CARNIVALIZATION OF GENDER HIERARCHIES AND THE BODY IN VIRGINIA WOOLF'S FICTION

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

BY

VICTORIA BİLGE YILMAZ

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR
THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY
IN
THE DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH LITERATURE

MARCH 2016

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 Doctor of Philosophy.

_____

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Nurten Birlik
Head of Department

This is to certify that I have read this thesis and that in my opinion it is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a thesis for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

_____

Assist. Prof. Dr. Elif Öztabak Avcı
Supervisor

Examining Committee Members

Prof. Dr. Ayten Coşkunoğlu Bear	(METU, FLE)	_____
Assist. Prof. Dr. Elif Öztabak Avcı	(METU, FLE)	_____
Assist. Prof. Dr. Mustafa Kırca	(Çankaya Uni., TIS)	_____
Assist. Prof. Dr. Nil Korkut Naykı	(METU, FLE)	_____
Assist. Prof. Dr. Selen Aktari Sevgi	(Başkent Uni., ACL)	_____

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:

Signature :

ABSTRACT

CARNIVALIZATION OF GENDER HIERARCHIES AND THE BODY IN VIRGINIA WOOLF'S FICTION

Yılmaz, Victoria Bilge

Ph.D., Department of English Literature

Supervisor: Assist. Prof. Dr. Elif Öztabak Avcı

March 2016, 221 pages

Virginia Woolf is a leading figure in feminist literature and criticism. Woolf's novels constitute the main channel through which her feminist ideas are expressed. *The Voyage Out* (1915), *To the Lighthouse* (1927), *Orlando* (1928) and *Flush* (1933) are the novels through which it is possible to see how Woolf sabotages the notions of stability and certainty, on which patriarchal ideology rests. Woolf's characters wrestle with the so-called domestic sphere in which women are entrapped to serve men, reveal the weaknesses of the patriarchal figures and manifest their flexible subjectivities and gender identities. In this regard, this study contends that these novels lend themselves to a Bakhtinian analysis. The thesis argues that Woolf's *The Voyage Out*, *To the Lighthouse*, *Orlando* and *Flush* carnivalize gender hierarchies and the notion of the stable body. The female characters in these novels tend to occupy a space where patriarchal norms are suspended; they obtain power to decrown the authoritarian father figures, and act in ways that transgress gender and sexual boundaries. However, the study also acknowledges that a total carnival sense of the world as conceptualized by Bakhtin is not yet possible in the period of time the novels are located.

Keywords: carnival, the carnivalesque, grotesque, Mikhail Bakhtin, Virginia Woolf

ÖZ

VIRGINIA WOOLF ROMANLARINDA
CİNSİYET HİYERARŞİSİ VE BEDENİN KARNAVALİZE EDİLMESİ

Yılmaz, Victoria Bilge
Doktora, İngiliz Edebiyatı Bölümü
Tez Yöneticisi: Yard. Doç. Dr. Elif Öztabak Avcı
Mart 2016, 221 sayfa

Virginia Woolf feminist edebiyat ve kuramın önde gelen temsilcilerindendir. Woolf'un romanları feminist bakış açısını yansıtmaktadır. Bu romanlardan özellikle *Dışa Yolculuk* (1915), *Deniz Feneri* (1927), *Orlando* (1928) ve *Flush* (1933), Woolf'un ataerkil ideolojiye karşı savaş açtığı metinlerdir. Bu metinlerde Woolf, hayatın daima değişebilir olduğuna ve hiç birşeyin sabit kalmadığına dair yeni fikirler ortaya koyarak feminist bir karşı duruş sergilemektedir. Woolf'un romanlarındaki kadın kahramanlar, romanların yazıldığı dönemde kadınların erkeğe hizmet etmeleri için var olduğuna dair olan genel kabulü bozarak ataerkil şahsiyetlerin zayıflıklarını vurgulayıp, kişiliklerin ve cinsiyetin değişebilirliğine dair fikirler ortaya koymaktadır. Bu açıdan yaklaşıldığında, söz konusu romanların Bakhtinian bir çerçeveden incelenmesinin mümkün olduğu görülmektedir. Bu çalışma Woolf'un *Dışa Yolculuk*, *Deniz Feneri*, *Orlando* ve *Flush* adlı romanlarında cinsiyet hiyerarşisi ve bedenin değişmezliği düşüncesinin karnavalize edildiğini savunmaktadır. Woolf'un eserlerindeki kadın kahramanlar, bir süreliğine ataerkil kuralları baş aşağı edebilecek kadar özgür, ataerkil figürleri tahtlarından indirebilecek kadar güçlü, cinsiyetin ve bedenin değişkenliğini, sınırların geçirgenliğini gösterebilecek ölçüde imkâna sahip karnavalesk uzamda konumlandırılıyorlar. Ancak, tüm bu karnavalesk özelliklerin yanı sıra, romanların yazıldığı dönemde karnaval duygusunu içeren bir hayatı tam anlamıyla yaşamanın mümkün olmadığı da bu tezde ortaya konulmaktadır.

Anahtar kelimeler: Mikhail Bakhtin, karnaval, karnavalize etmek, karnavalesk, Virginia Woolf

To Elay and Efe

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to express my gratitude to my advisor Elif Öztabak Avcı for her precious help and guidance in the long process of thesis writing. She is a valuable source of knowledge, inspiration and imagination. Her positive and respectful attitude and smile on her face made me believe that thesis writing is not a tiresome activity.

I would also like to thank Ayten Coşkunoğlu Bear for her belief in my ability to write this thesis. Her support throughout the writing process was a very significant impetus to continue. I would like to thank the jury members – Nil Korkut Naykı, Mustafa Kırca and Selen Aktari Sevgi for their constructive feedback and invaluable ideas.

I also want to thank my family and my husband who have always believed that one day I will definitely finish my thesis. The most important people who deserve my gratitude are my sweet children, Elay and Efe, without whom this thesis would have been finished long ago.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Born as Adeline Virginia Stephen in 1882 and raised in a Victorian environment, Virginia Woolf is one of the most prominent authors of English literature. Her fiction and non-fiction are widely discussed and analysed, especially in terms of feminism and modernism. Indeed, as Jane Goldman states, these two fields "are two broad axes on which Woolf criticism turns" (124). This dissertation will explore Woolf's feminist aesthetics from a Bakhtinian perspective. Its aim is to analyse Virginia Woolf's four novels – *The Voyage Out* (1915), *To the Lighthouse* (1927), *Orlando* (1928), and *Flush* (1933) – in terms of the novels' problematization of gender hierarchies and the body as a stable entity. This study will seek to locate the novels' subversion of the notions of stability and certainty with regard to gender and body within the framework of Mikhail Bakhtin's notion of the carnival.

Woolf's other novels, *Night and Day*, *Jacob's Room*, *Mrs Dalloway*, *The Waves*, *The Years* and *Between the Acts*, do not lend themselves to an analysis in terms of the carnivalesque problematization of gender hierarchies as much as the four novels identified above. Woolf's second novel *Night and Day* (1919), although it implies ambivalence in the title, is more mindful of the characters' inability to express their desires. Contrary to *The Voyage Out*, the female characters cannot decide whether or not they want to have an independent life from the norms and conventions. *Jacob's Room* (1922) and *Mrs Dalloway* (1925) focus on the characters who fail to integrate into the society around them; their isolation makes it impossible for them to hope for a better life. One of the most lyrical novels by Woolf, *The Waves* (1931) moves from naïve childhood sensations to the gloomy adulthood and old age. Woolf's last two novels, *The Years* (1937) and *Between the Acts* (1941) are permeated with the sense of depression, repression, approaching war, and

hopelessness; and the novels do not show any hope for overcoming these emotions. As a result, clinging to the past and conventions, the characters' failure to accommodate themselves among the others, the novels' closeness to lyrical features, the expression of the characters' inability to overcome the feelings of depression and their lack of hope for the future distance these novels from the idea of the carnival sense of the world.

However, *The Voyage Out, To the Lighthouse, Orlando* and *Flush*, much more than Woolf's other novels, allow observing Woolf's concern with subverting patriarchal ideology, especially gender hierarchies and the notion of the body as a stable unity, through the allocation of a special space for the female characters. This space where the characters of these novels are located contains characteristics of Bakhtin's carnival atmosphere. The female characters of Woolf's first novel, *The Voyage Out*, are located precisely in such a space where gender hierarchies are suspended and women's values and desires are not ignored. The atmosphere of this space is characterized by the female characters' challenging of the absolute patriarchal dominance by promoting disregard for static existence and social norms, and by fostering the entrance of the outside into the inside of the houses. All of these are accompanied by free contact between people, especially between men and women. In this way, *The Voyage Out*, more than any other novels by Woolf, allows an analysis in terms of its characters' entrance into a carnival atmosphere, which, according to Bakhtin, suspends everyday norms and enables the participants to contact freely. In *To the Lighthouse* and *Flush*, the female characters undermine patriarchal figures that want to subdue them. In this respect, these two novels lend themselves to an analysis in terms of Bakhtin's notions of the crowning and decrowning. The notion of the body as a static entity is subverted most explicitly in *Orlando*, in which the characters disrupt the body's stability and fixed frame by changing sexes, sabotaging the notion of gender, and their associations with non-human bodies. Such a perception of the body by Woolf makes it possible to analyse *Orlando* in terms of Bakhtin's grotesque imagery, which is characterized by the sense of perpetual transformation and ambivalence. Thus, these four novels can be

analysed against the background of Bakhtin's carnival marked by its carnivalistic reversed life with the profanation of higher orders, lack of privacy, free contact and ambivalence. Yet, the aim of this dissertation is not to claim that Woolf's novels are perfect examples of carnivalized fiction. Mindful of the aspects of Woolf's work that do not work well within a Bakhtinian framework, this study aims to bring to the fore the elements in Woolf's novels which lend themselves to a reading in the light of the Bakhtinian notion of the carnivalesque sense of the world.

Woolf's feminist aesthetics is founded on her challenge of the essential elements of patriarchal ideology: stability and certainty. Judy Little claims that "[w]hen Virginia Woolf, . . . , moves subtly against 'established values,' she moves against some of the most deeply established ones" (7). Woolf challenges certainty and stability by dwelling upon the ways of reconfiguring the notion of gender and by the manifestation of the body as a flexible unity. Woolf attempts to shatter the heteronormative perceptions of gender and the body by locating her characters into a specific space. To put it in Little's words, this dissertation will claim that Woolf creates a "liminal" space for her characters, especially for her female characters, where they can escape the rigid norms of patriarchal society. Little claims that "[s]ince persons in the liminal stage are 'betwixt and between,' socially and psychologically, they are temporarily stripped of identity, role, even sexual identity" (4). Hence, it will be argued that in Woolf's fiction the characters in this space are not divided into separate groups marked by sexual differences, gender and social roles. According to Little, "[s]uch manifestations of liminality are a potential threat to the established social structures" (5). Woolf's characters transgress sex and gender categories, merge the human and the non-human worlds and lose the notion of chronological time when they occupy this space. Hence, this liminal space or the carnival sense of the world allows Woolfian characters to unsettle the sense of stability and certainty on which the patriarchal ideology rests. Indeed, Little states that the writers who tend to express the experience of the liminal space are "outsiders" and thinks that Woolf is one of these writers. Little argues that the works

of these authors "manifest the distinctive features of inversion, mocked hierarchies, communal festivity, and redefinition of sex identity" (6).

A. Woolf's feminist politics and aesthetics

Woolf's feminist politics and aesthetics are mainly based upon her claim that women should be free from the constraints imposed on them by patriarchy. This part of the chapter will explore the historical background of the domestic ideology, its entanglement with patriarchy and its configuration of gender hierarchies, gendered space categorizations and the notion of the body that Woolf tries to subvert in her fiction. The chapter will also analyse the ways through which Woolf sabotages these concepts: reconfiguring the spaces according to women's values, brushing the authority aside and promoting the notion of the body as a fluctuating entity.

A.1 The domestic ideology: gender hierarchies and the "female space"

The shifts in the social world brought about changes in women's lives. In the nineteenth century, middle-class women were advised to "work" inside their homes so as to create a cosy haven for their husbands. "A new gender ideology pervaded the English-speaking world in the mid-nineteenth century. As ideas of rights and social justice spread more widely, ideas about women *narrowed*[1]" (French 128). Women "were forced into domestic roles as tight as their corsets" (French 128). Ellen Jordan sees the development of the industrial world as the reason behind this condition. "The late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries saw the emergence of industrial capitalism, the separation of work and home that this necessitated, and the development of a new gender ideology, now usually called the 'domestic ideology'" (Jordan 443). Nancy Armstrong, too, emphasizes the connection between the changes in women's lives and the shifts in the social and political arenas. She links the emergence of the idea that a woman's place is her home to the development of

[1]All the emphases in the quotations throughout this study are as in the original.

the middle classes as a force to mould a domineering ideology (9). In other words, the middle-class woman's role was to "work" at home and help strengthen the middle-class ideological construction by caring for her husband and by giving birth to children who would carry that ideology to the next generation. According to Marilyn French, the middle-class ideology needed self-generated support. "A new class was emerging. Lacking the semidivine ancestry claimed by aristocrats, the middle class (or bourgeoisie) had to fight for the privileges formerly reserved for nobles – the right to make policy and law, to govern" (French 130). Consequently, they started to see women as the main attribute of the enforcing of this ideology. By locating women inside their homes, the prevailing ideology assigned them the role of instructors for their children and the soothing carers for their husbands who struggled outside in the "public" sphere. So, as Jeanne Peterson claims, while these women were seen as the angels in the house and the symbols of a happy family life by some critics, the critics of the post-Victorian period saw them as "a symbol of oppressed women trapped in the gilded cage of Victorian male domination" (678).

According to the nineteenth-century middle-class ideology of domesticity, a woman is a promoter of peace and comfort at home. Karen Lipsedge states that "the notion of the idealised woman" refers to "her role as a good and virtuous wife and mother" (117). A woman was seen solely through the lens of functionality and facility. French lists four "virtues" by which "True Womanhood" was defined: "piety, purity, submissiveness, and domesticity" (129). Hence, the domestic ideology attributes great importance to a woman who has been ready to efface herself as an independent subjectivity and turn herself into an object. For example, John Ruskin condemns Shakespeare's Ophelia "because she fails Hamlet at the critical moment, and is not, and cannot in her nature be, a guide to him when he needs her most" (133). A woman's preliminary function, thus, was her submissiveness to and support of her man.

The domestic ideology rests on the assumption that there is a dichotomy between home and the outside. Armstrong calls these two spaces the "female domain" and the domain that "govern[s] the marketplace" (9-10). "The prevailing

ideology regarded the house as a haven, a private domain opposed to the public sphere of commerce" (Langland 291). The house with its angel, the woman, was closed to the outside world marked by its commerce and rivalry. As James Holstein and Jaber Gubrium state, "the inner reaches of the home" were invincible (894) for the outsiders. Ruskin delineates "home" as follows:

> This is the true nature of home – it is the place of Peace; the shelter, not only from all injury, but from all terror, doubt, and division. In so far as it is not this, it is not home; so far as the anxieties of the outer life penetrate into it, and the inconsistently-minded, unknown, unloved, or hostile society of the outer world is allowed . . . to cross the threshold, it ceases to be home. (145)

In this way, women have been severed from the outside defined as a place of commerce, terror, uncertainty, hostility and imprisoned into their female domain of domesticity seen as a place of peace. They were advised as to how to act in order to establish a peaceful and comfortable atmosphere for their husbands and fathers who came home from work. They had to look after the children, govern the servants, pay the bills, do accounting, write letters, support their husbands. As Ruskin argues, a woman's "intellect is not for invention or creation, but for sweet ordering, arrangement, and decision"; he adds that a woman's "great function is Praise" of her man (144-145). Elizabeth Langland claims that even the interior spaces of the home were also "coded as masculine or feminine" (295). While the drawing or sitting rooms, for example, were seen as feminine space, such spaces like smoking rooms or billiard rooms were seen as the "male domain" (Langland 295). Besides the categorization of spaces, the activities were also categorized according to gender. Beth Kowaleski-Wallace states, for instance, that tea drinking was seen as a *feminine* activity (131). She adds that a "respectable woman pouring tea" was seen as "the power" to withstand the danger of the rough world of the outside (134). Indeed, a woman's exit from this haven into the outside world was hindered. "[Middle-class] [w]omen's visibility in public challenged the deep-rooted association in nineteenth-century cultural discourse of women with the private sphere and men with the public" (Snaith 16). Anna Snaith argues that "Western women have been

systematically excluded from the public sphere" because of their "maternal role" (8). The domestic chores, such as looking after the children, controlling the servants, writing letters, kept "middle- and upper-middle-class, nineteenth-century, British women trapped in the private home" (Snaith 8).

A woman's role encompassed caring for the vast number of children, educating them ethically and religiously. It means that she had to have education which was accepted as her function of a vessel of knowledge which she had to pass to her children. "[T]herefore academic education was in fact the best preparation for marriage and maternity" (Jordan 442). A young girl had to prepare for the future role of an angel in the house. "Her single life provided training for her role as angel-wife" (Peterson 678). A woman had to have "such physical training and exercise as may confirm her health, and perfect her beauty" (Ruskin 147-148). In other words, a woman should be healthy enough to bear and grow up children and beautiful enough to please her man. A woman was expected to use her private domain to prepare herself for her role. "[W]omen had the leisure, privacy, and prosperity to aspire to the combination of innocence, piety, and dependency" (Peterson 678). However, women's positive qualities had to be used for the sake of the family. "She must be enduringly, incorruptibly good; instinctively, infallibly wise – wise, not for self-development, but for self-renunciation: wise, not that she may set herself above her husband, but that she may never fail from his side" (Ruskin 146-147). Single women, on the other hand, "were miserable . . . Even more than the wife, the spinster, representing purity, goodness, and virginity, was supposed to sacrifice herself to all who needed her" (French 143). In short, a woman was prepared to sacrifice herself for the sake of the others.

Women's submissiveness and self-renunciation were widely propagated through various channels. Portraits of women-angels were drawn to awaken young girls' interest in this role of an angel. French claims that the woman-ideal was "invested not just with moral superiority, but with *glamor*: the 'lady,' with her upswept hair, high-buttoned blouse, tiny waist, flowing skirt, bent neck, and sweet smile, sat on a velvet couch, protected from the harshness of life, an icon to be

desired and emulated" (128-129). Literature represented these angels in the house as "accepting restrictions and disappointments with stoicism" (Morris 32). While linking the "female ideal" to the empowerment of the middle-classes, Armstrong states that with the development of the middle classes, a woman's ideal portrait was presented through various writings and books (9). Armstrong claims that these writings promoted the spread of the knowledge about the ideal woman and "addressed a readership comprising various levels and sources of income and included virtually all people who distinguished themselves from the aristocracy, on the one hand, and from the laboring poor on the other" (63).

Marriage was regarded as an institution into which a woman entered to perform her role of an angel in the house. "Marriage has been portrayed as not only desirable, but also necessary, as a means of achieving true womanhood and assuring women of a life of security and respectability" (Baber and Allen 31). Marriage was seen as a woman's sole secure exit from her parents' house. It was a desirable act for a woman who wanted to assert her existence to a certain extent. Scott Coltrane claims that at a time when women "were excluded from independent careers of their own" marriage "guaranteed the economic support" (43). "The price they paid, however, was that they were confined to the home" (Coltrane 43). Creating a family, hence, was a way to exploit a woman for the purpose of the maintenance of middle-class ideology. "The family is seen as a pillar of stability and as fundamental to social order" (Walby 61). The extra-marital families were regarded as a challenge to this social order and the women who participated in such a life were punished by various exclusions from social spheres (Walby 179).

Armstrong claims that in the 19th century the middle-class ideology was further sustained by its dependence on "investments rather than . . . labor" (73). Middle-class people gained money through investment, and, in this way, they did not depend on labour; they did not have a financial relationship with the others. "Such money made the household into a self-enclosed world whose means of support were elsewhere, invisible, removed from the scene" (Armstrong 73). Consequently, middle-class men did use their bodies to earn money. Physical labour means working

for the others, having contact with other people, which middle-class ideology did not support. Women's working outside their households was even worse. "They generally found women who worked for their living to be morally bankrupt too" (Armstrong 78).

One of the conventions that a middle-class woman had to follow was the rejection of luxury and idleness. This woman had to lead "a discreet and frugal household" (Armstrong 72) by maintaining the money that her husband brought. Armstrong claims that the middle-class domesticity regarded a "privileged table as an object of disgust" (82). Spending money on unnecessary decoration, according to Walker, was seen as a woman's vanity and weakness (502). A middle-class woman could not spend time entertaining outside. As Armstrong claims, middle-class domesticity regarded outside entertainment for women as their desire to be "seen" by the others, which was condemned. "It is a woman's participation in public spectacle that injures her, for as an object of display, she always loses value as a subject" (Armstrong 77). Yet, she was able to enjoy amusing activities when they were taking place "in the sanctuary of one's parlor" (Armstrong 77). Thus, a woman's behaviour was seen as the major factor in establishing the link between the domestic atmosphere and middle-class ideology. "The domestic woman executes her role in the household by regulating her own desire" (Armstrong 81). And this regulation was seen as the labour of the middle-class women through which they ensured the prosperity of their families.

The middle-class domestic ideology conditionally allowed women to be present outside of their homes, which was, of course, functional. It was the work of charity, which, according to Armstrong, was the way to spread their techniques of self-regulation to the lower classes (93). Middle-class women possessed the knowledge required to promote domesticity and they were supposed to ensure the empowerment of this ideology. "To say, then, that beginning in the 1830s and 1840s middle-class women controlled significant discursive practices is to argue that they controlled the dissemination of certain kinds of knowledge and thus helped to ensure a middle-class hegemony in mid-Victorian England" (Langland 291). In this way, the

domestic ideology was spread to the lower classes and provided the increase of the number of the people who followed this ideology. French claims that in this way, "the cult of domesticity generated opposing tendencies. Middle-class women used their 'moral superiority' to redefine and expand the private sphere; working-class women, especially the better-off, adopted middle-class values" (142-143). However, it should be noted that a middle-class woman had to follow the rules of being outside or visiting somebody, which had to be maximum of twenty minutes (Langland 293). Obviously, her presence outside her home was limited by conventions. Regarding this position of a woman, Langland claims that "in a gendered politics of power, middle-class Victorian women were subservient to men; but in a class politics of power, they cooperated and participated with men in achieving middle-class control through the management of the lower classes" (294).

The domestic ideology of the middle-class people is in strong accord with patriarchy, which, however, contrary to the middle-class domesticity, is rooted in the ancient past. Walker claims that "the gendered differentiation of the private and public domains" is the "essential structural imperative for the maintenance of patriarchy" (495). Patriarchy needs women sitting at home and serving the function of the comforters for men. Snaith does not differ in this idea. She states that a "public/private dichotomy, then, is integral to women's history in that it has worked as a conceptual justification for various practices of patriarchal oppression" (9). Thus, there is a tight link between patriarchy and women's domesticity. "Patriarchy is a historic creation formed by men and women in a process which took nearly 2500 years to its completion" (Lerner 212). It is not a result of capitalism or industrial development.

> Patriarchy . . . means the manifestation and institutionalization of male dominance over women and children in the family and the extension of male dominance over women in society in general. It implies that men hold power in all the important institutions of society and that women are deprived of access to such power. (Lerner 239)

There are various reasons behind men's announcement of their superiority and their power establishment over women. Masculine physical strength, as opposed to relative physical weakness of females, makes them superior. Gerda Lerner claims that "this biological deterministic explanation is extended from the Stone Age into the present" (17). She adds that man's superiority was further strengthened by Freud's theory. "Freud's normal human was male; the female was by his definition a deviant human being lacking a penis, whose entire psychological structure supposedly centered on the struggle to compensate for this deficiency" (Lerner 19). What is more, women themselves have been responsible for their subordination. "Women have for millennia participated in the process of their own subordination because they have been psychologically shaped so as to internalize the idea of their own inferiority" (Lerner 218). Lerner believes, however, that it is possible for women to evade patriarchal oppression. "To step outside of patriarchal thought means: Being sceptical toward every known system of thought; being critical of all assumptions, ordering values and definitions" (Lerner 228). "It means getting rid of the great men in our heads and substituting for them ourselves, our sisters, our anonymous foremothers" (Lerner 228). This calls to mind Woolf's ideas in this regard; if women stop thinking about men as great figures, they will see that men's "fitness for life is diminished" (*Room*[2] 46).

A.2 Woolf's perception of gender hierarchies and the "female space"

Woolf does not accept the idea that a woman's role is to function as an obsequious object ready at hand to serve her husband or her father. According to Deepali Prakash, "Woolf deeply resented the role of women in Victorian society, wherein to nurture, preserve, and repair were the sacred duties of well brought up young ladies" (67) and "tried to liberate the woman from the male domination which is prescribed by tradition" (69). Woolf protests the division of social domains into

[2] A short form for *A Room of One's Own*.

gender-based categories. “The conceptual dichotomy between public and private spaces, spheres, . . . was one which captured her attention, to be reworked and questioned, rather than accepted wholesale in any particular form” (Snaith 1). Woolf explores and problematizes the position of women in her society by analysing the reasons behind the male/female dichotomy and its politics. “Woolf was interested in the underlying psychological and economic causes of masculine dominance and feminine repressed anger or acquiescence, and she used her powers of observation and divination to probe depths the earlier feminist writers had left largely unplumbed” (Zwerdling 216). Her salient ideas related to women and their placement in society are scattered throughout her oeuvre. Her own life is also an example of the development of her ideas related to the roles prescribed for genders. Prakash claims that Woolf “resisted . . . [her] father’s unreasonable demands for sympathy and flattery, and refused to follow . . . [her] mother’s role model of a perfect Angel in the House, an ideal wife and mother, confined to the home and hearth” (68).

Woolf criticises the patriarchal order of her country in *A Room of One’s Own*. She states that even from a small piece of newspaper it is evident that patriarchy reigns in England. “The most transient visitor to this planet, . . . who picked up this paper could not fail to be aware, even from this scattered testimony, that England is under the rule of a patriarchy” (*Room* 43). She thinks “[w]ith the exception of the fog he [patriarchy] seemed to control everything” (*Room* 43). However, Woolf holds that the strength of patriarchy is rooted in women’s internalization of the sense of inferiority. “Hence the enormous importance to a patriarch who has to conquer, who has to rule, of feeling that great numbers of people, half the human race indeed, are by nature inferior to himself. It must indeed be one of the chief sources of his power” (*Room* 45). The power of the patriarch comes from his image in women’s eyes. “Women have served all these centuries as looking-glasses possessing the magic and delicious power of reflecting the figure of man at twice its natural size” (*Room* 45). Woolf states that women serve the function of projecting the exaggerated image of a man. “For if she begins to tell the truth, the figure in the looking-glass shrinks; his

fitness for life is diminished" (*Room* 46). Woolf's ideas in this regard suggest that a woman possesses power to overwhelm the oppressive patriarchal order imposed on her life.

Virginia Woolf proposes a reconfiguration of the female domain, the space that was appointed for women by the middle-class ideology of domesticity. In her essay "Professions for Women," Woolf describes her notion of the middle-class woman, or the so-called the Angel in the House: "She was utterly unselfish. She excelled in the difficult arts of family life. She sacrificed herself daily. . . preferred to sympathize always with the minds and wishes of others. Above all – I need not say it – she was pure" (*Essays* 141). This is how Virginia Woolf sees the Victorian woman; the woman is entrapped in her domestic atmosphere which strips her of her desires and individuality.

Woolf proposes that a woman should have a room of her own – a liminal space – where she can be away from her domestic responsibilities and kill the angel in order to set herself free from patriarchal and oppressive domesticity. Woolf proposes writing as a means of making a woman's voice heard. According to Woolf, "[k]illing the Angel in the House was part of the occupation of a woman writer" (*Essays* 142) in order to be able to represent herself. Woolf wants women to transform their homes so that they can have their private rooms through which they escape the role of the angel of the house. Although it seems that Woolf propagates privacy and isolation for women in *A Room of One's Own*, it should be noted that what she celebrates is not physical isolation. In her discussion, the image of the private room signifies a woman's space for freedom from her domestic responsibilities. Woolf's room of one's own is "a liberating private space, an active choice, and, importantly, it is from the room that the woman will gain access to the public sphere through writing" (Snaith 2-3). The female domain, in this way, transforms into a space which a woman creates for herself to gain connection to the outside world.

According to Snaith, Woolf's concern with the public/private dichotomy lies in "her sense that women must write (make public) their experiences, her interest in

publicizing the lives of the obscure, and the private outlet to the public world which is a room of one's own" (11). Woolf advocates women to express themselves and make their ideas public rather than hiding them. She sees women's muteness as a problem because they lack self-representation. In her essay "Women and Fiction" she puts it as follows: "For very little is known about women. The history of England is the history of the male line, not of the female" (*Essays* 132). She suggests that when a woman produces fiction she debunks male discourse. "Thus, when a woman comes to write a novel, she will find that she is perpetually wishing to alter the established values – to make serious what appears insignificant to a man, and trivial what is to him important" (*Essays* 136). Indeed, many humorous scenes in Woolf's novels emerge as a consequence of a woman's sabotaging of the male discourse. In this way, Woolf underlines the fact that when a woman's voice is heard, the entire picture of the woman, which has been drawn by men, is obliterated providing, instead, her own representation of her universe.

Woolf herself reveals her ideas, feelings, desires, fears and preoccupations to the world through her writing. Besides her fiction, her huge number of non-literary output shows her desire to share. Alex Zwerdling states that Woolf has attained her fame as an author with "a major career" only after Quentin Bell's biography of her which revealed Woolf's much richer inner world through "an enormous body of unpublished material of the highest quality" (1). What Zwerdling stresses is the fact that Woolf's inner world of ideas and feelings, reflected in her non-literary writings, was revealed to the world. Although Woolf's fiction gives the reader a particular insight into her ideas, her non-fiction guides them into the deeper levels of her consciousness not only as an author, but also as an individual. Her letters "have given us a sense of the breadth of Woolf's interests and the variety of her engagements" (Zwerdling 2). Zwerdling adds that the more Woolf's personal and private matters become evident, the more changes occur in the grasping of her ideas in her fiction. The revelation of her private world through her non-literary material "changed our understanding of the more familiar works on which her original reputation was based" (Zwerdling 2).

While Zwerdling thinks that Woolf was introduced to the world through her writing, Snaith thinks that Woolf's move to the Bloomsbury area made her more aware of the events that happened in the world; particularly, Bloomsbury made Woolf familiar with the new condition of women in her country. She realized the fact that women could gain freedom by leaving the domestic sphere. Bloomsbury "was an area in which single, independent women could find accommodation in flats, rooms or bedsits" (Snaith 26). Bloomsbury also showed her the fact that women could enter the public world through their jobs. They could partake in the share in the financial affairs of the world. "Woolf's move to Bloomsbury instigated her own entry into the world of professional work" (Snaith 26). According to Carolyn Heilbrun, moreover, Bloomsbury was a place where Woolf came to be cognizant of an "androgynous spirit"; for Heilbrun, Bloomsbury was "the first actual example of such a way of life in practice" (115). "For the first time a group existed in which masculinity and femininity were marvelously mixed in its members" (Heilbrun 118).

Thus, by proposing women to have a room of their own, Woolf tries to refashion the female domain so as to make it a space where a woman can express her desires and assert her values. She also advises women to come out of their homes and become familiar with the outside world. Furthermore, it is evident in her works that she wants to redefine the public realm, too. She does not accept the public realm as the masculine space; and, therefore, she makes her female characters participate in it, too.

She alludes to women's position as a secondary sex in the public realm when she mentions the restrictions women encounter outdoors in *A Room of One's Own*. The narrator wants to walk on the grass but is made aware of the fact that a woman cannot do it. "Only the Fellows and Scholars are allowed here; the gravel is the place for me" (*Room* 7). The inviolable territory of a library is accessible only by certain members of the college: "ladies are only admitted to the library if accompanied by a Fellow of the College or furnished with a letter of introduction" (*Room* 9). Woolf concludes "how unpleasant it is to be locked out; and . . . how it is worse perhaps to be locked in" (*Room* 31). As it will be discussed below, Woolf tries to reconfigure

public places by making them available for women. Woolf's "work is full of women trespassing, intruding upon spaces to which women are denied access" (Snaith 11). Woolf's notion of the outside is the space in which people merge. In her essay "Street Haunting," she writes that when people are outside "one is not tethered to a single mind but can put on briefly for a few minutes the bodies and minds of others" (*Essays* 187). In this way, Woolf's vision of the outside is governed by the necessity of the destruction of all the barriers between people. "One could become a washer-woman, a publican, a street singer" (*Essays* 187). Rachel Bowlby claims that the "move outside involves the removal of individuality for anonymity" (210). A person loses his/her private self and displays him/herself to the others. Being outside is an escape from rigid stability; it is the replacement of a "fixed place" with "mobility" (Bowlby 210).

A.3 Conceptualizations of the body: an overview

Body is the outer manifestation of a human being through which one connects to the rest of the world. Body is the mechanism that binds people to life as human beings are regarded alive only if their bodies are alive. Notwithstanding such a vital role, the body has been usually ignored or repressed. It has been kept under pressure to be fixed and stabilized. It has had to be a controlled mechanism. This repression inevitably has changed one's attitude towards her/his own body; body has become the "other." "The body is both ourselves and other, and as such the object of emotions from love to disgust" (Brooks 1). The body, in this respect has produced a paradox. It belongs to the self, but has to be disregarded. One has to observe her/his body as if it is an alien entity with its own desires. Such a repressing ideology dictates the nature of the body and guides people with reference to their attitude towards their bodies. "What we know of our bodies' 'nature' is available to us only through the ideologies which fashion our understanding of the world and our place in it" (Atkinson 2). Although the body usually remains under the pressure of various social factors, there is always a tendency to withdraw the body from under that

pressure and foreground it as a significant component of a human being. What is more, the body's flexibility and changeability are focused on. "In this respect, the body is always implicated in a dialogue with cultural discourses – conforming to, resisting and negotiating the requirements of the culture" (Richardson and Locks 3).

In Western philosophy, starting from the medieval period, the body has been viewed by some as the container of the soul in this world. The soul as well as the mind, on the other hand, has been accepted as the chief constituent of a human being, which results in the emergence of a body/soul or mind hierarchy. "To consider the body in isolation was not merely difficult but, strictly speaking, impossible, since the body's primary function, it was held, was to act as a vessel of containment for the more significant feature of the soul" (Sawday 12). Such an understanding is widely held; "[t]o be human – in other words, to be more than animal – the mind must control and subjugate the body" (Richardson and Locks 6). As will be discussed in detail in the following chapter, the carnivalesque body, on the other hand, which "one finds most obviously represented in Rabelais" asserted its superiority by "claiming the final locus of significance" (Brooks 4). Rabelais's bodily images, in this respect, subverted the mind/body hierarchy. That is why Jonathan Sawday states that the bodily system is "'grotesque' in that specialised sense associated with Bakhtin's analysis of the body" (15). It disrupts the commonly accepted hierarchies.

Indeed, the "[b]odies that stray too far from what is considered to be the acceptable or predictable would be classed as 'monsters'" (Richardson and Locks 52). The bodies that are uncommonly formed reveal the desire to challenge the system that imposes its own rules on a body. "The 'monster', in this respect, is often a symbol for the dark emotions which we cannot accept about ourselves such as lust or rage" (Richardson and Locks 54). Thus, being a monster, that is having a body that does not match what is considered the normative image, may come to mean showing resistance to the status quo: "where there is power there is always resistance and when resistance takes place it tends to be performed through the body" (Richardson and Locks 24). Niall Richardson and Adam Locks refer to Bakhtin's carnival as the space and time which embraced such bodily resistance. Bakhtin's

"carnival permitted eccentric and inappropriate forms of expression – especially in relation to the body. People could dress inappropriately and style their bodies in unconventional ways" (Richardson and Locks 26). Sometimes a society identified certain people and labelled them as rebellious and grotesque with reference to the image of their bodies. For instance, "[i]n the Victorian era, two kinds of bodies definable as grotesque were the diseased body and the body of the prostitute – often one and the same. . . . the grotesque body was segregated from society, measured and weighed, sometimes destroyed" (Gilbert 17).

The body/mind hierarchy is visible in a wide range of discourses. The differences between social classes, for instance, have come to be expressed in terms of the body/mind dichotomy. "The upper echelons of society – especially the respected professions such as medicine, Church, education – are associated with the intellect. . . . By contrast, the lower echelons such as peasants, labourers and manual workers are thought of only in terms of their bodies" (Richardson and Locks 7). People who make less use of their bodies were seen as the upper layer, while the people who earned living through their bodies were accommodated in the lower layers of society. Thus, it can be said that middle-class women were regarded inferior to the middle-class men because a middle-class woman's body was functional according to the domestic ideology. Moreover, the body/mind hierarchy sharpened the boundaries between the races. In racist discourses, while the white bodies came to represent intellect and mind, "non-white bodies" were depicted "simply *as* their bodies" (Richardson and Locks 7). The non-white bodies were seen as devoid of mind and totally controlled by their bodies.

The body/mind hierarchy plays a great role in feminist discourse, as well. "There has always been a tradition of women simply being their bodies" (Richardson and Locks 8). In this way, gender hierarchies were established: "the female body and feminine attributes have for millennia been on the 'low' side of the logic of binary opposition . . . The body as a category has been cast as emotional and feminized in opposition to the masculinized rational mind" (Cregan 82). Women were accepted as beings who are governed by the rules of their bodies rather than their minds. And

this, consequently, led to the affirmation of the masculine superiority that had been established as a result of other significant factors. “This conflation of woman as body continues in the association of women with all bodily activities such as pregnancy, birth and breast feeding” (Richardson and Locks 9). Such bodily activities, which are impossible to attribute to males, became the fates of women because such female activities prioritise the notion of the body. “Rich with the imagery and subject matter of embodiment – with blood, milk, hunger, consumption, hymenal rupture, impregnation, expulsion – these inscriptions bespeak an insistent female materiality” (Moran 20). Consequently, a woman has been acknowledged as a being that exists only by means of her body. “[T]he mind/body split operates with even more ferocity for women. For, not merely fastened to the animal, women *are* the animal: the man/woman opposition combines with the mind/body split to align man with mind and woman with body” (Moran 1-2). A woman has been regarded as an anti-rational, absolute bodily creature that prioritises the body rather than the mind or reason. “We can go even further and argue that what has been defined as *mind*, as *rationality*, has been defined against what is female. . . . Thus intellectual aspirations have seemed to require, for many women, a profound denial of their female embodiment” (Moran 2). Being influenced by the body/mind hierarchy and religion, “Christian women viewed their bodies as encumbrances to salvation, and inevitably, in the course of the medieval period, holy women cast off their female garb and assumed male attire” (Ramet 5).

Feminist critics have responded differently to this body/mind hierarchy. While some feminists tend to acknowledge a female body as an inevitable entity, but still see it “bracketed out of consideration,” “other feminist writers have developed theory that is explicitly embodied and insistent on the centrality of the material body” (Shildrick and Price 1). Still, other critics, mainly influenced by poststructuralism and postmodernism, stress flexibility and fluidity of the body. Among the feminist writers, who acknowledge the fact that a woman’s body is different from that of a man in terms of the physiological experiences, there is Simone de Beauvoir, who according to Margrit Shildrick and Janet Price, “saw the corporeal in a decidedly

negative light" (4). Simone de Beauvoir, as Shildrick and Price hold, does not hide "an apparently deep aversion to some everyday experiences of the female body" (Price and Shildrick 19). She states in *The Second Sex* that "to give birth and to breast-feed are not *activities* but natural functions; they do not involve a project, which is why the woman finds no motive there to claim a higher meaning for her existence; she passively submits to her biological destiny" (98). Seeing the female body as a mechanism functioning only for particular activities such as giving birth or producing milk for the baby is an essentialist view and is based on biological determinism. In the essentialist view of the body the biological system of the body is an unchangeable category that determines a human being's position and function in society. "The modern world is a world steeped in sex: every habit, gesture, and activity is sexualized and categorized as male or female, masculine or feminine" (Moi 12). Since de Beauvoir sees the female body in a negative light and thinks that the experiences of the female body are not as lofty as the experiences of the male bodies, she has been regarded as an essentialist critic by certain poststructuralist critics as mentioned above. However, according to Moi, Simone de Beauvoir is not an essentialist thinker. Moi claims that Beauvoir's *The Second Sex* "provides exactly the kind of non-essentialist, concrete, historical and social understanding of the body" (5). According to Moi, Beauvoir sees the body as a flexible entity, which changes its shape from situation to situation.

Although Beauvoir's ideas about the female body cause a split among the critics in terms of whether she is an essentialist or not, Shulamith Firestone's discussion of the female body renders no doubt about her essentialist position. She "looked forward with optimism to a time when the then incipient advanced reproductive technologies might free woman from the 'oppressive "natural" conditions' of procreation" (Shildrick and Price 4). According to this standpoint, "women too must leave behind the materiality of their bodies" (Price and Shildrick 19). Hence, these feminist writers' ideas were not quite different from the dictates of the dominant ideology in terms of the notion of the body. Shildrick and Price call such a negative attitude to the female body "somatophobia" and claim that it "mimics

the masculinist fear and rejection of the body" (4). Essentialist thinking, thus, is based on stability. "To be determined by biology is to surrender to limitations, to deny the possibility of change" (Birke 1). Indeed, it is this attitude with which, according to Showalter, Virginia Woolf approaches the female body. Showalter claims that Woolf tried to "evade confrontation with her own painful femaleness" (264). Yet, as will be discussed below, this is not agreed upon by some others according to whom Woolf does not try to evade her femaleness.

Contrary to the somatophobic attitude to the female body, such authors like Adrienne Rich, viewed the female body as a site of strength and power. "The uniquely female capacity to give birth 'naturally' has been taken up as the centre of women's power, . . . *and* celebrated in its own right" (Shildrick and Price 4). Rich invites women to "*think through the body*" (qtd. in Birke 31). She stresses the idea that women have their own biological structure and suggests that women should explore and understand their "biological grounding" (qtd. in Birke 30). That is why Lynda Birke thinks that "Rich's work is often interpreted as being biologically determinist" (30).

However, feminist writers like Judith Butler and Donna Haraway stress the fluidity of the female body. These post-structuralist feminist critics are concerned with "the irreducible interplay of . . . physicality which posits a body in process, never fixed or solid, but always multiple and fluid" (Shildrick and Price 6). This approach to the body focuses on the body's changeability. Moi claims that Butler sees sex and body as "cultural, performative, unstable, discursive" (34). As Moi states, the poststructuralist theorists' aim is "to understand 'sex or the body' as a concrete, historical and social phenomenon, not as an essence" (4). They challenge the essentialist perception of the body and biological sex as "immobile, stable, coherent, fixed, prediscursive, natural, and ahistorical: the mere surface on which the script of gender is written" (Moi 4). In Donna Haraway's theorisation of the body, which has initiated cyberfeminism, the distinction between the human and the non-human body is problematical. In her work, "the dispersal of the normative body is taken for granted, and the distinctions between human and machine, between male

and female, between actual and virtual, lose currency" (Shildrick and Price 11). Thus, the body resists the conventional norms of stability. "In cyberspace, bodies are either of no consequence or may endlessly morph into new and uncategorisable forms that frustrate the modernist desire for hierarchy and order" (Shildrick and Price 11). Hence, "[w]hat falls to postmodernist feminism, then, is the task of reclaiming the marginalised female/feminine body without reinstating it as a unified, closed and given category" (Price and Shildrick 218). This thesis contends that, as opposed to Showalter's claim, Virginia Woolf's perception of the body is closer to its poststructuralist understandings rather than its conceptualizations by the earlier theorists because her notion of androgyny is based on the changeable nature of the body.

A.4 Woolf's perception of the body

Peter Brooks states that "[g]etting the body into writing is a primary concern of literature throughout the ages" (1). Rabelais's novels, for instance, are replete with grotesque images of the body. Feminist discourse tends to incorporate bodily images into literary discourse, as well. "The reintroduction of the body and categories of the body (in the case of carnival, the 'grotesque body') into the realm of what is called the 'political' has been a central concern of feminism" (Russo 54). And one of these authors who reintroduce the body into the feminist discourse is Virginia Woolf. Woolf's use of bodily images can be explained by her three major views: "a room of one's own," "granite and rainbow" and androgyny.

Woolf's two major phrases that are frequently discussed in relation to feminism and fiction writing – "a room of one's own" and "granite and rainbow" – indicate that corporeality is important for the author. Woolf's tendency to intersperse her fiction with the images of the bodily and material phenomena is in keeping with her argument that a woman must have a room of her own to produce fiction. Her major claim for a woman's separate room and enough money to write stresses the concept of a woman's freedom from patriarchal constraints. In *A Room of One's*

Own, Woolf imagines Shakespeare's sister, Judith, in order to portray a woman and her domestic responsibilities that hinder her from the realization of her desires. "She picked up a book now and then, one of her brother's perhaps, and read a few pages. But then her parents came in and told her to mend the stockings or mind the stew and not moon about with books and papers" (*Room* 61).

For Woolf, patriarchal constraints are experienced in a material way because a woman's body is imprisoned in the house. Woolf prioritises the physical body in her argument because she believes that a woman's body should be freed from all constraints in order to produce writing. She sees it as a basic need. When Woolf propagates the murder of the Angel in the House, she means the priority of a woman's body independent of all her responsibilities such as caring for the children, looking after the house, comforting a husband. In *A Room of One's Own* Woolf provides the temporary and physical details of a woman's having a baby.

> First there are nine months before the baby is born. Then the baby is born. Then there are three or four months spent in feeding the baby. After the baby is fed there are certainly five years spent in playing with the baby. You cannot, it seems, let children run about the streets. People who have seen them running wild in Russia say that the sight is not a pleasant one. People say, too, that human nature takes its shape in the years between one and five. (28)

Apparently, a woman is quite busy at home.

As is observed, Woolf subordinates a woman's spiritual and mental freedom to her physical freedom. According to Woolf, unless a woman frees her body from physical imprisonment, she will not be able to free herself mentally. Therefore, the body is reconceived by Woolf not as an object ready for service but as a part of an individual that demands its own rights. As Derek Ryan also claims, Woolf's concept of life is "embedded in materiality" (1). Woolf cannot dispense with the material side of life. Ryan adds that Woolf is "concerned with world-making, not simply subject-making or word-making" (2). Woolf's sophistication lies in her ability to merge world-, subject- and word-making. Varying combinations of the bodily images

surface throughout her fiction. Woolf's aesthetics elaborates on the characters' tendencies to manifest their bodies in different ways. In *A Room of One's Own* Woolf claims that fiction is about human beings' physical conditions (53).

Furthermore, Woolf celebrates a technique of writing premised on the conjunction of consciousness and materialism. Merry M. Pawlowski states that Woolf praises authors who aim "marrying granite to rainbow" (xi). In her essay "The New Biography," Woolf says that a new fashion in writing biography should be adopted, that of combining granite with rainbow. For her, truth is "something of granite-like solidity" and personality is "something of rainbow-like intangibility" (95). For Woolf, truth is the material dimensions of a person; the body, which makes that person visible and perceptible to the others. And personality is the formulation of that person's consciousness, an abstract dimension of a person. When Woolf portrays a character in her fiction she does not focus only on the abstract concepts or consciousness of that character. She adds granite, the material sides of people's lives, their physical conditions, settings, bodily functions, or financial situations. Ryan claims that "Woolf's granites and rainbows . . . are forming a map where lines cannot easily be drawn to separate culture (language, the human) and nature (materiality, the nonhuman) in a hierarchical relation" (51).

Seeing the masculine tendency to usurp a superior position in the literary world, Woolf tries to challenge the norms of dominant masculine writing, which usually disregards the body and its images. Nicholas Marsh states that Woolf observes "a masculine tendency towards the abstract and a feminine tendency towards the concrete" (64). Woolf tries to shatter the hierarchical system between the abstract and the concrete in her fiction. According to Bowlby, Woolf "regarded the lack of representation of the body in literature as something which needed to be remedied" (29). Two major ways in which Woolf represents the body in her fiction are: creating androgynous characters and associating her characters with animals or non-human bodies.

A.4.1 Woolf's notion of androgyny

Woolf foregrounds the notion of ambivalence in her approach to sex and gender and this ambivalence is demonstrated through the body. As is discussed below, Woolf propagates the idea of a harmonious balance between the male and the female in one body; and the appearance of both sexes in one body suggests ambivalence. One of her personal experiences is telling of her emphasis on ambivalence in gender matters. Her performance in the Dreadnought Hoax[3] was based on the role of a man from an Abyssinian royal delegation. "She was a woman disguised as a man but in garments that suggested female rather than male dress. The mediating factor that made this ambiguity possible was the simultaneous crossing of gender and of race" (Kennard 152). Woolf's act confirms her primacy of ambivalence in her conception of body and gender, which makes her transcend the normative separation of genders. "Cross-dressing in itself has the effect of carnivalizing political and cultural power and thus of undermining it" (Kennard 152). In other words, cross-dressing is a way to undermine the conventions which are imposed on men and women.

Androgyny is a term that celebrates the presence of both sexes – Greek *andr-* (male) and *gyne* (female) – in one body. As Robert Kimbrough states, the "androgynous vision is the human desire to reach a sense of human wholeness" (17), the state which was valid when "all generation was a unisexual operation" before human beings inherited "sub-division into sex, female and male" (15). It is the desire to return to the state when a human being could make use of her/his complete set of abilities rather than eliminating some of them because of the socially constructed gender roles. It is a state in which a woman does not tend to perform only activities associated with women; instead she presents herself as a complete human being with qualities associated with both men and women. Kimbrough also adds that androgyny is "an inner, psychic state of experience available to all human beings" (20) in order

[3]Dreadnought Hoax is the name for the joke Virginia Woolf and her friends played on the Royal Navy's ship named Dreadnought. Woolf and her friends were introduced as the delegation of Abyssinian royals.

to make it clear that it is not related to a physical body. Therefore, an "androgyne is a full human – one who in 'gender' is both male and female, though only of one sex" (Kimbrough 26). Androgyny suggests a notion of duality. Indeed, Bakhtin links the notion of androgyny and duality to grotesque imagery in Rabelais's novel, in which Gargantua's hat is described as follows: "It portrayed a man's body with two heads facing one another, four arms, four feet, a pair of arses and a brace of sexual organs, male and female" (qtd. in *Rabelais*[4] 323). According to Bakhtin, the "androgyny theme was popular in Rabelais' time" (*Rabelais* 323). Thus, Bakhtin mentions the theme of androgyny as a grotesque duality suggesting profound ambivalence. Bakhtin's linking of androgyny to grotesque imagery suggests that Bakhtin's notion of androgyny does not purport the predominance of one gender over the other because the grotesque image in his studies is always changing and becoming. In this way, Bakhtin's idea of androgyny anticipates the notion of androgyny in Woolf's oeuvre which will be discussed below.

Nancy Topping Bazin and Alma Freeman argue that androgyny is an important concept for the feminist movement because it plays a great role in the process of "the elimination of sex roles and the overthrow of the current male structures and values" (185). Bazin and Freeman claim that the "biological difference between male and female, . . . is a major factor in the origin of sex roles" (201). Such factors like "[m]enstruation, pregnancy, childbirth, infant care" "reduced woman's capacity for work, for participation in the shaping of the world, and made her dependent on man for protection and survival" (Bazin and Freeman 201). As a result, man "turned her biology against her, making it the source of her weakness and using it to label her inferior and thereby to circumscribe and restrict her social, political, and occupational endeavours" (Bazin and Freeman 201). Bazin and Freeman argue that "[i]t was primarily in the middle class that the problems of the dependent woman were most acutely felt during the nineteenth century" (206). It was the time of "accumulating wealth and sustaining . . . power in the world" and consequently, "women became a form of property" (Bazin and Freeman 208). Thus, Bazin and

[4] The short form of *Rabelais and His World*.

Freeman create a connection between the "destruction of patriarchy and the creation of androgyny" (212). They claim that "the Masculine and the Feminine must unite for the Rebirth of the new human being and the new society. This, in its widest possible sense, is the Androgynous Vision" (212).

The concept of androgyny has been discussed mainly under two distinct categories: fusion and balance. "[T]he difference between balance and fusion is, . . . the source of the problems surrounding the definition of androgyny" (Farwell 434). According to Marilyn Farwell, balance is regarded as an "interplay of separate and unique elements" which opposes "a fusion of one into the other" (434). Thus, for Farwell, fusion is a state that does not allow equality for the opposing elements because one element has to be melted in another element.

Farwell points to the inability of some critics to come to a mutual conclusion about Woolf's notion of androgyny; it is debated whether she applies it as a term suggesting fusion or balance (434). While Farwell claims that the difference between fusion and balance is quite essential, she states that Woolf's position is not clear in this regard.

> Although Virginia Woolf, along with her critics, ignores the importance of this distinction for the definition of androgyny and thus creates enough ambivalence in her book to prompt equivocation, the difference between balance and fusion is central to the understanding of androgyny as a practical critical tool, especially when dealing with women writers. (Farwell 435)

According to Farwell, balance is the perfect state in terms of feminist discourse because "the male and female sides of the brain would interact without either side dominating or subsuming the other" (435). This calls to mind Woolf's statement that "[i]f one is a man, still the woman part of the brain must have effect; and a woman also must have intercourse with the man in her" (*Room* 128). However, Farwell also states that androgyny in general is open to be discussed in terms of fusion. "In this case, androgyny would be identified with one supposedly asexual evaluative quality, usually one which has subsumed and defined its opposite" (435). And she states that "because the universal is most often identified with whatever is male" the subsumed

one in the androgynous fusion would be definitely the female part (435). As Farwell holds, androgyny is mainly seen as a state of fusion. "Not coincidentally, the dominant Western concept is fusion" (436) because in that sense the male is the part that subsumes the opposite. For instance, "[t]he myth of androgyny appears in a number of the Judeo-Christian accounts of the creation, Fall, and the redemption of man; and these early accounts depend upon this pattern of the One incorporating the Other" (Farwell 438). Farwell argues that this idea of subsuming the Other by the One resists time and is still evident in the works of many critics. "Although such a paradigm for androgyny is more apparent in the blatantly patriarchal myths of the past, the modern world has not delivered itself of this anachronism" (Farwell 440). The state of balance, on the other hand, eliminates the existence of the One or the Other; "one quality does not incorporate or at leisure while still retaining its individual validity" (Farwell 441). Both the male and the female gain validity and appear as equal; "each moves back and forth, partaking of the other here, that there is no identifiable One or Other; rather each member of the pair is the Other and each is the One" (Farwell 441-442). Having set the main frame of the discussion for the concept of androgyny it would be useful to accommodate Woolf's ideas of androgyny in this frame. While some critics think that Woolf's androgyny is founded on the sense of fusion, some others think that it refers to the balance between two sexes.

The notion of androgyny with reference to feminist discourse has become widespread in Woolf's scholarship. "Among literary critics – especially feminists – 'androgyny' has become virtually synonymous with 'Virginia Woolf'" (Rado 138). Woolf discusses her notion of androgyny in *A Room of One's Own* and as Frances L. Restuccia claims "[w]e have come to conceive of *A Room of One's Own* and the theory of androgyny as synonymous" (254). Indeed, because of her androgynous theme, Woolf has been "labelled the subversive, even deconstructive, feminist" (Rado 139). There are several critics who think that Woolf's notion of androgyny is the state of fusion in which the One incorporates the Other. Farwell claims that "Woolf hedges between balance and fusion, only to resort to fusion at the end" (443).

In other words, Farwell states that Woolf accepts male as a predominant power that subsumes the female element. Farwell comes to this conclusion because of Woolf's suggestion "that the ideal is a universal state of mind" (443); and according to Farwell, "male quality is identified with the universal" (448). So, for Farwell, Woolf comes back to the idea that androgyny does not mean equality among genders. Farwell adds that Woolf wants to escape being identified as a feminist writer and therefore "she withdraws from this vision and offers androgyny as a way to reconcile the sexes" (444). Thus, Woolf covers her feminist ideas by her notion of androgyny. Hence, Farwell sees Woolf's androgyny as "based on fusion, and this fusion tends to destroy the uniqueness [of the feminine part] which she so skilfully defended in her earlier pages [of *A Room of One's Own*]" (444).

Farwell, however, acknowledges that Woolf's discussion in *A Room of One's Own* of Mary Carmichael's authorship suggests the state of balance of an androgynous mind. "When Woolf introduces her mythical novelist, Mary Carmichael, and her novel, *Life's Adventure*, she finds hesitation and a broken sentence, but she gradually comes to appreciate its drive" (Farwell 446). Farwell states that in this way, Woolf seems to appreciate a feminine style of writing which is quite unlike masculinist writing. Farwell stresses Woolf's pleasure at seeing Carmichael's phrase "Chloe liked Olivia" (*Room* 106). According to Farwell, the phrase suggests the uniqueness of the feminine part mentioned above. She states that Woolf "also finds that the freedom gained by Mary Carmichael releases a wealth of new perceptions" (446). In this way, Farwell admits Woolf's tendency towards the idea of balance at this point. "It is crucial that Woolf establishes this uniqueness, for it is the basis from which to develop a dialectical theory [balance] of androgyny" (446). Yet, Farwell argues that when Woolf discusses an author's objective stance, she loses her tendency to create a balance. "When she deals specifically with the voice of the artist, with the relationship of the author to the work, she settles for the comfortable idea of the fusion of male and female" (Farwell 447). The idea of fusion in Woolf appears through her choice of objectivity, which, for Farwell, is the way male authors approach their writing. "Thus, instead of maintaining a dialectic

[balance] between two equally valid and traditionally sex identified qualities, objectivity and subjectivity, Woolf argues that they should merge into a single perspective, objectivity" (Farwell 447). Farwell discusses the fact that objectivity was the main feature of writing among male authors surrounding Virginia Woolf.

> Not only Eliot, but also Clive Bell and Roger Fry were instrumental in the popularity of these new theories of art. Art, they said, should not be personality or Romantic subjectivity, but form and classical objectivity. For Woolf, this meant that art should not be sexual, and the sooner women writers divested themselves of an identifiable voice the sooner they would be accepted as good writers. (Farwell 448)

Farwell claims that for Woolf, writing should not reveal the sex of the author; in other words, the author should adopt an objective stance towards her/his work. Hence, Farwell sees Woolf's advice regarding objectivity as her flight from balance in androgyny. "Then androgyny becomes objectivity overcoming the demon subjectivity . . . the One purifies the Other, and as usual the One is more readily identifiable with the cultural definition of the male" (Farwell 448).

Yet, what Farwell states with reference to Woolf's notion of objectivity loses its validity if one looks closely at Woolf's discussion of the writing of Mary Carmichael in *A Room of One's Own*. Although Woolf claims that Carmichael forgets about her sex when she writes, Woolf argues that by doing this Carmichael shows that she does not belong to the literary male tradition. In this way, Woolf separates Carmichael from the male authorship. "She had nothing like the love of Nature, the fiery imagination, the wild poetry, the brilliant wit, the brooding wisdom of her great predecessors" (*Room* 120). In other words, Carmichael's mind is not confined within a literary tradition, which is mainly dominated by male authors. For Woolf, Carmichael does not try to imitate male authors; instead she carves herself a totally different way of writing. Woolf claims that Carmichael "enjoyed some natural advantages of a high order" (*Room* 120-121). Carmichael's sensibility, as Woolf states, "ranged . . . very subtly and curiously, among almost unknown or unrecorded things" (*Room* 121). According to Woolf, Carmichael's sensibility is not recorded by

the existing literary tradition directed by male influence. Carmichael's writing "brought buried things to light and made one wonder what need there had been to bury them" (*Room* 121). What Woolf means when she says "buried things" is female sexuality. Thus, Carmichael writes with a mind that does not allow itself to be constricted by patriarchal norms and conventions shaping the literary tradition.

As indicated early on, like Farwell, Elaine Showalter also thinks that Woolf escapes from her femininity by focusing on androgyny. Although Showalter does not dwell upon the idea of fusion, she mainly stresses the idea that having a female body was something repulsive for Virginia Woolf. "Androgyny was the myth that helped her evade confrontation with her own painful femaleness and enabled her to choke and repress her anger and ambition" (Showalter 264). It might be stated that through androgyny Woolf suppressed her femaleness and this is similar to what Farwell claims. If the female part is subsumed in an androgynous vision in Farwell's study, in Showalter's study this female part is seen as covered and hidden. According to Showalter, androgyny is not a blissful harmony of sexes; Woolf "was advocating a strategic retreat, and not a victory; a denial of feeling, and not a mastery of it" (285). Apparently, Woolf advocates a denial of feminine feelings. For Showalter, "Woolf is aware that androgyny is another form of repression or, at best, self-discipline" (288). As Laura Marcus states, "Elaine Showalter, . . . presents herself as setting out to save feminist literary criticism, and women's writing more generally, from Woolf's fatal legacy of repression, passivity, sickness and suicide" (231). Therefore, for Showalter, Woolf's androgyny is not a feminist tendency. Heilbrun may agree with Showalter as she states that there is a difference between the feminist and the androgynous writing: "in androgynous novels, the reader identifies with the male and female characters equally; in feminist novels, only with the female hero" (58). Thus, according to what Showalter and Heilbrun claim, it means that through androgyny Woolf evades feminist discourse.

On the other hand, there are critics who claim that Woolf's idea of androgyny is based on balance. Indeed, this seems the most appropriate way of approaching Woolf's notion of androgyny. Woolf sees androgyny as a way to feel the wholeness

of a person, which suggests an escape from the idea of fusion discussed above; one part is not subsumed by the other. While Makiko Minow-Pinkney analyses Woolf's notion of androgyny in *Orlando* she claims that Woolf's notion of androgyny in the novel does not "emphasise the fusion of opposites" (121). Minow-Pinkney adds that the fantasy of sex-change in the novel is the "transgression of boundaries [and] . . . play with the limit, . . . a play of difference" (122). In this respect, she sees Woolf's notion of androgyny as a balance of the differences between the sexes. "Androgyny in *Orlando* is not a resolution of oppositions, but the throwing of both sexes into a metonymic confusion of genders" (Minow-Pinkney 122). Hence, the opposite sexes come together in one body not to resolve their differences – by incorporating one sex into the other – but to juxtapose the differences. The metonymic confusion that Minow-Pinkney mentions is further explained as "metonymical displacement, a sliding of one form into another" (131). Therefore, she claims that "Orlando lives alternation not resolution" (131).

By focusing on Woolf's fiction, Nancy Taylor also claims that Woolf's concept of androgyny is based on balance. "In her fiction, . . . she further deconstructs the ideal of a unified ego by allowing typically masculine and feminine traits to be distributed among both males and females, as if traits traditionally seen as gender-related may be interchanged" (368). What Taylor means is similar to the idea of metonymical displacement or a sliding of one form into another that Minow-Pinkney discusses. Thus, a woman can display masculine traits and a man can demonstrate feminine traits. In this way, Taylor claims, "[a]ndrogyny in character and dramatic situation and feminist readings that highlight this theme dig a grave for the oppressive patriarchal system" (375-376). The patriarchal system that propagates strict division of human beings into separate poles of two genders is unsettled. Woolf's notion of androgyny, thus, challenges patriarchal norms and subverts gender hierarchies. The male part is not the One that subsumes the Other as it is seen in the idea of fusion. The male and the female come together on equal terms. "Through an androgynous creation of character, dramatic situation, and language that deconstructs

the borders between male and female, Woolf dissolves any claim of innate superiority of men over women" (Taylor 377).

Men's loss of superiority over women – the balance of an androgynous subjectivity – is underlined by Woolf's discussion of Carmichael's novel in *A Room of One's Own*. Woolf holds that a possibility of a lesbian relationship between two women in Carmichael's novel endorses the idea of equality between the sexes; neither sex dominates the other. It shows the fact that Woolf tries to reconfigure the image of women in literature. "Virginia Woolf's task was to understand, to subvert and redefine the female subject in the literary field" (Humm 125). Mary Carmichael's phrase – "Chloe liked Olivia" (*Room* 106) – makes Woolf understand "how immense a change was there" (*Room* 106) in fiction writing. "Chloe liked Olivia perhaps for the first time in literature" (*Room* 106). Carmichael unsettles the heteronormative division between genders by inserting a possible sexual attraction between two women. Woolf notices Carmichael's tendency to ignore conventional notions of gender and to unsettle the gender hierarchies. Woolf is struck by the author's audacity to express women's feelings regardless of their relation to men. Consequently, for Woolf, Mary Carmichael's way of writing explores an unknown territory. "For if Chloe likes Olivia and Mary Carmichael knows how to express it she will light a torch in that vast chamber where nobody had yet been" (*Room* 109). Woolf thinks that Carmichael's way of writing offers a means for unearthing what has been hidden so far. Woolf sees Olivia – and women in general – as an "organism that has been under the shadow of the rock these million years" (*Room* 110). Carmichael's description of this hidden organism as an independent entity is her method of depicting the idea that when an androgynous mind creates, it should not rest on the existent patriarchal discourse of gender relationships.

Woolf also underlines that Carmichael's writing is not an attack on the opposite sex; her writing suggests the notion of balance. As was discussed earlier, Woolf's notion of androgyny is not her attempt to make one sex dominate the other; it is a creation of a balance between the sexes. Carmichael rather renders problematic the idea of dividing human beings into separate genders. Woolf states that

Carmichael does not regard men as "the opposing faction" (*Room* 120). Her novel is not set against men and their actions; "she need not waste her time railing against them" (*Room* 120). For Woolf, Carmichael has an androgynous mind when she writes; she makes the man and the woman part of her brain come together. As a result, Carmichael "wrote as a woman, but as a woman who has forgotten that she is a woman, so that her pages were full of that curious sexual quality which comes only when sex is unconscious of itself" (*Room* 121). For Woolf, Carmichael's writing is original because it does not resemble the work of any other author.

Woolf discusses masculine writing in *A Room of One's Own* in order to emphasize the difference between the writings of an androgynous mind and a writing performed only by "a male side" of the brain (*Room* 132). In this way, it becomes evident that masculine writing lacks a sense of balance. When Woolf analyses writing by a man, Mr A, she feels his urge to establish masculine superiority in his writing; "after reading a chapter or two a shadow seemed to lie across the page. It was a straight dark bar, a shadow shaped something like the letter 'I'" (*Room* 130). Woolf states that a masculine author tries to assert superiority and makes women's attempts at equality impossible. "He is protesting against the equality of the other sex by asserting his own superiority" (*Room* 132). Thus, in comparison with Carmichael, Mr A is conscious of his gender and writes accordingly. "A man's writing is, to Woolf, egotistical, the ubiquitous ego it embodies overshadowing any landscape – trees, women – behind it" (Restuccia 258). According to Woolf, Mr A's way of writing is an example of the exclusion of the woman part of the brain. Woolf adds that "men" write "only with the male side of their brains," which makes it "a mistake for a woman to read" because "she will inevitably look for something that she will not find" (*Room* 132). Yet, Woolf lists several male authors who have androgynous minds and create a sense of balance. "One must turn back to Shakespeare then, for Shakespeare was androgynous; and so were Keats and Sterne and Cowper and Lamb and Coleridge" (*Room* 135). Indeed, Heilbrun underlines that there is "Shakespeare's recognition that every human power is quickened when 'masculine' and 'feminine' forces are conjoined" (31). In brief, Woolf holds that it is "fatal to be a man or

woman pure and simple; one must be woman-manly or man-womanly" (*Room* 136). An author should forget his/her sex and gender and focus on the representation of a life in its wholeness. "Some collaboration has to take place in the mind between the woman and the man before the art of creation can be accomplished. Some marriage of opposites has to be comsummated" (*Room* 136).

A.4.2 Woolf's use of non-human imagery

Another way through which Woolf renders problematic the notion of the fixed body is the associations she establishes between her characters and animals or non-human bodies. According to Kate Flint, Woolf uses animal imagery in her personal life, too. "It was a constant habit of Woolf's mind to find animal correspondences for those whom she met" (Flint xiii). Flint adds that "[a]nimals – real, imaginary, and metaphorical – were a constant presence in Virginia Woolf's life" (xii). Flint observes several functions of Woolf's use of animal imagery in her works. "Sometimes, she does so in order to express anger, or passion, or violence: elemental responses which exist across species" (Flint xv). Flint also adds that animal imagery helps Woolf to "express intimate feelings through displacing them from the human sphere onto a cosier animal one" (xv). Another function is Woolf's desire to imply a particular idea or thought. By rejecting saying something directly Woolf conveys it through animal imagery. "This is particularly true of the language of emotions, especially sexual feelings" (Flint xxix).

In her fiction, it is possible to see Woolf's images of animals or non-human bodies as her desire to insert a theme of relativity and changeability in terms of the body. Likening her characters to various animals or other bodies, Woolf provides a new view of a familiar image. She suggests the idea that bodies are not as stable as they are usually conceived to be. Woolf's invoking images of animals and inanimate objects makes her fiction include the elements of comedy. As Little claims, Woolf's comedy attacks certain values and norms (7). So in this way, Woolf mocks the conventional idea of a human being as the carrier of mind and soul, two elements

that occupy a superior position in the body/mind hierarchy. She does it by degrading human beings down to the animal or inanimate objects' world. The two different worlds merge and the characters meet the world and become one with the others. "The frontiers of self and other blur" (Minow-Pinkney 159). The merging worlds of the human beings, the animals and non-human objects makes it possible to analyse Woolf's use of non-human imagery in terms of Bakhtin's notion of the grotesque. As Bakhtin claims and as it will be discussed in the next chapter, the main feature of the grotesque is its image of the merging of various worlds such as the world of the human beings, nature, and animals.

B. Literature review: Bakhtin, feminist criticism, and Woolf's fiction

B.1 The scholarship on Bakhtin, feminism and Woolf's humour

Feminist engagements with Bakhtin's theories and the role of humour in both Bakhtin's theories and Woolf's fiction pave the ground for approaching Woolf's fiction within a Bakhtinian framework. Although Bakhtin's works do not focus specifically on women's position in society, Keith Booker still states that for feminist critics Bakhtin's theories are quite useful because "his theories of dialogism lend themselves to a critique of the kind of authoritarian discourse often associated with the patriarchal tradition" (163). A seminal analysis of Bakhtin's works and his notion of dialogism and carnival from a feminist lens has been done by Dale Bauer. Bauer points to a lack of the discussion of gender issues in Bakhtin scholarship. "What is missing from the dominant mode of Bakhtin scholarship is any interest in gender theory or sexual difference in a materialist-feminist practice" (Bauer xiii). Yet, Bauer recognizes Bakhtin's oeuvre as a possible ground on which feminist issues can be positioned. "Bakhtin's social theory of utterance is congenial to a feminist approach to the normative discursive practices of patriarchal culture, which feminism would subvert" (Bauer xiii). What she means by social theory of utterance is Bakhtin's analysis of the dialogic structure of language; i.e. his conceptualisation of dialogism.

Bakhtin states that the "entire life of language, in any area of its use . . . is permeated with dialogic relationship" (*Dostoevsky*[5] 183). Any utterance is an arena for the meeting of voices or discourses of two or more people. Bakhtin's term for each voice with its own discourse is *ideologeme* (*Dialogic* 333). Any statement has an affirmation or a negation of another's statement. In this respect, every statement has a dialogic nature because it encompasses two or more discourses. In this way, Bakhtin elaborates on polyphony in a novel, "*a plurality of independent and unmerged voices and consciousnesses*" (*Dostoevsky* 6). None of these voices dominates the others.

Bauer sees Bakhtin's dialogism as a theory which can be employed in feminist literary criticism. She analyses various literary texts by bringing "female voices," which are usually subdued to the authoritative voice, into dialogue with the voices of the authoritative discourse. In this way, the female voice gains a chance to assert its own value among the other voices. And Bauer sees Bakhtin's theory as a solid ground for this aim because it shatters the idea that there is an authoritative voice in a text to which the other voices are subordinated. Bauer claims that "Bakhtin offers us a way to move beyond this question of inscription in language as a totalizing regime since language can never be completely totalizing; he theorizes a way to make the dominant (authoritative) languages into internally persuasive (resisting) ones" (xii). Bakhtin's theory, thus, relegates the authoritative voice to the level of the other voices; all voices become equal. In this vein, Bauer sees language not as a "prison house," but as the production of "eruptions of force which do not always follow the norms or conventions" (xiii).

Bauer's discussion of the connection between feminist concerns regarding gender hierarchy and carnival remains at the level of carnivalized discourse. She does not discuss Bakhtin's carnival as a physical space where women can escape, temporarily, from the oppressive world of patriarchy. So there occurs a gap in an attempt to bring Bakhtin's theory of the carnival into feminist critical discourse. This dissertation will focus on the bridging of this gap between Bakhtin's carnival and the

[5] A short form of *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics.*

challenge of the dominant patriarchal notions. Woolf's fiction provides a background against which women's "participation in the carnival" – their suspension of the patriarchal precepts – can be observed. Woolf's *The Voyage Out*, *To the Lighthouse* and *Flush* portray middle-class women and their attempt at redefining of the spaces they inhabit throughout their lives. They try to exit from the middle-class ideological confinement of their homes and enter into a space which is not shaped by the notions of the dominant patriarchal world. Moreover, in *Orlando*, Woolf challenges the stable subjectivity by portraying ambivalent characters in terms of sex, gender and physical appearance.

Another significant aspect that brings Woolf and Bakhtin together is humour. Bakhtinian carnival sense of the world is a humorous attitude to life and to everything serious that takes part in ordinary life. Virginia Woolf also appropriates a humorous attitude to life. As remembered by her contemporaries, Woolf was an amusing woman. Heilbrun states that "for those who remember her – and it is the saddest of ironies – the memory is of gaiety" (132). In Vita Sackville-West's words, "the enormous sense of fun she had, the rollicking enjoyment she got out of easy things" (qtd. in Heilbrun 132). Woolf's fiction, too, notwithstanding her dealing with serious subject matter, is replete with humour. Michelle Barrett states that Woolf advocated forgetfulness of the conditions that might arouse anger during the process of creating fiction, and was sure that it is important "for the artist to stay serene and keep a sense of humour" (20). Barrett also claims that humour plays an important role in Woolf's aesthetic principles; Woolf presents the serious subject matter "with humour or irony" (21). Judy Little discusses Woolf's use of humour in her fiction, too. She links Woolf's humour to the notion of liminal space. She claims that when authors express liminal experience they write in the mode of comedy. "Comedy derives many of its characteristic motifs from the ritual practices belonging to 'liminality'" (2). In this sense, according to Little, Woolf's fiction can be analysed in terms of comedy and liminality. She links Woolf's "comic fiction" (7) with its liminality and comedy to feminism. "Feminism is indeed a major presence in the comedy of this writer" (Little 23). Yet, neither Barrett nor Little approaches Woolf's

humour and its relationship to her feminist agenda from a Bakhtinian perspective. This dissertation will try to juxtapose Woolf's use of humour with reference to her feminist ideas in her four novels and Bakhtin's idea of humour.

B.2 Woolf's fiction and carnivalization

The scarcity of studies on Woolf's fiction in the light of Bakhtinian carnival is evident. Among these texts that engage in an analysis of Woolf's novels in this regard, a consensus seems to have been reached that *Orlando* is the most carnivalized novel among Woolf's works. *Orlando* is seen as gender subversive. Actually, Booker goes so far as to hold that "*Orlando*, by bringing gender so prominently into view, illuminates the feminist potential in Bakhtin's work" (163). Orlando's changeable sex and her/his transgression of gender categories make Booker notice "a great deal of transgressive potential in *Orlando*'s questioning of traditional notions of gender boundaries" (163) because the novel "refuses to settle within the categorical boundaries of gender" (164). What is more, in line with the subversion of gender notions, Booker claims that the novel unsettles the stable subjectivity of a person. "Woolf's book thus mounts a direct challenge to conventional notions of identity and to the hierarchies with which those notions are associated" (Booker 164). In his work *Virginia Woolf* (2000) Linden Peach also acknowledges *Orlando* as a portrayal of "the world turning upside down" and as a "temporary opportunity . . . to subvert traditional hierarchies and to challenge authority" (139). Peach sees carnival as "a key image" (139) in the novel.

The novel has also been discussed in terms of its subversion of the notion of genre. According to Booker, who juxtaposes *Orlando* and Bakhtin's notion of the carnival in his chapter titled "What's the Difference?: The Carnivalization of Gender in Virginia Woolf's *Orlando*", Woolf's *Orlando* is defined as an "antigeneric" work. Booker states that "the prevalence of critical attempts to pin it [*Orlando*] down by labelling its genre" (166) is an evidence to the subversive potential of the novel genre. Each attempt attaches a different reading to the novel. The novel depicts how

Woolf challenges the desire to classify and categorise. Booker links this challenge to feminist tendencies in Woolf's fiction. "After all, attempts at taxonomy and classification partake of exactly the sort of masculine drive toward totalizing systems that Woolf's book attacks and ridicules" (164). By defining Woolf's novel as antigeneric, Booker claims that it can be analysed in terms of Bakhtin's concept of the novel. He states that "genre subversion is . . . fundamental to Bakhtin's conception of the novel" (165). Bakhtin, according to Booker, sees novel as the main form in which genre subversion is possible. Thus, Booker argues that when a Bakhtinian approach is adopted, Woolf's novel is an "exemplary of the best features of the novel tradition" (167). The discussion of Woolf's novel in terms of its antigeneric qualities makes Booker juxtapose it with the Menippean satire, a genre Bakhtin dwells on in his works. Booker states that the novel includes "its serious as well as its comic elements" which is the feature of the Menippean satire (169). He also adds that *Orlando*'s fantastic elements, such as Orlando's magical change of sex, bring the novel closer to the Menippean satire (170).

According to Booker, the marginal position of the novel among other genres in the 19th century, as is also emphasized by Bakhtin, resembles the marginalization of women in society.

> Thus, if it is true that nineteenth-century society marginalized the novel in such a way as to associate it with the feminine, then it is also true that Bakhtin's attempts to recuperate the novel have an interesting feminist potential, despite Bakhtin's own apparent lack of interest in gender issues. (Booker 167)

Hence, according to what Booker states, the novel was seen as the form through which feminine experiences were expressed. In this way, the difference between the modes of expression of different genders occurs. While masculine experience was expressed through conventional literary forms, the novel, as a new literary form, expressed the experience of the marginal layer of society. Similarly, according to Booker, Woolf felt an emergency to separate women's writing from the dominant

writing system and "saw the novel as the genre within which these new forms and modes could be expected to develop" (165).

Suzan Harrison also thinks that a tendency to play with genres can be observed in Woolf's fiction. She claims that *To the Lighthouse* "function[s] as eleg[y] because [it is] autobiographical. Virginia Woolf in *To the Lighthouse* . . . re-create[s] [her] own parents through language in order to come to terms with [her] parents' deaths" (113). However, Harrison claims that because Woolf's novel includes "humour" and "laughter," it is not "pure elegy in the sense that Milton's 'Lycidas' or Shelley's 'Adonias' are" (115). For example, "'Time Passes,' with its stress on flux, change, and 'indeterminacy,' is almost pure carnival. Human tragedy is reduced to parenthetical statement, whereas human comedy in the character of Mrs. McNab cooperates with the forces of chaos and darkness" (117). As is indicated, Woolf's novel carnivalizes elegy by inserting comedy and laughter into it. Harrison claims that juxtaposition of laughter and elegy in a novel creates *carnival* because, she states, according to Bakhtin, "comic, parodic, irreverent qualities of the novel" pave the way for the sense of the carnival (116). Moreover, Harrison claims that elegy "in the traditional sense serves, as Bakhtin explains, to fix and distance its objects" (115). In Woolf's novel, in contrast, the objects of the elegy are not distanced; "rather, they are mocked as much as they are honored. Woolf reveals their absurdities along with their dignity" (Harrison 117). For instance, Harrison claims that Lily's thinking about Mrs Ramsay and feeling her presence adds to the carnivalization of the novel: "within the carnivalized world of the novel, the dead do not stay dead, do not maintain their distance and fixity" (117). As Harrison states, the sense of the carnival erases the gaps between the living and the dead.

> Carnival transgresses boundaries between the living and the dead, between the stylized dignity of myth and the absurdities of everyday life, between comedy and tragedy. *To the Lighthouse* mocks while celebrating the dead, and thus calls into question the power of the parents, the power of death, the power of myth, and diminishes the distance of elegy. (Harrison 118)

All these studies contribute to the discussion of Woolf's novels in terms of carnivalization. Yet, they do not encompass the whole possible range of carnivalistic elements in Woolf's fiction. Booker's analysis of *Orlando* is an illuminating study. However, it does not address the full carnivalesque potential of the novel, especially that of grotesque imagery. In this way, this dissertation will benefit from Booker's in-depth scrutiny of Woolf's novel and at the same time, it will attempt at providing a close analysis of the grotesque imagery. Peach's study is relatively short and does not provide a strong framework of *Orlando* from a Bakhtinian perspective. Harrison's study provides a possible direction towards viewing *To the Lighthouse* in terms of Bakhtin's carnival sense of the world. Nonetheless, it does not focus on the novel's carnivalistic elements such as crowning and decrowning.

This dissertation will focus on Woolf's use of carnivalistic elements with the intention of laying bare her notion of gender and gender hierarchies that are informed by the carnival sense of the world and show that through carnivalistic elements it is possible to undermine the dominant values related to the notion of the body. The dissertation will also pinpoint that although there are some carnivalistic elements in Woolf's novels, a complete Bakhtinian carnival sense of the world is not possible in her fiction. The age in which Woolf lived is a modern age which Bakhtin describes as the time of separation and division of human beings. And Woolf depicts this division in terms of sex and gender. The following chapter will analyse Bakhtin's notion of the carnival. It will dwell upon Bakhtin's analysis of Dostoevsky's fiction as well as Rabelais's novels because while the former constitutes an important platform for Bakhtin's discussion of carnivalization, the latter illustrates Bakhtin's ideas related to grotesque imagery clearly. However, it should be noted that this is not a comparative study of the works of Dostoevsky, Rabelais and Woolf. Bakhtin's analysis of carnivalization in the works of Dostoevsky and Rabelais constitute the basis for the discussion of carnival in Woolf's fiction.

Chapter Three will explore carnivalistic features in Woolf's *The Voyage Out* in terms of gender hierarchies. It will analyse how Woolf's female characters transform the spaces allocated for them by the patriarchal authority according to their

needs and values. Woolf's de-idealization of the domestic universe for women is vividly portrayed in the novel. The novel constitutes a suitable example of a work which can be analysed in terms of Bakhtin's notion of the carnival with reference to the merging of the self and the world. The female characters in *The Voyage Out* leave behind the sense of stability embodied in the image of England and domestic atmosphere. They participate in activities that change their fates. They experience life in a way that is contrary to what middle-class ideology propagates for women. This makes it possible to read this novel in the light of Bakhtinian carnivalistic reversed life; the female characters "suspend" the sense of stability, social rules, and the difference between the private and the public and tend to transcend the barriers that have been erected between the genders by middle-class ideology. The chapter will also underline the fact that although Woolf's characters manage to transgress the boundaries between men and women and indulge in a carnival sense of the world, they cannot experience total freedom from patriarchal dominance.

Chapter Four will analyse *To the Lighthouse* and *Flush* in terms of characters' acts of crowning/decrowning. It will scrutinize the female characters' ways of undermining the patriarchal authority embodied by their husbands and fathers. The disabling of the authority of the father figures in these two novels in a humorous way lends them to an analysis from a Bakhtinian perspective, specifically in terms of Bakhtin's conceptualization of the acts of crowning/decrowning that take place during the carnival and find a wide reflection in literature. According to Bakhtin, the presence of the acts of crowning/decrowning in literature signifies the fact that nothing is constant; everything is open to change. Thus, the sudden emasculation of the father figures, their loss of authority over the others and the humour that underlies these changes in Woolf's novels bring these novels close to Bakhtinian carnivalesque acts of crowning/decrowning. This chapter will also demonstrate that the act of decrowning of the figures of patriarchal authority in Woolf's novels mainly takes place on an abstract level, in the minds and emotions of the female characters.

The final chapter will dwell upon Woolf's *Orlando*. It will explore Woolf's theme of androgyny and link it to Bakhtin's notion of the grotesque. It will analyse

Woolf's ideas with reference to an encapsulation of both sexes in one body and the transgression of gender categories. This suggests a link between Woolf's idea of androgyny and Bakhtin's idea of grotesque ambivalence and flexibility. In this way, this chapter will focus on the notion of the grotesque in terms of gender discourse. Orlando's change of sex and gender makes it possible to draw parallels between *Orlando*'s characters and Bakhtin's grotesque images. Similar to carnivalesque grotesque imagery, Woolf's characters are devoid of stable bodily and gender manifestations. As Bakhtin states, the essential traits of a grotesque image are "becoming" and "ambivalence" (*Rabelais* 24). In brief, built on a historical overview of gender hierarchies and Woolf's ideas in this regard as well as on the theoretical discussion of the carnival in the following chapter, the analytical chapters will argue that Woolf's novels, *The Voyage Out*, *To the Lighthouse*, *Orlando* and *Flush*, carnivalize gender hierarchies and the body. These chapters will focus on the parallelisms between Woolf's female characters' tendencies to escape patriarchal oppression by challenging such notions like certainty and stability and the carnival's participants' freedom from class differences and the status quo.

CHAPTER II

MIKHAIL BAKHTIN'S NOTION OF THE CARNIVAL AND ITS INFLUENCE ON LITERATURE

Mikhail Bakhtin (1895-1975), a Russian intellectual, thinker, and philosopher, has contributed to various fields such as philosophy, language and literature, with his ideas formulated in his several seminal works mainly about language, literature, history, philosophy, sociology and ethics. Thus, it is difficult to fix his name onto one particular field; therefore, as Aileen M. Kelly states, Bakhtin's "heritage has become . . . fiercely contested by rival claimants" (192). This chapter will focus on Bakhtin as a literary critic and will explore his notion of the *carnival*. Bakhtin is the central figure in the theoretical discussion on carnival. He conceptualizes carnival mainly in his *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics* (1929) and *Rabelais and His World* (1965). Although Bakhtin's other works are no less important than the abovementioned ones, this dissertation mainly focuses on these works due to their in-depth analysis of carnival. The aim of this chapter is to provide a theoretical basis for the discussion of Virginia Woolf's novels, *The Voyage Out* (1915), *To the Lighthouse* (1926), *Orlando* (1928) and *Flush* (1933) in the following chapters in terms of Bakhtinian carnival. Firstly, this chapter will discuss Bakhtin's conceptualization of carnival and pursue its brief historical development. Next, the chapter will examine the carnivalization of literature in the works of Dostoevsky and Rabelais and prepare the background on which it will be possible to explore Woolf's novels in terms of Bakhtin's carnival.

Bakhtin's critical literary output coincides with the ruling time of Stalin (from the mid-1920s to 1953), who is known for the establishment of a strict political regime with its state violence and persecution of the citizens, who were thought to be a potential threat to the state. Stalin's unchallenged and aggressive political actions

influenced Bakhtin negatively and he was exiled to Kazakhstan in the late 1920s. Hence, there is a very direct connection between the content of Bakhtin's works and the times in which he wrote. In this line of thought, Bakhtin's ideas on carnival can be seen as an invitation to protest authoritarian regimes. Indeed, Simon Dentith percieves *Rabelais and His World* as a celebration of an "anarchic" world which can destabilize the dominant ideology (66). Bakhtin's exploration of Rabelais reflects his revolutionary thoughts because the images the French author invokes are infused with the gay freedom of people, especially the freedom related to the body. And such bodily freedom was the very thing Bakhtin lacked because of his exile and his chronic disease that severely damaged his body. Michael Holquist's ideas about Bakhtin's celebration of freedom are in agreement with Dentith's thoughts; for Holquist, Bakhtin's discourse in his study on Rabelais "is revolution itself" (1984, xviii). If read and analysed in terms of political discourse, Bakhtin's works suggest a possibility to unsettle the hierarchical order of the world, especially of Russia, and to initiate a great change if people come together. In short, Bakhtin sees carnival as a spatial and temporal space where people can suspend their ordinary lives, as a positive time of rebirth and renewal.

A. Bakhtin's notion of the carnival

Exploring carnival during which ancient, medieval and Renaissance communities used to revel and stay away from all kinds of restrictions, Bakhtin finds a revolutionary way of perceiving life. Seeing everything primarily in relation to the body renders him a revolutionary thinker especially at the time when any tendency to transgress social norms could result in vital consequences. Bakhtin's notion of the carnival is the expression of his desire of spiritual, intellectual and physical freedom, and his being imprisoned and immobilized in exile both politically and physically contributes to this desire. Carnival, in his words, was a second life that medieval people could afford to have and which was impossible in his day.

In Bakhtinian discourse, carnival is a manifestation of people's culture; culture that is not tainted by social norms or regulations. It is a culture that reflects people's instincts and desires which are usually repressed by social norms. In order to understand carnival, it is necessary to have a brief overview of this culture, to which Bakhtin refers as "folk culture," "folk humor," "folk tradition," "the tradition of folk humor," or "culture of folk humor" (*Rabelais* 3-4).

Bakhtin provides a historical overview of the process during which people started to lose freedom to express their culture. He provides an explanation for two epochs in the history of humanity; the time when people could express their culture freely and the time when they lost this freedom. The first epoch is "the earliest stages of cultural development," during which "primitive peoples" existed. They had "preclass and prepolitical social order" (*Rabelais* 6); an order based on the collective system of people's unity unhampered by the social division into classes. The epoch that comes afterwards, is, according to Bakhtin, marked by "the definitely consolidated state and class structure" (*Rabelais* 6). During this epoch people were divided into social classes and separated from each other. In the former epoch, Bakhtin notices the simultaneous presence and coherence of "the serious and the comic aspects of the world" in every sphere of life: both "were equally sacred, equally 'official'" (*Rabelais* 6). During this epoch, "in the early period of the Roman state," people could be seen "glorifying and . . . deriding . . . the victor" at the same time, "lamenting and deriding the deceased" during the funeral (*Rabelais* 6). Both the serious and the comic existed side by side in one scene. However, Bakhtin thinks that this coherence of the serious and the comic was shattered afterwards; "in the definitely consolidated state and class structure such an equality of the two aspects became impossible" (*Rabelais* 6). Life started to be divided into two in terms of its serious and comic aspects: official and nonofficial life. While the serious remained at the official level, the comic became the expression of the nonofficial level and became "the expression . . . of folk culture" (*Rabelais* 6). Bakhtin sees this expression of folk culture as the point from which the "carnival festivities," "Roman Saturnalias," and "medieval carnivals" spring forth. Because "clowns and fools,

constant participants in these festivals, mimicked serious rituals" (*Rabelais* 5) of the official life, folk culture is infused with people's laughter and always includes humour. That is why, Bakhtin uses the term "culture of folk humor" or "the tradition of folk humor" interchangeably with "folk culture."

Bakhtin divides the "manifestations" of this folk culture into three categories: (1) *ritual spectacles*: "carnival pageants, comic shows of the marketplace," (2) *comic verbal compositions*: "parodies both oral and written, in Latin and in the vernacular," (3) *various genres of billingsgate*: "curses, oaths, popular blazons" (*Rabelais* 5). Bakhtin's division of these manifestations into three seems logical; however, when he discusses them in detail, it becomes obvious that *comic verbal compositions* and *various genres of billingsgate* are parts of *ritual spectacles*. It can even be stated that the second category is the written form of the first while the third category is the language used during the carnivals.

In Bakhtin's works carnival means "a sum total of all diverse festivities of the carnival type" (*Dostoevsky* 122): all kinds of public entertainment in Europe in ancient times, Middle Ages, and the Renaissance. Bakhtin generalizes the term carnival and this can be seen in his use of the phrase "carnival atmosphere" when discussing *ritual spectacles* and its constituents: "pageants," "processions," "fairs," "open-air amusements," "participation of giants, dwarfs, monsters, and trained animals," "mysteries," *soties* (*Rabelais* 5). Bakhtin states that "[w]hile carnival lasts, there is no other life outside it" (*Rabelais* 7); so Bakhtinian carnival is the sum total of *ritual spectacles*, everything people experience outside their everyday lives.

A.1 The historical background of the carnival as a ritual

According to Bakhtin, carnival is a period of time when people come together on a carnival square and entertain themselves. It is the time of "uninhabited pleasure-seeking, challenges to official culture and a celebration of the material, physical body" (Bagshaw 84). "[P]eople celebrated this holiday period by indulging excessively in food, drink, sex, and violence" (Vaught 4). Although the idea of

carnival as a violent time does not match Bakhtin's idea of carnival, what Hilary Bagshaw and Jennifer Vaught say about other features means that carnival was the time of the suspension of traditions and conventions, and the time of the body. According to Bakhtin, carnival was a time of the displacement of "one-sided and gloomy official seriousness" and stability with mockery and laughter (*Dostoevsky* 160). Moreover, it is a dynamic entertainment at the core of which lie the ideas of absolute change and renewal through laughter. "Carnival is the festival of all-annihilating and all-renewing time" (*Dostoevsky* 124). In short, the Bakhtinian concept of carnival is the belief in the absolute power of community, celebration of the body, renewal of and challenging the official life.

Bakhtin traces carnival as a ritual in four eras: the ancient times, the Middle Ages, the Renaissance and the 17th century. As he states, carnivals were widely held in ancient times in Greek and Roman cultures. Ancient "pagan festivities, agrarian in nature" and which "included the comic element in their rituals" (*Rabelais* 8) have links to carnivals. The most famous Roman carnival, for instance, was named *Saturnalia*. Bakhtin thinks that Roman Saturnalias "clearly expressed and experienced" carnival's essence (*Rabelais* 7). For him, Saturnalia was the time of utopia because people perceived this time as "Saturn's golden age upon earth" (*Rabelais* 7-8). The god Saturn, god of fertility and agriculture, is known for his period of ruling when there was peace and harmony, when the land and property belonged to communal use. What is important is the fact that during Saturn's ruling there was no class distinction. However, it should be noted that this utopia is not something abstract "brought about by some kind of messianic . . . transformation of the present;" it is the world of "human agency . . . in starkly materialistic terms" (Gardiner 1993, 37-38). It is a "concrete utopia" (Gardiner 1993, 37-38). Saturnalia was a concrete carnival, not an idea in people's dreams. In short, agrarian cyclical time, humour, harmony between people, human beings' merging with nature, the equality among people and their physicality are the main components of the ancient carnivals that would remain thus in later epochs.

Bakhtin does not see any change in the popularity of carnivals in the Middle Ages. As he claims, medieval people usually held carnivals after religious holidays and festivals such as Corpus Christi (*Dostoevsky* 129), before Lent, during the time called *Mardi gras*[6] in French (*Rabelais* 8). Such gatherings usually had a feast atmosphere, at the core of which lay the idea of abundance of food (*Rabelais* 9). Obviously, Bakhtin sees feasts as an important part of medieval carnivals. Unlimited consumption of food was an inescapable factor of festivals and carnivals. A gathering before Lent showed the fact that similar to carnivals, such feasts took place during people's and nature's essential turning points in life (*Rabelais* 9). Bakhtin also states that medieval carnivals took place during non-religious holidays such as bullfights, fairs, festivals of grapes, miracle plays, and mystery play performances (*Dostoevsky* 129). He notes that every year medieval society spent nearly three months on carnivals. Therefore, he concludes that medieval people had two lives: the official life, which was "monolithically serious and gloomy, subjugated to a strict hierarchical order, full of terror, dogmatism, reverence, and piety," and the nonofficial life, which Bakhtin calls "the *life of the carnival square*, free and unrestricted, full of ambivalent laughter, blasphemy, the profanation of everything sacred, full of debasing and obscenities, familiar contact with everyone and everything" (*Dostoevsky* 129-130). Thus, Bakhtin's discussion of the medieval gatherings reveals other components of the carnival which are added to the list of carnival elements that are discussed above in relation to the ancient rituals. Such components like feasts, crises and turning points in people's lives, people's free contact with each other and a profane attitude towards everything can be seen as other elements of carnivals.

The Renaissance period is complex for Bakhtin since it provides the atmosphere for carnival's reaching its peak and at the same time witnesses its decline. Bakhtin sees carnival not only on the squares as it was in the previous eras, but in all spheres of life. The medieval heritage of carnival culture was experienced in a concentrated and extensive manner. Even the official lives of the people were

[6]Shrove Tuesday in English.

permeated with a carnival sense of the world (*Dostoevsky* 130). It is at this stage that the famous authors like Cervantes and Rabelais were producing their works, which were rich in the depiction of the carnival sense of the world. However, as Bakhtin claims, the Renaissance was also the time of carnival's decline. It witnessed the empowerment of the world, which Bakhtin calls "bourgeois," with its stress on privatization and isolation of the individual (*Rabelais* 3). The presence of such a world view, of course, weakened the belief in the power of the communal gathering of people.

Bakhtin holds that the 17th century is the time when carnival "almost loses touch with communal performance, its specific weight in the life of people is sharply reduced" (*Dostoevsky* 130). For Bakhtin, this is due to the priority of "private life" (*Rabelais* 33) that became pungent in 17th century European worldview. Carnival's significant quality of the coherent and harmonious unity of the people starts to disappear. Yet, some forms of carnival continue existing in some kinds of entertainment such as the *circus*, "*farcical* comic antics of the public square" and "theatre and spectacle" (*Dostoevsky* 131). This means that carnival starts to have its spectators. This has led to the entrance of carnival into literature, which will be discussed below in the section subtitled "Carnivalization."

A.2 The nature of the carnival as a ritual in Bakhtin's literary theory

As Bakhtin states, his aim is not to dwell upon carnival as a ritual, but to discuss it in relation to literature. Therefore, when he conceptualizes carnival, he "isolate[s] and examine[s] individual aspects and characteristic features of carnival" (*Dostoevsky* 122). According to this conceptualization, carnival's essence lies in the following: (1) it has a reversed life; (2) the participants have free and familiar contact; (3) it is replete with carnivalistic mésalliances; (4) it is infused with profanation; (5) it has crowning/decrowning acts; and (6) it parodies everything. Although some of these were shortly mentioned above, they will be explored in detail in this part.

The first feature Bakhtin discusses in relation to carnival is the carnivalistic reversed life. As Alexandar Mihailovic claims, Bakhtin was a "lover of inversion and the vision of a world turned upside down" (179). Indeed, for Bakhtin, carnivalistic life is a "life turned inside out," "the reverse side of the world." It suspends "hierarchical structure," "reverence," "piety," "etiquette," "inequality among people (including age)" and everything else that is connected with serious official life (*Dostoevsky* 122-123). It means that carnival enters into a dialogue with the noncarnival life as it is a reaction against it. By reversing the rules of the serious life, carnival establishes its own laws, which Bakhtin calls "the laws of its own freedom" (*Rabelais* 7), which are based on the disappearance of people's categorizations according to their social roles, statuses, or age. In carnival, as a result, "[p]eople were, so to speak, reborn for new, purely human relations" (*Rabelais* 10). The implication that Bakhtin brings forth by stressing the lack of class categorizations among people is the fact that carnival brings people to the same level. As he expresses, carnival "is a pageant without footlights and without a division into performers and spectators" (*Dostoevsky* 122). Thus, people from different classes come together in one place, temporarily forget about their class differences and entertain themselves freely.

Second, Bakhtin discusses a *new mode of interrelationship between individuals*. The engagingly free atmosphere of carnival leads its participants into a world of familiar contact. They suspend the social barriers between each other. Carnival is the time when a slave may approach a king and vice versa while leaving aside the etiquette required in such relationships in the official sphere. Bakhtin sees *eccentricity* as a dimension of this free contact. He states that the ways in which people act and talk during carnival seem eccentric if observed from a noncarnival life's angle (*Dostoevsky* 123). In a world ruled by piety, serious and gloomy atmosphere and social hierarchy such behaviour and language like blasphemy, profane attitude toward everything, the use of obscene discourse, and people's familiar behaviour towards everybody would definitely seem eccentric.

Another feature of the carnival sense of the world is what Bakhtin calls *carnivalistic mésalliances*. As Bakhtin claims, due to the "reversed" nature of carnival life and due to the temporary loss of the validity of the rules of noncarnival life, carnival becomes a meeting place of elements "that were once self-enclosed, disunified, distanced from one another:" the carnival square becomes the place where incompatible elements merge, "the sacred with the profane, the lofty with the low, the great with the insignificant, the wise with the stupid" (*Dostoevsky* 123). In this way, carnival reveals the idea that all these elements used to be incongruous not because of their essence, but because of the arbitrariness of the norms of the official life which tries to categorize everything according to the system of binary oppositions. As Michael Gardiner claims, "carnivalistic mésalliances reveal the arbitrariness" of every concept (1992, 35). Carnival life reveals the incompatibility between the rigid categorization of the official life and the nature of human beings.

The fourth "category" is *profanation,* which Bakhtin explains as "carnivalistic blasphemies, a whole system of carnivalistic debasings and bringings down to earth, carnivalistic obscenities linked with the reproductive power of the earth and the body, carnivalistic parodies on sacred texts and sayings" (*Dostoevsky* 123). During carnival, Bakhtin claims, nothing stays sacred, or holy. The participants of the carnival disregard various social systems including religious doctrines by their language and behaviour. Thus, everything can be mocked and parodied. Because of this, Gardiner links Bakhtin's carnival to utopia. As he states, Bakhtin imagines a utopic world by degrading "hegemonic values, ideas, and sentiments" (1993, 30-31), a world isolated from the official life. Charles Platter underlines the images of the body in Bakhtin's idea of profanation. He states that the "sacred" is merged with the "profane – specifically by drawing attention away from the soul to the body, the source of physical desire, fecundity, and decay" (7). In this way, the idea of the eternal is "desacralized by its forced cohabitation with what is temporary and unclean" (Platter 7). Platter's argument suggests that Bakhtin's system of profanation works by the technique of translating everything abstract, sacred, holy into the discourse of the body.

Bakhtin sees the *carnivalistic acts* of *crowning* and *decrowning of the carnival king* as another important component of the carnival. He states that during carnivals a mock king was elected from the participants, crowned and was simultaneously decrowned. Consequently, a mock king might be anybody: "a slave or a jester" (*Dostoevsky* 124). The crowning of an arbitrary participant depicts the crowd's ability and courage to maintain their rights. When the king is decrowned, Bakhtin adds, the rituals related to this act are the opposite of crowning. The king falls from the highest point of existence to the lowest: "regal vestments are stripped off the decrowned king, his crown is removed, the other symbols of authority are taken away, he is ridiculed and beaten" (*Dostoevsky* 125). Bakhtin states that these acts mainly reflect the fluctuating nature of life. "Carnival celebrates the shift itself, the very process of replaceability, and not the precise item that is replaced" (*Doestoevsky* 125). As Bagshaw points out, these carnivalistic acts are deeply subversive; they suggest "the overturning of authority, and reinforcing the power of the crowd" (91). It is the carnival's challenge to the official life; it underlines the relativity of everything and the impossibility of eternal stability.

For Bakhtin, these carnivalistic acts of crowning/decrowning are "permeated with carnival categories;" they can be discussed under each of the four categories of the carnival discussed above (*Dostoevsky* 125). People's ability to crown/decrown a king depicts the attributes of the carnivalistic life with its reversed elements. People take the place of the authority as they decide whom to crown/decrown. Free and familiar contact of the carnival square allows people to treat a king as their peer since they can beat and thrash him. The presence of two opposing classes – slaves and kings – in one act suggests the idea of carnivalistic mésalliances. And "playing with the symbols of higher authority" suggests profanation (*Dostoevsky* 125).

Finally, Bakhtin claims that carnival parodies everything, official life and carnival life itself. Everything in the serious noncarnival life was parodied and as Platter states, there is a "lack of insulating structures that protect the representatives of the status quo from the unseemly advances of common revellers" (8). Acts of crowning/decrowning parody the royal acts, for example. Setting the obscene

language of carnival against a religious content is the parody of religious acts. What is more, even the carnival images were parodied. During carnivals, therefore, Bakhtin states that images parody each other: "it was like an entire system of crooked mirrors, elongating, diminishing, distorting in various directions and to various degrees" (*Dostoevsky* 127). Similar to the acts of crowning/decrowning, parody is infused with other carnivalistic categories. Bakhtin states that parody is the world turned inside out as it turns its object inside out; it depicts its object from a different angle. He also discusses it together with the profanation and states that profanation is the parody of everything sacred. The "carnivalistic nature of *parody*" can also be added to the carnivalistic acts of crowning/decrowning as Bakhtin says that "parodying is the creation of a *decrowning double*" (*Dostoevsky* 127). Parody is a "laughing aspect" of a parodied object; it is the decrowning of that object. However, Bakhtin states that parody does not reject the parodied object; it paves the way for renewal. By parodying its object, parody invites it to change itself. Therefore, Bakhtin thinks that parody is ambivalent: it mocks and renews at the same time. It only transfers serious topics "into the key of gay laughter, into the positive material bodily sphere" (*Rabelais* 83).

A.3 Ambivalent carnival laughter

Bakhtin sees laughter, like carnival, as a specific inseparable ingredient of folk culture. It is a way of life. "Laughter is a specific aesthetic relationship to reality, but not one that can be translated into logical language; that is, it is a specific means for artistically visualizing and comprehending reality and, consequently, a specific means for structuring an artistic image, plot, or genre" (*Dostoevsky* 164). Hence, it is not possible to see carnival laughter as a separate characteristic of carnival. Laughter is the attitude to life and carnival is the visible expression of this attitude.

Several main traits of carnival laughter can be posited in order to theorize the concept in Bakhtinian terms. First, similar to parody, carnival laughter is based on

the premises of ambivalence and dualism: it mocks and invites renewal. As Bakhtin claims, carnival laughter used to be directed towards sacred elements to force them to *renew themselves* (*Dostoevsky* 126-127).

Another trait that can be detected in Bakhtin's analysis of carnival laughter is laughter's ability to degrade, which is parallel to carnival's idea of profanation. "Laughter degrades and materialises" (*Rabelais* 20). Carnival laughter transfers mocked objects to the level of the body, to the concrete sphere. Confronted with such laughter, the boundaries between the ranks, statuses or social positions become blurred and dissolved. Because of this trait, Gardiner cannot attribute "trivial ribaldry or light-hearted jesting" to carnival laughter but links this laughter "to essential philosophical questions" (1992, 49) of visualizing the world from the nonofficial point of view, from a different perspective.

Third, as Bakhtin claims, within the carnival practice, laughter is actualized in a festive and universal manner – it is a challenge to the whole world; rather than choosing a particular part of a whole, similar to parody, which parodies everything, carnival laughter mocks the whole universe. It "is directed not at one part only, but at the whole" (*Rabelais* 88). Carnival laughter is a collective laughter which emphasises the wholeness of people. Carnival laughter destroys hierarchical boundaries and this shows its power.

According to Bakhtin's conceptualizing, carnival laughter, which degrades and materialises helps people overcome the hardship they encounter. It is directed towards various challenges, which are "conquered by laughter" (*Rabelais* 336). By activating carnival laughter people depict their fearlessness. "Laughter . . . overcomes fear, for it knows no inhibitions, no limitations" (*Rabelais* 90). Carnival laughter makes "medieval man" understand that he is strong against "the forces of nature" and "mystic terror of God" and it makes this man change his/her view on life (*Rabelais* 90-91). As Bakhtin states, one of the challenges people encounter is class division which is also defeated by carnival laughter: "festive folk laughter . . . also means the defeat of power, of earthly kings, of the earthly upper classes, of all that oppresses and restricts" (*Rabelais* 92).

Carnival laughter also expresses the fluctuating nature of life. As Bakhtin contends, it does not allow phenomena to stabilize:

> This laughter could grasp and comprehend a phenomenon in the process of change and transition, it could fix in a phenomenon both poles of its evolution in their uninterrupted and creative renewing changeability . . . Carnival laughter does not permit a single one of these aspects of change to be absolutized or to congeal in one-sided seriousness. (*Dostoevsky* 164)

Carnival laughter stresses the circular nature of life, life's constant change and flux. Because carnival laughter emphasises collectivity, it is against one-sided seriousness.

A.4 The grotesque

The term *grotesque* is derived from Italian *la grottesca* and *grottesco* which mean *grotta*, a cave. *La grottesca* and *grottesco* "were coined to designate a certain ornamental style [of painting] which came to light during late fifteenth-century excavations" (Kayser 19). As Wolfgang Kayser states, this style was innovative because it merged the worlds of animals, plants and human beings. Thus, in grotesque images "the natural order of things has been subverted" (Kayser 20-21).

Bakhtin has become an important figure in the discourse on the grotesque. For him, the concept of "grotesque realism" that he dwells upon in his work on Rabelais is rooted in grotesque imagery, the main attribute of which is its collective nature. Bakhtin's concept of grotesque realism, his specific "aesthetic notion" (Dentith 67) and "literary genre" (Vice 155), stands for the "system of images created by the medieval culture of folk humor" (*Rabelais* 31). Before discussing Bakhtin's understanding of grotesque realism, first his conceptualization of the grotesque will be explored.

For Bakhtin the grotesque image depicts "a phenomenon in transformation" (*Rabelais* 24). It is an image of becoming and change. That is why Bakhtin thinks that the grotesque images are seen as "ugly, monstrous, hideous" (*Rabelais* 25) from a classical point of view. For Bakhtin the grotesque image embraces opposites: the

old and the new, birth and death; so it is ambivalent. "One of the fundamental tendencies of the grotesque image of the body[7] is to show two bodies in one: the one giving birth and dying, the other conceived, generated, and born" (*Rabelais* 26). In this vein, the body is not a static object among other similar bodies. "Rather, it is an active subject, an event-making agent" (Jung 98). It dies while giving birth to a new subject. Therefore, as Bakhtin says, the image of the body is usually shown close to the borderline, "in immediate proximity to birth or death, to infancy or old age, to the womb or the grave, to the bosom that gives life or swallows it up" (*Rabelais* 26). Therefore, death is not a "negation of life" (*Rabelais* 50); it is a part of it and a new beginning. As Caryl Emerson states, Bakhtin does not see a "blank space" after the death of somebody or something as a "void," but as "a space that is waiting for new meaning to flow in along newly available perspectives" (17). The grotesque image is the reflection of life which negates completeness and stability. For Bakhtin, it is the reflection of "a contradictory and double-faced fullness of life" (*Rabelais* 62), which includes both birth and death. As a consequence of such an attitude to death, Bakhtin's notion of time is that of constant death and rebirth. As Ronald Knowles claims, this conception of time is based on the "materialist principle" of "the cyclical year" in which the images of the agricultural world play an important role. Earth devours to create a new life and this goes on again and again; this process knows no end. Knowles adds that this concept of time is opposite to "linear time, from creation to doomsday" (37). In this way, the grotesque body "overthrows and uncrowns the authorities of the status quo" (Edwards 28), the ones who demand the reflection of the finished image of a body and cling to the linear notion of time.

Bakhtin's exploration of the grotesque provides a short historical overview of the genre. Bakhtin thinks that the grotesque is "an extremely ancient type" which can be found in mythology and "in the archaic art of all peoples" (*Rabelais* 30) in the period when the official and the nonofficial lives were not separated. In this respect, he "recognizes a legitimate status for . . . the grotesque in antiquity" (Edwards 32).

[7]Bakhtin's main preoccupation in the discussion of the grotesque is the exploration of the grotesque as bodily images.

When the official and nonofficial lives were separated, though, the grotesque found itself at the nonofficial level in "plastic comic art, . . . Kerch terracottas[8], comic masks, Sileni[9], figurines of the demons of fertility, and the popular statuettes of the little monster Tersitus" (*Rabelais* 31). In late antiquity, however, as Bakhtin states, the grotesque "embraced nearly all areas of art and literature" (*Rabelais* 31). In this era, the grotesque can be seen both on official and nonofficial levels. Bakhtin adds that these were the three periods – antiquity (no separation between the official and the nonofficial levels), afterwards (the levels are separated) and late antiquity – during which the grotesque prepared the ground for medieval grotesque realism.

Starting from the Renaissance, grotesque imagery loses its widespread appearance that it used to have in late antiquity. In the Renaissance, Bakhtin says, the "material bodily principle[10] was subject to a certain alteration and narrowing" (*Rabelais* 22). This narrowing starts in this period because the Renaissance witnesses "[t]wo types of imagery reflecting the conception of the world . . . one of them ascends to the folk culture of humor, while the other is the bourgeois conception of the completed atomized being" (*Rabelais* 24). Similar to carnival as a ritual, which is narrowed in the 17th century, the material bodily principle is also narrowed because of the sense of a private sphere (*Rabelais* 23). The body has become the privatized matter of an individual and as Bakhtin claims, the Renaissance has witnessed "the breaking away of the body from the single procreating earth, the breaking away from the collective, growing, and continually renewed body of the people with which it had been linked in folk culture" (*Rabelais* 23). According to Bakhtin, at this time, the grotesque became the image through which the authors depicted their "static" characters (*Rabelais* 52), which is the opposite of the previous feature of the

[8]The collection of earthenware objects that was found in Kerch, a city on the Kerch Peninsula in the east of the Crimea.

[9]The plural of Silenus, the companion and tutor to the wine god Dionysus in Greek mythology. The plural Sileni also refers to the mythological figure that has the attributes of a horse.

[10]Bakhtin's exploration of grotesque realism, the term he uses for the specific imagery of the Middle Ages and the Renaissance, mainly consists of the study of the body, which he calls "material bodily principle" or "material bodily lower stratum." So when Bakhtin refers to these when he discusses medieval and Renaissance imagery, he means grotesque realism.

grotesque, that of change and renewal. The public display of the body ceased its existence and the grotesque bodily images started to appear in private chambers. In seventeenth-century literature, Bakhtin adds, the expression of such images was "heard from behind a curtain" (*Rabelais* 105); the grotesque loses its collective nature and public display. This does not change in the following century. In the late 18th century, as Bakhtin examines, the grotesque was individualized and expressed the private ideas of an individual. It lost the sense of collectivity of the folk culture. While during the medieval carnivals grotesque imagery signified the merging of the body with the world, the grotesque imagery of the 18th century signifies the isolated body.

Bakhtin also discusses the grotesque of the Romantics, who interpret the grotesque for their own aims. He states that the Romantic grotesque of the late 18th century "was a reaction against cold rationalism, against official, formalistic, and logical authoritarianism; it was a rejection of that which is finished and completed" (*Rabelais* 37). The grotesque of this epoch, however, is not influenced by the folk tradition. It heavily depends on the literary tradition. Bakhtin finds similarities between the grotesque of the Romantics and the grotesque of the 17th century in that both epochs have the grotesque of the private character. The genre started to express a "subjective, individualistic world outlook" (*Rabelais* 36).

Bakhtin sees the grotesque of the 19th and 20th centuries as weak and quite changed. It is not the grotesque of the Middle Ages or the Renaissance with its regenerating power. What is more, in the 19th century "the interest in the grotesque was considerably reduced both in literature and in literary thought and studies" (*Rabelais* 45). In the 20th century, Bakhtin observes, the grotesque obtains new features: it is seen as "gloomy, terrifying tone" (*Rabelais* 47). Bakhtin sees that the grotesque is regarded as "something hostile, alien and inhuman" by the twentieth-century critics, one of whom is Kayser (*Rabelais* 47).

Bakhtin claims that grotesque imagery exists in modern times in the language people use. This language contains strong carnival elements as it refers to bodily images: "mockery and abuse" and "the unofficial speech of the people" include the

mentioning of "the body that fecundates, that gives birth and is born, devours and is devoured, drinks, defecates, is sick and dying" (*Rabelais* 318-319).

Bakhtin's exploration of the grotesque makes it evident that this grotesque is mainly related to the body, to the "grotesque concept of the body" (*Rabelais* 25). When he discusses the grotesque he links it to the grotesque concept of the body by providing an image of "figurines of senile pregnant hags" of the Kerch terracotta collection (*Rabelais* 25). The figurines depict the body in a positive manner by displaying its changeability and stress the idea of renewal and continuity. It is important to note that Bakhtin was quite interested in the concept of the body. That is why Ann Jefferson calls him the "theorist of the body" (201). Some critics see this interest rooted in Bakhtin's own physical condition: because of his chronic osteomyelitis[11], his leg was amputated. As Holquist maintains, for Bakhtin, "whose chronic osteomyelitis was a constant reminder of his own corporeality," the notion of the body has been of great importance throughout his critical output (1989, 22-23). Peter Hitchcock also claims that Bakhtin had a "grotesque order of pain" (78) and "carnivalized body" (80) because of his illness.

As was mentioned earlier, Bakhtin's notion of grotesque realism has to do with the body imagery that was formulated by medieval culture. Bakhtin links this culture to carnival. He states that "images of the human body with its food, drink, defecation, and sexual life . . . offered . . . in an extremely exaggerated form" (*Rabelais* 18) play an important role in carnival. According to David Wiles, Bakhtin's "semiotics of the body" has been his "most influential contribution" to the discourse on carnival (64).

Bakhtin's term of grotesque realism stems from his focus on the body which, according to him, is "realistic" (*Rabelais* 52) because it is primarily depicted as the body that eats, drinks, gives birth, defecates, has sex and is reborn. That is why, Bakhtin defines the imagery that includes such a body as grotesque realism. Hence, Bakhtin sees it necessary to give a different term to the medieval and Renaissance grotesque imagery which is the heritage of the folk culture.

[11]Infection and inflammation of the bone or bone marrow.

The most essential principle of Bakhtinian grotesque realism is degradation. "The essential principle of grotesque realism is degradation, that is, the lowering of all that is high, spiritual, ideal, abstract; it is a transfer to the material level, to the sphere of earth and body in their indissoluble unity" (*Rabelais* 19-20). In fact, grotesque realism is the expression of everything in its material aspect, in flesh, in body. Grotesque realism transforms the official sphere of life into the images of the body. Anthony T. Edwards states that the "state and what is serious or official is rendered comic and brought low through the contagion of the vulgar and lowly imagery of the grotesque" (28). In Mihailovic's terms, "the spirit *becomes* the body" (155). Bakhtin underlines the fact that grotesque realism transforms everything into the image of the body and bodily parts. As Dentith claims, Bakhtin constantly reminds the reader that "we are all creatures of flesh and thus of food and faeces also" (67). Besides, according to Edwards, Bakhtin regards grotesque realism as an "innately critical tradition which ridicules authority and self-important seriousness by representing it in images drawn from the 'material bodily lower strata'" (29).

Bakhtin provides two seminal features of grotesque realism. First, he sees the material bodily principle of grotesque realism as "festive," "cosmic, social." The bodily principle here is not "private, egotistic form, severed from the other spheres of life" as it becomes in the 17th century; it represents all people and links these people to the whole world (*Rabelais* 26). As Hwa Yol Jung states, "the body is the initial insertion of the self into the world of others, other bodies" (97). The body is "unfinished" and outgrowing its own boundaries; it connects to the world through its open parts such as mouth, nose and genital organs (*Rabelais* 26). Consuming food plays an important role here as when people eat, they take the world in. Feast is a "healthy transgression of the body's confines and the enlargement of the individual's self" (Vice 172). Moreover, Bakhtin focuses on the body that "can merge with various natural phenomena, with mountains, rivers, seas, islands, and continents. It can fill the entire universe" (*Rabelais* 318). He also mentions the body that has a connection to animals. "[T]he combination of human and animal traits is, as we know, one of the most ancient grotesque forms" (*Rabelais* 316). As a result, a

festive, cosmic and social feature of the grotesque realism brings forth an idea of an unfinished body, the body that becomes one with the world.

Grotesque representations of the body are imbued with fearlessness. They subvert all the conventional constructs. People become one with nature and, as a result, they are not afraid of the world: "All that was frightening in ordinary life is turned into amusing or ludicrous monstrosities" (*Rabelais* 47). Such a body with "its defecation, sneezing, farting, belching, and bleeding" is the subversion of the official life which demands the "perfection" of the images (Hitchcock 85). That is why, Hitchcock thinks that "Bakhtin is impressed by Rabelais's celebration of these bodily functions because they simultaneously transgress and destabilize the ideologies of the medieval world order" (85). Thus, the grotesque image of the body unsettles the medieval ideology of a man that deliberately ignores the body's excretion.

Secondly, Bakhtin states that the bodily principle of grotesque realism is growth and renewal. The Bakhtinian grotesque "represents the body as unbounded, in transformation" (Dentith 80). For Bakhtin, the images of the body express change, "fertility, growth, and a brimming-over abundance" (*Rabelais* 19). Therefore, as Daphna Erdinast-Vulcan states, Bakhtin cannot accept the idea that the self can draw the "boundary lines of its territory" (30); Bakhtin's "human subject" is "always in the process of becoming, taking the experience of the concrete" (25). There is always that impossibility of defining and limiting a body that constantly grows and is renewed. "The process of 'becoming' of the body resists its codification: it answers hypostatization with hyperbole, excellence with excrement" (Hitchcock 86). And in this way, it destroys the hierarchical distinctions. In direct relation to this feature, Bakhtin gives an example of the image of a mask that suggests the idea of change and renewal, "joy," "reincarnation," "gay relativity," "merry negation of uniformity and similarity" (*Rabelais* 39-40). The mask also suggests "the violation of natural boundaries," "mockery and familiar nicknames. It contains the playful element of life" (*Rabelais* 39-40). Such change and perpetual transformation links grotesque realism to carnival. Mihailovic claims that "variety and differentiation within the

body politic are indispensable to the efflorescence of the carnivalesque" (178), and in this way "carnival becomes the epitome of all change" (162).

B. *Carnivalization*: the influence of the carnival on literature

Carnivalized literature or *carnivalization* is Bakhtin's term to refer to the presence of the carnival sense of the world in literary works (*Dostoevsky* 107). Carnival as a ritual and carnival as a sense of the world are two different concepts in Bakhtin's works. Carnival as a ritual was discussed above; and the carnival as a sense of the world is Bakhtin's way of perceiving life. Bakhtin sees carnival as a phenomenon that is beyond ritual; it is "carnival culture," which embraces "a particular way of looking at the world" (Platter 7). Bakhtin sees carnival as a way of life and "carnivalized writing" as "writing which has taken the carnival spirit into itself and thus reproduces, within its own practice, the characteristic inversions, parodies and discrownings of carnival proper" (Dentith 65). In other words, carnivalization is the translating of the carnival sense of the world into language. Similar to carnival as a ritual, carnivalization is an arena where two forces come together: the carnival spirit and the ideas that this spirit decrowns. "[C]arnivalization is a rejoinder to what had already been said and thus helps to develop further the dialogical substrate out of which new utterances will come" (Platter 8).

According to Bakhtin, carnivalization can be seen throughout history because carnival as a ritual has shown its influence "on the development of culture as a whole, including literature, several of whose genres and movements have undergone a particularly intense *carnivalization*" (*Dostoevsky* 129). Bakhtin sees carnivalization in the ancient times in the early Attic comedy and in the serio-comical genres. In the medieval period, he states that a great bulk of literary output was related to the festivals – "Festival of Fools," "paschal laughter," and so forth (*Dostoevsky* 129). During the Renaissance, the "primordial elements of carnival . . . took possession of all the genres of high literature and transformed them fundamentally" (*Dostoevsky* 130).

As Bakhtin points out, the 17th century is an important stage in carnivalization as it is the era in which the ritual of carnival lost its power to be the direct source for carnivalized literature. Carnival loses its communal life and its "forms are impoverished, made petty and less complex" (*Dostoevsky* 130). As a result, carnivalization enters a new epoch, an epoch of independent literary organization. Up until the second half of the 17th century, Bakhtin states, people participated in carnivals and authors could express this experience in their works. However, afterwards with the decline of carnival, authors started to use carnivalized literature as the source for their carnivalized literature: "in this way carnivalization becomes a purely literary tradition" (*Dostoevsky* 131). Renaissance literature plays a great role in the depiction of the carnival sense of the world. As Bakhtin states, such authors like Boccaccio, Rabelais, Shakespeare, Cervantes, and Grimmelshausen have become the main sources for carnivalized literature (*Dostoevsky* 157-158).

Bakhtin explores carnivalization in the works of Dostoevsky and Rabelais. This part will explore how Bakhtin approaches Dostoevsky's fiction with reference to carnivalization and examine Bakhtin's study of grotesque realism in Rabelais's work. An exploration of carnivalization in Dostoevsky's works will help identify the carnivalistic elements in Woolf's novels in the following chapters. Bakhtin conceptualizes the notion of the carnival, discusses its influence on literature, and implements his ideas by conceptualizing carnivalization when he analyses Dostoevsky's works. Bakhtin's analysis of Dostoevsky's works depicts what he means by the influence of the carnival sense of the world on literature. It is the concretization and the embodiment of his theory of carnival. Therefore, an exploration of Woolf's novels in terms of carnivalistic elements will be assisted by an observation of carnivalization in Dostoevsky's fiction. On the other hand, Bakhtin's analysis of Rabelais's works mainly focuses on grotesque imagery. Similar to the study of Dostoevsky in Bakhtin's oeuvre, Bakhtin implements his ideas of the grotesque in his analysis of Rabelais's works. Therefore, analysing Woolf's novels from a Bakhtinian perspective will derive its sources from Bakhtin's study of Rabelais's grotesque imagery.

Bakhtin's analysis of Dostoevsky's carnivalized fiction is preceded by the analysis of the sources that inform Dostoevsky's carnivalization. Bakhtin starts with the ancient sources, the genres of the serio-comical. According to him, the works that constitute the genre of the serio-comical are the first works that can be shown as examples for carnivalized literature (*Dostoevsky* 107). It is important to discuss the genres of the serio-comic as they "initiate the 'carnivalistic line' in Western literature" (Morson 461). Therefore, it is useful to see what Bakhtin holds in relation to the serio-comical genres with the examples of the Socratic dialogue and the Menippean satire, and then go on with the study on Dostoevsky's and Rabelais's works.

Bakhtin includes "the mimes of Sophron[12], the 'Socratic dialogue', the voluminous literature of the Symposiasts[13], early memoir literature, pamphlets, the whole of bucolic poetry, 'Menippean satire'" (*Dostoevsky* 106-107) in the serio-comic genres. He thinks that these works express carnivalistic folklore, which bears "a specific *carnival sense of the world*" (*Dostoevsky* 107). He further provides several characteristics of the serio-comical genres.

The first characteristic is the depiction of the contemporary world. The genres in this style do not go far into history to express an idea. They remain in the everyday reality of their immediate surroundings. They stress the "crudely familiar contact with living contemporaries" (*Dostoevsky* 108); everything these works depict is familiar and easy to spot around. The subject matter of these works is not taken from a long mythological past, the elements of which are not possible to see in everyday world. Accordingly, the second characteristic is the disregard for myths. The works in this genre depend on experience and everyday life that the characters lead. And the third feature is the "multi-styled and heterovoiced nature of all these genres" (*Dostoevsky* 108). These works include serious and comic speeches, low and high

[12]Sophron (fl. 430 BC) was the writer of mimes, prose dialogues, which were serious and humorous in style. These mimes depicted scenes from the daily life of the Sicilian Greeks. They were written in pithy and popular language, and had plenty of proverbs and colloquialisms.

[13]In ancient Greece, symposium was a drinking party and the Symposiasts are the people who attended this symposium.

discourses. Moreover, they embrace different genres in their bodies – letters, dialogues, manuscripts, parodies. All three features of the serio-comic genres invoke the carnival sense of the world. The contemporary atmosphere reminds one of carnival's temporary nature. People who take part in carnival start a new life which is experienced only during the carnival, in which they do not cling to their past that they had in their noncarnival lives. What is more, during carnivals different people come together in one place and suspend the division of people into various categories. And through these three main features of the serio-comical genres, the carnival comes through the thick wall of time into the present.

B.1 The Socratic dialogue

Bakhtin spots the genre of the Socratic dialogue in the works of different authors such as Plato, Xenophon, Antisthenes, Aeschines, Phaedo, Euclid, Alexamenos, Glaucon, Simias, Crito and the others. Bakhtin adds that this genre started as memoir recordings of Socrates' conversations; yet, later on, it lost its link to the historical individuality of Socrates and started to embrace the "creative attitude toward the material" as it only "retained Socratic method" of discourse (*Dostoevsky* 109). Therefore, instead of the real Socrates' conversations there emerge fictitious ones which retain the Socratic method of questioning. Bakhtin provides five main "aspects" or "characteristics" of the genre of the Socratic dialogue. It is useful to observe these aspects here as they will provide a solid background to understanding carnivalization.

Bakhtin discusses the "dialogic nature of truth" (*Dostoevsky* 110) in the Socratic dialogue as the first aspect in this genre. This feature of the Socratic dialogue provides an essential feature for the carnivalized literature – *relativity*, which Bakhtin regards as a technique to question stability (*Dostoevsky* 166). Bakhtin states that in the genre of the Socratic dialogue truth is not a stable and defined phenomenon. Truth is the result of people's "dialogic interaction;" it is born *between people*, not found in the mind of one person. The truth changes and renews itself

whenever people start to discuss it. The Socratic dialogue encapsulates heated discussions on a particular subject, an idea. These debates are the perfect illustration of change and flux; as Bakhtin claims, they "did not permit thought to stop and congeal in one-sided seriousness or in a stupid fetish for definition or singleness of meaning" (*Dostoevsky* 132). Yet, Bakhtin underlines the difference between people's search for truth in the genre of the Socratic dialogue and some of the dialogues in Plato's works. While in the former, the truth is born during the discussions between people, in the latter the truth that is searched for is "already found, ready-made irrefutable truth" (*Dostoevsky* 110). These kinds of dialogues which include the search for stable and defined truths was used by the proponents of dogmatic views and lacked the carnival sense of the world.

Under the heading of the second aspect of the Socratic dialogue Bakhtin provides the description of two devices that the genre employed: *syncrisis* and *anacrisis*. Syncrisis is the "juxtaposition of various points of view on a specific object" (*Dostoevsky* 110) and anacrisis is the way "for eliciting and provoking the words of one's interlocutor, forcing him to express his opinion and express it thoroughly" (*Dostoevsky* 110). By bringing these two devices into this discussion Bakhtin makes it obvious that the Socratic dialogue depicts people's coming together and interacting: "Syncrisis and anacrisis dialogize thought, they carry it into the open, turn it into a *rejoinder*, attach it to dialogic intercourse among people" (*Dostoevsky* 111). The Socratic dialogue stresses the unity of people who interact in the constant creation of a new truth.

Another aspect that Bakhtin underlines in the Socratic dialogue is the heroes' being *ideologists* (*Dostoevsky* 111). Bakhtin thinks that people's coming together and searching for the truth and their participation in the birth of the truth make them ideologists. They firmly believe in their ability to reach the truth and pursue their aim throughout. Bakhtin calls Socrates himself an ideologist as he is the main participant in the dialogue.

The penultimate aspect that Bakhtin provides is the plot situation that consists of the characters' being *on the threshold*. For Bakhtin, this condition of being in-

between two different realms is an important aspect of carnivalization. Bakhtin often mentions Dostoevsky's characters' being *on the threshold,* which creates a carnivalistic atmosphere in Dostoevsky's works (*Dostoevsky* 169). Bakhtin states that such position of the characters makes them experience a carnivalistic time, time conception that does not match biographical time. Carnivalistic time is pregnant with instant changes and shifts in fates. In his discussion of the genre of the Socratic dialogue, Bakhtin relates this aspect of being *on the threshold* to anacrisis – a device employed to provoke speech. Similar to anacrisis, the characters' being on the boundary makes them speak, "to reveal the deepest layers of his personality and thought" (*Dostoevsky* 111). Mihailovic states that the terms referring to "boundary" "reverberate" and gain "almost incantatory quality" in Bakhtin's *Rabelais and His World* (153). What is more, these terms gain a similar quality in his study on Dostoevsky. Bakhtin maintains that being on the threshold leads into the presence of *extraordinary* situation, which also forces a person to speak his/her inner thoughts. Being in extraordinary situations means being away from normal life that is governed by social norms. Finding oneself away from a normal life makes an individual perceive an opportunity to behave according to his/her desires which reveal his/her inner emotions. The carnival sense of the world is also the atmosphere in which people reveal their inner world to the others. What is more, as it was mentioned earlier, participating in carnival is similar to being on the boundary as carnival is the time of continual change and renewal.

The final aspect according to Bakhtin is the link between the idea and the carrier of that idea. Each individual becomes the representative or the body of his/her idea. According to Bakhtin, in this way an *image of an idea* is born (*Dostoesvky* 112). Accordingly, the idea begins to have its concrete shape. The idea gains a body in the face of the creator of that idea. The idea does not remain on the abstract level because it is associated with the person who brings it forth. This aspect of the Socratic dialogue anticipates the notion of degradation that Bakhtin discusses with reference to his notion of the grotesque. He states that grotesque imagery degrades everything abstract to the level of the body, to the material level (*Rabelais* 19).

Bakhtin states that the genre of the Socratic dialogue could not survive and it underwent decomposition. Still, according to his discussion of the carnivalization it is possible to see some elements of the Socratic dialogue in carnivalized literature. For example, the first element of the Socratic dialogue, the notion of relativity of an idea can be seen in carnivalized literature. In such literature, there is not any stable point of view on a particular subject. Every idea gains its validity. And this in turn creates an atmosphere for the emergence of the second element of the Socratic dialogue in carnivalized literature – the emergence of a dialogue between the differing ideas. Another important element of the Socratic dialogue, being on the threshold, often appears in carnivalized literature where the characters find themselves in carnivalistic period of time when the usual norms of everyday life are suspended. In this way, as a consequence of a short overview of the Socratic dialogue, it is possible to define three main features of carnivalized literature: relativity of everything, the dialogic nature of the characters' interaction and the characters' being on the threshold.

B.2 The menippea

Bakhtin argues that Menippean satire, another genre that he discusses, includes some elements of the Socratic dialogue. Still, he claims that what lies at the heart of the Menippean satire is carnivalized folklore. Menippean satire derives its terminological origin from Greek Cynic Menippus (3rd C BCE), who profoundly influenced Roman scholar Varro (116-27 BCE) – the author through whose works the Menippean satire obtains its form and content. Therefore, unlike satire, which is a Roman genre, Menippean satire is a "Greco-Roman phenomenon" (Relihan 109). While satire is regarded as a genre targeting individuals, Menippean satire attacks ideas, attitudes, or philosophies. For example, as Joseph F. Bartolomeo states, Rabelais, whose works embody the elements of the Menippean satire, ridicules "literary learning" (258).

A short overview of the genre of the Menippean satire, which Bakhtin calls the *menippea* (*Dostoevsky*114) will help to draw a picture of carnivalization in a clearer way. Bakhtin places great importance on the menippea because he sees it as "the primary conduit for the most concentrated and vivid forms of carnivalization" (*Dostoevsky* 137). Bakhtin traces the genre's origins to a long time back into history and provides the names of the authors who produced this genre: Antisthenes, Heraclides Ponticus, Bion Borysthenes, Menippus, and Varro, Seneca and Petronius, Lucian and Apuleius, Boethius, Lucilius and Horace. Unlike the Socratic dialogue, the menippea resists time and as Bakhtin states, it "continues to develop even now" (*Dostoevsky* 113). Bakhtin links the development of this genre to the birth of Christianity. He describes the period as a time when different religious schools started to lose their strength, when various philosophical schools were struggling to overcome each other; as a time when people used to come together and dispute the meaning of life. Bakhtin also states that it was a time when a human being lost his/her position as a ruler; s/he becomes aware of the fate that governs human beings. Bakhtin states that the menippea is the reflection of these conditions of the world.

Bakhtin outlines fourteen main features of the menippea that were "defined in the epoch of antiquity" (*Dostoevsky* 114). These features can be shortly presented here in order to see what Bakhtin means by the term menippea:

(1) Menippea includes "the comic element," which Bakhtin links to "*carnival* nature" (*Dostoevsky* 114). Bakhtin notes that the range of humour varies from author to author. Indeed, laughter and humour are the basic features of carnival and carnivalization.

(2) As it was mentioned in relation to the features of the serio-comical genres, menippea is "free of legend" (*Dostoevsky* 114); it does not dwell upon the historical facts or events to develop its themes. Therefore, Bakhtin states that "in all of world literature we could not find a genre more free than the menippea in its invention and use of the fantastic" (*Dostoevsky* 114).

(3) Related to the previous feature, Bakhtin states that the menippea includes a wide range of the fantastic. Similar to the features of the Socratic dialogue,

menippea provokes ideas and their testing. And as it is in the Socratic dialogue, an extraordinary situation provokes the creation and the testing of the ideas in the menippea. The element of the fantastic provides a wide range of the portrayal of these extraordinary situations. What Bakhtin finds important is the fact that these fantastic elements help to test not an individual but an idea. Because of this, he states that "menippea is the adventures of an *idea* or a *truth* in the world: either on earth, in the nether regions, or on Olympus" (*Dostoevsky* 114-115).

(4) Bakhtin states that menippea is a combination of the fantastic with *slum naturalism* (*Dostoevsky* 115). For Bakhtin, menippea is the adventure of truth and idea and these adventures are seen in such places like "high road," "brothels," "dens of thieves," "taverns," "marketplaces," "prisons," "erotic orgies of secret cults." In other words, Bakhtin implies that these are the places where the characters can come face to face with such behaviour that they can see in a real life: "worldly evil, depravity, baseness, and vulgarity in their most extreme expression" (*Dostoevsky* 115).

(5) "Philosophical universalism" is the next feature that Bakhtin provides in the list (*Dostoevsky* 115). Bakhtin does not see menippea as a genre in which an individual's personal traits are questioned. On the contrary, he states that this genre questions the world as a whole. He adds that menippea poses universal questions; it provides ideas that are relevant to the whole world. Bakhtin states that syncrisis serves the function of bringing these different ultimate questions together in one work.

(6) As the next feature, Bakhtin states that such positioning of the ultimate questions through syncrisis can be seen on earth, in Olympus and in the nether world. Thus, the menippea has a "three-planed construction" (*Dostoevsky* 116). Bakhtin states that the testing of an idea and the posing of the ultimate questions occur not only in one place but can be seen in different situations, such as the Olympus and the nether world. Bakhtin links this feature of the menippea to the feature of the Socratic dialogue, that of the characters' being on the boundary. The characters' travels from

one world to the next place them in the situation of being in-between. They are not rigidly situated in a particular place.

(7) Bakhtin stresses the importance of seeing life from an "unusual point of view" (*Dostoevsky* 116) in menippea. He provides the example of seeing life in a city from a great height as it is in Lucian's and Varro's works. Bakhtin adds that this aspect includes a particular range of fantasticality. It also reminds one of the element of relativity of the Socratic dialogue that is also found in carnivalized literature.

(8) The next aspect that Bakhtin provides is the "abnormal moral and psychic states of man" (*Dostoevsky* 116). Bakhtin finds this feature important for the formulation of the genre as such human traits like "insanity of all sorts, split personality, unrestrained daydreaming, unusual dreams, passions bordering on madness, suicides" make the character lose his "finalized quality" (*Dostoesvky* 116-117). What Bakhtin opens up here is the flexibility of the characters; their ability to escape definition. The characters' minds change from situation to situation. Bakhtin also argues that such a depiction of a character creates a dialogic relationship of that person to him/herself. His/her two different conditions dialogize. At this point he mentions soliloquy as a kindred genre to the menippea: "It is a discussion with oneself" (*Dostoevsky* 120).

(9) Bakhtin also mentions "scandal scenes, eccentric behaviour, inappropriate speeches and performances" as another feature of the menippea. He claims that such scenes serve the function of disrupting the normal flow of life. He states that such scenes can be seen in Olympus, among gods, and on earth. What is more, Bakhtin adds that scandals create "inappropriate word," the language born of frank speeches, profanation towards religions and the tendency to abandon etiquette. However, Bakhtin differentiates between these scandal scenes and "epic events and tragic catastrophes" (*Dostoevsky* 117). The former scenes are not "comic brawls and exposes" (*Dostoevsky* 117). They are the events that depict the characters' suspension of norms and values.

(10) "Sharp contrasts and oxymoronic juxtapositions" is another feature that Bakhtin provides in his discussion of the menippea (*Dostoevsky* 118). Opposites can

come together, the characters can undergo sudden changes in their lives, or a king can become a slave.

(11) *Social utopia* is another aspect discussed by Bakhtin. He states that the works in this genre include "dreams or journeys to unknown lands" where life is completely different from the normal one (*Dostoevsky* 118).

(12) Menippea also includes "inserted genres" (*Dostoevsky* 118): novellas, letters, oratorical speeches, symposia. Bakhtin states that prosaic and poetic speech mix in the menippea. He adds that it is possible to see parody in the menippea as the author's rationale behind the employment of the different genres implies.

(13) The "multi-styled and multi-toned nature" of the menippea is another feature Bakhtin discusses. Similar to the serio-comical genres, which encapsulate various genres in one work, menippea stresses the dialogue of voices. It embraces different styles and tones in one work (*Dostoevsky* 118). A ground is created for an active dialogue between different voices from different genres.

(14) Menippea's "concern with current and topical issues" is Bakhtin's last point (*Dostoevsky* 118). As he states, the menippea used to reflect the ideological issues of its contemporary society. Bakhtin states that Lucian's satires provide the reader with the details of contemporary issues in the field of philosophy, religion, ideology and science. They show the portrayals of contemporary public figures and their ideas.

Bakhtin dwells upon the menippea's carnivalization and lists several analogies between carnival and the menippea. First, as Bakhtin states, "certain menippea directly portray festivals of the carnival type" (*Dostoevsky* 133). In this way, there is a structural resemblance between the two. Second, the three worlds are depicted in a carnivalized manner. The atmosphere of Olympus is that of "familiarity, scandals and eccentricities, crownings and decrownings" (*Dostoevsky* 133). Bakhtin calls this Olympian world a carnival square because of these scenes. The nether world "equalizes" all human beings; everybody is on the same level there: "death decrowns all who have been crowned in life" (*Dostoevsky* 133). Thus, there is a "carnivalistic logic of a 'world upside down'" (*Dostoevsky* 134). Similar features

can be discussed with reference to the earthly world: there are crownings/decrownings, familiar contacts, carnivalistic mésalliances, and scandals. Third, the menippea works out philosophical questions in a carnivalized manner, "in the concretely sensuous form of carnivalistic acts and images" (*Dostoevsky* 134). Abstract elements are debased and brought down to earth; they become concrete. In a way, it can be said that abstract thinking is decrowned. "A carnival sense of the world also made it possible to 'deck out philosophy in the motley dress of a hetaerae'" (*Dostoevsky* 134). An incongruous combination occurs: a prostitute discusses philosophical issues. Fourth, as a result of the third aspect, the menippea juxtaposes incongruous elements: "philosophical dialogue, adventure and fantasticality, slum naturalism, utopia, and so forth" (*Dostoevsky* 134) come together in one genre. Hence, the stable barriers between genres are weakened allowing the participation of one in another.

There are some other points that can be concluded from the analysis of the menippea and that can be directly related to carnivalization. The element of comedy and humour in menippea can also be found in carnivalized literature. Next, the three-planed structure of the menippea is similar to the idea of the characters' being on the threshold, which is another feature of the carnivalized literature. The unusual point of view in the menippea reminds one of the element of relativity observed in the Socratic dialogue and which is widely used in carnivalized literature. Menippea also portrays abnormal states of characters which suggests the characters' flexible nature. This, in turn, suggests carnivalistic ambivalence and fluidity of the grotesque. The juxtaposition of the opposites in one scene in the menippea also resembles the grotesque image in which the opposing tendencies come together. What is more, such juxtaposition is analogous to the carnival feature of carnivalistic mésalliances. And the last element which the menippea contributes to the carnivalized literature is its notion of the inserted genres. Carnivalized literature also parodies certain genres by encapsulating them into its structure.

Contrary to the Socratic dialogue, according to Bakhtin's conceptualization of the genre, menippea continues developing. He states that menippea changed its form

in the ancient times as it took the forms of novels and mixed with other genres. Bakhtin claims that the same happens with the menippea in the medieval and the modern period. He states that the menippea continues living in religious literature during the Middle Ages. It also takes its place in other genres which Bakhtin mentions: "arguments," "debates," "panegyrics," "morality and miracle plays," "mystery plays and *soties*," parodies, and novels. During the Renaissance, the menippea "infiltrates all the large genres of the epoch" (*Dostoevsky* 136) and appears in the works of such seminal authors like Rabelais, Cervantes, and Grimmelshausen. In modern times, the menippea takes its place in other carnivalized genres, but it also has its own process of growth. According to Bakhtin, "Lucianic dialogue," "dialogues of the dead," "philosophical tale," "fantastic story," and "philosophical fairy tale" (*Dostoevsky* 137) are the terms used for the genre of the menippea in modern times. Bakhtin concludes that "the menippea has been, in the literature of modern times, the primary conduit for the most concentrated and vivid forms of carnivalization" (*Dostoevsky* 137). Thus, the analysis of the menippea contributes to the understanding of the carnivalization of literature to a great extent.

B.3 Dostoevsky's carnivalized fiction

This section on Dostoevsky's carnivalized fiction will explore Bakhtin's ideas related to the carnival sense of the world in fiction. The discussion of Dostoevsky's carnivalized fiction will be categorized according to the major carnival features mentioned earlier: carnivalistic life, free contact, carnivalistic mésalliances, and profanation; the analysis of the Socratic dialogue and the menippea will also contribute to the discussion of Dostoevsky's carnivalized literature. An exploration of these major carnival features and carnivalistic serio-comic genres in Dostoevsky's fiction will help to establish a method through which it is possible to study Woolf's novels in terms of carnivalistic elements. An analysis of carnivalization in Dostoevsky's fiction will help to see what Bakhtin means when he conceptualizes it. An exploration of the main points that Bakhtin discusses with reference to

Dostoevsky's carnivalized fiction will help to identify similar carnivalistic elements in Woolf's novels.

B.3.1 Carnivalistic life

Bakhtin's approaches to carnivalistic life in Dostoevsky's fiction can be categorized under three aspects: lack of social norms, experiencing life in public places and the crisis times. For instance, he argues that in *The Village of Stepanchikovo and its Inhabitants* (1859), the images of carnivalistic life can be observed: "life that has left its normal rut" (*Dostoevsky* 163). The story is about the village's inhabitants who love, elope, swindle, and fall into ditches. Bakhtin likens the story to a carnivalistic atmosphere as there is a "*carnival king*," a "*mad* rich lady Tatyana Ivanovna, suffering from an erotic mania for falling in love," "little *fool* Falalei with his persistent dream about the white bull," *buffoon*, and an *eccentric* (*Dostoevsky* 163). As Bakhtin states, neither of these inhabitants of the village has an ordinary life as all of them are integrated into the scandals, secret behaviour, and the scenes of crownings and decrownings. The story contains menippean elements, too. The setting suggests the idea of slum naturalism that Bakhtin sees as an important element of menippea. There is also menippean characterization; the characters are represented in their unusual and abnormal states. The characters' scandals with each other also reflect the menippean element of scandal scenes, eccentricity, and obscene language.

Crime and Punishment (1866), Bakhtin argues, is a novel which portrays characters who experience life in public places. It is a story of a student, Raskolnikov, who mentally punishes himself after he kills an old woman. As Bakhtin states, important events in the characters' lives take place in the places which are open for everybody. He states that Raskolnikov lives "on a threshold," his door is never locked. Raskolnikov experiences horrible moments when he is at the door of the murdered woman (*Dostoevsky* 170). In his dream, Raskolnikov is rocked by the people's laughter and these people are situated *on the stairway* and *down below*. As

Bakhtin claims, Petersburg in this novel is "on the threshold," too. It "is on the borderline between existence and nonexistence, reality and phantasmagoria, always on the verge of dissipating like the fog and vanishing" (*Dostoevsky* 167). Bakhtin concludes that the novel does not have anything that can "enter the ordinary flow of biographical time and develop in it. . . . Everything is shown in a moment of unfinalized transition" (*Dostoevsky* 167). This feature of the novel makes it possible to see an element of the Socratic dialogue, being on the threshold, in which the characters are observed from a space which is somewhere in-between. Being on the threshold means being away from interior spaces and biographical time and provides, instead, a carnivalistic time; time infused with sudden changes of fates. Threshold provides a crisis time, the time when a king can lose his crown or a slave can become a king. Similarly, Raskolnikov in Dostoevsky's novel experiences a carnivalistic time on thresholds where his life changes from one condition to the other. In other words, being on the threshold is having a reversed life when all the rules of the ordinary life are suspended and the characters live in a carnivalistic atmosphere.

A similar Socratic dialogue's trait of being in-between and experiencing crisis time can be seen in Dostoevsky's other works. Dostoevsky's short story "The Gambler" (1867), Bakhtin thinks, depicts a time of crisis, which is similar to what people experience in carnivals. It is a story about Russian people living in Germany. Alexei, one of the protagonists tries his fortune in gambling. As Bakhtin sees it, within this context, the characters are released from their "norms" which were "regulated by that position which they had occupied in their homeland;" "they are not fastened down to their environment" (*Dostoevsky* 170-171). They experience important turning points, crises, in their lives. Moreover, as the title of the story suggests, the presence of gambling symbolises the various deviations from the norms. According to what Bakhtin states, the concept of a game, which underlies gambling, shifts the system of an ordinary life towards a different way. That is why, Bakhtin says that "[g]ambling (with dice, cards, roulette, etc.) is by nature carnivalistic" (*Dostoevsky* 171) as it is the turning point where people from different positions meet. "The *stake* is similar to a *crisis*: a person feels himself *on the*

threshold. And the time of gambling is a special time: here, too, a minute is equal to years" (*Dostoevsky* 171).

B.3.2 Free contact

Bakhtin examines *The Idiot* (1869) as a novel in which it is possible to see the characters' tendency to have freedom in relationships. It is a novel about a young Prince Myshkin, who comes back to St. Petersburg after spending some years in a Swiss sanatorium. Myshkin's naiveté and goodness render him different in his Petersburg community; he is an eccentric. Bakhtin sees his eccentricity in his feelings towards the others, for example. Myshkin welcomes "brotherly love for his rival, a person who made an attempt on his life and who has become the murderer of the woman he loves" (*Dostoevsky* 173). Bakhtin sees an image of eccentricity in all Dostoevsky's fiction. "It might be said that Dostoevsky's mode of artistic thinking could not imagine anything in the slightest way humanly significant that did not have certain elements of *eccentricity* (in all its diverse variations)" (*Dostoevsky* 150). Another aspect that interests Bakhtin in the novel is the tendencies of the characters to behave in a familiar manner to each other, which is inspired by Myshkin's presence. When Myshkin and Rogozhin meet, for instance, there is a "remarkable" "readiness" of the latter to answer Myshkin's questions. Or, sometimes the characters diminish the boundaries between the ranks. They advance a relationship based on equality. For instance, when Myshkin comes to Epanchin's house, the former "carries on a conversation *in the foyer* with the *butler*, on the inappropriate theme of capital punishment and the final moral torments of the condemned" (*Dostoevsky* 174). Here, the Prince and the butler's discussion of a delicate and serious subject undermines the barriers between people governed by different statuses. *The Idiot,* thus, embraces the menippean element of eccentric behaviour which is observed in Myshkin's personality.

B.3.3 Carnivalistic mésalliances

Bakhtin thinks that "Uncle's Dream" (1859) is a work based on carnivalistic mésalliances. It is a novella about a mother, Moskaleva, and a daughter Zina, whose ambition is to progress to a higher status in society through Zina's profitable marriage. For Bakhtin, the story is replete with carnivalistic ambivalent images which embrace opposites. The narrator's description of Moskaleva is ambivalent as Bakhtin thinks it is "a carnivalistic fusion of praise and abuse" (*Dostoevsky* 161). The *comic* decrowning of the old bridegroom is followed by a sad event: a young bridegroom, Vasya, decrowns himself and dies. This is similar to the menippean element of "sharp contrasts and oxymoronic combinations" (*Dostoevsky* 118).

B.3.4 Profanation

Dostoevsky's "Bobok" (1873) takes its place in Bakhtin's discussion of the carnivalization of literature as one of the most carnivalized works. Indeed, for Bakhtin, "Bobok" is "menippea almost in the strict ancient sense of the term" (*Dostoevsky* 137). The story is about Ivan Ivanovitch and his visit to a funeral ceremony at the graveyard during which he hears dead people's talk. As Bakhtin states, the narrator carnivalizes "cemetery, the funeral, the cemetery clergy, the deceased, the very 'sacrament of death' itself" (*Dostoevsky* 138). The narrator's profane attitude is seen in his thoughts; he comes to the cemetery just for *diversion*, he analyses the *odor* of the place, he thinks about the *income* of the clergy, he examines the faces of the dead, he contemplates the *restaurant* and its quality. As Bakhtin observes, the ceremony is debased and shot through with profanation by means of "oxymoronic combinations and carnivalistic mésalliances" (*Dostoevsky* 138), the menippean elements which often appear in carnivalization. For example, "death – laughter" and "feasting" (*Dostoevsky* 139) are combined in the scene during the funeral.

B.4 Rabelais's carnivalized fiction

An exploration of Bakhtin's study on Rabelais will illustrate what Bakhtin defines as grotesque imagery and realism in fiction. Bakhtin thinks that the use of the grotesque in literature carnivalizes literary works. His observation of the ways Rabelais employs grotesque imagery makes Bakhtin explore carnivalization in Rabelais's works. Thus, an analysis of this connection between the grotesque and the carnival in Rabelais's novels will provide establishing the link between Woolf's use of bodily images and the carnivalistic elements in her novels as well.

Bakhtin's work on Rabelais is mainly about grotesque realism and the body. "The most important feature of the Rabelais book is the discovery of the connection between the carnival culture of laughter and images of the grotesque body" (Ivanov 8). Bakhtin's analysis of Rabelais's *Gargantua and Pantagruel* (1532-1564) and the role of the folk tradition in this work constitutes *Rabelais and His World*, which was published long after his study on Dostoevsky. In *The Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics* Bakhtin begins his exploration of carnival and continues it in his study on Rabelais. Yet, his study on Rabelais is more comprehensive and detailed in terms of grotesque realism as the imagery of the carnival is.

Rabelais is regarded by Bakhtin as one of the most important authors who have been profoundly influenced by the culture of folk humour. In fact, since Rabelais makes use of "folk tradition," he becomes prominent for Bakhtin, who thinks that Rabelais's images "are completely at home within the thousand-year-old development of popular culture" (*Rabelais* 3). Although Bakhtin thinks that Rabelais has not been understood correctly or has not been explored completely, he states that Rabelais's images will carry him into the long future in literature (*Rabelais* 2). Bakhtin implies that the immortality and importance of an author lies in his/her use of popular sources. He sees the use of popular sources as the basis for authorship.

The following section will explore Bakhtin's analysis of Rabelais and will mainly focus on grotesque realism by discussing the language of the marketplace, popular-festive forms and images, and grotesque imagery.

B.4.1 The language of the marketplace

Bakhtin starts his analysis of Rabelais's carnivalized fiction with an exploration of his language, the "language of the marketplace," which, according to Bakhtin, "still prevent[s] public reading of Rabelais" (*Rabelais* 145) because of its obscene images. The language of the marketplace is opposed to the official language. As Mihailovic states, "the language of officialdom will have no truck with a mode of discourse that is defined as a bodily manifestation" (157). Bakhtin claims that the "coarse words" that Rabelais used in his work gained a different meaning in modern times, which makes the author difficult to understand. However, Bakhtin states that these "coarse words" used to be "universal and far removed from pornography" (*Rabelais* 146) during Rabelais's lifetime. Rabelaisian vocabulary was accepted as normal in his times. Bakhtinian research of Rabelaisian language reveals the link between this language and grotesque realism as Rabelais's verbal arsenal is mainly related to the body.

Bakhtin gives an example for the language Rabelais employs from the discourse of the advertisement on the marketplace. Bakhtin states that Rabelais's "atmosphere of the marketplace and the organization of its verbal idiom" can be seen in the prologues of each book of the Rabelaisian novel. Bakhtin provides an example from the prologue to *Pantagruel* of a "druggist" who sells the "Chronicles of Gargantua," a literary work. The speech of the druggist is replete with "the superlative" and "exaggerated style" (*Rabelais* 161). Moreover, "[h]e praises the 'Chronicles' as an excellent remedy for toothache," for "gout and veneral disease" (*Rabelais* 161). The frank discussion of these illnesses invites the image of "the material bodily lower stratum," as Bakhtin suggests (*Rabelais* 161). He draws parallels between the Rabelaisian image of the druggist and the medieval

marketplace performances "since the barkers and vendors of drugs were also actors in performances at the fair" (*Rabelais* 153). Bakhtin's description of such carnival-like atmospheres in the marketplace suggests "freedom, frankness, and familiarity" (*Rabelais* 153).

The second category of Rabelaisian language that Bakhtin explores is speech. In the prologue to *Gargantua*, Bakhtin observes a speech in which literary discourse is criticised in a covert way. The speech is full of "abusive praise and praiseful abuse": "drinkers," "pox-ridden comrades" (*Rabelais* 168). The speech includes the portrayal of Socrates: "He was ill-shaped, ridiculous in carriage, with a nose like a knife, the gaze of a bull and the face of a fool" (qtd. in *Rabelais* 169). Socrates's description suggests an annihilation of the boundaries between the worlds of human beings and animals, between the human beings and non-animate entities. The novel presents a grotesque image of Socrates, which is difficult to define. The prologue ends with an invitation to satisfy the body: "And now, my hearties, be gay, and gaily read the rest, with ease of body and in the best of kidney! And you, donkey-pizzles, hark! May a canker rot you! Remember to drink to me gallantly, and I will counter with a toast at once" (qtd. in *Rabelais* 170). As Bakhtin states, the theme of eating and food is central to the prologue.

In the prologue to the Third Book, Bakhtin thinks, Rabelais becomes more definite towards the enemies: the proponents of the "medieval philosophy," "Gothic darkness," "somberly hypocritical and serious," "the messengers of darkness" (*Rabelais* 172). The language that the speaker uses is full of references to the body: "How dare you come here, arsing and parsing, mumbling for my wine and then bepiddling my barrel?" (qtd. in *Rabelais* 172). As Bakhtin explains, these representatives of the serious aspect of life "dare to criticize this wine of gay truth and to urinate into the barrel" (*Rabelais* 172).

In the other parts of the prologue, as Bakhtin goes on, Rabelais degrades fear. "One of the symptoms and mishaps of fear is that it usually opens the back door of the rotunda where fecal guests await their turn to emerge" (qtd. in *Rabelais* 174). The language used here includes direct references to bodily images. In this way, the

feelings of fear are degraded to the bodily level and are associated with the waste material that leaves the body. An abstract feeling gains its material entity and transforms its shape. As Bakhtin states, in this way fear is transformed into laughter. He provides an example in which Panurge gets rid of his terror and becomes cheerful again after he defecates. Fear of the war is overcome by the invocation of the bodily images. Fear of death is surmounted by the use of language which is replete with the images of the body: "Doctor, doesn't my urine tell if I shall perish or get well?" (qtd. in *Rabelais* 180)

Finally, Bakhtin provides several examples of the marketplace language: "curses" and "oaths" that Rabelais widely employs in his work. He observes the speech of the druggist on the marketplace which is full of curses: the people who do not pay attention to the products he sells "are branded as poisoners and seducers of the people" (*Rabelais* 163). Bakhtin also gives an example of the curses that are pronounced by the characters who were soaked in Gargantua's urine: "God's plague and pox take it!," "'Sblood," "shit," "God's head" (qtd. in *Rabelais* 190). The terms that the curses include are related to the body. Bakhtin adds that "one of the men in the crowd calls upon Saint Sausage, which here symbolizes the phallus" (*Rabelais* 191). According to Bakhtin such curses directed at people provide an image of the grotesque body: "they burn it, hurt it to the ground, cripple the legs, cause diarrhea, and gripping; in other words, they turn the body inside out, causing the anus to protrude" (*Rabelais* 166). What is more, as Bakhtin states, such language is the reflection of these people's tendency to escape conventions, social norms, etiquette. Bakhtin states that oaths are "mainly the rendering of the human body" (*Rabelais* 192). People usually swear an oath in which they mention the organs of a holy figure. Bakhtin thinks that saying an oath is the same as dismembering a body through language: "The most improper and sinful oaths were those invoking the body of the Lord and its various parts" (*Rabelais* 192-193).

B.4.2 Popular-festive forms and images

The images Rabelais builds in his work belong to the popular-festive atmosphere and can be related to grotesque realism. Although carnival images are quite harsh and violent, Bagshaw states that Bakhtin is "uncritical" of them (97).

First, the popular-festive forms and images that Bakhtin discusses in Rabelais's work are images in which the characters are beaten and thrashed. Bakhtin gives an example from the fourth book in which Pantagruel visits the island of the Catchpoles, where people earn money by being thrashed. Bakhtin provides a scene of thrashing from Rabelais's book: "They laid on so heartily that blood spurted from his mouth, nose, ears and eyes. Catchpole was beaten to a pulp; his shoulders dislocated; his head, neck, back and breast pounded into mince-meat" (qtd. in *Rabelais* 201). There is also an image of dismemberment: giving the names of the parts of the body. Bakhtin states that this image of a dismembered body is widely seen during carnivals. Moreover, he relates thrashing to decrowning. "The abuse and thrashing are equivalent to a change of costume, to a metamorphosis. Abuse reveals the other, true face of the abused, it tears off his guise and mask. It is the king's uncrowning" (*Rabelais* 197). Such images of thrashing with their separated body organs and the suggestion of crowning/decrowning have "deep meaning" as Bakhtin concludes. The beaten character represents the dying and old age which should be destroyed in order to have a new one. According to Bakhtin's analysis in this regard, the dismembered parts of the body are like "bodily sowing" which fertilizes the earth (*Rabelais* 207).

Second, the images of "abundance and fullness of material goods," suggesting feasts, and merging of a human body with the world are also the examples of the popular-festive forms in Bakhtin's study. Bakhtin gives an example passage from Rabelais's work: "Three hundred and sixty-seven thousand and fourteen of these fat beeves had been slaughtered. They were to be salted on Shrove Tuesday so that there would be pressed beef aplenty that spring for the invocation of thirst and its subsequent exorcization by wine" (qtd. in *Rabelais* 221). Gargantua's mother,

Gargamelle, has difficulties when she gives birth to Gargantua because of her eating too much. Bakhtin provides an example from the book:

> As a result of Gargamelle's discomfort, the cotyledons of the placenta of her matrix were enlarged. The child, leaping through the breach and entering the hollow vein, ascended through her diaphragm to a point above her shoulders. Here the vein divides into two; the child accordingly worked his way in a sinistral direction, to issue, finally, through the left ear. (qtd. in *Rabelais* 225-226)

Such images of the slaughtered animals and the dismemberment of human bodies, Bakhtin states, show the dissolution of the boundaries between the humans and the nature around. Everything becomes one huge body which has "superindividual bodily life" (*Rabelais* 226). As Mihailovic claims, "the grotesque body is infinitely divisible and is relentlessly partitioned and fragmented at carnival time" (164). So, Bakhtin's concept of the body subverts and undermines the official ideology based on viewing an individual as a separate body without any sign of excretion. "Gargantua and Pantagruel are carnival heroes; the gigantic scale of their physical functions mocked medieval asceticism and celebrated the earthy realities of life" (Kelly 197).

Third, the soothsayings that are included in Rabelais's work can be observed as a link to grotesque realism. Bakhtin provides an example with Panurge, who wants to marry but is afraid of being cuckolded; all the soothsayers say the same: his wife will "cuckold, beat, and rob him" (*Rabelais* 242). The images of bodily terror are evident here. So, as Bakhtin claims, the soothsaying is related to "individual death, change, and renewal" (*Rabelais* 244). What Bakhtin maintains is an idea of a comic and gay image of life and its proceedings.

B.4.3 Grotesque imagery

As was stated earlier, Bakhtin's grotesque realism is the descendant of the grotesque. Therefore, Bakhtin sees it possible to analyse Rabelais's grotesque

imagery in terms of grotesque realism. He sees the major features of grotesque realism in Rabelais's work.

First, Rabelaisian images of the body degrade everything to the lower level. Bakhtin provides an example where "Friar John asserts that even the shadow of the monastery belfry can render women more fertile" (*Rabelais* 310). Here the religious symbol is transformed into a part of the body: "the monastic belfry, uncrowned and renewed in the form of a giant phallus" (*Rabelais* 312) is the grotesque image. As Bakhtin maintains, the whole religion is brought down to the level of the body. In another example that Bakhtin provides, Panurge proposes to use women's genital organs to build walls in the city. In this image, "the human body becomes a building material" (*Rabelais* 313). Another suggestion that Bakhtin provides in this image is the idea of "fecundity;" the use of women's genital organs as a wall to protect the city suggests the employment of women in the increase of the population (*Rabelais* 313). Thus, the idea of the safety of the country is expressed through bodily images. As Bakhtin states, everything that is accepted as serious and sacred is considered once more on the level of the body.

The substitution of the lower parts for the higher parts, of the bottom for the face, for example, is a widely used image in Rabelais's work. As Bakhtin claims, medieval thought acknowledged only a "vertical" movement: "upward" or "downward:" "All that was best was highest, all that was worst was lowest" (*Rabelais* 401). In grotesque imagery there is the inverted version of this movement; and the binary opposition of good-bad is abandoned. Bakhtin discusses the images of the swabs in Rabelais's work. Gargantua uses various objects as swabs to clean his "tailpiece:" "velvet scarf of a damozel," "hood," "neckerchief," "the earpieces," "page's cap," "March cat," "gloves" (*Rabelais* 371). Bakhtin states that the first five objects are related to the face and Gargantua uses them for his bottom (*Rabelais* 373). Rabelais debases the upper stratum of the body. The bottom sabotages the head. Hitchcock claims that the "body's materiality, especially the materiality of what Bakhtin calls its 'lower stratum,' conspires against the codes of order and rationality issued by its 'head'" (85).

Another example that Bakhtin provides shows the downward motion. Panurge tries to resurrect Epistemon. When Epistemon awakens, "he began to breathe, then he opened his eyes, yawned, sneezed. … Finally he let go a great household fart" (qtd. in *Rabelais* 382). As is observed, the sign of life comes from the lower parts as well. The bottom makes the body a whole human. As Bakhtin concludes, existing on the verge between two different worlds when medieval thought started to shatter, Rabelais "made the top and the bottom change places" (*Rabelais* 403). He "intentionally mixed the hierarchical levels in order to discover the core of the object's concrete reality, to free it from its shell and to show its material bodily aspect – the real being outside all hierarchical norms and values" (*Rabelais* 403).

Bakhtin links such switching of the upper and the lower parts of the body to death and the underworld. When Sybil shows "her backside to Panurge," the latter says "I see the Sybil's hole," and the phrase "the Sybil's hole" was used as the term for "the entrance to the underworld" in ancient times (*Rabelais* 377). The lower parts of the body are related to death and the underworld. However, as the Rabelaisian world is the world turned inside out, the underworld is not the end of life. It signifies the beginning of a new life as the lower parts of the body symbolise birth and regeneration: "the soul's beatitude is deeply immersed in the body's lower stratum" (*Rabelais* 378). The association of the lower parts of the body with the underworld suggests the carnivalization of the latter as it becomes the place of gaiety and pleasure. And this opposes the common medieval idea of the underworld as "an ultimate concentration of gloom, fear, and intimidation" (*Rabelais* 395). In this way, as Bakhtin claims, Rabelais undermines the religious doctrine: "he parodies all the elements of medieval teachings and sacraments" (*Rabelais* 379).

Secondly, Bakhtin finds the banquet imagery in Rabelais's work "interwoven with those of the grotesque body" (*Rabelais* 279). The grotesque image embraces the world: it is "cosmic and universal" (*Rabelais* 331). During banquets and feasts people eat and take the world inside. Bakhtin thinks Rabelais's work is replete with feasts and eating. Pantagruel's first important events are related to eating: "At each

feeding he sucked the milk of 4,600 cows" (*Rabelais* 331). Panurge's urine becomes universal in nature as it covers a large area: it can "drown them all and flood the countryside ten leagues around" (qtd. in *Rabelais* 334). Bakhtin ties the Rabelaisian grotesque themes and images of the "wide-open mouth," "swallowing," "open womb" with the feature of the universalism. Such a body can become one with nature, with mountains, rivers, seas. The body has an "unfinished nature" (*Rabelais* 281). Because the body is not a complete unit, its inside is also focused on: "blood, bowels, heart and other organs" (*Rabelais* 318).

Thirdly, the image of grotesque realism can be ambivalent and dualistic. The grotesque is ambivalent: "both the positive and the negative poles" are present in one image (*Rabelais* 308). Rabelais describes Pantagruel's birth in the grotesque image in which both birth and death are present; the mother dies during the process: "She died in the throes of childbirth. Alas! Pantagruel was so extraordinarily large and heavy that he could not have possibly come to light without suffocating his mother" (qtd. in *Rabelais* 329). The grotesque image is also dualistic. It embraces the presence of dual components. Bakhtin provides an example from Rabelais's work: there is a figure on Gargantua's hat, "man's body with two heads facing one another, four arms, four feet, a pair of arses and a brace of sexual organs, male and female" (*Rabelais* 323). This dual figure represents the utopian body/the androgynous body with its two heads, two bottoms, two couples of arms and feet. Regarding the opposites in the example above, opposite sexes are juxtaposed. As Bakhtin claims, "androgyne theme was popular in Rabelais' time" (*Rabelais* 323).

Bakhtin's main idea in his works on Dostoevsky and Rabelais is to underline the importance of the folk culture of humour and of the strength of people when they come together. Taking the carnival sense of the world from the ritualistic carnival of the medieval and the Renaissance community, Bakhtin accepts it as a way of looking at the world in every epoch. For him, the carnival sense of the world is perceiving life in its humorous way, with laughter. Trying to survive in the Stalinist era when the citizens were being persecuted just because they expressed their ideas, Bakhtin

was also trying to overcome his illness. Yet, such obstacles did not prevent him from expressing his thoughts through writing.

The carnival sense of the world finds its reflection in many literary works in all epochs. Studying this sense of the world in Dostoevsky's and Rabelais's fiction reveals what Bakhtin means when he refers to carnivalization. Bakhtin defines carnivalization through his analysis of the works of these two authors. This definition shows the way carnival is reflected in literature. The elements of the carnival sense of the world in the works of these authors, as examined by Bakhtin, create a solid background against which other literary works that have the carnivalesque potential, such as Virginia Woolf's fiction, can be explored.

CHAPTER III

RECONFIGURATIONS OF THE FEMALE SPACE IN *THE VOYAGE OUT*

Woolf's themes in her novels gesture in the direction of thought which undermines the idea of an affiliation of a woman with domestic responsibilities. Woolf seems insistent in welcoming new values in her themes – the adaptation of spaces according to women's desires; therefore, her female characters often attempt to be remote from homes, which are held to be the repository of laws, social rules and principles. In this respect, Woolf shatters the dominant idea of stability. This can be perceived specifically in her first novel, *The Voyage Out* (1915). The novel vividly and widely depicts the process of the possible change of the concept of home and the outside for women. This chapter will analyse *The Voyage Out* in terms of its characters' tendencies to avoid patriarchal domestic ideology; and this tendency will be analysed in the light of Bakhtin's notion of carnival.

The parallel between Virginia Woolf's novel and Bakhtin's carnival becomes visible in the female characters' desire to merge the inside and the outside and their tendency to establish free contact between people. The difference between the Bakhtinian carnival and Woolf's novel lies in the latter's preoccupation with gender hierarchies. While Bakhtin's carnival is characterized by the suspension of class barriers between the carnival's participants, the atmosphere in Woolf's novel provides the reader with scenes where gender hierarchies are suspended. Woolf reconfigures the so-called female space marked by middle-class ideology and opens the doors of the homes to let the women characters outside both spiritually and physically. In this way, her characters transform into carnival participants who suspend their noncarnival responsibilities and lead their carnival lives among the others on the public square. The analysis of the female characters' escape from the

confines of the domestic ideology in *The Voyage Out* can be divided into two main categories: merging of the inside and the outside and free contact between genders.

A. Merging of the inside and the outside

The Voyage Out is about 24-year-old Rachel Vinrace, and her physical and mental voyage. She travels in her father's boat from London to Santa Marina, a touristic place in South America, where she stays with her aunt and uncle, the Ambroses. On the boat she meets several people: Mr Pepper, the Ambroses, and the Dalloways. In Santa Marina she meets more people and falls in love with Hewet Terence but dies on the brink of their marriage because of a high fever. She spends her time in Santa Marina by climbing mountains, dancing and travelling to a native village. Throughout her voyage on the boat and her stay in Santa Marina, Rachel has a chance to see life from a different perspective. Indeed, her death is usually regarded as a fortunate event because in this way she escapes from her life as a married woman in a country where women's condition does not promise any freedom.

The basic premise of the Bakhtinian carnival is people's acquisition of a harmonious unity. Carnival "*belongs to the whole people*, it is *universal, everyone* must participate in its familiar contact" (*Dostoesvky* 128). Carnival is a space in which people's activities and lives are not eclipsed by the idea of privacy. What is more, the carnival participants are supposed to create a coherent unity when they gather. Such circumstances of carnival exert profound influence on literature by furnishing literary works with "meeting- and contact-points for heterogeneous people – streets, taverns, roads, bathhouses, decks of ships" (*Dostoesvky* 128). The main aim of Bakhtin's discussion of the carnival sense of the world is to imagine a world where people can transcend the class barriers between them. Thus, by eliminating the differences between social classes, people come together and form a coherent unity. In the same vein, although Woolf's characters try to shatter gender hierarchies instead of social class difference, they tend to create an atmosphere where they lose the sense of isolation. Some scenes in *The Voyage Out* entail a contradiction between

the female characters and their roles as domestic and isolated individuals; these characters tend to unite with the world. Hence, Woolf's *The Voyage Out* suggests adherence to carnivalization. Woolf's female characters merge the inside and the outside mainly for the following functions: escaping from stability and rules and erasing the boundaries between the private and the public.

A.1 Escape from stability

The first function of opening up of the doors of domesticity is an escape from stability and experiencing life in flux, in perennial change. The domestic ideology endorsed stability because it had to sustain its dominance. The main space where stability had to be established was the home because the outside was already marked by profound change and flux. As a result, women had to possess the roles of the holders of this stability. The only change they experienced was the growing number of their children. Hence, withdrawing themselves from such a role was seen as a challenge to the social system. Indeed, instability, uncertainty, ambivalence, flux are the main attributes of the carnival sense of the world. When Bakhtin discusses carnivalized literature, he focuses on the difference between the ordinary life and the life infused with the carnival sense of the world:

> The most essential feature in . . . novels is an application of carnivalization to the portrayal of contemporary reality and contemporary everyday life; *everyday life* is drawn into the carnivalized action of the plot; the ordinary and constant is combined with the extraordinary and changeable. (*Dostoevsky* 158).

There is a stress on constant flux in life in carnivalized literature. Moreover, Bakhtin adds that there is the presence of "joy at change" (*Dostoevsky* 160). Change is welcomed by the characters of carnivalized literature. Thus, as the female characters of *The Voyage Out* try to merge the inside and the outside in order to escape stability at home, the scenes with their actions in this regard can be seen as carnivalistic because they try to suspend the ordinary flow of life and subvert the ideology that

endorses their ordinary existence. The characters' eagerness to experience change and a life that is different from their usual lives pulls them to the carnival sense of the world.

To begin with, the novel starts with the characters' journey on Mr Vinrace's boat. The characters' life on the boat is different from the usual life they have in the city. It is a life experienced in a communal way, on the deck. The portrayal of this sea voyage may be the result of Woolf's sea trip to Portugal, with her brother Adrian in 1905. "Woolf's Portuguese excursion was her only sea voyage, but the metaphor of taking ship and watching the solid land drift away was the compelling thing" (Sage xii). This movement away from a solid land towards the unknown and fluctuating surface of the sea is the act of escaping stability. Woolf transfers her feeling of sailing away from rigid stability of the land to her first novel and draws a portrait of a young girl, Rachel, who experiences a turning point in life by embarking her father's boat. Indeed, the name of the boat – *Euphrosyne* – suggests change and transformation because St Euphrosyne used to cross-dress in order to escape marriage. She used to disguise her sex and, thus, her appearance was ambivalent and unstable. In addition, Euphrosyne was the Greek Goddess of Joy and Mirth. This version also fits the analysis of the boat's life according to the carnival sense of the world because the characters on the boat welcome change with joy. Indeed, *Euphrosyne*'s appearance suggests instability and uncertainty.

> From a distance the *Euphrosyne* looked very small. . . . The insect-like figures of Dalloways, Ambroses, and Vinraces were . . . derided, both from the extreme smallness of their persons and the doubt which only strong glasses could dispel as to whether they were really live creatures or only lumps on the rigging. (94)

People's mistaking the boat for a cargo boat that carries cattle and their inability to perceive the passengers as human beings deepen the boat's sense of strangeness and uncertainty. The boat can be likened to Petersburg, which Bakhtin analyses as a carnivalistic setting in Dostoevsky's *Crime and Punishment*.

> It is characteristic that the very setting for the action of the novel – *Petersburg* (its role in the novel is enormous) – is on the borderline between existence and nonexistence, reality and phantasmagoria, always on the verge of dissipating like the fog and vanishing. Petersburg too is devoid, as it were, of any internal grounds for justifiable stabilization; it too is on the threshold. (*Dostoevsky* 167)

The boat in Woolf's novel, similar to Petersburg, evades definition and description. Some scenes that take place on the boat confirm lack of sharp lines of definite phenomena. The light coming from the windows makes the images blur "so that 'The Coliseum' was scarcely to be distinguished from Queen Alexandra playing with her Spaniels" (14). The placement of Rachel on this boat suggests the novel's attempt to create an alternative space to the female domestic space that is marked by certainty, security and stability.

Moreover, the way the boat is seen from the other boats suggests a grotesque image because this image emphasizes the lack of boundaries between human beings and animals. As Bakhtin states, grotesque images "preserve their peculiar nature, entirely different from ready-made, completed being. They remain ambivalent and contradictory; they are ugly, monstrous, hideous" (*Rabelais* 25). Similarly, the boat and its passengers cannot be easily defined: "Glasses were turned upon her from the decks of great liners, and she was pronounced a tramp, a cargo-boat, or one of those wretched little passenger steamers where people rolled about among the cattle on deck" (94). The boat cannot be categorized; it is regarded as an object that changes its functions from one point of view to the other. The passengers are seen either as inanimate objects or as animals. Moreover, even if they are perceived as animals, none can be defined as a particular animal. "Mr Pepper with all his learning had been mistaken for a cormorant, and then, as unjustly transformed into a cow" (94). Thus, the boat and its passengers provide a grotesque image with their perpetually transforming shapes. Such an image of the passengers deflates their dignity and this invites a humorous reading of the passage. The Dalloways, who are from a higher social class and for whom the other passengers are as weird as the characters from

"an old number of *Punch*[14]" (49), are mercilessly thrown down to the level of non-humans, lumps and animals.

Experiencing a sea voyage is like being on the threshold. Woolf feels that the sea is "a border of mystery"[15] (qtd. in Sage xii). The boat has "a life of her own" (29-30); therefore, the characters are somewhere in-between. According to Bakhtin, in carnivalized literature the characters and everything they experience are "pushed to its boundaries" (*Dostoevsky* 167). They are situated in spaces where they have their turning points in life. For Rachel, the boat stands for her space in-between; it is a space between naiveté and maturity. The boat is the initiation of her acquisition of the knowledge related to the world and herself. She is kissed for the first time. Mr Dalloway kisses her "passionately" when they converse in her room (80). After the kiss, "[l]ife seemed to hold infinite possibilities she had never guessed at" (80). Yet, she also understands that being a woman is being open for sexual harassment by men. Her resentment becomes evident in her dream. "A voice moaned for her; eyes desired her. All night long barbarian men harassed the ship; they came scuffling down the passages, and stopped to snuffle at her door" (82). She becomes disturbed by Mr Dalloway's kiss because he makes it clear that the kiss is her fault: "'You tempt me,' he said. The tone of his voice was terrifying" (80). Rachel starts to feel that masculine authority represses her. Even though she likes the experience of a kiss, Mr Dalloway taints it by making it obvious that the kiss is something filthy and should be "hidden in ordinary life" (80). Consequently, Rachel is harassed because she is kissed against her will and moreover, she is accused of this kiss. "As the dream suggests, Rachel's true position in Richard's world and in the established order of *The Voyage Out* is as a trapped and threatened woman" (Kennard 154). Helen confirms her ideas related to being a woman. "[I]f you want friendship with men you must run risks" (87). This kiss makes Rachel understand an important factor of prohibition in her life.

[14]*Punch* was a British weekly magazine of humour and satire.

[15]*The Letters of Virginia Woolf*, ed. Nigel Nicolson and Joanne Trautmann (6 vols.; London: Hogarth Press, 1975-84).

> ‘So that’s why I can’t walk alone!’
>
> By this new light she saw her life for the first time a creeping hedged-in thing, driven cautiously between high walls, here turned aside, there plunged in darkness, made dull and crippled for ever – her life that was the only chance she had – a thousand words and actions became plain to her.
>
> ‘Because men are brutes! I hate men!’ she exclaimed. (87)

Rachel learns the reality of being a woman, of constituting a body that tempts men. She realizes the reason behind her limited activities. Being kissed or harassed is not the only danger that awaits women. Being accused of “being kissed or harassed” is more damaging.

Rachel’s being on the boat is a carnivalesque element because she experiences what Bakhtin calls a crisis time, she changes her attitude to life. She starts seeing life from a different perspective and understands that it is difficult to escape from patriarchal oppression. Her kiss with Richard Dalloway is the impetus to her change. She realizes that her present condition is only a temporary moment in which she can suspend the conventions of the ordinary life. Viewing her past and her life in a closed domestic space, Rachel realizes the fact that a woman is always under the threat of being victimized by the patriarchal dominance. She understands that the boundaries between the genders that are suspended on the boat do not simply serve the purpose of freeing women from patriarchal authority, but also of men’s satisfaction of their desires. This becomes a problem that hinders men and women from meeting each other in a manner that would make them forget about the social gender hierarchies. It is one of the two most important points in the novel which make the absolute carnival atmosphere be reduced only to the presence of some carnivalesque elements.

Being on the boat provides a remorseless insistence on exposing the foundations of limits and eternal stability of the city which is left behind. Even before the boat scene, at the beginning of the novel, it becomes clear that London does not welcome any digression from the concept of the “normal.” “In the streets of London where beauty goes unregarded, eccentricity must pay the penalty, and it is

better not to be very tall, to wear a long blue cloak, or to beat the air with your left hand" (3). Being on the boat helps the passengers see London's rigidity and its tendency to ostracise everything that extends beyond normalcy and stability. Being on the boat and drifting away from the city allows the characters to question the lives they had in England. Lorna Sage states that Woolf "wanted to shrink England and get English life into a new perspective" (xii). The characters' observation of the vanishing country makes them believe that they escape imprisonment. "The people in ships, . . . , took an equally singular view of England. Not only did it appear to them to be an island, and a very small island, but it was a shrinking island in which people were imprisoned" (29). The image of England is grotesque because it changes and transforms. And this happens despite the idea that the country stands for stability and certainty for the boat's passengers. A huge country transforms into a shrinking island that reminds the passengers of prisons so they avoid the existence under coercion; they liberate themselves from the oppression of stability and certainty. They usurp a place on the boat defined by the principles of perpetual change which is felt by Helen: "the whole course of their lives was now put out of order" (73). London, on the other hand, stands for permanence: "[n]o darkness would ever settle upon those lamps, as no darkness had settled upon them for hundreds of years" (13). And the passengers on the boat are horrified by this vision. "It seemed dreadful that the town should blaze for ever in the same spot; dreadful at least to people going away to adventure upon the sea, and beholding it as a circumscribed mound, eternally burnt, eternally scarred" (13). London, in short, loses its ability to be a setting suitable for a novel such as *The Voyage Out*, in which female characters try to subvert the dominant ideology. "From the deck of the ship the great city appeared a crouched and cowardly figure, a sedentary miser" (13). The active female characters of the novel cannot inhabit a crouched and cowardly city.

Viewing their lives from a distance and analysing England in a new perspective opens a way for these characters to question women's position in the country. Drifting away from land symbolises a woman's exit from her house marked by the permanent and staunch atmosphere of patriarchal order. Sage states that

Rachel leaves England and her home "crammed with Victorian furniture, . . . a world tamed and cluttered, . . . indefinably old" (xxi). Rachel leaves London marked by imprisonment which is suggested by the great amount of furniture.

What is more, the female characters leave behind a "tamed" world that imposes on them its rules of domesticity. The novel's particular stress on how the characters see England from the boat emphasises what exactly the female characters leave behind: imprisonment, order, sedentary life, Victorian values, tamed, cluttered and old world. Helen leaves her children at home and sails to Santa Marina for no particular reason. She leaves behind her domestic responsibilities and sails to have a long holiday. Nick Montgomery claims that the novel depicts the traverse of the boundaries "between home and the wider world, between interiority and exteriority, between known center and exotic periphery, or perhaps between the patriarchal establishment and some other, oppositional space" (36). The novel depicts the female characters' transgression of domestic borders, related to both literal and figurative notions of the home. The characters leave their literary homes and set off on a sea voyage for a place which is unlike their motherland. Montgomery observes a dichotomy between two spaces: the home and the outside; while the literary home and the motherland are defined as narrow, interior, known, and patriarchal, the outside is defined as "wider," exterior, "exotic," and "oppositional." Thus, the novel depicts the differences between a patriarchal ideology that imprisons women at "home" and the world outside through the depiction of the characters' journey away from England.

Second, Santa Marina becomes the place where the female characters experience change and "crisis time." Rachel explores new feelings and senses. She changes her perspective on her life and exclaims it during the dance activity at the hotel. "I've changed my view of life completely!" (182). Santa Marina is the place where she becomes familiar with Terence Hewet and falls in love for the first time. Her relationship with Terence makes her understand what she expects from love and what she wants from a man she loves. Rachel's experience of love is a carnivalistic ambivalence because it combines love and hatred, courage and fear. According to

Bakhtin, it is a "carnivalization of passion" which "is evidenced first and foremost in its ambivalence: love is combined with hatred, avarice with selflessness, ambition with self-abasement, and so forth" (*Dostoevsky* 159). Rachel falls in love and there is no denial of it. She likes her new feeling but at the same time she hates it. "Very gently and quietly, almost as if it were the blood singing in her veins, or the water of the stream running over stones, Rachel became conscious of a new feeling within her. . . . 'This is happiness, I suppose'" (330). However, later on in the novel, she objects to her new feelings. "'No,' she repeated, 'I never fell in love, if falling in love is what people say it is'" (342). Rachel is caught in a dilemma which makes her contemplate her condition. She even offers Terence to separate. "Let's break it off, then" (353). Her ambivalent feelings towards her condition are seen in their images when they are together. "As if they stood on the edge of a precipice they clung together. They knew that they could not separate; painful and terrible it might be, but they were joined for ever" (353). Yet, in another scene, the unity is broken. "But it chilled them to see themselves in the glass, for instead of being vast and indivisible they were really very small and separate" (353).

She understands that loving somebody is loving the whole world. "I hate these divisions, don't you, Terence? One person all in the dark about another person. […] Why should one be shut up all by oneself in a room?" (352). The object of Rachel's love is nebulous and she acknowledges this when she "wanted many more things than the love of one human being – the sea, the sky. . . . she could not possibly want only one human being" (352). This is reminiscent of the Bakhtinian notion of the grotesque the image of which embraces the whole world. The grotesque image suggests an effacement of the boundaries between the body and the world. It is becoming a part of nature and earth. However, Rachel's love and her desire to embrace the world remain at an abstract level. Although when Rachel dies, it seems as if she becomes one with the world, the image is not as concrete as the grotesque images of Rabelaisian work. As in not-fully concretized acts of decrowning in *To the Lighthouse* and *Flush*, grotesque images are not fully realized in this novel. Woolf's

treatment of the notions of oneness or fusion with the world is mainly on the abstract level while Bakhtin stresses concreteness.

In Santa Marina Rachel dies and before her death she feels as if she were on the threshold between two worlds: "at intervals she made an effort to cross over into the ordinary world, but she found that her heat and discomfort had put a gulf between her world and the ordinary world which she could not bridge" (383). Her condition makes her see images that do not match with the real ordinary world. "The sights were all concerned in some plot, some adventure, some escape" (397). Such activities take place during a time which Bakhtin calls a carnivalistic time; "special carnival time, excluded, as it were, from historical time, flowing according to its own special carnival laws and finding room in itself for an unlimited number of radical shifts and metamorphoses" (*Dostoevsky* 175-176). Rachel finds herself in this special time when even the nurse seems to have plunged into a carnivalistic atmosphere. "At a great distance an elderly woman sat with her head bent down; Rachel raised herself slightly and saw with dismay that she was playing cards by the light of a candle which stood in the hollow of a newspaper" (385). The nurse's playing cards contributes to Rachel's carnivalistic time because games themselves present a time of crisis. "Gambling (with dice, cards, roulette, etc.) is by nature carnivalistic. . . . The atmosphere of gambling is an atmosphere of sudden and quick changes of fate, of instantaneous rises and falls" (*Dostoevsky* 171).

Rachel's being between life and death is her turning point and it promises more changes. What is more, it is ambivalent because it promises a new beginning but at the same time it is the time of her death. Her death seems to be the beginning of her new relationship with Terence. When Rachel dies Terence does not accept it as an end. "So much the better – this was death. It was nothing; it was to cease to breathe. It was happiness, it was perfect happiness. They had now what they had always wanted to have, the union which had been impossible while they lived" (412). Yet, it should be added that Rachel's death is different from the notion of death Bakhtin conceptualizes in his discussion on carnival. Bakhtin's notion of death is regenerative; it brings a new life. Rachel's death, on the contrary, is the end of her

life. Although for a short time it suggests a refined reunion with Terence, Rachel's death is her physical demise. Hence, similar to the abstractness of the acts of decrowning in Woolf's novels that will be discussed in the next chapter, the regenerative power of Rachel's death is remote from being concrete.

Santa Marina is the place where Rachel becomes aware of women's condition and acquires a sense of protest against patriarchal dictates. Her conversations with Terence lead her to this enlightenment. "Hewet's words made her think. She always submitted to her father" (246). According to Terence, women harm themselves by exaggerating men's abilities. "The respect that women, even well-educated, very able women, have for men, . . . I believe we must have the sort of power over you that we're said to have over horses. They see us three times as big as we are or they'd never obey us" (239). He also stresses the fact that daughters are usually disregarded for the sake of sons.

> And then, of course, the daughters have to give way to the sons; the sons have to be educated; they have to bully and shove for their wives and families, and so it all comes over again. And meanwhile there are the women in the background … Do you really think that the vote will do you any good? (240)

Through Terence Rachel becomes cognizant of women's forced self-sacrifice. She learns about women's inability to voice their values and desires. She remembers her aunts.

> She reviewed their little journeys to and fro, to Walworth, to charwomen with bad legs, to meetings for this and that, their minute acts of charity and unselfishness which flowered punctually from a definite view of what they ought to do, their friendships, their tastes and habits; she saw all these things like grains of sand falling, falling through innumerable days, making an atmosphere and building up a solid mass, a background. (247)

Rachel has a chance to re-evaluate her aunts' lives by viewing them from a new perspective. Rachel's aunts and their everyday activities confirm Terence's ideas; women efface themselves as individuals for the sake of the others.

Consequently, Rachel's fear of marriage intensifies; she rejects coming out of the house after her engagement with Terence because she does not want the others to confirm that she is doomed to take the place among the ordinary women of her society. Rachel's death is her rejection to follow the conventions that underlie the marriage institution. "Rachel's illness and death . . . is a deliberate and shocking betrayal of the conventions of the marriage plot" (Zwerdling 177). Rachel's death suggests that only death can save a woman from the oppressions of patriarchal ideology. The critics state that from the beginning of the novel Rachel's death is implied. Montgomery states that the title of the novel is "an announcement of what is to follow, it stipulates a movement from an inside to an outside, a passage through or across boundaries, while leaving the nature of the voyage, the place of departure, and the destination obscure" (36). Sage states that "she is embarking on a course from which there is no turning back" (xii). Rachel's journey on her father's boat is the initiation of her escape from the patriarchal world. The novel is mainly about Rachel's act of resistance against social norms. According to Little, Rachel's "contract[ing] a fatal disease in the jungle" is a symbol of her "contract[ing] an austere judgement against the human rules for molding her identity" (28). So, as Little claims, Rachel's death is her insistence on remaining outside of the patriarchal world and away from the social norms.

A.2 Escape from domestic norms

Escape from stability inevitably leads to the tendency to escape norms. The female characters in *The Voyage Out* tend to open their homes to the outside world and refashion the inside because they want to break free from the presence of perennial precepts that govern the domestic space. The infiltration of the sense of the public into the home disrupts the routine flow of domestic life because the latter is based on the premise that life includes the actions that take place at home. Bakhtin states that "[c]arnivalization is much deeper and more substantial" when the work includes "life that has left its normal rut, almost a 'world turned inside out'"

(*Dostoevsky* 162-163). Thus, a carnivalized work focuses on the life in which the characters cease following appointed rules and start living following their own desires. In *The Voyage Out*, it is seen that the female characters' actions do not correspond to the actions that were expected of middle-class women then in an ordinary domestic environment.

The holiday mood of *The Voyage Out* places the female characters in a space where they suspend the norms regulating women's lives. Woolf "ships the English to Santa Marina, and deprives them of 'the supporting background of organized English life,' so that they are seen in high relief" (Sage xxiii). The English feel they are not supposed to remember the social norms when they are away from London, that they are completely free. In this vein, what Bakhtin says about Dostoevsky's carnivalized fiction can be applied to Woolf's novel, too. "Carnivalization allows Dostoevsky to glimpse and bring to life aspects in the character and behaviour of people which in the normal course of life could not have revealed themselves" (*Dostoevsky* 163). Depicting the characters in a place where life is different from the life they have led so far is making these characters reveal the sides of their personalities that have not been experienced before. Bakhtin calls such a group of characters *carnival collective* (*Dostoevsky* 171) and states that Dostoevsky's "The Gambler" includes such a collective.

> These are people cut off from their native land and folk, whose life ceases to be determined by the norms of people living in their own country; their behaviour is no longer regulated by that position which they had occupied in their homeland, they are not fastened down to their environment. (*Dostoevsky* 170-171)

Indeed, having a holiday has been regarded by Bakhtin as a kind of activity carrying the traces of the carnival. "The carnival spirit with its freedom, its utopian character oriented toward the future, was gradually transformed into a mere holiday mood" (*Rabelais* 33).

The characters in *The Voyage Out* are a collective of eccentric individuals. They disrupt the smooth atmosphere of stability and normalcy and in this way the

dominant ideology of patriarchy is subverted. According to Bakhtin, "carnivalized atmosphere" is also created when there are eccentric characters: "ambivalent and crisis-ridden characters, unfinalized, eccentric, full of unexpected possibilities" (*Dostoevsky* 171). Thus, the novel presents a space which contradicts the characteristics of the usual and conventional atmosphere. This space becomes an alternative for the life that these characters have in London. The Ambroses seem quite different from the others. For example, when they walk on the streets of London, the others are seen as "small, agitated figures" because "in comparison with this couple most people looked small" (3). The children on the Embankment tease the pair because of their appearance. Mr Ambrose seems eccentric, "awful" and "grotesque" to the children (4). Mr Vinrace's opinion about Helen confirms her peculiar nature. "Willoughby was reflecting that his sister-in-law was even more eccentric than he remembered, pushed her chair back and swept upstairs" (23). Mrs Dalloway also sees idiosyncrasy in Helen: "slightly eccentric in appearance" (40). In fact, for Mrs Dalloway, everybody on the boat is outlandish and she writes thus in her letter.

> [T]hey might have come trailing out of an old number of *Punch*. They're like people playing croquet in the 'sixties. How long they've all been shut up in this ship I don't know – years and years I should say – but one feels as though one had boarded a little separate world, and they'd never been on shore, or done ordinary things in their lives. (49)

Mr Pepper is portrayed as a grotesque character who is associated with the female and the image of a god of Far East belief.

> Mr Pepper, indeed, created a diversion of a kind by leaping on to his seat, both feet tucked under him, with the action of a spinster who detects a mouse, as the draught struck at his ankles. Drawn up there, sucking at his cigar, with his arms encircling his knees, he looked like the image of Buddha, and from this elevation began a discourse, addressed to nobody, for nobody had called for it, upon the unplumbed depths of the ocean. (18)

For Mrs Dalloway, Mr Pepper is "queer" and she even ridicules him.

> Oh, I'd forgotten, there's a dreadful little thing called Pepper. He's just like his name. He's indescribably insignificant, and rather queer in his temper, poor dear. It's like sitting down to dinner with an ill-conditioned fox-terrier, only one can't comb him out, and sprinkle him with powder, as one would one's dog. It's a pity, sometimes, one can't treat people like dogs! (50)

These eccentric characters reveal the varieties of life; the novel pinpoints the fact that it is impossible to insert a character into a common frame of behaviour. Everyone has her/his own inner world that can seem queer for the others. In this way, Woolf propagates uncertainty against dominant patriarchal notions of certainty and stability.

Besides being quirk, the characters demonstrate a profane attitude towards religion. In Bakhtin's terms profanation is "playing with the symbols of higher authority" (*Dostoevsky* 125). These symbols can be religious, royal, administrative or of any other kind that impose order and stability on society. Helen reveals her profane attitude toward Christianity.

> At this moment I have a nurse. She's a good woman as they go, but she's determined to make my children pray. So far, owing to great care on my part, they think of God as a kind of walrus; . . . what shall we do if we find them saying the Lord's Prayer when we get home again? . . . I would rather my children told lies. (23)

The other characters also demonstrate a profane attitude towards religious doctrines. In Santa Marina, when the characters attend the Mass, it becomes evident that the religious teachings do not correspond to what they experience in life.

> Then they returned to the New Testament and the sad and beautiful figure of Christ. While Christ spoke they made another effort to fit his interpretation of life upon the lives they lived, but as they were all very different, some practical, some ambitious, some stupid, some wild and experimental, some in love, and others long past any feeling except a feeling of comfort, they did very different things with the words of Christ. (263-264)

Rachel "listened critically to what was being said" and "the atmosphere of forced solemnity increased her anger" (264). The atmosphere of the Mass "suddenly

revealed to her what Helen meant and St John meant when they proclaimed their hatred of Christianity. With the violence that now marked her feelings, she rejected all that she had implicitly believed" (265). Hirst reads Sappho during the Mass and Mrs Flushing "gulped down the Ode to Aphrodite during the Litany" (267). Moreover, Hirst scribbles an "indecent" (313) poem about God at the back of an envelope during the Mass (267). His ideas about God indicates an attempt at undermining religious doctrines: "an old gentleman in a beard and a long blue dressing-gown, extremely testy and disagreeable as he's bound to be? Can you suggest a rhyme? God, rod, sod – all used; any others?" (324) The characters' profane attitude towards religion is the novel's attitude towards any kind of norms that impose stability and rigidity. The characters' playing with the notions of God, the Mass, and Christianity suggests their desire to be free from any stabilizing norms, to experience something that is prohibited, to break the boundaries and feel the flux of life.

A.3 Erasing the boundaries between the private and the public

The third function in the novel of merging the inside and the outside is to depict the characters' reluctance to remain in closed spaces. Women's coming out of the shell of domesticity brings them into contact with the others, particularly with men. Such behaviour on the part of female characters suggests their tendency to constitute a whole with the others. According to the Bakhtinian perspective, a body "is not separated from the world by clearly defined boundaries; it is blended with the world, with animals, with objects" (*Rabelais* 27). Woolf's characters have a capacity to dispense with the notion of identity based on isolation and privacy; they want to merge with the rest of the world. The characters tend to erase the boundaries between the private and the public in three ways: the domestic space is rendered visible to everybody; the characters look at and overhear each other; and they regard the outside as a space for action.

The domestic space becomes visible from the outside in some of the scenes in the novel; it loses its private atmosphere as a female space. Thus, the home loses its closed and secluded environment. It can be watched by anybody from the outside and the people inside can see the outside. In this way, it is possible to discuss these elements of the novel in terms of carnivalization. According to Bakhtin, one of the ways through which it is possible to discuss carnivalization in Dostoevsky is his "'leap[ing] over' all that is comfortably habitable, well-arranged and stable, all that is far from the threshold, because the life that he portrays does not take place in that sort of space. Dostoevsky was least of all an estate-home-room-apartment-family writer" (*Dostoevsky* 169). In *The Voyage Out*, the inside of the homes in Santa Marina, are seen through uncurtained windows. Any boundary between the inside and the outside is removed and a link between the two is established. Uncurtained windows let the outsiders see the life of the inhabitants of the house. Nothing remains private in this way. Helen leaves the windows uncurtained in her villa in Santa Marina. "The dinner-table was set between two long windows which were left uncurtained by Helen's orders" (100-101). The hotel, which becomes one of the centres of the action in the novel and where the other characters stay, can be observed from the outside because the curtains are not drawn. "A row of long windows opened almost to the ground. They were all of them uncurtained, and all brilliantly lighted, so that they [Rachel and Helen] could see everything inside. Each window revealed a different section of the life of the hotel" (109).

Bowlby states that *The Voyage Out* "is full of scenes of looking and overhearing, planned or unwitting" (175). Rachel's and Helen's preoccupation with gazing at what people do deserves attention. Nancy Sorkin Rabinowitz claims that feminist critics have always been engaged with the problem of a woman's being objectified by the male gaze (195). The theory of the male gaze presents woman as an object of the male's gaze. By gazing at a woman, a man subjugates her and her vision gives him physical pleasure. As Laura Mulvey claims, women "are being turned all the time into objects of display, to be looked at and gazed at and stared at by men" (13). This dichotomy between the object and its spectator incorporates the

notion of pleasure. “In a world ordered by sexual imbalance, pleasure in looking has been split between active/male and passive/female” (Mulvey 19). Consequently, a woman’s vision is created according to a man’s desires. Women, in this way, “connote *to-be-looked-at-ness*” (Mulvey 19). In this respect, Rabinowitz states that Mulvey sees the male gaze as “fundamental to male power” (195). By looking at a woman, a man establishes dominance and control over her. Yet, what Mulvey stresses is that the male gaze, in fact, is not directed towards a woman herself. “The true exhibit is always the phallus. Women are simply the scenery onto which men project their narcissistic fantasies” (Mulvey 13). Women serve the function of projecting men and the vision of male power that they want to see. Indeed, women’s function of projecting men is discussed by Woolf in *A Room of One’s Own*, where she claims that “[w]omen have served all these centuries as looking-glasses possessing the magic and delicious power of reflecting the figure of man at twice its natural size” (*Room* 45). Woolf’s and Mulvey’s thoughts converge on the idea that men need women to see themselves powerful. Mulvey also adds that man’s projection in a woman’s image expresses “a strange male underworld of fear” (8). It is the fear of loss of power and control. Similarly, Woolf states that if men lose their vision on a woman’s image, his figure will diminish and “his fitness for life is diminished” (*Room* 46).

The theory of the male gaze conceptualizes the ways in which women are exploited for males’ desires. By looking at his exaggerated projection on a woman’s image, a man satisfies his desire to see himself strong and great. In this way, the act of gazing is appropriated as a male activity, which cannot be assigned to a woman. Woolf’s novel unsettles this dichotomy between Mulvey’s “active/male and passive/female” gaze and transforms the act of gazing into the act of acquiring knowledge and seeing life. Woolf’s female characters gaze at men and women and are gazed at as well. This act of gazing makes them acquire knowledge with reference to the outside world; they become one with the rest of the world. By escaping the possibility of being objectified and being gazed at in the frame of the patriarchal order, subverting the dichotomy between being gazed at and gazing at,

and transforming the act of the gaze into the act of seeing the world, Rachel's and Helen's actions make the borders between men and women dissolve. Through this gazing both women tend to take part in the others' lives. Bakhtin discusses merging with the rest of the world as a carnivalistic activity.

> A carnival sense of the world helps Dostoevsky overcome gnoseological as well as ethical solipsism. A single person, remaining alone with himself, cannot make ends meet even in the deepest and most intimate spheres of his own spiritual life, he cannot manage without *another* consciousness. One person can never find complete fullness in himself alone. (*Dostoevsky* 177)

Thus, Rachel's and Helen's desire to be outside and see life can be analysed as a carnivalistic activity because they want to erase the boundaries between themselves and the world around them.

Rachel and Helen spend a considerable amount of time peering into the lives of the others when they are outside. This is an example of the novel's challenging of the social values related to the female space and responsibilities. Rachel's and Helen's portrayals depict their ability to escape their domestic responsibilities. "The angels in the house" in the persons of Rachel and Helen, leave their "haven." Rachel becomes accustomed to the idea of the public life in Santa Marina. When she and Helen come to the gates of the hotel, she does not hesitate to enter. "Rachel gave the gate a push; it swung open, and, seeing no one about and judging that nothing was private in this country, they walked straight on" (108). Rachel and Helen watch the hotel's inhabitants when they "gazed in" (109). In the dining-room "a waiter was eating a bunch of grapes with his leg across the corner of a table" (109). Then they watched "the drawing-room, where the ladies and gentlemen, having dined well, lay back in deep arm-chairs, occasionally speaking or turning over the pages of magazines" (109). In a big hall, they can see "the gentlemen lounging in chairs, the couples leaning over coffee-cups, the game of cards in the centre under profuse clusters of electric light" (109). What is surprising is that as they watch the hotel room, they themselves are being watched, so the division between the act of watching and being watched is dissolved. "A melancholy voice issued from above

them. ‘Two women,’ it said” (112). As Helen later on says: “We watched you playing cards, but we never knew that we were being watched” (147). And Rachel adds: “It was like a thing in a play” (147).

The home as the symbol of privacy and the female sphere is abandoned and the actions that are supposed to happen inside are moved to the outside. In *The Voyage Out*, Arthur and Susan, the inhabitants of the hotel, kiss and become engaged outside and are watched by the others. “They lay in each other’s arms and had no notion that they were observed” (155). Helen and Rachel are presented with a vision of the local people’s lives that are usually led outside. “The young women,” whom Rachel and Helen see on the streets, “sat on the doorsteps, or issued out on to balconies, while the young men ranged up and down beneath, shouting up a greeting from time to time and stopping here and there to enter into amorous talk” (107). Thus, the life of the inside flows outside; even the love affairs lose their intimate nature and become public. Money affairs lose secrecy and are evident to everybody. “At the open windows merchants could be seen making up the day’s account” (107). People, creating a crowd, “interchanged their views of the world as they walked, or gathered round the wine-tables at the street corner” (107). Apparently, life in Santa Marina takes its course in front of everybody. And this is in contrast to the life the English have in their country. The English in Santa Marina, in other words, experience a carnival sense of the world by suspending their life in England.

B. Free contact among people

During carnival, as people from different classes come together, Bakhtin sees the birth of *free and familiar contact among people*. The distance between people loses its validity and people approach each other equally. “[H]ierarchical structure,” “reverence” for the higher social ranks and classes, “etiquette” connected with the appropriate behaviour of the social statuses are suspended during carnival (*Dostoevsky* 123). Similarly, the lack of hierarchical structure, reverence for the authority and etiquette related to the appropriate behaviour is abandoned in Woolf’s

The Voyage Out. However, in the novel, the barriers that are temporarily effaced are between men and women.

The Voyage Out includes two places where the characters transcend the gender roles that are imposed on them by society: the boat and Santa Marina. The characters' adherence to the social values vanishes and they gain familiarity when they approach each other. According to Bakhtin, the meeting of characters in one place becomes carnivalistic when these characters come face to face with change and flux and meet them with joy.

> Carnival is past millennia's way of sensing the world as one great communal performance. This sense of the world, liberating one from fear, bringing the world maximally close to a person and bringing one person maximally close to another (everything is drawn into the zone of free familiar contact), with its joy at change and its joyful relativity, is opposed to that one-sided and gloomy official seriousness which is dogmatic and hostile to evolution and change, which seeks to absolutize a given condition of existence or a given social order. (*Dostoevsky* 160).

The characters come together, challenge the usual order of their lives, and start leading a new life.

Mr Vinrace's boat, *Euphrosyne*, becomes a meeting point for the characters who normally would not have a chance to come together. Indeed, Bakhtin stresses the fact that a deck of a ship usually takes on "carnival-square significance" (*Dostoevsky* 128). Rachel feels close to Mrs Dalloway despite the fact that they see each other for the first time. "She was overcome by an intense desire to tell Mrs Dalloway things she had never told anyone – things she had not realized herself until this moment" (62). This image of Rachel's desire to open her mind to Mrs Dalloway is very close to the image of Prince Myshkin in Dostoevsky's *The Idiot* whom Bakhtin discusses.

> Wherever Prince Myshkin appears, hierarchical barriers between people suddenly become penetrable, an inner contact is formed between them, a carnival frankness is born. His personality possesses the peculiar capacity to

> relativize everything that disunifies people and imparts a *false seriousness* to life. (*Dostoevsky* 174)

While in this passage, Prince Myshkin possesses the capacity to invite the others' frankness, in Rachel's and Mrs Dalloway's case the boat and its atmosphere assume the same function.

Besides Mrs Dalloway, Rachel feels close to Mr Dalloway. They try to learn more things about each other and Rachel becomes curious about his life and past. Richard likes this. "Crude as her manners seemed to him, Richard was flattered. There could be no doubt that her interest was genuine" (70). As they converse more, they come to more intimate topics. When Richard stresses two points that have become important for him in life, namely the "misery of the poor" and love, the latter subject confounds his mind because he feels that he transgresses the boundary of etiquette. He thinks it is not acceptable to talk about love with a young girl. "Upon that word he lowered his voice" (71). And he pronounces that this subject is not suitable for them to discuss. "It's an odd thing to say to a young lady" (71). Mrs Dalloway's asking Rachel to read a novel for Mr Dalloway intensifies the bond between Rachel and Mr Dalloway. Eventually, when Rachel reads to him, he falls asleep. "The sleeping politician was left in Rachel's charge. She read a sentence, and took a look at him. In sleep he looked like a coat hanging at the end of a bed; there were all the wrinkles, and the sleeves and trousers kept their shape though no longer filled out by legs and arms" (65). Eventually, later on in the novel, they become so close that Richard Dalloway feels tempted and kisses Rachel. "'You have beauty,' he said. The ship lurched. Rachel fell slightly forward. Richard took her in his arms and kissed her. Holding her tight, he kissed her passionately, so that she felt the hardness of his body and the roughness of his cheek printed upon hers" (80). Their familiarity reaches the point of desire and passion and they do not hinder the occurrence of the kiss. Richard's being married does not create a barrier between the two. They behave freely as if there is nothing to prevent them from approaching each other in such a passionate manner. Although Rachel feels nervous after the kiss, she likes it. "Nevertheless something wonderful had happened" (80). When Rachel reveals the

event to Helen, the latter approaches it with an unusual remark. “I think it’s worth it; I don’t mind being kissed; I’m jealous, I believe, that Mr Dalloway kissed you and didn’t kiss me” (87).

Santa Marina is another place that provides a chance for the characters’ intimacy. When Rachel and the people from the hotel go on expedition to Mount Rosa, an atmosphere for free contact among them is created. When they have a picnic on the mountain, men start flirting; one of the inhabitants of the hotel, Mr Perrott, flirts with Evelyn, who also stays at the hotel and whom he loves. “Playing this game they lost their stiffness, and even became unusually daring, for Mr Perrott, who was very shy, said, ‘Permit me,’ and removed an ant from Evelyn’s neck” (149). Rachel starts to feel closer to Terence. “She realized with a great sense of comfort how easily she could talk to Terence, those thorns or ragged corners which tear the surface of some relationships being smoothed away” (239). Familiarity among the characters intensifies when they start talking about their private lives. Hirst proposes “that each member of this party now gives a short biographical sketch of himself or herself” (159). When Rachel reveals her desire to talk about love, Helen teases her. “Oh, Rachel, . . . It’s like having a puppy in the house having you with one – a puppy that brings one’s underclothes down into the hall” (161). Terence wants to be with the others. “He wanted other people; he wanted Rachel, to see them with him” (361). Terence’s organization of the expeditions suggests his desire to know people around him better. “He becomes the novel’s go-between, organizing the picnic that first tempts people out of their grooves, and looking into their lives with curiosity and imagination” (Sage xxv).

When the characters go to a native village, they spend time on the deck of a steamer together. They even sleep on the deck and have a “question of nakedness” (310) because there is no place to change clothes in. “Mattresses were thrown down, rugs provided, and the three women lay near each other in the soft open air” (310) while men occupied the other end of the boat. The power and strictness of life in England loses its strong grip on them. The party goes away from the civilised world “into a primeval forest” (Sage xxii). In the native village, where a woman can

uncover her breasts “to the lips of her baby,” or “cry some harsh unintelligible cry” (332), the English become freer in their behaviour. Rachel and Terence, for example, do not hide their engagement. “They turned away and began to walk through the trees, leaning, without fear of discovery, upon each other’s arms” (332-333). They want to express their feelings of love and make Helen listen to them. They become “anxious to go on talking about themselves” (336). It shows their desire to make their love affair public.

Santa Marina invites the inhabitants of the hotel to free contact and familiarity. Evelyn feels this urge and yearns to share her feelings with the others and Terence seems to her the most available person. His being of the opposite sex does not hinder her from revealing her most intimate feelings and ideas related to her love affairs: “when he asked me to let him kiss me, I did” (212). She reveals her worries and dilemmas related to her feelings of love: “can one be in love with two people at once, or can’t one?” (213) She also reveals her illegitimate background, which seems eccentric for the people of the time. “I’m the daughter of a mother and no father” (214). She also demands Hewet’s confessions: “Look here – this isn’t fair, I do all the telling, and you tell nothing” (214). She openly states that she likes to be frank with people: “what a lot of bother would be saved if only people would say the things they think straight out! I’m made like that. I can’t help it” (214). Evelyn states that such behaviour makes other people think wrongly of her. “I don’t care what anyone thinks of me. Just because one’s interested and likes to be friends with men, and talk to them as one talks to women, one’s called a flirt” (215). She wants to live in a society that respects each other’s desires and feelings and welcomes women’s free behaviour with men. Evelyn’s familiarity with men is usually misunderstood and she suffers from it. The men with whom she behaves in a free and familiar manner think that she flirts with them. Therefore, she comes face to face with a man who kisses her against her wishes. “I can still feel his nasty hairy face just there” (287). She feels the pressure of the masculine power on her. And she attributes such behaviour only to men. “Would any woman have behaved like that . . . ?” (287) As is observed, the difference between free contact in Bakhtin’s theory and Woolf’s novel

lies in Woolf's female characters suffering as the result of a familiar manner in behaviour. Woolf provides a possibility of a free contact between men and women, but she also depicts the fact that men tend to exploit it for their own purposes and exploit female sexuality to satisfy their desires. Although a free contact between men and women is created in a carnivalesque manner in Woolf's novel, such scenes where men establish their dominance over women reveal the fact that a carnivalesque atmosphere in the novel is a matter of a very short moment. The novel depicts the power of the ordinary, non-carnival, life to impose its strict and rigid norms upon women.

This chapter has explored Woolf's refashioning of the so-called female domain as a space in which female characters are liberated from the oppressive patriarchal world. This chapter has also connected the process of the reshaping of this space to Bakhtinian carnival by building an analogy between the carnival's participants and Woolf's female characters in that both groups suspend traditions and conventions. The juxtaposition of Bakhtinian and Woolfian works has identified the possibility of stretching the notion of the carnival to the discourse on gender hierarchies. Although Woolf pictures them in their redefined female domain and in the outside, she also pictures their inability to grasp the absolute sense of freedom, which seems to be symbolized by Rachel's death. Rachel reconfigures her space but loses her life. Rachel's death, if read as her escape from the patriarchal norms, depicts Woolf's awareness of the fact that a woman can never be free in a world that is constructed according to the masculine values. As Little claims, Rachel dies and "travels deep into the primitive wildness of the nonhuman jungle", "the symbols of chaos and of freedom" and "a revolutionary country" (34). Thus, for Woolf, getting rid of the patriarchal norms seems hardly possible. Women can only be freed from these norms if they create a female space for themselves.

CHAPTER IV

THE DECROWNING OF PATRIARCHAL AUTHORITY IN *TO THE LIGHTHOUSE* AND *FLUSH*

One of the ways in which Woolf reconfigures the female domain in her novels is by emasculating the source that holds a woman entrapped. She draws portrayals of father figures who lose their power. Her fiction suggests the destabilization of the blatant patriarchal order. Her female characters are portrayed as enthusiastic figures to assert their values against patriarchal precepts. *To the Lighthouse* (1926) and *Flush* (1933) are the two novels in Woolf's oeuvre that can be discussed in terms of the dethronement of the patriarchal figure. Both novels express Woolf's desire to reveal the weakness of the male figures who lack self-sufficiency. They need female support to sustain their authority and sometimes fail to control the women of their household. These two novels, more than the other novels among her works, depict Woolf's attempt to show the possibility and significance of undermining the authority of a father figure. This chapter will analyse *To the Lighthouse* and *Flush* in terms of the decrowning of patriarchal authority and specify the similarities between the acts of decrowning in these novels and in Bakhtin's thought. The chapter will also stress that Woolf's novels tend to depict the female characters' disregard for patriarchal authority in their mental spheres rather than in the form of concrete, visible actions.

Bakhtin sees the act of crowning/decrowning as one of the significant aspects of carnival. "Crowning/decrowning is a dualistic ambivalent ritual, expressing the inevitability and at the same time the creative power of the shift-and-renewal, the *joyful relativity* of all structure and order, of all authority and all (hierarchical) position" (*Dostoevsky* 124). Bakhtin gives priority to the idea of constant change and renewal in these acts suggesting the inevitable end of all authority. The link that

binds Woolf's novels and Bakhtin's concept of the carnivalistic acts of crowning/decrowning is the eagerness to mock and ridicule the figures of power in ways that often include humour.

The figure of the authoritarian father governing his family appears in both novels. He controls and decides; he solves the problems and is the centre of attention. However, what Woolf foregrounds is the female characters' potential to undermine the male authority; the fathers in the novels are emasculated and challenged. Although the fathers are not physically beaten, as it happens with the mock kings during the carnival, the ways female characters disregard the fathers' authority suggest the act of decrowing. As Clair Wills claims, carnival reveals some distortions as it travels through time and space. "Shifted from public sphere to the bourgeois home, carnival ceases to be a site of actual struggle, but the conflicts of the modern private sphere may have generated a social force on to which the bodily energies of carnival have been displaced" (Wills 96). Thus, although Woolf's novels do not explicitly manifest the crowning/decrowning of a king, they display the emasculation of authority. What is more, while *To the Lighthouse* presents scenes of undermining male authority mainly through mental constructions, *Flush* presents this in a more concrete way and through characters' physical actions. The female characters' undermining of their fathers' authority in the former novel appears mainly in the form of their thoughts. Some of the actions of these women also suggest an attempt to ridicule the male characters, but it is on a minor level. The major female character in *Flush*, on the other hand, challenges her father's authority through her actual escape from him.

A. The emasculation of patriarchal authority in *To the Lighthouse*

To the Lighthouse focuses on the Ramsays and their visit to their holiday house near the seaside in September. Mr and Mrs Ramsay have eight children and host several guests who frequently visit them. The novel starts with a discussion among the family members of a journey to the lighthouse; while Mrs Ramsay and

her little son James want to go to the lighthouse, Mr Ramsay and Charles Tansley, a guest at the house, object to it because of the weather conditions. The novel ends with Mr Ramsay's journey to the lighthouse with his two children James and Cam. In between, ten years pass and Mrs Ramsay, her son Andrew and her daughter Prue die. The novel is divided into three parts. The first part describes the family's holiday time and their relationship with their guests. The second part is much shorter than the others; it conveys the sense of the passing time. The last part describes the journey to the lighthouse.

Mr Ramsay, the father of the big family, and Charles Tansley, a supporter and an admirer of Mr Ramsay, are depicted as the figures who try to express and establish themselves as representatives of the strong sex. However, both characters are revealed as weak and sometimes laughable people by the female characters and the narrator. In other words, it is possible to state that the subtly humorous ways in which their authority is challenged carry the traces of the Bakhtinian notion of decrowning. According to Bakhtin the "primary carnivalistic act is the *mock crowning and subsequent decrowning of the carnival king*" (*Dostoevsky* 124). This definition pertains to carnival as a ritual. Bakhtin states that the essence of the act of decrowning in literature is the focus on the inevitability of change. "Under this ritual act of decrowning a king lies the very core of the carnival sense of the world – *the pathos of shifts and changes, of death and renewal*" (*Dostoevsky* 124). Bakhtin identifies laughter as an important component of decrowning (*Dostoevsky* 168). He gives an example from Dostoevsky's *Crime and Punishment*; Raskolnikov sees a dream in which people laugh at him "louder and louder" (*Dostoevsky* 168). Bakhtin states that this is "the image of communal ridicule on the public square decrowning a carnival king-pretender" (*Dostoevsky* 168). In other words, when the act of decrowning takes its place in a literary work it loses its image of a mock king's physical decrowning. Yet, at least, it keeps the nature of being loud and visible to everybody. Woolf's scenes, however, are muted in this regard: the decrowning mainly takes place in the minds of the characters.

Mr Ramsay is an embodiment of order and stability. As a patriarch, he makes the members of his family uneasy because he seeks to enforce control over them. Bakhtin calls such behaviour in literary works "self-appointed *elevation*" and attributes it to "carnival logic" (*Dostoevsky* 169). A character elevates himself above the others after which comes an inevitable "falling *downward*" (*Dostoevsky* 169); a character's decrowning takes place. Such self-appointed elevation of Mr Ramsay becomes evident when he holds his patriarchal stance of a repressive father figure when his little son James wants to visit the lighthouse and Mrs Ramsay supports her son in this. "'But,' said his father [Mr Ramsay], stopping in front of the drawing-room window, 'it won't be fine'" (10). The idea of the window in this scene has some important connotations. Such objects like windows and doors suggest the fusion with the world, the disappearance of a boundary between a private self and the world. Mr Ramsay pronounces his reluctance to go to the lighthouse in front of the window which suggests his unwillingness to share his private world. He does not want to become one with the others. Indeed, the title of the first part of the novel, where the family members try to decide on their journey to the lighthouse, is "The Window." It represents the idea of merging with the world, an effort to escape domesticity. The novel resembles *The Voyage Out* in that there is a theme of a voyage on the sea. The sea is seen as a space that challenges the notions of stability and certainty, two significant elements on which patriarchal ideology depends. When Rachel is portrayed during her sea voyage, she escapes from London, which stands for utter stability for her and other characters in the novel. For Mrs Ramsay, the journey to the lighthouse is a kind of escape from her ordinary existence. In both novels the idea of a sea voyage suggests the shattering of the notion of domesticity which constraints female characters.

The scene in which Mr Ramsay's self-elevation is visible contains the signs of his decrowning. The narrator's attitude towards Mr Ramsay's self-elevation depicts Mr Ramsay's tendency to dramatize himself as a figure of authority. When Mr Ramsay disagrees about the journey to the lighthouse and tries to show his authority, "he would straighten his back and narrow his little blue eyes upon the

horizon" (10). His physical characteristics that the narrator reveals debunk his authoritarian stance. Mr Ramsay has to change his body's position in order to seem powerful; otherwise, the curled back and little eyes suggest frailty and pettiness. In other words, Mr Ramsay's posture does not contribute to his desire to be the authority. He has to change his physical appearance to support his ambitions. But even this change is not efficient. The narrator reveals this and makes it evident that Mr Ramsay will be undermined further in the novel as a figure of authority.

Mr Ramsay's thoroughgoing attitude of objection to the others' search for pleasure cuts James' desire short and intensifies the hatred the boy feels towards his father. Searing hatred of his father makes James imagine a way of killing Mr Ramsay, which merely intensifies James' situation of complete lack of force to fight back. "Had there been an axe handy, a poker, or any weapon that would have dashed a hole in his father's breast and killed him, there and then, James would have seized it. Such were the extremes of emotion that Mr Ramsay excited in his children's breasts by his mere presence" (10). James' violent thoughts may make the reader understand the gap between the son and the father which has been erected by the latter's desire to dominate. Apparently, James is not alone in his negative attitude towards his father as feelings infused with repulsion seem to fill the other children, too. Cam, the daughter, cannot forget "that crass blindness and tyranny of his which had poisoned her childhood and raised bitter storms, so that even now she woke in the night trembling with rage and remembered some command of his; some insolence; 'Do this', 'Do that'; his dominance: his 'Submit to me'" (184).

Moreover, by hindering James, Mr Ramsay overpowers and unsettles his wife because Mrs Ramsay exhibits the desire to make James happy by promising him the journey. As a result, as Frank Kermode claims, Mr Ramsay is "happy with the chance to disillusion his son and ridicule his wife" (xx). In other words, the politics of Mr Ramsay is to subjugate the members of his family and to make them understand that the actions should be done under his control. Even when he takes his children to the lighthouse years later at the end of the novel he does it in a way to enforce his power on them. "He had borne them down once more with his gloom and

his authority, making them do his bidding, on this fine morning, come, because he wished it, carrying these parcels to the Lighthouse; . . . so that they lagged after him, and all the pleasure of the day was spoilt" (179). For James, then, Mr Ramsay's movements during this journey to the lighthouse remind his ambitions. "He rose and stood in the bow of the boat, very straight and tall, for all the world, James thought, as if he were saying, 'There is no God'" (223).

Mr Ramsay clings to the notions of reason, truth and stability in every circumstance. "What he said was true. It was always true. He was incapable of untruth; never tampered with a fact; never altered a disagreeable word to suit the pleasure or convenience of any mortal being, least of all of his own children" (10). Lack of truth or reason in an utterance drives him mad: nothing should extend beyond the confines of these notions. Bowlby holds that Woolf "constantly associates certainty and conventionality with a complacent masculinity" (15). When Mrs Ramsay promises James to go to the lighthouse, Mr Ramsay clearly shows that "the folly of women's minds enraged him;" he sees Mrs Ramsay's promise to go to the lighthouse as an "extraordinary irrationality" (38). He thinks that Mrs Ramsay's promise to James is "lies" because they cannot be sure of the weather (38). He seems stuck in his desire to promote reason, certainty and stability in everything. "Mr Ramsay is driven by a utilitarian rationalism that Woolf critiques throughout the text" (Groover 222).

For Mr Ramsay, who "stands for masculinity and reason" (Prakash 69), the lighthouse is a "fabled land" (10) which shatters the truth he endorses. This truth is sustainable at his home and leaving this home for the lighthouse, for Mr Ramsay, means leaving truth for a fable. So, he builds a dichotomy between home and the lighthouse, truth and fable. The lighthouse is on the sea, on the constantly fluctuating surface of the water. A voyage there, for Mr Ramsay, is a purposeless act. He cannot grasp the purpose for the journey because he does not feel the urge to experience the change of atmosphere and sense of instability as his wife and children do. His sole urge is to feel the solidity of the earth, stability of family life, certainty in his relationships. Thus, Mr Ramsay does not want to leave his idealized world of truth

and stability, his home. Woolf's portrayal of Mr Ramsay is her way of questioning his ideas and the dominant patriarchal ideology. As Jeanette McVicker claims, Woolf's "subtle rendering of the tyranny that can be exerted by an obsession with facts, reason, and the compulsion to order life and manipulate truth is a masterful critique of patriarchy" (42).

Mr Ramsay's ideas about women are quite conventional. He does not show respect for women's opinions. He wants the women around him to follow his way of thinking. When he talks about Andrew's education with Mrs Ramsay, he shows his attitude towards his wife's opinion about scholarships. "He wished Andrew could be induced to work harder. He would lose every chance of a scholarship if he didn't. 'Oh scholarships!' she said. Mr Ramsay thought her foolish for saying that, about a serious thing, like a scholarship" (75). From his opinion about Mrs Ramsay's statement it can be seen that for him women do not understand anything just because they disagree with him on such a serious matter. He expects his wife to take his side in every circumstance. Furthermore, for Mr Ramsay, women's place is their houses. "Mr Ramsay is presented as an advocate of absolute sexual polarization, the Victorian assumption that each sex is assigned its sphere and must remain in it" (Zwerdling 183-184). Mr Ramsay cannot think that a woman can be as equipped with knowledge as a man. He even mocks his daughter Cam thinking that her knowledge of the world around her is limited. "Didn't she know the points of the compass? He asked. Didn't she know the North from the South?" (181) "He liked that men should labour and sweat on the windy beach at night, pitting muscle and brain against the waves and the wind; he liked men to work like that, and women to keep house, and sit beside sleeping children indoors, while men were drowned, out there in a storm" (178-179). Mr Ramsay likes exaggeration and indulges in imagining. He exaggerates life's conditions outside and overrates men's efforts because he wants to show their power which women lack. Indeed, such ideas add a subtle sense of humour to the novel. He imagines that the world outside is very harsh and that men risk dying while they work to earn money. In this way, women are quite safe at home.

Mr Ramsay's anger is known well by every member of his family. The novel is replete with his display of his fury. He becomes angry, for example, when Augustus Carmichael, one of the guests, asks for another plate of soup. "He was screwing his face up, he was scowling and frowning, and flushing with anger" (103). Mr Ramsay's aggression and rage, in fact, reveal his fear of loss of his power to command. His fury shows his desire to be the centre of the world. "He loathed people eating when he had finished" (103). He becomes angry with his children when they tend to disobey. He storms at them when he sees that nothing is ready to go to the lighthouse when he at last decides to take them there. "And Cam was not ready and James was not ready and Nancy had forgotten to order the sandwiches and Mr Ramsay had lost his temper and banged out of the room. 'What's the use of going now?' he had stormed" (159). Mr Ramsay's pained fury and aggression in this scene depicts the idea that he is disturbed by seeing the others' reluctance to obey. According to Zwerdling, Mr Ramsay's portrayal as an angry man serves Woolf's aim because "[o]ne of her consistent targets is male aggression and domination" (54-55).

Notwithstanding Mr Ramsay's tendency to govern the others, this patriarchal figure is "decrowned" in different ways by Mrs Ramsay, Lily Briscoe, and the narrator. Through Woolf's display of Mrs Ramsay's stream of thoughts it is possible to see her undermining her husband's authority. Mr Ramsay's movements, for example, remind Mrs Ramsay "of the great sea lion at the Zoo tumbling backwards after swallowing his fish and walloping off so that the water in the tank washes from side to side" (39). Although Mrs Ramsay associates her husband with a sea lion, it is an imprisoned sea lion which tumbles and wallops, suggesting submissiveness and weakness. Her vision of her husband includes her sense of humour which reveals her attitude towards her husband; she does not see him as a threat or danger. Indeed, Mrs Ramsay's vision of Mr Ramsay as a sea lion at the Zoo anticipates Lily's observation of Mr Ramsay as a "king in exile" (162) towards the end of the novel. In both scenes Mr Ramsay is drawn as a potent figure but with reduced power. Both women have the power to laugh at the figure of authority, in their minds, by envisioning him in these humorous ways. John Mepham states that the "binary opposition is

simultaneously constructed and internally undone" as the "female is domineering" in the novel (1992, 75). The female characters domineer because they do not internalize the authority of Mr Ramsay.

In some rare instances Mrs Ramsay undermines the way her husband sees himself not only within the confines of her mind but also through the ways she acts and speaks visibly in front of Mr Ramsay, as well. When he thinks about his abilities to act in the same way as he used to do in the past, Mrs Ramsay's behaviour and thoughts suggest just the opposite. Mr Ramsay wants to show off his freedom and strength to walk long distances and be away from home for a long time.

> When he was Andrew's age he used to walk about the country all day long, with nothing but a biscuit in his pocket and nobody bothered about him, or thought that he had fallen over a cliff. He said aloud he thought he would be off for a day's walk if the weather held. . . . Yes, she said. It annoyed him that she did not protest. She knew that he would never do it. He was too old now to walk all day long with a biscuit in his pocket. (76)

In this example, Mr Ramsay loses his power as an authority figure both in the eyes of the reader and in his own when Mrs Ramsay's thoughts are expressed. She undermines his physical abilities and renders visible his weakness. In this passage, again, Mr Ramsay's exaggeration of himself and dramatization of his situation are visible. The narrator reflects Mr Ramsay's exaggeration of the importance of walking in this way alone because the latter wants to stress his power and courage to perform such an activity. In fact, such ideas deflate Mr Ramsay's desire to seem serious; they transform his figure into an image open to ridicule.

Mrs Ramsay, on the other hand, overshadows Mr Ramsay's superiority because she overweighs him in terms of energy and vitality. The narrator depicts her as a source of energy; she is seen "to pour erect into the air a rain of energy, a column of spray, looking at the same time animated and alive as if all her energies were being fused into force, burning and illuminating" (44). And Mr Ramsay tries to taint the production of this energy because "into this delicious fecundity, this fountain and spray of life, the fatal sterility of the male plunged itself, like a beak of

brass, barren and bare" (44). Mrs and Mr Ramsay stand for life and death, respectively. Bakhtin states that "all carnivalistic symbols are of such a sort: they always include within themselves a perspective of negation (death) or vice versa. Birth is fraught with death, and death with new birth" (*Dostoevsky* 125). Hence, it is possible to state that Mrs and Mr Ramsay are two sides of the same coin; they constitute a carnivalistic pair. This pair can be likened to another carnivalistic pair which is seen in Dostoevsky's *The Idiot*: the protagonist Prince Myshkin – "*bright*, almost *joyful*" (*Dostoevsky* 173) – and the heroine Nastasya Filippovna – "*gloomy*, *infernal*" (*Dostoevsky* 173). While Mrs Ramsay's atmosphere is bright, Mr Ramsay's atmosphere is gloomy and serious. Yet, their atmospheres interact; they feel each other creating a sense of fantastic communication. Bakhtin discusses such an interaction between two opposite characters; they "intersect, intertwine in various ways, and are reflected in each other according to the laws of a profound carnival ambivalence" (*Dostoevsky* 173-174). For example, when Mr Ramsay wants to protect Mrs Ramsay and to be close to her, but cannot approach her, Mrs Ramsay infers his thoughts. "For he wished, she knew, to protect her" (73). There is a kind of a muted communication between the two which suggests a different existence, a world that is not an ordinary familiar world. Their interaction, despite their opposite tendencies, creates a different atmosphere into which other characters cannot penetrate. In this way, Mrs Ramsay's bright atmosphere hinders Mr Ramsay's tendency to dominate. She is capable of transforming his energies into vital sources. If he is the death side of one coin, she makes it a regenerative death by infusing her life energies into it.

When Mrs Ramsay feels that her husband demands sympathy and wants to be needed "all over the world," she goes on sending energy and life around her in a "confident" way (45). What is more, she laughs (45). She is sure of her strengths especially at the moment when Mr Ramsay is not, when he wants "to be assured of his genius" (44).

> Flashing her needles, glancing round about her, . . . she assured him, beyond a shadow of doubt, by her laugh, her poise, her competence . . . that it was real;

> . . . If he put implicit faith in her, nothing should hurt him; however deep he buried himself or climbed high, not for a second should he find himself without her. (45)

By her laughter, which is in no sense mocking, Mrs Ramsay makes it evident that however hard Mr Ramsay tries to impose his authority over the others, she knows Mr Ramsay is dependent on her and submits to her authority: he is "like a child who drops off satisfied" (45). Mr Ramsay's portrayal as a man who needs to be assured of his genius and be sympathized with reveals his dependence on the others; and, this makes his weakness evident. Only through the eyes of his wife does he seem great and powerful. Woolf widely discusses women's function of exaggerating men's image in *A Room of One's Own*: "Women have served all these centuries as looking-glasses possessing the magic and delicious power of reflecting the figure of man at twice its natural size" (*Room* 45). And in this novel she depicts her ideas through the portrayal of Mrs Ramsay. Mrs Ramsay's vision of her husband makes him a patriarch. Without her, Mr Ramsay is reduced; he loses his throne.

Furthermore, Mr Ramsay's power as a great man of science diminishes if Lily Briscoe's ideas about him are taken into consideration. Mr Ramsay is a great man of science in the eyes of his friends, William Bankes and Charles Tansley. According to Mr Bankes, Mr Ramsay "had made a definite contribution to philosophy in one little book when he was only five and twenty" (30). Similarly, "Charles Tansley thought him the greatest metaphysician of the time" (44). Lily, on the other hand, does not think so because she does not understand Mr Ramsay's occupation. Lily's way of comprehending Mr Ramsay's professional ideas is humorous; she dumbs them down. Andrew, Mr Ramsay's son, suggests to Lily a way to understand better what Mr Ramsay does.

> Whenever she 'thought of his work' she always saw clearly before her a large kitchen table. It was Andrew's doing. She asked him what his father's books were about. 'Subject and object and the nature of reality,' Andrew had said. And when she said Heavens, she had no notion what that meant. 'Think of a kitchen table then,' he told her, 'when you're not there.'

> So she always saw, when she thought of Mr Ramsay's work, a scrubbed kitchen table. (29-30)

Lily brings down Mr Ramsay's abstract thoughts to the level of concreteness and simplifies his effort. She moves Mr Ramsay's great effort of his work to the kitchen, the place that is supposed to be the realm of women. In Bakhtinian terms, it can be termed "degradation" and linked to grotesque realism. "The essential principle of grotesque realism is degradation, that is, the lowering of all that is high, spiritual, ideal, abstract; it is a transfer to the material level" (*Rabelais* 19). In Bakhtin's study of Rabelais, degradation is the subversion of the dominant ideology based on abstract ideas of religion. In Lily's case, she sabotages the patriarchal dominance based on the abstract ideas of stability, certainty and truth. She goes on viewing Mr Ramsay in an ironic manner.

> Naturally, if one's days were passed in this seeing of angular essences, this reducing of lovely evenings, with all their flamingo clouds and blue and silver to a white deal four-legged table (and it was a mark of the finest minds so to do), naturally one could not be judged like an ordinary person. (30)

The way Lily attributes extraordinary qualities to Mr Ramsay because of his work suggests a hint of humour. She "profanes" in a Bakhtinian sense his work by associating it with an old kitchen table; his work becomes devoid of any sacred or unworldly importance. At the same time, however, she thinks that a person who does this work is not an ordinary one. Indeed, for Lily, Mr Ramsay is an ambivalent figure. She cannot understand "why so brave a man in thought should be so timid in life; how strangely he was venerable and laughable" (52). Thus, although she accepts that Mr Ramsay deserves respect, she thinks that he is an object of laughter because of the incongruity between his ambitions and his individuality. "[I]f his little finger ached," thinks Lily, "the whole world must come to an end" (53). According to Lily, Mr Ramsay positions himself at the centre of the universe while at the same time he is blind because he cannot see that the others are aware of his pettiness. She remembers, for instance, how she and Paul Rayley, a guest at the Ramsays, laughed at Mr Ramsay's fury.

> They had laughed and laughed, like a couple of children, all because Mr Ramsay, finding an earwig in his milk at breakfast had sent the whole thing flying through the air on to the terrace outside. . . . But he had built round him such a fence of sanctity, and occupied the space with such a demeanour of majesty that an earwig in his milk was a monster. (214-215)

Lily sees that Mr Ramsay thinks too highly of himself. Her laughter, however, shows that she does not accept his dominance.

Furthermore, after Mrs Ramsay's death, when Lily once more visits the Ramsays, she becomes aware that Mr Ramsay still demands sympathy from the people around him (164). However, she cannot enter into a serious dialogue with him when Mr Ramsay approaches her demanding her attention. "His immense self-pity, his demand for sympathy poured and spread itself in pools at her feet, and all she did, miserable sinner that she was, was to draw her skirts a little closer round her ankles, lest she should get wet" (166-167). The narrator reflects Lily's ideas about her attitude towards Mr Ramsay. Lily stresses the sharp contrast between Mr Ramsay's demand from her and her reaction to it.

> 'What beautiful boots!' she exclaimed. She was ashamed of herself. To praise his boots when he asked her to solace his soul; when he had shown her his bleeding hands, his lacerated heart, and asked her to pity them, then to say, cheerfully, 'Ah, but what beautiful boots you wear!' deserves, she knew, and she looked up expecting to get it, in one of his sudden roars of ill-temper, complete annihilation. (167)

Lily does not want to sympathize with Mr Ramsay and her way of escaping it is to channel the topic of their dialogue to something else. And this happens to be his boots. This image with the boots resembles the image of the kitchen table; Mr Ramsay's grave disposition towards Lily is replaced by her simple amusement at his boots switching the topic to a petty everyday object. Lily's exaggeration of Mr Ramsay's grief reveals her laughter at Mr Ramsay's behaviour.

In addition, when the process of Mr Ramsay's thoughts about his "splendid" (40) mind is observed, his weakness inside becomes evident. It becomes obvious that

Mr Ramsay's mind does not progress. The vision of the working mind is described through concrete examples by associating the paths of thoughts with alphabet. "For if thought is . . . like the alphabet . . . ranged in twenty-six letters all in order, then his splendid mind had no sort of difficulty in running over those letters one by one" (40). Mr Ramsay knows that he is able to reach Q but cannot see his going beyond it. "He dug his heels in at Q" (41). Mr Ramsay's desire to transcend Q and move to R depict his desperate attempts at progress. Yet, Mr Ramsay fails. "On to R, once more. R –" (41). Eventually Mr Ramsay acknowledges the idea that he "would never reach R" (42). The great and powerful father of the Ramsays is depicted as a weak figure who is not capable of moving beyond his present situation in his professional ideas.

Although the novel does not give many details about how other characters see Mr Ramsay, Mrs Ramsay's thoughts reveal that they too laugh at him. Mrs Ramsay is aware of the fact that her husband likes spending time with young girls: his daughters and Minta Doyle who stays with them for the holiday. Young girls treat Mr Ramsay as if he is their peer. "They might cut his hair for him, plait him watch-chains, or interrupt him at his work, hailing him (she heard them), 'Come along, Mr Ramsay; it's our turn to beat them now,' and out he came to play tennis. . . . How many pipes have you smoked today, Mr Ramsay?" (107). Mrs Ramsay likes such a relationship between the young girls and her husband. "She was grateful to them for laughing at him" (107). In other words, Mr Ramsay's figure as an authoritative and serious father is shaken and "decrowned" because young people regard him as a man with whom they can play. Mr Ramsay's playing with the young girls suggests an image of a decrowned mock king from Bakhtinian carnival. "The ceremonial of the ritual of decrowning is counterposed to the ritual of crowning: regal vestments are stripped off the decrowned king, his crown is removed, the other symbols of authority are taken away, he is ridiculed and beaten" (*Dostoevsky* 125). However, Mr Ramsay is not beaten. His stance as a serious father figure is taken away, his authority vanishes and he is reduced to a peer with whom the others can play.

However hard Mr Ramsay endeavours to present himself as an authority figure, he confronts his own limits. Besides the others' disregard for his authority, he

debunks himself too and finds himself on the perils of losing his authority. Merrill Turner likens Woolf to Chekhov in terms of her portrayal of male figures. Turner states that both authors portray men as "pathetic and insecure, habitually seeking sympathy. . . . Both Chekhov's and Woolf's men often seem weak, in need of reassurance, while the women operate – against type – as pillars of strength" (401). Both authors yearn to dissipate the fog upon the myth of masculinity; male authority turns out to be not as strong as it is usually accepted. Mr Ramsay's authority, for example, dissipates when he demands sympathy. He debases himself. "There he stood, demanding sympathy" (44) from his wife because he acknowledges that "[h]e was a failure" (44). As a man of science he wants to compensate for that with his wife's projection of his greatness. "It was sympathy he wanted, to be assured of his genius, . . . warmed and soothed" (44). He wants his wife to show him how great and smart he is.

When Mrs Ramsay dies, Mr Ramsay seeks for another figure who can reflect his greatness. "And then, and then – this was one of those moments when an enormous need urged him, without being conscious what it was, to approach any woman, to force them, he did not care how, his need was so great, to give him what he wanted: sympathy" (165). He needs to be recognized as a powerful figure. He wants sympathy from his children, as well. "He would make her [Cam] smile at him" (182). He even approaches James with affection and praises him for his success in leading the boat. "'Well done!' James had steered them like a born sailor. . . . His father had praised him" (221-222). It seems that Mr Ramsay focuses all his energy on his drive to get sympathy; he wants to be sure that the others support him and that they believe in his power to sustain his authority. So he demands his authority back. "Sitting in the boat he bowed, he crouched himself, acting instantly his part – the part of a desolate man, widowed, bereft; and so called up before him in hosts people sympathizing with him; staged for himself as he sat in the boat, a little drama" (180). Zwerdling summarises the male characters' condition in Woolf's fiction as follows: "Woolf shows us that far from being self-confident, principled, secure, the rulers of

the family are often deeply unsure of themselves, as subject to panic and self-doubt as those whose lives they control" (198).

To sum up, despite his desire to dominate, Mr Ramsay is revealed unable to justify his superiority. Being aware of his weakness, Mrs Ramsay and Lily undermine his authority. In this way, Mr Ramsay, who wants to seem as a strong father figure, is mentally decrowned by the female characters. And this decrowning can be likened to a king's decrowning in Bakhtin's theory.

B. Decrowning of the father figure in *Flush*

Flush is a novel about a dog. It is based on the life of a real dog, Flush, that belonged to a famous British poet, Elizabeth Barrett Browning. *Flush* is a fictional biography; it begins with an account of Flush's background and ends with his death. The owner of the dog is Elizabeth. Her life in the novel is divided into two main periods: bedroom life on Wimpole Street and life in Italy. In both sections Flush is the focal character. Flush's focalization of Elizabeth's life in her bedroom conveys the idea that her life is similar to the life of a prisoner as she is seen as a woman who lives under the strict control of her father. Between the two periods in Elizabeth's life, Flush is dognapped and then rescued by Elizabeth. The second period is presented as Elizabeth's freedom from her father's authority. She secretly marries Mr Browning and leaves England for Italy. Through the dog's perspective it is possible to observe the differences between the two countries: while England stands for imprisonment, Italy symbolises absolute freedom.

Flush, as Flint claims, is "simultaneously entertaining and serious" (xv). The entertainment lies in the dog's focalization. Observing everything from a dog's perspective brings to the fore the notion of relativity in a joyful manner. For Bakhtin, the notion of relativity is an important element of a carnival sense of the world because it "*relativiz*[es] all that was externally stable, set and ready-made" (*Dostoevsky* 166). Thus, Flush's focalization creates a sense of viewing the world from a new perspective. Flush's focalization makes Woolf satirise people who

disintegrate themselves from the world of animals. In this way, the boundary between the worlds of human beings and animals is erased, which is similar to the suspension of the barriers between the classes in Bakhtin's carnival. Ryan thinks that this novel is one of "Woolf's most forward-looking texts" because it unsettles the conventional notions of the division of the human and animal worlds. Ryan contends that in this novel Woolf's humour is directed towards those who take their "human position too certainly" (138). In addition to Ryan's ideas it can be stated that Flush's focalization, in fact, underlines the limits of human beings' understanding of their environment. Perhaps, what Woolf tries to do in her novel is to show that the "pomposity" of human beings can be easily deflated (89). In this vein, it is possible to read the novel as a manifestation of the idea that animals are much more sensitive than human beings with reference to what happens in life. They possess the ability to feel the tiny change that happens in a person's life, but human beings, despite their intellect, lack this ability. By situating Flush in an environment where human beings live, Woolf explores an animal's perception of this environment which leads her to redefine its nature. Ryan states that Woolf provides a "reconceptualization of the complex spaces shared by human and nonhuman animals" (134) and "reimagining of the earthly space shared by humans and animals, where hierarchies are flattened and species categories blurred" (155). Combining human and animal characteristics bears a similarity to Bakhtin's carnival square where there is no hierarchical order. Hence, Flush's focalization depicts a different version of seeing the environment where human beings live. It underlines the effect of human beings' spiritual condition on the atmosphere of this environment. Flush makes it evident that the characters' spiritual condition can be evident in their physical environment; their rooms and houses signify their mood. It can also be stated that the perspective of a dog helps see the woman's condition from a different perspective. Flush's point of view helps the author to present the woman's situation by a voice which is not the voice of a dominant ideology. According to Flint, Woolf shows the reader that "the overlooked and underrated perspective of a dog may be uncannily close to the underrated perspective of the thinking Victorian woman" (xliii). However, Flint's idea of

associating a woman and a dog can be extended. Woolf, who has always demanded that women should express themselves, transcends her own demand and makes a woman's condition be visible in a much clearer and objective way through the eyes of a dog because a dog is not subject to the dominant domestic ideology.

This part of the chapter focuses on *Flush* with reference to the novel's father figure Mr Barrett and the ways through which his authority is undermined by his daughter, Elizabeth and her dog, Flush. Similar to *To the Lighthouse*, such an analysis of the novel makes it possible to observe the carnivalesque acts of crowning and decrowning in the characters' actions. As is seen in Bakhtin's works, crownings and decrownings are "sudden and quick changes of fate," "instantaneous rises and falls" of the characters (*Dostoevsky* 171). *Flush* also depicts the sudden shifts in the power Mr Barrett holds at home. The analysis of *Flush* in the light of Bakhtin's notion of the act of decrowning reveals the fact that the figure of authority in the novel is not as visible as it is in *To the Lighthouse* or in Dostoevsky's or Rabelais' works. Although Mr Barrett physically exists in the novel and controls his daughter, the act of decrowning is mainly performed in relation to an abstract idea of patriarchy. The relationship between Miss Barrett and her father is mainly seen through the lens of the dog. This, in turn, makes the criticism of the patriarchal system milder because it adds a sense of humour to the narration.

Mr Barrett's authority in the novel is established through his control of his daughter's life in her backside bedroom. He controls her obedience by visiting her every evening and spending some time by her bedside. "Signifying his approval of his daughter's obedience, Mr Barrett lowered himself heavily into the chair by her side" (31). Flush's perception of Mr Barrett depicts the father's dominance and his desire to frighten to make Elizabeth submit to his authority.

> His eye at once sought the tray. Had the meal been eaten? Had his commands been obeyed? . . . As that dark body approached him, shivers of terror and horror ran down Flush's spine. So a savage couched in flowers shudders when the thunder growls and he hears the voice of God. . . . A force had

entered the bedroom which he dreaded; a force that he was powerless to withstand. (31)

When seen from Flush's perspective, Mr Barrett loses his attribute of a father and just appears as a dark body devoid of the feelings of sympathy or affection. What is more, although Mr Barrett seems to visit his daughter to control whether she has eaten her dinner or not, Flush's focalization suggests that Mr Barrett's figure exudes the desire to terrorize and frighten. That is why, Mr Barrett is associated with God, who is not visible but can frighten. Although Mr Barrett does not mind Flush, the dog fears his force. Such a sense is described in *To the Lighthouse*, too, when James' feelings towards his father are presented. James always wanted to kill "the thing that descended on" Mr Ramsay – "tyranny, despotism" – "that fierce sudden black-winged harpy, with its talons and its beak all cold and hard, that struck and struck at you" (198-199). Therefore, it can be held that the novels present a struggle against these concepts of tyranny and despotism rather than against the individuals themselves.

Flush's fear of Mr Barrett stands for Miss Barrett's desperate condition in the hands of a patriarch. It is through Flush's feelings toward the father that Miss Barrett's condition is expressed and made visible. Elizabeth can neither move nor escape her father's authority. In that sense, Miss Barrett's positioning as an invalid and her use of a bath chair demonstrate her spiritual imprisonment. Hence, similar to Mr Ramsay in *To the Lighthouse*, Mr Barrett is portrayed as the commander of the family; and Elizabeth's constant presence in her bedroom is marked by her father's wish to keep her there rather than by her own choice. The father figure, thus, is portrayed "as choking the individuality" of a woman (Mohammad and Farooq 288). Mr Barrett tries to establish and sustain stability at his home and this makes him imprison his daughter, fix her to a particular place and define her as an invalid.

Elizabeth is "a prisoner of his [Mr Barrett's] authority" (Drobot 69). She lives in a bedroom that is remote from the other rooms. Although the other members of the family visit her sometimes, she is usually alone. Moreover, she is made to believe that she is an invalid, which intensifies her immobility and justifies her

imprisonment. “Hers was the pale worn face of an invalid, cut off from air, light, freedom” (18). When Flush enters Miss Barrett’s bedroom for the first time, he feels isolation and decay.

> Only a scholar who has descended step by step into a mausoleum and there finds himself in a crypt, crusted with fungus, slimy with mould, exuding sour smells of decay and antiquity, while half-obliterated marble busts gleam in mid-air and all is dimly seen by the light of the small swinging lamp which he holds, and dips and turns, glancing now here, now there – only the sensations of such an explorer into the buried vaults of a ruined city can compare with the riot of emotions that flooded Flush’s nerves as he stood for the first time in an invalid’s bedroom, in Wimpole Street, and smelt eau-de-Cologne. (16)

The dog’s perception helps the reader penetrate into the depth of Miss Barrett’s situation with the smells and the colours of her room. Her room is likened to a mausoleum, a room for the dead, which suggests decay and antiquity. Lack of sufficient light intensifies the feeling of death and burial. Anna Feuerstein states that although Miss Barrett’s bedroom may seem luxurious for a person, for a dog it smells of crypt and fungus. In this way, “the reader’s perception of Elizabeth’s bedroom is completely subverted into its near opposite: mold, decay, and old age” (Feuerstein 32). Feuerstein states that the reader “realizes the extent of Elizabeth’s oppressed life” (32). She adds that “Flush’s epistemology challenges an empirical engagement with gender oppression: Elizabeth’s life may not look problematic, living as she does in a rich house on Wimpole Street, yet she is in actuality stifled in the dark” (32). Indeed, even the street where the Barretts’ house is situated is described as an isolated space, untouched by any change.

> Even now perhaps nobody rings the bell of a house in Wimpole Street without trepidation. It is the most august of London streets, the most impersonal. Indeed, when the world seems tumbling to ruin, and civilization rocks on its foundations, one has only to go to Wimpole Street; . . . for as long as Wimpole Street remains, civilization is secure. (13-14).

The street is the symbol of stability and respect. It symbolises Mr Barrett, his power to stabilize everything and deserve respect because of his abilities. The street is impersonal and suggests loneliness.

The setting of the novel where Elizabeth is positioned can be discussed in terms of Bakhtin's approach to interior spaces. Bakhtin states that Dostoevsky's fiction gains its carnivalesque atmosphere because the author "leaps over" these interior spaces (*Dostoevsky* 169). "Dostoevsky 'leaps over' all that is comfortably habitable, well-arranged and stable, all that is far from the threshold" (*Dostoevsky* 169). Bakhtin adds that life in such places cannot be carnivalistic; life in interior spaces is a biographical life that has a linear time: people "are born, they pass through childhood and youth, they marry, give birth to children, die" (*Dostoevsky* 169). Nothing extraordinary happens.

During his first hours in Miss Barrett's room Flush realises lack of light, nature, freedom, and love. "Door after door shut in his face as Miss Mitford [his previous owner] went downstairs; they shut on freedom; on fields; on hares; on grass; on his adored, his venerated mistress" (17). As time goes by, every now and then, Flush feels that he is in a cage in his new room. The maid's closing the windows prevents the penetration of the outside into the room. "[N]ow at the sound of the ivy tapping on the pane Miss Barrett asked Wilson to see to the fastenings of the window" (24). The notion of the window, which is an important element in transforming an interior space into a carnivalesque space with its link to the outside world, appears as a closed one. The windows in Elizabeth's room do not perform the function of helping the characters escape the domestic suffocating atmosphere. Elizabeth disintegrates herself from nature and feels secure in her room. It is evident that Miss Barrett internalized the sense of isolation and seclusion that is imposed on her by her father. "Flush felt that he and Miss Barrett lived alone together in a cushioned and firelit cave" (24) where there are no windows. Here the idea of furniture suggests imprisonment rather than valuable possessions because the room is focalized by a dog. For Flush, it would be more amusing to have more space to run. Elizabeth's life is the life of "a bird in its cage" (33). She possesses her cage but it

imprisons her. Her room provides her with everything but freedom. “She sometimes kept the house for weeks at a time, and when she left it, it was only for an hour or two, to drive to a shop in a carriage, or to be wheeled to Regent’s Part in a bath-chair” (33-34). Miss Barrett’s life is absolutely limited if looked at from a dog’s perspective. For Flush, having such a life is the same as being in prison.

Thus, it seems deliberate that a dog is juxtaposed with a woman in such a condition. Being imprisoned in the bedroom together with Elizabeth, Flush misses the outdoors. Flush’s desire to come out and the expression of his lack of freedom demonstrate the extent of Miss Barrett’s secluded life. Every opening of the door seems to be promising and tempting. “[S]ometimes the step on the stair did not pass the door; it stopped outside. The handle was seen to spin round; the door actually opened; somebody came in. Then how strangely the furniture changed its look!” (28) The atmosphere of the bedroom changes when the door is opened. The outside world and the freedom that it provides are condensed into mere symbols for Flush. “[W]ith all her poet’s imagination Miss Barrett could not divine what Wilson’s wet umbrella meant to Flush; what memories it recalled, of forests and parrots and wild trumpeting elephants” (26). It is possible for him to grasp all his memories and feelings related to the outside world in an image of a wet umbrella. Flush acquires an ability to associate the outside world with the objects at home to sprinkle moments of freedom into the sense of seclusion.

However, leaving the bedroom and going out with Elizabeth does not solve the problem of Flush’s yearning for his freedom. Flush’s perceptions of the freedom of the outside world and being outside with Miss Barrett do not coincide. His feelings of imprisonment are intensified once more when they go out together. “[A] heavy weight jerked at his throat; he was thrown back on his haunches. . . . Why was he a prisoner here?” (22) His actions are controlled and limited even when he is outside. It seems to suggest that women are under control even when they are away from the source of authority, their fathers. Flush experiences the process of internalization of domestic imprisonment and now he is at the beginning of this process. He has to learn that even if he is outside, he has to behave as if he is in his

bedroom. Being outside does not mean that the rules of the indoors are suspended. He has to learn to remember and follow those rules everywhere. Eventually, Flush learns to submit.

> To resign, to control, to suppress the most violent instincts of his nature – that was the prime lesson of the bedroom school, and it was one of such portentous difficulty that many scholars have learnt Greek with less – many battles have been won that cost their generals not half such pain. (25)

Although it is very difficult to accomplish, Flush suppresses his instincts and acknowledges the power of authority and its values. Flush's condition parallels women's condition in a patriarchal world. "Thus the country dog finds himself needing to learn submission, . . . a parallel to women's internalization of the obligation to subjugate themselves to the confining social laws of patriarchy" (Flint xx-xxi). Similar to Flush, women have to get rid of the idea that their values are of importance. They have to exist according to the values of the patriarchal system.

As time goes by, Flush gets accustomed to being in the room and he even starts to fear the outside. His fear becomes obvious in his attitude towards Mr Browning, who starts to visit Miss Barrett frequently. Mr Browning's presence in Elizabeth's bedroom awakes in Flush a sense of alarm and intuition that something vital is going to happen, and which he is afraid of. Elizabeth's reading of Mr Browning's letters makes Flush alarmed.

> And as she read he heard, as when we are half asleep we hear through the clamour of the street some bell ringing and know that it is addressed to us, alarmingly yet faintly, as if someone far away were trying to rouse us with the warning of fire, or burglary, or some menace against our peace and we start in alarm before we wake. (34-35)

Furthermore, Flush's dognapping proves that the outside is dangerous. The Whitechapel, the place where he is taken, makes him suffer physically and spiritually. When he is dognapped he feels what Miss Barrett feels in her "imprisonment" in Wimpole Street (Flint xxi). Flush's short presence in Whitechapel symbolises a middle-class woman's household responsibilities. "Children crawled

out from dark corners and pinched his ears" (55). Flush's being disturbed by the children symbolises a woman's responsibilities towards her children. "He whined, and a heavy hand beat him over the head" (55). His desire to complain about his situation or his tendency to demand a better condition can be associated with women's lack of opportunity to express themselves. It also can stand for the patriarchal system's aggressiveness and violence as effective weapons to dominate and subjugate. "[Y]et all of them, Flush could see, were dogs of the highest breeding, chained dogs, footmen's dogs, like himself" (55). The valuable dogs Flush meets in Whitechapel symbolise middle- or upper-middle class women, suffering at the hands of patriarchy.

However, patriarchal norms are challenged in the novel. First, Mr Browning's entrance into Elizabeth's life is an initiation of the process of the fragmentation of her imprisonment. The change in Elizabeth's life after Mr Browning's appearance becomes evident through Flush's observations. Flush feels the change even in her tiny gestures. Flush redefines his perceptions of Miss Barrett. He becomes cognizant of the fact that Elizabeth gets rid of the psychological walls that have surrounded her hitherto; Miss Barrett, whom he used to imagine in a cave, goes out. "Miss Barrett was outside. . . . Flush had never heard that sound in Miss Barrett's voice before – that vigour, that excitement" (38). Flush feels the authority and freedom in her voice. "Miss Barrett's voice, that had been pleading and afraid, lost its faltering note. It rang out with a determination and a boldness that Flush had never heard in it before" (42). Miss Barrett challenges her physical condition, too. "Then she did what she had not done for many a long day – she actually walked on her own feet as far as the gate at Devonshire Place with her sister" (39). It is palpable that Mr Browning is the impulse that draws Miss Barrett to think about her ability to go out of her confinement by unsettling the order that her father establishes. Miss Barrett starts to eat everything that is brought to her. "At that night she ate her chicken to the bone. Not a scrap of potato or of skin was thrown to Flush" (39).

Flush feels the change in Miss Barrett, but Mr Barrett does not. Flush wants to make Mr Barrett feel it and this, in fact, stresses Mr Barrett's deficiency. Despite

his infinite power to control his daughter, he is powerless to feel what happens in her room. In this way, Flush's focalization undermines his power because Flush is depicted as more sensitive and alert than Mr Barrett. The dog seems to possess more power than Mr Barrett because he can feel the change beforehand. "When Mr Barrett came as usual, Flush marvelled at his obtuseness. . . . 'Don't you know,' Flush marvelled, 'who's been sitting in that chair? Can't you smell him?' . . . aghast at his obtuseness, Flush slipped past him out of the room" (39). Flush feels Mr Browning's power to change Miss Barrett while Mr Barrett remains blind to this situation. Flush regards Mr Barrett obtuse because he cannot feel such an obvious change in Elizabeth. Such a perception of Mr Barrett by Flush adds a sense of humour to the novel because Mr Barrett's seriousness and authority are deflated by a dog. Mr Barrett is rendered as a stupid and incompetent creature. This humorous focalization of Mr Barrett decrowns his figure of authority.

Flush's being dognapped also contributes to the destabilization of the preordained conceptions of patriarchal authority in the Barretts' household. When Miss Barrett goes to Whitechapel to rescue Flush, she comes to comprehend more fully the reality of the outside world. "She had seen more while she sat in the cab at the public-house than she had seen during the five years that she had lain in the back bedroom at Wimpole Street" (64). She understands that the authority that she subordinates herself to is not invincible; it is fragile. She recognizes the strength of the outside world to challenge the authority of the inside, of her domestic space. Moreover, Miss Barrett manages to go against the men who tell her what to do. All the men around her tell her that she should not pay the ransom for the kidnapped dog.

> Wimpole Street was determined to make a stand against Whitechapel. Blind Mr Boyd sent word that in his opinion it would be 'an awful sin' to pay the ransom. Her father and her brother were in league against her and were capable of any treachery in the interests of their class. But worst of all – far worse – Mr Browning himself threw all his weight, all his eloquence, all his learning, all his logic, on the side of Wimpole Street and against Flush. (60)

She disregards all men's decision to leave Flush in the hands of the dognappers and goes to Whitechapel all by herself. As Flint argues, "the actions to which she committed herself added up to an assertion of her own values. In these terms, rescuing Flush was as significant as eloping with Robert Browning" (xxii). Miss Barrett's action is a huge step in gaining her independence from the men around her.

> How easy it would have been to yield – how easy it would have been to say, 'Your good opinion is worth more to me than a hundred cocker spaniels'. How easy it would have been to sink back on her pillows and sigh, 'I am a weak woman; I know nothing of law and justice; decide for me'. She had only to refuse to pay the ransom; . . . And if Flush were killed, . . . there was Robert Browning by her side to assure her that she had done right and earned his respect. But Miss Barrett was not to be intimidated. Miss Barrett took up her pen and refuted Robert Browning. (61)

She even goes against Mr Browning, the man for the sake of whom she disregards her father.

Finally, Miss Barrett's escape with Mr Browning is the chief factor that makes Miss Barrett and Flush participate in a great change of life despite the norms of the patriarchal father confining her in her room. By her escape Miss Barrett interposes a veil between herself and her father; she asserts her subjectivity and establishes her own values. Flush feels that their escape is their journey to their freedom; "they were leaving tyrants and dog-stealers behind them. . . . He heard birds singing and the sigh of trees in the wind" (72). Their escape promises them a new perception of their existence.

> The light, infinitely sharp and clear, dazzled his eyes. . . . Instead of the solid and soporific hum of London there was a rattling and a crying, a jingling and a shouting, a cracking of whips and a jangling of bells. . . . He felt younger, spryer than he had done these many years. (73-74)

Their destination, Italy, presents to them all the jazzy atmosphere of freedom which sharply contrasts with that of London, "dominated by hierarchization, categorization, by regularization, by claustrophobia" (Flint xxiii). Italy is full of life and vigour.

"Here in Italy was freedom and life and the joy that the sun breeds" (76). Flush and Miss Barrett acquire a new sensation related to the outside. "In all of this, Woolf imagines what it may be like to apprehend the world from a different alignment of the senses" (Flint xix). The environment changes. "The noise of the street was deafening. Everybody seemed to be shouting shrilly at the same moment" (73). Elizabeth and Flush feel life outside, a life that is full and strong, that does not oppress silently. Flush leaves behind the decorated and cushioned rooms which symbolise imprisonment. "For at Casa Guidi the rooms were bare. All those draped objects of his cloistered and secluded days had vanished. The bed was a bed; the wash-stand was a wash-stand" (79). Flush feels the freedom when he sees the bare rooms in Italy. Miss Barrett metamorphoses into a lively and healthy woman. "She was a different person altogether. . . . instead of driving in a barouche landau to Regent's Park she pulled on her thick boots and scrambled over rocks" (75). Instead of a woman who was sitting in her back bedroom and closing all the windows, there appears Mrs Browning who "loved to sit there looking, listening, watching the people in the street" (79).

Elizabeth even has a baby and Flush perceives it in a defamiliarised way, in the form of a grotesque image. "Independently of them all, without the street door being opened, out of herself in the room, alone, Mrs Browning had become two people" (83). Here there is an image of "becoming;" a character embraces a transforming image, an image that gives birth to another image. "The grotesque image reflects a phenomenon in transformation, an as yet unfinished metamorphosis, of death and birth, growth and becoming" (*Rabelais* 24). Bakhtin mentions the "figurines of senile pregnant hags" (*Rabelais* 25) when he discusses the grotesque. He states that these figures are "typical and very strongly expressed grotesque. It is ambivalent. It is pregnant death, a death that gives birth" (*Rabelais* 25). Although Elizabeth is not old, nor dying, it can be stated that her previous condition dies at giving birth to a new life. Such an idea finds its embodiment in Elizabeth's image of a mother with her newly born baby. This grotesque image symbolizes her challenge of the patriarchal order that imposes on her the sense of isolation. Elizabeth's

becoming “two people” is an embodiment of her shattering her sense of loneliness. In other words, Elizabeth “escapes her confinement, which is both physical and psychological” (Drobot 71).

Everything they experience in Italy is the opposite of their life in England. The bright dazzling light of Italy contrasts with Miss Barrett’s dark bedroom. Miss Barrett acquires freedom and joy of life instead of the invalid bath chair. Flush and Miss Barrett hear the noise of the streets instead of the secluded august appearance of Wimpole Street. The bare rooms of their Italian home suggest freedom while the fully furnished room in England imprisons them. Invalid Miss Barrett, who rarely walked and used her bath chair, starts to mount the rocks. The loneliness of Miss Barrett is shattered by her giving birth to a baby. All these events constitute the act of decrowning; however, the decrowned body is absent in its concrete form. Instead, there is an abstract idea or ideology that is being undermined. Their life in Italy resembles the reversed carnivalistic life. Everything that was ordinary in London is suspended during their stay in Italy and Elizabeth and Flush become the participants of carnival.

> All the windows were full of faces; all the balconies were full of figures. The people in the windows were tossing flowers and laurel leaves on to the people in the street; and the people in the street – grave men, gay young women – were kissing each other and raising their babies to the people in the balconies. (80)

As is observed above, there is a carnival atmosphere. The windows are open to the outside world and there is a stress on balconies which bring to mind the “threshold” spaces in Bakhtinian theory. There is a gay and intense interaction between the people at home and the people outside so that the difference between the two spaces disappears. The whole scene is infused with bliss, familiar contact and freedom. Flush witnesses this carnival atmosphere during his wanderings in the streets.

> He went in and out, up and down, where they beat brass, where they bake bread, where the women sit combing their hair, where the bird-cages are piled high on the causeway, where the wine spills itself in dark red stains on the

> pavement, where leather smells and harness and garlic, where cloth is beaten, where vine leaves tremble, where men sit and drink and spit and dice. (87)

Flush and Elizabeth leave behind all the categories stemming from the patriarchal world order. Their new life is characterized by the absence of hierarchical divisions between people, between people and animals, and between animals. Flush learns that all the dogs are equal here; "here in Pisa, though dogs abounded, there were no ranks; all – could it be possible? – were mongrels. As far as he could see, they were dogs merely" (74). As a result, Flush has an opportunity to merge with the rest of the dogs rather than being punctilious in choosing a partner. He meets the world, he embraces everybody. "He was the friend of all the world now. All dogs were his brothers" (77). He is happy to feel the equality of the dogs. He does not feel the necessity to behave as a valuable dog anymore. He even gets fleas as all the other dogs do. "With a cruel irony the sun that ripened the grapes brought also the fleas" (88). Flush does not sense any sharp division between people. All the social classes merge one into the other. In one part of the day, they are workers and in the next, they are glamorous people. "In the streets of Pisa pretty women could walk alone; great ladies first emptied their own slots and then went to Court 'in a blaze of undeniable glory'" (76). Even Miss Barrett's maid, Wilson, abandons her strict values and starts to feel herself at home. She falls in love with a bodyguard. "Her fancy was fired; her judgement reeled; her standards toppled" (77). Nobody is afraid of anybody. "Fear was unknown in Florence; there were no dog-stealers here and, she [Elizabeth] may have sighed, there were no fathers" (78).

However, it should be also pinpointed that Elizabeth's escape from patriarchal confinement at home is realized with the help of another man, Mr Browning. Although he provides her with the freedom of Italian atmosphere, he makes it quite obvious that he is a part of the patriarchal authority when he sides with other men in the case of the dognapped Flush. What is more, marriage through which Elizabeth is able to get rid of her domestic imprisonment is another patriarchal construction. In short, what Woolf wants to stress is the fact that, as it is in *The*

Voyage Out, a woman cannot obtain a complete sense of independence; she cannot be completely free in a world governed by patriarchal precepts.

To conclude, the female characters in *To the Lighthouse* and *Flush* reveal their potential to undermine the patriarchal figures that constrict them in their homes. And the expression of their thoughts and behaviour suggests a subtle sense of humour, which underlies the fact that despite the male characters' effort to show themselves as great and powerful, the female characters' ideas about them reveal the opposite. Such images of emasculated patriarchs seem to express the author's yearning for a change in the world's social norms, particularly with reference to gender issues. However, Woolf makes it clear that what she tries to depict in her novels – women's absolute freedom – cannot be achieved yet. Her female characters either die or have to submit themselves to men who can provide them with a freer life than their previous one. Thus, Woolf's novels do not present a picture of a changed world; they present the ways through which it is possible to change it.

CHAPTER V

GROTESQUE IN *ORLANDO*: ANDROGYNOUS MINDS AND BODIES

Orlando (1928) can be read as Virginia Woolf's reaction against stabilized notions of being. Woolf underlines the sense of continuous change and ambivalence in her characters. Two main topics of discussion arise from an analysis of the novel in terms of its challenging of the stable unity of a human being: first, ambivalence in terms of sex and gender, which encapsulates the discussion of the fluidity of human subjectivity, and, second, the flexibility of physical appearance; i.e., its ability to change shapes. The first issue will be explored in the light of Woolf's notion of androgyny, which she discusses in *A Room of One's Own*. By proposing an androgynous subjectivity, which unsettles the notions of fixed sex and gender, Woolf attacks patriarchal definitions of "femininity." "[A]ndrogyny offered Woolf a way of rejecting biological determinism and undoing the privileging of the masculine over the feminine" (Rosenman 647). In this way, Woolf shatters in her fictional universe the gender hierarchies according to which women are subordinate to men. "In Orlando's multifaceted, multigendered identity, Woolf dismantles the masculine-self/feminine-other hierarchy and resists a phallocentric insistence on identity as static and unitary" (Harrison 62). Thus, besides challenging the patriarchal norms that tend to define femininity, Woolf's novel and her notion of androgyny suggest the fluidity of subjectivity. *Orlando* makes the reader "re-define identity as mobile" and "mutable" (Haines-Wright 178). Woolf, in this way, undermines the idea that human subjectivity is stable and unchangeable; she dwells upon the portrayals of her characters as ambivalent subjects. It is impossible to categorise them according to sex or gender. The novel

> rejects the idea that a person has a fixed gender, and is limited in what they can desire and enjoy to the standard, permitted forms of pleasure. Treating

> such subversive themes through fantasy allows them to be aired without too much anxiety, and allows moral and cultural norms and prohibitions to be transgressed in an unthreatening way. (Mepham 1991, 128).

According to what Mepham states, then, it is possible to claim that Woolf expresses serious subject matter through non-serious, or, humorous means. Moreover, the novel constantly evades fixing the characters' physical description because they are depicted through changing and metamorphosing images. And, this – Woolf's characters' ability to present continuously changing images – constitutes the second discussion topic in this chapter. It will be argued that Woolf's novel unsettles the stability of a human being in *Orlando* through characters, as well, who are in constant physical transformation. This chapter will analyse *Orlando* in terms of Woolf's notion of androgyny and explore the ways of framing this discussion into Bakhtin's notion of the grotesque. It will also dwell upon some other grotesque imagery in the novel – images that are not directly related to gender discourse – in order to enrich the discussion of carnivalization in *Orlando*.

Firstly, the chapter will focus on an androgynous mind in the portrayals of the biographer/narrator and Orlando. At this point, Woolf's problematization of gender division will be brought forth. While the narrator's androgynous mind will be explored with reference to Woolf's challenging of biography writing, Orlando's androgynous mind will be explored through her/his difficulties of being a woman. Then, the chapter will study the novel in terms of the "androgynous body" – Woolf's movement from a discussion on the abstract androgynous mind in *A Room of One's Own* to a concrete treatment of androgyny in the form of androgynous bodies of Orlando, Sasha, and the Archduchess/Archduke and the characters' sexuality. The chapter will underline Woolf's critique of the patriarchal system that appoints a subordinate role to women in society. The androgynous bodies in Woolf's novel will be analysed in the light of Bakhtin's notion of the grotesque as they perpetually fluctuate from one sex into another and resist fixity.

Woolf's novel is a fictional biography that accounts the life of Orlando, a man who becomes a woman. Orlando's change of sex is coupled with her/his

portrayal as a character with an androgynous mind that makes itself evident throughout the novel. *Orlando* is a manifestation of a human subjectivity which resists any kind of fixity, either in gender, in sex, or in appearance. Woolf's characters in this novel constantly change and metamorphose celebrating difference and transcendence of a rigid form. In this sense, Woolf's *Orlando* can be analysed in the light of Bakhtin's notion of the grotesque, an important element of the carnival sense of the world. "*Orlando* contains the greatest concentration of carnivalesque energies in all of Woolf's fiction, as well as her most direct assault on fixed gender boundaries" (Booker 177). As Bakhtin states, the "grotesque image reflects a phenomenon in transformation, an as yet unfinished metamorphosis, of death and birth, growth and becoming" (*Rabelais* 24). Bakhtin focuses on the images that resist stability and underlines the grotesque's "ambivalence" as its "indispensable trait" (*Rabelais* 24). Bakhtin's grotesque, in other words, is an image of perpetual transformation and change that challenges the dominant conventional perceptions of being which Bakhtin describes as "finished, completed man, cleansed, as it were, of all the scoriae of birth and development" (*Rabelais* 25). Thus, it is possible to draw a parallel between Bakhtin's grotesque images and Woolf's metamorphosing characters. As in Bakhtin's notion of the grotesque, the bodies of the characters in *Orlando* are changing ones, transforming from one form into another.

Like *Flush, Orlando* is a fictional biography. Orlando, the protagonist, is a member of a noble family. The novel starts in the age of Queen Elizabeth I when Orlando is a sixteen-year-old boy, who likes solitude and poetry. Orlando's encounter with Sasha, a Russian princess, their amorous relationship, and Sasha's mysterious disappearance leave Orlando frustrated. After a short period of solitude during which Orlando meets Mr Nicholas Greene, a literary critic, and becomes frustrated with the literary environment, Orlando comes across the Archduchess/Archduke. The entrance of the Archduchess/Archduke Harriet/Harry into Orlando's life makes Orlando go to Constantinople as an ambassador. After some time in Constantinople, Orlando becomes a woman. She escapes the city and starts to live with gipsies, whom she leaves after some time. On her coming back to

England, Orlando starts to attend the meetings of the noble society. She marries Marmaduke Bonthrop Shelmerdine, whom she occasionally meets, gives birth to a son and publishes her poem.

A. The androgynous mind

A.1 Manifestations of the androgynous mind in *Orlando*: the narrator and Orlando

The concept of androgyny in Woolf's *A Room of One's Own* appears in the context of the discussion of a creative mind. As was discussed earlier, Woolf's notion of androgyny is based on the idea of balance. For Woolf, unless an author incorporates both "man and woman part[s] of the brain" (*Room* 128), he/she is not able to reach creativity. If an author uses only a woman or a man part of the brain, he/she limits him/herself in terms of the mind's capacity. Woolf states that "a mind that is purely masculine cannot create, any more than a mind that is purely feminine" (*Room* 128). According to Woolf, life is very rich and various and cannot be expressed only through the writing of a mind that uses either a man or a woman part of the brain. "It would be a thousand pities if women wrote like men, or lived like men, or looked like men, for if two sexes are quite inadequate, considering the vastness and variety of the world, how should we manage with one only?" (*Room* 114) This idea "assumes that human knowledge and experience are wider than either mode of perception alone and that the artist must be sensitive to the full range of human insight" (Farwell 435).

Virginia Woolf's *Orlando* is a creation of an androgynous mind which Woolf propagates in her essay *A Room of One's Own*. *Orlando* is Woolf's expression of her objection to the classification of human beings in terms of heteronormative and hierarchical gender categories. Woolf's aim is to unsettle these categories. Woolf challenges gender boundaries and "carnivalized and exposed [them] as arbitrary social constructions" (Booker 163) in her novel, *Orlando*. Woolf clings to the idea

that human subjectivity cannot be reduced to the social categorizations of gender. *Orlando* can be read as a writing of an androgynous mind and as a work about an androgynous mind. *Orlando* is a fictional biography narrated by an androgynous biographer. And the novel is about Orlando who changes sex and transgresses gender boundaries. In Karen Kaivola's terms, Orlando is an "intermix" of sexes (235). Woolf's Orlando embraces both sexes by banning any kind of attempt at superiority. In this way, by depicting Orlando's androgynous identity, the narrator/biographer expresses her/his androgynous mind by depicting her/his ability to understand both sexes and both genders.

A.1.1 The narrator's androgynous mind

The narrator/biographer's androgynous mind becomes evident when *Orlando* is analysed as a subversion of a conventional biography. The narrator disrupts conventions of biography writing. In other words, *Orlando*'s narrator, similar to Mary Carmichael in *A Room of One's Own*, writes as if she/he is not conscious of her/his sex. So as in the work of Carmichael, whose androgynous mind does not conform to patriarchal gender norms, in *Orlando* the narrator's androgynous mind does not abide by generic conventions.

Genres such as biography and history writing are usually regarded as masculine enterprises because they often record the greatness of certain men. "History and biography, traditionally masculine genres, are dedicated to chronicling and often celebrating masculine achievements, whether they be the achievements of a nation or an individual" (Harrison 72). In other words, biography and history writing are highly conscious of gender hierarchies. They stress and valorise male activities while devaluing the female world. "Biography, by tradition, if not by definition, has been about the extra-ordinary person, a particular individual who in some manner did something deemed noteworthy by the conventional canons of significance" (Zinsser 44). Apparently, women's deeds such as domestic chores do not fit into these conventional canons.

> The model of biography as the study of great or exceptional people makes women marginal, as only very few can ever fit into its framework. It reinforces the idea that only public achievement is significant and that those women who lead predominantly domestic lives are of no particular interest. (Caine 250)

And because they wanted to express women's experiences regardless of their place in society, feminists started to revise biography writing in the 1980s. As Judith P. Zinsser states, feminists wanted "to chronicle the lives of all women" (43). "Women's history has taken as two of its primary goals the rescuing of women's lives from obscurity and the redefinition of history itself, so that the private and domestic worlds of women ceased to be seen as historically irrelevant" (Caine 250). Woolf propagates similar ideas related to the expression of women's experiences.

According to Mepham, Woolf "did not believe in biography at all. All her working life she had rejected biography as a form" (1991, 174). In her essay "The New Biography" (1927), Woolf states that it is easier for the biographers to describe the "truth in its hardest, most obdurate form" as it is found in the "British Museum" because "the true life" is easily visible in comparison with the personality that "meanders darkly and obscurely through the hidden channels of the soul" (*Essays* 95). According to Woolf, it is difficult to observe personality because it is not fixed or stable. The difference between obdurate truth and personality that Woolf mentions in this extract implies the difference between male and female activities. While male activities such as wars, for example, are clearly visible and possible to demonstrate in a museum, female activities such as domestic chores, for instance, are not noteworthy. In *Orlando*, Woolf makes her ideas related to biography writing clear. The description of Orlando's life is different from the description of the objects in the British Museum; Orlando's personality and life are not as hard or stable as those objects in the museum because they are in constant transformation. Orlando's life cannot be inserted into the context of gendered activities as she is neither a woman only nor a man only. Orlando's biographer laments on the exclusion of what is not visible, "thought and imagination," from conventional biography-writing.

> What is more irritating than to see one's subject, . . . slipping out of one's grasp altogether and indulging – witness her sighs and gasps, her flushing, her palings, her eyes now bright as lamps, now haggard as dawns – what is more humiliating than to see all this dumb show of emotion and excitement gone through before our eyes when we know that what causes it – thought and imagination – are of no importance whatsoever. (132)

Orlando neither participates in wars nor indulges in domestic affairs throughout her/his life. While recording Orlando's life, the biographer outlines the traditional way of biography writing. "Would, indeed, that a pin had dropped! That would have been life of a kind" (132). The biographer suggests in a mocking way that traditional biography and history writing should include certain type of content; they should record activities that are easily visible and that endorse male authority. It disregards thinking and does not see it as a worthy subject. And thinking is the activity that Orlando performs when her/his biographer diverts the text to contemplate biography writing: "thinking is precisely what Orlando is doing now" (132). So by choosing to write about "thinking" Orlando, the biographer disrupts the conventional system of biography and history writing which is usually regarded as a masculine field.

The narrator's androgynous mind becomes also evident in her/his discussion of Orlando's authorship of her/his poem "The Oak Tree." The narrator continually reminds the reader of the poem and its development as a literary piece. In this way, the narrator underlines the significance of successful authorship which is the consequence of an androgynous mind. Together with the description of Orlando's giving birth to her son, her writing a poem is foregrounded. "Orlando was safely delivered of a son on Thursday, March the 20th, at three o'clock in the morning" (146). The description of the appearance of her poem "The Oak Tree" in front of Mr Nicholas Greene resembles the description of an act of giving birth: "some hook or button fastening the upper part of her dress burst open, and out upon the table fell 'The Oak Tree', a poem" (138). This scene suggests Woolf's stress on Orlando as a creative author. "The fulfilment of Orlando's poetic quest is thus tied to the fulfilment of a specifically feminine creative potential, and writing is transformed in

the course of Woolf's novel from an adolescent, masculine pastime into a mature, feminine act of creation" (Harrison 63). Lack of focus on Orlando's actual birth giving to her son and the description of her growing up her child delimit the idea of Orlando's female body as a reproductive machine. Woolf does not want to foreground Orlando's female body only as one that gives birth to children.

> Rather than illustrate the myriad biological processes of a female reproductive life – menstruation, childbirth, breastfeeding – Woolf injects the feminine body with a healthy dose of masculinity, often wrestling these processes out of the grasp of the physical altogether and relocating them in the realm of the mental, of the bloodless. (Kingsley 40)

Woolf lays stress on Orlando's androgynous balanced subjectivity; besides Orlando's being a mother, she is also a successful poet. The novel underlines the idea that Orlando's having a baby does not limit her creativity. As Diane Long Hoeveler and Donna Decker Schuster claim, "[t]raditionally, women's creativity has been bracketed by their reproductive bodies. . . . Maternity has been valued as the highest form of creativity available for women" (x). By giving detailed accounts of Orlando's process of producing her poem throughout the novel and by inserting a scene where the poem comes out of Orlando's bosom, Woolf unsettles the conventional image of a woman's creativity. Instead of presenting a woman who only gives birth to a child, Orlando is also characterised as a woman who writes poems. Indeed, Orlando is granted an award for her poem. "The traditional tension between motherhood and authorship is resolved in the representation of her text as her child" (Harrison 63). Indeed, by making Orlando produce a poem Woolf underlines her androgynous mind as an author. "To birth a text in Woolf's model is to need *both* biological systems, the enfolding womb *and* the impregnating phallus, and the parts the writer lacks, he or she is supposed to conjure irregardless of physical bodily status" (Kingsley 40).

Orlando, thus, profoundly engages with biography writing; it plays with the genre while embracing its general frame of describing the life of a person. As Booker states, the novel includes an "engagement with literary and cultural tradition" which

"highlights the strong affinities between *Orlando* and . . . [the Menippean satire], especially as it has been described by Bakhtin" (163). Booker adds that the novel is a "parody of . . . traditional male authoritarian form, the scholarly biography" (171). So the novel can be analysed in terms of Menippean satire that Bakhtin discusses in his studies. According to Bakhtin, one of the main characteristics of Menippean satire, or Menippea, is its embrace of "inserted genres" (*Dostoevsky* 118). In this vein, *Orlando* encapsulates some features of the Menippea which constitutes another example of Woolf's novels' participation in Bakhtin's notion of the carnivalized literature. The Menippean strand in the novel makes it possible to view it as a challenge against male authority and its conventional subject matter in literary works.

A.1.2 Orlando's androgynous mind and the challenges of being a woman

Orlando's androgynous mind is revealed through the detailed account of her/his life as a man and as a woman. As a boy of sixteen, Orlando vows to be like his father or a grandfather, who "had struck [heads] from the shoulders" of Pagans "in the barbarian fields of Africa" (5). While such ideas convey Orlando's tendencies to violence, which is usually regarded as a masculine characteristic, sometimes Orlando reveals his other features which are usually attributed to women. For example, he is sometimes romantically charged:

> sights exalted him – the birds and the trees; and made him in love with death – the evening sky, the homing rooks; and so, mounting up the spiral stairway into his brain – which was a roomy one – all these sights, and the garden sounds too, the hammer beating, the wood chopping, began that riot and confusion of the passions and emotions which every good biographer detests. (6)

The biographer observes the complexity of feelings in Orlando's mind, the mind that is not structured according to life where there is gender division. Therefore, Orlando's brain is depicted as "roomy." Orlando's mind is roomy enough to

accommodate the wealth of life, of which Woolf mentions in *A Room of One's Own*; it can embrace both male and female attributes. Orlando's mind does not acquire the sense of gender division and gender hierarchy. What is more, the narrator's irony with reference to biography writing is evident when she/he states that a good biographer detests confusion of passions and emotions. As it was stated earlier, Woolf subverts biography writing by making Orlando a subject of a biography in her novel. Orlando's lifestyle and worldview sharply contrast with the content of conventional biography writing. Indeed, the androgynous narrator underlines Orlando's androgynous state of mind when she/he mentions the confusion of passions and emotions. Orlando's inability to project fixed feelings foregrounds his androgynous mind. And the narrator's choice of Orlando as a subject for a biography is an attempt to challenge conventional biography writing, a genre that is supposed to record the great deeds of men.

Indeed, Orlando's androgynous mind, similar to the androgynous mind that Woolf dwells upon in *A Room of One's Own*, makes Orlando write. Orlando likes writing; he "took out a writing book labelled 'Aethelbert: A Tragedy in Five Acts', and dipped an old stained goose quill in the ink" (6). Besides trying his pen in plays, Orlando writes poetry. "Soon he had covered ten pages and more with poetry" (6). However, Orlando is conscious of the transgressive nature of his hobby because "to write, much more to publish, was, he knew, for a nobleman an inexpiable disgrace" (37). Another behaviour, which Orlando displays when he is a man and which is usually attributed to women, is his desire to deal with the detailed decoration of his mansion. After Orlando's disappointment with Mr Greene, a literary critic who satirises Orlando and his play, Orlando decides to "devote himself to the furnishing of the mansion" (52). He spends a great amount of money to decorate his 365-room mansion. After a great deal of effort, "the house was furnished" (53).

Orlando's metamorphosis into a woman does not give an end to her/his androgynous mindset. Orlando's sexual metamorphosis is further evidence of Orlando's and the biographer's androgynous minds. Orlando does not reveal "any signs of discomposure" (67) when she/he sees her/himself in the mirror. The great

bodily change does not affect her/his androgynous mind. The biographer shows the signs of her/his androgynous mind in the use of pronouns. Although Orlando is introduced as a woman in a scene where the sex change takes place, the biographer continues using masculine pronouns. "Orlando looked himself up and down in a long looking-glass, . . . and went, presumably, to his bath" (67). Kaivola stresses the biographer's insistence on the idea that subjectivity is not as limited as is the language that is used to delineate it: "[T]he use of the masculine pronoun to describe a biological woman call[s] the singularity of Orlando's identity to question implying that human subjectivity is not reducible to a non-contradictory whole or consistently expressive of the sexed body" (235). Indeed, the biographer makes her/his point clear later on in the novel. "Different though the sexes are, they intermix. In every human being a vacillation from one sex to the other takes place, and often it is only the clothes that keep the male or female likeness, while underneath the sex is the very opposite of what it is above" (92-93). And as Kaivola states, Woolf generalizes the androgynous state to all humanity. "Despite the more fantastical aspects of Orlando's experience, then, Woolf asserts that we are all more like Orlando than we might think" (235).

Orlando awakes as a woman after several days' sleep. "He stretched himself. He rose. He stood upright in complete nakedness before us, . . . we have no choice left but to confess – he was a woman" (67). Although Orlando's naked body reveals the vital consequences of the metamorphosis, he/she "remained precisely as he had been" (67), which refers to his inner world. His/her identity does not change. "The change of sex, though it altered their [Orlando the woman and Orlando the man] future, did nothing whatever to alter their identity. Their faces remained, as their portraits prove, practically the same" (67). The outward manifestation of Orlando's change, her physical appearance and her clothes, do not confound the minds of the others. Orlando's "retinue of servants" greet her just with a slight appreciation of the change, devoid of an awareness that something extraordinary has happened. "No one showed an instant's suspicion that Orlando was not the Orlando they had known" (83). For them, both Orlando a man, and Orlando a woman "were as like as two

peaches on one branch" (83). The servants' attitude is that of absolute awareness of the existence of two Orlandos: male and female. Mrs Grimsditch, Orlando's housekeeper, even states that "she had always had her suspicions (here she nodded her head very mysteriously), which it was no surprise to her (here she nodded her head very knowingly)" (83).

Orlando's sleep before his change of sex can be analysed in terms of Bakhtin's notion of death. Orlando sleeps for several days and nothing can wake him. "[S]ave that his breathing was regular and his cheeks still flushed their habitual deep rose, he gave no sign of life" (64-65). Orlando's condition is like being in-between life and death; it is a carnivalesque time during which all the conceptions are inverted. Orlando's androgynous identity and body are compatible with his position in-between life and death. Indeed, when Orlando lapses into a long sleep for the first time after his affair with Sasha is aborted, the narrator questions Orlando's long sleep and likens it to death.

> Has the finger of death to be laid on the tumult of life from time to time lest it rend us asunder? Are we so made that we have to take death in small doses daily or we could not go on with the business of living? . . . Had Orlando, worn out by the extremity of his suffering, died for a week, and then come to life again? (32)

Orlando's sleep in Constantinople is like his death and when he wakes up again, he is reborn for a new life as Orlando experiences new feelings related to the fact of being a woman. Actually, Orlando's sea voyage back to England as a woman is regarded as her new life. "The journey by ship across a large body of water serves as a metaphoric, mythic initiation into the woman's world" (Harrison 60). Yet, a new Orlando is not completely new. She/he keeps the memories of her/his previous life: "her memory . . . went back through all the events of her past life without encountering any obstacle" (67). Bakhtin claims that during the carnival the "old world that has been destroyed is offered together with the new world and is represented with it as the dying part of the dual body" (*Rabelais* 410).

Orlando's androgynous mind and her/his sleep add an element of fantasticality to the novel. "Orlando's gender transformations are truly (and doubly) fantastic: not only is the reader unable to reach a final explanation for his/her changes in gender, but that gender itself remains indeterminate" (Booker 170). This is another aspect of the novel's participation in the Menippean satire, which embraces a fantastic turn in itself. As Booker claims, similar to the Menippean satire, having a fantastic element in *Orlando* has its function of expressing serious content. "Woolf's playfully fantastic anti-biography is not stupid stuff at all, but an effective assault on contemporary social conventions" (Booker 170) that try to impose narrow frames on people's sex, gender and subjectivity.

What should be underlined is that Orlando is not a fusion of two genders. In fact, she/he shatters the idea of gender division. Orlando is a being who does not acquire the sense of gender difference.

> Indeed, if Orlando's identity is androgynous, that androgyny is mobile, not static: presenting not a smooth synthesis of oppositions but a more chaotic hermaphroditic 'intermix,' Orlando's gender – and her desires – constantly change. Fluid and dynamic, Orlando both responds to and eludes gender imperatives and sexual codes that shape Western culture from the Renaissance to the early years of the twentieth century. (Kaivola 235)

One moment she/he is a woman and the next she/he is a man. Orlando embraces both biological sexes and this confuses ordinary gender perceptions. Orlando constitutes a frame into which both sexes are inserted and this whole resists gender-specific characteristics. Neither the feminine gender nor the masculine one predominates in Orlando; she/he rejects gender categories by creating an androgynous being. Orlando renders problematic the concept of gender altogether.

> The curious of her own sex would argue, for example, if Orlando was a woman, how did she never take more than ten minutes to dress? . . . And then they would say, still, she has none of the formality of a man, or a man's love of power. She is excessively tender-hearted. . . . Yet, again, they noted, she detested household matters, was up at dawn and out among the fields . . .

> Whether, then, Orlando was most man or woman, it is difficult to say and cannot now be decided. (93)

Orlando's mind is depicted as something causing wealth of experience. Flying back and forth from one sex to another is a vital factor causing greatness of vision of the world.

> She had, it seems, no difficulty in sustaining the different parts, for her sex changed far more frequently than those who have worn only one set of clothing can conceive; nor can there be any doubt that she reaped a twofold harvest by this device; the pleasures of life were increased and its experiences multiplied. For the probity of breeches she exchanged the seductiveness of petticoats and enjoyed the love of both sexes equally. (108)

As was discussed above, in *A Room of One's Own* Woolf points out the possibility of observing the richness of the world if looked at by an androgynous mind. Woolf integrates this idea in *Orlando* and makes her protagonist experience the "vastness and variety of the world" (*Room* 114). Orlando experiences the world both as a woman and as a man and as a result, she/he can perceive the world from all various angles. She/he "seemed to vacillate; she was man; she was woman; she knew the secrets, shared the weaknesses of each" (77). In fact, besides the richness of the outer world, Orlando experiences the richness of the inner world as she/he is seen to hold a multiplicity of selves. "Then she called hesitatingly, as if the person she wanted might not be there, 'Orlando?' For if there are (at a venture) seventy-six different times all ticking in the mind at once, how many different people are there not – Heaven help us – all having lodgement at one time or another in the human spirit?" (152)

As time goes by, as a woman, Orlando starts to feel the difficulties she has never experienced as a man. When she is on board of a ship and travels home from Constantinople, she forgets she is a woman and "tossed her foot impatiently, and showed an inch or two of calf" (77). The consequence is close to disaster. "A sailor on the mast, who happened to look down at the moment, started so violently that he missed his footing and only saved himself by the skin of his teeth" (77). This makes

Orlando become cognizant of the fact that people around her judge her according to normative gender roles in society. Orlando is forced to understand that as a woman she has to behave according to the social roles imposed upon women. “I must, in all humanity, keep them [legs] covered” (77). This scene shows that Orlando’s mind is not organized according to the commonly accepted gender roles.

> And I shall never be able to crack a man over the head, or tell him he lies in his teeth, or draw my sword and run him through the body, or sit among my peers, or wear a coronet, or walk in procession, or sentence a man to death, or lead an army, or prance down Whitehall on a charger, or wear seventy-two different medals on my breast. All I can do, once I set foot on English soil, is to pour out tea and ask my lords how they like it. D’you take sugar. D’you take cream? (77)

Orlando starts to see clearly the boundaries between the genders; she sees the difference between the male and the female activities. Baber and Allen state that the “inequity of gender roles was apparent to Orlando, as she thought of pouring tea in London” (76). Harrison claims that according to Woolf, “[a] woman’s identity, . . . is defined negatively, by what she cannot do” (61). Orlando, indeed, critiques the gender boundaries.

> To fall from a mast-head . . . because you see a woman’s ankles; to dress up like a Guy Fawkes and parade the streets, so that women may praise you; to deny a woman teaching lest she may laugh at you; to be the slave of the frailest chit in petticoats, and yet to go about as if you were the Lords of creation – Heavens! . . . what fools they make of us – what fools we are! (77)

Orlando’s difficulty in wearing women’s clothes intensifies the stress the novel lays upon the idea that the outward manifestations such as clothes are just social constructions. Orlando was

> dragged down by the weight of the crinoline which she had submissively adopted. It was heavier and more drab than any dress she had yet worn. None had ever so impeded her movements. No longer could she stride through the garden with her dogs, or run lightly to the high mound and fling herself

> beneath the oak tree. Her skirts collected damp leaves and straw. The plumed hat tossed on the breeze. The thin shoes were quickly soaked and mud-caked. Her muscles had lost their pliancy. She became nervous lest there should be robbers behind the wainscot and afraid, for the first time in her life, of ghosts in the corridors. (121)

Orlando feels the heavy impediments to her physical freedom and mental obstacles to her spiritual freedom. Here the novel foregrounds "the variety of restrictions imposed upon women" (Transue 119). Orlando realizes the difficulty of being a woman by losing her ability to move freely in any place. It suggests the fact that what is expected of a woman is lack of mobility. Another aspect that is suggested is the idea of a woman's need for a supporter. Orlando's inability to move freely in women's clothes inevitably leads to a sense of deficiency. Orlando starts to feel fear; she becomes afraid of robbers and ghosts. Orlando's inability to feel comfortable in women's clothes underlines the idea that a woman does not need to wear feminine clothes.

Additionally, Orlando's female sex makes her understand the way some women act which she was not able to comprehend when she was a man. For example, after becoming a woman, Orlando understands the motive that leads Sasha to escape Orlando.

> [H]owever much landing there meant comfort, meant opulence, meant consequence and state . . . still, if it meant conventionality, meant slavery, meant deceit, meant denying her love, fettering her limbs, pursing her lips, and restraining her tongue, then she would turn about with the ship and set sail once more for the gipsies. (80)

Orlando puts herself in Sasha's shoes and feels the patriarchal oppression women experience. She understands the limits women encounter throughout their lives. As a woman, Orlando starts to feel the pressure of marriage institution. Living in the nineteenth century, in a Victorian environment, Orlando has to submit to the common sense that demands marriage from women. "Though the seat of her trouble seemed to be the left hand, she could feel herself poisoned through and through, and

was forced at length to consider the most desperate of remedies, which was to yield completely and submissively to the spirit of the age, and take a husband" (120).

B. Ambivalent/androgynous/grotesque bodies: Orlando, Sasha and the Archduchess/Archduke

In *Orlando* Woolf plays with the notion of the body; she feels absolutely free to make her characters change sexes or physical appearance. "Virginia Woolf is a very physical critic just as the physiology of the body was to be her fictional motif" (Humm 135). Body constitutes an appropriate tableau on which Woolf inscribes her ideas. "Woolf uses a physiology of the body in her syntax and characterization to stand for her intellectual ideas" (Humm 140). Thus, Orlando's, Sasha's and the Archduchess/Archduke's bodies acquire a fluid nature in Woolf's hands. By playing with the shapes of the bodies. Woolf subverts conventional ideas of human subjectivity and presents her characters through their changeable physique.

Orlando is presented as a figure of both sexes as "he" becomes "she" in the middle of the story. At the beginning of the novel, Orlando is depicted as a boy. Some of his behaviour betray characteristics that are traditionally attributed to men in society. He is violent as he is seen "in the act of slicing at the head of a Moor which swung from the rafters" (5). "Orlando's swinging at the head with his sword links him with a long line of imperialist ancestors, underscoring his masculinity" (Kaivola 252). He wants to be like his ancestors. "Orlando's fathers had ridden in fields of asphodel, and stony fields, and fields watered by strange rivers, and they had struck many heads of many colours off many shoulders, and brought them back to hang from the rafters. So too would Orlando, he vowed" (5).

Notwithstanding the scenes in which Orlando is pictured as a masculine or a feminine character, there are instances where Orlando's androgynous body is emphasised. At the beginning of the novel, when Orlando is a boy of sixteen, there is an ambiguity about his appearance. "He – for there could be no doubt of his sex, though the fashion of the time did something to disguise it – was in the act of slicing

at the head of a Moor which swung from the rafters" (5). The narrator/biographer feels the urge to remind the reader that Orlando is a boy because his clothes seem to disguise his sex. Ryan states that such an urge makes the narrator/biographer challenge the stability of the male/female binary (103). According to Ryan, the narrator/biographer's statement underlines the possibility of doubts about the sex of the protagonist. In this way, the narrator/biographer unsettles the sharp distinctions between sex and gender at the onset of the novel. Orlando's clothes that suggest a feminine image and his acts that suggest violence present a scene pregnant with grotesque meaning as an image of a feminine body produces an image of a masculine act and vice versa. The continuous performance of the same act of slicing in this scene suggests perpetual transformation of one image into the other: masculine into the feminine and vice versa.

Orlando's physical appearance is described in a carnivalesque manner because the narrator/biographer plays with the conventional ways of describing a character. When Orlando is a boy he is described in a way through which women are traditionally described. The most striking feature which is continuously mentioned by the narrator about Orlando is his legs. The first part of the body that the biographer mentions when she/he describes Orlando is his "shapely legs" (5). As Ellen Bayuk Rosenman states, "women, not men, were appreciated for their shapely legs" (642). Then, the biographer goes on: "The red of the cheeks was covered with peach down; . . . he had eyes like drenched violets, . . . and a brow like the swelling of a marble dome" (6). Orlando is a grotesque image because as a man he has shapely legs and his face is described through the invocation of fruits and flowers. In this way, the biographer's carnivalesque discourse becomes evident; she/he transgresses gender-specific descriptions by picturing a man through the images of fruits and flowers, which are conventionally used to describe women. Moreover, the narrative starts with the narrator's description of violence Orlando demonstrates and smoothly moves on to the description of Orlando's tender legs and face. As Kaivola states, the biographer, by doing so, "calls his masculinity into question" (252).

Orlando's change of sex takes place in Constantinople, which is a symbolical location. As Pawlowski states, the city suggests the spatial instability because the "boundaries between East and West dissolve;" two continents merge. She thus suggests the city's power to destabilize gender conventions; it is the place "where buildings seem to float above ground defying fixity" (xix). Pawlowski, in fact, suggests the atmosphere's power to blur all distinctions and clearcut boundaries. It is in Constantinople that the biographer loses all his sources for Orlando's story and thus leaving the protagonist's biography in the mist. "[T]he revolution which broke out during his period of office, and the fire which followed, have so damaged or destroyed all those papers from which any trustworthy record could be drawn, that what we can give is lamentably incomplete" (58). The reasons behind the loss of biographical details are instability in the city, revolution and fire. Compared with the narration of England, the narration of Constantinople suggests chaos and uncertainty because of the citizens' activities and the "wild panorama" (59) observable in the city. "With its elusive mists and rounded domes, Constantinople is thus a privileged sign in Woolf's imagination for a complex web of associations among gender, race, and an emerging lesbian sexuality" (Kaivola 249).

Indeed, the environment in which Orlando's metamorphosis takes place is not an ordinary one. As an ambassador, Orlando organizes entertainment due to his new position of Dukedom. "The night was fine; the crowd immense, and the windows of the Embassy brilliantly illuminated. . . . people of all nationalities 'were packed like herrings in a barrel' in the courtyard" (61). The ordinary life conditions are suspended and people gather to watch Orlando's entertainment activities. Yet, even this scene is unsettled because "a great uproar rose" (63). So there is a suspension of a planned temporality within another suspension of everyday life. The revolution in the city disrupts the citizens' entertainment which disrupts their normal flow of life. "Bells began ringing; the harsh cries of the prophets were heard above the shouts of the people; many Turks fell flat to the ground and touched the earth with their foreheads. A door burst open. The natives pressed into the banqueting-rooms. Women shrieked" (63). There is an atmosphere of absolute chaos. The voices and

noises mix; the manifestations of higher spiritual system is not able to censure people's voices. The routine religious ceremonies are unsettled because the Turks abandon the rules of praying and fall to the ground. The boundary between the natives and the English that was erected during the entertainment is transgressed; the natives are seen in the space allocated for the Europeans. A woman, for example, "apparently of the peasant class, was drawn up by means of a rope" to Orlando's room where "they embraced passionately" (64). Later on, during Orlando's long sleep, the document signifying their marriage was found on Orlando's table.

> It was nothing less, indeed, than a deed of marriage, drawn up, signed, and witnessed between his Lordship, Orlando, Knight of the Garter, . . . and Rosina Pepita, a dancer, father unknown, but reputed a gipsy, mother also unknown but reputed a seller of old iron in the marketplace over against the Galata Bridge. (64)

So, there is a fusion of two realms, the aristocratic space and the marketplace of the Galata Bridge. Such a fusion loosens the tight notions of social categories such as social classes and races and prepares a suitable background for Orlando's fluid subjectivity and sex. Hence, Orlando moves from one class into another and merges with people from other nations.

The Archduchess/Archduke presents an ambivalent/grotesque body because she/he is a man disguised as a woman. Orlando sees a female figure in his house, but this figure's behaviour is not compatible with the behaviour that is expected of a lady. "Any other woman thus caught in a Lord's private grounds would have been afraid; any other woman with that face, headdress, and aspect would have thrown her mantilla across her shoulders to hide it" (55). Besides his/her behaviour that suggests gender ambivalence, the Archduchess/Archduke is portrayed in a grotesque manner by being associated with an animal. Indeed, Lisa Rado claims that the Archduchess has a "grotesque physique" (163).

> For this lady resembled nothing so much as a hare; a hare startled, but obdurate; a hare whose timidity is overcome by an immense and foolish audacity; a hare that sits upright and glowers at its pursuer with great, bulging

> eyes; with ears erect but quivering, with nose pointed, but twitching. This hare, moreover, was six feet high and wore a headdress into the bargain of some antiquated kind which made her look still taller. (55)

Moreover, Orlando even doubts her integrity as a sane human being assigning the attributes of her behaviour to a lunatic. She has "such a cackle of nervous laughter, so much tee-heeing and haw-hawing that Orlando thought she must have escaped from a lunatic asylum" (55).

According to Bakhtin, juxtaposition of human and animal characteristics is a grotesque image (*Rabelais* 316). The body "is blended with the world, with animals, with objects" (*Rabelais* 27). Bakhtin stresses the importance of the grotesque body's merging with the rest of the world. And bringing animal and human characteristics into one image is a way to erase the boundaries between a separate human body and nature. Indeed, the phrase "bulging eyes" in Woolf's extract above is seen in Bakhtin's discussion of the grotesque body; when Bakhtin states that some of the bodily parts link the body to "the world outside," he mentions eyes as the organs that display this link between the body and the world – "the bulging eyes manifest a purely bodily tension" (*Rabelais* 317). Moreover, Bakhtin stresses the importance of a nose as a link between the body and the world. He states that the nose "play[s] the most important part in the grotesque image of the body" (*Rabelais* 316). Bakhtin adds that a nose "always symbolizes the phallus" (*Rabelais* 316). It suggests Bakhtin's discussion of the notion of degradation in grotesque imagery. "To degrade . . . means to concern oneself with the lower stratum of the body, the life of the belly and the reproductive organs" (*Rabelais* 21). So associating a nose with phallus is the degradation of the head (a nose being a part of the head) an organ usually associated with thinking. Thus, the pointed nose in Woolf's extract can be associated with phallus. What is more, this nose twitches in Woolf's extract; the twitching nose can be seen as phallus which is not certain of itself. In this way, the image of Harriet/Harry in Woolf's extract can be seen as a grotesque image and can be read as a manifestation of an androgynous character. She/he is resembled to an animal, is

linked to the outside world through bulging eyes and a twitching nose. And the twitching nose symbolizes her/his transgression of gender-specific elements.

The atmosphere where Orlando and the Archduchess/Archduke come together and spend time later on in the novel is infused with the carnival sense of the world. Because they have nothing to do in common, they decide to gamble in order to kill time. "Indeed, Orlando was at her wit's end what to talk about and had she not bethought her of a game called Fly Loo, at which great sums of money can be lost with very little expense of spirit, she would have had to marry him" (89). The game they play is a parody of gambling. The game needed "only three lumps of sugar and a sufficiency of flies" (89). The seriousness of the possibility of losing all the possessions that is present during the gambling is deflated in Orlando's game through the necessity of sugar and flies. Yet, the issue of money is present. "For now, the Archduke would bet her five hundred pounds to a tester that a fly should settle on this lump and not on that" (89). According to Bakhtin, gambling is "the special nuance of carnivalization" in a work because it throws the characters into a crisis time, a time when their lives can totally change (*Dostoevsky* 171). Indeed, the Archduchess/Archduke's life changes because he realizes Orlando's joke played on him. "She caught a blue-bottle, gently pressed the life out of it . . . and secured it by a drop of gum arabic to a lump of sugar. While the Archduke was gazing at the ceiling, she deftly substituted this lump for the one she had laid her money on" (89). Orlando cheats him and when he becomes aware of it, he leaves her.

> When he realized the truth at last, a painful scene ensued. The Archduke rose to his full height. He coloured scarlet. Tears rolled down his cheeks one by one. That she had won a fortune from him was nothing – she was welcome to it; that she had deceived him was something – it hurt him to think her capable of it; but that she had cheated at Loo was everything. To love a woman who cheated at play was, he said, impossible. (90)

Orlando's behaviour disrupts the environment that itself has already disrupted the normal flow of life. There is a game in a game in this scene. Moreover, the Archduke's behaviour is evidence for the uncertainty of his gender identity. Being a

man, the Archduke does not feel any obstacles to love another man, Orlando, but starts to reveal his sense of profound masculinity when cheated in a game by a woman. “Happily, he said, recovering slightly, there were no witnesses. She was, after all, only a woman, he said” (90). Yet, the tears he sheds at the recognition of Orlando’s cheating, throw his masculinity into doubt once more.

B.1 Androgynous sexuality in *Orlando*

As Maggie Humm pinpoints, Woolf’s “revisions of . . . patriarchal, conservative sexuality are most explicit in *Orlando*” (133). The sexuality of the characters in *Orlando* is important evidence of their androgyny. The characters’ sexual behaviour in the novel does not fit into heteronormative standards of sexuality according to which, as Alexandra Howson claims, “attraction to the opposite sex (heterosexuality) is the default sexuality attributed to people” (53). The novel’s approach to sexuality problematizes the neat division of human beings into two opposite sexes. “The ‘natural attitude’ towards sex and gender in the West assumes that people belong to one of the two possible distinct categories determined on the basis of given biological and anatomical characteristics (that is, *either* male *or* female, *either* masculine *or* feminine)” (Howson 53). Orlando and the Archduchess/Archduke are the two characters whose sexuality is ambivalent.

Orlando’s sex or choice of gender does not prevent him/her from breeding feelings of love or passion towards the members of the same sex. Orlando’s first encounter with the Russian Princess Marousha Stanilovska Dagmar Natasha Iliana Romanovitch, whom Orlando calls Sasha, takes place when Orlando is a young man. Indeed, the name Orlando gives to the Russian girl is a male name, which, according to Booker, emphasizes “that Sasha’s gender is highly uncertain” (182). Orlando’s first seeing her is described as a series of uncertainties about Sasha’s sex. Orlando sees “a figure, which, whether boy’s or woman’s, for the loose tunic and trousers of the Russian fashion served to disguise the sex, filled him with the highest curiosity” (17). Orlando cannot perceive Sasha’s sex at first and although Orlando thinks Sasha

is a boy, he still feels attracted to her. “When the boy, for alas, a boy it must be – no woman could skate with such speed and vigour – swept almost on tiptoe past him, Orlando was ready to tear his hair with vexation that the person was of his own sex” (17). Indeed, the narrator’s description of Sasha’s physical appearance does not help to define her sex; her sex is ambivalent for the reader. “The person, whatever the name or sex, was about middle height, very slenderly fashioned” (17). What is more, the biographer focuses more on Sasha’s seductiveness rather than on trying to understand her sex. “But these details [about Sasha] were obscured by the extraordinary seductiveness which issued from the whole person” (17). Such a description underlines the fact that the narrator has an androgynous mind. Sasha’s seductiveness, according to Rado, “consists not in her sexual body but in her transcendence of conventional categories of identity” (162). Sasha attracts Orlando precisely by her ambivalence of sexual identity and this fact intensifies the idea that Orlando’s mind is androgynous. When Orlando becomes a woman, her passion towards Sasha does not change. She understands that “it was still a woman she loved” (79). Orlando even feels the development of her feelings to Sasha because of her understanding of Sasha’s emotions. Orlando’s being a woman just “quicken[s] and deepen[s] those feelings which she had had as a man” (79).

The setting in which Sasha and Orlando meet creates a suitable background against which it is easier to accommodate Sasha’s ambivalent sex. The setting is not an ordinary one. It is a carnival on the river Thames during the Great Frost. “London enjoyed a carnival of the utmost brilliancy” (15). The idea of being on the water adds great extraordinariness to the setting because the ground is not stable; it is prone to fracture. The king “directed that the river, . . . should be swept, decorated and given all the semblance of a park or pleasure ground, with arbours, mazes, alleys, drinking booths” (16). Similar to Sasha’s changeable physical appearance, the setting is not fixed or definitely defined because the river is only given a semblance of certain places. Moreover, the atmosphere is infused with the sense of the carnival. Normal activities are suspended and the public watches various performances on the stage.

Although the atmosphere of the carnival fails to melt the boundaries between the classes because the crowd and the noble class are spatially separated, the discourse of the aristocratic atmosphere among the nobility is disrupted by Sasha's presence. Throughout the novel Sasha's background is not certain. She is presented as a Princess, but Orlando sometimes notices some behaviour that betrays her lower origin. He once sees her "gnawing a candle-end in a corner, which she had picked from the floor. . . . Was there not, he thought, handing her on to the ice, something rank in her, something coarse flavoured, something peasant born?" (24) Moreover, her way of speech can be accepted as evidence for Orlando's doubts. "Who were those bumpkins, she asked him [Orlando], who sat beside her with the manners of stablemen? . . . Was that figure of fun at the end of the table with her hair rigged up like a Maypole . . . really the Queen? And did the King always slobber like that?" (19) Sasha deflates the noble men by her humorous attitude towards them. Her tendency to deflate the aristocratic air at the table is seen in her opposing the seriousness of the nobility. The dichotomy of comedy and seriousness is shattered in this scene. While the aristocracy represent seriousness, Sasha represents comedy and thus, the low layers of society; the poles are merged at the dinner table. Hence, it is possible to state that Sasha unsettles the aristocratic ambiance of the dinner table both by her probably low origin and by her discourse. Indeed, Orlando cannot help laughing, too. "Though these questions rather discomposed Orlando at first, they were put with such archness and drollery that he could not help but laugh" (19). Thus, the carnival atmosphere of the setting and Sasha's humorous discourse that disrupts the high aristocratic atmosphere of the royal table enrich the picture in which Sasha's sex seems uncertain.

Orlando's androgynous subjectivity is also revealed through her/his sexuality with reference to the Archduchess/Archduke Harriet/Harry Griselda of Finster-Aahorn and Scandop-Boom in the Roumanian territory. When Orlando meets the Archduchess/Archduke Harriet/Harry, a man disguised as a woman, Orlando cannot help being attracted to her: he becomes "suddenly and violently overcome by passion of some sort" (56). It is true that Orlando is not aware of the

Archduchess/Archduke's real sex; he thinks the Archduchess/Archduke is a woman and when the latter approaches Orlando, there is an interaction of passion between them. Orlando is "sexually aroused and thus sexually 'exposed'" (Rado 163). The scene is the manifestation of the fluidity of genders and the possibility of mutual attraction between people regardless of their sexes.

When Orlando is a woman she feels sexually attracted to other women. Orlando acquires a habit of wandering around in man's clothes. "It was a little out of fashion, indeed, but it fitted her to perfection and dressed in it she looked the very figure of a noble Lord" (106). Orlando's such disguise and masquerade invokes the carnival sense of the world because, according to Bakhtin, among the carnivalistic images there is an image of "[m]en . . . transvested as women and vice versa" (*Rabelais* 410-411). According to Bakhtin, people's change from men to women and vice versa is a carnivalistic image because carnivals are the time of negation of the existing order. And changing from men into women during carnivals is the concrete demonstration of this negation. "Negation in popular-festive imagery has never an abstract logical character. It is always something obvious, tangible" (*Rabelais* 410). Similarly, Woolf's making Orlando a woman masquerade as a man is her negation of the fixity of sexual identity. "'Disguise' is a play with the boundary between seeming and being, blurring their sharp distinction and opening up a space of heterogeneity within unitary being" (Minow-Pinkney 132). Hence, Orlando's masquerade is revealing of the presence of two genders in one body. It is the physical demonstration of an androgynous mind. "The recurrent disguises are another enactment of the impossible concept of androgyny, a literal realisation of the heterogeneity of sexuality by metonymical movement" (Minow-Pinkney 132).

During one of her wanderings, Orlando meets Nell, a prostitute, who takes Orlando to her lodgings. "To feel her hanging lightly yet like a suppliant on her arm, roused in Orlando all the feelings which become a man" (106). Since Orlando feels like a man, a woman can affect him passionately. Furthermore, when Orlando meets Marmaduke Bonthrop Shelmerdine, who becomes her husband, she realizes that he, too, has both sexes in him. "'You're a woman, Shel!' she cried. 'You're a man,

Orlando!' he cried" (124). The novel stresses sexuality as a force inevitably transgressing gender boundaries. It foregrounds the normalcy of such a transgression and subverts the heteronormative understanding of the divisions between genders. In this vein, the marriage of Orlando and Shel is not a conventional one. "Marriage as it had existed through the ages, with the male and female joining but not changing their preordained images, fails in Virginia Woolf's ideal androgynous world" (Heilbrun 163). As Minow-Pinkney states, when Orlando and Shel recognize each other as androgynous beings, they are not in disguise; disguise "is no longer necessary: even without it Orlando recognises a woman in Shel, Shel a man in Orlando. They reject an apparent unitariness of sex that is only held in place by clothes as signifying systems" (132). What is more, Woolf presents Orlando's and Shel's recognition of each other in terms of sex in a humorous way. The characters' humorous acceptance of each other's sex and gender transgression underlines Woolf's insistence on the idea that human subjectivity is fluid and impossible to fix. "Woolf's insistence upon masquerade throughout the text signals her intent to challenge society's assumption about sexuality" (Pawlowski xiii).

The Archduchess/Archduke's sexuality is also ambivalent. Normally, the Archduchess/Archduke is a man, the Archduke Harry, who falls in love with Orlando although he knows that Orlando is a man: "he had seen a portrait of Orlando and fallen hopelessly in love with him" (88). Therefore, he disguises as a woman and presents herself/himself to Orlando as the Archduchess Harriet. Yet, Orlando escapes him/her and goes to Constantinople. When Orlando becomes a woman and comes back, the Archduchess/Archduke comes to Orlando's mansion again and reveals himself as a man. When Orlando "turned to present the Archduchess with the salver . . . in her place stood a tall gentleman in black" (87). The Archduke's love and passion for Orlando does not cease. He follows Orlando everywhere she goes and he even rescues her once from the hands of the mob and "tradesmen's wives" who are aware of the fact that "ladies are not supposed to walk in public places alone" and try to bother her (94). The Archduke saves her and presents her a jewel as a sign of his proposal (94). The Archduchess/Archduke's passion towards Orlando transgresses

the gender boundary and disregards the sex binary. Moreover, he/she disregards the age boundary, too, because he/she is "his [Orlando's] elder by many years" (56).

C. Other grotesque images

Besides grotesque images in *Orlando*, which are analysed in terms of gender hierarchies and their transgression, the novel encapsulates some other grotesque images that enrich the carnivalesque aspect of Woolf's novel. To start with, the head of a Moor with which Orlando plays at the beginning of the novel is a grotesque image because it embraces both horror and laughter. "It was the colour of an old football, and more or less the shape of one, save for the sunken cheeks and a strand or two of coarse, dry hair, like the hair on a cocoanut. . . . grinned at him [Orlando] through shrunk, black lips triumphantly" (5). The head is the symbol of horror because it still carries the elements of a living human being. For example, it reveals the Moor's race and sex. The insertion of this image of the head intensifies Orlando's violence and magnifies the greatness of his ancestors. In other words, it presents masculine harshness, tyranny and despotism. On the other hand, the head grins in a triumphant way. It laughs back at Orlando who slices it continuously. It demonstrates the destruction of an idea that there is only one way of looking at an object. In other words, the head's grinning depicts the possibility of variety. While a Moor's head would directly suggest the binary between the European and the "other" races, or the power relations between them, the head's grinning depicts the possibility that a Moor can grin at a European man triumphantly.

The Queen is also another grotesque image in *Orlando*. Orlando's first encounter with the Queen is mainly presented through Orlando's perception of the parts of her body.

> It was a memorable hand; a thin hand with long fingers always curling as if round orb or sceptre; a nervous, crabbed, sickly hand; a commanding hand, too; a hand that had only to raise itself for a head to fall; a hand, he guessed, attached to an old body that smelt like a cupboard in which furs are kept in

> camphor; which body was yet caparisoned in all sorts of brocades and gems; and held itself very upright though perhaps in pain from sciatica; and never flinched though strung together by a thousand fears; and the Queen's eyes were light yellow. (9)

In another scene, again, the Queen's body is described as if it is an object. The Queen pulls Orlando

> down among the cushions where her women had laid her (she was so worn and old) and made him burry his face in that astonishing composition – she had not changed her dress for a month – which smelt for all the world, he thought, recalling his boyish memory, like some old cabinet at home where his mother's furs were stored. He rose, half suffocated from the embrace. (11)

Portraying the parts of the Queen's body in this sense can be discussed in the light of Bakhtinian grotesque image of dismemberment which Bakhtin finds widely used in carnivalized literature. Bakhtin calls such a technique "carnival anatomy," "an enumeration of the parts of the dismembered body" (*Dostoevsky* 162). Bakhtin states that such "enumerations" "were a widespread comic device in the carnivalized literature of the Renaissance (it is met very often in Rabelais, and in a somewhat less developed form in Cervantes)" (*Dostoevsky* 162). For Bakhtin, such enumeration of the body parts is an act of decrowning, shattering the integrity of an individual. Hence, in the above-mentioned scenes, the member of the noble class is decrowned in a humorous manner. Such scenes are the acts of "*tearing to pieces*" of an authority figure (*Dostoevsky* 162). Bakhtin provides an example from Rabelais's novel where one of the inhabitants of the island of the Catchpoles is beaten. "They laid on so heartily that blood spurted from his mouth, nose, ears and eyes. Catchpole was beaten to a pulp; his shoulders dislocated; his head, neck, back and breast pounded into mince-meat" (qtd. in *Rabelais* 201).

Such images add humour to the novel. Indeed, Harrison calls Woolf's *Orlando* a "comic work[] whose energy is fuelled by humour" (81). Comedy and humour in the novel are interspersed among the serious subject matter and this situation makes it possible to view *Orlando* in the light of the Menippea. According

to Bakhtin, Menippea as a carnivalized genre certainly includes "the comic element" (*Dostoevsky* 114) which is an indispensable element of the carnival. As Booker states, "obviously comedy plays a large role in *Orlando*, probably more so than in any other of Woolf's novels" (168). Booker adds that the novel "has its serious as well as its comic elements" (168-169) which, according to Bakhtin is a significant feature of the Menippea.

There are some other grotesque portrayals of characters in the novel. Sasha, for example, is likened to different non-human bodies. When Orlando sees Sasha for the first time, he cannot define her. "He called her a melon, a pineapple, an olive tree, an emerald, and a fox in the snow" (17). For Orlando, Sasha "was like a fox, or an olive tree; like the waves of the sea when you look down upon them from a height; like an emerald; like the sun on a green hill which is yet clouded – like nothing he had seen or known in England" (21-22). Moreover, the different names by which Orlando calls Sasha also stem from the difficulty to identify Sasha's sex. Orlando also likens a Russian seaman, whom he meets on the ship, to an animal. "The man was huge; stood six feet four in his stockings; wore common wire rings in his ears; and looked like a dray horse upon which some wren or robin has perched in its flight" (24). Such images suggest Woolf's insistence on the idea that human subjectivity is quite remote from being stable. She pinpoints the characters' changeable physical appearance to underline the fact that sometimes it is difficult to draw a boundary between the world of the human beings and that of the non-human beings. The insertion of such images in the novel gives force to Woolf's attempt to challenge the conventional notions of human subjectivity. While she tries to unsettle the fixed and stable human subjectivity in terms of her notion of androgyny, her disruption of the God-image of a human being is done through the merging of the human and non-human traits.

The Great Frost during which Orlando meets Sasha, turns people into various objects. Some people become frozen and turn to stones.

> The severity of the frost was so extraordinary that a kind of petrifaction sometimes ensued; and it was commonly supposed that the great increase of

> rocks in some parts of Derbyshire was due to no eruption, . . . but to the solidification of unfortunate wayfarers who had been turned literally to stone where they stood. The Church could give little help in the matter, and though some landowners had these relics blessed, the most part preferred to use them either as landmarks, scratching-posts for sheep, or, when the form of the stone allowed, drinking troughs for cattle, which purposes they serve, admirably for the most part, to this day. (15)

So the people turn into facility objects. Their bodies are used for various functions. What is more, by discussing these images the narrator stresses the fact that what people believe in can sometimes be just an illusion. While people believe that the stones are the results of a natural phenomenon, the narrator provides an idea that these stones are frozen bodies. Another such image appears in the form of a frozen old woman:

> The old bumboat woman, who was carrying her fruit to market on the Surrey side, sat there in her plaids and farthingales with her lap full of apples, for all the world as if she were about to serve a customer, though a certain blueness about the lips hinted the truth. 'Twas a sight King James specially liked to look upon, and he would bring a troupe of courtiers to gaze with him. In short, nothing could exceed the brilliancy and gaiety of the scene by day. (16)

In these scenes the frozen people encompass two images: terror of death and facility or death and joy. "Time has stopped for the old woman, death in life and life in death, as she sits suspended in glacial, frozen space" (Pawlowski xviii). As Joan Bennett states, "both extremes, the sense of life's magnificence, and the sense of life's ugliness and chaos" (67) are seen in Woolf's scenes.

Orlando includes some images in which the boundary between the human world and animal world is erased. Bakhtin states that "the combination of human and animal traits is . . . one of the most ancient grotesque forms" (*Rabelais* 316). Because the grotesque image is an image of "growth and becoming" (*Rabelais* 24), as Bakhtin claims, the body's growth and its embrace with the rest of the world constitutes a grotesque image. Consequently, when the boundaries between the human beings and

animals are erased, the image of the body becomes grotesque because it opens itself and embraces the outside world. The body "outgrows itself, transgresses its own limits" (*Rabelais* 26). Woolf often delineates her characters in terms of animal imagery. The noble people whom Orlando meets in the aristocratic houses after she becomes a woman are likened to dogs. "They, too, wag their tails, bow, roll, jump, paw, and slobber, but talk they cannot" (96). Despite their aristocratic background, for Orlando these people are nothing more than human beings who resemble dogs.

These grotesque images in *Orlando* constitute a background against which Woolf's idea of androgyny is positioned. Without these grotesque images, Orlando's, Sasha's and the Archduchess/Archduke's androgynous identity would seem excessive. What is more, through these images Woolf challenges such dominant categories like aristocracy, royalty, and people's belief in their uniqueness as human beings and their superiority over the other beings, animals or non-animate objects. As Harrison states, *Orlando* is a "feminist [novel] that cross[es] boundaries, resist[s] hierarchy, def[ies] categories, and embrace[s] paradox, contradiction, and disruption" (57).

To conclude, *Orlando* can be read as Woolf's challenge to the common assumptions of the stability of human beings. Woolf tries to unsettle these assumptions by two main means. Through her notion of androgyny, Woolf makes her characters embrace both sexes and genders to evade gender categorizations. As in Woolf's discussion of an androgynous mind in *A Room of One's Own*, *Orlando* focuses on the androgynous minds of the narrator/biographer and Orlando. The novel can also be regarded as a work in which Woolf transcends the abstractness of her notion of androgyny and practices her ideas in a more concrete sphere. Orlando, Sasha and the Archduchess/Archduke are the three characters whose bodies signify this transcendence towards the ambivalent grotesque body images. In this way, by bringing two sexes into one body, Woolf unsettles the conventional gender categorizations and allows a new perspective in this regard. *Orlando* throws gender division into doubt and emphasizes the fluidity of human subjectivity that allows the balanced juxtaposition of sexes in one body. Hence, what can be deduced from the

novel is the idea that Woolf tries to depict the absurdity of saddling women with feminine responsibilities when the division of human beings into opposing genders is highly problematic. In order to emphasize the novel's capacity for carnivalized discourse, some other grotesque images are also analysed and discussed in this chapter. The novel is replete with images in which the human body is transformed into different objects, animals or metaphorically torn to pieces. Such images suggest the fluidity of the body which in turn contribute to the novel's emphasis on gender transgression. Such flexible bodies and ambivalent sexes in *Orlando* allow the reading of the novel against the background of Bakhtinian carnivalistic grotesque imagery, which is marked by the sense of becoming, incompleteness, ambivalence and perpetual transformation.

CHAPTER VI

CONCLUSION

The pervasive pessimistic mood in Virginia Woolf's literary oeuvre as well as the lyric mode that she famously employs in most of her novels might make it look like an impossible project to study her fiction in the light of Bakhtin's gay carnivalistic atmosphere, in which even death is associated with birth and renewal. However, Woolf's sense of humour which she subtly scatters throughout the pages of her novels and her inexhaustible energy to sabotage the predominant patriarchal laws of the universe surrounding her make it possible to analyse her novels from a Bakhtinian perspective. What is more, the enthusiastic critical endeavour for the appropriation of Bakhtin's ideas from feminist perspectives also encourages one to set out for a Bakhtinian analysis of Virginia Woolf's fiction.

Bakhtin's carnival, its gay carnivalistic laughter and the grotesque images constitute a time of celebration for the participants. Carnival is the world turned upside down as all the social and cultural norms are suspended and the participants experience a time of release and pleasure. Woolf's four novels, *The Voyage Out* (1915), *To the Lighthouse* (1927), *Orlando* (1928) and *Flush* (1933) provide the portrayals of characters who have similar experiences; they manage to transgress the boundaries between the inside and the outside at certain moments, have free contact with each other, disregard authority and manifest bodily flexibility.

Throughout her literary career, Virginia Woolf struggled for women's rights. Nearly all her arguments are concluded by declaring that the world is patriarchal and by her offering certain ways of overthrowing the patriarchal system. She constantly reminds the reader of women's domestic oppression and problematizes women's condition in society. This study has shown that Woolf's four novels reveal her desire to challenge the notions of stability and certainty by carnivalizing gender hierarchies

and the notion of the body as a stable unity. The characters of these novels succeed in occupying a space where they are not constrained by the conventions of the patriarchal world and try to eliminate these conventions. Thus, Woolf's desire to create this space, which is analogous to Bakhtin's carnival sense of the world, is possible to explain as her solution to women's oppression by patriarchy. Rachel in *The Voyage Out* spends her time away from London and throughout the novel finds herself in an atmosphere she has never experienced before; she leaves her home, travels by the sea, is kissed by a married man, has a holiday away from England, falls in love, and questions her existence as a woman in a patriarchal society. This shows the changeability of life, which sharply contradicts the life based on certainty, the life that women usually have when they are situated in domesticity. Mrs. Ramsay and Lily Briscoe in *To the Lighthouse* and Elizabeth in *Flush* shatter life's predictability by bringing forth an idea of constant change. They reveal the slippery ground on which the patriarchal authority is positioned. In this way, the idea of stability and certainty is once more shattered. When it comes to *Orlando*, the notion of flux and changeability is transformed onto human subjectivity and the body. Virginia Woolf plays with her characters' bodies by throwing them into the sense of fluidity and flexibility. Neither Orlando's, Sasha's or the Archduchess/Archduke's gender nor their sex is easy to fix or define.

Another finding of this study is that the characters in these four novels can be regarded as carnival participants because they want to escape their ordinary lives and experience a sense of freedom from the constraining norms. The only difference between the carnivalistic elements in Woolf's novels and Bakhtin's carnival sense of the world lies in the disparity between the systems from which Woolf's characters and carnival's participants want to escape. While Bakhtin's study mainly focuses on the ways in which class differences are suspended during carnival, Woolf draws a carnivalesque space where characters, for a while, forget about patriarchy. Nonetheless, Woolf's subtle sense of humour in her novels, the possibility of finding a space where the characters can suspend their everyday existence, Woolf's profound belief in the necessity of constant change in human beings' lives, her disregard for

the idea that a human being has a stable subjectivity, gender and sex, and her humorous attitude towards her characters' bodily shapes which can take the forms of animals or non-human entities show the fact that the ways through which Woolf frees her characters are similar to the ways Bakhtin discusses the carnival sense of the world.

Yet, such a reading of Woolf's novels does not mean that these novels are carnivalesque in a full sense. This study also found that there are some factors making it difficult for one to talk about the complete carnivalistic atmosphere in Woolf's novels. Although Woolf's characters manage to find a space where they can escape the patriarchal dictates, they remain fully cognizant of the ubiquitous nature of patriarchy. Patriarchal laws reach every sphere and it becomes palpable that a special space of freedom is fragile. In this respect, it is possible to read Woolf's novels as the depiction of the ways through which patriarchy can be destroyed. Her fiction is not the portrayal of a completed ideal universe; it is the portrayal of the beginning of the process of building that universe. The novels also suggest that the time for the total destruction of patriarchy perhaps has not come yet. That is why Rachel in *The Voyage Out* dies; or the figures of authority are decrowned mainly in an abstract manner, through the thoughts of the female characters, in *To the Lighthouse* and *Flush*. Mrs Ramsay and Elizabeth lead a mental struggle against men around them. They overcome and decrown the father figures through their ideas which are transformed into behaviour only in some instances. Therefore, a loud act of decrowning of a father figure is not possible in an atmosphere where the patriarchal authority still holds its power. And lastly, that is why Orlando cannot inherit the possessions of her family when he/she becomes a woman. In other words, as Bakhtin claims, the modern world is not possible to turn into a coherent world where people can come together and enjoy their equality and their merging with the rest of the world. He stresses the modern world's tendency to separate human beings from the rest of the world and isolate them from each other. And in this way, people gradually become hostile to each other as it is seen in Woolf's portrayal of women oppressed by the patriarchal laws.

It is beyond the scope of this study to focus on the linguistic features of Woolf's novels in the light of Bakhtin's notion of the carnival. Further studies can focus, for instance, on Bakhtin's heteroglossia and dialogism in Woolf's novels. Woolf's novels are full of dialogic structures in a Bakhtinian sense. For example, in *Night and Day* it is possible to see how the characters struggle against the visions and psychological presence of their ancestors in their minds and how they try to find convincing answers to the demands of conventions. *Mrs Dalloway* depicts Clarissa's and other characters' monologues in which they create a dialogic discussion with their experience. Through a lyrical structure and a stream-of-consciousness style, *The Waves* is a long dialogic structure in which the dialogue is performed among the characters. And Woolf's last novel, *Between the Acts* presents a dialogic structure which takes place in the minds of some of the characters in some scenes. Such a study can gain further depth if carried out with reference to feminist discourse as Woolf's ideas expressed through her fiction are usually directed against patriarchal forces.

To conclude, reading Woolf's novels in the light of Bakhtin's carnival enables one to recognize the wealth of Woolf's fiction in terms of its ways to free women characters from patriarchal oppression. *The Voyage Out*, *To the Lighthouse*, *Orlando* and *Flush* provide a background against which it is possible to see how Woolf carnivalizes gender hierarchies and the notion of the stable body. In this way, Bakhtin's notion of the carnival with its reversed life, acts of crowning and decrowning, laughter and grotesque imagery gains its feminist hue. The fact that both Woolf and Bakhtin were fighting against oppressive systems makes it possible to juxtapose them. Thus, what comes to the fore is that an oppressive ideology always has the same essence although it changes its visible shell. Bakhtin imagines carnival as a space where it is possible to transcend the social divisions between people. Woolf also assigns people's togetherness a high place, but, within the framework of her oeuvre, her characters try to create a healthy union by staying out of gender hierarchy. In short, both authors struggle against the powers that try to divide human beings into separate hierarchical groups and they both imagine a community based

on a balanced and peaceful co-existence of different voices, consciousnesses and bodies.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary sources:

Woolf, Virginia. *Flush*. Oxford University Press, 1998. Print.

---. *Orlando*. Hertfordshire: Wordsworth Classics, 2003. Print.

---. *The Voyage Out*. Oxford University Press, 2009. Print.

---. *To the Lighthouse*. New Delhi: Peacock Books, 2007. Print.

Secondary sources:

Armstrong, Nancy. *Desire and Domestic Fiction: A Political History of the Novel*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1987. Print.

Atkinson, Tiffany. "Introduction." *The Body*. Ed. Tiffany Atkinson. London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005. 1-11. Print.

Baber, Kristine M., Katherine R. Allen. *Women and Families: Feminist reconstructions*. New York: The Guilford Press, 1992. Print.

Bagshaw, Hilary B. P. *Religion in the Thought of Mikhail Bakhtin: Reason and Faith*. Surrey: Ashgate, 2013. Print.

Bakhtin, Mikhail. *Dialogic Imagination*. Ed. Michael Holquist. Trans. Caryl Emerson and Michael Holquist. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1981. Print.

Bakhtin, Mikhail. *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics*. Ed. and trans. Caryl Emerson. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1984. Print.

Bakhtin, Mikhail. *Rabelais and His World*. Trans. by Helene Iswolsky. Indiana University Press, 1984. Print.

Barrett, Michelle. "Introduction." *Virginia Woolf on Women and Writing*. London: Women's Press, 1979. Print.

Bartolomeo, Joseph F. "Restoration and Eighteenth-century Satiric Fiction." *A Companion to Satire: Ancient and Modern*. Ed. Ruben Quintero. Malden: Blackwell Publishing, 2007. 257-275. Print.

Bauer, Dale M. *Feminist Dialogics: A Theory of Failed Community*. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1988. Print.

Bazin, Nancy Topping, Alma Freeman. "The Androgynous Vision." *Women's Studies* 2 (1974): 185-215. *EBSCO*. Web. 1 Dec. 2015.

Beauvoir, Simone de. *The Second Sex.* New York: Vintage Books, 2010. Web. 14 March. 2016. https://nashvillefeministart.files.wordpress.com/2014/06/1949_simone-de-beauvoir-the-second-sex.pdf

Bennett, Joan. *Virginia Woolf: Her Art as a Novelist*. Cambridge University Press, 1964. Print.

Birke, Lynda. *Feminism and the Biological Body*. Edinburgh University Press, 1999. Print.

Booker, Keith. *Techniques of Subversion in Modern Literature: Transgression, Abjection, and the Carnivalesque.* Gainesville: University of Florida Press, 1991. Print.

Bowlby, Rachel. *Feminist Destinations and Further Essays on Virginia Woolf.* Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1997. Print.

Brooks, Peter. *Body Work: Objects of Desire in Modern Narrative*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1993. Print.

Caine, Barbara. "Feminist Biography and Feminist History." *Women's History Review* 3.2 (1994): 247-261. *EBSCO.* Web. 14 Oct. 2015.

Coltrane, Scott. *Gender and Families*. Thousand Oaks: Pine Forge Press, 1998. Print.

Cregan, Kate. *Key Concepts in Body and Society*. Los Angeles: Sage, 2012. *EBSCO*. Web. 4 June 2015.

Dentith, Simon. *Bakhtinian Thought*. London: Routledge, 1995. Print.

Drobot, Irina-Ana. "The Image of the Father in Virginia Woolf and Graham Swift." *Scientific Journal of Humanistic Studies* 5.9 (2013): 67-71. *ESBCO*. Web. 5 May 2015.

Edwards, Anthony T. "Historicizing the Popular Grotesque: Bakhtin's *Rabelais and His World* and Attic Old Comedy." *Bakhtin and the Classics*. Ed. R. Bracht Branham. Evaston: Northwestern University Press, 2002. 27-55. Print.

Emerson, Caryl. "Coming to Terms With Bakhtin's Carnival: Ancient, Modern, Sub Specie Arternitatis." *Bakhtin and the Classics*. Ed. R. Bracht Branham. Evaston: Northwestern University Press, 2002. 5-26. Print.

Erdinast-Vulcan, Daphna. *Between Philosophy and Literature: Bakhtin and the Question of the Subject*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2013. Print.

Farwell, Marilyn R. "Virginia Woolf and Androgyny." *Contemporary Literature* 16.4 (1975): 433-451. *JSTOR*. Web. 3 Feb. 2016.

Feuerstein, Anna. "What Does Power Smell Like? Canine Epistemology and the Politics of the Pet in Virginia Woolf's *Flush*." *Virginia Woolf Miscellany* 84 (Fall 2013): 32-34. *EBSCO*. Web. 5 May 2015.

Flint, Kate. "Introduction." *Flush*. Virginia Woolf. Oxford University Press, 1998. xii-xlix. Print.

French, Marilyn. *From Eve to Dawn: A History of Women in the World*. Vol. 3. New York: The Feminist Press, 2008. Print.

Gardiner, Michael. "Bakhtin's Carnival: Utopia as Critique." *Critical Studies. Bakhtin: Carnival and Other Subjects*. Ed. David Shepherd. Amsterdam: Rodopi, 1993. 20-47. Print.

-----. *The Dialogics of Critique: M.M. Bakhtin and the Theory of Ideology.* London: Routledge, 1992. Print.

Gilbert, Pamela K. *Disease, Desire and the Body in Victorian Women's Popular Novels.* Cambridge University Press, 1997. *EBSCO*. Web. 9 June 2015.

Goldman, Jane. *The Cambridge Introduction to Virginia Woolf*. Cambridge University Press, 2006. 123-136. Print.

Groover, Kristina K. "Body and Soul: Virginia Woolf's *To the Lighthouse*." *REN* 66.3 (Summer 2014): 217-229. *EBSCO*. Web. 5 May 2015.

Haines-Wright, Lisa and Traci Lynn Kyle. "From He and She to You and Me: Grounding Fluidity, Woolf's *Orlando* to Winterson's *Written on the Body.*" *Virginia Woolf: Texts and Contexts*. Ed. by Beth Rigel Daugherty and Eileen Barrett. New York: Pace University Press, 1996. 177-183. Print.

Harrison, Suzan. *Eudora Welty and Virginia Woolf: Gender, Genre, and Influence*. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1997. Print.

Heilbrun, Carolyn G. *Towards a Recognition of Androgyny*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1973. Print.

Hitchcock, Peter. "The Grotesque of the Body Electric." *Bakhtin and the Human Sciences: No Last Words*. London: Sage Publications, 1998. 78-94. Print.

Holquist, Michael. "Bakhtin and the Body." *Critical Studies. The Bakhtin Circle Today*. Ed. Myriam Diaz-Diocaretz. Amsterdam: Rodopi, 1989. 19-42. Print.

---. "Prologue." *Rabelais and His World.* Mikhail Bakhtin. Trans. Helene Iswolsky. Indiana University Press, 1984. Print.

Holstein, James A. and Jaber F. Gubrium. "Deprivatization and the Construction of Domestic Life." *Journal of Marriage and Family* 57.4 (1995): 894-908. *EBSCO*. Web. 3 Mar. 2015.

Howson, Alexandra. *The Body in Society: An Introduction*. Second Edition. Cambridge: Polity, 2013. Print.

Humm, Maggie. *Feminist Criticism: Women as Contemporary Critics*. New York: St. Martin Press, 1986. Print.

Ivanov V. Viacheslav. "The Dominant of Bakhtin's Philosophy: Dialogue and Carnival." *Critical Studies. Bakhtin: Carnival and Other Subjects*. Ed. David Shepherd. Amsterdam: Rodopi, 1993. 3-12. Print.

Jefferson, Ann. "Bodymatters: Self and Other in Bakhtin, Sartre and Barthes." *Bakhtin and Cultural Theory*. Ed. Ken Hirschkop and David Shepherd. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1989. 201-228. Print.

Jordan, Ellen. "'Making Good Wives and Mothers'? The Transformation of Middle-Class Girls' Education in Nineteenth-Century Britain." *History of Education Quarterly* 31.4 (Winter 1991): 439-462. *EBSCO*. Web. 3 March 2015.

Jung, Hwa Yol. "Bakhtin's Dialogical Body Politics." *Bakhtin and the Human Sciences: No Last Words*. London: Sage Publications, 1998. 95-111. Print.

Kaivola, Karen. "Revisiting Woolf's Representations of Androgyny: Gender, Race,

Sexuality, and Nation." *Tulsa Studies in Women's Literature* 18.2 (Autumn 1999): 235-261. *JSTOR*. Web. 21 Sep. 2015.

Kayser, Wolfgang. *The Grotesque in Art and Literature*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1981. Print.

Kelly, Aileen M. *Views from the Other Shore: Essays on Herzen, Chekhov, and Bakhtin*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1999. Print.

Kennard, Jean E. "Power and Sexual Ambiguity: The *Dreadnought* Hoax, *The Voyage Out*, *Mrs. Dalloway* and *Orlando*." *Journal of Modern Literature* XX.2 (Winter 1996): 149-164. *Academic Search Complete*. Web. 22 Apr. 2015.

Kermode, Frank. "Introduction." *Between the Acts*. Virginia Woolf. Oxford University Press, 1992. xii-xxxiv. Print.

Kimbrough, Robert. *Shakespeare and the Art of Humankindness: The Essay Toward Androgyny*. New Jersey: Humanities Press International, Inc., 1990. Print.

Kingsley, Erin M. "Bloodless Birth: Reproduction and the Masculine Mind in Virginia Woolf's *A Room of One's Own*." Academia, n.d. Web. 4 Feb. 2016. https://www.academia.edu/8890826/Bloodless_Birth_Reproduction_and_the_Masculine_Mind_in_Virginia_Woolf_s_A_Room_of_One_s_Own

Knowles, Ronald. "Carnival and Death in *Romeo and Juliet.*" *Shakespeare and Carnival*. London: Macmillan, 1998. 36-60. Print.

Kowaleski-Wallace, Beth. "Tea, Gender, and Domesticity in Eighteenth-Century England." *Studies in Eighteenth-Century Culture* 23 (1994): 131-145. *Project Muse*. Web. 3 Mar. 2015.

Langland, Elizabeth. "Domestic Ideology and Middle-Class Women in the Victorian Novel." *PMLA* 107.2 (1992): 290-304. *EBSCO*. Web. 3 Mar. 2015.

Lerner, Gerda. *The Creation of Patriarchy*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1986. Print.

Lipsedge, Karen. *Domestic Space in Eighteenth-Century British Novels*. Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan, 2012. Print.

Little, Judy. *Comedy and the Woman Writer: Woolf, Spark, and Feminism*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1983. Print.

Long Hoeveler, Diane and Donna Decker Schuster. "Introduction: Women, Creativity, and the Female Body." *Women's Literary Creativity and the Female Body*. Ed. Diane Long Hoeveler and Donna Decker Schuster. Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007. ix-xxvi. Print.

Marcus, Laura. "Woolf's Feminism and Feminism's Woolf." *The Cambridge Companion to Virginia Woolf*. Ed. Sue Roe and Susan Sellers. Cambridge University Press, 2000. 209-244. Print.

Marsh, Nicholas. *Virginia Woolf: The Novels*. Hampshire: Macmillan Press, 1998. 69-88. Print.

McVicker, Jeanette. "Vast Nests of Chinese Boxes, or Getting to from Q to R: Critiquing Empire in 'Kew Gardens' and *To the Lighthouse*." *Virginia Woolf Miscellanies*. New York: Pace University Press, 1991. 40-42. Print.

Mepham, John. *Criticism in Focus: Virginia Woolf*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1992. Print.

-----. *Virginia Woolf A Literary Life*. Hampshire: Macmillan, 1991. Print.

Mihailovic, Alexandar. *Corporeal Words: Mikhail Bakhtin's Theology of Discourse*. Evanston: Northwestern University Press, 1997. Print.

Minow-Pinkney, Makiko. *Virginia Woolf and the Problem of the Subject.* New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 1987. Print.

Mohammad, Shazia Ghulam, Mohammad Farooq. "*To the Lighthouse*: A Sequel to *Night and Day*." *PUTAJ – Humanities and Social Sciences* 20 (2013): 283-289. *EBSCO*. Web. 5 May 2015.

Moi, Toril. *Sex, Gender, and the Body: The Student Edition of What is a Woman?* Oxford University Press, 2005. Print.

Montgomery, Nick. "Colonial Rhetoric and the Maternal Voice: Deconstruction and Disengagement in Virginia Woolf's *The Voyage Out*." *Twentieth Century Literature* 46.1 (Spring 2000): 34-55. *Academic Search Complete*. Web. 24 Apr. 2015.

Moran, Patricia. *Word of Mouth: Body Language in Katharine Mansfield and Virginia Woolf*. Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1996. Print.

Morris, Pam. *Literature and Feminism*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1993. Print.

Morson, Gary Soul and Cary Emerson. *Mikhail Bakhtin: Creation of a Prosaics*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1990. Print.

Mulvey, Laura. *Visual and Other Plasures*. London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009. Print.

Pawlowski, Merry M. "Introduction." *Orlando.* Virginia Woolf. Hertfordshire: Wordsworth Classics, 2003. v-xxii. Print.

Peach, Linden. *Virginia Woolf*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 2000. 137-167. Print.

Peterson, Jeanne M. "No Angels in the House: The Victorian Myth and the Paget Women." *The American Historical Review* 89.3 (June 1984): 677-708. *EBSCO*. Web. 3 March 2015.

Platter, Charles. *Aristophanes and the Carnival of Genres*. Baltimore: The John

Hopkins University Press, 2007. Print.

Prakash, Deepali. "Emerging Image of Women in Virginia Woolf's *Mrs Dalloway* and *To the Lighthouse*." *The IUP Journal of English Studies* IX.2 (2014): 66-70. *EBSCO*. Web. 5 May 2015.

Price, Janet, Margrit Shildrick. *Feminist Theory and the Body: A Reader*. New York: Routledge, 1999. Print.

Rabinowitz, Nancy Sorkin. "Women as Subject and Object of the Gaze in Tragedy." *HELIOS* 40.1-2 (2013): 195-221. *EBSCO*. Web. 20 May 2015.

Rado, Lisa. *The Modern Androgyne Imagination: A Failed Sublime*. Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 2000. Print.

Ramet, Sabrina Petra. "Gender Reversals and Gender Cultures: An Introduction." *Gender Reversals and Gender Cultures: Anthropological and Historical Perspectives*. Ed. Sabrina Petra Ramet. London: Routledge, 1996. 1-21. Print.

Relihan, Joel. "Late Arrivals: Julian and Boethius." *The Cambridge Companion to Roman Satire*. Ed. Kirk Freudenburg. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005. 109-122. Print.

Restuccia, Frances L. "'Untying the Mother Tongue': Female Difference in Virginia Woolf's *A Room of One's Own*." *Tulsa Studies in Women's Literature* 4.2 (1985): 253-264. *JSTOR*. Web. 22 Oct. 2015.

Richardson, Niall, Adam Locks. *Body Studies: The Basics*. London: Routledge, 2014. Print.

Rosenman, Ellen Bayuk. "Sexual Identity and 'A Room of One's Own': 'Secret Economies' in Virginia Woolf's Feminist Discourse." *Signs* 14.3 (1989): 634-650. *JSTOR*. Web. 22 Oct. 2015.

Russo, Mary. *The Female Grotesque: Risk, Excess and Modernity*. New York:

Routledge: 1995. Print.

Ruskin, John. *Sesame and Lilies*. Leipzig: Bernhard Tauchnitz, 1906. Print.

Ryan, Derek. *Virginia Woolf and the Materiality of Theory. Sex, Animal, Life*. Edinburgh University Press, 2013. Print.

Sage, Lorna. "Introduction." *The Voyage Out.* Virginia Woolf. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009. xii-xxxiii. Print.

Sawday, Jonathan. "The Renaissance Body: From Colonisation to Invention." *The Body*. Ed. Tiffany Atkinson. London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005. 12-26. Print.

Shildrick, Margrit, Janet Price. "Openings on the Body: A Critical Introduction." *Feminist Theory and the Body: A Reader*. New York: Routledge, 1999. 1-14. Print.

Showalter, Elaine. *A Literature of Their Own: British Novelists From Bronte to Lessing*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1977. Print.

Snaith, Anna. *Virginia Woolf. Public and Private Negotiations*. Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003. Print.

Taylor, Nancy. "Erasure of Definition: Androgyny in *Mrs. Dalloway*." *Women's Studies* 18 (1991): 367-377. *EBSCO*. Web. 1 Dec. 2015.

Transue, Pamela J. *Virginia Woolf and the Politics of Style*. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1986. 111-126. Print.

Turner, Merrill. "The Chekhovian Point of View in Virginia Woolf's *To the Lighthouse*." *Modern Language Quarterly* 74.3 (September 2013): 391-412. *EBSCO*. Web. 5 May 2015.

Vaught, C. Jennifer. *Carnival and Literature in Early Modern England*. Surrey: Ashgate, 2012. Print.

Vice, Sue. *Introducing Bakhtin.* Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1997. Print.

Walby, Sylvia. *Theorizing Patriarchy*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1990. Print.

Walker, S.P. "How to Secure Your Husband's Esteem. Accounting and Private Patriarchy in the British Middle Class Household During the Nineteenth Century." *Accounting, Organizations and Society* 23.5/6 (1998): 485-514. *EBSCO*. Web. 5 May 2015.

Wiles, David. "The Carnivalesque in *A Midsummer Night's Dream*." *Shakespeare and Carnival*. London: Macmillan, 1998. 61-82. Print.

Wills, Clair. "Upsetting the Public: Carnival, Hysteria and Women's Texts." *Bakhtin and Cultural Theory*. Ed. Ken Hirschkop and David Shepherd. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1989. 85-108. Print.

Woolf, Virginia. *A Room and One's Own* and *Three Guineas*. Oxford University Press, 1992. Print.

---. *Selected Essays*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009. Print.

Zinsser, Judith P. "Feminist Biography: A Contradiction in Terms?" *The Eighteenth Century* 50.1 (2009): 43-50. *Project Muse*. Web. 4 Oct. 2015.

Zwerdling, Alex. *Virginia Woolf and the Real World*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1986. Print.

CURRICULUM VITAE

PERSONAL INFORMATION

Surname, Name: Yılmaz, Victoria Bilge
Nationality: Turkish (TC)
Date and Place of Birth: 17 February 1980, Uzbekistan
Marital Status: Married
Phone: +90 505 7080103
Email: viktoria80@yahoo.com

EDUCATION

Degree	Institution	Year of Graduation
MA	METU ELIT	2008
BA	METU FLE	2004
High School	Kurbanov High School	1997

WORK EXPERIENCE

Year	Place	Enrollment
2011-Present	Yıldırım Beyazıt University	Instructor
2010-2011	Muğla University	Instructor
2004-2009	Atılım University	Instructor

FOREIGN LANGUAGES

Advanced Russian, Advanced English

PUBLICATIONS

1. Yılmaz, Victoria Bilge. "The Motive of Disguise in Graham Greene's *The Heart of the Matter* and Reşat Nuri Güntekin's *Acımak*." *Muğla Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi* 25 (2010): 159-176.

2. Yılmaz, Victoria Bilge. *Tom Murphy's Plays and Nietzsche's Philosophy*. LAP LAMBERT, 2011.
3. Yılmaz, Victoria Bilge. "Nietzschean Reading of Tom Murphy's Play: 'The Sanctuary Lamp' and Overcoming Nihilism." *Agathos* 3.2 (2012): 59-70.
4. Yılmaz, Victoria Bilge. "Salman Rushdie and Mikhail Bulgakov: Magical Realism and its Function in *The Satanic Verses* and *The Master and Margarita*." *Salman Rushdie and His Work*. Proceedings of the 20th METU British Novelists Conference, 13-14 December, 2012.

TURKISH SUMMARY

I. BÖLÜM

GİRİŞ

Virginia Woolf, romanlarında ataerkil toplum yapısının en önemli dayanağı olan istikrar ve hayatın değişmezliği anlayışına karşı çıkmaktadır. *Dışa Yolculuk* (1915), *Deniz Feneri* (1927), *Orlando* (1928) ve *Flush* (1933) adlı romanlarındaki cinsiyet hiyerarşisine ve bedenin sabit bir kalıp olduğu fikrine karşı tezler öne sürerek adı geçen anlayışları yok etmeye çalışmaktadır. Bu bağlamda, romanlarındaki kadın kahramanlar Bakhtin'in karnaval olarak nitelendirdiği ortamın katılımcılarına benzerlik göstermektedir. Woolf'un adı geçen romanları Bakhtin'in karnaval tezi doğrultusunda incelenebilir. Bu dört roman dışındaki romanların karnaval açısından incelenmesi mümkün gözükmemektedir. Çünkü bazı romanların şiirsel bir dille yazılması dolayısıyla diğer romanlardaki kahramanlar geçmişlerinden vazgeçemiyor, insanlara karışamıyor ve umutsuzluklarından kaçamıyorlar. Bu nedenle de karnaval yaşayamıyorlar.

Virginia Woolf adı geçen dört romanında, cinsiyet hiyerarşisi ve bedenin değişmezliği fikrine karşı gelerek kadın kahramanlarına özel bir ortam sağlamaktadır. Bu özel ortam da kadın kahramanlara Bakhtin'in sunduğu karnavalesk yaşam tarzına yakın bir hayat sunuyor. Woolf'un *Dışa Yolculuk* adlı romanında kadın kahramanlara kadın haklarının önemli ve değerli olduğu bir ortam sağlanıyor. Bu sağlanan ortamda kadın kahramanlar, istikrarlı bir hayatı ve sosyal kuralları yok sayarak, özel ile umumi hayatı birleştirerek ataerkil yapıyı bozmaya çabalamaktadırlar. Böylece roman kahramanları arasında özgür bir iletişim anlayışı hâkim olmaktadır. *Deniz Feneri* ve *Flush* adlı romanlarda ise kadın kahramanlar, Bakhtin'in karnaval ortamında olduğu gibi otoriteyi baş aşağı ederek onun gücünü yok saymaktadırlar. *Orlando* adlı romanda ise cinsiyetin değişebilir bir kavram olduğu ve bedenin insan dışı bir şekil alabileceği vurgulanmaktadır. Bu anlayış

değişken ve daima kendini yenileyen bir bedeni öne sürmesi bakımından Bakhtin'in grotesk kavramına benzetilmiştir.

A. Woolf'un Feminist Yazıları ve Politikası

A.1 Evcimenlik İdeolojisi: Cinsiyet Hiyerarşisi ve Kadının Konumu

Sosyal hayattaki hızlı değişimler kadın hayatında da değişimlere yol açmıştır. Orta sınıfın yükselişi ile kadınların eve hapsedilmesi ve erkek hizmetlerine verilmesi doğru oranda gelişmiştir. Böylece kadınlar evde huzuru sağlamakla sorumlu tutulmuşlardı. Bu anlayış ise dışarısı ile içerisi arasında bir hiyerarşinin oluşmasına neden oldu. İçerisinin huzurlu olması halinde dışarısı tehlikeli olarak kabul edilmiştir. Doğal olarak bu anlayış kadınların dışarıya çıkmasını ve dışarıda iş yapmasını gereksiz ve tehlikeli olarak kabul etmiştir. Kadınların dışarıya çıkmaları durumunda orta sınıf ideolojisinin alt tabakalara yayılması sağlanmıştır. Kadınların rolü genelde çocuklarına bakmak, hizmetçileri yönetmek ve ev işleriyle ilgilenmek biçiminde belirlenmiştir. Kadınların erkeğin kazandığı parayı idareli kullanarak gösterişli hayat tarzından da uzak durmaları öngörülmüştür. Orta sınıfın bu evcimenlik ideolojisi ataerkil sisteme dayanmaktadır. Ataerkil sistem eski çağlardan beri süre gelen bir anlayıştır.

A.2 Woolf'un Cinsiyet Hiyerarşisine Bakışı ve Kadının Konumu

Woolf, kadınların evcimenliğe bağlı kalmalarına karşı çıkmaktadır. Woolf, *Kendine Ait bir Oda* adlı kitabında kadınların kendilerine ait bir odada kendilerine dair olan değerleri yaşamasını vurgulayarak, kadınların kendi tecrübelerini kendilerinin dile getirmelerini öğütlemiştir. Bazı eleştirmenlere göre Woolf, kendini dünyaya yazılarıyla açmıştır. Kendi yazılarıyla duygularını ve fikirlerini ortaya koyabilmiştir.

A.3 Beden Kavramı: Genel Bakış

Beden ezelden beri ruhun evi olarak tanımlanıyor. Bedenin ruhun egemenliği altında yaşaması gerektiği vurgulanmıştır. Böylece ruh/beden hiyerarşisi oluşmuştur. Ruh/beden hiyerarşisi feminist kuramında da önemli rol almaktadır. Kadının bedensel faaliyetleri ön plana çıkarılarak kadın, beden ile özdeşleştirilmiştir. Cinsiyet hiyerarşisinde kadın bedeni erkeğe göre ikinci sınıf olarak kabul edilmiştir. Bazı feminist eleştirmenler kadın bedeninin doğum, emzirme gibi faaliyetlerini olumsuz ve engelleyici olarak görürken, bazıları bu faaliyetleri kadın bedeninin özel durumu olarak kabul etmiş ve kadın bedenini yüceltmiştir.

A.4 Woolf'un Beden Kavramına Bakışı

Woolf, bedenin önemini yok saymamış ve "kendine ait bir oda", "granit ve gökkuşağı" "androjenlik" kavramları ileri sürmüştür. Her kadın kendine ait bir odaya sahip olmalı derken kadınların evdeki bitmeyen sorumluluklarından kaçabileceği bir ortamdan bahsetmiştir. Böylece kadın bedeninin özgür olmadıkça ruhsal olarak da özgür olamayacağını vurgulamıştır. Granit ve gökkuşağı kavramında bir insan tanıtılırken onun sadece düşünsel bir varlık değil aynı zamanda bir beden olduğu da vurgulanmıştır.

A.4.1 Woolf'un Androjenlik Kavramı

Woolf, androjenlik kavramı ile bir bedende iki cinsiyetin var olabileceğinden bahsetmektedir. Marilyn Farwell'e göre androjenlik, feminist kuram içerisinde iki başlık altında tartışılmaktadır. Bu başlıklar birleşme ve balanstır. Farwell'e göre birleşme ile mutlaka bir taraf diğer tarafı egemenliği altına almaktadır. Balans ise her iki tarafın eşit olmasıdır. Yine Farwell'a göre Woolf'un androjenlik kavramı her ne kadar balans tanımına uyuyorsa da sonunda birleşme şekline dönmektedir. Bu durum

da Woolf'un yazı yazarken bir yazarın objektif olması gerektiğini savunmasına bağlanabilir. Farwell'e göre objektif olmak her zaman erkek yazarların savunduğu bir durumdur. Elaine Showalter da Woolf'un kadınlıktan kaçtığını ve bundan dolayı androjenlik kavramını kullandığını iddia etmektedir. Makiko Minow-Pinkney ise Woolf'un balans şeklini kullandığını düşünmektedir. *Orlando* adlı romanda Orlando'nun her iki cinsiyeti de eşit bir şekilde yaşadığı işlenmiştir. Aynı şekilde Nancy Taylor da Woolf'un balans şeklini kullandığını düşünmektedir. Woolf'un bu şekilde ataerkil cinsiyet hiyerarşisini alt üst ettiği söylenebilir.

A.4.2 Woolf'un Cansız İmgeler Kullanımı

Woolf, bedenin sabit bir şekil olmadığını, romanlarında kullandığı kahramanları hayvanlara ya da cansız varlıklara benzetmesiyle ortaya koymaktadır. Böylece Woolf'un bu benzetmeleri Bakhtin'in grotesk kavramına yaklaştığını ispat etmektedir. Çünkü Bakhtin'in grotesk kavramındaki imgeler, insan dünyasını ile hayvan dünyasını ve hayvan dünyasını ile bitki dünyasını birleştirebilmektedir.

B. Literatür Taraması: Bakhtin, Feminist Kuram ve Woolf'un Romanları

B.1 Bakhtin, Feminism ve Woolf'un Espri Anlayışı Üzerine Çalışmalar

Bakhtin'in teorileri feminist kuramda geniş bir şekilde kullanılmaktadır. Dale Bauer'e göre Bakhtin'in diyalojizm kavramı feminist fikirleri ifade etmek için kullanılabilir. Diyalojizm'e göre hiçbir seste, kelimede ya da söylemde egemenliği kuran bir bakış açısı bulunmamaktadır. Her bir söylemde, hatta her bir sözcükte farklı bakış açıları ve yankılar bulunmaktadır. Feminist kuramda ise bu durum kadın sesinin başka sesler arasında yer aldığı ve hiçbir egemenlik altında olmamaları gerektiği şeklinde ortaya konulmaktadır. Fakat Bauer'in bu teorisi söylem seviyesinde kaldığından Bakhtin'in karnavalını fiziksel bir ortam olarak

incelememektedir. Bu tezde bu boşluğu kapatmak için kadınların böyle bir fiziksel ortama ihtiyaç duydukları vurgulanmaktadır.

Woolf ve Bakhtin'i bir araya getiren başka bir unsur ise espri anlayışlarıdır. Bakhtin'in karnaval kavramı hayattaki her şeyi espri ile karşılamaktadır. Zaten kahkaha ya da gülme kavramı karnavalın vazgeçilmez unsurudur. Woolf da gülme kavramından uzak değildir. Vita Sackville-West'in dediğine göre Woolf, hayatında çoğu şeye espri ile yaklaşırdı. Woolf'un romanların da çok ciddi konular işlenmesine rağmen esprili diyaloglarda mevcuttur. Judy Little'e göre ise Woolf'un espri anlayışı romanlarında iki dünya arasındaki gibi özel bir ortam oluşturduğunda ortaya çıkmaktadır. Fakat hiçbir eleştirmen Woolf'un espri anlayışını Bakhtin'in teorileri açısından incelememiştir.

B.2 Woolf'un Romanları ve Karnavalizasyon

Woolf ve Bakhtin'i karnaval açısından yan yana getirenler olmuşsa da bu benzeşme daha çok *Orlando* adlı roman üzerinden yapılmıştır. Keith Booker, *Orlando* adlı romanı incelerken romanın her hangi bir roman tipine uymadığını ve bu haliyle yazı türlerini karnavalize ettiğini söylemektedir. Suzan Harrison ise Woolf'un *Deniz Feneri* adlı romanının yazı türleriyle karmaşık biçimde ortaya konulmak için yazıldığını ifade etmektedir. Romandaki espri anlayışı ve ölüler aslında ölü olarak kalmamışlar, romanda ağıt yazı türünü karnavalize etmişlerdir. Tüm bu çalışmalar bu alana önemli katkılar yapmışsa da Woolf'un romanlarının Bakhtin'in karnaval kavramı açısından tam olarak incelenmemiştir.

Bu çalışmada Woolf'un romanları Bakhtin'in karnaval kavramı ışığı altında incelenirken, Woolf'un cinsiyet hiyerarşisi ve bedenin değişmezliğinin karnavalize ettiği de ortaya konulmaktadır. Böylece ataerkil düşüncenin temel taşı olan istikrarın önemi ve hayatın hiçbir zaman kesin bir olgu halinde devam etmediği fikri tartışılmıştır. Bu çalışmada Woolf'un romanlarında tam bir karnaval havası oluşmadığı da ortaya konulmaktadır. Çalışmada Bakhtin'in karnaval teorisi ele alınırken Dostoevsky ve Rabelais'nin romanları da incelenmiş ve sonuçlar

çıkarılmıştır. Üçüncü Bölümde Woolf'un *Dışa Yolculuk* adlı romanında evcimenliğin kadın değerlerine göre yeniden oluşturulması işlenmektedir. Romandaki kahramanlar Londra'dan yola çıkarken arkalarında bıraktıkları şehri istikrar simgesi olarak görmekte ve deniz üstünde küçük bir gemideki yaşamlarını çalkantılı ve değişken bir tarz olarak ortaya koymaktalar. Böylece ataerkil toplumun daima savunduğu istikrar kavramı kaybolmakta, sürekli değişen ve dalgalanan deniz üstündeki yaşamları Bakhtin'in karnaval duygusuna benzeyen bir ortam sağlamaktadır. Dördüncü Bölümde *Deniz Feneri* ve *Flush* adlı romanlardaki kadın kahramanların baba figürlerinin zayıflıkları ortaya çıkarılarak bu figürlerin egemenliği temsil eden hayali tahtları yıkılmaktadır. Bu işleyiş Bakhtin'in teorisindeki kralı tahttan indirme sahnesine benzemektedir. Son bölümde Woolf'un *Orlando* romanı androjenlik kavramı açısından incelenmiştir. Roman kahramanlarında cinsiyet ve bedenin değişkenliği vurgulanırken Bakhtin'in grotesk kavramına benzeyen bir işleyiş ve anlam ortaya çıkmaktadır.

II. BÖLÜM

MIKHAIL BAKHTIN'İN KARNAVAL KAVRAMI VE EDEBİYATA ETKİSİ

Rus düşünür, filozof ve yazar Mikhail Bakhtin (1895-1975), felsefe, dil ve edebiyat gibi alanlarda oldukça etkili tesirler bırakmıştır. Karnaval kavramı en fazla *Dostoyevski Poetikasının Sorunları* ile *Rabelais ve Dünyası* adlı eserlerinde incelemektedir. Bu bölümde Virginia Woolf'un *Dışa Yolculuk* (1915), *Deniz Feneri* (1926), *Orlando* (1928) ve *Flush* (1933) adlı romanları Bakhtin'in karnaval kavramı açısından incelenmiş ve teorik zeminde karşılaştırmalar yapılmıştır.

A. Bakhtin'in Karnaval Kavramı

Halkın kendini ifade etme biçimi olarak nitelendirilen karnaval, Bakhtin'in teorisinde özgürlük ve beden olarak kendisini göstermektedir. Bakhtin öncelikle iki

tarihi zaman diliminden bahsetmektedir. Birincisi insanların daha sınıfsal ayrıma uğramadığı zaman dilimidir. Bu zaman diliminde insanlar olayları aynı şekilde yaşamışlardır. Hem üzüntüyü hem de sevinci aynı zaman içinde yaşayabilmişlerdir. Diğer zaman dilimi ise sınıfların oluştuğu, insanların bu sınıflara göre ayrıldığı zaman birimidir. Bu dönemde ciddiyetin daha üstün olduğu, samimiyetin ve gülümsemenin ise yasak olduğu ya da ayrı zamanlarda yaşandığı görülmektedir. Başka bir deyişle ciddiyet üst tabaka insanların uğraşı iken samimiyet ve gülmek alt tabaka insanların hayat tarzı olmuştur. Bakhtin'e göre karnaval bu alt tabaka halkının yaşam tarzının dışarıya yansımasıdır.

A.1 Ritüel Karnavalın Tarihçesi

Bakhtin, karnavalın tarihçesini dört zaman diliminde incelemektedir. Bunlar eski çağ, orta çağ, Rönesans ve 17. yüzyıl dönemidir. Bakhtin'e göre karnavallar Yunan ve Roma kültüründe geniş bir yer edinmektedir. Bu zamanlarda yaşanan karnavallar halkın kültürünü tam olarak yansıtmaktadır. Karnavalım en görkemli yaşandığı dönem ise orta çağdır. Bakhtin'e göre bu dönemde karnaval duygusu her tabakada hissediliyordu. Bu dönemdeki insanlar günlük ve karnaval olmak üzere iki hayat sürdürebiliyorlardı. Rönesans dönemi ise Bakhtin'in karmaşık bulduğu bir dönemdir. Çünkü karnaval bu dönemde hem zirveyi hem de düşüşü aynı anda yaşamıştır. Cervantes ve Rabelais gibi çok önemli yazarlar da bu dönemde ortaya çıkmıştır. 17. yüzyıl ise Bakhtin'in dediğine göre karnavalın zayıfladığı dönemdir. Bu dönemde karnaval nerdeyse bitmiş, karnaval duygusu sahnelere taşınmıştır. Böylece karnaval duygusu edebiyata girmeye başlamıştır.

A.2 Bakhtin'in Edebiyat Teorisindeki Ritüel Karnavalın Özellikleri

Bakhtin, karnaval özelliklerini altı ana alt başlığa bölmektedir. Bunlar:

1. Hayatın baş aşağı olması,
2. Katılımcıların birbirine özgürce ve samimi bir şekilde davranması,

3. Karnavalesk dengesizlikler,
4. Kutsallığa saygısızlık,
5. Kralın taçlanma ve tahttan indirilme dönemi,
6. Her şeyin taklit edildiği dönem.

Hayatın baş aşağı olması özelliği günlük hayatta var olan tüm kuralların karnaval döneminde yok olmasıdır. Sosyal statü, saygı, insanlar arasındaki eşitsizlik gibi olgular karnaval zamanında yok olmaktadır. Doğal olarak insanlar birbirine özgürce ve samimi bir şekilde davranmaktadır. Bu tarz, insan davranışlarının sıra dışı olmasına neden olmaktadır. Karnavalesk dengesizlikler ise daha önce ayrı tutulan unsurların bir arada olmasıdır. Zıt kutuplardaki olgular bir araya gelmektedir. Kutsallığı yok saymak ise düşünceye bağlı olan her şeyin bedensel şekle sokulmasıdır. Yüce ve kutsal olan her şeyin bedensel bir biçime sokulmasıdır. Kralın taçlanması veya tahttan indirilmesi olayı ise hayatın değişken olduğunu ve her zaman her şeyin olabileceğini göstermektedir. Halk arasından her hangi bir kişi seçilip taçlandırılıyor ve aynı zamanda da tahtından indirilip dövülebiliyor. Bakhtin'e göre tüm bu kategoriler bir birine bağlı olup iç içedir. Ayrıca karnaval bir parodidir. Karnaval sırasındaki tüm olaylar günlük yaşamdaki olayların ters çevrilmiş halidir.

A.3 Çelişkili Karnaval Kahkahası

Bakhtin'e göre kahkaha da karnaval gibi halk kültürünün bir parçasıdır. Hayata bir bakış açısıdır. Çelişkili kahkaha hem dalga geçer hem de yenilenmeye davet eder. Kahkaha aynı zamanda her şeyi aşağılar. Yani her şeyi bedensel bir seviyeye indirir. Hiçbir şey soyut kavramda kalmaz. Kahkaha hiçbir zaman tek bir kişiye veya olguya yönelik değildir. Tüm dünyaya yöneliktir. Kahkaha, bu sayede hayatın değişkenliğini ifade eder. Hiçbir şeyin sabitlenmesine izin vermez.

A.4 Grotesk

İtalyanca mağara anlamına gelen *grotta* teriminden türeyen grotesk kelimesi 15. yüzyılda bir mağaradan çıkarılan resimlerde anlam bulmaktadır. Bu resimlerde insan, hayvan ve bitki dünyasının birleşmesi gösterilmiştir. Bakhtin, grotesk kavramının önde gelen araştırmacılarındandır. Grotesk kavramını genelde beden ile birlikte işleyen ve tartışan Bakhtin, groteskin değişkenlik ifade eden bir imge olduğunu ortaya koymaktadır. Bakhtin'e göre grotesk imgesi bedenin ya ölüme, ya da doğuma yakın bir şekilde gösterildiğini vurgulamaktadır.

Bakhtin'e göre grotesk eski çağlardan beri devam eden bir imgedir. Grotesk, samimiyet ve gülmek gibi olguların halkın alt tabakasındakilere ait bir hayat biçimi olduğunu ileri sürmektedir. Rönesans döneminden itibaren ise beden özel ve saklanması gereken bir kavram olarak benimsendiğinden grotesk imgeler azalmaya başlamıştır. Bakhtin'e göre romantiklerin kullandığı grotesk kavramı halk kültüründen ilham almamıştır. Romantiklere göre grotesk daha fazla özel istek ve arzuları ifade eden bir kavram olmuştur. 19 ve 20. yüzyıldaki grotesk ise hayli zayıflamış ve değişmiştir. Bu dönemlerde grotesk, karanlığı ve korkunç olayları ifade etmiştir. Bakhtin'in groteskten türettiği ve detaylarıyla incelediği grotesk gerçekçiliği orta çağlardaki insanların bedenlerini temsil eden imgelerdir. Grotesk gerçekçiliğin temel özelliği aşağılayıcı olmasıdır. Düşünsel olan her şey beden ile ilgili olan imgelere dönüşmektedir. Ayrıca grotesk gerçeklilik kapsayıcıdır. Buradaki beden, özel ve tek kişiye ait değildir. Grotesk imge tüm dünyayı kapsayan ve ifade eden bir kavramdır. Buradaki beden tüm dünyaya sarılabiliyor. Bundan dolayı grotesk bir imgede bedenin dışa açılan bölümleri önemlidir. Bunlar ağız, burun, genital bölgelerdir. Grotesk gerçekçilikte insanlar hiçbir şeyden korkmazlar. Çünkü her şey bir bütündür. Grotesk gerçekçiliğin bir başka özelliği ise grotesk imgede daima büyüyen ve kendini yenileyen olguların ifade edilmesidir.

B. *Karnivalizasyon*: Karnavalın Edebiyata Etkisi

Bakhtin'e göre karnaval edebiyatı hayli etkilemiştir. Karnaval duygusunun bir edebi eserde görünmesine karnavalizasyon adı verilmiştir. Bakhtin'e göre karnivalizasyon tarih boyunca var olmuştur. 17. yüzyıl ise karnivalizasyon açısından önemli bir dönüm noktasıdır. Çünkü bu dönemde karnaval, ritüel yaşamını yitirmiş edebiyata giriş yapmıştır. Bakhtin, Dostoyevski'nin eserlerindeki karnaval duygusunu etkileyen bazı yazı türlerini incelemiştir.

B.1 Sokrates Diyaloğu

Sokrates diyaloğu adını taşıyan yazı türü birçok eski çağ yazarı tarafından kullanılmıştır. Sokrates'in gerçek tartışmalarından oluşan bu tür ondan etkilenen yeni türlerin ortaya çıkmasına da neden olmuştur. Bu tür yazıda gerçek denilen olgu herkesin tartıştığı bir ortamda doğar ve sürekli değişim halindedir. Böylece bu tür yazıda herkesin fikri ortaya konulmuş ve bu olaya "sinkrisis" adı verilmiştir. "Anakrisis" terimi ise herkesin kendi fikrini ifade etmesi için sağlanan ortama denmiştir. Bu şekilde tartışmada yer alanlar için özel bir ortam sağlanarak herkesin rahatça kendi fikrini ifade edebilmesi sağlanmaktadır. Bu duruma "eşikte bulunma" adı verilmiştir. Bu halde olan insanlar iki dünya arasında olup hiçbir dünyanın kurallarına uymamaktadır. Bakhtin'e göre bu durum karnavalesk bir durumdur. Bu biçimde normal zaman akışı durur ve karnavalesk zaman akışı yaşanır. Herkes kendi fikrini ortaya koymasıyla fikirler o kişi ile özdeşleşmiş olur. Böylece fikir bir beden kazanmış olur.

B.2 Menippea

Menippean hiciv yazı türü, Bakhtin'e göre tam bir karnavalesk yazı türü olup adını Yunan Menippus'tan (MÖ 3. yy) almıştır. Bakhtin, menippea yazı türünü on dört ayrı kategoride göstermektedir. Bunlar.

1. Menippean hiciv daima espri içerir.
2. Hiçbir zaman tarihi olaylara dayanmaz.
3. Doğaüstü olaylara dayanır.
4. Aynı zamanda doğaüstü ile gerçeklilik bir arada gösterilir.
5. Bu yazı türü dünyanın sorunlarını felsefi açıdan sorgular.
6. Menippea yazı türünde farklı dünyalar gösterilir.
7. Hayata farklı bir açıdan bakılır.
8. Kişilerin sıra dışı durumları gösterilir.
9. İnsanların kavga anları ve küfürleri resmedilir.
10. Dengesiz birleşmeler oluşturulur.
11. Sosyal ütopya resmedilir.
12. Bu yazı türünde farklı yazı türleri yer alır.
13. Farklı sesler ve stiller bir araya gelir.
14. Dünyanın güncel konuları ele alınır.

Devamlı değişen Menippean hiciv yazı türü karnavalizasyon içeriği açısından oldukça zengindir.

B.3 Dostoyevski'nin Karnavalesk Unsurlarını İçeren Romanları

B.3.1 Karnaval Hayatı

Dostoyevski'nin romanlarında karnaval hayatı üç ana kategori altında incelenebilir. Bunlar sosyal kuralların olmaması, hayatın herkese açık olan alanlarda geçmesi ve kriz dönemleridir. Dostoyevski'nin kahramanları sıra dışı, kavga ve skandallarla anılan, gizli işlerin döndüğü bir hayat sürdürürler. Bazı kahramanların yaşadığı önemli olaylar herkesin görebileceği ortamda gerçekleşmektedir.

Kahramanlar, farklı bir zaman kavramının olduğu kriz dönemlerinde büyük değişikliklerle baş başa kalmaktadır.

B.3.2 Samimiyet

Bu başlık altında kahramanların birbirine samimi bir şekilde davranması ele alınmaktadır. Dostoyevski'nin kahramanları, aralarındaki sınıfsal farklılıkları görmezden gelebiliyor ve davranışlarını buna göre biçimlendiriyorlar.

B.3.3 Karnavalesk Dengesizlikler

Karnavalesk dengesizlikler karnaval hayatının dışındayken çok farklı olan unsurların bir araya gelmesidir. Küfür etmek ve övmek, hayat ve ölüm, ciddiyet ve espri gibi zıt kutupların birleşmesidir.

B.3.4 Kutsallığa Saygısızlık

Karnaval zamanında karnaval katılımcıları kutsal ve saygı gerektiren her şeye saygısız davranırlar. Örneğin Dostoyevski'nin kahramanları bir cenazede gülünç şeyleri düşünebilmekte veya parasal konuları tartışabilmektedirler.

B.4 Rabelais'nin Eserlerinde Karnavalesk Unsurlar

B.4.1 Çarşı Dili

Bakhtin, Rabelais'nin eserlerini genelde grotesk açıdan incelemiştir. Bakhtin'e göre Rabelais'nin eserlerindeki çarşı dili genellikle küfür ve bedenle ilgili terimlerden oluşmaktadır. Bakhtin, Rabelais'nin romanlarında çarşıdaki bir satıcının ürününü ne şekilde tanıttığını örnek olarak gösterirken kullanılan ifadelerin ne kadar açık ve özgür olduğunun altını çizmektedir. Bakhtin'e göre çarşı dilinin başka

örnekleri ise beddualar ve yeminlerdir. Bunlar genellikle kutsal kişilerin beden dilleridir.

B.4.2 Halk Tarafından Kullanılan Popüler Şekiller Ve İmgeler

Bu şekiller ve imgeler öncelikle dayak yiyen ve hırpalanan insanlardan oluşmaktadır. Çoğu zaman bu imgeler parçalanmış beden olarak görülmektedir. Çok sayıda yiyecek ve içeceğin bulunduğu bir ortam da bu şekillerden birisidir. Karnavalın en önemli unsurlarından birisi sınırsız yemek tüketimidir. Kehanetler de popüler halk imgesidir.

B.4.3 Grotesk İmgeler

Rabelais'nin grotesk imgeleri her şeyi bedensel seviyeye indirmektedir. Bedenin alt kısmında yer alan organlar bedenin üst kısmında yer alan organların yerini alabilmekte ve böylece insan bedeni baş aşağı değişebilmektedir. Ayrıca insan bedeninden bahsederken bedenin alt kısmında yer alan organların daha önemli bir yer kapladığı görülmektedir. Rabelais'nin romanlarında bedenin alt kısmında yer alan organlar ölüm ve yer altı dünyasını göstermektedir. Fakat bu ölüm ve yer altı dünyası olumsuz bir anlama gelmemektedir. Aksine yeniden doğum ve yenilenme manasını taşımaktadır. Rabelais'nin romanlarındaki bir diğer grotesk unsur da yemek festivalleridir. Roman kahramanlarının tükettikleri yiyeceklerin miktarı aşırı büyüktür. Son olarak grotesk imgeler ikilidir. Grotesk imgede iki zıt kutbun birleşmesi söz konusudur.

III. BÖLÜM

DIŞA YOLCULUK ADLI ROMANDA KADININ YERİ VE YENİDEN YAPILANDIRILMASI

Woolf, her zaman kadının evde hapsolmasına karşı çıkmıştır. Romanlarında daima kadınların evden çıkıp dışarıda yer aldıkları konular işlenmiştir. *Dışa Yolculuk* adlı romanında kadının yeri olarak gösterilen evin iç kısmı bir şekilde yeniden yapılandırılarak kadının değerleri ölçüsünde değişime uğratılmaktadır. Bu açıdan bakıldığında romandaki kahramanlar Bakhtin'in karnaval katılımcılarına benzemektedir. Bakhtin'in karnaval katılımcıları sınıfsal farklılıkların hüküm sürdüğü bir dünyadan kaçarken, Woolf'un kahramanları ataerkil toplumunun baskıcı kurallarından kaçarak kendilerine yeni bir ortam oluşturmaktadırlar.

A. İç ve Dış Ortamların Birleşmesi

Rachel Vinrace, 24 yaşındaki genç bir kadındır. Babasının gemisiyle Londra'dan yola çıkmıştır. Gemideki insanlarla vakit geçirdikten sonra teyzesi Helen Ambrose ile Santa Marina adlı bir tatil kasabasında zaman geçirmeye karar verir. Santa Marina'daki hayatı Rachel'in hayata bakış açısını değiştirir. Burada Terence Hewet adındaki bir gence âşık olur. Farklı sosyal faaliyetlere katılır ve sonunda yüksek ateş nedeniyle hayatını kaybeder. Bu romanda Woolf'un kadın kahramanları iç ve dış ortamları iki temel neden için birleştirir. Bu nedenler istikrarlı ve sıkıcı bir hayattan kaçabilmek ve özel hayatlarıyla herkese açık umumi ortamları arasındaki duvarı kaldırmak içindir.

A.1 İstikrarlı Hayattan Kaçış

Woolf, *Dışa Yolculuk* adlı romanda kadın kahramanların hayatını heyecanlı ve sürekli değişen bir biçimde geçirmek istediklerini resmeder. Ev ortamı, bir kadın

için her zaman aynı faaliyetlerden oluşmaktadır. Woolf, bu işleyişi değiştirmek için kahramanlarını *Euphrosyne* adlı gemiye bindirir. Gemideki hayat Londra'daki hayata hiç benzemez. Gemide bulunmak, istikrarlı ve sıkıcı bir hayatın tam tersini yaşamaktır. Büyük bir gemi olan *Euphrosyne*, hiçbir kategoriye sığmayıp şekilden şekle girebilmektedir. Gemideki insanlar bazen hayvana, bazen de sadece cansız bir varlığa dönüşebilmektedir. Gemide bulunmak hiçbir dünyaya ait olmamak anlamını taşır. Denizin ortasında bir yerde sallanan bir konumda bulunmak, istikrarın ne kadar uygunsuz bir kavram olduğunu göstermektedir. Bu ortam Bakhtin'in karnaval ortamına benzemektedir. İki dünya arasında, günlük yaşamın kurallarının geçerli olmadığı bir ortamdır. Rachel bu gemide kriz dönemini yaşamaktadır. Karnavalesk bir zaman kavramı olduğundan kriz döneminde kahramanlar hayata dair yeni bir bakış açısı kazanır. Evli bir erkek kahraman tarafından zorla öpülen Rachel, olay hoşuna gitse de, kadınların ne kadar tehlikede olduğunu fark eder. Bu olay Woolf'un romanlarında Bakhtin'in karnaval duygusunun tam olarak yaşanamayacağını göstermesi açısından iyi bir örnektir. Gemi, günlük yaşam tarzından ve ataerkil kurallardan uzak olsa da erkeklerin bu ortamı hiçbir zaman eşitlik ortamı olarak kabul etmeyecekleri gösterilmektedir. Gemide bulunan kahramanlar arkalarında kalan Londra'ya bakarken şehrin değişmez yüzünü görüp korkuya kapılırlar. Sıkıcı ve baskıcı bir ortam onları ürkütür. Fakat gemideki ortam, Londra'daki ortamın tam tersidir.

Santa Marina tatil kasabasında Rachel hayatın değişken olduğunu bir daha anlar ve yeniden kriz dönemini yaşar. Terence'e âşık olsa da evlilik yaparak ataerkil düzenin kendi üzerinde bir baskı yaratmasını istemez. Evlendiğinde kendisini Londra'da nasıl bir hayat beklediğini bildiğinden korkuya kapılır. Nitekim yerli halkın yaşadığı bir köye gittiklerinde Rachel rahatsızlanır ve yüksek ateşle kıvranır. Yatağında yatarken etrafındakilerin hissettiklerini hissedemez. Çünkü artık bu dünyaya ait değildir. Fakat daha ölmemiş olduğundan iki dünya arasında sıkışıp kalmıştır. Bu olay Bakhtin'in iki dünya arasında yaşanan kriz dönemi olarak incelenebilir.

A.2 Ev Kurallarından Kaçış

Londra'daki istikrarlı bir hayatın tersine gemideki kahramanlar sıra dışı bir hayatı yaşayanlar olarak resmedilmiştir. Bazıları grotesk olarak nitelendirilmiştir. Bu açıdan bakıldığında gemi karnaval ortamı hatırlatmaktadır. Kahramanlar bir birini farklı varlıklara benzetmektedir. Böylece bir birini tuhaf buluyorlar. Ayrıca dine karşı saygısız bir tutum sergiliyorlar.

A.3 Özel ve Umumi Hayat Arasındaki Perdenin Kalkması

Romandaki kahramanlar Santa Marina'da Londra'daki hayatlarından farklı bir hayat sürdürmektedirler. Bu hayat tatil havasıdır. Bakhtin'e göre karnaval, modern edebiyata girerken tatil havasında da girebilmektedir. Santa Marina'daki İngilizler, İngiltere'de davranamadıkları biçimde davranmaktadırlar. Ortak kullanım için ayrılan alanlarda uyuyabilmekte ve yemek yiyebilmektedirler. Ayrıca evlerin iç kısmı her zaman dışarıdakilere görünebilmektedir. Çünkü perdeler hiçbir zaman kapanmamaktadır. Helen ve Rachel, dışarıda gezerken başka insanların hayatlarını izleyebilmektedir. Bu olay "erkek bakması/male gaze" teorisini baş aşağı etmektedir. "Erkek bakması" teorisine göre kadın her zaman erkeğin gözünde bir obje olarak vardır. Erkek, kadına bakarken zevk ve arzularını tatmin etmektedir. Helen ve Rachel ise bu durumu ters çevirip iki kadın olarak başka insanların hayatlarını izlemektedir. En önemli kısım ise onların da izlendiğidir. Böylece Woolf, romanlarında ataerkil bir sistemin yerine tam tersi bir sistem kurmuştur. Kadın ve erkeğin eşit bir biçimde yaşadığı bir hayatı kurgulamıştır.

B. İnsanlar Arasındaki Samimiyet

Karnaval sırasında insanlar bir birine samimi bir şekilde – aralarında her hangi bir fark yokmuş gibi – davranırlar. Gemide roman kahramanları aralarındaki cinsiyet farkını unutarak bir biriyle samimi olurlar. Rachel, Richard Dalloway ile

samimi bir şekilde zaman geçirir. Hatta Richard'ın eşi Clarissa, Rachel'in eline bir kitap tutuşturarak Richard'a okumasını ister. Yani Rachel, Clarissa'nin yerini almış olur. Rachel ve Richard'ın konuştukları konular da normalde evli bir erkeğin ve bekâr bir kızın konuşamayacakları konulardır. Santa Marina'da ise kahramanlar samimi bir şekilde birbirlerine yakınlaşırlar. Erkek kahramanlar kadın kahramanlara yanaşır ve flört eder. Rachel, Terence ile yakınlaşır ve aralarında aşk başlar. Kısaca bu bölümde Woolf'un *Dışa Yolculuk* adlı romanı Bakhtin'in karnaval kavramı açısından incelenmiş ve kadın kahramanların ataerkil baskıcı dünyadan ayrı biçimde nasıl yaşayabilecekleri işlenmiştir.

IV. BÖLÜM

DENİZ FENERİ VE *FLUSH ADLI ROMANLARDA* ATAERKİL FİGÜRLERİN TAHTTAN İNDİRİLMESİ

Woolf, kadının konumunu yeniden yapılandırırken otorite sağlayan figürlerin zayıflıklarını ortaya koymaktadır. Böylece ataerkil sisteme karşı çıkmaktadır. *Deniz Feneri* ve *Flush* adlı romanlarında kadın kahramanlar koca ve baba olan iki ataerkil figürün zayıflıklarını ortaya çıkararak kendi değerlerinin önemini vurgulamaktadırlar. Bakhtin'e göre tahttan indirme olayı karnaval sırasında sıkça yer alan bir olaydır. Karnaval sırasında halk, kendilerinden birini taçlandırmakta ve aynı zamanda tacını geri alarak o kişiyi dövebilmektedir. Bu olaydaki en önemli unsur hayatın daima değişebilir olmasıdır.

A. *Deniz Feneri* Adlı Romanda Ataerkil Figürün Zayıflaması

Deniz Feneri adlı romanda Ramsay ailesinin yazlıklarında geçirdikleri dönem anlatılmaktadır. Sekiz çocukları bulunan Ramsay ailesinin bir de misafirleri vardır. Bay Ramsay, ailenin reisi olarak herkesin onu dinlemesini ister. Ramsaylerin en küçük oğlu James, deniz fenerine gitmek istediğinde annesi onu desteklese de babası

karşı çıkar ve bu gezintinin anlamsız olduğunu belirtir. Kısacası Bay Ramsay, düzen ve istikrar abidesidir. Hiçbir amacı olmayan, sadece sıkıntılı bir hayattan kaçış olarak görünen deniz feneri yolculuğu Bay Ramsay için gereksiz bir olaydır. Bay Ramsay, böyle durumlara karşı çıkarak diğer kahramanların hoş vakit geçirmek adına isteklerini reddederek kendini güçlü hissetmektedir. Kadınlarla ilgili fikirleri ise sabittir. Kadınlar evde oturması gereken varlıklardır. Fakat tüm bu güç gösterilerine rağmen Bay Ramsay, eşi ve evdeki misafirlerden birisi olan Lily tarafından aşağılanır. Bayan Ramsay kocasını gördüğünde kapana sıkışmış bir deniz aslanına benzetir. Bay Ramsay kendini güçlü olarak göstermek ve zor işleri yapabilecek birisi olarak tanıtırken, Bayan Ramsay bunun aslında bir masal ve Bay Ramsay'ın hayal dünyası olduğunu ortaya koyar. Bu hikâyede Bayan Ramsay'e göre Bay Ramsey, aslında vadettiği hiçbir şeyi gerçekleştiremeyecek zayıf birisidir. Bay Ramsay da eşinin yanında zayıf olduğunu ve onun desteğine ihtiyaç duyduğunu düşünür. Bilim adamı olan Bay Ramsay'ın felsefi fikirlerini anlamayan Lily, bunu farklı bir yöntemle anlamaya çalışır. Bir mutfak masasının yerinde olmadığı zamanları orada var olduğunu düşünerek Bay Ramsay'ın felsefi fikirlerini somut bir zemine taşır. Bu şekilde Bakhtin'in aşağılama unsuruna benzeyen bir teknik kullanmış olur. Bakhtin'in dediğine göre karnaval sırasında tüm felsefi ve soyut fikirler somut bir bedenin seviyesine iner. Sonuç olarak Bay Ramsay kendini yüceltmeye çalışırken, zayıflıklarını görüp kadınların desteğine ihtiyaç duyduğu fikrini ortaya koyar. Bayan Ramsay ve Lily'e göre Bay Ramsay hayli güçsüz ve beceriksiz birisidir. Böylece Bakhtin'in karnavalındaki gibi olmasa da otorite figürü olan Bay Ramsay, kadın kahramanlar tarafından aşağılanmakta ve tahtından indirilmektedir.

B. *Flush* Adlı Romandaki Baba Figürünün Tahttan İndirilmesi

Flush adlı roman bir köpekle ilgilidir. Ünlü İngiliz şair Elizabeth Barrett Browning'in gerçekte yaşayan köpeğinin hikâyesini işleyen bu romanda Flush adındaki bir köpeğin hayat hikâyesi ikiye ayrılır. Elizabeth'in baba evindeki yaşamı ve evliliğidir. Elizabeth'in babası Bay Barrett, kızını evinin arka odasına hasta ve

sakat olduğu bahanesiyle hapseder. Elizabeth'in köpeği Flush, bu odayı küçük bir hapis odası olarak görür. Bay Barrett her gün gelip kızının kendi koyduğu kurallara uyup uymadığını kontrol eder. Flush, Bay Barrett'ten çok korkar. Bay Barrett, Elizabeth'in kendi sözünden çıkmasını istemez. Flush kaçırıldığında fidye vermekten kaçınır. Elizabeth'in de bunu yapmasını yasaklar. Bu arada Elizabeth'in arkadaşı olan Bay Browning, sıkça ziyarete gelir. Flush bu durumdan şüphelenir. Nitekim bir gün Flush, evden kaçtıklarını anlar ve kendini İtalya'da bulur. İtalya'daki ortam İngiltere'deki ortamın tam tersidir. Elizabeth sakatlıktan kurtulmuş hatta doğum yapmıştır. Flush özgürce dışarıda gezmeye başlar. Sonuç olarak Elizabeth babasının ev hapsinden kaçarak İtalya'da özgürce yaşamaya başlar. Flush bu özgürlüğü büyük ölçüde anlar ve yaşar. Fakat Elizabeth'in ataerkil bir baskıdan kaçma yöntemi başka bir ataerkil sistem olan evliliğe sığınmak olmuştur. Bu olay da Woolf'un romanlarında Bakhtin'in karnaval duygusunun tam olarak yaşanamayacağını göstermektedir.

V. BÖLÜM

ORLANDO'DA GROTESK: ANDROJEN ZİHİN VE BEDENLER

Woolf'un *Orlando* adlı romanı bedenin sabit olması gerektiği fikrine bir karşı duruştur. Orlando cinsiyet değiştirir. Başka kahramanların cinsiyetleri sabit değildir. Orlando üst sınıf bir ailenin erkek çocuğu olarak görülür. Sonra cinsiyet değiştirerek bir kadın olarak ortaya çıkar. Evlenir ve bir çocuk sahibi olur. Bu roman Bakhtin'in grotesk kavramı açısından incelenmiştir. Bakhtin'in grotesk imgeleri gibi, *Orlando*'nun kahramanları da sürekli bir değişim içindedir.

A. Androjen Zihin

A.1 *Orlando*'da Androjen Zihin: Anlatıcı ve Orlando

A.1.1 Anlatıcının Androjen Zihni

Orlando adlı roman biyografi tarzı olarak yazılmış olsa da bu yazı türüne de tam olarak uymamaktadır. Anlatıcının androjen bir zihne sahip olduğu bu düzenin bozulmasıyla ortaya çıkmaktadır. Genel olarak erkek bakış açısıyla yazılmış yazı türü olarak kabul edilen biyografi tarihte önemli rol oynamış erkeklerin hayat hikâyesini ele alır. Doğal olarak evde ev işleriyle uğraşan kadınların hayat hikâyeleri bu yazı türünde pek yer almaz. Woolf'a göre geleneksel biyografi yazarı anlattığı kişinin yaşadığı önemli olayları işlerken o kişinin içsel dünyasının farkına varmaz. Çünkü içsel dünya somut değildir. Dokunulamaz ve görülemez. Çoğu zaman düşünmekten başka bir şey yapmayan, yaşadığı olaylar sebebiyle kendisini hiçbir kategoriye sığdıramayan Orlando'nun hayat hikâyesini yazmayı seçen bir anlatıcı, geleneksel bir biyografi yazarından farklıdır. Romanın anlatıcısı Orlando'nun bir anne olduğundan sadece kısa bir cümleyle bahsederken, onun bir yazar olduğunu kitabın başından sonuna kadar en ince detayına kadar anlatmıştır. Orlando'nun cinsiyet değiştirmesi sırasında ise olağanüstü bir şey olmamış gibi davranarak hikâyesine devam etmektedir.

A.1.2 Orlando'nun Androjen Zihni ve Kadın Olmanın Zorlukları

Romanın başından itibaren Orlando'nun androjen bir zihne sahip olduğu vurgulanmaktadır. Orlando, ataları gibi başka insanların kafalarını koparıp zaferle eve dönmek isteyen, genelde erkeklerle özdeşleşmiş vahşi olmayı sergilerken aynı zamanda yumuşak kalpli olmakta, yalnızlıktan hoşlanmakta, şiir okuyarak veya yazarak zaman geçirmektedir. Yakışıklı bir erkekten kadına dönüştüğünde ise Orlando'nun yüzünde hiçbir şaşırma izi oluşmamaktadır. Kadın olmadan önceki birkaç günlük uykusunda Bakhtin'in teorisindeki ölüm haline benzer durumu yaşamaktadır. Orlando uyurken herkes onun öldüğünü düşünür. Çünkü yaşama dair hiç bir işaret yoktur. Bakhtin'e göre her ölüm yeni bir başlangıçtır. Orlando, uykusundan uyandığında bir kadın olarak yeni bir hayata merhaba demiştir. Orlando

cinsiyet değiştirip bir kadın olarak ortaya çıksa da erkek gibi davranabilmektedir. Toplumun kadına biçtiği rolleri oynayamamaktadır. Yani Orlando bir bedende iki cinsiyet taşıyarak dünyayı daha zengin görebilmektedir. Çünkü her iki bakış açısına da sahiptir.

B. Çelişkili/Androjen/Grotesk Bedenler: Orlando, Sasha ve Dük/Düşes

Romanın başından beri Orlando'nun görünüşü çelişkiler içermektedir. Bir genç erkek olarak ortaya çıksa da giydiği giysiler onu kadına benzetmiştir. Anlatıcı da Orlando'yu anlatırken geleneksel olarak kadınların anlatıldığı yöntemi kullanmaktadır. Orlando'nun yüzünü resmederken çiçek ve meyve imgelerini çizmektedir. Orlando'nun cinsiyet değiştirdiği şehir olan Konstantinopolis de Pawlowski'ye göre çelişkili bir ortamdır. Batı ile doğu arasındaki sınırın yok olduğu Konstantinopolis şehri vahşi bir manzara sunmaktadır. Aynı zamanda şehirde bir kargaşa ortamı oluşmuş ve halk bir birine girmiştir. Dük/Düşesin bedeni de androjen bir imgedir. Aslında Dük olan Harry, Orlando'nun erkek olduğunu bilerek ona âşık olmuş, kadın kılığında ona yaklaşmıştır. Orlando, Konstantinopolis'e elçi olarak gidince ve orada cinsiyet değiştirince Dük, Orlando'ya bu sefer erkek olarak yaklaşıp evlenme teklif eder. Anlatıcı Dükü gözleri kocaman ve burnu titrek bir tavşana benzetir. Bakhtin'e göre insan ve hayvan dünyasının birleştiği imgeler grotesk imgelerdir. Bu imgeler dünyayı bir bütün olarak göstermektedir.

B.1 Androjen Cinsellik

Romandaki cinsellik kavramının çelişkiler içermesi Woolf'un cinsiyet kavramlarının sabit olmadığını göstermektedir. Orlando genç bir erkekken Sasha adında Rus bir prensese âşık olur. Cinsiyet değiştirip kadın olunca da Sasha'ya âşık olduğunu anlar. Orlando, erkekken tanıştığı Düke cinsel ilgi duymaktadır. Fakat Dükün normalde erkek olduğu düşünülürse cinselliğin de androjen olduğu görülmektedir. Orlando kadınken de bir hayat kadınından etkilendiği görülmektedir.

Dük/Düşesin cinselliği de androjendir. Çünkü her ikisi de erkek olmasına rağmen, Dük Orlando'ya âşık olmuştur.

C. Diğer Grotesk İmgeler

Cinsiyet hiyerarşisi konusu hariç romandaki diğer grotesk imgeler romandaki olaylar için arka plandır. Orlando'nun oynadığı gülen yüz ifadeli kafatası da grotesk bir imge olup, vahşi bir olayı temsil etmekle olup yaşayan insanlara gülme imgesiyle karşılık vermektedir. Kraliçenin anlatıldığı bölümler de bir grotesk imgedir. Kraliçenin bedeni anlatılırken organları ayrı ayrı anlatılmıştır. Bu da Bakhtin'in teorisindeki beden parçalanması kavramına benzemektedir. Sasha anlatılırken ise farklı hayvanlara benzetilmiştir. Büyük don sırasında soğuktan donarak taşlara dönüşen insanlar da grotesk bir görüntü oluşturmaktadırlar. Kısaca, *Orlando* romanı Woolf'un geleneksel sabit bazı fikirlerine karşı geldiği bir romandır. Androjenlik kavramıyla cinsiyet olgusunu değişken olarak gösteren Woolf, roman kahramanlarını cansız çeşitli varlıklara benzeterek insanın tüm dünyaya sarılıp bir bütün oluşturabileceğini ortaya koymaktadır.

VI. BÖLÜM

SONUÇ

Virginia Woolf'un romanlarında var olan karamsar hava ve romanların şiirsel yapısı, ölümü bile sevinçle karşılayan Bakhtin'in karnaval teorisi açısından incelenmesini çok da mümkün kılmamaktadır. Fakat Woolf'un espri anlayışı ve bitmek tükenmek bilmeyen ataerkil toplum kurallarını baş aşağı eden işleyişi romanlarının Bakhtin'in teorisi açısından incelenebilmesine imkân tanımaktadır. Ayrıca Bakhtin'in teorilerinin feminist eleştirmenler tarafından yoğun biçimde kullanılması Woolf ve Bakhtin'i yan yana getirmek için uygun bir zemin oluşturmuştur. Dünyayı baş aşağı sunan karnaval ortamı, katılımcılara rahatlama ve

zevk alma duygusu sunmaktadır. Woolf'un *Dışa Yolculuk* (1915), *Deniz Feneri* (1927), *Orlando* (1928) ve *Flush* (1933) adlı dört romanında karnaval ortamına benzer bir ortam sergilenmektedir. Roman kahramanları geleneksel kuralları unutup, özgür bir hayat sürdürmektedirler. Otoriteyi yok sayarak bedenin değişken olduğunun farkına varmaktadırlar.

Woolf, yaşamı boyunca kadın haklarını savunmuştur. Bu tez Woolf'un ataerkil dayanağı olan istikrar kavramını, cinsiyet hiyerarşisini ve bedenin sabit bir şekil olduğu fikrini karnavalize ederek bozmaya çalıştığı tezini güçlendirmektedir. Yukarıda adı geçen romanların kahramanları ataerkil baskıcı bir ortamdan özgür olabilecekleri bir ortama kaçmaktadırlar. Cinsiyet kurallarının yok sayıldığı bir ortamda androjen bir kişilik sergilemektedirler. Bakhtin'in karnaval katılımcıları sınıfsal farklılıklardan kaçarken Woolf'un kahramanları cinsiyet farklılık baskısından kaçmaktadır. İki yazar arasındaki karşılaştırmada Woolf'un romanlarında Bakhtin'in karnaval yaşam tarzının tam olarak yaşanamayacağı ortaya konulmaktadır. Romanlarda da görüldüğü gibi ataerkil hayat biçimi hayatın her alanına sinmiş, yok edilmesi güç bir olgudur. Woolf'un romanlarında göstermek istediği şey, bu ataerkil yapısının nasıl yok edilebileceğidir. Woolf'un romanlarında ataerkil bir yapıdan kurtulmuş bir dünya sunulamamaktadır. Woolf'un romanları Bakhtin'in diyalojizm teorisi açısından da incelenebilir. Bakhtin'in diyalojizm kavramına göre her bir ifadede hatta her bir sözcükte farklı fikirler vardır. Woolf'un romanlarında da bu tip diyalojizmi bulmak mümkündür. Woolf, daima ataerkil yapıyla mücadele ederek romanlarının her satırında bu yapıya karşı bir sesleniş içerisindedir. Sonuç olarak Woolf'un romanlarını Bakhtin'in teorisi açısından incelendiğinde Woolf'un romanlarındaki ataerkil yapıdan kaçış yollarını işleyiş zenginliği ortaya çıkmaktadır. Woolf, cinsiyet ayrımcılığına, Bakhtin ise sınıfsal ayrımcılığa karşı çıkmaktadır. Her iki yazar baskıcı yapılara karşı çıkmaktadır. İki yazar da halkın bir bütün olmasını istemiş ve her hangi bir bölünmeye karşı durmuşlardır.

TEZ FOTOKOPİSİ İZİN FORMU

ENSTİTÜ

Fen Bilimleri Enstitüsü ☐

Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü ☐

Uygulamalı Matematik Enstitüsü ☐

Enformatik Enstitüsü ☐

Deniz Bilimleri Enstitüsü ☐

YAZARIN

Soyadı: Yılmaz
Adı: Victoria Bilge
Bölümü: İngiliz Edebiyatı

TEZİN ADI (İngilizce): Carnivalization of Gender Hierarchies and the Body in Virginia Woolf's Fiction

TEZİN TÜRÜ: Yüksek Lisans ☐ Doktora ☐

1. Tezimin tamamından kaynak gösterilmek şartıyla fotokopi alınabilir. ☐

2. Tezimin içindekiler sayfası, özet, indeks sayfalarından ve/veya bir Bölümünden kaynak gösterilmek şartıyla fotokopi alınabilir. ☐

3. Tezimden bir (1) yıl süreyle fotokopi alınamaz. ☐

TEZİN KÜTÜPHANEYE TESLİM TARİHİ: