T.C.
DOKUZ EYLÜL ÜNİVERSİTESİ
SOSYAL BİLİMLER ENSTİTÜSÜ
BATI DİLLERİ VE EDEBİYATI ANABİLİM DALI
AMERİKAN KÜLTÜRÜ VE EDEBİYATI PROGRAMI
YÜKSEK LİSANS TEZİ

FRAGMENTED SELVES, MADNESS AND WRITING: AN ANALYSIS OF INTELLECTUAL WOMEN'S DILEMMA IN DORIS LESSING'S *THE GOLDEN NOTEBOOK* AND SYLVIA PLATH'S *THE BELL JAR*

Zeynep KÜÇÜK

Danışman
Assist. Prof. Nilsen GÖKÇEN

2009

YEMİN METNİ

Yüksek Lisans Tezi olarak sunduğum **"Fragmented Selves, Madness and Writing: An Analysis of Intellectual Women's Dilemma in Doris Lessing's *The Golden Notebook* and Sylvia Plath's *The Bell Jar*"** adlı çalışmanın, tarafımdan, bilimsel ahlak ve geleneklere aykırı düşecek bir yardıma başvurmaksızın yazıldığını ve yararlandığım eserlerin kaynakçada gösterilenlerden oluştuğunu, bunlara atıf yapılarak yararlanılmış olduğunu belirtir ve bunu onurumla doğrularım.

10/04/2009
ZEYNEP KÜÇÜK
İmza

YÜKSEK LİSANS TEZ SINAV TUTANAĞI

Öğrencinin

Adı ve Soyadı	**: Zeynep KÜÇÜK**
Anabilim Dalı	**: Batı Dilleri ve Edebiyatı**
Programı	**: Amerikan Kültürü ve Edebiyatı**
Tez Konusu	**: Fragmented Selves, Madness and Writing: An Analysis of Intellectual Women's Dilemma in Doris Lessing's *The Golden Notebook* and Sylvia Plath's *The Bell Jar***
Sınav Tarihi ve Saati	**:**

Yukarıda kimlik bilgileri belirtilen öğrenci Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü'nün …….. tarih ve ……. sayılı toplantısında oluşturulan jürimiz tarafından Lisansüstü Yönetmeliği'nin 18. maddesi gereğince yüksek lisans tez sınavına alınmıştır.

Adayın kişisel çalışmaya dayanan tezini ……. dakikalık süre içinde savunmasından sonra jüri üyelerince gerek tez konusu gerekse tezin dayanağı olan Anabilim dallarından sorulan sorulara verdiği cevaplar değerlendirilerek tezin,

BAŞARILI OLDUĞUNA	O	OY BİRLİĞİ	O
DÜZELTİLMESİNE	O*	OY ÇOKLUĞU	O
REDDİNE	O**		

ile karar verilmiştir.

Jüri teşkil edilmediği için sınav yapılamamıştır. O***
Öğrenci sınava gelmemiştir. O**

* Bu halde adaya 3 ay süre verilir.
** Bu halde adayın kaydı silinir.
*** Bu halde sınav için yeni bir tarih belirlenir.

	Evet
Tez burs, ödül veya teşvik programlarına (Tüba, Fulbright vb.) aday olabilir.	O
Tez mevcut hali ile basılabilir.	O
Tez gözden geçirildikten sonra basılabilir.	O
Tezin basımı gerekliliği yoktur.	O

JÜRİ ÜYELERİ				İMZA
……	□ Başarılı	□ Düzeltme	□ Red	……...
……□ Başarılı		□ Düzeltme	□Red	…….....
……..…□ Başarılı		□ Düzeltme	□ Red	…….……

ÖZET

Yüksek Lisans Tezi

Fragmented Selves, Madness and Writing: An Analysis of Intellectual Women's Dilemma in Doris Lessing's *The Golden Notebook* and SylviaPlath's *The Bell Jar.*

Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi

Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü

Batı Dilleri ve Edebiyatı Anabilim Dalı

Amerikan Kültürü ve Edebiyatı Programı

Bu çalışmada, Doris Lessing'in *The Golden Notebook* ve Sylvia Plath'ın *The Bell Jar* adlı romanları 'kadın', 'parçalanmış kimlik', 'delilik' ve 'yazma edimi' kavramlarından yola çıkılarak feminist eleştiri kuramı ışığında incelenmiştir. Tezin amacı, Lessing'in ve Plath'ın romanlarından yararlanarak, ataerkil bir toplumda yaşayan entellektüel kadının toplumdaki yerini, sorunlarını ve ikilemlerini analiz etmek ve bunların entellektüel kadının kimliğine, kendisine ve topluma olan bakış açısına nasıl yansıdığını gözler önüne sermektir.

Bu tez beş bölümden oluşmaktadır. Tezin birinci bölümünde, Feminist Eleştiri Kuramı onsekizinci yüzyıldan günümüze kadar bu alana önemli katkılar yapan birçok seçkin ismin yorumları ışığında tanımlanmıştır. İkinci bölüm kadın ile delilik kavramları arasında nasıl bir ilişki olduğunu açıklamıştır. Bu bölümde varılmak istenilen sonuç, ataerkil toplum düzenine baş kaldırıp hayatını kendi istekleri doğrultusunda yönlendirmek isteyen kadınların "deli" olarak tanımlandığı ve bu kadınların erkek egemen toplum baskısından kurtulmak için deliliği bir kaçış yolu olarak gördükleridir. Üçüncü ve dördüncü bölümlerde Lessing'in ve Plath'ın entellektüel kadın kahramanlarının yazar kimliklerinden dolayı yaşadıkları ikilemleri ve bu ikilemlerin entellektüel kadın kahramanların iç dünyalarını ve yaratıcılıklarını nasıl etkilediği analiz edilmiştir. Sonuç bölümünde ise kadınlığın sadece eş ve anne olmak olarak tanımlandığı bir toplumda yazar kimlikleriyle varolma yolunda toplumla bir mücadele içine girmiş olan yaratıcı kadınların yaşadıkları depresyon sonucunda elde ettikleri farkındalık sayesinde, entellektüel kapasitelerinin önemini benimsedikleri, erkek egemen toplumun yazar kimliklerini yok etmesine izin vermedikleri ve mücadelelerini kazandıkları düşüncesine varılmıştır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Kadın, Delilik, Yazma Edimi, Doris Lessing, Sylvia Plath

ABSTRACT

Master Thesis

Fragmented Selves, Madness and Writing: An Analysis of Intellectual Women's Dilemma in Doris Lessing's *The Golden Notebook* and Sylvia Plath's *The Bell Jar.*

Dokuz Eylül University

Institute of Social Sciences

Department of Western Languages and Literatures

American Culture and Literature Program

The aim of this study is to analyse the intellectual woman's position in society as reflected in Doris Lessing's *The Golden Notebook* (1962) and in Sylvia Plath's *The Bell Jar* (1963). This thesis examines why Lessing's and Plath's creative women experience a dilemma as to whether to fulfill their literary aspirations or their societal roles as mother and wife, and discusses the oucomes of this dilemma. The main argument is that the artist woman suffers from a sense of fragmented self because of the patriarcal society's rejection of her creative powers, and this fragmentation results in her descent into madness. But it is through madness by which the intellectual woman gains an awareness and her identity as artist gives her the courage to defy male-centred culture. Consequently, the woman artist eliminates her dilemma and appreciates her intellectual capacity.

This study falls into five parts. In the first chapter, feminist literary criticism is introduced. The second chapter explores the relationship between woman and madness, and points out that woman's endeavour to free herself from the oppression of patriarchal society is labelled as madness. The third and fourth chapters are devoted to the analyses of Lessing's and Plath's intellectual heroines' dilemmas. Finally, the last chapter reaches the conclusion that even though the intellectual woman always struggles not only with the pressure of society but also with her doubts about herself, she never lets them defeat her and never fails to recognize the value of her creativity.

Key Words: Woman, Madness, Writing, Doris Lessing, Sylvia Plath

CONTENTS

FRAGMENTED SELVES, MADNESS AND WRITING: AN ANALYSIS OF INTELLECTUAL WOMEN'S DILEMMA IN DORIS LESSING'S *THE GOLDEN NOTEBOOK* AND SYLVIA PLATH'S *THE BELL JAR*

INTRODUCTION

This study will examine how Doris Lessing's *The Golden Notebook* and Sylvia Plath's *The Bell Jar* present the situation of the woman artist in the patriarchal society of the post-war world. The aim of this dissertation is to discuss the intellectual woman's dilemma, arising from her desire both to use her creative powers and to be socially acceptable at once. In this discussion the main arguments focus on why the intellectual woman suffers from a sense of fragmented self and show how she manages to set herself free from it. This thesis regards the clash between societal expectations and the creative woman's strong wish to have a voice in literature as the root cause of her sense of fragmented self and depicts madness as the result of this fragmentation. For the woman artist, in literature madness appears not only as the result of the fragmentation she is subjected to, but also as an outlet for her dilemma. As such, madness provides the artist woman with fresh ways of getting an awareness of her power of as an intellectual who can thus cope efficiently with the difficulties she faces.

Both Lessing's and Plath's novels testify to the lifetime commitment of the creative woman to her struggle for her literary aspirations. There are several reasons for choosing these two novels for my study. One reason is Plath's and Lessing's perspectives on women, society and literature. Both Lessing and Plath believe in the necessity for a revolution in the social system. In other words, Lessing's and Plath's main concern is to bring a change to the economic and social status of women with the help of their writing, because from Lessing's and Plath's standpoints, life and literature are intervowen.

For Lessing, women's writing not only expresses society's pressure upon women but also offers suggestions to subvert the patriarchal ideology. "Doris Lessing . . . goes on writing about the oppression of society's discourses, . . . devising different ways of presenting them, so that her readers cannot retreat into the kind of recognition which allows them to choose to look away" (Maslen, 1994: 11). Thus, the aim of Lessing's works is to provide society with a new view on the issue of woman question, and *The Golden Notebook* is one of her most important

works which contributes significant arguments to women's literature. *The Golden Notebook*, which highlights the inequality between the sexes, deals with women's problems, especially, creative and free women's problems, concerning their careers and ambitions. "The book's [*The Golden Notebook's*] strength lies . . . in . . . Mrs. Lessing's . . . attempt to write honestly about women" (Karl, 1977: 55). That is why, Lessing's work both exposes female consciousness and leads the readers to think about female experience.

It is no wonder that Plath's aim is not different from that of Lessing. Plath herself faces difficulties in gaining society's acceptance for her artist-woman identity, so Plath's works reflect her anxieties, stemming from being a mother and a writer at once. "Plath . . . explores what it means to be a woman in terms of the traditional conflict between family and career. Plath's life and her writing are filled with . . . despair over her refusal to choose and instead to try to have--what most males consider their birthright--both" (Dobbs, 1977: 11). For this reason Plath, like Lessing, intends to present and question women's position in a male-dominated culture. Plath herself feels obliged to play the role of the housewife/mother stereotype whereas she aspires after a career in literature. Such a double bind creates "[t]he myth of deprived woman . . . attributed to female writers, such as Plath, who are denied fulfillment as writers [and] mothers" (Feeney, 2007: 33). Plath's effort to be both a poet and a mother represents the artist-woman's endeavour to pursue her profession with a desire to avoid public hatred. Nevertheless, Plath cannot succeed in overcoming the difficulties she confronts as an artist woman, and her attempts to find a solution to her dilemma as to whether to have a socially acceptable identity or participate in literary arena end in suicide. Plath, like Lessing, strives against gender bias not only in social system but also in literature. Consequently, Plath's aim to eradicate the influence of male chauvinism upon social and literary arenas is embodied in her novel. *The Bell Jar* successfully fights for equal rigths even though Plath's hopes of equality between the sexes are dashed in reality.

In short, the importance of these two novels for this thesis also lies in their success in mirroring patriarchal ideology's dominance over society and literature; in fact, restraints of patriarchy imposed on female autonomy and on female writing are at the core of my arguments in this study. For example, chapter one presents how feminist literary criticism fights against the misogynist attitude of male-dominated

literature in order to put an end to the hegemony of the traditional and male-centred interpretations of literary texts. As such, feminist literary criticism is a challenge to the accepted norms of literary criticism which, support the superiority of the male writers. Some of the main concerns of feminist literary criticism focus on the exclusion of female writers from the literary canon, the stereotypical representations of women in the works of male writers', and women writers' use of language. All of these concerns are related to a gender-biased view of literary arena. According to feminist critics, literary canon tends to reject the worthiness of female writing. In other words, women writers are pushed to the periphery because of the prejudices against women's writing. "Male writers and male point of view are privileged. . . . [T]he canon is a reflection of the dominant power group in society, that is male" (Webster, 1990: 73). Therefore, one of the most important missions of feminist criticism is to destroy male power over literature by eliminating the influence of the stereotypical women images from the texts and by opposing male writers' control of language. Feminist literary criticism is based aims at eradicating sexism in literature and enabling the readers to appreciate the value of female creativity.

To understand the aims of feminist literary criticism better, it is useful here to mention briefly Annette Kolodny's "Dancing Through the Minefield: Some Observations on the Theory, Practice, and Politics of a Feminist Literary Criticism." In this essay, three claims are made by Kolodny. She writes: "(1) [L]iterary history . . . is a fiction; (2) insofar as we are taught how to read, what we engage are not texts but paradigms; and finally, (3) since the grounds upon which we assign aesthetic value to texts are never infallible, unchangeable, or universal, we must reexamine not only our aesthetics but, as well, the inherent biases" (1985: 151). According to Kolodny, literary history is a creation because the canon is based on the dominant ideology; similarly, reading is not free from established standards. For this reason, Kolodny asserts that prejudices which influence the reading activities should be eliminated; that is gender-biased perspective should be defied. To Kolodny, feminist literary criticism should aim to struggle with the accepted ideas which emphasize gender differences. Kolodny claims: "What unites and repeatedly invigorates feminist literary criticism . . . is . . . an acute and impassioned attentiveness to the ways in which primarily male structures of power are inscribed (or encoded) within our literary inheritance" (1985: 162). Thus according to Kolodny, it is feminist criticism's concern to put an end to the hegemony of the gender

discrimination in literature. Consequently, what makes feminist literary criticism revolutionary is that it has the courage to reject patriarchal politics of the literature and the determination to make female creativity flourish.

It is thus noteworthy that the main concern of chapter two parallels with that of chapter one in terms the power of patriarchy over the female. Chapter two focuses on the relationship between women and madness, examining the part patriarchy plays in women's insanity. In this chapter, the concept of female lunacy is explored in the light of the discussions which cover the periods from the Victorian era to modern times. Victorian psychiatrists, for instance, find most of the madwomen disobedient and base the treatment on women's passivity. In this period, depression, caused by the pressure of puberty and child-bearing, is very widespread. It is clear that for the Victorians, the female biology was responsible for much of women's psychiatric problems. After the Victorian period, psychiatry is influenced by Darwinism, which defines women's nature from a patriarchal standpoint. Anorexia, neurasthenia and hysteria are of great significance to Darwinian psychiatrists because these are the diseases women patients are diagnosed with in this period; especially hysteria plays an important role in the analysis of female lunacy. In order to elaborate on this issue, famous hysteric women, Breuer's Anna O. and Freud's Dora, will be examined. One of the most important conclusions drawn from the discussion about hysteria is that the connection between the female body and female psychiatric problems still dominates the medical circles. In the face of such an male-centred evaluations of women, it is also no coincidence that the increase in the number of hysteric women parallels with the emergence of "New Woman" who is determined to set herself free from the feminine ideals of the Victorian era. In the modern period the image of the schizophrenic woman replaces that of the hysteric woman of the previous era. The modern woman's identity is subjected to a fragmentation caused by the commitment of the post-war world to femininity. What connects schizophrenia with the question of woman in the modern era is the antipsychiatry's attempt to provide a new perspective on the analysis of the causes of schizophrenia. In this sense, antipsychiatry presents an opposition to modern psychiatry which is manipulated by male point of view. Actually, not only psychiatry in the modern era but also psychiatric Victorianism and psychiatric Darwinism are conditioned by the controlling power of male chauvinism. Therefore, the issue of women's madness becomes so

controversial that it becomes a favorite topic for not only psychiatrists but also women writers.

The figure of the madwoman is one of the most significant characters used by the male and female authors, and Shakespeare's Ophelia and Charlotte Bronte's Bertha Mason are the most famous mad female characters. These characters have minor parts in the texts. That is why most critics choose to ignore their existence. In other words, ". . . the critic . . . kills the [mad] woman, while killing, at the same time, the question of the text and the text as a question" (Felman, 1985: 132). Because what the figure of the madwoman in the text connotes is the challenge to the male power, critics' ignorance of the mad female character is attributed to the misogynist attitude of literature.

According to women writers, madness has a great part in making claims for women's suffering caused by patriarchy. Female writers believe writing about madness functions as a way of expressing women's burden, especially creative women's burden. Therefore, madness is seen as an outlet for women's problems from women writers' perspective. "[F]emale authors . . . have . . . offered a more positive view of madness. Debilitating though mental illness is, women have . . . found that experience of . . . having to remake their identity gave them a hard-won independence from conventional ways of seeing the world" (Small, 1985: 115). Also, madness provides female writers with a means of eliminating their dilemma, arising from their desire to exist in society as women artists because "[b]eing a female writer . . . involve[s] intolerable psychological pressures [owing to] their expected roles as women" (Small, 1985: 115).

The double standards applied to the creative woman lie at the heart of the woman artist's dilemma. Caught in a double-bind, the intellectual woman becomes a marginalized figure because of the established opinions about creativity. It is generally accepted that creativity is the man's characteristic since "[m]ale sexuality . . . is . . . actually the essence of literary power. The poet's pen is in some sense (even more than figuratively) a penis" (Gilbert, Gubar, 1979: 4). That is why the female writer's creativity, in other words her gift, turns into her disgrace. Society rejects the intellectual woman's creative powers, and she is forced to accept what society decrees for her.

Realizing society's loyalty to the relationship between creativity and manhood, women writers make a counterclaim in order to destroy the prejudices against female writing. This counterclaim emphasizes the relationship between creativity and child-bearing. Women writers use "the childbirth metaphor" against "the metaphor of penis." This metaphor is the female writer's opposition to the dominant ideology, which bases its arguments against female creativity on biological difference. "[T]he childbirth metaphor validates women's artistic effort by unifying their mental and physical labor into (pro)creativity" (Friedman, 1987: 49). For women writers, the childbirth metaphor associates motherhood with the intellectual woman's power to write. The woman's capacity to bear a child is connected with the artist-woman's ability to create. Also, the childbirth metaphor represents the difficulties the woman writer faces. For example, the clash between the artist woman's societal duties and her artistry is exposed by this metaphor. According to the creative woman, motherhood imposes restrictions on her career because it compels her to be a housewife/mother stereotype. For this reason, the artist woman carries the burden of motherhood more than the stereotypical housewife. Taking up too much time, heavy duties of motherhood prevent the creative woman from getting involved in intellectual activities. For the creative woman, "[h]aving a child means being conscious of the clock, never being free of something that has to be done at a certain moment ahead" (Lessing, 1963: 468). In this sense, motherhood increases the artist woman's anxiety about her part in literature, and she uses the childbirth metaphor to express the conflicts within herself. "[W]omen using the metaphor necessarily confront the patriarchally imposed, essential dilemma of their artistic identity: the binary system that conceives woman and writer, motherhood and authorhood, babies and books, as mutually exclusive" (Friedman, 1987: 65-66).

The childbirth metaphor explains not only the intellectual woman's dilemma but also her thoughts about motherhood. For the creative woman, this metaphor reflects the woman's biologically-destined role. In other words, motherhood stands for the woman's unavoidable fate since ". . . having a baby is where women feel they are entering into some sort of inevitable destiny" (Lessing, 1963: 532). The woman artist observes that most women are fated not only by biology and but also by society that they should play roles as mothers so as to gain society's acceptence. Therefore, the creative woman's literary aspirations are in direct conflict with the

expectations of society. From the intellectual woman's standpoint motherhood seems as a curse while it is a blessing for "normal" woman. Consequently, the chilbirth metaphor is an expression of many concerns of the artist woman as opposed to the metaphor of penis, which serves for supporting the exclusion of female writers from the literary arena.

Reflecting such dilemmas of the intellectual woman, both Lessing and Plath provide the readers with a harsh criticism of the power of patriarchy over women's freedom. These two novels successfully reflect social pressure on the creative woman. In *The Golden Notebook* Anna Wulf is a successful writer who makes a great effort to strike a balance between her career in literature and her roles as mother and mistress; similarly in *The Bell Jar* Esther Greenwood, a gifted young woman, is torn between her literary aspirations and social expectations. Although Anna and Esther experience an identity crisis first, and then a depression because of the restraints of male-centred culture, they manage to eliminate their dilemmas from their lives, owing to their awareness that being a creative woman is not a shame but a privilege. Anna and Esther understand that their identities as women artists give them the courage to defy gender discrimination in society. Realizing the value of female creativity, they get a new perspective on their literary powers. To conclude, what Lessing and Plath show by means of their novels is that it is the woman writer's responsibility to fight against social inequality, defending female autonomy and female consciousness since ". . . the women's novel has always had to struggle against the cultural and historical forces that relegated women's experience to the second rank" (Showalter, 1977: 36). For Lessing and Plath women's literature is one of the significant forces which can subvert the male centred culture, creating an awareness of gender bias in the social system.

CHAPTER ONE
FEMINIST LITERARY CRITICISM

This chapter will introduce feminist literary criticism by elaborating on the ideas of distinguished feminist writers and feminist critics. Feminist literary criticism, which develops as one of the most important branches of literary criticism in the second half of the twentieth century, is the direct result of feminist movements whose main concern is equality of women in society. As a term which includes a wide range of different perspectives on the relationship between literature and the question of woman, feminist literary criticism puts great emphasis on the influence of patriarchy and of sexism upon literary canon. In other words, "[l]iterary criticism . . . has reinforced patriarchal order in various ways. The construction of a male-dominated canon is one feature of this" (Webster, 1990: 77). Therefore, according to feminist criticism, literary canon is apt to exclude women writers by giving male writers an advantage that provides them with an obvious superiority over female writers. Apart from challenging gender bias in literature, feminist literary criticism focuses on the representations of women in male and female writers' works in order to expose the difference between male and female viewpoints. Also, another concern of feminist critics is to illuminate power relations between the sexes in literary texts since feminist critics put forward the idea that reading has a political purpose and serves for a political ideology. Moreover, feminist critics examine whether women writers use language differently than male writers or not. This examination raises the question of whether language can be labelled as male or female. In addition to elaborating on the problem of language, feminist criticism deals with women's inner-selves and their psychology by using the psychonalytic approach in the interpretation of literary texts. Consequently, feminist literary criticism aims to revise and re-define the dominant ideology in literature. As a revolutionary approach, feminist literary criticism, which makes a great impact on literary arena in the twentieth century, dates back to the eighteenth century.

In 1792 Mary Wollstonecraft's *A Vindication of the Rights of Woman* (hereafter cited as *VRW*) appears as one of the first feminist texts that deals with women's liberation. For feminist critics, Wollstonecraft's book is the manifesto of modern feminism because in her book Wollstonecraft argues for women's rights and women's education. According to Wollstonecraft, women are subjected to men's

oppression and society's discrimination. Wollstonecraft asserts that society dominated by men applies double standards. In other words, society treats women differently from men. For instance, she writes that society defines "virtue" differently in the case of men and women, and this difference results from the prejudices againsrt women. "To account for, and excuse the tyranny of man, many ingenious arguments have been brought forward to prove that the two sexes, in acquirement of virtue, ought to aim at attaining a very different character or to speak explicitly, women are not allowed to have sufficient strength of mind to acquire what really deserves the name of virtue" (*VRW* ch. 2, par. 1).

Wollstonecraft emphasizes society's pressure upon women by discussing society's negative influence; therefore, *A Vindication of the Rights of Woman* mostly deals with men's controlling power over women and with the restrictions imposed upon them. For Wollstonecraft women's lives are shaped by the expectations of society. "Women are told from their infancy, and taught by the example of their mothers, that . . . softness of temper, *outward* obedience . . . will obtain for them the protection of man; and should they be beautiful, every thing else is needless" (*VRW* ch. 2, par. 2).

Wollstonecraft's words clearly explain that social construction of women's roles plays an important role in women's lives, for women's duties are defined by society. It is compulsory for women to be beautiful, obedient, submissive, charming and passive. In other words; docility, modesty, beauty, loyalty and tender-heartedness are considered as women's characteristics in society's opinion.

It is noteworthy that Wollstonecraft makes use of the ideas of distinguished figures of her time while writing about society's domination over women. For example, Jean Jacques Rousseau's thoughts on women are used in Wollstonecraft's argumentation. "Rousseau declares that a woman should never for a moment feel herself independent, that she should be . . . made a . . . slave in order to render her a more alluring object of desire, a *sweeter* companion to man" (*VRW* ch. 2, par. 20). Wollstonecraft demonstrates that according to Rousseau women should always be under men's control and should obey men's rules. Also, he sees woman as an object, for he calls woman "object of desire," an expression of

woman's sexuality. For Rousseau, one of the most important duties of women is to fulfil their sexual functions in order to give satisfaction to men.

In *A Vindication of the Rights of Woman* Mary Wollstonecraft not only exposes woman's enslavement but also proposes that woman's education should enable her to be independent. "The most perfect education . . . is such an exercise of the understanding as is best calculated to strengthen the body and form the heart or, in other words to enable the individual to attain such habits of virtue as will render it independent" (*VRW* ch. 2, par. 8). Wollstonecraft values independence rather than beauty because she believes freedom provides women with equality in society. Therefore, for the woman should earn her own money. Wollstonecraft writes: "How much more respectable is the woman who earns her own bread by fulfilling any duty, than the most accomplished beauty!" (*VRW* ch. 9, par. 29). Wollstonecraft supports women's right to earn a living that gives them the opportunity to be self-determined. To sum up, in feminist criticism Wollstonecraft's work has an important part as its arguments question the rightness of men's power and present independence as the greatest necessity for women's equality.

After Wollstonecraft's *A Vindication of the Rights of Woman*, John Stuart Mill's *The Subjection of Woman* (hereafter cited as *SW*) is another important text that deals with women's liberation. *The Subjection of Woman*, the result of Stuart Mill's collaboration with his wife Harriet Taylor Mill, elaborates on woman's position in society and their right to vote. As a text that surpasses anything written about women's rights before, *The Subjection of Woman* is regarded as revolutionary due to its debate on the influence of patriarchal manhood upon women.

The first thing challenged by Mill is the general assumption that it is not in woman's nature to be better than man. In other words, woman is not supposed to have the capacity to have abilities which are as good as man's, but Mill objects to this prejudice by rejecting woman's inferiority. Mill says: "What women by nature cannot do, is quite superfluous to forbid them from doing" (*SW* ch. 1, par. 24). For Mill, woman's inferiority has nothing to do with her nature, but this so-called inferiority is men's strategy to subdue women. It is patriarchy's device to put the women's abilities and their mind under men's control. "Men do not want solely the obedience of women, they want their sentiments. . . . They have therefore put

everything in practice to enslave their minds" (*SW* ch. 1, par. 11). Mill also writes that patriarchy's devices to dominate women are education and marriage. Education stands for the process by which women's ways of thinking and feeling are formed by men who believe that women's destiny should be determined by men's desires. Therefore, "[a]ll women are brought up from the very earliest years on the belief that their ideal of character is the very opposite to that of men, not self will . . . but submission" (*SW* ch. 1, par. 11). Mill's words clearly explain that women's education teaches them to be meek, mild and willing to obey men's rules because "[the woman] is not taught self-dependence" (*SW* ch. 4, par. 11). In short, according to Mill, the aim of woman's education is not to provide her with independence, but to imprison her.

In *Subjection of Woman* Mill's other concern is marriage. Mill sees marriage as women's slavery for it is not based on an equal share, but on men's overwhelming victory. "Marriage is the only actual bondage known to our law. There remain no legal slaves, except the mistress of every house" (*SW* ch. 4, par. 2). Mill is of the opinion that the husband acts as a despot who rules his wife cruelly. "[T]he wife is the actual bond servant of her husband" (*SW* ch. 2, par. 1). In other words, marriage functions as an institution of tyranny which manipulates the woman shamelessly and the woman must revolt against the devices of patriarchy by gaining their economic independence and their rights to vote. Like Wollstonecraft, Mill gives support to women's participation in public arena. For Mill, women's fates should not be conditioned by marriage and motherhood; but women should be given the opportunity to earn their living. Like Wollstonecraft, Mill asserts: "The power of earning is essential to the dignity of a woman" (*SW* ch. 2, par. 16). Financial freedom enables women to subvert patriarchal ideology since it gives them the opportunity to use the power of her mind and that of her abilities.

Apart from the necessity of money, Mill writes about women's participation in politics. Firstly, Mill makes a complaint about woman's ignorance of her political duty. "[Woman] neither knows nor cares which is the right side in politics" (*SW* ch. 2, par. 5). On the one hand Mill expresses women's lack of political consciousness, on the other hand he knows that women's ignorance is the consequence of men's bias which makes women the slave of wifely and motherly concerns. "The general opinion of men is supposed to be, that the natural vocation of a woman is that of a

wife and mother" (*SW* ch. 1, par. 25). In contrast to men's assumptions, Mill claims that women should have the right to vote. "Under whatever conditions . . . men are admitted to the suffrage, there is not a shadow of justification for not admitting women the same" (*SW* ch. 3, par. 2). According to Mill, woman should not only be a mother and a wife but also a citizen who contributes to political affairs of her country. To conclude, Mill's *Subjection of Woman* puts forward the idea that women should be supplied with ". . . the free use of their faculties . . . [and] the free choice of their employments . . . for the higher service of humanity"(*SW* ch. 4, par. 6).

Like Wollstonecraft and Mill, Virginia Wollf argues against the social inequality in *A Room of One's Own* (1929) (hereafter cited as *ROO*). In A *Room of One's Own,* Woolf not only stresses the need for women's liberation but also provides the literary arena with a new perspective on the issue of women and writing by creating an imaginary character called Judith Shakespeare. Judith Shakespeare is presented as William Shakespeare's sister who is as gifted as Shakespeare, but unlike Shakespeare, Judith cannot show her artistic talents and cannot win fame and wealth because of the discrimination she faces. For example, she cannot complete her education because her family compels her to get married. Then, she leaves her home so as to be an artist, but she's rejected. After that, she starts living under the control of a man who exploits her sexually because she cannot support herself financially. In the end, Judith commits suicide in order to escape from the pressure she is subjected to.

Woolf's imaginary character clearly shows the expected condition of a woman who tries to reject the life that is dictated by society. In *A Room of One's Own*, Judith Shakespeare's end epitomizes what is wrong with the socially established opinions about women since it is a waste of Judith's talents to prevent her from using her intellectual powers. Judith's story exposes that woman is destined to fail if she tries to trangress the boundaries between the sexes. Woolf puts forward the idea that money is a must for woman if she wants to show her intellectual powers. Woolf writes: ". . . a woman must have money and a room of her own if she is to write fiction" (*ROO* ch. 1, par. 1). According to Woolf, money and the room enable the intellectual woman to gain freedom she needs for her creativity because "[i]ntellectual freedom depends on material things" (*ROO* ch. 6, par. 13).

In addition to attributing women's lack of intellectual freedom to their lack of income, Woolf cannot help writing about the lack of equality of opportunity in society. She complains that women cannot take part in the public arena because of the limits which imposed on women's desires beyond private sphere. Woolf tells: "[Women] need exercise for their faculties and a field for their efforts as much as their brothers do; they suffer from too rigid a restraint" (*ROO* ch. 4, par. 27). For Woolf, women are not allowed to demonstrate their abilities although they are as talented as men, and this unfair treatment by society depends on the mistaken assumption that women are characteristically different than men. "Women are supposed to be very calm generally; but women feel just as men feel" (*ROO* ch. 4, par. 27). Woolf opposes society's use of the characteristic differences between women and men to show women as inferior beings. Thus, Woolf defends androgyny, a concept she applies from S.T. Coleridge in fighning against society's prejudiced view on female creativity.

Androgyny means having both female and male characteristics. In *ROO,* it lies at the heart of artistic creativity. According to Woolf, being androgynous is one of the most noticeable characteristics of those who have great ability and of high intelligence. "[I]n each of us the two powers preside, one male, one female . . . the normal and comfortable state of being is that when the two live in harmony together, spiritually co-operating . . . Coleridge perhaps meant this when he said that a great mind is androgynous" (*ROO* ch. 6, par. 3). Being androgynous enables an individual to be aware of his/her powers without considering his/her sex. In this sense, androgyny includes the meaning of emancipating the individual from obstacles arising from sex consciousness. "[T]he androgynous mind is resonant and porous; that it transmits emotion without impediment, that it is naturally creative, incandescent and undivided" (*ROO* ch. 6, par. 4). Briefly, Woolf's perspective on androgyny is a strong resistance to society's generally accepted ideas judging women's artistic skills unfairly on the basis of sex.

In her essay, Woolf also comments on famous women writers such as Aphra Behn, George Eliot, Bronté Sisters and Jane Austen. Woolf's discussion is mainly based on their use of language. Woolf asserts that one of the most significant characteristics of the female writer should be her different attitude towards language because for the woman writer "the weigh, the pace, the stride of a man's mind are

too unlike her own for her to lift anything substantial from him successfully" (*ROO* ch. 4, par. 37). Therefore, the female writer should not copy "a man's sentence" (*ROO* ch. 4, par. 37) servilely in order not to be an imitator of the male writer. According to Woolf's arguments, when the women writers first start writing, they face the problem of language use since ". . . there [is] no common sentence ready for [their] use" (*ROO* ch. 4, par. 37). However, some women novelists such as Jane Auston and Emily Bronté solve this problem and find "a perfectly natural, shapely sentence proper for [their] own use" (*ROO* ch. 4, par. 37) while George Eliot and Charlotte Bronté do not reject the male writers' use of language as a model. Therefore, from the perspective of their language use, Woolf favours Jane Austen and Emily Bronté more than George Eliot and Charlotte Bronté.

In feminist criticism, the debate on the issue of the female writer's language continues throughout the twentieth century. Especially in the 1970's and 1980's the language question is crucial for French feminists, Julia Kristeva and for Helene Cixous. Cixous, for instance, introduces the concept of "ecriture feminine", female writing. In her essay "The Laugh of Medusa," Cixous attributes woman's creativity to her body. In other words, woman's body functions as a power that provides woman with creativeness. Therefore, it is not possible for the female writer to use man's language. Cixous claims: "[A] woman does not write like man, because she speaks with the body. [W]riting resembles the body and the sexual division is expressed in the difference of women's writing" (as cited in M. Eagleton, 1986: 221). For Cixous, women's writing should be not only different but also revolutionary, going beyond the dominant ideology; that is to say, écriture feminine should subvert the established systems. "Women . . . must invent the impregnable language that will wreck . . . rhetorics . . . and codes, they must . . . cut through . . . the ultimate reverse-discourse" (as cited in Barry, 1995: 128). In Cixous' view, the difference of écriture feminine lies in its reaction against male hegemony. Like Woolf, Cixous rejects male-dominated language that subordinates the female author's writing.

Julia Kristeva also elaborates on the issue of language by using Lacan's theories that divide the human psyche into twee: the imaginary order, the symbolic order and the real order. Instead of Lacan's imaginary and symbolic orders, Kristeva presents the semiotic and the symbolic. In Krstevan theory, the semiotic is related to the pre-oedipal phrase in which the child's state is shaped by the chora since the

child cannot use the language. Kristeva defines chora as “a wholly provisional articulation that is essentially mobile and constituted of movements and their ephemeral states” (as cited in Vice, 1996: 159), and the chora is dominated by the child’s connection with the mother’s body and by his/her needs. Next comes a separation from the chora when the child enters the symbolic order that depends on the father figure. In this stage, the semiotic is repressed and its fluidity and rhythms are held back. Nonetheless, the influence of the semiotic is still perceptible in language since this repression is not complete in itself. According to Kristeva, “[t]he semiotic is the ‘other’ language . . . [and] Kristeva looks to this ‘language’ of the semiotic as a means of undermining the symbolic order” (T. Eagleton, 1983: 188). Kristeva’s theory comes to the conclusion that the semiotic side of language, whose tendency towards femininity contrasts with the symbolic, is against all conventions which defends logic and order within language and it is generally associated with poetry.

Woolf’s arguments in *A Room of One’s Own* are of crucial importance not only for the French feminists but also for Anglo-American critic, Elaine Showalter. Showalter, like Woolf, elaborates on female writers and divides the history of woman’s writing into three phrases. There are three phrases: “feminine,” “feminist,” and “female.” Showalter writes: “I identify the feminine phrases as the period from the appearance of the male pseudonym in the 1840’s to . . . 1880; the feminist phrase as 1880 to 1920, or the winning of the vote; and the female phrase as 1920 to the present, . . . entering a new stage of self-awareness” (Showalter, 1977: 13). In Showalter’s view, the first stage of woman’s writing shows the dominance of male literature over woman’s writing. In feminist phrase, revolt against male chauvinism and claim for women’s rights influence woman’s writing, and the last stage, the female, is concerned with the discovery of the female imagination.

According to Showalter, feminist criticism includes two main categories. The first main category is “feminist critique” which “. . . is concerned with woman as reader--with woman as the consumer of male-produced literature” (Showalter,1985: 128), and the second one is called “gynocriticism” which “. . . is concerned with woman as writer” (Showalter, 1985: 128). Showalter claims that the first category deals with the question of woman from male perspective while the second one exposes the female writer’s experience. In feminist critique, representations of

women are examined in male writers' texts where feminist critics try to explain the hidden ideology in these representations as women's images depicted in male authors' literary works are just stereotypes with no individuality. In other words, male writers provide readers with the fixed set of ideas about what women are like. Therefore, the main aim of feminist critique is to elaborate on the literature by men who stereotype women for the sake of patriarchy. Gynocriticism, the second category of feminist criticism, deals with female writers' literary works, releasing itself from the male-dominated literature. "[I]ts subjects are the history, styles, themes, genres, and structures of writing by women; the psychodynamics of female creativity; the trajectory of the individual or collective career; and the evolution and laws of a female literary tradition" (Showalter, 2000: 311). Gynocriticism not only explores female-produced texts but also presents a female culture in which female imagination and female consciousness are highly appreciated. In this respect, gynocriticism does not limit itself to the illumination of characteristics of literature by women. Other functions of gynocriticism comprise female writers' claim for making a contribution to literary canon, their endeavour to reduce male writers' influence upon literature and their wish to enable readers to have an awareness of the importance of female writers' part in literature.

Showalter also asserts that gynocriticism has four aspects that define four different models of women's writing. These aspects distinguish one model of women's writing from another in biological, linguistic, psychoanalytic and cultural terms. The biological aspect of gynocriticism exposes how the female body affects woman's creativity. In other words, it questions how anatomical and physiological differences between male and female writers are reflected in their texts. The second aspect deals with female writer's language. The influence of the female psyche upon women's literature is explored by the psychoanalytic side of gynocriticism. The relationship between the female writer and the society in which she lives is the concern of cultural model.

The biological aspect of gynocriticism is one of the main issues in Sandra Gilbert's and Susan Gubar's *The Madwoman in the Attic: The Woman Writer and the Nineteenth-Century Literary Imagination* (1979). In *The Madwoman in the Attic*, Gubar and Gilbert question the relationship between sex and creativity, and they ask the question: "Is a pen a metaphorical penis?" (1979: 3). Then, they answer that

“Male sexuality . . . is . . . actually the essence of literary power. The poet’s pen is in some sense (even more than figuratively) a penis” (1979: 4) Gubar’s and Gilbert’s answer is based on Gerard Manley Hopkins’ assumptions that the power to create is associated with men, and Gilbert’s and Gubar’s main aim in using Hopkins’ views is to explain how male writers dominate literature because society’s prejudices against female writers prevent them from having a part in literature. From society’s standpoint it is believed that women’s responsibilities include domestic services such as cooking, child-caring and house-keeping and it is regarded as “unnatural” for women to have a share in politics, art, history and literature activities that require intellectual capacity. Therefore, in literature female writers are not paid any serious attention as “the text’s author is a father, a progenitor, a procreator, an aesthetic patriarch whose pen is an instrument of generative power like his penis” (Gilbert, Gubar, 1979: 6) Such a biological difference holds the key to the male writer’s privilege; therefore, writing is accepted as men’s job as a consequence of discrimination against women writers. As such Gilbert and Gubar again ask the question to demystify man’s power in literature: “If the pen is a metaphorical penis, from what organ can females generate texts?” (1979: 7). There are no easy answers to this question, but Gilbert’s and Gubar’s main objective is to show man’s manipulation of literature.

In *The Madwoman in the Attic*, Gilbert and Gubar also write that male writers’ manipulative attitude is reflected by their female characters who represent two distinct types of woman. In literature male writers’ first stereotype is “the angel in the house” who is a meek, gentle, chaste, faithful, passive, pure and obedient woman. This angel figure shows careful consideration for men’s demands and perfectly fulfils her duties in private sphere. For these reasons, the angel in the house is the epitome of ideal mother and of ideal wife. In brief, this figue symbolizes man’s ideal woman whose existence does not pose a grave threat to men’s hegemony.

The second category of woman’s image in literature is “the madwoman in the attic” that is diametrically opposed to “the angel in the house.” When the woman is represented as “the madwoman” she is identified with the monstrous; that is to say, the female monster is a disobedient, immoral, unruly and unfaithful woman whose rebellion against socially constructed female identity is labelled as madness. According to male writers, woman’s insanity is concerned with her rejection of

gender roles because woman's refusal to fulfil the expectations of society is not only a disgrace brought on the whole family but also a crime committed against nature. If the woman does not agree to be an angel, she transforms into a monster whose madness jeopardizes man's influence upon the woman. Shortly, woman's image as a monster figure symbolizes woman's lack of angelic traits and her reaction against patriarchal society.

Gilbert's and Gubar's other important concern is the woman's writing experience that exposes the female writer's anxieties and problems. Gubar and Gilbert assert that writing puts woman in a dilemma as to whether to express her female creativity or suppress it. On the one hand, the woman wants to write fiction to use her intellectual powers; on the other hand, she feels as if she is doing something shameful or something illegal because of society's pressure which forbid the woman to write. Therefore, the female writer's desire for writing brings her into conflict with society, and female writer's suffering results from this conflict whose burden compels the female writer to struggle both with psychological fears and for literary autonomy. In this context, Gubar and Gilbert say:

> *[T]he loneliness of the female artist, her feelings of alienation from male predecessors coupled with her need for sisterly precursors and successors, . . . her culturally conditioned timidity about self-dramatization, . . . her anxiety about the impropriety of female invention--all these phenomena of inferiorization mark the woman writer's struggle for artistic self-definition and differentiate her efforts at self-creation from those of her male counterpart. (1979: 50).*

Gubar and Gilbert not only write about the woman writer's difficulties but also tell about the strategy she employs to overcome them. For the woman writer, the way of expressing her worries is to create female characters whose ideas and feelings represent her own concerns. These fictional characters are the symbols of woman writer's fierce opposition to discrimination against woman. "The angel and the monster, the sweet heroine and the raging madwoman, are aspects of the author's self-image, as well as elements of her treacherous anti-patriarchal strategies" (Gilbert, Gubar, 1979: 60-61). Therefore, for the female writer writing turns into a means of resisting inequality in society; especially, one character plays a crucial role in her resistance. This figure is the mentally ill and wild woman who does not fit the stereotypical angelic figure, and this insane character reflects the female writer's own suffering and fury. "[T]he character (particularly the mad-woman) is the author's double, an image of her own anxiety and rage" (Gilbert, Gubar, 1979: 61).

Shortly, the female writer's psychological interiority is presented by her fictional characters and especially, the women labelled as mad in her works mirror the two opposing forces within the female writer's psyche, creating a clash between her desire to write and her societal duties.

Similar to Gilbert and Gubar, the French writer Simone de Beauvoir deals with the manipulation of the woman by exposing how woman is defined as the other in male-dominated society. In *The Second Sex* (hereafter cited as *SS*), Beauvoir discusses the construction of woman as the other with regard to biology, psychoanalysis, literature and history and explains how the process of othering works. Also, Beauvoir's arguments include the idea that in order to subvert the patriarchal ideology women must reject the representation of woman as the other. For this reason, Beauvoir, like Wollstonecraft, Mill and Woolf, puts a great emphasis on men's hegemony which excludes women from all areas of society.

In *The Second Sex* woman's otherness is presented as the most significant creation of patriarchy, confining woman to the category of an object. Woman, as an object controlled by men, cannot form her own identity since ". . . man defines woman not in herself but as relative to him [and] she is not regarded as an autonomous being" (*SS* Introduction, par. 6). Men's power that makes woman the other imposes the socially constructed identity upon woman. Thus, "she [woman] is simply what man decrees. . . He is the subject, . . . [and] the absolute--she is the other" (*SS* Introduction, par. 6).

According to Beauvoir, patriarchy's depiction of who women are results from its perspective on women's biological and psychological differences from men. For instance, what it means to be a woman is determined by her biological differences. According to Beauvoir: "She [woman] is a womb, an ovary" (*SS* B.1 ch. 1, par. 1). Beauvoir regards woman's body as the most dominant element in woman's life.

Beauvoir goes on to explain woman's otherness in the light of psychoanalysis, drawing the readers' attention to Freud's analysis of female psychology. According to Freud, women suffer a sense of lack because of their state of not having a penis and he calls this assumption penis envy. "As a child she [woman] identifies herself with her father; then she becomes possessed with a

feeling of inferiority with reference to male" (*SS* B.1 ch. 2, par. 9). In Beauvoir's view, "penis envy" is the chief theory from which patriarchal codes are developed and it forms the basis of woman's otherness since what man's sex organ connotes is power all women lack.

Readers also see Beauvoir's differenciation of "sex" from "gender". Beauvoir claims that sex is concerned with biology whereas gender is related to the norms of society; that is to say, what it means to be a female is shaped by XX chromosomes, yet as Beauvoir asserts society creates one's gender in accordance with its cultural values: "One is not born a woman, but rather becomes one" (as cited in Butler, 1995: 8). Therefore, the process of becoming a woman, in Beauvoir's terms, is connected with social construction in which woman is destined to fulfil her societal duities. To be a woman requires being a female at birth and it also demands playing gender roles that force woman to live under the control of patriarchy.

It is worth noting that Beauvoir's ideas are revised by the third wave feminism in the 1990's and Judith Butler, one of the most important post-modern feminists, introduces a new approach to the concept of gender. In *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity*, Butler explores sexual identity from a philosophical and psychoanalytic standpoint. For this reason, not only feminist critics but also queer theorists are interested in Butler's thoughts on gender and identity.

In *Gender Trouble*, performativity of gender is brought forward by Butler who, regards gender as a changeable notion. Butler defends the fluidity of gender that does not compel one's identity to be bound up with a particular context. "[G]ender is an identity tenuously constituted in time, instituted in an exterior space through a stylized repetition of acts" (1990: 140). For Butler, gender is shaped by a specific period and place. Therefore, gender has nothing to do with essentialism whose insistence on the fixed nature of the sexes results in the assumption that gender is not in a state of flux. From Butler's viewpoint, gender is not only exposed to a continual change but also connected with actions done again and again. According to Butler, gender involves an activity in itself and this activity requires a continuation as Butler writes: "Gender is the repeated stylization of the body, a set of repeated acts within a highly rigid regulatory frame " (1990: 33).

The fact that gender is performative is obvious; similarly identity is fluid and also depends on a group of connected acts. This idea of Butler results from her opposition to heterosexist ideology that presents heterosexuality as a norm. Butler asserts that the stability of identity is a lie because nothing can condition one's identity except for his or her actions. "There is no gender identity behind the expressions of gender; that identity is performatively constituted by the very 'expressions' that are said to be its results" (1990: 25). Butler's words clearly explain how one's identity is formed by his or her performances, and moreover, this explanation comes as a reaction against the social construct of femaleness which defines the woman's identity in accordance with social values. To sum up, Butler argues against compulsory heterosexuality as she supports the instability of gender and of identity, and one of the most significant conclusion that the readers can derive from Butler's *Gender Trouble* is that gender and identity are based on a process in which the words "doing" and "becoming" play important roles.

As I have already given an overview of first and third wave feminisms, it is also useful to mention the second wave feminism that covers the period between the 1960's and 1990's. For example, Kate Millet, who is an eminent figure of second wave feminism, discusses the political and ideological aspects of men's relation with women in *Sexual Politics* by analyzing the literary works of male writers such as Norman Mailer, Jean Genet, Henry Miller and D. H. Lawrence. Also, Freud's thoughts on women are examined by Millet. Therefore, Millet's *Sexual Politics* deals with both socio-cultural and psychological roots of patriarchal ideology.

In *Sexual Politics*, Millet's main argument concentrates on patriarchy as the root cause of women's subjugation in society. Millet asserts that the political side of the relationship between the sexes gives one sex the superiority over the other sex. In other words, "the term 'politics' . . . refer[s] to power-structured relationships, arrangements whereby one group of persons is controlled by another" (Millet, 1990: 23). In Millet's view sex has a political connotation which gives the male sex a highly elevated position in society, and this position proves that the relation between men and women depends not only on personal matters but also on a political ideology. "[S]ex is a status category with political implications" (Millet, 1990: 24). Millet's words clearly explain that the politicization of the connection between the sexes results in many inequalities in society. Moreover, these inequalities create a system in which

male members of society exercise considerable power over the female members. Therefore, men are given a special advantage as a result of this male-centred system and women have only a marginal effect on society. The order in society centres on the male power. “[T]he entire culture supports masculine authority in all areas of life and--outside of the home--permits the female none at all” (Millet, 1990: 35). Millet regards patriarchy as the main determinant in the subordination of woman as woman’s condition is shaped by the priviliged sex, in other words, by the male sex. In brief, *Sexual Politics* attributes woman’s suffering to patriarchal system, which confines woman to man’s rigid discipline.

It is noteworthy that Millet’s analysis of influences of patriarchy is also combined with psychoanalytic point of view, with Freud’s ideas about woman. Millet writes that male-dominated society’s prejudiced perspective on woman is re-told by Freud. “Beginning with the theory of penis envy, the definition of the female is negative . . . [S]he is not a male and ‘lacks’ a penis” (Millet, 1990: 179-180). In Millet’s view, Freud’s penis envy is a reflection of patriarchal ideology whose emphasis on woman’s biological difference causes major hindrance to woman’s right to share an equal life with man. For Millet, penis envy is an example of biological determinism that gives a very superficial analysis of difference between the sexes.

In addition to the theory of penis envy, Millet elaborates on Freud’s comment on female qualities that depict the woman as a narcissist, passive and masochist person. “The three most distinguishing traits of female personality [are] in Freud’s view passivity, masochism and narcissism” (Millet, 1990: 194). Millet regards these characteristics as the inventions of the misogynist attitude of male-dominated culture. In other words, Freud’s theories feed the hatred of woman since they provide unfair and unfavourable opinions about them. Therefore, Millet shows the psychological side of the idea of sexual politics which is one of the most important sources of discrimination against women.

At the end of *Sexual Politics* Millet offers a solution to the problem of inequality in society. Millet believes in the necessity of a complete change in society’s ways of thinking about woman’s status. For this reason, Millet is of the opinion that the norms of male-dominated culture should be re-considered for

woman's freedom. "The . . . social change involved in a sexual revolution is basically a matter of altered consciousness. . . . We are speaking, then, of a cultural revolution . . . And it would seem that the most profound changes . . . are ones accomplished by . . . true re-education" (Millet, 1990: 362-363). From Millet's words it can be concluded that woman's freedom lies in the defeat of patriarchy that will rescue woman from society's unfair treatment.

After Millet's accusation that patriarchy takes one of its sources from psychoanalysis, there comes a defence of Freud's ideas in 1974 with the publication of Juliet Mitchell's *Psychoanalysis and Feminism*. In her book, Mitchell asserts that patriarchy has not been created by Freud. According to Mitchell, Freud just presents what patriarchy has created; that is to say, Freud's ideas only show the roles men and women play, and she writes that: "women have to organize themselves as a group to effect a change in the basic ideology of human society" (as cited in Gallop, 1982: 13). For Mitchell, the problem of inequality in society lies not in psychoanalysis, but in ideology that creates a system based on men's power. Further, she concludes that women should fight for the change in society's ideology for the discrimination against them stems from it.

Another opposition to Millet comes from Jane Gallop's *The Daughter's Seduction: Feminism and Psychoanalysis* (1982). Instead of Freud, Gallop deals with Lacanian viewpoint to defend psychoanalysis against Millet. In her book, Gallop makes use of Lacan's separation of phallus from penis by pointing out it is obvious that women do not have penis, and the phallus is what both the male and female sexes do not own as "the phallus is the attribute of power which neither men nor women have. But as long as the attribute of power is a phallus which . . . can be confused with a penis, this confusion will support a structure in which it seems reasonable that men have power and women do not" (Gallop, 1982: 97). Gallop's words clearly explain society's mistake to see phallus as the symbol of man to justify the inequality. Therefore, for Gallop it is useless to find psychoanalysis guilty of patriarchy's hegemony.

From the brief discussion of feminist literary criticism in the ligth of the ideas of significant feminist critics, it is clear that feminist literary criticim offers a different perspective on male-centred literary arena which accepts the supremacy of male

writers. In feminist criticism there is a rejection of old and traditional ways of interpretting literary texts since its great emphasis on the question of women enables the reader to think critically about woman's place in society. To conclude, feminist critics endeavour to challenge to male-dominated literature with the novelty of their ideas.

CHAPTER TWO
WOMEN AND MADNESS

Madness is historically associated with the question of woman. Elaine Showalter's *The Female Malady: Women, Madness, and English Culture* (hereafter cited as *FM*), which will provide the fundamental arguments in this chapter, testifies to this association. In her book, Showalter gives a detailed analysis of women's insanity by dividing her work into three parts that cover the periods from the Victorian era to the modern times. Showalter aims to identify the relationship between women and madness, and this identicaton is the core of this chapter. Because the purpose of this chapter is to show the role patriarchy plays in female lunacy, this chapter examines how a mental illness turns out to be a cultural phenomenon, which supports male hegemony in society. In this examination one of the most significant ideas which demonstrates the contribution of male-dominated culture to women's mental breakdown is that women's madness is the outcome of a process in which women are subjected to the oppression of the restraints patriarchal ideology imposes upon their freedom. For this reason, in a male-centred culture madness is a label which functions as a punishment for women's endeavour to rid themselves of the burden of their societal roles.

The next idea emphasized in this chapter is women's subvertion of the patriarchally-created label. For many women who struggle with mental illness, lunacy is a means of creating a sphere in which they have freedom and power to some extent. Therefore, the objective of this chapter is to illuminate why women choose such a way to be free from feeling constrained by the decrees of patriarchy. However different the perspectives of different periods of history concerning female insanity, in all the periods from the Victorian era to the modern times it is possible to observe the influence of patriarchal ideology as the root cause of women's madness, but women writers have discovered the potential of subversion in madness by presenting it in all historical periods as a liberating force for women.

In the Victorian period a great change in the cure for insanity occurs owing to the establishments of public asylums and owing to a new perspective on madness. This new perspective is based on the idea of "taming of the brutish lunatic" (*FM* 28). To doctors, patients are child-like figures who need both affection and discipline.

For this reason, education of patients for social life gains importance. Patients' education is conditioned by their class and sex. For example, patients from upper class are given lectures. Also, parties organized for patients' having a good time are very common in this period.

In the Victorian era, the issue of women's madness is very crucial to psychiatrists and the first significant point that attracts attention is that the number of female patients is higher than that of male patients. Doctors attribute this difference to biology since they see puberty and child-bearing as the root causes of women's insanity. One of the most important reasons considered for women's lunacy in the Victorian era is the crisis emerging during puberty because girls have to adjust themselves very quickly to the restrictions of society. Puberty results in girls' feeling constrained to do what traditions decree. Therefore, girls who cannot endure a limited social life fall mentally ill.

Other reason regarded as a cause of women's madness is the stress after giving birth. Depression after child-bearing make women fail to be "feminine" in appearance and in manners. "Women with puerperal mania [are] indifferent to the unusual conventions of politeness and decorum in speech, dress and behavior" (*FM* 58). Moreover, women who go mad because of birth sometimes kill their babies, but killing of infants is mostly concerned with cruelty and lack of economic power that is necessary for child-caring.

In Victorian asylums the aim of the treatment of madwomen is to make them gain womanly characteristics such as obedience, passivity and piousness, for most madwomen are seen as unruly, disobedient and garrulous. Psychiatrists keep a careful watch on the activities of madwomen. Their activities generally include housework as opposed to male patients' outdoor activities. Madwomen who are difficult to control are given medicine with sedative effects or kept in isolation. In Victorian era the cure for women's insanity is based on making them submissive. For this reason, it is the women who rebel against traditional feminine ideals that are labelled as mad, for women's rejection of society's conventions is regarded as mental illness.

Madwomen's situation in the Victorian period is also evident in novels of the time. Novelists, unlike psychiatrists who believe that women's madness stems from biological problems, depict a hopeless life full of resrtictions as the root cause of women's depression. For example, Florance Nightingale's *Cassandra*, which deals with the story of a madwoman's suffering, gives a portrayal of middle-class Victorian woman who experiences a breakdown because of her dissatisfaction with her life. In her book, Nightingale creates a character called Cassandra who attempts to take Christ as a model to make women aware of their desperate state, but she descents into madness as a consequence of the pressure of society. Nightingale's purpose of writing *Cassandra* is to show how male-centred culture prevents women from taking action to liberate themselves from society's established opinions. "What terrifie[s] Nightingale [is] that middle-class Victorian women [are] Cassandras rendered so crazy and powerless by their society that they [can] rail and rave but never act" (*FM* 65).

Another novel that describes Victorian women's depression is Charlotte Bronte's *Jane Eyre*. In Bronte's novel, the madwoman is Bertha Mason who is secluded in an attic by her husband Rochester. Bertha, whose insanity is considered to have a connection with her sexual appetite, is depicted as uncontrollably fierce, wild and ferocious. Bertha does not attract the readers' attention so much because the novel is based on the love affair between Jane Eyre and Rochester, but Bertha becomes one of the most important figure for feminist critics, Sandra Gilbert and Susan Gubar, in the late 1970's.

Gubar and Gilbert claim that Bertha functions as Jane Eyre's alter-ego. In other words, Bertha represents Jane's suppressed desires, that is, Bertha is the symbol of "Jane's truest and darkest double . . . the ferocious secret self Jane has been trying to repress" (Gilbert, Gubar, 1979: 360). From Gubar's and Gilbert's perspective Bertha's unruliness and furiousness reflect what Jane suppresses in her inner-self. Gubar and Gilbert also assert that Bertha, in other words, the madwoman is the representation of ". . . the author's double, 'an image of her own anxiety and rage' "(1979: 61). According to Gubar and Gilbert, the female writer expresses society's pressure upon herself by creating the figure of madwomen. As a result of Gilbert's and Gubar's view on Victorian madwoman, women's madness in the

Victorian period brings a novel angle to the feminist criticism in the twentieth century.

After the Victorian era, Darwin's theories dominate psychiatry between the late nineteenth century and the early twentieth century. Darwinian perspective on human mind and on society results in the emergence of a new idea of madness. Darwinism attributes the cause of insanity to environmental and familial influences. From Darwinian standpoint lunacy symbolizes corruption and deterioration of social position. Psychiatrists show the lack of power to survive in life as the source of madness. In psychiatric Darwinism, there is a great emphasis on the "borderland" which means "the shadowy territory between sanity and madness" (*FM* 105). According to the psychiatrists in this era, one's condition between mental health and mental illness is shaped by the use of abilities. Determination and self-discipline are accepted as the signs of sanity while the lack of physical health and the descent into a low state of morals are regarded as the symptoms of madness. Also, association of lunacy with heredity and with downward reversal of social conditions creates class and gender bias in society. People from upper class are considered to epitomize mental health, but poverty-stricken people are supposed to have a tendency toward insanity. For Darwinian psychiatrists, women are much more liable to lose their mental health since Darwin's theories, which defend men's superiority, are dominant in psychiatry. In Darwinian psychiatrists' opinion, it is women's nature to be inferior to men because men are more intelligent and more talented than women. Also, Darwin's theories depict motherhood as the most appropriate work for women. For this reason, women who attempt to pursue a profession other than motherhood are considered as rebels who disobey their nature. Male psychiatrists defend that the more women get education, the less they become feminine; feminists at that time however, think otherwise. Feminists oppose male doctors' explanations of disastrous consequences of women's higher education.

During the period of psychiatric Darwinism male patients mostly suffer from "general paralysis of the insane" (GPI), whose symptoms are "grandiose delusions, dramatic personality changes, failing memory, facial tremor, slurred speech and unsteady gait" (*FM* 111). Also, the most widespread sign of the illness is moral wickedness, and the combination of immorality with familial influences is seen as the root cause of GPI.

While GPI is very popular with male patients, anorexia nervosa, neurasthenia and hysteria are common women's diseases at that time. All these diseases are associated with the female. One of the most significant women's diseases at that time is anorexia nervosa whose symptom is rejection of eating; especially young women lose their desire for food, and they completely quit eating meat. Eating habits based on vegetarianism are widespread. Female patients of anorexia nervosa generally get thinner and thinner, but they become more and more energetic, and they very seldom feel exhausted. Also, they ignore the importance of nourishment. Even though anorexia is considered by some doctors as a kind of hysteria, it certainly has the connotation of the female patients' protest against society's imposition of feminine ideals upon them. Lodahl writes: "The view of anorexia as a rejection of femininity which often manifests itself as a fear of oral impregnation is widely held" (1976: 343). In this sense, rejection of eating symbolizes women's refusal to obey society's norms which usurp women's rights to improve themselves intellectually; that is, what women try to show by means of anorexia is that they need not only food but also a field that can provide them with opportunities to use their abilities and creativity. Since women's lives are moulded more by the influence of male-centred culture than by their free choices, rejection of food serves as the only right women choose without social pressure. Therefore, ". . . eating disorders represent an indirect method of gaining power and control because no one can force an anorectic to eat . . . Thus, anorexia . . . allow[s] women a degree of power in their lives while appearing subordinate to society's expectations" (Killian, 1994: 314). Women, troubled by the established opinions of male-dominated society, see refusal to eat as a way of subverting the dominant ideology. Women's repressed desire to rebel against patriarchy emerges as women's opposition to nutrition.

Neurasthenia is another common mental illness associated with women in the late nineteenth century. Symptoms of the disease are ". . . blushing, vertigo, headaches, . . . insomnia, depression and uterine irritability" (*FM* 134). Neurasthenia is very widespread in America at that time, and mostly dominates patients who live in big cities. Therefore, neurasthenia is considered to have a connection with modernization. Male patients who suffer from neurasthenia are generally well-trained and skilled people. Female patients are educated women who desire to have

a successful career in public arena. For men, the disease is a sign of their ambition for success, but for women it is a proof of the absurdity of their desire to have a part in professional arena. Neurasthenia patients are advised to have complete rest. However, having a rest from usual activities usually does not effect a cure; especially preventing female patients from writing and reading is common, but it produces catastrophic consequences.

Disastrous results of rest cure for neurasthenia are also reflected in literature of that time. For example, Charlotte Perkins Gilman's "The Yellow Wall-Paper" tells how an intellectual woman is driven mad by rest cure. The story includes autobiographical elements, since Gilman herself experienced a mental breakdown and had a rest cure that made her feel more depressed. Gilman explains the negative influences of her doctor's therapy in "Why I wrote 'The Yellow Wallpaper' " : "This wiseman . . . applied the rest cure . . . , and sent me home with solemn advice to 'live as domestic a life as for as possible'. . . I . . . obeyed those directions . . . and came so near the border line of utter mental ruin" (1996: 126). Like Gilman, who suffers from the treatment which restricts her intellectual work, the heroine in "The Yellow Wall-Paper" is confined to a room by her physician husband who sees the rest cure as the remedy of his wife's disease. The husband, John, does not allow his wife to do any work and to write, but for the heroine writing has a great significance because she is not a conventional domestic woman. On the contrary, she is an intelligent woman who has a capacity to write, but her husband puts limits on her creativity by means of rest cure. Therefore, watching the wallpaper becomes the only activity of the heroine, and she sees a figure of a woman crawling in the wallpaper. This hallucination proves that the heroine loses her mental health because of the rest cure her husband applies. Her husband opposes her writing, so she suppresses her desire for creativeness. Nevertheless, she tries to find a way of using her intellectual powers by means of her analysis of the pattern in the wall-paper, but since she cannot endure the oppression of domestic life, she goes insane. As a consequence of the passive and dull life the rest cure prescribes, the heroine, the artist-woman cannot use her talents, and she tries to free herself from the restrictions of her husband by means of madness. "Gilman's mad narrator unveils not only the ills of the rest cure treatment and a repressive domestic culture . . . , but also indicts . . . gender-biased defintions of mental illness" (Hume, 2002:

12). Shortly, the heroine's insanity is ". . . her quest for freedom . . . associated . . . with . . . Victorian patriarchal culture" (Hume, 2008: 13).

As women demand more rights to participate in public sphere, a different kind of woman called New Woman appears. The New Woman wants to break away from the rigid discipline of Victorian femininity, but as the New Woman's efforts fail, she finds herself in a desparate situation, struggling with hysteria. Hysteria plays much more important role than the other mental illnesses in psychiatry at the time. It is more widespread than anorexia and than neurasthenia. "The word 'hysteria derives from the Greek word for 'womb': hysteria. Early medical writers believe . . . that the uterus [can] move around the body, giving rise to physical and mental disturbance" (Small, 1996: 117). According to Darwinian psychiatrists, the root cause of hysteria lies in women's trouble with their wombs. Psychiatrists' attribution of the cause of disease to an organ that belongs to women only shows that hysteria is considered to be "a female malady" (*FM* 148). To psychiatrists, the female reproductive system is the source of hysteria, and marriage is accepted as the best remedy for it. Therefore, the cure for hysteria is based on domestication of hysteric women.

One of the most important analysis of hysteria is Josef Breuer's and Sigmund Freud's study of a patient called "Anna O". Anna, whose real name is Bertha Pappenheim, is a rich Viennese Jewish girl and has great intellectual capacity, but she is not allowed to have a university education. For this reason, she spends most of her time at home by doing housework which does not allow her intelligence and abilities to flourish. Also, she has to look after her father who suffers from tuberculosis. Anna O. developes hysteria after her father dies, and she becomes Breuer's patient, attending his talking sessions.

An interesting point in Anna's illness is that she cannot show her great ability to use language even though she normally speaks German, English, French and Italian. "[S]he los[es] her command of grammar and syntax . . . [and] in the process of time she bec[o]me[s] almost completely deprived of words. She put[s] them togerher labıriously out of four or five languages and bec[o]me[s] almost unintelligible" (as cited in *FM* 155-156). While suffering from hysteria, sometimes Anna O. lacks the talent for languages, and sometimes she can speak a language

that is a combination of all the languages she knows. When Anna regains her ability to use language, she speaks English, French and Italian except German. A feminist critic, Dianne Hunter, attributes Anna's inability to use her native language to Anna's desire to rebel against her father's authority, in other words, against patriarchal culture: ". . . Pappenheim's linguistic discord . . . can be seen as a regression from the cultural order represented by her father as an orthodox patriarch. She regresse[s] from the symbolic order of articulate German to the . . . unintelligibility of foreign tongues" (1983: 474). Anna O. expresses her reaction againts men's supremacy by refusing the use of her native tongue.

Anna, who leads a restricted life because of the traditions which confine women to private sphere, attempts to find freedom by means of hysteria. In other words, "[i]n Breuer's analysis of the case, Anna O. [is] . . . silenced by the conditions of her role as the dutiful daughter . . . ; her hysteria [is] a 'creative' escape from the boredom and futility of her daily life" (*FM* 156). For Anna, hysteria functions as a way of liberating herself from patriarchal ideology whose insistence on male superiority denies women's intellectual capacity.

Other interesting point in Anna's case is her phantom pregnancy. During the talking sessions, she feels herself very close to Breuer. Anna, attracted sexually by Breuer, falsely imagines that she is pregnant. Anna's child-bearing in her imagination results in Breuer's abandonment of treatment. Anna's giving birth to an imaginary child not only shows the great influence of the talking cure upon her emotions but also implies that she has suppressed sexual desires because Anna's phantom pregnancy, that is the outcome of her imaginary sexual intercourse with Breuer, brings out Anna's sexual repression. For Anna, hysteria is a means of getting pleasure out of sex, since it is strictly forbidden to have sex outside marriage. "[T]he hysteric enjoys a sexuality that would normally be prohibited for her to express or to feel" (Simmons, 1996: 22). Consequently, Anna's imaginary child-bearing represents Anna's attempt to gain her sexual freedom.

Other case study that illuminates the issue of female hysteria is Sigmund Freud's "Dora." Dora; that is, Ida Bauer is a brilliant girl whose intelligence unfortunately does not have any meaning for the people around her. Dora's father is a strict authoritarian, and she is generally under her father's control. Therefore, Dora

has such a restricted life that she cannot make her own choices. When Dora becomes Freud's patient, she is eighteen years old. Dora's father forces her to get Freud's "talking cure" because she has been suffering from depression for a long time and her relationship with her parents has deteriorated. Freud's analysis of Dora's illness mostly depends on Dora's dreams, which not only expose Dora's anxieties but also uncover the problems of her family.

Dora's father does not have a good relationship with his wife and cheats on her with his friend's wife called Mrs K. Mrs K's husband is aware of his wife's disloyalty, but Mr K chooses to keep silent instead of reacting to his wife's adultery. Moreover, Mr. K molests Dora twice. The first molestation takes place when she is fourteen. One day while Dora is in Mr K's office, she is subjected to Mr K's sexual attack. All of a sudden Mr K attempts to kiss Dora, and she escapes in disgust. Another one occurs two years later. One day when Dora is walking with Mr K, he makes an obscene offer to her. Then, Dora gives him a slap on the face and runs away. Dora tries to get rid of Mr K by telling her father about Mr K's sexual harassments, but she fails because her father does not believe her. When Dora's father tells Mr K what Dora has said, Mr K refuses all the accusations. It is as a consequence of the events Dora faces that she experiences a breakdown and attends Freud's "talking cure" sessions.

In these sessions, one of Dora's dreams plays an important role. In her dream, she sees that a house is burning: "A house was on fire. My father woke me up. I dressed quickly. Mother wanted to . . . save her jewel-case, but father said 'I refuse to let myself and my children be burnt for the sake of your jewel-case.' We hurried downstairs and as soon as I was outside I wake up" (as cited in Barry, 1995: 104). From Dora's dream, Freud deduces that this dream exposes Dora's suppressed feeling of sexual pleasure. Freud is of the opinion that:

> *In the dream the father and Mr K are transposed. [T]he German word 'jewel-case' is a slang term for the female genitals. [T]herefore, the dream expresses Dora's repressed wish to give Mr K what he wants (that is, her jewel-case): the fire represents her own repressed passion. The figure of Mr K is transposed with that of the father to express the wish that her former Oedipal love for her father will protect her from the temptation to yield to Mr K's advances. (Barry, 1995: 104)*

Freud's analysis of Dora's dream shows that Dora faces a dilemma as to whether accept Mr K's lewd suggestion or reject it. Dora experiences a sexual repression,

since she holds back her sexual desires for Mr K. Also, Freud claims that Dora is aware of the relationship between her father and Mr K's wife, and she is furious with her father and Mrs K. Dora's anger stems from her love for her father that is connected with Oedipus complex she experiences in her past. In this sense, "[h]er [Dora's] hysteria signal[s] a breakthrough of the repressed oedipal constellation" (Ramas, 1980: 486). Dora, troubled by her suppressed sexual desires and by a trail of oedipal love concealed in her unconscious, finds herself in a struggle with hysteria. Unfortunately, Dora's case does not come to a conclusion because of her abandonment of talking cure. Dora spends the rest of her life as a patient of hysteria and remains one of the most important hysteric women who considers madness as an escape from dullness of domestic life.

Hysteria is of great significance to not only psychiatrists but also feminist critics. According to feminist critics, hysteria symbolizes the female author's anxiety about writing about female experience with a male-dominated language. "[T]he woman novelist must be hysteric. Hysteria is the woman's simultaneous acceptance and refusal of the organization of sexuality under patriarchal capitalism. It is simultaneously what a woman can do both to be feminine and to refuse femininity, within patriarchal discourse" (as cited in Small, 1996: 116). For feminist critics, the madwoman's position in society represents that of woman writer in literature, since both the madwoman and the woman writer are pushed to the periphery. In this sense, restrictions imposed upon madwoman's life are female writer's restraints imposed upon her use of language in her writing. For this reason, feminist critics see hysteria as female writer's rebellion against male-centred language use, and the figure of madwoman becomes an epitome of female writer's challenge against male-dominated literature.

One of the most striking analysis of the figure of madwoman's importance for feminist critics is Shoshana Felman's essay called "Women and Madness: The Critical Phallacy." In her essay, Felman discusses how the figure of madwoman is connected with women's writing and literary criticism. In Felman's discussion, Balzac's story "Adieu" plays a significant role because she focuses on the madwoman in this story in order to show why madness is associated with woman. Before emphasing Felman's main aim in her essay, it is useful to mention Balzac's "Adieu" briefly here.

The story deals mainly with a lengthy separation of an officer from the woman he loves because of Napoleonic Wars. When the officer, Philippe, comes back after the war, he sees that his love, Stephanie, has fallen mentally ill, and she does not remember him. The interesting point in Stephanie's insanity is that she says the word "adieu" continuously. "Adieu" is the word Stephanie has said to Philippe when they separate in wartime. "Philippe still hopes that Stephanie will some day recognize him. Driven to despair, however, by the long wait, Philippe decides to hasten Stephanie's recognition of him by subjecting her to a psycho-drama designed to restore her memory" (Felman, 1989: 122). Philippe succeeds in his attempt to "restore Stephanie's memory." Stephanie remembers Philippe, but she dies by saying "adieu."

Felman demonstrates in her analysis of Balzac's "Adieu" how the dichotomy Reason/Madness is related to the dichotomy Men/Women. It is known that what Jacques Derrida calls a "binary opposition" is the basis of Western culture. In the system of binary oppositions, the second term is considered to be inferior to the first term; that is, the system depends on a hierarchy in which Men/Women is the basic dichotomy. "The 'couple' cannot be left intact: it becomes a general battlefield where the struggle for signifying supremacy is forever re-enacted. In the end, victory is equated with activity and defeat with passivity; under patriarchy, the male is always the victor" (Moi, 1985: 105). As this hierarchial order gives an obvious superiority to men over women, all the negative qualities such as irrationality and marginality are attributed to femininity. For this reason, in Balzac's "Adieu" madness is represented by Stephanie while Philippe's endeavour to make Stephanie remember him symbolizes reason and maleness. In other words, Philippe uses ". . . masculine reason so as to objectify feminine madness, thereby mastering it" (Felman, 1985: 127). Since irrationality and madness are associated with femininity, "Stephanie's cure is in Philippe's reason" (Felman, 1985: 128). Stephanie's insanity and Philippe's rationality once again confirm the influence of the binary oppositions in Western philosophy.

To Felman, the importance of Balzac's story is not limited to binary oppositions. It also exposes how "[m]adness and women . . . turn out to be the two outcasts of the establishment of readability" (Felman, 1985: 124). In Felman's

opinion, critics deal with neither the female character nor the issue of madness in the story. Rather, they see the story as something written about Napoleonic Wars because, ". . . the critic seeks to 'normalise' the text, to banish . . . all trace of violence and anguish, of scandal or insanity, making the text a reassuring, closed retreat whose balance no upheaval can upset, where no convulsion is of any consequence" (Felman, 1985: 132). From Felman's standpoint, the exclusion of Stephanie from the critiques of the story is a sign of the misogynist attitude of literature. As mentioned before, the madwoman is a figure whose existence in the text provides a possibility of destroying the influence of male-dominated literature. Therefore, Felman attributes critics' ignorance of the madwoman in "Adieu" to their support for male supremacy in literature. As "[t]he hysteric woman . . . is . . . a representation of the clash between the realization of the New Woman's aspirations . . . and the patriarchal ideology of its containment into the confines of marriage and home" (Koyuncu, 2000: 123), the figure of madwoman in literature remains the symbol of marginalization of female writer who is subjected to the oppression of male-dominated literature because of her creative powers.

The fact that hysteria dominates female patients during the period between the late nineteenth century and early twentieth century is obvious; similarly the era of the Great War is dominated by the hysteria of male patients. In other words, in this period there emerges an illness called "male hysteria." It is also called "shell shock" because in psychiatrists' opinion, the underlying cause of male hysteria lies in the traumatic experience of the Great War. In this respect, male hysteria is considered to have a connection with masculine ideals that are on the verge of collapse because of the trauma soldiers experience. Since men's fear of war is regarded as something dishonourable, soldiers who suppress their feeling of danger develop shell shock. For this reason, shell shock is an escape for soldiers from society's labelling them as cowards. "[S]hell shock [is] the body language of masculine complaint, a disguised male protest not only against the war but against the concept of 'manliness' itself" (*FM* 172). In the era of the Great War, both common people and psychiatrists see men's fear of war as a sign of effeminacy and as an insult to masculinity. Even the term "male hysteria" disturbs some doctors, and they choose to use the term "shell shock" as the term "hysteria" connotes femininity. Therefore, for many shell shock patients, the disrespecful manner of psychiatrists is worse than the illness itself as from some psychiatrists' standpoint most of the

soldiers who suffer from shell shock are the epitomes of cowardice and weakness. As a result of the negative perspective on shell shock, the situation of male patients of hysteria is like with that of hysteric women in the previous era, and in a way the ill-treatment of male patients in the period of modern psychiatry heralds what female patients will come face to face in the era of psychiatric modernism.

The period of modern psychiatry is not different neither from psychiatric Victorianism nor from psychiatric Darwinism with regard to the situation of female patients. Even though the number of hysteric women reduces, women in the modern era find themselves in a struggle with another mental illness called schizophrenia; especially during the post-war era there is a sharp increase in the rate of schizophrenic female patients. This rise in female schizophrenia is related to the conservative policy of the post-war era because society's extreme adherence to sexist ideology strengthens the boundary between femininity and masculinity, for Judith Kegan Gardiner writes, "[a]fter the war, gender roles and sexuality become more rigid" (2006: 15). Modern women, besieged with the burden of the socially supported image of traditional woman, develop symptoms of schizophrenia which include "delusions, changes in emotions, senses and behaviour, hallucinations, altered sense of self, and sense of guilt" (Torrey, 1988: 18,55). The conflicts between society's strong loyalty to feminine ideals and modern women's great aspiration to have a share in public arena result in the loss of modern women's mental health. Therefore, in the culture of modern era female schizophrenia has the connotations of society's pressure on women and women's rebellion against this pressure. In this sense, schizophrenia is modern women's way of liberating themselves from their societal roles.

In the modern era, a new movement called "antipsychiatry" makes a great impact on the issue of schizophrenia. The movement of antipsychiatry presents a new perspective on the illness where especially, the schizophrenic women are of great significance because antipsychiatrists see schizophrenia as the patient's response to the experiences s/he has in social life. For this reason, the schizophrenic woman's suffering from society's and her family's oppression gains importance as the root cause of schizophrenia.

In the movement of antipsychiatry, R.D.Laing is an eminent figure whose studies of the concept of madness bring novelty. For instance, in Laing's theories schizophrenia of the female patient is regarded as her way of expressing her opposition to gender roles. According to Laingian concept of madness, schizophrenia does not serve for the destruction of the individual, but functions as an outlet for his/her suppressed anger with expectations of society.

One of the most significant works of R.D.Laing is *The Divided Self* which has a novel approach to schizophrenia. In *The Divided Self* (hereafter cited as *DS*) Laing's aim is ". . . to show that there is a comprehensible transition from the sane schizoid way of being-in-the-world to a psychotic way of being-in-the-world" (*DS* 16). Laing, who does not consider schizophrenia as just an illness, illuminates his concept of madness in his book. According to Laing, a schizophrenic patient ". . . does not experience himself [or herself] as a complete person but rather as 'split' in various ways" (*DS* 15). There is a fragmentation in the schizophrenic patient's self, and this fragmentation is the sign of lack of his/her "ontological security" in which "relatedness with others is potentially gratifying" (*DS* 44). There are three kinds of feeling the patient experiences because of ontological insecurity. These are engulfment, implosion and petrification. All of them are the outcomes of the patient's great anxiety about his/her identity.

Engulfment, Laing writes, represents the ontologically threatened person's desire to get rid of his/her self by using someone else's identity. "[B]eing engulfed by the other is an escape from himself" (*DS* 46). From the ontologically insecure person's standpoint, engulfment is a way of setting himself/herself free from being misunderstood by others. The sense of engulfment is exacerbated by implosion that is a feeling of emptiness in self. "In so far as he [the ontologically secure person] feels empty, the full . . . living reality of others is an impringement which is always liable to . . . become implosive, threathening to . . . obliterate his self completely" (*DS* 80). The patient who is troubled by the sense of implosion feels his/her identity is in a vacuum. Petrification, another feeling that is the sign of ontological insecurity, results in the patient's depersonalization of himself/herself. The patient reduces himself/herself to the status of a thing so as to feel himself/herself free. Petrification, Laing asserts, also includes the patient's depersonalization of others.

In *The Divided Self* Laing's other concern is "the false-self system" that ". . . exists as the complement of an "inner self" which is occupied in maintaining its identity and freedom by being transcendent, unembodied, and thus never to be grasped, . . . possessed" (*DS* 100-101). To Laing, the separation of self from the body causes the fragmentation of the inner self. It is impossible for the self to have a connection with the reality, since the self also experiences a division between itself and the outer world. Therefore, the world poses a grave threat to the schizoid person's existence as the inner self " . . . becomes unreal, improvished, empty, dead, and split" (*DS* 150). The schizophrenic person, besieged with the loss of the unity of his/her inner self, tries to survive by means of the false-self system. "Since direct communication with others in this real shared world has been turned over to the false-self system, it is only through this medium that the self can communicate with the outside shared world" (*DS* 148). For this reason, the falso-self system symbolizes the schizophrenic patient's strategy to deal with his/her anxieties created by the ontological insecurity, which is the result of the one's great doubts about his/her identity.

In *The Divided Self*, one of the most important case studies concerning the lack of individual autonomy is the case of Julie. Laing writes that Julie, who has the symptoms of schizophrenia such as delusions, hallucinations, loses her ontological insecurity. Julie feels "unreal," "empty," and "worthless" (*DS* 194). Also, she accuses her mother of restricting her life although her mother encourages her to be a sophisticated girl who has an active social life. The most interesting point in Julie's case is that she claims a child has been killed. Laing says:

> *[T]he basic psychotic statement she made was that "a child has been murdered". [S]he said she had heard of this from the voice of her brother (she had no brother). She wondered, however, if this voice may not have been her own. The child was wearing her clothes when it was killed. The child could have been herself. She had been murdered either by herself or by her mother, she was not sure. (DS 194)*

Laing also gives some details of Julie's childhood so as to eleborate on the issue. For example, Laing writes Julie is an obedient and submissive child who never annoys her parents. Julie never refuses to do what her parents want. From Julie's parents perspective, Julie is such a "normal" child that they cannot understand why Julie has fallen mentally ill. Julie suddenly changes when she reaches the age of fifteen. She turns into a disobedient and unruly girl who is never willing to do what she is told. Julie becomes a trouble-maker for her parents. Laing

attributes the root cause of Julie's insanity to the fragmentation of her inner-self because "she [Julie] ha[s] never established an autonomous self-being" (*DS* 202). Therefore, Julie's madness, Laing believes, stems from her ontological insecurity, but according to Elaine Showalter, ". . . Laing does not consider the social and psychiological effects of this [case]" (*FM* 231). Even though ". . . Julie . . . ha[s] parents who ha[ve] wanted [her] to be [a] boy" *(FM* 231), Laing would rather write Julie's accusation of her mother, but Laing does not forget to mention Julie's parents' failure to associate Julie's extreme obedience with her problems. Laing writes: "Mrs. X evidently takes just those things which I take to be expressions of an inner deadness in the child as expressions of the utmost goodness, health, normality" (*DS* 199). Laing sees Julie's extreme submissiveness as a sign of her anxiety about her inner self; similarly it is not difficult for readers who have a feminist point of view to relate Julie's insanity to her lack of self-expression. As a passive child, she is always under the control of her parents. She never rejects her parents' demands. For this reason, her parents see Julie's docility as normality, and her disobedience as insanity. Julie, dominated by her parents' pressure, cannot express her individual consciousness. For Julie, madness functions as ". . . the only escape from society's own state of schizophrenia called normality" (Rigney, 1978: 62). Taking Laing's concept of madness into consideration again, "Laing . . . indicate[s] that the result of going mad . . . may well be the emergence of a state of mind for saner than that understood by the normal world" (Rigney, 1978: 75).

Taking everything into account, it can be concluded the relationship between madness and women that insanity is not just a disease, but a social phenomenon that is based on cultural norms. As society's norms support male chauvinism, it is not a surprise to see that women's madness is more widespread than men's lunacy. The system of binary oppositions prevalent in patriarchal society's ideology subject women are to double standards as the equality between the sexes is always in question and in doubt. About madness nothing seems to change in terms of the unfair treatment to women. Women's nature is considered to be more vulnerable to mental breakdown than that of men because from the standpoint of patriarchal ideology women are weak and naive creatures who cannot maintain their lives without men's help. Women's madness is always associated with women's inferiority. According to patriarcal society, lunacy not only shows women's inferior nature but also is a definite proof of ridiculousness of women's endeavour to

participate in public life. Educated women who reject the stereotypical feminine roles are regarded as real freaks who dare to challenge the ideals of femininity. “Woman’s inability to adjust to or to be contented by feminine roles has been considered as a deviation from ‘natural’ female psychology rather than as a criticism of such roles” (Chesler, 1971: 746). For this reason, for many women who criticize male-dominated “female roles” madness functions as a way of releasing themselves from the pressure of domesticity.

It is clear that the concept of women’s insanity is always under the control of male-dominated psychiatry. In the Victorian era it is assumed that the underlying cause for women’s mental breakdown lies in women’s anxiety created by puberty and by child-bearing. Young Victorian women who cannot put up with the restriction of their freedom because of puberty go insane. Next, the burden of giving birth is considered the other common reason for Victorian women’s descent into madness. Victorian psychiatrists see making mad women obedient as the basis of the cure because madwomen are generally unruly; especially they refuse to fulfil her societal duties. Between the late nineteenth century and early twentieth century, psychiatry presents a different perspective on women’s lunacy owing to effects of Darwin’s theories. Hysteria is believed to be “a female malady.” According to psychiatrists, the female reproductive system is the basis of the illness, and hysteric women’s remedy is domestic life. Emergence of “New Woman” plays an important role in the increase of the number of hysteric women. “New Woman” asks for more freedom, but finds herself in a struggle with hysteria when her hopes are dashed because of the hegemony of patriarchy, but from psychiatrists’ standpoint “. . . ladies get sick because they are unfeminine--in other words, sexually aggressive, intellectually ambitious and defective in proper womanly submission and selflessness” (Wood, 1973: 36). In the modern era schizophrenia is widespread among women. The insistence of the post-war period on sexism results in modern women’s escape from society’s pressure by means of schizophrenia. In spite of modern psychiatry’s ignorance of the patriarchy’s great part in women’s schizophrenia, a movement called “antipsychiatry” puts an emphasis upon the importance of the analysis of the surrounding conditions from which women’s schizophrenia arises. Since antipsychiatrists, especially Laing believe schizophrenia is not just a disease, but a response the patient gives to the pressure s/he is subjected to, the perspective of antipsychiatry upon madness is a challenge to male-dominated psychiatry.

Therefore, “[c]ritics of modern psychiatry observe that while it purports to treat the patient in attempt to cure his or her illness, in actuality it serves as a means of social control” (Cosby, 2000: 5). From a critical standpoint, it is not difficult to draw a conclusion that modern psychiatrists, like the psychiatrists in the previous era, use madness as a label in order to help the dominance of patriarchal order to last. To sum up, in a male-centred culture women’s attempts to break away from the male supremacy and to fight for equality are regarded as madness. For women, going insane is not an act of self-annihilation, but an act of self-liberation.

CHAPTER THREE
THE GOLDEN NOTEBOOK

Doris Lessing's *The Golden Notebook* shows how a female writer suffers from a sense of fragmented self because of patriarchal society's restrictions that confine women to the traditional feminine domestic roles. Lessing's novel, set in 1950s' London, deals with the woman artist's struggle to form her identity through the fulfilment of her role as an independent and successful woman. In *The Golden Notebook* (hereafter cited as *GN*) the protagonist, Anna Wulf, is a divorcee, bringing up her daughter Janet alone. Having written a successful book, she maintains her life by virtue of the money she made from selling her work, but when Anna attempts to write another novel, she comes face to face with a difficulty known as "the writer's block." Anna's trouble with writing is made explicit from the very beginning of the novel in which Molly, Anna's close friend, asks Anna whether she has written anything or not since she has been away. As Anna's answer to Molly's question is negative, Anna's problem with writing is clear to the readers. Anna's conversation with Molly, who is an independent woman like Anna, also includes their complaints about society's perspective on "free women." Anna says: "They [people] still define us in terms of relationships with men, even the best of them [although] neither of us [are] prepared to get married simply to give our children fathers" (*GN* 10, 16). Anna, as a writer, and Molly, as an actress, are aware that it is quite out of the question for women to be completely free in a male-centered culture even if they are unmarried, financially independent, artistically gifted and intellectually superior. In other words, Anna and Molly are of the opinion that they are still subjected to the pressure of patriarchal codes which see women's dependence on men as one of the most important essentials of womanhood despite the fact that Molly and Anna have freedom to some extent. Anna's and Molly's belief in society's unfair treatment toward women becomes stronger when Richard, Molly's ex-husband, joins their conversation. Richard, who wants to talk with Molly about their son, Tommy, makes fun of their state of being unmarried by calling them "two emancipated females" (*GN* 31). Richard is a traditional man whose ideas support the inferiority of women. For instance, Richard finds Anna and Molly "as ignorant as monkeys about economics" (*GN* 27). Also, he approves of men's infidelity since he favours physical pleasure more than emotions as he says: "How to get an erection with a woman you've been married to fifteen years?" (*GN* 32). Because Richard's thoughts represent the

established opinions of the general public, Molly and Anna ". . . choose to be alone rather than to get married for the sake of not being alone [,] . . . knowing the penalties" (*GN* 39, 46). As a consequence of their decision to pursue their life without the bonds of marriage, Molly and Anna refuse to fit the stereotypical representation of domestic woman.

In the light of the very brief analysis of the positions of the female characters in *The Golden Notebook*, it can be said that "[Women] like Anna or Molly and that lot, they're not just one thing but several things" (*GN* 36) since they define their social female identities as not only mothers and wives but also artists who have careers and professional lives. In this respect, the artist woman's dilemma, that is, Anna's dilemma stems from the clash between her desire to be both a woman and an artist at once and society's expectations that deny her intellectual powers. Therefore, in this chapter my argument will focus on the reasons for and the results of Anna's conflicts in order to show how the fragmentation of Anna's self occurs and how she is driven to madness owing to this fragmentation.

Although Anna comes face to face with "the writer's block," she is determined to express her thoughts and emotions and she decides to keep four different notebooks that have four different colors: black, red, yellow and blue. Anna says: "I keep four notebooks, a black notebook, which is to do with Anna Wulf the writer, a red notebook, concerned with politics; a yellow notebook in which I make stories out of my experience, and a blue notebook which tries to be a diary" (*GN* 406). Anna's four different notebooks symbolize different sides of Anna's inner-self. The Black notebook, which Anna's novel *Frontiers of War* is based on, is a record of her early life in Africa. In the red one, the readers get the details of Anna's relationship with politics and with the British Communist Party. The Yellow Notebook deals with Anna's fictionalization of herself under the name of Ella, and finally, Anna's thoughts and feelings are revealed by the last notebook, by the blue one. From Anna's division of her life into different dimensions, it is clear that Anna's identity is exposed to a division that prevents her from achieving the fullness of her self. As Anna's notebooks depict her as Janet's mother, Molly's friend, author of *Frontiers of War*, the member of the British Communist Party and Michael's and Saul's mistress, Anna has a divided psyche, a fact also Ribeiro emphasizes: "Anna's search for a way to relate her different identities--as woman, writer, mother, lover, social activist--is what

leads her to separate them into different notebooks, each involving different aspects of her life" (1990: 83).

Like Anna's identity, the novel itself has a fragmented form. Apart from the notebooks, the novel includes sections called "Free Women," and moreover, there is a part which has the same name as the novel itself. For this reason, "Free Women" sections, the Inner Golden Notebook and Anna's notebooks reflect not only the division of *The Golden Notebook* but also ". . . symbolize . . . divisions within her [Anna's] psyche that must be integrated into a whole before Anna can reach self-actualization" (Hester, 1990: 52-53). In addition to mirroring the splits in Anna's personality, these narrative levels present the readers with several "Annas." For instance, Anna is not only a writer of the "Free Women" but also a character in it. In the Yellow Notebook, Ella is another version of Anna. Besides, Anna combines many parts of the novel so as to arrange *The Golden Notebook,* and finally, as mentioned before, she is the author of her notebooks. Therefore, in *The Golden Notebook* there is not only one Anna since the readers see many "Annas" such as the writer Anna, the editor Anna or the fictional character Anna. As a result of the different "Annas" in the narrative levels and of Anna's numerous roles in her notebooks, Anna is a fragmented woman who endeavours to reconcile the divided parts of her identity with one another.

As Anna continues to write in her four notebooks, she begins to explore her psychological interiority. The more Anna describes her inner self in great detail in her notebooks, the more the readers learn about Anna's identity since ". . . these notebooks represent a record of . . . self-discoveries" (Blondin, 1989: 10). Other important point I would like to raise is that Anna uses the form of diary in her notebooks. Anna's preference for including the form of diary in her writing shows her desire to express her personal concerns and her effort to break away from the traditional forms because "[t]he structure of the diary allows the woman author . . . to represent the anxieties she . . . feel[s] about herself . . . [and] convential forms" (Ribeiro, 1990: 97). Therefore, the diary in Anna's writing functions as her way of understanding the depth of her identity and of reacting against the generally accepted narratives as well.

Readers also see that newspaper clippings constitute a part of Anna's notebooks. These clippings provide Anna with a perspective on the post-war world she lives in. In other words, newspaper cuttings enable Anna to be aware of the society's confusion, violence and anarchy which reign over peace and order because the writer Anna wants to write "a book powered with an intellectual or moral passion strong enough to create order, to create a new way of looking at life" (*GN* 59). Anna feels obliged to follow carefully what is going on throughtout the world so as to write her novel. "The inclusion of newspaper articles performs a . . . function by giving Anna an objective angle . . . They clarify, for her, her role in society as a writer" (Ribeiro, 1990: 90). Anna's aim in using clippings can also be explained by Anna's ideas about the role of writing and the role of the novel. Anna says: ". . . the function of the novel seems to be changing; it has become an outpost of journalism; we read novels for information about areas of life" (*GN* 59). Hence Anna appears not an author in her ivory tower but as a writer sensitive to the society she lives in for she claims: "I don't hold the aristocratic view of art" (*GN* 406). Instead of being a passive woman who defines herself as a mother and a wife only, Anna wishes to influence her environment through her writing. Since Anna is a marginalized figure as a "free" woman, Anna's objective, as an author, is to bring a change into the chaotic society by means of her novel. Owing to Anna's assumption that ". . . writing is essentially impersonal" (*GN* 299), Anna's mission in the literary arena does not let her ignore the situation of the anarchic world.

It is worth noting that Anna's view on art parallels her political ideology due to "[her] powerful sense of service [to society]" (*GN* 148). Anna is a communist who works for the British Communist Party. In contrast with conventions that exclude women from the participation in politics, Anna gives much support to women's activities in the political arena. According to Anna, women should feel as responsible as men to society because women's concerns should not be isolated from society's concerns; that is, women should never forget that they are citizens who should be interested in political affairs. For this reason, politics, is the other area Anna can make a contribution to society. Anna's " 'party work' . . . consist[s] mostly giving lectures on art to small groups" (*GN* 299). In her "party work" Anna demonstrates her intellectual capacity through the lectures. That is why Anna sees politics as the other way of using her intellect. Anna's membership of the party provides her with an opportunity not only to be involved in politics but also to prove her inttelligence.

Readers can also see that in the Red Notebook, Anna gives a different reason for joining the British Communist Party. Anna says: “I came home thinking that somewhere at the back of my mind when I joined the Party was a need for wholeness, for an end to the split, divided, unsatisfactory way” (*GN* 142). Anna’s words clearly explain that in addition to her desire for affecting the world positively through her part in politics, Anna tries to find a solution to her personal problem, but her membership of the party cannot help her overcome her trouble with her sense of fragmented self. Rather, “. . . joining the party intensifie[s] the split” (*GN* 142); therefore, Anna leaves the party. The first possible reason for Anna’s giving up the party membership can be her split in political identity. Anna writes: “It occurred to me .today, that when I talk to Molly about politics, I never know what person is going to reply--the dry, wise, ironical political woman or the party fanatic who sounds, literally, quite maniacal. And I have these two personalities myself” (*GN* 141). Anna’s hope of finding “wholeness” does not come true because her political identity adds more fragments to her personality. That is why Anna’s endeavour to put an end to the division within herself through political activities fails.

“[T]he intellectual rottenness of the Party” (*GN* 297) is the second reason for Anna’s abandonment. Anna is of the opinion that what the Party stands for is not true in reality. In other words, Anna realizes that high principles of socialism are all lies. “[T]he tragedy is that [its] intellectual responsibility, [its] high seriousness, is in a vacuum: it relates, not to Britain; not to communist countries as they are now; but to a spirit which existed in international communism years ago, before it was killed by the. . . crazed spirit of struggle for survival to which we now give the name Stalinism” (*GN* 293). Anna is aware that hopes of change created by socialism are dashed all over the world when the dream of equality and order, which is the promise of ideals of socialism, does not come true. For this reason, Anna, disappointed with the Party, cuts her ties with it.

To most readers, intensification of Anna’s sense of split personality by the Party is not a surprise if the position of women in a traditional society is taken into account. It is no wonder that women are not expected to have a share in politics since it is regarded as men’s business. The generally accepted values of society chain women to the responsibilities of domestic sphere. For this reason, for Anna,

being a member of a Left-Wing group is so difficult that she cannot use her participation in the Party as a cure for her divided self. In Anna's view, being an activist-woman is as destructive as being an artist-woman. For example, Anna's lover Michael mocks at Anna's voluntary work for the Party. Anna says: "(Michael jokes: You're in the great British tradition of upper class service to the community, my dear Anna; you work for the Communist Party, unpaid, the way your grandmother would have worked for the starving poor. It's the kind of joke I make myself but when Michael makes it it hurts me)" (*GN* 293-94). Michael laughs at "Comrade Anna," ignoring Anna's political identity, and Anna is offended by her lover's making fun of her activities in the Party, but deep down the real reason for Anna's resentment is her consciousness of the futility of her efforts to make a contribution to society through politics. Anna is aware that Michael has a point in his words about her identity as an activist since Anna knows that her voluntary work is the patriarchal party's way of using her. Therefore, Anna's attemp to be a member of the party in order to rid herself of the domestic cycle turns out to be a trouble, causing Anna's suffrering from an identity crisis.

To better understand the relationship between Anna and Michael, it is necessary to elucidate the details of their love affair. Michael is a married physician whose affair with Anna lasts for five years. As the previous paragraph has made clear, Michael has no respect for Anna's involment in politics; similarly, he does not take Anna's profession seriously. Anna says: ". . . he [Michael] makes some crack about the fact I have written a book--he resents it, makes fun of my being 'an authoress' " (*GN* 204). Michael believes that the artist-Anna is not worth any serious attention because women's concerns should remain within the limits of domestic services. As long as women fulfil their duties as mothers and wives, they are acceptable as "real" women in society's eyes. Therefore, it is very disastrous for women to have a share in literature since norms of society decree that the public sphere should be under men's control. From societal standpoint, being an "authoress" amounts to the denial of femininity and to trangressing the boundaries between public and private spheres.

Anna tries to subvert this dominant ideology by destroying the taboo against the female writer. In this sense, Anna sees herself as a figure who is pushed to the periphery by society. Anna writes: "I believe I'm living the kind of life women never

lived before" (*GN* 403). Challenging the conventions of male-dominated culture, Anna is aware that her intellectual powers disturb Michael since her intelligence and artistry disprove the assumption that women are inferior to men. For this reason, Michael is jealous of the intellectual-Anna "the critical and thinking Anna" and it is "that Anna which Michael dislikes most" (*GN* 283). As a talented woman, Anna is subjected to her lover's contempt because of her abilities to reason and to criticize. According to patriarchal ideology, women's power to question is not a gift which deserves praise, but a disgrace which prevents women's obedience, passivity and docility, in other words, it hinders them from having feminine virtues. As a result of this perspective on women's intellectual capacity, "the critical and thinking" women are regarded as freaks who rebel against their "feminine" nature.

Other significant point in Michael's attitude toward Anna is that Michael not only makes fun of "Comrade-Anna" and "autheress-Anna" but also of "mother-Anna." Most of the time ". . . he is ironical about Janet" (*GN* 204) because Anna favours Janet more than Michael. In other words, Anna's motherhood provides her with a suprerior role which Michael does not have an equivalent in. This role cannot be contained in her role as Anna's mistress, so Michael disdains Anna's motherhood as Anna writes: "Last night Michael asked me to drive with him and I said I couldn't because Molly was going out, so I couldn't leave Janet. He said, ironically: 'Well, the cares of motherhood must ever come before lovers'. Because of the cold irony, I reacted against him" (*GN* 201). In Michael's eyes, Anna should only play the role of his mistress whose function is to give Michael sexual satisfaction as an "object of desire" (*VRW* ch. 2, par. 20) since ". . . he does not intend to marry" (*GN* 204).

Anna knows that their affair is not based on love, but physical attraction. It is impossible for Anna to take the place of Michael's wife because a "free" woman, an artist woman is not marriageable according to norms of society. For this reason, Anna is aware of her role in Michael's life, of her role as a woman whose duty is to satify Michael's sexual appetite. Anna writes: ". . . the cooking for Michael and the waiting for him--what does it mean? He already has another woman, whom he cares for more than he does for me. I know it. He'll come tonight out of habit"(*GN* 311). Anna's words express her worries about her relationship with Michael as she finds it meaningless and insincere.

Michael's ironical attitute toward Anna's motherhood enables Anna to understand a truth about her identity. During her affair, Anna has to isolate "mother-Anna" from "mistress-Anna" as she says: "He [Michael] prefers Janet to have left for school before he wakes. And . . . it divides me. The two personalities--Janet's mother, Michael's mistress" (*GN* 287). In order to play her role as Michael's mistress, Anna is compelled to divide herself into two, so the number of fragments in Anna's personality rises due to this division. Therefore, Anna's sense of fragmented self becomes more and more intense. Recognizing the catastrophic consequences of her affair, Anna pays for the price of being a mistress with the fragmentation of her identity. Anna, dissatisfied with her relationship with Michael, cannot live her life as an individual who has a unified identity, and her disappointment with this love affair makes their separation inevitable, but it does not matter to Michael if their relationship ends because he does not love Anna. She says:

> *Last night Michael said (I had not seen him for a week): "Well, Anna, and so our great love affair is coming to an end?" . . . I said, smiling but ironical . . . : "But at least it has been a great love affair?" He, then: "Ah, Anna, you make up stories about life and tell them to yourself, and you don't know what is true and what isn't." "And so we haven't had a great love affair?" . . . I felt a terrible dismay and coldness at his words, as if he were denying my existence. He said, whimsicall: "If you say we have. And if you say not, then not." "So what you feel doesn't count?" "Me? But Anna, why should I count?" (This was bitter, mocking) (GN 283).*

This dialogue between Anna and Michael enables Anna to understand that her value depends on her sexual function since a "free" woman does not deserve love, respect and loyalty in Michael's view. "[O]ne sees a tragic misunderstanding evolving around the interpretation of the word 'free.' For the women it signifies their contempt for marriage . . . For the men, . . . 'free' signifies 'loose' and consequently they lack respect . . . or even honesty in their encounters with 'free' woman" (Spencer, 1973: 253). As a result of the negative connotation of "free" woman, Michael puts Anna into the category of "fallen" woman and this is another punishment Michael metes out to Anna for her "freedom."

The catastrophic consequences of Anna's relationship with Michael are not limited to the split in Anna's personality and to her suffering from Michael's hypocrisy. Anna is also exposed to the danger of becoming a stereotypical woman who is basically very domestic. During the five years Anna acts as a housewife. Anna says: " 'the housewife's disease' has taken hold of me . . . the peace has already gone away from me . . . I must-dress-Janet-get-her-breakfast-send-her-off-

to-school-get-Michael's-breakfast-don't forget-I'm-out-of-tea-etc.-etc. . . . An unfairness. That I should have to spend so much of my time worrying over details" (*GN* 285). What Anna calls "the housewife's disease" is having to spend most of her time so as to supply the needs of people around her. The housewife's chores such as cooking, cleaning, child-caring take up her whole day. Like a housewife who devotes her life to her husband and children, Anna feels obliged to satisfy Janet's and Michael's demands. Anna's role as the housewife invades her artist-woman identity. "The housewife-Anna" never lets "the writer-Anna" flourish. Therefore, Anna is torn between her role as an artist-woman who has a career and her role as a stereotypical housewife who works at home for her family. Anna asks: "[W]hat stereotype am I?" (*GN* 48).

Anna's question explains her anxiety about her identity. She is worried that society's categorization of women forces her to make a choice between her role as domestic woman who spends all of her time with Janet and Michael and her role as career woman who writes novels. If I explore the categorization of women to better understand Anna's rightness, I can say that there are five categories which divide women, imposing different characteristics upon them. "Five subcategories of gender stereotypes emerge for women: housewife/mother, sexy woman, athlete, career woman and feminist" (Yoder, 2003: 137). The first category represents women who are very devoted to their families and they are considered to be obedient, meek and passive. Sexy woman stereotype is depicted as beautiful and charming woman with a "pretty face," "long hair" and "nail polish" (Yoder, 2003). The athlete woman is "muscular, strong, aggressive, and masculine" (Yoder, 2003: 137). The fourth category describes career woman who is self-assured, self-assertive, determined and powerful, and the subtype of feminist woman evokes a figure whose aim is to be sucessful in the public sphere and to support women's equality in society. "Both career women and feminists score high on a potency dimension, being regarded as independent, self-confident, and dominant" (Yoder, 2003: 139). As gender stereotypes play important roles in society's perspective on women, women's lives are moulded by these categories than by their own desires and choices.

The other important point in these categories is that society gives some stereotypes an elevated position while excluding others from society. For instance, the housewife/mother stereotype earns the respect of the whole community,

receiving high praise, but the career woman and the feminist stereotype are subjected to pressure, contempt and oppression. In other words, they are severely punished for not fitting the stereotype of the housewife/mother woman. Because ". . . 'typical' women are not career women" (Yoder, 2003: 138), the double standards of society compel women to play the role of the housewife/mother woman that is regarded as the norm in society's eyes.

The fact that women's worlds are conditioned by gender stereotypes is obvious; similarly in *The Golden Notebook* Anna is affected by the categories of gender stereotypes since they put her in a dilemma as to whether to be a career woman and a feminist as a writer and political activist or to include herself into the category of the housewife/mother stereotype as Janet's mother and as Michael's lover. Anna is aware that she is not considered to be completely "feminine" as long as she does not reject her career in writing, and this is the conflict that the woman artist has to face. In other words, because "[w]omen bringing up children on their own, taking lovers, having careers in the arts and professions [are] not the norm in London eleven years after the Second World War" (Mort, 2004: 88), Anna has to choose between being suitable to the values of society that reject her intellectual capacity or living in accordance with her own ideals that enable her to use her intelligence and talents. Anna carries the burden of both being a career woman and a mother. Anna neither completely rejects motherhood nor lets it come before her career. There is always a conflict between her position as an artist woman and her role as a mother. The following quote makes it clear: ". . . Janet--I can resent her existence violently because she prevents me doing so many things I want to do, and love her at the same time" (*GN* 204). Anna has an ambivalent attitude toward Janet since motherhood imposes restrictions on Anna's desires, forcing her to be a conventional woman. Unlike the housewife/mother stereotype who makes a lot of sacrifices willingly, Anna feels obliged to shape her life in accordance with her daughter's needs. Anna writes: "I haven't moved, at ease, in time, since Janet was born. Having a child means being conscious of the clock, never being free of something that has to be done at a certain moment ahead" (*GN* 468). Anna feels that motherhood is an obstacle to her freedom since heavy responsibilites of motherhood invade her time. Apart from bearing the burden of motherhood, Anna realizes how Janet is affected negatively by her divorce from Janet's father since "Janet needs a man, in her life, she misses a father" (*GN* 334). Believing that her life

style as an independent career woman also makes Janet a marginalized figure in society's eyes, Anna regards Janet's desire to go to boarding school as an effort to be a "normal" child. Lessing writes:

> *When Janet first asked her mother if she could go to boarding-school, Anna was reluctant. She hated everything boarding-schools stood for. Having made enquiries about various "progressive" schools, she talked to Janet again . . . . . Anna understood that a 'progressive' school was just what Janet did not want. She was saying, in fact, "I want to be ordinary, I don't want to be like you." (GN 553)*

Lessing's words clearly explain Janet's awareness of Anna's position in society. Janet knows that her mother, who has defied the traditions of society with her freedom and with her profession, is not a stereotypical woman like her friends' mothers, and as a child, whose mother has divorced from her husband and has attemped to enter into men's world by writing, Janet sees conventional boarding school as a way of entering into "normal" children's world. Anna, conscious of Janet's wish to escape from the unconventionality of her mother's life, accepts that Janet has a point in insisting on boarding school because to be the daughter of a "free woman," who identifies herself as an authoress, makes Janet different from those whose mothers are domestic housewives. Sharpe emphasizes: "The social script decrees that a woman's life outside the roles of mother and wife is meaningless. And Anna periodically feels guilty for not conforming to it for the sake of giving Janet a normal childhood" (1992: 77). For society, it is shameful to raise a child without a husband. Therefore, Anna lays the blame for Janet's marginalization on herself. The following quote makes it clear: "I've often thought that if she [Janet] hadn't been my daughter (I don't mean genetically, but my daughter because she's been brought up by me) she would have been the most conventional child imaginable" (*GN* 464).

The fact that Janet wants to have a normal life by means of boarding school is clear to Anna; similarly Anna considers Janet's existence as a power that enables her to be a "normal" woman. Anna writes: ". . . with her [Janet] I banish the Anna who is listless . . . [and] the reason why I don't want her to go is that she is my normality. I have to be, with her, simple, responsible, affectionate, and so she anchors me in what is normal in myself" (*GN* 464). Anna's words clearly explain that it is only possible to be suitable for the norms of society through motherhood because her motherhood is the only acceptable side of her identity. Therefore, for

Anna, Janet's departure from her life symbolizes her loss of motherhood. In other words, loss of society's respect. Although Anna complains about the restrictions motherhood imposes on her life, she is afraid of losing a part of her identity that makes her "feminine" in society's eyes. After Janet leaves for the boarding school, Anna, again, realizes how motherhood influences her life. Lessing writes:

> *Anna understood, when Janet had gone to school, how much she had depended on the discipline which having a child had enforced on her--getting up at a certain time in the morning, going to bed soon enough not to be tired because of having to get up early, arranging regular meals, organizing her moods so as not to upset the child (GN 553).*

The fact that the influence of motherhood upon Anna's identity cannot be eradicated is obvious; similarly, being a mistress for the second time makes such a great impact on Anna's life that she cannot avoid paying the price for being "the mistress-Anna" again. This time the price Anna pays is not the the increase in the number of fragments in Anna's identity, but her descent into madness. After Michael and Anna have parted company, Anna falls in love with an American writer called Saul Green. Like her affair with Michael, this relationship produces devastating consequences for Anna because Saul Green, who is an expat and a socialist, uses Anna for the sake of his sexual appetite. Besides, Anna's psychology is influenced negatively by Saul's schizophrenia and by his megalomania. In this respect, Saul's contribution to Anna's insanity is beyond question.

In Anna's relationship with Saul, the first thing that requires attention is Saul's ideas about women and about Anna. Saul believes in the inferiority of women and he is jealous of Anna's success. Saul tells Anna: "The truth is, I resent you for having a written a book which was a success. . . . and in fact I enjoy a society where women are second-class citizens, I enjoy being boss and being flattered" (*GN* 516). Saul, as a strong supporter of patriarchal society, defends men's supremacy and inequality between the sexes as something he is proud of. Therefore, it is not a surprise for the readers to see Saul's fury at Anna's success in her profession. Saul considers women's success in literature as a violation of men's rights in literary arena since ". . . the text's author is a father . . . [and] an aesthetic patriarch" (Gilbert, Gubar, 1979: 6). Literature is regarded as a field in which men hold all the power. For this reason, in Saul's eyes Anna's best-selling novel is an attack against men's superiority in literature. Anna is aware of Saul's resentment when she says: ". . . he [Saul] was directing a pure stream of hatred against me, for being a woman "

(*GN* 539). Saul is s a misogynist who cannot endure women's existence in public sphere.

Saul's hatred for Anna can also be inferred from his attitude towards his relationship. Their affair is not based on love, respect and honesty and Anna is exploited sexually by Saul. He reveals to Anna: "I'm making use of you" (*GN* 482). Saul not only takes advantage of Anna but also is untrue to her. In other words, Saul does not feel loyalty to Anna. When Anna discovers Saul's infidelity, he reacts angrily and violently. Saul says: "I'm not a woman's pet, to be locked up" (*GN* 496). Saul does not feel obliged to be loyal to Anna since Anna is a "fallen" woman in Saul's eyes. Like Michael, Saul attaches a wrong meaning to the term "free" woman, and he explains the reason for his infidelity in his diary. When Anna sneaks a look at Saul's diary, she discovers that "[H]e wrote I don't like sleeping with her" (*GN* 490). Saul's confession of his true feeling for Anna in his diary shows that he is such a hypocrite: he claims he does not have the faintest liking for Anna but he has no hesitation in having sex with Anna. Also, according to Saul, Anna functions as a servant who does personal services for him, such as cleaning and cooking. The next quote makes it clear: ". . . make me some coffee, because that is your role in life" (*GN* 517). From Saul's words it is clear that he has adopted the patriarchal ideology that confines women to the domestic roles. Saul's perspective on women's roles in life proves that for him Anna's identity as an intellectual woman who writes novels means nothing. As a consequence of Saul's approval of traditional gender roles, he does not accept Anna as an authoress.

Other important point in Anna's affair with Saul sees Anna as a mother-like figure which angers her: "I shouted at him: 'Like all Americans you've got mother-trouble. You've fixed on me for your mother" (*GN* 496). Believing that Saul compares her with his own mother, Anna gets angry with Saul because he expects Anna to behave with the loving kindness of a mother. Saul, obsessed by the image of his own mother, cannot maintain a normal sexual relationship with his lover. Anna says: "[H]e was looking for this wise, kind, all-mother figure" (*GN* 502). Therefore, Saul, as a man who fails to overcome the Oedipus Complex, drives Anna into depression, causing fear in Anna's inner-self.

The fundamental reason why Saul affects Anna's psychology negatively is that Saul is both schizophrenic and megalomaniac. Saul's split personality results in his different attitudes toward Anna. Anna writes: "I sit here . . . and I think how I, Anna Wulf, sit here waiting, not knowing who is going to come down the stairs, the gentle brotherly affectionate man . . . ; or a furtive and cunning child; or a madman full of hate" (*GN* 504). Because of the splits in Saul's personality, his moods change very quickly; one moment Saul feels a deep affection for Anna, and the next he detests her, attacking her ferociously. For this reason, Anna, horrified by Saul's unbalanced character, cannot understand Saul's psychology. The following quote makes it clear:

> *I know he had just come from sleeping with another woman. I said: "You've slept with another woman, haven't you?" He stiffened and said . . . .: "No." But I didn't say anything and he said: "But it doesn't mean anything, does it?" Wha was strange was, that the man who had said: No, defending his freedom, and the man who said, pleading. It doesn't mean anything, were two men, I couldn't connect them . . . then a third man said, brotherly and affectionate: "Go to sleep now." (GN 480)*

Anna's words clearly explain the destructive influence of schizophrenia upon Saul's identity. On the one hand Saul seems to have feeling of friendliness and companionship; on the other hand he becomes suddenly uncontrollably fierce and cruel. As a result, Anna's nerves are completely frayed because ". . . Anna believes herself invaded by the personalities of Saul" (Vlastos, 1976: 247).

Apart from being schizophrenic, Saul is preoccupied with the belief that his physical and mental powers are much more priceless than they really are. In other words, he is so egotistical that he is obsessed with the idea that he is better and more important than the people around him. Anna says: "I, I, I, I, I, he shouted, but everything disconnected, a vague, spattered by machine-gun bullets. It went on and on, I, I, I, I, I . . . I, I, I, I, I--I began to feel as if the word I was being shot at me like bullets from a machine-gun" (*GN* 475, 496). For Anna, Saul's "I's", which signify his megalomania, epitomize his self-assertiveness and self-centredness, increasing Anna's despair. Anna confesses: ". . . I discovered I am suffering from an anxiety state . . . [and] I understood that my anxiety state was due to Saul Green" (*GN* 474, 476). From Anna's words it is clear that Saul's enigmatic personality makes an important contribution to Anna's psychological disorder, so she finds herself "in a sort of psychological fog" (*GN* 490). The more Anna knows Saul, the more she has ambivalent attitudes toward him. Although Anna is attracted sexually by Saul, she

expresses her abhorence at him. Anna writes: "When we quarrel, we hate each other, then sex comes out of the hate" (*GN* 491). Anna is aware that her opposing feelings toward Saul stem from Saul's unbalanced character because "he [Saul] can be five or six different people" (*GN* 490). According to Anna, her relationship with Saul includes anger, violence and detestation rather than love, respect or tenderness because of Saul's lack of balance and this affair turns into a "sadistic-masochistic cycle" (*GN* 517). In short, trying negotiate successfully her sense of fragmented self, Anna is victimized by her lover Saul whose aim is to use her for his own benefit.

Subjected to her lovers' humiliation and insults because of being an independent career woman, Anna feels herself troubled by doubts that put obstacles in the way of her writing her book. Anna's doubts about her career in writing result from a serious clash of opinions between Anna and the people around her. Anna, as a woman who aspires after freedom and a profession, refuses the socially constructed female identity because it is not possible for Anna to live according to conventions of society that disrespect women's creative work and consider marriage and motherhood as women's fate. Anna believes that society's definition of womanhood is not appropriate for her; that is, what society decrees for her is diametrically opposed to what she chooses for herself. For this reason, it is impossible for her to make marriage and motherhood as the core of her life, but the people around her take no notice of her creativeness which enables her to form her identity as a writer. For instance, Anna's intelligence and artistry are despised by Michael and by Saul, and Janet longs for a childhood in which a stereotypical mother figure plays a significant role. Therefore, a sense of guilt captures Anna and she feels doubtful about her ability to write. Anna says: "I came home, conscious of a feeling of disgust so much powerful than usual that I sat down and made myself read the novel for the first time since it was published. As if it had been written by someone else" (*GN* 58). Anna, disappointed by her lovers' mockery of her success in literature, is burdened with dissatisfaction with her novel *Frontiers of War* and she starts to find it disgraceful. Anna writes: ". . . I can't read that novel now without feeling ashamed, as if I were in a street naked" (*GN* 61). Realizing that her authoress-ness has no meaning and no value for the people around her, Anna feels herself "too diffused" (*GN* 59) because of the pressure of her identity as a writer which makes Anna "unfeminine" in the eyes of society. Even though Anna regards

her career in writing as an inseparable part of her self, she cannot avoid resentment against it, since her occupation results in society's prejudices that define Anna as a rebel and a freak who dares to take part in men's world. Therefore, Anna starts to have an ambivalent attitude towards her profession, towards her creativity that enable her to emancipate herself from the conventions of society.

Anna's opposing feelings toward her success in literary arena result from not only the pressure of male-dominated society but also from her idea that her novel *Frontiers of War* does not reflect the reality. For Anna, her novel deals with "a lying nostalgia" (*GN* 61), as ". . . what she has written does not match what she remembered, and therefore seems false" (Sinclair, 1997: 111-112). Anna believes she is not "someone who writes little novels about the emotions. [She] write[s] about what's real" (*GN* 41), but she finds herself unable to do that in *Frontiers of War*. Anna writes: ". . . it is so powerful, . . . nostalgia . . . Nothing is more powerful than this nihilism . . . And the people who read *Frontiers of War* will have had fed in them this emotion . . . That is why . . . I feel continually as if I had committed a crime" (*GN* 62). Anna, filled with a feeling of inadequacy to write the truth, criticizes herself and her novel relentlessly and she cannot avoid considering herself as an incompetent writer whose work does not have the power to show the truth, but just reflects "yearning nostalgia" (*GN* 508).

Other reason for Anna's discomfort with her occupation is that her creativity is regarded as something which can be exploited by society. According to Anna, her writing is commercialized when two companies want to adapt her novel for TV series because both of them demand to change the original story so as to attract the audience's attention. Although *Frontiers of War* is about the colour bar, the companies want to adapt it as a love story since they do not ". . . consider screenplays dealing with religion, race, politics, or extra-marital sex" (*GN* 248). Instead, they ". . . want adventure, romance, travel stories, stories of exotic experience, domestic life, family life, parent-child relationships, fantasy, comedy, tragedy" (*GN* 248). Anna, disappointed by the companies attitude toward her novel, ". . . feel[s] ashamed and dissatisfied and depressed" (*GN* 254). The reason why Anna is furious with the companies is that the companies underestimate the aesthetic value of her novel by changing it into a simple love story that will enable the audience to pass the time pleasantly, but the aim of true art, from Anna's

perspective, is not to delight only. For Anna, the true art should not only serve for amusement but also ". . . create a new way of looking at life" (*GN* 59). Therefore, ". . . Anna . . . face[s] the trauma of having a book read very differently from her intention" (Maslen, 1994: 19), since the producers consider *Frontiers of War* as something they can consume in order to entertain the audience. As a result of such a contrast between Anna's and the companies' opinions about art, Anna gets more and more worried about her authoress-ness and a sense of alienation captures her. Society's wrong judgement on her writing estranges Anna from herself and from her identity as a writer. Anna says: ". . . when I read my notebooks I didn't recognize myself" (*GN* 488). Then, Anna ". . . decide[s] to use the blue notebook . . . as nothing but a record of facts" (*GN* 407), but Anna's attempt to find the truth fails because "[t]he Blue Notebook, which [Anna] . . . expect[s] to be the most truthful of the notebooks, is worse than any of them" (*GN* 400).

Anna attributes her failure to write what is true in the Blue Notebook to her awareness that ". . . the real experience can't be described" (*GN* 542). Anna believes language cannot define exactly what she feels and what she thinks. As Anna becomes alienated from her identity as a writer, she loses her power to use words. For Anna, society's denial of her creativity results in her inability to express herself by means of language. Anna writes: "Words mean nothing. They have become, *when I think*, not the form into which experience is shaped, but a series of meaningless sounds, like nursery talk . . . So, I can't write" (*GN* 407). Anna understands that it is society's rejection of her career as a writer that resuls in her loss of power over words and their fragmentation into senselessness. In order to find a solution to her problem of using language, Anna remembers ". . . . something from [her] childhood" (*GN* 469). Anna calls it "naming" which she regards as a way of giving meaning to words. Anna says:

> *First I created the room I sat in, object by object, 'naming' everything, bed, chair, curtains, till it was whole in my mind, then move out of the room, creating the house, then out of the house, slowly creating the street, then rise into the air, looking down on London . . . Then I would create the world, continent by continent…until the point was reached where I moved out into space . . . Sometimes I could reach what I wanted, a simultaneous knowledge of vastness and of smallness or I would concentrate on . . . a single flower or a moth, and try to create to "name" the being of the flower, the moth . . . And then out suddenly, from the smallness into space. (GN 469)*

According to Anna, naming functions as a power that will enable her to re-gain her ability to use language. By attributing meanings to the objects, Anna tries to get rid of the chaos, resulting from her failure to record what is real. For this reason, ". . . 'naming' provides a coherence where it did not previously exist" (Ribeiro, 1990: 92). According to Anna, naming serves as an agent which can put an end to the meaninglessness of words, but she cannot overcome her great difficulty in writing down her experience. As a result, ". . . she cannot deeply feel about anything. She is frozen" (*GN* 202). Anna is numbed because words have ceased to mean anything to her as an author, and unable to endure the fact that she is lacking in feeling, she decides to go to a psycho-analyst called Mrs. Marks to get psychological help.

When Anna goes to her psycho-therapist she tells her about her problems. During the sessions Anna shares her thoughts about art, the artist and politics. Also, Anna's dreams attract Mrs. Marks' attention for Anna cannot help mentioning them. For instance, one of Anna's dreams is about a casket which she consideres to have valuable things in it, but it contains ". . . bits and pieces from . . . all over the world" (*GN* 216), reflecting disease, terror and atrocity. Then, the things in the casket change into "a small green crocodile" (*GN* 216), and its ". . . large frozen tears . . . turn . . . into diamonds" (*GN* 216). Since dreams symbolize the deepest anxieties in psychoanalytic view, "[o]ne may assume that the casket and the malicious crocodile are Anna's burdens or obstacles, always there when she seeks good faith or release" (Karl, 1977: 59). From Anna's casket dream, it can be deduced that even in her dreams Anna's identity as an artist becomes a force that causes her suffering from the pressure of norms of society when she tries to set herself free from the influence of patriarchal ideology by means of her writer image. Like the casket that seems to have beautiful things at first and then lets out horrible things, Anna's writing, which appears to promise success and career, causes Anna's marginalization. In other words, Anna's ambition of writing, which first appears as a power that provides Anna the opportunity to show her intellect and creativity, later makes Anna come into opposition with society.

In the other dream Anna sees a dwarf figure whose sex is in flux. Anna writes: ". . . the principle or element took shape in an old man, almost dwarf-like . . . The element took a variety of shapes, usually that of a very old man or woman (yet there was a suggestion of a double sex, or even sexlessness)" (*GN* 408). It can

be inferred from Anna's dream that Anna is aware of the importance of the androgynous mind for the artist. "The indeterminate sexual nature of the dwarf . . . suggest[s] to Anna that creativity has no innate ties to biological sex" (Cornier, 1990: 77). Like Virginia Woolf who argues for androgyny for the artist's creativity, Anna is against the judgement of creative work on the basis of the creator's sex. Therefore, in Anna's dream, the dwarf, whose sex is unstable, implies Anna's support for androgyny which liberates her from the burden of sex consciousness.

In *The Golden Notebook*, the more Anna tells about her dreams, the more obvious Anna's troubles, arising from her identity as an independent and intellectual woman become. The dream that shows Anna as a mother who has two children is a good example, making Anna's fears explicit. In her sleep Anna dreams that she is the mother-of-two. Lessing writes:

> *One was Janet, plump and glossy with health. The other was Tommy, a small baby, and she was starving him. Her breasts were empty, because Janet had all the milk in them; and so Tommy was thin and punny, dwindling before her eyes from starvation. He vanished altogether, in a tiny coil of pale bony staring flesh before she woke, which she did in a fever of anxiety, self-division and guilt. (GN 556-557)*

In her dream, Anna feels a sense of guilt since she cannot feed Tommy for the male-centred culture, that imposes the role of devoted mother upon women, has a controlling influence over her unconscious. Although in reality Anna refuses to make motherly concerns the focus of her life, in her dream she is anxious that Tommy suffers from starvation because of her inability to give milk to him. "She has this anxiety because she has taken for granted that she has to conform to the stereotyping of femininity as food nurturer" (Tsui-Yan, 2002: 45). Anna knows that in society's eyes she is a rebel who rejects socially constructed female identity by choosing a career, but she still feels the oppression of society. Anna says: "I was astonished at how many of female roles I have not played in life, have refused to play . . . Even in my sleep I knew I was being condemned to play them now because I had refused them in life" (*GN* 516). Anna's words clearly explain her awareness of her opposition to gender roles and of her position in society as a career woman. Therefore, she cannot help feeling as if she committed a crime against her "feminine" nature and even in her dreams she cannot get rid of her conflict between her aspiration to write and her sense of shame in not accepting the norms of society.

As Anna's feeling of self-condemnation gets deeper and deeper, she gets more and more depressed. She feels herself worthless and corrupt. Anna writes: "I was overwhelmed with a feeling of cheapness and nastiness" (*GN* 541). The reason why Anna lacks a sensation of worthiness is that as an independent artist woman, she is a complete failure from society's standpoint because she does not succeed in marriage, which is regarded as the main source of achievement of womanhood. Moreover, Anna's motherhood does not match a stereotypical representation of a mother. Anna never thinks she can be a traditional domestic woman, yet at the same time she can never escape from blaming herself because of not fulfilling the expectations. Therefore, she feels a sense of "meaninglessness [and] the emptiness of emotion" (*GN* 428). Anna finds herself in a desparate situation and starts to suffer from an identity crisis. Anna says: "I felt my sense of identity fade" (*GN* 499). Anna's identity crisis arises mainly from her awareness that she cannot obey the patriarchal society's rules. Anna, stuck between what she wants to be and what she is supposed to be, begins to question her identity as Anna says: "Anna, Anna, I am Anna . . . What then am I, Anna? . . . Who am I, Anna" (*GN* 332). The crisis in Anna's identity is the result of her conflicts within her self and her conflicts stem from her wish both to be as respectable as the housewife/mother stereotype and to pursue her life as a free career woman, but Anna knows it is impossible to gain society's acceptance as long as she does not give up writing and her independence. Caught in a double bind, Anna loses her mental health because of "the disintegration of Anna" (*GN* 526).

In *The Golden Notebook*, Anna's descent into madness is not sudden but inevitable. Her depression turns into schizophrenia. Among the symptoms of schizophrenia Anna suffers are her feelings of guilt because of her notebooks. Lessing writes: "She [Anna] turned the pages of these books over and over, but had no connection with them she knew that some of guilt, which she did not understand, cut her off from them" (*GN* 556). "Ambivalence is another common symptom of schizophrenic thinking" (Torrey, 1988: 38); similarly Anna's thoughts about Saul conflict with one another. On the one hand Anna loves Saul, on the other hand he disgusts her. Anna says: "the . . . man [Saul] . . . made me ill" (*GN* 487). Another symptom of schizophrenia is that it causes changes in senses, and Anna sees the colours "too bright, as if they were hot" (*GN* 541), and she feels as if ". . . colours attacked [her] by their hot unreality" (*GN* 541). Also, ". . . alterations in . . . sense of

self are not uncommon" (Torrey, 1988: 52), and Anna loses her self in her dreams since she becomes "an Algerian Soldier" and "a Chienese peasant" (*GN* 513) while sleeping. Anna is aware of her loss of self as she says: "I wake a person who had been changed by the experience of being other people. I did not care about Anna, I did not like being her. It was with a weary sense of duty I became Anna, like putting on a soiled dress" (*GN* 514). Apart from being other people, Anna is besieged with her past personalities. Anna writes: ". . . I tried to summon up younger, stronger Annas, the schoolgirl in London and the daughter of my father, but I could see these Annas only as part from me" (*GN* 506).

Anna is conscious of her insanity as Lessing writes: ". . . she [Anna] knew she was mad" (*GN* 556). As an artist woman whose identity is subjected to society's attack, Anna escapes from the heavy burden of her identity by means of lunacy. In this respect, for Anna madness is not a self-destruction that causes her loss of mental health, but a way of releasing herself from society's prejudiced perspective on "free woman" because in society's eyes Anna's success in literary arena does not show Anna's intellectual capacity but represents her failure to be a wife and a mother who sacrifices herself for her family. Also, it symbolizes Anna's lack of womanly virtues such as docility, mildness, naivity and domesticity. Intelligence, aspiring mind, resoluteness, creativity turn out to be Anna's sins as they are attributed to men. For this reason, Anna pays the penalty for having "masculine" qualities with the loss of her self. Challenging the socially-determined roles of mother and wife, Anna understands that what society thinks about women's freedom is different from her perspective on it. According to Anna, freedom represents her power to shape her life in accordance with her own choices, but from society's standpoint women's freedom is the symbol of their inability to be a "normal" woman who accepts the social construction of the figure of the suppressed female. Therefore, for Anna freedom transforms into a torment which causes her to question her femininity, her motherhood and her profession doubtfully. In this sense, ". . . 'freedom' . . . signif[ies] the chaos or 'cracking up' that accompanies . . . the disintegration of individual subjectivities" (Krouse, 2006: 40). Therefore, freedom does not enable Anna to do whatever she wants, but results in her alienation from her identity and her descent into madness.

In *The Golden Notebook*, Anna's insanity is also reflected by the fictional character Ella in the Yellow Notebook. As "a metaphor for Anna" (Barnouv, 1977: 43), Ella functions as Anna's alter ego and shares Anna's dilemma whether to be a career woman or conform to the male-centred culture. Just like Anna, Ella is a free woman who both works for a women's magazine and writes stories. Also, she has an affair with a married man called Paul. In the Yellow Notebook, Ella is depicted as a woman whose father and mother do not have a good relationship. Ella's father, who is a military officer, internalizes the idea that ". . . all . . . family ties--family stuff, marriage [are] . . . pretty unreal" (*GN* 396), and Ella's mother is described as a very submissive woman who cannot satisfy her husband sexually. Ella, influenced negatively by her parents' problems, cannot maintain happy relationships with men. "Daddy's denial of love sets the stage for . . . Ella's involvement in a series of disastrous . . . relationships that shatter her sense of self" (Henke, 2008: 12). Ella's affair with Paul causes her depression because she is subjected to Paul's sexual exploitation. For instance, when Ella wants to talk with Paul about his profession, Paul replies: ". . . Ella, you're my mistress, not my wife. Why do you want me to share all the serious business of life with you?" (*GN* 184). From Paul's standpoint, Ella is just a mistress whose duty is to give pleasure to him. Like Michael who makes fun of Anna's authorship, Paul does not take Ella's writing seriously. "[H]is voice is full of distrust when he mentions her writing [and] . . . he thinks she is too naive and ignorant to write" (*GN* 180). Paul despises Ella's talents; similarly as a result Ella herself does not like what she writes. She finds her writing "sensitive and feminine" (*GN* 149). The reason for Ella's doubts about her creativeness is Paul's attitude towards her. Lessing comments on how Paul dominates Ella: "Paul gave birth to . . . the naive Ella. He destroyed . . . sophisticated Ella and . . . he put her intelligence to sleep" (*GN* 183). As a consequence of Paul's devastating thoughts on Ella's literary powers, "[s]he [Ella] begins to hide her work from him. She says she doesn't care about 'being a writer' " (*GN* 180). Unlike Anna, Ella is manipulated by patriarchal ideology. "She [can] not imagine [her] future without a man" (*GN* 150). After Ella and Paul separate, Ella feels obliged to go to the parties and be "on the market" (*GN* 149) so as to find a new man because "[s]he suffers sex desire in a vacuum, . . . thinking that this means she is dependent on men for 'having sex', for 'being serviced', for 'being satisfied' " (*GN* 390). Even though Ella is aware of the fact that ". . . the kind of sex offered [her] is a threat to [her] dignity and [her] self-respect" (Morgan, 1973: 474), she believes she cannot have a life without sex. On

the one hand, Ella strongly resents men's opinions about sex; on the other hand, she cannot help using sex to suppress her anger with men. In short, Ella seems to internalize society's conventions which defend the woman's inability to live without a man. In this respect, Anna's alter-ego is diametrically opposed to Anna. In spite of the difference between Ella's and Anna's personalities, they share the same fate as both of them become mentally ill. Ella's depression after Paul's abandonment results in her insanity. Ella feels herself "in pieces" (*GN* 269), and in "an emotional vacuum" (*GN* 270). Just like Anna, Ella cannot escape from detrimental consequences of her relationship with her lover.

Laing's ideas about the fragmentation in inner-self would help elaborate on Anna's alter-ego, Ella. As mentioned before, a schizophrenic patient cannot see himself or herself as "a complete person." The schizophrenic person is besieged with a sense of fragmented self, and this sense stems from his/her ontological insecurity. An ontologically threatened person experiences a kind of anxiety called "engulfment" that shows one's "failure to sustain a sense of one's own being without the presence of other people" (*DS* 55). Taking Laing's view on engulfment into account, it is not difficult to say that in *The Golden Notebook* Ella symbolizes Anna's ontological insecurity. In other words, Anna's double helps Anna to be aware of the split in her self. Rigney writes: ". . . the doppelganger seems to represent the recognition of the tragedy of one's own fragmentation and alienation from the self" (1978: 10). Ella functions as a sign that proves Anna's sense of fragmented self. Anna's desire to escape from herself is shown by the creation of Ella, but Anna quits writing in the Yellow Notebook to put an end to Ella's existence. After Anna needs her double for a certain time, she decides to destroy Ella completely by eliminating the Yellow Notebook.

This decision shows Anna's attempt to rid herself of the fragmentation in her self, since "[i]n order for . . . a self-integration to occur, the doppelganger, who has represented the self as split, must in some way be annihilated or at least relegated to obscurity" (Rigney, 1978: 123). Anna, troubled by her sense of fragmented self, sees the annihilation of Ella as a way of uniting her splits in her inner-self. Therefore, Ella not only makes Anna aware of her need to be engulfed but also provides her with an opportunity to regain her individual autonomy. With the help of Ella's destruction, Anna tries to find a solution to her lack of ontological insecurity.

Consequently, Anna's lunacy is not a self-annihilation, but functions as an outlet for her problems. Madness provides Anna with the ways that enable her to overcome her conflicts between her wills and society's expectations. In other words, ". . . Anna's madness . . . becomes Anna's solution to the 'insanity' of her traditional ideas about love and marriage" (Goff; 2000: 74). Mental illness serves as a rejuvenation for Anna because it helps her to gain an awareness that ". . . the word neurotic means the condition of being highly conscious and developed. The essence of neurosis is conflict" (*GN* 402). According to Anna, being mad is better than being sane, since lunacy symbolizes achieving a breakthrough that gives her an ability to go beyond the boundaries of traditions. "People stay sane by blocking off, by limiting themselves" (*GN* 402). For this reason, Anna obtains "out of chaos, a new kind of strength" (*GN* 400). This strength results in Anna's realization that her sense of fragmented self is not destructive, but it shows her difference from those who cannot dare to reject the stereotypical roles of women. Anna understands that her identity as a writer provides her with a power that makes it possible for her to cope with the restrictions of patriarchal ideology. Being a free woman represents Anna's determination to pursue her life without men's control and her desire to have a career which promises success. According to Anna, women's independence denotes a challenge to social norms that support male chauvinism. Fragmentation and madness teach Anna that existing as an intellectual career woman in a male-dominated society requires self-assertiveness, self-confidence, self-reliance and self-esteem. Therefore, at the end of *The Golden Notebook* Anna does not have difficulty in accepting the fluidity of her idendity, and she decides to use only one notebook. Anna says: "I'll pack away the four notebooks. I'll start a new notebook, all of myself in one book" (*GN* 519). As a consequence of the elimination of her dilemma by means of madness, Anna starts working as a marriage counsellor, becomes a member of the Labour Party and teaches for delinquent children. "[T]o divide [her]self up into compartments" (*GN* 234) bocomes Anna's way of understanding the multiplicity of her identity, so Anna achieves wholeness through "all of herself in one book."

CHAPTER FOUR
THE BELL JAR

In *The Bell Jar* Sylvia Plath portrays how a young and smart woman, who aspires to become a writer, falls mentally ill because of her mixed feelings about her future and about her identity. Plath's novel, which takes place in 1950's America, deals with a teenager's problems, arising mainly from the ambiguities within her self, reflecting the outcomes of the inequality between the sexes in society. In *The Bell Jar* (hereafter cited as *BJ*), the protaganist Esther Greenwood, who lives with her mother and her brother in Boston, ". . . gets a scholarship to college" (*BJ* 2-3) and wins ". . . a fashion magazine contest by writing essays and stories and poems and fashion blurbs" (*BJ* 3). This fashion magazine contest gives Esther the opportunity to be an intern in *Ladies Day* Magazine in New York City. To Esther, this internship is an excellent chance that will enable her to leave her suburb for a short time and to take advantage of the opportunities of the big city; that is, Esther has the great good fortune to be free from her family's restrictions and to spend her time pleasantly by going out with friends and by attending banquets. For this reason, Esther is ". . . supposed to be having the time of [her] life [and] . . . to be the envy of thousands of . . . college girls . . . all over America" (*BJ* 2), but Esther is not satisfied with her situation in the big city either. Working as a guest editor in a fashion magazine and going to the parties do not make Esther happy. She says: "I guess I should have been excited . . . , but I couldn't get myself react. I felt very still and very empty, the way the eye of a tornado must feel, moving dully along in the middle of the surrounding hullabaloo" (*BJ* 3). The reason for Esther's dissatisfaction is related to the atmosphere in which she finds herself in the big city. In New York, Esther stays at a hotel which is for women only, and most of the girls, staying there, have rich families ". . . who want . . . to be sure their daughters [will] be living where men [cannot] get at them and deceive them" (*BJ* 4). Esther cannot identify herself with these wealthy girls. According to Esther, all of them are dull as she complains: "I saw them on the sunroof, yawning and painting their nails and trying to keep up their Bermuda tans, and they seemed bored as hell. . . . Girls like that make me sick" (*BJ* 4-5). Esther cannot get much enjoyment out of the days she spends in New York, for she is aware that she misses out on a lot of advantage. Thus Esther confesses: "It was my first big chance, but here I was sitting back and letting it run through my fingers like so much water" (*BJ* 5).

Esther also knows that her dissatisfaction is connected with other contest winners. For instance, ". . . one of [her] troubles [is] Doreen" (*BJ* 5), who is a confident and outgoing girl "from a society girls college down South" (*BJ* 5). Doreen is an independent girl with her "full-length nylon and lace jobs you [can] half see through, and dressing gown the color of skin" (*BJ* 6). Doreen has boy friends and is able to act in social life as she wishes. Other contest winner is Betsy whose naivity is mocked by Doreen. Betsy has almost no experience of social life; therefore, she is called "Pollyanna Cowgirl" (*BJ* 7). In contrast with Doreen's world of enticements, Betsy's world symbolizes innocence, purity and inexperience. Esther, as an inexperienced young girl, is stuck between the images of these two girls. One image is Doreen's which represents, for Esther, freedom, sexual permissiveness and rebellion against the figure of the suppressed female. Other one is Betsy's which is a representative of these of stereotypical women whose lives are moulded by society's expectations. Therefore, Esther is confronted with two opposing images that put her in a dilemma. Esther vacillates between these two different images. Nevertheless, Esther understands that "It [is] Betsy [she] resemble[s] at heart" (*BJ* 25), after she spends time with Doreen. For example, one day Esther goes out with Doreen for a drink, and wears a dress which is ". . . cut so queerly [she] [cannot] wear any sort of a bra under it" (*BJ* 8). To Esther, that sort of dress looks extraordinary because it is considered inappropriate for a young woman to wear such a dress in such a place Esther lives, but Esther does not see her dress as an inappropriate one. Owing to Doreen's influence upon her, Esther says: "Ordinarily, I would have been nervous about my dress . . . but being with Doreen made me forget my worriess. I felt wise and cynical as all hell" (*BJ* 9). In the bar where Doreen and Esther go for a drink, they meet men called Frankie and Lenny. Even though Esther wants to pass the time pleasantly, she does not feel comfortable. Esther expresses her feeling of anxiety: "I felt myself melting into the shadows like the negative of a person I'd never seen before in my life" (*BJ* 11). Moreover, a sense of insecurity captures her. For this reason, Esther does not give her real name to the men she meets. She introduces herself under a different name and says: " 'My name's Elly Higginbottom', I said. 'I came from Chicago'. After that I felt safer. I didn't want anything I said or did that night to be associated with me and my real name and coming from Boston" (*BJ* 13). Esther's lying about her identity shows that she feels guilty about forming a friendship with such a girl and about spending time

with the men she does not know, since society condemns doing such things that are accepted as immoral acts. Society's rules decree that it is against the conventions for "normal" girls to make friends with men who are eager to flirt with girls, and pay no attention to taboos. For this reason, Esther feels obliged to hide her name because of the situation she finds herself in while she is with Doreen and her male friends. Esther's untrue statement about her name functions as something that can help her lessen her anxiety about her friendship with Doreen. Esther's lie demonstrates her desire to avoid society's condemnation for what she is doing with Doreen. "Being 'another' person, she can diverge from the path she was expected to take without feeling guilty" (Lagunas, 2000: 24). In other words, Esther needs to be Elly in order to escape from the pressure of society.

That day Doreen and Esther also go to Lenny's apartment after the bar. As the time passes, Esther's anxiety increases. Esther's distancing strategy of lying does not work here. Esther gets more and more worried. Esther says: "I felt myself shrinking to a small black dot against all those red and white rugs and that pine paneling. I felt like a hole in the ground" (*BJ* 17). In Lenny's apartment Esther considers herself as "the only extra person in the room" (*BJ* 18) when Doreen and Lenny start to have a sexual intercourse. This disturbs Esther a lot because their sex is full of violence. Esther says: "I noticed . . . that Doreen's breasts had popped out of her dress . . . as she circled belly-down on Lenny's shoulder, thrashing her legs in the air and screeching, and then they both started to laugh . . . and Lenny was trying to bite Doreen's hip through her skirt" (*BJ* 18). Esther is irritated by the physical harm of the sex. Moreover, she is aware that Doreen and Lenny are doing something society forbids as there is a taboo against premarital sex. According to social customs, having a sexual relationship outside marriage is forbidden, and this view makes purity the most important womanly virtue. Esther is conscious that in society's eyes Doreen is an impure and immoral girl. Therefore, due to society's perspective on women's purity and sex, Esther cannot endure Doreen's and Lenny's sexual behaviour, and she comes back to the hotel.

After returning, Esther takes a hot bath so as to "meditate in the hot bath" (*BJ* 21). After a shocking night with Doreen, Esther feels as if she committed a sin, and she wants to rid herself of her "sin" by means of hot bath. While thinnking, she says: "I felt myself growing pure again. I don't believe in Baptism or the waters of Jordan

or anything like that, but I guess I feel about a hot bath the way those religious people feel about holy water. . . . The longer I lay there in the clear hot water the purer I felt" (*BJ* 22). While having a bath, Esther thinks about the people she has spent the night with. Esther thinks that they are corrupted by big city life, and the hot bath enables her to eliminate the sense of corruption. Esther says: "I said to myself: 'Doreen is dissolving, Lenny is dissolving, . . . New York is dissolving, they are all dissolving away and none of them matter any more. I don't know them, I have never known them . . . All . . . those sticky kisses I saw . . . is turning into something pure" (*BJ* 22).

After feeling "pure and sweet as a new baby" (*BJ* 22), Esther sleeps, but her peace of mind is interrupted by Frankie who brings Doreen back. Doreen is sick because of drinking too much alcohol and she needs help. Frankie knocks at the door by calling Esther "Elly" and Doreen says "Miss Greenwood" in a sharp whisper. At that moment Esther feels "as if [she] had a split personality" (*BJ* 23). Esther realizes that her fake name "Elly" represents the division in her self. "Elly" symbolizes Esther's rebellious self which enables her to form a friendship with Doreen. In other words, Esther's using a fake name to allay her anxiety about being with Doreen demonstrates that in Esther's personality there is a part which is like Doreen's. This part provides Esther with a way to challenge society's norms that create virtues for women such as passivity, naivity, docility, and purity. When Esther becomes Elly, she goes to the bar and meets the men she does not know. Elly does things Esther does not dare to do because Elly has none of the socio-sexual restrictions in Esther's past. Unlike Esther, Elly is not expected to be an obedient and submissive girl who keeps her virginity until marriage. For this reason, being Elly enables Esther to be active, and flirtatious in social life. However, when Esther quits becoming Elly, Esther is besieged with a sense of guilt and with a sense of immorality. Therefore, Esther suppresses her desires which help her become Elly because she knows that a figure like Elly is not regarded as a "normal" girl whose purity and innocence are praised by society, and she decides to ". . . be loyal to Betsy and her innocent friends" (*BJ* 25).

Next day Esther goes to the Ladies' Day banquet. Then, she meets with Jay Cee who is the editor of *Ladies Day*. During the meeting Jay Cee asks Esther about her plans after graduation from the college and Esther says she does not know.

Even though Esther is a very successful student, she cannot form a judgement about her future. After doing ". . . everything well enough and [getting] all A's" (*BJ* 34), Esther is still in a state of being unable to decide what she is going to do for a living. Esther reveals her low spirits as she says: "I had been unmasked . . . that morning by Jay Cee herself, and I felt now that all the uncomfortable suspicions I had about myself were coming true . . . After nineteen years of running after good marks and prizes . . . I was letting up, slowing down" (*BJ* 31). Esther's meeting ends with Jay Cee's a piece of advice that Esther should learn some languages and should ". . . offer something more than the run-of-the-mill person" (*BJ* 36). Ironically this advice only increases Esther's anxiety about her identity and her future because until then she has always had success in all subjects she is interested in. Esther's "all A's" provide her with several alternative possibilities as Esther says: "What . . . I had in mind was getting some big scholarship to graduate school or a grant to study all over Europe, and then I thought I'd be a professor . . . or write books of poems and be an editor of somesort. . . . I toyed with the idea of being a botanist" (*BJ* 35, 37). Esther's intelligence and talents enable her to have a chance to consider more than one career, but this chance leads Esther to an indecisiveness.

Esther's indecisiveness is also clear when the contest winners have their pictures taken for the magazine. The contest winners are ". . . supposed to be photographed with the props to show what [they] want . . . to be" (*BJ* 112). As opposed to her friends, who enjoys being photographed, Esther does not feel happy, since she cannot decide how to pose for the photograph. "Betsy h[o]ld[s] an ear of corn to show she want[s] to be a farmer's wife . . . and Doreen h[o]ld[s] a . . . sari to show she want[s] to be a social worker in India" (*BJ* 112), but when it is Esther's turn she says she does not know what she wants to be because in Jay Cee's words "[s]he wants . . . to be everything" (*BJ* 112). It is Esther's intellectual capacity which makes it difficult for her to reach a decision about her choices that will mould her future. As a consequence of feeling confused by her alternatives, Esther is besieged with her troubles, concerning her career.

In another encounter with Esther, Jay Cee also advises her not to ". . . let the wicked city get [her] down. This advice reminds the readers of Esther's dilemma so as to whether to make use of the advantages of the big city--in other words, to oppose the socially constructed female identity by becoming Elly--or play her

supposed role of a “normal” girl who remains within the boundaries of domestic sphere. After Jay Cee’s advice, Esther starts to think about Jay Cee in a different light: “I tried to imagine what it would be like if I were Ee Gee, the famous editor . . . I wished I had a mother like Jay Cee. Then I’d know what to do” (*BJ* 42). Esther attributes her inability to choose a career to the lack of a role mother, namely her mother, who is a far cry from Jay Cee. Esther obviously has problems with her family. Esther confesses that her anxiety about her identity and her future is connected with her mother: “My mother wasn’t much help. My mother had taught shorthand and typing to support us ever since my father died, and secretly she hated it and hated him for dying and leaving no money” (*BJ* 42-43). As such, Esther cannot model herself on her mother, and Esther’s anxiety about her identity increases.

It is noteworthy that almost all events Esther confronts in New York results in her questining her problems, concerning her identity. For instance, one day Esther goes to a movie with her friends. The film is a “football romance” which she does not like. In the film “. . . [a] nice girl . . . end[s] up with [a] nice football hero and the sexy girl . . . end[s] up with nobody” (*BJ* 45-46). The film shows that the socially acceptable girl gets married whereas the sexually free girl is rejected by the football hero. “In that production, the sexy, assertive young woman is ‘punished’, deserted by the male characters, and the docile young woman collects the reward of marriage” (Howlett, 1999: par. 14). In the film the stereotypical representation of “pure” girl and the stereotypical representation of “immoral” girl confront Esther again with her conflicts caused by the difference between Doreen’s and Betsy’s images. Esther realizes that chastity before marriage is demanded in the society in which she lives. In a male-centred culture a young woman is not supposed to take part in a sexual activity without getting married. For this reason, a “chaste” girl has an exalted position like the “good” girl in the film Esther watches. Esther knows that society’s perspective on women’s sexuality results in two opposing women’s images. One image, like Betsy’s, mirrors women as innocent, pure and meek creatures who need protection. Another one, which is projected by Doreen, stereotypes women by depicting them as lustful, immoral and attractive ones who deserve punishment. As a consequence of the negative effect of the film upon Esther, the film turns into a torment rather than a diversion.

Esther's preoccupation with the two opposing female images stems not only from society's view on female sexuality but also from her relationship with Buddy, her ex-boyfriend. Buddy Willard, who is a medical student, is described by Esther as a "hypocrite." Although Buddy wants to marry Esther, she never wants to ". . . marry him if he were the last man on earth" (*BJ* 57). Esther hates Buddy because of his crudity. For example, she remembers him calling a poem "a piece of dust" (*BJ* 62). Demonstrating a typically male behaviour, "[h]e [is] . . . very scientific" (*BJ* 62) and he never considers poetry as a serious subject while Esther is. Buddy believes in "prov[ing] things" (*BJ* 62). For Buddy poetry is insignificant and foolish, and Esther feels obliged to agree with Buddy about poetry because of her initial adoration for him. Esther says: "My trouble was I took everything Buddy Willard told me as the honest-to-God truth" (*BJ* 63). Although Esther has a boundless enthusiasm for literature, she has to suppress her real feelings on poetry. Thus Buddy, as the embodiment of patriarchal force here, controls Esther to accept his position at the expense of self-denial.

To the readers, Buddy's dominance of Esther is also evident when Esther goes to a hospital with Buddy in order to get "some really interesting hospital sights" (*BJ* 69). In the hospital Esther sees cadavers and "some big glass bottles full of babies that had died before they were born" (*BJ* 69). Moreover, Esther gets a view of the birth of a baby that shocks her greatly. Buddy does not want Esther to observe the scene because of its horror. Buddy says: " 'You oughtn't to see this.' . . . 'You will never want to have a baby if you do. They oughtn't to let women watch. It'll be the end of the human race' " (*BJ* 71). In Buddy's opinion, the birth of a baby is such a terrifying scene that it can frighten women of bearing a child, and women's fear can discourage pregnancy. Buddy's intention to prevent Esther from seeing the birth scene represents his belirf in male superiority in science. According to Buddy, science is a field in which men hold all the power and the female body is just an object for science. For Budddy, scientific knowledge belongs to the male only. Therefore, Buddy thinks it is better for Esther not to see the childbirth. However, Esther enters into the room where a woman is in great pain. Esther finds herself in a puzzling situation. Esther says: "I was so struck by the signt of the table where they were lifting the woman . . . It looked like some awful torture table, with those metal stirrups" (*BJ* 71-72). Esther is rather disturbed by ". . . an enormous spider-fat stomach and two little ugly spindly legs propped in the high stirrups, and . . .

unhuman whooing noise" (*BJ* 72). Buddy also tells Esther that women who give birth are given a medicine that make them fail to remember the pain during the operation. To Esther, ". . . it sound[s] like the sort of drug a man . . . invent[s]" (*BJ* 72), since the pain cannot prevent women from being pregnant. Gail D. Sinclair suggests: "Esther surmises that the drug the woman is given to block her memory of pain is really a male conspiracy designed to lure women into their biological role as birth-givers" (1997: 129). According to Esther, the pain women suffer while giving birth is so great that they cannot dare have another one, but they forget it because of the drug they are given. Therefore, they are entrapped into another pregnancy. In Esther's eyes, the drug represents patriarchy's trick that makes motherhood women's biological destiny. Esther feels that men decieve women into biologically-destined role of mother. Therefore, "the interesting hospital sight" results in the change of Esther's perspective on motherhood. After Esther sees the birth-giver's helplessness and suffering, she associates motherhood with torment, deception and inevitability. Consequently, Esther fears that perhaps some day she may come face to face with that unavoidable fate.

The more Esther spends time with Buddy, the more she learns about him, and the more she knows about him the more she understands how she is restricted by male-centred ideology. For instance, one day Buddy asks Esther whether she has ever seen a naked man, and then he takes off his clothes and says that she should get accustomed to seeing him without his clothes. This attitude shows that ". . . Buddy appoints himself as Esther's rightful initiator into the sexual world" (Pompele, 2004: 167). Buddy tries to make Esther aware of the sexual aspect of their relationship. While doing this, Buddy embarrasses and humiliates Esther because Buddy's desire to show his body aims to make Esther feel sexually abused. Buddy acts as if he is doing a show to prove men's controlling influence upon sex and female sexuality. While Buddy undresses, Esther remembers what her mother said about Buddy. Esther brings her family's praise of Buddy into her mind. She says: "My mother and my grandmother had started hinting around to me . . . about what a fine . . . boy Buddy Willard was, coming from such a . . . clean family, and how everybody . . . thought he was a model person, so kind . . . so athletic and so handsome and so intelligent" (*BJ* 75). Esther's family's admiration for Buddy suggests to Esther that ". . . marriage to a successful doctor is exactly the situation for which she was trained" (Palumbo, 1990: 149). Esther infers from her family's

opinion about Buddy that he is regarded as “an ideal husband” for her. From society’s standpoint, a “normal” girl takes her marriage vows so as to gain the achievement of womanhood when she reaches a certain age because “[f]ulfillment as a woman had only one definition . . . the housewife-mother” (as cited in Bennett, 1991: 101). That is why marriage is the only way for women to be respectable and to have a place in the community. Women are raised to find a proper man and to get married to him; similarly, Esther is expected to do what she is obliged to. In other words, she is supposed to take part in marriage so as to be a decent man’s wife, Buddy’s wife.

As opposed to society’s view on marriage in which her family shares fully, Esther does not like the idea of getting married. She does not believe in romantic marriages, and considers them as a kind of slavery. Esther says: “The trouble was, I hated the idea of serving man” (*BJ* 83). To Esther, marriage is based on the exploitation of women. According to Esther, what a man expects from marriage is not love or romance, but service and benefit. Esther says: ”I knew that in spite of all the roses and kisses . . . a man showered on a woman before he married her, what he secretly wanted when the wedding service ended was for her to flatten out underneath his feet like [a] kitchen mat” (*BJ* 93-94).

Esther’s parents’ marriage contributes greatly to Esther’s negative perspective on marriage. Esther’s father and mother do not get along well, and their marriage does not depend on love. It is just a source of trouble and discomfort for Esther: ”Had’nt my . . . mother told me that as soon as she and my father left Reno on their honey- moon . . . my father said to her, ‘Whew, that’s a relief, now we can stop pretending and be ourselves’ and from that day on my mother never had a minute’s peace” (*BJ* 94). Esther’s father is neither a good husband nor a good father. She describes the years she had with her father as “the years of neglect” (*BJ* 186). He is such an indifferent man that he cannot give the love and care Esther needs. Therefore, growing up in such a family, Esther has a very bad opinion of marrriage, and does not want to share the same fate with her mother by getting married to Buddy. She desires a future without a husband and children.

On the same day Buddy takes off his clothes in front of Esther, she asks Buddy a question whose answer not only surprises Esther but also makes a great

impact on her opinions about sexuality. Esther wants to know whether Buddy has ever had a sexual relationship with anyone, and Buddy reveals that he has slept with a waitress. Esther is perplexed by this answer, since judging from Buddy's pretences of sexual purity also for himself she ". . . expect[s] him to say, 'No, I have been saving myself for when I get married to somebody pure and virgin like you" (*BJ* 76). With Buddy's actual answer, Esther comes face to face with Buddy's extreme insincerity. Esther says: "Actually, it wasn't the idea of Buddy sleeping with somebody that bothered me. . . . What I couldn't stand was Buddy's pretending I was so sexy and he was so pure" (*BJ* 78). Although Buddy's affair lasts for a whole summer he behaves as if he had no sexual experience. For this reason, Esther is disturbed by ". . . the kind of double life Buddy live[s] and [his] feeling so superior to people" (*BJ* 80). Buddy is raised by a family which is really ". . . fanatic about virginity for men and women both" (*BJ* 78), and Buddy always tells Esther about his mother's opinions about the relations between the sexes. Esther says: "He was always saying how his mother said, 'What a man wants is a mate and what a woman wants is infinite security' and, 'What a man is is an arrow into the future and what a woman is is the place the arrow shoots off from', until it made me tired" (*BJ* 79). Even though Buddy seems to adhere to his family's ideals verbally, this adherence to purity is nothing but deception. In Esther's eyes, Buddy's image transforms from "the most wonderfull boy [she]'d ever seen" into "an awful hypocrite" (*BJ* 57-58). Esther, disappointed at Buddy's dishonesty, decides to separate as she reveals: ". . . I had just decided to ditch Buddy . . . , not because he'd slept with that waitress but because he didn't have the honest guts to admit it straight off to everybody and face up to it as a part of his character" (*BJ* 79). To Esther, honesty is much more important than purity. Esther cannot endure Buddy's lack of honesty. According to Esther, a man, a husband should be trustworthy. For this reason, Buddy cannot be an ideal husband. Esther says: ". . . I did not want to give my children a hypocrite for a father" (*BJ* 133). Buddy thus loses Esther's trust and admiration.

Buddy loses not only his respectability but also his health. He becomes infected with tuberculosis and receives treatment in a sanatorium. Even though Esther sees Buddy's illness as a "punishment" for his wickedness, she pays him a visit. During the visit Buddy proposes Esther, but she rejects him by saying that she is never going to marry. Buddy associates Esther's decision with madness and

advises her to chance her mind. Buddy's patriarchal ideology regards marriage as the most reasonable choice women should make because patriarchy decrees that women should be raised to be controlled by men and it is a must for women to remain within the boundaries of domestic sphere. Esther is aware of the influence of male-dominated culture upon Buddy and as opposed to Buddy she does not consider marriage as the only choice. Esther believes in her alternatives which can provide her with an opportunity to rid herself of the socially constructed female identity. Esther knows that owing to her intelligence and talents she has the power to be a career woman rather than a housewife. For this reason, Esther does not hesitate to turn down Buddy's proposal. Esther puts an end to her relationship with Buddy, but it has caused great changes in Esther's perspective on marriage, sexuality and motherhood.

Esther's view on sexuality undergoes quite a metamorphosis as a result of her relationship with Buddy. Esther plans to have sex with someone after she hears about Buddy's betrayel, and in New York she decides to allow a man to "seduce" her. This man is Constantin who is an interpreter at the UN. One day Esther goes to Constantin's apartment to listen to music even though Esther's ". . . mother . . . always t[ells] [her] never under any circumstances to go with a man to a man's rooms after an evening out, it [can] mean only the one thing" (*BJ* 88). In Constantin's apartment, Esther reminisces about an article her mother gave her. The title of the article is "In Defense of Chastity" and "[i]t g[ives] all the reasons a girl shouldn't sleep with anybody but her husband and then only after they [are] married" (*BJ* 89). The article deals with society's double standards concerning male and female sexuality since it defends women's purity until marriage, but Esther believes in the contrary. She says: "It might be nice to be pure and then to marry a pure man, but what if he suddenly confessed he wasn't pure after we were married . . . I couldn't stand the idea of a woman having to have a single pure life and a man being able to have a double life, one pure and one not" (*BJ* 89-90). Esther cannot understand why society considers women's virginity as a norm while it does not demand men's chastity. Esther is so preoccupied with this unfairness that she cannot get rid of the pressure this inequality puts upon her. Esther says:

> *Instead of the world being divided up into Catholics and Protestants or Republicans and Democrats or white men and black men or even men and women, I saw the world divided into people who had slept with somebody and people who hadn't and this seemed the only really significant difference between one person and another. (BJ 95)*

While Esther spends time with Constantin in New York, she is troubled not only by her thoughts on sexuality but also by the problems, concerning her future. For instance, when Esther meets with Constantin at the UN, Esther feels "dreadfully inadequate" (*BJ* 84). Whilst Esther is watching Constantin and a Russian girl interpreter, she ponders over what she cannot do. Esther thinks that she is not able to cook, to know shorthand, to dance, to ride a horse, to speak German, to read Hebrew or to write Chinese. "The only thing [Esther] [is] good at [is] winning scholarships and prizes and that era [is] coming to an end" (*BJ* 84). Esther is so confused and so depressed that she cannot help feeling ". . . like a racehorse in a world without racetracks" (*BJ* 84). Esther worries that she does not have enough knowledge or experience to be successful in social life or in family life because she is of the opinion that her success in school will be futile after the graduation. Therefore, she feels obliged to make a choice so as to decide on how she is going to shape her life after she graduates, but she cannot make up her mind. Esther says:

> *I saw my life branching out before me like the green fig tree . . . From the tip of every branch, like a fat purple fig, a wonderful future bekoned and winked. One fig was a husband and . . . children, and another fig was a famous poet and another was a brilliant professor, and another fig was Ee Gee . . . and another fig was Constantin and . . . a pack of lovers . . . and beyond and above these figs were many more figs I couldn't quite make out.(BJ 84-85)*

Esther knows that she can choose marriage which will enable her to have a husband and children. This choice is what her family expects her to make, since her family regards Buddy as a perfect husband in every way, but Esther has great expectations such as having a job and being an artist. Esther does not want to waste her abilities on domestic concerns. "Esther is torn apart by intolerable conflict between her wish to avoid domesticity, marriage and motherhood, on the one hand, and her inabililty to conceive of a viable future in which she avoids that fate, on the other" (Bonds, 1990: 54). Therefore, she is besieged with a dilemma as to whether to be a stereotypical woman or take part in professional life. Esther says: "I saw myself sitting in the crotch of this fig tree, starving to death, just because I couldn't make up my mind which of the figs I would choose. I wanted each and every one of them, but choosing one meant loosing all the rest" (*BJ* 85). Esther, unable to decide on her future, imagines being married to Constantin. She says:

> *I tried to imagine what it would be like if Constantin were my husband. It would mean getting up at seven and cooking him eggs and bacon and*

toast and coffee and dawdling about in my nightgown and curlers after he'd left for work to wash up the dirty plates and make the bed, and then when he came home after a lively, fascinating day he'd expect a big dinner, and I'd spend the evening washing up even more dirty plates till I fell into bed, utterly exhausted.
This seemed a diary and wasted life for a girl with fifteen years of straight A's.(BJ 93)

According to Esther, marriage represents a dull life in which she is destined always to do things based on a routine. Esther cannot put up with the stultifying effect of uninteresting housework because she ". . . want[s] change and excitement and shoot off in all directions [her]self, like the coloured arrows from a Fourth of July rocket" (*BJ* 92). As such, marriage does not make it possible for Esther to use her creativity and aspiring mind. She thinks what use do "the fifteen years of straight A's" have if she gets married like a girl of avarage intelligence? Esther also reminisces about Buddy's words of marriage. She remembers Buddy's statement that she will feel differently and will not want to write poems any more when she has children. Buddy's words cause an increase in Esther's anxiety about marriage and motherhood. To Esther, playing the roles of mother and wife seem to be ". . . like being brainwashed, and . . . numb as a slave in some private, totalitarian state" (*BJ* 94). Therefore, Esther does not see marriage as a right choice.

Burdened with her troubles with her future and with her career, Esther returns to her home and she decides to write a novel in order to rid herself of the pressure of her problems. Esther creates a heroine called Elaine and begins her novel by writing a few sentences, but she is not satisfied with what she writes because she thinks she is too inexperienced to write a novel. She says: "How could I write about life when I'd never had a love affair or a baby or even seen anybody die?" (*BJ* 135). Then, Esther decides to read *Finnegan's Wake* and to study on her thesis. When she starts reading *Finnegan's Wake* she realizes that she cannot grasp the meaning of what she reads. She says: "Words . . . twisted all awry like faces in a funhouse mirror, fled past, leaving no impression . . . The letters grew barbs and rams' horns. I watched them separate, each from the other, and jiggle up down in a silly way. Then they associated themselves in fantastic, untranslatable shapes" (*BJ* 139). Esther has a great difficulty in understanding the outer world, and this difficulty shows that she has lost her mental health since "A fundamental defect of schizophrenic patients' brains is their frequent inability to sort, interpret and respond" (Torrey, 1988: 28). Similarly, Esther cannot think clearly and comprehend

without difficulty because “Esher loses her highly-prized ability to control and manipulate language” (Cooper, 1997: 113). Esther, troubled by her inability to write and and to read, goes to her family doctor to get some sleeping pills and she is recommended that she should see a psychiatrist called Dr. Gordon.

Esther’s days pass with sleepless nights and she cannot do her daily activities such as having a shower and washing her clothes. To Esther, life seems meaningless since she loses all her energy. Esther says: “. . . I hadn’t washed my clothes or my hair . . . because it seemed so silly. . . . It seemed silly to wash one day when I would only have to wash again the next. It made me tired just to think of it. I wanted to do everything once and for all and be through with it” (*BJ* 143). The influence of her inability to write continues to control her. Her writing becomes more and more fragmented because of her fragmented mind. Esther says: “. . . when I took my pen, my hand made big, jerky letters like those of a child, and the lines sloped down the page from left to right almost diagonally, as if they were loops of string lying on the paper” (*BJ* 145-146). Esther’s insanity causes her loss of intellectual powers. Such a clever and gifted girl who aspires to be a poet finds herself unable to use language. Her mind is in a complete turmoil because of the anxiety created by her indecisiveness and by society’s expectations.

When Esther goes to Dr. Gordon to receive treatment, she comes face to face with Dr. Gordon’s complete indifference. In Dr. Gordon’s opinion, it is imperative that a shock treatment should be given, but consequences of shock treatment are disastrous because she gets worse because of the pain she experiences. Esther says: “Doctor Gordon was fitting two mental plates on . . . my head. He bucked them into place with a strap that dented my forehead . . . Then something bent down and took hold of me and shook me like the end of the world. . . . I thought my bones would break . . . I wondered what terrible thing it was that I had done” (*BJ* 160-161). To Esther, shock treatment seems as a price she pays for her attempts to free herself from society’s established opinions about femininity. “[S]he . . . become[s] the helpless object of the others. The clumsily applied shock treatment represents the epitome of such acts” (as cited in Boyer, 2004: 214-215). Because of the shock treatment Esther feels like a medical object used by Dr. Gordon. Like the woman Esther sees in the hospital, Esther is under the control of the male-dominated science. Shock treatment, which is regarded by Dr. Gordon as

a cure for Esther's madness, produces a catastrophic result such as her tendency to commit suicide.

Esther's obsession with death is evident when she becomes continually concerned with the news of death in the newspaper. People who killed themselves attract Esther's attention because she wonders how it is to be feel suicidal. Esther says: "I folded the paper . . . It was what my mother called a scandal sheet, full of the local murders and suicides . . . and just about every page had a half-naked lady on it . . . They were the only things I could read" (*BJ* 153). Esther's fixation about death results in her attempts to kill herself. For instance, one day Esther tries to cut her veins while taking a bath. Later, she wants to put an end to her life by means of drowning and hanging, but all of them fail. Then, she decides to take an overdose of sleeping pill, and this time she succeeds in a way as her attempt ends in hospital. After that incident Esther is taken to a private mental institution.

Going to the private mental intitution is a turning point in Esther life. In hospital she meets Dr. Nolan. A great change occurs in Esther's psychology after she is aided in her treatment by Dr. Nolan. When Dr. Nolan introduces herself to Esther, Esther gets ". . . surprised to have a woman [psychiatrist]" (*BJ* 210). To Esther, Dr. Nolan is different from all women she knows. For instance, Dr. Nolan, like Jay Cee, does not have "plug-ugly looks" (*BJ* 6). Dr. Nolan is a respectable career woman who practices psychiatry. In other words, Esther realizes that a woman can both pursue a profession and be socially acceptable. Esther does not hesitate to share the thoughts that trouble her. She tells Dr. Nolan about her opinions about marriage and motherhood. Esther says: " 'What I hate is the thought of being under a man's thumb', I had told Doctor Nolan. 'A man doesn't have a worry in the world, while I've got a baby hanging over my head like a big stick, to keep me in line' " (*BJ* 249). Esther makes a complaint about gender roles and about society's double standards. The influence of Esther's problems is eradicated by Dr. Nolan. She helps Esther rid herself of her troubles, concerning her identity. ". . . Dr. Nolan . . . is the instrument whereby Esther learns to be, not some other women, but herself" (Perloff, 1972: 520). Esther understands that she can exist in society with her own choices, and she can challenge society's values.

Other important point in the change in Esther's view on life is connected with her friend Joan. In order to elaborate on this issue it is useful to mention Laing's engulfment briefly here. Since engulfment is an ontologically insecure person's use of someone else's identity, the doppelganger serves as a representative of one's split in his/her inner-self. The ontologically threatened person becomes aware of her sense of fragmentation by means of the doppelganger, similarly Esther gains a consciousness that Joan is her double. Esther believes she can have shared qualities with Joan. Esther says: ". . . it occurred to me Joan and I might have something in common" (*BJ* 225). Like Esther, Joan experiences a depression, tries to commit suicide and receives treatment for her mental illness. Therefore, Esther sees Joan as her alter-ego who enables her to recognize her separation from her inner-self. Esther says: "[H]er thoughts and feelings seemed a wry, black image of my own. Sometimes I wondered if I had made Joan up" (*BJ* 246). According to R. D. Laing, "In order to exist she needs someone else to believe in her existence" (*DS* 60), but Esther has to annihilate Joan to achieve a sense of unity. Joan's existence comes to an end owing to Joan's suicide. She hangs herself, and Esther liberates herself from her double completely. Joan's influence upon Esther is eliminated by her self-destructive act. Esther says: "Joan was the . . . double of my old . . . self, specially designed to follow and torment me" (*BJ* 231). As a consequence of elimination of Esther's alter-ego from Esther's life, Esther gets an opportunity to take action to re-gain her autonomy.

One of the most important choices Esther makes as a liberated woman is her decision to have an affair with a man in order to get rid of her virginity which ". . . weigh[s] like a millstone around [her] neck" (*BJ* 257). This decision represents the first step Esther takes so as to begin her new life. Esther says: "I decided to practice my new . . . personality on this man . . . Irwin" (*BJ* 254). Since ". . . Esther's fear of the consequence of sex--pregnancy--keeps her in line with the traditional double standards" (Cramer, 1980: 155), what Esther expects from her first sexual experience is a different life determined by her own desires, not by conventions. Before sleeping with Irwin, Esther does not forget to take contraceptive pills. Contraception provides Esher with a power that makes her sexually free. For this reason, contraception symbolizes female autonomy in sexualty from Esther's perspective. After she loses her virginity, she feels as if she won an overwhelming victory over society's taboos. Esther says: ". . . stories of blood-stained bridal sheets

and capsules of red ink bestowed on already deflowerd brides floated back to me. . . . it occured to me that the blood was my answer. I couldn't possibly be a virgin anymore. I smiled into the dark" (*BJ* 258). Esther transforms into a self-confident and self-assertive woman with the help of her first sexual experience.

Undergoing quite a metamorphosis, Esther gains a new ideology that enables her to see life differently. What Esther has experienced because of the ambiguities in her inner-self makes her aware that her life should depend on what she chooses. She does not have to imitate any woman around her, and she does not have to conform to patriarchal ideology which presents to Esther male-centred values. Esther thinks that socially contructed female identity is not the only alternative for her identity. Instead of making a choice between Doreen's and Betsy's images, Esther creates her own image based on her own characteristics. She makes herself into her own image: "I was my own woman" (*BJ* 251). Esther accepts her ambiguities within her self as she says: ". . . they were part of me" (*BJ* 267). Realizing that life is neither totally fair nor completely foul, Esther decides to struggle with her conflicts that cause her descent into madness. This decision results in the emergence of Esther's "new . . . personality" (*BJ* 254). This emergence is like "a ritual for being born twice" (*BJ* 275). Esther gets a new perspective that makes her aware that her life should be under her control. "Esther's rebirth, therefore, is a self-birth" (Budick, 1987: 883).

To conclude, Esther, a gifted young woman, comes face to face with a dilemma as to whether to be a conventional girl whose life is shaped by the desires of the people around her or fight for her ambition to be an artist woman. Esther understands that society tries to decide her fate by presenting marriage as an obligation, but she wants to have a free life in which she has a successful career. Esther's desire to have such a life stems from her intellectual capacity which enables her to oppose society's dominant ideology. Esther is aware that society applies double standards, and this inequality between men and women dominates the issue of sexuality. Although Esther sees virginity as a burden, she cannot free herself from this burden for a certain time because of her obsession with child-bearing. Since she witnesses the birth of a baby, she never desires to have such a painful experience. When Esther loses her virginity, she feels "perfectly free" (*BJ* 273). Other important point that liberates Esther from society's pressure is her

rejection to marry. Esther's turning Buddy down shows Esther's desire to have a life which is different from that of the stereotypical housewife-mother, and "Esther rejects domestic 'security' in favour of instability or 'change' reiterating her refusal to marry" (Kahan, 2002: 206). Esther eliminates marriage from her life, and takes a step to make her free choices. With the help of Dr. Nolan who is the epitome of career woman from Esther's standpoint, Esther realizes that a career woman can have a respectable place in society. Dr. Nolan's image makes Esther aware that not only marriage but also profession is a way of defining her social identity. According to Esther, an intellectual woman is not obliged to be a wife and a mother only; that is, she can both have a career and be accaptable to society. As a result of Esther's success in overcoming her dilemma, she ". . . climb[s] to freedom, freedom from fear" (*BJ* 251). To sum up, Plath's *The Bell Jar* highlights the causes and the result of a young woman's conflicts. Teresa De Lauretis writes: "*The Bell Jar* is the account of a journey, of Esther's descent into the hell of self-disintegration, her rebirth, and ascent into self-unity and freedom" (1976: 173). Esther achieves to get a sense of unity out of a chaos. She is no longer "the person in the bell jar, blank and stopped as a dead baby" (*BJ* 267), but a resolute and self-reliant woman who has a desire to fulfil her aspirations.

CONCLUSION

Both Doris Lessing's *The Golden Notebook* and Sylvia Plath's *The Bell Jar* provide the readers with a new perspective on the women-artists' conflicts between their free choices and society's expectations. Strikingly both novels take up the issue of women's madness, and both achieve a critical analysis of society's pressure upon the intellectual women who want to use their intelligence and talents in literary arena. Not only Lessing but also Plath present the readers with women's situation in the post-war era which puts rigid distinctions between gender roles.

In *The Golden Notebook*, Doris Lessing draws the readers' attention to the fact that a woman writer, who is always on the periphery of society, has to struggle with social norms whose ignorance of her intellectual powers results in her doubts about herself. Lessing's heroine, Anna Wulf, is a free woman who has proved a great success with her novel, but she feels unable to write another novel because of the writer's block. Then, she makes a decision to keep four notebooks which represent different aspects of her self. Thus, Anna's notebooks mirror the fragmentation in her identity. In the notebooks, there are different "Annas" such as author Anna, comrade Anna, mother Anna and mistress Anna. Author Anna intends to put an end to the turmoil of the post-war world with her writings, but she is troubled by the lack of her confidence in her novel because of the marginalized position of female writers in literature. Comrade Anna's aim is not only to have a share in politics but also to free herself from her sense of fragmented self. Unfortunately, Anna's identity as a political activist cannot find a solution to her problem. Mother Anna both considers motherhood as a burden and feels guilty of not providing her daughter with a "normal" life such as her daughter's friends have. Mistress Anna is mocked by her lovers who disrespect her profession. As a result of the identity crisis, Anna suffers from a mental breakdown, but her descent into madness has rather a constructive effect upon her. Anna's depression enables her to be aware of the power of the different aspects of her identity. Eliminating her sense of fragmented self, Anna overcomes her dilemma, and starts to use only one notebook called the golden notebook. "[T]he golden notebook . . . symbolizes the reintegration of Anna's personality [and] unification of her fragmented self" (Hester, 1990: 55).

In *The Bell Jar* Sylvia Plath's main concern is to show how difficult it is for a creative woman to make a choice between her literary aspirations and expectations of society. Plath focuses on an intellectual young woman's coping with her ambiguities which are the outcomes of the conflicts between her ambition and society's demands. Marilyn Boyer writes: ". . . Plath was assessing the plight of the young woman artist at the mid century who was attempting to overcome the values of domesticity" (2004: 200). Plath's protagonist, Esther Greenwood, gets an opportunity to be a guest editor in New York, but the results of this experience are disastrous, since it makes Esther aware of her inability to decide on her future plans and of her problems concerning her identity. Esther, torn between the image of "good girl" and that of "bad girl," finds herself in stuggle with the socially constructed female identity. While society expects Esther to play the stereotypical the housewife-mother role, Esther wants to have a career in literature in order not to waste her intellectual capacity on housework and on child-rearing. As a conseqence of the pressure Esther feels upon herself, she loses her mental health. However, Esther's breakdown turns into a breakthrough. Realizing that "[t]he intellectual or creative woman must divide, is already divided by her society into incompatible selves or half-selves" (Whittier, 1976: 145), Esther eliminates her dilemma and decides to mould her life in accordance with her own choices and desires.

It is noteworthy that Plath herself, like Esther, is stuck between her literary ambitions and her belief in the necessity of fulfiling her societal roles. Being aware of society's difficulty in accepting the female writer's literary powers, Sylvia Plath creates Esther, her fictional doppelganger. "In *The Bell Jar*, Esther Greenwood mirrors Plath's ambivalence" (Dobbs, 1977: 12). Like Esther, Plath suffers from depression and the most important similarity established between them is their dilemmas to be acceptable to society or be an artist woman. Plath tries to eliminate her dilemma by getting married and by writing poems, but her efforts fail. Unlike Esther, Plath cannot find a solution to her problems arising from her dilemma. Sylvia Plath, burdened with a double bind, first falls mentally ill, then commits suicide.

Plath's madness and suicide show that Plath, unlike Anna and Esther, cannot overcome her conflicts between her self and society. In other words, for Plath madness does not function as a liberating force which can enable her to eliminate her dilemma. Plath's mental breakdown cannot transform itself into a

breakthrough. Obviously, reality follows a different path from fiction in this particular instance. Although fiction shows madness as a way of finding a solution to the creative woman's problems, in reality the artist woman's dream to escape from her burden through madness may not always come true. Plath understands that an artist woman is always a marginalized figure from society's standpoint although she makes an attempt to play the stereotypical housewife/mother role by marrying and having children. Bennett writes, ". . . she [Plath] was never able to abandon the dream of normalcy, including marriage and children, that . . . her society held out to her as the ultimate test and reward of a successful woman's life" (1991: 98). For this reason, Plath feels herself obliged to fulfil the roles as mother and wife, and Plath gets married to a famous poet, Ted Hughes, and bears two children. However, her ambition for literature never lets her give up poetry. Therefore, Plath divides her life between the housework and poetry, and this division makes a great impact on her mental health. Madness, which functions to eliminate social pressures and resolve her characters' dilemmas in her fiction, fails to function in the same way in her life. Seeing suicide as the solution to her problem, she kills herself at the age of thirty-one. According to Bennett, "[t]he tragedy of Sylvia Plath is the tragedy of a woman who was split apart by her need to be what she thought others wanted her to be. . . . Plath tried to fulfill in herself every aspect of what her society meant by the term 'normal woman' " (Bennett, 1991: 162). It is bitterly ironic that, Plath, unlike Anna and Esther, cannot reconcile her artist woman identity with her societal roles.

It is worth noting that like Anna and Esther, most women writers such as Virginia Woolf, Charlotte Perkins Gilman suffer from depression because of the pressure being artist-women in a patriarchal society where creativity is attributed to men and women are not expected to have a share in literature. For this reason, the female writer is always subjected to society's oppression, since her desire to write is accepted as a challenge to male supremacy in literary arena. Being a marginal figure in the male-dominated society, the female writer starts questioning her creativeness. As a result of this questioning, the female writer finds herself in a dilemma as to whether to pursue her writings or to give them up. Bennett expresses this internalization as follows: "The woman writer's principal antagonists are . . . the inhibiting voices that live in within herself" (1990: 10). The artist woman is aware that she is rejected by society since she does not fit the housewife/mother stereotype whose interests are centred around her husband and children. Such awareness

inevitably brings doubts about the value of her art and of herself as an artist. These doubts result in the intellectual woman's alienation from herself. Consequently, the artist woman is troubled with an identity crisis because of the futility of her effort to exist in society as a writer.

Such circumstances are, according to writers such as Wetzel, grounds for madness. "When women are denied full access to their power as individuals and are obliged instead to shape themselves to cultural standards of femininity, a vital part of women's self is stifled. This is a setup for 'depression' " (Wetzel et. al., 1993: 34). When the feminine ideals of society prevent the artist woman, she feels she has lost a part of her self. It pains the creative woman to feel obliged to suppress her desire to write, so her great suffering turns into a mental breakdown. In other words, ". . . madness is the price women-artists have had to pay for the exercise of their creativity in a male-dominated culture" (*FM* 4). In reality madness serves as one of the penalties of the artist woman's creativity whereas in the two specific novels discussed in this thesis madness is a liberating force which enables the heroines in the novels to escape from society's oppression. Yet, since reality and fiction are different they present two different aspects of madness. On the one hand, fiction defines madness as an agent which rids the creative woman of the burden of her artist woman identity; on the other hand, in reality liberating function of madness does not always work. Nonetheless, however different aspects of madness exist, the root cause of intellectual woman's descent into madness in both reality and fiction lies in her resentment against the gender bias in society. The artist-woman is aware that society considers her creativity as a sin or as a crime while men's ability to write is praised; that is, ". . . whereas men are rewarded for deriving their sense of self from creative endeavours . . . , a woman's creativity is unrewarded" (Wetzel et. al., 1993: 35). As a consequence of society's prejudices against woman's intellectual capacity, the artist-woman's madness is "a doomed search for potency" (as cited in Rigney, 1978: 6).

To conclude, in a male-dominated society the artist-woman always puts up a struggle for her literary autonomy. It is the creative woman's destiny to fight for gaining society's acceptance for her part in literature. In other words, the intellectual woman has to oppose the established rules of patriarchy that confine her to feminine domestic roles. The woman-artist's aim should focus on annihilating the female

suppressed figure in society. Therefore, as Virginia Woolf writes, she herself should destroy the image of “the Angel in the House”:

> *And while I was writing this review, I discovered that if I were going to review books I should need to do battle with a certain phantom. And that phantom was a woman, and when I came to know her better I called her after the heroine of a famous poem, The Angel in the House. It was she who used to come between me and my paper when I was writing reviews. It was she who bothered me and wasted my time and so tormented me that at last I killed her. . . . I turned upon her, caught her by throat. I did my best to kill her. My excuse, if I were to be had up in a court of law, would be that I acted in self-defence. Had I not killed her she would have killed me. She would have plucked the heart out of my writing.* (as cited in Rigney, 1978: 120)

Annihilating this “angel” will give the intellectual woman the power to appeciate her literary powers and help her cope with the difficulties she comes face to face. On her part, then she should not lose her belief in the power of her art, in her identity as an artist and in her abilities because she cannot win an overwhelming victory if she lacks confidence in herself. The intellectual woman never should allow her dilemmas, her doubts and her ambiguities to dominate her inner-self and to defeat her. With the help of her intellectual capacity, the creative woman should know that the power is in herself, in her artist-woman identity. “The acceptance of the self . . . is the base upon which the woman poet [writer] must work, the source of her greatest authority and strength” (Bennett, 1990: 5). Coming to terms with her self and discovering her powers as a woman, the woman-artist should be a survivor like the heroines in the the two novels analyzed in this study.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Barnouv, D. (1977). Disorderly Company: From *The Golden Notebook* To *The Four-Gated City. Contemporary Women Novelists: A Collection of Critical Essays*. (pp. 30-54). Prentice-Hall: New Jersey.

Barry, P. (1995). *Beginning Theory: An Introduction to Literary and Cultural Theory*. Manchester UP: Manchester.

Beauvoir, S. (2005). Marxists, *The Second Sex.* http://www.marxist.org/reference/subject/ethics/de-beauvoir/2nd-sex/index.htm (14.10.2008).

Bennett, P. (1990). *My Life is a Loaded Gun: Dickinson, Plath, Rich and Female Creativity*. U Illinois P: Urbana.

Bonds, D. S. (1990). Ebscohost, The Separative Self in Sylvia Plath's *The Bell Jar*. http://web.ebscohost.com/ehost/pdf?vid=7&hid=3&sid=340c395a-f0f0-4a7e- a066-5fb333786491%40sessionmgr102 (03.11.2008).

Blondin, B. G. (1989). Proquest, Imaginative Integration in Four Novels by Doris Lessing. Florida Atlantic University. Florida. http://proquest.umi.com/pqdweb?index=25&did=747542271&SrchMode=1&sid=2&Fmt=6&VInst=PROD&VType=PQD&RQT=309&VName=PQD&TS=1226568068&clientId=42977 (24.10.2008).

Boyer, M. (2004). Ebscohost, The Disabled Female Body as a Metaphor for Language in Sylvia Plath's *The Bell Jar*. http://web.ebscohost.com/ehost/pdf?vid=73&hid=113&sid=5794c278-ef2d-403f-bf79-ad8808d8609d%40SRCSM2 (13.11.2008).

Budick, M. E. (1987). Jstor, The Feminist Discourse of Sylvia Plath's *The Bell Jar*. http://www.jstor.org/stable/378115 (14.10.2008).

Butler, J. (1990). *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity.* Routledge: New York.

Chesler, P. (1971). Jstor, Women as Psychiatric and Psychoetherapeutic Patients. http://www.jstor.org.stable/349448 (14.10.2008).

Cooper, P. (1997). Ebscohost, A Body Story with a Vengeance: Anatomy and Struggle in *The Bell Jar* and *The Handmaid's Tale*. http://web.ebscohost.com/ehost/pdf?vid=81&hid=106&sid=5794c278-ef2d-403f-bf79-ad8808d8609d%40SRCSM2 (13.11.2008).

Cornier, M. M. (1990). Proquest, Feminism and the Postmodernist Impulse: Doris Lessing, Marge Piercy, Margaret Atwood, and Angela Carter. Unpublished Doctoral Thesis. Emory University. Georgia. http://proquest.umi.com/pqdweb?index=24&did=747129631&SrchMode=1&sid=2&Fmt=6&VInst=PROD&VType=PQD&RQT=309&VName=PQD&TS=1226568068&clientId=42977 (24.10.2008).

Cosby, S. G. (2000). Proquest, Resisting Madness: Women's Negotiation of Social Control in Early Modern English Literature. Unpublished Doctoral Thesis. University of Oklahoma. Norman. (02.01.2008). http://proquest.umi.com/pqdweb?index=0&sid=2&srchmode=1&vinst=PROD&FMT=6&startpage=1&clientid&42977&vname=PQD&rqt=309&TS=1230894379&clientId=42977 (02.01.2009).

Cramer, K. C. (1980). Proquest, The New Democratic Protagonist: American Novels and Women Main Characters, 1960-1966. Unpublished Doctoral Thesis. Texas Christian University. Texas. http://proquest.umi.com/pqdweb?index=26&did=753429521&SrchMode=1&sid=1&Fmt=6&VInst=PROD&VType=PQD&RQT=309&VName=PQD&TS=1227687689&clientId=42977 (26.11.2008).

Dobbs, J. Viciousness in the Kitchen: Sylvia Plath's Domestic Poetry. http://www.jstor.org/stable/3194361 (20.03.2009).

Eagleton, T. (1983). *Literary Theory: An Introduction*. U of Minnesota P: Minneapolis.

Eagleton, M. (ed.). (1986). *Feminist Literary Theory: A Reader*. Basil Blackwell: Oxford.

Feeney, S. (2007). Ebscohost, Sylvia Plath and James Dickey: Societal Constraints upon a Woman. http://web.ebscohost.com/ehost/pdf?vid=7&hid=106&sid=340c395a-f0f0-4a7e-a066-5fb333786491%40sessionmgr102 (3.11.2008).

Felman, S. (1989). Women and Madness: the Critical Phallacy. *The Feminist Reader: Essays in Gender and the Politics of Literary Criticism.* (pp. 117-132) London: Macmillan.

Friedman, S. S. (1987). Jstor, Creativity and the Childbirth Metaphor: Gender Difference in Literary Discourse. http://www.jstor.org/stable/3177835 (20.03.2009)

Gallop, J. (1982). *The Daughter's Seduction: Feminism and Psychoanalysis*. Cornell UP: Ithaca.

Gardiner, J. K. (2006). Ebscohost, Historicizing Homophobia in *The Golden Notebook* and "The Day Stalin Died". http://web.ebscohost.com/ehost/pdf?vid=3&hid=4&sid=da857ddf-d1bc-4465-bbec-4145281d4536%40SRCSM2 (30.10.2008)

Gilbert, S. M., Gubar, S. (1979*). The Madwoman in the Attic: The Woman Writer and The Nineteenth Century Literary Imagination*. Yale UP. New Haven.

Gilman, C. P. (1996). "Why I wrote 'The Yellow Wallpaper'. " *Approaching Literature: Literature and Gender.* (pp. 126). New York: Routledge.

Goff, K. (2000). Proquest, Women, Marriage, and Madness in Jean Rhys's *Wide*

Sargasso Sea, Virginia Woolf's *Mrs. Dolloway*, and Doris Lessing's *The Golden Notebook*. Unpublished Master Thesis. University of Lousville. Kentucky. http://proquest.umi.com/pqdweb?index=6&did=729101891&SrchMode=1&sid=2&Fmt=6&VInst=PROD&VType=PQD&RQT=309&VName=PQD&TS=1225353494&clientId=42977 (24.10.2008).

Hester, P. J. (1990). Proquest, Doris Lessing's Use of Spatial Perimeters: Friend or Foe? Unpublished Master Thesis. Northeast Missouri State University. Missouri. http://proquest.umi.com/pqdweb?index=23&did=747923901&SrchMode=1&sid=2&Fmt=6&VInst=PROD&VType=PQD&RQT=309&VName=PQD&TS=1226568068&clientId=42977 (24.10.2008).

Hester, S. (2008). Ebscohost, Reading Doris Lessing's *Golden Notebook* as Feminist Trauma Narrative. http://web.ebscohost.com/ehost/pdf?vid=3&hid=120&sid=7e2f134cea17-43a0-a89a-01e7e477b612%40sessionmgr102 (30.10.2008).

Howlett, J. (1999). Sylvia Plath's *The Bell Jar* as Counter-Narrative. Journal of American Studies of Turkey. http://www.bilkent.edu.tr/~jast/Number10/Howlett.html (02.01.2009).

Hunter, D. (1983). Jstor, Hysteria, Psychoanalysis and Feminism: The Case of Anna O. http://www.jstor.org/stable/3177609 (02.02.2009).

Hume, B. A. (2002). Wilson Select Plus, Managing Madness in Gilman's "The Yellow Wall-Paper." http://firstsearch.oclc.org/WebZ/FTFETCH?sessionid=fsapp452727-fmx9xtlr-gxd33u:entitypagenum=19:0:rule=100:fetchtype=fulltext:dbname=WilsonSelectPlus_FT:recno=6:resultset=5:ftformat=PDF:format=BI:isbillable=TRUE:numrecs=1:isdirectarticle=FALSE:entityemailfullrecno=6:entityemailfullresultset=5:entityemailftfrom=WilsonSelectPlus_FT: (24.10.2008).

Kahan, L. H. (2002). Proquest, Stategies of Self-Making: Narrating Racial Passing,

Performing White Femininity. Unpublished Doctoral Thesis. Colombia University. New York. http://proquest.umi.com/pqdweb?index=7&sid=1&=srchmode=1&vinst=PROD&FMT=6&startpage=1&clientid=42977&vname=PQD&RQT=309&did=764929752&scaling=FULL&ts=1230890920&vtype=PQD&rqt=309&TS=1230890960&clientId=42977 (02.01.2009).

Karl, F.R. (1977). Doris Lessing in the Sixties: Anatomy of Melancholy. *Contemporary Women Novelists: A Collection of Critical Essays*. (pp. 55-74). Prentice-Hall: New Jersey.

Killian, K.D. (1994). Jstor, Fearing Fat: A Literature Review of Family Systems Understandings and Treatments of Anorexia and Bulimia. http://www.jstor.org/Stable/585423 (02.02.2009).

Kolodyn, A. (1985). Dancing Through the Minefield: Some Observations on the Theory, Practice, and Politics of a Feminist Literary Criticism. *The New Feminist Criticism: Essays on Women, Literature and Theory.* (pp. 144-167). Pantheon: New York.

Koyuncu, N.Y. (2000). Gender, Identity and Ideology: Discourse of the Oppressed in the Works of Charlotte Perkins Gilman and Olive Schreiner. Unpublished Doctoral Thesis. İzmir: Ege University Institute of Social Sciences.

Krouse, T. (2006). Wilson Select Plus, Freedom as Effacement in *The Golden Notebook:* Theorizing Pleasure, Subjectivity, and Authority. http://firstsearch.oclc.org/WebZ/FTFETCH?sessionid=fsapp4-52727-fmx9xtlrgxd33u:entitypagenum=6:0:rule=100:fetchtype=fulltext:dbname=WilsonSelectPlus_FT:recno=3:resultset=2:ftformat=PDF:format=BI:isbillable=TRUE:numrecs=1:isdirectarticle=FALSE:entityemailfullrecno=3:entityemailfullresultset=2:entityemailftfrom=WilsonSelectPlus_FT: (02. 01. 2009).

Lagunas, S. (2000). Proquest, Study of *The Bell Jar* and Cronica Del Desamor. Unpublished Master Thesis. West Virginia University. Morgantown.

http://proquest.umi.com/pqdweb?index=9&did=7292655461&SrchMode=1&sid=1&Fmt=6&VInst=PROD&VType=PQD&RQT=309&VName=PQD&TS=12344862724& clientId=42977 (26.10.2008).

Laing, R. D. (1969). *The Divided Self: An Existential Study in Sanity and Madness*. London: Tavistock.

Lauretis, T. D. (1976). Ebscohost, Rebirth in *The Bell Jar*. http://web.ebscohost.com/ehost/pdf?vid=85&hid=6&sid=5794c278-ef2d-403f-bf79-ad8808d8609d%40SRCSM2 (13.11.2008).

Lessing, D. (1963). *The Golden Notebook*. McGraw Hill: New York.

Lodahl, B. M. (1976). Jstor, Cinderella's Stepsisters: A Feminist Perspective on Anorexia Nervosa and Bulimia. http://www.jstor.org/stable/3173453 (02.02.2009).

Maslen, E. (1994). *Doris Lessing*. Plymouth: Nortcote House.

Mill, J. S. (2004). Adalaide, *The Subjection of Woman*. http://ebooks.adelaide.edu.au/m/mill/john-stuart/m645s (14.10.2008).

Millet, K. (1990). *Sexual Politics: The Classic Analysis of the Interplay Between Men, Women and Culture.* Simon Schuster: New York.

Moi, T. (1985). *Sexual Texual Politics: Feminist Literary Theory.* Routledge: London.

Morgan, E. (1973). Jstor, Alienation of the Woman Writer in *The Golden Notebook*. http://www.jstor.org/stable/1207467 (14.10.2008).

Mort, J. A. (2004). Wlson Select Plus, The Golden Notebook. http://firstsearch.oclc.org/WebZ/FTFETCH?sessionid=fsapp4-52727fmx9xtlr-gxd33u:entitypagenum=10:0:rule=100:fetchtype=fulltext:dbname=WilsonSelectPlus_FT:recno=4:resultset=2:ftformat=PDF:format=BI:isbillable=TRUE:nu

mrecs=1:isdirectarticle=FALSE:entityemailfullrecno=4:entityemailfullresultset=2:entityemailftfrom=WilsonSelectPlus_FT: (24.10.2008).

Palumbo, K. E. (1989). Proquest, Psyche Revisited: Images of Female Heroism in American Literature, 1950-1980. Unpublished Doctoral Thesis. Emory University. Georgia. http://proquest.umi.com/pqdweb?index=29&did=745314531&SrchMode=1&sid=1&Fmt=6&VInst=PROD&VType=PQD&RQT=309&VName=PQD&TS=1227692421&clientId=42977 (26.11.2008).

Perloff, M. G. (1972). Jstor, A Ritual for Being Born Twice: Sylvia Plath's *The Bell Jar*. http://www.jstor/stable/1207445 (14.10.2008).

Pompele, G. (2004). Proquest, Trauma and Survival in Twentieth Century Women's Asylum Narratives. Unpublished Doctoral Thesis. University of Southern California. California. http://proquest.umi.com/pqdweb?index=6&did=775162491&SrchMode=1&sid=4&Fmt=6&VInst=PROD&VType=PQD&RQT=309&VName=PQD&TS=1226563238&clientId=42977 (24.10.2008).

Plath, S. (1971). *The Bell Jar*. Harper Row: New York.

Ramas, M. (1980). Jstor, Freud's Dora, Dora's Hysteria: The Negation of a Woman's Rebellion. http://www.jstor.org/stable/3177476 (02.02.2009).

Ribeiro, O. (1990). Proquest, A Different Thread: An Analysis of the Diary Form in The Representation of the Female Self. Unpublished Master Thesis. Concordia University. Montreal. http://proquest.umi.com/pqdweb?index=22&did=748009041&SrchMode=1&sid=2&Fmt=6&VInst=PROD&VType=PQD&RQT=309&VName=PQD&TS=1226568464&clientId=42977 (24.10.2008).

Rigney, B. H. (1978). *Madness and Sexual Politics in the Feminist Novel: Studies in Bronte, Woolf, Lessing and Atwood.* Wisconsin: U of Wisconsin P.

Sinclair, G. D. (1997). Proquest, Rising to the Surface: Suicide as Narrative Strategy in the Twentieth-Century Women's Fiction. Unpublished Doctoral Thesis. University of South Florida. Florida. http://proquest.umi.com/pqdweb?index=12&did=736795051&SrchMode=1&sid=1&Fmt=6&VInst=PROD&VType=PQD&RQT=309&VName=PQD&TS=1227600661&clientId=42977 (25.11.2008).

Sharpe, M. (1992). Proquest, Autonomy, Self-Creation,and the Woman Artist Figure in Woolf, Lessing, and Atwood. Unpublished Master's Thesis. McGill University.Montreal. http://proquest.umi.com/pqdweb?index=14&did=748081231&SrchMode=1&sid=1&Fmt=6&VInst=PROD&VType=PQD&RQT=309&VName=PQD&TS=1226567863&clientId=42977 (24.10.2008).

Showalter, E. (1977). *A Literature of Their Own: British Women Novelists from Bronte to Lessing*. New Jersey: Princeton UP.

Showalter, E. (1985). Toward a Feminist Poetics. *The New Feminist Criticism: Essays on Women, Literature and Theory*. (pp.125-143). Pantheon: New York.

Showalter, E. (1987). *The Female Malady: Women, Madness, and English Culture, 1930-1980.* Virago: London.

Showalter, E. (2000). Feminist Criticism in the Wilderness. *Modern Criticism and Theory: A Reader.* (pp. 308-330). Longman: Essex.

Simmons, M. A. (1996). Proquest, Fictions of Femininity: Fin-de-Siecle Representations of Hysteria. Unpublished Doctoral Thesis. The City University of New York. New York. http://proquest.umi.com/pqdweb?index=3&did=739474951 SrchMode=1&sid=2&Fmt=6&VInst=PROD&VType=PQD&RQT=309&VName=PQD&TS=1233573149&clientId=42977 (02.02. 2009).

Small, H. (1996). Madness as a Theme in Women's Literature. *Appoaching*

Literature: Literature and Gender. (pp.114-120). New York: Routledge.

Spencer, S. (1973). Ebscohost, Femininity and the Woman Writer: Doris Lessing's *The Golden Notebook* and the Diary of Anais Nin. http://web.ebscohost.com/ehost/pdf?vid=90&hid=7&sid=5794c278-ef2d-403f-bf79-ad8808d8609d%40SRCSM2 (13.11.2008).

Torrey, E. F. (1988). *Surviving Schizophrenia: A Family Manuel*. New York: Harper Row.

Tsui-Yan, L. (2002). Proquest, The Female Self, Body and Food: Strategies of Resistance In Doris Lessing, Margaret Atwood, Zhang and Xi Xi. Unpublished Doctoral Thesis. The Chienese University of Hong Kong. Hong Kong. http://proquest.umi.com/pqdweb?index=3&did=764936031&SrchMode=1&sid=2&Fmt=6&VInst=PROD&VType=PQD&RQT=309&VName=PQD&TS=1225353494&clientId=42977 (24.10.2008).

Vice, S. (ed). (1996). *Psychoanalytic Criticism: A Reader.* Polity: Cambridge.

Vlastos, M. (1976). Jstor, Doris Lessing and R. D. Laing: Psychopolitics and Prophecy. http://www.jstor.org/stable/461511 (14.10.2008).

Webster, R. (1990). *Studying Literary Theory: An Introduction*. Edward Arnold: London.

Wetzel, J. et.al. (1933). *Women's Studies: Thinking Women*. Kendall Hunt: Iowa

Whittier, G. (1976). Ebscohost, The Divided Woman and Generic Doubleness in *The Bell Jar*. http://web.ebscohost.com/ehost/pdf?vid=77&hid=7&sid=5794c278-ef2d-403f-bf79-ad8808d8609d%40SRCSM2 (13.11.2008).

Wollstonecraft, M. Oregonstate, *A Vindication of the Rights of Woman.*

httm://oregonstate.edu/instruct/ph/302/texts/wollstonecraft/woman-contents.html (14.10.2008).

Wood, A. D. (1973). Jstor, The Fashionable Disease: Women's Complaints and Their Treatment in Nineteenth-Century America. http://www.jstor.org.stable/20235 (14.10.2008).

Woolf, V. (2004). Adelaide*, A Room of One's Own.* http://ebooks.adelaide.edu.au/w/woolf/virginia/w91r/complete.htm (14.10.2008).

Yoder, J. D. (2003). *Women and Gender: Transforming Psychology*. Prentice Hall: New Jersey.