later, Beatrice explains Maxim's reaction, and the narrator understands that she is tricked by Mrs. Danvers into wearing the same costume that Rebecca wore the last time at the traditional Manderley fancy ball. While running to her room in tears, she sees Mrs. Danvers at the door of the west wing, watching her with a triumphant smile.

After a while, she leaves her room in a regular night dress to attend the dinner. She wants to go downstairs without being seen: "I tip-toed to the end of the passage and turned the corner. The door to the west wing was closed. There was no sound of anything at all" (du Maurier, *Rebecca* 200). Just as she stands in the gallery, however, at a moment of hesitation about going downstairs, she hears a creaking sound: "A board creaked in the gallery. I swung round, looking at the gallery behind me. There was nobody there. The gallery was empty, just as it had been before" (200). Against the fact that there is no one in the gallery, the narrator realises immediately: "A current of air blew in my face though, somebody must have left a window open in one of the passages. The hum of voices continued in the dining-room" (200). Presence of somebody in the passages contradicts with her observation that there is nobody around, and although the hum of voices suggests that there must be nobody upstairs, she goes back to questioning her experience: "I wondered why the board creaked when I had not moved at all. The warmth of the night perhaps, a swelling somewhere in the old wood. The draught still blew in my face though" (200). Again, her rationalisation of the strange sound as a part of the board swelling because of the warm air falls in conflict with the cool draught blowing from somewhere in the house. Not being able to get rid of the strangeness of this experience, the narrator tries to detect physical proof for the draught: "A piece of music on one of the stands fluttered to the floor"

(200). Her experience reaches the peak of strangeness when she finds where the draught is coming from:

> I looked towards the archway above the stairs. The draught was coming from there. I went beneath the arch again, and when I came out on to the long corridor I saw that the door to the west wing had blown open and swung back against the wall. It was dark in the west passage, none of the lights had been turned on. I could feel the wind blowing on my face from an open window. I fumbled for a switch on the wall and could not find one. I could see the window in an angle of the passage, the curtain blowing softly, backwards and forwards. The grey evening light cast queer shadows on the floor. The sound of the sea came to me through the open window, the soft hissing sound of the ebb-tide leaving the shingle. (200-1)

This play of absence and presence of somebody, warmth of air and the coolness of the draught, the open doors of the west wing when they should be closed and darkness of the passage and the room and the dim light of the evening and, what is more, the hissing sound of the sea heard against the humming voices of the people at the party make this experience totally uncanny. It is experienced in the liminal space of the gallery, when the narrator is just about to go downstairs from her room. As the narrator learns more about Rebecca, that haunting sense she frequently feels at home becomes more disturbing. On this specific occasion, it is ironic because it is her who, through Mrs. Danvers' manipulation, impersonated Rebecca who had then impersonated Caroline, has haunted Maxim and others. Yet, still, as she gets closer to learn about Rebecca, Manderley becomes increasingly uncanny, and the house's real and imaginary dimensions become completely inseparable.

At the night of the fancy-dress ball, her greatest social event, the narrator reveals the absurdity of the conventions. The ball is described at times in gothic while at other times in grotesque terms. Earlier in the evening, she finds it extremely exciting: "What fun it was, what mad ridiculous childish fun!" (192). After her fun is spoilt by Maxim and Mrs. Danvers, disillusioned, the narrator describes it as repetitive, lifeless, mechanical and fragmented:

> When I look back at my first party at Manderley, my first and my last, I can remember little isolated things standing alone out of the vast blank canvas of the evening. The background was hazy, a sea of dim faces none of whom I knew, and there was the slow drone of the band harping out a waltz that never finished, that went on and on. The same couples swung by in rotation, with the same fixed smiles, and to me, standing with Maxim at the bottom of the stairs to welcome the late-comers, these dancing couples seemed like marionettes twisting and turning on a piece of string, held by some invisible hand. (201)

What is unconscious about discourse becomes conscious, in a way that reveals the automaton in the human. The narrator's social and psychic spaces completely disintegrate in a way that exposes the constructed-ness of them. The narrator is surprised that after experiencing a traumatic event, she and Maxim can act like nothing happened. She likens herself to "a dummy-stick of a person," and Maxim to a wooden figure (203):

> His face was a mask, his smile was not his own. The eyes were not the eyes of the man I loved, the man I knew. They looked through me and beyond me, cold, expressionless, to some place of pain and torture I could not enter, to some private, inward hell I could not share. . . . [N]o one but myself could know that every utterance he made, every movement, was automatic and the work of a machine. We were like two performers in a play, but we were divided, we were not acting with one another. We had to endure it alone, we had to put up this show, this miserable, sham performance, for the sake of all these people I did not know and did not want to see again. (203)

After that, as she describes the party her tone gets very cynical and as humorous as it never is anywhere else in the novel. She is surprised to see, now that her intrasubjective and intersubjective spaces are separated, how easily she can pretend and lie to people's faces. She has a friendly conversation with a guest dressed as a Tudor woman: "'When are you coming to see us?' she said, as though we were old friends, and I answered, 'Soon of course; we were talking about it the other day,' wondering why I found it so easy to lie suddenly, no effort at all," and when the woman invites her one last time saying that they expect them "at the Palace soon," the narrator mocks her, thinking "[w]hat did she mean, where, what palace? Were we entertaining royalty?" (204). Her mockery stands in deep contrast with the time she likens Maxim to a gentleman from the past, someone from the Renaissance with a ruffle around his neck, just like the

woman dressed as a Tudor lady. Now demystified, she finds the entire crowd vulgar and funny. The masquerade reveals the constructed-ness of normal social situations. The contrast between her inner agony and her pretension becomes most absurd when a man dressed as a Chinese mandarin suddenly seizes her hand, and they all start dancing merrily to *Auld Lang Syne* and then pass on to singing *God Save the King*. She describes another woman, whom she calls the salmon lady with all her vulgarity:

> I caught the salmon lady's eye. God Save the King had taken her unawares, she was still holding a plate heaped with chicken in aspic. She held it stiffly out in front of her like a church collection. All animation had gone from her face. As the last note of God Save the King died away she relaxed again, and attacked her chicken in a sort of frenzy, chattering over her shoulder to her partner. (206)

As people say goodbye, she says "I'm so glad" again and again until it becomes ridiculous, and she wonders, "Was there no other sentence in the English language?" (206). Now that they are demystified, she does not feel intimidated by these people at all. The narrator's masquerade mimics how Rebecca performed the role of the perfect wife and mistress of the house for years. Rebecca accommodates the patriarchal space as an infiltrator, who, in a parasitic symbiosis with the patriarchal social space, does not necessarily accommodate the margins, but can, through masquerade, manipulate the spatial dynamics. The infiltrator's game, as Mireille Rosello argues, "is to perform a lack of ambiguity:"

> When the infiltrator 'passes' for a member of a group to which he or she knows that he or she does not belong naturally, transparently, the ambiguity of the performance of belonging, of being at one with the others, exposes the fact that each performance of identity is also similar to his or her game. If the infiltrator's insertion into a structure that imagines itself solid is relatively successful, then the identity of all the other members of the supposedly natural community is brought into question. (252)

After the night of the fancy-dress ball, the narrator feels completely disillusioned with her marriage. She feels that the servants in the house and the other people in the county are intruders into her privacy. A person, like Maxim, brought up for this lifestyle can

ignore the servants and think that they do not matter, but the narrator's middle-class upbringing does not allow that. She resents that they know everything about her private life from where her husband sleeps to the details of her underwear and that they gossip about her. She does not mind if Maxim does not sleep in the same room with her, but she minds that the servants, the outsiders know all about it. The servants are the outsiders, who, strangely, have access to the most private corners of the house and their life. Her greatest fear is that her marriage will be a failure, and it is her greatest resentment that she cannot make Maxim happy because as a wife, her *raison d'être* is to make her husband happy. Still, her greatest concern is what others would think:

> I thought with a tired bitter feeling of despair that I would be content to live in one corner of Manderley and Maxim in the other as long as the outside world should never know. If he had no more tenderness for me, never kissed me again, did not speak to me except on matters of necessity, I believed I could bear it if I were certain that nobody knew of this but our two selves. If we could bribe the servants not to tell, play our part before relations, before Beatrice, and then when we were alone sit apart in our separate rooms, leading our separate lives. (du Maurier, *Rebecca* 209)

The narrator finds it easier to pretend than actually getting on well with her husband and having an intrasubjective relationship. This is, in fact, how Maxim and Rebecca acted as the perfect couple for years. Their marriage was a masquerade. As Maxim confesses later, it is this kind of conduct by which Rebecca fooled everyone and that is why Maxim kills her when she threatens him to give birth to an illegitimate child as an heir to Maxim:

> Have you ever thought . . . how damned hard it would be for you to make a case against me? In a court of law, I mean. If you wanted to divorce me. Do you realise that you've never had one shred of proof against me, from the very first? All your friends, even the servants believe our marriage to a success? . . . If I had a child, Max . . . neither you, nor anyone in the world, would ever prove that it was not yours. It would grow up here in Manderley, bearing your name. There would be nothing you could do. And when you died Manderley would be his. You could not prevent it. The property's entailed. You would like an heir, wouldn't you, for your beloved Manderley? (251-2)

Rebecca's sexual mobility makes her a monstrous woman/mother in Maxim's eyes since her ability to reproduce gives her the power to take over what is his by law. Her threat exposes the vulnerability and impotency of the patriarchal order, and reveals her castrating power over Maxim in that she can rob him of his power, both socially and psychically. It is because of the threat that Rebecca poses to his patriarchal lineage that Maxim kills her, which psychically castrates him because he continues his life in constant fear of being discovered. Rebecca transgresses the patriarchal borders of the house by performing a game of "the-woman-as-housed" as Wigley calls it (318) while living a private life elsewhere, in her apartment in London, or in the cottage in the cove. There is nothing private and personal about the rooms she kept in Manderley: they are part of her staged social self as the perfect wife. Learning this, the narrator feels free, now that she knows "he did not love Rebecca" (du Maurier, *Rebecca* 257):

> I knew then that I was no longer afraid of Rebecca. I did not hate her any more. Now that I knew her to have been evil and vicious and rotten I did not hate her any more. She could not hurt me. . . . Rebecca's power had dissolved into the air, like the mist had done. She would never haunt me again. She would never stand behind me on the stairs, sit beside me in the dining-room, lean down from the gallery and watch me standing in the hall. Maxim had never loved her. I did not hate her any more. Her body had come back, her boat had been found with its queer prophetic name, *Je Reviens*, but I was free of her for ever.
>
> I was free now to be with Maxim, to touch him, and hold him, and love him. I would never be a child again. I would not be I, I, I any longer; it would be we, it would be us. We would be together. (257)

With Maxim's confession, the narrator finally feels free to be an adult, a wife and live her own domestic ideal and construct her social space. She has a chance to reintegrate into the patriarchal symbolic. Maxim's confession gives her the license to feel at home at Manderley and not feel haunted by the traces of a dead wife and intimidated by the servants. She now speaks to the servants with authority: "I had not thought it would be so easy to be severe. I wondered why it had seemed hard for me before" (261). She sees the menu for the dinner and realises that it includes the food from the dress ball. She takes it as a sign of disorder: "The staff were taking things easily, it seemed" (262). She calls Robert and gives orders: "Tell Mrs. Danvers to order something hot . . . If

there's still a lot of cold stuff to finish we don't want it in the dining-room" (262). She can now act as an active agent in the social space as Mrs. de Winter.

On the surface, the narrator and Rebecca are depicted in perfect opposition: Rebecca is good at everything while the narrator is inexperienced and childish. Rebecca is, despite being dead, described in vivid and corporeal terms. Unlike Rebecca, the narrator is described in spectral terms. She is pale, ghostly, and quiet. Also, a variety of oppositions can be drawn between Rebecca and Mrs. Danvers. Mrs. Danvers, with her skull face, black dress and cold manners, stands in contrast to Rebecca's liveliness and the narrator's youth. They are constantly contrasted against each other. All the three women, however, impersonate one another: Mrs. Danvers impersonates Rebecca by haunting and tormenting the narrator instead of Rebecca. The narrator, unknowingly, impersonates Rebecca, who had impersonated Caroline de Winter, at the fancy-dress ball. From time to time, she also impersonates Rebecca deliberately, as she does one morning at breakfast with Maxim. Rebecca impersonates Mrs. Danvers at the doctor's office. More importantly, Rebecca impersonates Mrs. de Winter throughout her marriage. Each one substitutes for another. Their characteristics change with the revelation of each secret. The names Mrs. de Winter, Rebecca and Mrs. Danvers are signifiers without leading to any final signified. Instead, they always twist and turn. Mirroring this, everything is described as twisting and turning in Manderley: the drive that leads up to Manderley, the path that lies from the boat house in the cove into the woods, the dancers at the fancy-dress ball, and Rebecca's hair. All are described as twisting and turning, underlining the sinister topology of the house.

The last chapter, which also includes a dream sequence, informs the reader that what the narrator loses is a promise of a sense of home, and it is a promise which is never fulfilled. Through the end of the novel, in the aftermath of the climax of the murder investigation and resolution, both the narrator and Maxim develop a certain telepathic connection with Manderley. As they drive back from London, Maxim hurries to get back, based on a bad feeling: "I have this feeling I must get down tonight. . . I want to get home. Something's wrong. I know it is. I want to get home" (341). The narrator cannot understand his anxiety: "It seems very odd to worry now, when everything's

over. I can't understand you" (341). However, at an unconscious level, she also possesses such telepathic knowledge. In a sequence of dreams, she gradually sees Manderley as she described it in the opening chapter. In that dream sequence, she sees herself on the threshold spaces of the house. In the first dream there is the staircase and a door:

> I saw the staircase at Manderley, and Mrs. Danvers standing at the top in her black dress, waiting for me to go to her. As I climbed the stairs she backed under the archway and disappeared. I looked for her and I could not find her. Then her face looked at me through a hollow door and I cried out and she had gone again. (342)

The image of Mrs. Danvers looking through a "hollow door" shows her as the holder of the keys, watching over a door that opens into nothing. While the narrator is dreaming, Manderley is really no more. It is burned down in the fire set probably by Mrs. Danvers. Although the narrator does not know this yet, she feels the anxiety before she discovers that right when she can finally call Manderley her home, it is gone. On the other hand, that image of Mrs. Danvers waiting for the narrator to come to her, then running away from her only to appear looking at the narrator through a hollow door can also be seen as the collapse of Mrs. Danvers' previous superior position as the keeper of the secrets of Manderley. The narrator now feels that she knows better. Those secrets, which had long promised to make up the truth about Rebecca and her marriage with Maxim, have also proved to be hollow, for in reality there was never love between Maxim and Rebecca. Maxim has never mourned over the death of his wife.

In the second part of the dream, anxiety returns to the narrator, as she fails to locate all the places she loves and identifies with in Manderley:

> Frith and Robert carried the tea into the library. The woman at the lodge nodded to me abruptly, and called her child into the house. I saw the model boats in the cottage in the cove, and the feathery dust. I saw the cobwebs stretching from the little masts. I heard the rain upon the roof and the sound of the sea. I wanted to get to the Happy Valley and it was not there. There were woods about me, there was no Happy Valley. Only the dark trees and the young

> bracken. The owls hooted. The moon was shining in the windows of Manderley. There were nettles in the garden, ten foot, twenty foot high. (343)

Along with the second part of her dream sequence, the narrator's anxiety rises as the narrative actually returns to where it starts. The context of the moon shining on the windows, the dark trees and nettles of a height of ten foot is how she dreamed of Manderley in the opening chapter. Still, she continues dreaming, this time entirely occupying Rebecca's space:

> I was writing letters in the morning-room. I was sending out invitations. I wrote them all myself with a thick black pen. But when I looked down to see what I had written it was not my small square hand-writing at all, it was long, and slanting, with curious pointed strokes. I pushed the cards away from the blotter and hid them. I got up and went to the looking-glass. A face stared back at me that was not my own. It was very pale, very lovely, framed in a cloud of dark hair. The eyes narrowed and smiled. The lips parted. The lips in the glass stared back at me and laughed. And I saw then that she was sitting on a chair before the dressing-table in her bedroom, and Maxim was brushing her hair. He held her hair in his hands, and as she brushed it, he wound it slowly into a thick long rope. It twisted like a snake, and he took hold of it with both hands and smiled at Rebecca and put it round his neck. (343)

Finally, Rebecca makes her last attack upon the patriarchal order. This oneiric attack becomes real with the fire. In this respect, Rebecca constitutes the centre of the novel which does not really exist, yet functions. She embodies everything that disturbs the dominant patriarchal discourse and the domestic space that is both produced by and reproduces that discourse. She embodies the return of the repressed female in the patriarchal discourse. No matter how far she is pushed, she always comes back. She is the anti-wife who turns the whole domestic ideology into a masquerade and who threatens to give birth to illegitimate babies while her womb is sick with cancer. In that, she is also an anti-maternal figure. In the end, she burns Manderley down. In the closing lines of the novel, the fire in Manderley turns the sky into crimson, just like the sun in the dawn of a new day. Indeed, the narrator is liberated from the spatiality of the house. Finally, in exile, she can construct a social space of her own. It is obvious that now it is the narrator who takes care of Maxim, who is psychically, if not physically, crippled. Also, now the narrator controls what information Maxim gets.

She can actively construct her social space. However, the existence of the narrative is a sign that Rebecca continues to haunt her psychic space.

4.4. The House in *My Cousin Rachel*

In this section, the domestic space in *My Cousin Rachel* will be discussed by focusing on the legal and marital systems in relation to the haunting of the Father and the uncanny femininity. The narrative centres on Philip Ashley, who has been raised by his relative Ambrose in the Ashley family estate in Cornwall. They live in peace until Ambrose has to move to Italy for his health. There, Ambrose meets Rachel, a distant cousin who is half-Italian by her mother and marries her. After a short while, Ambrose dies in Italy, and Rachel comes to visit Philip. At first, Philip blames Rachel for Ambrose's death, but he gradually builds a good relationship with her. However, his suspicions are not resolved. In the end, he sends Rachel to her death by not warning her about an unsteady bridge. The narrative is written in retrospect by a guilt-driven Philip who is still unsure about Rachel.

My Cousin Rachel departs from the other two novels discussed in this dissertation due to the use of first-person male narrator, a technique that du Maurier experimented with early in *I'll Never Be Young Again*. Therefore, in parallelism with the male perspective, the construction of space is different from *Jamaica Inn* and *Rebecca*. Even before her actual introduction as a character in the novel, Rachel represents a rupture in Philip's reality and his social space. Rachel embodies the Other in a double sense: the Other in terms of both gender and space for she introduces Philip to the Oedipal economy on which the patriarchal symbolic based. Throughout the novel, we witness the estate's defamiliarization for Philip and its reconstruction due to the introduction of femininity through Rachel. Through this defamiliarization, the house's spatial features change, too, as a more topological construction of space progressively prevails and takes the place of the early topographic mappings.

Despite the differences, like *Jamaica Inn* and *Rebecca*, the Oedipal family drama, along with the interruption of the female in the patriarchal order and monstrous female

sexuality as embodied by the intruder half-Italian half-English Rachel constitute the main lines of the novel. *My Cousin Rachel* is similar to *Rebecca* in several ways. The main female character, Rachel, bears a number of parallelisms with Rebecca. As in *Rebecca*, in *My Cousin Rachel*, the long-established patriarchal order of the house is threatened by this female intruder. In terms of the domestic setting, too, parallelisms can be found between the two novels. However, *My Cousin Rachel* departs from *Rebecca* in that it focuses on the house as a patriarchal space that is formed through a repression of the maternal and its function in the constitution of male identity and subjectivity.

4.4.1. Femininity as Intrusion

Although Rachel is present in the novel, the ever-shifting perception of the narrator with regard to her character and motives marks her with an irreducible uncertainty and otherness. Du Maurier herself says about Rachel that "[t]he symbol behind the living woman can either be the Healer, or the Destroyer" (qtd in Forster 422). For Philip Ashley, Rachel takes on the roles of the mother, angel-in-the-house, monstrous feminine and *femme fatale*, interchangeably, without making it possible to decide on one role. Rachel, like Rebecca, surpasses the textual limits.

My Cousin Rachel depicts Cornwall in a much more topographical way than *Rebecca* since there are repeated references to real places and cartographic details. Cornwall and the domestic space are not primarily conceived of as Gothic. On the contrary, for the protagonist and the first-person narrator Philip Ashley, the estate and the towns and villages around it are everyday places that ensure his identity and self-perception. These are uncontradictory places, stable in their meaning and in an unproblematised symbiotic relationship with Philip, the inhabiting subject. Philip is first introduced to the other when Ambrose gets married to Rachel in Italy. With the introduction of the new wife into his life, Philip's status regarding the estate and his inheritance is blurred.

The Ashley estate embodies a homosocial domestic space. However, the absence of women in this homosocial space does not necessarily mean the absence of the

feminine. It can be claimed that the house itself constitutes the maternal space by substituting for the absent mother. The feminine space is gradually evoked when Rachel starts to live in the Ashley estate, in ways that disrupt the symmetries of the social space. Philip's early life on the estate is depicted as harmonious and carefree. His homosocial environment is controlled and organised by Ambrose, who believes that women are a bad influence on men. This harmony is first spoiled by Ambrose's departure for Italy due to his health. Then, his unexpected marriage with the distant cousin Rachel presents conflict regarding Philip's status and the house's order, culminating in Ambrose's dubious death, which happens after his paranoid letters in which he makes accusations against Rachel. All these lead Philip to build a monstrous image in his mind before his encounter with Rachel. He creates an abject image, shaped by misogyny and xenophobia:

> [A]lways within earshot, always within sight, was the shadowy hated figure of that woman I had never seen. She had so many faces, so many guises . . . Since my journey to the villa she had become a monster, larger than life itself. Her eyes were black as sloes, her features aquiline like Rainaldi's, and she moved about those musty villa rooms sinuous and silent, like a snake. (du Maurier, *My Cousin Rachel* 49-50)

When his childhood friend, Louise, suggests that Rachel might, when married to her first husband, have had lovers, he dismisses the speculation as the stuff of fiction and therefore feminine fancy: "This aspect of my cousin Rachel had not occurred to me. I only saw her as malevolent, like a spider. In spite of my hatred, I could not help smiling. 'How like a girl,' I said to Louise, 'to picture lovers. Stilettos in a shadowed doorway. Secret staircases'" (56). He dismisses the idea of a woman not controlled by patriarchal order as fictional material. He does not recognise his own naiveté of his own assumptions in constructing different characters for Rachel.

The encounter with Rachel is for Philip, as it probably was for Ambrose, an encounter with an unknown other:

> This novel defamiliarizes femininity for the female reader (as indeed it may have done for the writer, hence its claimed therapeutic effect); it represents it

> from the perspective of a masculinity which has been constructed upon the exclusion of women. In order to do this, the text presents Rachel's 'foreignness' as a literal foreignness, her Italian identity, but a foreignness which is itself inherently ambiguous. (Horner and Zlosnik 131)

In this sense, femininity is, for Philip, a dark continent. Kokoli notes that femininity in its mystified state by psychoanalysis as well as the patriarchal discourse in general is linked to the uncanny (26). The defamiliarized femininity seen from the perspective of the male narrator brought up in a homosocial domestic environment helps to construct femininity as uncanny. In a sense, femininity is that alien element that infiltrates the house. Rachel's foreignness increases the impact of her strangeness, yet she is the uncanny element for she is a woman. She embodies the feminine as what constitutes the outside. This is, according to Grosz, the founding repression that underlies the conception of space as void:

> [T]he feminine becomes elaborated as darkness and abyss, as void and chaos, as that which is both fundamentally spatial and as that which deranges or unhinges the smooth mapping and representation of space, a space that is too self-proximate, too self-enclosed to provide the neutrality, the coordinates, of self-distancing, to produce and sustain a homogeneous, abstract space. The feminine becomes a matrix that defies coordinates, that defies the systematic functioning of matrices that propose to order and organize the field. (158)

Understanding the repression of the feminine for the sake of a Firstspace epistemology where space is understood as a seamless surface also disturbs that concept of space, since repression always points out to a rupture in the working of a system. In the novel, this rupture is explored through Rachel and Italy. Italy can be understood as the spatialisation of the feminine. It is described as an anisotropic space that defies coordinates and resists smooth mapping. Italy becomes a gothic space in Philip's experience. It is a space where everything twists and turns, and is overpopulated in a way that reminds uncanny natural growth, associated with the uncontrolled feminine energy in *Rebecca*. There, just as he stands next to the bridge, fascinated by the slimy river due to his thirst, he encounters a beggar woman on the street, who destabilises his epistemological and therefore spatial categorisations:

> A woman stood by my side, a whimpering child in her arms, another dragging at her torn skirt, and she stretched out her hand to me for alms, her dark eyes lifted to mine in supplication. I gave her a coin and turned away, but she continued to touch my elbow, whispering, until one of the passengers, still standing by the coach, let forth a string of words at her in Italian, and she shrank back again into the corner of the bridge whence she had come. (30)

The woman nullifies the categories of young/old, human/animal and dead/alive by embodying all of them. Therefore, she evokes a repressed extralinguistic space, which is textually created by her foreignness:

> She was young, not more than nineteen or so, but the expression on her face was ageless, haunting, as though she possessed in her lithe body an old soul that could not die; centuries in time looked out from those two eyes, she had contemplated life so long it had become indifferent to her. Later, when I had mounted to the room they showed me, and stood out upon the little balcony that gave upon the square, I saw her creep away between the horses and the carozzas waiting there as stealthy as a cat that slinks by night, its belly to the ground. (30)

The woman evokes what Kristeva defines as the abject and associates with the evocation in the symbolic of what pre-dates it: It is the "jettisoned object . . . radically excluded and draws me toward the place where meaning collapses" (*Powers of Horror* 2). Unlike the uncanny, the abject does not evoke something that is forgotten or censored -the return of the repressed-, but predates the ego, order or differentiation, including that differentiation between the conscious and the unconscious. It is from the area of the pre-Oedipal, pre-linguistic, that of the *chora*, a term that Kristeva borrows from Plato to describe a space before form, but in which forms emerge, a state of being before identity but in which identity will come into being: "Abjection preserves what existed in the archaism of pre-objectal relationship, in the immemorial violence with which a body becomes separated from another body in order to be . . ." (10). Defined also as a narcissistic crisis, Kristeva writes, "The abject confronts us ... within our personal archaeology, with our earliest attempts to release the hold of *maternal* entity even before ex-isting outside of her, thanks to the autonomy of language" (13). Despite its roots in the pre-symbolic, abjection is incommensurable with language, but rather manifests as a break, an inter-/dis-ruption within it. Kokoli

argues, “Unlike the pre-Oedipal phallic mother and the Oedipal castrated mother, the archaic mother remains beyond the control of patriarchal gender economy” (58), even though she is combined “with the mother of the dyadic and the triadic relationship”(Creed 25).

The ambiguity of the feminine as a signifier is also achieved by Rachel’s status as the phallic mother who uses womanliness as masquerade in order to accommodate the patriarchal society without giving up her autonomy entirely and to construct her own social space in subversive ways. In other words, the phallic woman can warp the symmetries of social space and fit it to her psychic space by producing new folds, or ruptures that can accommodate her subjectivity within the patriarchal social space. She is not confined to the limits of the domestic space. This is signified by the multiple spaces that phallic woman characters choose to call home. Rachel, like Rebecca who has another house in London and uses the cottage in the cove as her alternative homes, prefers not to stay in one place for a long time.

In *My Cousin Rachel*, besides femininity, masculinity is also put into question. In this novel, du Maurier focuses on domestic space from a male perspective. In this respect, her representation of the domestic space is shaped by a look at space from the outside in a double bind: first, in the writer’s adoption of the first-person male narrator who has grown up in a homosocial domestic atmosphere, and second, in her depiction of the interruption of the other as the infiltration of a woman who comes from the outside. For Philip, the foreignness of Italy is brought to England by Rachel. Rachel has the symbolic power of a witch, a woman who has access to the wisdom and knowledge of ancient ages, unknown by others. She knows more about men than they do about themselves. As Louise remarks, “How simple it must be for a woman of the world, like Mrs Ashley, to twist a young man like yourself around her finger” (du Maurier, *My Cousin Rachel* 122). In this sense, Philip, probably like Ambrose before him, learns about masculinity as well as femininity when he comes face to face with Rachel. All his assumptions about women are put to test as he gets to know Rachel, but at the same time his assumptions about men are tested too. That is why Rachel states: “At twenty-

four, . . . it is high time you saw a pleasant homely sight such as aunt Phoebe doing up her hair. Are you embarrassed? . . . Oh, Philip, what a lot you have to learn" (125).

Like Rebecca, Rachel cannot be contained by the patriarchal domestic space, and she does not constitute her social space in a way that will limit her mobility. She does not stay in one house or one city all the time, and she does not stay with one man. Her fluidity can be seen as a sign that she cannot be controlled by the patriarchal order. Indeed, Philip relates her fluidity and her transgressions to her upbringing within what he considers as the weak Italian patriarchal order. Therefore, he tries to eliminate Rachel's foreignness by marrying her and restoring her to the family line. He gives her the pearl collar which has been worn by Ashley women: "it made a bond to think that the last woman to wear them had been my mother" (167). His offering of the collar, one that was last worn by his mother is a sign of his attempt to restore the patrilineage by restoring Rachel in the family.

Philip wants to establish a relationship with Rachel on both intrasubjective and intersubjective levels, which opens him to the impressions from the unconscious. Thus, Rachel's fluidity cannot be fixed, even after her death. Her effect on Philip is ambivalent. She shifts between the status of the homely feminine, uncanny phallic woman and that of the abject archaic mother. Because Philip, as the narrator, cannot fix Rachel, neither can the reader. For the inexperienced Philip, Rachel's discourse is confusing, and it destabilises the reader, too.

Underlying the doubts that are raised regarding Rachel, there is a distrust in her fluid sexuality, perceived as polygamy, although no one accepts that openly. Also, the fact that the collar, what symbolises for Philip the marriage bond, is just a piece of accessory for Rachel, something she can put on and off whenever she wants to hints at her perception of man and woman relationships and marriage, which in turn defamiliarize the English reader to the marital laws and traditions in the country at the time. Like the collar, that Rachel does not see sexual intercourse as a marriage promise, a token of an unbreakable vow (Horner and Zlosnik 138). Philip, and possibly Ambrose before him, tries to immobilise Rachel's fluidity by marrying her.

4.4.2. The Haunting of the Father and Matricide

The novel employs haunting as a narrative tool to address the issues of death, burial and inheritance, and raises important questions regarding the nature of inheritance, the principles that regulate the passing of inheritance and the extent to which inheritance makes up the subject and the space of the subject in its physical, social and psychical dimensions. Ambrose, Philip's surrogate father, goes to Italy for his health and gets married to their half Italian cousin. He gets sick there and dies before being able to return to England. Consequently, he is buried in Florence. Materially, Ambrose cannot come back to England, but symbolically he returns and haunts Philip.

Philip unconsciously seeks to replay the Oedipal family romance by marrying Rachel, who can be seen as a maternal figure. However, although he hands over all he inherits from Ambrose to her hands, he cannot escape from the father that he represses and symbolically tries to kill and replace. The father repeatedly returns in the form of the impressions that Ambrose leaves behind and through Philip himself, who, in uncanny resemblance to Ambrose, acts as Ambrose's double and ultimately exacts the patriarchal will on Rachel. By killing Rachel, Philip gets rid of the phallic mother and returns to the Law of the Father. Domestic violence against women, the novel seems to suggest, is inevitable. Horner and Zlosnik explain this with reference to Irigaray's idea that the western civilisation is based on matricide:

> His subsequent acts culminate in what is effectively the murder of Rachel which thus restores his patriarchal inheritance to him and reasserts the social order. . . . The novel re-enacts the matricide . . . Philip's return to the Law of the Father revives fully the fear and anxiety he had felt about Rachel before meeting her and leads him inexorably to desire her death. In this, he acts out the fears of patriarchy itself . . . (140-1)

The inexperienced misogynist Philip, who is first hostile towards Rachel but later seduced and symbolically castrated by her, in the end murders her although he is not sure if she killed Ambrose. Philip first willingly hands over his patrimony to her, trusting that he can secure her in marriage. Rejected, he retrieves it by knowingly allowing her to go to her death.

In attempt to incorporate Rachel into a patriarchal order which shapes both his social and psychic space, Philip enters a deferred Oedipal relationship with Ambrose, his surrogate father. Rachel, as Ambrose's widow, is in a sense a mother figure for Philip. She is at least ten years older than he is and treats him affectionately, but she always teases him, stating how little he knows and understands about women, about himself, and about everything. The scene in Rachel's room when, after having a bath, she does her hair and lets Philip watch her, is the moment of first intimacy with a woman, a moment that is usually experienced in the presence of a mother. Philip mistakes this kind of intimacy for something else. Rachel introduces Philip to the symmetries between femininity and masculinity, and constructs the domestic social space in the house. She easily integrates not only in the lives of the tenants, prescribing herbal remedies for their various problems but also in the re-planning of the garden. Thus, she has power to shape her social space and the topography of the house. This process culminates in the Christmas festivities. Here, Philip and Rachel act out the roles of the lord and the lady of the manor, bestowing largesse on the tenants at a great Christmas feast complete with giant Christmas tree. It is on this occasion that Philip gives Rachel the pearl collar, which he unconsciously sees as a token of their intimate relationship. "The term collar, rather than necklace, implies shackling and provides an uncomfortable echo of the hanged man described in gruesome detail in the opening chapter when Philip recalls a childhood memory" (Horner and Zlosnik 138). It also foreshadows the most violent scene in the novel, Philip attempts to strangle Rachel after being rejected by her. The pearl collar, therefore, can be seen as a token of patriarchal contract. "Nick Kendall's insistence that it be returned to the family jewels only confirms Philip's belief that what he must do is to win Rachel by giving away his inheritance to her" (Horner and Zlosnik 138). Therefore, when he gives her all the family jewels just before his birthday, he misunderstands her response. She makes love to him, and Philip takes this as a sign of their future marriage. Thus, when it is finally revealed that Philip has misunderstood Rachel, her reaction causes estrangement:

> She went on looking at me, incredulous, baffled, like someone listening to words in a foreign language that cannot be translated or comprehended, and I realized suddenly, with anguish and despair, that so it was, in fact, between us both; all that had passed had been in error. She had not understood what it was

> I asked of her at midnight, nor I, in my blind wonder, what she had given, therefore what I had believed to be a pledge of love was something different, without meaning, on which she had put her own interpretation. (du Maurier, *My Cousin Rachel* 243)

The fact that Rachel wears the collar on Christmas Eve and then takes it off, without giving any symbolical meaning to it, shows that she sees it for what it is: an accessory. It does not have the symbolic meaning that Philip attaches to it. That is, she does not accommodate the same system of representation as Philip does. Indeed, Rachel is depicted as this foreign element within the patriarchal discourse since she does not regulate her actions in accordance with the symbolic meanings attached to things in the domestic space. In other words, she does not acknowledge the patriarchal discourse as the system of representation out of which she cannot exist. In fact, her subjectivity surpasses this system. Her defiance perplexes Ambrose as well as Philip since they cannot understand whether her strangeness is due to her femininity or her foreignness.

The formation of masculinity in the phallogocentric discourse is dealt through the theme of the double. Philip is haunted by Ambrose, which is revealed, apart from his physical resemblance, as a compulsion to repeat Ambrose's actions. This repetition is rendered uncanny through both his relationship with Rachel and his murder of her. A sense of impotency and lack of free will is foreshadowed even at the opening chapter: the hanged man in the town square can be taken both as a foreshadowing of Philip's future murder but also as the will to power of the phallogocentric discourse to comprehend all of its subjects. Inheritance is indeed unavoidably transferred from father to son, in a chain of succession that cannot be broken. This is mirrored in the doubling of Ambrose and Philip but also through the symptoms of Ambrose's illness, which point at a brain tumour that his father before him also had. Furthermore, in a drawing of Ambrose, "his eyes . . . themselves had a haunted look about them, as though some shadow stood close to his shoulder and he feared to look behind" (301). What he is afraid of might as well be understood as his patriarchal legacy, from the repetitive pattern from which he cannot escape.

Horner and Zlosnik argue that the domestic space is the centre of haunting in the novel: "In this novel, the embodiment of the Other is itself shifting: apparently located in the foreign, the female and the *unheimlich,* it actually appears as its most destructive in the form of the *heimlich,* where there is most likeness" (142). The uncanny does not only emerge through Rachel but also through Ambrose. Indeed, in time, Philip's jealousy of Rachel shifts focus to his jealousy of Ambrose, yet he finally resolves the uncanniness by identifying with Ambrose and getting rid of Rachel. The uncanny theme of the double is a recurring motif that underlines the repetitive patterns of the novel. Ambrose's residues, along with the remarkable resemblance between Philip and Ambrose, repeatedly return in the text. Ambrose's symbolic return is accompanied by Rachel's arrival in Cornwall. As a result, the impressions that Ambrose sends are repressed by Philip due to his entry into a symbiotic relationship with Rachel. Just as he starts living in synchrony with Rachel, his symmetries are again disrupted by Ambrose's letters, which return to haunt Philip. Even after his death, Ambrose's letters from Italy continue to haunt Philip, and do not allow Philip to erase his suspicions about Rachel. As Philip grows fond of Rachel, he ignores Ambrose's warnings in the letters, which are not only about Rachel's murderous intents but also about the danger she poses to the estate: "'I cannot any longer, nay I dare not, let her have command over my purse, or I shall be ruined, and the estate will suffer. It is imperative that you warn Kendall, if by any chance . . .' The sentence broke off. There was no end to it. The scrap of paper was not dated" (du Maurier, *My Cousin Rachel* 146). Not wanting to face the conflict that Ambrose's warning evokes, Philip buries the letter in what he considers to be symbolically Ambrose's last resting place, beneath a piece of granite set up on the highest point of the Ashley land which commands a view of the whole estate. This is where Ambrose would prefer to be there in spirit after his death rather than in the family vault. Philip remembers this and buries the letter under the granite slab: "This marks his desire to repress such knowledge and to resist the Law of the Father but after his rejection by Rachel, Philip exhumes the letter, now taking its words as truth" (Horner and Zlosnik 140).

With the shift in his feelings, Philip now hates to find Ambrose's letters since they cause a disruption in the new reality he has constructed. Therefore, he wants to make

Ambrose's will real, one that he wrote but never signed, instead of believing his letter that he signed but never sent. This raises a question of authentication that prevents Philip from taking action and causes doubt, when he acts, over whether he has acted in accordance with Ambrose's will. By doing so, he passes beyond inheriting Ambrose's will. He replaces Ambrose. Thus, Philip turns into a Hamlet-like character in his indecision and need for conviction. Indeed, the novel is full of references to *Hamlet*. Ambrose's accusations of Rachel coming after his death and Philip's reluctance to believe him and act, his hesitation all echo Hamlet's conflicts. Therefore, his neurotic behaviour can also be discussed by making use of Lacan's interpretation of Hamlet:

> The first factor … in Hamlet's structure was his situation of dependence with respect to the desire of the Other, the desire of his mother. Here now is the second factor that I ask you to recognize: Hamlet is constantly suspended in the time of the Other, throughout the entire story until the very end. ("Desire" 17)

Philip obviously echoes Hamlet' lines "To be, or not to be, that is the question" (Shakespeare 59), while trying to make up his mind about Ambrose's letter: "To read, or not to read; I wished to heaven the choice was not before me" (du Maurier, *My Cousin Rachel* 186). Like Hamlet, Philip's decision is difficult. Lacan asserts, "Whatever may happen later, this is not the hour of the Other, and he suspends his action. Whatever Hamlet may do, he will do it only at the hour of the Other" (Lacan 18). Like Hamlet, Philip has to wait until the end. However, unlike Hamlet, Philip's reality is suspended because he is not sure, which puts him in a liminal position between Oedipus -who does not know- and Hamlet -who knows. The mixed messages prevent Philip from being able to choose the most authentic document. In the face of Ambrose's unexpected death far away from his home, his marriage to a half foreigner a short time before his death, and a lack of any regulated document accepting the wife to the will raise a lot of conflicts. Since Ambrose is no longer present and thus cannot authenticate any document, Philip assumes his place and decides to authenticate the will himself. He chooses the document that he thinks he can authenticate by replacing Ambrose, whose authenticity is found questionable. With this action, he chooses to

ignore the two paternal figures' warnings, Ambrose's letter and his godfather Mr Kendall's warnings, and decides to believe in Rachel. However, in his decision to impersonate Ambrose, Philip goes mad: "I did not know lunacy could give such delight" (du Maurier, *My Cousin Rachel* 225). In his madness, a wish to escape from the Other's desire into fantasy can be detected. Philip succumbs to the mother's demand. He decides to be even more extravagant than Rachel and spend all his wealth on her as long as she stays. In Philip's taking sides with Rachel, however, there is a kind of Oedipal rivalry rather than the triumph of the maternal over the paternal law. Philip is, it is possible to argue, having a deferred Oedipal complex. His romantic interest in Rachel is paralleled with the theme of the double, in his uncanny resemblance to Ambrose and his being Ambrose's heir. Philip identifies strongly with the estate:

> It came upon me strongly and with force, and for the first time since I had learnt of Ambrose's death, that everything I now saw and looked upon belonged to me. I need never share it with anyone living. Those walls and windows, that roof, the bell that struck seven as I approached, the whole living entity of the house was mine, and mine alone. The grass beneath my feet, the trees surrounding me, the hills behind me, the meadows, the woods, even the men and women farming the land yonder, were all part of my inheritance; they all belonged. (51)

The spectrality of this space that is constituted by what is inherited from the father is given, using the gothic trope of the double. The question how much of the subject is made up of the residues of the dead is raised regarding the issue of ownership and inheritance. Philip, who inherited everything from Ambrose, implicitly thinks that he can inherit his wife too. However, being a phallic woman like Rebecca, Rachel performs and appropriates the patriarchal gender roles with mastery while building her own social space in the house, raising a need for a woman -a need which was not recognised prior to her arrival. When the house can no longer accommodate her subjectivity, she decides to leave. In this account, the novel is similar to *Jamaica Inn*, and as in *Jamaica Inn*, it suggests that no permanent break from the patterns of phallogocentric discourse is possible. Philip finally makes up his mind because Rachel stops being part of his intrasubjective reality. As Lacan notes: "the uncanny . . . is

linked not, as some believed, to all sorts of irruptions from the unconscious, but rather to an imbalance that arises in the fantasy when it decomposes, crossing the limits originally assigned to it, and rejoins the image of the other subject" ("Desire" 22). When Philip understands that Rachel will really leave him, he finds the document, a list of poisonous plants, which proves to him that Rachel poisoned Ambrose. He does not warn her about the bridge over the new sunken Italian garden, thus allows her to die, "an ironically fitting end for this 'foreign' woman who has disrupted the 'natural' order of this English country house" (Horner and Zlosnik 140). Here, Rachel "dissolves as a love object" as is the case with Ophelia for Hamlet, as indicated by Lacan: "For the subject the object appears . . . on the outside. The subject is no longer the object: he rejects it with all the force of his being and will not find it again until he sacrifices himself. It is in this sense that the object is here the equivalent of, assumes the place of, indeed is -the phallus" ("Desire" 23). Only after her death, with the help of some proof discovered suggesting her innocence, is Rachel recovered to Philip's psychic space. Philip, like Hamlet, enters the third stage: "Here we see something like a reintegration of the object *a*, won back here at the price of mourning and death" (Lacan 25). In Philip's guilt and mourning, Rachel returns in his confessional narrative.

Philip wants to fix and stabilise Rachel's unstable and fluid status by immobilising her through the legal arrangements he makes. These arrangements make sure that Rachel can live in comfort as long as she lives in the estate with Philip. Philip is threatened by the ambiguity which he sees as an indication of Rachel's double nature, which results from her being half-English and half-Italian. He tries to resolve his conflicting feelings regarding Rachel by rejecting and forcing her to leave her Italian half behind. However, by letting Rachel die, Philip condemns himself to an irreducible uncertainty which plagues him in visions of another woman-killer, whose body he saw hanging from a gibbet during childhood, and with whom he might now have to admit he shares an abject symmetry:

> Tom Jenkyn, battered specimen of humanity, unrecognizable and unlamented, did you all those years ago, stare after me in pity as I went running down the woods into the future?
>
> Had I looked back at you, over my shoulder, I should not have seen you swinging in your chains but my own shadow. (10)

The Ashley estate malfunctions as a mechanism of patriarchy and patriarchal family because it destroys Rachel, but in doing so, it eliminates the possibilities of its own continuation too. First, with the death of Rachel's unborn child, Ambrose loses his heir, and Rachel loses her ability to give birth. Hence, Philip inherits the estate. However, Philip falls in love with Rachel too, and with this, he removes all the possibilities of the continuation of the family line. Even after Rachel's death, Philip does not marry anyone. Thus, the woman once more poses a break in the history of patriarchy.

CHAPTER 5

EXTIMACY

5.1. General Introduction

In this part, I will focus on the Gothic landscape and analyse how du Maurier sets up the domestic space in relation to the land on which it stands, what kind of dichotomies she constructs and undermines using the topology of the landscape, through the interaction between the characters and space along with the spatial experiences they (re)produce. It is possible to suggest that in the novels, a yearning for a connection with the collective consciousness, a search for a grand narrative beyond Christianity, Enlightenment and patriarchy, one that would accommodate the writer's own subjectivity, but also a critique of it, are present. In this respect, the Cornish land can be viewed as a spatiotemporal and psychosocial entity that provides the writer with this connection. In alignment with this, an analysis of gothic landscape in the novels can show that the writer constructs an outside space that undermines the time and space dichotomy as she looks for ways to evoke multiple temporalities co-existing in the simultaneity of space. Therefore, I will trace the ways the writer communicates the sense of repressed material within the dominant discourses through the topology of the gothic space and spatialises repression and resistance by merging subjectivity and space. In this respect, I have adopted a topological approach to gothic landscape as I have done in the analysis of domestic space.

Lefebvre claims "any space implies, contains, and dissimulates social relationships" (82–3), and it can be claimed that gothic landscape is not an exception to this. In line

with this, Healey and Yang's argument can be taken as a starting point in the analysis of the gothic landscapes in the novels: They argue, "Gothic landscapes are a lens by which cultures reflect back their darkness hidden from the light of consciousness" (5). Hence, they "are fertile ground for understanding the repressed and dispossessed in society" (8). Indeed, the construction of the gothic landscape in close relation to nature and in opposition with modern society can open it up as a liminal space that acts as an intermediary between the two spheres. This can be broadened so as to relate the landscape to the dark side of human nature, that is, what escapes or is excluded from the representation of human in dominant discourses. In doing so, the Gothic functions as a literary and cultural heterotopia that contains deviation, and, through this containment, helps define the limits of social and cultural deviation. Thus, the gothic landscape works as a locus of the forces that are at work within and against the dominant representations of society and the human as a social being.

It can be claimed that the topology of Cornwall as constructed in the novels enables du Maurier to communicate the repressed material. It can also be added that this Gothicised landscape becomes a site on which not only the individual but also the collective or cultural unconscious, and the culturally repressed, are also imprinted. In other words, this unconscious and repressed material is imprinted on the created space and finds expression in the relationship between the subject and space. Thus, it is possible to argue that although it offers a glimpse at the world as the space that is beyond what is represented in language, it is never entirely a pure outside, devoid of social and linguistic intervention, nor is it solely imaginary, gaining metaphorical implications for the psychic world of the subject. Rather, the multiplicity of its meanings can be understood from a Thirdspace perspective, as simultaneously real and imaginary.

It is possible to put forward that one persistent feature of the gothic landscapes in the novels is that they are represented in a way that marks a break from linear temporality and time/space duality since different temporalities are contained in one space, and space becomes a spatiotemporal entity, in which time works both diachronically and synchronically. In that, temporality and spatiality collapse into one another. This

encourages a reading of the gothic space not as merely physical or mimetic, which opens gothic novels up to a reading that adopts the postmodern and post-structural theories of space that argue against time/space duality, a duality which is seen to be depriving space of its constitutive role in the formation of social meaning. Such duality prevents us from seeing space as a dimension that plays an active role in the formation of social reality and meaning. Doreen Massey states that "the strategy of radically polarizing time and space, and of defining space by the absence of temporality" is actually connected to "the broader western mode of dualistic thinking which has been . . . linked into the same system of thought which so sharply distinguishes between masculine and feminine, defining them through continuous series of mutual oppositions" (*Space, Place and Gender* 6). Her argument becomes relevant here. Massey's conceptualisation of space as that category which helps us to conceive of the simultaneity of human actions and interactions makes it possible to break away from linear temporality, through which, as in western epistemology, meaning is constructed. Focusing on the functions of du Maurier's undermining a time/space binary in her novels by using this approach can allow for a refined evaluation of the complexity of the writer's work.

Although du Maurier undermines the time/space binary in more than just her Cornish novels, Cornwall proves an appropriate site to write against this binary due to its peripheral position with regards to more modern centres of population. Rather than choosing an urban space and a modern urban domestic sphere as a locus that brings together modern society as the exterior and the complicated interiority of the modern subject, her Cornish setting allows du Maurier to explore and critique modernity from the periphery. This is also pointed out by Horner and Zlosnik who suggest that within her literary imagination du Maurier's "sense of identification with the peripheral culture of Cornwall may be seen as deriving from her attraction to its strangeness, the 'otherness' of a landscape permeated by relics of the past and hints of beliefs alien to the seemingly rational world of the twentieth century" (68). Such a perception of Cornwall, as Ella Westland notes, is one that has a long literary history and a place in gothic imagination dating back to the eighteenth century:

> By the 1790s it was no longer necessary to leave Britain in search of a rugged landscape which would inspire ecstasy, tranquillity, sweet melancholy or Gothic horror. . . . The transformation of Cornwall in the English imagination depended on rocky shores and surging seas taking their place with dark forests and snowy summits as approved sites for romantic sublimity, and literary evidence suggests that this had been achieved before 1800. (154)

Despite the fact that Westland refers only to the physical features of the Cornish landscape, it is appropriate to claim that, added to such physical characteristics, its peripheral location and its cultural and literary heritage allowed Cornwall to be a proper setting for the Gothic. Thus, it is important to note that when du Maurier used Cornwall in her narratives, she mixed individual memory and cultural history, and by bringing together the physical Cornwall, Cornwall as represented in literature and the Cornwall that she lived in, she moved beyond the Secondspace perspective and constructed a Thirdspace. From her vantage point, the pre-historical pagan past and the Christian and enlightened present exist side by side in Cornwall, making it an appropriate space that can help explore personal traumas as well as repressed personal and cultural histories. Cornish land is constructed as a porous space where the boundaries between the past and present along with the repressed and the dominant are permeable. By going back and forth in time, du Maurier tries to comprehend the multiplicity and simultaneity of space.

In accordance with this argument, Horner and Zlosnik claim that "[d]u Maurier's Cornwall is a psychological landscape in which the conscious imagination battles with deeper fears. Because these deeper fears are not excised by the resolution of plot, the desire for freedom and autonomy continues to generate a creative tension in all her work" (67). An analysis of space in the novels can be revealing in exploring this tension. Very often, fears and desires in du Maurier's Gothic exist in the narrative in the form of repression. While she explores taboos and transgressive actions, the repressed material remains largely repressed, or, put in another way, embedded. However, it endures. Building a gothic space, the writer imprints this repressed material on spatial entities. The novels are thus open to multiple meanings that are produced through a repetitive process of repression and resistance of the repressed simultaneously. Discussing the novels from a spatial perspective can show that

transgression and trauma on the one hand, and repression and taboo on the other hand are not necessarily temporal processes in the sense that they occur chronologically over a linear history, but they are in the constant process of (re)production, and hence dynamic processes that make it impossible to stabilise meaning.

The gothic outside in the novels is marked by extimacy, an intimate exteriority, which, from the perspective of Lacanian psychoanalysis, manifests the pleasurable fantasy which always circles the object just beyond the subject's grasp, thus becoming "something in it more than itself," the Thing that has been excluded, "something strange to me, although it is at the heart of me" (Lacan, *Seminar VII* 71). In order to map the topology of subjectivity, Lacan coined the neologism *extimit*é, in order to explain the subject's intimate relation with what he perceives as himself, but what is not located in him. As Mladen Dolar writes, by asserting that the interior is present in the exterior and vice versa, Lacan blurs the distinctions between inside/outside: "The extimate is simultaneously the intimate kernel and the foreign body; in a word, it is *unheimlich*" (6). The result is an uncanny psychic topology, the alienating effect of which cannot be removed because subjectivity merges into the space, and the unconscious material in the novels is dispersed in the space. The outside space stops being an externality through which the subject navigates itself. The boundary between the internal and the external is lifted , thus creating a space that can be understood and analysed as topological rather than topographical. The psychic space is not represented as part of the subject's interior world, nor is subjectivity represented as interiority.

5.2. Cornwall in *My Cousin Rachel*

As discussed in the previous chapter, du Maurier's choice of male narrator in *My Cousin Rachel* results in a different construction of space. In the novel, Cornwall is not identified with otherness, but it is the familiar space of Philip Ashley's social and psychic reality. Philip, as the narrator, depicts Cornwall as a homely space, and describes it in topographic terms. It is also a space of order and law, organised by the patriarchal order. The book opens with the scene of a public hanging, a sign of judicial power, and it is shown to young Philip by the paternal figure Ambrose as a test on his

reaction to death. Cornwall is set in contrast with Italy, which is depicted as chaotic and unruly. When Philip goes to Italy, he finds beggars on the streets, narrow alleyways and tall houses touching one another. Therefore, it is possible to argue that the Cornish land has a different function than it has in *Jamaica Inn* and *Rebecca*. It is where the everyday reality of Philip is located and provides him with safe reference points through which he can accommodate his subjectivity in the patriarchal social space. In *My Cousin Rachel*, the danger comes from outside. In other words, in *My Cousin Rachel*, Cornwall does not intrude, but is intruded upon.

Philip definitely experiences Italy as uncanny, and it has a disorienting effect on him. Also, due to the ambiguity that Rachel poses, his homely experience turns unhomely. However, Philip's alienation and liminality do not extend over the Cornish landscape and lead him to form an extimate relationship with it. The lack of extimacy and liminality regarding Cornwall in *My Cousin Rachel* tells us a lot about the production of gothic space in du Maurier's novels. It shows that gothic space as extimate is experienced by the female subject which can be seen as an outcome of the patriarchal production and organisation of space. For Philip, the private and public spheres are divided in a way that enables him to accommodate his psychic and social spaces without a blurring of the inside/outside dichotomy.

As discussed in the theoretical framework, in the patriarchal construction of domestic space, the homeliness of home is built upon the repression of the maternal body. While the male subject can separate himself from the maternal body more easily due to his difference from it, for the female subject, whose body and positioning in the social space resonate with those of the mother, this separation is not without problems. Therefore, for the female subject, the repression of the maternal body is a less smooth process than it is for the male subject. The inside/outside distinction and subjectivity as interiority do not work for the female subject. This can be found both in *Jamaica Inn* and *Rebecca*. For the male subject, who can repress the maternal body back to Firstspace, home can signify an interiority, a private space that can accommodate his subjectivity without complications. The boundaries between the physical and mental spaces are well-defined. Thus, Philip can accommodate Firstspace while placing his

subjectivity in Secondspace. His consciousness is not immersed in his surroundings as the female subjects in the two novels. Rather than the landscape, Rachel has an unsettling effect on him. She becomes the uncanny element whom Philip comes to identify both with the maternal space and the foreignness of Italy. Not the landscape, but Rachel, her body and psyche become the locus of Philip's attention and the source of uncanny. When Philip develops a close relationship with Rachel, he regresses from his social space to the private sphere of the home. However, he does not complicate the division between the two. Since he wants to limit Rachel in the private sphere of the home, dissolve her strangeness and make her part of his psychic space, his liminal experience takes place within the confines of home. Rachel's ease at integrating into the social space of Cornwall does not have an unsettling effect on Philip, but her foreignness does. Exploring Rachel, her physical features, her behaviours, the way she moves and the way she speaks, becomes in part exploring Italy, but also femininity and the maternal, both of which he identifies with the private sphere of the home. Philip cannot decide whether he should attribute what he sees as irrational or disproportionate in Rachel's actions to her femininity or to her Italian background. Her financial extravagance and her sexual mobility also prevent Philip from associating her with the domestic ideals of femininity and restoring the private space of the house. Thus, Italy intrudes upon Cornwall through Rachel. This intrusion becomes even more threatening with the arrival of Rainaldi in Cornwall. When Philip fails to dissolve Rachel into the private space of the home, he leads her to death. On the other hand, as argued in the previous chapter, against the unsettling effect of Rachel, help and protection always come from outside, the social space of Cornwall. In the end, while Cornwall still provides comfort, it is Philip who is haunted by the memory of Rachel and his guilt, and this haunting effect lingers within the confines of the house.

Since Rachel is depicted through the lens of Philip, she remains an enigmatic character until the end, and it is not possible to explore her experience of space in the novel in relation to extimacy. Thus, this chapter will explore the gothic landscape in *Jamaica Inn* and *Rebecca*.

5.3. Bodmin Moor and the Repressed History in *Jamaica Inn*

In this section, I will discuss the significance of Bodmin Moor in *Jamaica Inn* as a topological space where repressed history is released, and the boundaries between the past and present, the human and non-human, and the self and other collapse, causing manifestations of a spatial uncanny. Bodmin Moor becomes a space free from linear time, and the Cartesian conception of space which is seen as isotropic, as it merges with Mary Yellan and Francis Davey's subjectivity and becomes non-referential in the sense that it stops being a reference point for the subject's perception of the world. Through the course of the novel, the moor gains metaphorical meanings and becomes uncanny as the space takes over subjectivity. In order to analyse this space, I will consult the concepts of the uncanny and the sublime in relation to Soja's Thirdspace and focus on the ways in which du Maurier thirds space to create spatial uncanny in the sense that the uncanny experience emerges as a result of the interaction between the subject and space.

The depiction and representation of nature constitutes an important role in thirding the landscapes in the novels. As discussed above, in du Maurier's fiction, nature is divided into two different categories. Bodmin Moor is identified with hostile and monstrous qualities of nature. In this du Maurier follows the gothic literary tradition in which, as Botting maintains, "Landscapes stress isolation and wilderness, evoking vulnerability, exposure and insecurity," and "[n]ature appears hostile, untamed and threatening . . . darkness, obscurity and barely contained malevolent energy reinforce atmospheres of disorientation and fear" (*Gothic* [2nd ed.] 4). It can be claimed that this fear and disorientation form the core of the spatial uncanny in *Jamaica Inn*. From the very beginning of the narrative, Bodmin Moor is identified with an irreducible otherness. It is built up as an aggressive, monstrous space in that it exceeds human rationalisation and control, and causes disorientation, creating an excessively and irrationally disturbing effect that even the violence within Jamaica Inn or the lethally dangerous marshes without cannot explain away. In other words, the moor is monstrous, but this monstrosity cannot be attributed to its physical wilderness and the social violence employed by the landlord of Jamaica Inn alone; it has a dimension that is perceived as

threatening, but not externally. Rather, it is possible to argue that this dimension lies along the boundaries between the conscious and unconscious, the dominant and repressed, past and present permeable. As the narrative unfolds, the threat of the moor turns into a full experience of the uncanny. In the final flight of Francis Davis and Mary, this monstrous space turns into what Gomel calls an "impossible space, in which distance and difference are abolished, and past and present coexist" (37).

The moor is represented as a multi-layered space which is found by Mary to be too monstrous to be inhabited. Its monstrosity is first represented on the level of the physical, but soon the physical dimension is mixed with the psychical and the social. It is initially set as the infernal opposite of Helford, Mary's hometown. In contrast to Helford which is associated with maternity in being nurturing and protecting, Bodmin Moor is identified with hostility and aggressiveness that encroaches on the inhabitant. On the journey to Jamaica Inn, through Mary's memories of Helford, in an irreducible contrast to the "green hills" (du Maurier, *Jamaica* 7) and "the tall protecting trees" (32) which are far behind, the changing landscape creates a sense of a fall from paradise, but also foreshadows the radical transformation that Mary is about to go through. The rain is overwhelming, obscuring the whole land, and it is impossible to be totally safe from it:

> This was a lashing, pitiless rain that stung the windows of the coach, and it soaked into a hard and barren soil. No trees here, save one or two that stretched bare branches to the four winds, bent and twisted from centuries of storm, and so black were they by time and tempest that, even if spring did breathe on such a place, no buds would dare to come to leaf for fear the late frost should kill them. It was a scrubby land, without hedgerow and meadow; a country of stones, black heather, and stunted broom. (3)

Mary experiences the pressure of the threatening scenery. This barren land offers no shelter. She extends the hostility of nature to people, thinking that the effects of such a landscape on the people who inhabit it would be great:

> No human being could live in this wasted country . . . and remain like other people; the very children would be born twisted, like the blackened shrubs of broom, bent by the force of a wind that never ceased, blow as it would from

> east and west, from north and south. Their minds would be twisted, too, their thoughts evil, dwelling as they must amidst marshland and granite, harsh heather and crumbling stone.
>
> They would be born of strange stock who slept with this earth as a pillow, beneath this black sky. They would have something of the Devil left in them still. (13)

Here, Mary thinks about monstrosity and transgression on spatial terms, recognising a symbiotic relationship between the subject and space. The reference to the Devil, on the other hand, strengthens the analogy of the Christian fall and helps to identify Mary as a Christian country girl. She makes sense of the world from this vantage point, and it later becomes even more obvious when she questions whether smuggling, even though it is against the law, is actually evil. She distinguishes between the judicial law and Christian values, putting the latter on a higher level. This can also be seen in her putting her trust in the Vicar of Altarnun instead of in Squire Bassat. Therefore, Joss Merlyn's transgression is for her even more abject for it is a transgression of the religious values.

In her journey, the oppressive atmosphere of the moors gains a higher reality as Mary sets a link between the natural landscape and the human world in her depictions. The coach "rock[s] between the high wheels like a drunken man" (1), utters "creaks and growls" (15). This impact does not lose its power over Mary when she starts to live in Jamaica Inn for there, she continues to connect nature and the landscape with the terrors she suffers and witnesses. In her perception the wind shouts, cries, and moans (38), "[shudders] like a man in pain" (38). It appears that the association between this space apparently "untouched by human hand" (38), in the sense that it is not domesticated and organised into a fully grown settlement, not civilised, and its underlying social aspect heightens the threat. The tors seem to alter, taking on a humanly dimension, forming a scene which is very similar to Jamaica Inn and Joss Merlyn: "Some were shaped like giant furniture, with monstrous chairs and twisted tables; and sometimes the smaller crumbling stones lay on the summit of the hill like a giant himself, his huge, recumbent form darkening the heather and the coarse tufted grass"(38-9). The economy of metaphors used in the depiction of Mary's experience

intensifies the liminality of space since the boundaries between the land and the human as well as between human and non-human are blurred.

As discussed in the previous chapter, a great part of Mary‘s change through the narrative is due to Bodmin Moor. Du Maurier builds a liminal space the ambiguity of which does not disappear. The moor is depicted in ways that shift between the real and imaginary, the psychic and social, or the natural and supernatural, never entirely dissolving into one category. As such, it is a gothic space that is built through a constant shift back and forth between irreconcilable categories. Even before Mary is introduced to the moor’s capacity to evoke pre-history, she can sense this liminality.

On her final day at the inn, Mary realises that with the deaths of Joss and Patience Merlyn, the inn loses its oppressive masculine energy, but it reveals a connection with an archaic power that is inhuman and beyond any cultural categorisation and signification:

> She looked up at Jamaica Inn, sinister and grey in the approaching dusk, the windows barred; she thought of the horrors the house had witnessed, the secrets now embedded in its walls, side by side with the other old memories of feasting and firelight and laughter before her uncle cast its shadow upon it; and she turned away from it, as one turns instinctively from a house of the dead, and went out from the road. (225)

This unnameable entity signifies a more organic relation between the sinister topology of the building and the land on which it stands, a connection that has endured despite the repression of history and modernity. While Mary’s fear of Jamaica Inn is the fear of the unknown at the beginning of the novel, in the end, it turns into the fear of what was once known but is forgotten in the present day, although it has endured:

> Death had come upon the house tonight, and its brooding spirit still hovered in the air. She felt now that was what Jamaica Inn had always waited for and feared. The damp walls, the creaking boards, the whispers in the air, and the footsteps that had no name: these were the warning of a house that had felt itself long threatened.
>
> Mary shivered; and she knew that the quality of this silence had origin in far-off buried and forgotten things. (245-6)

While Mary senses the connection between silence and fear from time to time in the narrative, here for the first time she most openly connects it to something archaic beyond language. The silence of the clock is also a sign of this out-of-time/out-of-space experience: "It was the silence that frightened her most. Now that the clock no longer ticked, her nerves strained for the sound of it; the slow wheezing choke had been familiar and a symbol of normality" (245). The spider that walks over her uncle's body both startles and frightens her with its awareness that the body on which it is walking is dead: "A spider settled on her uncle's hand . . . there was a lack of fear in its rapidity that was somehow horrible and desecrating to death. The spider knew that the landlord could not harm him" (245). The spider can be understood as embodying the gaze in a Lacanian sense: when the object we look looks back at us, we are reminded of our own lack, of the fact that the symbolic order is separated only by a fragile border from the materiality of the Real. The split between the eye and gaze marks a traumatic encounter with the Real. This is Mary's first glimpse of death, and the spider's indifference brings her own lack to her consciousness for a moment.

Mary first perceives Bodmin Moor as a socially unmapped space. It is "wilder than she had at first supposed. . . . Where was [its] final boundary she could not tell" (du Maurier, *Jamaica* 38). When she does not have to pass through the moor, however, it loses its impact on her: "Tonight she had no fear of the moors; they did not concern her. Her business was with the road" (225). The moors lose their significance "when unnoticed and untrodden; they loomed beyond her and away from her" (225). It is possible to argue that unlike the road, which provides a certain trajectory to follow, the difficulty of navigating oneself in the moor, because of the marshes and the streams that spread all over the land, makes it a labyrinthine gothic space very difficult to pass through and causes one to question its reality once one is removed from it.

During her time in Jamaica Inn, as Mary cannot find any reference points for her subjectivity in the house, she turns to the moor. The moor stands out as a favourable alternative to the Bodmin road, on which she can encounter other people. Thus, instead of the more social and safer road, she chooses to wander in the moor despite the danger it poses. It can be maintained that the moor offers a way out of the social and cultural

boundaries of the everyday life which Mary, as an inhabitant of Jamaica Inn, is identified with Joss Merlyn's transgressive social position. In this sense, although Bodmin Moor offers Mary a chance to escape the claustrophobic atmosphere of Jamaica Inn, it can be claimed that, at the same time, its isolated and disconnected atmosphere forces the repressed material in her psyche to come to the surface. That is, the moor induces transgressive thoughts in Mary, and it also challenges her ability to navigate herself, both physically and psychically. In accordance with this, Horner and Zlosnik suggest that the moor can best be understood metaphorically: "it represents a desire for psychosexual freedom, and an intimation of the possibility of moving beyond a social, gendered identity" (77). Therefore, in bringing together the conscious and the unconscious, along with the past, present and the future, Bodmin Moor is represented as a liminal space which induces the experience of the uncanny. Despite his monstrosity and the terror and horror that Joss Merlyn causes, it is Francis Davey, the Vicar of Altarnun, who is revealed as the ultimate villain at the end of the novel. Indeed, Titlestad argues that "rather than wrecking being the archetype of evil, it merely approximates and expresses the primal darkness embodied by Francis Davey" (100). Du Maurier translates the mythology built around wrecking "in imagining what potentially motivates it: a dark, archaic, and irrepressible force that cannot be concealed by the veil of civilisation, by reason, progress or Protestantism" (100).

Davey first gains Mary's trust and then causes her total disillusionment, leading her to relinquish any hope of living the ordinary life of a country girl. It can be said that Davey is the uncanny incarnated:

> [S]he saw his eyes for the first time from beneath the brim of his hat. They were strange eyes, transparent like glass, and so pale in colour that they seemed near to white; a freak of nature she had never known before. They fastened upon her, and searched her, as though her very thoughts could not be hidden . . . (du Maurier, *Jamaica* 95)

Despite his uncanny physical qualities, for Mary, Francis Davey and his house come to represent security against the dangerous atmosphere of Jamaica Inn. Before she learns his role in shipwrecking and smuggling chain, Mary puts all her trust in the

Vicar: “There was always Francis Davey and his promise; there would be peace and shelter for her at the house in Altarnun” (137):

> There was a haven of rest for her in Altarnun –the very name spelt like a whisper – and the voice of Francis Davey would mean security and a forgetting of trouble. There was a strangeness about him that was both disturbing and pleasant. . . . He was a shadow of a man, and now she was not with him he lacked substance. He had not the male aggression of Jem beside her, he was without flesh and blood. He was no more than two white eyes and a voice in the darkness. (143-44)

Although Mary imagines Francis as lacking substance, her emphasis on his eyes and voice bears significance. The emphasis on the white eyes can be taken as the sign of the fact that Davey can see things that Mary cannot see, even things she wants to hide. This becomes clearer when she later refers to his eyes as “eyes that had looked upon the past” (281). Her reference to a voice in the darkness can be understood as a foreshadowing of first the fact that he literally is the voice in the dark, the stranger that she heard but could not see on her first night in Jamaica Inn and, second that he is the one that would tell her of the things that remained in the dark for a long time. His voice also becomes the voice of the moor for Mary as he becomes integrated into that place. He is thus uncanny in bringing to light what was meant to remain hidden. The green light that infiltrates his paintings of the church represents the pre-historical heritage of the land that has never ceased its existence.

Davey moves beyond the binaries of man and woman, the past and present, the human and inhuman, and is thus a liminal character. In Mary’s mind, he is similar to the moor. Like the moor, he loses reality in his absence. The gendered depictions of Helford and Bodmin, and the opposition set between them are undermined by the androgynous appearance of Davey and in his behaviours that blur gender distinctions. In this respect, as Horner and Zlosnik suggest, “he is visually and sexually an inversion of the Byronic hero” (81). Tracing the literary examples of the Byronic hero in the conventions of Female Gothic, Williams notes the common characteristics:

> He seems ‘fallen,’ though of apparently noble origins. He is tall and imposingly masculine ... His eye is always piercing, penetrating. (One remembers the conventional Female Gothic cover illustration-the house with one lighted window, often in a tower.) Most insistent, however, is this figure's duality-the perceived incongruity of inner and outer, present and past, his paradoxical, deceptively mixed nature. His masculine strength, even harshness, masks a conventionally ‘feminine’ capacity for intense feeling. (144-5)

Unlike Joss Merlyn and other men of the moors, Francis Davey is depicted in incorporeal terms. Furthermore, in opposition to Joss Merlyn, he keeps his real actions and motives concealed until the end. He masks himself as the wise and benevolent clergy man who represents a higher order. He is the only person for whom Mary has respect and to whom she feels inferior. Behind his actions there is a certain way of thinking and a system of belief that keep him from feeling any sense of guilt. In his search for a more authentic system of belief and a more organic unity and connection with the land, Francis Davey believes that he can find it in the moor:

> I live in the past, when men were not so humble as they are today. Oh, not your heroes of history in doublet and hose and narrow-pointed shoes –they were never my friends- but long ago in the beginning of time, when the rivers and the sea were one, and the old gods walked the hills. (du Maurier, *Jamaica* 274)

By transgressing the moral and linear thresholds, Francis Davey holds a superior vantage point, the position of the outsider who is not bound to moral and social limits. Bodmin Moor becomes for him a spatiotemporal ontological site of existence, challenging the boundaries of time and place. He forces the boundaries between past and present, real and imaginary. In this way, he searches for a more authentic origin. Why Francis Davey got involved in shipwrecking in the beginning is not clear, but it is partly due to his hatred for society and human-made rules. Unlike Mary, he does not establish a symbiotic relationship between space and its inhabitants. He blames ordinary people for their ignorance of the land upon which they stand, and is disgusted at their sheep-like obedience:

> The church was a roof above their heads, with four walls of stone, and because it had been blessed at the beginning by human hands they thought it holy. They do not know that beneath the foundation-stone lie the bones of their pagan

> ancestors, and the old granite altars where sacrifice was held long before Christ died upon His cross. I have stood in the church at midnight, Mary, and listened to the silence; there is a murmur in the air and a whisper of unrest that is bred deep in the soil and has no knowledge of the church and Altarnun. (280)

This repressed world is not seen but heard. Untouched by civilisation, the moor, for Francis Davey, is a space of resistance that has stood still against the effects of time. Davey's search for a point of origin that is beyond humanity brings him to Bodmin. There, he tries to connect to a collective consciousness that has long been repressed by Christianity and Enlightenment, but nevertheless endured. For him, the Cornish land and especially Bodmin Moor house the repressed pagan and barbarian roots of humankind that have long been repressed by the pretensions of civilisation and Christianity. He evokes this other world to accommodate his own subjectivity since he cannot accommodate his otherness in the ordinary world. Rejecting Christianity as human-made, Davey looks for a different organising principle that can help him transcend humanity and civilisation. For him, accommodating, or even catching a glimpse of, this other world is the privilege of the selected few who have a superior intellect. That is why he takes Mary with him, thinking that she can understand, owing to her marginal position. Marginality and otherness in this sense are found to be superior to conformity and self-sameness. Furthermore, like du Maurier herself, Davey is not born and/or raised in Cornwall; he is an outsider. It is his spatiotemporally –and physically- marginal position that gives him a licence to access this repressed material:

> Yes, I am a freak in nature and a freak in time. I do not belong here, and I was born with a grudge against the age, and a grudge against mankind. Peace is very hard to find in the nineteenth century. The silence is gone, even on the hills. I thought to find it in the Christian Church, but the dogma sickened me, and the whole foundation is built upon a fairy-tale. Christ Himself is a figurehead, a puppet thing created by man himself. (274)

Being a freak in time, it can be claimed that Davey wants to locate himself outside the temporal world, in his pursuit of an eternal reality, an absolute truth. In his church, he can only catch the glimpses of this space, following the residues of the past in the silence of the night. However, he tries to intensify those glimpses to the point of full experience of reality, by creating a psychic space. His paintings can be seen as products

of this effort. His ideas on religion, civilisation and the land find expression in his paintings as an infiltrating green light. Bodmin Moor in this sense becomes a gothic space, working on similar principles to those of gothic architecture.

Davey visualises this repressed pre-historical world only as an infiltrating green light in his paintings. Mary finds this light unnatural, and therefore, uncanny: "She could not have put her feelings of discomfort into words, but it was as though some spirit, having no knowledge of the church itself, had groped its way into the interior and breathed an alien atmosphere upon the shadowed nave" (260). This green light infiltrates into all of Davey's paintings: "she saw that they were all tainted in the same manner and to the same degree" (260). Although Mary cannot comprehend the meaning of the light, she is able to sense its otherness; therefore, she feels that the church is tainted by this light. The estrangement that his paintings evoke in her leads Mary to doubt Davey's sight: she thinks that the reason for the "haunting and uncanny light" may be due to the fact that being an albino, he has problems with his perception of colours, an effect of his being "a freak of nature" (260-1). Here, again, there can be seen both an overdependence on and undermining of vision. The green light for Mary is something that must not be there; it is an alien entity. Yet she does not doubt her own sight; she doubts Davey's. Of course, the paintings are representations of the Church, but even though Mary has not seen the actual church, she is sure that the green light does not belong there. Still, she can separate the representation of space from the space of representation. However, the green light that Davey has added evokes an uncanny Thirdspace which cannot be explained from a Secondspace perspective. Although Mary sees the painting as a projection of Davey's mental space, the disturbance it causes in her can be understood as a moment of hesitation and doubt that perhaps it is neither a mere mental abstraction, nor it is explainable through malfunctioning sense perceptions. The green light, by tainting the Church, renders the Church's sacredness questionable. This uncanny Thirdspace is one that is not organised by linearity and a break from the pre-history and paganism.

Through the pagan heritage of Cornwall and the wild and isolated landscape, Francis Davey creates a non-human point of origin in his effort to find an alternative

organising principle as a result of his disillusionment with Christian values. He says that it is his learning that turned him against the Church. However, although his learning --his enlightenment-- has alienated him from religion, it has not eliminated his yearning for transcendence and a sense of the sacred. Enlightened by knowledge, he turns to darkness to find a transcendent space.

Like Davey, Mary also finds it very difficult to accommodate her own subjectivity in the ordinary world. As a young woman who seeks courage and power to control her life and what is happening around her, she feels dissatisfied with both her social position defined for her gender and what she sees as physiological limitations defined by her sex and wishes to be a man. Moreover, the violence and injustice that Mary witnesses in Jamaica Inn leads to her disillusionment with the Church and the society. Her marginality opens her up to difference and otherness. When Davey introduces his thoughts about the land, Mary can at once make sense of the horror she felt at Jamaica Inn upon finding her uncle dead:

> His words found echo in her mind, and carried her away, back to the dark passage at Jamaica Inn. She remembered how she had stood there with her uncle dead upon the ground, and there was a sense of horror and fear about the walls that was born of an old cause. His death was nothing, was only a repetition of what had been before, long ago in time, when the hill where Jamaica stood today was bare but for heather and stone. She remembered how she had shivered, as though touched by a cold, inhuman hand; and she shivered now, looking at Francis Davey with his white hair and eyes; eyes that had looked upon the past. (280-1)

In Francis Davey's talk about this strange and new way of thinking about the world and religion, Mary catches the glimpse of something old, long-established and familiar. This time, she trusts Davey's perception as she also recognises the repetitive pattern in the death of her uncle and in what Davey tells her. This raises a question of origin and telos: the repetitive pattern suggests that there may never be an original cause of horror behind the death, violence and transgressions that occur in Bodmin – in the past and present- as in the way that Davey believes. On the contrary, the repetition of violence and transgression makes it a horrible place, and becoming this liminal space of transgression and repeated violence, Bodmin, just like Jamaica Inn,

initiates more violence and death. In this respect, the simultaneity of the conscious and unconscious, the past and present along with the repressed and dominant makes it possible to see the uncanny not as solely a temporal experience that emerges from the return of what was repressed long ago. Instead, both repression and resistance/return of the repressed can be understood as activities that are constantly repeated and happen simultaneously in the process of constructing a stabilised meaning. The Gothic, in giving voice to the repressed side of binary oppositions and working against linearity, in other words, by giving shape to darkness, helps to understand the uncanny as a spatiotemporal experience that can arise as a side-effect of the mechanisms that are always at work. By giving voice to the repressed, even temporarily, the Gothic destabilises the representation process. In the evocation of the past, space does not simply act as a nostalgic fixation of the past against the more fluid time. On the contrary, despite Francis Davey's effort to accommodate himself in the spatiotemporal otherness of Bodmin Moor, it is only for a short time. It can be claimed that space loses its uncanniness once it loses its liminality: since the uncanny is the suspension of the parameters that organise experience, uncanny space cannot be permanently accommodated. Therefore, shortly after Davey and Mary escape into the moor, they are caught by the law, and their flight into this Thirdspace is interrupted. The next time Mary goes to Bodmin Moor, it loses all its uncanniness and connection with the pagan past.

Through Bodmin Moor, Francis Davey attempts to connect with a space beyond social realities along with legal and moral liabilities of the present. The moor becomes a kind of transcendental space that lies beyond any human intervention and dates back in an ancient and pre-modern past before civilisation. When Mary learns about his understanding of life and religion and then goes to the moor with him, she enters his psychic space, which transforms her experience of space: "There was an old magic in these moors that made them inaccessible, spacing them to eternity. Francis Davey knew their secret, and cut through the darkness like a blind man in his home" (281). Space is given an omniscient power which, Mary believes, Davey has access to and offers to share with her. Mary's estrangement from the Church due to the violence she witnessed in Jamaica Inn and on the coast enables her to be open to an alternative

reality. The mention of darkness and blindness is important because it points to an overriding of sight as the dominant sense perception. Also, it helps to draw a parallelism between the moor and the concepts related to a womb, and thus to think of it as a space of origin, which turns out to be very different from what Mary, the Christian country girl, has been taught. This notion is intensified through the addition of protective qualities: "This was his kingdom here, alone in the silence with the great twisted peaks of granite to shield him and the white mist below to shroud him" (286). The moor provides a shelter to Davey. Unlike Davey, Mary does not experience the protective and sheltering qualities of the moor. On the contrary, that this world is beyond what is visible, and marked by silence and whispers in the dark is what Mary has long associated with fear and danger but is unable to make any sense until Francis Davey introduces her to his view of the world. The moor as introduced by Davey is uncanny, evoking the uncancellable togetherness of the self and other, the familiar and unfamiliar. It can be understood in relation with the notion of ex-centric subjectivity that the writer gradually builds in her novels. The moor offers a possibility of the disappearance of the borders between the self and other, the human and non-human, the subject and space, life and death and finally, the past and present.

For Mary, in its eternal present, the moor becomes autonomous, having an energy of its own:

> [O]ut of the silence came the whisper of the wind again. It rose and fell, making a moan upon the stones. This was a new wind, with a sob and a cry behind it, a wind that came from nowhere, bound from no shore. It rose from the stones themselves, and from the earth beneath the stones; it sang in the hollow caves and in the crevices of rock, at first a sigh and then a lamentation. It played upon the air like a chorus from the dead. (286)

A space without coordinates and boundaries, the moor can be understood as the ultimate uncanny. Here, the emphasis on the senses of hearing and touch instead of sight in the description of the wind moving through the surfaces add to the uncanniness of the space for the Cartesian subject depends largely on the sense of sight for knowing, and the disturbance created by the wind that is felt but not seen creates an uncanny effect. If the uncanny is a side-effect of the Enlightenment (Castle, *Female* 8), then it

can be argued that the uncanny experience is a side-effect of this over-dependence on sight in making sense of the world. The loss of sight can also be linked with the loss of the self in the encounter with the Other. Furthermore, the wind does not come from some other place but from another time, and acts as the voice of the dead. It is as if the land has a memory of its own, remembering and lamenting over all the blood that has been shed on it:

> There was no source to the disturbance; for below the tor the heavy fog clung to the ground, obstinate as ever, with never a breath of air to roll away the clouds. Here on the summit the wind fretted and wept, whispering of fear, sobbing old memories of bloodshed and despair, and there was a wild, lost note that echoed in the granite high above Mary's head, on the very peak of Roughtor, as though the gods themselves stood there with their great heads lifted to the sky. (du Maurier, *Jamaica* 286)

It is this obstruction of vision that leads Mary to imagine a space beyond what she can conceive of through her sense perceptions. In other words, the obstruction of vision induces the experience of a spatial dimension which is beyond the visible world. Mary gains a retrospective vision that is triggered by the loss of vision of the material reality:

> In her fancy she could hear the whisper of a thousand voices and the tramping of a thousand feet, and she could see the stones turning to men beside her. Their faces were inhuman, older than time, carved and rugged like the granite; and they spoke in a tongue she could not understand, and their hands and feet were curved like the claws of a bird. (286-7)

That the men she imagines are inhuman and older than time points at an evocation of pre-historical world. This evocation of the pre-history can be taken as a sign of resistance to modernity. As Vidler claims, the uncanny is a category which provoked terror through obscurity and became the indication of "that mental space where temporality and spatiality collapse" (*Architectural* 39). Bodmin Moor, in this respect, emerges as an uncanny space where the temporality collapses into space, and space is constructed as a simultaneity and porosity. In her interaction with this uncanny space, Mary gains what Vidler calls a "retrospective vision" which is obtained through an "unsettling merging of past and present" (47). This evocation of the uncanny makes Bodmin Moor a gothic space resistant to the effects of modernity and the modernity's

version of social and spatial reality as a break from the past. By bringing together the pagan pre-historical past and the Christian present in the Bodmin Moor du Maurier creates a Thirdspace, but for Mary, this space emerges as a distorted version of both spheres, similar to Davey's paintings and drawings and comes into existence as uncanny Thirdspace. It is a freak space, threatening to devour the subject. The moor turns into an impossible space, with no connection to any other space and any other time: "she thought how far removed they were from any sphere of life, two beings flung together in eternity, and that this was a nightmare, with no day to follow it, so that soon she must lose herself and merge into his shadow" (du Maurier, *Jamaica* 286). Mary's fantasy of merging into Davey's shadow is significant in the sense that she fears losing her shape and her boundaries if she inhabits Davey's psychic space. In her dream, she sees herself riding together with him in a coach, "and the walls closed in upon them both, squeezing them together, pressing the life and the breath from their bodies until they were flat, and broken, and destroyed, and lay against one another, poised into eternity, like two slabs of granite" (288). Also, merging into Davey's shadow, rather than merging into him, suggests that Mary still distinguishes between the physical and psychical, identifying her own experience in the moor with the night, dream and out of history. In other words, here, the external reality is not equated with the physical, what is perceivable through the five senses.

Through Mary's uncanny experience in Bodmin Moor, du Maurier downplays the Romantic sublime. According to Thomas Weiskel, there are three stages in the Romantic sublime: in the first stage, the relationship between the mind and the perceived object is determinate and habitual; the second occurs when "the habitual relation of mind and object suddenly breaks down," and there is "a disconcerting disproportion between inner and outer. Either mind or the object is suddenly in excess;" at the third stage, "the mind recovers the balance of outer and inner through by constituting a fresh relation between itself and the object such that the very indeterminacy which erupted in phase two is taken as symbolizing the mind's relation to a transcendent order" (23-4). The sublime gives the subject a feeling of transcendence, in which the subject is able to sense and connect with something larger than itself, something that is beyond what s/he perceives as reality. At the end of the

sublime experience, the subject keeps his/her integrity, returning wiser and better, having accessed this transcendental knowledge. Therefore, it widens the borders of the self without threatening its boundaries, and it still depends on binary divisions between the transcendental and immanent and the self and other. In Mary's case, however, the recovery stage does not come with a higher sense of recognition. It points at a moment of blockage: "an abridgment of the sublime moment so that we are confined to the second phase and await futilely the restorative reaction which never comes" (26). Mary's experience does not lead to an epiphany resulting in higher recognition or empowerment as in the Romantic version of the sublime. Instead, in what Susan Yi Sencindiver regards as a constituent of the spatial experience in the Gothic, "[t]he state of aporia, disproportion between mind and object, self and other, host and double is not resolved through a synthesizing moment of transcendence" (15). It leads to the dissolution, rather than the synthesis, of the difference between the subject and the object.

Different from Davey's search for an alternative grand narrative, when read through Mary's experience, their flight can be understood as a departure from language and society. Mary's part sleeping part awake state makes it possible to also suggest that it is a flight into a liminal space where the boundary between the conscious and the unconscious becomes porous. In the fantasies of turning into granite rocks, the moor threatens to bring an end to Mary's biological status as human, but it also offers a departure from the society, opening a different ontological possibility. In the moor, Mary encounters a point of origin different from the one that is dogmatised by Christianity. This origin is not man, as is represented as God/father or Christ in the Christian doctrine; nor is it woman as the mother, or nature as the maternal. It is non-human. The pre-historical past/present is also non-human; it is the stone, earth and animal. Therefore, the moor offers an exit from family and language, an escape from subjectivity formed through the Oedipal drama in patriarchal family. Horner and Zlosnik suggest,

> If ancient Cornwall is seen as a pre-oedipal space, in which landscape and people are not differentiated, Davey's uncanniness lies in his challenge to the

> very categories of modern western thought. The text short-circuits this by placing him back in the modern rational world but making him culturally abject because of his murderous criminal behaviour. In his uncanny aspect, Davey comes close to the sublime but identification with him would mean for Mary abandoning the boundaries that define gender. The text makes Mary's choice easier for her by making the vicar abject because cultural abjection *confirms* the familiar categories that underpin civil society. (84-5)

Although they see the greatest challenge as one posed to gender roles, it is possible to argue that Francis Davey makes it possible for Mary to glance at what lies beyond the symbolic order. In addition, the death of Davey and the rescue of Mary by Jem Merlyn and the law enforcement officers signify the intrusion of the paternal metaphor and Mary's return to the symbolic order.

Her flight into the moor with Francis Davey offers Mary a glimpse of the extra-linguistic world and promises a freedom from all kinds of repression, which means an annihilation of the subject. With the death of the Vicar, Mary leaves this uncanny space and gets back to the symbolic order. It is with the interruption of the outside social reality that the uncanniness of the moor is dispersed, and Mary once again returns to the everyday reality. With the death of the two villains, both Jamaica Inn and Bodmin Moor lose their terrifying hold on Mary although they continue to have a haunting effect. She cannot leave the symbolic order and the patriarchal society, yet she locates herself on its margins. As Horner and Zlosnik note, "*Jamaica Inn*'s achievement lies in its use of Gothic writing to interrogate boundaries in such a way as to hold the abject and the sublime in an uneasy balance for much of the narrative and then to demonstrate that abjection and transcendence are in the end relative" (78). Therefore, according to them, "Her decision to go with Jem means abandoning the domesticity and security that life and marriage in Helford would have offered, and the comfort but servitude of life in the squire's household. It means living like the horse-thief he is, in restless insecurity - a life not considered suitable for a woman" (83-4). What is found the most disturbing in the end is the uncanny introduced by Francis Davey and evoked by Bodmin Moor. Therefore, in her choice to go with Jem Merlyn, it can be said that while Mary comes to terms with the interrelatedness of fascination and aversion, the abject and the sublime, she cannot accommodate herself in the uncanny. Beyond this

abandonment of domesticity and choosing an insecure life, however, lies a desire to protect her psychic boundaries, which were threatened by the moors. Returning to the status quo from this transgressive space is problematised by du Maurier. The alienating experience of the uncanny transforms the subject in an irreversible way. Therefore, although Francis Davey is depicted as a gothic villain, the threat that he poses is not imprisonment and setting confining limits on the gothic heroine. On the contrary, he offers limitlessness. He introduces Mary to a psychic uncanny space that she finds impossible to inhabit permanently. As a result, although Mary chooses a life which is unconventional for a young woman, she nevertheless chooses to stay within the rational boundaries.

5.4. The Sea and the Coastline as the Margins of Gothic Space

The sea and the Cornish coastline are important spatial components in the novels. In *Jamaica Inn* and *Rebecca*, the sea has multiple implications, and it poses a challenge to rationality and human understanding. Like the moor, its significance can be understood on a metaphorical level. The aim of this part is to explore the otherness of the sea and the liminality of the Cornish coastline in relation to the cultural and historical connotations of these spaces and the psychic investments of the characters. Although the sea is the space where murders are committed, it is depicted as free from human control and just as treacherous as the moor. On the other hand, the implication of the sea is not free from the cultural and historical associations that the writer makes with Cornwall, England and the dominant discourses in the period that the novels were written. These associations overlap or clash with the characters' experience.

Gemma Goodman states that "Cornwall can be configured as a space of freedom, yet it is simultaneously a space where freedom is denied or curtailed. This dichotomous reading of space is relevant to Cornwall as a whole but is particularly germane at the coastal site and on the sea surrounding Cornwall" (177). This ambivalence has its roots in the lived and imagined history of these spaces. The sea as a dangerous site is not far from a historical reality when the physical conditions surrounding Britain are considered. As Bella Bathurst suggests, "The sheer variety and range of natural

hazards around the coastline—riptides on the Pentland Firth, whirlpools on the west coast, sandbanks in Norfolk and Kent, reefs in the Scillies, collisions in the Channel—sometimes makes it seem astounding that anyone made safe landfall in Britain at all" (xviii). She also discusses the limitations of navigational tools that made seas dangerous places until very recently. In alignment with this, it can be argued that du Maurier's depiction of the sea as dangerous is quite literal. The sea that is depicted in the novels is not only a metaphor for other dangers. The sea itself is an actual and potential threat to anyone who ventures into it. Thus, du Maurier presents the sea as a real, imagined and lived space simultaneously, without making any clear distinctions between these dimensions.

The cyclical movement of the sea is an important feature that is emphasised in both novels. Everything comes back from the sea, and nothing remains hidden forever. The eternity that the sea represents comes from its repetitive flow. In *Rebecca*, the narrator underlines this by noting its "eternal roll and thunder and hiss" and calls it "restless" (du Maurier 107). This emphasis on the sea's cyclical mobility sets it against the ideas of linear temporality that creates an assuring effect of continuity and a forward movement. On the other hand, it is also depicted as a kind of indifferent force. Something indefinable and unidentifiable in the representation of the sea persists in the novels. It evokes Kristeva's concept of the Semiotic *chora*. Creed associates this space with the archaic mother: "The archaic mother is the parthenogenetic mother, the mother as primordial abyss, the point of origin and of end" (17).

The Cornish coastline, which constitutes an important part of the topology in both narratives calls for a different, though related analysis from the sea. Being the place where the sea meets the land, the coast is a liminal space that requires thinking differently from the sea. As Thomassen notes, "Seasides and beaches are archetypical liminal landscapes. The seaside is more than just the end of dry and inhabited land: it is a coast*line* with something on the other side of the threshold" (21). The coast and the line that it marks between the land and the sea are depicted as unstable and fluid due to the tides. The coastline has different implications in the novels, being the site of different social conflicts.

5.4.1. *Jamaica Inn*

Like Bodmin Moor, in *Jamaica Inn*, the sea is also depicted as a treacherous space. In contrast to the psychic spatial experience in the moor, the danger of the sea and the seaside is depicted in very physical and material terms. Also, a very short part of the narrative actually takes place on the coast, and that part serves to create the shocking effect of grotesque horror. Mary has to fight her way out of an attempt of rape, and she is made to watch Joss Merlyn and his crew murder the passengers of a ship, which is described in a very graphic manner. She is beaten, assaulted, tied down and carried away like the other valuable cargo that Joss Merlyn obtains from the ship. In all these incidents, the coastline is represented as a violent masculine space, uncontrolled by law and civilisation.

In *Jamaica Inn*, due to the activities of ship wreckers, the sea turns into a deadly space. Ship wrecking itself can be seen as a gothic subversion of sea trade and sea voyage in a more general sense. Wrecking revealed the limits of knowledge people had of the land and the sea. As Bathurst explains:

> In Britain and most of Europe, wrecking's heyday occurred during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, when sea traffic was at its heaviest. For much of the nineteenth century and all of the eighteenth, captains setting out from or returning to the coast of Britain faced a formidable set of obstacles. They groped their way across the oceans using the best equipment they had at the time, which did not amount to much. Charts and pilot books were often inaccurate and incomplete; cloud cover made sextant readings impossible; compasses could distort, and barometers only provided sailors with advance warning of their impending fate. (xviii)

In addition to these limitations on the seas, Bathurst also notes the limitations on land: "Until the early nineteenth century, there were almost no navigational aids to help sailors on their way; no lighthouses, no beacons, no VHF or radar. Captains relied as much on a keen eyed lookout as they did on any more sophisticated technology" (xviii). Joss Merlyn and his crew use the limited navigational tools at hand against the ships. The ships that carry valuable cargo from overseas are a symbol of prosperity,

but they also attract ship wreckers. Wreckers depend on the tides in their activities, but they also use the techniques of navigation and communication on the sea to their own means. Joss Merlyn tells Mary how they silence the bell-buoy, the sound of which ships depend on for finding their way:

> A mournful, weary sound, Mary, is a bell-buoy out in the bay. It rubs on your nerves and you want to scream. When you work on the coast you have to pull out to them in a boat and muffle them; wrap the tongue in flannel. That deadens them. There's silence then. Maybe it's a misty night, with patches of white fog on the water, and outside the bay there will be a ship casting for scent like a hound. She listens for the buoy, and no sound comes to her. And she comes in then, driving through the fog –she comes straight in to us who are waiting for her, Mary –and we see her shudder suddenly, and strike, and then the surf has her. (du Maurier, *Jamaica* 130)

They also use lights to lure the ships to the shore. The false light, which appears to be "at first a thing of friendliness and comfort, winking bravely alone in the wild night" turns into "a symbol of horror" at the hands of ship wreckers (185). In their work, Joss Merlyn and his men are depicted as nocturnal animals because they need to work in the dark. Also, most of the time, the wreckers are like scavengers. They do not kill the passengers; they wait for them to drown in the sea. Then, they collect the cargo of the ship. For this to happen, the tides must be high. Joss Merlyn tells Mary how he and his crew had to kill the passengers of a ship once violently because they forgot about the tides and that the sea would be shallow:

> There was a woman once, Mary; she was clinging to a raft, and she had a child in her arms; her hair was streaming down her back. The ship was close in on the rock, you see, and the sea was as flat as your hand; they were all coming in alive, the whole bunch of'em. Why, the water in places didn't come to your waist. She cried out to me to help her, Mary, and I smashed her face in with a stone; she fell back, her hands beating the raft. She let go of the child and I hit her again; I watched them drown in four feet of water. We were scared then; we were afraid some of them would reach the shore . . . For the first time we hadn't reckoned on the tide. In half an hour they'd be walking dry-shod on the sand. We had to pelt at 'em all with stones, Mary; we had to break their arms and legs; and they drowned because we smashed them with rocks and stones; they drowned because they couldn't stand . . . (129)

For Mary Yellan, who would later witness the violence that Joss Merlyn relates, just like the moor, the coastline and the sea that lies beyond emerge as disorienting spaces. However, unlike the moor, Mary goes to the coast only once, and her experience is shockingly alienating, in alignment with the violence she is exposed to. Not being able to see in the dark, she tries to find her way by using her other senses, but she fails:

> [I]t seemed as though she could hear the sea on every side of her and there was no escape from it . . . She realised that the wind had been no guide to direction, for even now, with it behind her, it might have shifted a point or two, and with her ignorance of the coast-line she had not turned east, as she had meant to do, but was even now upon the brink of a sagging cliff path that, judging by the sound of the sea, was taking her straight to the shore. (183)

Not knowing anything about the coast, Mary also uses her reasoning faculties to navigate, but she finds herself on the beach, fifty yards away from Joss Merlyn and his men.

In *Jamaica Inn*, the Cornish coast becomes literally a site and instrument of death at the hands of the ship wreckers. Allowing Joss Merlyn and his crew to lure ships, the coastline is the most dangerous and the least protected part of the country. The activity of ship wrecking inverts the meaning of the coast as a place where the journey ends. It is the space where the power of the state is the weakest, though this changes through the end of the narrative. Because of Joss Merlyn's miscalculation of the tides, however, the coast also brings an end to shipwrecking activities. It is where the legal power exerts itself by bringing a new guarding system over the coastline and putting an end to criminal activities once and for all.

The shipwrecking days of Joss Merlyn and his men are over because a new regulation is about to start on the coasts of the country which will make it impossible for ship wreckers to execute their crimes in secret. Through this new regulation, the coasts of Cornwall will stop being marginal spaces over which the power of law is weak. Their marginality will come to an end. In this respect, Cornwall coastlines will stop being what Lefebvre calls "differential space". According to Lefebvre, differential spaces

exist as threats to the dominant social and spatial order, and at the same time as opportunities to those who dwell on the margins:

> Differences endure or arise on the margins of the homogenized realm, either in the form of resistances or in the form of externalities (lateral, heterotopical, heterological). What is different is, to begin with, what is *excluded*: the edges of the city, shanty towns, the spaces of forbidden games, of guerrilla war, of war. Sooner or later, however, the existing centre and the forces of homogenization must seek to absorb all such differences, and they will succeed if these retain a defensive posture and no counterattack is mounted from their side. In the latter event, centrality and normality will be tested as to the limits of their power to integrate, to recuperate, or to destroy whatever has transgressed. (*Production* 373)

With the imposition of the new law, Cornwall and the Cornish coastline will lose its marginality and heterogeneity; it will stop being an unmapped space, but will become part of the topography, defined and controlled by the law. This control will put an end to the unrestricted masculinity. Until then, the sea is associated with animosity and monstrosity, and the coast becomes the ultimate site of this monstrosity:

> They were animals, fighting and snarling over lengths of splintered wood; they stripped, some of them, and ran naked in the cold December night, the better to fight their way into the sea and plunge their hands amongst the spoil that the breakers tossed to them. They chattered and squabbled like monkeys . . . (du Maurier, *Jamaica* 187)

This animosity becomes even more disturbing when Mary later watches the spider scavenging on her uncle's dead body, or when she sees Francis Davey's portrayal of himself as a wolf. All these exhibitions of animosity become uncanny because, for all their alienating power, they are not alien. Mary, a farm girl who is not a stranger to the animal behaviour, recognises the animal within the human. The reader too, through the perspective of Mary, the main character, is invited into that recognition.

Unlike the pirates or smugglers that are very often romanticised in literature and in du Maurier's earlier novels *The Loving Spirit* and *Frenchman's Creek*, there is nothing to be romanticised about the ship wreckers. They are "demented, inhuman" (187). Furthermore, their monstrosity is triggered so instantaneously and reaches at such an

extreme that they sober up in the shock of their own carelessness and fight against each other, burning all the cargo for which they killed and risked everything in the meantime. Like the movements of the tides, the impulsive nature of the men of Bodmin Moor makes them unaccountable and unreliable. This puts them in a more debased position in the eyes of the rational Mary Yellan.

Although the novel is set in the late nineteenth century, its concern with shipwrecking can be related to contemporary issues. Bathurst argues,

> While the twentieth century might have offered many improvements to lifesaving and sea safety . . . it also provided work for the wreckers. Two world wars, the introduction of new technology and a vast increase in the size and tonnage of shipping often meant more wrecks, not less. Electronics fail, old skills atrophy, and undermanning makes ships vulnerable. (xix)

Thus, du Maurier's representation of the sea and the Cornish coastline as a locus of crime is not a mere recess into the past, but a displacement of the contemporary anxieties in a way that evokes the present insufficiency of the legal regulations which Mary Yellan is so hopeful about and raises questions about the power of the law over the land and the sea in the time that the novel was written as well.

5.4.2. *Rebecca*

In *Rebecca*, the sea and the coastline gain different meanings on different spatial levels. Rather than being gendered, the sea can be seen as a hermaphrodite; its implications are far too complicated to be associated as singly masculine or feminine. It represents a fluidity that cannot be contained within a feminine or masculine principle, but challenges those definitions.

Mark Wigley argues that "the 'outside' of a house continues to be organised by the logic of the house and so actually remains inside it'" (107). The sea is set in opposition to the domestic land on which Manderley stands. The titular character is identified with the sea in different ways. Rebecca's skills as a sailor are depicted as part of her

subversion of traditional gender roles. Part of Rebecca's challenge to the traditional gender roles comes from her being a skilled sailor, a skill which is traditionally identified as male. On the other hand, however, the sea is also identified with a kind of feminine power, its comings and goings bring back into the land unexpected and unwanted things. Its main principle of movement is epitomized in the name of Rebecca's boat, *Je Reviens* – I return.

For Maxim, the sea is a space that he cannot domesticate and shape. The fluidity of the sea resonates with Rebecca's fluid personality and sexuality, which are, for Maxim, unreliable. After Maxim murders Rebecca, the sea becomes a source of fear and guilt. He cannot even stand the sound of the sea and for that reason closes the entire west wing of the house. Contrary to the narrator's assumption that the west wing is closed because the loss of the late wife makes it unbearable to hear the sound of the sea as it reminds him of Rebecca's tragic death, it turns out that the sound is unbearable to him because he cannot face his fear and guilt. West wing is part of the associations that Maxim make between Rebecca, the sea and her murder by Maxim due to her transgressive fluidity. After Rebecca's death, the places associated with her become for Maxim spaces of avoidance and repression. Thus, psychic barriers between different parts of the house form, and the sinister topology of Manderley is established, long before the narrator's arrival.

The private coast which is a part of the Manderley estate is the locus of the most important secrets in the narrative. Being the place where Rebecca's cottage is located, the coast is a space of transgression for both Rebecca and Maxim de Winter. Rebecca takes her male visitors to her cottage. Moreover, this is also the place where the actual family drama takes place and where the nature of the relationship between the wife and the husband is revealed. Maxim shots Rebecca in that cottage. In this respect, the coast is the most private space on Manderley estate, but it is also the place where this private estate has to be opened up to the public due to the sea accident on the cove. With this opening up, Rebecca's body is discovered, and Maxim de Winter's respectability becomes questionable. As Botting suggests, the settings in gothic fiction often "manifest disturbance and ambivalence in spatial terms as movements between

inside and out" (*Gothic* [1st ed.] 4). In *Rebecca*, the cove plays an important role in creating such disturbance and ambivalence.

The construction of the coast as a liminal space confirms the emphasis Thomassen puts on experience regarding the liminal: where there is a line, a limit, so there is a confrontation (21). In *Rebecca*, as in *Jamaica Inn*, du Maurier uses this liminal space to bring legal force into effect and to question the privilege of privacy that de Winter family have on their land. In other words, the coast lifts away the separation between the inside and outside, the private and public and the personal and social, making de Winter family and especially Maxim de Winter susceptible to the power of the state. Marking the margins of the estate, the coast also proves its permeability in ways that are far more uncontrollable than any other border. The narrative transforms dividing lines into thresholds that enable contact with others. The illusion of the house being isolated from the rest of the society shatters.

The passage from Happy Valley to the coast is very sudden. Maxim notes that "no one ever expects it. The contrast is too sudden; it almost hurts" (du Maurier, *Rebecca* 98). As they move from Happy Valley to the beach, the narrator depicts a passage from what appears to be an enchanted space to an everyday space: "We were mortal again, two people playing on a beach" (98). However, the cove where Rebecca's cottage is hidden is discovered precisely at this moment of peace, as the repressed material infiltrates into their everyday life. Rebecca's cottage stands "at the fringe of the woods was a long low building, half cottage, half boat-house" (99).

For Rebecca, the coast, like the sea, is a space of resistance. It is where she accepts her guests freely on Manderley estate. Thus, she is the one who reminds Maxim of the permeability of the borders of his estate. Maxim settles for Rebecca's offer to keep their marriage as her cover because she promises him to keep Manderley pure and make it the epitome of the great English house. As long as she keeps this promise and sustains an image of a pure domestic space and a pure wife, he does not interfere with her life. Rebecca's life is split between her masquerade as the perfect wife in Manderley and her life in London. In this respect, she subverts the private/public space

dichotomy. Later, however, she starts seducing men in their social circle, first Giles, Maxim's brother-in-law and then Frank, Maxim's manager. Also, she moves her London lifestyle to Manderley and starts to bring visitors to the stone cottage on the cove. At this point, Maxim protests against Rebecca's private life, for her secret life infiltrates Manderley, blurring Maxim's borders between the public and private and thus introducing liminality. The narrator's description of the cottage on the cove reinforces the ambivalent representation of Rebecca's femininity:

> It was damp in the cottage, damp and chill. Dark, and oppressive. I did not like it. I had no wish to stay there. I hated the hollow sound of the rain pattering on the roof. It seemed to echo in the room itself, and I heard the water dripping too into the rusted grate . . . I had the odd, uneasy feeling that I might come upon something unawares, that I had no wish to see. Something that might harm me, that might be horrible. (101)

The cove becomes the limit of Maxim's potency. It is the part of his estate that he dares not enter after killing Rebecca; it is the centre of his repression: "I never go near the bloody place, or that God-damned cottage. And if you had my memories you would not want to go there either, or talk about it, or even think about it" (103). Part of his estate, the cove nevertheless becomes the locus of Maxim's impotency. Even his violent act of murder, his attempt to put an end to Rebecca's transgression, cannot cancel Rebecca's castrating power over him: first, his murder is a result of Rebecca's manipulation; second, his effort to keep it a secret fails through the intrusion of outside events, and third, even though he does not regret killing Rebecca as he sees her as a threat to the patriarchal social space, he cannot take responsibility for it as the police investigation ends with the conclusion that Rebecca committed suicide due to her cancer. Aware of this, he declares that in the end, Rebecca has won. His refusal to go to the cove and explain the reason makes the cove a locus of both fear and attraction for the narrator after she discovers it:

> I did not want to think about the cottage. I remembered it too often in the day. The memory of it nagged at me whenever I saw the sea from the terrace. . . . I wanted to forget them but at the same time I wanted to know why they disturbed me, why they made me uneasy and unhappy. Somewhere, at the back of my mind, there was a frightened furtive seed of curiosity that grew slowly

> and stealthily, for all my denial of it, and I knew all the doubt and the anxiety of the child who has been told, 'these things are not discussed, they are forbidden'. (107)

Thus, without the narrator's knowledge, one wife's transgression becomes censorship implemented on the other wife. The cove signifies a rupture in Maxim de Winter's order, and he attempts to enclose this rupture by turning it into a taboo, as he did in the subject of Rebecca, by not talking about her at all. From that rupture, however, all his secrets resurface, and his fears are realised. Like the sea, all he wants to keep aside flows through that rupture. What is more, the cottage is left to decay with everything left inside it; Maxim cannot even order the clearing up of the furniture there. It signals the end that is awaiting Manderley itself. Thus, the family estate starts to be destroyed from its margins. This space carries one key aspect of liminality, which, as is seen in the analysis of some other liminal spaces in du Maurier's novels, is not always found in the Gothic. It carries "the element of potential:" Hazel Andrews writes, "The ambiguous and unstable state that liminality provokes invites transformation and potential for becoming" (Andrews 163).

With the incident of the stranded ship in the bay, the cove loses its qualities of isolation and privacy. Suddenly, it is filled with motor-boats, coast guards, divers and a crowd of people who come from Kerrith to watch it. Someone shouts through a megaphone while a woman takes snapshots, and the tugs are brought to shift the ship. All these details bring the cove and Manderley estate back to the modern day and social reality. The sea and the coast become measurable landscape in the speech of the rescue team as they talk about yards, and a holiday-maker comments that "all these big estates will be chopped up in time and bungalows built" (du Maurier, *Rebecca* 232). This intrusion of the everyday ordinariness marks in a sense the break with the illusion that is created in Manderley, showing that as secluded as it seems, Manderley estate is still a part of the modern world, and it is subject to the effects of modernity as any other place in the world. Also, the cove and along with it Manderley, opens up as once more as a multiplicity of stories, turning it from being the centre of Maxim and Rebecca's secret, Maxim's aversion and a locus of the narrator's curiosity, into a more dynamic and

simultaneous social space. Moreover, with the discovery of Rebecca's boat, Manderley is exposed to legislation, to state power.

In this respect, while the intrusion of the everyday life turning the private coast of Manderley into a more publicly accessible space can be threatening for Maxim de Winter, it creates ambivalent feelings in the unnamed narrator. On the one hand, the life of the modern day holiday-makers, rather simple, ordinary and instantaneous compared to the one she has in Manderley, in which even the evening tea turns into a ceremony is appealing. She too wants to go away like the holiday-makers: "I wish I could lose my own identity and join them. Eat hardboiled eggs and potted meat sandwiches, laugh rather loudly . . . Instead of which I must go back alone through the woods to Manderley and wait for Maxim" (232). On the other hand, walking back to Manderley after seeing how people are curious about its secluded atmosphere, she feels privileged because she lives there, and the privacy of the house that separates the residents from the outside evokes a feeling of superiority:

> The house looked very peaceful as I came upon it from the woods and crossed the lawns. It seemed sheltered and protected, more beautiful than I had ever seen it. Standing there, looking down upon it from the banks, I realised, perhaps for the first time, with a funny feeling of bewilderment and pride that it was my home, I belonged there, and Manderley belonged to me. (234)

The outsiders' addressing the narrator as Mrs. de Winter and their interest in her create awareness and give her a new perspective that she does not have inside the house. Furthermore, setting the novel in a large and old house on the Cornish coast allows du Maurier to renegotiate the implications of centre and periphery as she exposes their dynamic nature and shows how they are constituted by power relations as well as social dynamics, rather than being fixed locations, and how centres and peripheries are constantly produced and reproduced through those geometries of power.

CHAPTER 6

CONCLUSION

This study claimed that the representation of space in Daphne du Maurier's novels *Jamaica Inn*, *Rebecca* and *My Cousin Rachel* coincides with the preoccupations of the spatial turn. I aimed to discuss the production of gothic space in the novels against the background of spatial and psychoanalytical theories and Gothic criticism. The main argument of this dissertation is that the polysemic and multi-layered representation of the gothic space and subjectivity in the novels makes it necessary to depart from a topographical view of space and understand it in a non-Newtonian context. With this aim, gothic space was explored as a Thirdspace, which made it possible to explore spatial experiences that cannot be limited to Firstspace and Secondspace epistemologies. It was asserted that a discussion of space can provide new layers of reading that can address the radical and subversive content in the novels that is not revealed on the surface textual level. Even though du Maurier's novels appear to exemplify the repetitive spatial patterns based on the binaries with which the Gothic is usually identified, adopting a Thirdspace perspective helped to see that the distinctions between those binaries are blurred, and it offered a distinct theoretical basis for discussing the novels.

In this dissertation, I argued that du Maurier's narratives speak from an extra-linguistic space that addresses the unconscious. This is a separate space of signification, which offers its own semiotics to the characters and readers. In this sense, du Maurier uses space as a language through which she can articulate what she cannot in verbal language. The writer does not pass any judgment, but the texts invite the reader to have

a very active role which involves digging into the gaps and ruptures. The spatial analysis offered this study the basis for such a reading. I have also chosen to consult a Lacanian epistemology regarding the unconscious and subjectivity because it displays parallelisms with du Maurier's externalised unconscious. Lacanian concepts of intrasubjectivity and intersubjectivity provided a pathway to the discussion of the interactions between characters and space while proving useful in understanding the splits and overlaps between psychic and social spaces.

It is claimed that the gothic space in the novels is also non-Cartesian since the intrasubjective symbiosis between the subject and space blurs the distinction between the subject and its exteriority. The subject's psychic space coexists with the outside materiality, and thus spatiality and subjectivity become inseparable. An investigation of this relationship opens subjectivity to alternative understandings because this is a relatively new field of discussion. Until the early postmodern and post-structural readings, although the connection between time and subjectivity, and how temporality shapes subjectivity were explored, the role of spatiality was largely left out. Thus, addressing this relationship, which is a constituent feature of du Maurier's fiction, brought up the need for an alternative conceptualisation of subjectivity as well. This kind of subjectivity can be named spatial-subjectivity, and it is marked by a blurring of the dichotomies of the inside/outside, the self/other, the subject/object and the personal/social. In the novels, the main characters' externalised unconscious leads to the construction of an ex-centric subjectivity that is built up through their extension and/or dispersal over space, and the relations between characters are organised by the intrasubjective space of the unconscious rather than intersubjective social space because they cannot (re)constitute their social space. The extimate relationship between the subject and space required the conceptualisation of a form of subjectivity that is constituted through spatial experience and a subjectivisation that is not entirely organised by the symbolic. I thus argued that in the absence of the intrusion of the paternal metaphor, psychic space extends over social space. Therefore, spatial-subjectivity is marked with fluidity; it is elusive and not fixed. Its elusiveness is built through the dynamism, mobility, fluidity and obscurity of the external world.

I also claimed that time and space are integral to one another, and the intermingling of different temporalities, which is a component of gothic fiction, is found in du Maurier's Gothic as well. It was asserted that du Maurier's Cornwall is constructed as a spatiotemporal entity where temporality and spatiality merge and are written on to one another. This pointed at a need for understanding gothic temporality as a break from linearity and for reformulating gothic spaces as spatiotemporal entities that bring together the residues of the past and the experience of the present. In this way, du Maurier builds heterogenous spaces. It can be argued that the dynamics of du Maurier's spatiotemporalities prevents the characters from turning space into place in a Masseyan sense, for the negotiation between multiple temporal and spatial dimensions and experiences is done on unconscious level. The result of this heterogeneity is the destabilisation of meaning, which allows for subversive readings of traditional spaces. I discussed how du Maurier uses the topology of Cornwall to explore the repressed material on personal and cultural levels. Therefore, the Thirdspace in the novels evokes destabilising spatial experiences that are explored through the concepts of the uncanny, liminality, abjection and the gothic sublime. Used specifically to address the symbiosis between the subject and space, these concepts have proved to be useful tools in exploring the crisis of representation that is at the core of the Gothic.

In this dissertation, liminality was consulted as a conceptual tool to discuss different characters' intermediary status with regard to patriarchal social space. Their position as outsiders in and out of patriarchal intersubjectivity makes it possible to make a critique of this space. Although the novels are organised by the phallogocentric discourse on the surface textual level, this study contends that an investigation of the spatial dynamics of the texts can activate a subversive feminist discourse. Du Maurier regards the patriarchal discourse from the flip side of the coin and reveals the feminine in masculinity. When the Firstspace/Secondspace dichotomy is left behind, and when space is understood as a product of social relations, it is found that in the novels, the symmetries of the patriarchal social space are broken. This in turn allows us to see their constructed-ness and show that the geometries of social space are dynamic. Hence, du Maurier can create female characters who have castrating power, and the

male characters are emasculated by these phallic women. Rebecca and Rachel can constitute their social space by bending the geometries of patriarchal space, producing and making use of the riffs, faults and ruptures in it. They become infiltrators and intruders who threaten the patriarchal social space because it is not a seamless surface.

Depending on what I discussed in the previous chapters, I can infer that du Maurier's novels deal with the return of the repressed female of the phallogocentric discourse. In du Maurier's gothic space, the return of the repressed never totally compromises with the coordinates of the consciousness. It coexists as a spatial residue of the patriarchal social space and is evoked in the intrasubjective relationship between characters and space. This residual and pre-Oedipal space emerges as the space of the archaic mother, a concept that refers to that undifferentiated space which precedes the phallic mother and subjectivisation in the patriarchal symbolic. It persists in the ordinary spaces of patriarchal society, and an encounter with it creates spatial uncanny. Although this residual space may not be conceivable and/or inhabitable on the conscious level, on the unconscious level, it accompanies everyday spatial and social practices as an undercurrent. In this study, to discuss the workings of this space, the uncanny was used as a concept that can address such contemporality of repression and the return of the repressed. When the three novels are read in chronological order, it can be seen that this space shows an evolution from being un-gendered to being feminine. In *Jamaica Inn*, the unmappable and inaccessible Bodmin Moor, which lies in the extra-linguistic sphere and offers an alternative origin to patriarchal family, is not differentiated in terms of gender. In *Rebecca*, the psychic impressions that the narrator encounters everywhere on Manderley estate are more obviously related with the return of the repressed feminine. In *My Cousin Rachel*, this residual space is located outside Cornwall and first embodied by the beggar woman that Philip encounters in Italy and then by Rachel. This, I believe, reflects the gendered spatial experiences of the characters and points out how space can be constructed differently from various positions. It can be put forward that, in relation to the changes in the location of the repressed, in the novels, the topology of Cornwall shifts from being a space of masculinity unregulated by patriarchy and an unmappable landscape in *Jamaica Inn* to being a sinister topology that quivers between realistic and gothic qualities in

Rebecca. Eventually, in the spatial experience of the narrator Philip Ashley, it turns into the homely Ashley estate in *My Cousin Rachel*, where the uncanny element comes from outside. The position of the outsider occupied by Mary Yellan in *Jamaica Inn* and the narrator in *Rebecca* gives way to Philip Ashley's position as the insider in *My Cousin Rachel*, who is not an intruder but is intruded upon. The change in the spatial anxieties helps to conceive of the intersections of psychic and social spaces. Women are positioned as intruders in the patriarchal social space, but the social space in the novels also intrudes into women's psychic space and to integrate into social space without losing their constitutive role, women need to develop spatial strategies, ways of accommodating space, that are different from men. On the other hand, patriarchal social space and male subjectivity are not free from the intrusion of woman and the repressed female.

One can reach an understanding of Cornwall as Daphne du Maurier's gothic space where she could deal with the repressed psychic and/or cultural material by focusing on the intersections of psychic and social spaces in order to offer a fresh reading by providing a coherent theoretical frame for an analysis of space and subjectivity in the novels of du Maurier. I chose to focus on subjectivity, spatiality and temporality together because as discussed above, they are inseparable from one another in du Maurier's gothic fiction. Even though space and subjectivity are central themes of the writer, there is no scholarly work on the symbiosis between them from a Thirdspace perspective. Furthermore, in spatial studies, although the view of space as a social construct and the unconscious aspect of spatial experiences are dealt separately by a number of critics as discussed in this study, the combination of the conceptual tools of spatial analysis in geography and psychoanalysis is very rare. This study also attempted to furnish gothic themes like the return of the repressed, entrapment and flight with alternative interpretations. I hope this dissertation can establish a bridge between postmodern geography, psychoanalysis and literary studies, which would facilitate exchange in theory and practice between these disciplines; thus, it can offer a new hermeneutical frame within which du Maurier's novels can be reconsidered.

This dissertation has some limitations, which further study on du Maurier can work on. One limitation is that while most of du Maurier's novel are set in rural Cornwall, considering the writer's ambivalent relationship with modern urban life, an exploration of the urban space in her novels like *Parasites* could offer valuable insight into the concepts of spatial-subjectivity and spatiotemporality that I have used here. Besides, an investigation into du Maurier's short stories such as "Don't Look Now" and "Monte Verità" could be fruitful in opening up new discussions regarding the liminality and uncanniness of gothic space in the context of different settings from Cornwall. Furthermore, the relationship between male subjectivity and space in connection to the return of the repressed can be further developed through a discussion of the novels with male narrators and/or main characters, such as *The Scapegoat* and *The House on Strand*. Yet another interesting trajectory would be to focus on the heterogenous spatiotemporalities in her historical novels such as *Hungry Hill* and *The King's General*, or the fantastic spatiotemporal shifts in *The House on Strand*. Finally, in this study, since space is understood as a gothic component that emerges as a symptom of a crisis in representation, I chose to focus on the spatial un-mappings in du Maurier's work in this thesis. However, it is important to note that space in the writer's work can be discussed in ways that I have not preferred to do here. For instance, a look into the recent phenomenological studies on space and an exploration of sense of place in the context of Daphne du Maurier would definitely add new layers of reading the representation of space. In addition, more topographical mappings of du Maurier's Cornwall may prove a fertile field.

REFERENCES

Abraham, Nicolas, and Maria Torok. "'The Lost Object- Me': Notes on Endocryptic Identification." *The Shell and the Kernel: Renewals of Psychoanalysis*. Edited and translated by Nicholas T. Rand, Volume I, The U of Chicago P, 1994, pp. 139-56.

Abraham, Nicolas. "Notes on the Phantom: A Complement to Freud's Metapsychology." *The Shell and the Kernel: Renewals of Psychoanalysis*. Edited and translated by Nicholas T. Rand, Volume I, The U of Chicago P, 1994, pp. 171-76.

Abraham, Nicolas, and Maria Torok. *The Wolf Man's Magic Word: A Cryptonymy*. Translated by Nicholas Rand, U of Minnesota P, 1986.

Aguirre, Manuel. "Geometries of Terror: Numinous Spaces in Gothic, Horror and Science Fiction." *Gothic Studies*, vol.10, no.2, Nov. 2008, pp. 1-17. *Edinburgh UP Journals*, doi.org/10.7227/gs.10.2.2.

Andrews, Hazel. "Another Place or Just Another Space? Liminality and Crosby Beach." *Liminal Landscapes: Travel, Experience and Spaces in-between.* Edited by Hazel Andrews and Les Roberts, Routledge, 2012, pp. 152-166.

Anzaldúa, Gloria. *Borderlands: La Frontera –The New Mestiza*. Aunt Lute Books, 1987.

Armstrong, Dianne. "The Inverse Gothic Invasion Motif in Daphne Du Maurier's *Jamaica Inn*: The National Body and Smuggling as Disease." *Women's Studies*, vol. 38, no.1, Dec. 2008, pp. 23-42. *Routledge*, doi.org/10.1080/00497870802525564.

Auerbach, Nina. *Daphne du Maurier: Haunted Heiress*. U of Pennsylvania P, 2000.

Bachelard, Gaston. *The Poetics of Space*. Translated by Maria Jolas, Beacon Press, 1994.

Bathurst, Bella. *The Wreckers: A Story of Killing Seas and Plundered Shipwrecks, from the Eighteenth Century to the Present Day*. Harper Collins Publishers, 2005.

Bennett, Andrew, and Nicholas Royle. *An Introduction to Literature, Criticism and Theory*. Pearson Longman, 2004.

Blum, Virginia, and Anna Secor. "Psycho-topologies: Closing the Circuit between Psychic and Material Space." *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*, vol. 29, no. 6, December 2011, pp. 1030-47. *Sage Journals*, DOI:10.1068/d11910.

Brabon, Benjamin, A. "Gothic Geography, 1760-1830." *The Gothic World*. Edited by Glenis Byron and Dale Townshend, Routledge, 2014, pp. 98-109.

Botting, Fred. *Gothic: The New Critical Idiom*. 1st ed., Routledge, 1995.

--- . *Gothic: The New Critical Idiom.* 2nd ed., Routledge, 2014.

---. "In Gothic Darkly: Heterotopia, History, Culture." *A New Companion to the Gothic*. Edited by Glenis Byron and David Punter, Blackwell, 2013, pp.13-24.

---. "The Gothic Production of the Unconscious." *Spectral Readings: Towards a Gothic Geography*. Edited by Glenis Byron and David Punter, Palgrave Macmillan, 1999, pp. 11-36.

Castle, Terry. *The Female Thermometer: Eighteenth-Century Culture and the Invention of the Uncanny*. Oxford UP, 1995.

---. "The Gothic Novel." *The Cambridge History of English Literature, 1660-1780.* Edited by John Richetti, Cambridge UP, 2005, pp. 673-706.

Cixous, Hélène. “Fiction and its Phantoms: A Reading of Freud’s *Das Unheimliche* (The ‘Uncanny’).” *New Literary History*, vol. 7, no. 3, Johns Hopkins UP, 1976, pp. 525–645. *JSTOR*, doi.org/10.2307/468561.

Clemens, Valdin. *The Return of the Repressed: Gothic Horror from the Castle of Otranto to Alien*. State U of New York P, 1999.

Cloarec, Nicole, Anne Hall and Xavier Lachazette, editors. *The Enduring Appeal of Daphne Du Maurier's Fiction*. *Revue Lisa*, vol. 19, no. 52, 2021. *Open Edition Journals*, doi.org/10.4000/lisa.13277.

Colomina, Beatriz. "The Split Wall: Domestic Voyeurism." *Sexuality and Space*. Edited by Beatriz Colomina, Princeton Architectural Press, 1990, pp.73-128.

Creed, Barbara. *Monstrous Feminine: Film, Feminism, Psychoanalysis*. Routledge, 1993.

Cuéllar, David Pavon. *From the Conscious Interior to an Exterior Unconscious: Lacan, Discourse Analysis and Social Psychology*. Karnac, 2010.

DeLamotte, Eugenia. *Perils of the Night: A Feminist Study of the Nineteenth Century Gothic*. Oxford UP, 1990.

Derisi, Stephanie. “Objects of Power: the Threat of the Domestic Environment in Daphne du Maurier’s *Rebecca*.” *Space and Place: Diversity in Reality, Imagination, and Representation*. Edited by Brooke L. Rogers and Anna Sugiyama, Brill, 2013, pp. 187-97.

Derrida, Jacques. “The Animal That Therefore I Am (More to Follow).” Translated by David Wills, *Critical Inquiry*, vol. 28, no. 2, Winter 2002, pp. 369-418. *JSTOR*, www.jstor.org/stable/1344276.

---. *Dissemination*. Translated by Barbara Johnson, The Athlone Press, 1981.

---. *The Post Card: From Socrates to Freud and Beyond*. Translated by Alan Bass, The U of Chicago P, 1979.

Dolar, Mladen. "'I Shall Be with You on Your Wedding Night': Lacan and the Uncanny." *October*, vol. 58, Autumn, 1991, MIT P, pp. 5-23. *JSTOR*, doi.org/778795.

Duggett, Tom. "Gothic Forms of Time: Architecture, Romanticism, Medievalism." *Romantic Gothic: An Edinburgh Companion*. Edited by Angela Wright and Dale Townshend, Edinburgh UP, 2016, pp. 339-60.

Du Maurier, Daphne. *Enchanted Cornwall: Her Pictorial Memoir*. Michael Joseph Ltd, 1992.

---. *Jamaica Inn*. Virago Press, 2003.

---. *My Cousin Rachel*. Pan, 1977.

---. *Myself When Young*. E-book ed., Hachette UK, 2012.

---. *Rebecca*. Longmans, 1961.

---. *The Rebecca Notebook and Other Memories*. Gollancz, 1967.

---. *Vanishing Cornwall*. E-book ed., Virago Press, 2016.

Dunn, Jane. *Daphne du Maurier and Her Sisters: The Hidden Lives of Piffy, Bird and Bing*. E-book ed., Harper Press, 2013.

Ellis, Kate Ferguson. *The Contested Castle: Gothic Novels and the Domestic Subversion of Domestic Ideology*. U of Illinois P, 1989.

Fletcher, Lisa. "Space, Place and Popular Fiction." Introduction. *Popular Fiction and Spatiality: Reading Genre Settings.* E-book ed., Palgrave MacMillan, 2016, pp.1-8. doi.10.1057/978-1-137-56902-8.

Forster, Margaret. *Daphne du Maurier*. Arrow Books, 2007.

Foucault, Michel. *Language, Counter-Memory, Practice: Selected Essays and Interviews by Michel Foucault.* Translated by Donald F. Bouchard, Cornell UP, 1977.

---. "Of Other Spaces: Utopias and Heterotopias." Translated by Jay Miskowiec, *Diacritics,* vol. 16, no. 1, Spring 1986, pp. 22-7. *JSTOR,* doi.org/10.2307/464648.

---. *The Order of Things: An Archeology of the Human Sciences*. Translated by Alan Sheridan, Vintage Books, 2005.

Freud, Sigmund. "The 'Uncanny'." *The Standard Edition of the Complete Psychological Works of Sigmund Freud: An Infantile Neurosis and Other Works.* Edited and translated by James Strachey, Volume 17 (1917-1919), Hogarth Press, 2001, pp. 217-56.

Gifford, Terry, and Teresa Goméz Reus. *Women in Transit through Literary Liminal Spaces.* Palgrave Macmillan, 2013.

Gilbert, Sandra, and Susan Gubar. *The Madwoman in the Attic: The Woman Writer and the Nineteenth-Century Literary Imagination*. Yale UP, 2000.

Gindin, James Jack. *British Fiction in the 1930s: The Dispiriting Decade*. Palgrave MacMillan, 1992.

Gomel, Elena. *Narrative Space and Time: Representing Impossible Topologies in Literature*. Routledge, 2014.

Goodman, Gemma. "Women at Sea: Locating and Escaping Gender on the Cornish Coast in Daphne du Maurier's *The Loving Spirit* and *Frenchman's Creek.*" *Sea Narratives: Cultural Responses to the Sea, 1600-Present*. Edited by Charlotte Mathieson, Palgrave MacMillan, 2016.

Grosz, Elizabeth. *Architecture from the Outside: Essays on Virtual and Real Space.* MIT P, 2001.

Habermann, Ina. *Myth, Memory and Middlebrow: Priestley, du Maurier and the*

Symbolic Form of Englishness. Palgrave MacMillan, 2010.

Hallett, Nicky. "Did Mrs. Danvers Warm Rebecca's Pearls? Significant Exchanges and the Extension of Lesbian Space and Time in Literature." *Feminist Review*, no. 74, pp. 35-49. *JSTOR*, www.jstor.org/stable/1395950.

Hartsock, Nancy C. M. "The Feminist Standpoint: Developing the Ground for a Specifically Feminist Historical Materialism." *Discovering Reality: Feminist Perspectives on Epistemology, Metaphysics, Methodology, and Philosophy of Science.* Edited by Sandra Harding and Merrill B. Hintikka, Kluwer Academic Publishers, 2004, pp. 283-310.

Healey, Kathleen, and Sharon Rose Yang. Introduction. *Gothic Landscapes: Changing Eras, Changing Cultures, Changing Anxieties.* Edited by Kathleen Healey and Sharon Rose Yang, Palgrave MacMillan, 2016, pp.1-18.

Heeley, Melanie. "Christianity Versus Paganism: Daphne du Maurier's Divided Mind." *The Daphne du Maurier Companion*. Edited by Helen Taylor, Virago, 2007, pp. 122-132.

Hock Soon Ng, Andrew. *Women and Domestic Space in Contemporary Gothic Narratives.* Palgrave Macmillan, 2015.

hooks, bell. "Choosing the Margin as a Space of Radical Openness." *Yearning: Race, Gender and Cultural Politics*. South End Press, 1990, pp. 145-55.

Horner, Avril, and Sue Zlosnik. *Daphne du Maurier: Writing, Identity and Gothic Imagination*. Palgrave Macmillan, 1998.

Hurley, Kelly. "British Gothic Fiction: 1885-1930." *Cambridge Companion to the Fiction*. Edited by Jerold E. Hogle, Cambridge UP, 2002, pp. 189-208.

Kilgour, Maggie. *The Rise of the Gothic Novel.* Routledge, 1995.

Kirby, Kathleen. "Re: Mapping Subjectivity: Cartographic Vision and the Limits of Politics." *BodySpace: Destabilizing Geographies of Gender and Sexuality*. Edited by Nancy Duncan, Routledge, 2005. pp. 45-55.

Kokoli, Alexandra. *Feminist Uncanny in Theory and Art Practice*. Bloomsbury, 2017.

Korkut Naykı, Nil. "A Hauntological Reading of Daphne du Maurier's *Rebecca*." *English Studies at NBU*. vol. 7, no. 1, 2021, pp. 21-36, doi.org/10.33919/esnbu.21.1.2.

Kristeva, Julia. *Black Sun: Depression and Melancholia*. Translated by Leon S. Roudiez, Colombia UP, 1992.

---. *Powers of Horror: An Essay on Abjection*. Translated by Leon S. Roudiez, Columbia UP, 1982.

---. *Strangers to Ourselves*. Translated by Leon S. Roudiez, Colombia UP, 1991.

Lacan, Jacques. "Desire and the Interpretation of Desire in *Hamlet*." Translated by James Hulbert, edited by Jacques-Alain Miller. *Yale French Studies*, no. 55/56, 1977, pp.11-52. *JSTOR*, www.jstor.org/stable/2930434.

---. *Écrits: The First Complete Edition in English*. Translated by Bruce Fink, Norton and Company, 2006.

---. *The Seminar of Jacques Lacan. Book VII: The Ethics of Psychoanalysis: 1959-1960*. Translated by Dennis Porter, Norton, 1997.

---. *The Seminar of Jacques Lacan. Book X: Anxiety*. Translated by A.R. Price and edited by Jacques-Alain Miller, Polity, 2014.

---. *The Seminar of Jacques Lacan. Book XI: The Four Fundamental Concepts of Psychoanalysis*. Translated by Alan Sheridan, W. W. Norton and Company, 1998.

Lefebvre, Henri. *The Production of Space*. Translated by Donald Nicholson-Smith, Blackwell, 1991.

Light, Alison. “Daphne du Maurier’s Romance with the Past.” *Forever England: Femininity, Literature and Conservativism between the Wars*. Routledge, 1991, pp. 156-207.

Luna, Alina M. *Visual Perversity: A Rearticulation of Maternal Instinct*. Lexington Books, 2004.

Massey, Doreen. *For Space*. Sage Publications, 2005.

---. *Space, Place and Gender*. U of Minnesota P, 1994.

Mitchell, Margaret E. “‘Beautiful Creatures’: The Ethics of Female Beauty in Daphne du Maurier’s Fiction.” *Women: A Cultural Review*, vol. 20, no. 1, 2009, pp. 25-41. *Taylor and Francis Online*, DOI:10.1080/09574040802684798.

Morrison, Paul. “Enclosed in Openness: Northanger Abbey and the Domestic Carceral.” *Texas Studies in Literature and Language*, vol. 33, no.1, 1991, pp. 1-23. *JSTOR*, www.jstor.org/stable/40753745.

Mulvey, Laura. “Melodrama Inside and Outside the Home.” *Visual and Other Pleasures*. Palgrave Macmillan, 2009, pp. 63-77.

Paddy, David Ian. “Home is Where the Dark is: A Literary Geography of Daphne du Maurier’s Disturbing Genres.” *Space(s) of the Fantastic: A 21st Century Manifesto*. Edited by David Punter and C. Bruna Mancini, Routledge, 2021, pp. 96-114.

Perec, George. “Approaches to What?” *Species of Spaces and Other Places*. Translated by John Sturrock, Penguin, 1997, pp. 205-7.

Petersen, Teresa. “Daphne du Maurier’s *Rebecca*: The Shadow and the Substance.” *Journal of the Australasian Universities Language and Literature Association*, vol. 112, 2009, pp. 53-66. *Taylor and Francis Online*, doi.org/10.1179/000127909804775650.

Pons, Auba Llompart. “Patriarchal Hauntings: Re-reading Villainy and Gender in Daphne du Maurier’s *Rebecca*.” *Atlantis*, vol. 35, no. 1, 2013, pp. 69-83. *JSTOR*, www.jstor.org/stable/43486040.

Punter, David. “Civilization and the Goths.” *The Gothic*. Edited by Glenis Byron and David Punter, Blackwell, 2004, pp. 3-6.

---. “Of Apparitions: Introduction.” *Spectral Readings: Towards a Gothic Geography*. Edited by Glenis Byron and David Punter, Palgrave Macmillan, 1999, pp.1-8.

Radović, Stanka. “Outside Within: Natural Environment and Social Place in Daphne du Maurier’s *Rebecca*.” *Ecocriticism and Geocriticism: Overlapping Territories in Environmental and Spatial Literary Studies*. Edited by Robert T. Tally Jr. and Christine M. Battista, Palgrave Macmillan, 2016, pp. 137-54.

Rashkin, Esther. *Family Secrets and the Psychoanalysis of Narrative*. Princeton UP, 1992.

Ridenhour, Jamieson. *In Darkest London: The Gothic Cityscape in Victorian Literature*. Scarecrow Press, 2012.

Rosello, Mireille. “The Infiltrator Who Came from the Inside: Making Room in Closed Systems.” *The Canadian Review of Comparative Literature*, vol.22, no.2, June 1995, pp. 241-54, 13 Dec. 2021, journals.library.ualberta.ca/crcl/index.php/crcl/article/view/3394

Royle, Nicholas. *The Uncanny*. Manchester UP, 2003.

Sedgwick, Eve Kosofsky. *The Coherence of Gothic Conventions*. Methuen, 1986.

Sencindiver, Susan Yi. *Fear and Gothic Spatiality*. Akademiet for Æstetikfaglig Forskeruddannelse, 2010.

Shakespeare, William. *Hamlet*. Peacock Books, 2007.

Smith, Allan Lloyd. “The Phantoms of *Drood* and *Rebecca*: The Uncanny Reencountered through Abraham and Torok’s ‘Cryptonymy’.” *Poetics Today*, vol. 13, no. 2, Summer 1992, pp. 285-308. *JSTOR*, www.jstor.org/stable/1772534.

Soja, Edward. *Postmodern Geographies: The Reassertion of Space in Critical Theory and Social Theory*. Verso, 1989.

---. “Taking Space Personally.” *The Spatial Turn: Interdisciplinary Perspectives*. Edited by Barney Warf and Santa Arias, Routledge, 2009.

---. *Thirdspace: Journeys to Los Angeles and Other Real-and-Imagined-Places*. Blackwell, 1996.

Spooner, Catherine. “Gothic in the Twentieth Century.” *The Routledge Companion to Gothic.* Edited by Catherine Spooner and Emma McEvoy, Routledge, 2007, pp. 38-48.

Stafford, William. “The Gender of the Place: Building and Landscape in Woman Authored Texts in England of the 1790s.” *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, vol. 13, 2003, pp. 305–18. *Cambridge*, doi.org/10.1017/S0080440103000173.

Taylor, Helen, editor. *The Daphne du Maurier Companion*. Virago, 2007.

---. Introduction. *The Daphne du Maurier Companion*. Edited by Helen Taylor, Virago, 2007, pp. xiii-xxiv.

Teahan, Sheila. “Untimely Returns: Shoring Fragments Against Ruins in Daphne du Maurier’s *Rebecca*.” *Ruins in the Literary and Cultural Imagination*. Edited by Efterpi Mitsi, et al. Palgrave MacMillan, 2019.

Thomassen, Bjørn. “Revisiting Liminality: Danger of Empty Spaces.” *Liminal Landscapes: Travel, Experience and Spaces in-between.* Edited by Hazel Andrews and Les Roberts, Routledge, 2012, pp. 21-35.

Titlestad, Michael. *Shipwrecking Narratives: Out of Our Depths*. Palgrave Macmillan, 2021.

Trigg, Dylan. *Topophobia: A Phenomenology of Anxiety*. Bloomsbury, 2016.

Tuan, Yi Fu. *Space and Place: The Perspective of Experience.* U of Minnesota P, 2001.

Turner, Victor. *The Ritual Process: Structure and Anti-Structure.* Cornell UP, 1991.

Van Gennep, Arnold. *The Rites of Passage*. Translated by Monika B. Vizedom and Gabrielle L. Caffee, The U of Chicago P, 1960.

Vidler, Anthony. *The Architectural Uncanny*: *Essays in the Modern Unhomely*. MIT P, 1992.

---. *Warped Space: Art, Architecture, Anxiety and Modern Culture*. MIT P, 2002.

Walpole, Horace. "Preface to the Second Edition." *The Castle of Otranto and the Mysterious Mother*. E-book Ed. Edited by Frederick S. Frank, Broadview Press, 2003, pp. 65-70.

Watt, Ian. *The Rise of the Novel: Studies in Defoe, Richardson and Fielding.* Penguin Books, 1981.

Wegner, Philip E. "Spatial Criticisim." *Introducing Criticism at the 21st Century*. Edited by Julian Wolfreys, Edinburgh UP, 2002, pp. 179-201.

Weiskel, Thomas. *The Romantic Sublime: Studies in the Structure and Psychology of Transcendence*. Johns Hopkins UP, 1986.

Westland, Ella. "The Passionate Periphery: Cornwall and Romantic Fiction." *Peripheral Visions: Images of Nationhood in Contemporary British Fiction.* Edited by Ian Bell, U of Wales P, 1996, pp. 153-172.

Westphal, Bertrand. *Geocriticism: Real and Fictional Spaces*. Translated by Robert Tally, Jr, Palgrave Macmillan, 2011.

Williams, Anne. *Art of Darkness: A Poetics of Gothic*. The U of Chicago P, 1995.

Wigley, Mark. “Untitled: The Housing of Gender." *Sexuality and Space*. Edited by Beatriz Colomina, Princeton Architectural Press, 1990, pp. 327-389.

Wisker, Gina. “Dangerous Borders: Daphne du Maurier’s Rebecca: Shaking the Foundations of Romance of the Privilege, Partying and Place.” *Journal of Gender Studies*, vol. 12, no. 2, 2003, pp. 83-97. *Taylor and Francis Online*, DOI: 10.1080/0958923032000088292.

---. “Undermining the Everyday: Daphne du Maurier’s Gothic Horror.” *The Enduring Appeal of Daphne du Maurier’s Fiction*. *Revue Lisa*, vol. 19, no. 52, 2021. *Open Edition Journals*, doi.org/10.4000/lisa.13590.

Wolfreys, Julian. *Transgression: Identity, Space and Time*. Palgrave MacMillan, 2008.

APPENDICES

A. CURRICULUM VITAE

PERSONAL INFORMATION

Surname, Name: Erdem Özge

Nationality: Turkish (TC)

Date and Place of Birth: [redacted]

email: [redacted]

EDUCATION

Degree	Institution	Year of Graduation
MA	Ankara University English Literature	2009
BA	METU Foreign Language Education	2007
High School	Edirne Anatolian Teacher Training High School	2003

WORK EXPERIENCE

Year	Place	Enrollment
2003- Present	METU Department of Basic English	Instructor
2008-2013	Ufuk Üniversitesi İngilizce Hazırlık Bölümü	Instructor

FOREIGN LANGUAGES

Advanced English, Basic French

PUBLICATIONS AND CONFERENCE PAPERS

Erdem, Özge. "Defoe's Dark London: *Moll Flanders* and *A Journal of the Plague Year* as Early Examples of Urban Gothic." *25th METU British Novelists Conference: Daniel Defoe and His Work.* METU, Ankara, Turkey, 12-13 December 2019.

Birlik N., Günday M., Erdem Ö., Sert G. "Öğretmen Adaylarının Masallardaki İkili Zıtlıkların Kültürü Kodlayıcı Özellikleri Hakkındaki Farkındalıkları Üzerine Bir Çalışma." *International Ankara Conference on Scientific Researches,* Ankara, Turkey, 4 - 06 October 2019, vol.1, no.1, pp. 566-576.

Birlik N., Arıkan A., Erdem Ö., Sert G. "Öğretmen Adaylarının Toplumsal Farklılıkları Algılamaları Üzerine Bir Çalışma." *International Ankara Conference on Scientific Researches*, Ankara, Turkey, 4 - 06 October 2019, vol.1, no.1, pp. 557-565.

Erdem, Özge. "Memory, Knowledge and Truth in *Elephants Can Remember* and *Five Little Pigs*." *23rd METU British Novelists Conference: Agatha Christie and Her Work.* METU, Ankara, Turkey, 16-17 March 2017.

B. TURKISH SUMMARY / TÜRKÇE ÖZET

DAPHNE DU MAURIER'IN *JAMAICA INN, REBECCA* VE *MY COUSIN RACHEL* ROMANLARINDA GOTİK MEKÂNIN ÜRETİMİ

Bu tez Daphne du Maurier'in *Jamaica Inn, Rebecca* ve *My Cousin Rachel* romanlarında gotik mekânın üretimini post modern ve post-yapısalcı mekân teorileri ve psikoanalitik teori çerçevesinde incelemeyi ve bu sayede yazarın romanlarını tartışabilecek yeni okuma katmanları oluşturmayı amaçlamıştır. Bu tezin ana argümanı, Daphne du Maurier'in bu romanlarında gotik mekânın Kartezyen ve Newtoncu anlayıştan ayrıldığı ve mekânın üretimi Üçüncüuzam açısından incelendiğinde, romanların Birinciuzam ve İkinciuzam epistemolojilerini istikrarsızlaştıran mekânsal deneyimleri tartışmaya açık bir hale geldiğidir. Böylelikle, mekânsal analiz temelinde tartışıldıklarında, romanların egemen diskura karşıt söylemler üreten metinler olarak ele alınabilecekleri savunulmaktadır.

Bu tezde Gotiği yazıldığı diskurda bastırılmış olan içeriğin dile getirildiği bir yazım türü olarak ele aldım ve Daphne du Maurier'in romanlarını bu yazım türünün örnekleri olarak inceledim. Bu amaçla, öncelikle du Maurier'in sanatla iç içe geçmiş çocukluğunu ve ebeveynleriyle ilişkisini onu Gotik yazın türünü benimsemeye iten etmenler olarak inceledim. Bunun yanında, bir yirminci yüzyıl yazarı olarak du Maurier'in modern yaşamla olan sorunlu ilişkisini ve döneminde gerçekleşen önemli olaylara verdiği tepkileri tartıştım. Ayrıca, yazarın 1930'larda İngiliz edebiyatında yaygın bir eğilim olan mit üretme ve İngiliz ulusal kimliğini yeniden inşa etme çabalarına katkıda bulunduğunu, ancak bunu Cornwall bağlamında, yani merkezden

değil de marjinden gerçekleştirdiğini ele aldım. Ayrıca, yazarın toplumsal cinsiyet rollerini benimseyerek bilinç düzeyinde feminizme ve feminist harekete karşı bir duruş sergilediğini, ama eserlerinde ataerkil diskuru altüst edici unsurlara rastlanabileceğini irdeledim. Tüm bunların ışığında, Cornwall'un du Maurier'in eserlerinde bastırılmış içeriği ifade edebildiği bir alan olarak üretildiğini ve yazarın edebi hayal gücünü barındırması özelliğiyle romanlarda anlamı biçimlendirici rol oynadığını savundum.

Çalışmanın bir sonraki bölümünde kuramsal çerçeveyi oluşturmak amacıyla Gotik yazın türünün on sekizinci yüzyıldan günümüze gelişimini ve değişen tanımlarını tartıştım. Tarihsel anlamda Gotik, orta çağ döneminde Avrupa'yı istila ederek Roma İmparatorluğu'nun çöküşüne sebep olan kuzeyli Germen kabilelerine verilen bir ad olsa da, Rönesans döneminde İtalya'da bu kabilelerle bağdaştırılan Kuzey Avrupa topluluklarının mimarisini klasik batı mimarisinden ayırmak için kullanılan estetik bir kavram halini almıştır. Bu ayrım, Gotik kavramının zamanla negatif bir estetik kategoriye dönüşmesine ve barbarlık, yıkım, asimetri gibi özelliklerle ilişkilendirilmesine yol açmıştır. Diğer yandan, Gotiğin Germen kabileleriyle bağlantısı, yazılı belgelerin yokluğu sayesinde, kavramın on sekizinci yüzyılda İngiltere'de politik diskurda önemli rol oynamasına olanak sağlamıştır. Gotik, Roma İmparatorluğu'nun etkilerine karşılık yerel ve ulusal bir tarihi köken arayışında kullanılmış ve etrafında ulusal bir mit örülen politik bir kavram halini almıştır. Gotların Roma uygarlığından farklarının özgürlük ve eşitlik gibi değerlerle bağdaştırılmış ve İngiltere'nin o dönemdeki siyasi yapısını temellendirmekte kullanılmıştır. Bu da Gotiğin olumlu bir kavram olarak algılanmasının önünü açmıştır. Bunun yanında, estetik bir kategori olarak Rönesans'ta kazandığı negatif anlamlarını on sekizinci yüzyıla kadar taşıyan Gotik, ilk defa Horace Walpole tarafından bir yazın türü olarak kullanılmıştır. Walpole'dan sonra edebiyatta bu kavram bazı aydınlar tarafından İngiltere tarihindeki farklı yazarları bir araya getirerek ulusal bir edebi geleneği adlandırmak için dahi kullanılmıştır. Anlamındaki bu zıtlık, Gotiğin bir yazın türü olarak algılanışında da etkisini göstermiştir. Gotik, kimi zaman hayal gücünü mantığın egemenliğinden kurtaran özgürlükçü bir yazın türü olarak görülmüş, kimi zamansa bu Gotiğin bir kaçış edebiyatı olarak değerlendirilmesine neden olmuştur. Geçmişin etkisine yapılan vurgu ise bazı eleştirmenler tarafından bu yazın türünün

nostaljik bir muhafazakarlıkla ilişkilendirilmesine yol açmıştır. Bunun yanında, tabu olarak adlandırılan ve/ya da diskurda problematik olarak nitelendirilen eylemlere yer vermesi Gotiğin zaman zaman etik açıdan eleştirilmesine sebep olmuştur.

Gotik kavramının zaman içindeki gelişiminde bu zıt niteliklerin ve tartışmalarının hepsinin etkili olması, Gotiğin yirminci ve yirmi birinci yüzyıl eleştirmenlerince Aydınlanma epistemolojisiyle ilişkili olarak ele alınmasında etkili olmuştur. Fred Botting, Terry Castle ve Catherine Spooner gibi eleştirmenler tarafından Gotik, Aydınlanma epistemolojisinde temsil krizini ifade eden bir yazın türü olarak görülmüştür. Bu görüşten yola çıkarak, Gotiği Aydınlanma epistemolojisiyle bağlantılı olarak ele aldım. Bu ilişkiyi Michel Foucault'nun heterotopya kavramından yararlanarak açıklamaya çalıştım ve Gotiğin Aydınlanma epistemolojisinde sorun teşkil eden ve mimetik yazın türlerinde tartışılamayan içeriğin ele alındığı edebi bir heterotopya olarak görülebileceğini savundum. Bu bağlamda, Gotik yazın türü bir temsil krizine işaret ederken aynı zamanda bu krizi temsil etme çabası olarak karşımıza çıkmaktadır. Gotik metinler yazıldıkları diskurdaki baskın ve bastırılmış olan içerikler arasındaki gerilimi ikili zıtlıkları ayıran sınırlar ve o sınırların sürekli ihlal edilmesi, bulanıklaşması ve yeniden çizilmesi ile şekillenirler. Gotik yazın türünde mekân içeri/dışarı, ben/öteki, kadın/erkek ve tanıdık/yabancı gibi ikili zıtlıklar çerçevesinde inşa edilirken, bu zıtlıkların bir arada bulunuşu ve aralarındaki sınırların geçirgenliği bu çalışmada gotik mekânların heterojen yapısının göstergesi olarak alınmıştır. Gotik mekânın incelenmesi romanlarda bu gerilimin tartışılması açısından önem teşkil etmektedir.

Bu tezde mekân ve yazın türlerinin birbirini ürettiği düşüncesini temel aldım. Bununla ilişkili olarak, Gotikte bulunan haritalandırılamaz ve sınırları belirlenemez mekân algısının, bu yazın türünü Realizm ve realist romanların detayları belirli mimetik mekânlarında ifade edilemeyen içeriği incelemek açısından belirleyici rol oynadığını öne sürdüm. Bu amaçla, du Maurier'in incelenen romanlarında mekân ve özne ilişkisini tartışmak ve mekânın metinlerde anlamı belirleyici rolünü ortaya koymak için post modern ve post-yapısalcı mekân kuramlarına başvurdum. Bu kuramların ortak noktası mekânın sosyal ilişkilerin bir ürünü olduğu ve buna karşılık sosyal

ilişkilerin ve kavramların üretilmesinde de belirleyici rolü bulunduğu düşüncesidir. Bu düşünce ilk olarak Henri Lefebvre tarafından *Mekânın Üretimi* kitabında ortaya atılmış, daha sonra 1990'larda sosyal bilimlerde gerçekleşen mekânsal dönüş sırasında çoğu kuramcı ve düşünür tarafından benimsenmiştir. Mekânsal dönüşle birlikte mekânın nitelik ve niceliklerinin ölçülebilen ve haritalandırılabilen bir olgu olduğu ve zaman kavramının aksine, edilgen, sabit ve apolitik bir boyut olarak sosyal gerçekliklerin üretiminde etki sahibi olmadığı görüşleri sorgulanmıştır. Topoğrafyadan uzaklaşıp topolojik bir perspektif edinen post modern ve post-yapısalcı mekânsal kuramlar mekânı dinamik, akışkan, geçirgen, eşzamanlılık ve iç içe geçmiş ilişkilerle anlam kazanan bir olgu ve bu ilişkilerin üretiminde önemli rol oynayan bir etmen olarak tartışmışlardır. Bu tez du Maurier'in romanlarını bu kuramsal çerçevede ele almıştır. Bu bağlamda, romanlarda mekân ve öznenin birbirini ürettiği ve mekânsal deneyimlerin öznelliğin oluşmasında belirleyici rol oynadığı tartışılmıştır. Bunun yanında, romanlarda işlenen mekânın ataerkil diskurun ürünü olduğu, karşılığında bu diskurun üretiminde rol oynadığı ortaya konmuş, ancak karakterlerin mekânla olan ilişkisi ve mekânsal deneyimleri incelendiğinde metinlerin bu diskuru sorgulayan ve altüst eden biçimde okunabileceği düşüncesi savunulmuştur.

Lefebvre sosyal mekân kavramını batı epistemolojisinde öne çıkan algılanan ve tasarlanan ya da somut ve soyut gibi mekânsal ikili zıtlıkların ötesine geçen ve bu anlayışların arasındaki farklılıkları karmaşıklaştıran üçüncü bir kavram olarak ortaya koymuştur. Coğrafyacı Edward Soja da hiçbir mekânsal düşünme biçiminin diğerine üstün olmadığını ve mekânın aynı anda hem gerçek hem de tasarı olarak görülebileceğini savunmuştur. Bu tezde romanları incelemek için Lefebvre'nin mekânsal kategorilerini ve sosyal mekân anlayışını geliştiren Soja'nın Üçüncüuzam kavramına baş vurdum. Soja, Lefebvre'nin algılanan, tasarlanan ve yaşanan mekân olarak özetlenebilecek üçlü mekân anlayışına karşılık gelen Birinciuzam, İkinciuzam ve Üçüncüuzam boyutları olmak üzere üç mekânsal boyut ve bu boyutları temel alan epistemolojileri tartışmıştır. Soja bu epistemolojileri sorgulayıp onların varsaydığı mekân kavramının dışına çıkan mekânsal eylem ve görüşleri Üçüncüuzam kavramı altında bir araya getirmiştir. Mekânın tarihi incelendiğinde, baskın olarak iki mekân kavramı görülmektedir. Birincisi mekânın kendi içinde hiçbir anlamı olmayan bir

nesne, boşluk ve uzam olarak algılandığı görüştür. Bu görüş Aydınlanma epistemolojisinin direk bir ürünü olarak düşünülebilir ve pozitif bilimlerde baskın olan mekân anlayışıdır. Soja bu anlayışı mekânın Birinciuzam boyutu olarak adlandırırken bu anlayışı temel alan epistemolojileri de Birinciuzam epistemolojisi olarak nitelendirir. Bu görüş temel alındığında mekânın fiziksel nesne ve formlara indirgendiği görülmektedir. Diğer yandan, Plato, Kant ve Leibniz'in felsefelerinde mekân materyal bir gerçeklikten uzak soyut bir tasarı olarak ortaya çıkmaktadır. Bu görüşe göre mekânın sosyal boyutu ve materyal gerçekliği birbirinden ayrılmaktadır. Soja bu mekânsal boyutu İkinciuzam olarak nitelendirir. Bu görüşü temel alan epistemolojileri de İkinciuzam epistemolojileri olarak adlandırır. Üçüncüuzam ise ilk iki boyutu kapsayan ama onlara indirgenemeyen bir mekân anlayışı olarak ortaya çıkmaktadır.

Bu tezde görüşlerine başvurduğum bir diğer mekânsal kuramcı da post modern coğrafyacı Doreen Massey'dir. Massey de Lefebvre ve Soja gibi iç içe geçmiş, geçirgen ve heterojen mekân kavramını benimser. Massey özellikle mekân ve zamanın birbirine zıt olduğu ve mekânın zamandan yoksun olduğu görüşüne karşı çıkmış, değişim, hareketlilik ve yeniden kurulmaya açık bir mekân anlayışının gerekliliğini savunmuştur. Massey'e göre böyle bir anlayış için mekân pürüzsüz bir yüzey değil, birçok yörüngenin bir arada var olduğu bir çokluk olarak ele alınmalıdır. Bu bağlamda Massey keskin bir mekân ve yer ayrımını kabul etmeyip bu iki olguyu birbiriyle ilişkili olarak algılar. Bu çalışmada da Massey'nin mekân anlayışına başvurulduğunda, romanlarda karakterlerin çoğunun sosyal mekânlarını yönetemedikleri, psişik alanlarının da bastırılmış olan içeriğin etkisine açık hale geldiği, bu yüzden de onlar için mekânın yere dönüşemediği görülmüştür. Bunun yanında, Massey'nin mekânın toplumsal cinsiyet rolleri ile de bir ilişki içinde bulunduğu argümanı incelenen romanlarda kadın ve erkek karakterlerin mekân ile olan ilişki ve etkileşimini incelemek için temel alınmıştır. Bu çerçevede, Gotikte mekân ve zamanın gerçekliğin birbirinden ayrışabilen iki farklı boyutunu oluşturmaktan çok birbirine bağlı olgular oldukları görülmüştür. Buradan yola çıkarak, du Maurier'in romanlarında farklı zamanların aynı mekânda iç içe geçmesiyle oluşan mekânsal-zamanların bulunduğu iddia edilmiştir.

Massey'nin yer ve zaman zıtlığını kabul etmeyişi ve bunun yerine ilişki ağları tarafından belirlenen ve bu ilişkilerde belirleyici rol oynayan mekân anlayışı, bir yeri, daha geniş mekânsal geometrilerin artikülasyonu olarak anlamayı ön görmektedir. Böylelikle, bu anlayışta kapalı alanlara yer yoktur. Bu bağlamda, *Jamaica Inn, Rebecca* ve *My Cousin Rachel* romanlarındaki zıtlıkları incelediğimde, içeri/dışarı zıtlığının birden fazla mekânsal ilişkiyi düzenlediğini gördüm. Bu da beni içeri/dışarı kategorilerini ve onlarla ilişkilendirilebilecek tanıdık/yabancı, ben/öteki ve özel/kamusal gibi ikili zıtlıkları da mekânsal boyutlarıyla yeniden düşünmeye yönlendirdi.

Mekânın toplumsal cinsiyet rolleri ile paralel olarak biçimlendiği görüşü sosyal mekân anlayışının bir parçası olarak ortaya çıkmaktadır. Bu paralelliğe değinmek için feminist düşünürlerin fikirlerine başvurdum. Özellikle fenomenolojide ve hümanist coğrafyada ev kavramının güven, huzur gibi olumlu duygularla bağdaştırılması, evin birincil narsisizm döneminde anne ile bebek arasında var olan simbiyotik ilişkiyi yansıtan esirgeyici özelliklerle ilişkilendirilmesi Elizabeth Grosz ve Julia Kristeva gibi düşünürler tarafından dilde özne olarak yer edinebilmek için bu ilişkinin terkedilmesinin ve anne bedeninin bastırılmasının bir sonucu olarak görülmektedir. Bu şekilde düşünüldüğünde, domestik alanın kuruluşunda anne bedeninin bastırılması yatmaktadır. Nitekim bu bastırma evin kusursuz bir yüzey olarak kurulmasını sağlamaz; annenin alanının psişik kalıntıları direnir ve bu kalıntılar anne figürünün ve/ya da annenin alanının yabancılaşmış biçimlerde ortaya çıkmasına tehdit olarak algılanmasına sebep olur. Ev kavramının kuruluşunda bulunan tanıdık olanın yabancılaşması süreci bu çalışmada domestik alanın tekinsizlik ve eşik kavramları temelinde tartışılması açısından önemli olup beni gotik mekânı Üçüncüuzam olarak tartışmaya yöneltmiştir. Bu amaçla, kuramsal çerçeveyi oluştururken eşik mekânın farklı türlerini ele aldım ve eşiğin dinamiklik, değişim, akışkanlık ve geçirgenlikle bağdaştığı olumlu anlamlarının yanında tüm anlamların askıda bekletildiği bir araf olarak ortaya çıkabileceğini tartıştım. Daha sonra, tekinsizlik kavramının Freud tarafından yapılan tanımını ve bu tanımın farklı düşünürler ve kuramcılar tarafından eleştirisini ve yeniden yapılandırılmasını inceledim. Bunun sonucunda tekinsizliği belirsizlik karşısında ortaya çıkan bir kriz anı, ikili zıtlıklar arasında karar vermek

imkansızlaştığında deneyimlenen bir olgu, kişinin koordinatlarını kaybettiği bir deneyim olarak tanımladım. Bu da tekinsizliğin mekân ile yakın ilişkisine değinerek onu özne ve mekân arasındaki ayrım belirsizleştiğinde ortaya çıkabilecek bir mekânsal deneyim olarak tartışabilmemi sağladı.

İlk analiz bölümünde romanlardaki domestik alanı inceledim. Du Maurier'in romanlarında içeri/dışarı zıtlığının bir ev ve bu evi çevreleyen açık alan ile kurulduğunu, ancak anlatım ilerledikçe bu mekânsal ilişkilerin karmaşıklaştığını, yeni zıtlıklara yer açtığını ve mekân-özne ilişkisi bağlamında içeri/dışarı mekânların anlamlarının ve konumlarının değişkenliğini ele aldım. Buradan yola çıkarak, gotik mekânın haritalandırılamayan, anlamı sabitlenemeyen ve sınırları çizilemeyen dinamik, akışkan ve geçirgen bir topoloji olarak karşımıza çıktığını savundum. Ayrıca, erkek ve kadın karakterlerin farklı mekânsal deneyimleri ve stratejileri, yani mekânı üretme, düzenleme ve kendilerini konumlandırma yöntemleri olduğunu ileri sürdüm. Romanlardaki domestik alanı gotik bir Üçüncüuzam, sosyal ve psişik mekanların bir arada bulunduğu ve birbirine müdahale eder biçimde iç içe geçtiği, farklı zamanların mekânda kesiştiği bir mekânsal-zaman olarak ele almayı amaçladım. Kadının domestik alanı güvenlik ve rahatlık sunan bir yer, kimliğini tutarlı bir biçimde inşa edebileceği sağlam bir zemin olarak deneyimleyemediğini, böyle bir deneyimin yalnızca erkek karakterlerin erişimine açık olduğunu öne sürdüm. Bu yüzden evi kadın karakterlerin deneyiminde tekinsiz bir yer olarak irdeledim. Bu tartışmada, domestik alanın sunduğu ev deneyiminin anne bedeninin bastırılması ve anne-bebek ilişkisinin özne-ev ilişkisiyle yer değiştirmesine bağlı olarak geliştiği düşüncesini temel aldım. Romanları tartışırken, Lacan'ın özneler arası ve özne içi kavramlarından bilinç ve bilinç dışı düzeylerde kurulan mekânsal ilişkileri ele almak için yararlandım.

Bu amaçla, öncelikle *Jamaica Inn* romanındaki hanı eşik kavramıyla ilişkilendirerek psişik ve sosyal bir araf olarak tartıştım. Bu romanda du Maurier anlatıyı kaçakçılık ve gemi enkaz yağmacıları hakkındaki Cornwall hikayeleri üzerine inşa ederek gotik bir suç ve kötülük öyküsü kurgulamıştır. Kanun ve güç merkezinden uzak konumda olan Bodmin toplum ve uygarlığın marjinlerinde yer almaktadır. Bu tezde Bodmin'in ataerkil sistem tarafından düzenlenmeyen sosyal mekânını kaygan bir zemin olarak ele

aldım. Bu, romanda ataerkil düzenin temsilcisi olan yerel yönetici Bassat'ın Joss Merlyn ve adamlarının suçlarını durdurmakta yetersiz kalmasından da anlaşılmaktadır. Ana karakter Mary Yellan, ataerkil diskurun düzenlendiği Helford'ı terk edip sosyal mekânı düzenlenmemiş Jamaica Hanı'na yerleşerek bu kaygan zeminde konumlanır. Romanda domestik alanı incelemek için Arnold van Gennep tarafından ilkel toplumlarda geçiş ritüellerinin evrelerini tanımlamakta kullanılan, daha sonra ise Victor Turner tarafından geliştirilen eşik kavramına başvurdum. Bu kavramın mekânsal sınırları tartışmak için kullanıldığı kuramlardan da yararlanarak sosyal mekânların geometrileri dışında kalan bireylerin konumlandığı ve mekânsal paradigmaların askıya alındığı bir tür araf olarak ele aldım. Sosyal sınırların ihlal edildiği bir yer olmasıyla Jamaica Hanı'nı sakinlerini günlük yaşamın mekânlarından izole eden, onların sosyal hareketliliğini sınırlayan ve psişik gerçekliklerini askıya alan, geçilemeyen bir eşik, diğer bir deyişle araf olarak tartıştım. Bu bağlamda, Joss Merlyn'den önceki misafirperver işlevinin aksine hanın bir suç ve ihlal merkezi haline geldiği ve pek çok açıdan gündelik yaşamın paradigmalarının istikrarsızlaştığı bir mekân olduğu görülmektedir. Bu çerçevede, Mary Yellan'ın Helford'daki aile çiftliğini terk etmesinin ataerkil sosyal mekândaki yerinden olmasına yol açtığını öne sürdüm. Bu yerinden olma durumunu karakterin gerçekliğini sarsan ve onu varoluşsal bir eşiğe getiren mekânsal bir deneyim olarak ele aldım. Denebilir ki, Mary handa yaşamaya başladığında sosyal gerçekliği askıda kalmış bu mekâna dahil olmuştur ve bu askıda kalmışlık hali onu Francis Davey ve Bodmin Kırı'nın etkilerine açık hale getirmiştir.

İşlevi dolayısıyla başkaları için geçici bir mekân anlamını taşırken, Jamaica Hanı Joss ve Patience Merlyn ve Mary Yellan için ev olmasıyla bu karakterlerin özel alanlarını oluşturmaktadır. Bu açıdan, bu çalışmada hanın özel ve kamusal alan karşıtlığının ötesine geçmesiyle bu kavramlar arasındaki ayrımı belirsizleştirdiğini ele aldım. Buna bağlı olarak, han psişik ve sosyal mekânların birbirinden ayrışmadığı bir araf olduğu için karakterlerin bastırdıkları içeriği barındırırken, domestik alanın özel/kamusal ya da bireysel/sosyal sınıflandırmaları olmadan, karakterlerin bastırma mekanizmasıyla psişik ve sosyal mekânlarını düzenleyemediklerini, sosyal hareketliliğe izin verir biçimde mekânı üretemediklerini ve ataerkil sosyal mekâna entegre olamadıklarını

öne sürdüm. Handa yaşamaya başlamasıyla Mary Yellan'ın ataerkil sosyal mekândaki hareketliliğinin kısıtlandığı görülmektedir. Diğer yandan, karakterin bu araf mekandaki yaşantısı irdelendiğinde, burada yaşamanın yalnızca negatif mekânsal deneyimlerle biçimlenmediği ortaya çıkmaktadır: İhlal ve suç ile bağdaştırılan bir evde yaşamanın Mary'e toplumsal cinsiyet rolleri temelinde ataerkil düzende verilmeyen bir özgürlük sağladığı ve yeni hareket alanları açtığı anlaşılmaktadır. Bu da beni romanda toplumsal cinsiyet rollerinin temsilini ve mekânsal üretimini tartışmaya yöneltti. Romanda ataerkil sosyal mekânın toplumsal cinsiyet rollerini düzenleyiciliği olmayan handa, Joss ve Patience Merlyn'in ataerkil cinsiyet rollerinin karikatürize edilmiş versiyonları olarak betimlendiği görülmektedir. Merlyn çiftinin ilişkisi efendi ve köle ile anne ve bebek simbiyotik ilişkileri arasında gidip gelmektedir. Bu açıdan, Mary gelene kadar çiftin arasında özneler arası bir ilişki, paylaştıkları ve/ya da birlikte ürettikleri bir sosyal mekân yoktur. Patience Merlyn eşinin psişik alanına tamamen entegre olmuş bir biçimde yaşamaktadır. Patience'ın kimseyle gerçek anlamda sözlü iletişim kuramaması, konuştuğunda sözcüklerinin bir anlam ifade etmemesi onu dilin dışında yer alan bir varlık olarak görmeye itmektedir. Bununla ilişkili olarak, Mary'nin bu araf mekânı terk etmeden sosyal mekânını üretmesinin mümkün olmadığını ve bu mekânın onun psişik alanını romanda bastırılmış olan içeriğe açık hale getirdiğini ileri sürdüm.

Domestik alan incelemesinde *Rebecca* romanında Manderley'i bastırılmış kadın imgesinin geri döndüğü tekinsiz bir ev olarak ele aldım. Çok katmanlı ve birden fazla anlama sahip bir mekân olarak Manderley'nin diskurda bastırılmış, dışlanmış içeriğin adsız anlatıcıya musallat olmasını mümkün kılan bir mekanizma olarak işlev görmesini inceledim. Buna bağlı olarak öncelikle ataerkil sosyal mekânın geometrilerini tartıştım. Adsız anlatıcının sosyal mekânını oluşturup düzenleyemediği ve ataerkil düzene entegre olamadığı ortadadır çünkü evlendiğinde sosyal parametreleri kendisinden çok önce belirlenmiş, geometrileri çizilmiş bir evde yaşamaya başlamıştır ve ataerkil toplum parametrelerine göre kendini konumlandırabileceği her pozisyon başka bir karakter tarafından işgal edilmektedir. Bu yüzden, anlatıcı mekân ile özneler arası bir düzeyde değil de özne içi bir boyutta ilişki kurmaktadır. Kendisini konumlandıramamak, anlatıcının öznelliğinin tüm eve

dağılmasına, dışmerkezli olarak oluşmasına; burada mekânın bilinçdışını oluşturan bastırılmış içerikle karşı karşıya kalıp evi tekinsiz olarak deneyimlemesine neden olmaktadır. Bu bastırılmış içerik, eşi Maxim de Winter'ın ve çevresindeki diğer herkesin sessizliğiyle anlatıcının diskurunda oluşan açıktan sızıp, anlatıcının evle etkileşimi sırasında ifade bulur. Evin içinde kendini dışlanmış halde bulan anlatıcı diskurdan dışlanan bu içeriğin etkisine açık hale gelmektedir. Bu ilişkiyi tartışarak romanda mekânın geçirgen ve heterojen olarak inşa edildiğini öne sürdüm.

Rebecca'da domestik alan toplumsal cinsiyet rollerine göre kategorize edilmiş ve düzenlenmiş mekânlardan oluşmaktadır. Bu mekânlar farklı eylemlerin gerçekleştirildiği alanlar olarak, kadın ve erkeklerin yaşayışında, sosyal hareketliliğinde ve değişiminde belirleyici rol oynamaktadır. Dolayısıyla, mekânsal sınıflandırma toplumsal cinsiyet rollerinin düzenlenmesinde, kontrol edilmesinde ve yeniden üretilip normalleştirilmesinde etkilidir. Romanda anlatıcının ataerkil düzende sahip olabileceği hareket alanından mahrum kaldığı görülmektedir. Bu da onu ataerkil sosyal mekânın dışında bırakmaktadır. Domestik alanın içinde ama sosyal mekânın dışında kalan anlatıcı bu mekânın kurmaca yapısını tartışmak için uygun bir bakış açısı sunar. Manderley'nin mekânsal simetrilerinin bozuk olduğu, eve yeni dahil olan anlatıcının deneyiminde ortaya çıkmaktadır. Bu parametreleri belirli mekân Maxim de Winter'ın ilk evliliğiyle düzenlenmiştir. Bu bağlamda, Maxim'in ilk eşi Rebecca'yı anlatıcı için mekânın anlamını düzenleyici ve bozucu bir unsur olarak ele aldım. Rebecca'yı Barbara Creed'in tanımından yararlanarak canavar kadın ve Freudyen anlamda bir falik anne olarak irdeledim.

Rebecca'nın kendini ataerkil domestik alanda maskeleme yöntemi ile konumlandırması, hareket özgürlüğünden vazgeçmemesi, öznelliğini eş ya da anne rolleriyle sabitlememesi ve bu alan dışında kendi sosyal mekânını kurabilme ve yönetebilme becerisine sahip olması onu ataerkil düzene karşı bir tehdit haline getirir. Bu yüzden, Maxim'in ilk eşi hakkındaki sessizliğinin anlatıcı ile arasındaki ilişkide çatlaklara ve boşluklara yol açması, anlatıcının bu boşlukları doldurmak için yaptığı keşiflerde Rebecca'nın kalıntı ve izleriyle karşılaşması romanın incelenmesinde önem taşımaktadır. Bu bağlamda, Rebecca'nın mekânsal düzeninde yaşayan Mrs. Danvers

tarafından çeşitli oyunlara maruz bırakılan anlatıcı için Manderley'nin tehditkâr bir topolojiye dönüşmesini tartıştım. Anlatıcı ve ev arasında bilinçdışı düzeyde gelişen simbiyosisin onu bastırılmış içeriğin etkilerine açık hale getirdiğini öne sürdüm. Diğer yandan, koca/baba rollerini üstlenen Maxim'in anlatıcıyı bu etkiden ve bilgiden uzak tutmaya çalışarak onun cinsel kimlik edinmesine ve sosyal mekânda etkin rol almasına engel olduğunu savundum. Maxim'in anlatıcıyı ataerkil sosyal mekânın dışında tutarak aslında Lacansal anlamda baba metaforunun müdahalesinden uzak bir alana ittiği görülmektedir. Bu açıdan anlatıcının annenin alanında konumlanan Mrs. Danvers'ın etkilerine açık hale geldiğini ve Mrs. Danvers'ın onu ataerkil diskurda bastırılmış içeriği keşfetmeye teşvik edici rol oynadığını ileri sürdüm. Mrs. Danvers ve anlatıcı arasındaki ilişki ele alındığında, Mrs. Danvers'ın sosyal konumunun anlatıcıdan aşağı seviyede olmasına rağmen domestik alanın parametrelerine daha hâkim olmasının evdeki güç geometrisinin simetrilerinin bozulmasına yol açtığı görülmektedir. Diğer yandan, Rebecca'nın her karakter tarafından farklı anlatılmasını onun akışkan kimliği ve ataerkil düzenin parametrelerini manipüle ederek mekân üzerinde kontrol sahibi olmasıyla ilişkili olarak irdeledim. Anlatıcı sosyal mekâna entegre olabilecek ve mekânsal deneyimini bilinç düzeyinde düzenleyebilecek gücü ancak Manderley yandıktan ve Maxim ile aralarındaki hiyerarşi kendi lehine değiştikten sonra bulabilmiştir.

My Cousin Rachel romanı anlatıcının erkek olması ve Cornwall'u diğer iki romana göre daha tanıdık ve haritalandırılabilir bir yer olarak betimlemesi açısından *Jamaica Inn* ve *Rebecca*'dan ayrılmaktadır. Bu bölümde Cornwall ve Ashley mülkünü romanın anlatıcısı Philip Ashley için tanıdık parametrelere sahip, güvenli bir mekân olarak ele aldım. Bu güvenli alana müdahalenin dışarıdan geldiği görülmektedir. Bu nedenle, yarı İtalyan yarı İngiliz olan Rachel Ashley'nin öncesinde sadece erkeklerin bulunduğu eve gelerek yabancı bir unsur olarak domestik alanın simetrilerini değiştirmesini inceledim. Bu bağlamda görülmektedir ki, Philip ve Ambrose'un kendilerine kurdukları homososyal mekân Ambrose'un sağlığı için İtalya'ya gitmesi ve orada Rachel ile evlenmesiyle Philip için güvenli bir alan olmaktan çıkar ve Philip'in Ashley mülkündeki konumunu yasal olarak tehlikeye sokar. Bu durum Ambrose'un İtalya'da ölmesiyle daha da karmaşık bir hal alır.

*My Cousin Rache*l'ın birçok anlamda *Rebecca* ile benzerlikler taşıdığı tespit edilmiştir. Rachel da Rebecca karakteri gibi metnin sınırları dışına taşan bir unsur olarak karşımıza çıkmaktadır. Bununla bağlantılı olarak, başlangıçta Philip'in sosyal ve psişik mekânlardaki konumu birbiriyle örtüşen ve birbirini perçinleyen yapıda iken bu iki mekânın ayrışmasına sebep olan Rachel'ı gotik bir unsur olarak tartıştım. Rachel'ın cinselliğinin de Rebecca gibi ataerkil normların dışında yer aldığı için canavarca niteliklerle betimlendiği görülmektedir. Rachel dişil unsur olarak Philip'in hayatına girmesiyle onu ataerkil sosyal mekânın kadın/erkek simetrileriyle tanıştırsa da, kendisinin Rebecca gibi bu alanın geometrilerini yönetmekteki becerisi ve kendi alanını oluşturmadaki başarısı metinde Philip'in öznelliğini tehdit eden unsurlar olarak ele alınmaktadır. Her ne kadar Philip Rachel'ı Ambrose'un intikamını almak için öldürse de yıllar sonra hala onunla ilgili karar verememesi, Rachel'ın akışkan yapısını sabitleyememesi karakterin metnin sınırlarını aştığına işaret etmektedir.

Bu tezde incelenen diğer iki romandan farklı olarak *My Cousin Rachel*'da Cornwall ve Ashley mülkü değil İtalya gotik bir mekân olarak betimlenmiştir. İtalya'nın Philip'in psişesi üzerindeki yabancılaştırıcı ve dengelerini bozucu etkisi Rachel'ın Cornwall'a taşınmasıyla önce arka planda kalır. Ancak Rachel Ambrose'un etkisiyle çelişkili bir etki yaratarak Philip'in psişik alanında bir krize yol açınca evin gotik nitelikler kazandığı görülmektedir. Philip'in İtalya deneyimini karakterin arkaik anne ile karşılaşması, bastırılmış anne alanının yabancılaşmış formlarda metnin yüzeyine çıkması ile ilgili olarak tartıştım. Philip'in sokakta karşılaştığı dilenci bir kadını bu alanın bedene bürünmüş hali olarak ele aldım. İtalya'nın, buradaki yer şekillerinin ve mimari yapıların ana karakterde hem büyülenme hem de tiksinti uyandırması ile Julia Kristeva'nın *abjection* kavramı ile ilişkili olarak tartışılmasına uygun bir zemin oluşturduğunu öne sürdüm. Daha sonra Rachel'ın da bu etkiyi yaratmasını Philip'in ataerkil sosyal mekândaki konumunu tehdit etmesiyle ilişkilendirdim. Sonunda Ambrose'un Rachel hakkındaki iddialarına inanmayı seçen Philip'in ataerkil diskurun düzenlediği sosyal ve psişik alanlarında oluşan tutarsızlığı tamir etmek için Rachel'ı öldürerek sembolik anlamda anneyi öldürdüğü ve arkaik anneyi bastırdığı sonucuna vardım. Philip'in romanın anlatıcısı olarak bu metni yazması ise tıpkı *Rebecca*'nın adsız anlatıcısında olduğu gibi bastırılmış olanın geri dönüşü ve dilde ifade edilme

çabası olarak değerlendirilebilir. Philip'in Rachel'a dair karar verme sürecinde yaşadığı kriz Shakespeare'in *Hamlet* eserinde ana karakter Hamlet'in deneyimlediği krizle benzerlikler gösterdiğinden Lacan'ın *Hamlet* analizinden yararlandım. Bu bağlamda, sonunda annenin arzusunun yerini babanın adı alsa da metnin varlığı Rachel'ın izlerinin Philip'in psişesinde hala etkili olduğunu göstermektedir.

Çalışmanın sonraki bölümünde romanlardaki gotik açık alanları ve bunların domestik alanlarla ilişkisini, yazarın kurduğu ve alt üst ettiği zıtlıkları özne-mekân ilişkileri temelinde tartıştım. Bu bölümde du Maurier'in romanlarında yer alan dıştan merkezli öznellik anlayışını irdelemek için Lacan'ın *extimacy* kavramına başvurdum. Lacan *extimacy*'i bir şeyin hem dışta konumlanması hem de o şeyle çok yakın ilişki içinde bulunulması olarak tanımlar ve içeri/dışarı zıtlığını problematize etmek için kullanır. İncelenen romanlarda özne ve mekân arasında bu tür bir ilişki olduğunu ve bu ilişkinin en çarpıcı biçimde özne ile dışarı olarak betimlenen mekânlar arasındaki etkileşimde ortaya çıktığını öne sürdüm. Bu çerçevede, gotik açık alanları romanlardaki sosyal mekânın parçası olan ama bu mekânı düzenleyen diskura karşı çalışan eylemleri ve anlamları üreten mekânlar olarak inceledim. *Jamaica Inn*'de Bodmin Kırı'nı ve hem *Jamaica Inn* hem de *Rebecca*'da denizi ve sahili ele aldım. Bu mekanların lineer zaman anlayışından ayrıldıkları noktalar ve zaman/mekân zıtlığını reddetmeleri açısından çok zamanlı mekânlar olarak tartıştım. Böylece, du Maurier'in romanlarında Cornwall'un yazarın kişisel belleği kültürel tarihle harmanlayıp, bölgenin fiziksel özelliklerinin edebiyattaki temsili ve kendi deneyimlerini bir araya getirmesiyle oluşan bir mekân olarak ortaya çıktığı görülmektedir. Bundan dolayı, Cornwall'un Birinciuzam ve İkinciuzam anlayışlarının ötesine geçtiğini ve Üçüncüuzam olarak anlaşılabilecek heterojen bir mekân ve karmaşık bir ilişkiler ağı olarak inşa edildiğini öne sürdüm.

Bu bölümde ilk olarak *Jamaica Inn*'de yer alan Bodmin Kırı'nı ele aldım. Haritalandırılmamış bir topolojisi olan bu mekânı geçmiş ve bugün, insan ve insan olmayan, ben ve öteki kategorilerinin bir arada bulunduğu geçirgen bir mekân olarak inceledim ve kırın öznede uyandırdığı mekânsal deneyimi tekinsizlik kavramıyla ilişkilendirdim. Bodmin Kırı doğanın canavarca ve düşmanca nitelikler kazandığı bir

yer olarak yansıtılmaktadır. Bu anlamda Mary Yellan'ın Helford'da alışık olduğu domestik alanın bir uzantısı olarak görülebilecek esirgeyici ve iyileştirici doğadan çok farklı şekilde betimlenir. Bodmin Kırı evcilleştirilmemiş, uygarlık tarafından düzenlenmemiş bir vahşi bir alan olarak karşımıza çıkmaktadır. Dilin dışında bir alan olarak kır Mary'de hem özgürlük hem de endişe uyandırır. Francis Davey'nin kimliğini ve görüşlerini açıklaması ile bu mekân tarih öncesi pagan geçmişi Hristiyan bugünle bir araya getirir. Bu bağlamda, bu bölümde Bodmin Kırı'nın psişik ve sosyal mekânın simetrilerini bozan topolojisini inceledim.

Romanda erkekliğin kontrol edilmeyen, dizginlenmeyen canavarca bir enerji ile tanımlanması Jamaica Hanının ve Bodmin Kırı'nın Kilise'nin dogmaları tarafından da düzenlenmedikleri izlenimini güçlendirici bir unsur olarak görülebilir. Francis Davey karakterini bu bağlamda ele aldım. Davey'nin bir din adamı olarak gemi enkaz yağmacılarının başına geçerek Kilise ve Bodmin'in pagan tarih öncesi geçmişi arasında bulunan birçok ayrımı altüst etmesinin Bodmin'in dinsel anlamda da çok katmanlı ve çok zamanlı heterojen bir mekân olarak yapılandığını gösterdiğini ileri sürdüm. Geçmişle bugünün, aydınlıkla karanlığın üst üste yansıtılması Bodmin Kırı'nın tekinsiz olarak deneyimlenmesine yol açar. Bu anlamda Francis Davey'nin resimlerine sızan yeşil ışığı bu iki farklı zamanın, iki farklı düzenin iç içe geçmişliğini anlatan bir imge olarak değerlendirdim. Francis Davey'i görünüşüyle de toplumsal cinsiyet rollerinin ikili zıtlıklarının dışına çıkan bir eşik karakter olarak inceledim. Rebecca ve Rachel'ın ataerkil normları maskeleme yöntemiyle kendi mekanlarını yaratmaları gibi Francis Davey'nin de Hristiyan normlarını maskelediği ve Kilise çatısı altında kendi alanını inşa ettiği, bu alanı Bodmin Kırı'nın suçlularıyla doldurduğu anlaşılmaktadır. Böylelikle, Davey zamansal ve ahlaksal sınırları ihlal ederek sadece kendisinin erişebileceği bir mekân oluşturup kendini diğer insanlardan üstün bir yerde konumlandırmaya çabalamaktadır. Kendini zamanda bir ucube olarak tanımlayan Davey'nin bu çabasını karakterin alternatif bir epistemoloji kurma, Hristiyanlığın ötesinde bir büyük anlatıya ulaşma amacıyla ilişkilendirdim. Mary'nin mekânsal deneyiminde Bodmin Kırı'nın bilinç ve bilinç dışı arasındaki sınırların kalktığı, dil dışı bir alan olarak şekillendiği görülmektedir. Bu bağlamda kırın Mary için ataerkil aile ve dilden kaçış olasılığı sunduğunu tartıştım.

Mary'nin ataerkil toplumdaki marjinal konumu onu Davey'nin etki alanına soksa da, baba metaforunun müdahalesiyle Mary sonunda yine ataerkil sosyal mekana dönüş yapacaktır. Buradan bir mekânın eşik özelliğini kaybetmesiyle tekinsiz olmayı da bıraktığı sonucuna varılmıştır: eşiğin iki tarafından birine geçiş gerçekleştirildiğinde tekinsizliğe neden olan belirsizlik sona erer. Buna bağlı olarak, romanda yücelik deneyimi irdelendiğinde, gotik yazında kurgulanan yücelik deneyiminin romantik şiirde bulunandan farklı olduğu anlaşılmaktadır. Gotik mekân incelendiğinde görülmektedir ki, özne ve mekân arasındaki sınır bir defa geçirgenleştiğinde, daha sonra sınırlar yeniden çizilse bile o eşik anının, tekinsiz deneyimin kalıntıları öznenin psişik alanında izler bırakmaktadır. Dolayısıyla, Francis Davey ve Mary'nin kaçışı baba metaforunun müdahalesiyle sona erse de, romanın sonunda Mary Bodmin'e gelmeden önceki sosyal mekâna geri dönemeyecek kadar değişmiştir.

Bodmin Kırı'nın dışında deniz ve deniz kenarı da Cornwall'un tarihi ve kültürel geçmişiyle şekillenen anlamlarının yanında incelenen romanlarda da gerçek, yaşanmış ve tasarlanmış anlamlar kazanmaktadır. Denizin teşkil ettiği tehlike, İngiliz tarihine bakıldığında somut bir tehlike olarak karşımıza çıkmaktadır. Diğer yandan, döngüsel hareketine yapılan vurgu, denizi romanlarda bastırılmış olan içeriğin geri dönüşü ile bastırma mekanizmasının ve bastırılanın geri dönüşünün sürekli tekrar eden yapılarını simgeleyen bir alan olarak tartışmaya açık hale getirmektedir. Bunların yanında, romanlarda denizin temsilinde tanımlanamayan ve sabitlenemeyen bir unsur hep bulunmaktadır. Bu yönüyle deniz arkaik anne ve anne alanı ile bağdaştırılmıştır. Deniz kıyısı ise her ne kadar denizle bağlantılı da olsa kara ve deniz arasında eşik bir alan olarak denizden ayrı tartışmayı gerektirmiştir. Romanlarda deniz kıyısının da sabit olmayan bir mekân olarak betimlendiği görülmektedir.

Jamaica Inn'de bu iki mekân gemi enkaz yağmacılarının suç alanı olarak önem kazanır. Bu romanda anlatının çok kısa bir bölümü sahilde geçmekte ve bu bölüm şok edici ve grotesk korku uyandırıcı bir işlev görmektedir. Bu yönden deniz ve deniz kenarını Joss Merlyn ve adamlarının kontrol edilemez canavarca enerjilerinin en üst noktaya ulaştığı, Bodmin Kırı'nın muğlak betimlemelerinden çok farklı olarak grafik detaylarla ve karakterin fiziksel tepkileriyle yapılanan alanlar olarak inceledim. Bunun

yanında, denizin koordinatları olmayan bir yer olmasının romanda materyal anlamda taşıdığı önemi tartıştım. Enkaz yağmacılarının elinde hem Cornwall sahilleri hem de deniz birer ölüm enstrümanına dönüşmekte, denizcilerin yönlerini bulmak için kullandıkları yöntemler çarptırılarak kendilerine karşı kullanılmaktadır. Bu yönüyle deniz ve sahil merkezi yönetimin de marjinlerini temsil etmektedir. Merkezi yönetimin kontrolü sağlamasıyla bu alanların Lefebvre'nin tanımıyla farklı mekanlar olmaktan çıkıp merkezin homojenleştirici gücüne maruz kalacakları, suç ve ihlal alanları olmayı bırakacakları üzerinde durdum.

Rebecca'da deniz ve sahilin taşıdıkları çeşitli anlamları ele aldım. Denizin eril ya da dişil olmaktan öte her iki cinse atfedilen özellikleri de bünyesinde barındırdığını vurguladım. Romanda denizin Maxim de Winter için taşıdığı negatif anlamları tartışıp, denizi Maxim'in gücünün sınırlarını temsil eden, ataerkil otorite tarafından kontrol edilemeyen bir alan olarak inceledim. Deniz ve sahilin domestik alanda bastırılmış içeriğin konumlandığı alanlar olarak yapılanmasını tartıştım. Bu alanların Rebecca, Rebecca'nın ataerkil normları ihlali ve Maxim tarafından öldürülmesiyle bağdaştırılıp Manderley'nin farklı bölümleri arasında psişik bariyerler oluşmasına neden olduğunu öne sürdüm. Denizin döngüsel deviniminin ve akışkanlığının Maxim için bu alanı tehditkâr hale getirmesini irdeledim. Buna ilişkin olarak, sahildeki kulübenin eşikte konumlanması ve Rebecca'nın karakteri arasında paralellikler kurdum. Buradan yola çıkarak, deniz ve sahili Rebecca için ataerkil sosyal mekânın müdahalelerine karşılık psişik bir direnç alanı olarak tartıştım. Sahilin romanda domestik alanı düzenleyen ikili zıtlıklar arasındaki ayrımı belirsizleştirdiğini, bu sayede bu zıtlıklar arasındaki sınırların diğer tarafla karşılaşmalara, kesişmelere ve etkileşimlere imkân sağlayan eşikler haline geldiğini ileri sürdüm.

Bu çalışmada du Maurier'in gotik romanlarının okurun bilinçdışına hitap eden dil dışı bir alandan seslendikleri ve bunun okura çok aktif bir rol yüklediği sonucuna vardım. Bu dil dışı alanın romanlarda mekânın üretiminde ifade bulduğunu ve mekânsal analizin romanları tartışmak için uygun bir okuma çerçevesi sunduğunu gördüm. Romanlarda betimlenen bilinçdışının özneye içkin olmadığını ve öznenin dışında yer aldığını saptadım. Bu açıdan, metinlerin Lacansal bilinçdışı ve öznellik kavramları ile

paralellik gösterdiğini görerek, Lacan'ın özneler arası ve özne içi ilişkiler ayrımının ve *extimacy* kavramının romanlarda özne ve mekân ilişkisini ele almak ve psişik ve sosyal mekanlar arasındaki kesişme ve ayrışmaları tartışmak için uygun bir zemin oluşturabileceğini öne sürdüm. Bu bağlamda, romanlarda öznenin psişik alanı dış gerçeklikle bir arada bulunduğu için gotik mekânın Kartezyen düşünceden ayrıldığını vurguladım ve farklı bir özne anlayışı gerektirdiğini savundum. Bu özne anlayışını mekânsal-öznellik olarak adlandırdım. Ayrıca, gotik yazında farklı zaman ve mekânların iç içeliğini ifade etmek için mekânsal-zaman kavramını kullandım. Bu nedenle, du Maurier'in romanlarında Üçüncüuzam epistemolojileriyle açıklanabilecek mekânsal deneyimleri işlediğini vurguladım ve bu deneyimleri tekinsizlik, eşik, *abjection* ve gotik yücelik kavramlarıyla ilişkili olarak tartıştım.

Sonuç olarak, romanlarda fallosantrik ve logosantrik diskurda bastırılmış olan kadının dönüşü ele alınmıştır. Du Maurier'in gotik mekânlarında bastırılan içeriğin hiçbir zaman bilincin koordinatlarıyla tamamen uyuşmadığı görülmektedir; bir kalıntı olarak diskur içinde günlük mekanlarda bulunur ve özne-mekân ilişkisinde kendini gösterir. Romanlarda sosyal ve psişik mekanların birbirine müdahale eder biçimde iç içe geçmişliğini tartışmak ve mekânı sosyal ilişkilerle şekillenen bir olgu olarak ele almak bu ilişkiyi tartışmamı sağladı. Ayrıca, du Maurier'in romanlarında ataerkil sosyal mekânın geometrilerini eğebilen ve istedikleri gibi şekillendirebilen karakterler yaratmasını ve ataerkil diskuru bu diskurun içinden alt üst etmesini ortaya koymakta faydalı oldu.

C. THESIS PERMISSION FORM / TEZ İZİN FORMU

ENSTİTÜ / INSTITUTE

Fen Bilimleri Enstitüsü / Graduate School of Natural and Applied Sciences ☐

Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü / Graduate School of Social Sciences ☒

Uygulamalı Matematik Enstitüsü / Graduate School of Applied Mathematics ☐

Enformatik Enstitüsü / Graduate School of Informatics ☐

Deniz Bilimleri Enstitüsü / Graduate School of Marine Sciences ☐

YAZARIN / AUTHOR

Soyadı / Surname : Erdem
Adı / Name : Özge
Bölümü / Department : İngiliz Edebiyatı / English Literature

TEZİN ADI / TITLE OF THE THESIS (**İngilizce** / English):
DAPHNE DU MAURIER'IN *JAMAICA INN*, *REBECCA* VE *MY COUSIN RACHEL* ROMANLARINDA GOTİK MEKÂNIN ÜRETİMİ/GOTHIC SPACE IN DAPHNE DU MAURIER'S *JAMAICA INN*, *REBECCA* AND *MY COUSIN RACHEL*

TEZİN TÜRÜ / DEGREE**:** **Yüksek Lisans** / Master ☐ **Doktora** / PhD ☒

1. **Tezin tamamı dünya çapında erişime açılacaktır. /** Release the entire work immediately for access worldwide. ☒
2. **Tez iki yıl süreyle erişime kapalı olacaktır.** / Secure the entire work for patent and/or proprietary purposes for a period of **two years. *** ☐
3. **Tez altı ay süreyle erişime kapalı olacaktır.** / Secure the entire work for period of **six months**. ***** ☐

***** *Enstitü Yönetim Kurulu kararının basılı kopyası tezle birlikte kütüphaneye teslim edilecektir. / A copy of the decision of the Institute Administrative Committee will be delivered to the library together with the printed thesis.*

Yazarın imzası / Signature ..... **Tarih** / Date .....

Tezin son sayfasıdır. / This is the last page of the thesis/dissertation.