The term, ‘spatial’ refers to position, area, and size of things. The term is borrowed from Latin *spatium*, used with a sense of ‘space’. Space is, in terms of Science and Mathematics, is a dimension of height, depth, and width within which all things exist and move. It is an abstract concept in Geometry. In Physics, space is interval of time. In Geometry, space is a concept of set of points, having some specified structure. Thus in Science, it is known as ‘Euclidean’, ‘isotropic’, ‘infinite’, or an empty area.

But, in Humanities and Social Sciences, the term is extensively used with reference to the meaning of human existence and its interdisciplinary alliances. From geographical points of view, for example, space connotes a physical universe beyond the earth atmosphere. From astrological points of view, it means near vacuum extending between the planets and stars. But, in Humanities and Social Sciences, ‘space’ is studied in the context of social, geographical and psychological phenomena. Historians, geographers, critical theorists and philosophers like Martin Heidegger, Michel Foucault, Edward W. Said, Gaston Bachelard, Henri Lefebvre, Paul Carter, Edward Soja and Richard Rorty have mostly used the phrases like “ritual space”, “cognitive space”, “narrative space”, “social space”, “historical space”, “heterotopias” & “heterochronias”, “chronotopes” and so on. These concepts of space is discussed with reference to Martin Heidegger’s *Being and Time* (1927), Gaston Bachelard’s *The Poetics of Space* (1964), Georges Perec in ‘Species of Spaces and Other, Pieces’ (1974) Henri Lefebvre’s *The Production of Space* (1974), Said’s *Literature and Society* (1978), Bakhtin’s *The Dialogic Imagination* (1975) and, Homi K. Bhabha’s *The Location of Culture* (1994) are foundation books for understanding the concept of spatial criticism.
Heidegger, German philosopher of Being, presented the lecture, “Building Dwelling Thinking” (Bauen Wohnen Denken) to the Darmstadt Symposium on Man and Space on August 5, 1951. It is a must read essay for architects. The lecture is about the interrelation of world, thing, space, time, language, artwork with experience (Erlebnis) of Being. Relating the word ‘space’ to its origin words, stadium and spatium, Heidegger says, “Men’s relation to locales, and through locales to space, inheres in his dwelling. The relationship between men and space is none other than dwelling.” (395) In his other lectures titled, “The Things” and “Poetically Men Dwells” are additional to “Building Dwelling Thinking”. Bachelard’s Poetics of Space is a classic piece of spatial criticism. Said in Orientalism (1978; 2003: 54) and Lefebvre acknowledge Bachelard contribution to the conceptualization of space in its relation with human sensibility embedded in literature. He insisted to understand the ontology of space. Think about the extract taken from Engels’ The Condition of the Working Class in England:

A city like London, where One can roam about for hours without reaching the beginning of an end, without seeing the slightest indication that open country is nearby, is really something very special. This colossal centralization, this agglomeration of three and a half million people on a single spot has multiplied the strength of these three and a half million inhabitants a hundredfold ... But the price that has been paid is not discovered until later. Only when one has tramped the pavements of the main streets for a few days does one notice that these Londoners have had to sacrifice what is best in human nature in order to create all the wonders of civilization with which their city ..., that a hundred creative faculties that lay dormant in them remained inactive and were suppressed . . . There is something distasteful about the very bustle of the streets, something that is abhorrent to human nature itself. Hundreds of thousands of people of all classes and ranks of society jostle past one another; are they not all human beings with the same characteristics and potentialities, equally interested in the pursuit of happiness? . . . And yet they rush past one another as if they had nothing in common or’ were in no way associated with one another. Their only agreement is a tacit one: that everyone should keep to the right of the pavement, so as not to impede the stream of people moving in the opposite direction. No one even bothers to spare a glance for the others. The greater the number of people that are packed into a tiny space, the more repulsive and offensive becomes the brutal indifference1 the unfeeling concentration of each person on his private affairs. (Cited in Illuminations: 166. Italics Mine—VR)

Walter Benjamin (1892-1940) has cited Engel with reference to witnessing Baudelaire’s description of the masses whereas I cite Engel here to exemplify how a word ‘London’ encapsulates meanings of rest of the words used in the extract. The italicized part of a sentence exposits the relationship of people, place with a “tiny space” which refers to the whole existence of the Londoners. Furthermore, I would again quote Benjamin’s lines from the same source: “When Hegel went to Paris for the first time not long before his death, he wrote to his wife: “When I walk through the streets, people look just as they do in Berlin; they wear the same clothes and the faces are about the same-the same aspect, but in a large crowd” (167). It illustrates that a visit to places helps formulate the unique experiences which is worded in a semantic creation or the arts.

The idea of time and space culminates in Benjamin’s “The Work of Art in the Age of Mechanical Reproduction” in which he announces, “Even the most perfect reproduction of a work of art is lacking in one element: its presence in time and space, its unique existence at the place where it happens to be. This unique existence of the work of art determined the history to which it was subject throughout the time of its existence. This includes the changes which it may have suffered in physical condition over the years as well as the various changes in its ownership” (220). Benjamin’s idea of space has influence on the visual artists and theorists. His concept of “aura” that represents the authenticity of originality is null without understanding of time and space as two important subjects of human history. Spatial criticism traces the space of human history.
Edward W. Said as Progenitor of Spatial Criticism


Among the most influential of these scholars, Edward W. Said represents an important figure in the development of spatially oriented cultural criticism. Although it would be misleading and anachronistic to characterize him as a geocritic, Said remains a powerful precursor whose writings on a vast range of subjects and topoi offer indispensable resources for geocritics and other scholars interested in the relations among spatiality, representation, and cultural forms. In his commitment to a critical approach that gave due attention to the geographical and historical registers of both narrative and lived experience, Said was an early trailblazer for critics now working in spatial literary studies. (2015: 1)

The French philosopher Gaston Bachelard once wrote an analysis of what he called the poetics of space. The inside of a house, he said, acquires a sense of intimacy, secrecy, security, real or imagination homelike, or prisonlike, or magical. So space acquires emotional and even rational sense by a kind of poetic process, whereby the vacant or anonymous reaches of distance are converted into meaning for us here.

The best example of his spatial criticism is Culture and Imperialism (1993). I would give an example from the book which illustrates understanding the difference between the shift and a paradigm shift readings. The Conrad expert, Said studies Conrad’s fiction as if they are narratable spaces of the jungle, the desperate natives, the great river, Africa’s magnificent, ineffable dark life. These spaces were shifted by the West interpretative critics. Let us read two significant paragraphs of Said’s Culture and Imperialism:

Let us look at Conrad and Flaubert, writers who worked in the second half of the nineteenth century, the former concerned explicitly with imperialism, the latter implicitly involved with it. Despite their differences both writers similarly emphasize characters whose capacity for isolating and surrounding themselves in structures they create takes the same form as the colonizer at the center of an empire he rules. Axel Heyst in Victory and St. Antoine in La Tentatio-late works, both are withdrawn into a place where, like guardians of a magic totality, they incorporate a hostile world purged of its troubling resistances to their control of it. These solitary withdrawals have a long history in Conrad's fiction-Almayer, Kurtz at the Inner Station, Jim at Patusan, and most memorably Charles Gould in Sulaco; in Flaubert they recur with increasing intensity after Madame Bovary. Yet unlike Robinson Crusoe on his island, these modern versions of the imperialist who attempts self-redemption are doomed ironically to suffer interruption and distraction, as what they had tried to exclude from their island worlds penetrates anyway. The covert influence of imperial control in Flaubert’s imagery of solitary imperiousness is striking when juxtaposed with Conrad’s own representations.

Within the codes of European fiction, these interruptions of an imperial project are realistic reminders that no one can in fact withdraw from the world into a private version of reality. The link back to Don Quixote is obvious, as is the continuity with institutional aspects of the novel form itself, where the aberrant individual is usually disciplined and punished in the interests of a corporate identity. In Conrad’s overtly colonial settings, the disruptions are occasioned by Europeans, and they are enfolded within a narrative structure that is retrospectively resubmitted to European scrutiny for interpretation and questioning. One sees this in both the early Lord Jim and the later Victory: as the idealistic or withdrawn white man Jim, (Heyst) lives a life of somewhat Quixotic seclusion, his space is invaded by Mephistophelian emanations, adventurers whose subsequent malfeasance is examined retrospectively by a narrating white man.

Heart of Darkness is another example. Marlow’s audience is English, and Marlow himself penetrates to Kurtz's private domain as an inquiring Western mind trying to make sense of an apocalyptic revelation. Most readings rightly call attention to Conrad’s skepticism about the colonial
enterprise, but they rarely remark that in telling the story of his African journey Marlow repeats and confirms Kurtz’s action: restoring Africa to European hegemony by historicizing and narrating its strangeness. The savages, the wilderness, even the surface folly of popping shells into a vast continent—all these reaccentuate Marlow’s need to place the colonies on the imperial map and under the overarching temporality of narratable history, no matter how complicated and circuitous the results. (163-5)

Further he continues to compare the character Marlow’s historical spaces to two prominent writers of imperialism Sir Henry Maine and Sir Roderick Murchison who were known as massive cultural and scientific writers. However, Said justifies their works as unintelligible responses to paradigm shifts of the periods and there is nothing significant except the imperial context in them. If we read the extract, we find how the names of places are cited to reflect the contexts of the writers. He traces those human spaces that ‘describe how it was that the imperial European would not or could not see that he or she was an imperialist and, ironically, how it was that the non-European in the same circumstances saw the European only as imperial’ (162).

Fredric Jameson demonstrates a map reading of the “global space” in “Modernism and Imperialism” (1988) with reference to Joyce’s Ulysses and Conrad’s Heart of Darkness calling them literature of imperialism. He argues for tracing different spaces in the texts that recoordinates “the concept of style with some new account of the experience of space, both together now marking the emergence of the modern ... set of modernisms begins to flourish” (1988; 1990. p 64). He justified how the narrative places, landscapes, and houses spatially spot check the threads of imperialism in Irish literature esp. in Joyce’s modernism. Joyce’s experimental language is “nonlinguistic contingencies of modern life ... is itself a result of imperialism, which condemns Ireland to an older rhetorical past and to the survivals of oratory (...), and which freezes Dublin into an underdeveloped village in which gossip and rumor still reign supreme.” This remark is a remark of a man who knows about the history of the causes of WWI, WWII, and geography of Ireland, Britain and Africa that affect language of writer/writers, and writer/writers affect the states of the countries. The essay is full of historical, geographical, and literary references that reflect Jameson’s spatial reading of Joyce, Conrad, Virginia Woolf alongside “urban fabric”, psychological status of people of the countries etc.

The geographer Neil Smith’s Uneven Development: Nature, Capital and the Production of Space (1984) can be studied as formulator of idea of reading a literary text to analyze the reasons behind the productive spaces of commercial geography or commercial aesthetics in global era.

Foucault as explorer of Spatial Criticism

Foucault is much known for his theory of “power” of knowledge, biopolitics and history of sexuality. In all discussions of the concepts, he has used the word ‘space’ in many different places along with many references and paradigms. The ‘space of the transgression’, ‘language space’, ‘empty space’, ‘barred space’, ‘space of language’, ‘free space’, ‘space of nonexistence’, ‘space of madness’, ‘space of closure’ etc. for example, are effectively used in his works. His essay “Different Spaces” is thesis of the concept. In fact, the essay was first presented as a lecture to the Architectural Studies Circle on 14 March 1967. Robert Hurley translated the text and was first published in the October Issue of Architecture, Mouvement, Continuité (46-49) in 1984.

Foucault’s concept of “emplacements” (i.e. ensemble of relations) and its subjects “utopias” and “heterotopias” are great contributions to the emergence of spatial criticism. In his essay “Different Spaces”, Foucault, with reference to the concept of space given by Gaston Bachelard and spatial descriptions of the phenomenologists, describes that space is not void, null area, as seventieth century geoscientists and natural scientists, on the contrary, a space is ‘laden with qualities, first perception, our reveries, our passions, haunted by fantasy. He describes these spaces as internal spaces.

...our passions harbors qualities that are all but intrinsic; it is a light, ethereal, transparent space, or rather a somber, harsh, cluttered space. It is a space from on high, it is a space of peaks, or, on the contrary, it is a space from below, a space of mire, it is a space that can be fluid like running water, it
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is a space that can be fixed, solidified like stone or crystal. These spaces are primarily concerned with internal space. (177)

He adds a new concept of space i.e. “the space outside” (du dehors) which formulates our individual, social, political, national, global, and international life by constituting what he called “emplacements” where our gradual growth and decay take place, where, in terms of Foucault “the erosion of our life, our time, and our history takes place … this space that eats and scrapes away at us, is also heterogeneous space in itself.” Thus, “we live inside an ensemble of relations that define emplacements that are irreducible to each other and absolutely nonsuperposable.” In the light of ‘emplacements’, he describes set of relations, bundle of relations and web of relations referring to public locations, landscapes like trains, buses, streets, transits etc.; public domains, places like park, cafes, movie theaters, and beaches; and the emplacement of repose, closed or semi-closed like private rooms, houses, bed and so on respectively. On the basis of his conception, he proposes to study different kinds of emplacements in texts by “‘looking for the set of relations by which a particular emplacement might be defined’ and described ‘the set of relations that define emplacements of transit, streets, trains’.

Foucault has broadly studied these different spaces of existence into two categories: ‘utopias’ and ‘heterotopias’. He defines utopias as unreal emplacements.

Utopias are emplacements having no real place. They are emplacements that maintain a general relation of direct or inverse analogy with the real space of society. They are society perfected or the reverse of society, but in any case these utopias are spaces that are fundamentally and essentially unreal. (178)

On the contrary, Heterotopias are defined in terms of existing and localizable emplacements.

There are also, and probably in every culture, in every civilization, real places, actual places, places that are designed into the very institution of society, which are sorts of actually realized utopias in which the real emplacements, all the other real emplacements that can be found within the culture are, at the same time, represented, contested, and reversed, sorts of places that are outside all places, although they are actually localizable. Because they are utterly different from all the emplacements that they reflect or refer to, I shall call these places "heterotopias," as opposed to utopias; and I think that between utopias and these utterly different emplacements, these heterotopias, there must be a kind of mixed, intermediate experience, that would be the mirror. (178)

The Mirror Utopia-cum-Heterotopia Paradigm for Example

Foucault, in order to illustrate and justify the difference between the two emplacements he described as Utopias and Heterotopias, gives a paradigm of a mirror which functions as both kinds of emplacements utopias and heterotopias. He writes, “The mirror is a utopia after all… But it is also a heterotopia in that the mirror really exists, in that it has a sort of return effect on the place that I occupy. Due to the mirror, I discover myself absent at the place where I am, since I see myself over there…” (179)

Mirror is a utopia, an unreal place for what it reflects because the reflected one is not oneself. It is an unreal reflection of what is being reflected. However, mirror is a heterotopia for two reasons. Firstly, occupies a place and truly a thing of establishment. In itself, mirror is a real image, a real thing, a visible, localizable thing. You locate a mirror somewhere as per your requirements. You locate a mirror in your bathroom according to required size, in your bedroom and so on. Mirror is, thus a heterotopia too. Secondly, it makes a realization of identity of the reflected place of a being or a thing. Whoever looks at mirror, he/she realizes his/her image, though the image is a utopia. He writes, “From that gaze which settles on me … I come back to myself and I begin once more to direct my eyes toward myself and to reconstitute myself there where I am.” Thus, “the mirror functions as a heterotopia in the sense that it makes this place I occupy at the moment I look at myself in the glass both utterly real, connected with the entire space surrounding it, and utterly unreal.” (178-79)
On the basis of this social scientific study of different places that fetch existence to human life, Foucault introduces a new branch of knowledge he called, “heterotopology”, a discourse that describes both mythical and real spaces, imagined and realized, utopias and heterotopias.

a sort of systematic description that would have the object, in a given society, of studying, analyzing, describing, “reading,” … these different spaces, these other places, a kind of contestation, both mythical and real, of the space in which we live. (179)

**Six principles of Heterotopology i.e. description of heterotopias**

Foucault gives six principles of descriptions of heterotopias.

1. The first principle of heterotopology classifies different heterotopias. Heterotopias represent every human group, since it is diverse, is not the result of a single culture. Because of this aspect of heterotopias, Foucault has devised its two different kinds: Crisis heterotopias and heterotopias of deviation. Crisis heterotopias are observed in primitive society and heterotopias of deviations are observed in our society that represents the replacements of the crisis heterotopias.

a. **“Crisis heterotopias”** are traced in primitive societies that there are many forbidden places reserved for individuals. “There are privileged or sacred or forbidden places reserved for individuals who are in a state of crisis with respect to society and the human milieu in which they live. Adolescents, menstruating women, women in labor, old people, and so on. (179)

b. **Heterotopias of deviation**: those in which individuals are put whose behavior is deviant with respect to the mean or the required norm. These are the rest homes, the psychiatric hospitals; they are also, of course, the prisons, to which we should probably add old people's homes, which are on the borderline, as it were, between the crisis heterotopia and the deviation heterotopia, since after all old age is a crisis and also a deviation, seeing that in our society, where leisure activity is the rule, idleness forms a kind of deviation. (180)

2. The second principle of heterotopology traces the social formulation of heterotopia. In the course of time, society needs for making some heterotopias for its smooth functionaries. Foucault exemplifies it with 'cemetery' which, in ancient times, used to be placed in the courtyard of the church, later, its form was changed in the course of time, and people needed for individual graveyard, “each person began to have the right to his little box for his little personal decomposition” hereafter people begun to put shared graveyard or cemetery at the ‘edge of cities’. Alongside these changes of emplacements, people also begun to feel and realize that the graveyard or cemetery brought diseases, illness, and death to the city.

This great theme of disease spread by the contagion of cemeteries persisted at the end of the eighteenth century; and it was only in the course of the nineteenth century that cemeteries began to be moved toward outlying districts. Cemeteries then no longer constituted the sacred and immortal wind of the city, but the "other city" where each family possessed its dark dwelling. (181)

3. The third principle of heterotopology traces the ability of heterotopias. Heterotopias juxtapose several incompatible emplacements, theatre, cinema, garden etc. for example. For Foucault, the space of theatre, cinema, and garden juxtapose several emplacements of human activities, sensibilities, beliefs, habits, and, thus the whole existence of individuals and their worlds. He illustrates ability of these heterotopias with reference to Persian concept of ‘garden’ and its symbolic sacred meaning encapsulated through uses of carpet, the ‘reproduction of garden’ which encapsulates the entire world.

The garden is a carpet in which the entire world attains its symbolic perfection, and the carpet is a kind of garden that moves through space. The garden is the smallest parcel of the world and the whole world at the same time. Since early antiquity the garden has been a sort of blissful and universalizing heterotopia.” For example, zoological gardens (182).

4. The fourth principle refers to heterotopias which are connected with temporal discontinuities or break with traditional establishments or traditional emplacements. Thence, heterotopia begins to function and opens ‘heterochronia’ i.e. men’s absolute break with their traditional time. Thus, cemetery can be understood as a heterotopia that has to go through heterochronias. (182)
Organization and arrangements of heterotopias and heterochronias

a. Heterotopias of indefinite accumulation of time: Museums and Libraries: Foucault categorizes museums and libraries as heterotopias of time. Such heterotopias accumulate indefinite forms of places, ages, tastes, habits, cultures, and histories in one place that will not move. Such heterotopias are not ceased by time. The concept of such heterotopias remains the same from its inception to its contemporaneity. ‘The museum and the library are heterotopias that are characteristic of Western culture in the nineteenth century.’ Museums and libraries are heterotopias that satisfy “the idea of accumulating everything, the idea of constituting a sort of general archive, the desire to contain all times, all ages, all forms, all tastes in one place, the idea of constituting a place of all times that is itself outside time and protected from its erosion, the project of thus organizing a kind of perpetual and indefinite accumulation of time in a place that will not move-well, in fact, all of this belongs to our modernity.” (182)

b. Heterotopias of transitory accumulation of time: Museums and Libraries: Opposite these heterotopias, which are linked to the accumulation of time, there are heterotopias that are linked, rather, to time in its most futile, most transitory and precarious aspect. The festival of any kind falls under this head characteristic. These are heterotopias are absolutely chronic, timely, and solve temporal purposes of social groups. Indian special Pradarshni, (exhibition) weekly or yearly melās (fairs) are set up of special days or occasions for example, cover marvelous empty emplacements on the outskirts of cities. Such melās or fairs are dated yearly and are remarkable for food booths, stalls for unusual objects, wrestlers, snake ladies, fortune tellers.

c. Chronic heterotopia: The heterotopias that refer to the hybrid form of unique mixture of heterotopias and heterochronia. The sub-type of chronic heterotopia i.e. heterotopias transitory accumulation of time connotes the heterotopia of the festival and that of an eternity of accumulating time are combined in one place. Durgā puja melā, Ganpati melā, Rāmlīlā melā, Eid melā and so on, are exemplification of such unique combined heterotopias: heterotopia of transitory taste, fulfillment of desire of contemporary people and heterotopia of eternity. Durgā puja, Ganpati puja, Rāmlīlā are reminders and remainders of theological subjects and eternal times which are akin to the libraries and museums; and the way of celebrations are transitory i.e. every year people wish to bring about new way of celebration.

Foucault gives an example of “vacation village” for this heterotopia. He writes, “a new chronic heterotopia has been invented, the vacation village, those Polynesian villages which offer three short weeks of a primitive and eternal nudity to city dwellers”, that exemplify, “the two forms of heterotopia, the heterotopia of the festival and that of an eternity of accumulating time are combined: the straw huts of Djerba are in one sense akin to the libraries and the museums, for, by rediscovering Polynesian life one abolishes time, but time is also regained, the whole history of humanity goes back to its source as if in a kind of grand immediate knowledge.” (183)

5. The fifth principle of heterotopology refers to understand the heterotopias of force or permission, and the heterotopias of freedom. To these kinds of heterotopias we can term the closed and open heterotopia.

a. Getting entry to a windmill, barracks and prisons, submissions to rituals and purifications, are examples of such heterotopias. The heterotopias do not give freedom to do on one’s wishing. One has to perform on the command of certain ideology or on certain permission. Ablution, rituals of taking bath at death ceremony, Yagyopawīt samskār, Janeu samskār are purification activities in Indian society are the examples of such heterotopias. Foucault exemplifies this principle with Scandinavian saunas

b. Everybody can enter these heterotopian emplacements, but actually this is only an illusion: one believes he is going inside and, by the very fact of entering, one is excluded. Motel, hotel, rooms in large farms of Brazil, America motel rooms. The emplacements where you can enter at his own wishes, but nothing related to the emplacements belongs to you. You think that you are in while the truth is you are excluded from the property. You are no one to property. (183)
6. The sixth principle explains the extreme trait of heterotopias that are emerged in relation to the lost or remaining spaces. To such heterotopias, Foucault characterizes as illusionary and compensatory. Brothel and colonies are two extreme types of heterotopias.
   a. Heterotopias that create a space of illusion “that denounces all real space, all real emplacements within which human life is entangled, as being even more illusory.” Famous brothels are examples. (183)
   b. Heterotopias that “create a different space, a different real space as perfect, as meticulous, as well-arranged as ours is disorganized, badly arranged, and muddled. This would be the heterotopia not of illusion but of compensation” (184). Such heterotopias caused general organization of terrestrial space and residential places with civilized surroundings where human perfection was effectively achieved. For examples, establishments of new colonies for family, societies, coaching and training centers, colonies of Jesuits founded in South America etc.

In concluding paragraph, Foucault gives a paradigm of ship which is symbolic of floating heterotopias. It has no end, sails at its own, is self-enclosed and self-exposed. It is boundless. It occupies its own emplacements. He ends the essay saying that “from the sixteenth century up to our time, the ship has been at the same time not only the greatest instrument of economic development, of course, but the greatest reservoir of imagination. The sailing vessel is the heterotopia par excellence. In civilizations without ships the dreams dry up, espionage takes the place of adventure, and the police that of the corsairs.” Foucault does not directly exemplified the ship paradigm of heterotopias. I think he refers to our wisdom, reason, dream, imagination, thinking process, consciousness and deeds sailed by the desire etc. are the emplacements of medium and source of our expression. And, they are boundless.

The simplification of Foucault’s essay “Different Spaces” solves two purposes here: first, we understood that human existence in its entirety is nothing but a symbolic narration of different spaces. We do not live in void spaces, but each space is an emplacement of each human activity. Human activity is perched on emplacements. Second, Foucault, on the basis of the study of heterotopology essentialized in “Different Spaces”, can be justified as one of the founders of spatial criticism, though he never used the term, spatial criticism in his works. He used the term “aesthetics of existence” many a times in his works. And, the term can never be understood unless one understands his concept of heterotopology—the description of emplacements and heterotopias, and heterochronias.

Robert says that the spatial turn in the humanities and social sciences has offered an explosion of innovative multidisciplinary academic scholarship. Spatially oriented literary studies, whether working under the signature of literary geography, literary cartography, geophilsophy, geopoetics, geocriticism, geopsychoanalysis or the spatial humanities have reframed or transformed contemporary criticism by focusing attention, in various ways, on the dynamic relations among space, place, and literature. In his words, “Reflecting upon the representation of space and place, whether in the real world, in imaginary universes, or in those hybrid zones where fiction meets reality, scholars and critics working in spatial literary studies are helping to reorient literary criticism, history, and theory.” (2015: ix) On the basis of my reading, I generalize the following points are taken care for Spatial studies in the arts:

- Identification of the representation of place in literary works,
- Comprehension of the relations between literature and geography,
- Tracing the historical transformation of literary, critical, paracritical i.e. causes and reasons for and behind the critical and transformational changes come up in the course of time, and cartographic practices, and
- Comprehension of the difference between a shift (to examine any text to avoid its most significant aspects) and a paradigm shifts (to examine any text to include all factors of the changes in formulation of approach and underlying assumptions of the arts) embedded in the text
- Studying the facile distinction between real and imaginary places.

III
Nature

Spatial Criticism develops an interdisciplinary or transdisciplinary methods and practices, frequently making productive connections to developmental studies, architecture, art history, geography, history, philosophy, politics, social theory, public policies and urban studies. Because, it is not limited to the spaces of the so-called real world or virtual world or a particular life-world or world-view, however, it connects us with what Edward Said called “real-and-imagined” places we experience in literature as in life. Spatial criticism examines literary representations not only of places themselves, but of the experience of place and of displacement, while exploring the interrelations between lived experience and a more abstract or unrepresentable spatial network that subtly or directly shapes it. Soja theorizes about the tendency to transform real space into an imaginary place, using the example of Los Angeles, a city that, according to a famous slogan, is really “seventy-two suburbs in search of a city.”

The geographer Edward Soja in Postmodern Geographies: The Reassertion of Space in Critical Social Theory (1989) looks at “real-and-imagined” with reference to Lefebvre’s terminology. Soja’s concept of ‘third space’, which is akin to Augeé’s idea: “We come ... from a state where the fictions feed the transformation of the imaginary into the real to a state where the real attempts to reproduce the fiction... In urban space, and in social space in general, the distinction between reality and fiction becomes blurred.” That means the difference between reality and fiction are shown in literature and visual art as if there is no difference between them at all. As Freud, being a doctor by profession, gives examples from Greek literature and Shakespeare’s characters as if they are living beings in order to justify his theories of human abnormal psychology. In the very way, postmodern geographers observe realities of the world as if they represent human existence. Augé has illustrated “the real copies fiction” in Impossible Voyage and described Disneyland Paris, Center Parcs in Normandy, Mont-Saint-Michel, and the L’Oreal factory in Aulnay-sous-Bois. Bertrand Westphal’s Geocriticism: Real and Fictional Spaces describes that the space where innumerable transitory real spaces transgress their status and communicate with fictional spaces; where real spaces copy and mime to transform into fictional spaces are described with “third space”. The postmodern literature and art focus on such realities: the hybrid realities. What I want to suggest here is that spatial criticism also traces the threads of such derealised realities through which our actual life is reflected. This is a confused state of real-and-imagined or ‘realinimagined’ in term of Soja. (2011: 88) A spatial critic dismantles the oppositional nature, decided by the classics, between real and imagined, fact and fiction and so on.

A spatial critic engages with Dickens’s London, Baudelaire’s Paris, Rushdie’s India, Naipaul’s Britain, or Joyce’s Dublin, Beckett’s Paris. Spatial critics have also explored the otherworldly spaces of literature, such as those to be found in myth, fantasy, science fiction, video games, film or television, music, comics, computer programs, and cyberspace. Emily Johansen’s Cosmopolitanism and Place: Spatial Forms in Contemporary Anglophone Literature, Robert T. Tally Jr’s edited volume Literary Cartographies: Spatiality, Representation, and Narrative, and his The Geocritical Legacies of Edward W. Said: Spatiality, Critical Humanism, and Comparative Literature are examples of spatial criticism.

An emerging scholar, Phillip E. Wegner in his “Spatial Criticism: Critical Geography, Space, Place, and Textuality” alludes to celebrated lines “All the world’s a stage...” of William Shakespeare’s As You Like It (II. vii. ll.139-143) by relating it with Michel Foucault’s concept of space according to which indefinability of space defines itself and its power to reflect the existence of human being. The essay attempts to introduce us to research reviews of spatial criticism. In doing so, he bifurcate the concept of space in terms of mathematics and sciences from the concept of space given by Foucault, Lefebvre, historian Paul Carter, and geographer Edward Soja. Foucault goes on to argue:

For all those who confuse history with the old schemas of evolution, living continuity, organic development, the progress of consciousness or the project of existence, the use of spatial terms seems to have an air of an anti-history. If one started to talk in terms of space that meant one was hostile to time. (Foucault, 1980, 70)
The Australian historian Paul Carter, even more directly echoing Shakespeare’s lines, describes the dominant narrative mode of what he calls modernity’s ‘imperial history’ as one ‘which reduces space to a stage, that pays attention to events unfolding in time alone . . . Rather than focus on the intentional world of historical individuals, the world of active, spatial choices, empirical history of this kind has as its focus facts which, in a sense, come after the event’ (Carter, 1987, xvi). Wegner thinks that the idea of Carter is much akin to the idea of character and points of view of the realist Henry James, who thinks that characterization through actions of the character is the complex psychology of characters. A character is ‘space’, a ‘setting’, or a ‘stage’ upon who subsumes into the space of existence.

Thus, we can see literature as spatial spectrum of our existence. Theorists of spatial criticism observe life and literature as space of archeological existence. For scientific investigators space is an undefinable subject but for social and humanistic scientists space is a totality of human existence. We fight for our space which is not above the sky but is traceable entity in human society and all formulation and formulators of anthropomorphic identities and establishments.
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