UDC 821.111.09 Gaskell, E.
911.3
Original scientific paper
Received on 30 October 2011
Accepted for publication on 15 November 2011

The Novel as Cultural Geography: Elizabeth Gaskell's *North and South*

Borislav Knežević
Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences
University of Zagreb
bknezevi@ffzg.hr

The article examines the work of cartography in the 1854/5 Gaskell novel *North and South*, which has long been considered an example of the genre of the industrial novel dealing with capital/labor relations. The novel is analyzed as a complex exercise in the mapping of national space, which involves the creation of a map stretching from the global to the domestic. An argument is made that in the mid-19th century the English novel took it upon itself to take part in the articulation of knowledge about society that the novelists felt was necessary at a time when society was rapidly changing and new discourses on social relations were needed. The article claims that the spatiality in Gaskell's novel needs to be read in relation to three historical coordinates: the topical imperative of the condition of England debate, the work of imagining the nation that characterizes the novel as a genre, and the ability of the novel as a genre to narrativize the mediations between the private and the public: in case of *North and South*, there is a clear example of mediating conventions of domestic fiction and social-issue topical literature.

Much as the title of *North and South* (1854-5) advertises an exercise in cultural geography, the novel has received little critical attention for its map-making work. The text has been almost exclusively read in the context of the industrial novel and the condition of England debate in the 1840s and 1850s, but even in that context most influential critics dealing with the industrial novel have focused primarily on *Mary Barton*, Gaskell's first industrial novel, whereas *North and South* has received far less critical attention. In both her industrial novels Gaskell centered on the relationship between capital and labor, attending to a whole array of questions dominating the imagination of middle-class authors who took part in this debate: conditions of work and life of the industrial working classes, attitudes of employers and workers to one another, strikes, and the general character of industrial capitalism and industrial relations. Gaskell's narratives were in fact more ambitious in their engagement with the realities of contemporary industrial relations. Unlike Dickens's *Hard Times*, which framed a general observation of the plight of the industrial poor in a characteristically Dickensian melodrama largely

unsustained by attention to either the actualities of working class culture or the intellectual problems of interpreting industrial capitalism,[1] and unlike Disraeli's *Sybil*, which rested on the idiosyncratic historiographic discourse of its author that had little to do with the realities of labor/capital relations but much with his project of rejuvenating the Tory party and Tory ideology, the Gaskell novels were meticulously detailed in their handling of the historical realities and discourses they engaged, and were certainly more socially realist, in the broadest sense, than the other texts. In this regard, *North and South* differs from *Mary Barton*, as has often been remarked, in that its portrayal of labor/capital relations is less concerned with conflict and more with the possibility of mutual understanding.[2] Permeated with both a documentarist representation of the circumstances of working-class life and a highly articulate engagement with contemporary issues of political economy and class politics rendered through dialogues among the chief characters, the novel is a remarkably ambitious ideological foray into a highly contested area of social analysis.

In addition, *North and South* is also a complex formal affair in its own right, bringing together a tradition of the domestic novel, whose most significant earlier practitioner was Jane Austen, and the predilection of the Victorian novel for intense immersion in the most public issues of the day. But my primary interest in this essay is on the work of Gaskell's spatial imagination in this novel, that is, the narrative procedures employed to delineate what is meant to be a map of the nation (for of course the title already suggests the mapping of two parts of national cultural geography). Margaret Hale, the novel's female protagonist, provides the primary narrative of cartography in the novel, organized by her various travels in different social spaces. On the one hand, she experiences displacement from a relatively genteel life in the south to the industrial north, which provides the stage for the novel's exercise of comparative cultural geography. In addition, she

---

[1] In a brief but influential account of the industrial novels, Raymond Williams succinctly put it: "*Hard Times* is less imaginative observation than an imaginative judgment" (92). While Williams admired Dickens's depiction of contemporary industrial capitalism, and especially its greed, the novel in general he saw as an expression of an "adolescent" position. "As a whole response, *Hard Times* is more a symptom of the confusion of industrial society than an understanding of it" (96-97). Somewhat reluctantly, Williams's account implies that Gaskell's vision was more observing, to say the least. See Raymond Williams, *Culture and Society 1780-1950*. New York. Columbia University Press, 1983.

[2] *Mary Barton* was published in 1848, and Gaskell writes that "the idea which I have formed of the state of feeling among too many of the factory-people in Manchester, and which I endeavoured to represent in this tale (completed above a year ago), has received some confirmation from the events which have so recently occurred among a similar class on the Continent" (xxxvi). In other words, Gaskell saw her novel as a cautionary tale about the level of working-class discontent. In *North and South* a few years later, there is still much consideration of the possibility of violent class conflict, but overall the narrative is constructed around the idea of replacing the politics of antagonism with the politics of social accommodation.

develops a relationship with working-class characters she visits in a charitable but also a friendly capacity, in the manner of what Dorice Williams Eliot identified as the historically and culturally specific trope of the female visitor (an upper- or middle-class woman visiting the poor to dispense charitable help and counsel),[3] a figure that would have been readily recognizable to contemporary audiences. With equal willingness to learn, Margaret moves into the worlds of the industrial working class as well as their capitalist "masters." Margaret repeatedly travels to and from the north and the south, and is found also in London on several occasions, participating in the world of the lower ranks of the country's genteel society. Altogether, the novel presents a complex map of its world, or to be more specific, a set of complex maps, with emphasis on the changing relations between different kinds of social spaces, politics and economies. But while the novel is indisputably interesting for the character of its overall social ideology, in particular with regard to labor/capital relations, this essay is not centrally engaged in reconstructing such an ideology, albeit some gestures in that direction will necessarily have to be made. Rather, my reading of the novel is constructed as an explication of the idea that Gaskell fortuitously exploited a unique characteristic of the novel as a genre, its default capacity for the blending of the public and the private, and thus created a text that presents an exemplary clear case of the novel as a form of cultural geography. This will require a brief but necessary reference to the social and geographic world of Jane Austen, which may help us to assess the work of the Gaskell novel regarding the cultural conventions of domestic fiction, but also regarding the need of including the domestic space in the mapping of larger social spaces and dynamics. Altogether, the ambition of this essay is not to provide an exhaustive analysis of the novel, but rather to attempt to delineate the work of cartography in the text, and, finally, to examine the cultural assumptions that such novelistic work of cartography relies on. A particularly significant feature of the industrial novel in its participation in the condition of England debate was precisely the attempt of the various writers to reflect on the problematic of the nation, its condition as well as it social makeup. In that regard, Gaskell stands out for the astuteness of her pursuit of social cartography as part of a novelistic examination of contemporary social forces, structures and conditions.

An Industrial Novel

The protagonist of the novel, Margaret Hale, is a domestic woman who finds herself on a mission to acquire knowledge of society, which takes her outside the narrow confines of the home. Perhaps all the more uniquely qualified to explore the wide world outside her home because she has no socially sanctioned role in it, Margaret Hale is directly or indirectly engaged in many practices of mapping the

[3] Dorice Williams Elliott, "The Female Visitor and the Marriage of Classes in Gaskell's North and South." *Nineteenth-Century Literature* 49.1 (1994): 21-49.

social and geographical spaces around her. The exercise of cultural cartography is hinted at by the title of the novel, *North and South* (presumably suggested by Charles Dickens[4]), which refers to mid-19th century England with its polarization between the industrial north of the country and the metropolitan and rural south. While certainly not the first to observe it, Gaskell was perceptive enough in 1854 to accept Dickens's suggestion and give a label to the spatial reorganization of England that was being brought about by the industrial revolution; in addition, the novel implies the existence of uneven social developments in the country, and attributes this unevenness to regional cultural specificities. In spite of the binarism of the title, much of the focus of this industrial novel is predominantly on industrialization and industrial relations in the northern town of Milton-Northern (a pseudonym for Manchester). At this time, in the middle of the 19th century (the time in which the story is set), the industrial revolution was still a relatively new thing, but already had a considerable history which made obvious its great power of social transformation, as the cotton-mill owner Thornton states in the novel: "The whole machinery of the cotton trade is so new […] Seventy years ago what was it? And now what is it not?" (124). However, we know today that the mid-19th century, the time when Dickens, Disraeli and Gaskell were publishing their industrial novels, was also the cusp of another historical process—the beginning of the decline of British industrial supremacy, something that Gaskell's novel already began to register in its attention to the gradual decline of the economic power of the Milton-Northern millocracy, primarily due to the rise of American competition. The novel depicts the industrial world of the northern town at a point of crisis: a deepening conflict between capital and labor amid a trade downturn, rising competition, disputes over wages, intensified union activity and strikes, and attempts by the capitalists to import cheap labor from Ireland. Gaskell has Thornton the industrialist propose an evolution in the development of industrial capitalism from the time of the first "cotton-lords" and "the tyranny they exercised over their work-people" (124), to his own time, when, in his view, "the power of masters and men became more evenly balanced; and now the battle is pretty fairly waged between us" (125); Thornton sets himself up from the start as a different kind of "master." Some changes in industrial relations were occasioned by factory legislation in the 1840s, which slightly lessened the harsh exploitation of labor that characterized the early stage of industrialization; at the same time, there were industrialists who were interested in creating better working conditions for their workers, realizing there were long-term benefits for productivity and social accommodation. In the Gaskell novel, Thornton gradually evolves into one such industrialist: from initially regarding capital/labor relations as a "battle," he increasingly comes to view it as a process requiring a higher level of cooperation (a stance that carries the novel's message about industrial relations).

While the novel is not in any way an extensive study of the south, with the bulk of its narrative taking place in the northern town, Gaskell chose an

[4] According to Rosemarie Bodenheimer, "North and South: A Permanent State of Change," p. 281.

ingenious focalizing device in order to highlight the very process of comparative cultural cartography; namely, in Margaret Hale she created a protagonist who is an outsider to the problematic that needs to be mapped, and this outsider comes equipped with a measure of distance, possibly even a critical distance. Margaret is an outsider to the issues of industrial relations both as a woman and as a southerner with genteel connections (no matter how feeble they are). In this regard *North and South* is quite different from Gaskell's first industrial novel, *Mary Barton*, insofar as in Margaret she could present an actively dialoguing voice, which is outside the conflict between labor and capital, but which can enter into conversation with both in its capacity as intermediary (in *Mary Barton* the narrative did not allow for such a personalization of either the very idea of social dialogue or the practice of mediation). The closed dynamic of an industrial city, which is the stage of *Mary Barton*, is replaced in *North and South* by a more ambitious attempt at mapping labor/capital relations within larger constellations of power and economy, and some of this mapping is enabled by Margaret's geographic background and social habitus. In addition, Margaret herself is far from remaining set in her ways: in the process of socializing with the denizens of the northern town, her own views undergo a slight evolution, at the very least through her appreciation of industry (in opposition to the genteel abhorrence of economic effort which Margaret affects early on in the story), and in a gradual abandonment of the genteel deference to social hierarchies in favor of social dialogue among members of different groups she increasingly comes to define as equals. In the context of the intense contemporary debate on the condition of England, Gaskell created a surprisingly egalitarian character in Margaret Hale, thus joining the debate in a much more democratic spirit than someone like Carlyle (who fantasized about paternalist and authoritarian solutions to capital/labor relations), or someone like Disraeli (who similarly entertained a medievalist model of fealty as the desirable model of industrial relations). Gaskell rejected the otherwise popular mid-Victorian paternalist discourses, advocating a fundamental human equality with the explicit goal of fostering mutual understanding and cooperation between the industrial classes of labor and capital (at the end of the story, the narrator states that the industrialist Thornton and the worker Higgins had each "begun to recognize that 'we have all of us have human heart,'" 511[5]). The novel features a series of dialogues between Margaret and Higgins, and Margaret and Thornton, in which all characters eventually redefine their own initial views, with Margaret serving as a mediator who herself changes the way she relates to social issues.

[5] Gaskell uses here a quote from William Wordsworth's "The Old Cumberland Beggar." The narrator expects that between the capitalist and the worker "arose that intercourse, which though it might not have the effect of preventing all future clash of opinion and action, when the occasion arose, would, at any rate, enable both master and man to look upon each other with far more charity and sympathy, and bear with each other more patiently and kindly" (512-13).

The Austen Connection

It is necessary, both in order to analyze the novel's spatial imagination and to analyze its cultural ideologies, to recognize the complex relationship *North and South* has with the world of Jane Austen. To start with, the beginning of the novel interestingly presents a series of false starts of emplotment, the sum of which marks a difference from Jane Austen's world of half a century before. We are first introduced to Margaret Hale in a setting which is already not quite her own, as she is visiting with her somewhat socially more prestigiously placed relatives in London, her second home away from her father's country parsonage in the south. The setting is already a departure from Austen's consistent refusal to portray London directly, which was the logical consequence of her centering of national culture in a network of southern provincial estates. The beginning of the Gaskell novel impresses on the reader the sense of the unparalleled importance of London on the national map, as an intersection of conduits of power, influence and prestige that somehow stitches together a national culture that is increasingly becoming aware of its continually evolving internal differentiations. It is at this London location that the novel announces its unwillingness to reproduce the Austenian exclusive narrative focus on the country life of the country's landed elites, and Austen's staging of the countryside as the arena for her idea of a changing marriage market increasingly affected by the quiet empowerment of independently minded womanhood. In the Gaskell novel, the London setting is immediately coded as the site of the initial dislocation away from the Austenian paradigm, inasmuch as Margaret is immediately rendered radically different from her cousin Edith. This is a difference not unlike the one between Elizabeth and Jane Bennet from *Pride and Prejudice*; however, in the Austen novel the independence of Elizabeth's culture of mind is reintegrated into the social order that she thereby changes ever so slightly, whereas in the Gaskell novel there is no such ready and subtle possibility of social compromise to be metaphorized by marriage. The novel's opening chapters clearly engineer a departure from an Austenian constellation of the marriage market. Admittedly, Margaret's rejection of Lennox the lawyer could be regarded as equivalent to Elizabeth's or Emma's rejection of suitors unsuited to their idea of marriage as affective companionship, but Gaskell's next narrative twist, Mr Hale's abdication of his position in the Church of England takes the family out of a world, in the words of Rosemarie Bodenheimer, "more stable than even Jane Austen's" (283). The family is no longer rooted in a relationship to land and the patrician order, but now thrust into the realm of commercial intellectual labor, with Margaret's father now struggling to carve out an entirely new social position for himself and the family. In Austen's world the female protagonists often experience the threat of being cast out of the social network of landed influence, but are never quite forced out of it, and their continued association with it simply suggests a need for adaptation of the social network. In Margaret Hale, however, Gaskell creates a character whose sensibilities are formed by the social world of the landed elites, but whose connections with it are for all purposes severed, meaning she can no longer expect to marry into that world.

There is thus a double renunciation at the beginning of the story of the novel, excluding Margaret from the possibilities of the conventional marriage of convenience as well as the social resources of the patrician connection. The outcome is the daunting prospect of self-reliance; while the Hales are not exactly pauperized, they find themselves much reduced in circumstances and forced to rely on the value of Mr Hale's labor in the marketplace for intellectual services such as tutoring—the condition that Mrs Hale fails to reconcile herself to, unlike Margaret, who is quick to begin searching for a new social role for herself. It develops into a twofold role, with Margaret on the one hand performing as her father's second in the often impassioned debates with the industrialist Thornton on industrial relations; and, on the other hand, appearing in the role of the female visitor, striking up a relationship with the working-class Higginses. The novel thus enters a very different generic terrain, in the sense that the social reality largely ignored in the domestic fiction of the Austenian kind (such as that of the Brontë sisters, who were contemporaries of Gaskell's) is admitted into the realm of representation in a manner so abrupt and ambitiously comprehensive that there remains the impression that the text ends up not quite knowing how to deal with that much novelty (George Eliot would soon offer a way out of the quandary by re-personalizing the narratives of the political and the economic firmly within the Bildungsroman motif of calling). True enough, some of the conventional melodramatic tropes are still used in the Gaskell novel, for instance in the subplot featuring the mutiny of her brother Frederick and the slightly sensationalist style of the emplotment of his clandestine return to England. Even more importantly, the marriage market narrative is in effect restored after the initial renunciation of it in the Margaret/Lennox episode: the Margaret Hale / John Thornton relationship adheres in the long perspective to the general conventionalities of the marriage plot (albeit this is not a marriage in the Austenian sense that focuses by and large on a single social class). In reconfiguring its narrative around the marriage plot the novel seems to risk subordinating its other, vast social themes to it—which quite a few readers have found to be a flaw in the novel's design that oversimplifies its social vision. However, I am rather inclined to call for an appreciation of the subtleties of the novel's design, instead of seeing it as merely an agglomeration of simple analogies dominated by a central narrative. If anything, the accomplishment of the novel is in its managing of quite diverse narratives, with some of them aspiring to convey the complexities of industrial relations while others unfold along the lines of the common Victorian novelistic trope of a turbulent romantic relationship between two strong-willed characters (*Jane Eyre* comes readily to mind).

Let us here reflect on the structure of the social world of Jane Austen's novels, classically described by Raymond Williams:

> […] while it is a community wholly known, within the essential terms of the novel, it is as an actual community very precisely selective. Neighbours in Jane Austen are not the people actually living nearby; they are the people living a little less nearby who, in social recognition, can be visited. What she sees across the land is a network of propertied houses and families, and

> through the holes of this tightly drawn mesh most actual people are simply not seen. (166)

This image places emphasis on the chief term of Williams's analysis of the countryside, the knowable community, a term which in itself is an empty abstraction that can be meaningfully discussed only in relation to concrete historical examples and ideologies of such knowability, and much of the interest of Williams's analysis can be attributed to the attention he pays to the role of literary texts in articulating such ideologies over the course of the recent centuries. A good Austenian example of one such ideology (although not discussed in Williams) is found in *Mansfield Park*, where Edmund Bertram explains his choice of the clerical vocation in a conversation with the city-bred Mary Crawford by building an argument about the superiority of country over city because of the knowability of small country communities which allows the country clergyman a much greater opportunity to provide ethical guidance than is available to a city clergyman. In addition, Edmund also develops an argument that such small countryside communities are more representative of the nation than a large city such as London.[6] It is not difficult to see that the knowability of Edmund's idea of community is predicated on exclusion in class terms, for Edmund's congregation, it goes without Edmund actually saying it, would be composed of, as Williams wrote, the "people [...] who, in social recognition, can be visited." Yet this is certainly not the whole story of the community as Austen saw it: the neighborhood is indeed defined by the residential local gentry, but the driving force of the Austenian narratives is not exhausted by a neighborhood dynamic, but rather it is a national affair, inasmuch, as Franco Moretti argues, as the Austen novels are about the national marriage market: "They take a local gentry, like the Bennets of *Pride and Prejudice*, and join it to the national elite of Darcy and his ilk" (18). Even if Moretti's observation is not true of all of Austen's plots (*Emma* or *Mansfield Park*, for instance), Moretti has a point in calling attention to what he calls Austen's "middle-sized world" (22), indicating that a species of cartographic imagination informed her narratives by setting them within the concept of national space (however exclusively conceived).

It is in this sense then, that Gaskell inherits some of this kind of imagination. Along the way, she has put together a map of the national space much more detailed, and much more socially inclusive: she peoples this national map with industrialists and industrial working classes, in a way that parallels Dickens's mapping of London to foreground the lower middle classes and the urban poor. But in doing so, she seems still to retain the Austenian idea of the national marriage market (which has prompted critics to see marriage as the central metaphor of social negotiation). Yet, as my reading will further show, the novel

---

[6] As they discuss the public conduct of the clergy, Edmund says to Mary Crawford: "You are speaking of London. I am speaking of the nation at large" (78), a clear indication of the simple coordinates of Austen's cultural geography. (Jane Austen, *Mansfield Park*. London: Penguin Books, 1996.)

does not fix on a central metaphor—rather, it uses conventional plot devices to suggest a process, or even a map, of social interactions between different types of spaces and geographies.

The Traveling Cartographer

In the novel Margaret is constantly going places. Again one thinks of Austen's women characters who tend to do a lot of walking, visiting one another and visiting with the neighbors in the sense identified by Williams (that is, visiting those who can in a social sense be visited), which in turn often involves large distances and substantial walks; indeed, Austen's women are among the first tourists in the modern sense, traveling to view scenic landscapes and historic buildings and estates. Gaskell's Margaret Hale is obviously a relative of Austen's characters, perhaps even more agile in her own time as she takes advantage of the nation-wide train service; she is certainly more independent. In terms of narrative chronology, the novel takes Margaret from the drawing rooms of the lower ranks of fashionable London society to the bucolic, Austen-like setting of the countryside in the south (where Margaret does a lot of walking, sometimes visiting the rural poor) to the smoggy bustle of a northern industrial city, where she also does a lot of walking (sometimes visiting the industrial poor). Her father's decision to leave the Church of England cuts the father off from the dominant system of social distinction and plucks the daughter from the conventionalities of the Austenian marriage market, but it also releases her from some of the social rigidities associated with the world of gentility. The displacement and the subsequent wandering of Margaret Hale serve to map out a system of economic and cultural relations which the protagonist is initially unfamiliar with, and which is supposedly a novelty to the audience too. Margaret moves around England with remarkable ease thanks to the national system of railway lines, only recently laid down, and the novel takes a great deal of interest in detailing her trips up and down the country. Her mobility is crucial in getting her family settled in Milton-Northern comfortably: she briefly resides in a small coastal town while going house-hunting in Milton-Northern some twenty miles down on the railway line, and she finds a place for the family to rent in the suburbs of that industrial town. Interestingly enough, while Margaret's independence of movement turns her into something of a modern woman, the house-hunting episode also registers a very modern form of spatial organization, for which Gaskell had a keen eye: a separation between the commercial and the residential, which also potentially means a separation between classes. Margaret initially looks for a place where the family would be sequestered from the commercial part of town, which means residing in the suburbs. Interestingly, this separation is doubly coded in class terms, as on the one hand it seems to replicate the more traditional genteel preference for country living (which preference characterizes Margaret early in the novel), but on the other hand it suggests that Margaret might also be partaking in a different and new kind of class separation, the one practiced by the middle

classes whose public life took place in cities and private life in the suburbs. London was a specific case in this regard, primarily as a place that attracted the national fashionable or genteel society, which seasonally resided in the center of town. Thus, Moretti's mapping of Dickens's London identifies a great separation between the genteel spaces of West End and the poor areas of the eastern part of London, with a middle-class wedge in-between, occupying areas such as the City and Soho. However, this third London, as Moretti calls it, is already defined by an increasing separation between workplace and residence: while most of the middle-class Dickens characters work there, large numbers of them live in the northern suburbs (and some, like Wemmick from *Great Expectations*, a Dickens character commonly singled out for articulating a sharp separation between his work and residential lives, in the southern ones).[7]

Gaskell's spatial imagination was captured by urban developments outside the metropolis, or more precisely those in the north of the country, where larger urban centers were a recent development brought about by industrialization. In *Cranford* (1851-3) Gaskell registered a class-based reorganization of the provincial areas, with the transformation of provincial small towns into suburbs of larger, industrial towns; she focused on the lives of those inhabitants who spent all their time in such small towns, which meant women, with the men either in the army, on a ship, or "closely engaged in business all the week in the great commercial town of Drumble, distant only twenty miles on the railroad" (1). The gentlewomen of Cranford rather ignore their connections to the neighboring industrial town, preferring to align themselves with London as the center of the national genteel elite. But even as the small-town ladies present a façade of resentment to the neighboring industrial town, Gaskell's novel still foregrounds a weakening of their insularism brought about by the march of industrialization, and the construction of the railroad line in particular. Gaskell, not a Londoner herself but a Mancunian, called attention to a different kind of urban expansion, which was not happening in quite the same way as in London. The urban sprawl of London, of which Dickens and his contemporaries were quite aware, was of a megalopolitan type, whereby the city encroached upon and devoured the small communities in its vicinity. Dickens's London has something in common with the megalopolises in Asia at the turn of the 21st century: the constant flow of people into the city brought about by the magnetism of a bustling urban economy (in which manufacturing is often not the central component), the massive polarization of wealth and poverty, the massive numbers of the urban

[7] Moretti's reading is that Dickens ultimately "did not know what to do with this third space in the middle" (117), meaning that this third space of the middle class does not ultimately serve in Dickens's imagination as a force of urban social cohesion. However, that is only partially true. It could be argued that indeed Dickens could not imagine the social polarizations, conflicts and problems of London being easily settled, yet his focus on the unmanageability of the metropolitan relations and the metropolitan space itself does not preclude his ideological investment in the idea of the social centrality of the middle class.

poor (depicted by Dickens in his novels and by Henry Mayhew in his *London Labour and the London Poor*), and the massive consumption of neighboring space. In *Cranford*, on the other hand, Gaskell rendered a provincial perspective that allowed her to focus on related but distinct historical processes that would result in the transformation of small towns far from the reach of the megalopolitan conurbation of London, but close to the rising industrial cities.[8]

In *North and South* Gaskell returned to the mapping of this provincial world, but (as in Mary Barton) with a focus on the industrial urban space. The main stage of the novel, after its early London and southern settings, is the industrial cityscape of Milton-Northern: a "lead-coloured cloud" hanging over the city, "long, straight, hopeless streets of regularly built houses, all small and of brick. Here and there a great oblong many-windowed factory stood up […] and great loaded lurries blocked up the not over-wide thoroughfare. People thronged the footpaths […]" (96-97). This is a classic representation of the mid-Victorian industrial city: industrial pollution, uniform, depressing residential buildings, interspersed randomly with industrial facilities, and the bustle of activity. But the city is also compact, and does not allow for the degree of separation of classes that Margaret expected when the family first arrived at Milton-Northern: as it turns out, Margaret's suburb of Crampton also happens to be a "thoroughfare for the factory people" (110), a cramped part of town, and Margaret is at first uneasy about being constantly talked to by working class men and women in the streets. Interestingly, the male protagonist, mill-owner John Thornton lives right next to his cotton mill, not only uninsulated from its noise and pollution, but also from close contact with his workers (which makes Margaret wonder early on why he does not live "in the country, or even some suburb," 158). Much is made in the novel of Margaret's perception of the inadequacy of the house they rent in Crampton, but she manages to muster a "genius for management," putting the space to the best use for her family and a domestic servant. She even finds enjoyable the view from one of the rooms "over the plain, with a great bend of river, or canal, or whatever it is, down below" (98). Seeking to recreate in the north the kind of relationship with nature she enjoyed in the south, she has to settle for a version of the countryside that has already been touched by industrialization (canals provided the major route for transport of the coal needed for powering the industrial machinery, as well as transport of industrial products). In contrast, on the margins of the story Margaret exchanges letters with her cousin Edith, who lives in Corfu where her husband captain Lennox is posted, and writes of "her house with its trellised balcony, and its views over white cliffs and deep blue sea" (105). One of the functions of Edith in the novel is to remind the reader of the continuing strength of the genteel paradigm, but also, needless to say, of the significance of the Empire in the totality of mid-Victorian British life.

[8] A similar process of separating the residence and the place of work created in the United States of the second half of the 20th century a geography dominated by suburbs and exurbs.

Edith's residence abroad is one of the indications that the Gaskell novel imagines a world beyond a concern with merely the national space as the stage for its characters. The most dramatic event in the narrative is the strike of cotton-mill workers, the course and the outcome of which is decisively shaped by two events beyond the immediate scope of the nation: the rise of American cotton manufacturing which caused a gradual decline of the English cotton industry, and the importation of cheap labor from Ireland, a country devastated by the Great Famine (a disaster that was exacerbated by, amongst other things, the British government's inadequate relief policies). In *Mary Barton* Gaskell shipped her working class characters off to Canada as a conclusion to the story, conveniently using such narrative dislocation as a solution to the novel's tensions, but not entirely unrealistically, for emigration to the empire was indeed a course taken by many of England's poor. In the manner of a studious political economist, in *North and South* Gaskell showed an appreciation of the ways in which England was internally affected by a form of globalization it helped produce itself. Of course, that meant that the seemingly local problem—the strike in an industrial town—cannot be understood outside a global constellation of forces.

It would be inadequate, however, to reduce the cultural geography of the novel to the vast stages of regional, national and international character. Much of the novel's work of cartography is done by problematizing the point of view from which such spaces are imagined. In the most immediate terms, this problematization proceeds from the fact that the novel features a woman character (whose class identity changes over the course of the story) as the protagonist. From the beginning of the novel, Margaret appears to be able to contemplate her immediate surroundings in a manner that sets her social imagination apart: we are first introduced to her as she stays with a cousin in London society, from which she already is slightly distanced (by virtue of the relative inferiority of her father's position vis-à-vis the London social circle of her cousin). Once in Milton-Northern she immediately begins to redefine the conventional gender roles, as she takes part in her father's conversations with Thornton. Gaskell takes great care to describe in detail the drawing-room in which Hale tutors Thornton: "Pretty baskets of work stood about in different places: and books, not cared for on account of their bindings solely, lay on one table, as if recently put down" (120); the suggestion, of course, is that this is a family room, in which both the conventional female occupations such as needlework and the conventionally male work of studious reading (Mr Hale's work) take place side by side. Albeit this arrangement was brought about by necessity, for the Hales cannot afford a larger house to rent, the room sets a stage for Margaret to become an active participant in the political and economic conversations of the two men. As they enthusiastically discuss industrialization and Thornton praises the prospect of technological progress to harness natural resources (that "compels, and shall compel, all material power to yield to science," 122), Margaret joins their conversation for the first time, prompted by Thornton's exaltation of northern ambition to dominate nature by industry and new technology ("I won't deny that I am proud of belonging to a town—or perhaps I should rather say district—the necessities of which give birth

to such grandeur of conception. I would rather be a man toiling, suffering—nay, falling and successless—here, than lead a dull, prosperous life in the old worn grooves of what you call more aristocratic society down in the South" (122). It is significant that what induces Margaret to join in the conversation is Thornton's exercise of cultural geography, one which she feels to be not altogether wrong in its binarism, but quite objectionable in Thornton's framework of explanation. Her retort tries to immediately reframe the debate from the issue of northern energy vs. southern lethargy to the issue of social justice: "You do not know anything about the South. If there is less adventure or less progress—I suppose I must not say less excitement—from the gambling spirit of trade, which seems requisite to force out these wonderful inventions, there is less suffering also. […] in the South we have our poor, but there is not that terrible expression in their countenances of a sullen sense of injustice which I see here" (122-23).

The retort is a shorthand version of a whole series of contemporary debates about capitalism, which are writ large in mid-Victorian novels, and not only of the industrial novel genre. In having Margaret deliver the counterargument through which attention is shifted from technological progress to human suffering, Gaskell also slips in another assessment of industrial capitalism, the hint that it is a form of "gambling." In mid-Victorian narratives there abound episodes dealing with finance capitalism, and in particular with the speculative practices associated with it, which clearly represent such activities as a form of gambling, and denounce them as deviations from the otherwise central middle-class Victorian ethos of work and self-reliance (in *North and South* there is the story of Thornton's father who lost everything speculating). This kind of novelistic concern was especially strong just before and after the passage of the Joint Stock Companies Act of 1857, which instituted the category of limited liability, and with it boosted corporatization of capital and an expansion of the importance of the finance sector. But here Gaskell goes a step further (like some other novelists at the time), in that she suggests that even industrial capitalism might be a form of gambling; the unelaborated but clear suggestion is that the production of any commodity for the marketplace contains a speculative element as to the successful marketing of the commodity. The novel, however, does not further explore this kind of assertion about industrial capitalism, or it does so only insofar as it provides a model for understanding the uncertainties of any capitalist enterprise, which indeed is a motif that permeates the last two thirds of the novel with its focus on the downturn in the Milton-Northern economy and the workers' strike. But it is precisely this precariousness of capitalist enterprise that allows Gaskell to accentuate her primary ideological interest—how to problematize class relations in good times as well as hard times.

Having considered the global, national, regional, and domestic extent of the novel's spatial imagination, the question remains of the suggestion of social conflict in the novel's title (the dichotomy of two regions of England with their presumably different cultures), and of what the novel suggests about this dichotomy. This dichotomy, as we have seen, is rendered as the contrast between the presumably more leisurely southern life and the presumably more vigorous

northern life, which Margaret first contemplates on the trip to the small coastal town of Heston in the vicinity of Milton-Northern ("To use a Scotch word, everything looked more 'purposelike,'" 95). It is also rendered in terms of capacity for social accommodation: the supposedly sympathetic culture of the south is contrasted by the supposedly antagonistic culture of the north. The leisure and the vigor, the sympathy and the antagonism are attributed to the proclivities of the dominant social classes in the respective regions; that is, the difference in the social habitus of the two locations is largely associated with the social influence of landed classes versus industrial capitalists, and the focus in the last few chapters of the novel shifts away from the capital and labor relationship to the relationship between Margaret and Thornton. A great accomplishment of the novel is that it equips the two protagonists with a good deal of psychological complexity,[9] but Margaret and Thornton nevertheless clearly embody the differences between the two cultures which they themselves continue to debate over the course of the novel. Raymond Williams stated that the tension between the two cultures is worked out by the marriage between the two characters, which "serves/s/ as a unification of the practical energy of the Northern manufacturer with the developed sensibility of the Southern girl" (*Culture and Society* 92). This is in fact a momentous proposition, for the novel does not amount to a comprehensive study of regions, their internal dynamics, peculiarities and uneven developments but rather treats the regions as representatives of what Gaskell thought to be the best in the two dominant British cultures—the middle class ethos of self-reliance and hard work and the genteel sensibility for social interaction and especially for patronage (which probably had found its most vocal literary ideologue in Jane Austen). But the marriage between the two protagonists can hardly be seen as an unconventional turn, either in narrative or in ideological terms. The marriage between the two is best analyzed in the context of a long tradition of historical compromise in English society between the patrician elites and the rising middle classes, which, in the words of Tom Nairn, created after 1688 a mixed state-form that "turned into 'the nightwatchman state' of the Industrial Revolution, and presided over the most dramatic initial phase of world industrialization" (26). A similar but slightly differently accented view is held by P.J. Cain and A.G. Hopkins, whose economic analysis of empire in the 19th century foregrounds what they call the domination of gentlemanly capitalism (de-emphasizing the role of industrial capital): "The nineteenth-century gentleman was […] a compromise

[9] An argument could easily be made on the importance of the representation of the psychological in *North and South*, along the lines of Mary Poovey's analysis of Mary Barton in which Poovey examines what she calls a (proto)psychological domain which emerges in the novel, which is not yet fully modern, but which sets the novel apart from much of the mainstream Victorian novel. See Mary Poovey, *Making a Social Body. British Cultural Formation, 1830-1864*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1995. This line of analysis could be shown to be even more pertinent to *North and South*, in which Gaskell sought to depict characters not as mere embodiments of social ideas, but rather as consciousnesses grappling with the problems arising from social realities they encounter.

between the needs of the landed interest whose power was in decline and the aspirations of the rising service sector" (33). In practice, this meant that around the middle of the 19th century manufacturing capitalists were far from exerting the political influence proportionate to their economic stature, and far from enjoying the social prestige entertained by the gentlemanly elite. Contemporary novelists were quite alert to this state of affairs, and Dickens for instance, who was no great friend of large industrial capital, blamed in *Little Dorrit* the patrician grip on the political society for what he perceived was the possible decline of British global technological/industrial supremacy.

Like most other middle-class novelists at the time, Gaskell was acutely aware that industrial capitalism was a tremendous social force but just as aware that other social and political forces in Britain were far from reduced to a secondary role. Already in *Cranford*, published a few years before *North and South*, Gaskell created a novel dedicated to the idea of mapping the current constellation of different social forces in the space of the nation. Setting the novel in a small northern provincial town, Gaskell brought into focus two kinds of national coordinates: the relationship between the provincial and the metropolitan, and the relationship between "genteel" provinciality and the industrial urbanity. Although not a novelist of London life, Gaskell was always concerned with acknowledging the hegemonic cultural role of London in British life (and so the novel features a narrator sending "intelligences" from provincial life to a London audience). While the urbanity of London was not, as any reader of Dickens knows, characterized primarily by industrialization, the city's stature in national life was overwhelming for its size, for its political and economic power, and for its power to control the cultural imagination of the nation. Again, as any reader of Dickens knows, this London was a place of vast internal complexity and differentiation, almost appearing in the imagination of the rising middle-class novelist as yet another unexplored continent that needed to be mapped. This was London to whose cultural domination Gaskell herself was peripheral, and whose centrality she was ready to acknowledge writing from Manchester and its simpler social polarizations. But *Cranford* suggested an interesting interpretation of English society in the 19th century, with London featuring as a center of cultural consumption (in the sense that the London audience is the reference audience, the audience which dictates the taste and for which one writes), but the countryside, with its social conservatism, better expressing the course of national social change. *Cranford* exuded a conviction that English small-town life in the first half of the 19th century, defined by its marginal participation in the social world of genteel connections, in fact testifies to the still uneroded power of the landed elites to form the dominant model of social distinction, one which was based on minute elaborations of hierarchy rather than on massive class identities and confrontations. In *Cranford* the map of the nation is on the one hand shaped by the idea of the nation not unlike the Austenian one (the nation defined as a sum of extraterritorial places connected by the social bond, or the marriage market); on the other hand, the novel's map also contains a shrinking of the national space through its attachment to the imperial space which serves as a second home

to some segments of the patrician society that staffs it with adventurers and soldiers. The industrial world of Drumble (the novel's name for Manchester) is not directly represented in the novel, other than by its power to reshape the country through the construction of railways, which are necessary for its industrial growth. The persistence of the old social hierarchies or the transformative power of industrialization—which is going to have a more decisive influence on the shaping of English society? This is the question posed by the novel. The drift of social commentary represented by *Cranford* is that the relationship between the two forces has been and will continue to be one of compromise and mutual adaptation. We need to consider the geographies and ideologies of *North and South* in the same way; whereas the social world of *Mary Barton* was that of the industrial city, and the social world of *Cranford* that of a provincial small town, North and South brings the two cultures together in bringing Margaret Hale to Milton-Northern, but always with the awareness in every chapter that this is not the whole national story.

If we keep in mind the view that the mid-19th century was marked by the social centrality of gentlemanly capitalism (rather than industrial capitalism), and that the social and political power of industrial capitalists was unequal to their economic importance, then we can begin to appreciate the marriage between the two protagonists as a narrative construction carefully aware of historical trends, and one that is very finely calibrated in that regard. Around the middle of the century industrialists still did not enjoy sufficient symbolic capital to be co-opted into the patrician elites (the way that finance and mercantile capital were able to), but then Margaret's background is not quite from the upper ranks of the landed classes. The marriage between Margaret and Thornton is of course narratively interesting precisely for the inequality of their social backgrounds and status, a plot device abundantly exploited in the English novel up to that time. But Gaskell's handling of it is a masterful combination of narrative craft and social awareness. She did not simply want to construct the marriage as the symbol for the necessity of social dialogue; rather, she has the two characters take on characteristics they did not have prior to their encounter, in order to signify the actual possibilities of social accommodation and compromise. Thus, Thornton's management of his cotton mill becomes dependent on a much more considerate relationship to his workers, a change engineered under Margaret's influence, while Margaret comes to inherit the land on which Thornton's mill is built and for which he pays rent, which turns her effectively into a rentier capitalist (she inherits the land from Mr Bell, an Oxford professor), creating a business relationship between herself and her husband-to-be. Gaskell was in fact careful not to have the marriage plot smooth out the conflicts which the text had explored, and instead she suggests that the marriage plot simply reconfigures the existing problems into new ones. At the very least, the marriage re-foregrounds the fact that English industrial capitalism had to develop under an unfavorable regime of land ownership (given that most of the land in England was owned by a small patrician elite), which produced a strong variety of rentier capitalism. After all, Margaret herself becomes a rentier capitalist, which is quite a step away from her initial dislike for (all and especially service-sector) capitalism.

The Novel as a Spatial Form, and a Historical One

The map-making of *North and South* needs to be placed within the larger context of the history of the Victorian novel. Critics like Raymond Williams and Catherine Gallagher presented influential readings of the industrial novel as a genre to which *North and South* belongs; on their readings we are asked to view such texts as being firmly anchored in the condition of England debate that dominated English writing in the Hungry Forties and in the 1850s as well. This is an invaluable perspective, as up to this point the genre of the novel had not been really alert to the impact that industrialization had on British society, even though the factories and their technologies, and their shaping of new urban cultures, had existed for quite some time, and the plight of the industrial working class had equally been evident for some time. By writing industrial novels mostly middle-class authors were seeking ways to address the huge social frictions in the relationship between capital and labor, and these narrative efforts were indubitably motivated by the topicality of the genre. Yet there was more at stake in the social authority of the mid-Victorian novelist than just the ambition to address such issues as industrialization. There are at least three different novelistic tendencies that agglomerated into the Gaskell version of the industrial novel, which are not as narrowly topical as industrialization and capital/labor relations in this limited time period (in the middle of the 19th century). The first broader context is the general shift in the constellation of the field of culture that has happened with the rise of Dickens and the subsequent qualitative leap in the social authority of the novelist. The advent of the professional middle-class novelist was accompanied by the perception that existing forms of social knowledge were getting increasingly inadequate in the face of massive and accelerated social change, and the novel as a genre took it upon itself to fill in some of this contemporary epistemic void.[10] In other words, while it is true that Victorian middle-class novelists derived some of the authority to address a wide array of social issues from what they felt was the rising authority of their social class, it is also important to notice that they were responding to a crisis in the structure of contemporary social knowledge. This often took the form of deferential acknowledgment of other contemporary discourses, as in Gaskell's famous statement of a lack of ambition with regard to political economy in the Preface to *Mary Barton* ("I know nothing of Political Economy, or of the theories of trade. I have tried to write truthfully; and if my accounts agree or clash with any system, the agreement or disagreement is unintentional," xxxvi). Of course, even in *Mary Barton* there is an element of coyness in this kind of statement, as

[10] It is worth adding that the crisis in mid-19th century episteme would also result in a vast disciplinary reorganization of social knowledge, and a specialization of it that was going to take place in the discourses of the university. But at Dickens's time the academic world did not yet pursue knowledge of contemporary society. On the other hand, much of the social authority of the Victorian novel relied on a pursuit of the imperative of dealing with contemporaneity.

the novel clearly handled issues of social and economic policy with more than a modicum of ambition. The ambition and the projection of social authority are even more pronounced in *North and South*, which involves passages that more directly address the discourse of political economy. The point here is that Gaskell (very much like Dickens) realized that the novel as a genre was a greatly suitable medium not only for articulating social ideas, but also for orchestrating the social debates and affecting the general production and circulation of social knowledge, and that it was particularly important at a time when such knowledge seemed wanting in the face of massive social change.

The second relevant frame for understanding the novel's cartography is opened up by the kind of perspective proposed by Benedict Anderson in *Imagined Communities*. Studying the emergence of modern nationhood, Anderson underscored the role of print capitalism, and in particular of the rise of the newspaper and the novel, as two genres of modern print culture that mediated a sense of cultural commonality and simultaneity necessary for members of a population to imagine themselves belonging to a nation. It is easy to comprehend the idea that a newspaper creates a sense of common belonging for its readership, as the private act of reading a newspaper is necessarily underwritten by the accompanying assumption that many other readers are engaged in the same act at the same time. Novels and the reading of novels may be said to produce the same species of effect in creating a common readership interrelated and interpellated by the experience of reading the same narrative simultaneously. With serial publication of novels, a standard Victorian practice, this sense of a readership that is on the same page at the same time was further strengthened by the very fact that a serially published novel commands the attention of its readers over a long period of time. Gaskell showed a significant form of awareness of not only the role of the novel in creating national culture, but also of the role played by Dickens's *Pickwick Papers* in introducing serial publication into 19th century novel publishing: the ladies of Cranford read installments of the novel, shipped to their town and other remote corners of the country by train, simultaneously with London audiences. In this regard, *North and South*, which ran in Dickens's *Household Words* over 22 installments in 1854 and 1855, formally availed itself of the dominant contemporary form of publication. But more importantly, it is a text that actively considers its own function as a national narrative, along with quite a few other contemporary texts, and in doing so it proposes a complex national map, with its title serving primarily as an indication of lines of rift and conflict on the national map.

The third relevant historical frame of the novel's spatial imagination is its habitation in the genre of domestic fiction. This habitual relationship of course derives from the ideological construction of the domestic space as the proper space for womanhood, a patriarchal ideology stretching quite a way back to pre-Victorian times, but finding a particularly restrictive expression in Victorian middle-class gender discourses and practices. In this regard, the novel as a genre has played a momentous historical role. As a number of critics rightly noted (with

Nancy Armstrong doing so in probably the most systematic way[11]), the novel as a genre was historically powerfully associated with representation of the domestic space. It needs to be emphasized that in doing so the genre took it upon itself to illuminate a space largely unrepresented by official, public discourses: it pointed to the realm of the home as an important location of culture. Much of the novelty that characterized the genre, as Ian Watt argued half a century ago, in his still important work on the rise of the novel, was associated with a new focus on particularities of space. Much of this new focus in the history of the genre, it can easily be added, had to do with particularities of domestic space. At the same time, if novels historically have often privileged the space of the private, this has invariably been done with the conviction that the private space of the home has larger social ramifications, and that it exists, in all its varieties, as a form of complex negotiations between the private and the public, and as a result of complex social forces that need to be mapped precisely at the intersection between the home and the world.[12] Historically, the novel has thus been committed to mapping such constantly evolving interactions of the two (also continually changing) spheres, and it is in that regard certainly not accidental that the one more easily available to representation and narrative, the private sphere, has often served as an analogue for the other—as in Jane Austen's imagination of the nation in terms of the marriage market (to use a simplified formula of Austen's novels offered by Moretti). In combination, the perspectives of Armstrong and Anderson can help illuminate the shaping of that space of the national imagination which Moretti called the middle-sized world of Jane Austen's novels. The concern with industrial relations, which swept over English fiction over the two decades of the 1840s and 1850s, also produced a number of narratives that found themselves dealing with the issue of imagining the nation in spatial terms, of which *North and South* is of particular significance. What set it apart was the sheer solidity of its attempt to think the complexity of the social situation narratively, as well as its elaborate,

---

[11] In *Desire and Domestic Fiction: A Political History of the Novel*, Armstrong proposed that the domestic novel was a central tradition of the English novel, which performed an important cultural role in articulating gendered experiences associated with the domestic sphere, otherwise culturally eclipsed by male-dominated public discourses of economics and politics. In doing so, the novel also "produced a language of increasing psychological complexity for understanding individual behavior" (253), thus partaking in the processes of creation of modern subjectivity as well as modern culture. See *Desire and Domestic Fiction: A Political History of the Novel*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1987.

[12] A particularly effective reading of this mediating function of the domestic space was offered by Dorice Williams Eliot in her article; she focuses on the Gaskell novel for its representation of what she calls the "social," which is "a space that is both public and private" (25), and also "both an ideological and a material space" (26). In my article I have chosen not to engage the distinctions made by Williams Eliot, even though it is readily obvious than any theorization of the social in the broadest sense that does not account for the domestic sphere is bound to be incomplete.

historically reflective use of the tropes of domestic fiction in proposing a form of social accommodation.

However, the drift of the analysis of Gaskell's *North and South* presented in this essay has not been to redefine the place of that novel within the context of the condition of England debate, even though such a direction in analysis is worth pursuing. Rather, the focus in my reading of this novel has been on its spatiality as an important instance of its social and historical imagination. Joseph Frank famously proposed decades ago that a literary text is a spatial form,[13] meaning that its internal relationships should not be considered as ordered in the temporal linearity of reading, but rather in a spatial architectonics of signification. This is certainly a valid proposition and a catchy statement about the character of the literary text, and a close relative to the kind of hermeneutics proposed by structuralism (Frank arrived independently at the same idea that the internal architectonics of the text is the proper subject of scholarly analysis). The imperative of a structure-oriented reading of this kind has often and undeservedly been ignored especially in recent decades, when a predilection for overly politicized readings has taken root in academic discourse. But the novel is also a spatial form in a different sense—in its constant engagement with extra-literary geographies, ranging from the global to the domestic. This kind of spatiality of the novel is perhaps the kind of spatiality that is more difficult to think and analyze than the kind Frank wrote about, for it continually requires us to accumulate knowledge and proffer analyses of that extraliterary world with which literature is dialoguing. But it is this kind of spatiality that provides the stage for a proper historicism in the study of literature, by which I mean the cultivation of the habit of reading literature with consideration to the histories of the spaces that it represents. In this regard, Gaskell's *North and South* is a text that reminds us particularly clearly of the need to rigorously search for new ways of conducting historical interpretations of literature. At the same time, it is a text that not only sought to insert itself in the contemporary debates about the social changes and polarizations created by industrial capitalism (what has traditionally been called the condition of England debate); it also presents a powerful expression of the transformation in the social authority of the novel as a genre, which made it an important location for the articulation of knowledge about society.

[13] Frank first explicated the idea of the text as a spatial form in an essay entitled, "Spatial Form in Modern Literature. An Essay in Two Parts." *The Sewanee Review* 53.2 (1945): 221-240.

Bibliography

Anderson, Benedict. *Imagined Communities*. London: Verso, 1983.
Armstrong, Nancy. *Desire and Domestic Fiction: A Political History of the Novel*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1987.
Austen, Jane. *Mansfield Park*. London: Penguin Books, 1996.
Bodenheimer, Rosemarie. "North and South: A Permanent State of Change." *Nineteenth-Century Fiction* 34.3 (1979): 281-301.
Cain, P. J. and A.G. Hopkins, *British Imperialism 1688-2000*. London: Longman, 2002.
Frank, Joseph. "Spatial Form in Modern Literature. An Essay in Two Parts." *The Sewanee Review* 53.2 (1945): 221-240.
Gaskell, Elizabeth. *Cranford*. London: Oxford University Press, 1972.
--.*Mary Barton*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1987.
--.*North and South*, London: Penguin Books, 1986.
Moretti, Franco. *Atlas of the European Novel*. London: Verso, 1998.
Nairn, Tom. *The Break-up of Britain*. London: NLB, 1977.
Poovey, Mary. *Making a Social Body. British Cultural Formation, 1830-1864*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1995.
Williams, Raymond. *The Country and the City*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1973.
--.*Culture and Society* 1780-1950. New York. Columbia University Press, 1983.
Williams Elliott, Dorice. "The Female Visitor and the Marriage of Classes in Gaskell's North and South." *Nineteenth-Century Literature* 49.1 (1994): 21-49.

ROMAN KAO KULTURNA GEOGRAFIJA: *NORTH AND SOUTH* ELIZABETH GASKELL

Članak se bavi kartografskim radom u romanu Elizabeth Gaskell *North and South* (1854/5), koji se u kritici često navodi kao primjer tzv. industrijskog romana koji se bavi odnosom kapitala i rada. Analiza pristupa romanu kao složenom pokušaju kartografiranja nacionalnog prostora u kojem nastaje mapa koja se proteže of prostora doma do globalnog prostora. Autor tvrdi da je sredinom 19. stoljeća engleski roman preuzeo na sebe ulogu artikuliranja znanja o društvu u vrijeme kada se je društvo rapidno mijenjalo i kada se pojavila potreba za novim diskursima o društvu. Također, autor smatra da je pitanje prostora u ovom romanu potrebno čitati u odnosu na tri povijesne koordinate: aktualni imperativ suvremene „debate o stanju Engleske," rad romana kao žanra u kontekstu zamišljanja nacije, te sposobnosti romana kao žanra da narativizira posredovanje između privatnog i javnog: u slučaju romana *North and South*, riječ je o jasnom primjeru međusobnog posredovanja konvencija romana o prostoru doma i konvencija romana o aktualnim društvenim problemima.

Key words: class, cultural geography, industrial capitalism, industrial novel
Ključne riječi: klasa, kulturalna geografija, industrijski kapitalizam, industrijski roman