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Abstract

Space used to be disregarded in scholarly works as it was thought to be secondary to time in accordance with dualistic worldview. However, this trend has come to be challenged with contemporary theories that problematize binary oppositions that are formed out of dualistic worldview, and space has gained attention. An understanding of space can contribute to an understanding of feminisms studies because women were disregarded as well by teleological and patriarchal thinking. This study aims to explore space and its relation to women by analyzing two signature feminist short stories of American literature and English literature, “The Yellow Wallpaper” and “To Room Nineteen” through Foucault’s theory of heterotopias. It is argued that the rooms where the heroines are secluded function as heterotopias where women find freedom and space of signification. The two short stories reveal signification of heterotopias within society for providing space for women and repercussions in the case of the loss of a heterotopia.
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Bir Heterotopya Olarak İnziva: “The Yellow Wallpaper” ve “To Room Nineteen” Kısa Öykülerinin İncelemesi
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1. Introduction

With the advent of Enlightenment, the period when dualistic worldview had emerged, a hierarchy between time and space was established. Time is accepted as the
medium of teleological thinking, marking beginnings and endings and showing developments and changes throughout history. That’s why, time was on the focus of scientific studies extensively. Space, on the other hand, was overlooked since space was thought to be empty and devoid of agency. Foucault explains this hierarchy established between time and space as follows:

“The great obsession of the nineteenth century was, as we know, history: with its themes of development and of suspension, of crisis and cycle, themes the ever-accumulating past, with its great preponderance of dead men and menacing glaciation of the world” (Foucault, 1986: 22).

Time was favored over space because the general assumption was that space had no agency over individuals and events. It can be deduced that a binary opposition between time and space has been formed, and space belongs to the stigmatized leg of this binary opposition, as in the case of other binary oppositions such as culture/nature, mind/body, light/dark and man/woman.

The dualistic understanding that disregards space has come to be challenged in the light of contemporary theory such as Foucault’s “heterotopia”, Bhabha’s theorizations on hybridity, Bakhtin’s “chronotope” and Soja’s “thirdspace” theory. Foucault interprets the budding interest in space as, “The present epoch will perhaps be above all the epoch of space” (Foucault, 1986: 22). That’s why, having an insight as to space will lead to an understanding of world beyond binary oppositions that have dominated the world-view. It will also result in a deeper understanding of the overlooked and stigmatized leg of binary oppositions, one of which is “woman”. It is argued that understanding of space can open horizons regarding feminisms studies. This paper aims to explore how space functions on women’s identity and freedom through two anchor works of feminisms in English literature and American literature.

2. Theoretical Framework & Methodology

This paper takes on a Foucauldian approach for its theoretical basis because among contemporary theorizations on space, Foucault’s theory of heterotopia stands out with discussions on space agency, social signification and function of space and prioritization of space over time. In his essay titled “Of Other Spaces”, Foucault draws attention to significations of space in contemporary society:

“In any case I believe that the anxiety of our era has to do fundamentally with space, no doubt a great deal more than with time. Time probably appears to us only as one of the various distributive operations that are possible for the elements that are spread out in space” (Foucault, 1986: 23).

Foucault argues that beyond binary oppositions and preconceived conceptions which categorize spaces as private space and public space, there are spaces full of “diverse shades of light” and “a set of relations” (Foucault, 1986:23). Such sites make it difficult to have clear-cut distinctions and categorizations among spaces. Foucault names such sites “heterotopia” and defines heterotopias as follows:
ones that have the curious property of being in relation with all the other sites, but in such a way as to suspect, neutralize, or invert the set of relations that they happen to designate, mirror, or reflect. These spaces, as it were, which are linked with all the others, which however contradict all the other sites, are of two main types” (Foucault, 1986: 24).

Foucault mentions two types of heterotopias, crisis heterotopias, which are devoted to individuals at the margins of the society such as the elderly, and deviation heterotopias, which are devoted to individuals whose behavior is deviant from norms such as mad people. Today, crisis heterotopias and deviation heterotopias are merging such as rest homes since old age is both a crisis and deviation from societal norms.

Foucault lists six main principles that govern heterotopias. Firstly, heterotopias occur in every culture. Secondly, one specific function of a heterotopia can change over time. Thirdly, a heterotopia can bring incompatible, even contradictory sites, together. Fourthly, heterotopias open onto “slices of time” (Foucault, 1986:26) that are certainly at a break from traditional understanding of time. Fifthly, heterotopias are both enclosed and penetrable sites since their entrance is reachable, but entrance is compulsory or requires certain rituals and conditions. Sixthly and finally, heterotopias function in relation to all other non-heterotopic sites. Heterotopias reflect them as they are like an illusion, or they can be organized just in opposition to real places as orderly and regularized.

In light of Foucault’s theorizations of heterotopia, this paper focuses on heterotopic spaces in “The Yellow Wallpaper” by Charlotte Perkins Gilman and “To Room Nineteen” by Doris Lessing. Through textual analysis of these short stories, it is aimed to find out functions and effects of the seclusion places as deviation heterotopias. It is argued that the rooms where heroines of these stories are confined are deviation heterotopias, for they result in the heroines’ finding their own selfhood, and they subvert traditional understandings of gender, time and space. Although both spaces act as heterotopias where the women find peace, freedom and empowerment, one heroine manages to carve out a space of signification for herself while the other heroine loses her own space and loses her life eventually.

3. Literature Review

“The Yellow Wallpaper” and “To Room Nineteen” are two short stories that are studied extensively in light of feminisms theories due to their raising questions as to women’s place in marriage, their role as mother and wife, psychological disorders, emotional abuse and search for identity. However, they are studied together rarely, and the scholarly works on these short stories focus either on the issues of madness or on marriage. To illustrate, Amro in “A Breakdown or a Breakthrough? ‘Madness’ in Charlotte Perkins Gilman’s ‘The Yellow Wallpaper,’ Doris Lessing’s ‘To Room Nineteen,’ and Khairiya Saqqaf in ‘In a Contemporary House’” problematize associations made between female sex and psychological ailments. Similarly, Seklem in “A Comparative Study of ‘The Yellow Wallpaper’ and ‘To Room Nineteen’” probes the heroines’ mental disorders. Bak, on other hand, focuses on the effects of panoptical forces on the heroine in “The Yellow Wallpaper.” Although space emerges as a central
theme in both short stories, which is also clear in the titles, little emphasis is given to space’s signification, agency and effect on the female protagonists. This study aims to fill in this gap and offer an insight into overlooked impact of space as a symptom and an agent in “The Yellow Wallpaper” and “To Room Nineteen.”

4. Discussion

Published in 1892, Gilman’s “The Yellow Wallpaper” outlasts as “an American feminist classic” (Lanser, 1989:415) as it is clear in its being studied by the forerunners of feminisms studies such as Gilbert, Gubar and Lanser. The story covers the whole summer the unnamed heroine spends in the rented mansion where she is staying with her husband, newborn baby and sister-in-law. Her condition is never stated openly, but the heroine shows symptoms of postpartum depression because her nerves are strained, and she cannot stand being around her baby. She is helped out by the maid, her sister-in-law and her husband. They, especially the husband, interfere her a lot and banish her from writing altogether. Despite a change of air and good food, the heroine does not get any better; eventually, her husband, who is also a physician, prescribes her the rest cure, confining her to the nursery at the top of the house. The woman wants to get out and stay in another room because she finds the wallpaper in the nursery terrifying at first. In time, she gets quite fond of the room due to the wallpaper because she realizes there is a trapped woman behind the bars of the wallpaper. She tries to release her by scrapping the paper each day. On the day of moving out, she manages to tear off the paper completely. Later, she creeps round and round in the room, stepping over her husband, who has fainted at the sight of his wife’s crazed look.

In “The Yellow Wallpaper,” space plays a great role over the course of the woman’s psyche and mindset. The woman is advised constantly to stay away from writing and thinking about her psychological condition by her husband because he thinks giving much heed to her condition will make it worse. That’s why, she decides to focus solely on the house and keeps to writing about the house in secret (Gilman 1995:481). In her writings, the house and especially the room where she is constrained are on the fore. From the very beginning, she observes that there is something quite strange about the mansion such as its being an “ancestral hall,” a “hereditary estate,” “haunted house,” and “queer” (Gilman, 1995:481) suggesting that there is too much history in the house like a gothic setting. She marks, “there is something strange about the house – I can feel it” (Gilman, 1995:482). The woman can feel the force of the house over herself in the early days. The house has agency and affects her, but she cannot pin down its force yet. When she takes to the nursery at the top of the house, her description of the room is in line with her description of the rest of the house. She notes that it is a “big, airy room,” but the wallpaper in the room is “committing every artistic sin” (Gilman, 1995:482). She finds the room ghastly because of the wallpaper; however, her reaction to its color and pattern is beyond mere dislike. She occasionally sees patterns “committing suicide – plunge off at outrageous angles, destroy themselves in unheard of contradictions” (Gilman, 1995:482), or even horrid figures looking like “a broken neck and two bulbous eyes” (Gilman, 1995:483).
She shows great resistance to the room because of the paper and begs for moving to another room downstairs that opens to the garden. However, her husband never accepts her request saying that if he gives way to her nagging, the rest will follow. The husband’s insistence on confining her to a room at the top of the house is quite unreasonable because a better room would help her a lot in her recovery process. Instead, he detaches her from the rest of the house and ends her connection with other people, creating yet another mad woman in the attic. It is clear that he constrains her to the room purposefully to keep the house intact from her illness. The woman’s room, therefore, turns into a heterotopia of deviation. Her behavior is deviant from what is expected from her as a mother and wife traditionally since she rejects her baby, and she does not do household chores. She cannot function within the house and act out her social and gender roles. She is disrupting the social order, so she is confined to the room(10,10),(990,992) where she is away from the sight of others. However, in her seclusion, the woman gains more confidence and starts to operate more freely in this deviation heterotopia in time.

Contrary to her initial reaction to the room and wallpaper, the woman starts to like them: “I’m getting really fond of the room in spite of the wallpaper. Perhaps because of the wallpaper” (Gilman, 1995:485). This suggests that she has gained ease with workings of this heterotopia. Foucault lists compulsory entrance and having an order of its own among the defining traits of heterotopias, and these traits can be seen in the room the woman is enclosed. To illustrate, the woman stays there out of compulsion, and other residents do not enter her room except for John who sleeps with her at night. At first, others’ entrance to the room is not strictly regulated, so Jennie and the maid visit the room occasionally. As the heroine gets accustomed to the room after realizing the woman behind the patterns of the wallpaper, she takes on a protective and an aggressive attitude. When another person enters the room, a feeling of unease surges inside her especially if the visitor is studying the wallpaper:

“I have watched John when he did not know I was looking, and come into the room suddenly on the most innocent excuses, and I’ve caught him several times looking at the paper! And Jennie too. I caught Jennie with her hand on it once. She didn’t know I was in the room, and when I asked her in a quiet, a very quiet voice what she was doing with the paper – she turned around as if she had been caught stealing” (Gilman, 1995: 488).

The woman wants to keep the room to herself only, so she closes the entrance of the room to others. In the end of the story, she literally locks John out of the room. She hides the key, making John try to open the door with an axe. She claims this space her own, regulates and constrains others’ entrance and asks for an explanation for their presence in the room when she catches them enter without her permission.

The room also has its own governing rules like any other heterotopia does, and it is organized in opposition to ordinary rules. To illustrate, the woman spends the night like it is the day. She is awake all night, studying the wallpaper and walking around the room while she spends the day in bed because it is the night when she can see the woman figure on the wallpaper best: “At night in any kind of light, in twilight,
candlelight, lamplight, and worst of all by moonlight, it becomes bars! The outside pattern I mean, and the woman behind it as plain as can be” (Gilman, 1995: 487). Like temporal conception, spatial conception is different from traditional understanding as it can be seen in her moving in circles around the room without a certain destination (Gilman, 1995: 488). Similarly, the borders of the room are not mentioned clearly, but they are mentioned in a haze. The room shows traits of a heterotopia also because it works in opposition to patriarchal order; it is a feminine space. The woman banishes John from the room wholly, and she also does not let Jennie into her room for she is the female representative of patriarchal order. Similarly, when the woman looks out of the window, she perceives only women passing by in the street, disregarding men. She also devotes the room to the liberation of the caged woman behind the bars, thus to her own liberation. Therefore, it can be argued that this room acts as a devotional heterotopia that has its own matriarchal order.

This devotional heterotopia provides space for the unnamed woman to liberate herself from the confinements of the world outside the room. In this room, she is free from oppressions of patriarchal order, teleological temporal and spatial conceptualization, and she can regulate the entrance to this heterotopia. By gaining ease within the heterotopia, she creates a space of her own and gains an upper hand over the forces that try to normalize and regulate her. In the beginning of the story she draws a meek and hopeless picture as to her condition. To illustrate, she says, “And what can one do?” (Gilman, 1995: 481) several times. She gives up submissive attitude and takes on an assertive and even aggressive attitude towards others, as it can be seen in her relationship with her husband. At first, she is treated like a baby and even called “a blessed little goose” (Gilman, 1995:483) by John. After she sets the woman in the wallpaper free, she starts to call names like “John dear,” “young man” and “that man” (Gilman, 1995: 492) on John in the same belittling attitude. Her dominance over him is even more apparent in the final scene where she creeps around the room and steps on him while he lays unconscious. She has always been uneasy about the way she is treated by John and Jennie, but she hides her opinion on them for she feels like a burden on them. For example, she says that Jennie is a lovely girl, and she only thinks of her wellness (Gilman, 1995: 482) and that John thinks the best for her (Gilman, 1995: 481). However, after she achieves liberation within the heterotopia, she openly cries her heart out, calling Jennie “the sly thing” (Gilman, 1995: 490) and rejecting John totally. The heterotopia provides her a space of existence that is free from constraints and oppressions because she finds her space of signification there.

“To Room Nineteen” is similar to “The Yellow Wallpaper” in its portraying a woman confined in a room, but it is differentiated from “The Yellow Wallpaper” in that the heroine willingly secludes herself to the room, rather than out of compulsion in this short story. Susan Rawlings is a stay-at-home mother of four. She is happily and reasonably married to Matthew Rawlings. They portray the perfect married couple traits such as raising kids, managing a big suburban house and inviting friends over. However, under this happy marriage mask, there is something rotten buried deep. In her middle ages, Susan confronts a grave reality, which is that her soul has always
belonged to her husband and kids, not to her. When her husband’s adultery and the youngest children’s starting school coincide, a big rupture in her understanding of herself and her family is created. She starts to lead a double life, seeming to leave the adultery issue behind, but never forgiving her husband. Similarly, she seems to be happy with the kid’s being in the school and having all the spare time to herself; however, she cannot stand being in home alone because she feels as if she has lost her soul. That’s why, she looks for a different place to which she can feel herself belonging.

First, she arranges a room at the top of the house solely for herself. She later books a hotel room, but the hotel owner disturbs her. Then, she takes a trip in Wales, but she cannot find peace there either. Lastly, she books a shabby hotel room, where she finds peace only to be disturbed soon. The last hotel room functions as a heterotopia, so in the remaining section of this paper, heterotopic characteristics of the room nineteen and how it is different from the other rooms where Susan takes shelter will be analyzed.

After her uneasiness within the house surges, Susan arranges the spare room at the top of the house to rest when she feels suffocated. Her children prepare a notice to put on the door saying “PRIVATE! DO NOT DISTURB!” (Lessing, 1993:2310), which is in fact quite disturbing with the capitalized letters and exclamation marks as if there is a sick person inside. Susan feels “even more caged there than in her bedroom” (Lessing, 1993:2310) eventually. All the same, the children get used to this room in time, and they forget about the rule of not trespassing. Soon, other members of the household start entering this room freely, and it turns into an ordinary room. Susan realizes that what she needs is a private room outside the house; otherwise, she will be disturbed by others again. Therefore, she settles down with a hotel room located in a remote district from her house. When she enters the room, she feels freedom for the first time:

“The room was ordinary and anonymous, and was just what Susan needed. She put a shilling in the gas fire, and sat, eyes shut, in a dingy armchair with her back to a dingy window. She was alone. She was alone. She was alone. She could feel pressures lifting off her” (Lessing, 1993: 2310).

The anonymity and ordinariness of the room comfort Susan. However, her peace is disturbed by the manageress, who is suspicious of her. She keeps pestering Susan with questions about her reason for being there, who she is and where she lives.

Susan realizes having peace of mind is impossible there; however, the brief moment of freedom she experienced in that room haunts her. She wants to revive that feeling by taking a trip to Wales on her own, for Wales is the place she knows to be the “remotest” (Lessing, 1993:2313). Although she is as far from home as possible, she feels the same pressure on her since she makes long telephone conversations with the children, Matthew and the char, Mrs. Parkes. She keeps thinking about household problems, feeling as if “the telephone wire holding her to duty like a leash” (Lessing, 1993:2313). She again understands that her whereabouts should be unknown to the household members; otherwise, she will not be free from her duties and roles as Susan
Rawlings the mother, the wife and the employer. She finds this space in Fred’s Hotel, in the room nineteen.

She makes an arrangement with the manager under the name Mrs. Jones; she books the same room for three days a week from ten until six and overpays him in return of asking no questions, which is an arrangement that will last for a year. In time, this hotel room becomes more like Susan’s home rather than the house she lives in (Lessing, 1993:2317). She likes the absence of “friendship” and “acquaintanceship” (Lessing, 1993:2313) in the hotel room and enjoys anonymity there. The hotel room functions as a heterotopia for Susan, as it is in line with Foucault’s discussion of hotel rooms acting as a heterotopia:

“Everyone can enter into these 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. I am thinking, for example, of the famous bedrooms that existed on the great farms of Brazil and elsewhere in South America. The entry door did not lead into the central room where the family lived, and every individual or traveler who came by had the right to open this door, to enter into the bedroom and to sleep there for a night. Now these bedrooms were such that the individual who went into them never had access to the family’s quarters; the visitor was absolutely the guest in transit, was not really the invited guest. This type of heterotopia, which has practically disappeared from our civilizations, could perhaps be found in the famous American motel rooms where a man goes with his car and his mistress and where illicit sex is both absolutely sheltered and absolutely hidden, kept isolated without however being allowed out in the open” (Foucault, 1986:26-27; emphasis added)

Susan can be anyone in the room nineteen without being disturbed and probed about her life. This aspect is what makes the room nineteen a heterotopia contrary to the room in Mrs. Townsend’s hotel. The manageress’s presence in the room and her efforts to provide comfort combined with her wondering about Susan make this room an ordinary place where she feels suffocated. On the other hand, in the room nineteen, Susan can get rid of her familial bonds and social roles, which is an act unacceptable by the society:

“What did she do in the room? Why, nothing at all. From the chair, when it had rested her, she went to the window, stretching her arms, smiling, treasuring her anonymity, to look out. She was no longer Susan Rawlings, mother of four, wife of Matthew, employer of Mrs. Parkes and Sophie Traub, with these and those relations with friends, school-teachers, tradesmen. She no longer was mistress of the big white house and garden, owning clothes suitable for this and that activity or occasion. She was Mrs. Jones, and she was alone, and she had no past and no future” (Lessing, 1993: 2316-2317).

In the room nineteen, she stops being the trespasser, but she becomes the owner of the room, so other clients that book the same room are the “invited guests” (Foucault, 1986: 27). They can enter the room, but they are in fact excluded. That’s why, Susan does not mind waiting when the room is booked (2318), or when the room still bears traces of the previous clients such as wrinkled bed covers, windows set wide open (Lessing, 1993:2318) or remnants of “powder on the glass” (Lessing, 1993: 2322).
Within the year she spends visiting the room nineteen, Susan regains her soul and freedom and empowers herself there, but she also grows detached from her family and gets more reckless about her behavior. Her husband is suspicious of her absence, so he tracks her down. When he interrogates her about the hotel room, she cannot do anything but “confess” that she has an illicit affair. She thinks this is a much more reasonable answer than saying that she spends every weekday in a hotel room all by herself. Now that Susan’s seclusion place where she takes shelter from her unfaithful husband and demanding children is revealed, the nurturing and secure aura of the room nineteen is spoiled. In her first visit after her conversation with Matthew, Susan realizes that nothing will be the same in this room again: “She went up to sit in her wicker chair. But it was not the same. Her husband had searched her out. (the world had searched her out.) The pressures were on her. She was here with his connivance” (Lessing, 1993: 2319).

The room nineteen stops functioning as a heterotopia for Susan as she regresses to the visitor, the guest in transit, position with her being there due to her husband’s permit. Although nothing is changed in the room, the room is not the same for Susan. She understands that she has lost her soul once again, and she has no chance to recall it. She realizes that she is a stranger in her own house too since the maid and the au pair girl along with her children are not accustomed to her being there during day time anymore. She is a visitor in her house as well, and she cannot connect with any of household members. Realizing that she has no place where she will not be an outsider, she visits the room nineteen for the last time and commits suicide in the room by turning on the gas. There are mixed interpretations of Susan’s committing suicide. Some researchers interpret the suicide as a protest stance and Susan’s rejecting her social roles and impositions made on her altogether. However, it is clear that suicide is the last resort of this homeless woman who is ironically the mistress of a big suburban house. The loss of the space where she has found her empowerment and existence makes her lose all her hopes as to freedom; thus, she commits suicide.

5. Conclusion

In the epilogue of “Of Other Spaces,” Foucault argues that the ship functions as a heterotopia because of its importance for civilizations:

“…you will understand why the boat has not only been for our civilization, from the sixteenth century until the present, the great instrument of economic development (I have not been speaking of that today), but has been simultaneously the greatest reserve of the imagination. The ship is the heterotopia par excellence. In civilizations without boats, dreams dry up, espionage takes the place of adventure, and the police take the place of pirates” (Foucault, 1986: 27).

Foucault defends that heterotopias open up spaces for alternative life styles and offer opportunities to ones that are outside the margins of society; thus, heterotopias nourish imagination and diversity. “The Yellow Wallpaper” and “To Room Nineteen” portray functions of heterotopias for women as the first shows the effects of retaining of a heterotopia while the latter shows the effects of loss of a heterotopia. The unnamed
woman in “The Yellow Wallpaper” manages to protect the heterotopia where she is secluded. In her room, she achieves empowerment and agency by keeping her husband and her sister-in-law away from entrance. Although she is confined there out of her will at first, she manages to liberate herself along with the woman figure on the yellow wallpaper. On the other hand, “To Room Nineteen” depicts social and psychological repercussions that might occur if a heterotopia is lost. Susan experiences empowerment and freedom from constraints of patriarchal order in the room nineteen where she confines herself willingly. However, her sense of protection and anonymity is betrayed by her husband. Once her location is revealed, and the room loses its heterotopic qualities for her, which leads up to her committing suicide.

Both in “The Yellow Wallpaper” and in “To Room Nineteen,” the rooms where heroines are confined are deviation heterotopias. They deviate from the reasonable order of patriarchal understanding because in these rooms they practice matriarchal order, non-teleological temporal and spatial understanding and claim the ownership of space. Written in different continents with a hundred years’ time between publication dates, both short stories reveal the link between women’s struggle for carving a space of signification and space, the importance of space for women and women’s owning spaces where they can feel free from physical, social and psychological constraints, which is beyond merely having “a room of one’s own.”
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