T.C.

KOCAELİ ÜNİVERSİTESİ

SOSYAL BİLİMLER ENSTİTÜSÜ

THE IMAGE OF WOMAN IN VIEW OF KRISTEVA IN THE THREE VICTORIAN NOVELS OF *NORTHANGER ABBEY* BY JANE AUSTEN, *SHIRLEY* BY CHARLOTTE BRONTË AND *JUDE THE OBSCURE* BY THOMAS HARDY

YÜKSEK LİSANS TEZİ

ÖZGÜ AYVAZ

ANABİLİM DALI: BATI DİLLERİ VE EDEBİYATLARI

PROGRAMI : İNGİLİZ DİLİ VE EDEBİYATI

KOCAELİ - 2012

T.C.

KOCAELİ ÜNİVERSİTESİ

SOSYAL BİLİMLER ENSTİTÜSÜ

THE IMAGE OF WOMAN IN VIEW OF KRISTEVA IN THE THREE VICTORIAN NOVELS OF *NORTHANGER ABBEY* BY JANE AUSTEN, *SHIRLEY* BY CHARLOTTE BRONTË AND *JUDE THE OBSCURE* BY THOMAS HARDY

YÜKSEK LİSANS TEZİ

ÖZGÜ AYVAZ

ANABİLİM DALI: BATI DİLLERİ VE EDEBİYATLARI

PROGRAMI : İNGİLİZ DİLİ VE EDEBİYATI

DANIŞMAN: PROF. DR. METİN TOPRAK

KOCAELİ - 2012

KABUL VE ONAY

Özgü AYVAZ tarafından hazırlanan The Image of Woman in view of Knitus to the Three Victorian Novels of Northanger Abbey by Jane Austen, Shirley by Charlotte Bronte' and Jude the Obscure by Thomas Hardy adlı bu çalışma jürimizce Yüksek Lisans Tezi olarak kabul edilmiştir.

Jüri Üyelerinin Ünvanı, Adı-Soyadı ve Kurumu	İmzası
Jüri Üyesi: Prof. Dr. Metin Toprak	M. Toprak
Jüri Üyesi: Yrd. Doç. Dr. Dağan Yüksel	
Jüri Üyesi: Yrd. Doç. Dr. Burcu İnan	

Sınav Tarihi: 13/07/2012

Enstitü Yönetim Kurulunun Onay Tarihi ve Karar No: 13/07/2012
14 sayılı karar

CONTENTS

ÖZET

19. yüzyıl Victoria Dönemi, 18. yüzyıl Akıl Çağı ve 20. yüzyıl Modern Dönem arasında bir süreç dönemidir. Dönem, süreç dönemi olmasından kaynaklı, birtakım değişikliklere sahne olduğundan, ilk, orta ve son olmak üzere üç bölüme ayrılır.

Bu tezde, her biri Victoria Dönemi'ndeki ayrı bölümlere karşılık gelen üç romana değinilmiştir: Dönemlere göre sırasıyla Jane Austen'ın *Northanger Abbey*, Charlotte Brontë'nin *Shirley*, ve Thomas Hardy'nin *Jude the Obscure* adlı romanları. Bu romanlar, Freud ve Lacan'ın psikanalitik kuramından etkilenen Julia Kristeva'nın feminist kuramıyla incelenmektedir.

Kristeva'ya göre kişi, sürekli birbirinin alanında kendisine yer bulmaya çalışan semiyotik ve sembolik alanlar içerisinde bitmek tükenmek bilmeyen kendi kimliğini ve benliğini arama çabası ve süreci içindedir. Bu nedenle romanlardaki bayan karakterler hangi cinsiyet rolünü benimseyeceklerinin ve nasıl davranacaklarının ikilemini yaşarlar. Bunun sonucunda toplumsal baskıyı üzerlerinde hisseden karakterler, sembolik düzene uyarak bu ikilemden kurtulmaya çalışırlar. Fakat romanlar, toplumsal baskıyı hissetseler de, karakterlerin bu ikileme hala devam ettiğini ortaya koymaktadır. Bu nedenle tezin amacı, karakterlerin yaşadıkları ikilemi ortaya koymak, semboliğin baskısından sonra dahi hissedilen ikilemin olası sebebini bulmaktır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Victoria Dönemi, Kristeva, Semiyotik, Sembolik, Cinsiyet İkilemi

ABSTRACT

The Victorian Age in the 19th century is the age of a process from the Age of Reason in the 18th century to the Modern Age in the 20th century. As the age reveals some changes due to its being the age of a process, it is divided into three periods as early-Victorian, mid-Victorian, and late-Victorian.

Pertaining to each period, *Northanger Abbey* by Jane Austen, *Shirley* by Charlotte Brontë, and *Jude the Obscure* by Thomas Hardy are analyzed in the thesis in view of the feminist approach of Julia Kristeva, who has been influenced by the psychoanalytic approaches of Freud and Lacan.

For Kristeva, a person is always in the process of searching for the identity and the self through the semiotic and the symbolic fields, which are continuously in the conflict of finding themselves a place in each other's sphere. Thus, the female characters in the novels experience the dilemma of which gender role to adopt, and of how to behave. That is, experiencing a gender dilemma, the characters feel the social pressure towards themselves, and are forced to leave the dilemma back by obeying to the symbolic. Yet, the novels reveal that although they are forced, they still go on experiencing the same dilemma. Hence, the aim of the thesis is to reveal the dilemma the characters face, and to find the possible reason for the dilemma to be felt even after the suppressions of the symbolic to hinder the uncertainty of which gender role to adopt.

Key Words: Victorian Age, Kristeva, Semiotic, Symbolic, Gender Dilemma

REPRESENTATIONS and ABBREVIATIONS

Country: England

Early Victorian Period: 1810s-1840s

Late-Victorian Period: 1870s-1901

Mid-Victorian Period: 1840s-1870s

Queen: Queen Victoria

Victorian Age: 19th Century of England

I. INTRODUCTION: THEORETICAL PART

A. VICTORIAN AGE

The longest age of England, the Victorian age takes its name from Queen Victoria, who came to throne in 1837, at the age of eighteen, and who ruled the country till her death in 1901. The years between 1837 and 1901 are, in fact, the time period when the Queen was on the throne. However, the beginning of the Victorian age goes back to the earlier years of the 19th century considering the age's some peculiar characteristics, especially the social structure when the Queen came to the throne and also the place of woman in the social system. When looked from this perspective, the age becomes much longer because of the fact that it witnesses many different social, political, religious, and scientific changes. Therefore, it is divided into three periods thinking on the changes in the fields mentioned: Early Victorian (1810s-1840s), Mid-Victorian (1840s-1870s), and Late Victorian (1870s-1901). "It may also be convenient to subdivide the Late phase by considering the final decade, the nineties, as a bridge between two centuries", 19th century, the Victorian age, and the 20th century, the age the modernization in life, arts, and literature is observed (Abrams 1993: 893). Each phase has its own peculiar features which distinguish it from the other phases as well as some similar characteristics which relate all these phases to each other, especially in the family and the gender relations, the dilemma of the woman about her identity in the Victorian society, and the social pressure towards woman to sustain her womanly duties which are determined by the male sex. The differences and the similarities being considered, the Victorian age is the age that witnesses the oppositions: It is the age of differences and similarities, agriculture and industry, poverty and enrichment, and the repression of the feelings and the expression of the sentiments. That is, it is the period of changes, from agricultural to industrial, from repression of the feelings to the expression of the sentiments, and the period of poverty and enrichment together, thinking on the age's social structure, which had considerable

impact on the class and the gender structures of the age, and also dwelling on the place of a person, especially a woman who was struggling to find a place and her identity in such a society which was experiencing the changes and the oppositions resulting from these changes. The social structure was, therefore, not stable and fixed. Instead, it was a changing structure with many classifications in itself.

1. Social Background and the Social Life of the Victorian Age

The Victorian age, being divided into three periods because of the age's being the longest one in the history of England, showed different social aspects in each period: in the early, mid-, and the late Victorian. The differences in the age's social structure were observed not only in the classification of the time periods, but also in the society's class structure which consisted of upper-class, middle-class, and the lower -class.

The differences among the upper, middle, and the lower-classes stemmed from the inequalities in the living and the working conditions of the members of the society, also from the inequalities in the power, authority, and education. The inequalities were also "largely dependent on inherited status at birth, ownership or non-ownership of land, and profession or occupation" (Ingham 2003: 5). The upper-class, which was in the political power whereas the middle and the lower-classes were not, referred to the aristocracy, and the aristocrats inherited status at birth while the middle and the lower-classes did not. The upper-class members of the society did not need to work like the middle and the lower-classes, so the upper-class men were not expected to earn money through some kind of work, because the money was already ready for them, and it was "already present, usually generated by rents received from the farmers who lived as tenants on the family land" (Nelson 2007: 28). That is, as the owners of land, the aristocrats did not need to work because of the necessity to earn money or to make their living. Instead, they

felt the need to work when the family had some economic problems such as not having

> controlled enough money and property to enable each of its sons to be independently wealthy in adulthood [...]. Junior members of aristocratic families might enter government service by joining the diplomatic corps or standing for election to Parliament's House of Commons. Like the sons of the middle classes, they might become Army officers or Church of England clergymen (74).

Another option for the upper-class men to help the family when it was in economic problems was that they might marry a woman who was also the member of aristocracy, or who was a member of the middle-class but wealthy enough to sustain the family. When he was married, the husband was "expected [...] to produce legitimate offspring (ideally including at least one boy) so that the cycle [could] continue in the next generation" (74). It was important for the aristocrat man that the offspring should be legitimate either because of himself or the mother and his sisters as the Victorian society gave much importance to purity and morality. It would be immoral for the aristocrat to have an illegitimate child, which was against the social conventions and the morality as one of the social conventions, and it was the governess's or the tutor's task in the upper-class family to teach the morality and the other social conventions appropriate for the social norms of the Victorian age. In the aristocracy, the governess or the tutor taught not only the social conventions, but also the tasks that the son or the girl of the aristocrats should carry out. It was the tutor's task to teach "Latin and Greek" to sons, and "French and German or Italian" to girls, and it was the governess's task to teach "music, history, watercolour sketching, and the kind of basic cultural knowledge" to the daughters of the aristocrats so as to prepare them for their future life in their marriages (78).

> For, according to the dominant opinion in the Victorian era, the primary goal of the upper-class girl should be a suitable marriage - that is, a marriage that would permit her to maintain her social standing. (79)

The knowledge of the girl's primary goal was also given to her by the governess who taught the girl the manners according to which she had to act

either in her marriage or in her future social life, but the governess had to instruct the lady that the man she would marry had to be in the same social standing, that is, he had to be an aristocrat for the girl to sustain her social superiority and the position in the social structure.

The task that the tutors or the governesses performed in the upper-class was done by the family members, especially by the mother, in the middle-class. It was an expectation from the mother to teach the social conventions to her children. It was also the mother's task to teach the morality as a social convention, the morality which the Victorian society was obsessed with. It is Catherine's mother in the novel *Northanger Abbey* that spends "three months in teaching her only to repeat the 'Beggar's Petition'", which is a poem by Thomas Moss that talks about a man's losing his job, wife and almost everything in life (Austen 2000: 3). It was taught to children because of its emphasis on the morality and how to behave such a man, or how to behave such kinds of men in the society. Just like Catherine's mother, the mother of the middle-class members of the society was expected to teach the moral conventions. Otherwise, the mother was criticised, and her motherhood was questioned owing to her not achieving to perform one of the tasks she had to carry out. Besides the middle-class mothers, the daughters of the middle-class had to pay attention to their manners and their standing in the society thinking on the moral conventions. They had to "function as domestic centers of morality, in a way that even their mothers could not" (Nelson 2007:85). They had to act considering the social and the moral conventions, and maintain their sexual purity, and become a centre of morality, even better than their mothers, so as to have a place and survive in a society which gave so much importance to the morality and the virginity. Otherwise, the daughters would not find a place for themselves and even would not survive in such a society just like Tess in Thomas Hardy's novel named *Tess of the D'Urbervilles*. She dies because she loses her virginity. Along with behaving in a moralistic way to maintain their sexual purity, the middle-class daughters had to perform some tasks to help their mothers in the household jobs such as "teaching the younger children, mending torn

garments, arranging flowers, dusting the father's study [...], and the like" (82). Namely, all the tasks of the daughters were all the womanly duties which were expected to be performed in such a social structure in which the male sex was in the power, and in which men decided the social standing and the tasks of the women.

Deciding the moral and the social conventions and woman's tasks and place in the society, the middle-class man had the most dominant social standing in the Victorian society. Getting more and more powerful and becoming a threat in time to the aristocracy, the middle-class, also, affected the lower class. It was the middle-class defining the social norms and the conventions because of its increasing population and outnumbering both the aristocracy and the people working at the lands of the aristocracy as well as the people working at the factories which provided work for the lower-class members of the society with the Industrial Revolution. Therefore, it was generally the middle-class that changed the Victorian age, or that made the age witness the oppositions and the changes either in the social or economic life, or in the political one. That is, it was the middle-class man, who was "patriotic and benevolent, always ready to take an active part in the political and social life of his town and nation" (Morgan 2007: 33). Being active in the social and the political life, he was

> able to enrich the society in which he moved and to fulfil the offices of husband and father, so providing the perfect example to another generation of active citizens (33).

Hence, the middle-class's being not stable made the Victorian age witness the changes in the social, political, and the economic structure, and it also affected so many people in the middle-class that they became much more active to take part in the change of the social system and the structure of the society. Hence, having so much greater impact upon the society, the middle-class people referred to the ones among whom there were also the "shopkeepers and small businessmen through the owners of factories of one size or another to entrepreneurs and bankers" (Trilling and Bloom 1973: 6). With the growing tendency of mechanization and the machinery in the

industrialization, only active and brave citizens just like entrepreneurs could change the social system as did the middle-class men in the Victorian age. Having to make their living unlike their superiors, the middle-class men could also attend the Army. They could become,

> without jeopardizing their social position, [...] physicians, solicitors, chartered accountants, pharmacists, journalists, architects, civil engineers, bankers, police inspectors, educators, or creative artists (Nelson 2007: 88).

They had to be careful about maintaining their standing in the society, which was not only important for the middle-class man but also for his family. The middle-class men had to behave considering also the moral conventions of the society so as not to make their mothers and the sisters be ashamed of any evil doings of their sons and the brothers, because, as George Eliot argued, it was the men who were "responsible for fallen women because they lacked self-control" (Reed 1975: 62). For Eliot, men had to control themselves and their sexual desires because they were, in fact, responsible for an unmarried woman to lose her virginity and be named as fallen as she did not manage to maintain her purity. Therefore, the middle-class men had also to conform to the social and the moral norms they were already changing.

The lowest class in the social strata was the lower-class or the working-class, which was affected by the changes caused by the middle-class. Named as the lower-class in the early years of the 19th century, it was, then, called as the working-class as it was reflected by Harriet Martineau in Himmelfarb's *The Idea of Poverty: England in the Early Industrial Age* published in 1984:

> The term 'lower class' or 'lower classes', is gone out of use. The term is thought not complimentary to the democracy, and so we say 'the working class', which is less precise, and conveys false notions. (quoted in Ingham 2003: 7)

What Martineau argued was that although the poor people working hard for others so as to earn money to sustain their lives belonged to the lowest social strata in the society, they had to be called as working-people so as to avoid both dehumanizing the people of this social class and badly affecting the

country's political standing because it would be worse for the country to be called as undemocratic. The working-class, then, included men and women that were the workers of physical labour. The workers of the lower-class were also subdivided into two as the skilled and the unskilled ones. The skilled workers had a better living condition compared to the unskilled ones. They were generally the poor people living in the countryside. They had to work hard to earn their living because they did not have any social, political, and economic privileges as did their superiors. They could be an "agricultural labourer, domestic servant, miner, tradesman, and so on" (Nelson 2007: 91). Namely, the jobs they could do are very limited. The jobs were related with the farming of a land, or serving to a middle-class or to an aristocrat. The women of the lower-class could work at a farmland or work as a servant, too. Although, it was the class paying the least attention to the moral values and the legitimacy, the women of the lower-class had to keep their purity just like the aristocrats and the middle-class women in all the periods of the Victorian age.

To sum up, the Victorian society consisted of three types of people considering their social standing in this society: the upper, the middle, and the lower-classes. However, it was the middle-class who was leading and deciding the social conventions and the social structure of the age because of its ascending power over both the aristocracy and the lower-class. It was the shaft of a mail-cart which entered the breast of the horse named as Prince in *Tess of the D'Urbervilles*, and it was the shaft of a mail-cart that killed the animal and made it fall to the ground in blood. That is, the mail-cart, which was the representative of the middle-class, entered the horse named as Prince. The name Prince referred to the aristocracy, so the middle-class hurt Prince as a representative of aristocracy, and hurt Prince the horse which was ridden by Tess who belonged to the lower-middle class in the social strata. Namely, it was the middle-class gaining power over the aristocracy and over the lower-class especially in the mid- and the late 19th century.

The change, however, was not only seen in the class structure of the society, but it was observed in the early, mid-, and the late phases of the age,

as well. Each phase, having some similarities in their view of the social standing of the male and the female sex, had also different features which distinguished one from the others.

Although some sources state that the beginning of the age was the year 1837, when the Queen came to the throne, the early Victorian age corresponded to the time period which was approximately between 1810s and 1840s in view of the political and the social structure of the time. The year 1789 witnessed one of the social and the political upheavals of the French society, and the upheaval called as the French Revolution affected not only France but also the other European countries and England. Therefore, the early years of the 19th century reflected the effects and the fear of the French Revolution as in the years 1830s and '40s. From the early years of the 19th century to the 1840s, England, which was a class-conscious country with its different social classes as upper, middle, and lower-classes, underwent the fear of losing aristocracy's power, and the fear of being replaced by the equality in all the people, which were the ideas that were supported by the French Revolution. The fear of losing the power and the idea of equality made both the Queen and the aristocrats fear for their social standing. That was the reason why people started to take precautions. "Religious tracts for the poor and didactic literature for children[,therefore,] emphasized the need to accept one's place and respect authority" (1), which was the Queen of England, in case a revolution like the French one would occur in England and they would lose their superior social standing. That was an indication that the effects of the French Revolution were felt in the years when the Queen Victoria was on the throne as well as in the earlier years of the 19th century. In this sense, the date of the beginning of the Victorian age goes back to the earlier years of the century before the Queen's coming to the throne.

The early years of the century witnessed people who earned their livings through agriculture, so the economy was primarily based on land. The Industrial Revolution, which started in the 18th century, was not felt so much in the earlier years of the century. That's why, at the beginning of the century,

> most work connected with daily life - dressmaking, cleaning, food production, hauling water for sanitation and consumption - was still done by hand (1).

While all these works started to be done by the machines in the mid-Victorian age, in the early period of the Victorian age the income came generally from people who were doing these tasks by using their hands. Without feeling the effects of the Industrial Revolution as much as the ones in the mid-Victorian, people did not need to travel so much, because they were dependent on the land. "They travelled slowly, [if they needed to travel] in horse-drawn vehicles or by sailing ship or on foot" (1). However, towards the end of the early Victorian age, the Industrial Revolution and the technological and industrial changes started to be felt, and it was the middle-classes, "who were gradually taking control of England's economy", and who were strongly aware of the changes, and who also made especially the lower-class feel the effects of mechanization harshly (Abrams 1993: 893). Maybe the most influential event about the middle-classes towards the end of the early Victorian age was passing of the Reform Bill of 1832, which

> extended the right to vote to all males owning property worth £ 10 or more in annual rent. In effect the voting public hereafter included the lower middle classes but not the working classes, who did not obtain the vote until 1867 when a second Reform Bill was passed. (893)

That is, the middle-classes, who were aware of the industrial and the social changes, started to gain power with the Reform Bill of 1832, but the bill did not include the lower-classes who would harshly feel the changes and the effects of the Industrial Revolution from then on.

The Reform Bill of 1832 was an indication of middle-classes' gaining power, and especially in the mid-Victorian (1840s-1870s) they gained more power and rights over especially the lower-classes. As the effects of the Industrial Revolution were mostly felt in the mid-Victorian, middle-classes gained more and more power over the lower-classes, who worked in the factories as hands for the middle-classes.

> By the factory owner the worker was regarded and dealt with not as if he were a fellow being, even though of a different social order, but as an abstract unit of the work force (Trilling and Bloom 1973: 11).

The factory owners, who were generally the members of the middle-classes, gained so much power over the working-classes that almost in any cases they did not treat them as if they were human beings. They regarded them even as abstract units, who did not have any place or any identity in the social system, because they were seen as not human beings but units who just worked for the middle-classes and who performed their tasks they had to do. They did not have even concrete bodies, so an existence, they were the abstract units that could not find any identity or a place in the social system constructed in time by the middle-classes. Namely it means:

> The machine had not only brought about a new method of production which had changed the nature of work and the traditional modes of life, it had also imposed itself as the model of what society is and must be, precluding from the social arrangement all possibility of mind, intention, and will. (11)

The society had to preserve the middle-classes' norms by not giving any possibility to the mind, intention, or will of any working-class man. That's why, the middle-classes, in general, ignored what the lower-classes felt, and also ignored their intentions and wishes to have better working conditions, to live better, to earn enough money to sustain their lives, and to have a place in the social structure. Namely, there was not a harmony and equality among the classes in the mid-Victorian period. It was the period of oppositions, dehumanizing the lower-classes by regarding them as abstract units while preserving the rights and the social standing of the middle-classes. Therefore, the mid-Victorian period both meant hunger for the poor and the working-classes, and prosperity for the middle-classes.

By feeling the effects of the Industrial Revolution, England prospered economically, commercially, and socially. Therefore, the mid-Victorian period is also called as ""The Age of Improvement", as the historian Asa Briggs has called it" (Abrams 1993: 895). Improving technology and machinery provided job opportunities for the skilled workers who were

working for the middle-classes, and the society moved very quickly to the industrial one from the agricultural. Carlyle stated in his *Signs of the Times* written in 1829 that:

> Were we required to characterize this age of ours by any single epithet, we should be tempted to call it, not an Heroical, Devotional, Philosophical, or Moral Age, but, above all others, the Mechanical Age. It is the Age of Machinery, in every outward and inward sense of that word. [...] Nothing is now done directly, or by hand; all is by rule and calculated contrivance. [...] Men are grown mechanical in head and heart, as well as in hand. (quoted in Ford 1982: 20)

What Carlyle meant was that the mid-Victorian age was the age of machinery unlike any other ages in the history of England and also the early period of the Victorian age, which gave so much importance to morality as well as the devotion to the religion. It was a mechanical age as everything was done not by hand as in the early years of the Victorian period, but by the machines. Therefore, people working at factories had to conform to the mechanical age, and work as the mechanization necessitated.

As people internalized the age of machinery and worked as the mechanization necessitated, people could find many job opportunities related with the machinery.

> The construction of a national rail network [...] brought jobs for railroad personel, laborers, engineers and machinists, and miners of coal and iron (Nelson 2007: 2).

With the construction of the rail network, people could travel faster than before, and they could transmit food to the cities and also the news to each other faster than they did on foot. Thanks to the revolution in the press besides the railway, books became cheaper as they were printed by the machines in many copies and as they were distributed quickly, as a result of which literacy increased. With the growth of literacy, however, people became frustrated towards the end of the mid-Victorian age as both they felt themselves as "alien by the technological changes", and they could find time to educate themselves and to question the universe and the place of human being in the universe (Abrams 1993: 892). "In the mid-Victorian period,

biology reduced humankind even further into "nothingness"." (897) With Darwin's *The Origin of Species* (1859) and *The Descent of Man* (1871), people started to question the evolution theory of human beings' coming from an animal, which led to pessimism and the idea of nothingness as people also questioned their places in the universe, and saw that they were in fact not in the centre of the universe, but they were just a kind of existence coming from an animal. Although the ideas of Darwin were not so much influential in the mid-Victorian age as they were in the late Victorian period, they were, however, enough to change the view of people towards themselves, and their source of existence.

Questioning their existence so much in the late Victorian age (1870s-1901), people became more pessimistic about their origins. Therefore, the late Victorian age witnessed more pessimism unlike the optimism of the early and the mid-Victorian age. The search of the origin and a place in the universe brought also the challenging questions towards the obsession with the morality of the Victorian Age, and a person started to give importance to only himself or herself, so individuality became much more important rather than the humanity, human's place in the universe, and the morality of the humanity. With the growing attention towards individuality, the individual needs and feelings became important, and morality lost its dominant impact on people's actions. The growing attention to the individual needs and the feelings, and the psychology of people led the way to modernism. Hence, the late Victorian period led to modernism with its emphasis on the individual and the feelings of these individuals. Thus, that move to the modernization was reflected in the social life.

2. Woman in Social Life

It was not only in the social system and the social life but also in the look towards woman that the Victorian age witnessed similarities and differences as well as the changes as a result of these differences. Women and

men had different places in the Victorian age. While the women were the members of the private sphere, which was the domestic one, the men belonged to the public sphere, sphere of business, commerce, and politics, in which he had to work outside the home to sustain the family economically. Those spheres were determined especially by the middle-class man who was gaining power socially, economically, and politically. As the spheres were determined by the male sex, the females were seen as the second sex, so they were regarded as "second-class citizens" (Morgan 2007: 69). As regarded as the second sex and second-class citizens coming after men, women had to undergo the domestic tasks such as doing the housework, cleaning the house, ironing, washing the dishes and the clothes of the family, but they also had to be tidy and clean and smile at their husbands when the husbands came home after the work. Besides doing the household tasks, women, and especially the mothers, had the responsibility to look after the children. It was seen as the mothers' task to look after them, because the mothers were regarded as having a different and a special bond with the child even before the birth. The father was just the

> onlooker. Even after the baby's birth, fathers, unable to breast-feed [...], unlikely to change diapers or button clothing, often [had] little intimate contact with infant offspring. (Nelson 2007: 46-47)

Therefore, having a special bond with the child, mothers brought up the child, and they, with fathers, taught morality, the importance of innocence, and also the sexual purity to the child. For instance, it was also Mr. Allen, who warned Catherine not to get on a carriage of a man more than once, besides her mother's teaching of morality, in *Northanger Abbey*.

In the Victorian age, it was the male sex who was dominant over the female. Men's being dominant and suppressive towards women was accepted also by women in the early and the mid-Victorian ages as women internalized to be "an object" like a doll (Marcus 2007: 112). Men, who were in power either socially or economically, saw the women like an object with some household duties to perform, but not human beings who had feelings and passions.

Preserving the sexual purity or not being able to preserve the innocence divided women as the angel and the fallen woman. That is, the angel was the one who had "emotional sensitivity, weakness of intellect, unlimited selflessness, and, crucially, a lack of 'animal' passion" (Ingham 2003: 23). While the fallen woman referred to the one that lost her sexual purity and virginity before the marriage, and also the one that had the inclination to alcoholism and prostitution, the angel was the woman who was sensitive, and who was not selfish but was the one that thought on the responsibilities to her husband and the family. The angel also had the lack of passion, which means that she had to suppress her sexual feelings. Besides these features, she had to be the one that was not as intellectual as the man. That's why;

> In Victorian England, many boys left home for all-male boarding schools at age seven; earned degrees from universities that usually did not officially admit women (although a handful of female students began attending lectures at Oxford and Cambridge in the 1870s); and entered professions that in most cases were open only to men. (Nelson 2007: 38-39)

The schools were open only to men, and women were not admitted to universities, because men did not want women to be as intellectual as themselves. This was because of the fact that men had the fear of women's not performing the tasks they had to do if they spent their time in educating themselves as well as the fear for their gaining power, which would weaken the men's control over them. That's why; women had to be less intellectual than the men in the Victorian society.

Besides not attending school or university, women were to do only the housework, but they were not permitted to work outside. However, with the industrial changes in the mid-Victorian age, women were also seen in public spheres.

> As technological progress offered new types of employment, jobs such as typewriting and operating a telephone switchboard appeared and were quickly defined as "women's work" because they involved fine motor skills rather than strength (23).

Women who began to work in the jobs that did not necessitate strength also began working at schools as a teacher besides being governesses, who worked for the middle-class although they were the members of the middle-class society but had to work to sustain their lives as they were generally the unmarried women who were regarded as redundant because of women's outnumbering men in the Victorian society. Women's working in public spheres was also reflected in the literature of the time. For instance, in *Shirley* by Charlotte Brontë, Shirley, who was a female character, was a mill and a land owner who made the working-class citizens of the country work for her.

Beginning to find a place in the public sphere, and hence, beginning to gain power, women also started to question their individuality towards the end of the 19th century. Questioning their individuality, working at a public sphere and also at the jobs in which masculinity outweighed, women also began to talk about their feelings and to reflect their passions in the late Victorian age unlike the early and the mid-Victorian ages. As an example, as argued by Ingham, Arabella in Thomas Hardy's *Jude the Obscure* expressed her feelings very openly (Ingham 2003:163), and in a way that was seen obscene and forbidden thinking on the Victorian conventions of morality of especially the early and mid-Victorian ages. After meeting Jude for the first time, she said:

> I've got him to care for me: yes! But I want him to more than care for me; I want him to have me – to marry me! I must have him. I can't do without him. He's the sort of man I long for. I shall go mad if I can't give myself to him altogether! I felt I should when I first saw him! (Hardy 1993: 40)

The expressions like "I want him to have me – to marry me!" and "I shall go mad if I can't give myself to him altogether!" were reflecting that late Victorian age was different from the earlier ones, because in the early and the mid-Victorian age, it was not considered to be appropriate for a woman to reflect her desires and to talk in an obscene way as in the speech of Arabella, considering the Victorian conventions and its persistence on morality. However, in the late Victorian age, women began to express their feelings and their desires. As questioning their individuality, working at a public

sphere, and expressing their feelings and desires, women were regarded as the New Woman. They were new women because they did not resemble to the women in the early and the mid-Victorian age in view of their being aware of their individuality and their expressing their feelings and reflecting desires, which made them closer to the modern women who reflected their psychology and the inner feelings and desires as well as the passions. For instance, Sue in Hardy's *Jude the Obscure* was a New Woman as she was aware of her feelings, and reflected her desire to be with Jude rather than her husband. Like Sue, other women in the late Victorian age were regarded as new because of

> their likeness to men. Predominantly middle class, they aspired to higher education, to the vote, and to careers; they might ride bicycles, smoke cigarettes, or embrace dress reform, and they uniformly displayed an uncomfortable readiness to shock the sensibilities of traditionalists. (Nelson 2007: 67)

That is, they resembled to men in their search for the education, vote, and career in the public sphere. They behaved like men in the social life, and they were new to Victorian conventions and traditions.

To sum up, especially the early and the mid-Victorian ages gave much importance to morality, and the purity of the women. If women did not perform the household tasks they had to do, or did not take care of the children, they were not regarded as womanly women, and if they did not preserve their sexual purity, they were deemed as fallen. However, morality and chastity lost their impact in the late Victorian age, and women started to express their feelings and sexual desires to men, which made them closer to the modernity in which the inner self of a woman and her psychology as well as her feelings showed themselves both in the social life and also in the literature of the time.

3. Basic Characteristics of Victorian Literature

Social and class structures, economic and political changes, and the Victorian conventions highly affected the Victorian literature. As the age was not a stable one, but it was the age of oppositions and changes, the literature of the Victorian age was not homogenous, as a result. The literature had different types and genres such as poetry, novel, prose, drama, and "diaries, [...] biographies, autobiographies, memoirs, reminiscences," and so on (Marcus 2007: 33). However, it was the novel genre that mostly and well reflected the social structure, the social and the economic changes and their effects upon people, and women's search for a place and identity. Reflecting all these social and economic systems and the changes they underwent in time, as well as the women's search for place and identity, the novel genre was, also, subdivided in itself into the "novels about history, novels about crime [...], novels of mystery, [...] domestic novels", New Woman novels, and the like (Ford 1982: 100). Each sub-genre reflected different topics and themes related with what the novel wanted to reflect. If the writer wanted to mirror historical facts, the genre would, of course, be historical novel, or if the writer wanted to illuminate the domestic duties of women, it would be a domestic novel. Therefore, the aim of the novel writer was important in deciding the genre and the topic. For example, women writers of the Victorian age

> used the novels as a channel [...] to raise social awareness and promote change and reform. Most of them had powerful things to say about the restrictions imposed upon women. (Ayres 2003: xvi)

Therefore, the novels of the women writers had the aim of making women be aware of their social standings, and their need to achieve the enfranchisement rights as well as the rights that enabled them to be on equal terms with men in their marriages and in their social lives.

Like the divisions in the genre, the topics of the novels differed from one another. The novels of the early Victorian age focused on the reflection of a quiet and rural life, and the duties of men and women in their different

spheres. In this sense, Jane Austen's novels were the good representatives of the early Victorian age. Her novels were generally domestic echoing the duties of the different sexes in their different spheres. In *Sense and Sensibility*, for instance, she talked about two sisters, Elinor and Marianne, who had to act according to the social and the moral conventions of the Victorian age. So as to make Marienne survive, she had to silence her, which was the most significant thing for a girl or a woman to pay attention, because it was the men's task to speak if the one had to speak of his or her feelings.

As in the early Victorian age, obeying to the moral conventions was important for the mid-Victorian society, and this, also, found itself a place in the mid-Victorian literature, and especially in the novel, because

> novels were commonly read aloud in family gatherings, and the need to avoid topics that might cause embarrassment to young girls established taboos that novelists could not dare ignore (Abrams 1993: 904).

Thus, while writing, the novelists felt the need to keep the moral conventions in mind either not to embarrass the young children and the other family members in the family gatherings where the novels were read loudly or not to be criticised by the society and by the other literary men because they wrote an immoral or an obscene scene, and they paid attention to the moral conventions also for the moral purpose to show especially the women the need to preserve their chastity and morality.

Morality reflected especially in the early and mid-Victorian literature was the most prevalent topic in all the age. Almost all of the novelists ranging from Jane Austen, Charles Dickens, Brontë sisters, George Eliot, and the like talked about morality. As Anthony Trollope stated in his Autobiography,

> "the novelist, if he have a conscience, must preach his sermon with the same purpose as the clergyman, and must have his own system of ethics." (Reed 1975: 7)

Therefore, for Trollope, the novelist's aim in writing had to be to teach morality to people. George Eliot's *Adam Bede*, for instance, was one of the most moralistic novels with its religious preaching of Dinah. The character,

Hetty Sorrel, who was a beautiful peasant girl, had sexual intercourse, without marrying, with Captain Arthur Donnithorne, who left her with her baby alone, and Hetty committed the crime of killing her baby. When she was arrested and in jail, it was again Dinah, who made her confess her crime, because the confession was a way of attaining morality.

For Victorians, chastity was deemed as the most important thing related with morality. For the Victorian society, a woman had to keep her chastity, her virginity before the marriage, and this was reflected in the literature of the time. The poet Coventry Patmore emphasized the importance of chastity in his poem named as "The Tragedy of Tragedies" by regarding "woman's loss of chastity as the tragedy of tragedies", which meant that it was the woman's first and the most important task to preserve her virginity (72). Becoming a virgin woman and being pure before the marriage was what the Victorian society gave importance to. A woman had to lose the virginity only when she got married, and it was not the loss of the purity then because she was married. That's why; for Victorians, marriage had to be the foremost aim of the women to preserve their innocence.

As the first aim of the women, marriage was another topic which was reflected in almost all the novels of the Victorian age. The Victorian woman had to marry to secure her life and also her social standing so as not to be redundant or a fallen one.

> Motivations for marriage included romantic love and the longing for companionship and children, but also the desire for productive work (wives), for financial security and social status (wives, but also many husbands), for an acceptable outlet for sexual urges (husbands, but also many wives), and for a dependable housekeeper (husbands). (Nelson 2007: 11)

Besides loving the man who the woman was interested in, the woman had to be interested in the man whom she loved. She wished to marry not only she longed for companionship and children but also she wanted to secure her social status. However, in her marriage, she had to take care of the husband and the children while fulfilling the household tasks, which was highly reflected in the Victorian novel. Mrs. Joe, for example, in Charles Dickens's

Great Expectations, fulfilled her household tasks, cooked, baked, cleaned the house while looking after her brother Pip and taking care of her husband Joe Gargery.

However, in the late Victorian age, marriage reflected in the literature was different from the early and mid-Victorian reflections of the topic. In the late Victorian literature, personal feelings of characters began to be reflected. With the expression of the personal feelings, the late Victorian age demonstrated the New Woman literature, in which women could talk about their feelings, try to find a new place and identity for themselves, and thus, differ from the other women especially in the early and mid-Victorian ages. In *Jude the Obscure*, for example, "Sue [attempted] to break free of constraints imposed" upon her by the Victorian society (Ingham 2003: 175). She left her husband and began to live with her lover, her own cousin, Jude, which was the case strictly criticized by the early and mid-Victorian society. However, she broke the constraints. When she turned back to her husband, he accepted her, which had scarcely been welcomed in the early and mid-Victorian age.

Besides the reflection of New Woman, the late Victorian literature also reflected pessimism unlike the early and mid-Victorian literature. Regarding themselves so much mechanized, and losing faith in religion and in their place in the universe, so feeling the sense of nothingness due to the scientific developments, people started to become more pessimistic in time. Although Jude, in Hardy's *Jude the Obscure*, had the aim and the strong wish to go on his education in Christminster, he was rejected, and he felt the pessimism that he would never be accepted by the men of higher status, so he lost his faith in his society, and he left the aim of going on his education.

There were also many different topics, such as madness, orphans, return, and disguise, reflected in the Victorian literature. *Jane Eyre* by Charlotte Brontë was a good representation of the reflection of the madness as a topic. Bertha Mason, Rochester's wife, who was locked in the attic because she was insane, echoed the Victorian's interest in reflecting the-

madwoman-in-the-attic notion. Besides madness, orphans were highly reflected in the Victorian literature, and Pip in *Great Expectations* by Charles Dickens was an orphan boy who attained morality as he grew up. Abel Magwitch, who was Pip's benefactor sending him money to educate himself, turned back to see Pip running away from the jail. That is, the novel also displayed the return as a topic. However, maybe the most important one, concerning the woman, and their search for a place and an identity, was the disguise topic. Because of the moral and the social conventions, women had to conceal their real identity and feelings, so they were forced to act in a mechanized manner, sexless and passionless. Marianne in Jane Austen's *Sense and Sensibility* had to be silenced for her to find a place, her social standing, in the society. Although she expressed her feelings at the beginning of the novel, she stopped doing that in the end, so she concealed her real identity. Just like Jane Austen's novel in the early years of the Victorian age, disguise was also reflected in the mid- and late Victorian literature, especially by demonstrating women and their struggle to find their real identities in the age.

4. Women Novelists and the Image of Woman in the Victorian Literature

The Victorian state of mind, seeing women only in the private sphere, did not like and accept the women novelists. Therefore, it was much more difficult for the women writers to find a place in literature. The rejection of women writers from literature was reflected in Jane Austen's *Northanger Abbey* in a very sarcastic manner:

> 'And what are you reading, Miss – ?' 'Oh! it is only a novel!' replies the young lady; while she lays down her book with affected indifference, or momentary shame. – 'It is only Cecilia, or Camilla, or Belinda [...]' (Austen 2000: 20).

All the names, Cecilia, Camilla, Belinda, were the names of women writers, and the question of what the lady was reading was answered with the

expression like “it is only”. It was only a woman writer’s novel, but nothing more. The novel by a woman writer had no importance in literature because it was laid down with indifference or shame. That is, it was very difficult for the women novelists to find a place in literature.

Because of the difficulty in finding a place in literature, women novelists needed to disguise their own identity by using pseudonyms. Marian Evans, for instance, preferred to use pseudonym “George Eliot”, a man’s name, to “[avoid] discrimination” against herself and her novel, *Adam Bede* (Reed 1975: 352). In this way, she tried to escape from being excluded from literature, or being called as “only Marian Evans”.

Just like the women novelists, women characters reflected in literature had to conceal their own identities so as to find a place in the society. They had to conceal their feelings and the thoughts on the issues of the public spheres either for morality or for the fear of being excluded and alienated from the society. They were made to be silent and conceal their feelings and passions also to survive in such a society. For example, Catherine Earnshaw, in *Wuthering Heights* by Emily Brontë, did not vocalize her feelings and her dilemma of her identity. Instead, she revealed her confusion of who she was in her diary she kept. She was either Catherine Heathcliff or Catherine Linton. She disguised her dilemma of her identity and also her standing in the society, she concealed the dilemma of her longing for a natural life or a cultural one, and the only medium for her to reveal herself was the diary she kept, which was a very conventional way for women to express themselves in a more openly manner in the Victorian society and the literature.

However, the most startling examples of disguise of women characters were seen in the novels *Northanger Abbey* by Jane Austen, *Shirley* by Charlotte Brontë, and *Jude the Obscure* by Thomas Hardy. Catherine in *Northanger Abbey*, Shirley in *Shirley*, and Sue in *Jude the Obscure* tried to conceal their feelings and the dilemma of their identities, the dilemma of their belonging to either the private or the public sphere. Therefore, theirs were the psychological disguises about their identities. The characters were forced to

disguise their dilemma of their identities so as to find themselves a place in the society, and they were forced to disguise and hide their feelings to have a better social standing and social status, and to be accepted by the social system.

A woman in the Victorian age, then, suffered from not revealing their own feelings and their own identities although in the late-Victorian they began to express themselves in a more candid manner. However, this was not a full expression of the identity in the late Victorian age, but it was generally a more candid revelation of the feelings and the passions. Hence, women always suffered from not fully and openly revealing their real identities and the psychological and the gender dilemmas they faced and felt.

5. The Novels Chosen

As women always suffered from not fully and openly revealing their real identities and the psychological and the gender dilemmas they faced and felt, the aim of this study is to approach the aforementioned women characters of the novels chosen in a more candid and psychological way so as to make the characters reveal their duality in their identities, whether they belong to the private sphere or the public one, and whether they are more like a woman or a man. Namely, this is the study of the characters' searching for, if they have any, a stable identity that can help them say that "I am Catherine", "I am Shirley", and "I am Sue". However, it will not be easy for them to find the stable identity they are searching as they live in a Victorian society, so they should be lost to be accepted by the same society. If they are lost, then, the thesis questions what the other ways of helping them are to find their identity, so their subjectivity. Therefore, it examines and analyzes the characters with a feminist approach and with the views of Kristeva in their search to their subjectivity. While analyzing and discussing the novels, the transformation of the Victorian literature and the Victorian woman due to the social, political, and economic changes in the Victorian age will also be

reflected in a chronological order beginning from the early Victorian, then, covering the mid-Victorian, and ending in the late Victorian age.

The first reason why these three novels have been chosen is that they are the best representatives indicating the social and the political change the Victorians underwent, so while choosing the novels, their reflecting the social structure of each period of the Victorian age is considered. The second reason is their depiction of the duality and the contradictions the characters feel in their search for their subjectivity. As the study is a feminist one, the sex of the novelists is not taken into consideration, because in the feminist approach women are already made to speak the language of the male sex. If the reasons why these novels have been chosen are to be expressed one by one, Jane Austen's *Northanger Abbey* is chosen because of its good depiction of both the social and the economic conditions of the early Victorian age, and Catherine's dilemma about her identity. The novel is chosen also because of the fact that it reflects the character's experiencing a kind of duality in her way to subjectivity, and interestingly her taking pleasure from this duality. Secondly, *Shirley* by Charlotte Brontë is chosen because, in *Shirley*, the effects of industrialization and Shirley's position in the society, whether her belonging to the private or the public sphere, is reflected in a better way than the other mid-Victorian novels. Although Mrs. Gargery in Charles Dicken's *Great Expectations* is another good depiction of reflecting the duality in her subjectivity, *Shirley* is chosen because she is the one who, unlike the others, manages to vocalize this duality she experiences, which is exactly not approved by the strict rules of the Victorian age. Therefore, the novel surpasses the other novels of the mid-Victorian age. Finally, the last novel, *Jude the Obscure* by Thomas Hardy is chosen since it depicts the New Woman of the late Victorian society in a more candid manner than the other novels of the period. Not only the character that is analyzed, Sue, but another woman character, Arabella, is also a new woman in a sense that she vocalizes her feelings openly. That is, the novel is chosen both its reflecting the change in the late Victorian age, the change in the image of woman, and its reflection of the contradictions Sue undergoes. Therefore, it is chosen as the best

representative of the late Victorian literature in terms of its revealing the social status of the woman and her social standing in the late Victorian age as well as its depiction of the woman character's duality she feels in her identity. To be more candid, it can be said that the characters' reflecting their duality in their search to attain the subjectivity in a society as Victorian, which highly forces women to identify moderately with men, is the reason why this study has been done.

B. FEMINISM

1. Feminism and Feminist Movements in the Victorian Age

Feminism is a social, political, psychoanalytical, philosophical, and a linguistic movement that is derived from and that opposes to power relations. It is derived from the power relations, and it questions these power relations between western and eastern, reason and feeling, public and private, man and woman, father and mother, culture and nature, and I and Other. That is, feminism is rooted in the dualism and the oppositions. Although it is rooted in this dualism, it is against the dualism which is welcoming only for the western ideology which is centred on reason, public, man, father, culture, and I, so it is against the logo-centric ideology that is in favour of the western centrism rather than the eastern and feeling, private, woman, mother, nature, and Other.

Feminism, as it is rooted in the opposition between the ideologies of reasoning, rationality as well as the power of the male sex, and the understandings of reflecting the feelings, and the weakness of the female sex, reflects also the dualism of the gendered identities and masculinity and femininity. Feminists

> argue that it is masculine rationality that has always privileged reason, order, unity and lucidity, and that it has done so by silencing and excluding the irrationality, chaos and fragmentation that has come to represent femininity. (Moi 1985: 159-160)

That is, feminists have always discussed masculinity and femininity as the signifiers of reason, rationality, order, unity, lucidity, and of irrationality, chaos and fragmentation. Masculinity has always been regarded as the power over femininity with its emphasis on reason, rationality, unity, lucidity, and the like. As it has been assumed to have more power, irrationality, chaos, fragmentation, and the expression of the feelings have been regarded as the features of femininity, and these features have been made to be silenced and even excluded because they do not conform to the orders of masculinity. Therefore, it has been the feminists' task to stop the categorization of the traits of masculinity and femininity, and also the gendered roles such as men's belonging to the public sphere and women's belonging to the private one.

Striving for ceasing the categorization of the traits of masculinity and femininity, and the imposed gendered roles, feminists argue that sex and gender are two separate issues. While sex is related with biology and it shows that the person is biologically male or female, gender refers to the socially and culturally structured expression of masculinity and femininity. Therefore, it is not the male sex, but the gender roles that the feminists are against. They have asserted so far that women should be against and should reject the imposed gendered roles put forward by masculinity. They have also argued that women should subvert "the masculinity in [...] [their] heads" as Duchen says in his book *French Connections: Voices from the Women's Movement in France* (quoted in Cavallaro 2003: 34). Women should not accept the imposed gendered roles if they want a place or a status in the society they live in. They should firstly subvert the roles and the rules given to them by masculinity.

So as to subvert the taught roles and the rules as well as the norms of the society, women have tried to find the ways to express themselves. Especially in the Enlightenment Age, they began to speak more about their social standing in the society. It is not a chance that they began to vocalize their social standings and their roles in the Enlightenment Age, since it is the age which propounds liberty in many fields. It was in the Enlightenment Age

that the gap between the public and the private spheres began highly to be felt. As argued by Donovan, the gendered roles of the spheres were sharply divided in the 18th century when the Industrial Revolution isolated most women from the public spheres of men who worked in the factories (Donovan 1997: 18). When the gap grew so much, women saw that they were isolated not only from the public sphere, but also from the rights of humanity. They started to speak more of their not having the rights which men had, and they began to question equality in the rights of law, education, family and marriage. That is,

> Revolution ushered in a far more comprehensive feminist agenda, whose demands included the right to full participation in political life and leadership and the advocacy of equality in both the family and the world of work. (Cavallaro 2003: 4)

Regarding themselves as isolated and excluded from these familial and political rights, they started to express this isolation and the inequality towards them, and Mary Wollstonecraft became an important voice in the Enlightenment Age to make women be aware of the inequality especially in the politics and the governmental affairs, education, and familial affairs and marriage.

Mary Wollstonecraft, who has reflected the inequality towards women in her manifesto, *A Vindication of the Rights of Woman*, has become an important spokesperson for the women and the feminists of the age who supported the equality of the two sexes. If feminism is divided into three waves, Mary Wollstonecraft's feminism belongs to the first wave which argues that men and women should be equal in many fields such as in education and in political rights. Therefore, it is the first wave feminism that "led to the enfranchisement" of women, which made them be equal in the law (Green and LeBihan 2001: 230). Reflecting the need to have the equal standing either in politics or in the familial affairs, Wollstonecraft also argues in *A Vindication of the Rights of Woman* that women should be educated so as not to be the "intellectual inferior of man", and also not to be "confined to the home" and perform only the housework (Roberts 1995: 155). She states the importance of education many times. "Men and women must be educated,

in a great degree, by the opinions and the manners of the society they live in" she says (Wollstonecraft 1993: 86). She argues that it is not only the men's task but also the women's task to be educated as much as they can, so she is in favour of equality in the education of both sexes. If the woman does not get any education, "she will stop the progress of knowledge and virtue", so she argues that "truth must be common to all" (66). As truth, knowledge and virtue are for everyone, women should be educated so as not to be excluded from gaining knowledge. Thus, she is the supporter of advance in education that is equal for both woman and man. For her, "the neglected education [...] [of women] is the grand source of the misery" (71). It is the grand and the main source for women not to gain their political rights as well. At the very beginning of her manifesto she states

> that to see one half of the human race excluded by the other from all participation of government, was a political phenomenon that, according to abstract principles, it was impossible to explain. (66)

It was impossible to explain the exclusion of women from their having their political rights, and from politics. Therefore, she "speak[s] of the improvement and emancipation of the whole sex" of women (262). For Wollstonecraft, women should gain their political rights, and they should be emancipated and given the right to vote, which were done by men, then. Improvement should, again, be "mutual" (262). Women should not be confined to the house, but they should improve themselves socially and through education. "Women might certainly study the art of healing, and be physicians as well as nurses" she says (229). Besides studying the art of healing and being physicians or nurses, she tells:

> Business of various kinds, they might likewise pursue, if they [are] educated in a more orderly manner, which might save many from common and legal prostitution (229).

That is, she argues women should not be excluded from the public sphere, and if they are educated, this will save them from prostitution and many illegal ways of earning their lives. If men behave them properly and affectionately, they will be "more faithful wives, more reasonable mothers – in a word, better citizens" (231). That's why; men should not behave women

as if they were slaves, and were chained to house. Otherwise, women might not either be faithful to their husbands or be reasonable mothers who teach their children their tasks and their roles to be performed considering the norms and the expectations of the society. Thus, she warns men by stating that women are not slaves, but they are forced to "submit to authority blindly" (238). Instead, they should regard women as their equals, but not the inferiors, and they should respect and be affectionate to them in the familial and the political affairs, and also in their getting the right of education if they want a better society where women perform their household tasks and be good mothers to their children besides taking place in the public sphere.

Wollstonecraft's opinion on the equality of men and women have been influential in the Victorian Age, and her ideas on the equality of the two sexes in education, in the familial and the political affairs and the rights have affected many Victorian women and the feminists. Victorian feminism reflects the double-standards against women who were silenced and excluded by men from gaining their educational, political, and marital rights. That's why; the Victorian feminism reflects the

> double 'politics of gender'[...] : an outer struggle for women's legal and political rights, and the inner struggle of both men and women to cope with the demands of powerful but failing cultural stereotypes (Gilmour 1993: 189).

In the outer struggle, women have fought for their educational and political rights, and in the inner struggle, they have tried to subvert the stereotypes as Angel in the House, Fallen Woman, public sphere, and private sphere, especially in their marital struggles.

As an outer struggle, beginning from the mid-Victorian Age, lower and middle-class women started to work in the public sphere, especially in the factories so as to contribute to the income of the family. When they realized the inequality towards them in many fields, they began to question the rights they had been bereaved, and the questioning of the rights led the ""Woman Question", which concerned issues of sexual inequality in politics, economic life, education, and social intercourse" (Abrams 1993: 902-903).

To give women the right of education, Oxford and Cambridge Universities accepted them as well, and some feminists established colleges as "Queen's College" founded in 1848 and "Bedford College" founded in 1849 so as to enhance the level of education of women (King 2005: 31). By the end of the century, women, although they could not get a degree, were educated by such colleges and the universities. Besides in education, women questioned their rights in politics. In the Victorian society, only the upper-class women had the right to vote, but the middle and the lower-classes were excluded from politics. Seeing the inequality among classes, "Petitions to Parliament advocating women's suffrage were introduced as early as the 1840s" to lessen the inequality (Abrams 1993: 903). However, it was in 1918 that middle and the lower-class women could get the right to vote.

However, maybe the most dramatic questioning happened in marital issues. Women did not have the same rights as men. They were only confined to the house and they were made to do the housework and look after the children, so women belonged to the private sphere. However, men who belonged to the public sphere were working out, and they were earning their living to sustain their families. As they worked out, they were the Fathers of the family who did the jobs that necessitated more power than the jobs women could do. Therefore, men were seen as the powerful and the leading group in the society. As they were the power over women, they had many rights which women did not have because they were confined to the inferior position in such a social system. For instance, before the Divorce and Matrimonial Causes Act of 1857, women could not own any property. They had to give the money they earned from governessing or doing the housework of their social superiors to the husband. However, with the Divorce and Matrimonial Causes Act of 1857, women who divorced gained the right to "own property and control their own money", so they became equal to men considering the right to have and control their own properties and money (Nelson 2007: 8). After the 1857 Act, Married Women's Property Committee was established in 1868, and it "organized petitions, lobbied parliament,

drafted legislation, published pamphlets, and issued annual reports" so as to make women be aware of their familial rights (Hamilton 2006: 65).

An important figure making women realise their rights in their marriages is Frances Power Cobbe, who is a feminist journalist of the mid-Victorian age. She gave so much importance to the press, and believed that women were able to change their social standing and to "decry abuses" through press (1). By reading published works such as pamphlets and journals, women could educate themselves and enhance their social status besides searching the ways to gain the rights they had been defrauded. With these things in mind, Cobbe "was involved in the national women's suffrage campaign, [and she] argued for women's increased educational and employment opportunities" (1). She also became "instrumental in the passage of the 1878 Matrimonial Causes Act", which enabled the women to get the custody of their children (1). Before the 1878 Matrimonial Causes Act, the custody of the children was in the father, and mothers could not claim any right on their children.

Married Women's Property Acts of 1882 and 1893 followed the first Married Women's Property Act of 1870 and the Matrimonial Causes Act of 1878. The Act of 1870

> protected a married woman's earnings after marriage, certain monies invested in specific ways, and any legacies under £ 200 that she might inherit (66).

While the 1870 Act protected the earnings of a woman after marriage, the 1882 Act gave the woman the right to have the "possession of all her property, before and after marriage", and the woman could get the right to buy and sell her own estate (66). The last Act of 1893 made married and unmarried women equal in terms of possessing their whole properties coming after marriage or through inheritance.

All the Acts and the Committees in the Victorian Age reflect that the feminists of the age supported the equality of man and woman in the marital and the familial affairs just like the feminism in the Enlightenment Age in the

18th century. Therefore, the feminism of the Victorian Age, also, belongs to the first wave of feminism supporting the equality of the two sexes. If the two sexes are equal, then, women and men, and mothers and fathers are equal, and if they are equal, then, there is a union of the two sexes, so they are one in two. If women and mothers become equal to men and fathers, femininity becomes assimilated by masculinity, because it is the female sex and the femininity which struggle to become like and be equal to masculinity considering their efforts to gain the rights of education and the marital and political rights men have. If femininity becomes assimilated, it means that women and mothers are assimilated, and they are regarded as valueless and sexless, so they turn into only objects with no real identity in fact.

Namely, both the Enlightenment feminists' such as Wollstonecraft's ideas and the Victorian feminists' efforts on the equality of man and woman are supported by the first wave feminists, who argue that men should behave women humanely, and they should respect women and give them the chance to improve themselves through education in many fields such as in familial and the political affairs. Such an understanding of giving women the chance to improve themselves in the familial and the political affairs for the sake of educating women and making them be good mothers and good citizens to their countries does not, in fact, reveal that they are for the social and the intellectual improvement of women, and they do not confirm the equality of women in these fields. Instead, the rights are given by a man who is the power, so the rights are not gained by women. Giving women the right to educate themselves and the ways to work in the public sphere outside their houses is letting women educate themselves and work in the public sphere. That's why; feminists have turned their attention from equality to the difference of women. Letting women educate and work outside is the act of man who is the representative of masculinity in fact. Hence, women seem to be equal to men, but they are not, in fact, the equals of men. Men let them oppose to masculinity, and they seem to oppose to men, so they seem to oppose to the inequality towards them while they do not in fact, which means that although they seem to oppose to masculinity and the inequality towards

them, they oppose to equality which they are trying to achieve. They are against the equality given by men. When they have understood that they are against the so-called equality in fact, they have started to support that women are different from men, which is the key point of the second wave feminists who argue that men and women are different from each other.

Supporting the difference of the two sexes, second wave feminism began in the late years of 1960s for Green and LeBihan (Green and LeBihan 2001: 230), and in 1970s for Maggie Humm. (Flynn 2002: 2) Besides regarding the difference of the two sexes, second wave feminism opposes to the union of men and women as well as the oneness idea among the women themselves. For the second wave feminists, women are also different from each other, so they cannot be equal to anyone. It is also true for the male sex, as the feminists of the second wave support that no one can be the same with and equal to one another. That is, the second wave feminists reject universalism saying that

> feminism no longer demand[s] certain rights that [are] beneficial to all women, but rather, affirm[s] the radical particularity of each woman as a unique feminine subject (Oliver and Walsh 2004: 8).

The idea of equality, so the union and the universalism, is dead for the feminists of the second wave. They are, no longer, in favour of equal rights, but of the uniqueness of each woman. When women become unique, they search a way to express who they are, so they become no longer objects as they begin to find their identity.

About the particularity of each woman, French feminists have mostly been influential. Although academically there were not many studies on feminism, feminist movements began in France and in England in 1890s, and Hubertine Auclert was the first woman who proclaimed herself a feminist. From then on, what French feminists have studied on are not the "sociopolitical apparatuses such as the familial, educational, religious, medical, legal and commercial systems" as do the first wave feminists (Cavallaro 2003: 94). Instead, French feminists have discussed the power

relations between man and woman, father and mother, culture and nature, I and Other, and I as a subject. Therefore, it has a very close relation to psychoanalysis studying on the self and the identity in view of these oppositions and contradictions.

> Both [psychoanalysis and feminism] of them examine the common themes: The psychic relations of children with the mothers and fathers, the relationship between sexuality and its vocalization [...]. They both share the similar techniques: approaching the texts in a way that they are the codes and the signifiers of the things which are not vocalized in daily lives. (Humm 2002: 48; Translated by Özgü Ayvaz)

Namely, they examine the relations of children with the mother and the father in a psychological way. Also, in literature, they approach the child and the mother as separate entities and as different signifiers of the unvoiced selves. The child, the mother, and the father are not only different selves, but they have many selves in themselves, so French feminism rejects the oneness of the subject, either the subject is male or female. Therefore, French feminists argue that women are not the same as the other, and also a woman is not same, and coherent within herself. She is fragmented and fractured, and has many diversities and contradictions, so she is not one, but many, and she has many selves. That's why; she cannot be categorized by the phallic constitutions of subjectivity.

Categorizing women by the phallic constitutions makes them be confined to the private sphere, so it makes women be assimilated and "lost" as Simone de Beauvoir says in *The Second Sex* (Simone de Beauvoir 1953: 13). As it is the male sex categorizing women by the phallic constitutions, women are born in a world that is ruled by men. Therefore, they have to adapt to rules and the norms formed by masculinity. However, the adoption and the internalization of the norms are more difficult for women in the process of becoming a subject. It is also difficult for the male sex as he passes from the same stages to attain his subjectivity and identity.

Regarded as one of the founders of psychoanalysis, Sigmund Freud (1856-1939) talks about attaining the subjectivity, so French feminists have

been highly affected by his theory on the stages of becoming a subject, and they have mostly been affected from his theory on Oedipus Complex. For Freud, before the Oedipus Complex that happens in the phallic stage in the ages three to five, a child sees no difference between himself and the outer world, so he does not see any difference from his mother and the father as well. However, in the phallic stage he starts to realize that he is different from the mother, but resembles to the father who has the penis the child has. Realizing the mother's lack of penis, he begins to identify with the father, the authority, and he becomes a subject as a result. This process of becoming a subject is more difficult for a female child, because she realizes that she is in fact the same as the mother who does not have the penis as a signifier of power, so she feels that she has to identify with the father as he is the authority. However, the difficult thing for her is that she still longs for the mother, which makes her not identifying with the two sexes completely, and as Kate Chopin says:

> this places the girl in a position of ambivalence where she belongs completely to neither the mother nor the father but still she seeks to belong to the powerful masculine culture. (Madsen 2000: 95)

Although she experiences the dilemma of identifying with the mother or the father, she is led to the identification with the powerful masculine order so as to find a place in the society she lives in, and in a society which is governed by men.

Jacques Lacan (1901-1981) is also one of the psychoanalysts who talks about attaining subjectivity. Affected by Freud's theory on Oedipus Complex, he has divided the way to subjectivity into three phases which are Imaginary, Symbolic, and Real. Before the imaginary, the child is already a whole within the womb of the mother. After he is born, he always longs for the wholeness he has lost, and he tries to reach to the wholeness in the phases of imaginary, symbolic, and the real. The imaginary, also regarded as the mirror stage, is the first phase the child tries to achieve the wholeness he has lost. In the mirror stage, he sees himself in the mirror, and he assumes that the image in the mirror is himself. However, what he sees is only an image which

does not reflect the psychological processes the child undergoes. That's why; what is in the mirror is an idealized imaginary reflection of the child who is longing for the I as a whole. When the child realizes the image is not the I he is longing for, he accepts to pass into the symbolic to find the wholeness. Symbolic is the second phase of attaining the subjectivity, and it is also the phase in which the child acquires the language of the Father, who is the symbol of masculinity and power. It is the language that defines the subjectivity and identity, so it is the language that defines I. Therefore, a child is born in a language which is already ready to shape him and to teach him the social norms, so the child identifies with the father to find the wholeness he has lost as the father is the signifier of power and language. However, the child cannot fully find the wholeness in the language, because there are some remnants that are not and cannot be represented either in the imaginary or in the symbolic, and these are called real, which consists of the unvoiced things that cannot be explained. That is, for Lacan, the subject is already in search of the whole I he has lost when he is born. He firstly tries to find it in the mirror, and then in the language which distinguishes I and Other. Other is the mother who is rejected in the pre-Oedipal phase, so it is the woman that is a lack. Because woman is a lack, she is inferior to men, so she is made to speak the language of men, and it is the language of men that women speak so as to become a subject.

Being made to speak the language of masculinity is the thing that three French feminists, Luce Irigaray, Hélène Cixous, and Julia Kristeva, are against. They are also against Lacan's forming his theory on only the male sex making woman be forced to speak the language of man. Woman should speak and write with her own language, so Hélène Cixous is the first feminist talking about feminine writing or écriture féminine.

> This is a style of writing that seeks to recapture the pleasures of the Imaginary, which undermines the rationality of the Symbolic, fractures the closed state of binary oppositions, and seeks to construct an open-ended textuality. (97)

It is the feminine writing, in textuality or in literature, aiming at reflecting the silenced, the unvoiced, the unspoken, and the repressed expressions of

femininity pertaining to the phase before the symbolic rather than the vocalized and the rationalized speech of the symbolic. The aim of the écriture féminine is to deconstruct the closed state of binary oppositions like man and woman, father and mother, culture and nature, logos and pathos, and I and Other, so Cixous opposes to the subjectivity and identification through binary oppositions. For this reason, she proposes an open-ended textuality which is not confined to the rationality and the masculinity of the symbolic. For Cixous, écriture féminine can be written not only by women but also by men, so she claims that men can reflect a feminine writing, because both men and women pass from a pre-Oedipal stage which has, in itself, the silenced, the unvoiced, and the repressed which are also hidden in the unconscious. However, for Irigaray, it should only be the woman who expresses the silenced and the unvoiced in her feminine writing, because she claims that "only the symbolism created by a woman [...] can speak to the women" (Humm 2002: 143; Trans. Ö.A.). That is, only a writing written by a woman can reflect the unconscious of the woman which occurs as a result of the repressions of the symbolic. That's why, only a woman who is seen as a "lack" can express her unconscious in her writings of her own body, as well. Both Cixous and Irigaray believe the importance of writing women's own body because it "will unfold the resources of the unconscious" (Habib 2005: 669). Writing of the women's body will deconstruct the repressions and the rationalism of the symbolic, so women will be able to speak not the language of men and the masculinity, but they will speak and write with their own feminine language. As stated by Humm, if women express, also, their physical desires that are repressed by the symbolic, what Freud names id, it will create a different language from the language of masculinity, as a result of which women will deconstruct the order and the linearity of the masculine language (Humm 2002: 144; Trans. Ö.A.). Another French feminist, Julia Kristeva, is also against women's being expressed by the language of masculinity. She is also against Lacan's formation of subjectivity on the basis of only the male sex, so she proposes a different formation of subjectivity for both boys and girls though she is affected by Lacan's formation.

2. Julia Kristeva's Feminist Theory

Born in 1941, Kristeva, affected by Lacan, explains the formation of subjectivity through semiotic and symbolic. Although Lacan has been influential on her theory of the formation of subjectivity, she opposes to him as he has formed his theory only on the male sex, so isolating the female, woman, and the mother, and making her marginalized by masculinity. Therefore, she is against women's speaking only the masculine language, and their being made to express themselves only with the phallic, ordered, linear, and symbolic language with the ordered, linear, and limited grammar and syntax structure.

While, for Lacan, a child becomes a subject in the symbolic phase when he speaks the language of the Father, of masculinity, for Kristeva, a child's, either a girl's or a boy's, subjectivity begins in the semiotic, "where sexual difference does not exist" yet (Moi 1985: 164). The sexual difference, however, begins when the child enters into the symbolic. It is stated in *Julia Kristeva and Literary Theory* that

> cries and laughter, sound and touch and gesture indicate for Kristeva a pre-symbolic dimension to signification that is bodily and drive-motivated and that lacks the defining structure, coherence, and spatial fixity implied by Lacan's formulations. Bodily interdependence, shared smiles, crying, and the abstract rhythms, sounds, and touches of the symbiotic mother-child interaction set up and intimate a space [...] that Kristeva calls the "semiotic chora." (Becker-Leckrone 2005: 28)

That is, for Kristeva, the semiotic is a drive-motivated phase reflecting the expressions before attaining language, expressions such as cries and the laughter of the child, the pre-linguistic sounds the child articulates, and the child's gestures. These are all the expressions that are not confined to the limits of the symbolic, so they are not coherent and stable. Instead, semiotic is related with the unconscious of the child which is not vocalized and spoken in the coherent and stable symbolic. It reflects the unconscious of the child and her/his feelings and desires that are repressed by the symbolic. As semiotic is the place which reflects the feelings and the desires, it is related

with mother, because symbolic does hardly give a chance to express the hidden desires and the feelings as it is a systematic and rationally structured space including the systematic and rationally structured language of the father or the Father as power. Thus, Kristeva gives so much importance to the maternal language in the semiotic to deconstruct the rationality and the linearity of the language of the symbolic. For her, it is the mother that gives birth to a child, so there is a close relation between the mother and the child, and this relation may sometimes become "disruptive" of the symbolic either when the child rejects to pass to the symbolic or when s/he finds a way to express the unvoiced desires and the feelings in the symbolic (Campbell 2000: 103).

Symbolic, for Kristeva, is the second phase of the constitution of subjectivity, and the subject. While semiotic is related with mother, symbolic is associated with Father. That is, symbolic is the social and the cultural place of constituting the subject and I. Just as what Lacan says, Kristeva argues that when the child, either a boy or a girl, enters into the symbolic, s/he begins to articulate the phallic language of the father and the Father as the signifier of the masculine domain. With the articulation of the language, however, the child represses the desire and the feelings, so s/he identifies with the father as s/he sees the mother as lack of penis, which makes the child see the mother as other. Although the child regards the mother as other, s/he still longs for the maternal domain, and the desires and the feelings s/he cannot express in the symbolic. That is, for Kristeva, unlike Lacan's view, the symbolic is not the sole place of the formation of I and the subjectivity. Instead, the constitution of subjectivity is a process. It is the continuing process of comings and goings to the semiotic and the symbolic.

When the child enters into the symbolic, the socially, culturally and linguistically limited space, s/he feels herself/himself repressed because s/he cannot find any place to express her/his feelings, desire for the mother, and her/his sexual desires which are unlimited unlike the linguistic expressions of the symbolic. Feeling herself/himself repressed, the child, and also the adults, search for a way in the symbolic to express the feelings and the sexual and

the maternal desires. However, it is not easy for the person to express the desires and the feelings in the symbolic, so s/he reflects these maternal desires in her/his cries, laughter, gestures, and in her/his games and the literature s/he produces. That is, for Kristeva, the child or the person cannot be a subject only through the semiotic or the symbolic. Instead, becoming a subject happens through a process of shifting from the semiotic to the symbolic, and from symbolic to the semiotic, so there is not a fixed formation of subjectivity, or not a fixed and a stable formation of the subject, but it is the subject in process as Kristeva names. She states her theory on subject in process by saying:

> We are no doubt permanent subjects of a language that holds us in its power. But we are subjects in process, ceaselessly losing our identity, destabilized by fluctuations in our relations to the other (Kristeva 1987: 9).

What she means is that there is not a fixed and a permanent subject speaking the language of masculinity, but the subject is fractured, and fragmented always losing the identity, and the wholeness of I as s/he experiences both the semiotic and the symbolic at the same time, and as s/he becomes destabilized as a result. To indicate the destabilized subject, she says in an interview with Susan Sellers that:

> all identities are unstable: the identity of linguistic signs, the identity of meaning and, as a result, the identity of the speaker. And in order to take account of this de-stabilization of meaning and of the subject I thought the term 'subject in process' would be appropriate. (Eagleton 1996: 351)

As the subject is destabilized, then, the language s/he articulates is destabilized, because there is not a stable identity of any linguistic signs or the meaning, so there cannot be any fixed identity, and any fixed representation of identity.

For Kristeva, the mentioned idea of not having a fixed identity is also seen in literary works and in literature although she forms her theory on people who are not fictitious like the ones in novels but the real ones not living in the world of the narration but in the world of real people. Yet, the

reason why she argues that one can see the destabilized subject also in literature stems from the fact that her study is based on the psychoanalytic approach to texts and literature. As, in the psychoanalytic approach, the real author is the creator of the characters, one can also analyze the psychology of the author of a novel, for instance, by looking at her/his characters because of the fact that s/he reflects her/his personality, her/his feelings, her/his views on the things s/he describes, and her/his unstable identity through the characters s/he creates. That's why; as affected by the psychoanalytic theory and especially what Freud mentions in *Delusions and Dreams In Jensen's Gradiva* in 1907, Kristeva believes that one can interpret a character in a piece of literature through the use of her own theory on real people (Freud 2010)[1]. Therefore, the ideas, the views or the feelings of the author or the creator of a piece of literature are also reflected in a work of art through the characters s/he creates. That's why; for Kristeva, it is possible for the psychoanalytic theory to study on the fictitious characters in a work of art as they are the reflections of the thoughts, ideas, and views of the real people in fact. Hence, according to Kristeva, it is possible to analyze the characters in a work of art to see the destabilized and fractured identity of the characters or the subjects created by the real author. On the basis of this approach to a literary work, Kristeva argues in literature that as the destabilized and fractured subject experiences both the semiotic and the symbolic simultaneously, s/he articulates the pre-linguistic signs, cries, laughter, gestures, and the like in the symbolic, that is, in the limited and linear syntactical formulations of the language:

[1] In *Delusions and Dreams In Jensen's Gradiva*, Freud states that the characters in a literary work can also be analyzed with the psychoanalytical approach owing to the fact that the literary work is created by a real person, the author himself living in the world of real people. He tells in the postscript:"psycho-analytic research has summoned up the courage to approach the creations of imaginative writers with [...] another purpose in view. It no longer merely seeks in them for confirmations of the findings it has made from unpoetic, neurotic human beings; it also demands to know the material of impressions and memories from which the author has built the work, and the methods and processes by which he has converted this material into a work of art. It has turned out that these questions can be most easily answered in the case of writers who (like our Wilhelm Jensen, who died in 1911) were in the habit of giving themselves over to their imagination in a simple-minded joy in creating." (Freud 2010: 1885)

> when [...] the limit between inside and outside becomes uncertain, the narrative is what is challenged first. If it continues nevertheless, its makeup changes; its linearity is shattered, it proceeds by flashes, enigmas, short cuts, incompletion, tangles, and cuts. (Kristeva 1982: 141)

As the subject is a subject in process, there is not a certain limit and a line that separates the semiotic and the symbolic. For that reason, the language and the narrative of the subject are also in process, so the semiotic and the unconscious maternal drives challenge the language and the narrative of the symbolic. If the challenge continues, it deconstructs the linearity of the symbolic and the phallic language. Thus, the semiotic finds a place in the narrative through flashes, enigmas, or the mysteries that are difficult to rationalize, short cuts, incomplete expressions, tangles and contradictions, so through silences, meaninglessness, and absences that are not voiced. Therefore, the pre-linguistic articulations of the subject in process are expressed through ellipsis and the exclamation mark, which indicate the unspoken and the repressed feelings pertaining to the maternal domain of the semiotic. Namely, as the narrative is associated with the subject who is in process all the time, it is also in process, and it reflects this process through some flashes, contradictions and dilemmas, silences, enigmas, incompletion, and the like. Therefore, for Kristeva, there is not a complete, a coherent text and a narrative as there is nothing like a fixed identity and a fixed subjectivity. If the subject is in process, the language s/he uses is challenged all the time by the unlimited maternal domain of the semiotic, and this is reflected also in literature, in *Northanger Abbey* by Jane Austen, *Shirley* by Charlotte Brontë, and *Jude the Obscure* by Thomas Hardy.

II. THE INTERPRETATION OF THE NOVELS

A. THE FIRST NOVEL: *NORTHANGER ABBEY* BY JANE AUSTEN

The first novel is *Northanger Abbey* by Jane Austen. The novel, belonging to the early Victorian age, is, in fact, the criticism of the social, familial, and the marital conventions of the early period of the age. It is the burlesque of the novels reflecting the strict reasoning of the 18th century, the Enlightenment Age, as well as the strict social and the familial conventions of the early Victorian Period. In the novel,

> Austen [has] burlesqued fictional themes, conventions and character types through close imitation, exaggeration [...] or some other unexpected turn. (Roberts 1995: 22)

She has burlesqued, in *Northanger Abbey*, the comedic ending of the novels, the happy ending with a marriage, the status and the roles of woman in the social and marital concerns, and the characters emulating the Victorian modes of femininity or masculinity. Thus, the novel credits neither the strict reasoning of the Enlightenment Age as it burlesques the reasoning through the reflection of the feelings of the female character nor the strict Victorian conventions on the roles of the sexes, and especially on the roles of femininity, as Austen criticizes these roles and the social positioning of the sexes through the character Catherine. Therefore, the novel displays the oppositions between the rational positioning of the character with her given-roles in the Victorian Age and in the symbolic, and her need to express her semiotic side; that is, her feelings, enthusiasms, and imaginations. The reflection of the semiotic and the symbolic highlights the character's dilemma of identity and the self. She finds herself in the dilemma of identification with the Mother or the Father, and sometimes in the excessive identification with the male sex. She is always in between the semiotic and the symbolic, reflecting her semiotic and the maternal side in the symbolic. Therefore, she cannot be a "unary subject [...] [that is a] homogeneous, consistent whole"

(Kristeva 1941: 19). She is a divided and a split subject identifying entirely neither with the Mother nor with the Father. That's why; she does not reflect a fixed identity in her search for the expressions of her selves. She evinces the instinctual drives and the feelings in the symbolic through her cries, silences, and through the reflection of her imaginations and enthusiasms, reflecting the lack of knowledge in most of the feminine manners and feminine styles as well. Her in-between standing in the identification with the female or the male sex is firstly seen in her familial relations. The dilemma of the self begins in the childhood of the character, and it goes on in her older ages, so, early in the family and at home, which is the place where the social standing of the sexes is taught to children, she unveils the semiotic in her search for the ways to disclose her feelings in the symbolic.

1. Familial Relations of Catherine

For Victorians and for Kristeva, the familial relations of the child are important in the child's development of her/his identity. For Victorians, it is the family which is the basis of the education of the child. The child begins to get education in the family, so parents teach the child the norms of the society, the duties of both sexes, and the moral conventions of the Victorians. The most influential members in a family in the Victorian society are the mothers and the fathers. Besides teaching the norms and the morality, they lead the child to make her/him find her/his identity and the self by helping her/him to find a place and a standing in the society. It is not only for the Victorians but also for Kristeva that the family and the parents are highly influential in the child's discovering and finding the self. The first helper of the child is the mother, who has a closer relationship with the child as she is the one who gives birth to the child, which means that there is a special bond between the child and the mother, and this bond is a maternal one which continues to exist although the father separates the child from the mother. Therefore, it is, first, in the family and at home that the child, in her/his search for the self, experiences the semiotic and the symbolic; that is, the

oppositions as maternal feelings, instinctual drives and desires, and paternal rules, and socially systematized conventions. Thus, as the family, the mother and the father are the first helpers of the child to have her/him discover her/his identity, the family and the familial relations of the character, the family, the mother and the father of Catherine and also Mr. and Mrs. Allen, who take over the role of her mother and her father, will be discussed first.

As the family is a social issue, determined and defined by the social system, mothers and fathers in the early Victorian age, without considering the sex, serve to the same systematized social issue by performing the tasks they have been made to do. It is also true for the family of Catherine. Her parents serve to the same systematized social phenomena, that is, they serve to the same socially designed and described familial and marital rules. The family of the character, the Morland family, as many Victorian families, is a crowded one with sisters and brothers. The protagonist, Catherine Morland, who is considered to be "an heroine", has three elder-brothers before her, and she has a very "plain" family, a plain mother and a plain father as the narrator describes (Austen 2000: 3). It is plain in a sense that the mother performs the tasks she has to do in a house in the Victorian social system, and it is also plain as it is the father who works outside the house as a clergyman. The mother is at home, serving to the private sphere, and the father works outside, belonging to the public sphere, thus, serving to the social norms which he is bound to by the early Victorian conventions. As the family is a social matter of fact, Catherine's mother and father obey to this social phenomenon. However, it is, also, true for Catherine's parents that besides serving to the systematized social norms and rules, they reflect the familial relationship through the voice of the mother.

Although in the Victorian social and familial system, fathers have a voice rather than mothers, it is the mother whose voice is heard in Catherine's family. In nowhere of the novel, reader can hear the voice of the father, but s/he gets information about him through the voice of the narrator. On the contrary, it is Catherine's mother, who speaks to Catherine and the others. This is because mothers are mostly the representatives of the symbolic

domain in the house. As the house is the sphere of the female sex, it becomes only the mother of Catherine speaking to others in the novel, because most of the things that happen in the country take place in the house of the character. As the private sphere of the home is determined by the public sphere, and as mothers are made to obey to masculinity and speak with the language of the male, Catherine's mother, in fact, speaks the language of her husband, so, at home, in the private sphere, she substitutes for the father. Thus, while serving to the socially systematized norms of the age, she makes the reader hear her voice as the representative of the masculine force. When Catherine returns from Northanger Abbey, where she has been with the man she loves, Henry Tilney, and his family, the mother sees that Catherine is depressed, and she regards that her depression is because of her coming back to home, to the country. That's why; as a representative of the masculine discourse at home, she tells Catherine:

> 'There is a very clever Essay in one of the books upstairs upon much such a subject, about young girls that have been spoilt for home by great acquaintance – "The Mirror", I think. I will look it out for you some day or other, because I am sure it will do you good.' (158)

"The Mirror" is a periodical by Henry Mackenzie, and it "details the corruptive effects on [...] two daughters" who have "been to stay with a fine lady" (179). Thus, it argues that the ladies return home corrupted after a visit to a fine lady, which is the case, for the mother, with Catherine. As, at home, her mother represents for the masculine language, she speaks to Catherine, and tells her that longing for Northanger Abbey, which is the place that is related to Henry Tilney, so which is related to feelings and sensibility in this respect, is not sensible because it spoils her for home. As an archetype of a woman being made to speak the language of man, Catherine's mother states that a clever and a sensible essay which serves to the social conventions and the symbolic will make her forget the abbey and make her act rationally without dreaming of the abbey, without silencing herself at home, and without spoiling herself with her tears. That is to say that, the mother is made to censor her feelings so as to speak the language of the father and teach Catherine the conventions. That's why; the reader hears the voice of the

mother who performs the tasks she is made to. She is the substitution of the father in the house serving to the systematized familial norms. As her utterances are the utterances of the symbolic order as Lacan and Kristeva calls, she represents the symbolic, reason, and sense; thus, she is made to censor the semiotic, the instinctual drives, feelings and sensibility because she is made to suppress them.

Although, for feminism and for Kristeva, mothers are highly significant in the child's search for the self because they carry more semiotic features like acting with the feelings, reflecting the drives and feelings through contradictions in the utterances, silences, tears and so on, Kristeva also argues that mothers censor their semiotic side so as to find their places in the society. Thus, mothers accept the dominance of the symbolic, and obey to the masculine order just like the mother of Catherine. K. Oliver says the same in *Ethics, Politics and Difference in Julia Kristeva's Writtings* published in 1993: "We have no choice, ultimately, but to accept the Symbolic and the figurative death it brings: namely, the repression of bodily drives" as Catherine's mother's accepting the symbolic, the male discourse, which causes the suppression of the drives and feelings (Cavallaro 2003: 134). This is the suppression like the death of the drives, because they are excessively repressed in a way that they find a little chance to be revealed. Accepting to be the part of the symbolic domain, Catherine's mother suppresses her feelings, too. Although she does not lose them at all, she censors and hides these maternal drives and feelings so as to survive, even while giving birth to her third son before Catherine. What she can do is only to hint these drives and feelings under the disguise of the "serviceable" quotations by Pope, Gray, Thompson, and Shakespeare (Austen 2000: 4). The three poets and the playwright are all male, so Catherine's mother chooses the extracts of the male sex because in the early period of the Victorian Age it is believed that what men write are better, more serviceable for people to learn the conventions and more sensible than the writings of women, which reveals that Catherine's mother accepts to be the part of the masculine discourse. Yet, she also carries her hidden semiotic side because all the extracts chosen by

the mother either reflect or are about feelings. Thanks to the extracts chosen by the mother, the narrator tells what Catherine has learnt:

> From Pope, she [Catherine] learnt to censure those who
> bear about the mockery of woe.
> From Gray, that
> Many a flower is born to blush unseen,
> And waste its fragrance on the desert air.
> From Thompson, that
> -It is a delightful task
> To teach the young idea how to shoot.
>
> And from Shakespeare she gained a great store of information –
> amongst the rest, that
> -Trifles light as air,
> Are, to the jealous, confirmation strong,
> As proofs of Holy Writ.
> That
> The poor beetle, which we tread upon,
> In corporeal sufferance feels a pang as great
> As when a giant dies.
> And that a young woman in love always looks
> -like a Patience on a monument
> Smiling at Grief. (5)

With the quotation by Pope, Catherine's mother wants her daughter to be aware of the woe of the other people. Catherine has learnt to criticise those who mocks the woe of others. The word "woe" is about the feelings of people. Woe is a kind of sense a person feels. Thus, Catherine learns to criticise the people who satirize the woe of others. Hence, under the disguise of Pope, a male poet, Catherine's mother chooses an extract about one of the feelings. From Gray, the mother wants Catherine to learn the status of people. When the flower is compared to a woman, the social status of the woman reveals itself. The female sex is born to blush unseen. Women are born to be unseen, they are born to obey to the symbolic and hide the semiotic, and so they are born to their figurative deaths. Thus, the quotation by Gray is also the revelation of the status of women, and their suppressing the semiotic, their feelings and desires. Then, the extract is about the feelings and their being suppressed. From Thompson, she has learnt a delightful task. Although shooting is a sport done by men, the quotation reveals its being a delightful task. That is, the task is reflected with a feeling. Its giving pleasure is emphasized, and pleasure is one of the feelings. From Shakespeare, Catherine

learns how a jealous person thinks and behaves. Another extract by Shakespeare talks about how a beetle feels when it is trodden. The words "feel" and "pang" are all about the feelings of the small animal. Even a small animal like a beetle has feelings, which shows that the quotation is about a feeling. The last one by Shakespeare is also about a feeling, which is love. Although a woman should not reflect her love and admiration to a man in the early Victorian age, so she should seem as a monument without reflecting the feeling of grief, she has in fact this feeling. She just pretends to hide it because she is not the patience on a monument. Instead, she is like patience on a monument. Thus, she seems to hide the feeling of grief although she reveals just like Catherine when she is away from Henry. Thus, it is concluded that all the quotations above echo the semiotic side of the mother. However, she suppresses her feelings and the semiotic through the symbolic like how a woman in the early Victorian age feels herself to do, which causes Catherine to be in-between about her gender because she has seen a mother who is female and has, therefore, the semiotic side, yet who acts like the symbolic wants her to do. She becomes in-between because she is also a female, just like her mother, yet she is made to speak the language of the male discourse, and to leave the semiotic back in the thetic phase.

Besides her mother, Mr. and Mrs. Allen, as a mother and a father figure, are influential in her manners in the early Victorian society. They are the people with whom she lives in Bath, where she meets Henry Tilney. Unlike her father, the reader can sometimes hears the voice of Mr. Allen, but s/he hears mostly the voice of Mrs. Allen in Bath again although it is the reiteration of the thing she has uttered before. Mr. Allen, as a representative of the symbolic order, becomes her father figure advising Catherine how to act properly. It is Mr. Allen that warns Catherine not to get on a carriage with a man that has no relation with Catherine. Thus, he warns her, and tells her the expectations of the Victorian society, which has highly strict norms about morality. It is also Mr. Allen who inspects Henry Tilney, with whom Catherine has spoken intimately in the ballroom, in the Lower Rooms, and it is Mr. Allen who gets information about Tilney's profession. That is, he is the

signifier of the masculine domain, the symbolic order, so he is the representative of the father-figure who investigates the man Catherine finds proper to love and marry.

Mrs. Allen, however, as one of the signifiers of the female sex who is made to obey to the masculine order, is, for the narrator, a hindrance for Catherine to have a better place in the Victorian society. Having no children, thus, not being a mother, she has little understanding and communication on the matters related with mothering. When, for instance, Mrs. Thorpe and Mrs. Allen meet, their topics in their speeches become different. As Mrs. Thorpe has children, her speech is, generally, on mothering and her children. However,

> Mrs. Allen [has] no similar information to give, no similar triumphs to press on the unwilling and unbelieving ear of her friend, and [is] forced to sit and appear to listen to all these maternal effusions, consoling herself, however, with the discovery, which her keen eye [has] soon made, that the lace on Mrs. Thorpe's pelisse [is] not half so handsome as that on her own. (16)

Thus, she is the opposite of the Victorian understanding that argues that female sex should be a mother and look after the children. For the narrator, having no children, she becomes forced to sit and appear to listen to the maternal triumphs of others while feeling she has not the same triumph to talk about. Although narrator feels like that, Mrs. Allen, in fact, does not care about her not being a mother, so her topic becomes another feminine feature. She is so much obsessed with dressing that she thinks on or speaks of only dressing. Her dresses become a consolation for her as they reflect her taste on dressing. Instead of instructing Catherine in the manners and behaviours, as a mother-figure in the early Victorian age, she talks about the physical appearance, the dresses all the time. When Mr. Allen speaks with Catherine about the manners and how to behave a man having no relation with her, he asks Mrs. Allen's views, but the answer is on the dresses again. After Catherine's saying to Mr. Allen that Mr. Thorpe is so obsessive on her going out with him, Mr. Allen talks to Catherine:

> 'and do you think of going too?'

> ‘No; I had just engaged myself to talk with Miss Tilney before they told me of it; and therefore you know I could not go with them, could I?’
> ‘No, certainly not; and I am glad you do not think of it. These schemes are not at all the thing. Young men and women driving about the country in open carriages! Now and then it is very well; but going to inns and public places together! It is not right; and I wonder Mrs. Thorpe should allow it. I am glad you do not think of going; I am sure Mrs. Morland would not be pleased. Mrs. Allen, are not you of my way of thinking? Do not you think these kind of projects objectionable?’
> ‘Yes, very much so indeed. Open carriages are nasty things. A clean gown is not five minutes wear in them. You are splashed getting in and getting out; and the wind takes your hair and your bonnet in every direction. I hate an open carriage myself.’
> ‘I know you do; but that is not the question. Do not you think it has an odd appearance, if young ladies are frequently driven about in them by young men, to whom they are not even related?’
> ‘Yes, my dear, a very odd appearance indeed. I cannot bear to see it.’
> ‘Dear madam’ cried Catherine, ‘then why did not you tell me so before? I am sure if I had known it to be improper, I would not have gone with Mr. Thorpe at all; but I always hoped you would tell me, if you thought I was doing wrong.’ (66)

The conversation echoes the obsession of Mrs. Allen with dressing and her dresses, also by revealing that she has little maternal duties and maternal feelings at all. Thus, she is also divided between the semiotic and the symbolic. Although she tells that she finds a woman’s going out with a man that has no relation to her improper, she has not warned Catherine as expected from the Victorian mothers. Thus, Mrs. Allen is criticized by the narrator in not instructing Catherine the manners. She does not reflect maternal feelings and a relation to semiotic in terms of the mothering instinct. The reader sees her mostly through her obsession with dresses, with little maternal attention or concerns. That is to say, the reader can find little semiotic relation, in terms of mothering, with Mrs. Allen and Catherine. Mrs. Allen is the one who only takes over the role of a mother when they are in Bath, yet she is the one who shows little maternal drives and feelings to Catherine. Thus, the mother figures, Catherine’s own mother and Mrs. Allen, reflect little semiotic relation to Catherine. Her own mother, although she hints them, shows little semiotic drives and feelings because she is submissive to the symbolic, and Mrs. Allen reflects little maternal drives as she has no children at all. Then, Catherine, seeing little semiotic bond with

the mother figures, feels herself forced to obey to the symbolic and the masculine order. Yet, because of the little semiotic bond with the mother figures, the obedience to the symbolic causes excessive identification with the male discourse and the male sex. Then, she feels herself in-between about her gender and the roles of the gender.

2. Gender Dilemma and the Uncertainty of Identity

Finding little semiotic bond with the mother-figures, Catherine identifies so much with the Father figure. However, the excessive identification with the symbolic domain makes the reader regard her in a dilemma of not deciding exactly what her gender is. Then, the search for the self becomes problematic for her since she is left on her own in her quest because of the little semiotic bond with the mother-figures, which is shown either in her childhood or when she is older in her manners, in the games she takes pleasure, and in her little attention to some other feminine features such as dressing up.

In her childhood, while growing up, the uncertainty of gender shows itself in her games she takes pleasure. As, in her childhood, she is mostly left alone in her feelings due to the little relation with her mother, the identification with the male sex becomes so excessive that in her games it is reflected. She takes pleasure in the games that are played by the male sex, by boys. Thus, the suppression of the semiotic in her search for identity has shown itself in the excessive identification with the male sex, which is reflected in her games.

> She was fond of all boys' plays, and greatly preferred cricket not merely to dolls, but to the more heroic enjoyments of infancy, nursing a dormouse, feeding a canary-bird, or watering a rose-bush. Indeed she had no taste for a garden; and if she gathered flowers at all, it was chiefly for the pleasure of mischief – at least so it was conjectured from her always preferring those which she was forbidden to take. – Such were her propensities – her abilities were quite as extraordinary. (3)

In the childhood, she preferred cricket, a boy's game, to dolls, the objects with which girls play, and the objects which teach the girls mothering. Wollstonecraft describes the games played by different sexes:

> Boys love sports of noise and activity; to beat the drum, to whip the top, and to drag about their little carts: girls, on the other hand, are fonder of things of show and ornament; such as mirrours, trinkets, and dolls: the doll is the peculiar amusement of the females (Wollstonecraft 1993: 153).

Besides preferring the active sports such as cricket to dolls, she does not take pleasure from the tasks such as nursing, feeding, and watering the flowers. All these tasks are the ones that are related with the private sphere, they are done by the mothers. However, as her mother represents the father in the house, she has always been exposed to the symbolic order and its arrangements on the family and the society. Thus, she has not taken pleasure from the girls' games because of the fact that she has seen little semiotic support or the feeling of the mother. That's why; she has taken pleasure from the boys' games, which causes the dilemma in her identity. For the narrator, her preferring the boys' games is not sensible, as s/he tells:

> it was not very wonderful that Catherine [...] should prefer cricket, baseball, riding on horseback, and running about the country at the age of fourteen, to books – or at least books of information [...]. (Austen 2000: 4)

Cricket, baseball, riding on horseback, and running about the country, running outside the home, are the noisy and active boys' games. They are also the games with systematic rules, which are almost not seen in girls' enjoyments such as playing with dolls, looking at mirrors, watering flowers, and the like. Thus, she takes pleasure from the games which are played outside the home, without confining herself to the house, the private sphere of the female sex. In her childhood,

> she was [...] noisy and wild, hated confinement and cleanliness, and loved nothing so well in the world as rolling down the green slope at the back of the house. (4)

All these things, being wild and noisy, hating confinement at home, and loving rolling down the slope, are the male attributes which Catherine takes

pleasure in, and they all signal that Catherine is excessively identified in her childhood with the male sex. Thus, the childhood is the basis of Catherine's ongoing dilemma as it is the basis of the uncertainty of gender causing her to be confused in her quest for the self.

Besides preferring the games which do not confine her to the house, she is not good at music and drawing, which are the attributes females should learn in the Victorian society to amuse her husband in their marriages. In the childhood, her mother tried to lead her to female attributes.

> Her mother wished her to learn music; and Catherine was sure she should like it, for she was very fond of tinkling the keys of the old forlorn spinet; so, at eight years old she began. She learnt a year, and could not bear it [...]. The day which dismissed the music-master was one of the happiest of Catherine's life. (3-4)

It has been her mother's wish Catherine should learn music, and Catherine is sure she should like, but not will, so she has begun the music lessons. When she has understood that she cannot bear it, she has stopped learning to sing and playing the old spinet on that day which is one of the happiest in Catherine's life. Another female attribute she has to learn to amuse the husband is drawing. However, Catherine is not good at drawing, too; "she had no notion of drawing" in her younger ages (5). Hence, drawing and music are the hallmarks of female tasks that should be learnt, for the Victorians, to amuse the husband in the marriage. On growing up, she still identifies with the male sex, and she is sure that she should like the music. Thus, it is a good idea for her to learn how to sing and play an instrument. It will be good for her to learn the music and drawing to amuse the husband, so it will be good for her not to be marginalized and silenced by the society, thus, to find her place in the society, and this happens when she obeys to the symbolic order. Yet, the symbolic and the norms of the period want a daughter to be like and behave like how a female sex should behave. That is, the symbolic and the norms want Catherine to behave like a daughter and a mother, to play with dolls, to look at mirror, to take care of the house and the garden and to water the flowers. Catherine, however, becomes indecisive about what a society or the symbolic wants. It wants children both to accept the Law of the Father

and speak the language and the discourse of the male sex, and behave like what their sex does, which means if the child is a boy, he should do the tasks a boy or a man does and he should behave like how a boy or a man behaves, on the other hand, if she is a girl, she should do the tasks a girl or a woman does and she should behave like how a girl or a woman behaves. As she is indecisive about what a society or the symbolic wants, she becomes indecisive about how to behave, and when she sees little semiotic bond with the mothers for her, she identifies with the male sex, but it is an excessive identification, which makes her search the real self for her. As the search for the self is an endless progress, Catherine is always in search of the self either in her childhood or in her older ages, and as a result, she is always in-between the symbolic masculine order and the semiotic maternal features through which she finds a way to express her feelings, her dreams and her imagination. Thus, she is always in dilemma of her gender, whether she carries and should reveal the female attributes or she has to obey all the time to the masculine order, so she becomes confused about having the maternal or the masculine attributes, and this makes her uncertain about her gender and the self as a result.

Besides in the childhood, the reader considers Catherine, also in her grown ages, in the dilemma of gender when s/he thinks on her lack of interest in some of the female attributes which should be had by the Victorian women. Although in her childhood the identification with the male sex is allowed to some extent, in her early adulthood her excessive identification with the male sex is hindered by the same symbolic when she is made to obey to the norms of the society of the period. Yet, being made to be like what the society and the symbolic wants, that is, silencing or hiding the semiotic feelings and the drives by submitting to the conventions of the age and the rules of the patriarchy, and being forced to have the female attributes such as keeping a diary or knowing how to dress up at the same time makes her be in-between in finding her identity and the self. That is, although the society and the symbolic want her to stop the excessive identification with the male attributes, it becomes not easy for her to cease it as, for instance, she does not

still keep a diary or does not have an interest of dressing, and she, this time, begins to identify herself with the man she loves. That is, she is, also in her early adulthood, in dilemma of her gender and self, which is revealed in her choice of writing and literature, in her lack of interest in dresses, and in her identifying herself with the man she loves.

Her being in the dilemma of her gender is firstly revealed in her choice of writing and literature. She does not keep a journal, which is a female attribute, but she does not like reading history or a historical fact and she takes pleasure in reading gothic novels appealing mostly to the senses of women. Keeping a diary or a journal is an attribute that is performed by the women in the Victorian age. In the early adulthood, the female sex keeps a journal, and talks either about what she has experienced or about her feelings. However, it is different for Catherine. She has not kept a diary or a journal. When Catherine and Henry talks for the first time, Henry asks her where she has visited in Bath, and after learning that she has been to most of the places, he tells Catherine that he will take place in her journal as a man who has had a bad impression on her:

> 'I see what you think of me,' said he gravely – 'I shall make but a poor figure in your journal tomorrow.'
> 'My journal!'
> 'Yes, I know exactly what you will say: Friday, went to the Lower Rooms; wore my sprigged muslin robe with blue trimmings – plain black shoes – appeared to much advantage; but was strangely harassed by a queer, half-witted man, who would make me dance with him, and distressed me by his nonsense.'
> [...]
> 'But, perhaps, I keep no journal.'
> '[...] Not keep a journal! How are your absent cousins to understand the tenor of your life in Bath without one? How are the civilities and compliments of every day to be related as they ought to be, unless noted down every evening in a journal? [...] My dear madam, I am not so ignorant of young ladies' ways as you wish to believe me; it is this delightful habit of journalising which largely contributes to form the easy style of writing for which ladies are so generally celebrated. Everybody allows that the talent of writing agreeable letters is peculiarly female. [...]'
> 'I have sometimes thought,' said Catherine, doubtingly, 'whether ladies do write so much better letters than gentlemen! That is – I should not think the superiority was always on our side.' (12-13)

That is, the quotation above tells that it is not a habit of Catherine to keep a journal where she can talk about what she has experienced and how she has felt in Bath. On hearing that she does not keep a journal, Henry speaks to her and tells that journalising is a delightful habit in which the female sex takes pleasure, which means that he emphasizes that journalising is a task that appeals to the women of the age. It is not a rational way of describing what has happened. That is, it does not resemble to reading or writing about a historical fact. For Henry, it is delightful, appealing to the senses of women, but an easy feminine style of writing for which ladies are so generally celebrated, which is the indication of Austen's criticism to the understanding that women take pleasure in an easy and irrational kind of writing. Catherine, not keeping a journal, even doubts whether women are good at writing letters or keeping journals. She is, also, made to consider that the superiority in writing is not on the female sex, but in the male, because women are born into a language that is governed by the systematic rules, and hence, by the symbolic rather than the instinctual drives and the semiotic. As the language shows itself in speech and writing, then, women speak and write in the language of the symbolic, so they are made to regard speaking and writing the symbolic language as a male attribute, which is same for Catherine because she assumes that the superiority in writing is on the male sex rather than on the female. Not writing a letter or a journal, she accepts the symbolic understanding that women do not write better letters and journals, thus she does not do what the other women do. Instead, she identifies with the understanding that is supported by the male sex, so she identifies with the male sex and she does not write journal that reflects sense and feelings. However, her dilemma lies in the fact that although she does not keep a journal like the men of the age, she takes pleasure in reading gothic novels that appeal to the senses of women. She takes pleasure in reading Ann Radcliffe's *The Mysteries of Udolpho*, which is a gothic novel talking about the mysteries of Emily in the castle, Udolpho. Catherine, while reading the novel, wants to be in a castle, like the character in the novel, and when she is in Northanger Abbey, she undergoes some imaginary adventures like Emily.

Her pleasure in gothic novels appealing to the senses is seen in her dialogues with her friend Isabella:

> ‘[...] Have you gone on with Udolpho?’
> ‘Yes, I have been reading it ever since I woke; and I am got to the black veil.’
> ‘Are you, indeed? How delightful! Oh! I would not tell you what is behind the black veil for the world! Are not you wild to know?’
> ‘Oh! yes, quite; what can it be? – But do not tell me – I would not be told upon any account. I know it must be a skeleton, I am sure it is Laurentina’s skeleton. Oh! I am delighted with the book! I should like to spend my whole life in reading it. I assure you, if it had not been to meet you, I would not have come away from it for all the world.’
> ‘Dear creature! how much I am obliged to you; and when you have finished Udolpho, we will read the Italian together; and I have made out a list of ten or twelve more of the same kind for you.’
> ‘Have you, indeed! How glad I am! – What are they all?’
> ‘I will read you their names directly; here they are, in my pocket-book. Castle of Wolfenbach, Clermont, Mysterious Warnings, Necromancer of the Black Forest, Midnight Bell, Orphan of the Rhine, and Horrid Mysteries. Those will last us some time.’
> ‘Yes, pretty well; but are they all horrid, are you sure they are all horrid?’ (21)

This quotation is about Catherine’s taking pleasure in reading gothic novels. She not only takes pleasure from the gothic novels but also is wild to know what under the black veil is, and she also wants to read other horrid and gothic novels. The expressions like “Oh! I am delighted with the book!” or “How glad I am!” show her enthusiasm in reading such novels that horrify, that is, that appeal to her senses. Hence, it is concluded that Catherine both does what male sex does although the symbolic does not want so much identification with the male sex; that is, she both rejects to keep a journal, a feminine style of writing, and she takes pleasure in reading novels that appeal to her senses and that amuses her. In other words, she is in-between the feminine and the masculine writing, which signifies that she is uncertain about accepting or rejecting the masculine discourse, and this uncertainty in accepting or rejecting the masculine discourse, thus, in accepting or rejecting the symbolic, and in silencing or trying to find a way to reveal the semiotic, makes her be uncertain about her identity and the self as a result.

Besides the dilemma of gender and self in her writing and reading manners, Catherine reveals the dilemma of gender in her lack of interest in dressing manners. Dresses are the medium for women to reveal their social status and their beauty, and the women in the Victorian Age gave so much importance to dressing up so that they could reveal the class they belonged to. Even if they were the members of the lower-class, they wore their best dresses in the special ceremonies and the meetings, just like Mrs. Gargery in *Great Expectations*. However, for Catherine in *Northanger Abbey*, dresses and dressing up does not mean so much either in her childhood or in her early adulthood. She does not concern how to dress up unlike the women of the age and unlike Mrs. Allen. As dress is the reflection of fashion besides its being passion for Mrs. Allen, for about three or four days before going to the balls taking place in Bath, she teaches Catherine how to wear as she does not have much knowledge and interest in dresses. Also, the cloth of one of her dresses bought by Catherine reveals that she is not talented in choosing a better one. When Mrs. Allen asks Henry Tilney about Catherine's dress, his answer becomes "'It is very pretty, [...] but I do not think it will wash well; I am afraid it will fray.'" (13) That is, he thinks that although the dress is a nice one, the cloth of the dress which Catherine has chosen for herself will fray quickly, and it will not last long. Thus, her lack of knowledge and interest is revealed in the novel, in her not knowing how to dress herself up, but in learning it from Mrs. Allen. The lack of knowledge and interest is also revealed in her choice of dresses and the cloth of the dresses. Although Catherine's interest in what to wear is revealed later in the novel, this interest does not reflect that it stems from the wish or the knowledge of Catherine. Instead, the interest shown later is the result of the repressions towards the character. That's why; the interest existing later does not sign that she has found her identity. It does not also sign that her dilemma in the gender is resolved because of the fact that the interest occurs as a result of the social pressure towards the character. Thus, her confusion in her gender is still unresolved, and this confusion still causes her to identify herself with the male sex.

The identification with the male sex reflects that the character is confused about her gender and the self as a result. Although Catherine thinks different in most cases from the male characters in the novel, she, then, identifies with them and accepts what she has thought before is not rational and it does not reflect the general understanding of the society that is governed by the masculine discourse. Her confusion in which idea, hers or the idea of the male sex, to follow reflects the dilemma in the self as she is not able to grasp her identity due to the confusion in gender. Thus, she is divided between the thoughts of the male discourse and her own thoughts which are reflected before her being repressed to accept the idea and the thoughts of the male discourse. Then, she "is always a divided subject and always a subject of language" (Kristeva 2000: 7). As she begins to identify with the masculine language, she becomes a subject of language who is divided between her own thoughts and the thoughts of the male sex. Hence, she is always unsure about the gender, or which roles of a gender to follow, and she is confused mostly in the cases when she talks with the man she is in love. Though it is the female sex that mostly reflects feelings and drives, the declaration of love is expected firstly from the man in the Victorian society. Thus, in terms of the conventions, it should be Henry who should reflect his love to Catherine. However, in the novel, the roles of the gender are changed, and it is Catherine, a female character, who is the first to reveal the affection to the other sex. Trying to explain the event of the journey to the Blaize Castle, Catherine says:

> '[...] I begged Mr Thorpe so earnestly to stop; I called out to him as soon as ever I saw you; [...] and, if Mr Thorpe would only have stopped, I would have jumped out and run after you.' (Austen 2000: 59)

The explanation by Catherine is interpreted as the declaration of affection to Henry, so the narrator feels the need to ask if "there [is] a Henry in the world who could be insensible to such a declaration" (59). Although the declaration of affection is firstly expected by the male sex in the Victorian society, the quotation reveals that it is Catherine in the novel to disclose her love and affection to Henry. In consequence, the extract echoes that she is confused in

which role to accept, and she has adopted the role of the male sex. That is, she has behaved like a man, and she has adopted and submitted to the discourse of the male sex, so she has reflected that she is a divided subject who is in-between either to behave like a woman or a man. However, much identification with the male discourse, because the role of a woman is already given by a male-dominated society, signifies her confusions in her identity. Before talking to Henry, she has some fears about the relationship between her brother's fiancée and Henry's brother. Yet, Henry, by speaking to her with a masculine discourse, makes Catherine feel that "Henry Tilney must know best." (97) Then, she finds herself guilty of her fears, so guilty of revealing the semiotic in the symbolic discourse. Her blaming herself shows that she is divided and confused because of much identification with Henry and his discourse. Then, she is confused about reflecting her own thoughts and fears or repressing them as the symbolic wants. Thus, she is uncertain about which domain to obey to, which makes her uncertain about her identity and who she is. Yet, at the end, she is always left to obey to the symbolic and hide the semiotic so as to end the confusions in her mind. However, this is a problem for her again, as the repression of the semiotic does not end her confusions about her identity because of the fact that it is already the wish of the symbolic, the wish of the society, rather than the wish of Catherine herself.

3. Social Pressure towards the Character

The repression of the feelings to end the confusions in the mind of Catherine is a social one done by the masculine force and the discourse. It is a social pressure towards the character's uncertainty in her identity. Her dilemma about her gender, which role she will follow and she should follow, is tried to be determined by the society, either by the mother figures as representatives of the masculine discourse or by a male character, Henry, in the novel.

The mother-figures, Catherine's own mother and Mrs. Allen, are the two female figures that try to end the gender confusion in Catherine by making her behave like how a woman should act in the Victorian society, which has a close sympathy for the understanding of the Law of the Father. As the Victorian society is the strict follower of the understanding that argues that men are the ruling power over the women, the mother figures of Catherine speak mostly with the discourse of masculinity, and they lead Catherine to stop her confusions in gender and identity. For instance, it is Catherine's own mother that leads her to play an instrument, which Catherine has no interest. As, for the Victorians, playing an instrument is a task of the female sex to amuse her husband of the future, Catherine's mother leads her to pianoforte. Although there is

> no chance of her throwing a whole party into raptures by a prelude on the pianoforte, of her own composition, she [listens] to other people's performance with very little fatigue (5),

thanks to the pressure of the mother on her daughter's learning a female attribute. Another pressure towards the character in her choice of the role of a male sex is by the mother's courses on drawing. As drawing is also a female attribute and as Catherine has no interest in drawing, too, her mother gives her courses on drawing by giving her a paper to make her draw some animals or houses or trees. However, also in drawing, the mother's efforts end in failure because what she has drawn resembles to one another, so she has no talent in drawing despite her mother's efforts. Besides her own mother, Mrs. Allen also leads her to a feminine attribute that is dressing up properly. Thus, the courses given by Mrs. Allen on how to dress up, what to wear, and what to choose as a cloth for a gown or a dress are the pressures towards the character to make her behave like a woman rather than a man. That is, the mother figures of Catherine guide her to the female attributes to stop her confusions about her gender, and they, as representatives of the society, do it by repressing the character to submit to the masculine understanding that women should behave like a woman without so much identifying with the male sex.

Though, for the symbolic, women are expected to accept the Law of the Father as a leading and governing force, the symbolic also wants the female sex that she should not so much identify with the male sex and be like a man as a result, also wanting that she should have her own tasks that are related to the private sphere. If she is not so much interested in the tasks of the private sphere, she is made to be interested in them; therefore, she is approved then, as Henry does in the novel. When Catherine learns to love a flower, a hyacinth, from Henry's sister, Henry talks to Catherine:

> '[...] a taste for flowers is always desirable in your sex, as a means of getting you out of doors, and tempting you to more frequent exercise than you would otherwise take. And though the love of a hyacinth may be rather domestic, who can tell, the sentiment once raised, but you may in time come to love a rose?'
> 'But I do not want any such pursuit to get me out of doors. The pleasure of walking and breathing fresh air is enough for me, and in fine weather I am out more than half my time. – Mamma says, I am never within.'
> 'At any rate, however, I am pleased that you have learnt to love a hyacinth. The mere habit of learning to love is the thing; and a teachableness of disposition in a young lady is a great blessing.[...]' (112)

Henry's approach to loving a flower is that he thinks it is desirable in the female sex; thus, it is the one that is generally loved by the female sex. Although it is a female taste to love flowers, Catherine has not had any interest in flowers before. Yet, she has become to love a flower, a hyacinth, then, which is approved by Henry Tilney. Henry also believes that the disposition of teachableness is a blessing for a young lady. That is to say that, he means that a woman should be willing to be taught. She should be pleased to be taught by the masculine discourse and the symbolic. As the sister of Henry does what her father wants, and as she speaks the language of her father, she is another representative of a masculine discourse in the novel. Catherine's learning to love a hyacinth happens through the same representative of the symbolic system, through the sister of Henry. Thus, Catherine's confusion about which role to follow is mostly hindered by a masculine discourse, by the sister of Henry. After Catherine tells Henry the situation, she is made to believe that loving a flower is a female attitude, so it is desirable for the females, which means that she is repressed in her thoughts

on flowers, and made that she should behave and think like a woman rather than a man and the excessive identification with the male sex.

All the repressions to the character, either by the mother figures or by Henry, are the social ones that are to end the confusions in her mind. The social pressure towards Catherine to make her stop the confusion of which role to adopt is, in fact, the pressure to end her confusions about her gender. Being confused about her gender, she is also confused about her identity, so she cannot grasp her self, as a result. She is always divided between two selves, the female and the male. Thus, she has not a fixed identity despite the repressions of the society and of the symbolic. Instead, due to the repressions of the symbolic, she is left to more confusion because she is made to hide her semiotic, maternal feelings and instincts.

4. Interpretation of the Character in view of Kristeva

Despite the fact that s/he has a sex when s/he is born, a person begins to have a gender in time when s/he is on the way to enter into the symbolic, and also in the symbolic with the "external pressures and demands" towards her/him (Cavallaro 2003: 35). Thus, s/he feels the social pressure and the pressure of the symbolic upon herself/himself, which makes her/him hide and censor the semiotic, submit to the symbolic, and speak its language and its discourse. However, the semiotic, which is a limitless domain related with the drives and the feelings of a person, cannot be hidden or censored all the time, as it feels the need to reveal itself in some cases in a person's life. Thus, the person is always divided between these two domains, the semiotic and the symbolic, as a result of which s/he does not have a fixed identity and self, so s/he is always in search of the self without the slightest hope of finding it no matter how s/he tries, which is the case of Catherine in *Northanger Abbey*.

Catherine, who is in-between her gender and which gender role to follow, is also split in her identity. She does not have a fixed identity which is all the time semiotic or all the time symbolic. Instead, she is coming and

going between these two domains. As Kristeva mentions body as a representation of the semiotic and the language as a representation of the symbolic, Catherine is already divided between these two representations. She is "the speaking being [...] where inner drives are discharged into language, where language interplays with thought, where the body and culture meet." (McAfee 2004: 1) Thus, she is the speaking being that has both the semiotic and the symbolic, and the speaking being where the body, the inner drives and the feelings of the semiotic meet with the culture and the language and the discourse of the symbolic. It is because of this reason that the language she speaks is also divided, and it is "a dynamic *signifying process*" (14). It is in the process of comings and goings between the semiotic and the symbolic. Hence, it carries both the semiotic and the symbolic characteristics. As Kristeva says, in *Revolution in Poetic Language*, ""linguistic changes constitute changes in the *status of the subject* – his [or her] relation to the body, to others, and to objects"", the changes in the language Catherine uses reflect her status as a subject (14-15). She is also divided and confused about her gender, and in her relations to others and the objects to play and love. Upon running to the Tilneys to apologise for the unreal message told by Mr. Thorpe, Catherine speaks to the Tilney family:

> 'I am come in a great hurry – It was all a mistake – I never promised to go – I told them for the first I could not go. – I ran away in a great hurry to explain it. – I did not care what you thought of me. – I would not stay for the servant.' (Austen 2000: 65)

The quotation reflects her way of using language when she is divided between the semiotic and the symbolic. She is in hurry to explain her feelings. Thus, while speaking, she reflects the semiotic through the use of an intermittent language. The em dashes reflect the breaks of thought rather than a continuation in the thought. They show that the language is interrupted by the long breaks signifying the expressions of the feelings. Besides the long breaks in the representation of the symbolic, in the language, another representation of the symbolic, the correct use of grammar, is also ignored. Instead of saying "I have come in a great hurry", she says "I am come", which means that she has not used the language appropriately as symbolic

wants. That is, in expressing the feelings, she does not use the language correctly in terms of grammar, which is the symbolization of the symbolic, so her language is divided between the semiotic and the symbolic. The use of a divided language is also seen in her explaining her feeling about Isabella's standing up to dance with the elder brother of Henry. She speaks to Henry and says "'Oh! but, because – and your brother! – After what you told him from me, how could he think of going to ask her?'" (85) The extract reveals the semiotic breaks of thought in the language. It includes the em dashes and the intrusions of feelings in a language that is a representation of the symbolic. Thus, her being a divided subject is revealed in her utterances. Being a divided subject, she is still in search of her identity and self.

Catherine's not having a fixed identity is also revealed in her wish to see the Northanger Abbey. For her, it is an old and a historical place decorated with furniture reflecting the ancient time of the Reformation, and her enthusiasm to see the abbey is expressed by the narrator who has identified herself with Catherine while talking about this enthusiasm:

> Northanger Abbey! – These were thrilling words, and wound up Catherine's feelings to the highest point of ecstasy. Her grateful and gratified heart could hardly restrain its expressions within the language of tolerable calmness. (88-89)

The thrilling words of "Northanger" and "abbey" make Catherine feel the highest point of ecstasy, and her great enthusiasm cannot be restrained within the limits of a language. That is, her feelings reveal themselves when she hears the invitation to the abbey. She cannot hide the semiotic desire to see an old place as an abbey, and she cannot limit the desire and the enthusiasm in the representation of the symbolic domain. Therefore, she is divided again reflecting in the symbolic the suppressed desires of the semiotic.

The dialogue between Catherine and Tilney about the abbey is the other signification of the divided self. Her wish to see such an old place discloses her wish to reveal the semiotic feelings that are suppressed in her. Catherine tells Henry that:

> '[...] you must be so fond of the abbey! – After being used to such a home as the abbey, an ordinary parsonage-house must be very disagreeable.'
> He smiled, and said, 'You have formed a very favourable idea of the abbey.'
> 'To be sure I have. Is not it a fine old place, just like what one reads about?'
> 'And are you prepared to encounter all the horrors that a building such as "what one reads about" may produce? – Have you a stout heart? – Nerves fit for sliding panels and tapestry?'
> 'Oh! yes – I do not think I should be easily frightened, because there would be so many people in the house [...]' (100-101).

The quotation signifies her wish to disclose her semiotic drives and feelings in the symbolic domain. Her regarding the abbey as a fine old one unfolds that she wishes to see this old place decorated with not modern but with old furniture. Thus, she wishes to see the ancient abbey that has not been demolished yet, which becomes impossible by the suppressions of the symbolic. Her wish to see the old and the ancient place is related with her wish to unfold the semiotic feelings which are also left behind just like the ancient buildings. Like the abbeys that are related with the past, the semiotic is also related with the early feelings that are mostly revealed before the entry into the symbolic. Therefore, they both have a relation with the past. Besides the relation with the past, they are already related with the present, because they still survive although they are hidden, repressed, and replaced either by the modern buildings or the symbolic. Thus, it is concluded that her wish to see such an old place stems from her wish to reach to the repressed feelings pertaining to the semiotic. Upon the wish to reach to the repressed feelings, Freud's interpretation of Wilhelm Jensen's *Gradiva* is one of the most prominent works in the psychoanalytic theory. As feminist approach is based on Freud and his works, the interpretation of *Gradiva* is essential to mention to reveal the cause of the love and of the wish to see an ancient and an old place as Pompeii in *Gradiva*, and the abbey in *Northanger Abbey*. Freud, in his work called *Delusions and Dreams in Jensen's Gradiva*, discloses the protagonist's wish to go to an ancient place for his archaeological searches to find the traces of Gradiva, and he relates the man's wish to go to and see the ancient place to the repressed feelings and the repressed wish to see the lady he has been fond of when they are children. That is, for Freud, the reason of

the wish to see the ancient place is related with the man's repressed wish to see his childhood friend that is also repressed by the man (Freud 2010). Hence, one can relate what Freud mentions to Kristeva, and so s/he can conclude that Catherine's wish to see such an old and an ancient place is relevant to her wish to find the repressed semiotic side and the repressed maternal feelings in her. Thus, her desire to see such an old place is pertinent to the wish to reach to the repressed care and love of the mother as well as the feelings and drives pertaining to the semiotic. Yet, it should be noted that what Freud mentions as repressed is not a thing that will come to the conscious and that will survive again. On the contrary, Kristeva's repressed is the one that always already lies in somewhere, and thus, waits for a chance to reveal itself. Therefore, in the novel one can see that Northanger Abbey is the place of the oppositions because of the fact that it survives as an ancient building in spite of its modern furniture. Thus, it consists of both the ancient and the modern together. However, as it consists of modern furniture, it tries to suppress the semiotic at the same time with the present-day furniture, present-day conventions, and the present-day understanding of the social expectations, that is, with the symbolic. Thus, the place is also the symbol of the oppositions as Catherine, herself, sometimes represses the semiotic with the symbolic. For instance, what Henry means horror is related with the feelings that are suppressed by the symbolic when Catherine tells that she will not be frightened as there will be so many people in the house. That is, it is Catherine, this time, that submits to the rationality of the symbolic saying that there will be many people in the house, so it is Catherine who suppresses the semiotic here although her wish to see the place, to reveal the semiotic, still goes on. Then, it is concluded that like the semiotic surviving despite the suppressions of the symbolic, Catherine reveals the semiotic, which survives and lies to awaken, while submitting to the symbolic, so she is divided between the semiotic and the symbolic as she reflects the features of the two sides. Thus, she is divided in her identity, as a result of which she cannot grasp the self.

Her confusions in her understanding and grasping the identity and the self is reflected when she wants to see the portrait of Henry's mother. Although she is repressed by Henry's father, by the representative of the symbolic, and told that there is no need for her to see Henry's mother's portrait, she cannot submit to what symbolic says, and she tries the ways to see the portrait. While strolling around the abbey and the rooms, Catherine has been hindered by Henry's father when Henry's sister, Eleanor, wants her to see her mother's room. However, Catherine has not given up the idea to reach to the room where Henry's mother has lost her life. Therefore, she has not given up the idea to reach to the mother. As she is repressed by the symbolic, reaching to the mother is important for her, because she will not only reach to the mother of Henry, but she will also reach to a maternal domain consisting of the semiotic desires and feelings. The wish to reach to the maternal domain by reaching to the mother she is longing for because she is away from her own mother never leaves her. Thus, even after the first pressure of the father, of the symbolic, towards her to hinder her to reach to the mother and the semiotic, she has not given up imagining that Henry's father has killed or kept the mother in that room, so she has gone on reflecting the semiotic under the pressure of the symbolic. That's why; she is divided between her feelings and the repressions of the symbolic, as a result of which she cannot manage to achieve a fixed identity.

Not having a fixed identity, Catherine is divided in her grasping the self. She is divided between the semiotic and the symbolic, which is seen after her being humiliated by Henry Tilney because of the revelation of the excessive semiotic imagination. Her imagination of her regarding Henry's father as the murderer of his mother reveals how semiotic discloses itself in the symbolic. However, as it is the symbolic that forces the character to hide and not to reveal the semiotic, Henry rebukes Catherine. Then, the narrator describes how she feels, and s/he says:

> THE VISIONS OF ROMANCE were over. Catherine was completely awakened. Henry's address, short as it had been, had more thoroughly opened her eyes to the extravagance of her late fancies than all their several disappointments had done. Most

> grievously was she humbled. Most bitterly did she cry. It was not only with herself that she was sunk – but with Henry. Her folly, which now seemed even criminal, was all exposed to him, and he must despise her for ever. The liberty which her imagination had dared to take with the character of his father, could he ever forgive it? The absurdity of her curiosity and her fears, could they ever be forgotten? She hated herself more than she could express. (129)

For Catherine, what she has dreamt about the death of Henry's mother is a kind of romance that has no chance to happen in an England of the time, which is already protected by laws and which has "a neighbourhood of voluntary spies" (128). After the rebuke of Henry, a representative of the symbolic, that is, after the rebuke of a male sex, she has been awakened, thus she has left the semiotic temporarily. Then, with the pressure of the symbolic, she has begun to regard her imagination as a fancy. However, she has not thoroughly left the semiotic behind. Although how she begins to feel, with the pressures of a male sex, reflects her submitting to the symbolic, she has also revealed the semiotic feelings in her cries. Regarding her imagination as folly and absurdity as the discourse of the symbolic says, she hated herself more than she could express. That is, although she thinks that her imagination is foolish and absurd, how she reacts to the case is through cries and through a feeling that is hard to be expressed with and within a language. Namely, she begins to regard her imagination and fear as folly and absurdity as symbolic names, and she reacts to that case through the semiotic, through her cries and a feeling, hate. Thus, she is divided between the semiotic and the symbolic, revealing the semiotic while regarding the case as folly or absurd. Therefore, she is confused about her identity, and who she is. She is confused if she is the one that behaves with her feelings and imagination, or she is the one that is repressed to behave and think as symbolic wants, so she is always in-between, and she is always split.

Finally, the place, Northanger Abbey, is the representation of Catherine's divided identity. It is the place where she feels both the semiotic and the symbolic. It is an abbey, an old house, which is related with Henry Tilney, the man she loves. Thus, it is the place where she desires to be with the man she wants to marry, so it is the place that is related with the semiotic.

The abbey is also the place where she is afraid to be because of her imaginations on Henry's father's being a murderer of his wife or on her regarding the washing bills as mysterious papers which are there for her to be found. On the other hand, it is the place where she is repressed by Henry's father and Henry himself who are the representatives of the symbolic domain. Thus, it is the place which reflects her divided self.

As a result, Kristeva talks about a subject that is split between the semiotic, a maternal domain of feelings and desires, and the symbolic, the rules and the norms of the society. Thus, the subject, being divided, is always in the process of comings and goings from the semiotic to the symbolic. Therefore, she has not a fixed identity, which is also seen in Catherine in *Northanger Abbey* by Jane Austen. Catherine is also divided, so she is also confused in her identity and gender as a result, which echoes that there will not be a fixed identity for her since she is already split by the semiotic and the symbolic.

B. THE SECOND NOVEL: *SHIRLEY* BY CHARLOTTE BRONTË

The second novel reflecting the split character between the semiotic and the symbolic is *Shirley*, by Charlotte Brontë. It is a mid-Victorian novel published in 1847. Despite the fact that it describes the political and the social effects of the Napoleonic Wars in the years 1811 and 1812, it also reflects the industrialization and the place of women in the public sphere, which are the features of the mid-Victorian period. Therefore, the industrialization and the use of machinery shown in the novel, and a woman, Shirley Keeldar, working in the public sphere make the readers regard it as a mid-Victorian piece of literature.

One of the themes of the Victorian novels, "disguise" is seen as a "concealed identity" in *Shirley* (Reed 1975: 314). In the novel, Shirley is, like Catherine in the first novel, a split character who is in the search of her identity. Thus, she has a concealed identity besides the feminine Shirley, or

she has a concealed identity besides the masculine Shirley. As a split character in view of her confusion in which gender role to accept, she has two selves as masculine and feminine pertaining to the public and private life, which is mostly criticized by her governess as one of the representatives of the social masculine discourse at home. Hence, her relationship with her governess should be taken into consideration both in that she substitutes for one of the members of the Keeldar family, and in that, as a representative of the masculine discourse, she shows social pressure towards the character. Besides the governess, some characters in the novel represent for the masculine discourse and try to lead her like one of the members of her family.

1. Familial Relations of Shirley

As the familial relations and the familial understandings of the character is influential on her search for the identity, her governess, a clergyman who is called Mr. Helstone, and her own uncle will try to lead and guide her as if they were her real parents. Although Shirley's understanding of how a mother should be will be discussed later in the "Interpretation of the Character in view of Kristeva" part, her familial relations and how she sees the people as an influential member of the family will be discussed first.

Mrs. Pryor, Shirley's governess, is one of the characters in the novel who substitutes for a mother for Shirley. As Shirley's own parents are not described in the novel, Mrs. Pryor becomes a mother figure for Shirley. She is the one who, as a representative of a mother figure, takes care of Shirley, and also the one who becomes a friend to Shirley. As she substitutes for a mother figure in the Victorian society, she obeys to the Victorian conventions such as submitting to the "order and loyalty" (Brontë 1994:203), and to the "authorities" (387). Thus, she submits to the feminine roles given by the masculine domain. She is, therefore, one of the proper mother figures in view of the males of the age. As a proper mother figure, she chooses to be silent in public matters such as a charity organization to be held. Namely, the

relationship between Shirley and her governess is on the private sphere and the private matters, so in the matters related with home. She is not only Shirley's helper on the household issues, but also her friend whose ideas are influential on Shirley to decide and choose a friend. Therefore, the governess becomes a mother figure for Shirley who leads her in her friendship and in the household matters just like a mother.

Besides Mrs. Pryor, Mr. Helstone is another character that substitutes for a parent for Shirley in the novel. Mr. Helstone, the clergyman, represents for one of the father figures on religious matters for Shirley. As a clergyman and a father figure, he checks how Shirley is adhered to religion and her religious beliefs. On the day to introduce Catherine, his niece, to Shirley, the man talks as a father figure and as a representative of the symbolic domain to Shirley:

> 'Say your creed,' he ordered.
> 'The Apostles' Creed?'
> 'Yes.'
> She said it like a child.
> 'Now for St. Athanasius's: that is the test!' (204)

He wants Shirley, as it is seen in the quotation above, to say the Apostles' and the Athanasius's Creed. Thus, he leads Shirley on the religious matters as do the parents of the age. That's why, for Shirley, he substitutes for a father figure who leads and guides her on religious issues. However, his style of leading the woman to religion is in a way that he wants to be the controlling power over her, which is understood in his order and the use of the imperative sentence structure. Therefore, his approach to Shirley is a father-like one that corresponds to the symbolic masculine discourse that wants to be in charge of the females and the feminine expressions of the self.

Finally, Shirley's own uncle is the other father figure that represents for the masculine domain and the masculine discourse for Shirley. As a father figure, he wants his niece to have a socially proper marriage. As Shirley is a middle-class landowner, her uncle wishes that she should marry a man that is a member of the middle-class with much income. Therefore, he urges Shirley

to marry the men he finds proper for her. That's why; he questions Shirley about Sir Philip, one of the men he finds socially proper for his niece, and about the letter given to Shirley by Sir Philip. The man tells Shirley:

> 'I should like to see that letter.'
> 'You cannot see it.'
> 'I must and shall ma'am. I am your guardian.'
> 'Having ceased to be a ward, I have no guardian.' (562)

The conversation between Shirley and his uncle reveals the fact that the uncle is in the role of a father figure for Shirley since he assumes that, for her, he is a guardian and a protector, which are the characteristic features of the fathers, and of the males and the masculinity. Yet, Shirley, not regarding him as the guardian for her, rejects the idea to be protected by the uncle as she thinks that she does not need to be protected, and thus, to be ruled and controlled by a father or an uncle. That is, she rejects her uncle's dominance over her as a father figure.

To conclude, the three people, who act as if they were the real parents of Shirley, are the representatives of the symbolic domain that wants the woman to be protected and guided under the masculine discourse. Although the governess is a female character, she echoes, like the others, the dominance of the symbolic domain and the masculinity over the females and the femininity since her job requires to teach and to lead the girls in view of the social and moral conventions of the age. That's why; she does the same to Shirley as a representative of the masculine discourse at home. Just like the governess, the clergyman and her uncle want to lead and control the woman as they regard themselves as a father figure for her. As a result, the influence of these people is not much on Shirley, as they are just the signifiers of the symbolic domain. Yet, she has also the semiotic side, as Kristeva mentions, which causes her to have confusions about her identity, and to be in a dilemma about her gender, as a result.

2. Gender Dilemma and the Uncertainty of Identity

Considered to be a mid-Victorian novel in terms of reflecting the effects of machinery that were mostly felt in the mid-eighties, and a woman working at a public sphere with the rise of the middle-class, *Shirley* discloses the dilemma of gender in Caroline and Shirley, two female characters in the novel. However, as Shirley usually considers herself as a male character besides vocalizing her masculine identity, she is the one that is to be analyzed as she highly reflects the dilemma of gender, that is, the confusions about her gender.

The first confusion about the gender is seen in the name of the character. Although Shirley is a male name, she is named Shirley by the family that wants a son. That is the reason she is called Shirley, a "masculine family cognomen" (205). Though it is a masculine name, it means shining and bright meadow and a field with lots of flowers in it. That is, the name, being a masculine one, has the meaning that is related with nature. That's why; it is on the same page that her love of flowers is also stated as the flowers are the parts of the nature. Loving the flowers that are the parts of the nature, she loves also the nature. Namely, having a masculine name, therefore, having masculine attributes sometimes, she is also related with the nature, and has the feminine attributes, as well. Since nature is linked to femininity, and culture and its signifiers like the name of a person, on the other hand, are linked to masculinity, she has both of these features as femininity and masculinity. That's why; she feels herself sometimes a woman, and sometimes a man, and she names herself a woman, and a man, as a result.

Regarding herself as a man, Shirley names herself a man on the matters of business, which reflects that she is confused about her identity and who she is. In contrast to the women of the age, she works at the public sphere as a mill-owner. While talking with Mr. Helstone, she answers him:

> 'Captain Keeldar, you have no mercantile blood in your veins: why are you so fond of trade?'

> ‘Because I am a mill-owner, of course. Half my income comes from the works in that Hollow.’ (209)

As a mill-owner, she differs from the women of the age as they mostly worked at the private sphere. Yet, it was the male sex working at the public sphere at that time, and Shirley is one of the women who are few in number working at the public sphere. Being interested in the works and the jobs of the male sex, such as in business outside the home and also in the trade, Shirley is the only woman with whom Gerard Moore and some other gentlemen talk about business, for instance, “unimportuned by the curiosity of” neither Caroline nor Mrs. Pryor (255). Thus, she is the one that is considered to be like a man on the business matters. Besides the men considering her like a man on the business matters, Shirley, also, regards herself as a man. What she names herself are the titles that are used by men, or the pronouns substituting for the male sex:

> ‘[...] Business! Really the word makes me conscious I am indeed no longer a girl, but quite a woman and something more. I am an esquire; Shirley Keeldar, Esquire, ought to be my style and title. They gave me a man’s name; I hold a man’s position: it is enough to inspire me with a touch of manhood; and when I see such people as that stately Anglo-Belgian – that Gerard Moore before me, gravely talking to me of business, really I feel quite gentlemanlike. You must choose me for your churchwarden, Mr. Helstone, the next time you elect new ones: they ought to make me a magistrate and a captain of yeomanry: Tony Lumpkin’s mother was a colonel, and his aunt a justice of peace – why shouldn’t I be?’ (207)

Since she works at a public sphere as a mill-owner, the word “business” makes her regard herself as a man. She is no longer a girl or only a woman, but something more of that. She feels herself an esquire and a gentleman as she holds a man’s position, that is, as she is the owner of the mill. That’s why; she can be the next churchwarden, magistrate or a captain, so she can work at the jobs that are occupied chiefly by men. Thus, she is confused about who she is. She is more like a man on the matters of business, so she names herself a man on such matters.

Shirley's confusion about her identity, about who she is, a man or a woman, is also reflected in the pronouns she chooses for herself. Talking with Caroline, she tells her her happiness when she makes others happy:

> '[...] when Captain Keeldar is made comfortable, accommodated with all he wants, including a sensible genial comrade, it gives him a thorough pleasure to devote his spare efforts to making that company happy.' (247)

The speech, uttered by Shirley herself, reflects the fact that, besides other people calling her captain, she also uses the title as well as the pronouns substituting for the male sex for herself.[2] That is, in regard to the business matters she regards herself like a man rather than a woman who are not fond of the business matters of men.

Shirley, who is also interested in history, politics, and the religious matters like the male sex and unlike the female sex, has also confusions about her identity on her views on marriage. She considers marriage both as a hindrance to her freedom, and as obedience to the master of the house, that is, the husband. Therefore, she is confused about her own identity since she both wants not to obey to the domestic duties that women are made to and she also wishes to obey to her husband who will be her superior and her master. That's why; she is in the dilemma of the duties of which sex to adopt, and in the dilemma of her gender, as a result. She says "I [have] never liked to be the centre of a small domestic whirlpool" (518). Yet, she also states:

> '"Leading and improving! teaching and tutoring! bearing and forbearing! Pah! My husband is not to be my baby. I am not to set him his daily lesson and see that he learns it, and give him a sugar-plum if he is good, and a patient, pensive, pathetic lecture if he is bad. But it is like a tutor to talk of the 'satisfaction of teaching' – I suppose *you* think it the finest employment in the world. I don't – I reject it. Improving a husband! No. I shall insist upon my husband improving me, or else we part." (636-637)

[2]One of the people who call her a "Captain", or who use the pronouns like "he", "him", and so on is Mr. Helstone. His approach to Shirley, on page 209, reveals that, besides Shirley herself, he regards her as a man as he uses the pronouns substituting for the male sex. Also on page 341, Mr. Helstone's considering Shirley a man is reflected in his seeing her a guardian to protect his household and Caroline when he is away. Besides Mr. Helstone, the narrator, also, on page 279, sympathies with Mr. Helstone and Mr. Hall, and s/he utters "Captain", or "his", and "him" while describing Shirley.

The quotation above reflects the fact that Shirley, in her marriage, does not want to lead and improve, or teach and educate the husband. Instead, she wants to be taught, tutored and improved at home in her domestic and familial relation with her husband. That's why; one can conclude that she wants neither to be the submitting wife of the Victorian age nor to be the leader and the tutor of the husband, so she is confused about which role to choose, either the role of the man freeing himself from the domestic duties of the home or the role of the woman who is at home to be taught, educated and governed like the Victorian age stereotypical woman who is ready to be guided by the man.

Shirley's being in the dilemma of gender, that is, in the dilemma of the understanding and the idea of which sex to adopt, is revealed in her speech also with her uncle. Not wanting to be the centre of the domestic house, that is, not wanting to be the stereotypical housewife, Shirley wants, also, a superior man who is better than herself. Yet, she is indecisive again during the speech with the uncle:

> '[...] What are your intentions, Miss Keeldar?'
> 'In what respect?'
> 'In respect of matrimony.'
> 'To be quiet – and to do just as I please.'
> [...]
> '[...]You said just now you would act as you please. You acknowledge no rules – no limitations.'
> [...]
> 'What, madam – what could be your reasons for refusing Sir Philip?'
> [...]
> 'He is very amiable – very excellent – truly estimable, but not my master; not in one point. I could not trust myself with his happiness: I would not undertake the keeping of it for thousands: I will accept no hand which cannot hold me in check.'
> 'I thought you liked to do as you please: you are vastly inconsistent.'
> [...]
> '[...] Did I not say I prefer a master? One in whose presence I shall feel obliged and disposed to be good. One whose control my impatient temper must acknowledge. A man whose approbation can reward – whose displeasure punish me. A man I shall feel it impossible not to love, and very possible to fear.' (563-565)

The extract reflects that Shirley is inconsistent in her ideas of how a woman she will be in the marriage. She both wants to be far from the understanding of an ordinary wife working at home, and she wants to be ruled and controlled by the husband who will be her master in the marriage. Her rejection to speak with the uncle, her wish to be quiet, reflects that the word "quiet" is also the signification of her wish to be governed and controlled by the husband. That is, she will be quiet and will "[submit] passively" to the man she will marry, which is seen in her relation with Louis Moore, the man of whose wife she will be (475). Thus, it is concluded that she is uncertain about how a woman she will be in her marriage, and hence uncertain about the role of which sex to adopt, so she has some confusions about her gender, as a result.

3. Social Pressure towards the Character

Being uncertain about the role of which sex to adopt either in her marriage or in the business matters, Shirley, like Catherine in the first novel, is suppressed by the symbolic order and the masculine discourse to make her be far from the masculine side in her identity. Yet, it is confusing that, unlike in *Northanger Abbey*, many male and female characters in the novel approves her calling herself a man, a captain, or an esquire, which are the titles used for men, and that they also call her a man with the same titles whereas the governess and her own uncle are the only characters that suppress her. The reason for such a change can also be the result of the change in the age, which became more industrialized, and which witnessed more women working in the public sphere than the women in the early period of the age. Therefore, only the governess will be analyzed in this part as she is the most preponderant suppressor representing for the symbolic order that wants to hinder the excessive identification of the female sex with the male one.

As stated before, Mrs. Pryor, the governess, is the most dominant suppressor who forces Shirley to behave and speak like a woman. As she is

the representative of the masculine discourse, and is made to speak with the language of the Father as a signifier of the masculinity, the governess tries to make Shirley speak like how a female sex should speak considering the Victorian norms. That's why; she warns Shirley when she names herself a captain and an esquire:

> If she had had the bliss to be really Shirley Keeldar, Esq., Lord of the Manor of Briarfield, there was not a single fair one in this and the two neighbouring parishes, whom she would have felt disposed to request to become Mrs. Keeldar, lady of the manor. This declaration she made to Mrs. Pryor, who received it very quietly, as she did most of her pupil's off-hand speeches, responding, – 'My dear, do not allow that habit of alluding to yourself as a gentleman to be confirmed: it is a strange one. Those who do not know you, hearing you speak thus, would think you affected masculine manners.' (211)

Besides naming herself "the lady of the manor", Shirley uses the words "esquire" and "lord" for herself, which signifies the dilemma in her personality. She is in the dilemma of what and how to be called. Yet, when the governess hears the titles used by the men, she warns Shirley so as to make her speak like a female sex rather than the male one. That is, the governess, as one of the women speaking like how the society and the masculinity want, suppresses Shirley to speak like herself, that is, to speak like a woman instead of a man, so she tries to hinder Shirley's excessive identification with the male sex.

Besides warning Shirley about her using the titles that are used for men, Mrs. Pryor tells her that she should be careful about what she does. For instance, as whistling is an attitude that is considered to be proper to the male sex, it is found strange when it is done by the female sex, thus, when it is done by Shirley. When Shirley whistles a song, it becomes, again, Mrs. Pryor, who warns her about her whistling, that is, about her attitude that is generally done by the men:

> 'But, Miss Keeldar, where did you learn to whistle? You must have got the habit since you came down into Yorkshire. I never knew you guilty of it before.' (212)

The habit of whistling is also seen as a kind of guilt when it is performed by a woman, which is pointed out in Mrs. Pryor's speech. That is, it becomes again the governess that talks to Shirley and tells her that what she has done is the habit of men, and that it should be abandoned.

In conclusion, the governess, being the most predominant suppressor for Shirley to make her give up the masculine side and the masculine understanding in her identity, that is, the dilemma of gender, warns her about the masculine attitudes that she does. Yet, Shirley is observed, even after these warnings, that she goes on performing the same attitudes. The reason for this is that the other members of the society and even Mrs. Pryor herself consider Shirley a man in the matters concerning the house just like they consider her a man in the business matters. Besides the people around her, Shirley also calls herself a man, and she uses the pronouns referring to the male sex. As it is observed that she still goes on having the same dilemma and the confusion about what title and gender pronoun to use for herself, she still does not have the fixed identity that the symbolic wants her to have. Therefore, she is still divided between her masculine and the feminine side in her divided self.

4. Interpretation of the Character in view of Kristeva

As a divided subject who does not have a fixed identity in terms of the adoption of the roles of each sex either in business life or in the marriage, Shirley is also divided between semiotic and symbolic as Kristeva names in the analysis of a person who has undergone and undergoes some changes in the self, in her/his search to find her/his identity. Thus, not having a fixed identity due to the changes Kristeva mentions, Shirley reflects the semiotic in the symbolic, and she does it through nature. Yet, the nature for Shirley is the one that is opposed to the traditional way of thinking that argues that nature and culture are the two separate signifiers of the semiotic and the symbolic. In fact, as Kristeva argues, hers is the one, as a signifier of the semiotic, that

is interwoven with the symbolic so as to intrude into the symbolic and break its strict borders by finding herself a place in the same symbolic system through the use of language as its signifier. Thus, Shirley's nature is the semiotic side in her that is trying to find a place for her in the symbolic system of the language she has to speak, and also the symbolic system of the society.

As a medium by which Shirley reflects the semiotic side in the self, nature is also the medium through which she discloses her feelings, joys, and fears in the symbolic system of the social life and of the language. That's why; nature is, in fact, the semiotic side in her identity, which is breaking the borders of the symbolic.

> Often, after an active morning, she [may] spend a sunny afternoon in lying stirless on the turf, at the foot of some tree of friendly umbrage: no society [will] she need but that of Caroline, and it [will suffice] if she [is] within call; no spectacle [will] she ask but that of the deep blue sky [...]; no sound but that of the bee's hum, the leaf's whisper. (235)

She will need nobody who speaks the symbolic language but Caroline, a female sex reflecting the feelings more openly, and Caroline herself who also discloses her feelings and fears in the nature. Therefore, she will need no society representing for the culture, that is, the governing and the masculine system of the symbolic order. However, the only society she will need, except for Caroline, is the nature, the sound of a bee or a leaf. Therefore, the nature is the medium that makes Shirley uncover the semiotic because it is the medium through which she reflects her feelings and the internal drives.

For Shirley, nature is the mother whom she is in the pursuit of in the social-life order, and in the systematic order of the symbolic as well as its order pertaining to the language. Although it is a mother that succumbs to the symbolic order, it is also a mother that is not entirely expressed in the symbolic order. It is like "art, poetry, and myth that are irreducible to the "language" object" (Kristeva 1984: 22). Therefore, it is irreducible to the language and to the culture like art, poetry, and myth that are related with the semiotic rather than the symbolic. That is the reason, for Shirley, why nature

is related with the semiotic, where she finds the chance to express her joys and fears and the feelings pertaining to the mother she is in the search of. On talking with Caroline, Shirley describes the nature:

> '[...] Nature is now at her evening prayers: she is kneeling before those red hills. I see her prostrate on the great steps of her altar, praying for a fair night for mariners at sea, for travellers in deserts, for lambs on moors, and unfledged birds in woods. Caroline, I see her! and I will tell you what she is like: she is like what Eve was when she and Adam stood alone on earth.'
> [...]
> '[...] the first men of the earth were Titans, and that Eve was their mother: from her sprang Saturn, Hyperion, Oceanus; she bore Prometheus –'
> 'Pagan that you are! what does that signify?'
> 'I say, there were giants on the earth in those days: giants that strove to scale heaven. The first woman's breast that heaved with life on this world yielded the daring which could contend with Omnipotence: the strength which could bear a thousand years of bondage, – the vitality which could feed that vulture death through uncounted ages, – the un-exhausted life and uncorrupted excellence, sisters to immortality, which, after millenniums of crimes, struggles, and woes, could conceive and bring forth a Messiah. The first woman was heaven-born: vast was the heart whence gushed the well-spring of the blood of nations: and grand the undegenerate head where rested the consort-crown of creation.'
> 'She coveted an apple, and was cheated by a snake: but you have got such a hash of Scripture and mythology into your head that there is no making any sense of you. You have not yet told me what you saw kneeling on those hills.'
> 'I saw – I now see – a woman-Titan: her robe of blue air spreads to the outskirts of the heath, where yonder flock is grazing; a veil white as an avalanche sweeps from her head to her feet, and arabesques of lightning flame on its borders. Under her breast I see her zone, purple like that horizon: through its blush shines the star of evening. Her steady eyes I cannot picture; they are clear – they are deep as lakes – they are lifted and full of worship – they tremble with the softness of love and the lustre of prayer. Her forehead has the expanse of a cloud, and is paler than the early moon, risen long before dark gathers: she reclines her bosom on the ridge of Stilbro' Moor; her mighty hands are joined beneath it. So kneeling, face to face she speaks with God. That Eve is Jehovah's daughter, as Adam was his son.'
> 'She is very vague and visionary! Come, Shirley, we ought to go into church.'
> 'Caroline, I will not: I will stay out here with my mother Eve, in these days called Nature. I love her – undying, mighty being! [...] She is taking me to her bosom, and showing me her heart. Hush,

> Caroline! you will see her and feel as I do, if we are both silent.'
> (Brontë 1994: 327-329)[3]

If they are both silent; Caroline will also see the nature, the nature of Shirley, that is, the Nature that is, in fact, the first mother, Eve, for Shirley. It is, like Eve the mother and Eve the daughter of God, the un-exhausted life and uncorrupted excellence. That is, it is an endless, immortal and an undying life that will never be exhausted and corrupted by the culture in the symbolic order. Therefore, the nature where Shirley finds a chance to talk about how she feels is linked to the semiotic.

Besides reflecting her feelings in the nature, and relating nature to Eve, Shirley relates the nature to the mother she is in the pursuit of. Although the novel does not talk about Shirley's own mother, and therefore we cannot know the relationship between her mother and herself, the idea of a mother for Shirley is revealed in the last stated extract. Instead of a physical mother, it is the nature that takes Shirley to her bosom, and that shows her its heart like a mother. Thus, for Shirley, a mother should be the one that will embrace the child with her care and love for her. Hers is a mother that is mighty and undying. She is, thus, immortal and endless like the semiotic. She is not limited to the symbolic, and to the masculine discourse. Instead, she is so much related with the semiotic that Shirley can hear and see the struggles and woes that the nature has experienced. Yet, she is also forced to obey to the masculine. As she is a Christian mother, kneeling before the hills, praying for the lambs on the moors, and after many struggles bringing forth a Messiah, she worships the God, God the Father according to the Christian belief. Thus, kneeling before the God, she, in fact, kneels before the masculine order, and therefore, the symbolic, as Kristeva names. Hence, the mother, whether she is the nature or the idealized, vague and visionary form of her, is also a split

[3] As Shirley states " I see her!", "Her steady eyes", and "you will see her and feel as I do, if we are both silent", seeing the nature is not reflected only in the English Literature in the 19th century. It is a concept that is also seen in the American Literature of the time. Ralph Waldo Emerson, one of the representatives of Transcendentalism, a movement that is seen especially in the years from 1930s to 1940s, talks about the idea of seeing the nature in his work, *Nature*. Therefore, it may be concluded that Brontë, while writing the novel, was influenced by the Transcendental Movement of the 19th century because of the fact that the year in which the novel was published is 1847.

one, like Shirley herself who is in between the semiotic and the symbolic. The mother is also divided; she is a semiotic one being forced to kneel before the symbolic. Therefore, she does not have a whole self that is entirely semiotic or symbolic.

Influenced, by the mother in her dreams or by the nature as a mother, it is concluded that Shirley does not have a fixed identity and the self that is wholly semiotic or symbolic. While on the business matters, as stated before, she acts with reason speaking like Gerard Moore, thus, speaking the masculine language, about the maternal feelings and the mothering issue as well as the marriage she reflects the feelings that are suppressed by the symbolic order. Namely, as Kristeva argues, she is already divided between the semiotic and the symbolic. Therefore, the language she speaks is neither wholly semiotic nor entirely symbolic; it changes in the business matters and in the marriage and mothering issues.

C. THE THIRD NOVEL: *JUDE THE OBSCURE* BY THOMAS HARDY

The last novel to be discussed in view of Kristeva and her approach to identity is *Jude the Obscure* by Thomas Hardy. *Jude the Obscure* is a novel that talks about the characters "who are or become alienated from their society and are never reintegrated with it" (Rogers 1987: 392). That is, reflecting the social and the intellectual understanding of the last years of the Victorian age, the novel talks about a man, Jude Fawley, who is in the search of self in the Victorian society that witnesses the change towards the modernity. Therefore, it is a novel discussing the character's suffering from not finding himself a social and intellectual place in the changing society that witnesses both the obedience to the strict Victorian conventions and the choice of expressing the self and the feelings freely as modernism argues.

Like Jude, another person suffering from the need to find a place and the self in the society is his cousin, Sue, Susanna Florence Mary Bridehead.

She is the one that undergoes the problem to explain herself and her feelings to the society in which she lives. Thus, she is the one who will be analyzed in the third novel as she is uncertain about her identity, that is, who she is. Therefore, she is the one feeling the social pressure towards her, like the other characters in the first two novels. Yet, her confusion in her identity will be analyzed in view of both the Victorian conventions and the modernism, the effects of which are seen in the novel. The novel, concerning the female character, Sue, will firstly be studied in view of her familial relations, her confusions in her choice of which gender role to accept, and the social pressure towards her due to the confusions aforementioned. Yet, they will be related to her search to find a place in the society, and above all, to the search in her identity and the self in which she experiences the intrusions of the semiotic to the symbolic, which Kristeva mentions.

1. Familial Relations of Sue

As, for Kristeva, the familial relations of a person is influential in her/his search for the identity, Sue's relations with her parents and with the other relations to her reflect how such a family as hers has led her to some confusions about which gender role to adopt. Therefore, her relations with the family members are effective on the dilemma she undergoes about her gender as well as on her later life, especially on her thoughts on marriage.

The reader can hear the familial relations of Sue, the history of her family, and what kind of family she comes from from Mrs. Edlin, who is a friend and a neighbour to Jude's aunt. The Fawleys and the Brideheads are the two families that are notorious for not keeping their marriages from breaking and splitting up. Besides Arabella, the legal wife of Jude, and Jude's aunt, Mrs. Edlin talks about the marital and the familial history of the two families, and their failures in their marriages. While talking with Sue and Jude, Mrs. Edlin explains, upon the question of Jude, where the notoriety of the families comes from:

> ‘[...] What – did this man – my ancestor and Sue’s – kill his wife?’
> ‘Twer not that exactly. She ran away from him, with their child, to her friends; and while she was there the child died. He wanted the body, to bury it where his people lay, but she wouldn’t give it up. Her husband then came in the night with a cart, and broke into the house to steal the coffin away; but he was catched, and being obstinate, wouldn’t tell what he broke in for. They brought it in burglary, and that’s why he was hanged and gibbeted on Brown House Hill. His wife went mad after he was dead. [...]’ (Hardy 1993: 247)

The quotation reflects the marital history of the Fawleys and the Brideheads. They are such unsuccessful families in keeping their marriages from breaking up that almost everybody in their families experience the unhappiness in their marriages. Thus, the notorious history of the family makes Sue regard marriage as an unwanted event in her life, which is one of the reasons why she escapes from the marriage.

Besides Mrs. Edlin, Jude’s aunt also talks about the history of the two families. Yet, when compared to Mrs. Edlin, her relation to Sue becomes more influential in her as she takes care of the child. Sue is the daughter of a worker who is specialized in the metal carving and the ironworks and a mother who is not mentioned so much. “She was brought up by her father to hate her mother’s family”, tells Jude’s aunt (Hardy 1993: 94). That is, the child does not know much about her mother, but the father, who she does not know much because, for Mrs. Edlin, he goes to London by leaving the child to a relation, Jude’s aunt. Therefore, it becomes Jude’s aunt, who is also a relation and the aunt to her, who looks after the child. Although it is a female sex looking after Sue, the aunt is the representative of the society of the Victorian age; therefore, she is the representative of the masculine discourse educating and leading Sue to the conventions, which is reflected in her speech to Jude:

> ‘[...] Many’s times I’ve smacked her for her impertinence. Why, one day when she was walking into the pond with her shoes and stockings off, and her petticoats pulled above her knees, afore I could cry out for shame, she said: “Move on, aunty! This is no sight for modest eyes!”’ (94)

As stated above, Jude's aunt, and also the aunt of Sue, wants her to be raised by her obeying to the conventions. For the aunt, it is not appropriate for a female sex to pull the petticoat above and walk with the shoes and the stockings off. Therefore, she feels the need to lead the child to the conventions, which echoes that she speaks like what the society wants her. Namely, she is the voice of the society leading the girl to what the appropriate thing for the same society is. That's why; she speaks the masculine discourse while warning the girl. Yet, her speaking the masculine discourse besides Sue's living with her father with having almost the least chance of interacting with the mother makes Sue be uncertain about which gender role to adopt, and thus she is confused about the self because she has almost seen only a father figure, in fact.

2. Gender Dilemma and the Uncertainty of Identity

Seeing almost only a father figure without having the least interaction with the mother, Sue, a female character, experiences the dilemma of which gender role to perform. She encounters the dilemma both in her childhood and when she is grown-up, like Catherine in the first novel.

As she has seen almost only the father in her own family in the childhood, she identifies with her father rather than a mother or a female character. Thus, identifying with the father, she, in fact, identifies with the male sex, and she behaves like a male son, which is the revelation of her dilemma about her gender. It is Mrs. Edlin that talks about this dilemma:

> 'She was not exactly a tomboy, you know; but she could do things that only boys do, as a rule. I've seen her hit in and steer down the long slide on yonder pond, with her little curls blowing, one of a file of twenty moving along against the sky like shapes painted on glass, and up the back slide without stopping. All boys except herself; and then they'd cheer her, and then she'd say, "Don't be saucy, boys," and suddenly run indoors. They'd try to coax her out again. But 'a wouldn't come.' (95)

What Mrs. Edlin tells reveals the dilemma about gender in Sue. She does what boys do, and she plays with the boys outside by hitting in and steering down the long slide in contrast to the games which girls play such as playing with their dolls and with flowers, playing house game, and so on. That is, Mrs. Edlin gives information about her gender dilemma, the dilemma of which gender role to perform in her childhood.

Besides in the childhood, Sue has the dilemma of which gender role to adopt when she is grown-up, too. The first example of her dilemma is her identifying with her father and taking up the hobby of writing on a piece zinc like her father carving a piece of metal and writing on it. It is revealed in the novel in many places, and one of the examples related to her identifying with the father is reflected while Jude is looking at her and thinking about what she is doing then:

> What was she doing? He stole a glance round. Before her lay a piece of zinc, cut to the shape of a scroll three or four feet long, and coated with a dead-surface paint on one side. Hereupon she was designing and illuminating, in characters of Church text, the single word
>
> Alleluja
>
> 'A sweet, saintly, Christian business, hers!' thought he.
> Her presence here was now fairly enough explained, her skill in work of this sort having no doubt been acquired from her father's occupation as an ecclesiastical worker in metal. The lettering on which she was engaged was clearly intended to be fixed up in some chancel to assist devotion. (75)

Namely, it can be told that her being interested in the work of her father reveals her identification with the father. Yet, it is the identification which is not found proper by the society as the society wants a woman to behave like the people who have the same sex with her. That's why; Sue's taking up her father's work and going on with it reveals that she takes up the work of a male sex rather than the female one, and thus, it reflects her too much identification with the male sex, and as a result, her dilemma of gender, and which sex to behave like.

Her excessive identification with the male sex and with her father is also revealed in the quotation below in which she describes Jude how she has begun to identify with her father and begun taking up her father's work:

> '[...] My life has been entirely shaped by what people call a peculiarity in me. I have no fear of men, as such, nor of their books. I have mixed with them – one or two of them particularly – almost as one of their own sex. I mean I have not felt about them as most women are taught to feel – to be on their guard against attacks on their virtue; for no average man – no man short of a sensual savage – will molest a woman by day or night, at home or abroad, unless she invites him. Until she says by a look "Come on" he is always afraid to, and if you never say it, or look it, he never comes. However, what I was going to say is that when I was eighteen I formed a friendly intimacy with an undergraduate at Christminster, and he taught me a great deal, and lent me books which I should never have got hold of otherwise.'
> [...]
> 'You saw a good deal of him, I suppose?'
> 'Yes. We used to go about together – on walking tours, reading tours, and things of that sort – like two men almost. He asked me to live with him, and I agreed to by letter. But when I joined him in London I found he meant a different thing from what I meant. He wanted me to be his mistress, in fact, but I wasn't in love with him – and on my saying I should go away if he didn't agree to my plan, he did so. We shared a sitting-room for fifteen months; and he became a leader-writer for one of the great London dailies; till he was taken ill, and had to go abroad. He said I was breaking his heart by holding out against him so long at such close quarters; he could never have believed it of woman. [...] I went down to Sandbourne to his funeral, and was his only mourner. He left me a little money – because I broke his heart, I suppose. [...]'
> [...]
> '[...] Tell me all.'
> 'Well, I invested his money, poor fellow, in a bubble scheme, and lost it. I lived about London by myself for some time, and then I returned to Christminster, as my father – who was also in London, and had started as an art metal-worker near Long-Acre – wouldn't have me back; and I got that occupation in the artist-shop where you found me. [...]' (127-128)

As stated above, the quotation reveals her identification with her father and the male sex. She explains how she has begun to take up the metal-work, writing on a metal, which is occupied by the male sex. Thus, the quotation illuminates the gender dilemma of the woman by reflecting her excessive identification with the male sex.

Along with the identification with the father, the same quotation reveals also the identification with the discourse of the male sex. She tells Jude that she has lived with men and mixed with men almost as one of their own sex. That is, she reveals that she has the confusions about which sex she will be named after, because she regards herself not almost like one of their own sex, but almost as one of their own sex. Thus, she speaks the masculine discourse like the men of the age and tells:

> no average man – no man short of a sensual savage – will molest a woman by day or night, at home or abroad, unless she invites him. Until she says by a look "Come on" he is always afraid to, and if you never say it, or look it, he never comes. (127)

This is the belief of the men at that time because they regard that it is the woman who leads men either to the marriage and their homes in their marriages or to the pubs where they can drink and chat up with the women working at these pubs. Therefore, it is concluded that the excessive identification with the male sex is revealed in Sue's using the language. Thus, she reveals she is not like the women of the age, so she does not think like them, as a result of which she regards herself a peculiar one. Saying that she is not like the women of the age who speaks to the detriment of the men, she tells that she is on their guard, and thus, she reveals she differs from the other women and she is like men speaking with their discourse. Therefore, the quotation reveals her dilemma in which she finds herself confused about which gender to identify with.

Yet, the same quotation still reveals maybe the most startling example of Sue's choice of the role of which gender she adopts. As the age is in its last phase, and as it is experiencing the change towards modernism, the expression of freedom is reflected in some of the characters, and especially in Sue. She tries to free herself from the conventions of the Victorians and the restrictions upon the women living in that age. Thus, her choice in which gender role to adopt lies in the fact that she differs herself from the women living at that time by not behaving like the women who are still obeying strictly to the Victorian conventions, silencing themselves, and submitting to the roles they are made to follow by the men. Thus, she frees herself from the dependence on a man by rejecting the man's proposal to Sue to be his

mistress. Unlike the women wishing to marry a man so as not to be named redundant or so as not to be a fallen one, Sue rejects to be dependent on a man, and she escapes from the man whenever she feels herself restricted and confined to home and the Victorian understanding that women should marry and stay at home looking after the children who should be born legally. Thus, she differs from the women of the age, and also from the role she is forced to follow and adopt by the male sex. By rejecting the role she is made to follow, she, in fact, does not silence herself unlike the women of the time as she behaves like how a man does: she goes to London, and lives there alone for some time.

Freeing herself from a confinement is also revealed in her marriage with Phillotson, one of the major characters in the novel, and in her not-legally-performed familial relationship with Jude. After the marriage with Phillotson, she tells him that she wants to leave him because she feels their marriage is the one that is like "adultery" because she does not love him as a husband (193). Therefore, she leaves the man, and frees herself from the confinement to the house where they live, and the restrictions upon her, which is the thing that is not assumed to be appropriate for the wives and the women of the age to do. Yet, feeling herself different from those women, Sue escapes from the confinement, and goes near to Jude to live with him without marrying him. That is, not only in her relation with Phillotson, but also in her relation with Jude, she tries to avoid being confined to a man, so while speaking to Jude, she reveals her fear of losing her freedom by marrying a man and being dependent on him:

> 'My liking for you is not as some women's perhaps. But it is a delight in being with you, of a supremely delicate kind, and I don't want to go further and risk it by – an attempt to intensify it! [...]' (210)

Namely, the quotation reflects her rejection to being dependent on any man. Thus, it reflects her rejection to Victorian conventions and the Victorian understanding that women should find a husband and marry. Therefore, it reveals her freeing herself from the confinement to a house and a man, which is not considered to be proper for women living at that time. That's why; she

does not resemble to the women of the Victorian age as she does not accept the idea of being dependent on a man. Instead, the quotations reveal that she is like a man of the age who considers himself free from the confinement to a home. She identifies with the men and behaves like them as she does not accept to be under the yoke of the spouse as men think and behave like at that time. Thus, her rejecting the restrictions upon herself reveals her not choosing intentionally the role of the women of the age. Hence, it reveals her accepting the role of the men, and her deliberate choice of adopting the role of the male sex.

3. Social Pressure towards the Character

The deliberate rejection of the role of the female sex and the adoption of the male sex make Sue encounter the social pressure towards her. The society, considering that the illegal marriage of a man and a woman is immoral, also considers that the rejection of the role of the female sex and the adoption of the male sex is not proper to the conventions, so it shows suppressions to Sue, and tries to make her obey to those conventions.

While talking with Phillotson, Sue reveals the social pressure towards her:

> 'Richard,' she said all at once; 'would you mind my living away from you?'
> 'Away from me? Why, that's what you were doing when I married you. What then was the meaning of marrying at all?'
> 'You wouldn't like me any the better for telling you.'
> 'I don't object to know.'
> 'Because I thought I could do nothing else. You had got my promise a long time before that, remember. Then, as time went on, I regretted I had promised you, and was trying to see an honourable way to break it off. But as I couldn't I became rather reckless and careless about the conventions. Then you know what scandals were spread, and how I was turned out of the Training School you had taken such time and trouble to prepare me for and get me into; and this frightened me, and it seemed then that the one thing I could do would be to let the engagement stand. [...]' (192)

That is, Sue's wish to free herself from the marriage, from the Victorian conventions, and so from the confinement to a man and a house is not regarded to be proper by the society. As she has promised to marry him before, she is forced to obey to this promise because of the conventions, and she is made to engage to the man. That is, she is, in fact, made to submit to the conventions of the society, and is not allowed to take over the role of a male sex that is seen as the leading and deciding member of the family.

Another pressure towards the character is seen in her talking to Jude after the death of their illegitimate children in view of the society. As Sue always rejects to marry Jude, the society, regarding it immoral, also oppresses her and tries to lead her to the conventions, and thus, tries to make her behave like how a woman should do. As a result, she tells Jude:

> '[...] I would go back to Richard [Phillotson] without repeating the sacrament, if he asked me. But "the world and its ways have a certain worth" (I suppose): therefore I concede a repetition of the ceremony ... [...]' (319).

Besides this one, she also tells Mrs. Edlin that she wants to be free from Phillotson, the man she is married then:

> 'I – don't hear him! And perhaps – perhaps – '
> 'What, child?'
> 'Perhaps he's dead!' she gasped. 'And then – I should be *free*[4], and I could go to Jude! ... Ah – no – I forgot *her* – and God!' (351)

The two quotations above reveal that she still wants to be free from the restrictions upon herself, but the society still wants her to behave considering the conventions. She is made to consider the world, the society, and Arabella, as Sue implies by saying "her", as one of the members of the society, and God. Thus, she is made, by the society, to obey to the conventions, and is made to free herself from the idea of adopting the role of a male sex by regarding herself the leading and the deciding figure in the marriage.

[4]The words "free" and "her" are already italicized in the original text.

4. Interpretation of the Character in view of Kristeva

Jude the Obscure, a novel reflecting the change in the age towards modernism, also reflects the changes in people's understandings about the age and about the other people, and their own understandings of themselves. Thus, it reveals the different selves in people that are already foreigners to themselves, and as a result, that have already Others in themselves. One of the characters reflecting the Others, the different selves in herself, is Sue who has undergone and still experiences the dilemma about her gender, as a result of which she feels the uncertainty about her identity and the self. Sue's uncertainty about her identity causes the reader to consider that she does not have a fixed, a stable, and an unchangeable self, which Kristeva argues in her approach to a person and her/his search for the self and the identity. Hence, Sue reveals her unstable self through the semiotic and the symbolic features in Kristeva's approach to a person and the changes s/he undergoes in the process to understand the self.

The reason why Sue has an unstable self can be explained by Kristeva's own approach to a person, a subject as Kristeva names. In the article *How Does One Speak to Literature?*, Kristeva mentions the subject's different selves as she argues that a subject is a divided one that is affected by both the semiotic and the symbolic orders. That is, she utters in the same article the notion of a divided and a split self:

> What we discover [...] is the function of the subject caught between instinctual drives and social practice within a language that is today divided into often incommunicable, multiple systems. (Kristeva 1941: 97)

Namely, for Kristeva, a subject, a person, is a divided one that has the instinctual drives, and that feels the need to behave considering the social practices. Therefore, she speaks a language that is already divided with multiple systems, including these incommunicable drives that are repressed by the same language as the signifier of the symbolic. That is the reason why a person is not always stable, and s/he can speak different things that do not

appear similar to the things that s/he mentions before, which is the case seen in Sue.

The unstable, divided self that speaks a language that is already divided in itself is reflected in the novel via the character Sue, who reveals some discrepancies in what she says. She not only speaks a symbolic and a systematic language that is in favour of rationality, but she also speaks a language in which the intrusions of the semiotic drives can be seen. That is seen in the novel in many places, and one of them is when she speaks with Jude:

> 'I want to tell you something – two things,' he said hurriedly as the train came up. 'One is a warm one, the other a cold one!'
> 'Jude,' she said. 'I know one of them. And you mustn't!'
> 'What?'
> 'You mustn't love me. You are to like me – that's all!'
> Jude's face became so full of complicated glooms that hers was agitated in sympathy as she bade him adieu through the carriage window. And then the train moved on, and waving her pretty hand to him she vanished away. (Hardy 1993: 133)

The quotation above reveals that she speaks using the symbolic language that wants a person to speak considering the norms and the rules as well as the conventions. That is, she does not want him to love her because both they are cousins to each other and their families have bad reputation in their relationships, so she regards that it is not rational for them to love each other. As what the rational and the proper is defined by the symbolic, her rejecting the love of each other means that she behaves like what the symbolic wants her to do, so she suppresses the love, the feeling, the instinctual drive that is related with the semiotic. Yet, at the same time, she also writes in her letter to Jude:

> What I really write about, dear Jude, is something I said to you at parting. You had been so very good and kind to me that when you were out of sight I felt what a cruel and ungrateful woman I was to say it, and it has reproached me ever since. *If you want to love me, Jude, you may*[5]: I don't mind at all; and I'll never say again that you mustn't! (133-134)

[5] It is already italicized in the original text.

In the former quotation she suppresses her feelings and the drives, whereas it can be seen that she reveals the semiotic drive of love in this quotation. Hence, she reflects her divided self in a way that she both speaks a language that approves the social and the cultural norms and the conventions, and she reflects the repressed feelings that are related to the semiotic in the same language she uses. Therefore, it can be concluded that she does not have a fixed and a stable self. Instead, as Kristeva argues, she is a divided and a split subject speaking a language, which is a signifier of the symbolic, with the intrusions of the feelings, which are the signifiers of the semiotic, in it.

Another example reflecting the different selves in her is seen in her accusing herself because of the fact that she has let Jude kiss her and then in her dialogue with Phillotson when she tells him that she wants to live with Jude:

> Sue, after parting from him [Jude] earlier in the day, had gone along to the station, with tears in her eyes for having run back and let him kiss her. Jude ought not to have pretended that he was not a lover, and made her give way to an impulse to act unconventionally, if not wrongly. She was inclined to call it the latter; for Sue's logic was extraordinarily compounded, and seemed to maintain that before a thing was done it might be right to do, but that being done it became wrong; or, in other words, that things which were right in theory were wrong in practice.
> 'I have been too weak, I think!' she jerked out as she pranced on, shaking down tear-drops now and then. 'It was burning, like a lover's – Oh it was! And I won't write to him anymore, or at least for a long time, to impress him with dignity! And I hope it will hurt him very much – expecting a letter tomorrow morning, and the next, and the next, and no letter coming. He'll suffer then with suspense – won't he, that's all! – and I am very glad of it!' – Tears of pity for Jude's approaching sufferings at her hands mingled with those which had surged up in pity for herself. (189)

In the quotation, Sue accuses herself because she thinks that she has acted in an improper way by letting Jude kiss him. Therefore, she tries to suppress her feelings and behave like how symbolic wants her to do. Yet, a few pages later, while talking with Philotson, she reveals the suppressed semiotic feeling and the drive to live with the man she loves:

> '[...] It is as culpable to bind yourself to love always as to believe a creed always, and as silly as to vow always to like a particular food or drink!'
> 'And do you mean, by living away from me, living by yourself?'
> 'Well, if you insisted, yes. But I meant living with Jude.'
> 'As his wife?'
> 'As I choose.' (193)

After suppressing the instinctual drive of the wish to live with the man she loves, she, then, reveals that vowing to a person to live with him all the time is as silly as vowing to like the same food or drink. That is, for her, vowing to live within a stable social system is as silly as vowing to like only a particular food or drink. Therefore, she criticizes, in the latter quotation, the holistic idea of the symbolic and its understanding of forming a personality that is systematic and stable. For this reason, the quotation also reveals what Kristeva argues; that is, it reveals that there is not a stable self who is undivided. However, a person is subjected to be divided as s/he has different selves thanks to the semiotic and the symbolic features that try to help the person to understand her/his personality, which is seen in Sue's attempts to grasp a self for her. Although she represses her feelings just as the symbolic wants, it is not easy for her to repress them entirely because of the fact that the feelings and the instinctual drives are the ones that are living, always present in a person, and always ready to react against such repression and the symbolic, too. Therefore, the drives and the feelings cannot be repressed all the time, and they sometimes reveal themselves in the social system and in the language of the symbolic, as a result of which the person becomes divided because s/he experiences both the semiotic and the symbolic features in herself/himself. That is the same reason why Sue wants to escape from Phillotson. In fact, she wants to escape from the symbolic that is always repressive upon the semiotic, and she wants to free herself from the symbolic that is repressive upon her own feeling of love and the drive to live with the man she loves. That's why; she is not an undivided one. Instead, she has different selves in her in view of Kristeva and her approach to grasping a self.

In conclusion, Sue is a split character that is divided between the semiotic and the symbolic. She not only speaks like a man because of the

dilemma that has been stated before, but she also reflects the repressed semiotic side in her. That's why; she is not entirely a unary subject as Kristeva mentions.

III. CONCLUSION

As stated earlier, Kristeva's theory on subject, subjectivity, and the self can be applied to literature since her approach is based on the psychoanalytical one that argues that a literary text is also the revelation of the psychology of its creator because of the fact that s/he reflects her/his own views on things s/he describes via the characters s/he creates in the text. Thus, it enables one to analyze a literary text with the help of the theory of Kristeva, who has been affected by Freud and the psychological approach to a subject, a self, and her/his representation in the literature. Therefore, the study in this thesis is based on the aforementioned tendency of the psychoanalytical approach to a piece of literature, also with the feminist approach of Kristeva to a subject.

Formed considering that the characters in a text can be analyzed on the basis of psychoanalytical approach because of the fact that the creator of the text is a real person, the thesis is also formed with Kristeva's approach to literature, which argues that the suppressed feelings that are related with the semiotic are best revealed in literature. Thus, for Kristeva, literature shares with reality the same feature of reflecting the intrusions of the semiotic in the symbolic. Therefore, the thesis is based on Kristeva's idea about literature, and also about her idea on the relation between literature and reality.

Based on Kristeva's idea on the relation between literature and reality, the thesis is about the gender dilemmas of the three female characters

in the three Victorian novels that are analyzed, and it also dwells on the characters' search for the self. The novels that are chosen intentionally about the different periods of the age discuss the changes in the age by dividing it as the early, mid-, and late Victorian. The first novel, *Northanger Abbey* by Jane Austen, reflects the social and the cultural features of the early Victorian age whereas the second novel, *Shirley* by Charlotte Brontë, ponders on the aforementioned features of the mid-Victorian period. Finally, the last novel, *Jude the Obscure* by Thomas Hardy is about the late Victorian and its change towards modernism. As stated before, the sex of the writers of the novels are not taken into consideration while choosing the novels because the study is on feminism, which argues that women are made to speak the language of men, the male discourse.

Arguing that the female sex is made to speak the male discourse, French feminists offer a way of writing that is a feminine one that insists on expressing the femininity and the feminine attributes of women so as to deconstruct the force of the symbolic order and the male discourse as its signifier upon themselves. On the matter of expressing the femininity and the feminine attributes in the search for the identity and the self, Kristeva argues an approach by rejecting the former idea of Freud and Lacan that states that a person gains the identity when s/he accepts the Law of the Father and when s/he enters into the symbolic order. For her, the subjectivity is not a thing that is gained only in the entrance into the symbolic order. Yet, it begins to be gained also in the semiotic, which refers to the pre-Oedipal phase on the way to the subjectivity. The semiotic is a field that is related to the instinctual drives that have a connection to the mother, the feelings and the emotions, rather than the father, the logic and the reason. On the other hand, the symbolic represents for the Father, the systematic and the logical reasoning in which grammatical language finds itself a place. Thus, Kristeva argues it is not only the rational symbolic that forms the identity of a person, but it is also the semiotic field reflecting the feelings and the instinctual drives of that person. Therefore, for her, gaining subjectivity, an identity, and a self is a process that a person undergoes, because s/he is in the process of comings

and goings of the semiotic and the symbolic in her/his life. Thus, that is how a person tries to gain her/his identity. Through the continuous process, s/he grasps the self, and finds the chance to express the feelings pertaining to the semiotic that are repressed by the symbolic. Thus, that is the way, for the person, to subvert the strict reasoning of the symbolic and its discourse.

The three characters that are analyzed in the novels in this thesis try to subvert the symbolic and its discourse through the reflections of the semiotic in their lives. That is, although being made to speak the male discourse, and to behave rationally as the symbolic wants, the female characters in the novels reveal their feelings and drives that are related to the semiotic. Yet, it becomes not easy for them both to obey to what the symbolic wants them to do and to reveal their own feelings at the same time. As they have excessively identified with the symbolic, they feel the dilemma on which role to adopt, the role of the female sex or the male sex, as a result of which they feel the social pressure upon themselves. Thus, their search for the identity is a problem for the society. They are all made to feel the same dilemma by the society as one of the representatives of the symbolic, and are forced to get rid of the dilemma by the same society, the same representative of the symbolic. Therefore, they cannot find a self for each other, and does not have a fixed identity as a result, because they are already living in an era of the oppositions in which they encounter the two different discourses of the symbolic that say that one has to identify with the male discourse, but one cannot identify with it excessively. However, this understanding of the society and the symbolic is not valid for the characters, and the suppression of the society is not so much influential on them because they feel the same dilemma on which gender role to adopt even after the pressure upon them. That is, theirs is the dilemma that lies in them before the suppression and after the suppression, so it is the dilemma that goes on continuously although it may seem last for a short time. Therefore, that's how they subvert the strict rules of the symbolic with their continuous dilemma in the gender.

The dilemma of the female characters analyzed in the novels about their genders and the adoption of the roles of different sexes is the one that

goes on continuously like the subject in process as Kristeva mentions. That is, the continuous dilemma resembles to the subject in process who experiences continuous comings and goings of the semiotic and the symbolic in the not fixed and not stable personality. Therefore, the subject in process shares the same feature of being always in process; that is, being always changeable and active in the search for the self as the subject that undergoes a continuous active change in the adoption of the gender roles of two different sexes in the search for the self. For instance, in the search for the self, Catherine in *Northanger Abbey* has the dilemma in her gender both in the childhood and when she is grown up even after the pressures of the society happening in her younger ages, in the childhood. Likewise, she experiences the continuous intrusions of the semiotic in the symbolic, and the continuous pressure of the symbolic to the semiotic, again, in her search for the self. Besides Catherine, Shirley in *Shirley* has the same unceasing dilemma of gender in the same search for the self. Even after the social pressure towards her, she still goes on adopting the role of a male sex, working in the public sphere and earning money for the household expenditures as well as adopting the role of the female sex at the same time. That is, she has a continuous dilemma in her gender in the search for the self for herself in the same way as the continuous process of the semiotic and the symbolic intruding into each other's sphere in the mentioned search for the self. She not only reveals the semiotic features but also the symbolic ones in her life like Sue in *Jude the Obscure*. Sue, revealing the feelings and the instinctual drives related to the semiotic, reveals also the symbolic features as behaving rationally as the society wants her to do and thinking logically by repressing the feelings and the drives of the semiotic. Yet, the endless semiotic intrudes into the symbolic that still shows pressure on the semiotic. Thus, it is an endless process for the semiotic and the symbolic to intrude into each other in Sue's search for the self. Therefore, it resembles to Sue's continuous dilemma on gender as she is always in the search of freeing herself from the strict rules of the symbolic and thus behaving like the male sex who rejects being dominated by the other sex. Like it is an endless wish and process for Sue to reject behaving like the female sex that accepts being dominated in her age, it is an endless process

for Sue that the semiotic and the symbolic intrudes into each other's sphere. Therefore, it is concluded that the characters experience the ongoing gender dilemma like the ongoing process of the intrusions of the semiotic and the symbolic in their lives.

The reason for the resemblance of the continuous gender dilemma of the characters analyzed to the continuous intrusions of the semiotic and the symbolic into each other lies in the fact that the dilemma of gender stems from the aforementioned continuous intrusions of the semiotic and the symbolic into each other's field. If, as Kristeva mentions, a person is in the continuous process of becoming a subject, gaining an identity, and grasping a self for her/him; that is, if s/he is in the process of comings and goings from the semiotic to the symbolic, and from the symbolic to the semiotic, s/he experiences the continuous dilemma of gender in herself or himself because of the fact that the semiotic is a maternal domain related to the femininity and the expression of the female attributes whereas the symbolic is the paternal domain related to the father, his rational and systematic attributes. As the person is in between the semiotic and the symbolic, s/he is in dilemma in the adoption of the maternal attributes or in the adoption of the paternal ones. The continuous process of the semiotic and the symbolic intrusions, therefore, makes the person in the continuous dilemma of the gender and which gender role to adopt. That is the reason why Catherine, Shirley, and Sue experience the same dilemma of gender because they are already under the influence of the maternal semiotic field and the paternal symbolic field. It is astonishing that it is not only Catherine, Shirley, and Sue that undergoes the same gender dilemma, but many other female and male characters in both the novels that are analyzed in this thesis and in the other novels of the Victorian age and of its different periods. For instance, like Catherine, Henry Tilney and Eleanor Tilney in the first novel; like Shirley, Caroline in the second novel; like Sue, Jude in the third novel; and also Catherine Earnshaw in *Wuthering Heights* by Emily Brontë; Hetty Sorrel, Dinah Morris, and Seth Bede in *Adam Bede* by George Eliot; Joe Gargery and Mrs. Joe Gargery in *Great Expectations* by Charles Dickens; Tess in *Tess of the d'Urbervilles* by

Thomas Hardy; and many other characters in many other Victorian novels experience the dilemma on which role of the gender to adopt because they are under the influence of the society, the social life, and the symbolic as well as the semiotic and its maternal feelings and the drives. Hence, it can be concluded that the characters that are analyzed here and many others in many other Victorian novels experience the same gender dilemma because of the fact that they are both under the repression and the influence of the symbolic which is a paternal domain and they are under the influence of the endless maternal semiotic that wants to find a place for itself and for the feelings it is associated with in the symbolic. As the conflict between the maternal semiotic and the paternal symbolic is a process that goes on continuously, the characters in the novels undergo the continuous dilemma of which gender role to adopt.

WORKS CITED

Abrams, M.H. (1993): The Norton Anthology of English Literature. United States of America: W. W. Norton and Company, Inc

Austen, Jane (2000): Northanger Abbey. Great Britain: Wordsworth Editions

Ayres, Brenda (2003): Silent Voices, Forgotten Novels by Victorian Women Writers. United States of America: Praeger Publishers

Becker-Leckrone, Megan (2005): Julia Kristeva and Literary Theory. China: Palgrave Macmillan

Brontë, Charlotte (1994): Shirley. London: Penguin Popular Classics

Campbell, Jan (2000): Arguing with the Phallus, Feminist, Queer and Postcolonial Theory, A Psychoanalytic Contribution. London and New York: Zed Books

Cavallaro, Dani (2003): French Feminist Theory. Great Britain: Continuum

De Beauvoir, Simone (1953): The Second Sex. Great Britain: Lowe And Brydone (Printers) Ltd.

Donovan, Josephine (1997): Feminist Teori. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları

Eagleton, Mary (1996): Feminist Literary Theory: A Reader. United Kingdom: Blackwell Publishing

Flynn, Elizabeth A. (2002): Feminism Beyond Modernism. United States of America: Southern Illionis University Press

Ford, Boris (1982): From Dickens to Hardy. Great Britain: Penguin Books

Freud, Sigmund (2010): Complete Works, electronic version of *The Standard Edition of the Complete Psychological Works of Sigmund Freud*, ed. by James Strachey (Ivan Smith, 2000, all rights reserved).

Gilmour, Robin (1993): The Victorian Period: The Intellectual and Cultural Context of English Literature, 1830-90. United Kingdom: Longman Group

Green, Keith and LeBihan, Jill (2001): Critical Theory and Practice: A Coursebook. London and New York: Routledge

Habib, M. A. R. (2005): Modern Literary Criticism And Theory. United Kingdom: Blackwell Publishing

Hamilton, Susan (2006): Frances Power Cobbe and Victorian Feminism. Great Britain: Palgrave Macmillan

Hardy, Thomas (1993): Jude the Obscure. Great Britain: Wordsworth Editions

Humm, Maggie (2002): Feminist Edebiyat Eleştirisi. İstanbul: Say Yayınları

Ingham, Patricia (2003): The Language of Gender and Class, Transformation in the Victorian Novel. London and New York: Taylor and Francis e-Library

King, Jeannette (2005): The Victorian Woman Question in Contemporary Feminist Fiction. New York: Palgrave Macmillan

Kristeva, Julia (1941): Desire In Language: A Semiotic Approach to Literature and Art. New York: Columbia University Press

Kristeva, Julia (1982): Powers of Horror: An Essay on Abjection. New York: Columbia University Press

Kristeva, Julia (1984): Revolution in Poetic Language. New York: Columbia University Press

Kristeva, Julia (1987): In the Beginning Was Love, Psychoanalysis and Faith. New York: Columbia University Press

Kristeva, Julia (2000): Crisis of the European Subject. United States of America: Other Press

Madsen, Deborah L. (2000): Feminist Theory and Literary Practice. London and United States of America: Pluto Press

Marcus, Sharon (2007): Between Women: Friendship, Desire, and Marriage in Victorian England. United States of America: Princeton University Press

McAfee, Noëlle (2004): Julia Kristeva. New York and London: Routledge, Taylor and Francis Group

Moi, Toril (1985): Sexual Textual Politics. England: Routledge

Morgan, Simon (2007): A Victorian Woman's Place: Public Culture in the Nineteenth Century. India: Replika Press Pvt. Ltd.

Nelson, Claudia (2007): Family Ties in Victorian England, Victorian Life and Times. United States of America: Praeger Publishers

Oliver, Kelly and Walsh, Lisa (2004): Contemporary French Feminism. United States: Oxford University Press

Reed, John R. (1975): Victorian Conventions. United States of America: Ohio University Press

Roberts, Warren (1995): Jane Austen And The French Revolution. London: The Athlone Press

Rogers, Pat (1987): The Oxford Illustrated History of English Literature. New York: Oxford University Press

Trilling, Lionel and Bloom, Harold (1973): The Oxford Anthology of English Literature, Victorian Prose and Poetry. United States of America: Oxford University Press

Wollstonecraft, Mary (1993): A Vindication of the Rights of Men and A Vindication of the Rights of Woman. United States: Oxford University Press

ÖZGEÇMİŞ

1984 Giresun doğumlu Özgü Ayvaz, 2004 yılında Kocaeli Üniversitesi Batı Dilleri ve Edebiyatları Bölümü İngiliz Dili ve Edebiyatı Anabilim Dalı'nı kazanmış olup 2008 yılında bu bölümden mezun olmuştur. Selçuk Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi'nden İngilizce Öğretmenliği Sertifikası almış ve 2008-2009 Eğitim-Öğretim yılı içerisinde Kocaeli Üniversitesi Yabancı Diller Yüksekokulu'nda bir yıl çalışmıştır. 2009-2010 Eğitim-Öğretim yılında ise Kocaeli Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü İngiliz Dili ve Edebiyatı Anabilim Dalı'nda yüksek lisansa başlamıştır. Aynı dönemde Kocaeli Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü'ne bağlı Batı Dilleri ve Edebiyatları Bölümü'nde Araştırma Görevliliği'ne başlamış, daha sonra, 2012 yılında, Karabük Üniversitesi'ne Okutman olarak geçmiştir. Şu anda da aynı görevde devam etmektedir.