

THE CONSTITUTION OF THE FEMALE SUBJECT IN *EMMA* AND
THE PROUD WOMAN (MAĞRUR KADIN)

A THESIS SUBMITTED TO
THE GRADUATE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES
OF
MIDDLE EAST TECHNICAL UNIVERSITY

BY

EBRU DİDEM ALPARSLAN

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR
THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF SCIENCE
IN
MEDIA AND CULTURAL STUDIES

FEBRUARY 2012

Approval of the Graduate School of Social Sciences

Prof. Dr. Meliha Altunışık
Director

I certify that this thesis satisfies all the requirements as a thesis for the degree of Master of Science.

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Raşit Kaya
Head of Department

This is to certify that we have read this thesis and that in our opinion it is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a thesis for the degree of Master of Science.

Prof. Dr. Meral Çileli
Supervisor

Examining Committee Members

Prof. Dr. Meral Çileli	(METU, FLE)	_____
Prof. Dr. Nursel İçöz	(METU, FLE)	_____
Assist. Prof. Dr. Necmi Erdoğan	(METU, ADM)	_____

I hereby declare that all information in this document has been obtained and presented in accordance with academic rules and ethical conduct. I also declare that, as required by these rules and conduct, I have fully cited and referenced all material and results that are not original to this work.

Name, Last name : E. Didem Alparslan

Signature :

ABSTRACT

THE CONSTITUTION OF THE FEMALE SUBJECT IN *EMMA* AND *THE PROUD WOMAN (MAĞRUR KADIN)*

Alparslan, Ebru Didem

M.S., Department of Media and Cultural Studies

Supervisor: Prof. Dr. Meral Çileli

February 2012, 91 pages

The main aim of this thesis is to analyze the constitution of the female subjectivity in the novels, *Emma* by Jane Austen and *The Proud Woman (Mağrur Kadın)* by Muazzez Tahsin Berkan, through the discourse of romance and within the discursive features of the narratives reflecting their time and cultures. The reflections of modernity are also analyzed in both texts in relation to the life styles and the representations of the male and female characters. This thesis deals with the issue of romance and romantic love in these novels in terms of examining the women's experience of romance within the patriarchal order through the pleasure of the texts offering to its readers.

Keywords : Female Subject, Romance, Jane Austen, Muazzez Tahsin Berkand

ÖZ

EMMA VE MAĞRUR KADIN ROMANLARINDA KADIN ÖZNESİNİN KURULUŞU

Alparslan, Ebru Didem

Yüksek Lisans, Medya ve Kültürel Çalışmalar Bölümü

Tez Yöneticisi : Prof. Dr. Meral Çileli

Şubat 2012, 91 sayfa

Bu tezin temel amacı, Jane Austen'in *Emma* ve Muazzez Tahsin Berkand'ın *Mağrur Kadın* romanlarını romans söylemi açısından incelemek ve kendi zamanlarını ve kültürlerini yansıtan bu anlatıların söylemsel özellikleri içinde kadın öznesinin kuruluşunu analiz etmektir. Her iki metinde de, modernitenin kadın ve erkek kimlikleri ve hayat tarzlarının temsiline ilişkin yansımaları üzerinde durulmaktadır. Bu tez, metinlerin okurlarına sunduğu zevk aracılığıyla ataerkil düzen içinde kadının romans deneyimini inceleyerek, bu romanlardaki romans ve romantik aşk konusunu ele almaktadır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Kadın Öznesi, Romans, Jane Austen, Muazzez Tahsin Berkand

To my mother

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

First and foremost, I would like to acknowledge gratefully the guidance, advice, criticism, and insight that I received from my supervisor Prof. Dr. Meral Çileli throughout this thesis. She has supported me for five years and never lost her trust in me. I am indebted to her for always keeping me motivated and showing her great interest at every step of my thesis.

I owe special debt of gratitude to my intimate friends Serap K rođlu, Őefika  zkal, Funda  zvatan, Mehtap Tatar, Őule Erdal, G zde Yazıcı C r t and Cevahir  zg ler for their constant encouragement, support and suggestions in the painful course of thesis writing. I also wish to thank especially to A. Max Pearson and Selda K rođlu who supported me technically and encouraged me through writing this thesis.

I would also like to express my deepest and sincere appreciation to my family for their presence in my life. I have always felt their existence and emotional support in my hard times.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PLAGIARISM.....	iii
ABSTRACT	iv
ÖZ.....	v
DEDICATION	vi
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.....	vii
TABLE OF CONTENTS	viii
CHAPTER	
1. INTRODUCTION.....	1
2. ROMANCE AS A GENRE.....	6
2.1. Gendered Nature of Romance as a Genre	8
2.2. Feminist Theories on Romance	12
2.2.1. The Structure of Romance.....	17
2.2.2. The Discourse of Romance.....	19
2.2.3. Reading the Romance	20
2.2.4. The Object of the Romance: “Romantic Love”	22
3. THE PLACE OF THE POPULAR ROMANCES IN TURKISH LITERATURE OF THE EARLY REPUBLICAN PERIOD	27
4. THE ANALYSIS OF THE CONSTITUTION OF THE FEMALE SUBJECT IN MUAZZEZ TAHSIN BERKAND’S <i>MAĞRUR KADIN</i> THROUGH THE KEMALIST DISCOURSE OF MODERNIZATION.....	31
4.1. The Impact of Kemalist Modernization on the Formation of Female Identity.....	34
4.2. Freedom and Sexuality of the Modern Turkish Women in the Kemalist Era	37
4.3. A Popular Romance Writer of the Early Republican Period: Muazzez Tahsin Berkand.....	39
4.4. Reading <i>The Proud Woman</i> (Mağrur Kadın)	44
5. THE VOICE OF “ORDINARY” WOMEN: <i>JANE AUSTEN</i>	54
6. THE CONSTITUTION OF THE FEMALE SUBJECT IN <i>EMMA</i>	59
7. CONCLUSION	76
APPENDIX	91

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

“[A]ll ..visions of woman are contaminated by male-defined notions of the truth of femininity. This is true not only of the negative cultural images of women (prostitute, demon, medusa, bluestocking, vagina dentata) but also of positive ones (woman as nature, woman as nurturing mother, or innocent virgin, or heroic Amazon...) Woman is always a metaphor, dense with sedimented meanings.”
(Felski in Thornham, 2007: 23)

The aim of this study is to analyze how the female subject is constituted through the discourse of romance in the novels, *Emma* by Jane Austen and *The Proud Woman* (*Mağrur Kadın*) by Muazzez Tahsin Berkand, in terms of love relationships between male and female characters. As romance fiction, the plot in *Emma* and *The Proud Woman* revolves around the courtships and the central theme is the search for love. The issue of romantic love and romance is widely accepted as an “unimportant, unprofessional, emotional and mundane” issue which also reflects the common-sense perspective towards woman’s sphere, associated particularly with being woman/female. It can be asserted that the discourses on individual subjectivity over the last few centuries are closely connected with the discourses around gender. The female identity and its constitution as a “subject” have been analyzed through investigating multiple discursive practices. As women, our subjectivities are not coherent and consistent and the categories of “women” and “women’s experience” have uncertain and sometimes contradictory meanings. As Thornham asserts, “the definition of female identity is that of ‘female-embodied social subject [with a] specific, emergent, and conflictual history’ which brings the notion that identity itself has narrative structure” (2007:73).

The theoretical part of this study includes feminist and post-structuralist theories on romantic love and romance. For feminists, romantic love as a culturally constructed phenomenon can either be recognized as a site of women’s complicity in patriarchal relations or it can also be a site of resistance. As Jackson points out, in feminist theory there is a lack of convincing theory of female subjectivity and it has become

conventional to introduce psychoanalytic explanations at this point. Psychoanalysis has been used in order to understand the attractions of romance reading for women (1995:56). But the psychoanalytic explanations of romantic love take it as a universal category and assume that all women in different cultures make sense of them in exactly the same way. It leads to the misreading of the culturally constructed nature of love in various romantic narratives and discourses of different social structures. Our subjectivities, as Jackson suggests, are shaped by the social and cultural milieu and through positioning ourselves within discourses, constructing narratives of self and drawing on whatever cultural resources are available to us (1995:58). The intention of my study in order to analyze the constitution of the female subject in the novels, *Emma* and *The Proud Woman*, belonging to different narrative traditions of two different cultures, calls attention to this culturally relative side of romance fiction and the contingent character of the constitution of femininity in this fiction. The question how the heroines of the novels are constituted as “female subjects” by their “woman writers” is the heart of the matter in this study. Before going over such an investigation, it is necessary to dwell upon the different arguments on romantic discourse and romance which are accepted as feminine narratives.

The “generic nature of romance” leads to the devaluation of it as woman’s genre, literature of romantic love, as “trash” sub-genre beside valued public genre and mainstream classical literature. This construction of binary opposition reflects the patriarchal attitudes within the social system we live in, which can be seen in the constituting of culture as high/low and public/private. The category of the feminine, of “woman” is also constructed through these cultural distinctions (Thornham, 2000: 189). The literary division of the “feminization” of “mass” cultural forms such as romance novel and the woman’s magazine in opposition to “authored” writing leads to aligning “the feminine” with commodification, standardization and passivity, and which maintain it within the sphere of private, understood as subordinate, emotional and domestic (Ibid.). Although the characteristics of being irrational or emotional can be devalued in the patriarchal system, feminist literary studies have been an important factor in paying special attention to the operations of power relations in society and the politics of female representations in literature.

In the 20th century and onwards, feminist social theorists and literary critics enlarged their agenda through an investigation of the forms of representation of gender in

cultural texts such as films, literature, magazines and pictures. In my study, I draw upon the post-structuralist and feminist theories because they provide an illuminating and impressive perspective through cutting across the boundaries between social sciences, history, literary and cultural studies in order to understand “the ideology of femininity”. As with the Lacanian tradition, there is a focus on language and subjectivity which flourished with the analysis of Foucault’s notion of “discourse” focusing on knowledge and power relations. As the female subjectivity is “permeated by repression, resistance, ambivalence, and contradiction” Light argues, “romance reading becomes a kind of “literary anorexia” which functions as a protest against, as well as a restatement of, oppression (1999:392).

Feminist theories on romantic love include different perspectives, which are lately shaped by post structuralist theories on identity formation process. Despite the criticisms of the earlier feminist writers like Simone de Beauvoir, Kate Millett, Shulamith Firestone, and Germaine Greer who saw romantic love as a disabling ideology which serves to justify women’s subordination to men, the work of Modleski and Radway in the 1980s which offer more sophisticated accounts of women’s reading practices and their pleasure of reading, reflected a radical departure from the earliest feminists. While for the earlier feminists, “romanticism” is a cultural tool of male power to keep women from knowing their “real” conditions, after the 1980s, new perspectives of feminist theory takes the strength of its fiction and reveals the extraordinary power and seduction of romantic discourse (Stacey and Pearce/ Jackson, 1995). They believe that the romance narrative can be analyzed and challenged but a total rejection or refusal would not help in explaining the reasons why women still keep reading romances. As Light points out, the attraction of romance narrative lies in the meshing of the question of pleasure, fantasy, and language which literary culture takes up so profoundly and which makes it so uniquely important to women:

Subjectivity-the ways in which we come to express and define our concepts of ourselves-then seems crucial in any analysis of the activity of reading. Subjectivity can be recognized as the place where operations of power and possibilities of resistance are also played out. Romance fiction deals above all with the doubts and delights of heterosexuality, an institution which feminism has seen as problematic from the start (Light, 1999:373).

Austen and Berkand are widely accepted as distinctive popular romance writers of their time by literary critics. Even though, there are big differences in the period and socio-economic conditions of the countries in which they wrote- Austen in the early 19th century in Britain and Berkand in the 20th century Early Republican Era of Turkey- the similarities in their plots are noteworthy in terms of the representation of female characters and ideological and sociological context of the novels. In both of the novels, the effects of Enlightenment thinking and the reflection of Industrial Revolution can be easily noticed through the representation of middle class bourgeoisie within their life styles and social relations. The novels reflect the contradictions in the celebration of modernity and its projection on the values of middle class which can be observed mostly through the relationships of men and women. In both of the novels, the “femininity” and “masculinity” of the characters are constructed through these relationships within their social and cultural context.

The other important similarity of Austen and Berkand is that both writers have been influenced by the prominent woman authors, Mary Wollstonecraft and Halide Edip Adivar, who are accepted as the leading feminist figures of their time. My study also aims to reveal their influence on the constitution and the representation of the female subjects in *Emma* and *The Proud Woman*, in terms of showing the extent of how the heroines in these novels resist the existing patriarchal social structure through their female voice. The reason why Mary Wollstonecraft wrote to vindicate the rights of women was mainly to illuminate the question of dominant patriarchal ideology which encompasses all the spheres of women’s life such as morals, manners, education and religion. Halide Edip Adivar, was one of the prominent literary and political figures of Kemalist discourse in the Early Republic of Turkey, the period which can be analyzed as the Turkish Enlightenment in relation to the liberation of women in terms of legal and social rights and the political secularism leading to the democratization of the state. In this study, I’ve also tried to analyze the similarities and differences between the female characters in *Emma* and *The Proud Woman* and the influence of the leading women figures, Mary Wollstonecraft and Halide Edip Adivar, on the constitution of the female identity in the novels studied.

How the discourse of modernity is dealt with in both texts in terms of the representations of the male and female characters and the life styles of people is also one of the questions in this study. This study focuses on the constitution of the

female subject within the intertextual and discursive features of the narratives reflecting their time and culture. Foucault envisions the self as embodied, embedded in a social and cultural milieu, constituted by power relations and thoroughly contextualized, and takes resistance as a point of departure which offers feminist literary critics useful resources for thinking about the role of narrative structures such as romance as a site of resistance. Could these novels open a new path to women through an experience of resistance against the existing patriarchal order within the romance discourse which is read with pleasure by women in two different historical and cultural contexts?

CHAPTER II

ROMANCE AS A GENRE

As Cawelti (1976) argues that there is a strong connection between the concepts of “literary formula” and “popular genre” in terms of embodying the structures of narrative or dramatic conventions and collective fantasies shared by large groups of people. According to Cawelti, the relation between formula and genre reflects the way in which popular genres develop: “all kinds of popular story types such as western, the detective story or the spy adventure carry embodiments of archetypal story forms in terms of specific cultural materials.”(1976:6.). The conception of genre can be conceived either in term of the specific formulas of a particular culture or in relation to larger, more universal literary archetypes. Certain story archetypes particularly fulfill man’s needs for enjoyment and escape which is similar in many ways to the traditional literary conception of a genre (Ibid.).

As Radway (1984) points out, a theory in which genre is conceived relates to the production of the meaning and exploring the reasons why certain sets of texts are especially interesting to particular groups of people. The question of “how and where a given set of generic rules had been created, learned, and used” needs attention (Radway, 1984:10). Williams mentions the proliferation of “genres” and “subgenres” as “novel, picaresque novel, romance, short-story, comedy, tragedy, melodrama, children’s literature, essay, humour, journalism, light verse, mystery and detective stories, oratory, parody, pastoral, proverb, riddle, satire, science fiction” and points out the combination of three types of classification : “by literary form, by subject matter, and by intended readership (this last a developing type in terms of specialized market-sectors)” (1977:181-82).

The formulaic structures and popular genres such as mystery and adventure stories have been criticized mainly in terms of their essential standardization and their primary relation to the needs of relaxation and escape from the frustrations of life. They are defined as “sub literature (as opposed to literature), entertainment (as opposed to serious literature), popular art (as opposed to fine art), lowbrow culture (as opposed to highbrow)” (Cawelti, 1976:8).

This kind of approach tends to evaluate popular literature forms as an inferior or perverted form of something better, “instead of seeing its “escapist” characteristics as aspects of an artistic type with its own purposes and justification.” (Cawelti, 1976:13). What needs attention here is the focus on inter discursive formations, as Radway underlines “on the questions about the kinds of cultural competencies that are learned as a consequence of certain social formations and how those are activated and perpetuated within and through multiple, related genres or discourses.”(1984:10). According to Williams, there are two important facts in genre theory:

First, that there are clear social and historical relations between particular literary forms and the societies and periods in which they were originated or practiced; second, that there are undoubted continuities of literary forms through and beyond the societies and periods to which they have such relations. In genre theory, everything depends on the character and process of such continuities (1977:183).

In the last instance, according to Williams, genre is neither an ideal type nor a traditional order nor a set of technical rules, it is constituted through the practical and variable combination and even fusion of different levels of the social material process (1977:185).

Beer, in the analysis of the history and definition of romance, asserts that the romance as a literary kind is often exclusively associated with medieval literature which established a pattern as the dominant form for fiction until the beginning of the seventeenth century (1986:5). He pointed out that though the subject-matter of the romances was courtly, its language could be understood by all. According to Beer, there is distinction between “the romance” and “romance” as an element in literature which can be captured as a shift from form to quality: “We tend to speak of “medieval romances” but of “the Elizabethan romance” and then of “romance” in nineteenth century novels.” (1986:5).

According to Cawelti, there are similarities in elements of the “gothic romance” with adventure and mystery. He points out that the gothic romance uses mystery as an occasion for bringing two potential lovers together, for placing temporary obstacles in the part of their relationship, and ultimately clearing up the separation between the lovers by making solutions (1976:41). Modleski focuses on the psychological side of the gothic in terms of “providing a way for women to work through profound

psychic conflicts, especially ambivalence toward the significant people in their lives—mothers, fathers, lovers.” (Modleski, 1988:75). According to Modleski, Mary Wollstonecraft as a writer, through connecting the social with the psychological, the personal with the political, used the genre to explore these conflicts in relation to a society which systematically oppresses women (Ibid.).

According to Beer, there is no single characteristic which distinguishes the romance from other literary kinds but rather, he mentions a cluster of properties:

The themes of love and adventure, a certain withdrawal from their own societies on the part of both reader and romance hero, profuse sensuous detail, simplified characters, a serene intermingling of the unexpected and the everyday, a complex and prolonged succession of incidents usually without a single climax, a happy ending, amplitude of proportions, a strongly enforced code of conduct to which all the characters must comply (1986:11).

2.1. Gendered Nature of Romance as a Genre

Before going over an analysis of the theories on romance as a literary genre, it is important to emphasize its *gendered nature*. According to Beer, the works now popularly called “romances” are usually sub-literature deliberately written to flatter daydreams (1986:1). The question whether romance can be valued as a public genre or a trash subgenre and the woman’s genre needs questioning the gendered nature of culture itself and the construction of the social category “woman” and “femininity”. The arguments related with “culture” and “cultural products” and the revision of the theories of femininity reveal their gendered aspects.

Sue Thornham, by focusing on the various categories of “high culture” during the 19th century, in the field of art, within print culture and with the elevation of the novel, reveals that their source of value is the concept of “the individual” whose supreme embodiment is the artist which is related with progressive *masculinization* (2000:189). Thornham emphasizes that the “woman’s novel” gradually became “women’s fiction”, a lower category lacking “originality” leading to high/low culture divide which is thoroughly a gendered concept corresponding to a division between mainstream cultural activity and public professionalism on the one hand, and a critically marginalized, privatized and “less original” form of production on the other (2000:189).

The question related with the *constitutive* nature of cultural products is also connected to arguments on ideology which focus on the nature of its relation to the social reality and cultural practices. As Eagleton asks, “If there is a misrepresentation of social reality, does this misrepresentation has a “constitutive” character, or is it “contingent” to social reality?” (1991:15). Althusser’s perspective on ideology gives an important part of the answer. It is not the issue of its connection to the social reality or it is not their real condition of existence, but the real world that men represent to themselves in ideology. As Althusser declares, “what is represented in ideology is not the system of real relations, but the “imaginary” relation of individuals to the real relations in which they live.” (1994: 125). Similarly, Thornham also emphasizes that it is not simply the constituting of culture as high/low, public/private in an already existing, socially structured sexual division. The category of the “feminine”, of “Woman”, is also constructed through these cultural distinctions (2000:189).

In the case of gendered divisions in literary productions, the “feminization of “mass” cultural forms (the romance novel, the woman’s magazine)”, in opposition to “authored” writing, according to Thornham, is not merely the *result* of gendered social divisions which identify the former with a privatized realm of content and consumption, and the latter with professionalism and public responsibility (2000:189). She proposes that it also helps to *construct* notions of “the feminine” which align it with commodification, standardization and passivity, within the sphere of the private, understood as subordinate, emotional and domestic (Ibid.) She continues, “if the literary work tells the story of female / feminine / feminist cultural production (“low” culture), it is considered as a marginal story within a “woman’s genre.”(2000: 190).

If gendered identities are *constructed* through social practices and the cultural products that are produced and reproduced in the existing dominant system in which we live, how will the “feminine” identity be characterized? As Hollows states, the notion of “femininity” is not fixed and stable, on the contrary definitions are continually changing within the relations of power and these various representations of femininity are ultimately related to the politics of identity (2000: 31). In her work on women’s magazines, Inness states that these magazines collectively comprise a social institution which foster and maintain a cult of femininity (2004: 127).

According to her, “this cult is manifested both as a social group to which all these born female can belong, and a set of practices and beliefs: rites, rituals, sacrifices and ceremonies, whose performance reaffirms a common femininity and a shared group membership” (Ibid.).

Basically two different feminist critiques of “femininity” are discussed; one of which sees femininity as inferior to masculinity, that is equality between men and women might be achieved if women reject feminine values and behavior in favor of masculine values and behavior. The other explores a different opposition; between femininity and femaleness, a position that equates women’s liberation with throwing off the “false” mask of femininity to reveal the “real” female values lying beneath (Hollows, 2000: 10). The second understanding of femininity is much closer to the notion of “folk feminism”, in which “authentic” feminine cultural forms and practices are privileged over commercially produced popular culture and an attempt is made to unearth a women’s cultural tradition which has been hidden, marginalized or trivialized by a masculine cultural tradition and/or an “inauthentic” women’s culture (2000: 29).

Feminism has tended to look at women as constituting a group that is characterized by a certain shared reality (Olkowski, 1998:10). Olkowski argues that feminism has developed a unique epistemological practice that can account for women’s oppression as a sex and this is what differentiates feminism from all other critical practices (1998: 8). Hollows focuses on the “sisterhood” notion of feminists which affirmed the similarity and solidarity of all women and their common experience of oppression (2000: 5). But some post-modern feminists, who draw theoretically upon the deconstructionism of Derrida and the discourse analysis of Foucault, argue that not only is the concept of patriarchy essentialist but also is that of “women”. There are a number of overlapping, cross-cutting discourses of femininities and masculinities which are historically and culturally variable. Their focus is usually on an investigation of the forms of representation of gender in cultural texts such as film, literature, magazines and pictures. These writers try to “catch the nuances of different forms of femininities” (Walby, 1992: 34). According to Ballaster, Beetham, Frazer and Hebron, a gap emerges between the reader’s social and economic reality, and that projected by the text she consumes. According to Ballaster this gap vividly illustrates Simone de Beauvoir’s famous observation that “one is not born, but rather

becomes a woman” (de Beauvoir in Ballaster, 1991:12). In the romance structure of popular fiction, Ballaster underlies that femaleness is in itself punishable, but can only be transcended or transformed through the acquisition and display of an excessive femininity (1991: 13).

Wetherell (1995) by using the terms “opening and closing” suggests a combinatory feminist politics in terms of defining female identity. According to her, “closing” involves defining a community of women, and an identity from which to act. On the other hand, she proposes that “opening” questions the way how this female identity is constructed and imagined. This new method of politics, she argues, is about “tracing out the power dynamics of different discourses of femininity, about investigating the ways the imagined community of women has been constructed in different contexts”(1995: 141).

It should be asked how romance intrudes on the lives of women and how it affects the construction of “femininity” in the private and public realm of women and it needs questioning of the romance as a discourse. Discourses have multiple uses and multiple meanings. Romance for example can both be read as disabling women, fixing them into oppressive sexual relations and a source of resistance to men’s power or as a fantastical way of getting back at men, at rewriting their power plays (Wetherell, 1995:142). So, in order to understand the narrative, generic and gendered character of romance, it is important to revise the foremost feminist theories and critics on romance dealing with its structural, psychological and discursive character.

2.2. Feminist Theories on Romance

“A woman’s presence was the result of herself being split into two, and of her energy being inturned. A woman was always accompanied, except when she was quite alone- by her own image of herself. Whilst she was walking across a room or whilst she was weeping at the death of her father, she could not avoid envisaging herself walking or weeping. From earliest childhood she had been taught and persuaded to survey herself continually. And so she came to consider the surveyer and the surveyed within her as the two constitutive yet always distinct elements of her identity as a woman....in each action there was an ambiguity which corresponded to an ambiguity in the self, divided between surveyer and surveyed.” (Berger in Modleski, 1986: 122).

Modleski as a feminist theorist who studied romance, states that in the romance, the prime element is woman’s adaptability to rules that she has not made and over which she has no control (1986:123), She argues that the split female personality, which seems to be related to woman’s dual role as token in exchange and as a thinking person, has become a primary mechanism of mass culture narrative. In at least one form of this narrative- the romance- she claims, women are invited to reenact the process of censorship by which the thinking part of themselves has to be suppressed. Modleski focuses on the archaic mechanisms underlying romance, which she calls a kind of anachronistic “political unconscious”, which allows the modern woman to be constituted. Thus, she continues, the ancient form of romance is deployed to represent the utopian side of modernization, the utopia in which there can be unlimited gratification without guilt or social disapproval: “The (utopian) romance provides women with a dream of an ideal reconciliation between their individual desire for love and their desire for social approval, a reconciliation, which will be achieved by a process of self- censorship.” (1986: 123).

Modleski (1986) analyzed Harlequin romances, which are distributed not only in North America but also in Latin America. She called them “paradigmatic” among many kinds of romantic fiction. She tries to answer the question which has puzzled feminists - namely, “why in countries like U.S and in Latin America this anachronistic formula literature should be so attractive?” (Ibid: 124). She emphasizes that many of these feminist critics, were caught in a dilemma, neither wanting to

adopt an elitist position of condemning romance readers as passive nor wanting altogether to endorse this literature. These feminist critics do not claim entirely a positive or negative opinion on the effects of romance. As Modleski mentions, some critics underlie that romance feeds certain regressive elements in female experience but they also claim that women achieve a sort of power in the romantic fiction (1986:125). Modleski refers to Rosalind Coward's argument that women's romantic fiction: "restores the childhood world of sexual relations and suppresses criticism of the inadequacy of men, the suffocation of the family, or the damage inflicted by patriarchal power." (Coward in Modleski, 1986: 125).

Wetherell (1995:136) tries to understand the psychological side of romantic discourse through looking for the answers of some important questions such as: "Why do we position ourselves within romantic discourse? Why do women do, if they do, more than men?" She uses Lacanian psychoanalytical theories in order to understand the issue. She refers back to the subjectivity of the child in the pre-Oedipal stage, to the patterning of early relationships, most usually with the mother. The process of separation and gradual individuation is crucial here, Wetherell argues with referring to Lacan, it is a process in which object relations are pivotal in the development of self-esteem, a self-concept, a sense of physical security, and a self-confident and optimistic attitude to life (1995:137). She emphasizes that for boys, it is suggested that individuation has a further dimension of a much stronger disidentification from the mother, as a core gender identity begins to form. The boy, unlike the girl, is forced into a much stronger repudiation of the mother (Ibid.).

In this scenario, according to Wetherell, romance represents a form of nostalgia, the hankering for a return to some early sense of wholeness, subjective unity and self/other diffusion. (1995:138). She states that romance represents a desire for perfect mothering but men, because of the precarious and particular character of their sexual/gender identity, resist diffusion and desire for the Other (Ibid.).

Modleski suggests that the very tightness of the Harlequin romance plot is a proof of the degree of control needed to cope with women's resentment, which can only be "managed" by making the heroine perform a "disappearing act", by making her sacrifice "her aggressive instincts, her pride and-nearly-her life"(1988: 37). Readers according to Modleski, are thus forced into a kind of schizoid reaction, having to

cope with both the heroine's self surrender and their own revenge fantasies directed against the proud male: "Far from achieving undiluted escape, they experience a compulsion to repeat the reading because there is no real life solution to these contradictory feelings" (1988: 37).

According to Modleski, though Janice Radway criticizes literary and psychoanalytical analyses of this type, her own study, *Reading the Romance*, bears out these very conclusions. Radway interviewed a group of readers who claimed that the romances enabled them to escape from family and everyday routines and to enter a private world (Radway in Modleski, 1986:125). Radway also concludes that "the repetitive style of the romances, their use of familiar syntax and language and of a trustworthy narrator means that they function as cultural myths even though the readers remember them as distinct stories." (1986:126).

Modleski asks "what constitutes narrative pleasure for women?" She begins her investigation by studying the oldest type of women's narrative, which is also the most rigid of the three forms (romances, gothic novels and soap operas) in terms of its narrative structure. She refers to a writer of the "sentimental novel", Susanna Rowson, who remarked in 1793, "I wonder the novel readers are not tired of reading one story so many times, with only the variation of its being told in different ways" (Rowson in Modleski, 1988:32). Modleski underlines that the reader who reads the story already knows the story, at least in essentials, and she tries to show that this situation both reflects and contributes to a mild "hysterical" state- using this term in its psychoanalytic sense:

In his famous case study of Anna o., Josef Breuer, who worked with Freud, with female hysterics, discusses the way the patient's early "habit of daydreaming" to escape from her "monotonous family life" prepared the way for the extreme hysteria she was to develop. Eventually, she began to experience a kind of "double conscience" as Breuer calls it, which, among other symptoms, was manifested in a need to tell stories about herself in the third person and in a feeling that even when she was at her most "insane", "a clear-sighted and calm observer sat...in a corner of her brain and looked at all the mad business" (1988:32).

According to Modleski, this kind of duality exists at the very core of romances, particularly in the relation between an "informed" reader and a necessarily innocent

heroine (1988:32). As Roland Barthes and his followers consider classical narrative to be based on the male oedipal drama, Modleski wants to demonstrate that there is at least one kind of story which closely follows the female oedipal drama. And she thinks that Harlequin Romance may be called the “hysterical text” bearing a sense of the insufficiency of female selfhood (1988:33).

As feminist critics of romance have shown, women enjoy traversing the familiar plot terrain not only because it is familiar but also because it ends satisfactorily, ends moreover by giving them an unequivocal place in the world as adored and valued objects. The success of Harlequins may in fact be due to their acknowledgement of women’s desire for recognition, and also of their desire to be valued, which is a direct consequence of their devalued position in society as a whole (Modleski, 1976:128).

In his typology of literary formulas, besides adventure, mystery and melodrama John Cawelti classifies romance as the feminine equivalent of the adventure story. But he emphasizes that this does not mean that there is a sexual property in these archetypes of fantasy. Nonetheless, he adds, “the fact that most adventure formulas have male protagonists while most romances have female central characters does suggest a basic affinity between the different sexes and these two story types” (1976:41). According to Cawelti, the crucial defining characteristic of the modern romance is its core issue that is the development of a love relationship, usually between a man and a woman. The moral fantasy of the romance is that of a love triumphant and permanent, overcoming all obstacles and difficulties (1976:42). He adds, though the usual outcome is a permanently happy marriage, more sophisticated types of love story sometimes end in the death of one or both the lovers, but always in such a way as to suggest that the love relation has been of lasting and permanent impact. This characteristic, according to Cawelti, differentiates the mimetic form of the romantic tragedy from the formulaic romance. He declares: “The result is sentimental rather than tragic; we feel sad that something so perfect cannot continue, but we do not confront the basic irreconcilability of love with other responsibilities and needs, which is the essential tension of romantic tragedy” (1976: 42).

Since romance is a fantasy of the all-sufficiency of love, Cawelti proposes, most romantic formulas center on the overcoming of some combination of social or

psychological barriers. He classifies two kinds of formulaic plot. The favorite formulaic one is that of the poor girl who falls in love with some aristocratic man, which might be called the Cinderella formula. And the other is the Pamela formula, in which the heroine overcomes the threat of meaningless passion in order to establish a complete love relationship. Finally another more contemporary formula, according to Cawelti is that of the career girl who rejects love in favor of wealth or fame, only to discover that love alone, is fully satisfying (1976:42).

Stacey and Pearce ask, “Why romance retains such a hold in the postmodern world? How does romantic love, an emotional configuration that most of us experience in a hot confusion of sickness and delight, continue to do so well?”(1995:12). And they give the answer that, “romance survives because of its narrativity” (1995:12). The narrative character of romance for them is similar to that of romantic love as a phenomenon, which is “always already written”. So, according to Pearce and Stacey, it is liable to perpetual re-writing; and has a capacity for “re-scripting”. Thus for them, romantic love as a discourse is the heart of the matter. Referring to a feminist theorist, Stevi Jackson, they argue that its success depends precisely upon the fact that it is one of the most compelling discourses by which any one of us is inscribed (1995:12).

Pearce and Stacey state that Jackson’s emphasis on textuality of romantic love also relates to the work of feminist critics like Tania Modleski and Janice Radway who have attempted to show why popular romance- from Harlequin and Mills and Boon novels to television soap operas continues to be so massively popular with women readers and viewers. They argue that “romance offers women a place in which to explore their own gendered identities, social and emotional desires, and life expectations” (1995:13). Modleski, referring to Radway, accepts the view that despite the fact that the formulae are made necessary by mass production, romances provide readers with a considerable amount of reading pleasure, a pleasure which she, in common with other feminist critics, recognizes as utopian, that is, promising to fulfill desires that come from society itself: “It presents them not precisely with escape, but with a world in which the rules, once learned, bring about a magic resolution” (Radway in Modleski, 1986:126).

2.2.1. The Structure of Romance

As mentioned above, the narrativity of romance is its distinctive characteristic as a literature genre, which crosses the common-sense boundaries of “fact and fiction”, “representations and lived experience” and “fantasy and reality”. So, it could be argued that romance has a structure of itself. What is striking, according to Pearce and Stacey is the extent to which the traditional narratives of love are being written. According to them, the emphasis on the pervasive textuality of the romance, its always already written character, begs the question of whether the “classic romance ever existed” (1995:14).

Stacey and Pearce believe that (in western cultures) romance is a discourse with a structural(ist) “heart”: “it is known to us through a set of conventions, the re-writing of which has given rise to the transformations now taking place”.(1995:14) Structuralist analysis looks for the system or pattern underlying a particular sign of a cultural practice. Structuralist analyses of romantic love investigate the “typicality” of the emotion and its narrative construction. But, according to Stacey and Pearce, they have often failed to point out that typicality is not universality (1995: 27).

Central among the theorists who popularized a structuralist reading of romance/romantic love, for Stacey and Pearce, are Roland Barthes as a semiotician, and feminist literary critics Tania Modleski and Janice Radway. In “A Lover’s Discourse”, Barthes presents the classic love affair as a series of discrete figures such as “absence”, “waiting”, “declaration”, “jealousy”, “fade-out” which cluster around the climatic moment of “falling in love”. Barthes’s model proposes the idea that these “figures” occur in a particular order and he stresses the “always already” textual nature of romance (1995.: 26). Modleski and Radway also study Harlequin romances, gothic novels and television soap operas through a structural analysis of the “typical” plots and characters associated with the various sub-genres.

Stacey and Pearce (1995) analyse the structure of romances and they reveal that one of the typical characteristics of romance is the story that offers the potential of a heterosexual love union whose fulfillment is threatened by a series of barriers or

problems, for example, geographical distance, class, national or racial difference, deeming the relationship unsuitable, inhibition or stubbornness of temperament, a murky past, the existence of another lover or spouse. But, its narrative structure requires the overcoming of obstacles in the name of love and also in the name of truth, knowledge, justice or freedom. Pleasure in the “progress of romance” lies in the solution to the narrative problems, and the affirmation of desire to see “love conquering all”, thus confirming its transcendental power (1995:16). One final favourite variant of the classic formula is the tragic one in which illness or death threatens the loss of the loved one, and in so doing intensifies the desire. This raises the interesting question of whether “true romance” is most often affiliated with comedy (with a happy ending) or tragedy? (1995:16).

For Stacey and Pearce, the possibility of becoming “someone else” through a romantic relationship is one of the most interesting and positive aspects of the process:

This transformative promise holds out possibilities of change, progress and escape which are often figured through both a literal and metaphorical journey (to a new self); hence travel, relocation and movement have been central to such romantic trajectories.....In this way, romance offers its subjects, the possibility of a new “becoming”: through the encounter/fusion of self and other, a new self might be imagined (1995:18).

In fact there are many questions left unanswered related to the romantic scenarios. One of the most important is what resolution do the romances offer? (Stacey and Pearce, 1995: 18). What is the classic satisfactory closure in a romance narrative? As Stacey and Pearce asks, if romance is a quest for love, does it end once it has been found, once it has been secured, or once it has been lost or destroyed? Is romance a prelude to a first meeting, to a sexual encounter, to relationship, to marriage or, to divorce (or separation)? According to Stacey and Pearce, within different romance texts there is considerable variation on this point because the meaning of romance is culturally and historically specific but also its formation varies enormously within one culture and within one historical moment (1995: 18-20). Stacey and Pearce argue that the models to explain romantic love and its cultural representations in terms of a fixed structure or psychoanalytic projection would be inadequate to account for the emotional encounters. Their survey of the diverse

'narratives of romance' reveals that there is no longer a single (foundational) story to which they all refer (Stacey and Pearce, 1995: 37).

2.2.2. The Discourse of Romance

According to Stacey and Pearce, closely connected to the structuralist theories of romance and romantic love are the cultural theories which regard it as a discourse or ideology: "While structuralism focuses on the codes, conventions and narrative patterns typical to a cultural, literary genre, discourse theorists examine the way in which particular discourses wield power over society and individuals." (1995:27). Discourse here, is associated with a way of thinking in a particular historical moment and legitimated by its ruling institutions.

The big difference between using structuralist and discourse theory to explain the mechanism of romantic love, according to Stacey and Pearce, is that while the former attempts to explain all romance according to a single (typical) model, the latter allows for plurality and contradiction within the construction (1995:27). This is to say that the discourse of romantic love might be informed by many (competing) textual and cultural sources, and that the discourse might be plural: throughout history, and within different cultures, there have been multiple discourses of romantic love (Ibid.)

In discourse analysis, according to Wetherell, the experience, the psychology, the feeling is always inevitably identified, labeled and constructed through narrative, language and stories and it is narrative which creates and produces the identity and the desire (1995:133). Margaret Wetherell, argues that the psychological interpretations of romantic love look at romance as primarily an emotional experience: "an experience outside time, history and culture which has an authority in itself, an authority which originates in being." (1995:134). Wetherell refers to James Averill whose social constructionist analysis of romantic love points out that romantic love provides a 'paradigm' of emotion, a model and a rationale for feeling and action (1995:135).

For feminists attempting to theorize romance, the prime advantage of the discourse model according to Stacey and Pearce, is that it is conceived as historically and culturally specific (different women, in different historical periods, and in different

cultures will have experienced it differently), and it is dynamic: liable to change and transformation (1995:28). Similarly, the second strength of discourse analysis for Wetherell, is the view of identity or subjectivity which emerges as a result of the model of representation based on Hall's argument that the "real me" is always formed in relation to cultural narratives. Wetherell supports Hall's theory that Identity is formed at the unstable point where the "unspeakable" stories of subjectivity meet the narratives of history, of a culture and the person comes to be positioned and repositioned within different narratives and versions (1995:135).

Walby also points out that talks and texts need to be continually placed in their inter-textual social context and the positioning of the texts of romance in the texts of the social makes it appropriate to talk of discourse as ideology (1990:140). "Ideology" is the other crucial word on romance for Stacey and Pearce. They think that the most significant connotative difference between the two terms would seem to be that ideology (favored by Millett, Greer, Firestone and the earlier feminist critics) has a pejorative inference absent in 'discourse', and it signals the existence (somewhere) of a world uncontaminated by ideological misrepresentation (1995:28). Stacey and Pearce argue that despite the revisions of the post-Althusserians, "ideology" still carries with it the sense of "false-consciousness, but a post-structuralist / Foucauldian analysis will be able to reveal the problematic nature of our social and cultural construction together with an acknowledgement that there is no life "outside" of discourse. Discourse theory, for them, then provides feminist theorists with a means of understanding the complex and contradictory nature of romantic love. They also propose that Foucault's work on power enables us to conceive of romance as a (re) productive rather than a repressive discourse (Ibid.).

2.2.3. Reading the Romance

Van Zoonen emphasizes the insufficiency of textual analysis in terms of explaining not much about the popularity and the meaning of popular genres to their audiences. She asks: "Why are cultural forms like women's magazines, soaps and romances so immensely popular among women?" "Does their popularity also imply an acceptance of the dominant ideology embedded in the texts?" "How are they consumed in everyday life?" "What do they mean to women who enjoy them?" "Can the popularity be reconciled with feminist concerns?" "What is the relation between

audience pleasures and feminist politics?”(1994:106). She concludes that such questions have neither been addressed nor answered by textual analysis while they are becoming increasingly pressing. She proposes the new audience research as the ideal method, which assumes that the meaning of popular culture could be understood better if one would ask the audience about their interpretations, use and experience (Ibid.).

Ballaster focuses on the intertextuality of the reading process. She declares: “There is no pure woman reader; subjects” reading of *Woman* will be informed by their consumption of a complex matrix of other texts: from romance fiction to the Brontes, *The Times* to the tabloids, soap opera to Shakespeare” (1991:27). This argument is directly related with Stuart Hall’s (1980) encoding-decoding analysis, which proposes that media reception process is not a direct transmission of the message to the address, rather it is a complex structure of articulation of different meanings, practices, readings etc. As Wetherell points out, this politics of articulation tries to combine two contradictory movements-opening and closing (1995:141). Closing, in feminist terms, involves defining a community of women and an identity from which to act. But also opening, for Wetherell, in that this community of women must not be taken for granted; the way it is constructed and imagined must be continually open to question (Ibid.).

On the pleasure side of the reading process, Tania Modleski points to the proximity of pleasure and fantasy, complicating an interpretation of the satisfactions of popular culture as pure commodity fetishism. Romantic and gothic fiction, she suggests, resonate with feminine hysteria and paranoia. The manifest content of the Harlequin romance, the pursuit of heterosexual union, conceals and represses deep anxiety and ambivalence in relation to rape, validating the desire for power and revenge (Modleski,1988: 48). She understands women’s consumption of popular fiction as a form of addiction, the point at which pleasure dissolves into pain.

Reading in modern society is understood to be a private and solitary pursuit and, it has been suggested, has peculiarly strong connections with the construction of private family life (the sphere of femininity) and the building of bourgeois hegemony (Ballaster1991: 40) What reader research does offer, for Ballaster, is an outline of the

range of possible ways of reading and making sense of texts and, perhaps more important, the limits and range of discourses available to talk about them (Ibid.).

The work of Janice Radway (1984), *Reading the Romance*, is accepted as a classic work both in feminist and cultural studies which was made on romance readers that is a concrete example of reception analysis. According to Ballaster, the responses of women reading romance novels provide an important insight into these discursive limits. Questions designed to elicit interpretations of particular texts, Radway reports, were almost invariably responded to with descriptions of the pleasure of reading itself, particularly as an ‘escape’ from the living room, television and family (1991: 41) According to Ballaster this interesting phenomenon has several possible implications for theorists of reader response. First, the most challenging of all, it may mean that the process of making meaning, or interpretation, is not the most important aspect of reading (Ibid.). She argues that Radway’s respondents alert us to the possibility that the literary and formal aspects, even the content, of texts may not be their most important characteristics for readers. However, according to Ballaster, this does not explain, why women choose to read romantic fiction or women’s magazines to “escape” domestic pressures and enclosure, rather than a newspaper or Tolstoy. So, the crucially important thing is to consider whether there are specific and shared pleasures for women in the romance, as well as how reading and pleasure may differ from reader to reader (Ibid.)

2.2.4. The Object of the Romance: “Romantic Love”

The single word love in fact signifies two different things for man and woman. What woman understands by love is clear enough: it is a total gift of body and soul, without reservation, without regard for anything whatever. This unconditional nature of her love is what makes it a faith, the only one she has. As for man, if he loves a woman, what he wants is that love from her; he is in consequence far from postulating the same sentiment for himself as for woman; if there should be men who also felt that desire for complete abandonment, upon my word, they would not be men. (Nietzsche in de Beauvoir, 1971: 642)

Simone de Beauvoir, in *The Second Sex* argues that the word *love* has by no means the same sense for both sexes, and for her, this is one cause of the serious misunderstanding that divides them. On the part of women, according to de Beauvoir, “there is no other way out for her than to lose herself, body and soul, in

him who is represented to her as the absolute, as the essential” (1971:643). This statement reminds Althusser’s perspective on ideology. He proposes that the structure of all ideology, interpellating individuals as subjects in the name of a Unique and Absolute Subject is constitutive of ideology and ensures its functioning (1994:135). He continues: “Which means that all ideology is *centred*, that the Absolute Subject occupies the unique place of the Centre, and interpellates around it the infinity of individuals into subjects in a double-mirror connection such that it *subjects* the subjects to the Subject, while giving them subjects in the Subject in which each subject can contemplate its own image.” (1994:135). This argument is also valid for patriarchal ideology, feminists try to reveal their “femaleness” is shaped around the lack of “Phallus” as the central Subject. If we refer to the ideas of Friedan (1963), de Beauvoir (1971), Millett (1970), Greer (1970) and Firestone (1993), love is accepted as a cultural, sexual and discursive practice embedded in patriarchy as a phallic ideological tool.

Germaine Greer (1970:136) begins her investigation from the mythological roots of love, claiming that “If the God who is said to be *love* exists in the imagination of men it is because they have created him” and the proposition “God is love” seemed a law of life implying that without love there could have been no world. But she underlines that this does not refer to the love that is woman’s destiny. She refers to the Platonists who believed that women were not capable of love because, for Greer, they thought that women were men’s inferiors and love is not possible between the inferior and the superior, because the inferiors cannot free their love from selfish interest, either as the desire for security, or social advantage (1970:136). According to Firestone (1993: 142), “*falling in love*” means nothing more than to change men’s opinion- through *idealization*, *mystification* and *sublimation* on women’s inferiority as a way to cover it. And woman could love herself only when a man finds her worth loving. She stresses the economic and social pressures of the society on women, which result in the dependence of women on men psychologically. Romantic love, for her, as a psychological phenomenon which flourishes in and reinforces this gendered system. Thus, Firestone continues, the problem lies not in the process of *love* itself, but lies in the *political* sphere of this process, in other words in unequal power relations (1993 :143).

Simone de Beauvoir stresses the *religious* side of love, which operates through the subjection of women to men. For her, women seek God in men: “She chooses to desire her enslavement so ardently that it will seem to her the expression of her liberty; she will enthrone him as supreme value and reality: she will humble herself to nothingness before him. Love becomes for her a religion.” (1971:643). But according to Beauvoir,; it is not enough to serve him, also the measure of values, the truth of the world for women comes to be seen in his consciousness, the woman in love tries to see with his eyes (1971: 653). However, de Beauvoir is not totally hopeless about love. She declares: “On the day when it will be possible for woman to love not in her weakness but in her strength, not to escape herself- on that day love will become for her, as for man, a source of life and not of mortal danger” (Ibid.:669).

Kate Millett (1970:37) also stresses the ideological and patriarchal character of courtly and romantic love as the “grants”, which the male concedes out of his total powers and she focuses on their general tendency to attribute impossible virtues to women by confining them in a narrow and constricting sphere of behavior. According to Millett, the concept of romantic love affords a means of emotional manipulation which the male is free to exploit, since love is the only circumstances in which the female is (ideologically) pardoned for sexual activity. Furthermore, romantic love for Millett, obscures the realities of female status and the burden of economic dependency (Ibid.).

Generally in feminist discourse, love is seen as captured by the discourse of romance (Hollway 1995:98). Ballaster (1991) refer to Germaine Greer’s examination of romance in *The Female Eunuch*, which expands on Adorno and Horkheimer’s identification of the degradation of “love” into “romance” under mass culture, to point to romance’s place in the continuing oppression, humiliation and defeat of women. She proposes that Greer’s argument is structurally similar to that of the Frankfurt School. As for Adorno and Horkheimer, the downgrading of love is one symptom of a wider process of class domination directed toward the production of political quietism among the working classes, for Greer, Ballaster argues, romance is pivotal in the oppression of a different class, a sex class of women (1991: 17). Thus, she implies that Greer sees romance as one of the strategies of ideology working through the imposition of false consciousness. Real Life does not match up to the

desires produced by romance, for heterosexual relations are more commonly experienced as boredom and brutality than wine and roses (Ibid.). But, Ballaster declares that an understanding of (romantic) ideology as false consciousness results in Greer's final rejection of women as political agents in favour of anger at their willing victimage. She underlines that her sympathy comes to lie with the men who treat with contempt the servile woman who has swallowed such transparent lies.

As a result, it could be noted that in the same way that material economic relations under capitalism dictate how we receive mass cultural products, according to Greer, material sexual relations dictate how we experience desire. For instance, Greer emphasizes that authentic sexuality (orgasm) is supplanted by romance (the kiss) (Ibid.).

While feminists and others focus on the social construction of emotions and of pleasure, Wendy Hollway (1995:97) argues that in the theorization of this area, just of desire, the relation between the historical construction of subjectivity and contemporary world in which these women are attempting to negotiate satisfying relationships and enjoyable sex needs to be kept in view. She uses the terms "differentiation" and "recognition" in order to explain heterosexual love in a psychological manner. According to Hollway, the version of power is gendered and a symmetrical just as long as differentiation and recognition are split between heterosexual partners (Ibid.:99). If both have developed a capacity to hold both within themselves- that is a capacity for true recognition and true differentiation- then this power is symmetrical; there is equality in this arena, which, though limited, is primary when it comes to egalitarian significations of sex. Equality here does not mean no power and no difference, for Hollway, it means no power difference resulting from the needs for recognition and differentiation (Ibid.).

Ballaster argues that definitions of female (male) sexuality are central to our cultural constructions of the "feminine": "The moral messages are quite clear; in order to be good, a girl must be neither sexually provocative nor demonstrative" (1991: 141). Sexuality is dangerous if women give in to sexual desire they will live (or not) to regret it (Ibid.:142). Ballaster states that for some theorists, pleasure is connected with sexuality and disruption, opening a space for authenticity and freedom; for others such pleasures are simply further symptoms for false consciousness (Ibid.:

161). She argues that all pleasure is socially constructed and we must reject the principle that pleasure can be “pure” or “authentic” (Ibid.:161).

All the theories of the relation between the “feminine” and the “popular”, encapsulate the articulation of different discursive settings with particular cultural and historical contexts. As Huyssen states, the universalizing ascription of femininity to mass culture always depended on the very real exclusion of women from high culture and its institutions. But, according to Huyssen, such exclusions are a thing of the past and the old rhetoric has lost its power due to the change in realities (1986: 205-06). As Modleski points out, while popular feminine texts provide outlets for women’s dissatisfaction with male-female relationships, they never question the primacy of these relationships and nor do they overtly question the myth of male superiority or the institutions of marriage and the family (1988:113).

According to Hollway, there is no emancipatory discourse concerning women’s heterosexual desire; that is, there is no currently available way of conceptualizing women’s pleasure and sexual desire in heterosexual sex which is regarded as consistent with principles of women’s liberation (1995:86). However, women’s liberation may not be achieved within the discourse of heterosexual love or desire; she can find a place for her “own” pleasure or desire through reading romance, outside her life imposed by the patriarchal system. The works on romance try to reveal the aspects in the pleasure of reading through which women seek some other experience in heroines’ lives in terms of fulfilling their individual desires and expectations. Theories and surveys on romance showed that the structure and the discourse of romance is dislocated in different texts and contexts. According to Stacey and Pearce, the roles and actions of the protagonists are being challenged by specificities of gender, class, race and sexuality (1995:37). Although the lover’s discourse may still be “always already” textual, the texts which inform the discourse and the discourse itself are in a constant transformation (1995:38).

CHAPTER III

THE PLACE OF THE POPULAR ROMANCES IN TURKISH LITERATURE OF THE EARLY REPUBLICAN PERIOD

The entrance of novel into Ottoman culture is traced back to the second half of the 19th century. According to Moran, the novel in Turkey did not emerge by the cause of social conditions such as was in Europe but in order to understand its formation and function we must look at both the traditional story type and the social and historical conditions of the time it emerged (2005:11). The first novels in Turkey were written by members of the new intelligentsia, Young Ottoman Turks, who were parts of the government service and familiar to French literature. For the writers of the time, the transition from the old story genre to the novel is a kind of transition to rationalism, maturity and civilization (Moran, 2005:11). The new generation of writers included “men exposed to modern liberal concepts, men with firsthand experience of Europe, men who knew a European language and to whom Western literature, especially French, had opened new horizons, both literary and ideological” (Burrill, 1973:14).

Evin underlines that the appearance of the novel in Turkey did not follow a long process of evolution; such as was the case in the West, its antecedents must be searched for among the innovations introduced in the Tanzimat period. As referring to the arguments of Tanpınar, he pointed that “the first authors who wrote novels in Turkey were not born with the imagination of a novelist, they began by imitating a genre which lent itself well to their purposes.” (1983:49). Evin states that the foppery of certain middle classes and their pretentious imitation of European life style became a central concern of the novel. In the novels of Tanzimat, as Evin argues, “the dandy emerged as a representative type embodying the negative aspects of Western influence and exemplifying the misguided notions of Westernization; it was caricatured relentlessly and exaggerated beyond proportion.” (1983:80).

According to Baker, Turkish “national” literature has been marked by a kind of ambiguity, since the nineteenth century Tanzimat era to destroy the remnants of the

old. He called this collage of the old and new literature “an aesthetic pragmatism”, which adopted the philosophy of the Western literary genres like Romanticism, Realism, Symbolism and Naturalism which led to a strange literary attitude. Baker asserts that it is a kind of experimental writing, “which notably fails to develop any kind of “avant-garde” while subsumed in a rootless formalism.” (1999:25).

It is accepted that there were two main directions in the early Turkish literature. One of them, which was first used by Ahmet Mithat and traced by Şemsettin Sami, is based on the tendency to merge Turkish folk tales with Western story and novel through modernizing and simplifying them. The other style of narration was used by writers such as Namık Kemal, Sami Paşazade Sezai and Recaiade Mahmut Ekrem, who proposed to write in a more complicated and consistent language against a simple and direct style. Both Şinasi and Namık Kemal, the central figures, among the Young Ottoman thinkers, insisted often on the didactic value of literature. According to Namık Kemal, as Evin points out, literature is a discourse which serves the proper education of a nation and it is the spiritual (aesthetic) source from which learning is disseminated, Ahmet Mithat on the contrary declared that the language of people ought to be used in writing. (1983:11). He criticized Tanzimat nobles and considered that using “pure literature” and performing “art for art’s sake” is a luxury for the time in which illiterate people are the majority (Mardin,1991). His views anticipated the basic principle around which the Turkish language reform movement would be organized in the twentieth century (Evin, 1983:11).

With the Republican Era, an official “language” was established by the elimination of the old writing and the adoption of the Latin alphabet. Turkish novel gained its characteristics in an epoch in which the appearance and constitution of the Turkish language and literature changed constantly and became enriched with the new elements and correspondents (Evin, 1983:42). The new Turkish government and the intellectuals of the early Republic created the national literature through establishing a *literary canon* which can be described “as a collection of texts recounting the story of the nation that facilitates the experience of solidarity by allowing people to see themselves as citizens of a unified nation” (Jusdanis 1991:49). According to Jusdanis, the canon, however, not only represents national identity but also participates in its production by instilling in people the values of nationalism and it seeks, by offering hopes of cultural revival, to overcome the shortcomings of an

uncertain present and to recapture the past (Ibid.). Belge points out the problematic side of identifying a literary canon in Turkish literature in terms of the criteria through which the literary works are defined as “valuable”. He asserts that in the societies such as ours, the selection of the canonic works and decision of which is “the best” as a novelist, singer or a composer, is done by the holy apparatuses such as the state, party or religion and this selection lacks artistic and literary understanding (2009: 83).

The emergence of popular novels in Turkey is dated back to the Tanzimat Era, the popular writings of Ahmet Mithat. In the early Republican Turkish literature, it is noticeable that the first translation novels from French literature were mainly based on romantic literature. Writers such as Güzide Sabri, Burhan Cahit Morkaya, Ethem İzzet Benice, Esat Mahmut Karakurt Mükerrerem Kamil Su, Kerime Nadir and Muazzez Tahsin Berkand gave various examples of popular romance starting from the establishment of the Republic to the 1980s. But these novels didn’t have a place as a subject matter in literary criticisms on the Turkish novel and story. The reason why they mostly remained untouched is their exclusion from the canonical literature of the time and being perceived as noncanonical and lacking artistic value. Yalçın points to this fact by referring to Rauf Mutluay’s criticism about romance writers of the age:

They don’t have the power of ability, imagination, responsibility, endeavor and art, required for novel writing. They write for the market. They gather their works through narrating the dreams of love, adapting skillfully the subjects of foreign literature, presenting adventures which are full of elements of the modern tales to the uneducated people who are accustomed to tales (1998:184).

Oktay underlines the effect of popular Turkish literature in terms of its leading role in motivating people to read and write after the alphabet revolution, and in adopting the principles of the new regime by the society. But, Oktay claims that instead of adopting the principles of the regime popular writing acquired a content of entertaining and killing time through an escape to a fantasy world (1993: 125). Peyami Safa has a similar evaluation of the popular novel of his time:

It is the carouse of leisure time (boş vakitler cümbüşü) for the dreams of middle-level or lower middle-level reader (orta ve ortadan aşağı okuyucu). If the crime fictions and romances gain more interest from the readers than the novels which need to be thought and analyzed, it is because the readers

do not need to understand the text, they only want to idle and spend time by reading (Safa in Mutluay, 1998: 185).

Türkeş points to a controversial issue about the relation between the Republican Ideology and the Turkish literary canon and he asserts that despite the effort of the new ideology to create a canon in Turkish literature, “high literature” of the time had little concern with revolutions and the modernist ideology. On the contrary, the enlightenment thought of the new Republican ideology overlapped with the discourse of modernity in popular romances of the time which were not conceived as the works of high art (2002:436). The inclusion of popular romances into Turkish literature can be traced back to the last quarter of the 1920s, and was accelerated in the 1930s and they continued to be published extensively until the 1980s. The popular romances in the Republican era were published first in newspapers as serialized novels, and then were published as books. They became the best seller novels of the time. However it is a striking fact that they are still being ignored even today by the critics in the mainstream literary textbooks.

CHAPTER IV

THE ANALYSIS OF THE CONSTITUTION OF THE FEMALE SUBJECT IN MUAZZEZ TAHSIN BERKAND'S *MAĞRUR KADIN* THROUGH THE KEMALIST DISCOURSE OF MODERNIZATION

In order to understand the sociological and ideological context of Muazzez Tahsin Berkand's novels, it is necessary to analyze the impact of the Kemalist Modernization project on the Early Republican Literature. The basic arguments about the changes in the female identification process underline the fact that the modernization process creates and reinforces itself on the female identity. It's important to focus on the development of the female identity with the construction of the new Republican Ideology, Kemalism, and the significance of the representation of Turkish Women with different images through the formation of the nation-state ideology. Since the Tanzimat Period the question of women has accompanied the advancement of "civilization consciousness" and with the Republican Era women became leading actors-figures in the civilizational change (Göle, 1998).

The emergence of the Turkish novel in the 19th century intertwined with the "modernization" and "civilization" process through political, administrative and educational reforms in the late Ottoman and early Republican Periods. According to Evin, the novel was seen as a testament of the achievements of the age; and like science and technology it was considered to be an integral part of the modern civilization to be emulated. (1983:16). As the writers of the first novels, Turkish intelligentsia mostly dealt with the idea of progress through westernization by reflecting contradictory ideas on the cultural changes in Turkish society. On the one hand they praised abstract progress and the material advances of Europe and on the other hand they looked back wistfully on the harmoniousness of an imaginary, ideal Islamic state (Kandiyoti, 1998: 273).

Gürbilek, through analyzing the relation between modern Turkish literature and East-West dilemma in every social sphere, asserts that modernization of the Turkish culture leads to an anxiety in literature and more specifically to author's anxiety of narration. This anxiety stems from the degeneration of local culture intertwined with

the loss of masculinity. The readers of early Ottoman-Turkish literature can notice a detail in the novels which seems to be unimportant; in most of them the heroine has a novel in her hands. But the detail of a “woman reader” has almost become a characteristic of the genre. Gürbilek tries to explain the reasons why the “woman reader” has become a main sensitive figure in the early works of modern Turkish literature, by the belief that women tend to be more open to foreign inclination and influence (2004:10).

Gürbilek analyses the reasons for associating “the novel” of early Turkish literature with women and argues that this association is projected either as a sign of modernization or to “feminization of the novel as a genre”(Ibid.11). “Every work is born from an anxiety” is the starting point of her argument with which she differentiates the novels. According to Gürbilek, some novels reflect the anxiety of feminization to their characters by labeling them as “woman reader”, “effeminate dandy” and “childish man”. However, she claims there are other novels which are “deeper and more mature” which can place “the anxiety” as the essential material of the novel. She explains this differentiation in terms of the author’s style of narration. In these novels the author tells his/her story by reflecting this anxiety as a part of his/her inner conflict and schizophrenic personality. Moreover the success of the author lies in his/her ability to speak to the “readers” anxiety”. (Ibid: 13).

Huysen’s analysis could provide an answer to the question why women who are generally excluded from the public sphere and deprived from acquiring first hand information about life, in his analysis of “the history of the perception of mass culture as feminine”, Huysen stresses the fact “Flaubert himself was caught by the craze for romantic novels during his student days in College at Rouen.” He wonders “if the adolescent Flaubert read these novels in the same way Emma Bovary would have, had she actually lived- or, for that matter, as real women at the time read them.”(1986: 188). He draws on Flaubert’s famous claim, “Madame Bovary, c’est moi”, but he argues that there is a difference between Emma Bovary’s reading practice and Flaubert’s masculine identification with woman. According to Huysen, “the imaginary femininity of male authors can easily go hand in hand with the exclusion of real women from the literary enterprise and with the misogyny of bourgeois patriarchy itself.” (1986:189). He settles his arguments about the identification of women with mass culture, on this difference. In the mass culture

debate, woman (Madame Bovary) is positioned as a reader of inferior literature as “subjective, emotional and passive”, while man (Flaubert) emerges as a writer of “genuine, authentic literature” which is accepted as “objective, ironic, and in control of his aesthetic means” (1986:190).

Kandiyoti argues that what was at stake was not just the remaking of women but the wholesale refashioning of gender and gender relations. The refashioning of gender necessarily involved the articulation of new images of masculinity and femininity. In Turkey, while the question of changing femininities and the effects of republican Kemalist reforms on images of womanhood have become a subject of inquiry, the masculine ideals of Turkish nationalism have rarely received explicit attention. (1998:281). According to Kandiyoti, the images of “modern” women carried their own ambiguities and tensions. In literary and polemic writings, predominantly penned by men, the world of tradition was a place where women were portrayed both as victims and as culpable of social inertia through their idleness and ignorance. Male longing for the “modern” woman expressed itself insistently through clamorous demands for “love,” demands thwarted by tight social controls over access to the opposite sex and over the choice of marriage patterns. Kandiyoti asserts that a persistent anxiety over sexual morality lodged itself at the heart of the images of “modern” woman (1998: 282).

As carrying both qualities of approval and refusal of the westernization, romance novels can be captured as the spheres of the constitution of the female subject either connected to Kemalist Ideology or freed from it. According to Türkeş, romance novels of the period can be read as manifesting of good manners (*adab-ı muaşeret*) of the generation of the Republic (2002:437). In the period when the novels were written, the Turkish Republic was trying to cope with various economic and social problems. However, Türkeş underlines that there is no concern about the system, the government or the society in the minds of youth in these popular romances. They were having entertainments among both girls and boys; they were flirting and going to their good schools in order to walk to an enlightened future (Ibid.).

Oktay, conceptualizes romances as “woman literature” and as sentimental writing which pervades a large area including cosmetic advertisements, soap operas and sentimental novels. According to him, the romance of popular culture forces women

to live adjusted to the system as part of it. He argues that woman literature settled the viewpoint of dominant patriarchal ideology and tried to appropriate women to their secondary and dependent position by implying that they are liberated (2002:152). Oktay in his analysis of Kerime Nadir's *Hiçkirik* published in 1937 also argues that Kerime Nadir neither presents a social background in her novels nor does she endow her female characters with a social identity and although, according to Oktay, Kerime Nadir does not have a negative attitude against Kemalist Ideology, her conceptualization of women and her idea of love which are highly influenced by her narrational and moral anxieties place her among the conservative writers of her time. He argues, in the final analysis, the evaluation of women issue in Kemalist Ideology also reflects a conservative approach similar to hers (Ibid.165).

Kandiyoti referring to Najmabadi, an Iranian woman writer argues that: "When the female voice found a public audience, it became a veiled voice, a disciplined voice. Erasing or replacing its sexual markers, it sanitized itself."(1998:283). Kandiyoti claims, that expressions of femininity, just like masculinities, became multivalent signifiers of class, cultural tastes, and styles but did so under an ambivalent male gaze that continued to sexualize the female body and presence. Given the nature of this dilemma, it is hardly surprising that the search for new and more enabling expressions of femininity should take contradictory and sometimes conflictual forms (Ibid.).

4.1. The Impact of Kemalist Modernization on the Formation of Female Identity

During the Early Republican Period, the Kemalist cultural policies which were introduced as cultural reforms within the discourse of the new regime, had a considerable place in the creation of the new modern individual - the citizen of the modern Turkish nation. Cultural policies of Kemalism aimed to impose a new "life style" on people which is "modern" and "western", through breaking off cultural ties with the Ottoman Empire. According to Göle, Kemalism was the most conscious expression of the shift through modernization experienced by the Turkish society since the Tanzimat Period, penetrating daily family life (1998).

It's a widely accepted view that the beginning of the Turkish Modernization process was taken to be the wide-ranging reforms known as the "Tanzimat" (reorganization)

which began in 1839 and initiated Turkey's shift from a theocratic sultanate to a modern state. The principle of equality of all persons of all religions before the law was considered a very radical departure from the non-secular conservative system for the times. Toward the end of the 19th century, opposition to the Sultan was manifested in the Young Turks movement, officially called the Committee of Union and Progress. One of the principal tenets of the Young Turks was the demand for modernization and westernization. World War I inaugurated the breakup of the Ottoman Empire and the emergence of a new group from among the Young Turks. This faction advocated the building of modern Turkish national state that was "republican, secular and non-imperialist". Mustafa Kemal set up a revolutionary government in Ankara in 1920 and established the Turkish Republic in 1923. Kemalist revolutions furthered the process of Westernization through economic development, separation of religion from state affairs, Latinization of the alphabet, promotion of secular civil code.

The basic arguments about the changes in the female identification process underline the fact that modernization process created itself on the female identity. Kandiyoti stresses the centrality of the family, sexuality and sex identities within the modernity discourse (1997). The representation of the identity of women and women's rights rhetoric had a special place in Turkish modernization process. Since the 19th century, the hegemonic paradigm in Turkey has been "nationalism" and according to Berktaş (1998), it results in the collaboration of Turkish feminism and Turkish nationalism in the early Republican period and she asserts that this is the case mostly seen in societies which set their nation-state lately.

In order to comprehend the Turkish nationalist understanding of the Tanzimat Period, it is important to focus on the conceptualization of nationalism in Ziya Gökalp. The outstanding representative of the Turkish Movement, Ziya Gökalp (1876-1924) intended to develop his suggestions aiming at a synthesis of a Turkization, Islamization and civilization. Gökalp criticized both imitative Westernism and conservative Islamism and set forth the idea of a national culture (Göle, 1998). Durakbaşı (2000) underlies this understanding of Turkish feminism as having a negative perspective towards Western feminism, so the Turkish female identity which is shaped within Turkish nationalism is constructed as an identity against Western femininity. Gökalp and the nationalists of both the Tanzimat and the

early Republican period conceived the new family as a “national family” based on Turkish culture which should not be a copy of the modern western family. In terms of woman issue they both criticized the traditional views which accept polygamy and gender discrimination (haremlik selamlık) (Durakbaşa, 2000:121).

The first Ottoman feminist movements only had educational demand from the male-rulers (Berktaş, 2001). The necessity for women’s education was to be able to bring up loyal sons to the nation-state by being the “mothers” of the nation. According to Berktaş, education was seen as a magic tool for the Ottoman modernization since the second Constitutional Period (Ibid.). Even though, women were permitted to have equal educational, political and social rights together with men, they were primarily seen as mothers and teachers within the social transformation. These “new women” were expected to be the models of modernization for traditional women, and at the same time they were expected not to stand against the values of society in their representation of modern woman (Saktanber,2002:327). Durakbaşa (1998) by referring to the Weekly newspaper, “New Man” in the years of 1930-40’s, shows ideal new woman’s characteristics as a positive minded woman who is able to give secular training to her children and is a suitable life partner to her husband.

Education for women was seen a means of joining the public life by working in the public sector but this differentiation between private and public spheres does not indicate a full equality of women with men; on the contrary it refers to the state intervention in the lives of women. Berktaş summarizes this image of the “new women” as having responsibilities to her family and society with national missions (Berktaş, 1998). Her mind and body do not belong to herself, she is the symbol of the new modern republic as a “mother, sister, daughter and wife”. Zehra Arat (1998) points out that Kemalist reforms were not aimed at liberating women or at promoting the female consciousness and feminine identity, instead they strove to equip Turkish women with the education and skills that would improve their contributions to the Republican Patriarchy by making them better wives and mothers.

Durakbaşa by referring to Atatürk’s speeches on women underlines a distinction in the construction of the image of women. According to Durakbaşa, the liberated woman image of Kemalists as “educated and professional” was not a model for

Anatolian country women rather it was constituted for middle or upper class urban women as a symbol of the Republic and modern Turkey (2000: 122).

Compared with their counterparts in other developing countries, especially those in the Muslim world, Turkish women enjoyed considerable civil and political rights and were more visible in the public domain. As early as the 1920's, they gained legal rights, including the right to choose their own spouse, initiate divorce, and demand child custody. In 1923, free elementary education was made mandatory for both sexes. Women were granted the right to vote and run in municipal elections in 1930, and in national elections in 1934. Consequently, although these rights were not equally enjoyed by the entire female population, many Turkish women gained access to education, public office and employment opportunities (Arat, 1998).

According to Arat (1998), the development and modernization in Turkey, meant westernization and the Kemalist reforms attempted to reorganize life by the replacement of patriarchy with that of a secular Western one. Kemalism sought to improve women's lives only to the level prevailing in the West, where the female was still perceived as the "second sex". Berktaş (1998) underlines the fact that Republic, despite the very important women reforms, continued to be a patriarchal system. It basically replaced the Islamic patriarchy by a Western one. The abstract citizenship in fact put the rational, masculine identity in the center while women were placed at the peripheries. According to Durakbaşa, women, not being the core "subjects", were always represented as the "symbols" and tools of the modernity and civilization. They are forced to be good symbols of the bourgeoisie puritan morality in their private and public lives, as a housewife, mother, teacher with their clothing and social practices (1998).

4.2. Freedom and Sexuality of the Modern Turkish Women in the Kemalist Era

Durakbaşa (1998) argues that "Kemalist male psychology", which aspired to rearing female children under the guidance of Republican principles, did not lay down any barriers against the participation of women in social life, on the contrary their involvement was encouraged. As much as the training of female students, the image of professionalized working women also defined Kemalist female identity. According to Durakbaşa (1998), "Kemalist fathers" and their "ideal daughters"

injected the idea of equality between the sexes and the public visibility of women into the Turkish social imagination but the socialization of women, permitted by the will, approval, support and regulation of men, was determined at the expense of the individual and sexual identities of women. Berktaş (2001) points out the fact that in the nation states, although women are formally accepted as “citizens”, it’s impossible for them to be considered “individuals” as men. Women’s attainment of a new social identity outside the private realm became possible only when they were stripped off their sexual identities. According to egalitarian liberal feminism, the liberation of women is equivalent to the freedom from captivity of femininity in terms of the biology and nature of women. According to Göle (1998), emergence from the private familial sphere and their subsequent entry into the public arena would raise women to the level of humanity, free of femininity. She argues that likewise, Kemalist feminism has defined the female identity by the principle that “a woman is a human being”, and it supported the participation of women in the public sphere through their labor. Kemalist feminism found itself, however in a position that obliged it to prove that women who gained visibility in public and worked with men, were not deprived of their honor at all, thus did not pose any threat to public morality (Göle, 1998).

Kandiyoti (1997) underlines that the entry of Turkish women into public life was legitimized only when the signs of her “esteem” were emphasized instead of her sexual identity. Educated and professionalized women were among the glorified values of the Kemalist reforms, yet these women were “desexualized” or even “masculinized” at the same time. The new woman of the Republic adopted the behavioral principles which set new borders to her female identity. She entered the public life with a dark colored costume, short hair and no make-up. This was like a symbolic armor on their sexuality (Kandiyoti, 1997:179).

The content of the rising new novel in the Tanzimat and early Republican period mostly focused on the transformation in terms of the representation of gender roles and the female identity through modernization and westernization in the social life by the legal and cultural interventions of the new regime. As it is mentioned above, the identity of the new Republican woman was not only based on the western values such as being educated and professionalized, but it also intertwined with both “modern” and “traditional” codes in order to reach a new national and cultural purity of women identity. According to Kandiyoti, Halide Edip Adivar depicted the positive

image of the Republican woman as a “woman companion” and a “warrior of the national mission” (1997:144). In her novel *Yeni Turan*, Halide Edip depicts the respectful ideal female character as someone “who rescued women from the state of being flesh and machine and who accompanied men as a virtuous, hardworking friend; a mother, governess of her children, and of her nation. Conforming to her assigned mission, she was not tempting at all: There was no reminder of sex, neither masculinity nor femininity in this look” (Adıvar in Göle, 1998: 87). According to Kandiyoti the heroine of Adıvar’s novel, is “the prototype of the nationalist woman” (1997:144). Adıvar defined womanhood with the use of qualities like calmness and “tenderness”, which were associated with respect and motherhood. It’s similar to the depiction of a female “teacher” in the novel like who, on the one hand, loses her individuality and unselfishly legitimizes her profession in terms of her national mission and responsibilities, and on the other hand does not show any sign that would remind one of her sex (Göle, 1998).

4.3. A Popular Romance Writer of the Early Republican Period: Muazzez Tahsin Berkand

Among the many popular romance writers of the early Republican period (1923-1950), Kerime Nadir, Esat Mahmut Karakurt and Muazzez Tahsin Berkand can be counted as the prominent figures in terms of their fame and popularity. Most of their novels were shot-used? in the movies of Turkish film industry, Yeşilçam, which experienced its heyday during the 1950s-1980s. In the popular romances of the authors such as Aka Gündüz, Esat Mahmut Karakurt, Raif Necdet, Salveti Ziya, Selami İzzet, Feridun Hikmet Es, Muazzez Tahsin Berkand, Halide Nusret Zorlutuna, Rakım Çalapala, Mükerrerrem Kamil Su, Peride Celal, Cahit Uçuk, Kerime Nadir, Mecbure Koray, Halit Fahri Ozansoy, Sukufe Nihal, like in the canonical novels of the early Republican period, there are traces of the East-West controversy in social life including mainly the moral degeneration of young educated ladies. However, Türkeş stresses that these novels mainly displayed the educated and enlightened young lady as a figure of modern Turkish Woman of the new Republic, as a legacy of which Muazzez Tahsin Berkand had taken from Halide Edip Adıvar (2002:438).

Muazzez Tahsin Berkand was born in Selanik in 1900. Her father, Hasan Tahsin Bey, was a lawyer. She migrated to İstanbul with her family during the years of Balkan Wars. She was taught English and French by private teachers and graduated from the French Nun School (Saeurs d'Assomption) in İstanbul and the Teacher Training School for Girls (Darülmualimat). She worked as a teacher of Turkish and French in several public schools in İstanbul. She was invited to Beirut by Halide Edip Adivar in order to work in the schools which Adivar had opened. Because of her great admiration for Halide Edip Adivar, Berkand accepted her invitation and went to Beirut. After staying several years in Beirut, she returned to İstanbul, and worked in a bank as a translator during 1929-56, for twenty five years. Berkand's first novel was published in 1933 as a serial in a newspaper. She wrote forty nine novels between the years, 1933-80. In the time she wrote, Berkand was a best seller popular romance writer and the newspapers demand for popular romances was very high (İleri, 2001:535).

In spite of the popularity of her novels for a long period of time, Berkand was not even mentioned in the mainstream literature texts and criticisms on Turkish literature. Her works, like the other romances of her time, were criticized as being unrealistic and as not having literary value like other canonical novels. In his book on contemporary Turkish literature, Rauf Mutluay describes Berkand's works as worthless and claims that there is no need to mention her novels in Turkish literary criticism. He evaluates her work as:

having a simplistic attitude like other novelists who were born in the beginning of the century, Muazzez Tahsin Berkand wrote her novels for the market by introducing the themes of love all the time in her novels to meet the needs of the pre-novel readers. Even the names of her novels show her irresponsibility....She is one of the unforgettable names among the writers who had an influence on our literature as keeping away it from the real values of literature. By dealing with romantic and unreal themes, she functions as a writer of tales and earns money (1973: 302-303).

In the interview with Ülkü Demirtepe, Berkand also pointed out this fact: "I do not know whether they would place my works in literature. They did not really accept us." (Özçelik, 2007:60). However, in the last twenty years of Turkish cultural agenda, by the decline of the popularity of these novels and the melodramas of their plots, some of the important Turkish literary critics such as Ömer Türkeş and Selim

İleri re evaluated the place of these romances in Turkish literature and drew attention to the need of a sociological research on the influence of the European (alafranga) marginal life style in these novels, on the public (İleri, 2001:536).

We can group Berkand's novels in three categories. Twenty of them are her copyright novels: *Sen ve Ben* (1933), *Ask Fırtınası* (1935), *Bahar Çiçeği* (1935), *Sonsuz Gece* (1937), *Bir Genç Kızın Romanı* (1938), *O ve Kızı* (1940), *Kezban* (1941), *Perdeler* (Kızım ve Askım) (1943), *Saadet Güneşi* (1944), *Lâle* (1945), *Büyük Yalan* (1948), *Sevmek Korkusu* (1953), *Kırılan Ümitler* (1957), *Bir Rüya Gibi* (1958), *Yılların Ardından* (1960), *Gençlik Rüzgârı* (1963), *Bir Gün Sabah Olacak Mı?* (1972), *İki Kalp Arasında* (1972), *Ugur Böceği* (1974), *Yabancı Adam* (1980). Twenty one of them are adaptation novels: *Muallâ* (1941), *Dağların Esrarı* (1943), *Bülbül Yuvası* (1943), *Ask ve İntikam* (1943), *Askla Oynanmaz* (1944), *Garip Bir İzdivaç* (1944), *Kalbin Sesi* (1944), *Sabah Yıldızı* (1944), *Küçük Hanımefendi* (1945), *Nisan Yüzüğü* (1945), *Çiçeksiz Bahçe* (1947), *Ask Tılsımı* (1949), *Çamlar Altında* (1949), *Gönül Yolu* (1950), *Sarmasık Gülleri* (1950), *Magrur Kadın* (1958), *Sevgim ve Gururum* (1959), *Işık Yağmuru* (1962), *Kıvılcım ve Ateş* (1963), *Bulutlar Dağılınca* (1966), *Uzayan Yollar* (1968). She has eight translation novels: *Atesli Kalp* (1939), *Safo* (1940), *Jezabel / İhtiyarlamayan Kadın* (1943), *Hemsireler* (1944); *Nöbetçi Hemşire* (1957), *Evleniyorum* (1945), *Meçhul Sevgili* (1945).

Eighteen her novels have been adapted to films in Turkish cinema in Yeşilçam: *Sönen Yıldız* (1956), *Bülbül Yuvası* (1961 -1970), *Küçük Hanımefendi* (1961 – 1970), *Magrur Kadın* (1962 - 1970), *Çiçeksiz Bahçe* (1963), *Kezban* (1963 – 1968), *Mualla* (1964 - 1971), *Gençlik Rüzgarı* (1964), *Günah Bende Mi?* (1964), *Garip Bir İzdivaç* (1965), *Sevgim ve Gururum* (1965), *Ask ve İntikam* (1965), *İftira* (1968), *Sabah Yıldızı* (1968), *Sarmasık Gülleri* (1968), *Saadet Günesi* (1970), *Bir Genç Kızın Romanı* (1971), *Ask Fırtınası* (1972). These films are identified as melodramas in which many well-known Turkish film stars played such as Belgin Doruk, Türkan Şoray, Hülya Koçyiğit, Ayhan Işık, Ediz Hun and Ekrem Bora. They had important effects in Turkish cultural agenda during the 1960-1980s.

Muazzez Tahsin Berkand wrote nearly all of her novels by the inspiration of French romance literature and she also adapted many of them to Turkish, through merging the scenes of the balls and country life in French novels with the modern life in İstanbul in the 1930s and 1940s (İleri, 2001:535). In most of her novels, she uses the first person narration because her main concern is reflecting the thoughts and feelings of her central female characters. As a result the readers can easily identify with the heroine of the novel. Like the other romance novels, in Berkand's novels, the central theme is love and the plot revolves around the heroine's search for love. In spite of the barriers and obstacles to reach love in the structure of the plot, most of Berkand's novels end with a "happy ending", with the reunion of lovers and marriage. Yalçın points out one of the features of the romance novels as reflecting the excessive understanding of pride and irrational choices of the heroes and heroines which result in their suffering (1998: 194). According to Oktay, the suffering of lovers had directly been inherited from the Ottoman culture and despite the ventures of modernization, the society maintained its general ascetic identity (2002:165-66). He argues that Turkish popular sentimental literature undertakes the function of constructing the image of a romantic and love centered woman whose final aim is to become a loyal wife and a good mother. For him, the suffering lovers, the death of virgins, moral marriages, the transcendence of the spirit over the flesh, the appraisal of loyalty and chastity (iffet), in the final analysis, are the signifiers of the conspiracy against "love and sexuality" (Ibid.166). Oktay underlines that Karakurt's novels differ from the Berkands' and Nadirs', in terms of the love relationships of heroes and heroines. According to him, "While the female writers almost cut the sexuality, Eros from its body and transform it into the spirit, the male writer re-embodies it. Karakurt's heroes and heroines experience the physical love." (1993:127).

In his analysis of the romance structure in folk stories (aşık hikayeleri), in the early Turkish literature, Moran focuses on the common structural themes in their plots which include four main parts; "the emergence of love among the hero and the heroine, their separation because of undesirable reasons, the struggle of lovers to come together again, and ending in marriage or death" (2005:29). He asserts that there are universal forms in romance structure in different countries and also in different ages. In spite of the noteworthy similarities and repetitions in these structures, the content of the plots can change from one culture to another in terms of

its social and historical context (Moran, 2005: 32). In Berkand's novels, we can trace a universal structure of romance plot but on the other hand, due to its historical context, there are also the reflections of social life of the young Turkish Republic in which fundamental changes occurred.

According to Yalçın, these novels mainly encourage the transition from traditional large family to western nuclear family. He states that almost in all of the romance novels of the era, the message is the importance of flirting of the couples before marriage and building the marriage on mutual understanding (1998:189). Yalçın argues that one of the most important contributions of these novels to the social change is that they dwell upon the negative effects of the family system based on authority of the father which leads to the suffering of children because of their fathers' intervention in their private lives. The other contribution is that these novels encourage women to stand on their own socially and economically by giving the images of working women as teachers, officers and workers. They also affected the society in terms of introducing a western life style in clothing, house decoration, fashion, music entertainment etc. (1998:190).

Berkand was deeply inspired by the works and the personality of Halide Edip Adivar as a prominent literary and political female figure of the Young Republic. The main reason of her stay in Beirut was her admiration for Adivar as she wrote her in a letter: "In my heydays as a young woman, you influence was very dominant and strong and I admired you highly. Your works excited me more than anything. I still remember the memories of the months I spent with you." (Enginün in Özçelik, 2007: 45). Halide Edip Adivar as one of the pioneers of Kemalist feminism, studied and wrote about the East-West dilemma in Turkish modernization project and the conflicts in the formation of a modern female identity. She intertwined the women rights rhetoric with her nationalist views and formed a synthesis in the construction of female identity which reflected the authentic Turkish culture and European feminist calls for women rights. But Adivar was against western type of feminism which she called sexism and according to her, national and social issues were much more important than women issues because both men and women should work side by side for the national purposes regardless of their sexes (Durakbaşa, 2000:198). In her novels, the heroines carry both the features of being chaste and honorable and they are at the same time social and political actors leading people in terms of national matters

(Kandiyoti, 1997:144). Her heroines reflect both national and modern values of Kemalist modernization project. As Durakbaşı asserts, mothering metaphor in Adivar reflects the role of being a carrier of cultural heritage and constructing the values of a nation. This kind of “enlightened mothering” was presented as a model of the new women (2000:200).

According to Oktay, in Kerime Nadir’s novels, the characters are not the *subjects* who are totally dependant on their circumstances nor do they stand against the conditions that assign them certain roles, but they prevail as the figures embodying the dominant discourse (Ibid 167). This study also aims to read and analyze Muazzez Tahsin’s *Mağrur Kadın (The Proud Woman)* in terms of the discourse used in relation to the dominant ideology and the construction of female identity.

4.4. Reading *The Proud Woman (Mağrur Kadın)*

Nearly in all the novels of Muazzez Tahsin Berkand, the scene of the story is an isolated place like a mansion, seaside residence or a ranch which signifies the same isolation of the story from its social and political context. As it is mentioned above, the period of the novels coincides with the period of the Early Turkish Republic in which the Kemalist modernization project takes place through the changes in social and cultural life within the idea of civilization and westernization. We can examine some important points related to the ideological standpoint of the time in which the story takes place, through the life styles, the content of the dialogues and the social relations of the characters in the novels. However, Berkand’s main aim is not to reflect the ideological and sociological context of the period in which her novels take place, her main aim is telling her story from the eyes of the heroine in order to reflect her thoughts, emotions and anxieties against the compelling and restrictive barriers of her life. As a romance writer of the time, Kerime Nadir reflects similar thoughts about the aim of the novelist:

The novelist chooses the subject of his/her story from history, real life and imagination. But, if the event which takes place in history and real life is narrated exactly as it happened, it loses its interesting characteristic. The plot which the author creates, by also giving it a realistic flavor, shouldn’t ever be a real-life plot , because the novelist does not write a story which belongs to a historical problem, a newspaper interview or an event in everyday life. What we want from a novelist is to find and display the thing that we can not see and find in real life. Not to forget the fact that the

humanity needs not a novel as real life, but life as a novel. (*Memories of Kerime Nadir*, 1981:142)

The story of *The Proud Woman (Mağrur Kadın)* takes place on a ranch, namely Kantarcılar Ranch in Gebze. In the beginning of the novel, we are introduced to Münevver Hanım, a middle-aged old school teacher who had worked in several schools giving courses in Natural Sciences (tabiat dersleri). She becomes a widow at a young age and then moves to her friend, Ferdane Hanım's ranch in Gebze and lives there with her and her children. Ferdane is also a widow of a rich man who owned the big Kantarcılar Ranch. Berkand's description of the ranch denotes the importance of the residence where the family has lived for a long time and shows their family background and economic and social roots:

This ranch is just like a village. The famous Kantarcı Ahmet Paşa owned this ranch once upon a time, he had hosted even the sultans here and was influential in the affairs of his country. The estate was nearly two hundred and fifty years old, it is managed by his grand children now There is a saying among the villagers: This ranch has been created not by illegal (haram) money, but by hard earned (helal) money (p.9).

Not only the ranch itself but also the qualities of men owning this ranch are noteworthy, because they are just like the human metaphors of the "perfect" soul of the ranch, as having a long history of generations, being social but isolated, looking after the family members as the head of the family, being rational and disciplined, modern but traditional at the same time, the ancestors who lived in this ranch in the past reflected the qualities of the ranch. This characteristic is expressed in the novel:

The ranch has several grooms and servants controlled by a strong discipline. Despite the modern and comfortable structure of the buildings in the ranch, there are rigid rules and a strong system of discipline. Nothing can disrupt the inner order of the family. Though girls in the family study at American and French schools, the boys have education in Europe and travel around the world, they do not ever forget who they are (p.9).

In the novel, marriage is a very important notion for the transmission of the family tradition from one generation to the next, because the patriarchal system of the ranch shouldn't be weakened by the inappropriate women who enter the family through marriage. Even though "love marriage" is an inevitable component as a "sine qua non" of the discourse in the novels of Berkand, the "love itself" is also lived within social expectations and demands and the compatibility of the heroine with the hero is also an important requirement :

When a man of the Kantarcılar family wants to marry, he scrutinizes the temper and the character of the girl he chooses and does not marry her until he is sure that her blood is not impure. Beauty and wealth are second in importance. The brides of Kantarcılar should be honourable, (helal süt emmiş), well known and not weak in bodily constitution. The purpose here is raising healthy children for Kantarcılar descendants.” (p.9).

Münevver Hanım, while going to Gebze from Eskişehir by train, gets deeply affected by the picture of “triple misery” including a sick woman and her two little children who sit in front of her in the train. She watches them with a pain in her heart. Her depiction of them denotes their hidden history. As Tauchert asserts romance seems to suggest that truth is signified by beauty (Tauchert, 2005: 125). The “face” is considered as the reflector of the soul of the person and if she has a beautiful face her soul is accepted as “good” which is also associated with high morality and appropriate manners.

Though she could not see the woman’s face, Münevver Hanım understood that they must have fallen into misery while living a good and wealthy life, The poor children, how polite, shy and ashamed they looked (p.9).

Before the arrival of the train in Gebze, she realizes that the mother of the children has died. She feels pity for the poor kids and decides to take them with her to the Ranch. Meral is aged eleven and Ferdi is eight years old. Münevver Hanım asks Ferdane Hanım, the owner of the Ranch, whether she can look after and raise the children on the Ranch. Her answer is positive but what is remarkable here is that she can not give the final decision herself. She replies: “Let me ask Kenan. In fact he respects our decisions but he is the “man” of this house.”(P.15). Berkand explains the reason of her character’s attitude: “Ferdane Hanım conforms to the old tradition of the Kantarcı Family and she accepts his son as having the total authority in the Family.” (p.15).

After their meeting, the older child asks Münevver Hanım whether they are going to live with the owners. The answer reflects the hidden rigidity of the class stratification in the ranch:

No, my child, I can not say that you are going to live with them. But, you will live with me by the help of them. They are rich people, even though we join the life of people like them, we are obliged to be placed away from them. They are kind of our masters; we obey them (p.19).

Meral is the central character and the protagonist of the novel, around whom the discourse and the structure of the narrative revolves. Berkand emphasizes her temper several times: “Meral is a proud girl. When her pride is wounded, she feels strong psychological depression.” (p.19). Meral’s excessive emotions are described in detail in order to reveal her attitude towards the people around her:

Her feeling of love is as strong as her feeling of anger. She either loves a person to death or hates him/her very deeply. She is very merciful, kind, modest and altruistic to people that she likes. However she does not hesitate to take a tough and haughty -attitude to people that she does not like, and keep a distance from them, not even remembering their existence in the world. (p.21).

Meral’s distinct character and attitude can be captured in a striking scene in the novel. Kenan, the male protagonist of the novel, beats a little servant in the ranch with his whip. When Meral sees his behavior she feels pity for the child and gets very angry with Kenan. She cries and tries to stop him but Kenan can not hold his temper and lashes Meral’s ankle. Then he stops and wants to come close to Meral, but he can not move when he sees her look at him: “Meral raised her head and looked at Kenan’s pupils with resistance. There was such disgust and hate in her gaze that Kenan froze in his place.” (p.23).

After this event, Meral’s feelings for Kenan are shaped with these negative terms and in a conversation with Münevver Hanım she declares: “I’m supposed to obey him...But don’t tell me to love him!”(p.25). It is implied in her sentence that the importance of obedience of women to men above their social classes is required, but it has nothing to do with “love”.

Kenan goes to an American College. Then he makes a trip to America, after his arrival on the Ranch, he wants to make some changes in the Ranch. According to Ömer Türkeş, in the romance literature of the Early Republic, there are signs of the East-West antagonism which is also seen in Tanzimat and Meşrutiyet literature (2002:438). In the romance novels of the period there exists a loyalty to tradition which can be read as the traces of late Ottoman cultural atmosphere and a reaction to a modernization shift in terms of the moral norms and manners of people. Meral’s inner thoughts about Kenan show this viewpoint against westernization:

Let's see what changes the "young sir" is going to make in the Ranch? What a pity if he wants to Americanize the Ranch! But, according to aunt Münevver, he is not a kind of snob. He has taken only the positive aspects of America... (p.27).

Kenan's opinion about Meral is also noteworthy since the boundaries of the social class stratification in the Ranch can easily be noticed in his words:

She is bound to live a simple life. She can't cope with a luxurious life with horse trips, salon entertainments and so forth. She is essentially a proud girl. It is no use to encourage her proud temper (p.32).

The dialogue which develops between Kenan, Zerrin and Meral is important to show how the ideal female subject is constructed in the novel from the perspectives of the three characters in the novel. :

Kenan: I, personally, hate the pedant and smart women who display their knowledge too much. I can't tolerate masculinized girls who see themselves over men. But, I can notice that you are not such a woman.

Meral: Today, being a high school graduate is not a very important education degree.

Kenan: Yes, but some ladies are eager to display themselves as knowing everything. Behind a so called plain manner they measure swords with men. If it continues like this, they will declare superiority above men and challenge them with resistance.

Kenan said these words with a laugh. Zerrin instantly drew near to him.

Zerrin: I never have a desire to behave like a man. Meral, you don't either, do you?

Meral: My situation is completely different dear. I don't intent to choose a profession which suits men. But because of my necessity to work, I always aim to reach my modest goal (p.34).

This dialogue reflects the representation of the female identity in the novel and also within its social and historical context. It can be read as a critic towards the emerging woman after modernization in the Early Republic, a critic of "a woman like a man". On the other hand, Türkeş argues that the women in the novels of Muazzez Tahsin are "the sample figures of petty bourgeois enlightened women in the Kemalist Republic". In her novels, there is a representation of the Republican Woman who is identified with a depiction of a "perfect woman devoted to intellectual struggles,

movements of literature, sports and at the same time to mothering and wifedom” (2002:439).

Through a tennis match between Kenan and Meral, there is a scene of competition which displays a power struggle of the male and female protagonists in the novel. Each player is eager to show his/her strength and has an ambition to win the match. They challenge each other in front of the audience who watch their play with pleasure. In the end, Kenan can't take Meral's final shot and Meral wins the match. Then he explains why he couldn't hit the ball: “Because I realized that the match might continue until midnight. Both of us have equal strengths.” (p. 47).

While Kenan's sister Zerrin, admires Meral's character and beauty; their cousin, Şermin envies her intensely. By drawing two distinct and opposite characters, Berkand constitutes the dichotomy of good temper/ bad temper, love/hate, and admiration/envy. Despite the fact that this antagonistic approach seems a simple and surface manifestation of the attitude of female characters, her real intention is to show the readers the complexity and depth of Meral's feelings and behaviors which carry both positive and negative aspects. She is represented as a female subject neither like an angel nor like an evil person

According to Kandiyoti, “Woman”, always becomes the sphere of the arguments in relation to the anxiety about modernism and the moral nature of community threatened by modernity; because “she” is conceived as a natural extension of the private realm and identified by the “inner” against the “outer” realm, woman becomes a field within a society which is effected by social changes. (1998:29). In the novel, Kenan asserts that the spiritual and moral purity of a young girl is her most important merit. He thinks, “if a girl has a high moral character, not even living among men or being with soldiers in battle fields, or some loathsome situation can damage her spiritual purity ” (p.57). He admires Meral's character:

In fact, Meral has distinct talents and merits. She attracts everybody with her seriousness in studying at school, practicing English and playing the piano at home. In addition to these, she helps Münevver Hanım in housework and looks after Ferdi just like a mother. (p. 21).

Although she can sing, play the piano and tennis very well, Meral does not want to join the “modern” life, full of entertainments like evening parties, balls, plays, horse

trips, salon parties and tennis matches. She tries to escape from guests coming to these parties and meetings. Berkand explains the reason of her escape;

Meral knows very well that if she appears like a member of the family, people will gossip about her past life and tell that she is a “found girl” and an adopted child whose family background is unknown. It is better not to be noticed than being insulted by people. (p. 60).

A friend of Kenan’s mother acts like a matchmaker and introduces a daughter of a rich tradesman to Kenan, but he doesn’t even consider her and responds harshly:

I’m not for sale. Let them find another man. There is nothing more disgusting than the arrogance of these people whose descent and source of income are not known, to intrude into the affairs of old Families. Please let us close this discussion (p. 67).

Şermin, Kenan’s cousin, has a secret love and passion for Kenan and she observes Meral and Kenan’s relationship with envy. The readers, can watch every encounter of Kenan and Meral from the eyes of Şermin, and grasp their feelings for each other, even the changes in their emotions are conveyed to the readers by Sermin:

Şermin sensed that Kenan was attracted by the moral beauty of Meral. There was no doubt about his interest in the beautiful and the young, but also, Meral’s plainness, seriousness and dignity attracted him to her. Şermin understood this and she was afraid of the consequences. (p. 73).

Different from most of Berkand’s novels in which the story is told by a first-person, in *Mağrur Kadın*, the author speaks outside the story as a third-person narrator. The narrator’s voice displays the thoughts of all the characters, so the readers can follow the events from the eyes of different characters. The use also of the voices of both Meral and Kenan strengthens the intensity and the authenticity of the love between them. One evening Kenan while thinking about her, realizes his deep emotions for her:

He remembered the day he first saw her, a little girl with wild eyes. The angry girl who tried to take the whip from him... The young lady whose voice and face he missed during his stay in America for years. He remembered the different modes of Meral as working silently in her modest clothes, the patient girl tired of being criticized by Şermin’s sarcastic words, the proud girl playing tennis with her sparkling eyes, the sober girl not interested in the rich young men around her, and finally, Meral with her enchanting, captivating beauty (p.86).

Kenan receives an anonymous letter in which Meral's past is revealed. He reads the letter again and again. In the letter Meral's father is described as an alcoholic and gambler who was killed in Egypt after committing a robbery. Besides giving English and piano lessons, her mother's main source of income was arranging blind dates, for people who do not know each other. Then, the narrator displays Kenan's inner voice and his conflicting ideas:

Kenan did not know the author of the letter. The information given might have been just untrue. Maybe what was written was only lies. But, this was an important document for a proud and traditional man who was tied to family tradition and values (p.87).

Is it right to leave a girl whose qualities I appreciate completely and love deeply, because of a fictitious stain? In my place, another man would not hesitate even a second, but me... (p. 87).

After a while Kenan gives his final decision:

I will overcome my weakness in this situation. Kenan Kantarcı won't forget his family background and he will prove to be a son who deserves his heritage. He won't marry a girl with a stain! (p. 87)

Meral is also aware of the fact that she can not take place in high society because of her family background. "In fact, everybody should know his/her place in society. There is nothing smarter than this." (p. 97).

One of Kenan's friends, Hamid declares that he is in love with Meral and wants to propose to her. In a conversation with him, Kenan reveals his opinions about women:

Kenan: As men, we can't explore what lies beneath a woman's heart. You can not understand the real feelings of even the one who smiles and is nice to you. Woman's soul is like a cliff, a deep and dark cliff (p.100).

Hamdi: You are right. I should tell this fact to myself. You don't seem to support my decision, do you?

Kenan: In my opinion, in a marriage men and women should be suitable to each other in terms of their family, wealth, manners, environment, discipline, opinion, in short; everything. Happiness, then, would not only be a word but would also have a real meaning.

Hamdi: What about love?

Kenan: I believe that there are much more important feelings than love.

Hamdi: So, you can leave your love and heart for principles?

Kenan answers in a wild voice: If it is necessary, yes (p. 100-101).

Kenan's mind is full of conflicting thoughts about Meral. He becomes aware of his love for Meral but his mind can not accept the idea of marrying a girl whose family background is unknown. However, as the time passes he is more affected by the beauty and the character of Meral. Kenan's cousin, Şermin also realizes his changing feelings towards Meral. She is surprised by this change:

At first she thought that, after his arrival from America, Kenan had become a very modern young man who thought like an American and she tried to prove herself as a complete modern woman by her manners, clothing and conversations. Then she realized that Kenan did not lose his old beliefs and still liked elegant, solemn and mature girls rather than too modernized and arrogant salon girls.(P. 104).

A big party is organized for Zerrin's birthday. The guests are asked to come to the party not in evening dresses but in authentic and national clothes. Meral dresses like a village girl. Münevver Hanım likes her clothes but she adds: "A city girl can be distinguished from a villager no matter what she wears?" (p.109).

Meral, thinks about the guests in the hall through her inner voice: "Why did she join these hypocritical people? What was she doing among these ballroom puppets who gossip about her but can also smile to her?" (p. 111).

Meral attracts the guests in the party by her beauty and manners. In spite of his confused attitude toward Meral, Kenan declares his positive feelings and thoughts about her to a woman guest in the party: "This young lady (Meral) not only has physical beauty, the deep meaning in her eyes reflects the delicacy and gentility of her soul. Ferdi and Meral are not ordinary people, they have nobility in their souls." (p. 110).

Toward the end of the novel, the secret past of Meral is revealed by her unknown uncle, Fahri Bey's confession. He is invited to the ranch as a guest and when he sees Meral and Ferdi, he realizes that they are his niece and nephews. At first he does not say anything to them but after his serious illness, he decides to reveal the whole truth about their parents. He calls Meral and Ferdi to his house and tells everything about their mother and father. Meral's mother had musical education in Vienne and met her

husband Fahri Bey at a concert. Meral's father was from Bursa and he was an artist who earned his living by painting.

After Kenan learns that Meral is not the daughter of a murderer and an immoral mother he decides to reveal his feelings to Meral and he blames himself because of his arrogant and cold attitude toward Meral:

Oh Meral, in the past I wanted to go away from you. I thought that there were barriers between us which we could not overcome. Now I do not care about your father and mother's backgrounds. It has no importance since you are the most innocent girl in the world. Forgive me my darling, even my doubts about you prove that I do not deserve you....My dear Meral, my honest, open hearted and kind darling! What should I do to deserve you? (p. 140).

Then he decides to propose to her and he declares his love by giving her a gold bracelet and a precious diamond ring which belongs to Kantarcı family for generations:

In the past, a rude and an arrogant child hurt your arm with his whip. Your love helped him to overcome his pride and treat people like a human being. What changed me is your love. For this I owe you Meral. As I put this bracelet on your wrist. I am begging you to forgive that arrogant child. There may still be a wound there. If you cover that wound with this bracelet, I will be the happiest man in the world (p. 172).

Stacey and Pearce evaluate that the attainment of "heroic status" on the part of the male characters relates to their power of transformation vis-à-vis both male and female characters which is a common key ingredient in romantic trajectories: "In this way, romance offers its subjects the possibility of a new "becoming": through the encounter/fusion of the self and the other, a new self might be imagined." (1995: 19). Meral and Kenan gain their "heroic status" through an oppositional transformation in terms of their male and female identities and the roles given to them in the existing patriarchal system. While Meral loosens her proud and reserve character in the name of love, Kenan realizes his brutal and insensitive attitude toward her and wants to be forgiven by Meral. Although the patriarchal roles given to the heroine in terms of being a perfect lady as a lover-wife and an elder sister-mother through her nurturing role intensifies the passive and subversive discourse in the construction of women, the heroine can satisfy her desire for love through the punishment and transformation of the hero which is also the pleasure the text offers to its readers.

CHAPTER V

THE VOICE OF “ORDINARY” WOMEN: *JANE AUSTEN*

“Women are told from their infancy and taught by the example of their mothers, that a little knowledge of human weakness, justly termed cunning, softness of temper, “outward” obedience and scrupulous attention to a puerile kind of propriety, will obtain for them the protection of man...”

Mary Wollstonecraft,
A Vindication of the Rights of Women, 1796, p.33

I took the term “ordinary” from an article of Ceylan (2004) in which she tries to explore the reasons why both ordinary and critical women like to read Jane Austen. First she points out the very ordinary life of Jane Austen herself which is similar to her characters that live in her novels who are in harmony with their age, social conditions and residence and busy with the issues of everyday life (Ibid:60). My aim is also to analyze the reasons why she has been so attractive both for ordinary women readers and to feminist critics all over the world. First Austen’s brief life history is given:

Jane Austen was born in Steventon in Hampshire, England, on December 16, 1775, as the seventh of eight children. Jane was educated at home by her father, then in 1783 she was sent with her sister Cassandra to attend a school. During 1784–85 Jane and Cassandra went to the Abbey School in Reading. Austen started writing around 1787. Among her juvenilia she wrote several love stories and romances. During 1794–96 Austen wrote a novel entitled *Elinor and Marianne*, followed in 1796 by *First Impressions*. In 1797, Austen began rewriting *Elinor and Marianne*, retitling the work as *Sense and Sensibility*. In 1798 she wrote a novel entitled *Susan* which was published only posthumously in a revised version under the title *Northanger Abbey*. Around 1799 Austen wrote another novel entitled *Lady Susan*. But none of them were published. *Sense and Sensibility* (1811) was the first published novel of Austen, although only as “by a Lady.” Austen then revised *First Impressions*, and it appeared as *Pride and Prejudice* in 1813. *Mansfield Park*, begun in 1811, was published in 1814, followed by *Emma* the next year. *Persuasion*, her last novel, was written in 1817. In May of that year, the family went to Winchester to seek medical attention for Jane, who had developed Addison’s disease. She died two months later, on July 18, 1817. Much of Austen’s work appeared posthumously, beginning with the joint publication of *Northanger Abbey* and *Persuasion* in 1818. In the

1820s her juvenilia began to appear, as well as a fragment of a novel, later known as *Sanditon*, written in early 1817 (Bloom, 2008:1-2).

Jane Austen (1775-1817) lived in a period of transition in the social and political context of British society and in the narrative style of British fiction while the effects of Enlightenment were decreasing and when the effects of the Industrial Revolution were felt in the society. It cannot be asserted that Austen was a Victorian writer, because her works do not reflect the features of the novels which were written after the 1830s including political and economic impact of the Industrial Revolution. In English literary criticism, she is mostly accepted as a writer of Romantic Literature. But, as Tarba underlines, the plots in Austen's novels are more traditional and usual than the Gothic and historical novels of the time. Unlike the works of Ann Radcliffe and Mary Shelly, which carry mysterious, dark, metaphysical and unusual features of the Gothic novels, Austen's plots are mainly based on traditional country life with ordinary characters (2004:62).

There are persistent disagreements in recent criticism revolving around the question of Jane Austen's feminism as a writer. . Some critics, such as Kirkham and Alison Sulloway, affirm Austen as a "consciously feminist author since her viewpoint on the moral nature and status of women, female education, marriage, authority and the family, and the representation of women in literature is strikingly similar to that argued by Mary Wollstonecraft in *A Vindication of the Rights of Women*, but some others are skeptical (Kirkham in Duckworth, 2002:418). According to these critics, Austen, like Wollstonecraft, attacked those who valued female "accomplishments" and undervalued female reason and intelligence. On the other hand, the skeptical critics argue that, unlike Wollstonecraft, Austen had no programmatic plans for improving woman's lot. Austen's "political quietism" let some feminist critics deny Austen's feminism and according to their arguments "Austen relied too much on the marriage plot, brought into the ideology of romantic love, gave short shrift to female friendship, tamed her independent heroines and avoided institutional criticism." (Duckworth, 2002:418).

Mary Wollstonecraft's *A Vindication of the Rights of Women* was published in 1792, in which she argues that women are not naturally inferior to men, but appear to be so only because they lack education. She suggests that both men and women should be treated as rational beings and imagines a social order founded on reason. Her

arguments are based on the ideas of the French Revolution and the Declaration of Human Rights, through which she tried to draw attention to the women's private and public spheres. She challenged her society's ideological definition of the female as emotional, intuitive, illogical, capable of moral sentiment but not of rational understanding. She pointed out that if women are to be held ethically responsible for their actions, then it must be argued that they are also capable of ethical thinking and have a rational faculty. The education of women as fully as men, for Wollstonecraft, is the preliminary necessity for them to be able to realize their innate capacities for moral virtue (Mellor, 2009: 80).

Wollstonecraft was Mary Shelley's mother and died giving birth to her; perhaps as Mellor stresses the fact that Jane Austen was also a committed disciple of Wollstonecraft's teaching:

Austen frequently quotes *A Vindication* in her novels, even though she never dared to acknowledge her debt openly to Wollstonecraft. In Jane Austen's circle, no respectable woman could publically avow her agreement with Wollstonecraft's opinions. Even today, the extent of Jane Austen's debt to Wollstonecraft has only begun to be documented (2009: 80).

According to Poovey, although Austen also lived through and wrote about the crisis of values that dominated late eighteenth- and early nineteenth-century English society, her perspective on this crisis was markedly different from Wollstonecraft and Shelley who witnessed the radicals' challenge to propriety from outside its eminent domain. Poovey points out that Jane Austen spent her entire life in the very heart of propriety and she never flamboyantly defied propriety and she claims "perhaps partly as a consequence of her limited experience, Austen did not choose to write about politics, nature, or metaphysics, and she assiduously avoided the highly imaginative, melodramatic incidents that so fascinated her contemporaries." (2009:21).

Beside the differences of their writing style and main concern of the plot, Jane Austen shared many issues similar to the concern of Wollstonecraft and Shelley, such as "the process of a young girl's maturation and the complex relationship between a woman's desires and the imperatives of propriety." (Poovey, 2009: 21). But it can be claimed that Austen has class elitism in her novels. She didn't dwell upon the lives of the working or peasant women in any of her novels. According to

Poovey, Austen's class position placed her firmly in the middle of the crisis of values and as in Wollstonecraft and Shelley. Austen's gender and her decision to write professionally focused on the contradictions inherent in this crisis (Ibid.22).

Referring to gender critic Claudia L. Johnson, Murfin states that in *Emma*, Austen achieved Wollstonecraft's grand aim better than Wollstonecraft did: "diminishing the authority of male sentimentality and reimmasculating it" by "making more masculine again" – "men and women alike with a high sense of national purpose." (2002:434). Similarly, Mellor also underlines the affect of Wollstonecraft's ideas on Jane Austen's portrayal of the heroines in her novels. Austen portrayed her heroines not as the women of sensibility celebrated by the romantic poets and the prevailing ideological doctrine of the separate spheres which consigned women to the role of promoting the domestic affections. Instead, according to Mellor, her heroines are "women of sense, women like Elinor Dashwood who refuse to succumb to erotic passion.", and "like Catherine Morland in *Northanger Abbey*, capable of recognizing the errors of her youthful delusions." (2009:82).

Mellor continues that "all of Austen's novels are novels of female education, novels in which an intelligent but ignorant girl learns to perceive the world more correctly and to understand more fully the workings of human nature and society. *Emma* Woodhouse must recognize her own cruelty to Miss Bates, must understand how wrongly she has perceived both Jane Fairfax and Harriet Smith, before she can equal the intelligence and benevolence of a Mr. Knightley (Ibid.). Withshire argues that "Emma's attack on Miss Bates originates in, and gives fictional release to, impulses that are present in the author herself." So the two sides of Austen's characteristic "dilemma" are here brought together: on the one hand, impatience, frustration, contempt for the petty-mindedness of society, on the other a deep respect for convention, and for the reality of other people, and above all the concern for one's standards of behavior, that is pride in one's own moral life. Jane Austen indeed in Harding's term, is a "genteel satirist" in gratifying "the comfort of middle-class readers through a genuine style of writing whose work displays a sophisticated negotiation between solidarity with the society that nourished her and intense critical scrutiny." (Harding in Wiltshire, 2004: 129).

How could she achieve this sophisticated negotiation? This is a question which leads to various criticisms, in terms of both her artistic style of writing and her ideological standpoint. What made her read by both “ordinary” women, the housewives and “feminist” women like critics? According to Poovey, her novels culminate a sequence of stages of female insight and artistic achievement. She asserts that her genius cannot be fully explained but in considering the ways in which Austen both completes Wollstonecraft’s analysis of female inhibition and perfects Shelley’s attempt to make propriety accommodate female desire, her accomplishment and some of the functions her artistic strategies served, can be understood (Poovey, 2009: 22).

In fact, Austen did not want to reach a “complete truth” in her fiction through the display of relationships among her characters. In her novels, as she mostly used, disguise and role-play are the dramatic elements which lead to “equivocation and mystery”. Bryne asserts, “The acknowledgement of the incompleteness of human disclosure strikes at the very heart of Jane Austen’s creative vision.” (2009:203). The incompleteness of human disclosure is what lies beneath our – as ordinary or feminist women- way of loving and our perception of romance.

CHAPTER VI

THE CONSTITUTION OF THE FEMALE SUBJECT IN *EMMA*

As women, how we conceptualize “the self” and settle our “subject” positions is closely related to our identification process through the states of “beings” and “representations” within varying social and cultural discourses. In his genealogies of power, Foucault “envisions the self as embodied, embedded in a social and cultural milieu, constituted by power relations, in short, thoroughly contextualized” (Foucault in Allen, 2004: 235). According to Allen, “it offers feminists extremely useful resources for thinking about the role that oppressive socialization plays in the formation of gendered selves” (Ibid.).

It is important to underline that “discourses from which we construct a sense of self are inconsistent, contradictory, varying and embody the relics of many different social and ideological struggles” (Connell in Wetherell, 1995 :135). Wetherell points, “Our self-knowledge, our self- accounts, our self-descriptions are discursively organized”, and she adds, “a sense of identity is always an invention, a construction, a melding and meeting point of discourses”. She refers to Stuart Hall: “the “who am I”, “the real me” is always formed in relation to cultural narratives. Identity is formed at the unstable point where the “unspeakable” stories of subjectivity meet the narratives of history, of a culture” (Ibid).

Foucault’s work deals with the modes of the transformation of human beings into subjects. He declares: "My objective has been to create a history of the different modes by which, in our culture, human beings are made subjects." (1983: 208). As Çileli underlines, “Foucault’s evaluations on language as an entity and the formation of the individual subject are closely related to literature” and “the female subject position is firmly linked to the periods in which the works have been produced.” (2010: 244). There exists a parallel confirmation between Foucault’s idea of the practices of the self and the feminist analysis of women’s oppression that seek to avoid positing women as powerless victims of patriarchal structures of domination (Mc Nay: 66). Jane Austen, as being accepted a romance writer and who took the

love affairs and courtships as a central theme in her novels, is an important female author for the analysis of the constitution of the female subject within the particular discourse and narrative structure of her writing and for searching the operation of ideology in literature. The question whether she could stand against the dominant ideology or not, is a crucial one to understand the formation of female identity through romance literature.

In order to understand how the dominant ideology works in the constitution of the subject position, it is important to dwell upon the arguments of Althusser. He declares, “all ideology hails or interpellates concrete individuals as concrete subjects, by the functioning of the category of the subject.” (1970). According to Althusser the category of the subject is constituted in ideology through “interpellation” or hailing: “Hey, you there!” (Ibid.)

The opening voice, in *Emma*, is that of the narrator which leads to a kind of identification between the writer and the narrator (Pam Morris in Tanrıvermiş, 2005: 8). This voice “speaks from outside the story” as “a third-person narrator”. Therefore, the narrator, who is able to see the thoughts of all the characters, is omniscient (Ibid.). Related with the narrative voice, Byrne mentions that “dramatic dialogue is thus often followed by “free indirect discourse” in which the third-person narratorial voice follows the unfolding of Emma’s thoughts.” (2009: 190). Referring to Skinner Tauchert claims that the elimination of “the distinction between first- and third-person narrators” is conceived as “the most radically original aspect of Austen’s writing” (2005: 125).

According to Tauchert, “free indirect discourse” is a “specifically realist trope that signals access to the consciousness of a separate individual: it does this by performing a linguistic breach in the subject-object relation. This breach is apprehended critically as a “contamination” of narrative voice by the consciousness of the character.” (2005: 126). At this point, there exists a distinction between the narrative voice and the speaker of the text, the third-person consciousness, the centre of consciousness or the reflector is the “*focalizer*” while the user of the third person is the “*narrator*” (Shlomrith Rimmon-Kenan in Tanrıvermiş, 2005: 8).

The concept of “focalizer”, is similar to Althusser’s (1970) notion of “Unique and Absolute Subject” in whose Name the ideology interpellates all individuals as subject

which means that all ideology is *centred*, that the Absolute Subject occupies the unique place of the Centre.

Çileli underlines the “author function” in realistic novels of the 19th century and refers to Bersani that “the formal and psychological reticence of the most realistic fiction makes for a secret complicity between the novelist and his society”’s illusions about its own order which can be defined as the “author function” in the sense of grouping discourse as a focus of coherence and unity” (2010: 245). Foucault asserts that the author’s name “seems always to be present, marking off the edges of the text, revealing, or at least characterizing, its mode of being”. The author’s name, for Foucault, “manifests the appearance of a certain discursive set and indicates the status of this discourse within a society and a culture” and “the author function is therefore characteristic of the mode of existence, circulation, and functioning of certain discourses within a society” (Foucault, 1984: 108). So, the crucial point here is that, all discourses endowed with the author function possess “the plurality of the self”. As Çileli asserts, the author function can give rise to several selves, to several subject positions that can be occupied by different classes of individuals (Çileli, 2010: 245). She claims: “this is what Jane Austen does in *Emma*, where characters reveal themselves from the positions they can occupy in society in terms of the way they behave towards each other.” (Ibid.).

In the beginning, *Emma* starts with an opening sentence which clearly gives a description of Emma and her attitude towards life:

Emma Woodhouse, handsome, clever, and rich, with a comfortable home and happy disposition, seemed to unite some of the best blessings of existence; and had lived nearly twenty-one years in the world with very little to distress or vex her. (*Emma*,1).

However, quite after this positive description, Austen makes the readers aware of her faults and defects:

The real evils, indeed, of Emma’s situation were the power of having rather too much her own way, and a disposition to think a little too well of herself; these were the disadvantages which threatened alloy to her many enjoyments. (*Emma*, 1).

Emma and her governess Miss Taylor, “had been living together as friends and very mutually attached”. Emma, despite “highly esteeming Miss Taylor”’s judgment”, is

described as “doing just what she liked” and “directed chiefly by her own” (*Emma*,1). Çileli underlines the distinguishing elements in the character of Emma as “willful, manipulative, and confident” (2010: 245). She claims that Jane Austen was probably aware that Emma would be different from the generally submissive female characters of her other novels when she wrote to a friend, “I am going to take a heroine whom no one but myself will much like” (Austen-Leigh in Çileli, 2010: 245).

Mc Nay emphasizes the importance of “liberty” in the analysis of power relations in Foucault that “there cannot be relations of power unless the subjects are free...In order to exercise a relation of power, there must be on both sides at least a certain form of liberty” (Foucault in Mc Nay, 1992: 67). According to Çileli, “Emma is unique since she does not experience, but tries to act actively to shape events, and she enjoys exceptional freedom of action.” She notes that her position in society, her rule in her father’s household and her financial independence make her eligible to play an active role in her community and take on a masculine subject position. However, for Çileli, Jane Austen secures Emma a masculine position by emphasizing the loss of the patriarchal authority of Emma’s aging father, which gives her possibilities as a speaking subject (2010: 246). Çileli by referring to Roulston points out, Emma is only allowed to take up a space as the speaking subject through a weakened construction of the masculine “other” (Ibid).

The plot of the novel mainly revolves around the matchmaking tactics of Emma between “genteel” men and women in Hartfield and interlocking sets of courtships:

Robert Martin courts Harriet Smith, Mr. Elton courts Emma, Emma courts Mr.Elton on behalf of Harriet, Frank Churchill courts Jane Fairfax and (apparently) Emma, Mr. Elton and Mrs. Elton court each other, Emma courts Frank Churchill, Jane Fairfax courts Frank Churchill, Harriet Smith courts nearly everyone: Robert Martin, Mr. Elton, Frank Churchill, and Mr. Knightley. Finally, Mr. Knightley courts Emma and Emma courts Mr. Knightley (Hecimovich, 2008:26).

According to Hecimovich, how these interlocking courtships function and how Austen works these materials give much of the pleasure of reading *Emma*. He describes this narrative structure as a “shell game of anticipation and surprise.” (Ibid.).

The most important male character, Mr. George Knightley, “Emma’s brother in-law and the Woodhouses” trusted friend and advisor”, as Çileli points, “is there to correct her subversive discourse.” (2010: 246). Austen defines his role:

Mr Knightley, in fact, was one of the few people who could see faults in Emma Woodhouse, and the only one who ever told her of them: and though this was not particularly agreeable to Emma herself, she knew it would be so much less so to her father, that she would not have him really suspect such a circumstance as her not being thought perfect by every body (*Emma*, p.5).

According to Waldron, Knightley could be interpreted as “Austen’s model for wisdom” which is “carrying the moral authority of the novel” (2004: 114). Referring to Roulston, Çileli argues that the patriarchal discourse represented by Knightley contains and neutralizes Emma’s subjectivity by encoding it within dominant discourse. There are conflicting discourse centered around Emma and Mr. Knightley. (2010: 247). According to Çileli, Mr. Knightley is “the representative of dominant discourse and the speaking subject in the novel.” (Ibid.).

The corrective and sarcastic voice of Mr. Knightley could be seen in his critical attitude and judgment of Emma:

I do not understand what you mean by “success,”” said Mr. Knightley. Success supposes endeavour. Your time has been properly and delicately spent, if you have been endeavouring for the last four years to bring about this marriage. A worthy employment for a young lady’s mind! But if, which I rather imagine, your making the match, as you call it, means only your planning it, your saying to yourself one idle day, I think it would be a very good thing for Miss Taylor if Mr. Weston were to marry her,” and saying it again to yourself every now and then afterwards, why do you talk of success? Where is your merit? What are you proud of? You made a lucky guess; and *that* is all that can be said. (*Emma*, p.7)

Waldron dwells upon the ideas of feminist criticisms that question the moral authority of Mr. Knightley, such as Margaret Kirkham who sees an irony in the presentation of Mr. Knightley through “a fairly equal distribution of praise and blame between Emma herself and Mr. Knightley” (2004: 114). According to Waldron, Austen’s main purpose is to produce a critique of fictional figures who control the action of the story. She argues that Mr Knightley is involved in the same kind of social/moral confusion as Emma and all the other characters. The main concern of the novel, according to Waldron, is to entertain rather by confusion than by satisfying certainties with a general fictional chaos (2004: 115).

Harriet Smith, in the beginning of the novel, became an important female companion for Emma, not as her equal but as a friend whom she could dominate and influence easily. In the novel, the description of Miss Smith gives the idea to the reader that it is not important who she is:

Harriet Smith was the natural daughter of somebody. Somebody had placed her, several years back, at Mrs. Goddard's school, and somebody had lately raised her from the condition of scholar to that of parlour-boarder. This was all that was generally known of her history (*Emma*, p.14).

But the crucial point here is, Emma's intentions about her:

She (Emma) would notice her (Harriet); she would improve her; she would detach her from her bad acquaintance, and introduce her into good society; she would form her opinions and her manners. It would be an interesting, and certainly a very kind undertaking; highly becoming her own situation in life, her leisure, and powers. (*Emma*, 15)

Mr. Knightley, however, does not agree with Emma about her companionship with Miss. Smith. While talking to Mrs. Weston, he reveals his ideas about Harriet Smith:

I think her the very worst sort of companion that Emma could possibly have. She knows nothing herself, and looks upon Emma as knowing every thing. She is a flatterer in all her ways; and so much the worse, because undesigned. Her ignorance is hourly flattery. How can Emma imagine she has any thing to learn herself, while Harriet is presenting such a delightful inferiority? And as for Harriet, I will venture to say that *she* cannot gain by the acquaintance. Hartfield will only put her out of conceit with all the other places she belongs to. She will grow just refined enough to be uncomfortable with those among whom birth and circumstances have placed her home. I am much mistaken if Emma's doctrines give any strength of mind, or tend at all to make a girl adapt herself rationally to the varieties of her situation in life.—They only give a little polish. (*Emma*, p.25)

Consequently, according to Çileli, Emma's assuming the role of a teacher planning to educate Harriet runs parallel with her own education by Mr. Knightley and thus becomes a parody of her own education process. She underlines the fact that since Emma herself is not yet a member of the dominant discourse, she cannot be an adequate model for the representation of truth and she would be out of place as a teacher in a Pygmalion myth, due to her gender (2010: 248).

According to Waldron, "Harriet is the extreme example of the doubt about everybody's true social position, the collapsing nature of old ideas about rank". By the time of Harriet's entry into the novel, she argues, the reader's initial relationship

with Mr. Knightley has been established (2004: 118). He is introduced in the first chapter as a 'sensible man'; his brisk tone in dealing with Mr. Woodhouse's neurotic anxieties and Emma's self-congratulation about having 'made the match' between Miss Taylor and Mr. Weston evinces a sane and rational prudence; his whole persona breathes confidence and common sense. From the start, we feel safe with Mr. Knightley. Unless we are very vigilant indeed in our reading, we agree with him that Emma is rather a silly girl, interfering in what does not concern her. We feel sure that Mr. Knightley will not be engaging in any romantic games of chance. He is apparently a typical hero/guardian on the Grandison model. But Austen enjoys exploiting the reflexes of her readers, and means to disillusion us." (Waldron, 2004: 118).

As Tauchert emphasizes, Emma is unique as an Austen heroine, since marriage is simply unnecessary for her. According to Çileli, Emma's struggle for a subject position in a patriarchal discourse is extremely personal and depends on her privileged socioeconomic position in society (2010: 248). She is conscious of her own powers, and enjoys her independence. Emma is aware of her privileged position when she tells Harriet. Emma reveals her thoughts about marriage and the reasons why she does not want to marry:

I have none of the usual inducements of women to marry. Were I to fall in love, indeed, it would be a different thing; but I never have been in love; it is not my way, or my nature; and I do not think I ever shall. And, without love, I am sure I should be a fool to change such a situation as mine. Fortune I do not want; employment I do not want; consequence I do not want: I believe few married women are half as much mistress of their husband's house as I am of Hartfield; and never, never could I expect to be so truly beloved and important; so always first and always right in any man's eyes as I am in my father's (*Emma*, p.60).

According to Hecimovich, "the play of mind, the playfulness" is the defining characteristic of Emma's style which testifies to Austen's belief in the essentially creative nature of play (2008:28). The most distinctive aspect of Emma, which gives her joy and some kind of power over others in Hartfield, is her interest in "matchmaking". She does not take it just as "a lucky guess" and she thinks "there is always some talent in it" (*Emma*, p. 7). In the conversation with Knightley and her father, she mentions her success in the marriage of Miss Taylor and Mr. Weston:

I made the match myself. I made the match, you know, four years ago; and to have it take place, and be proved in the right, when so many people said Mr. Weston would never marry again, may comfort me for any thing (*Emma*, p. 6).

Although, in *Emma*, the central importance is given to courtship and conduct among women and men in Hartfield, the underneath theme could be noticed as “the assimilation of the social classes through marriage” which “was one of the great themes of the drama, and alliances between “blood” and “money”, or “old” money and “new” (Byrne, 2009:190). According to Byrne, “Emma is concerned with preserving “the distinctions of rank” and she is initially resistant to social change, unless upon her own terms.” (Ibid.). Austen, by putting an emphasis on social mobility through intermarriage between the classes and by means of trade, manages to display different social types. However, Emma does not have a positive attitude towards social mobility through trade:

How much his business engrosses him already is very plain from the circumstance of his forgetting to inquire for the book you recommended. He was a great deal too full of the market to think of any thing else—which is just as it should be, for a thriving man. What has he to do with books? And I have no doubt that he *will* thrive, and be a very rich man in time - and his being illiterate and coarse need not disturb *us*. (*Emma*, p.22).

In the novel, the upward mobility of The Cole family through trade is described as a rise only in their life styles which has no affect on their gentility:

The Coles had been settled some years in Highbury, and were very good sort of people—friendly, liberal, and unpretending; but, on the other hand, they were of low origin, in trade, and only moderately genteel. On their first coming into the country, they had lived in proportion to their income, quietly, keeping little company, and that little unexpensively; but the last year or two had brought them a considerable increase of means—the house in town had yielded greater profits, and fortune in general had smiled on them. With their wealth, their views increased; their want of a larger house, their inclination for more company. They added to their house, to their number of servants, to their expenses of every sort; and by this time were, in fortune and style of living, second only to the family at Hartfield. Their love of society, and their new dining-room, prepared every body for their keeping dinner-company; and a few parties, chiefly among the single men, had already taken place. (*Emma*, p.147)

In the projection of the characters and the representation of female identity, Austen mainly uses “satire, irony and comedy” in her works. Referring to Jane Nardin, Tanrıvermiş asserts that the concept of satire is not used by Austen as a way of

correction, she uses “irony” exclusively which could be described as “the humorous awareness of incongruity” and “the yardstick by which she measures the adequacy of moral positions in the society” (2005:3). The comic misunderstandings on love between the three characters (Emma, Elton and Harriet) are “very much in the tradition of stage comedy”: “Harriet believes (or is made to believe) that she is worthy of Mr. Elton, whilst he, in turn, believes that he is worthy of Emma” (Byrne, 2009: 190). Emma’s excessive imagination, according to Wright, makes her think that she is always right in her observations of life: “Emma is always wrong but she always thinks that she is right. Therefore, *Emma* is considered as a comedy of self-deception.” (Tanrıvermiş, 2005:3).

The word games and social games, with their multilayered structure, have an important place in the texture of *Emma*. They are used as metaphors for “the misunderstandings and misreadings – Harriet’s picture; Frank’s word games; Jane’s mysterious pianoforte; Mr. Elton’s charade- give way to a final realization of truth that reverses an otherwise inevitable tragedy” (Tauchert, 2005: 116). Tauchert, referring to Miles, argues that Austen adapted the narrative structure of tragedy to her comic plots: “Emma learns that she does not write the romance at the centre of the narrative, but is written to it” (Ibid.).

Bryne analyses the distinctive perspective in Jane Austen’s writing in terms of carrying both the individualistic and the traditional values in bourgeois ideology:

Jane Austen’s irony enables her to reproduce some of the contradictions inherent in bourgeois ideology; for by simultaneously dramatizing and rewarding individual desire *and* establishing a critical distance from individualism, she endorses both the individualistic perspective inherent in the bourgeois value system *and* the authoritarian hierarchy retained from traditional, paternalistic society (2009:53).

He asserts, Austen replicates the marriage of romantic desire and realistic necessity that she believed was capable of containing individualism’s challenge to traditional authority.” (Bryne, 2009: 53). It could be argued that the discursive characteristic of *Emma*, through the usage of irony, includes the individualism’s challenge, which gives way to “conceptual and normative resources for individuals to draw upon in naming, understanding, criticizing, and ultimately overcoming assumptions, norms, practices, ideals, and exercises that reinforce oppression.” (Allen 2004:252). As Wetherell points out, although there are always attempts at unification and definition,

“real feelings” will be always contingent, always escaping, always changing, as the person comes to be positioned and repositioned within different narratives and versions (1995 :135). This contingent position of the subject within different discourses and narratives can give way to a personal transformation. Mc Nay stresses Foucault’s analysis of “how the individual comes to understand him/herself as a subject” argues that “he found that a predominant underlying theme was that of the “desiring subject”” (1992: 49). In *The History of Sexuality*, Foucault made a theoretical shift from his emphasis on the body to the self through displaying social agents not as passive receivers of power. Instead he asserted the dynamic character of power relations: “An element of freedom is inherent to all power relations in the sense that they can only operate between free individuals and are, therefore, unfixed, fluid and reversible” (Foucault in Mc Nay, 1992: 67). Foucault describes these operations on individuals through power relations as the “technologies of the self”:

I became more and more aware that in all societies there is another type of technique: techniques that permit individuals to effect, by their own means, a certain number of operations on their own bodies, their own souls, their own thoughts, their own conduct, and this in a manner so as to transform themselves, modify themselves, and to attain a certain state of perfection, happiness, purity, supernatural power. Let us call these techniques "technologies of the self." (1997: 177-78).

Despite the existing structures of domination in the constructions of gender and female identity through the subordination of women in society, according to Mc Nay, “in their daily lives many women do not experience themselves as oppressed and, indeed, they exercise an amount of power and influence over other individuals” (1992:67). Mc Nay, referring to Lauretis, mentions “a discrepancy and slippage between “Woman” as representation and women as historical beings and subjects of real relations of which gender is primary but not the only relation”. According to Mc Nay, “in order to understand this discrepancy, it is necessary to analyze power not just from the perspective of mechanisms of domination, but also from the level of a “microphysics” of power.” (Ibid).

In “*The Subject and Power*”, Foucault suggests another way to go further towards a new economy of power relations through taking the forms of resistance as a point of departure: “Rather than analyzing power from the point of view of its internal rationality, it consists of analyzing power relations through the antagonism of

strategies.”(1983:210-11). According to Thornham, Foucault’s conceptualization of power, is attractive to feminism because it serves to position female subjectivity within culture and history rather than as always the “Other” of male-centred culture. She takes the arguments of Foucault into account that the relationship between power and sexuality is not a negative one, in which power seeks to control an “unruly sexuality”. Rather, she argues, for Foucault: “sexuality” is far more a positive conduct of power than power was ever repression of sexuality” (Thornham, 2000: 92).

Çileli argues that in spite of the confirmation of the status quo through the character of Emma, Jane Austen has managed to explore the fundamental paradox between female subjectivity and power. Patriarchal power operates by attaching women to paradigms of feminine identity and it is through the institution of marriage that Emma is able to define her social role as a means of becoming a member of the dominant discourse. According to Çileli: “Jane Austen, by permitting a voice of resistance to patriarchal discourse in *Emma*, is able to encourage us into an emphatic response to Emma’s struggle for autonomy.” (2010: 250).

In *Emma*, Austen, by applying games, disguises and misunderstandings, creates a narrative structure in which the unconscious desires of Emma are hidden beneath the apparent social scene. According to Tauchert, Emma’s quest, and the quest of the feminine subject of history is “to find and secure her own desire”. She asserts that this desire, unconscious to the heroine for most of the narrative calls on recognition of a “truth” beneath appearances. For her, its absence in the earlier parts of the novel is reinforced by images of a distorted surface reflection: “Emma imagines herself “in love” with Frank Churchill; Mr.Elton imagines himself “in love” with Emma; and Harriet imagines herself “in love” with Mr. Elton and, later, Mr. Knightley, before remembering her experience of love with Martin Smith.” (2005: 113).

Emma misreads the affection of Elton for her and thinks he is interested in Harriet. Austen, in the novel, maintains this comic delusion for a while, giving a sense of play with her characters. Emma’s insistence on drawing a picture of Harriet, is also misread by Elton “who finds Harriet’s likeness “exquisite” and wishes to “possess” it, not because it refers to Harriet, but because it refers also to Emma’s desire to represent her friend in a “pretty picture”” (Tauchert, 2005: 125). Payne refers to

Althusser that, the focal point of the humanist ideology is the human face, which is distinguishing sign of the individual and the outward expression of subjectivity: “the human face is to be seat of the “soul”, of subjectivity, and therefore the visible proof of the existence of the human *subject* with all the ideological force of the concept of the *subject*” (Althusser in Payne, 1997: 91). In *Emma*, Austen also emphasizes the importance of physical appearance and “well-being” and she depicts Emma’s beauty as the proof of her “vitality of spirit and mind” (Hecimovich, 2008:54).

In her dialogue with Mr. Knightley, Mrs. Weston describes Emma as having “a perfect beauty altogether-face and figure”. And Mr. Knightley confesses: “I have seldom seen a face or figure more pleasing to me than hers.” (*Emma*, p. 26). Mrs. Weston depicts Emma:

Such an eye! - the true hazel eye- and so brilliant! regular features, open countenance, with a complexion! oh! what a bloom of full health, and such a pretty height and size; such a firm and upright figure! There is health, not merely in her bloom, but in her air, her head, her glance. One hears sometimes of a child being “the picture of health;” now, Emma always gives me the idea of being the complete picture of grown-up health. She is loveliness itself. Mr. Knightley, is not she? (*Emma*, p. 26).

Jane Fairfax- an orphan, the only child of Mrs. Bates’s youngest daughter- is a distinctive female character in the novel, depicted as having high qualities but not extroverted like Emma. Austen describes her as “very elegant, remarkably elegant who had herself the highest value for elegance” (*Emma*, p.117). Despite Emma is “no great favorite with her”, Mrs. John Knightley and Mr. Woodhouse declare their positive thoughts about Jane Fairfax: “but only Jane Fairfax one knows to be so very accomplished and superior!—and exactly Emma’s age.” (*Emma*, p.74)

Jane Fairfax, as being “apparently the perfect conduct-book young woman, well-informed, but discreet; a responder rather than an initiator, scintillatingly accomplished, but at the same time modest and quiet” (Waldron, 2004: 126), reveals the envy of Emma through displaying what she lacks herself: “she dislikes Jane because “she saw in her the really accomplished young woman, which she wanted to be thought herself.” (Waldron, 2004: 126). Mr. Knightley plays the role of a judge between Emma and Jane Fairfax in terms of their tempers and accomplishments. Despite his admiration towards Jane Fairfax, eventually he says:

Jane Fairfax is a very charming young woman, but not even Jane Fairfax is perfect. She has a fault. She has not the open temper which a man would wish for in a wife (*Emma*, p.201).

Jane Fairfax has feeling," said Mr. Knightley—"I do not accuse her of want of feeling. Her sensibilities, I suspect, are strong—and her temper excellent in its power of forbearance, patience, self-control; but it wants openness. She is reserved, more reserved, I think, than she used to be—And I love an open temper. No—till Cole alluded to my supposed attachment, it had never entered my head. I saw Jane Fairfax and conversed with her, with admiration and pleasure always—but with no thought beyond. (*Emma*, p.207).

Waldron, examines Knightley's choice, which could be seen as a choice of the quality of having "open temper", as preferring "a stormy relationship with someone he can trust" to "a calm one with someone whose thoughts may be hidden from him". (2004: 127). Waldron argues, by preferring Emma's open temper, Mr. Knightley hints that he will no longer invoke his own superiority to oppose her and it denotes a change in "the self-confident paternal/ fraternal guardian and pedagogue" character of Mr. Knightley during the course of the novel: "Gradually his position is undermined, for in the long run experience teaches him that his attitudes are too rigid, that Emma's intuitions are sometimes better than his 'reasonable' assumptions and that love has little to do with rules of conduct." (Waldron, 2004: 132).

In the novel, the most striking aspect is the reflection of social class through the "gentility" of people in Highbury. While talking to Harriet, Emma reveals her opinions on how a genteel man should be, it can be noticed that gentility is not always realized from appearance but also from deep manners:

Mr. Knightley's air is so remarkably good that it is not fair to compare Mr. Martin with *him*. You might not see one in a hundred with *gentleman* so plainly written as in Mr. Knightley. But he is not the only gentleman you have been lately used to. What say you to Mr. Weston and Mr. Elton? Compare Mr. Martin with either of *them*. Compare their manner of carrying themselves; of walking; of speaking; of being silent. You must see the difference. (p. 21)

Kirkham argues that Mr Knightley is a portrait of an English gentleman and a mock-heroic "parfit gentil knight" who shows a consideration for women that is realized in his tactful kindness to the Bateses and Harriet Smith: "In so far as he shows a preference for what accords with Reason and Nature, as he does in his own open nature and manners, and his valuing them in women as well as in men, he is the

Enlightenment feminist ideal of a man of sense.” (Kirkham,127-28). Emma, in the novel describes the “true gentility” when she looks from Donwell Abbey to the Highbury residence of Mr. Knightley: “It was just what it ought to be, and it looked what it was-and Emma felt an increasing respect for it, as the residence of a family of such true gentility, untainted in blood and understanding.” (*Emma* ,p.257).

According to Hecimovich, “the house itself displays moderation, taste, concern for others and a reluctance to deceive-the very personal qualities that make Mr. Knightley the novel”’s hero.” (2008:9).

Toward the end of the novel, the misreading of Knightley and Emma for each other”’s feelings is corrected in a conversation while they are walking outside. Finally, they could see how they were so unaware of the “complete truth”. The truth that, Emma is not in love with Frank Churchill neither is Knightley with Harriet. However the conversation in which Knightley announces his love to Emma which is supposed to be the climax of the text, does not seem to have a shocking and surprising effect for the readers. Their attitude is so realistic and simultaneous that it gives the understanding the readers have already accepted their mutual love. From the conversation:

My dearest Emma," said he, "for dearest you will always be, whatever the event of this hour”’s conversation, my dearest, most beloved Emma—tell me at once. Say “No,” if it is to be said."— She could really say nothing.— "You are silent," he cried, with great animation; "absolutely silent! at present I ask no more (p. 309)

I cannot make speeches, Emma:" he soon resumed; and in a tone of such sincere, decided, intelligible tenderness as was tolerably convincing.—"If I loved you less, I might be able to talk about it more. But you know what I am.—You hear nothing but truth from me.—I have blamed you, and lectured you, and you have borne it as no other woman in England would have borne it.— Bear with the truths I would tell you now, dearest Emma, as well as you have borne with them. The manner, perhaps, may have as little to recommend them. God knows, I have been a very indifferent lover.— But you understand me.—Yes, you see, you understand my feelings—and will return them if you can. At present, I ask only to hear, once to hear your voice (*Emma*, p.310).

Unlike Emma’s previous confident and strong voice as a woman, the dialogue with Knightley displays that the prior subject position of Emma is replaced by a submissive and passive voice. Çileli asserts that “she takes up a subject position”

appropriated by the dominant patriarchal discourse” (2010:250). According to Tauchert, Emma is shown to gain her “perfect happiness” and “the exact truth of the whole”, by first learning to subjugate her “vain” reason to Mr. Knightley’s judgement (2005: 130). Tauchert argues: “Emma only recognizes her true value once she accepts his authority to judge as well as hers. She has to learn that she has been in error, before she can learn to understand her own place in the narrative.” (Ibid.).

In the previous chapters, it could be seen Emma’s transformation is achieved through a curbing of her willful activity, her romancing, coupled with her acceptance of a narrative authority beyond her own free will (Tauchert, 2005: 112):

The first error and the worst lay at her door. It was foolish, it was wrong, to take so active part in bringing any two people together. It was adventuring too far, assuming too much, making light of what ought to be serious, a trick of what ought to be simple. She was quite concerned and ashamed, and resolved to do such things no more (*Emma*, p. 98)

According to Çileli (2010), the readers are able to see the difference in Emma’s discourse in the scene where Knightley proposes to her: “What did she say?—Just what she ought, of course. A lady always does.” (*Emma*, p.310) According to Waldron, “while Mr. Knightley tries to escape from the patriarchal/fraternal role, Emma shows every sign of submitting herself in conventional womanly manner to her husband’s dominion whether he likes it or not” (2004: 132).

Besides the change and regression of Emma’s subject position towards the end of the novel, it can be argued that Austen does not display her female hero merely as a passive character. She balances the dominance of Emma and Knightley, by not giving either of them complete freedom and hegemony. As Waldron notices, Austen’s endings are never conclusive. She asks: “Does she really mean us to accept the victory of the patriarchal stereotype? (2004: 133). She underlines the fact that the relationship of Emma and Mr. Knightley was born of conflict neither resolution because of their critical attitude toward each other. According to Waldron, “the marriage of Emma and Mr. Knightley holds the possibility of becoming a balance of opposing but equal forces, rather than the subjection of one personality to another”. (2004: 133). According to Byrne, “Austen’s happiest alliances are those between equals, not necessarily social equals, but those in whom there is compatibility of mind, and mutual respect and understanding.” (2009: 201). He argues that in the

union between Emma and Knightley there is the promise of an equal discourse” (Ibid.).

By referring to Foucault’s arguments which involves the assertion that “individuals are the vehicles of power, not only its point of application, but also in the possibilities of resistance and self representations that are neither fixed nor stable.”, Çileli claims:

Emma will be able to interrogate issues of gender, authority and propriety in her restrictive society. Emma’s self-assertion and self- esteem definitely challenges the subject position to which Emma is assigned by the dominant discourse. This is particularly evident since as readers, we are made to believe by the narrator every time Emma is corrected by the dominant discourse that Emma is capable of creating possibilities of space for new forms of subjectivity and empowering practices of self-creation (2010: 251).

Tauchert argues that Emma “ends where she began, at the feminine centre of her father’s house, but with the transformative supplement of a loving husband.” (Tauchert, 2005: 112). According to Kirkham, Austen criticizes the romanticisation of devoted daughters through underlying Emma’s similar role in the novel as “the sentimental stereotype of the devoted daughter whose love of her father is an obstacle to her marriage” (Kirkham, 1997:122) Emma enables to marry when “she falls in love with a relation (brother-in-law) peculiarly acceptable in the invalid father’s house.”(Ibid.). Kirkham(1997) argues that the rightness of Emma and Mr. Knightley as marriage partners is established both morally and psychologically. He is “not only a very old and intimate friend of the family but particularly connected with it as the older brother of Issabella’s husband” (*Emma* ,p .5)

The novel ends with the resolution of the several misunderstandings and the realization of a “truth”, as Tauchert points out her particular revelation is given as the sudden lifting of layers of prior blindness (2005:129):

He never wished to attach me. It was merely a blind to conceal his real situation with another.—It was his object to blind all about him; and no one, I am sure, could be more effectually blinded than myself—except that I was not blinded—that it was my good fortune—that, in short, I was somehow or other safe from him. (*Emma*, p.307).

Emma ends with the transformation of the heroine and with the discovery, or rediscovery, of desire; according to Tauchert, “Emma is freed from an excess of subjectivism.” (Tauchert, 2005: 112). Emma, in the first chapters, is introduced as a

“female subject” aware of her own powers and she enjoys her independence until she realizes her desire for Mr. Knightley by the threat of losing him. According to Tauchert, Emma’s quest, and the quest of the feminine subject is to find and secure her own desire (2005:113). Although, Emma experiences a transformation which is needed in terms of her social role as a middle class woman of her time within the dominant discourse, she also discovers and secures her own desire.

CHAPTER VII

CONCLUSION

In this study, I have aimed to analyse the constitution of the female subjectivity in romance discourse in *Emma* and *The Proud Woman*, in terms of their ideological and sociological contexts. As having roots in two different literary traditions, the discourse of romantic love in these two novels might be analysed by many textual and cultural sources. As Stacey and Pearce point out, throughout history and within different cultures, there have been multiple discourses of romantic love (1995:27). In the theoretical part of my study, I have mentioned different theories on romance based on two main approaches; structuralist approach and discourse analysis. While the structuralist approach on romance seeks common elements in the plots to construct a model for an ideal narrative structure, the discourse theorists examine how romantic love is organised through power relations of particular discourses.

If we read *The Proud Woman* through a structuralist approach, it can be said that the novel carries most of the common elements of a romance fiction. As Stacey and Pearce emphasize, the story in romance offers the potential of a heterosexual love union whose fulfilment is threatened by a series of barriers or problems: "Romance might be described as a quest for love. Like all quests its structure requires the overcoming of obstacles in the name of love, and perhaps, by extension, also in the name of truth, knowledge, justice and freedom." (1995:16). Radway, summarizes the narrative structure of the ideal romance in several steps (1984:134), and in *The Proud Woman*, there is a very similar narrative structure: The heroine's (Meral) social identity is destroyed in the beginning of the novel. She reacts antagonistically to an aristocratic male, Kenan, and he responds ambiguously to Meral. She responds to Kenan's behaviour with anger and coldness. Kenan retaliates by ignoring her. Kenan and Meral are emotionally separated. Then, Kenan understands his fault and treats Meral tenderly. She responds warmly to Kenan's act of tenderness. Meral reinterprets Kenan's ambiguous behaviour as the product of previous hurt. Finally, Kenan openly declares his love and his unwavering commitment to Meral with a supreme act of tenderness and proposes to her. Meral responds emotionally and

accepts his proposal. As a result, Meral's identity is restored. The female subjectivity is constituted first by being destroyed and then restored through the love of the hero.

In order to grasp how the female subjectivity is constituted through the romantic discourse of the novels, first of all it is necessary to reveal their social and political contexts. Even though, Berkand and Austen do not employ a realistic style of narration and they do not have a concern about reflecting social and political contexts of the time, both of the authors reflect the underlying mechanisms of the constitution of the female subject of their times by either representing or misrepresenting a "heroic identity" through the female and male characters. Despite the differences in narrative structure of the novels, the heroines carry some common elements as a reflection of how the female subject is constituted in their times. Both writers, Austen and Berkand were deeply affected by two prominent female figures of their countries, Mary Wollstonecraft and Halide Edip Adivar, who were concerned with the women's issue at their times. Durakbaşı points out that there is a parallelism between the arguments of Wollstonecraft in *A Vindication of Women Rights* which was published in 1792 and which has roots in the Enlightenment thought, and Turkish modernization project which can be called as the Turkish Enlightenment, in terms of introducing the paradigms of women emancipation and modern feminism (2000:54).

In the Early Republican Period of Turkey when Berkand wrote her novels, Turkish women were witnessing legal and social changes for their liberation and equality with men. By these egalitarian movements, Turkish women gained their civil rights and joined the public life. The political and ideological shift from an Islamic state towards a modern country affected by Western civilization had its reflections mostly in the constitution of female identity. As Göle (1998) points out, Halide Edip Adivar, both as a writer and a political woman figure of the early Republican Period, in her novel *Yeni Turan*, depicts the respectful ideal female character as someone who accompanies men as a virtuous, hardworking friend; a mother, governess of her children, and of her nation. According to Göle (1998) there was no reminder of sex, neither masculinity nor femininity in this look. Halide Edip defined womanhood with the use of qualities like "calmness" and "tenderness", which were associated with respect and motherhood as the depiction of a female that best symbolizes the image of Kemalist female identity.

In *The Proud Woman* as the name of the novel suggests, the central female character of the novel, Meral is a proud and calm young woman who has a high moral character that makes her perfect with the physical beauty she has. She goes to a high school for girls. Not only is she a hardworking student at school, but she also learns to play the piano at home, cares for her little brother like a mother and helps Münevver Hanım, the governess of the house, in housework. However, there is a difference between the female characters of Halide Edip and Berkand's novels; unlike Berkand's heroines with the feminine features of being more sensitive and emotional, for Kandiyoti (1997), Halide Edip created asexual heroines who struggle for their national mission. As Göle (1991) and Kandiyoti (1997) state, Adivar's female characters reflect the new female identity of the Kemalist discourse in terms of carrying both national and modern features through a synthesis of the East-West values by deemphasizing femininity and projecting a "neuter" identity. According to Kandiyoti, the management of femininity and sexual modesty became a part of the symbolic armor of the "modern" woman (1997:126).

In *The Proud Woman*, Meral also reflects the image of a modern woman through achieving the social and cultural engagements of a modern life style in the 1950s such as the balls, evening parties (suareler), plays, horse trips, piano concerts, tennis matches etc. On the other hand, Berkand does not have a negative approach in her novels to the modern and western values of Kemalist discourse unlike the critical perspectives of the canonical novels in the early Republic which consider the modern life style of the age as leading to degeneration in Turkish culture and in the relationships of men and women. In *The Proud Woman*, there isn't any trace of a nationalist and conservative perspective against western values and the story is isolated from its historical and sociological context of the 1950s. *The Proud Woman* was written in 1958 when the socio-economic and political structure of Turkey experienced a radical change after the elections in 1950. The single party system of the state, of which CHP (Republican People's Party) was the head of the government, was abolished by the second general elections in 1950. After the elections, CHP left its seats to DP (The Democratic Party) which was a central-right party interested in privatizing state industries and leading the construction of free market economy by the influence of American policies through the economic aids of America to Turkey. Not only economically did the political shift affect the country,

but it also had social and cultural impacts and introduced an American life style. The only reflection about the period of the novel is the hesitant approach to the American impact. In the novel, the hero goes to America to study in a college, and when he comes back to the ranch, the heroine, Meral worries about his new attitude toward the conventional life style in the ranch:

Let's see what changes the "young sir" is going to make in the ranch? What a pity if he wants to Americanize the ranch! But, according to aunt Münevver, he is not a kind of snob. He has taken only the positive aspects of America (p.27).

According to Ömer Türkeş, in the romance literature of the Early Republic, there are signs of the East-West antagonism which is also seen in Tanzimat and Meşrutiyet literature (2002:438). But Berkand's portrayal of modern men and women through their western lifestyles does not lead to an antagonism of the East-West, instead she depicts modernity as a means of reaching a new and enlightened way of life through education, arts, literature, entertainment and sports. Although the new life style which reflects "Americanization" is criticized, modernity including "the positive aspects of America" is the real and true model for the modern social and cultural life in the novel. The rules of good manners are much more important than being rich even a person who becomes poor, can preserve his/her nobility and good manners. Having only "money" without necessary good manners can be degenerating for modern people who carry the western values of modernity.

Both novels, *The Proud Woman* and *Emma*, carry negative approaches to nouveau riche who make money through trade. They are not approved as genteel and there is a pejorative perspective toward them in terms of being "low origin, in trade, and only moderately genteel" (*Emma*, p.147). Both novels emphasize family tradition as the source of values of gentility and good manners. The heroes and heroines come from this tradition and they marry men/women who also have similar family backgrounds. The compatibility of their marriage in terms of their class position and cultural level is the core issue of both novels. Love can only be attained if only the hero and heroine have the same cultural, economic and social backgrounds.

In *Emma*, Austen portrays the economic and social conditions of the lives of fourteen women mostly of the "middling ranks" of society through which she explores "the plight of impoverished gentlewomen not just their scrimping and saving and constant

worry about financial security, but also their depression over their loss of social status and shame and all the small indignities accompanying their social exclusion.” (Tobin, 2002:475). According to Tobin;

Austen was acutely aware of how economically vulnerable and socially powerless women were in this society. Miss Bates, Mrs. Bates, Jane Fairfax, Mrs. Goddard, Miss Nash, and Miss Taylor had real life counterparts, representing a large segment of nineteenth century British society- women of the middle and upper classes who either lived in genteel poverty or worked as governesses or teachers (Ibid).

Emma, on the other hand, had a privileged position among the impoverished gentlewomen of Highbury, because of her social and economic powers she assumes the role of matchmaker and the right “to tinker with the very delicate social and economic adjustments involved in arranging a marriage in her highly structured world.”(Tobin, 2002:480). Emma, while talking to Harriet about Miss Bates, reveals her class” elitist perspective:

I shall not be a poor old maid; and it is poverty only which makes celibacy contemptible to a generous public! A single woman with a very narrow income must be a ridiculous, disagreeable old maid! the proper sport of boys and girls; but a single woman of good fortune is always respectable, and may be as sensible and pleasant as anybody else! And the distinction is not quite so much against the candour and common sense of the world as appears at first; for a very narrow income has a tendency to contract the mind, and sour the temper. Those who can barely live, and who live perforce in a very small, and generally very inferior society, may well be illiberal and cross. (Emma, p.61).

Jane Austen was influenced by Mary Wollstonecraft who wrote *A Vindication of the Rights of Women* in 1792 however she did not declare it explicitly. Wollstonecraft argued that “more highly educated women will not only be more virtuous, but they will also be better mothers, more interesting wives and “companions,” and more responsible citizens.” (Mellor, 2009: 81). Wollstonecraft observed, as Mellor asserts:

Her society’s practice of teaching females only “accomplishments”—singing, dancing, needlework, a smattering of foreign languages—produced women who were obsessed with their personal appearance and fashion, who devoted all their energies to arousing a man’s sexual appetites while duplicitously appearing “modest” and chaste in order to capture the husband upon whom their financial welfare depended, and who became “slaves” to their masters but were petty tyrants to their children and servants. (Ibid.).

Kirkham emphasizes that there is striking similarity between the viewpoints of Jane Austen and Mary Wollstonecraft in terms of “the moral nature and status of women, female education, marriage, authority and the family, and the representation of women in literature” (1997: xxi). According to Mellor, Austen portrayed the heroines of her novels, not as the women of sensibility celebrated by the prevailing ideological doctrine of the separate spheres which consigned women to domestic affections; instead her heroines are women of sense in which an intelligent but ignorant girl learns to perceive the world more correctly and to understand more fully the workings of human nature and society: “Emma Woodhouse must recognize her own cruelty to Miss Bates, must understand how wrongly she has perceived both Jane Fairfax and Harriet Smith, before she can equal the intelligence and benevolence of a Mr. Knightley.” (2009:81).

When we look at Austen’s heroine Emma, neither is she a representation of “a more highly educated woman and a more responsible citizen”, nor is she fully “obsessed with her personal appearance and fashion nor is she someone who devotes all her energy to arouse a man’s sexual appetites”. Similar to Mary Wollstonecraft’s ideal marriage description; “a marriage should be based on rational love, mutual understanding, and respect”, in the end of the novel Emma’s marriage to Mr. Knightley is also not a passionate and irrational choice, instead he is the perfect match who also suits her middle class values. However, before Mr. Knightley’s proposal, Austen introduces Emma’s negative opinions about marriage:

Marriage, in fact, would not do for her. It would be incompatible with what she owed to her father, and with what she felt for him. Nothing should separate her from her father. She would not marry, even if she were asked by Mr. Knightley. (*Emma*, p. 299).

The reason for the change in Emma’s attitude toward marriage and the contradiction it creates in terms of the dominant and independent female subject is evaluated by Johnson. According to Johnson, Emma’s devolution to marriage puts an end to her “reign alone”, and brings her back within the confines of that relationship which she had offended so many readers by slighting (1988:142). She asserts that the main reason is that Emma and Knightley are social equals and the conclusion which seemed conservative takes an unexpected turn. Emma’s prestige and prerogative is secured by Knightley’s move to Hartfield: “In moving to Hartfield, Knightley is

sharing her home, and in placing himself within her domain, Knightley gives his blessings to her rule.”(Ibid: 143).

Stacey and Pearce analyse that the attainment of “heroic status” on the part of the male characters which relates to their power of transformation vis-à-vis both male and female characters which is common as a key ingredient in romantic trajectories:

The possibility of becoming “someone else” through a romantic relationship is most certainly one of the most interesting and positive aspects of the process. In this way, romance offers its subjects the possibility of a new “becoming”: through the encounter/fusion of the self and the other, a new self might be imagined.” (1995: 19).

According to Johnson, female authority itself is the subject of Emma and what makes her unusual is not her self-love, but rather that “she is a woman who possesses and enjoys power, without bothering to demur about it.”(1988: 125). Austen’s achievement in the development of the “indirect free style” through which she was increasingly able to show the rational mental powers of her individual heroines, may seem disconnected from her central moral purpose (Kirkham, 1988: xxvii).

Radway (1984), draws on Nancy Chodorow’s object relations theory that the female self as constructed under patriarchy is a ‘self-in-relation’ (unlike the ‘autonomous’ male self); hence the desire around which the romance narrative is structured is, for Radway, the desire of the heroine (and reader) for an emotionally fulfilling heterosexual relationship which will satisfy this mature female self. This desire, for Radway, can be fulfilled within a patriarchal culture which constructs masculinity in terms of distance, separation and control. On the other hand, Thornham argues by referring to Hilary Radner that Radway misreads the true functioning of the romance narrative, which is not to fulfil a female fantasy of ‘the nurturing feminine man’ (2007:58). Rather, according to Thornham, “the romance as a genre is built upon a silencing of the feminine voice -a transformation of the feminine into a voice that speaks not for itself but for its ‘‘master as a subjected voice’’. She asserts that the principal object of the romance, “might be best summarized as the transformation of this loss of voice into a dream of love and happiness” (Thornham, 2007:58). However, in both novels, for the heroines, “love” is more a matter of determination than tender emotion.

Bryne asserts whether or not Emma finally does reveal the whole truth to Knightley is left open. But this ambiguity should come as no surprise, for the authorial voice has already warned the reader: “Seldom, very seldom, does complete truth belong to any human disclosure; seldom can it happen that something is not a little disguised, or a little mistaken” (p.311). Bryne emphasizes the theatrical side of this disclosure that at last there is no escape from a little disguise, a little mistakenness.” (2009: 202).

Yakın (2001) argues that the popular romances of Turkey can be seen as a moment of a society living on the borders. Similar to the appreciation of the novel as a genre which is “a sign of anxiety”, popular literature is “the hesitation”. Even though it creates “a mass”, popular culture is still “the border” itself or “the hesitation” of the borderline. The woman’s perception of her body and its borders represent the society she lives in. For Yakın, the woman who gets involved in the public sphere through westernization is in fact living on the borders (2001:103). In *The Proud Woman*, the female subjectivity is constituted through the hesitation of the woman about modernity and her concept of self is highly influenced by this hesitation and is highly dependent on the feedback she receives from the dominant ideology represented by the male protagonist through love in the narrative structure of Berkand’s novels. In Jane Austen’s work on the other hand the reader is presented by multiple voices and multiple truths and alternatives although the female character is finally corrected and embodied by the patriarchal ideology

Even though modernity in popular literature of the early Republican period of Turkey does not have an emancipatory reflection on the female identity in its full sense, it carries opportunities for women to have education or work with men side by side. However there is an anxiety against the negative attributes of modernity in the canonical novels of the time, Berkand, by giving voice to her female characters and making them appear in the public sphere, displayed an effort to offer solutions and answers to the anxiety and hesitation in the society against modernity in terms of women’s place in the social realm. The character of the heroine in *The Proud Woman*, does not live a moral degeneration, instead as an honest, dignified and educated woman, she is the “true” representation of the modern woman of her time. Similar to the union between Emma and Knightley, embracing the promise of an

equal discourse, there is compatibility of mind, and mutual respect and understanding between Meral and Kenan along with the equality in their social and economic positions.

REFERENCES

- Allen, Amy. (2004) "Foucault, Feminism, and The Self: The Politics of Personal Transformation", in Dianna Taylor and Karen Vintges (eds.), *Feminism and The Final Foucault*, University of Illinois Pres.
- Althusser, Louis. (1994) "Ideology and Ideological State Apparatuses" in Zizek, S. (ed.) *Mapping Ideology*. Verso.
- ARAT, Zehra. (1998) "Kemalizm ve Türk Kadını", Ayşe Berktaş Hacımirađlu (der.) içinde," *75 Yılda Kadınlar ve Erkekler*", İstanbul: Tarih Vakfı Yayınları.
- Austen, Jane. (2000) *Emma*. London : Wordsworth Classics.
- Baker, Ulus. (1999) *Ulusal Edebiyat Nedir?* In "Toplum ve Bilim", 81 Yaz. İstanbul: Birikim Yayınları, (p.7-26).
- Ballaster R., Beetham M., Frazer E. and Hebron S. (1991) "Contemporary Magazines, Contemporary readers", in *Women's World: Ideology, Femininity and Women's Magazines*. Hong Kong: Macmillan.
- Beer, Gillian. (1986) *The Romance*. London & New York: Methuen.
- Belge, Murat. (2009) *Sanat ve Edebiyat Yazıları*. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.
- Berkand, Muazzez Tahsin. (1962) *Mağrur Kadın* (nakleden). İkinci Basılış. İstanbul: İnkılap ve Ata Kitapevleri.
- Berktaş, Fatmagül. (1998) "Cumhuriyet'in 75 Yıllık Serüvenine Kadınlar Açısından Bakmak" Ayşe Berktaş Hacımirađlu (der.) in *75 Yılda Kadınlar ve Erkekler*. İstanbul: Tarih Vakfı Yayınları.
- Berktaş, Fatmagül. (2001) "Osmanlı'dan Cumhuriyet'e Feminizm" in Tanıl Bora (ed.) *Modern Türkiye'de Siyasi Düşünce: Cilt1, Cumhuriyet'e Devreden Düşünce Mirası, Tanzimat ve Meşrutiyet'in Birikimi*. İletişim Yayınları,.
- Bloom, Harold. (2008) *Bloom's Classic Critical Views: Jane Austen*. New York: Infobase Publishing.
- Burrill, Kathleen. (1973) "Modern Turkish Literature" in Talat Sait Halman (special ed.) *Turkey: From Empire to Nation*. New York: St. John University.

- Byrne, Paula. (2009) "Emma" in Harold Bloom (ed.) *Bloom's Critical Views, Jane Austen*. New Edition. New York : Infobase Publishing.
- Cawelti, John G. (1976) *Adventure, Mystery and Romance: Formula Stories as Art and Popular Culture*. Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press.
- Ceylan, Deniz Tarba (2004). "Sıradan Kadınların Yazarı Jane Austen" in Sibel İrzık, Jale Parla (eds.) *Kadınlar Dile Düşünce: Edebiyat ve Toplumsal Cinsiyet*. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.
- Çileli, Meral. (2010) "Discourse, Power and Identity" in John L. Watzke, Paul Chamnes Miller and Miguel Mantero (eds.), *Readings in Language Studies. Volume 2, Language and Power*. International Society for Language Studies Publication, 241-51.
- De Beauvoir, S. (1971) *The Second Sex* (ed. Parshley), Alfred A. Knopf: New York.
- Duckworth, Alistair M. (2002) *Case Studies in Contemporary Criticism, Jane Austen: Emma*. London: Bedford/St. Martin's.
- Durakbaşı, Ayşe. (1998) "Cumhuriyet Döneminde Modern Kadın ve Erkek Kimliklerinin Oluşumu: Kemalist Kadın Kimliği ve Münevver Erkekler" in Ayşe Berktaş Hacımiraçlı (eds.), *75 Yılda Kadınlar ve Erkekler*. İstanbul: Tarih Vakfı Yayınları.
- Durakbaşı, Ayşe. (2000) *Halide Edip: Türk Modernleşmesi ve Feminizm*. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.
- Eagleton, T. (1991) *Ideology: An Introduction*. London: Verso.
- Evin, Ahmet Ö. (1983) *Origins and Development of the Turkish Novel*. Minneapolis: Bibliotheca Islamica.
- Firestone, Shulamith. (1993) *Cinselliğin Diyalektiği*. Payel Yayınevi: İstanbul.
- Foucault, Michel. (1983) "Afterword: The Subject and Power" in Dreyfus, Hubert L. and Rabinow, Paul (eds.), *Michel Foucault, Beyond Structuralism and Hermeneutics*. Chicago: Chicago University Press, 208-226.
- Foucault, Michel. (1984). "What is an Author?" in Paul Rabinow (ed.), *The Foucault Reader*. New York: Pantheon Books.
- Foucault, Michel. (1997) "Sexuality and Solitude" in Paul Rabinow (ed.), *Ethics: Subjectivity and Truth*. New York: New Press.
- Göle, Nilüfer. (1998) *The Forbidden Modern: Civilization and Veiling*. Michigan: The University of Michigan Press.
- Greer, Germaine. (1970) *The Female Eunuch*. London: Mac Niggon & Kee.

Gürbilek, Nurdan. (2004) “Erkek Yazar, Kadın Okur: Etkilenen Okur, Etkilenmeyen Yazar” in *Kör Ayna, Kayıp Şark: Edebiyat ve Endişe*. İstanbul: Metis Yayınları.

Hecimovich, Gregg A. (2008) “Reading Emma” in *Austen’s Emma*. New York & London: Continuum International Publishing Group.

Hollows, Joanne. (2000) “Second-wave feminism and femininity and Feminism, Cultural Studies and Popular Culture” in *Feminism, Femininity and Popular Culture*. Manchester and New York: Manchester University Press.

Hollway, Wendy. (1995) “Feminist Discourses and Women’s Heterosexual Desires” in Wilkinson, S.& Kitzinger, C. (eds.), *Feminism and Discourse, Psychological Perspectives*. London: Sage.

Huysen, Andreas. (1986) “Mass Culture as Woman: Modernism’s Other”, in Tania Modleski (ed.), *Studies in Entertainment: Critical Approaches to Mass Culture*. Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press.

Inness S. A. (2004). “Pretty Though: The Cult of Femininity in Women’s Magazines” in Carter and Steiner (eds.), *Media and Gender*. Mainhead: Open University Press.

İleri, Selim. (2001) *Türk Romanından Altın Sayfalar*. İstanbul: Doğan Kitapçılık.

Jackson, Stevi. (1995) “Women and Heterosexual Love: Complicity, Resistance and Change” in Lynne Pearce and Jackie Stacey (eds.), *Romance Revisited*. New York & London: New York University Press.

Johnson, Claudia L. (1990) *Jane Austen: Women, Politics and the Novel*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Jusdanis, Gregory. (1991) “Belated Modernity and Aesthetic Culture: Inventing National Literature” in *Theory and History of Literature*, Volume 81. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Kandiyoti, Deniz. (1997) *Cariyeler, Bacılar ve Yurттаşlar: Kimlikler ve Toplumsal Dönüşümler*. Metis Kadın Araştırmaları.

Kandiyoti, Deniz. (1998) “Some Awkward Questions on Women and Modernity in Turkey” in Lila Abu-Lughod (ed.), *Remaking Women: Feminism and Modernity in the Middle East*. Princeton University Press.

Kirkham, Margaret. (1997) *Jane Austen, Feminism and Fiction*. London: The Athlone Press.

Light, Alison. (1999) “Returning to Manderley: Romance Fiction, Female Sexuality and Class” in Morag Shich (ed.), *Feminism and Cultural Studies*. Oxford University Press.

- Mardin, Şerif. (1991) *Türk Modernleşmesi*. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.
- Mc Nay, Louis. (1992) *Foucault and Feminism: Power, Gender and the Self*. Boston: Northeastern University Press.
- Mellor, Anne K. (2009) “Why Women Didn’t Like Romanticism: The Views of Jane Austen and Mary Shelley” in Harold Bloom (ed.), *Bloom’s Critical Views, Jane Austen New Edition*, , New York : Infobase Publishing.
- Millett, Kate. (1970) *Sexual Politics*. New York: Doubleday & Company.
- Modleski, Tania. (1986) *Studies in Entertainment: Critical Approaches to Mass Culture*. Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press.
- Modleski, Tania. (1988) *Loving with a Vengeance: Mass Produced Fantasies for Women*. New York, London: Routledge.
- Moran, Berna. (2005) “Türk Romanı ve Batılılaşma Sorunsalı” in *Türk Romanına Eleştirel Bir Bakış 1: Ahmet Mithat’tan Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar’a*. İstanbul: İletişim.
- Murfin, Ross C. (2002). “Gender Criticism and Emma” in Alistair M. Duckworth (ed.), *Case Studies in Contemporary Criticism, Jane Austen: Emma*. London: Bedford/St. Martin’s.
- Mutluay, Rauf. (1973) *100 Soruda Çağdaş Türk Edebiyatı*. İstanbul: Gerçek Yayınevi.
- Nadir, Kerime. (1981) *Romancının Dünyası (Yazarlık Anıları)*. İstanbul: İnkılap ve Ata Kitabevleri.
- Oksala, Johanna. (2005) *Foucault on Freedom*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Oktay, Ahmet. (1993) *Cumhuriyet Dönemi Türk Edebiyatı, 1923-1950*. Ankara: Kültür Bakanlığı Yayınları.
- Oktay, Ahmet. (2002) *Türkiye’de Popüler Kültür*. İstanbul: EverestYayınları.
- Olkowski, Dorothy. (1998) “The Logic of Difference” in *Gilles Deleuze and the Ruin of Representation*. Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- Özçelik, Ümran. (2007) *Muazzez Tahsin Berkand’ın Hayatı, Edebi Kişiliği ve Eserleri*. Hacettepe Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Türk Dili ve Edebiyatı Anabilim Dalı, Yeni Türk Edebiyatı Bilim Dalı Yüksek Lisans Tezi.
- Payne, Michael. (1997) *Reading Knowledge : An Introduction to Barthes, Foucault and Althusser*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.

Poovey, Mary. (2009) "Ideological Contradictions and the Consolations of Form: The Case of Jane Austen" in Harold Bloom (ed.), *Bloom's Critical Views, Jane Austen New Edition*. New York : Infobase Publishing.

Radway, Janice. (1984) *Reading the Romance: Women, Patriarchy, and Popular Literature*. Chapel Hill and London: The University of North Carolina Press.

Saktanber, Ayşe. (2001) "Kemalist Kadın Hakları Söylemi" in *Modern Türkiye'de Siyasi Düşünce; Cilt 2, Kemalizm*. İletişim Yayınları.

Stacey, J. & Pearce, L. (1995) "The Heart of the matter: Feminists Revisit Romance" in *Romance Revisited* (eds. Stacey, J. & Pearce, L), New York & London: New York Press.

Tanrıvermiş, Mihriban. (2005) *Female Voice in Jane Austen: Pride and Prejudice and Emma*, M.A. dissertation, METU: Ankara.

Tauchert, Ashley. (2005) *Romancing Jane Austen: Narrative, Realism, and the Possibility of a Happy Ending*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Tekeli, Şirin. (1998) "Birinci ve İkinci Dalga Feminist Harekatlerin Karşılaştırmalı İncelemesi Üzerine Bir Deneme" in Ayşe Berktaş Hacımırzağlı (ed.) *75 Yılda Kadınlar ve Erkekler*. İstanbul: Tarih Vakfı Yayınları.

Thornham, Sue. (2000) *Feminist Theory and Cultural Studies: Stories of Unsettled Relations*. London: Oxford University Press.

Thornham, Sue. (2007) *Women, Feminism and Media*. Edinburg: Edinburg University Press.

Tobin, Beth Fowkes. (2002). "Aiding Impoverished Gentlewomen: Power and Class in Emma" in Alistair M. Duckworth (ed.), *Jane Austen: Emma*. Boston: University of Florida.

Türkeş, Ömer. (2002) "Güdükl Bir Edebiyat Kanonu" in Tanıl Bora and Murat Gültekinçil (eds.), *Modern Türkiye'de Siyasi Düşünce: Kemalizm, cilt 2*, İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.

Unat-Abadan, Nermin. (1998) "Söylemden Protestoya: Türkiye'de Kadın Hareketinin Dönüşümü" Ayşe Berktaş Hacımırzağlı (ed.), in *75 Yılda Kadınlar ve Erkekler*. İstanbul: Tarih Vakfı Yayınları.

Van Zoonen, Liesbet. (1994) *Feminist Media Studies*. London: Sage.

Walby, Sylvia. (1990) *Theorizing Patriarchy*. Cambridge: Basil Blackwell.

Walby, S. (1992) "Post-post Modernism: Theorizing Social Complexity" in Barrett, M. and Philips, A. (eds.), *Destabilizing Theory: Contemporary Feminist Debates*. California: Stanford University Press.

Waldron, Mary. (2004) *Jane Austen and the Fiction of Her Time*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Wetherell, Margaret. (1995) “Romantic Discourse and Feminist Analysis: Interrogating Investment, Power and Desire” in Wilkinson, S.& Kitzinger, C. (eds.), *Feminism and Discourse, Psychological Perspectives*. London: Sage.

Williams, Raymond. (1977) *Marxism and Literature*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Wiltshire, John. (2004) *Recreating Jane Austen*. UK: Cambridge University Press.

Wollstonecraft, Mary. (1796) *A Vindication of the Rights of Woman: With Strictures on Political and Moral Subjects*. The third edition. London: J. Johnson.

Yakın, Aslı Yazıcı .(2001) “Sınırdaki Yapılan Bir Çeviri Girişimi: Popüler Kültür” in *Doğu Batı: Popüler Kültür* , sayı 15. Ankara: Doğu Batı Yayınları.

Yalçın, Alemdar. (1998) *Siyasal ve Sosyal Değişmeler Açısından Cumhuriyet Dönemi Türk Romanı*. Ankara: Günce Yayıncılık

APPENDIX



TEZ FOTOKOPI İZİN FORMU

ENSTİTÜ

- Fen Bilimleri Enstitüsü
- Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü
- Uygulamalı Matematik Enstitüsü
- Enformatik Enstitüsü
- Deniz Bilimleri Enstitüsü

YAZARIN

Soyadı : Alparslan
Adı : Ebru Didem
Bölümü : Medya ve Kültürel Çalışmalar

TEZİN ADI (İngilizce) : THE CONSTITUTION OF THE FEMALE SUBJECT IN
EMMA AND THE PROUD WOMAN (MAĞRUR KADIN)

TEZİN TÜRÜ : Yüksek Lisans Doktora

1. Tezimin tamamı dünya çapında erişime açılsın ve kaynak gösterilmek şartıyla tezimin bir kısmı veya tamamının fotokopisi alınsın.
2. Tezimin tamamı yalnızca Orta Doğu Teknik Üniversitesi kullanıcılarının erişimine açılsın. (Bu seçenekle tezinizin fotokopisi ya da elektronik kopyası Kütüphane aracılığı ile ODTÜ dışına dağıtılmayacaktır.)
3. Tezim bir (1) yıl süreyle erişime kapalı olsun. (Bu seçenekle tezinizin fotokopisi ya da elektronik kopyası Kütüphane aracılığı ile ODTÜ dışına dağıtılmayacaktır.)

Yazarın imzası

Tarih