

T.C.
BEYKENT ÜNİVERSİTESİ
LİSANSÜSTÜ EĞİTİM ENSTİTÜSÜ
İNGİLİZ DİLİ VE EDEBİYATI ANABİLİM DALI
İNGİLİZ DİLİ VE EDEBİYATI BİLİM DALI

**A POSTMODERN APPROACH TO GENDER ROLES,
STEREOTYPES, AND WOMAN'S IDENTITY QUEST IN
TRACY CHEVALIER'S FALLING ANGELS AND JOHN
FOWLES' THE COLLECTOR**

Yüksek Lisans Tezi

Tezi Hazırlayan:

Serdar ÖZTÜRK

İstanbul, 2023

T.C.
BEYKENT ÜNİVERSİTESİ
LİSANSÜSTÜ EĞİTİM ENSTİTÜSÜ
İNGİLİZ DİLİ VE EDEBİYATI ANABİLİM DALI
İNGİLİZ DİLİ VE EDEBİYATI BİLİM DALI

**A POSTMODERN APPROACH TO GENDER ROLES,
STEREOTYPES, AND WOMAN'S IDENTITY QUEST IN
TRACY CHEVALIER'S FALLING ANGELS AND JOHN
FOWLES' THE COLLECTOR**

Yüksek Lisans Tezi

Tezi Hazırlayan:

Serdar ÖZTÜRK

1955069011

0000-0001-8195-0937

Danışman: Dr. Öğr. Üyesi Seval ARSLAN

İstanbul, 2023

YEMİN METNİ

Yüksek lisans tezi olarak sunduğum “**A Postmodern Approach to Gender Roles, Stereotypes, and Woman’s Identity Quest in Tracy Chevalier’s *Falling Angels* and John Fowles’ *The Collector***” başlıklı bu çalışmanın, bilimsel ahlak ve geleneklere uygun şekilde tarafımdan yazıldığını, bu tezdeki bütün bilgileri akademik ve etik kurallar içinde elde ettiğimi, yararlandığım eserlerin tamamının kaynaklarda gösterildiğini ve çalışmamın içinde kullanıldıkları her yerde bunlara atıf yapıldığını, patent ve telif haklarını ihlal edici bir davranışımın olmadığını belirtir ve bunu onurumla doğrularım. 23.01.2023

Serdar ÖZTÜRK

T.C.
BEYKENT ÜNİVERSİTESİ
LİSANSÜSTÜ EĞİTİM ENSTİTÜSÜ MÜDÜRLÜĞÜ
TEZLİ YÜKSEK LİSANS SINAV TUTANAĞI

23/01/2023

Enstitümüz *İngiliz Dili ve Edebiyatı* Anabilim Dalı *İngiliz Dili ve Edebiyatı* Programı yüksek lisans öğrencilerinden 1955069011 numaralı **Serdar ÖZTÜRK**'ün "*Beykent Üniversitesi Lisansüstü Eğitim – Öğretim Yönetmeliği*"nin ilgili maddesine göre hazırlayarak, Enstitümüze teslim ettiği "*A Postmodern Approach to Gender Roles, Stereotypes, and Woman's Identity Quest in Tracy Chevalier's Falling Angels and John Fowles' The Collector*" konulu tezini, Yönetim Kurulumuzun 10/01/2023 tarih ve 2023/02 sayılı toplantısında seçilen ve Taksim yerleşkesinde toplanan biz jüri üyeleri huzurunda, Beykent Üniversitesi Lisansüstü Eğitim ve Öğretim Yönetmeliğinin 29. maddesinin 3. fıkrası gereğince 45 dakika süre ile aday tarafından savunulmuş ve sonuçta adayın tezi hakkında "**OYBİRLİĞİ**" ile "**KABUL**" kararı verilmiştir.

İşbu tutanak, 2 nüsha olarak hazırlanmış ve Enstitü Müdürlüğü'ne sunulmak üzere tarafımızdan düzenlenmiştir.

DANIŞMAN
Dr. Öğr. Üyesi Se*** AR***
(Beykent Üniversitesi)

ÜYE
Prof. Dr. Vi*** MA***
(Beykent Üniversitesi)

ÜYE
Doç. Dr. Sa*** HA***
(Yeni Yüzyıl Üniversitesi)

Adı ve Soyadı : Serdar ÖZTÜRK
Danışmanı : Dr. Öğr. Üyesi Seval ARSLAN
Türü ve Tarihi : Yüksek Lisans Tezi, 2023
Alanı : İngiliz Dili ve Edebiyatı
Anahtar Kelimeler : Feminizm, Stereotipler, Cinsiyet Roller, Postmodernizm

ÖZ

A POSTMODERN APPROACH TO GENDER ROLES, STEREOTYPES, AND WOMAN'S IDENTITY QUEST IN TRACY CHEVALIER'S FALLING ANGELS AND JOHN FOWLES' THE COLLECTOR

Tracy Chevalier'in *Falling Angels* ve John Fowles'un *The Collector* adlı romanları, çoklu anlatımları ve belirsiz sonlarıyla postmodern eserler olarak öne çıkmaktadır. Bu iki çalışmanın, kahramanlarının kişisel yaşamlarında karşılaştıkları zorlukları ortaya koyması ve gerçeğin kişiden kişiye değişen doğasını göstermesi de çok önemlidir. Bu bağlamda romanlardaki kadın karakterlerin kimlik arayışları üzerinde durulacak ve toplumsal cinsiyet rollerinin bu arayışları nasıl etkilediği incelenecektir. Ayrıca tez, karakterlerin sosyal koşullarındaki benzerlik ve farklılıklara dikkat çekerek mücadelelerini karşılaştırmayı amaçlamaktadır. Ayrıca iki romanın geçtiği mekânlar birbirinin kronolojik devamı niteliğinde olduğu için Kitty'nin 1900'lerin başındaki kadın hakları mücadelesinin Miranda'nın 1960'lardaki kimlik arayışına yansımaları incelenecektir.

Name and Surname : Serdar ÖZTÜRK
Supervisor : Dr. Lecturer Seval ARSLAN
Degree and Date : MA / 2023
Major : English Language and Literature
Key Words : Feminism, Stereotypes, Gender Roles, Postmodernism

ABSTRACT

A POSTMODERN APPROACH TO GENDER ROLES, STEREOTYPES, AND WOMAN'S IDENTITY QUEST IN TRACY CHEVALIER'S FALLING ANGELS AND JOHN FOWLES' THE COLLECTOR

Tracy Chevalier's *Falling Angels* and John Fowles' *The Collector* stand out as postmodern works, with their multiple narrations and ambiguous endings. It is also critical that the two novels reveal the challenges that their protagonists face in their personal lives and present the shifting nature of truth from person to person. In this context, this thesis focuses on the identity quests of the female characters in the novels and examines how social gender roles affect their search. In addition, it compares the struggles of the characters by drawing attention to the similarities and differences in their social conditions. Moreover, as the settings of the two novels are chronological continuations of each other, the reflection of Kitty's fight for women's rights at the beginning of the 1900s on Miranda's identity quest in the 1960s is analysed.

CONTENTS

ÖZ

ABSTRACT

GLOSSARY ii

INTRODUCTION 1

CHAPTER ONE

1. POSTMODERNISM AND GENDER ROLES 4

1.1. Postmodernism..... 4

1.2. Gender Roles..... 6

1.3 Postmodern Feminism 9

CHAPTER TWO

1. TRACY CHEVALIER'S FALLING ANGELS: TO BE OR NOT TO BE AN ANGEL
IN THE HOUSE 16

CHAPTER THREE

1. DELICACY IN THE HANDS OF A SAVAGE: MIRANDA'S IDENTITY QUEST IN
JOHN FOWLES' THE COLLECTOR 30

CONCLUSION..... 44

BIBLIOGRAPHY 48

ÖZGEÇMİŞ 50

GLOSSARY

Feminism:	The advocacy of women's rights on the basis of the equality of the sexes.
Gender Role:	A social role encompassing a range of behaviors and attitudes that are generally considered acceptable, appropriate, or desirable for a person based on that person's sex.
Postmodernism:	Postmodernism is a philosophical movement that impacted the arts and critical thinking throughout the latter half of the 20th century.
Stereotype:	A widely held but fixed and oversimplified image or idea of a particular type of person or thing.
Suffragettes:	Female political activists in the early 20th Century who fought for democratic rights and socio-economic equality.
Women's Social and Political Union:	Political Party of the suffragette movement.

INTRODUCTION

Postmodernism is a late-twentieth-century philosophical movement that mainly criticizes the fundamental assumptions of modern Western philosophy. In other words, it is a philosophical movement in the late 20th century characterised by wide scepticism, subjectivism, or relativism. It is hard to define postmodernism, as its philosophy rejects all types of general definitions or patterns. In postmodernism, there is no single truth. Truth can vary from person to person, as it focuses on the shifting nature of human perception. Its philosophy covers a broad perspective that has influenced many areas, from literature to art, from architecture to social life. When the effects of postmodernism on literature are examined, techniques such as unreliable narration, metafiction, intertextuality, and self-reflexivity come to the forefront. Tracy Chevalier's novel *Falling Angels* and John Fowles' novel *The Collector*, are also noteworthy for having multiple narrations and ambiguous endings. It is also important that the two novels reveal the dilemmas that their characters experience in their personal lives and present the shifting nature of truth from person to person.

Feminism is another area influenced by postmodern philosophy. In particular, postmodernism's reluctant approach to generalisations and the existence of a single truth also affects feminist philosophers. Postmodern feminists like Luce Irigaray, Hélène Cixous, and Judith Butler claim that the problems experienced by women cannot be solved through generalisation; on the contrary, their individuality should come to the fore, and the problems should be discussed on this basis. They are interested in approaches that adopt multiple discourses and reject logocentric views. They do not generally focus on gender differences; instead, their main interest is the individuality of a woman because the diversities of personalities are more prominent than generalised qualities of genders.

Within this context, the thesis focuses on the female characters of Tracy Chevalier's *Falling Angels* and John Fowles' *The Collector*, Kitty and Miranda, it analyses their identity quests to reveal to what extent they are able to free their identities from gender stereotypes and gain their voices. By comparing the conditions of these characters, the similarities and differences between their lives are revealed. At the same time, since the settings of the two novels coincide with periods that could be a continuation of each other, it presents the reflections of women's rights Kitty fought for at the cost of her life in the early 1900s on Miranda's life in the 1960s and their effects on Miranda's identity quest.

The first chapter of the thesis offers background information for the reader. Since the novels in the thesis are postmodern works, it begins with an examination of postmodernism. Furthermore, because *Falling Angels*' setting is the Victorian era, the social status and conditions of women during that period are emphasised. It also provides information on the difficult conditions of women living at that time and how they survived in a male-dominated society. This section gives details about their absence from the public sphere and the fact that they can only find space in the domestic sphere and have to live a life dependent on their husbands. By providing this background information, this chapter aims to enable the reader to visualise Kitty's living conditions more clearly. Then it discusses the ideas of postmodern feminist thinkers like Luce Irigaray, Hélène Cixous, and Judith Butler. It intends to explain the problems in Kitty's and Miranda's identity quests with the theories of these feminist thinkers.

The second chapter discusses Tracy Chevalier's novel, *Falling Angels*. This section takes a close look at Kitty's relationships with her husband and the people around her. It questions Kitty's dissatisfaction with life. Kitty actually belongs to the upper middle class. She has a beautiful, big house, a handsome, wealthy husband and a smart daughter, so other women living at that time envy the good conditions of her life. However, she is unhappy with her life. She attempts to break free from traditional roles and takes numerous steps in this direction. She does not want to have children, does not deal with the house as a woman, and does not take care of her daughter. Besides, she ignores all the pressures of her mother-in-law and husband. She joins the Women's Social and Political Union and fights for women's right to vote. This chapter analyses the reasons of Kitty's dissatisfaction and seeks to reveal, through the lenses of feminist theorists, whether Kitty gains her own voice in this struggle.

The third chapter is about John Fowles' novel *The Collector*. This section offers a deep analysis of the selected scenes from the novel to question Miranda's identity quest. Miranda is an educated, modern, and beautiful girl. Clegg is platonically in love with Miranda and kidnaps her. He imprisons Miranda in a house far from the city and dreams that, over time, Miranda will fall in love with him. Clegg, who does not release Miranda under any circumstances, causes her death. In her life of captivity, Miranda tries every way to get rid of Clegg, but she cannot escape. Apart from Clegg, Miranda's relationship with G.P. also seems to have problems. The fact that she cannot resist him and takes a passive role in the relationship does not go unnoticed by the reader. This chapter will discuss Miranda's journey in search of identity by highlighting some scenes from the book.

The final chapter mainly examines Miranda's conditions during her quest for identity. In addition, it places emphasis on the connection between Kitty, Maude, and Miranda. The reflections of Kitty's struggle for women's rights in the 1900s are examined in Miranda's life in the 1960s. This chapter compares the two female characters and draws attention to the similarities or differences between them. Finally, it discusses whether the characters have freed themselves from gender stereotypes and found their own identity at the end of the stories.



CHAPTER ONE

1. POSTMODERNISM AND GENDER ROLES

1.1. Postmodernism

It is hard to make a clear definition of postmodernism as its philosophy rejects any fixed definitions or patterns. According to postmodernism, truth is not unique; it is changeable, and it consists of shifting nature of human perceptions. From architecture to philosophy, it has influenced many areas and become the area of study for many practices in the late 70s. Though it is a well-known fact that nearly all literary movements have a starting point and an end, the basics of modernism were adapted to postmodernism and continue to survive. Some critics like Fredric Jameson do not deny the close relationship between modernism and postmodernism. Jameson claims postmodernism is a continuation and validation of modernism (Jameson, 1991, p. 55). Literary periods do not necessarily mean changing the context; instead, updating the formal qualities is also possible. In addition, some minor characteristics of the previous movement may become the major parts of the forthcoming period. From this perspective, postmodernism is the validation of the modernist context in the following years. However, analysing the period with its social background is necessary to understand the postmodern concept. The social structure of the period was not very different from the modernist society. After World War II, similar chaotic events were taking place, but their reflection on society was deeper than the previous years. The role of the media was prominent as some trends in society like scepticism, anti-authoritarianism, rejection of the definition of art, and anti-totalitarian movements, etc. became wider with the help of the media. Especially the emergence of Rock and Hippie culture, micro sub- and contra-cultures affected society's perspective on the striking events of the period. These incidents shaped the psychology of society and constructed the background of postmodern literature. Just like the term modern, making a clear definition of the term postmodern is not easy. Due to its rejection of any general form and definition, only some personal perceptions of the term can be reflected rather than making a general definition. Therefore, the unique points of view of each distinguished figure of the period come forward to discuss postmodernism, like those of Ihab Hassan, John Francois Lyotard, Steven Connor, Fredrick Jameson, Linda Hutcheon, Jean Baudrillard, and Francis Fukuyama.

To start with, Lyotard defines postmodern as “incredulity towards metanarratives” (Lyotard, 1984, p. xxiv). The notion of self is important to understand Lyotard's words better.

According to Lyotard, it is impossible to be sure about one's true self. The notion of self is changeable depending on the perceptions of people and culture. He believes self is constructed by how you and others perceive each other. In addition, human perceptions are not consistent. He clarifies his opinion about the notion of self as follows: "A self does not amount to much, but no self is an island; each exists in a fabric of relations that is now more complex and mobile than ever before" (Lyotard, 1984, p. 15). To sum up, according to Lyotard, the term "self" is an abstract entity that is created in a person's mind which is shaped by the society and the culture a person grows in. Due to this spurious nature of human perception, the validity of metanarratives is open to discussion for him. At this point, the importance of "little narratives" comes (Lyotard, 1984, p. 60). He argues that pluralistic knowledge or truth is more suitable for the postmodern age and its life conditions. Little narratives make it possible for us to reflect multiple realities, unlike metanarratives. Lyotard rejects the Habermasian suggestion of consensus, which claims that knowledge is constructed by the consensus of a group of people or legalized with an authority. In contrast, he supports dissensus, a war against absolute truth (Lyotard, 1984, p. 61-62).

Postmodern concept and its hesitant approach to absolute truth and generalization effected the feminist philosophers as well. They argued that society and culture produced realities about gender. They questioned accepted forms of both genders and rejected general truths about genders and their qualities. They argue that if the universal belief about women was accepted, individual qualities would be ignored, and they focused on individual differences of each woman to show not all women have same personality (Tong, 2009, 217). Postmodern feminists look for the approaches that prioritize multiple discourses and criticize logocentric notions. In the postmodern feminist theory, subjectivity is one of the key notions for postmodern feminists, as they concentrate on individuals rather than gender differences (Tong, 2009, p. 217). They intend to demonstrate differences between women. In the heart of this theory, varieties among individuals are more significant than the generally accepted qualities of genders.

1.2. Gender Roles

This thesis focuses on the characters of Tracy Chevalier's *Falling Angels* and John Fowles' *The Collector* by spotting stereotypical gender role examples and making their analysis within the scope of the Fowles' and Chevalier's perception and reflection on the topic. In *Falling Angels*, the setting is early 1900s. Therefore, giving background information will be useful to understand the conditions of the characters. Throughout history, the gender roles of men and women have been a part of our lives. Though it may change from time to time and culture to culture, the distinction of the roles between the two genders has always been open to discussion. Gender roles are the codes of behaviour that a society expects from each gender. In the early social structure, there were distinctive roles for males and females. Fundamentally, man had the responsibility of protecting woman and providing the basic needs of the family while woman had roles as the child-bearer and caretaker of the family. Though the roles have changed somewhat corresponding to the structure and needs of society, this primitive belief is still the major reason for the dispute between genders. John Fowles uses this kind of gender role representations in his novels through his male and female characters. To explain this better, first, I shed light on the norms of Victorian society and its gender roles. Later, I focus on the postmodern background of gender roles and its relation to creating an identity. While analysing the subject, I benefit from feminist theories, as gender roles and feminist philosophy are inseparable.

The gender role history of 19th century England is observed in two distinctive ways. One was the patriarchal representation that underlined the power and superiority of men while the other was the gradual awakening and reactions of women against this condition. Though these efforts were significant, they were not enough to get a result. Although some positive regulations changed conditions for women in educational, social, and working life, it did not help to change their actual status in society at the beginning of the 1900s. In the Victorian era, there was a paradoxical situation as Queen Victoria ruled the country. She was less than twenty when she was enthroned, and she was socially and symbolically superior to all other people in the country, including men. However, traditionally, women were regarded as the weaker gender, and men were ruling them. Their husbands or fathers were controlling their private life. In addition, men held the power in terms of economy, politics, and legislation. On the other hand, in this era, it was hard to change the conditions of women, as these changes would affect the social order negatively, including the position of working-class and younger people. From

this perspective, supporting the women's movement was equal to being against democratization, as man had the responsibility of bringing money and food while woman positioned herself as a loyal helper. This situation brought about the theory of separate spheres that designated man as a competitor for earning money at all cost, even immoral ways, and woman as a religious and moral complement. The emergence of Darwin's theory "survival of the fittest" also put a scientific depth to the superiority of man.

One of the eminent philosophers, John Ruskin, defines men's position as "active, progressive and defensive" and attributes the performer and creator roles to men and passive roles to women. Their physical qualities are not for battling, or their intellectual potential is not for inventing and creating. However, he explains his opinion on women as follows: "She must be enduringly, incorruptibly good; instinctively, infallibly wise-wise, not for self-development, but for self-renunciation: wise, not that she may set herself above her husband, but that she may never fail from his side" (Ruskin, 1864, p. 69). In the Victorian gender philosophy, men were superior to women. During the period, masculinity and its values like courage were promoted through campaigns by the army. However, women had a more supportive role when compared to men. Virginal innocence, maternity, and self-sacrifice were promoted under the name of womanly virtue while they were facing misogyny at all levels of society (Poovey, 1988, p. 8). Even in intellectual writing, the inferiority of women was openly discussed during the period. In their works, some prominent figures of the time stated that even being born as a little boy meant being superior to half the race. John Stuart Mill rejected this idea in his work *The Subjection of Women*, stating that without giving equal opportunities to women, it would be impossible to understand the reality (Mill, 1869, p. 5). Moreover, he finds this distinction unnatural and explains his point by giving some examples from ancient societies:

The independence of women seemed rather less unnatural to Greeks than to other nations, on account of the fabulous Amazons (whom they believed to be historical), and the partial example afforded by the Spartan women; who though no less subordinate by law than in other Greek states, were more free in fact, and being trained to bodily exercises in the same manner with men, gave ample proof that they were not naturally disqualified for them. (Mill, 1869, p. 10)

Mill here opposes the claim that women are in fact innately physically inferior. He explains that Spartan women were more liberated than their contemporaries and performed physical labour like men. He explains this situation with social prejudices. In fact, society will understand the

truth if it accepts that women have the same potential as men and gives them a chance, like in the past. He says that men do not have an innate superiority over women; there is just such a misconception about it.

When it comes to education for women in the 1800s, it was practical and limited to work and domestic concerns. The purpose of education was mainly to prepare the “angel in the house.” Women could only obtain these limited and domestic skills at boarding schools. This education was popular among middle-class women, as it was a better way of attracting “potential husbands” rather than proving their domestic skills. These middle-class girls were known as “accomplished.” In Jane Austen’s novel *Pride and Prejudice*, which has some similar aspects of Victorian era and its setting, a character named Caroline Bingley summarizes some qualities of the accomplished girls as follows: “A woman must have a thorough knowledge of music, singing, drawing, dancing, and the modern languages.” She continues to count the required skills in the same chapter: “she must possess a certain something in her air and manner of walking, the tone of her voice, her address and expressions” (Austen, 2006 p.43). These lines of Jane Austen’s novel highlight that education is a way to improve their feminine manner for woman to draw the attention of the opposite sex.

Moreover, at the end of the century, primary education became universal and reached a higher level. Woman also had the opportunity to study at universities; however, they were segregated from men and had limited areas to study like geography and literature, as these areas were considered suitable for women. Men had privileges at universities and were easily promoted at universities, as society believed that women were inferior to men in intellectual areas (Mill, 1869, p. 49). In short, though women attended to universities, male dominance in education was apparent, and discrimination was an enormous obstacle for women.

During the Victorian period, employment was another area where gender played a determinant role. Throughout the era, types of employment changed because of industrialization, but gender discrimination remained the same. Male employment shifted from agricultural works to heavy industrial jobs. Men left domestic work, and women were recruited to these positions (Mill, 1869, p. 38). Agriculture, laundering, and textile were other sectors that women engaged in during the era (Mitchell, 1962, 60). The laws that protected the working class were mostly about men. Men were the responsible gender who provided money for his house, which enabled women to stay at home and perform motherly duties (Ittmann, 1995, p. 142). Men dominated nearly all the important labour movements. However, in the mid-century,

the number of women working in some professional areas started to increase. In addition to the limited number of physicians, vets, architects, and dentists, a great number of female musicians, actors, and painters appeared. On the other hand, aristocrats were not working for money. They were living on revenues from estates and bureaucratic positions. Generally, the aristocrats took part in court in various positions regardless of their sex. In contrast to the aristocrats, women who belonged to the middle- and upper-middle classes could not find a job outside the house. They looked like idle women sitting at home. In reality, they had the responsibility of all the domestic work, from running the house to childcare. Besides, they were supervising the servants on cooking, cleaning, and other related domestic works. Another common profession was dressmaking. Mending clothes was one of the main duties of women living in that period, and, after the invention of the domestic sewing machine, it became a popular profession among women (Ittmann, 1995, p. 60). Lastly, nursing of the aged members of the family or children was a duty of women. Though it was possible for some women to hire a professional nurse when needed, it was also a failure to perform their traditional roles, and many women did not prefer it.

1.3 Postmodern Feminism

Another subject affected by postmodernism was feminism. The 20th century was a period when European cultures started to revise their perspective on the position of women. In this period, women gained some freedom and rights in social life, like access to education and the right to vote. Especially feminist movements played an important role in changing the position of women in society. Briefly, postmodern feminism intends to demolish patriarchal norms of society to maintain equality for both sexes. To achieve this, they reject the common idea that argues each gender has its typical attributes. Feminists in this era reject the narratives that describe women in domestic environments and isolate them from social life. Topics like equality between women and men changed, and feminists started to discuss gender identity and questioned common forms of two genders within the frame of Jacques Derrida's deconstruction theory and the psychoanalytic theories of Jacques Lacan. In the postmodern era, feminists like Hélène Cixous, Judith Butler, and Luce Irigaray formed the feminist perspective.

Hélène Cixous is one of the founders of French feminism and her works, "The Laugh of the Medusa" and *The Newly Born Woman* are reputable in this area. She examines language and gender relationships in these works. Cixous mainly thinks that women should write to find a place in patriarchal society. She dwells on how, historically, women have fallen behind men

in writing due to men's authority in the intellectual environment. In "The Laugh of the Medusa," she argues that women should be portrayed by women rather than by men. She argues that some female characteristics are imposed by male perspective on women via male writers' works, and women cannot adopt themselves to these qualities. She encourages women to write, as she also thinks writing "brings women to their senses and to their meaning in history" (Cixous, 1976, p. 875-876). She believes that writing is a medium to take place in history, and without having a history, one cannot fully exist in society. She also points out that women should recognize their body's secret meaning. Prevention of women's writing leads to censorship of the female body. The female body is reflected as something to be ashamed of, and writing is a way to break this censorship. She encourages women to love their bodies instead of being ashamed of them. She says that only when women achieve this, will they be able to change the patriarchal order:

By writing her self, woman will return to the body which has been more than confiscated from her, which has been turned into the uncanny stranger on display - the ailing or dead figure, which so often turns out to be the nasty companion, the cause and location of inhibitions. Censor the body and you censor breath and speech at the same time. Write your self. Your body must be heard. Only then will the immense resources of the unconscious spring forth. (Cixous, 1976, p. 880)

Cixous says that women are accused of qualities contradicting each other, such as having or lacking sexual desire, having maternal feelings or not having enough of them, and having children or not (Cixous, 1976, p. 880). At this point, she suggests women's writing will be a key to recognizing the male pressure that imposes these two binary oppositions on women and stimulating women to find a salvation. For Cixous, women's salvation begins with loving their body and being proud of their sexuality (Cixous, 1976, p. 880). By doing this, they can regain control of their bodies and recognize their secret qualities rather than be ashamed of them. She also adds that women should write subversively to demolish the traditions of society:

A feminine text cannot fail to be more than subversive. It is volcanic; as it is written, it brings about an upheaval of the old property crust, carrier of masculine investments; there's no other way. There's no room for her if she's not a he. If she's a her-she, it's in order to smash everything, to shatter the framework of institutions, to blow up the law, to break up the "truth" with laughter. (Cixous, 1976, p. 888)

Another point she discusses is that speaking is precious, and she encourages women to speak. However, it may not be enough to be heard by a “deaf male ear which hears in language only that which speaks in the masculine” (Cixous, 1976, p. 881). She motivates women “to write and thus to forge for herself the anti-logos weapon” (Cixous, 1976, p. 880). Writing can be a tool to overcome this silencing, as man dominates speech. “It is by writing, from and toward women, and by taking up the challenge of speech which has been governed by the phallus, that women will confirm women in a place other than that which is reserved in and by the symbolic, that is, in a place other than silence. Women should break out of the snare of silence” (Cixous, 1976, p. 881). In the last part of her article, she advises women to be careful about obstacles that men may create to prevent their progress and says women should have “generative power” to overcome these problems.

In her other work, *The Newly Born Woman*, today’s ideology, which is rooted in ancient periods, is about to collapse. Due to the effects of this ancient ideology, women have had a passive role both socially and sexually in society throughout history. In “Sorties,” Cixous outlines some basic binary oppositions like mind and heart, nature and culture, mother and father. She argues that these binary oppositions are the root of the man-versus-woman opposition. As binary opposition theory claims that without their opposites, concepts cannot exist, in gender opposition, man always considers himself superior to the other side and neutralizes the superior sides of woman by using biology (Ebert, 1991, p 888). From this point of view, man can express himself better and always be the authority in almost all aspects of social and personal life.

Another topic she underlines is that women are excluded from philosophy. She discusses that women stay away from this area due to the logocentric system, as it controls the production of information (Cixous, 1986, p. 65). By considering this situation, she claims that creation of a new generation of information should be free from phallocentrism and logocentrism. She asserts that, at historical level, women’s writings are ignored, and that leads to their non-existence in the philosophical area (Cixous, 1986, p. 65). She thinks that, in order to support women’s writing on historical level, society must abandon conceptualization. After this achievement, people start to appreciate their bodies and feel their existence (Cixous, 1986, p. 65).

Another prominent figure among French feminists is Luce Irigaray. She works in multiple fields. She is both a philosopher and a psychoanalyst. In addition to these fields, she

is also a linguist. She avoids sharing her private life, as she believes personal information can be used against the work of women who are against the traditional systems of institutions. In fact, she had a similar experience when she criticized Lacan in her work *Speculum of the Other Woman*. Because of her ideas in this work, she was expelled from the academy where she was teaching. Like Hélène Cixous, Irigaray also claims that women should not take role in society only by their domestic duties (Irigaray, 1987, p. 120). She also states that culture defines women through men. Due to this belief, man has the incentives of freedom in almost all areas of life unlike woman. This mentality explains why, throughout history, men have been depicted as independent, while women have been depicted as dependent on men.

Irigaray, in her books *This Sex Which Is Not One* and *Speculum of the Other Woman*, questions the concept of gender and criticizes Lacan's symbolic order. Irigaray's ideas can be analysed in three phases. The first phase is Western culture and its relationship with masculinity. In the second phase, she analyses masculine culture and seeks the conditions for building up female culture. In the last phase, she examines the relationship of both genders without sexual differences. Irigaray bases her theories in *Speculum of the Other Woman* on the rejection of Lacan's symbolic order and Freud's theory of the development of sex. She criticizes Freud's theory, in which he divides two sexes into male and female distinctively, and at this point, the feminine existence begins (Irigaray, 1987, p. 14). She rejects the patriarchal idea that the female subject must be silenced and suppressed in order to achieve male subjectivity. Due to this suppression, from the moment they first become aware of their sexuality, young girls undergo a phallogentric order that limits them from appreciating their bodies. Irigaray's main opposition to Freud's opinion is about his phallogentric point of view, which explains the development of female sexuality in comparison with male sexual development. Freud describes this development in opposite ways for both sexes, and female development becomes the negative version of male development (Irigaray, 1987, p. 52). This creates the feeling of lacking subconsciously, which is described as "castrated genital organ" (Irigaray, 1987, p. 36). This physical lacking turns into psychological total absence for woman. As this problem has physical roots and is fixed, woman rejects her body, which leads to hysteria. Irigaray explains the reason of this condition as the absence, which "radically escapes any representation" (Irigaray, 1987, p. 68). She rejects this perspective, argues that female sexuality is not all about the phallus, and draws attention to the plurality of female sexuality (Irigaray, 1987, p. 28).

In addition to these points, Irigaray discusses language and its effects on women's subject position. She argues that women exempt themselves from being subjects, as there is a clear distinction between the speech patterns of both sexes. She extends her argument with experiments by asking man and woman to form a sentence with predetermined words. She recognizes that both sexes abstain from inserting woman as the subject of the sentences. The results of these experiments are analysed by Margorie Hass. In her work, Mass concludes that men more often see themselves as speakers. Another thing she points out is that women tend to adapt themselves more to dialogues and value interpersonal interactions more than men do. Moreover, women adapt to differences more easily, as they tend to view differences positively in contrast to men. Lastly, she states that both women and men avoid using woman as the subject of a sentence (Hass, 2000, p. 66).

Irigaray's research claims that the difference in language use of the two sexes also shows the perception of sexual differences for both sexes. In her analysis of language, Irigaray deals with subject forms and states that grammatical forms are also sexed. Hass supports this idea by dividing subjects into two categories as speaking and grammatical subjects. She points out that grammar functions for both sexes differently, as it promotes masculinity while degrading femininity in language (Hass, 2000, p. 70). Irigaray thinks that not only the subjects He and She but also I is sexed and believes language should change itself by allowing female subjectivity. There is a close relationship between language and society that tends to remove female subjectivity as all the pronouns serve for the male subjectivity.

Judith Butler is another prominent scholar who is well known for her performative theory of gender. In her work, she argues that social conventions determine gender rather than biological terms. She subverts the notion of gender and opens the definition of the term to discussion. She argues that the common definition of gender serves masculine hegemony and heterosexist power (Butler, 2006, p. 44). She thinks that feminists should not insist on "strategies that figure a utopian beyond"; instead, they should deal with "mobilization, subversive confusion, and proliferation of precisely those constitutive categories that seek to keep gender in its place by posturing as the foundational illusions of identity" (Butler, 2006, p. 46). With these words, Butler aims to deconstruct common definitions of gender and sex. In the frame of feminist thinkers who adopt phenomenological theory, she develops her own gender and sex argument. In addition to this, especially John Searle's studies on speech-act theory affected Butler while she was constructing her performative theory. Speech-act theory, as Butler

states, examines how social agents use language, gesture, and some other types of symbolic social signs to create social reality (Butler, 1988, p. 519). She continues her explanation as follows: “within speech act theory, a performative is that discursive practice that enacts or produces that which it names” (Butler, 1993, p. 21). From this perspective, Butler asserts that culture constructs sex, and sociocultural dynamics give name the biological and physical qualities that is known as sex. Moreover, she claims sexuality is an artificial concept that is created by existing social norms. She also refers to Simone de Beauvoir’s ideas about the distinction between sex and gender. About Beauvoir’s opinion on woman’s being a historical idea, not a fact, Butler underlines that Beauvoir makes a distinction between sex and gender. For Beauvoir, sex is biological while gender is a cultural reflection of sex (Butler, 1988, p. 522). Butler expands on the argument stating, “If gender is the cultural meaning that the sexed body assumes, then a gender cannot be said to follow from a sex in one way” (Butler, 2006, p. 10). She believes that traditional norms that construct genders are not suitable for both genders. She opposes the idea that gender must be considered binary. She believes that gender will free itself from restrictions and become unique when this relationship between sex and gender is rejected (Butler, 2006, p. 10). She also criticizes other feminists who distinguish sex and gender in a traditional way, as she believes this approach would limit the potential of gender. She says: “If the immutable character of sex is contested, perhaps this construct called ‘sex’ is as culturally constructed as gender; indeed, perhaps it was always already gender, with the consequence that the distinction between sex and gender turns out to be no distinction at all” (Butler, 2004, p. 10).

Until now, Butler’s arguments about the cultural construction of sex and gender and her opinions on the distinction of sex and gender have been discussed. In addition to these ideas, in her work *Gender Trouble*, she discusses how this construction happens and claims performativity plays an important role in gender construction. By stating that gender and sex are the same, she deconstructs the traditional perspective and opens a new discussion about the gender concept. She states that gender cannot exist without a social definition; that means individual genders cannot survive without the definition of culture. In addition to this, Butler believes gender construction depends upon repeated acts. She asserts that repeated acts are constructive and create particular characteristics of gender. If these acts are repeated for a certain period, gender construction starts (Butler, 2006, p. 46). She says: “Gender is the repeated stylization of the body, a set of repeated acts within a highly rigid regulatory frame that congeal over time to produce the appearance of substance, of a natural sort of being” (Butler, 2006, p.

43). She uses drag performances and parodies to illustrate her point of view on performative gender theory. She believes that gender construction is imitation of behaviours. In addition to this point, she claims some repeated behaviours are internalized by sex. She talks about make-up activity as an example. Society accepts make-up as a female activity, and women perform it in the framework of feminine purposes. However, Butler claims that women do make-up to belong to a certain gender. By doing make-up or wearing a skirt, women find and recognize the predefined meaning of their body so that they become a part of a certain gender created by society. She states that “the gendered body is performative, suggests that it has no ontological status apart from the various acts which constitute its reality” (Butler, 2006, p. 173). Gender is not the ground that produces some typical behaviours; instead, repeated behaviours that belong to certain genders create the gender phenomenon.



CHAPTER TWO

1. TRACY CHEVALIER'S *FALLING ANGELS*: TO BE OR NOT TO BE AN ANGEL IN THE HOUSE

Falling Angels is a historical novel written by Tracy Chevalier. The novel begins with Queen Victoria's death and depicts the lives of two middle class families, the Colemans and the Waterhouses. These two families are quite different from each other, both culturally and economically. The Colemans seem modern and open to new trends while the Waterhouses stick to Victorian norms. The novel generally portrays the rising spirit of change in society at the beginning of the 1900s. During that time, development in industrialization affected Victorian family structure. Barbara Caine believes that industrialization brought a new order to families as men went out to work and women stayed at home for domestic responsibilities. That created "separate spheres" (Caine, 1982, p. 540). Within the frame of this idea, people started to believe that the roles of both genders were defined by biological terms. Thus, women's roles were designated by nature and could not be changed (Shanely, 1993, p. 6). Men needed to support their families and dealt with public problems while women stayed at home and did domestic work. In addition to domestic roles, women were supposed to guide the moral and religious side of the family (Caine, 1982, p.540). However, although separate spheres ideology was "highly effective in ordering people's values according to its precepts" as Philippa Levine claims, due to changing economic conditions, Victorian ideals about women were never fully achieved (Levine, 1987, p. 12-13). As the economic conditions for families became harder, women began to work in various jobs. Therefore, they could not fully fulfil their traditional roles in their families. Also during this period, the women's suffrage movement started to arise among women who were dissatisfied with their conditions in society. In the second half of the 1800s, with the help of their propaganda, improvements were made in some areas such as married women's property and custody rights (Shanley, 1993, p.13). Although these changes did not affect many families at first and preserved the Victorian family structure, they weakened societal support for traditional values over time (Tosh, 2005, p. 108, 119). Victorian norms detained women from public sphere. In addition, one of the most important fights was for women's right to vote. Following the formation of the Women's Social and Political Union, the women's suffrage movement gained traction. It was a radical organization, and the suffragettes became famous with their militant protests. Due to this fame, the police were harsh in their interventions against the suffragettes.

Backgrounding this setting, Tracy Chevalier portrays the life of a middle-class family, the Colemans, and their surrounding families in a detailed way. The multiple narration technique that Chevalier uses makes it possible to witness the inner sides of the characters in the novel. When analysed closely, some characters try to free themselves from Victorian norms and find their identity. The two main female characters of the novel, Kitty Coleman and Gertrude Waterhouse, show some characteristic qualities of Victorian women; however, Kitty Coleman tries to change her condition while Gertrude Waterhouse looks comfortable with her situation. Kitty Coleman is unhappy with her private and social life as a woman and resists the normative conditions of the Victorian era. However, in her identity quest, I think she is unable to free herself completely from the conditions dictated by society. Her struggle against this issue is not stable, and she frequently oscillates between being a free woman and being a stereotypical woman in critical scenes. This dilemma paralyses her and pushes her to fail on the way to her quest. In addition to this, while this chapter mainly focuses on the condition of Kitty Coleman, it will also analyse some other female characters in the novel and aim to reveal the reasons why they cannot fully find their own free identities in Victorian society. To achieve this, I plan to do a close reading of some scenes from the novel and show what kind of dilemmas the characters are in and what circumstances shape their position in society.

To begin with, the dilemma Kitty experiences can even be recognised in her words in the opening scene of the novel: “I woke this morning with a stranger in my bed. The head of blond hair beside me was decidedly not my husband’s. I did not know whether to be shocked or amused” (Chevalier, 2002, p. 8). At first glance, this scene is significant as it presents the Coleman family’s rejection of the traditional lifestyle. However, Kitty is in a dilemma here. Above all, she does not fully understand why her husband has forced her into this situation. That is why she does not “know whether to be shocked or amused.” In the same scene, she continues to explain her complex feelings as follows:

I could barely look at him. I was embarrassed, and angry too - angry that I should feel embarrassed and yet not expect him to feel so as well. It was the more infuriating that he simply kissed me, said, ‘Hello darling,’ and began to dress. I could smell her perfume on his neck. Yet I could say nothing. As I myself have so often said, am open-minded - I pride myself on it. Those words bit now. (Chevalier, 2002, p. 8)

Although she thinks of herself as “open-minded” and prides herself on it, she has dilemmas about sharing a bed with a stranger and cannot control her feelings of embarrassment. And also,

the fact that she feels embarrassed without expecting Richard to be embarrassed makes her angry with herself. The dilemma she has in here hints that she experiences a confusion in her identity. She perceives this situation like a traditional Victorian woman and reacts accordingly, and this makes her angry with herself at the same time. Women in the Victorian era were supposed to guide their families morally and protect their marriages. A stereotypical woman could be embarrassed by this incident and would never approve. In addition, during this era, the sexuality of women was considered in the context of reproduction and being a mother. Sexual pleasure was out of the question for women, as they were supposed to protect their purity. On the other hand, Kitty does not want to be a stereotypical Victorian woman as defined here, but she cannot save herself from traditional thoughts and experiences an identity confusion.

Another important detail about this scene is that she comes to this party at the urging of her husband. During that time, the position of genders in a marriage was clearly defined, and women had to obey the decisions of their husbands. Even from the beginning of the novel, it is apparent that Kitty is looking for a change in her life. She even vainly hopes that the new century would bring change. But this hope shows that she does not know how to do it. The reason why she falls into this dilemma and confusion is that her husband designs the setting of her efforts against Victorian social rules. As can be seen, Richard is the type of man who also wants to be accepted as an open-minded person in his environment. That shows Kitty is trying to express herself by taking a stand against Victorian society in an environment organised under male dominance. This is insufficient for her, and she begins to doubt herself. Here, Irigaray's opinion on female subjectivity can be related to Kitty's condition. She rejects the phallogentric point of view in *The Speculum of the Other Woman* as follows:

...woman's castration is defined as her having nothing you can see, as her having nothing. In her having nothing penile, in seeing that she has No Thing. Nothing Like man. That is to say, no sex/organ that can be seen in a form capable of founding its reality, reproducing its truth. Nothing to be seen is equivalent to having no thing. No being and no truth... (Irigaray, 1985, p. 48)

Irigaray discusses how woman's psychical absence becomes a psychological total absence. As it is a psychical fact and cannot be changed, woman rejects her body, which leads her to hysteria and fall into a total absence. From this point of view, on one side of the binary opposition, man tends to ignore woman's identity, creates an environment suitable for himself, and expects

woman to survive in this environment. Therefore, Kitty's attempts to free herself in a male-dominated atmosphere seem useless, and she just expects the new century to make this change for her because she cannot do anything herself. As an absent figure both sexually and personally, she cannot focus on her own qualities in her quest for identity and seasaws between two sides.

In Queen Victoria's funeral scene, Kitty's dark blue dress is another point to be discussed. Queen Victoria ruled the country for more than 60 years and was a significant figure in her time. She was very strict on the traditional values of British society, and she placed great emphasis on religious and family matters. Her remarks about pure family morality were deeply respected (McDowall, 2004, p. 144–145). Her death affected society considerably, and people mourned for a period of time. In the novel, a national holiday is declared, and people wear black clothes for her funeral. However, in this setting, Kitty does not share society's feelings about Victoria's death and is pleased with the change in enthronement. While she struggles to express her grief appropriately by wearing a dark blue dress, she sends a clear message about her true feelings toward Queen Victoria's opinions and death. By wearing a dark blue dress rather than a black one, she implies that she does not share the community's grief during the funeral. In addition to this, the dark blue dress explains Kitty's situation in general. Dark blue includes both black and blue colours, and the black colour belongs to society, while the blue colour is Kitty's choice. Dark blue, like her previous attempts to break free from social norms, represents both Kitty's marginality and social pressure on her. She takes a great step toward freeing her identity from normative Victorian society with this attitude. On the other hand, during the funeral, her words about the dress after a while show another dilemma that she faces. She says, "In truth, I was now rather embarrassed about my choice—not one adult I'd seen since leaving the house was wearing anything but black. My dress was dark blue, but still I stood out far more than I'd intended" (Chevalier, 2002, p. 19). Here again, she is embarrassed about her attempt to save herself from norms and judges herself as if she were a stereotypical Victorian woman. Another conspicuous detail in this scene is that she is hopeful about King Edward. She thinks that Edward will achieve the change that she hopes for. Again, she is unable to achieve subjectivity and expects a male authority to change her situation. Although Kitty tries to express herself to society in a marginal way at first, she cannot properly pursue her attempt and eventually criticises herself, and expects her intended change to be achieved by a male authority figure.

Gertrude Waterhouse's narration on the funeral scene gives details about her feelings toward Kitty; she considers Kitty's silk blue dress an "affront to the eyes." While she criticises Kitty, she also envies her. She compares her physical appearance with Kitty's. She says, "It made me feel quite shabby and I was embarrassed even to stand next to her, as doing so begged comparisons and reminded me that my figure is not what it once was." This admiration, however, does not last long, and she says, "The one comfort I could take -- and it is a shameful one for which I shall seek God's forgiveness -- was that her daughter Maude is so plain. I feel proud to see Livy look so well next to drab little Maude" (Chevalier, 2002, p. 22). She defines herself by her child rather than her own identity. Here Irigaray's evaluation on this subject comes forward: "You look at yourself in the mirror. And already you see your own mother there. And soon your daughter, your mother. Between two, what are you? What space is yours alone? In what frame must you contain yourself? And how your face show through, beyond all the masks?" (Irigaray, 1981, p. 63). She claims that women define themselves through the lens of motherhood and wifehood. To be able to exist in a patriarchal society, she must be married and have a child. Her free identity is captured by maternity and wifehood. In this entrapment, the mother defines her existence through her daughter. The two sides of this relationship become mirrors for each other, and as today's daughter, who is brought up with this mindset, becomes tomorrow's mother, she continues to mirror her daughter as well to exist in society. In this scene, Mrs. Waterhouse, rather than looking at her own appearance, comforts herself by looking at her daughter's appearance. She thinks that being a good mother is more important than being a free individual woman in society. She compares her outlook with Kitty Coleman's and recognises how Kitty is more beautiful than herself. However, she values her child's appearance more than her own and feels sorry for Kitty Coleman because her child appears plain in comparison to Mrs. Waterhouse's Livy.

The setting is also noteworthy in this scene. It is Queen Victoria's funeral, which means that the entire society is out and performing their funeral traditions. The setting symbolises the whole society, and Mrs. Waterhouse's position in society. Within the frame of this setting, Mrs. Waterhouse is captivated by maternity and expresses herself in society not by her identity or appearance, but by her daughter's outlook. She is captivated by the Victorian norms and mirrors her daughter just as Irigaray explains in her essay. With this perspective, she represents a stereotypical Victorian woman who is happy with her position. However, in another scene when Mrs Waterhouse visits Mrs Coleman, she says, "her taste is very refined -- embroidered silk shawls over the sofas, potted ferns, vases of dried flowers, and a baby grand piano. I was rather

shocked by the modern coffee set, which has a pattern of tiny black and yellow checks that made me feel dizzy.” Mrs. Waterhouse gives a French reaction to the beauty of the decoration of the house. Kitty responds in French in return, however, she does not understand “a word of it!” and regrets “trying to show off” (Chevalier, 2002, p. 37). When Mrs. Waterhouse’s actions are examined, it is possible to conclude that she envies Kitty and has an inferiority complex. She is jealous of Kitty and tries to seem intellectually developed like her. Kitty seems like a well-educated, independent woman to Gertrude, and she tries to keep up with her. This shows that she admires Kitty so much that she feels inferior and makes “silly faults” in front of her. On the other hand, in the same scene, Gertrude evaluates Kitty’s condition as “she has a fine house and a handsome husband and a clever daughter” and talks about her unhappiness. Gertrude attributes Kitty’s dissatisfaction to her Christian commitment and says, “She thinks too much and prays too little, I suspect” (Chevalier, 2002, p. 37). Once she admires the independent, well-educated woman and pretends as if she were like her, later she returns to her safe zone, behaves as a stereotypical Victorian woman, and starts judging Kitty. Here Gertrude presents every detail of a Victorian stereotypical woman profile, and the reader can evaluate how different their perspectives on life are. She both envies and criticises Kitty as she looks a stronger figure than her. When Gertrude feels inadequate in comparison to Kitty, she tries to console herself by emphasising her traditional identity because a woman who fits gender stereotypes and meets the expectations of society feels herself in a safe zone.

However, if a woman, such as Kitty, leaves her safe zone, she will face difficulties in her life and have psychological problems. The difference between these two characters’ points of view about life is obvious here. One is happy with her limited life, and the other is dissatisfied with her life and tries to find a way to free herself, which makes her distressed. In addition to these scenes, Kitty’s remarks about having a child and its assumed effects on her life are prominent enough to discuss. She describes Maude’s birth as “a shock from which I have not recovered.” She continues her description as follows: “When I came to from the ether and first held her in my arms I felt as if I were nailed to the bed, trapped by her mouth at my breast. Of course I loved her -- love her -- but my life as I had imagined it ended on that day” (Chevalier, 2002, p. 49). Kitty does not want to have a child because she is planning to have a life free from the restrictive duties of maternity. As having children was one of the vital parts of families, the most important duty of women was regarded as motherhood (Branca, 1977, p. 74). One can claim that Kitty does not want to take on the role of the Victorian woman by having a baby. Just like in the condition that Irigaray explains, she refuses to be a mother who defines her

position with her daughter. She intends to claim her identity by herself and thinks that having a child would end the life she has imagined. By considering these details, unlike Gertrude, she is an independent woman who does not want to shape her life with maternal duties, does not care for her child as society expects from her, and behaves accordingly.

However, there is a noticeable conflict in the later part of the scene. She talks with her doctor and tells him that she does not want more babies. And the doctor teaches her how to avoid further pregnancies. In return, she pays an “ironic fee” to the doctor for his teaching. This ironic fee is the doctor’s request to sleep with her, which she accepts. She finds herself lucky to have “an understanding doctor” like him. She says, “I have always been grateful for his biology lesson” (Chevalier, 2002, p. 49). It is apparent that Kitty has tried to save her identity from masculine authority by not having more babies. Nevertheless, she asks for help from another man and pays for it in flesh without even being annoyed. At the beginning of the scene, she behaves like an independent woman who does not want to have more children and rejects obeying Victorian social norms. While trying to free her identity from her husband and patriarchal norms, she is entrapped by another male character in society and accepts his dominance for the sake of paying his “ironic fee.” In short, Kitty cannot be regarded as a free woman in this scene. Although she is able to escape her husband’s desire to have more children to some extent, she is unable to escape male authority in general and its abuse of her body. This freedom effort brings another type of enslavement to Kitty. Moreover, she is not aware of this situation and is in total acceptance of this male authority over her.

One other character that draws the reader’s attention is Edith Coleman. She serves as the voice of Victorian society in the novel. She is very strict about gender roles in society and very conservative about traditions. Furthermore, she criticises her daughter-in-law in nearly all areas, as she thinks Kitty is not a proper mother and an ideal wife for her son, Richard. She is concerned about her granddaughter’s upbringing because she lacks a proper mother who guides her to become an ideal woman in the future. As stated previously, one of the most important duties of women is raising their children. Patricia Branca claims Victorian woman must “devote a great deal of her time and energy” to give the required education that children need and discipline them properly for social rules (Branca, 1997, p. 111-112). In this frame, Edith feels dissatisfied with her daughter-in-law and criticises both Maude and Kitty. In her visits, she also feels pity for Maude, interferes with her education, and tries to guide her granddaughter. While trying to teach Maude how to be an ideal girl, she is very rigid and has clear instructions. Judith

Butler's performative gender theory and Edith's advice for Maude has a close relation in this context. Butler, in her theory, asserts that gender roles are not organic and are created by society and culture (Butler, 1988, p. 522). In some scenes, the reader can see some related examples from this point of view. Edith says in a scene that "A girl needs to learn these things," and she asks "How's her sewing?" Kitty replies "not good" and continues "But she reads very well." In this scene, she criticises Kitty for not teaching these kinds of womanly duties to her daughter and says, "That won't get a girl anywhere. It'll just put ideas in her head. Especially rubbish like those Alice books" (Chevalier, 2002, p. 54). Edith Coleman believes that reading is not suitable for a woman and criticises performing an action that is associated with the male gender. In addition to Butler's ideas about performative theory, Jamie Smith asserts that "it is society that needs to know the sex of a baby so that it can be gendered. From the minute that a child's sex is identified, everything has changed, from how the child is treated to how they are observed" (Smith, 2016, p. 3). In his essay, he broadens his discussion by discussing John Berger's opinions on this topic. Berger states that in addition to the childhood period, gender construction extends into adulthood. He claims that gender construction does not only consist of performing actions or wearing gendered clothes. Moreover, Berger discusses the topic in *Ways of Seeing* as follows:

She comes to consider the surveyor and the surveyed within her as the two constituent yet always distinct elements of her identity as a woman. She has to survey everything she is and everything she does because how she appears to others, and ultimately how she appears to men, is of crucial importance for what is normally thought of as the success of her life. Her own sense of being in herself is supplanted by a sense of being appreciated as herself by another. (Berger, 1972, p. 46)

In other words, this means men act, and women appear (Berger, 1972, p. 46). Edith Coleman's position for Maude is prominent here. She functions as an eye of social norms and "observes" Maude. For Edith Coleman, if Maude does not appear successful enough to be "appreciated," she is harshly criticised and reminded of performing her stereotypical gendered actions. When Mrs. Coleman's sentences to Kitty in the same scene such as "you should have more children," are taken into consideration, one can see her pressure on the women characters around her. Edith always has remarks about people and explains how a woman should or should not behave. The observations on women may function as the watchtower in Foucault's prison theory. Even in their childhood years, society observes women and criticises their actions that do not suit

stereotypical gender roles. Later women feel this pressure of being monitored and tend to change their behaviours. This feeling of being monitored becomes autonomous for women in the end. The performative gender role theory of Butler and Berger's discussion of women's being observed by society are highly related. The state of being observed stimulates women's performative acts that construct gender identities and roles. Here, Edith's remarks on women around her lead women to perform their gender roles designed by society. However, this oppressive environment creates a dilemma for women in their search for identity. They are lost between doing what they want and the behaviours that society forces them to perform. These viewpoints are the primary impediments to Kitty and Maude's quests for identity.

On the other hand, Mrs Waterhouse asks her daughter Ivy May why she is so silent. And she responds, "When I do speak you listen." After hearing this unexpected response from her daughter, she starts to consider herself. She thinks there is a lesson to learn from her daughter's sentence and says, "I do go on and on from nerves and to fill the silence. Sometimes in front of Kitty Coleman, I could just sink into the ground from hearing myself chatter like a performing monkey" (Chevalier, 2002, p. 73). When this dialogue is deeply analysed, one can understand that Gertrude speaks but feels unheard. She tries to tell something to the people around her, but no one listens. She just speaks to "fill the silence." Moreover, while she is speaking, she hears herself "chatter like performing monkey" because she thinks her words have no importance for others. Although the reasons of Gertrude's problem about expressing herself may well be considered personal, it is an undeniable fact that Chevalier here portrays the condition of women in Victorian society in general. Due to male dominance in all areas of society, women are passive in speech as well. Helen Cixous states that "A double distress, for even if she transgresses, her words fall almost always upon the deaf male ear, which hears in language only that which speaks in the masculine" (Cixous, 1976, p. 881). Gertrude's situation and Cixous opinion have a connection. She knows that nobody listens to her and tries to understand her; that is why she feels like a "performing monkey." One can object to this idea by stating that she says these words in a dialogue with another woman. However, Kitty's manner is similar to the masculine point. She seems to have an attitude that belittles and ignores what Gertrude says, and she listens to her like a "deaf male ear." In addition to this point of view, Irigaray claims that as men dominate the language, women cannot survive in a masculine language. Women cannot be subjects in masculine language, and that leads them to passivity. This passivity in language makes it difficult for them to express themselves and leads to social inferiority. Thus, she believes, the speech patterns should be divided into two for both sexes so that women can

find a place for themselves as subjects. Gertrude experiences a similar problem as Irigaray expresses in her theory. Although there is a huge age difference between these two characters, Gertrude's meaningless talking and Ivy May's silence show a clear communication problem for these two female characters, and the main reason is their obligation to speak masculine language.

Masculine language silences and suppresses female subjectivity to achieve male subjectivity. Due to the obstacles that have been discussed above, these characters cannot escape the bonds of society, and they cannot find another option to free themselves except for being stereotypical women in Victorian society. In addition to the previous scene, there is one more example that shows the relationship between language and women's subjectivity. In the scene that Lavinia writes a guide titled "The Complete Guide to Mourning Etiquette," she describes how to mourn to the bereaved. In her guide, she talks about some types of relationships and their rules for mourning. However, she does not mention the husband's mourning for his wife although the wife's mourning for her husband is clearly instructed in the guide. This is a conspicuous example that shows women's position in written works. One can infer from this guide that woman is not a subject in the language that she uses. She does not need to talk about mourning for women in the guide because she does not see herself as a subject even in the guide that she prepares. In this sense, Lavinia subconsciously reflects her perspective on women's position in masculine language and social setting. This scene reminds the reader of Irigaray's discussion of language and its effects on women's subject position and Hass' analysis of Irigaray's experiments. Both sexes refrain from using woman as the subject of the sentence in her experiment (Hass, 2000, p. 66).

When Kitty has sex with her doctor, she reflects on her life, recalls her honeymoon, and discusses her newly acquired London home. After her husband leaves home for work, she becomes jealous of him because, as a woman of this era, she is required to stay at home and deal with domestic duties. She is dissatisfied with her condition, as she is supposed to stay in the domestic sphere and cannot be a part of the public sphere. She wants to work outside like a man and rejects her stereotypical gender role. This demonstrates her desire to participate more actively in social life rather than being a typical Victorian woman who sits at home. On the other hand, some conventional ideas run through her mind at the same time. She considers her life and feels lucky in many ways, like having a handsome husband who is well enough to hire a maid and cook. These statements remind the reader of Gertrude's comments about Kitty. In

her visit to the Colemans, she thinks that Kitty has “a fine house and a handsome husband and a clever daughter” (Chevalier, 2002, p. 37). Gertrude represents a traditional Victorian woman in the novel; she behaves and thinks accordingly while Kitty looks like a more rebellious character than she is. However, based on the two scenes, one might conclude that Kitty’s mindset is not so dissimilar to Gertrude’s. She feels discontented with her life but comforts herself by having a handsome and wealthy husband, like a stereotypical Victorian woman. This scene can add depth to the idea that Kitty cannot save herself from dilemmas in her identity quest. She is both rebellious and conventional at the same time. The main difference between these two characters is that Gertrude looks happy with her comfort zone while Kitty is unhappy with her conditions and tries to save herself from the normative society’s pressure.

Kitty has a dialogue with her mother-in-law, Edith Coleman. It is about taking care of the house. When Kitty is depressed, Richard’s mother, Edith Coleman, takes over the house. However, Kitty and Jenny have made an agreement that Jenny would help Kitty about abortion; in return, Kitty would help Jenny for getting her job in the house back. However, Edith, who functions as the voice of traditional values in society, rejects Jenny’s return to her job in terms of moral values. For the first time in the novel, Kitty resists Edith’s decision by saying: “it is time that I took charge of my own house once more. I have decided that Jenny may work for us again, and there is really nothing more to be said about it” (Chevalier, 2002, p. 137). In this scene Kitty raises her voice against social values and stands against Edith who is a major representative of the strict norms of the era in the novel. On the other hand, the fact that Kitty wants to dominate her house shows that she behaves like a stereotypical woman. However, Kitty uses a traditional gender role for her own purpose and opens up a space for her own marginal act. Here, Kitty has become pregnant with an illegitimate child from Mr. Jackson and receives Jenny’s help to have an abortion. In return, she guarantees Jenny a return to work. In short, Kitty manipulates this situation for a marginal act of her own, posing as a traditional woman willing to run the house to get rid of the pressure that society would put on her over an illegitimate child. She manages to break the pressure on herself by clashing two issues, domestic works and abortion. In other words, she is not ruled by traditional gender roles in this context; rather, she dominates traditional roles in order to make room for her own marginal action.

In the novel, Kitty’s participation in the women’s suffrage movement is also prominent. She meets a woman named Caroline Black, who is a suffragette. Kitty is inspired by her and joins the group. She joins the WSPU (Women’s Social and Political Union), which fights for

the voting rights of women in elections. In fact, the WSPU was a real organisation in England that held campaigns, protests, and meetings to gain support for women's right to vote at the beginning of the 1900s (Turner, 1913, p. 603). Kitty attends the meetings, gives up housework, and even ignores Maude while she is dealing with the movement. She finds other women who have the same problems as her, and joining together to fight against society for their rights would be a great chance for Kitty to claim her free identity, both for her husband and mother-in-law and for society in general. She spends all her time attending WSPU organisations. She also buys a bicycle, which is considered one of the symbols of the movement. After joining the movement, Kitty starts to feel better and recovers from her depressive mode. Along with these developments, Kitty is at the forefront of the fight. The reason for this devotion is her need to gain an identity that is salvaged from norms. Owning a bicycle is a symbolically important detail. It is an opportunity that allows women to gain more mobility in the public sphere in an environment where women are confined to the home and not welcomed to go out. Now, instead of being a woman watching her husband go to work from the window of the house, she becomes a woman who fights for her own rights outside, and this is another big step toward gaining her own voice in the story. Barbara Caine's opinion about women who join the WSPU supports the idea for joining the movement for Kitty. Caine states that women joined this movement not only to gain political benefits but also to break down the domestic sphere that confines them to their homes (Caine, 2006, p. 538). In addition to Caine's opinion, Branca describes this movement as "a reaction against boredom" (Branca, 1977, p. 74) which refers to the fact that women want to work at skilled jobs rather than domestic ones like sewing or cleaning. These reasons are closely related to Kitty's case. By joining the suffrage movement, Kitty finds a chance that will bring her freedom, and she clings to it. She spends all her time and energy on the activities of the WSPU and puts all her efforts into gaining the right to vote for women. She recovers from her depressive mode and feels more content with her life, now that she has the possibility of doing something meaningful outside the domestic sphere.

However, another point of view about this movement comes forward with Jenny's comments about Kitty and her friend's efforts. In her dialogue with Mrs. Baker, she talks about the suffragettes and says, "Let working women decide what's what." And she continues her remarks with "Labour for a labouring woman. But these ladies upstairs won't vote Labour, or even Liberal. They're all Tories like their husbands, and them Tories'll never give the vote to women, no matter what they say" (Chevalier, 2002, p. 144). Jenny does not believe that the women in Kitty's house fight for the rights of women sincerely. During this era, WSPU

members were highly criticised because, as members of wealthy families, they were bored with their comfortable lives at home and sought an occupation to pass free time. Within the scope of these criticisms, although one cannot evaluate the whole movement only with these ideas, Jenny may be right to some extent in terms of Kitty's situation. Kitty belongs to an upper-middle-class family and has a nice, big house. Moreover, she has a wealthy husband and a clever daughter. Although their relationship started with romance, they started to have problems after a while. She is dissatisfied with her life at home and looking for something to change. These qualities perfectly match the idea that she could be a stereotypical Victorian woman who is bored at home. Besides, by looking at Jenny's harsh working conditions, Kitty's dissatisfaction may be due to the fact that she has a lot of free time at home and does not have to do any work. Kitty may be trying to end this boredom by adding new adventures to her life. The activities of this movement could be a suitable stage for Kitty's adventures. There are some points that justify what Jenny said about the women in Kitty's house. In particular, she participates in all WSPU activities with the financial resources provided by her husband. For instance, while Kitty and other women are working to prepare some banners for the big demonstration in Hyde Park, her servants help them. Moreover, they prepare the banners at Richard's house. When the readers consider these details, they may agree with Jenny's opinion that Kitty is not the true sufferer when compared to a labouring woman like herself. Kitty's search for independence may have been interrupted because it is not based on realistic grounds. She may be unsure of what she wants from her life and drift from one side to another.

Another remarkable point about this issue is that Kitty wears the costume of a male superhero at the meeting where she defends women's rights. In the search for a female identity in the patriarchal social order, her taking on the role of another male figure is a contradiction for Kitty because women struggle to find their own identity in the face of male dominance. However, wearing a male hero's outfit pushes Kitty toward artificiality in her search for identity. That shows that she does not trust her own identity as a woman for the women's freedom fight but trusts another male hero's identity. Moreover, despite her fear of horses in daily life, Kitty leads a horse in the big march. The horse is a figure that symbolises masculine power, and Kitty, by leading a horse, tries to rule patriarchy. But the horse injures her in her chest and causes her death. This scene symbolically depicts Kitty's failure to rule the patriarch. Kitty's participation in this meeting is a significant step in her search for identity, but the decisions she has made during this process raise significant questions in the minds of the readers. These dilemmas in her search for identity cannot carry her very far in this regard.

Although Kitty's dilemmas and contradictions partially obscure her search for identity, her struggle for these rights has given birth to great hope for the next generation of women. Especially her own daughter Maude's shaping her life in line with her mother's advice after her mother's death, wearing her mother's clothes and conflicting with her father to study at a university means that she has inherited this flag from her mother. This story leaves the reader with a clear hope for the future even if there is uncertainty about the result of Kitty's struggle to find her own identity.

To sum up, Kitty and other female characters in the novel have problems finding their identities. Some of them are not in search anyway, and some of them are helpless because of the dilemmas in the actions they experience in the patriarchal social order. Especially throughout the novel, Kitty appears to be a rebellious character, unlike Gertrude, who looks content with her position as a traditional woman in society. Kitty's attitude towards her husband and mother-in-law, her approach to housework, and most importantly, her participation in the WSPU and fighting for women's rights to vote show that she is on an identity quest. However, during Kitty's quest for identity, the dilemmas she experiences bring to the reader's mind the question of whether she has come a long way in this regard. At first glance, she is a character who fights for freedom and even risks dying on this issue, but with a deeper analysis, readers can see that her behaviour has many traditional traces. In almost every scene analysed above, a stereotypical behaviour or a confusion is obvious in every act of rebellion against society. I think that the ideas of Irigaray, Judith Butler, and Helen Cixous discussing the origins of the difficulties experienced by women in patriarchal societies constitute an important background in explaining the situation of the characters in this novel. In this context, just as Kitty is subjected to sexual abuse to learn the secret of not having children from the doctor, the fight for freedom ends under a horse at the end of the story. In both cases, Kitty tries to free herself from the strict norms of patriarchy, but she survives these troubles by having bigger problems. Although Kitty wants to change her condition, she cannot reach her goal completely due to both her hesitations and the fact that she cannot completely get rid of the traditional gender roles in her actions. However, Kitty's struggle certainly leaves some hope for the next generations of women to gain freedom and find their own voice in a patriarchal society. Therefore, in the next chapter, I will examine the impact of Kitty's struggle for women's rights in the early 1900s on Miranda's struggle for existence against society in John Fowles' *The Collector* which takes place in the 1960s.

CHAPTER THREE

1. DELICACY IN THE HANDS OF A SAVAGE: MIRANDA'S IDENTITY QUEST IN JOHN FOWLES' THE COLLECTOR

John Fowles' first published novel, *The Collector*, highlights at first glance the conflicts between the working class and the upper class in 1950s England. The novel strikingly depicts the search for identity of characters from different classes in England at that time and the problems they face in this effort. In addition to social class and economic differences, the novel also deals with male-female relations and gender roles. Fowles' novel begins with the narration of an asocial character named Clegg. Clegg is platonically in love with the character named Miranda and follows every step she takes psychopathically. Through Clegg's eyes, Miranda is a beautiful, cultured, and free-living modern girl. Clegg, on the other hand, is an orphan who does not have any of these characteristics as the child of a working-class family, and he grew up with his relatives. Clegg's obsessive love leads him to devise a cruel plan. He buys a house in a secluded place with the money he has won from the lottery, and one day he chases and kidnaps Miranda. He prepares the house where he will live with Miranda and takes Miranda there. He puts Miranda in a cell full of security measures, and so the story begins. Before Clegg kidnaps Miranda, he goes to art galleries. He tries to learn something about literature and art. Because Miranda is a cultured girl, he thinks she would not accept him in this ignorant state. He tries to appear intellectual to her; he buys whatever Miranda wants from him and brings them home like a typical husband. Clegg's perfectly conceived plan works, and he believes that, as time passes, Miranda will fall in love with him too. No matter what Miranda does, she cannot escape the cell Clegg has prepared. She does not get used to being in captivity, and in the end, she gets sick and dies.

Within this plot, Fowles gives some clues about the identity problems of these two characters. The reader has the chance to see the differences between the characters' perceptions of the same scenes thanks to multiple narrations. Clegg narrates half of the story while Miranda narrates the other half. In this way, the readers can see how the two characters perceive the same events. In addition, this gives the reader an idea about the identities of the characters. In general, Clegg appears to be opinionated, obsessive, and psychologically troubled; he thinks everything and everyone is wrong, but he is right. Miranda, on the other hand, appears to be a modern woman who carries the qualities of a modern persona: she is open-minded, closely

related to art and literature, and sensitive about the environment and other living creatures. In the novel, the readers witness both the psychological and physical conflicts of these two characters during Miranda's captivity at home. At first glance, Fowles presents Miranda as a strong female figure who fights for freedom and stands upright against being imprisoned by a man. However, I think that there is also a traditional aspect to this strong modern woman. While Miranda draws a modern and strong character image in some moments, I also identify a weak woman image that accepts male dominance and does not feel any discomfort in this regard. By reading the text closely, I am going to highlight certain scenes and analyse Miranda's effort to free herself from Clegg's entrapment and her identity quest during the story.

Although Miranda appears to be a strong female character who risks death for her freedom, she has some contradictions in her identity quest. In the dialogue with Clegg and her attitude toward G.P., she appears as a traditional female figure. Miranda is a character who has not completely freed herself from the pressure and norms of society in her inner world even though she is a woman who has gained all the rights Kitty fights for like education, voting, and the social status of women in *Falling Angels*. In this novel, Fowles discusses the relationship between men and women and the place of women in modern society through the characters of Clegg and Miranda. The house that Clegg prepares for Miranda represents patriarchal society in general. Miranda, as the person who has to live there, also represents the female identity in this society in general. Clegg's approach to Miranda represents the relationship between men and women in general. He is ignorant, obsessive, and selfish toward Miranda. He justifies every act of cruelty he has committed to possess Miranda. In the beginning of the novel, Clegg talks about a dream that comes true:

It began where she was being attacked by a man, and I ran up and rescued her. Then somehow I was the man that attacked her, only I didn't hurt her; I captured her and drove her off in the van to a remote house and there I kept her captive in a nice way. Gradually she came to know me and like me and the dream grew into the one about our living in a nice modern house, married, with kids and everything. (Fowles, 1963, p. 14)

This scene reveals what Clegg has in mind. He locks the woman he wants to have for his entire life in a house and waits for her to get used to him over time. Moreover, he wants to meet her needs in this captivity and ensure that she is happy in the house. And finally, he believes that she will have a child from him, and they will live happily ever after. While this scene sounds brutal at first glance, it can be an outrageous representation of the situation a woman often encounters in society. It is still a valid problem in modern society that women are objects in

men's eyes, that their subjective existence is ignored, and that women live their lives based on men's decisions. Miranda's opinions have no importance in this dream, and even in a two-person event like marriage, Miranda's subjectivity is not part of the issue. Moreover, Clegg's meticulousness in preparing the house for Miranda does not go unnoticed. He says, "I went down to her room, everything was all right, not too stuffy because I left the door open. I slept in it one night before to see if there was enough air and there was. There were all the doings to make tea with and so on. It looked very snug and cosy" (Fowles, 1963, p. 26).

The bond Clegg establishes between the house and woman brings to mind the perspective of Victorian society on women, which has also been discussed in the previous chapter. In the Victorian era, women did not take part in activities in the public sphere; instead, they stayed at home and dealt with domestic duties. Man was the one who fed the family and worked in public sphere jobs. Having a man who could meet the needs of her home was a chance for a woman. Recalling the words of Gertrude in the previous chapter, having a wealthy husband and being able to live comfortably in a large, beautiful house was a woman's luck. The main reason for this condition was that they did not have jobs to work outside and depended on their husbands economically, so the houses were the living spaces for women. They did not have many choices but to do domestic work and spend most of their lives at home. Here in Miranda's case, Clegg prepares a setting for her that one can compare with the Victorian setting in *Falling Angels*. In addition to this, his efforts to develop an interest in art adds depth to this resemblance. There is a resemblance between the Victorian man and the fake gentlemanliness of Clegg. The aspect of Victorian men that attaches importance to science, art, and manners is similar to Clegg's thinking that he can influence Miranda by learning something about these subjects. This similarity also emerges in their perspectives on women. Clegg treats Miranda as a stereotypical Victorian woman. Clegg's dream that Miranda stays in the domestic sphere and becomes the woman of her house while Clegg takes care of the public sphere and supplies her needs suggests a setting in which stereotypical Victorian gender roles are performed. There is a dream that hints at Clegg's perspective on Miranda:

I used to have daydreams about her, I used to think of stories where I met her, did things she admired, married her and all that. Nothing nasty, that was never until what I'll explain later. She drew pictures, and I looked after my collection (in my dreams). It was always she loving me and my collection, drawing and colouring them; working together in a beautiful modern house in a big room with one of those huge glass windows... (Fowles, 1963, p. 4)

Clegg's effort to be a stereotypical Victorian man leads him to treat Miranda like a stereotypical woman. As Clegg states above, Miranda has a passive role in his life; she stays in a big house with him and functions as a supplementary figure to his artistic work. Moreover, Miranda becomes another piece of Clegg's collection. Miranda describes her predicament as "I know what I am to him. A butterfly he has always wanted to catch" (Fowles, 1963, p. 129). She feels that she is an object for Clegg to collect for joy. She is well aware that Clegg ignores the fact that she is a person with emotional and physical needs. During her captivity, she considers herself 'above' him and looks dominant while resisting Clegg. Although she is captivated by a man and in a helpless position, she takes a strong stand against him, which shows that she has a free identity unlike a traditional woman. On the other hand, she falls in a conflict with this strong, free woman image with her words for Clegg: "I remember (the very first time I met him) G.P. saying that collectors were the worst he was just trying to shock Caroline — and me. But of course, he is right. They're anti-life, anti-art, anti-everything" (Fowles, 1963, p. 129). Considering the resemblance between Clegg's butterfly collection and Miranda's captivity, Miranda, describes her condition while she is talking about collectors. Here in Miranda's situation, a man kidnaps Miranda. Moreover, she explains her condition with the words of G.P. who ignores her identity as a woman as well. She describes her captivity with another man's opinion, who also does not give importance to her identity. This contradiction shows that Miranda is not yet fully mature in her search for identity; she cannot express her own conditions as a subject in sentences; instead, she expresses her own situation through the words of another man on whom she is dependent in her private life. This situation shows that she cannot fully see herself as a subject in society.

In addition, Miranda's relationship with G.P. gives the reader some clues about her identity quest. Throughout the novel, Miranda idealises G.P. and accepts him as a guide for her life. She gives high importance to what he says about life and art and is in total acceptance of his remarks. This dependence creates another form of captivity for Miranda. Unlike Clegg, G.P. captures her in psychological terms rather than physical ones. While G.P. evaluates Miranda's work, one can see a clear example of this situation:

And at the end he said, they're not much good. In my opinion. But a bit better than I expected. It was as if he had turned and hit me with his fist, I couldn't hide it. He went on, it's quite useless if I think of your feelings in any way at all. I can see you're a draughtsman, you've a fairish sense of colour and what-not, sensitive. All that. But you wouldn't be at the Slade if you hadn't. (Fowles, p.167, 1963)

Later in her dialogue with Clegg, Miranda says, “I’m a good draughtsman... I might become a very clever artist, but I shan’t ever be a great one. At least, I don’t think so” (Fowles, 1963, p. 60). Her total acceptance of G.P.’s opinion about her being a draughtsman but not a great artist shows her captivity to G.P.’s opinions. Pamela Cooper believes that Miranda idealises G.P. like Clegg’s idealisation of her: “Thus Miranda’s diary records not only growth but a Clegg-like capacity for idealisation and fantasy, which converts even the violence of Paston into beatitude: ‘G.P., I shall be hurt, lost, battered and buffeted. But it will be like being in a gale of light, after this black hole. It’s simply that. He has the secret of life in him’ (247)” (Cooper, 1991, p 45).

Miranda idealises G.P. so much that even G.P.’s violence becomes a source of happiness for her. This brings to the reader’s mind Miranda’s attitude towards Clegg. She is violent toward him, always hates him, and is in a relentless rush of self-defence against him. While trying to respond properly to Clegg’s actions against her identity, she stays silent and even seems happy about G.P.’s psychological violence. The contrasts in these two situations make Miranda’s struggle to protect her identity against Clegg questionable. She utters these words about showing self-respect while she is discussing the H-bomb with Clegg: “But we do it to keep our self-respect to show to ourselves, each one to himself or herself, that we care” (Fowles, 1963, p. 142). Her contrasting reactions against two similar psychological violence show how confused Miranda is in her search for identity. On the other hand, Gorgiana Dila deepens the discussion by drawing attention to the hierarchical relationship between G.P., Miranda, and Clegg:

The introduction of G.P. as a non-present character seems to serve to both challenge and to reaffirm this opposition. Thus, a hierarchy is extended into a tripartite structure between Clegg – (the worst reader) – Miranda (the disciple) and G.P. (the “master-reader”). Compared to G.P., Miranda is still a student, while here it is she who teaches Clegg. In G.P.’s opinion, Miranda does not articulate her own personality in her pictures, she tends to plagiarise. (Tukács) (Dila, 2014, p. 5)

Miranda considers herself superior to Clegg, but according to G.P., she produces replicas of paintings that she sees beforehand; in fact, she does not create a unique art piece in which she has her own voice (Dila, 2014, p. 5). Miranda considers herself superior to Clegg by restating G.P.’s ideas to him as well. By voicing ideas to Clegg that do not belong to her, she gets above him and tries to counsel him. Of course, while doing this, she positions G.P. as her life guide. As a woman, instead of struggling with her own ideas and thoughts to break the patronage of

the man who has taken her captive, she voices the ideas of another man to save herself. This shows that she is not in the desired place in her identity quest.

In addition, in another dialogue with G.P., he criticizes Miranda's art, and in her diary, she writes, "He spoke in fits and starts. And there was a silence. I said, shall I tear them up? and he said, now you're being hysterical. I said, I've got so much to learn" (Fowles, 1963, p. 142). Like in the previous scene, G.P.'s dominance over Miranda is clear. The fact that Miranda does not even have the need to oppose this dominance shows that she is in a state of general acceptance on this issue. Miranda, despite being an intellectually free woman with access to education and the arts prior to being abducted by Clegg, requires shelter with another man for her art. Dila says that "Nevertheless, we cannot omit G.P., who is the artistic guide Miranda needs in order to be able to have form, definition and clarity about herself and her artistic work" (Dila, 2014, p. 5). G.P. is an authority on Miranda, which defines her art. This brings to mind the character Kitty from *Falling Angels*. Kitty participates in the suffragette movement against the exclusion of women from social life, education, the arts, and political rights. Kitty is hopeful about the future for women. She believes that her daughter Maude will not suffer from the patriarchy in the future thanks to the efforts of suffragette activists. Her motivation is to end women's educational, social, and cultural exclusion from society so that women could benefit from these opportunities, gain individual freedom, and liberate themselves from male dominance in patriarchal society. This dream Kitty has for all women, particularly herself and her daughter at the turn of the century, does not fully come true, even for Miranda, who is now Kitty's granddaughter's age. Despite having all of the political, cultural, and artistic opportunities that the suffragettes fought for, Miranda has not been completely successful in her effort to liberate herself. Miranda subjects to another masculine bondage even when dealing with art.

One can relate Miranda's bondage to these two men to Freud's theory, which Irigaray opposes. Irigaray's main point of contention with Freud is his phallogentric point of view, which explains female sexual development by comparing it to male sexual development. Freud portrays this development in diametrically opposed ways for both sexes. Moreover, in his theory, female development is the opposite of male development (Irigaray, 1987, p. 52). And this causes a subconscious feeling of lack, which is referred to as a "castrated genital organ" (Irigaray, 1987, p. 36). For a female, feeling of physical lacking turns into a psychological absence. Because this problem is physical, woman tends to ignore her body, resulting in hysteria. This situation, according to Irigaray, is caused by the absence, which "radically

escapes all depiction” (Irigaray, 1987, p. 68). She criticizes this viewpoint, arguing that there is no need for a phallus to explain female sexuality. Given this information and looking at G.P.’s approach to Miranda, one might apply Freud’s theory of sexual development to Miranda’s situation. Miranda’s socially repressed consciousness tends to ignore herself when it comes to G.P., which means her total absence. She always accepts his criticism of her. Even if she becomes angry at his words, she refrains from rejecting them. For instance, in a scene G.P. says, “You don’t really stand a dog’s chance anyhow. You’re too pretty. The art of love’s your line: not the love of art.” In return Miranda says, “I’m going to the Heath to drown myself” (Fowles, 1963, p. 169). Miranda’s total absence against G.P. represents women in general in the public sphere. While Miranda is dealing with something in the public sphere, man’s evaluation of her appearance and consideration of her mental inadequacy for art is an indication that women are still exposed to patriarchy in general. This patriarchy pushes women into their traditional gender roles and implies that they should not leave their domestic sphere. Miranda also struggles on the verge of this situation, but she is not very successful in her relationship with G.P. and embraces the stereotypical passive female role.

Miranda’s relationship with Clegg is also prominent and worth discussing. She describes him as follows: “He’s a collector. That’s the great dead thing in him” (Fowles, 1963, p. 169). While Miranda portrays Clegg as a collector, Clegg describes her as follows: “Seeing her always made me feel like I was catching a rarity, going up to it very careful, heart-in-mouth as they say. A Pale Clouded Yellow, for instance. I always thought of her like that, I mean words like elusive and sporadic, and very refined — not like the other ones, even the pretty ones. More for the real connoisseur (Fowles, 1963, p. 3). Within the scope of the two descriptions, Miranda’s depiction of Clegg is completely accurate. By looking at Clegg’s impressions of Miranda, one can understand that he sees Miranda as a piece he wants to add to his collection. Pamela Cooper claims that the language Clegg uses here reveals his perception of Miranda, “The imagery of lepidoptery illuminates Clegg’s worship of Miranda as a kind of reification — words like “it” and “connoisseur” imply his perception of her as an object” (Cooper, 1991, p. 36). Miranda’s biggest problem is Clegg’s objectification of her. Because Clegg sees her as an object, he cannot meet her emotional and physical needs, and Miranda eventually dies of these causes. As discussed earlier, Clegg gives Miranda a sort of Victorian setting and dictates the typical gender roles in his troubled mind. He dreams of Miranda happily waiting for him at home while he is performing public sphere duties. So, to generalize, he expects Miranda to be an angel in the house like a woman in Victorian era. Just as expected

from the female stereotype at that time, Miranda should be Clegg's 'pure' love, and she should not go out of his way. In this context, Kitty and Miranda are exposed to similar perspectives in similar environments. Miranda is also angry with Clegg, who is trying to play the role of her husband, just like Kitty's Richard. They resist being seen as objects, and they struggle for existence against all the men and patriarchy that imprison them in society. Her evaluation of patriarchy in one of the scenes is notable:

A martyr. Imprisoned, unable to grow. At the mercy of this resentment, this hateful millstone envy of the Calibans of this world. Because they all hate us, they hate us for being different, for not being them, for their own not being like us. They persecute us, they crowd us out, they send us to Coventry, they sneer at us, they yawn at us, they blindfold themselves and stuff up their ears. They do anything to avoid having to take notice of us and respect us. They go crawling after the great ones among us when they're dead. They pay thousands and thousands for the Van Goghs and Modiglianis they'd have spat on at the time they were painted. Guffawed at. Made coarse jokes about. (Fowles, 1993, p. 221)

Here, Miranda makes comments about the people who G.P. describes as New People. According to her, they are ignorant of all artistic and human virtues. These qualities perfectly suit Clegg as well. On the other hand, Calibanity, in Miranda's description, has similarities with patriarchy. Both are male dominated and directly related to selfishness. As understood from Miranda's description, they have an attitude that does not hesitate to disturb the comfort of others for their own interests. They give more importance to materialistic values than to human values. For instance, just because Clegg likes Miranda, he confines her in the house, ignores her identity, tries to communicate with her only by his own rules, and locks her in the house, which is exactly the same lifestyle that Victorian society dictates to women. There are similarities between Miranda's and Kitty's experiences. The society, particularly her mother-in-law, expects Kitty to stay at home and wait for her husband, to handle domestic duties, and to live a prison life without leaving the house. Patriarchy dictates that she should not disobey her husband and that she should live her life by her husband's choices. Patriarchy expects Kitty to maintain her purity as a woman with her moral and domestic zeal to set a good example for her child. Kitty rebels against these conditions and tries to claim her own identity by refusing to be a typical Victorian woman, and she experiences Miranda-like dissatisfaction in her life.

Considering the resemblance between the patriarchy and the New People, Miranda is aware of her condition as a woman. She rebels against society's ignorance and its indifference

to her existence. She cannot accept that people like her are not heard by patriarchal society as the New People hold power with all their brutality. This recognition pushes her to resist this problem. In this context, she fights against Clegg psychologically and physically with her whole being. She both tries to befriend and mistreat Clegg, but all her efforts are wasted because she cannot exist as a person in his eyes. Clegg neglects Miranda's existence as a living person so much that her identity and spirit cannot reach him. In contrast, Miranda's human existence is so insignificant that Clegg sees her as a piece he can only snatch like a butterfly and add to the collection. Clegg is not interested in a living butterfly that flies freely and adds beauty to nature. Instead, he is only interested in its soulless beauty. Clegg objectifies Miranda, just as he does for the butterfly. In addition to this discussion, Cooper analyses Miranda's objectification as follows:

Clegg's language here associates the adored woman with the humanly unattainable perfection suggested by the butterfly's beauty; it also arrogates sexual power exclusively to Clegg himself as collector. Thus, when he presents Miranda in his narrative as a butterfly, Clegg is celebrating not only her beauty, but her vulnerability to capture as well. He is elevating her spirituality — the Greeks used the same word for "butterfly" and "soul" — even as he locates her firmly within the non-human world as a particularly fragile example of a lower form of life. (Cooper, 1991, p. 27)

Cooper's analysis of Clegg being a collector and the butterfly metaphor are worth discussing. She claims that Clegg idealises Miranda in such a way that he both exalts and despises her. With the metaphor of the butterfly, Clegg idealises her so much that, she refers to both a Greek goddess and an insect at the same time. However, neither of them is human. Miranda never becomes a person for Clegg during the story. From this point of view, women cannot position themselves as subjects in society. Their survival becomes impossible unless they adopt the stereotypical gender roles that society artificially creates for them. Under these conditions, women cannot liberate themselves and find their own unique voice. Miranda, who has some awareness of this problem, starts to keep a diary while fighting physically and psychologically against Clegg.

Keeping a diary is prominent here as Hélène Cixous's theory relates women's writing and identity quests. She urges women to write, as she believes it "brings women to their senses and to their meaning in history" (Cixous, 1976, p. 875-876). Cixous thinks that, with the help of writing, women can find a place in history, and without history, one cannot exist in society. Here Miranda considers her situation and recognises that she cannot be heard by a 'deaf male

ear' and decides to keep a diary to assure herself against Clegg that she really exists. In fact, she has taken a very important step to prove her identity to Clegg and herself. Miranda is aware that she is not a subject in Clegg's story, and she wants to survive this condition by writing. Miranda's only way to escape from the captive life Clegg has devised for her is to keep a diary. She is the object of the life that Clegg designs, and by keeping a diary against it, she intends for the story to continue not just as Clegg desires but as she desires. Miranda wishes to tell the story in order to be able to write her own history; she wishes to be the author of this experience so that she can be a living part of it rather than an object. From this perspective, Miranda's keeping a diary is a prominent development to find her own voice; however, Docherty's opinion about her salvation via writing is as follows:

She tries to break imprisonment and also to escape the metaphysical labelling and reification implied in Clegg's plan for her. It is on this second level that she achieves at least the dignity of freedom. The tragedy is that as a result of her physical death, she cannot exercise the human freedom which she has found; she has the potential to walk out of mere text into the world of history (ultimately the reader's world) but the potential will never be realized in actuality. (Docherty, 1981, p. 122)

Docherty argues that, despite Miranda's efforts, she is unsure if this potential will be realized because, after Miranda's death, her diary is also under Clegg's control. The diary may not serve its intended purpose of recording her own existence in history, as there is no clear ending about it. Moreover, in her diary, Miranda describes G.P. and his opinions about life and art. She always presents him to the reader as if he were a wise man whose words enlighten the people around him. The context of the diary is about the men in her life and their dominance over Miranda. She does not tell her own story in her notes; she translates what G.P. says to the reader. The men around Miranda dominate her diary, and she is not the authority in her writing. She does not talk about her problems enough; she just gives details about the men that she interacts and their reflections on her. Unexpectedly, this diary may have pushed Miranda into passivity rather than assisting her quest for identity, and it serves as a proof that Miranda cannot fully liberate herself from the traditional gender roles imposed by patriarchy.

Art is another subject in which Miranda seeks her identity. Miranda, especially in her conversations with G.P., seeks advice for art from him and worries about authenticity. In addition, in some scenes, she gives advice to Clegg about photography. This gives her superiority over him. Art is one of the few things she dominates over Clegg during her captivity, and as Miranda counsels Clegg on art, her authority increases on him. Throughout the story,

the reader witnesses Miranda's potential for development as an artist. In her dialogues with G.P., Miranda behaves like an amateur art student; however, while she is talking with Clegg on photography, she acts as a professional artist and dictates her opinions on Clegg. Readers may consider her maturation as an artist when they see Miranda's self-confidence while she is commenting on Clegg's works. However, Cooper draws attention to Miranda's death and questions her maturation as an artist:

If Miranda is dead, she can never move from the creatively immature position of art student to the creatively powerful one of artist; never coming of age, she remains a protegee without ever becoming a competitor. This means that Miranda is kept a novice and willing recipient of G.P.'s ideas on life and art: he advises her to give up her artistic vocation and adopt a sexual one — “you don't really stand a dog's chance anyhow. You're too pretty” (161) — and he wants less to teach her about art than to marry her (214). Similarly for Paston's double, Clegg, Miranda is safely confined in images of his devising and cannot herself become the authoritative creator of images. (Cooper, 1991, p. 46)

Here, Cooper believes Miranda stays as an art student who needs the advice of a man. As discussed before, Miranda cannot free herself from G.P.'s opinions about her artistic career. She is totally bound to him. In her dialogues with G.P., there is no clue that she has the potential to grow as an artist. Furthermore, when the reader analyses her interactions with Clegg, they also recognise that her dominance over him on an artistic level is not completely valid. During her captivity, Miranda turns into a material for Clegg's art from being a mentor who gives advice. She does not have a creator role for his art; instead, Clegg imprisons her in his photos. Though Miranda initially refuses to accept his demands for taking her photos, she eventually finds herself in a position where she has no choice but to comply. In other words, Miranda's relationship with art is indirect and passive, and she functions as an erotic artefact in the novel.

To sum up, Miranda experiences some confusion in her search for identity throughout the novel. She is a modern woman who has gained the rights that Kitty fought for more than sixty years ago. Kitty's struggle was against the fact that women were kept away from education, law, and parliament and that they could only pursue their lives within the boundaries drawn by men. She rejected living a life dependent on men, where women could not find their own voice and, most importantly, had no personal freedom. In this context, as Kitty struggled, she thought that she might not see the results of her efforts, but she was hopeful for Maude's future. She dreamt of her daughter becoming an individual who lives a life where she can enjoy

all the rights that men have, just like Miranda, and who makes her own choices. In this way, she would gain her identity in society and stand on her own feet, and her daughter would not suffer from the male dominance that Kitty suffered in her own life. Miranda appears chronologically old enough to be Maude's daughter in this novel. However, Miranda's situation does not quite match Kitty's dreams for her daughter. On the positive side, Miranda has taken all the rights that Kitty fought for in the social setting; she is studying at the university, is a potential artist, and is living a free life. However, despite having all the privileges Kitty dreamt of for Maude, Miranda, in this novel, does not completely succeed in her quest to find her own identity. She is aware of the influence of society and male dominance on her. This recognition triggers her to struggle against it. However, her confusion about one of the biggest roles that society assigns her is apparent in her words here:

When I get away. What shall I do? I want to marry, I want to have children, I want to prove to myself that all marriages needn't be like D and M's. I know exactly the sort of person I want to marry, someone with a mind like G.P.'s, only much nearer my own age, and with the looks I like. And without his one horrid weakness. But then I want to use my feelings about life. I don't want to use my skill vainly, for its own sake. But I want to make beauty. And marriage and being a mother terrifies me for that reason. Getting sucked down into the house and the house things and the baby-world and the child-world and the cooking-world and the shopping-world. I have a feeling a lazy-cow me would welcome it, would forget what I once wanted to do, and I would just become a Great Female Cabbage. (Fowles, 1993, p. 221)

Miranda worries that marriage will keep her away from her dreams. This brings to mind Kitty's advice to Maude. Kitty advises Maude to go to a university rather than being a wife: "'As long as you become something, I don't mind what it is. Except perhaps a wife. But don't tell Daddy that.' She winced as she took a breath. 'Go to university.'" (Chevalier, 2002, p. 202). Miranda has a thought here in parallel with the advice Kitty gave Maude. She believes that marriage will trap her in the home and cause her to waste her life fulfilling the wishes of society rather than her own. There is a stance against social imposition here. On the other hand, Miranda also says that she wants to get married when she is freed from captivity. And she explains it from a very traditional point of view. She wants to have children, and wants her partner to be close to her age with GP's intelligence. She briefly states that she wants to have a child with a young, handsome, and mature man, which suits the traditional qualities of an ideal husband. Furthermore, she claims that her marriage will not be like other marriages, and she will try to

prove it by marrying a stereotypically ideal man. In addition to all her conflicts about marriage, this is an indication that women still have to choose between marriage and personal freedom in modern society. Just like Kitty, Miranda also experiences a similar dilemma, even in the postmodern age.

Besides getting a university education, which is the highest level of education, Miranda's struggle to be an artist is another important step for her to express herself, as it is an area dominated by man. However, while taking these steps, Miranda is unable to fully distance herself from traditional women's roles. For example, she says, "I'm not egocentric enough. I am a woman. I have to lean on something" (Fowles, 1993, p. 221). Moreover, Miranda's approach to G.P. goes far beyond her respect for his art. Miranda cannot find her own voice in front of G.P. On the contrary, she transforms into a woman, just as the patriarchy wants. Falling in love with him, idealising him, and recognising his perfection in every area while ignoring her own virtues are exactly what patriarchal society expects from women. Likewise, there is a physical and psychological bondage with Clegg as well. She tries hard to resist his physical strength and psychological pressures even though she knows that she is far superior to him in everything. Although Miranda projects the image of a strong woman with her own voice, she cannot get out of Clegg's control in general. Clegg's obvious dominance over Miranda is revealed in many scenes. Clegg asks to take pictures of Miranda, and her reaction shows her conditions. Miranda appears to be a strong character who has an influence on Clegg while giving her advice for photography. However, later in the story, Miranda has to let Clegg take pictures of her even though she does not want to. He takes obscene photos of her and likes the ones with the head cut off which implies Clegg's reification of Miranda. Even in this area, she cannot take control over Clegg. He represents patriarchy against women in general; men ignore the existence of women's identities, even in cases where women are more knowledgeable and superior to men. Miranda is in this situation and has no choice but to agree with Clegg. In addition, there is a scene where Miranda says she does not regret having had this experience with Clegg. Although Miranda's opinion about her captivity shows how she becomes mature in her identity quest here, this potential maturation is overshadowed by her death. Miranda's identity quest leaves some question marks in the reader's mind about gaining her voice against male dominance in her life. While she is fighting male dominance throughout the novel, she cannot fully achieve success in this struggle because she cannot completely free herself from traditional gender roles. Miranda's dual portrayal creates ambiguity about her success on the identity quest. Moreover, Kitty's dreams for Maude do not fully come true with Miranda. She has all the rights

as a woman that Kitty dreamt of, but she cannot save herself from both the male characters' physical and psychological captivity and cannot survive in a society that the patriarchy designs for her. She is also killed by the masculine power just like Kitty at the end of the story.



CONCLUSION

John Fowles' *The Collector* and Tracy Chevalier's *Falling Angels* are two novels written in a postmodern style and stand out especially with the contradictions that the characters experience in their search for identity. The reader closely witnesses the endless struggles of the characters in their identity quests, and the distances the characters have covered on this path are always in sight. In these quests for identity, the place of women in the social structure stands out in both novels. Although the two novels have different settings, the female characters have similar experiences. Both Kitty and Miranda are dissatisfied with their conditions as women in the society of the period they belong to, and they are trying very hard to overcome the situation. However, no matter how hard they try to break free, they can never fully escape stereotypical gender roles that have been so deeply entrenched in their society, and that leads to an ambiguity in their quest for identity.

In *Falling Angels* Tracy Chevalier depicts the life of an upper class family. Richard and Kitty are married, and they have a daughter named Maude. Also, their neighbours, the Waterhouses, have two daughters named Lavinia and Ivy May. The plot mainly focuses on Kitty's life, and thanks to the multiple narration technique Chevalier uses, the reader witnesses the scenes through the eyes of all other characters. This makes it possible for the reader to hear the inner voices of the characters and their personal development throughout the novel. Kitty is the main character, and she is dissatisfied with her life. Although Gertrude considers Kitty a lucky woman, as she has a wealthy and handsome husband, a large house, and a smart child, Kitty is unhappy with her life and is searching for a solution. Unlike Gertrude, Kitty differs from the women of her period in some ways. In the Victorian era, what women expected from life was to marry a wealthy man, live in a big house, and have clever children. It was also important for the husband to be cultured and to lead his wife and family both financially and morally. Kitty is different from the women of her age. Although she has these privileges, she is not satisfied with her life because her expectations are different from those of a stereotypical Victorian woman. She does not accept the stereotypical gender role that society imposes on her. Unlike Gertrude, she gives more importance to education. She does not want to have children and struggles to do so. Just like her brother and husband, she wants to go to school and work in public sphere jobs instead of domestic ones. When her daughter is firstborn, she believes that her world comes to an end, as she does not want to take care of her child. Therefore, she escapes from being a stereotypical woman who is trapped in childcare and other domestic duties at

home. Moreover, she also resists the pressures of her husband Richard and her mother-in-law Edith. Her mother-in-law always criticizes her for not being a good example for her daughter, Maude. In contrast to Kitty, Edith thinks that Kitty misguides Maude and her granddaughter should learn domestic works like sewing instead of reading books that fills her mind with useless ideas. However, Kitty advises her daughter to go to university instead of getting married in the future, and she resists the social pressure that her husband and mother-in-law try to put on her and her daughter.

Furthermore, Kitty joins the WSPU and fights for women's rights. Here she works with other members of the movement and ignores her domestic duties while chasing her ideals. Maude grows up with her maids and the support of her neighbour Gertrude and suffers from her mother's absence. Finally, Kitty attends the Demonstrations in Hyde Park in a Robin Hood costume. They hold meetings on many issues related to freedom, especially about women's right to vote. However, as a result of the violent intervention of the police and the chaos that ensued, Kitty is hit by the horse she leads, gets injured, and dies soon after. Despite the strict social rules in the Victorian era, this stance of Kitty shows her attitude towards dictated stereotypical gender roles in Victorian society. Given what she has done, Kitty has rejected patriarchy and has done things that could actually be a role model as a free woman for the others, especially for her daughter Maude.

However, despite Kitty's perspective on life, the reader also witnesses her dilemmas and inner conflicts during her identity quest, which causes some doubts about whether she has really succeeded in gaining her own voice at the end of the story. From the very first scenes of the novel, Kitty's conflicts are obvious. Though Chevalier presents Kitty as a character who fights against normative society even risking her life, the scenes analysed in the second chapter of the thesis show that she could not fully save herself from social pressure and could not escape from the patriarchy. All her actions and behaviours discussed in the previous chapter point out that there is an ambiguity in her success about finding her voice. One can admit that she is different from a traditional Victorian woman; however, in her quest for identity, she may have the potential to free herself from the norms, but the result is not clear. Furthermore, her death at the end of the story by a horse attack makes it impossible for her to realise this potential. In addition, being hit by a horse at a meeting she attends for the women's rights movement is the author's desire to make the reader feel that Kitty's quest for identity is violently ended by patriarchy, as the horse is a well-known symbol for masculine power and authority. The only potential left in this regard is her daughter Maude and the next generation of women. Maude represents

potential because, although she is unhappy that her mother joins this movement at times when Kitty is alive, after her death, she follows her advice and argues with her father about going to university. Then she starts wearing her mother's clothes and shows the possibility of taking over Kitty's flag. Given all this, Kitty cannot fully free herself from stereotypical gender roles and patriarchy to achieve her own free identity, but it is clear that she has left a legacy of hope for Maude and many other women who may face similar problems in the future.

Similar to *Falling Angles*, in John Fowles' *The Collector*, the reader witnesses an identity quest of Miranda. Miranda is a modern, independent girl who goes to university, studies art, and dreams of becoming a successful painter in 1960s England. She is in the profile of a woman who is free to chase her own wishes and stand on her own in the public sphere. She is also a cultured female character who is sensitive to the problems of modern world like war and H-Bomb. She has the freedom in society to do whatever she wants. While Fowles presents Miranda to the reader as a free modern woman at first glance in the novel, the conflicts within herself show that she is not as free as she seems. Especially, in her relationship with G.P., Miranda seems unduly dependent on him. Overestimating him and accepting everything he says actually shows that Miranda is lacking her own voice. Miranda's mere acceptance of G.P.'s criticisms without even questioning, on her art and his views on how unsuccessful an artist she will be in the future, may indicate her inability to gain her voice rather than just respecting of G.P.'s artistic experience. G.P. is a figure that forms her art, and he has a function that, without his presence, she cannot define anything about art. Even in front of a fake art enthusiast like Clegg, she uses G.P.'s words when she evaluates Clegg's photos. Her idealisation of him is so deep that she could not develop an independent identity against him. G.P. ignores her identity in many cases throughout the novel, and Miranda accepts this manner without question and makes no effort to resist. She behaves like a stereotypical woman, which perfectly fits society's expectations. When someone evaluates Miranda's conditions in general, one can see that Miranda has a confusion to present her identity to G.P.

Moreover, she has a similar dependence on Clegg as well. Considering her dialogues with Clegg, when the readers look at Miranda's situation from a wider perspective, they can see that she is dependent upon Clegg, both physically and psychologically during her captivity. Miranda tries several times to escape from Clegg's captivity by using her physical strength, but she cannot save herself. On the other hand, Miranda knows that she is psychologically superior to Clegg. In addition to Clegg's mental health problems, Miranda's being more educated and cultured than him and being more socially active give her a natural advantage on

Clegg. However, she could not establish a complete authority over him. There are some indications that her captivity aided her quest for identity. For example, Miranda expresses she has no regrets about having this experience, which implies that she has changed. This development shows that Miranda has made a big step in the search for her identity. However, her death at the end of the story creates a hopelessness about the potential development of her voice.

Miranda's bondage to G.P. and Clegg actually bears parallels. Because of the environment created by society, there is no significant difference between Miranda's physical captivity by Clegg and her psychological captivity by G.P. Therefore, in this story, Clegg and society have similar functions. Moreover, Miranda, despite all her awareness, cannot escape the fate that normative society inflicts on women through stereotypical gender roles. Miranda is torn between her efforts to liberate herself and the gender roles society expects of her.

Finally, there is a similarity between Miranda's and Kitty's cases. Although the two novels have different settings, the fates of the characters are very similar. Although the time changes, the fate of the women in these two stories remains the same. Even if both of them struggle to find their own voice and gain their freedom, they cannot receive the full reward for their efforts. Although, chronologically, the two stories take place as the continuation of each other, it is obvious that the problem of social oppression and confinement of women in these two novels cannot be resolved. Although the rights that Kitty fought for in the early 1900s were gained in the 1960s, it is clear that the rights did not fully serve them on a social level. It is obvious that the struggle is left unfinished by Kitty's death and inherited by Maude and is not completely succeeded by Miranda either. The potential for change that Maude offers by wearing her mother's clothes and rebelling against her father is not fully realised, even in Miranda, who is at the age that Maude's daughter could be. Unfortunately, Kitty's dream for Maude and other new generation women is not fully realised by Miranda, as they are strictly oppressed by society to fit gender role stereotypes and could not escape from them.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Austen, J. (2006). *Pride and Prejudice*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Berger, J. (1977). *Ways of Seeing*. London: British Broadcasting Corporation and Penguin Books.
- Branca, Patricia. (1977). *Silent Sisterhood: Middle Class Women in the Victorian Home*. London: Croom Helm.
- Butler, J. (1988). "Acts and gender performative: An essay in phenomenology constitution and feminist theory." *Theatre Journal*, 40(4), 519-531.
- . (1993). *Bodies That Matter: On the Discursive Limits of Sex*. New York: Routledge.
- . (1999). *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity 2nd Edn*. New York: Routledge.
- Caine, Barbara. (1982). "Feminism, Suffrage and the Nineteenth-Century English Women's Movement." *Women's Studies International Forum*, 5 (6) 537-550.
- Chevalier, T. (2002). *Falling Angels*. New York: Plume Books.
- Cixous, H. (1986). "The Newly Born Woman." In W. Godzich, & J. Schulte-Sasse, *Theory and History of Literature 1-168*. Minnesota: University of Minnesota Press.
- Cixous, H., Cohen, K., & Cohen, P. (1976). "The Laugh of the Medusa." *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society*, 1(4), 875-893.
- Cooper, P. (1991). *The Fictions of John Fowles: Power, Creativity, Femininity*. Ottawa: University of Ottawa Press.
- Dilă, E. (2014). "Butterflies and Voices in John Fowles' The Collector." *The 61 Round Table*. Partium Christian University.
- Docherty, T. (1981). "A Constant Reality: The Presentation of Character in the Fiction of John Fowles." *NOVEL: A Forum on Fiction*, 14(2), 118-134. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1344848>.

- Ebert, T L. (1991). "The Difference of Postmodern Feminism." *College English*, 53(8), 886.
- Fowles, J. (1963). *The Collector*. Boston: Little, Brown and Company.
- Hass, M. (2000). "The Style of the Speaking Subject: Irigaray's Empirical Studies Of Language Production." *Hypatia*, 15 (1), pp. 64-89.
- Irigaray, L. (1987). *Speculum of the Other Woman*. Cornell University Press. Itaca, New York.
- Irigaray, L., & Wenzel, H. V. (1981). "And The One Doesn't Stir Without The Other." *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society*, 7(1), 60-67.
- Ittmann, K. (1995). *Gender and Family in Victorian England*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Jameson, F. (1991). *Postmodernism or, The Cultural Logic of Late Capitalism*. North Carolina: Duke University Press.
- Levine, Philippa. (1987). *Victorian Feminism 1850-1900*. London: Hutchinson Education.
- Lyotard, J. F. (1984). *The Postmodern Condition: A Report on Knowledge* (Vol. 10). Minnesota: University of Minnesota Press.
- McDowall, David. (2004). *An Illustrated History of Britain*. London: Harlow: Longman.
- Mill, J. S. (1869). *The Subjection of Women. The Basic Writings of John Stuart Mill*. London: Longmans, Green, Reader, and Dyer.
- Poovey, M. (1988). "Feminism and Deconstruction." *Feminist Studies* 14(1), 51–65. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3177998>.
- Ruskin, J. (1864) "Of Queens' Gardens: From Sesame and Lillies," *Essays: English and American*, 28, 1909-14.
- Shanley, L. (1993) *Feminism, Marriage and the Law in Victorian England*. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press,
- Tong, R. (2009). *Feminist Thought: A More Comprehensive Introduction*. Colorado: Westview Press.
- Turner, E. R. (1913). "The Women's Suffrage Movement in England." *The American Political Science Review*, 7(4), 588–609. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1944309>.