T.C.
İSTANBUL ÜNİVERSİTESİ
SOSYAL BİLİMLER ENSTİTÜSÜ
BATI DİLLERİ VE EDEBİYATLARI ANABİLİM DALI
İNGİLİZ DİLİ VE EDEBİYATI BİLİM DALI

YÜKSEK LİSANS TEZİ

AN ECOFEMINIST READING OF MARGARET ATWOOD'S *THE EDIBLE WOMAN* AND ISABEL COLEGATE'S *THE SHOOTING PARTY*

Selcen KAVASLAR

2501210286

TEZ DANIŞMANI

DOÇ. DR. Arpine MIZIKYAN

İSTANBUL – 2024

ABSTRACT

AN ECOFEMINIST READING OF MARGARET ATWOOD'S *THE EDIBLE WOMAN* AND ISABEL COLEGATE'S *THE SHOOTING PARTY*

SELCEN KAVASLAR

The aim of this thesis is to explore the linked experiences of women and animals in a patriarchal culture. To do so, ecofeminism as a means of discussion in terms of the subordination of women and animals is utilized in this study. Ecofeminism inspects how patriarchy in the centre dominates women, animals, nature and other marginalised groups. Within this context, this study investigates how patriarchal culture establishes a hegemony over nature and justifies the secondary position of otherised groups, specifically women, by associating them with nature. The dichotomies, such as nature/culture and body/mind that play an important role in ecofeminist theoretical frame is analysed in the study, which also highlights the related objectification of women and animals since they are both reduced to the body and excluded from the realm of the mind. Ecofeminists argue that the violation of animals and nature are metaphorically connected to sexual violation of women. Moreover, hunting, is considered as an act of domination over nature and animals; thus, it is evaluated as an act of masculinity. The novels here studied are **The Edible Woman** by Margaret Atwood and **The Shooting Party** by Isabel Colegate. In **The Edible Woman**, Carol J. Adams's concept of the absent referent is mentioned in the analysis of Marian's vegetarianism and her identification with animals. In **The Shooting Party**, the construction of the masculine self as the hunter and the link between war and hunting are evaluated. The position of the marginalised groups, such as women, animals and the lower classes are referred to and analysed within the light of ecofeminism with the aim of revealing the conjoint objectification of women and animals by hegemonic masculinity.

Keywords: Ecofeminism, vegetarianism, hunting, war, absent referent, intersectionality.

ÖZ

MARGARET ATWOOD'UN *THE EDIBLE WOMAN* VE ISABEL COLEGATE'İN *THE SHOOTING PARTY* ROMANLARININ EKOFEMİNİST BİR OKUMASI

SELCEN KAVASLAR

Bu tezin amacı, patriyarkada kadın ve hayvanların ortak deneyimlerine işaret etmek ve bu ortak deneyimleri incelemektir. Kadın ve hayvanların ikincil konumlarını tartışmak için ekofeminizm bir araç olarak kullanılmıştır. Ekofeminizm, merkezdeki ataerkinin kadın, doğa, hayvanlar ve diğer marjinalleştirilmiş gruplar üzerinde nasıl tahakküm kurduğunu inceler. Bu bağlamda, bu çalışma, patriyarkal kültürün, doğa üzerinde kurduğu tahakkümü ve özellikle kadınlar olmak üzere ötekileştirilen grupları, doğa ile ilişkilendirerek ikincil konumlarını meşrulaştırışını inceler. Ekofeminist teorik çerçevede önemli rol oynayan ve hem kadınların hem de hayvanların bedenlerine indirgenerek, akıl alanından dışlandıklarından dolayı, yaşadıkları benzer nesneleştirilmeyi aydınlatan doğa/kültür, beden/akıl gibi dikotomiler analiz edilmiştir. Ekofeministler, doğanın ve hayvanların istismarının kadınların cinsel istismarı ile metaforik bir bağı olduğunu iddia eder. Buna ek olarak, avlanmak, doğa üzerinde tahakküm kurma eylemi olarak görüldüğünden, maskülen bir eylem olarak atfedilir. Bu tezde çalışılan romanlar, Margaret Atwood'un **The Edible Woman** ve Isabel Colegate'in **The Shooting Party** romanlarıdır. Margaret Atwood'un **The Edible Woman** adlı romanında Carol J. Adams'ın kayıp gönderge kavramı, Marian'ın vejetaryenliğinin ve kendini hayvanlar ile özdeşleştirişinin tahlilinde kullanılmıştır. Isabel Colegate'in **The Shooting Party** adlı romanında maskülen öznenin avcı olarak inşası ile savaş ve av arasındaki bağ incelenmiştir. Adı geçen her iki romanda, kadın ve hayvanların, hegemonik erkeklik tarafından benzer şekilde nesneleştirildiklerini gösterme amacı ile kadınlar, hayvanlar ve alt sınıflar gibi ötekileştirilen grupların konumlarına değinilmiş ve ekofeminizm çatısı altında incelenmiştir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Ekofeminizm, vejetaryenlik, av, savaş, kayıp gönderge, kesişimsellik.

PREFACE

Ecofeminism has been a very interesting and inspirational topic for me to study. I believe that if we can understand and internalise the theoretical background of ecofeminism, it may lead us to change the world for better. My first encounter with ecofeminist theorists was when I was an undergraduate student. When I first read **The Sexual Politics of Meat** and **Feminism and Mastery of Nature,** I found them fascinating, which motivated me to research about the subject more. This thesis has given me the opportunity to dwell on the topic and discover the philosophy of ecofeminism further. Thus, the preparation of this thesis has been an exciting process for me. I feel that ecofeminism is a promising theory that can be a key to an equal future. Reading the selected novels through an ecofeminist perspective has been an inspiring journey. I have found that both novels should be read closely since they have so much material to evaluate from an ecofeminist perspective. Studying these novels has given me the chance to ponder upon stunning topics related to the subject under scrutiny. In the research process, I have found that my research topic of examination has extended to various discussion points such as, war and masculinity, which I have felt enthusiastic to study. Moreover, this thesis has played a significant role in joining my passion for ecofeminism with my interest in nature and animals.

I owe a great debt of gratitude to my supervisor Associate Professor Arpine Mızıkyan who has guided me in the preparation of this thesis. I would like to thank all my professors at Kütahya Dumlupınar University since they have been so kind and supportive. I also thank all my professors and colleagues at İstanbul Nişantaşı University for motivating and cheerful days of my assistantship there. Finally, I am grateful to my family; they have always been there to support me.

Selcen KAVASLAR

İSTANBUL, 2024

CONTENTS

Page

ABBREVIATION LIST

Ed. : Edited

EW : **The Edible Woman**

Feminists : **Feminists for Animal Rights**

Ibid : Ibidem, meaning “in the same place”

w. date. : without date

qtd. in : quoted in

SP : **The Shooting Party**

Trans. : Translated

INTRODUCTION

Ecofeminism is a theory that is established among women as a consciousness that revolts against both ecological destruction and the exploitation of women. Historically, it is seen that the word "ecofeminisme" is first used by the French feminist Françoise d'Eaubonne, in her book, **Le Feminisme ou la Mort** published in 1974 which refers to ecological subjects criticising patriarchy (Mellor, 1997: 44). Ecofeminism brings a theoretical explanation to the patriarchal domination of women, animals, and nature. Nature is seen as an inferior place and all marginalised groups are associated with the realm of nature to reinforce the hegemony over them. As Alicia Ostriker points out both women and nature are regarded as "essentially, ideally, and properly inferior, passive, intended for man's use; yet at the same time potentially dangerous, threatening, wild and evil, requiring to be tamed by force" (Ostriker, 1982: 82). Therefore, ecofeminism underscores the necessity of challenging the anthropocentric perception of nature. It aims to free nature from human exploitation and advocates the emancipation of all marginalised groups. It imagines a future that we see animals and nature as independent subjects rather than passive inert objects. It advocates the idea that instead of establishing mastery over nature and animals, humans should have mutual interaction with them. Ecofeminist theory emphasises the need for intersectional emancipation movement between all marginalised groups such as women, animals, the lower classes, non-European ethnic identities, and non-heterosexual people. Their subordination is justified by associating them with nature and the body. Within this context, ecofeminism deals with the role of dichotomies such as body/mind, nature/culture in the subordination of marginalised people. The mastery of human culture over nature draws a parallelism with the mastery of the white upper-class men over otherised groups and that is the core idea of ecofeminism. As a theory, is interrelated with other theories such as, poststructuralism and postmodernism since it also takes the binary oppositions into account as a tool of hegemony. It deconstructs the anthropocentric world view which puts nature in a second position while also dismantling patriarchal ideology that treats women and nature in the same way. Moreover, animals as part of nature, are also objectified just as women.

The association of women with nature is widely discussed in ecofeminism. The representation of women and nature as closer to each other is elaborated by ecofeminist theorists which will be explained in detail in the first chapter. Within that context, ecofeminism has its own subbranches. Janet Biehl names ecofeminists who have an essentialist perspective as Psycho -Biologistic Ecofeminists (Biehl, 1991: 11) and the other group who believes that "the woman-nature association is a social construction, an ideology that is the product of men" as Social Constructionist Ecofeminists (Biehl, 1991: 17). The image of mother nature is reinforced by the first group of ecofeminists, who glorify the fertility of the female body as closer to nature. A critical ecofeminist approach does not approve these essentialist ideas, it underlines that these are social constructions that are used to justify the subordinate positions of both women and nature.

Ecofeminism marks that the subordination of nature and animals should also be dismantled as well as of women. Ecofeminist theorists recognise the theoretical connection between the subordination of marginalised groups: "For the past two thousand years, women, animals, nature, and people of color have become conceptually associated in Western patriarchal thought, and it is their culturally constructed 'closeness to nature' as well as their supposed lack of reason that authorizes and reinforces their subordination" (Gaard, 2002: 126). Human identity as a master is constructed with values that are attributed to men; therefore, it excludes both women and animals as Greta Gaard asserts: "These value dualisms create value hierarchies that construct an artificially distinct and superior Master identity by justifying the inferiority, subordination, and colonization of indigenous people, people of color, animals, and the natural world, as well as women, emotions, and the body, as Plumwood argued; as I have argued, these value dualisms also include sexually diverse beings and behaviors, and the erotic itself" (Gaard, 2017: xxiv). Women are seen as closer to the realm of nature and animals whereas men are positioned as masters of nature, animals and women. On the contrary of feminist aim of emancipation of women by engaging them with the human identity that is constructed by male values, ecofeminists believe that the anthropocentric understanding of human identity and domination of human over nature should be

deconstructed as well as domination of men over women. Ecofeminism criticises using rationalism as a justification of domination over nature, animals and women. Thus, feminists that promote moving women to rational and cultural realm without deconstructing dichotomies such as nature/culture, body/mind, human/animal are disapproved in ecofeminist theory. As such, Carol J. Adams explains that feminists that try to break the association of women and animals should also be critical to human/animal dualism.:

> The initial feminist response to this positioning between man and beast—found for instance in Mary Wollstonecraft and continuing today in liberal feminism— is to say "we are not animals, we are humans." But this position assimilates the malestream culture's contempt for animals within feminist theory. The human/animal boundary is left secure, while women are moved from one side of it to the other. An alternative feminist position asserts that we are not man, since man is not and never can be generic, and we are not beasts, since beast exists largely as metaphor for human behavior, as self-judgment. Rather than resituating any of the players from one side to the other, this position calls the human/animal dualism into question (Adams, 2018: xxxvii).

Feminists such as Mary Wollstonecraft, who is one of the earlier feminists, and Simone de Beauvoir who has published a significant feminist work, **The Second Sex,** in 1949; are examples of the feminist attitude that ecofeminism denounces. There are many earlier feminists that advocate animal rights and Mary Wollstonecraft is one of them (Gaard, 2002: 125), however; her theoretical explanation for the defence of women's rights is criticised by ecofeminists. An 18th century text, **A Vindication of The Rights of Woman** is her important feminist work that destroys the traditional understanding of femininity. However, ecofeminist theory believes that whereas breaking the traditional understanding of femininity, feminists should not reinforce values that justify the subordination of animals. About Wollstonecraft's text, Barbara Brook states: "her defence of the rights of women to citizenship in part rests on an establishment of the middle-class, educated woman as

man's equal by virtue of her separation from the more animal, uneducated serving classes" (Brook, 2014: 24). Wollstonecraft emphasises rationality of women and promotes superiority of rationality over emotions: "let the dignified pursuit of virtue and knowledge raise the mind above those emotions which rather embitter than sweeten the cup of life, when they are not restrained within due bounds" (Wollstonecraft, 2006: 28). As Adams also highlights, Wollstonecraft promotes women's rights and deconstructs the association of women with animals by stating that women are reasonable as opposed to animals (Adams, 2018: 123). In terms of ecofeminist perspective, this attitude is not enough for emancipation since it still reinforces the exploitation of animals by excluding them from the realm of rationality. Brook states that de Beauvoir also embraces the dichotomies that ecofeminism deconstructs: "For de Beauvoir, it was necessary for women to conquer the 'swampy' female body and give the self to the mind" (Brook, 2014: 15). Ecofeminist perspective towards the female body is different than the patriarchal ideology that devalues the body which will be discussed in detail in the following chapters. Ecofeminist theory rejects dichotomous thinking that justifies the subordination of women and animals, and it aims the emancipation of animals as well as of women. Accordingly, Adams states:

> In response to the conceptual connections between women and animals, feminists as diverse as Mary Wollstonecraft and Simone de Beauvoir have attempted theoretically to sever these connections. Clearly, in the light of the connections between the abuse of animals and the abuse of women, this theoretical response is inadequate because it presumes the acceptability of the human/animal value dualism while moving women from the disempowered side of the dyad to the dominating side. Any adequate feminist peace politics will be nonanthropocentric, rejecting value dualisms that are oppositional and hierarchical, such as the human/animal dualism (Adams, 2018: 152-153).

The Edible Woman is published in 1969 which corresponds to the development of second wave feminism as well as the birth of ecofeminism. Accordingly, it highlights ecofeminist criticism of the first wave and the second wave of feminism which will

be evaluated in the second chapter of the thesis. **The Shooting Party** is published in 1980 but sets in Edwardian era; thus, suffragette movement of the era is mentioned in the novel. Yet essentially it provides ecofeminist intersectional ideas which have begun to develop when the novel is written.

Ecofeminism deconstructs the dichotomy of body/mind; therefore, contemporary ecofeminists who advocate animal rights do not base their theory on mere reason but they also value emotions. Certain important texts of animal rights theory are Peter Singer's **Animal Liberation** (Singer, 1975), Tom Regan's **The Case for Animal Rights** (Regan, 1983), Jacques Derrida's "The Animal That Therefore I am" (Derrida, 2002). As different than male theorists of the field, feminist animal rights theorists such as Carol J. Adams, Greta Gaard, Josephine Donovan, Marti Kheel, Lori Gruen, Laura Wright, Emelia Quinn, highlight intersectionality. Derrida criticises Cartesian thought in "The Animal That Therefore I am"; however, Laura Wright still disapproves seeing him as the leader of animal rights and ignoring the works of feminist women in the field (Wright, 2021:13). Moreover, Josephine Donovan criticises Peter Singer and Tom Regan who exclude emotions from animal rights theory for emotions are devalued and attributed to women (Donovan, 1993: 167). Adams also states that how animal rights activists emphasise rationality since they do not want to be accused of being irrational which is a negative value that is used to define women (Adams, 2018: 125). Both Donovan and Adams point out how rationalism and dualisms are used as tools to justify the subordinate position of animals; thus, it is ironic to establish the theoretical background of the defence of animal rights by approving only reason and excluding sentimentality (Donovan, 1993:168) (Adams, 2018: 125). Women are excluded from the realm of reason and are associated with the realm of sentimentality which has a lesser value; thus, it is considerable that ecofeminists validate the significance of emotions in animal rights theory. Accordingly, Adams states that: "one could build on feminist ethicists who develop a theory of embodiment" (Adams, 2018: 125) which is a term explained as feminists who advocate animal rights should see pain of animals that are invisible in our culture. (**Ibid**.). Val Plumwood, also defences "a virtue-based ethics— for example, an ethic of friendship, care and responsibility"

(Plumwood, 1993: 173). As Greta Gaard articulates that empathy and understanding, due to common experiences between marginalised groups and animals, play an important role in ecofeminist thinking that defences animal rights:

> Mothers can 'empathize with the sow whose reproductive freedoms have been denied and whose nursing experience seems so wretched'; survivors of rape or domestic violence can imagine 'feeling like a piece of meat,' though this violence is not to be equated with or confused with becoming meat. Moreover, people of color, women, gays, and lesbians all know the experience of being hunted (Gaard, 2002: 120).

Ecofeminist literary theory dwells on the representation of the link between women and nature in literature as Rebekah Taylor- Wiseman articulates: "Much of the existing ecofeminist scholarship on literature in English suggests that constructions of nature as mother (female) are perpetuated in order to control, conquer, or objectify nature, and by extension, women who are traditionally associated with nature in the binary opposition" (Wiseman, 2023: 245). The association of women with nature can be elaborated under two subtitles: one is that their fertility is seen as closer to nature; the other is that they, just like nature, are seen as primitive creatures that need to be tamed by the patriarchal culture. Thus, traditional representations of nature are parallel with female stereotypes in literature, which are ideal domestic woman and evil woman as Carolyn Merchant articulates:

> The images of both nature and woman were two-sided. The virgin nymph offered peace and serenity, the earth mother nurture and fertility, but nature also brought plagues, famines, and tempests. Similarly, woman was both virgin and witch: the Renaissance courtly lover placed her on a pedestal; the inquisitor burned her at the stake. The witch, symbol of the violence of nature, raised storms, caused illness, destroyed crops, obstructed generation, and killed infants. Disorderly woman, like chaotic nature, needed to be controlled (Merchant, 1989: 127).

The belief that witches have a pact with Satan has emerged in Medieval era (Akın, 2024, 181). It is believed that women, such as Eve, have weaker willpower, thus; they are easily tempted by the Satan (**Ibid**., p. 142). Interestingly, Satan is believed to have an animalistic body or female breast which is an idea comes from Pan, Cernunnos and Diana in ancient mythology (**Ibid**., p. 175). Accordingly, animals such as goat, pig or wolf have negative symbolic meanings (**Ibid**., p.140 p.195); and in Anglo Saxon beliefs, animals such as raven or owl accompany witches (**Ibid**., 140). Further, witches are seen as capable of transforming themselves to animals (**Ibid**., p. 195). Forest is seen as a gothic space where witchcraft is practiced (**Ibid**., p. 158) (Merchant, 1989: 140). Thus, it can be said that women are associated with wilderness of nature as opposed to civilisation. In that context, Plumwood's definition of anthropocentric understanding of wilderness is important: "'Wilderness', traditionally the territory excluded as the underside of the contrasts of reason and civilisation, is also traditionally a wasteland empty of culture and inviting colonisation" (Plumwood, 1993: 163) and that is "the alien, fearful and disordered domain of animals, women, savages and the underside of the human psyche" (**Ibid**.). Negative assumptions that are attributed to women, nature and animals can be observed in Western history which are also reflected in literature. The portrayal of women and nature as wild and evil can be observed in **the Book of Genesis** as Jean M. Higgins states that both Eve and the serpent are accused of temptation (Higgins, 1976: 641). As Gaard states: "it is a woman, a tree, and an animal that are blamed for the Fall of Man" (Gaard, 2002: 126). Merchant also interprets the story of Adam and Eve: she articulates that since they fall to wilderness due to the serpent's temptation, it is a place associated with evil as opposed to the Garden of Eden as a nurturing land (Merchant, 1989: 131). Merchant gives further examples from literature,[*] for instance she argues that in William Shakespeare's **The Tempest,** nature is conceptualised as to be tamed by human power to achieve civilisation (**Ibid**., p. 130). The myth of Circe with her wolves, can be given as another example of a negative female stereotype, who is represented as a witch that opposes the civilised world (Donovan, 1993: 179).

[*] Merchant's other readings of representation of nature in literature can be found in **The Death of Nature** (Merchant, 1989)

The other stereotype for women and nature is being a passive, nurturing tool for men which is embodied as the image of mother earth. Merchant defines it as "a nurturing mother: a kindly beneficent female who provided for the needs of mankind in an ordered, planned universe" (Merchant, 1989: 2). Aloka Patel explains the root of this association: "Ancient mythologies of the West, beginning with the Greek, Gaia, or the Roman Cybele have contributed to the representation of earth as a mother because of its fertility and procreative abilities, likening it to a womb" (Patel, 2021: 3). The archetype of the mother earth is reinforced in literary texts as Rebekah Taylor- Wiseman states that writers have adopted the mythical and religious texts that conceptualise nature as a nurturing female (Wiseman, 2023: 244). Merchant explains that in Renaissance pastoral poetry, as opposed to the chaotic city, nature is depicted as calm and peaceful setting that is equivalated to the tender and fertile female image (Merchant, 1989: 7). Patel also articulates that nature is represented as a nurturing female in British Poetry[*] (Patel, 2021: 4). Moreover, he states that the female body is resembled to the land that can be conquered as it is in the "The Sun Rising" By John Donne: "Further, there is also reference to the man's claim to the mistresses' body as much as to that of the colonized land: 'She's all state (states) and all princes, I'" (**Ibid**., p. 8). Colonial control over lands is associated with patriarchal control over women; thus, there is a correspondence between women and nature as objects that need to be tamed and conquered as Patel explains:

> But new images of controlling and dominating nature emerged in Europe with explorations of new worlds and beginnings of colonialism during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, when white men began to plunder newly "discovered" lands and their resources, in the name of civilization. These "virgin" lands, as they called them, opened another view of nature (and the native woman) as passionate, wild and uncontrollable. Literature written during these times of colonial expansion often sexualized the conquered lands as feminine (**Ibid**., p.4).

[*] Further discussion can be found in "Representation of Women and Nature in English Literary Texts" (Patel, 2021) in which Patel gives examples from English poets such as John Milton, William Cowper, Lord Byron, John Donne, Andrew Marvell.

In “For the love of Nature: Ecology and Cult of the Romantic”, Chaia Heller states that nature is associated with the idealised female that should be protected in medieval romance and in romantic tradition (Heller, 1993:). The aim of this romantic conceptualisation of nature and women is to have control over them (**Ibid**., p.231), which is also the purpose of the construction of the negative image of women and nature. As a result, both nature and women are seen as essentially wild; thus, they should be controlled and tamed. Women are essentially associated with wild and disordered nature, therefore; just as nature, they should also be domesticated and transformed to nurturing and romantic image of nature.

Animal studies are interrelated with ecofeminism as Laura Wright believes that vegan studies are empowered by ecofeminist theory (Wright, 2021:13), or as Adams argues that ecofeminism should focus on animals too (Adams, 2018, 71). Emelia Quinn and Benjamin Westwood defines veganism as avoiding using animal products since it is a lifestyle that validates animal rights (Quinn & Westwood, 2018: 19). Accordingly, Emelia Quinn and Laura Wright state that vegan literary studies focus on the function of literature in the perception of animals as well as humans. (Quinn & Wright, 2022: 3). Literature can be viewed from an ecofeminist intersectional perspective, as about animal studies Lesley Kordecki states that “Its overlap with ecofeminism provides us with a stimulating interpretive instrument for a ready body of texts that either hint at or overtly process the dual oppression and/or mutual distinctiveness of women and animals in stories of earlier ages and today” (Kordecki, 2023: 282). Ecofeminism elaborates on how victimised positions of women and animals are related to each other and how this is represented in literature.[*] As ecofeminism believes that there is a connection between experiences of women and animals, it gives a place to animals in feminist literary criticism and philosophy.

[*] For instance, Kordecki elaborates on women’s transformation to animals in Ovid’s stories by an ecofeminist perspective (Kordecki, 2023: 284-285). She interprets Medusa with serpents on her head as a symbol of resistance (Ibid., p. 286). She presents an overview of certain literary texts by focusing on the role of animals in her article “Animal Studies & Ecofeminist Literature” (Kordecki, 2023) Further discussion of literature and animal studies can also be found in **The Edinburgh Companion to Vegan Literary Studies** (Quinn & Wright, 2022).

I have chosen these two novels to read them through an ecofeminist perspective because both depict men as violators of animals and discuss hegemonic masculinity as a force that dominates marginalised groups. The imagery of hunting in the novels should be held by an ecofeminist critical look since in both novels it is displayed as an activity of patriarchal domination. The theme of hunting links the two novels in an ecofeminist context. In **The Edible Woman**, Peter is a man who hunts as a hobby and his hunting memories trigger Marian's rebellion. In **The Shooting Party**, hunting is depicted as a leisure activity of the white upper-class men to which Olivia, as a woman, brings a critical perspective. In both novels, hunting, as a cruel activity, is portrayed as a characteristic of hegemonic masculine identity which the novels challenge. In **The Edible Woman** Marian is positioned as an animal of prey with her certain behaviours such as escaping and hiding from the symbolic hunter, Peter. She is the object of Peter's gaze. **The Shooting Party** also portrays women as objects that men are fighting for. Both novels depict men as the subjects of hunting whereas women remain as their prize. Accordingly, the theme of hunting as a male behaviour of violence in these two novels will be discussed.

In **The Edible Woman**, Marian identifies herself with victimised animals; thus, shows reaction to Peter's hunting narrative. In **The Shooting Party**, Olivia undermines the heroic narrative of the masculine power that directs violence towards animals. Shooting is a male practice; Olivia, as a woman is only a spectator of it, she is not the perpetrator of patriarchal violence. Thus, she is able to empathise with animals and develop an opponent perspective to patriarchal ideology that glorifies hunting as a heroic masculine act. Likely, Marian rejects eating meat since she, as a woman, does not embrace the idea of objectifying others; on the contrary, she herself, is treated like eaten animals. Marian and Olivia are two women who recognise animal violence as a form of patriarchal practice. They underline the identity of the killer: it is men. Their opponent behaviours towards patriarchal practices are closely linked to their identity and experiences as women. It is important that **The Shooting Party** does not only direct a criticism to hunting but also to war as a male violence; it contributes to the discussion of killing as a male behaviour. This thesis will evaluate how the killing is associated with men and being

life-giving and compassion are attributed to women. The aim of this study is not to reinforce essentialist assumptions but to display how women, since they are constantly objectified and marginalised by the dominant patriarchal ideology, can bring a challenging perspective to patriarchal violence.

In both novels, there is an analogy between sexual violence and animal slaughtering that can be observed in Tom's and Peter's hunting scenes. In **The Edible Woman**, Peter's telling the story of his killing a rabbit is in parallel to Tom's killing a rabbit in **The Shooting Party**. Both scenes from both novels display the process of animals' objectification. Both Peter and Tom use a knife as a phallic symbol that echoes the sexual violation inflicted on a woman. It is significant that the bodies of women as well as those of animals are passivized and objectified. In both novels the male gaze plays a critical role in objectifying animals which also creates an analogy with the objectification of the female body. Both novels reflect comments of ecofeminist theorists on the conjoint objectification of animals and women by emphasising how women are metaphorically slaughtered, and animals are metaphorically raped.

The Edible Woman focuses on meat eating through Marian's inner journey and uses meat as a metaphor for the objectified female body. Compared to **The Shooting Party** the discussion of meat eating takes a bigger place in the novel. It is not only discussed with the discourse of animal rights, but it is highlighted by an ecofeminist approach. When Marian starts to feel something wrong with their relationship, she becomes able to empathise with animals and rejects eating meat. Her identification with animals is brought to the fore and meat eating is evaluated as a patriarchal practice. Moreover, Marian loses her ability to eat anything at all. Since she is not respected as a subject but reduced to a consumable object, she loses her agency. **The Shooting Party** gives place to the discussion of meat eating too: it has a vegetarian character named as Cornelius Cardew. In many parts, the novel underlines the subjectivity of animals and challenges the dominant anthropocentric ideology by opening ethical discussions.

The Shooting Party portrays the social structure of the Edwardian era and highlights the class struggle as part of intersectional idea of ecofeminism. It depicts one day of the shooting party of the white upper-class men and brings a criticism to the class-based society by showing the struggle of the working classes. The representation of the class struggle in the novel by focusing on Tom's accidental death is underlined. Besides, the novel uses the shooting party as a means to criticise war; thus, it dwells on the social structure and power relations other than gender relations too. However, this study will interpret how both the issue of war and class-based society is related to the criticism of hegemonic masculinity. On the other hand, **The Edible Woman** specifically focuses on women's position in patriarchal society in the 20th century by the presence of Marian, Clara, Ainsley and other women. However, both novels have an ecofeminist content that nurtures each other and opens valuable discussions.

The first chapter of the thesis attempts at explaining basis of ecofeminism by referring to significant theorists. Specifically, Val Plumwood's explanation of the role of the dichotomies in hegemonic relations is relied on. Since the focus of the thesis is women and animals, **The Sexual Politics of Meat** by Carol J. Adams, who is an important vegetarian feminist activist, is interpreted and used in the reading of the novels. In the second chapter, **The Edible Woman** is analysed by focusing on Marian's inner conflict, her vegetarianism and eating disorder and the dichotomous thinking that ecofeminism criticises. The conventional gender relations between Marian and Peter are depicted. Peter as a representative of ideal masculinity and the ideal wife identity that he tries to impose on Marian are evaluated. Marian's objectified status that leads her to identify with animals will be depicted by giving various examples from the novel. Body politics of the patriarchal culture will be mentioned through analysing the psychological effects of body/mind dichotomy that Marian has internalised. In the third chapter, **The Shooting Party** is analysed by discussing the link between masculinity, war, and hunting. Olivia's criticism about war, hunting, the dichotomous thinking, and masculine values function as undermining the patriarchal ideology. Further, Osbert, as an unconditioned child, also develops an opponent approach to male violence. The novel touches upon the

idea of how masculinity is socially constructed and imposed on children. Moreover, the representative of a vegetarian socialist character, Cardew, and the struggle of the working classes will be interpreted. Both novels challenge hegemonic masculinity as the destroyer of marginalised groups, and open discussion about patriarchal anthropocentric ideology which will be held in this thesis. Therefore, this thesis aims to prove that animals are also victimised by the same patriarchal ideology that victimises women, which is represented in the selected novels.

CHAPTER ONE

ECOFEMINISM

The term “ecofeminism” refers to both ecocriticism and feminism, and it dwells upon ecological and gender issues in a certain framework that ties them together. Moreover, ecofeminism creates conceptual links between the exploitation of nature, women, and other marginalised human groups. Ecofeminist critics argue that patriarchy has always connected women with nature, therefore there is an association between the subordination of women and nature. While women are associated with nature, men are associated with culture. Susan Griffin points to this issue in her poetical book, **Women and Nature** as such: “The fact that man does not consider himself a part of nature, but indeed considers himself superior to matter, seemed to me to gain significance when placed against man's attitude that woman is both inferior to him and closer to nature” (Griffin, 1978: XV). She notes that patriarchal discourse disengages men from nature which is regarded as an inferior sphere and uses it as a tool to degrade women, thereby devaluing both women and nature. Rosemary Radford Ruether is another ecofeminist critic who draws attention to this association implying how it is used as a ground for the exploitation of both women and nature. She also marks the correlation between the domination of women and nature:

> Since women in Western culture have been traditionally identified with nature, and nature, in turn, has been seen as an object of domination by man (males), it would seem almost a truism that the mentality that regarded the natural environment as an object of domination drew upon imagery and attitudes based on male domination of women (Ruether, 1975: 186).

She expresses how the subordination of women and nature feeds and completes each other. Ecofeminist theory also elaborates on this association, arguing that there is a correlation between the subordination of women and nature, thus feminism should intersect with ecocriticism, and fight against the exploitation of nature together with the struggle for women’s rights and freedom to end the oppression by its conjoint

point. Ecofeminism expands the argument by signifying that there are certain dualisms, including culture/nature dualism, that marginalise specific groups other than women, too. Therefore, it accentuates the intersected oppressions under the roof of patriarchy.

Ruether further explains the reason for women-nature association and gives a brief history of it in Western religion, philosophy, and science. She states that the origin of women-nature association is ancient. It comes from the reproductive biology of women and their labour based on domestic daily needs, whereas men perform works that are seen as more valuable and cultural (Ruether, 1993: 15). She expresses how women are regarded as beings belonging to the inferior material realm, which is the earth, while men belong to culture:

> It is from the perspective of this male monopoly of culture that the work of women in maintaining the material basis of daily life is defined as an inferior realm. The material world itself is then seen as something separated from males and symbolically linked with women. The earth, as the place from which plant and animal life arises, became linked with the bodies of women, from which babies emerge (**Ibid**.).

As she says religion justifies the patriarchal system: "God is the ultimate patriarchal Lord, under whom the human patriarchal lord rules over women, children, slaves, and land" (**Ibid**., p.16-17). She expresses the role of nature in science as well: although it is deprived of religious beliefs, it still has a negative value since it becomes a passive object of science (**Ibid**., p. 20). The conceptualisation of nature in religion, science, and philosophy as an inferior realm leads to the exploitation of it. Ruether, also alludes to the hierarchical way of thinking in Plato's philosophy; seeing the intellectual world as above the material world which maps the man/woman hierarchy (**Ibid**., p. 17). The notion of the degradation of the body as a substance of the material world and the female exists in Christianity, too. The female body is seen as sexually tempting, thus dangerous and inferior whereas the male soul is the dualistic opposition of it as Ruether states: "Eternal life was disembodied male soul,

freed from all material underpinnings in the mortal bodily life, represented by woman and nature. (**Ibid**., p.18). In her brief history of Western thinking, it is seen that the set of dualisms such as nature/culture, body/mind, man/woman has a significant role in the exploitation of women, animals, and nature. As she argues, we need to change our perspective towards the mind, and establish a mutual relationship with nature instead of the hierarchical relations that depend on dualisms (**Ibid**., p.21). The aim of ecofeminism, then, is to reveal the connections between oppressions and discard these dichotomies.

Ecofeminist theory maintains that women, animals, nature, the lower classes, non-European people, non-heterosexual people are placed on the margins in the circle that centres the privileged white heterosexual upper-class men who construct hegemony over marginalised ones. Greta Gaard explains the ecofeminist approach to the patriarchal oppressions as such;

> In their analyses of oppression, socialists, animal liberationists, ecologists, and feminists each distinguish between privileged and oppressed groups, where the privileged are upper- or middle-class, human, technologically and industrially "developed," male, and the oppressed are poor or working-class, nonhuman animal, "undeveloped" nature, and female, respectively (Gaard, 1993:1-2).

Ecofeminist theory argues that patriarchal ideology places the white upper-class man at the centre and suppresses both marginalised human groups and nature. It tries to reveal the bonds that tie these oppressions to each other, therefore creates an intersected movement of emancipation. Karen Warren defines this connection as such: “Ecological feminists (“ecofeminists”) claim that there are important connections between the unjustified dominations of women, people of colour, children, and the poor, and the unjustified domination of nature” (Warren, 2000: 1). Ecofeminism aims to demonstrate that the source and the dynamics of the subordination of these marginalised groups are the same and it tries to create a sense of solidarity between them. It exposes that the dominant sexist ideology that directs

oppression towards woman is related to the dominant racist, classist, speciesist, anthropocentric ideology, pointing out that these have the same discriminative, supremacist mentality as their common ground. As Gaard argues nature is also regarded as part of oppressed groups: “ecofeminism's basic premise is that the ideology which authorizes oppressions such as those based on race, class, gender, sexuality, physical abilities, and species is the same ideology which sanctions the oppression of nature” (Gaard, 1993:1). Ecofeminist theory tries to uncover how the same oppressive source, namely the patriarchal culture, reifies both women and nature and builds an affinity between them. By revealing that these associations have negative meanings that justify their subordinate position, ecofeminist theory fights with all patriarchal oppressions. As Warren states: “at least in Western societies, whenever there has been a historical identification of women and other human Others with inferior nature, the domination of women and other human Others has been explained and "justified" by their connection with nonhuman nature” (Warren, 2000: 24). Therefore, the issue of the exploitation of nature is closely related to the oppression of women and the other marginalised groups. Accordingly, ecofeminism brings the ecological problems to the field of feminist theory.

Ecofeminism analyses the dynamics of hegemony that subordinates women, animals, and nature. Traditional dominant Western thought is based on dichotomies such as body/mind, nature/culture, female/male which are the skeleton of the hierarchy of men over nature and over otherised human groups. Women, colonised people, the lower classes, animals are all associated with nature and the body whereas the white upper-class men are associated with the mind and culture. This operates as positing the white upper-class men at the centre and pushing others to the margins. Nancy Hartsock states that “‘a way of looking at the world characteristic of the dominant, white, male Eurocentric ruling class, a way of dividing up the world that puts an omnipotent subject at the centre and constructs marginal Others as sets of negative qualities’” (Hartsock, 1990: 161). Negative meanings are associated with the ones that are on the lower side of the hierarchical dualisms. The body and nature are seen as an inferior sphere. Gaard states that this functions as legitimating the oppression:

> the way in which women and nature have been conceptualized historically in the Western intellectual tradition has resulted in devaluing whatever is associated with women, emotion, animals, nature, and the body, while simultaneously elevating in value those things associated with men, reason, humans, culture, and the mind. One task of ecofeminists has been to expose these dualisms and the ways in which feminizing nature and naturalizing or animalizing women has served as justification for the domination of women, animals, and the earth (Gaard, 1993: 5).

Ecofeminism reveals how these dichotomies function to reinforce the mastery of the white upper-class men while subordinating marginalised human groups and nature.

One of the most important ecofeminist theorists, Val Plumwood, discusses hierarchical dualisms and gives a detailed significant analysis of them in her book, **Feminism and Mastery of Nature**. She discusses rationalism and articulates that in Western philosophy reason is always positioned as the opposite and superior to nature:

> The concept of reason provides the unifying and defining contrast for the concept of nature, much as the concept of husband does for that of wife, as master for slave. Reason in the western tradition has been constructed as the privileged domain of the master, who has conceived nature as a wife or subordinate other encompassing and representing the sphere of materiality, subsistence and the feminine which the master has split off and constructed as beneath him. The continual and cumulative overcoming of the domain of nature by reason engenders the western concept of progress and development (Plumwood, 1993:3).

Plumwood depicts the theoretical root of the exploitation of nature by exposing how rationalism works, how it shapes the dominant human perspective which situates nature as a passive object that should be dominated by human reason. Just like Plumwood, Ruether also links the intersected oppression of women and nature to the dichotomies. She refers to this hegemonic relation in which rationality and the mind are at the centre whereas the body is positioned in an inferior status:

> As we have seen, the relation of spirit to body is one of repression, subjugation and mastery. Materiel existence is ontologically inferior to mind and the root of moral evil (Ruether, 1975: 189).

Since reason is given the role of domination and the body the role of inferiority, the fact that women and nature are deprived of the realm of rationality justifies their subordinate position. Moreover, it is not only women and nature that are positioned as inferior and opposite to reason but also certain human groups. As Plumwood says, other marginalised groups are also seen "as closer to the animal and the body construed as a sphere of inferiority, as a lesser form of humanity lacking the full measure of rationality or culture" (Plumwood, 1993: 4). The exclusion of marginalised human groups and nature from the field of reason is a way of otherising and subordinating them. It creates a dichotomy in which reason controls nature and otherised people such as women, the lower classes, colonised people that are almost always associated with nature. Thus, different oppressions become intersectional through classifying non-humans and marginalised human groups as nature under the control of reason as Plumwood explains (Plumwood, 1993: 4). Accordingly, ecofeminism tries to express hegemonic nature of dualistic thinking and considers it as the ground for the exploitation of women and nature.

Nature, animals, women, and other marginalised groups are seen as tools to serve male-oriented needs. They are not seen as subjects that have their own purposes and desires but are seen as objects that can be used and shaped. Plumwood names this as "instrumentalism" and defines it "as the kind of use of an earth other which treats it as entirely a means to another's ends, as one whose being creates no limits on use and which can be entirely shaped to ends not its own" (Plumwood, 1993:142). The patriarch at the centre has a right to shape, organise and operate the ones who are pushed to the margins, and who are seen as inferior beings that lack certain values such as intellect that the patriarch is supposed to have. Nature and

otherised human groups are seen as irregular[*], uncontrollable as opposed to the order of reason/culture, thus they need to be shaped in accordance with the patriarch's needs. As Plumwood, in her criticism of Plato, argues when marginalised others do not fit with the patriarch's intentions, it is a situation that goes against norms and should be fixed by imposing the order of reason (Plumwood, 1993: 85-86), which can be seen as a tool that subdues nature and other human groups. Thus, ecofeminism brings a criticism towards rationalism.

Culturally constructed identity of the male as a master and the dichotomies as the tools that build this hegemonic identity can clearly be seen in Western philosophical history. As Plumwood says that "different philosophers and different periods of philosophy have focused on different pairs of these dualisms and have defended different linking postulates has obscured the pervasiveness of dualistic and rationalist influence in philosophy" (Plumwood, 1993: 45). For instance, ecofeminist theorists criticise Plato and Descartes for building their philosophy on dichotomies that devalue nature, animals and women. In his concept of the world of ideas, Plato devalues the physical world, nature that we live in now; he attributes value to the abstract concepts and reason. In Plato's **Phaedo**, a text that consists of a dialogue with Socrates and discusses the immortality of the soul, it is implied that the earth that we live in is temporary and illusionary (Plato, 2002: 64). He relies on body/mind dichotomy that ecofeminists are critical of as it is stated: "For these reasons, then, any man should have confidence for his own soul, who during his life has rejected the pleasures of the body" (Plato, 2002: 69). Elizabeth V. Spelman depicts Plato's philosophy that is based on the body/mind dichotomy:

> According to Plato, the body, with its deceptive senses, keeps us from real knowledge; it rivets us in a world of material things which is far removed from the world of reality; and it tempts us away from the virtuous life. It is in and through the

[*] In **Feminism and Mastery of Nature**, Plumwood argues that nature and marginalised groups are attributed irregularity as opposed to the regular realm of the mind. It is a negative value that is used to justify the subordinated position of them.

> soul, if at all, that we shall have knowledge, be in touch with reality, and lead a life of virtue (Spelman, 1999: 40).

Plumwood is critical of Plato's philosophy in that, for Plato, humans can achieve their authentic self by going beyond their body and natural world; human identity is separated from the bodily/natural sphere. Therefore, in Plato's view, death is something that is targeted (Plumwood, 1993: 92). As in **Phaedo**, it is stated: "When death attacks a man, his mortal part, it seems, dies, whereas the immortal part gets out of the way of death, departs, and goes away intact and undestroyed" (Plato, 2002: 61).

Plato's understanding of human identity relies on the dichotomies that despise women; therefore, his philosophy can well be a target for ecofeminist criticism. Plumwood implies that Plato builds his philosophy on getting rid of what is the feminine. She elaborates on his metaphor of the cave: she resembles the cave to a womb, and argues that it signifies all the things that humans should be excluded from:

> The image of escape from the Cave unifies in a single brilliant metaphor these multiple exclusions, the transcendence (in the sense both of inferiorisation and of denial of dependency) of all these aspects of nature as the primal matrix of being, of the woman and the mother, of the body and the senses, of the whole lower order of physicality and changeability, and finally of the earth itself (Plumwood, 1993: 93).

Plato believed that it is the world of ideas that is the real valuable world in which the meaning of human life lies. Therefore, his sense of human identity is separated from bodily desires, senses, and nature which are all associated with women in the hierarchical dualisms. Ecofeminism should reveal and deconstruct the dualistic thinking beyond Plato's philosophy that serves for the patriarchal domination on women.

Plumwood also discusses Descartes's philosophy which is a good example of how reason is used as a means of subordination. Descartes believes that biological limitations can be overcome through reason: "We could be freed from innumerable maladies, both of body and of mind, and even perhaps from the infirmities of age, if we had sufficient knowledge of their causes and of the remedies provided by nature (Descartes, 1952: 152) Thus, the body is positioned as a machine to be dominated by reason: "A machine is made to be controlled, and knowledge of its operation is the means to power over it" (Plumwood, 1993: 152). The exclusion from the field of reason marks animals and nature's existence; they are also positioned as machines that need to be operated by reason, hence their domination is naturalised. Susan Griffin's description of the general patriarchal perspective towards animals manifests the traces of Cartesian thought:

> It is argued now that animals do not think. That animals move automatically like machines. That passion in animals is more violent because it is not accompanied by thought. That our own bodies are distinguished from machines only by "a mind which thinks without reference to any passion" (Griffin, 1978: 17).

What she explains is the core of Cartesian thought that equates animals with machines and sees them as irregular beings that lack the intellect. She also refers to the body/mind distinction in which humans are associated with the mind and animals with the body. Hence, human identity is constructed as separate from animals and as a master that dominates them. Consequently, like Plato's philosophy, Cartesian thought also contributes to the construction of the identity of the white upper-class man as master.

Kate Millet, a second wave feminist, discusses Sigmund Freud's psychoanalytic theory in her book, **Sexual Politics**, which is regarded as one of the fundamental texts of feminism. Freud's view is another example of excluding women from the cultural/rational sphere which creates human identity. Certain parts

of Millet's critique can be interpreted from an ecofeminist perspective since it shows women-nature connection in patriarchal thinking. The argument and refusal of ecofeminism that women are associated with nature and men with culture can also be seen in Freud's thoughts. When explaining the dichotomies Ruether argues:

> Women are the primary symbols of this lower moral and ontological sphere which is to be repressed and subjugated. In social terms this means that women are cut out of the "progress" of male civilization. They are forbidden to participate in the formation of its sanctioning religious, educational, and political processes. While males use knowledge to free themselves from biological determination, women are subjugated all the more to exclusively biological processes (Ruether, 1975: 196).

Freud can be given as an example for Ruether's argument of how women are linked with the lower sphere which includes the body and undoubtedly nature, and how they are excluded from culture and civilization. In **Civilization and Its Discontents**, Freud argues:

> Women represent the interests of the family and of the sexual life. The work of civilization has become increasingly the business of men … Thus the woman finds herself forced into the background by the claims of civilization and she adopts a hostile attitude towards it (Freud, 1962: 50-51)

He believes that women cannot contribute to civilization; it is men who participate in cultural activities, whereas women are petty creatures that belong to nature. As such, they develop jealousy towards men and culture. Millet reveals this sexist approach towards women when she says:

> This view of woman as a species unalterably primitive is remarkably popular in our century … But one may also, with Freud, see her as surly savage, a drag on any social amelioration, an unassimilated tribeswoman (Millet, 2000: 202).

Millet's criticism has ecofeminist consciousness in it, since she realises how Freud posits women as the opposite of culture/civilisation. It is seen that one of the well-known and efficient psychoanalytic theorists bases his theory on a culture/nature dichotomy. He uses this dichotomy to discredit women and confine them in a domestic/natural/biological sphere. By associating women with the body rather than the mind, he believes that it is their bodily activity that completes their womanhood and the duty of women is to reproduce whereas men produce in the cultural area. As Millet argues: "This is happily conservative, in that it appears to salute motherhood, while tying the woman to a mere biological existence" (Millet, 2000: 200). Therefore, the reduction of women to their biological functions, the imprisonment of them in the domestic sphere and the exploitation of their body can be detected in Freud's way of thinking. This subordinated position of women in Freud's argument derives from nature/culture dichotomy that Plumwood also points out: "The masculine rational sphere of public life, production, social and cultural life and rational justice is contrasted with the feminine sphere of the private, domestic and reproductive life, the latter representing the natural and individual as against the social and cultural" (Plumwood, 1988: 16). It can be said that women-nature connection has its effects and reflections in Western science and philosophy, and it helps the patriarchal ideology to posit women in a subdued position.

Dualistic thinking has its place in the roots of Western philosophy, thus it shapes the dominant Western patriarchal perspective towards nature/animals and creates the culturally constructed human identity. Human identity is constructed with the qualities that are excluded from the realm of animality/nature, and as Plumwood argues what is attributed to the realm of masculinity is accepted as a human feature, hence it also excludes what is seen as the feminine.

> The model of what it is to be human is basically masculine because the crucial human feature is identified as the possession (to at least a greater degree than anything else) of mental characteristics of mind, of soul, spirit, consciousness, rationality or intelligence, and this is the sphere that has been generally identified also with masculinity (Plumwood, 1986: 134).

Therefore, it is not enough to reject the roles of masculinity, but it is also needed to reject the human model which is predicated on the dichotomies that justify the subordination of women. In Plumwood's view, feminists should not try to make women fit into this human identity, but they should deconstruct the human model and mastery (Plumwood, 1986: 134). Therefore, domination on nature becomes the subject of feminism. As a result, ecofeminist emancipation is required because the fundamental equality can be achieved only with the deconstruction of the human model that excludes certain groups from the centre (women, colonised people, the lower classes, animals) and has ascendancy over them.

Ecofeminism as a theory has a variety of approaches: Ynestra King addresses two groups of ecofeminism, one includes radical cultural feminists who honour woman-nature connection and the other radical rationalist feminists who criticise it (King, 1990:110-111). In **Feminism & Ecology**, Mary Mellor also divides ecofeminism into two branches: one is radical/cultural/ spiritual feminism that emphasises affinity and the other one is social constructionist position (Mellor, 1997). One perspective of ecofeminism, which King names as radical cultural feminists and Mellor as affinity ecofeminism, attributes positive value to women-nature connection as Plumwood explains: "Women are naturally closer to nature and are 'earth mothers', according to this position, but are to be valued precisely because they are identified with nature and the body" (Plumwood, 1986:133). This view confirms that women have a biological link with nature. Thus, critics state that it is grounded on a biological determinism which feminism is against. As Mellor puts it:

> Critics have argued that an ecofeminist reassertion of woman's association with the natural world, whether through their bodies, their caring role as mothers or nurturers, or their traditional subsistence work, far from being an agent for change in society, could become a reaffirmation of women's present position (Mellor, 1997: 73).

This perspective of ecofeminism should be criticised since it is settled on the dichotomies and patriarchal definitions of womanhood. This approach praises the roles of femininity which are being caring, compassionate, selfless, and nurturing. It is, evidently, a controversial view because it falls to the trap of essentialism by agreeing that women essentially have these qualities. However, to abstain from that trap, the body does not have to be rejected. A strong ecofeminist perspective should value the body, bodily functions, and nature whereas they are devalued in patriarchal ideology. Ecofeminists, by idealising biological features of women as an affirmation of the link between women and nature, should not reinforce patriarchal view that reduces women to their bodily functions, such as being fertile or sexual, but they should not also devalue their body as patriarchal ideology traditionally does. Women's relationship with their body is an important subject in ecofeminism which will be discussed in the analysis of **The Edible Woman**. Questions are asked about the embodiment:

> Feminism has moved, as we have seen, from a rejection of women's biology/sex to a reassessment of their relationship to biology/nature, at least by radical feminists and ecofeminists. Is such an approach necessarily essentialist? (Mellor, 1997: 95).

Instead of alienating themselves from their body, being disconnected from their body and reinforcing the body/mind dualism, women should be integrated with their body. What is needed is uniting the body and the mind without being trapped into the realm of biological determinism.

Ecofeminism does not necessarily have an essentialist approach, there is another group of ecofeminists, too. Ecofeminists like Plumwood do not uphold the values of biological determinism; they point out the related subordination of women and nature in patriarchal civilization. Plumwood is critical of attributing any value to the associations that are made with women, without rejecting the hierarchical dualisms: "A simple reversal of valuation, attaching less or zero value to the rational sphere in contrast to the natural sphere, is unconvincing and incomplete if it does not also challenge the polarisation of these spheres and aim also for renegotiation of the contrasts and for some areas of integration" (Plumwood, 1993: 134). Perhaps in other cultures, woman-nature connection may be assigned a positive value because they have "an ample understanding of the interconnectedness and interdependence of humans and nature" (Gaard, 1993: 295-296). However, since in Western culture nature is not attributed a positive value but seen as an object that can be dominated, ecofeminists should deconstruct women-nature connection instead of romanticising it. A coherent and critical ecofeminist approach should destroy the dichotomies and argue that "women are not seen as purely part of nature any more than men are; both men and women are part of both nature and culture" (Plumwood, 1993:36). Instead of having an essentialist position and falling prey to the manipulation of patriarchy, a critical approach is more powerful. In this light, the novels that will be analysed in this thesis do not romanticise women-nature connection, they, on the contrary, emphasise ecofeminist consciousness in terms of the intersected oppressions and offer solidarity between women and animals that are subordinated by the same patriarchal force.

1.1. Animals in Ecofeminist Thought

In addition to the subordination of nature, ecofeminism should also give a substantial place to animals since the exploitation of animals is likewise a part of the problem. As Lori Gruen explains:

> In fact, I will suggest that an adequate ecofeminist theory must not only analyze the joint oppression of women and nature, but must specifically address the oppression

> of the nonhuman animals with whom we share the planet. In failing to do so, ecofeminism would run the risk of engaging in the sort of exclusionary theorizing that it ostensibly rejects (Gruen, 1993: 61).

In this thesis the focus is on the relation between animals and women who are positioned in a lower level in a male centred hierarchy. There are certain ecofeminists that study the related objectification of women and animals in patriarchal societies. They look at the similar position of women and animals in terms of the objectified status of them, which refers to the exploitation of their body and reproductivity by reducing them to their body which is positioned as a functional object that serves the male/human needs. They render the invisible intersected oppression on women and animals visible by talking, writing, thinking about these subjects. In patriarchal societies both women and animals are designated as passive objects and become the victims of masculine violence which is a situation that enables women to empathise with animals. Therefore, a theoretical background emerges that specifically focuses on the alike subdued status of women and animals in patriarchy.

A consciousness that focuses on animal rights has started to emerge among women since suffragettes in Britain. Feminists began to focus on the struggle for animal rights along with women rights. As Adams points out:

> At the end of the nineteenth century, British women began to recognize the relationship between how they were positioned in society and how other animals had been positioned. They might have lacked the ecofeminist language of value dualisms and the interactions among them, that is, the way reason/emotion, male/female, and human/animal were being mapped onto each other, but women, as the majority of activists for animals in both the United States and Great Britain, nonetheless discussed these connections (Adams, 2022: 12).

When they were fighting for their own rights, women also saw the subordinated position of animals and began to think about it as an important issue that is closely connected to the subordinated position of women. A 19th century magazine named as **Shafts** that Hilda Kean defines as “the feminist and progressive journal” (Kean, 1995: 18) is a good example for the raising consciousness of the time. It gave place

to the discussions about violence towards women and animals as such: “The plethora of issues highlighted included slaughter-houses, inoculation, prison treatment, stag and fox hunting, dangerous trades, prostitution and all acts of cruelty” (Kean, 1995: 19). It emphasised an intersectionality and solidarity since it fought for “'women, children, the poor, every helpless human being, every animal that breathes and moves, every bird, fish and reptile’” (**qtd. in** Kean, 1995:19). Edith Ward, the editor of **Shafts**, articulated that normalising violence towards animals increases the possibility of violence towards women and the fight for the rights of animals empowers the idea of women rights. She argued that:

> What, for example, could be more calculated to produce brutal wife-beaters than long practice of savage cruelty towards the other animals? And what, on the other hand, more likely to impress mankind with the necessity of justice for women than the awakening of the idea that justice was the right of even an ox or a sheep? (**qtd. in** Adams, 2022:12).

Thus, an awareness of animal rights emerged between feminist groups who were defending their rights.

There were certain groups that worked for animal welfare and certain activists that raised their voices for both women and animal rights. It is seen that a cognisance of animal rights emerged in the late 19th and the early 20th centuries: Kean mentions the organizations of the time which advocated animal rights such as Anti-Vivisection and Animal Defence Society, League for the Prohibition of Cruel Sports, Humanitarian League (Kean, 1995:17). Campaigns were produced against violence towards animals such as hunting and vivisection (Kean, 1995:19). Feminist women were active in such campaigns, for instance, Frances Power Cobbe was a “feminist campaigner … and founder of the British Union for the Abolition of Vivisection” (Kean, 1995: 24), and she realised “the connections between vivisection, pornography, and the condition of women” (**qtd. in** Adams, 2022: 12). Louise Lind-af-Hageby was another feminist who worked for animal rights, she was “the secretary of the Anti-Vivisection and Animal Defence Society” (Kean, 1995:

20). She saw animals as living creatures that have rights and not as objects that exist for humans. She described her ideas when she talked about the evolution theory:

> It taught that if there is this kinship physically between all living creatures, surely a responsibility rests upon us to see that these creatures, who have nerves as we have, who are made of the same flesh and blood as we are, who have minds differing from ours not in kind but in degree, should be protected, as far as in our power lies, from ill-treatment, cruelty and abuse of every kind (**qtd. in** Leneman, 1997: 280- 281).

Isabella Ford was another feminist who recognized the intersected oppressions as Kean puts it:

> Her pamphlet 'Women and Socialism' is perhaps best known for the links she makes between class and sex oppression. Yet the connections she draws between the experiences of women and domestic animals are also perceptive (Kean, 1995: 29).

Thus, it can be said that an advocacy of animal rights gained impetus among feminist women. In the early 20th century, the vivisection of a dog that caused a riot also culminated in an awareness for women: “Through their experience of being subjected to torturous forced feeding during hunger strikes in prison, English suffragettes found themselves identifying with vivisected animals” (Adams, 2022: 13). There was an intersectional struggle which also included workers: “And not just suffragists—workers, too, found themselves identifying with animals as victims” (Adams, 2022: 14). In the light of the argument of intersectionality between animals and the oppressed individuals is of paramount significance for ecofeminism and will be alluded to in the analysis of the novels within the framework of the thesis.

The upbringing awareness about animal rights was not limited to being against hunting, wearing fur or vivisection; meat eating was also questioned. Vegetarianism was one of the main topics of the animal emancipation and as Leah Leneman expresses there were many vegetarians among the suffragettes (Leneman, 1997: 271). She states that Charlotte Despard, who was the president of Women’s

Freedom League, was a vegetarian (Leneman, 1997: 272). Despard pointed out that animals are objectified, exploited, abused and unheard: "The awakened instinct which feels the call of the sub-human, which says: – 'I am the voice of the voiceless" (**qtd. in** Leneman, 1997: 281). She managed to realise that animals are marginalised from the centre which only gives a place to hegemonic human identity, thus they are the voiceless sub-humans. She was one of the early feminists who stressed intersectionality:

> It works itself out as food reform on the one hand, and on the other, in strong protest against the cruel methods of experimental research. Both of these are in close unison with the demands being made by women (**qtd. in** Leneman, 1997: 281).

Lady Constance Lytton was another suffragette who saw the relation between the status of animals and women, and "vegetarianism was a central part of her identity" (Leneman, 1997: 274). She described an event in which a sheep ran away from a slaughterhouse, and she wished it to be free (Leneman, 1997: 279). She recognized the objectified status that human culture imposed on it. "She had a vision of how it might have been on its native mountainside" (Leneman, 1997: 279), thus she perceived that the sheep's real existence is beyond the limited definitions that humans have created. She imagined it as a subject free from human control, as "'vigorous and independent'" (**qtd. in** Leneman, 1997: 279). It caused her to think about the status of women in patriarchal culture:

> I realised how often women are held in contempt as beings outside the pale of human dignity, excluded or confined, laughed at and insulted because of conditions in themselves for which they are not responsible, but which are due to fundamental injustices with regard to them, and to the mistakes of a civilisation in the shaping of which they have had no free share (**qtd. in** Leneman, 1997: 279).

She acknowledged that both women and animals are positioned in a similar inferior status in patriarchal culture.

In the 20th century, intersectionality between animal rights and feminist activism was developed as it is seen in Sally Gearhart's words:

> I now see that there are fundamental connections between women's rights and the rights of nonhuman animals, and I want to talk about those connections, about the dehumanization that I feel is going on in all of us, and about my own change from being just a lesbian and a feminist activist, to being an animal activist as well (**qtd. in** Adams, 2022: 19).

Women talked about these connections as it is seen in the interview below with vegetarian feminist women:

> One said, "Animals and the earth and women have all been objectified and treated in the same way." Another explained that she was "beginning to bond with the earth as a sister and with animals as subjects not to be objectified." A third reported, "Feminists realize what it's like to be exploited. Women as sex objects, animals as food. Women turned into patriarchal mothers, cows turned into milk machines. It's the same thing" (**qtd. in** Adams, 2022: 16).

These women recognized an identical victimhood with animals: they observed that the bodies of women and animals are exploited by the same patriarchal mentality which is reductive and objectifying. Through their own experiences as women in patriarchy, they were able to see and listen to the non-human others that were abused. Women had empathy with animals since the same form of violence is also directed to them as Kean states: "Women in particular empathised with animals as an object of the male gaze and physical violation and saw an identification with them" (Kean, 1995: 27). Just as in the novels that will be analysed in this thesis, women realised that they had a different perspective than men towards animals, because they were also positioned as objects under the domination of men.

Peter Singer's **Animal Liberation** (Singer, 2009) marks the animal rights movement of the 20th century; however, he is usually criticised by ecofeminists for being a rationalist. Carol J. Adams, who is an ecofeminist theorist, argues that there were efforts of women in creating theoretical background of animal rights, but they were not given enough credit and remained invisible under the domain of men, such as Peter Singer. She refers to these women such as Roslind Godlovitch who inspired Peter Singer and Brigid Brophy who inspired Godlovitch and wrote "The Rights of Animals" in 1965 (Adams, 2022: 14-15). In the 20th century, women were organized for the purpose of the emancipation of both animals and women. Connie Salamone "started "Vegetarian-Feminists" which urged feminists to resist the exploitation of animals and to stop eating meat" (Adams, 2022: 16). Lesbians for Animals' Irreducible Rights which changed their name to League for Animals' Irreducible Rights and then to Women for Animal Liberation (Adams, 2022: 18) has ecofeminist principles that are reflected in their words: "The exploitation and oppression of animals is a direct result of opportunist patriarchal attitudes and of power control" (**qtd. in** Adams, 2022: 18). Besides LAIR, there were other organizations too, such as World Women for Animal Rights, Feminists for Animal Rights, Canadian Feminists for Animal Welfare, the Australian Feminists for Animal Rights and British Women's Ecology Group (Adams, 2022: 19). Thus, it is seen that women did works and campaigns for animals within the light of ecofeminist insights.

The newsletter, **Feminists for Animal Rights**, including texts about animal rights, ecofeminism, book reviews etc., clearly declare its ideals and aims, which can be considered as the basic definition of ecofeminism:

> Feminist for Animal Rights is a group of feminists, vegetarian women, with a vegan orientation who are dedicated to ending all forms of animal abuse. Since exploitation of animals and women derive from the same patriarchal mentality, our struggle is for women as well as animals. FAR attempts to expose the connections between sexism (discrimination against women) and speciesism (discrimination against animals) whenever and wherever we can. We feel that the common denominator in the lives of both women and animals is violence -either real or threatened- and we work in non-violent ways to change that (**Feminists, w. date.**:1).

Their purpose is an ecofeminist fight against violence towards animals and women which they think have a common patriarchal background:

> We feel that such violence towards animals is inherently the same type of violence that is directed against women. In patriarchal society women's bodies are also exploited for entertainment and profit (**Ibid**.).

The connection between the objectification of the bodies of women and animals, which will be analysed in detail with the light of ecofeminism and will be used in the analysis of the novels, is one of the things that they tried to make visible. These works of women have the idea of intersected ecofeminist emancipation and show that an awareness about animal rights emerged and developed between feminist women in the late 19th and 20th centuries. In this thesis, when interpreting the novels, ecofeminist theory will be used as a source with the ideals and insights of these women who were able to see and hear the suffering of the voiceless animals.

There was, moreover, a sustained advocacy of animal rights between feminist women, and accordingly Carol J. Adams is an important name whose challenging thoughts are grounded on a well-established ecofeminist theory putting animals at the centre. She criticises ecofeminist theory for not giving enough space for animals and fills in the blank by specifically concentrating on animals (Adams, 2018: 71). She argues that animals as creatures that belong to nature should have a significant position in the ecofeminist theoretical frame (Adams, 2018: 71-72). Both animals and women are marginalised under the same roof of patriarchy, violated by the same force of male hegemony. As Gruen states they are classified under the category of the other, sharing the same role of being a functional object and that connection undoubtedly maintains the patriarchal order. As such, it should be studied and deconstructed (Gruen, 1993: 61). Adams investigates the subjugated status of animals and women under the patriarchal hierarchical structure.

In her book **Neither Man nor Beast**, which is a collection of her essays on intersectionality between feminism and animal rights, she discusses the position of

women in an anthropocentric world view. Just like Plumwood who argues that the construction of human identity excludes the qualities that are attributed to femininity, Adams brings a similar argument specifying animals:

> The emphasis on differences between humans and animals not only reinforces fierce boundaries about what constitutes humanness, but particularly what constitutes manhood. That which traditionally define humans from animals—qualities such as reason and rationality—has been used as well to differentiate men from women (Adams, 2018: xxxviii).

She argues that women are not regarded as having the qualities of humanness and points out to the ecofeminist idea of how they are seen as related to animals because of their reproductivity (Adams, 2018: xxxviii). As a result of the dehumanisation that is directed to women, they "were traditionally viewed in Western culture as neither man nor beast" (Adams, 2018: xxxviii). In the hierarchical structure that posits humans in a higher and animals in a lower level, women are left in an in-between position. As Plumwood offers to demolish hegemonic human identity, Adams likewise believes that the hierarchal structure based on human/animal dualism should be destroyed totally instead of raising women to the higher level of the hierarchy and leaving animals behind (Adams, 2018: xxxviii). She calls humanity to question this dualism and to realise that it does not only degrade animals but also other marginalised groups. Like other ecofeminists, Adams also stresses intersectionality: she states that not only women but also people of colour are viewed as closer to animals, thereby a discourse has emerged that is useful for justifying the subordination of human groups (Adams, 2018: 53). Thus, an intersectional approach is necessary. Since the oppressions work connectedly, the emancipation movements should have the realisation of that connection and of how it works. Consequently, the hierarchal structure of patriarchy should be breached to achieve freedom for all.

In **The Sexual Politics of Meat**, Adams first utters that meat is culturally associated with powerful groups, with the upper-class white male, thereby as a food, it becomes a strong emblem:

> People with power have always eaten meat. The aristocracy of Europe consumed large courses filled with every kind of meat while the laborer consumed the complex carbohydrates. Dietary habits proclaim class distinctions, but they proclaim patriarchal distinctions as well. Women, second-class citizens, are more likely to eat what are considered to be second-class foods in a patriarchal culture: vegetables, fruits, and grains rather than meat. The sexism in meat eating recapitulates the class distinctions with an added twist: a mythology permeates all classes that meat is a masculine food and meat eating a male activity (Adams, 1990: 48).

She gives examples from the association of meat with men, from fairy tales, biblical stories, cookbooks, and some cultures that forbid women to eat meat (Adams, 1990: 49-50). She expresses that meat is a priority for men in the situations of famine (Adams, 1990: 49). Thus, as a food of the white upper-class men, meat symbolises male power and reinforces not only sexist hierarchy but also racist and classist hierarchy. It is important in terms of the novels that will be analysed in this thesis since in both novels, men gain their masculine identity through applying violence towards animals in which the product is meat. Adams, moreover, refers to hunting, which is also a matter of discussion in the novels. She states that societies that make a living by hunting are more sexist since men provide the main source of food, but societies that make a living by gathering vegetables are less sexist since women do the work. As a result, meat becomes a concept that is primarily associated with masculinity and a symbol of patriarchal power.

The attitude towards women and animals in patriarchy is similar: they are not regarded as subjects or as individuals that have self-autonomy. Women are designated as objects possessed by the men of the house and animals as objects possessed by humans. They are objectified in the same way: reduced to their body and seen as a consumable, inert, passive body without feelings or thoughts. Thus, they become “meat”. While animals are objectified through being reduced to food, women, on the other hand, are objectified through being sexualized by the male gaze;

ultimately both are being consumed. Women become consumable objects through patriarchal practices of pornography, prostitution, and sexual violence. Adams argues that both animals and women are constructed as functional objects with the help of language, and it is regarded as their natural existence not as an identity that is imposed on them by patriarchal ideology:

> In other words, ideology creates what appears to be ontological: if women are ontologized as sexual beings (or rapable, as some feminists argue), animals are ontologized as carriers of flesh. In ontologizing women and animals as objects, the dominant language simultaneously eliminates the fact that someone else is acting as a subject/ agent/perpetrator of violence (Adams, 2018: 85).

She further argues that the agent who converts women and animals to "battered woman" and to "meat" is hidden in the dominant narrative, therefore the objectified status of women and animals is considered as natural, not as a cultural construction (Adams, 2018: 85). Animals are objectified for the pleasure of taste; women are objectified for the sexual pleasure of men. Adams discusses this interwoven reification and consumption of women and animals in **The Sexual Politics of Meat.**

The main argument of Adams is the concept of absent referent. In the act of eating meat, it is not thought that the meat once belonged to a living animal with a consciousness and the ability to feel pain and pleasure. Animals are reduced to their body, to a piece of meat, to an object of kitchen. Their existence as a living being is not considered: only the meat on the plate is seen, not the animal behind it or the killing of the animal that has produced it. The living animal is the reason why the meat exists, but its existence as a sensitive creature is 'absent' in the act of eating meat. Since they are converted to food through slaughtering, animals as subjects become absent referents (Adams, 1990: 66). Adams states that there are three ways to make animals absent: literal, definitional, and metaphorical. They are absent because they are literally dead. They are made absent through how humans define them; language becomes a tool for objectifying them. And the last one is by being a metaphor to describe human experience (Adams, 1990: 66-67).

Adams gives examples of how animals become metaphors when telling the experiences of women in patriarchy. When a woman says "I felt like a piece of meat" to depict how sexual or physical violence feels like, she uses the same experience of an animal (Adams, 1990: 67). As such, she is dehumanised and objectified. However, the pain and the experience of the animal that is literally transformed to meat is ignored, as Adams articulates: "the originating, literal, experience that contributes the meaning is not there" (Adams, 1990: 67). Thus, when the animal becomes a metaphor its existence as a subject is absent in the narrative (Adams, 1990: 67). When a woman uses the butchering of an animal to describe that she is sexually violated, it displays the interlaced victimization of women and animals by patriarchal violence. Adams comments on the act of feeling like a piece of meat: "the phrases used by rape victims when describing their feelings suggest that animals' fate in meat eating is the immediate touchstone for their own experience" (Adams, 1990: 81). Feeling like a piece of meat signifies that the woman is subjected to an unethical treatment that ignores her individuality.

Adams states that feeling like a meat means being directed to an "implemental violence" when she questions why being violated makes women feel like a piece of meat (Adams, 1990: 82). She argues that slaughtering and sexual violence are intertwined; both actions convert women and animals to objects through using a tool: the knife in slaughtering and the penis in rape:

> Rape, too, is implemental violence in which the penis is the implement of violation. You are held down by a male body as the fork holds a piece of meat so that the knife may cut into it (Adams, 1990: 82).

The joint images of these two forms of violence in which women are equated with animals and the knife as a phallic symbol is equated with the penis will be analysed within the context of the novels. These two forms of violence are connected in terms of how they reduce women and animals to their body and posit them as consumable objects:

> "In addition, just as the slaughterhouse treats animals and its workers as inert, unthinking, unfeeling objects, so too in rape are women treated as inert objects, with no attention paid to their feelings or needs. Consequently they feel like pieces of meat" (Adams, 1990: 82).

Reducing women to their bodies and seeing them as objects of pleasure result in transforming them to meat, which means slaughtering them metaphorically; as Adams states: "metaphorical 'butchering' silently invokes the violent act of animal slaughter while reinforcing raped women's sense of themselves as 'pieces of meat'" (Adams, 1990: 86).

Both forms of violence, sexual and slaughtering, derive from the same patriarchal mentality that objectifies women and non-human others. As Adams states both acts are connected to one another; they have the same "cycle of objectification, fragmentation, and consumption" (Adams, 1990: 73). Animals are fragmented and they are abstracted from their selfhood and identity as a subject in the act of meat eating which is a consumption of their bodies. Patriarchal culture also constantly fragments women's bodies to sexualise them, to serve them to the consumption of the male gaze. The integrity and agency of both women and animals are broken, they become disconnected body parts. When Adams gives examples of how women and animals become overlapping absent referents for each other, she also emphasises fragmentation as a way of objectification. She articulates that men slice the female body to its parts just like a consumable meat (Adams, 1990: 87). She gives a poster "depicted a woman's body sectioned off as though she were a slaughtered animal, with her separate body parts identified" (Adams, 1990: 87) as an example of the linked objectification in the cultural imagery among other examples.

Adams expresses that women and animals become overlapping absent referents; the imagery and the language of sexual violence and slaughtering refer to and reinforce each other. She argues that sexual violence reminds the victimized position of animals: "Cultural images of sexual violence, and actual sexual violence,

often rely on our knowledge of how animals are butchered and eaten" (Adams, 1990: 68). Also, eroticising the animal butchering and the dead animal body, which she illustrates by examples from advertisements, paintings, language etc, put women in the position of absent referent (Adams, 1990: 68). Animals become absent referents in the violation of women and women become absent referents in the violation of animals: it signifies that these two oppressions are connected. Nevertheless, since we socialise in this culture, we normalise the objectifying mentality as Adams stresses our participation in this culture (Adams, 1990: 69). She says "however, the absent referent, because of its absence, prevents our experiencing connections between oppressed groups" (Adams, 1990: 72). Hence, absent referents should be made visible, and the related oppressions hidden under the absent referents should be exposed. When explaining the unjust subordinated position of women, the similar position of animals should not be normalised. Adams argues that feminist critics should have the consciousness of the intertwined oppressions (Adams, 1990: 103). The implicit connection between two forms of oppression that exists in Western culture should be uncovered since they strengthen each other.

Andrée Collard is another ecofeminist who brings up the link between the exploitation of women and animals:

> In patriarchy, nature, animals and women are objectified hunted, invaded, colonised, owned, consumed and forced to yield and to produce (or not.) This violation of the integrity of wild, spontaneous Being is rape. It is motivated by a fear and rejection of Life and it allows the oppressor the illusion of control, of power, of being alive. As with women as a class, nature and animals have been kept in a state of inferiority and powerlessness in order to enable men as a class to believe and act upon their 'natural' superiority/dominance (Collard, 1989: 1).

In **Rape of the Wild: Man's Violence Against Animals and the Earth**, she touches upon the subjects such as hunting, animal experimentation and the control over the reproductivity of animals and women. Like Plumwood who highlights the role of reason in justifying subordination, Collard has a similar approach to the issue as well. She expresses the concept of the slave in Aristotelian logic: slaves are tools since they lack reasoning. She points to the term of "living tool" and states that in animal

experimentation, animals are regarded as living tools to legitimate animal experimentation (Collard, 1989: 58). She sees the connected ideology in sexual violence: “rapists justify rape by first perceiving women as ‘living tools’ placed on the earth by their god to gratify the desires of men” (Collard, 1989: 64). As Adams recognizes the similar supremacist perspective towards women and animals, Collard, too, signifies the interlaced objectification. Yet, since she underlines the biological qualities of women as connected to nature, Mellor states that she has an essentialist approach (Mellor, 1997: 49). The fact that Collard really emphasises female reproductivity as something that links women to nature (Collard, 1989: 106) should be criticised since it reinforces the patriarchal dualisms. However, she also acknowledges the social structure of the linked oppressions: “Women can readily identify with the plight of animals, not only because we are so closely of nature but also and primarily because we recognise the many faces of oppression” (Collard, 1989: 96). One of the parallel oppressions between animals and women that she marks is the control over the fertility of women and animals, thereby stressing the biological role of women.

Sexuality and reproductivity of women are always kept under the control of male force in patriarchy. Sexuality of women is subdued: they are not considered as sexual subjects, but they are positioned as sexual tools to serve male desire. Under patriarchy, their bodies are converted to objects by the male gaze. Their fertility is also controlled: they are reduced to their reproductivity, treated like an animal for breeding, thus they again become objects that serve male needs. Like Collard, who emphasises the control over the biological functions of the female body, Griffin also alludes to the same issue as connected with the exploitation of animals. She describes the exploitation of cows’ reproductivity in the animal industry: impregnating the cow, obtaining its milk, and separating its child (Griffin, 1978: 68-70-71). The fertility of the cow becomes a tool for the needs of humanity. As Lisa Kemmerer puts it, women can recognise this type of exploitation: “Women and nonhuman animals are exploited for their reproductive abilities, and both are devalued as they age and wear out—when they are no longer able to reproduce” (Kemmerer, 2011:18). Griffin implies that women have the similar experiences in the male

dominated world: “We are the cows. With our large brown eyes and our soft fur there was once something called beauty we were part of” (Griffin, 1978: 72). She mentions the identification of women with animals since they go through a similar exploitation of their bodies. She underlines motherhood as something that creates a bond between women and female animals:

> When we awaken, there is a child given to us. We are mothers. We feel a pain where the vulva has been cut. We are mothers (Griffin, 1978: 72).

This view should be approached with caution because of the risk of being an essentialist and of reinforcing patriarchal dualisms. Yet, it is also important in terms of alluding to the same colonisation of the female body.

1.2. Hunting as a Masculine Behaviour

The act of hunting takes an important place in the novels that will be examined, and it is defined as an act of violence in ecofeminist theory. As it is explained above, ecofeminists stress that the violation of animals and women is linked by the fact that they both derive from the patriarchal mindset. The hunting of animals is a form of animal abuse and the analysis of it has parallel theoretical points with the objectification of women since it is an activity of masculinity that subordinates women as well as animals. It is carried out mostly by men, and therefore associated with being masculine. Men build their masculine identity by applying violence towards others, by constructing hegemony over them. Hunting is a part of these aggressive behaviours. In that context, Marti Kheel brings an explanation towards the motivations under the act of hunting. She refers to Dorothy Dinnerstein’s theory of the young boy’s process of becoming a subject in which the boy needs to be disengaged from both women and nature (Kheel, 1995: 105). She also mentions Paul Shepard who argues that animals as being the other have a place in the identification process of humanity: children see that they are separated and different from animals so they become conscious about who they are (Kheel, 1995:

106). Moving from these theoretical points, Kheel argues that the boy leaves the world of women/ nature and reaches a masculine self by killing and hunting animals (Kheel, 1995: 106). She argues that the boy searches for the wholeness in nature, but returning to nature risks his masculine identity, therefore he develops an urge to kill it (Kheel, 1995: 106). Hunting becomes an action that helps men to build their hegemonic masculine identity, which directly harms women on many levels. As Kheel states:

> In the process of killing the animal, the hunter (re)establishes his secondary identity, that is, his masculine self. It is, in reality, the mental construct of masculinity that is fed by violence and death (Kheel, 1995: 108).

Hunting is one of the violent acts of hegemonic masculinity which is a concept that expresses "fluid, dynamic ways that white men of power maintain and reproduce their positions of power as a normative practice, dominating women, nature, and other emergent forms of masculinities" (Rose, 2023: 323). Kheel argues that animals are tools in the process of becoming masculine (Kheel, 1995: 110), and women are in the same position with animals in this dynamic. Because of its role in hegemonic masculinity, hunting should be criticised by feminists. Accordingly, Collard also points out that hunters love the power of killing: "In point of fact, hunters do not love nature as such but rather how they feel *in* nature as they stalk and kill her animals" (Collard, 1989: 52). She adds that they do not hunt to survive and underlines the thirst for power under the appetite for hunting (Collard, 1989: 52). Kemmerer, too, brings an ecofeminist criticism to hunting, arguing that it stands for the sexual aggression of men (Kemmerer, 2011: 18). Consequently, while hunting is a violent behaviour of men towards animals, it also symbolises more: hegemonic masculine identity that dominates all otherised groups.

1.2.1. Hunting - War Analogy

Elaborating on hunting and war through an intersectional lens uncovers the connection between these two forms of male violence. An intersectional look does not differ between the death of animals and people. It sees that these two forms of violence reinforce each other and stem from the same root: dominant patriarchal ideology that marginalises certain groups. When discussing men as perpetrators of killing in war, Woolf charges men with killing of animals too: "the vast majority of birds and beasts have been killed by you, not by us; and it is difficult to judge what we do not share" (Woolf, 1943: 13-14). Adams traces the development of vegetarianism and examines its connection to World War I. She states that seeing the catastrophic outcomes of the war has led to question the unethical treatment of animals; thus, it has provided a context to see the connection (Adams, 1990: 168). Accordingly, she states that since different forms of violence correspond with each other, being a pacifist becomes deeply connected with being a vegetarian; and this intersectional standpoint is strengthened by pointing out the subordination of women like animals by the same male violence (**Ibid**., p. 164). Thus, there is an intersectional area of emancipation that is developed intensely by the effects of World War I. Especially, women have recognised that the same male oppression has come into various forms; the killing in hunting is not different from the killing in war. Women writers have identified the male agent of these violent actions and evaluated them in an expanded front as Adams calls it.: "The front, they suggest, exists not only in traditionally viewed warfare, but also in what they view as the war against nonhuman animals, typified in hunting and meat eating" (Adams, 1990: 169). An ecofeminist perspective focuses on an intersectional realm of emancipation that recognises the link between particular forms of male violence; thereby, creating a powerful discourse that is able to denounce various structures of domination simultaneously.

Although there have been female warriors as an exception, fighting in a battle has been widely a male activity throughout history (Ferguson, 2021: 115). As it is precisely asserted: "War has historically almost exclusively been undertaken by men, and still is" (Christensen & Rasmussen, 2015: 192). Like hunting, it is a violent

action performed by men and it is perceived as heroic. Virginia Woolf also makes a clear statement that identifies men as fighters: “to fight has always been the man’s habit, not the woman’s” (Woolf, 1943: 13). The word, habit, can be questioned here. Does it mean that men are naturally willing to fight, or they are conditioned as such? There were essentialist opinions about why war has been associated with men, as Adams verbalises the belief that women have compassionate feeling like a mother (Adams, 1990: 164-165). However, there are also feminists who view the subject from a sociological perspective: “Other feminists decried political violence by arguing that it was male domination, not male traits” (Adams, 1990: 165). Woolf also evaluates socio-political conditions that lead men to war and emphasises masculinity as a constitution of socio-cultural understanding of manly behaviours. She defines war as: “an outlet for manly qualities, without which men would deteriorate” (Woolf, 1943, 15-16). However, since biology of women also plays an important role in ecofeminist criticism, it should be explained how maternity of women is seen as dualistic opposition of killing of men and that contributes to the patriarchal narrative of war. For instance, R. Brian Ferguson provides an important study that analyses socio-cultural background of the relation between men and masculinity. He describes the evolutionary theory presented as an explanation of why killing is a male trait; however, he does not agree with this perspective and brings a sociological approach to the subject. As he puts it: “Contrarily, my own and other research finds none of those support an inborn inclination to kill outsider males, but instead indicate a plastic, flexible nature that turns to war through a combination of culture and circumstances” (Ferguson, 2021: 113). Whereas evolutionary theory explains that men are instinctually more motivated to fight, in his theory, Ferguson describes socially learned behaviours which lead to the idea of war as a heroic act that reaffirms masculinity. As opposed to the evolutionary theorists’ emphasis on biological inclination, war and masculinity should be looked from a sociological and cultural perspective as a feminist approach would do.

Ferguson provides a coherent and substantial theory that has the potential to explain why war is regarded as a male activity:

> My general approach to war utilizes a modified version of Harris's (1979) cultural materialism, which categorized social phenomena into Infrastructure, Structure, and Superstructure. Infrastructure covers a population's demography and interface with the physical environment through technology and associated labor, its modes of production and reproduction. Structure is patterned social life—economics, social organization from kinship to class, and politics. Superstructure encompasses belief and motivational systems (Ferguson, 2021: 114-115).

He reinforces the role of socialisation of boys, which is one of the issues in **The Shooting Party**. He states that boys are raised to be competitive and aggressive, and they aim to impress women with their power based on these masculine attributes (Ferguson, 2021: 119). Besides, he points to the consequences of the division of labour between the sexes (Ferguson, 2021: 115) as Alice Eagly and Wendy Wood assert that it characterises behaviours, skills and social position of the sexes: "Women and men seek to accommodate to these roles by acquiring role-related skills" (Eagly & Wood, 1999: 413).

Ferguson's study puts a specific emphasis on a biological female role for which an ecofeminist perspective can provide a further analysis. It arrives at the ecofeminist outcome that biological acts of women that are associated with nature are regarded as inferior, whereas cultural acts of men are designated as superior. Marilyn French states: "menstruation and childbirth—are seen as related, and equally unclean" which are "manifestations of nature in humans" (French, 1985: 100), which implicates that the feminine belongs to the inferior world of nature. Jane Bethke Elshtain also emphasises how men are posited as life takers and women as life givers, and that draws a distinction between the strong and tough male body designed to fight and the nurturing and fertile female body designed to get pregnant (Elshtain, 1987: 165-166). Correspondingly, Sherry B. Ortner states that hunting and warfare are respected because of "the transcendental (social, cultural) nature of these activities, as opposed to the natural- ness of the process of birth" (Ortner, 1972: 14). The dichotomy that puts nature under culture overlaps with women/men and explains why war is regarded as a heroic male activity. As de Beauvoir states killing is

something that marks the difference of humanity from animals and nature: “For it is not in giving life but in risking life that man is raised above the animal; that is why superiority has been accorded in humanity not to the sex that brings forth but to that which kills” (de Beauvoir, 1956: 89). What marks human, and what is also the characteristics of war, is the transcendence of nature which is the feminine and inferior.

An important discussion about war as a transcendence of nature and the feminine appears in Genevieve Lloyd’s article, “Selfhood, War and Masculinity”, in which she expresses the ideas of certain philosophers such as, Kant and Hegel. What Kant sees as sublime in the warfare is facing death, indeed overcoming nature and emotions by rationality (Llyod, 1987: 67-68). In warfare, male selfhood is reaffirmed by putting reason over emotions and nature:

> His self-esteem is grounded in the sense of self as rational being, transcending mere nature. Through overcoming the fear of death he has attained a higher form of selfhood—a kind of self-consciousness which transcends what distinguishes self-interested individuals from one another, being focused rather on what they have in common as rational beings (Llyod, 1987: 68).

Hegel also thinks that becoming a true self requires facing death and being aware of life as Llyod declares: the self “asserts itself, transcending dependence on mere nature” (**Ibid**., p. 71). Within this context, in warfare, the masculine self is “transforming private attachments into universal concerns of citizenship” (**Ibid**., p. 75). Hegel associates women with the private sphere, whereas war taking place in the public sphere contributes to being a citizen (**Ibid**.). In this regard, Elshtain, underlines the distinction between the public/private sphere; affirming that battlefield is a male domain: “Thus: To men's wars, women are backdrop” (Elsthain, 1987: 165). She declares the women’s attachment to the private sphere: “He may own the house, but she makes the home-if anybody does” (**Ibid**.). Additionally, Llyod points to Rousseau’s idea of citizenship which is based on sacrificing self-interest and

feelings for the public good (Llyod, 1987: 65). Since women are associated with emotions, they are perceived as contradictory of the civilised public life; therefore, they belong to the domestic sphere (**Ibid**.). The public sphere of war is created by masculine values that exclude women. As Llyod asserts, femininity, as opposed to masculinity, is constructed as an exclusion from the values of what marks the human as a citizen of a community (**Ibid**., p. 75). Accordingly, leaving the attributes of femininity behind marks male selfhood:

> The masculinity of war is what it is precisely by leaving the feminine behind. It consists in the capacity to rise above what femaleness symbolically represents: attachment to private concerns, to 'mere life'. In leaving all that behind, the soldier becomes a real man, but he also emerges into the glories of selfhood, citizenship and truly ethical, universal concerns. Womankind is constructed so as to be what has to be transcended to be a citizen (**Ibid**.).

Consequently, women do not belong to the battlefield that is the embodiment of the masculine realm of public life and the masculine ideal of transcending nature; they belong to the opposite world: the realm of emotions, private and nature.

The dichotomies of private/public, nature/culture, emotion/reason discussed widely in ecofeminist theory are reflected in the concept of war as a masculine act. In **Beyond Power: On Women, Men, and Morals,** Marilyn French also touches upon these subjects. She points out that one of the ways of eliminating men from nature is going beyond emotions and the body which a warrior requires to do (French, 1985: 105). An important point she makes is the idea of purpose: "Another powerful element in patriarchy is the idea of purpose. Because this ideology shifted humans' vision of life from a cyclical to a linear shape" (**Ibid**., p. 272). Regarding the cyclical biology of women and cyclical quality of nature, linear life committed to a purpose can also be seen as a masculine attribute that separates men from nature and women. Subsequently, French expresses it is believed that for women and animals it may be enough to experience natural feelings and instincts such as, pleasure, hunger or

reproduction; however, a man needs purposes that are beyond nature (**Ibid**., p. 273). This accords with Llyod's explanation of man's motivation for war as transcending natural feelings for the public good. French also underlines that "One of the most important functions of the idea of purpose is to rationalize suffering" (French, 1985: 273). Therefore, the idea of purpose functions as the justification of war which causes suffering. Furthermore, French underlines the thirst for power under the motivation for killing as a quality of the masculine identity separated from nature:

> killing became the mark of the truest man, of manhood itself. The willingness to kill does delineate humans from most animals, who generally do not kill their own kind; but killing also offers a prime instance of control. This control is somewhat self-defeating—if you kill all of those you wish to control, there is no one left to control. But in Western thinking, murderousness and manliness have often been equated (French, 1985: 279).

To conclude, war is created by masculine ideals which disconnect men from nature, and one of these ideals is the urge to control as a way of establishing hegemony. Like other theorists, French also signifies the distinction between nature/women and men: "Certain values are fundamental to patriarchy: control is the highest good; control over nature—transcendence—is the mark of the human; men are human and women are part of nature; it is necessary for men to prove their loyalty to the transcendent by demonstrating power over nature" (French, 1985: 112). Therefore, warfare is essential in constructing the transcendent male identity which fundamentally excludes and supresses women, nature, and animals.

In the same way as war, hunting has also a significant part in masculine identity. Within the context of **The Shooting Party**, hunting can be analysed further by an interrelating critical look; since it is both condemned literally and used as a metaphor to direct criticism to war. Given that killing marks the distinction of man from nature, Collard emphasises that hunting creates the separate masculine identity that constructs domination: "By playing hunter, man ritualises what he sees as his

greatest glory: his passage from ape to human and the consequent creation of a category of domination, the politics of which have changed the face of the earth and the quality of our lives" (Collard, 1989: 34). The "prey is named women, animal, or land" (**Ibid**., p. 46) and they are linked to each other in terms of being conquerable commodities of the patriarchal hunter. Collard makes a comparison between hunters and a predator animal, the bear, and explains that: "Bears do not kill gratuitously for 'pleasure', status, profit, power, masculinity. Hunters do" (**Ibid**., p. 52). Catherine Bates, on the other hand, questions why hunting is regarded as a heroic male activity (Bates, 2013: 5) and searches for the reasons under the motivation for hunting. She uses an evolutionary perspective and reaches at the same conclusion that hunting plays a vital part in power relations.:

> Hunting is about status, not subsistence. To the extent that this strategy can signify degrees of quality between different individuals, moreover, it also serves the purposes of male competition and all the evolutionary advantage this plays out in terms of sexual selection and long-term species benefit. Hunting may not be a reliable means of procuring food but it is reliable as a signal of the hunter's ability, and the evolutionary purpose it serves is in allowing females to make informed decisions in their choice of the most favourable mates (Bates, 2013: 7).

The competitive spirit, the indication of status and the need to demonstrate strength for women's attention can be seen in the psychological motives of characters in **The Shooting Party.** It is not just the aim of hunting but also the aim of war as French puts it: "the purpose of killing in war or hand-to-hand combat was fame and glory" (French, 1985: 279). Moreover, Kheel's explication of hunting as an action that a boy does to construct his masculine identity by overcoming nature and the feminine explained above accords with the ideas in terms of war as an act of constructing the masculine identity by transcending nature. Thus, one can see the theoretical parallelism between war and hunting. Besides, Kheel states that "By complying with the rules of 'fair play,' sport hunters felt they were able to express their 'animal instincts,' while also demonstrating their superiority to the animal world" (Kheel,

1996: 34). Accordingly, as in **The Shooting Party**, it is a brutal activity that is indicative of power which helps men to prove and display their masculine authority over nature. As Kheel argues, women are in the same position with animals in this power struggle; they are objects for the masculine self to conquer (Kheel, 1996: 41), and that is reflected in **The Shooting Party**, too.

CHAPTER TWO

THE EDIBLE WOMAN

The Edible Woman, published in 1969, revolves around the protagonist's search for female identity, the female character's relation to her body, her observation of her status in patriarchal society, and the dilemmas, struggles and discomforts she has to face. Marian, the main character of the novel, works for Seymour Surveys, a market research company where she edits questionnaires. She has a boyfriend, Peter who is a lawyer. They are engaged; however, she develops second thoughts about Peter. Marian is stuck between two kinds of unfulfilled life: one is maintaining her stable job that has no bright future, and the other one is quitting her job and having a traditional marriage predicated on gender hierarchy in which the male has the controlling power whereas the female is subordinated. She has a conventional relationship with her fiancé, Peter, who seems to have the features of "ideal" masculinity. She goes through a process of rejection of her role in their relationship, identifying herself with the objectified and consumed animals that are hunted and eaten. She becomes a vegetarian as a rebellion against patriarchal social norms, which eventually evolves into an eating disorder that explains so much about her alienation and relation to her body. As a result, after an uncomfortable journey of awakening she leaves Peter and the traditional life he represents, deciding that it is not what she actually wants.

The overwhelming effect of her relationship with Peter on Marian shows its signs through her unexplained behaviours such as escaping and hiding from him or becoming sensitive towards animals. Peter used to go hunting in the past and his hunter identity is part of his hegemonic masculinity that dominates both animals and Marian. The novel draws attention to a parallelism between his hunter's gaze that depersonalises animals and his gaze behind the camera that depersonalises Marian. Marian's perception of her own body is distorted due to patriarchal notions of the female body. The novel opens a debate regarding the body/mind dichotomy by displaying her body's autonomous reactions to the objectification by the patriarchal mind. It leads the reader to an ecofeminist understanding by presenting the linked

victimisation of women and animals. In this chapter, her vegetarianism and eating disorder will be evaluated in an ecofeminist frame by pointing out her conjoint position with animals as being edible objects of the hunter and her alienation towards her body due to her constant objectification.

Peter, as a representative of the patriarchal ideas, prejudices, and practices that degrade women, is the embodiment of hegemonic masculinity. He is the man in the centre: a privileged, white heterosexual male who establishes hegemony over the ones who are pushed to the margins. In many parts of the novel, it is demonstrated that his character signifies hegemonic masculinity. In the beginning of the novel, Ainsley, who is the roommate of Marian, says: "And naturally I didn't let on what my job was: those professional men get so huffy if you know anything about their subject. You know, like Peter" (**EW***:* 13).[*] It is implied that Peter wants women to be distanced from work; he posits them as opposed to civilization. Evidently, he has sexist thoughts: he despises women as being "scatterbrained" (**EW***:* 92) which means he does not think they can reason properly. Moreover, he has a patriarchal perspective towards women that is built upon excluding them from the realms of culture and the mind. Nevertheless, he says to Marian: "but you're such a sensible girl. You may not have known this but I've always thought that's the first thing to look for when it comes to choosing a wife" (**Ibid**.). He does not praise her honestly: he suggests that she accords with the patriarchal expectations of women. As a patriarch, he regards marginalised groups as irregularity if they do not act in accordance with his benefits; he only accepts them when they suit his aims as explained above with a reference to Plumwood. Accordingly, Marian is regarded as sensible only when she does not go beyond the lines that are drawn for her by the man in the centre. Peter tries to make her the ideal wife that serves his needs. He says to Marian: "I know I can always depend on you" (**EW***:* 92) suggesting that he relies on her as a tool to construct his hegemonic masculinity. As Plumwood asserts, although the master denies his dependence, he needs the marginalised others to define his hegemonic identity and to fulfil his needs (Plumwood, 1993: 48-49).

[*] From then on, **The Edible Woman** will be referred to as **EW**.

Another important scene that reveals Peter's mindset is when they talk about the education of children. Peter defends the physical violation towards children to discipline them whereas Marian is uncomfortable with this thought (**EW**: 149). The fact that he is not hesitant to use physical violence to sustain his control reveals his internalisation of toxic masculine behaviours. As a man, he may use violence as a means of dominating others positioned in a lower level in the male centred hierarchy. In a dispute with Marian, he uses an arrogant discourse towards her: "'Darling, you don't understand these things'" (**EW***:* 149). His words again signify that he belittles women in terms of developing socio-political ideas and sees them as disconnected to such important subjects that belong to the "cultivated" world of men. On the other hand, as a woman, Marian has a socio-psychological perspective; she develops an empathy for marginalised children: "Perhaps, Marian said primly, "somebody kicked hell out of them when they didn't deserve it. Children are very sensitive to injustice, you know" (**EW***:* 149). Atwood points to the fact that while a privileged man emphasises the significance of having power and control, a woman can bring a standpoint that focuses on the injustice since she, herself, is also exposed to unequal treatments. Peter, as a patriarchal man, aims to keep his mastery over others including homosexuals. He has a discriminative approach: he worries that people can think of him as a queer if he does not get married (**EW**: 92). Before meeting Len, he suspects if he is homosexual or not (**EW**: 66); his suspect holds negativity towards homosexuality. Accordingly, through their conflict with Ainsley, it is demonstrated that Peter is closely tied to the conservative ideas and he is not a progressive man: "Politically Peter is conservative. She had offended him too by calling one of his opinions 'conventional,' and he had retaliated by calling one of hers 'uncivilized.'" (**EW***:* 69). The adjective he chooses to define Ainsley's ideas again refers to eliminating women from the domain of civilised discussions. As a result, Peter is a traditional patriarchal man who has a supremacist approach towards otherised groups, and he aims to keep his hegemonic position. In this context, the novel is grounded on Marian's struggle for realising that she is a mere possession of Peter's hegemonic masculinity.

Interestingly, the origin of the name Peter comes from the Greek word "petros" which means stone or rock (Hanks & Hodges, 1990: 265). Stone connotates being hard, rigid, and adamant which are thought to be qualities associated with masculinity. In addition, Piers is the middle English form of Peter (**Ibid**., p. 268) which can be seen in the medieval text **Piers the Plowman** by William Langland. In the poem, Piers is the representative of "hard work, honesty, and fairness" (**Ibid**.) which are the qualities that glorifies masculinity, he even symbolises the Christ (Urgan, 2010: 69). Thus, the origin of the name is evocative of what Peter represents in the novel: he is the embodiment of the ideal masculinity. The name Marian is a variant form of Marion which is "a medieval French diminutive form of Marie" (Hanks & Hodges, 1990: 225) and it is "French from of Maria" (**Ibid**., p. 224). Maria is "Latin form of Mary" (**Ibid**., p. 223). The name Marian is also "sometimes understood as a combination of Mary and Ann" (**Ibid**., p. 224). The name is also derived "from the Latin name Marianus … often bestowed among Roman Catholics in honour of the Virgin Mary" (**Ibid**.) Thus, the name Marian originates from the cult of the Virgin Mary which represents ideal femininity. Within this context, it is relevant that Marian is shaped as an ideal wife by Peter. As such the etymology of characters' names corresponds well with their roles in the novel.

As a representative of toxic masculinity, Peter establishes a certain hegemony over Marian as Thakur explains:

> Margaret Atwood assertively presents the aspect of male domination through her protagonist's relationship with her fiancé, Peter. Peter is a person, who wants everything from Marian according to his desire. Every action of hers is instructed by him. We can say that Marian became a prey of Peter's dictatorship. He finds her important only for her physical appearance whereas he ignores her emotional and psychological requirements completely. Marian is strictly expected by Peter to fulfill his desires and needs (Thakur, 2015: 44).

The novel provides the reader with the small details which indicate that their relationship is based on traditional gender roles. Peter does not want to be with a woman who is independent and free from his control, as Marian tells: "He had recently had an unpleasant experience with what he called "the other kind" (**EW**: 63). "The other kind" refers to his way of categorising women. The woman he defines as such is a woman who does not appeal to his idea of the ideal woman. Peter is interested in Marian because he thinks she can adjust to his understanding of the ideal woman that is a submissive obedient female who would not resist his mastery: he thinks of her as "the kind of girl who wouldn't try to take over his life" (**EW**: 63). He imposes this ideal female identity that is constructed in accordance with patriarchal norms on Marian as she says: "That was the assumption we had been working on, and it had suited me" (**Ibid**.).

Peter becomes a controlling power that shapes Marian, as she turns to an object designed by him. She is to be shaped in accordance with "his moods" (**EW**: 63), and as Marian realises it is a conventional thing: "but that's true of any man" (**Ibid**.). Men modifying women according to their own desires is a conventional thing in patriarchal relationships. In agreement with beauty standards that are based on male fancy, Peter interferes with her physical look and tailors her body: he asks her to do her hair and buy a new dress "'not quite so mousy' as any she already owned" (**EW**: 211). She fulfils his request and goes to a beauty salon, the place where the idea of the female body formed according to patriarchal expectations is practiced as Sanchez-Grant argues (Sanchez-Grant, 2008: 85). Marian does not feel like herself since it is not her own choice (**EW**: 211). As Thakur argues: "She presents herself as a commodity to suit the wants of her consumer, Peter" (Thakur, 2015: 43). Thus, she loses her autonomous agency and becomes an object fulfils the demands of Peter. It has a profound meaning in terms of being in a parallel position with animals:

> By relinquishing her subjectivity and trying to adhere to a social norm that seems appropriate as 'bride-to-be', Marian's situation starts to mirror those of animals in how she feels she has no control over her own life, and how she starts to feel

> invisible or absent from it; her own opinions no longer count, as she has to adhere to social norms and conventions (Drewett, 2016: 23).

Even before their marriage, Marian is expected to perform the roles of the ideal wife in the patriarchal family. Commonly, she cooks for him and does acts of service. In the scene where they have to eat frozen food because she has not cooked, Peter reacts: "Peter pushed his plate away. 'Why can't you ever cook anything?' he said petulantly" (**EW**: 66). Stanković and Vlašković Ilić argue that the scene marks the traditional role of women (Stanković & Vlašković Ilić, **w. date**.: 231). Susan Bordo describes it as "most gratified by feeding and nourishing others, not themselves" (Bordo, 1993: 118) which pertains to Marian's eating disorder. When she serves him, he becomes joyful and affectionate: "I got up and dished him out some ice-cream, which he took as a sympathetic gesture, putting his arm round my waist and giving me a gloomy hug" (**EW**: 67). It is indicative of the fact that Peter does not perceive their relationship as an equal, loving connection between two individuals but as his ascendancy over a woman who must meet his needs.

When Marian talks about her drinking habits, she says: "This puts me at a disadvantage with Peter; he likes me to try and keep up with him" (**EW**: 17) which specifies that Peter tries to control Marian's even minor behaviours. He tries to have his authority over tiny details: he does not let her put her hand on the top of his hand (**EW**: 67). Although Marian develops a reaction against it later, first she conforms to gender norms and lets Peter become the dominant part in their relationship after being engaged; he chooses what Marian will eat: "She had fallen into the habit in the last month or so of letting him choose for her" (**EW**: 148). It is an important detail within the context of the novel considering that the act of eating is an important metaphor in terms of power relations: "Significantly, Peter's power is demonstrated by his ability to directly control what Marion (Marian) eats. He chooses her order in the restaurant, and this is the moment from which Marion (Marian) can no longer tolerate food" (Parker, 1995: 350). While Peter totally controls Marian's life, he makes her feel that she cannot go beyond any boundaries of his personal life. She cannot even go to his house spontaneously: "No matter how unobtrusive she made

herself with a book in the living room, he would silently accuse her of being overpossessive, or of being jealous and interfering about his work" (**EW**: 122). All these details express the unequal dynamics in their relationship.

Slightly, Peter gains his control over Marian and moulds her into his ideal of submissive woman. Marian realises the change in herself:

> But instead I heard a soft flannelly voice I barely recognized, saying, "I'd rather have you decide that. I'd rather leave the big decisions up to you." I was astounded at myself. I'd never said anything remotely like that to him before. The funny thing was I really meant it (**EW**: 93).

It is something that causes an inner struggle about her identity: "Marian's submission to Peter, while seemingly willing, creates an inner conflict between her perceived role as wife on the one hand and her loss of subjectivity on the other" (Drewett, 2016:10). She cannot recognise herself since it is not her autonomous self. Marian looks at her reflection as a symbol of process for finding her identity.[*] She sees a distorted body image which symbolises her alienation from herself: "Marian gazed down at the small silvery image reflected in the bowl of the spoon: herself upside down, with a huge torso narrowing to a pinhead at the handle end" (**EW**: 148). Subconsciously, she feels that it is not her essential identity, but an artificial frozen object controlled by Peter.

Marian is uncomfortable with the power dynamics in her relationship with Peter. She does not accept what Peter does to her passively. She reacts to losing her subjectivity and does not want to conform to the concept of the ideal submissive woman imposed on her by Peter. She senses that something is wrong. She feels overwhelmed:

[*] In psychanalytic terms, when children look at the mirror at the age of 6 to 18 months, they recognise their independent individuality as Jacques Lacan explains it in "The Mirror Stage as Formative of the I Function as Revealed in Psychoanalytic Experience" (Lacan, 2006).

> she had felt as though she had been trying to unsnarl herself from all the telephone lines in the city. They were prehensile, they were like snakes, they had a way of coiling back on you and getting you all wrapped up (**EW**: 136).

The telephone lines resemble snakes and can be regarded as a phallic symbol refer to the patriarchal pressure on her. As Ainsley says Peter is "nicely packaged" (**EW***:* 148), Marian has to make an effort to see the reality beneath his character and their relationship that look casual when overlooked. Marian thinks a moment of the possibility of Peter being the Underwear Man who assaults women, and this shows how she goes through a process of awakening inwardly:

> Perhaps this was his true self, the core of his personality, the central Peter who had been occupying her mind more and more lately. Perhaps this was what lay hidden under the surface, under the other surfaces, that secret identity which in spite of her many guesses and attempts and half-successes she was aware she had still not uncovered: he was really the Underwear Man (**EW**: 119).

Marian starts to recognise the real identity of Peter that he hides under the mask of love and marriage, while dragging her to a psychological inner fight. Although on the surface Peter seems to have succeeded in his goal of shaping her as a submissive woman, Marian's insights tell her that something is disrupted; thus, she revolts subconsciously against her subordination and rejects it at the end.

2.1. Representation of Hunting as Male Violence

Atwood shows that traditional understanding of masculinity constructs mastery over animals besides women. The act of hunting has a significant place in the novel in terms of signifying the relation between domination on women and animals by men. At the beginning of the novel, the theme of hunting is presented through a beer advertisement that has substantial underlying meanings. The

advertisement conveys the message that men need to kill animals to fulfil their masculinity:

> *Any real man, on a real man's holiday – hunting, fishing, or just plain old-fashioned relaxing – needs a beer with a healthy, hearty taste, a deep-down manly flavour. The first long cool swallow will tell you that Moose Beer is just what you've always wanted for true beer enjoyment. Put the tang of the wilderness in* YOUR *life today with a big satisfying glass of sturdy Moose Beer (***EW**: 27).

The advertisement conceptualises masculinity through the practices that violate animals, such as hunting and fishing. It also associates drinking beer with being masculine: it establishes drinking "deep-down manly flavour" (**Ibid**.) Moose Beer as a parallel action with hunting and fishing in terms of establishing men as masters. Thus, through using the conventions of masculinity, it triggers the need of buying beer on the targeted customer. As Marian notices, it uses the socially constructed traits of masculinity that have obtained a place in life as casual habits: "I admired the subtlety of 'just plain old-fashioned relaxing'" (**EW**: 28). It is a good technique of selling the product because targeted customer will automatically identify himself with the hunter man that is mentioned in the advertisement as Marian has remarked: "That was so the average beer-drinker, the slope-shouldered pot-bellied kind, would be able to feel a mystical identity with the plaid-jacketed sportsman shown in the pictures with his foot on a deer or scooping a trout into his net" (**Ibid**.). Through the advertisement's impact on the consumer, the role of media in terms of constructing conventional masculinity is also reaffirmed.

Further, the advertisement recalls Kheel's arguments about hunting: men search for nature but construct their identity by killing it, not being in peace with it. In this context, the song of the advertisement refers to being in nature: "From the land of pine and spruce" (**EW**: 27). Through drinking Moose Beer, you can "Put the tang of the wilderness in YOUR life today" (**Ibid**.). However, these images of wilderness do not serve the meaning of being in integrity with nature. On the

contrary it points to dominating nature as a way of building the cultural masculine identity. The visual side of the advertisement is also significant: "the label was to have a pair of antlers with a gun and a fishing rod crossed beneath them" (**EW**: 28). Through the tools that are used to violate animals, it provides an image of masculinity that relies on objectifying animals. The position of the animal in between the tools of violation foreshadows its conversion from a subject to an object. The advertisement illustrates hegemonic masculinity which is based on destructive power over animals and that excludes women. As a result, Atwood uses the advertisement to point out the devastating force over animals, which is masculinity constructed by aggressive behaviours.

The novel gives the message that hunting as an act of violation towards animals is part of masculine identity, and this is what Peter represents. The concept of male gaze is a prevailing theme in the novel, and it is discussed with its relation to hunting which will be analysed in the other parts of the story. The objectifying male gaze that is directed to women and animals behind the gun and the camera can be traced in Marian's observation of Peter's room. Marian observes that in his room, he has a "collection of weapons: two rifles, a pistol, and several wicked-looking knives" (**EW**: 61). These are parallel tools with his "cameras hang there too, their glass eyes covered by leather cases" (**Ibid**.) in terms of being used to convert women and animals to object from subject. "A full-length mirror" (**Ibid**.) signifies Peter's subjectivity.[*] Laura Mulvey expresses two effects of the cinema on the male audience: one is scopophilia which posits another person as an object of the gaze (Mulvey, 1975: 9) and the other one is the identification process with the superior male actor and his gaze, and that is linked with the mirror stage which provides ego ideal (Mulvey, 1975: 13). Accordingly, Peter constructs his subjectivity by the identification process with the male characters in hunting stories, and by being the owner of the gaze. He actively looks at others as a subject and objectifies them through his gaze. He shapes and dominates others via different actions such as photographing and hunting and as such he constructs his hegemonic masculine

[*] Seeing yourself in the mirror leads to acknowledge yourself as an I in Lacan's conception of the mirror stage (Lacan, 2006: 76).

identity. All these details about Peter drive Marian to perceive him as a threat as Barbara Hill Rigney explains:

> Under the facade of the impeccably-dressed young lawyer and prospective husband, Marian finds the heart of a killer, a reader of detective novels, a collector of guns and cameras, even the possibility of perversion as 'the Underwear Man', that anonymous male voice reputed to telephone women in order to learn their preference in intimate garments (Rigney, 1987: 26).

Power struggle within the relationships is embodied by the hunting imagery throughout the novel. For instance, Peter's thoughts about marriage are explained in terms of hunting. From a feminist perspective, marriage is an exploitative institution that women are imprisoned in; however, for a sexist man such as Peter, it is a trap for men. He views marrying as something that women convince men into and men are defeated by women in that power struggle; thus, it is an unpleasant thing. He finds it unappealing whenever one of his friends decides to marry. Seeing the emasculation of his friends by women bothers him; he feels that his masculinity is also under threat. When Trigger is engaged "he attacked the bride, accusing her of being predatory and malicious and of sucking poor Trigger into the domestic void" (**EW**: 67). When he thinks his friend has lost his power over a woman, he demonises the woman by calling her "predatory" (**Ibid**.). Len, Marian's friend, has the similar misogynistic perception of women, his words make Peter joyful since he also thinks as the same way (**EW**: 69). Len expresses his ideas about marriage: "Len Slank's articulation of his philosophy about women, 'You've got to hit and run. Get them before they get you and then get out' is accompanied by a dazzling display of teeth" (Parker, 1995: 360). Displaying his teeth refers to his position as the hunter. It symbolises the dominative and manipulative role of men in relationships.

Len is a man who has the habit of deceiving women, nevertheless; power relations are subverted in the relation of Ainsley and Len: Ainsley becomes the trickster that manipulates Len and this causes Marian to imagine "a disturbing vision

of a trophy room with stuffed and antlered heads nailed to the walls" (**EW**: 123). She directly associates Len with animals that are hunted and asks: "'Why not just use his scalp?'" (**Ibid**.). She resembles Ainsley to a "pitcher-plant in a swamp with its hollow bulbous leaves half-filled with water, waiting for some insect to be attracted, drowned, and digested (**EW**: 78). It underlines the analogy of hunting and power relations within men and women. Dating world is depicted through the hunting terms in the novel, Lucy is described as:

> trailing herself like a many-plumed fish lure with glass beads and three spinners and seventeen hooks through the likely-looking places, good restaurants and cocktail bars with their lush weed beds of potted philodendrons, where the right kind of men might be expected to be lurking, ravenous as pike, though more maritally inclined (**EW**: 113).

Lucy tries to seduce a man to marry, and her efforts are presented as hunting. She is depicted as a fish lure. Thus, in this case, she is the hunter who tries to trick men into marriage which corresponds to Peter's opinions about marriage that are explained below. However, she is still represented as a consumable object waiting for a man to eat her since she is not a fisher, but a fish lure. She has to present herself as a visual object that addresses to the male gaze. Nevertheless, she fails because "those men, the right kind, weren't biting, or had left for other depths, or were snapping at a different sort of bait – some inconspicuous brown-plastic minnow or tarnished simple brass spoon, or something with even more feathers and hooks than Lucy could manage" (**EW**: 113-114). Atwood depicts dating and marrying as something that people trick each other into, and that contributes to hunting symbolism that takes place throughout the novel.

Sarah Sceats explains that eating is tinged with a variety of social, cultural and psychological meanings (Sceats, 2003: 1), which women give place in their writings (Sceats, 2003: 2). Atwood also uses food and eating as related to political power (**Ibid**., p. 3). Accordingly, the main theme of the novel revolves around the act

of consuming as a symbol of power which is a general characteristic of Atwood's novels:

> In her novels eating is employed as a metaphor for power and is used as an extremely subtle means of examining the relationship between women and men. The powerful are characterized by their eating and the powerless by their non-eating. Eating is not the only, or the most predominant, metaphor for power; indeed, images of consumption seem so ordinary as to be insignificant. Nevertheless, they reappear persistently throughout the novels and, examined in totality, assume a potent significance (Parker, 1995: 349).

The authority of men over women is reinforced through their act of eating and hunting, whereas women are perceived as consumable objects as Stevan Mijomanović exemplifies in the following quotation:

> Ainsley is once compared to a pitcher plant (being a more progressive and aggressive woman, she has the carnivorous, male elements); Marian's colleagues are compared to various fruits: … Even Clara's motherhood is portrayed by her saying that babies resemble prunes. On the other hand, men, throughout the book, literally devour meat and, as mentioned above, are represented as hunters (Mijomanović, 2016: 72).

Closely linked with Marian's eating disorder as a reaction to patriarchal control over her life, the imagery of consuming exists both in details and in significant parts of the novel which is mentioned below. Parker gives an example of symbolism in between the lines: "Ainsley's anecdote about the woman who tries to murder her husband short-circuiting his electric toothbrush is humorous but simultaneously signals the power dynamic inherent in teeth" (Parker, 1995: 360). As it stands for the act of eating and being a predator, teeth repeatedly appear as a symbol of power. Marian thinks that the act of eating is an unpleasant thing to watch which spoils the romantic

setting. She looks at her knife which suggests that eating is a dark and bestial act (**EW**: 150). This negative depiction of eating contributes to the symbolism of the novel. Eating is used as a metaphor that signifies the hegemony over the one eaten. Further, it has a crucial meaning in its literal level too since eating animals requires the killing of them and Marian, by becoming a vegetarian, rejects this hegemonic relation between animals and humans.

Since Peter holds the idea that being married implies women hunting men, his uneasy reactions, which include various symbols, to his friends' marriage is worth examining from an ecofeminist perspective. He finds diverse ways to prove his masculinity and annihilate the threat of emasculation. For instance, after one of his friends' marriage, he puts "sheepskin on his bedroom floor" (**EW**: 62). As a product that is derived from the violation and objectification of animals, sheepskin has a significant meaning in the analysis of Peter's mood. It is an object that is made from a dead animal. Just as it is in meat eating, the live animal is made absent and converted to an object. Through using a part of a dead animal, Peter asserts his power over animals. Thus, it can be recognized that he has an urge to use animals as a tool to build his masculinity upon. In another scene, they have sexual intercourse in a field and Marian thinks he came into that idea in a "hunting story from one of the outdoorsy male magazines" (**EW**: 62). Regarding that hunting is an act necessary for the construction of a masculine identity, it is interesting to note that a hunting story involves a scene of sexual intercourse in a field. It highlights the masculine identity by engaging the relationship of men and women into the story. Both women and nature become the apparatuses of men to use. Masculine power is achieved through domination on women and nature. Moreover, Marian thinks he has obtained the idea of the sheepskin from "one of the men's glossies, the kind with lust in penthouses" (**EW**: 62) which also refers to the sexual relation between men and women. Peter applies the things that are presented to him as manly and in this context, the hunting story, the beer advertisement, and the men's glossies signify the role of the media in constructing masculinity and shaping relations between men and women. Peter's reactionary behaviours that he performs to keep Marian under his masculine control are related to the violation of animals: one is using a sheepskin and the other one is

applying the material he has read in a hunting story. It signifies the intertwining of violence towards animals and women.

After Trigger's engagement, Peter wants to have sexual intercourse with Marian in a bathtub which Marian cannot make a sense of. Marian says he may have encountered this idea of having sexual intercourse in a bathtub in "murder mysteries he read as what he called 'escape literature'" (**EW**: 62), then she imagines a dead body of a woman in a bathtub as a cover of the book (**Ibid**.). Although she cannot consciously figure out Peter's motivation, the image of a dead woman that comes to Marian's mind shows that she has her suspicions about Peter. Peter tries to suppress Marian and condemn her to limitations that are drawn for women so that she would not be a threat to Peter's masculinity, just as the image of a dead body of a woman which is passive and inert. There is a parallelism between the reality of a dead animal behind the sheepskin and the dead woman in the bathtub. The dead woman is directly shown to the reader's attention with "her open eyes staring up into those of the reader" (**Ibid**.). Whereas the dead woman is graphically depicted, the dead animal is absent behind the daily used object. However, they are conjoint images that refer to male violence. This scene can be read through Adams' concept of the absent referent; male hegemonic attitude towards women creates images of violated, battered, and harassed women that overlap with the images of objectified animals.

When they have sexual intercourse in the bathtub, he behaves in a disregardful manner: "Peter stretched and yawned beside me, grinding my arm against the porcelain. I winced and withdrew it gently from beneath him" (**EW**: 64). The fact that he physically harms her is another sign that indicates how he tries to have his power over her. As Adams points out, violence is a tool to regain masculine control (Adams, 1995: 57) which will be mentioned again later. She feels pain, but Peter is not affected by the uncomfortable physical environment: "it wasn't his flesh that was being mortified: he had been on top" (**EW**: 64). Therefore, the scene does not display a romantic connection between them, on the contrary it depicts Peter as an insensitive man. Peter biting her is another unusual action of him (**EW**: 65). It posits him as a predator animal, and it is a symbol that accords with the eating symbolism throughout the novel. However, as someone who goes to a process of

resistance, Marian bites him back as a way of asserting her subjectivity and refusing being an edible object of him (**Ibid**.).

Marian observes that Peter is not depressed due to his friend's engagement as she expects him to be (**EW**: 62). He is not depressed because he has ways to fight with the demoralization that his friend's engagement has brought about. Peter needs these rituals to identify himself as masculine as Marian puts it: "I supposed this was part of the same pattern, whatever the pattern was" (**Ibid**.). The pattern is to assert his dominance by practicing new ideas such as putting sheepskin on the floor, having sexual intercourse in a field or in the bathtub. Marian is triggered to question his motives: she thinks his actions as his way of imposing his idea of the ideal woman traits on herself. She inwardly suspects that he defines a personality for her: "Or maybe – and the thought was chilling – he had intended it as an expression of *my* personality" (**EW**: 64). She slightly comprehends that these are to pacify her as a woman. She thinks if he sees her as a worthless object to use, as a "lavatory fixture?" (**Ibid**.) and that makes her feel uneasy which is a feeling that goes throughout her quest for finding her own identity.

The act of hunting continues to occupy a paramount place throughout the novel. As a violation against animals, it is a touchstone quality of Peter's toxic masculine identity. Moreover, it exists in the novel as a symbol for the hegemonic relationship between Peter and Marian, thus referring to the intersected otherised positions of women and animals. As Lydia Rose argues: "The narratives of the hunt, the rites of passage tied to the killing of animals, and the abuse of animals are used in storytelling as metaphors and allegories, especially when symbolically describing romantic relationships and interactions" (Rose, 2023: 326). In her article "Woman-Battering and Harm to Animals", Adams discusses the relation between violence towards animals and women, pointing out that men harm animals as a tool to threaten women and sustain control over them (Adams, 1995: 56). Although she specifically focuses on pet animals, her arguments can be applied to the motivations under the violence towards animals in general as Peter's hunter identity is attached to his hegemonic masculinity. Killing of an animal is an act carried out for masculine power: "If the batterer executes the animal, he and everyone in his family perceive

that matters of life and death are in his hands. Thus, he feels more powerful" (Adams, 1995: 69).

An important scene that causes a reaction in Marian is when Peter tells one of his hunting stories to Len. It is a significant detail that Peter has never told these stories to Marian before (**EW**: 71): considering that hunting belongs to the realm of masculinity, he does not share these memories with Marian. Since Len shares similar traits of masculinity with Peter, they forge a bond together. Accordingly, Peter's hunting story functions as underlining their brotherhood. The graphic scene that he describes is the killing of the rabbit in which the rabbit is converted to an object by using a gun:

> So I let her off and Wham. One shot, right through the heart. The rest of them got away. I picked it up and Trigger said, You know how to gut them, you just slit her down the belly and give her a good hard shake and all the guts'll fall out.' So I whipped out my knife, good knife, German steel, and slit the belly and took her by the hind legs and gave her one hell of a crack, like a whip you see, and the next thing you know there was blood and guts all over the place. All over me, what a mess, rabbit guts dangling from the trees, god the trees were red for yards.… (**EW**: 71).

The scene itself and Peter's rhetoric give so much material to evaluate it from an ecofeminist perspective. He has an absolute control over the rabbit, an object for his use is formed from an autonomous being. Using a knife, which can be seen as a phallic symbol, and slitting the rabbit's belly evokes the sexual violation of women. Peter objectifies and fragments the rabbit to consume it. As Adams argues these are the phases of a cycle of the two connected forms of violence, sexual and slaughtering. After this scene, "Len bared his teeth" (**EW***:* 71) which contributes to the image of consumption referring to the domination over women and animals. Besides, Peter calls the rabbit as "her", indicating the shared lower status of women and animals. As Adams states: "'She' represents not only a 'minor power,' but a vanquished power, a soon-to-be-killed powerless animal" (Adams, 1990: 103). By

referring to the rabbit as “her”, he reinforces its objectified status through using women’s secondary place in patriarchy. As Drewett suggests: “When prey is feminised, women become the absent referent in how the animals are described” (Drewett, 2016: 24). The situation of women and animals is overlapped at the point of being a prey that is looked at by men: “Men see prey as female because the way they gaze at women and animals is similar” (**Ibid**.). Peter’s story of hunting opens a discussion about this intertwined subdued position of women and animals which the dialogue about cameras also contributes to. Peter says that they have taken a picture of that bloody scene, and they start talking about cameras (**EW**: 71). Taking a picture of the rabbit strengthens its objectified status: after converting the rabbit to an object by using a gun, he also uses a camera as a parallel functioning tool. Cameras that have a male gaze behind it work by reducing women to their physical look and transforming them to objects of male desire. Therefore, it again refers to the objectification of women, emphasising the connected hegemonic ideology over women and animals.

Peter’s killing of the rabbit deeply affects Marian: she sees the toxic masculine identity of Peter that hunts both her and the rabbit. Developing certain insights and suspicions about Peter, she realises she has gained an unfavourable perspective towards him. She starts to see his real face which she is alienated from, indicated by the fact that she does not recognize his voice when he tells the story (**EW**: 71). She starts to perceive Peter as a hunter that hunts her too: she thinks that it seems like except for Ainsley, men consist of a chin (**EW**: 72) which signifies the act of consuming. Subconsciously, she goes through a questioning process of toxic masculinity which is characterised by consuming both animals and women. Since the hunting story, beside its literal significance, has a symbolic importance in terms of signifying male domination over women, Marian is triggered to consider her status in their relationship. She recognises that she is a victim of Peter, an object that is dominated by him just like the rabbit in the story.

> She experiences a moment of epiphany and identifies herself with the rabbit, entrapped by the hunter, Peter. She perceives her body as an object of slaughter and

> consumption. She also realizes that her body can be imprisoned, subdued and disciplined forcibly. This moment of epiphany causes uneasiness in her body, it ejects tears, as an implication of a rebellion. It is a profound expression of deep rooted anxiety and an urge to emancipate, by transcending the defined borders, marked by the socio-cultural norms. From this moment onwards she begins to perceive herself as a victim, as the hunted rabbit (Sarkar, 2019: 49).

When she tries to see that scene, she cannot see the rabbit because she has already identified herself with the rabbit: "because in her fantasy she is there in the rabbit's place" (Drewett, 2016: 23). She is looking at the scene through the eyes of the rabbit. As Rigney articulates, since she sees her own subordination in the death of animals that are converted to food, her identification with the prey results in an eating disorder which will be evaluated in detail (Rigney, 1987: 24). When Marian listens to their conversation about taking a photo, she understands that he sees her as "a stage prop" (**EW**: 73). Just like the rabbit, she is also an object that he needs to reinforce his masculinity as she says: "he was depending on me!" (**Ibid**.). As a woman, she recognises that she is in an akin position with the rabbit that Peter hunts; thus, this part, like so many other parts of the novel, underlines the intertwined destiny of women and animals.

Marian does not understand what she goes through fully, but still, she feels that she needs to do something. Since she identifies herself with the prey, the rabbit, she does not feel safe in that environment filled with predators. It creates anxious feelings in her: thinking that the "air was filled with a soft menace" (**EW**: 74). The awakening affects her: she cries without realising she is crying (**EW**: 72). She does not realise it because her awakening starts subconsciously, it is her body rather than her mind that reacts to the oppression. At this level, she is disconnected and confused about her physical reactions which are her instincts trying to save her from the hunter. She is split by the dualistic understanding. She cannot integrate her body with her mind yet. Thus, she cannot recognize the situation consciously. She has internalised patriarchal norms that tell her to behave in an easy going way; however, a seed of riot is planted somewhere inside her. Before rejecting meat and developing

an eating disorder as a rebellion, her body first starts to rebel against patriarchal norms in this scene, which is triggered by the hunting story.

The hunting story provokes Marian to recognise her objectified status in her relationship with Peter. Consequently, she performs reactionary behaviours that empower the hunting symbolism. Similar to her identification with the rabbit, she acts like a prey that is in danger. To protect herself from the predator, she, instinctually, starts to run away from Peter: "I was running along the sidewalk. After the first minute I was surprised to find my feet moving, wondering how they had begun, but I didn't stop" (**EW**: 75). Being surprised by her own bodily movements again signifies that her body reacts autonomously. She is confined in the dualistic thinking that splits the body from the mind. As Mijomanović argues: "The chase looks exactly as if a rabbit were pursued by hounds" (Mijomanović, 2016: 71). Therefore, it underlines Marian's identification with the rabbit. As a hunt, she is chased by the two men, Len and Peter, who are the hunters. The hunting story's another function is creating a bond between Len and Peter in terms of having the characteristics of toxic masculinity, now chasing Marian together contributes to their conjoint role as hunters, as patriarchs. In Marian's words about Len, it is seen that she has considered their brotherhood as a threat against herself: "He was my friend. But he had taken sides against me and would have to pay the price" (**EW**: 76). Chasing continues until Peter catches Marian and she hears his normal voice (**EW**: 77) which signifies that she submits to Peter again and discards her critical perspective of him. For a moment, she goes out of her journey of awakening. Transformation is a hard process: she tries to find peace by going back to the social norms of their relationship, by resigning herself to him again. However, after her quest for finding her autonomous self has once begun, it is inevitable for her to go back to her former state.

Marian's peace is interrupted in a point of no return by her inner struggle between adjusting to patriarchal norms that impose the identity of the submissive woman on her and claiming her independent identity which is a hard process to go through. When they are in Len's apartment, her urge to escape from Peter is again triggered: this time it is by Len and Peter's talk of cameras which signifies the

objectifying male gaze. Taking a photograph is in parallel with hunting which also triggers Marian. Both acts have the male gaze as an agent that objectifies and consumes women and animals as Drewett explains:

> It is significant that Marian's urge to hide under the bed is triggered by the men discussing and playing with cameras. The connection between cameras, the male gaze, guns and hunting is especially evident in a later scene in the novel, one that clearly highlights the interlocking oppressions of women and hunted animals (Drewett, 2016: 25).

Not to be consumed by the male gaze, Marian wants to conceal herself and listen to her instincts that tell her to be away from the eyes of men. She considers "the dark cool space between the bed and the wall" (**EW**: 78) as alluring since that place will cover her. She applies a technique pertaining to an animal of prey that tries to protect itself: she hides from the predator. Her action marks her identification with the prey (Mijomanović, 2016: 71). However, her position does not satisfy her need of safety. Thus, she goes further: she feels a necessity to be under the bed. She thinks that "It will be like a tent" (**EW**: 78) which signifies the bed's protective function from the danger of the outside. She considers the place as a haven; thus, she feels secured: "But the semi-darkness, tinted orange by the filter of the bedspread that curtained me on all four sides, and the coolness and the solitude were pleasant" (**EW**: 79). How she defines her action is also significant: "I myself was underground, I had dug myself a private burrow. I felt smug" (**EW**: 79). When her shelter is broken, she associates herself with animals again: "I scuttled out backwards like a crayfish when its rock has been upset" (**EW**: 80). The analogy is clear: she is in a related position with animals that are consumed, and she utilizes the survival techniques of these animals.

Marian is in an unstable position in her awakening process which is slowly developing. After spending some time in her shelter, she cannot remember the reasons that drive her there (**EW**: 79). However, she still finds a moment under the

bed to think about their relationship with Peter, to face with her inner conflict. Sensing that their commitment gets stronger makes her feel anxious since she is not sure if she can be her real self when she is with Peter. Her words that depict their physical situation signifies the unequal dynamics of their relationship which drive Marian to think: "My resentment at Peter for letting me remain crushed under the bed while he moved up there in the open, in the free air, jabbering away about exposure times, started me thinking about the past four months" (**EW**: 80). Peter's talking about cameras symbolises his hegemonic position since he is the active agent that looks behind the camera while Marian is stuck under the bed as a symbol of her psychological imprisonment. Marian manages to possess her true feelings for the situation she is in: "I had realized by this time what my prevailing emotion was: it was rage" (**EW***:* 81). Her rage is towards a relationship based on the patriarchal norms which posit her as an object that is shaped and consumed by Peter. Nevertheless, since her awakening emerges in her subconscious mind, she cannot figure out her reasons clearly: "Though I wasn't at all certain why I had been acting this way, I had at least acted" (**Ibid**.). She knows that it is not because they are in a quarrel (**Ibid**.), since the problem is something deeper: it is the basis of their relationship. Peter performs a controlling behaviour: "He took me by the upper arm as though he was arresting me for jaywalking and turned to Len" (**Ibid**.). Marian has gained certain insights about power dynamics in their relationship; hence, she maintains her reactionary behaviours: she confronts him and rejects to go with him (**Ibid**.). Nevertheless, since it is raining, eventually she gets in his car and expresses her discomfort about their friendship with Len which is built upon their common hobby of photography. She knows it is not that she cannot share Len as a friend (**EW**: 83), but that she is bothered by their shared roles of hegemonic masculinity.

As a patriarch that centres himself in his hegemonic order, Peter sees Marian's rebellious behaviours as irregularity that do not fit his aims. "The trouble with you is," he said savagely, "you're just rejecting your femininity" (**EW**: 83). Marian acts in opposition to his expectations and does not adapt to the socially constructed roles of the ideal femininity. Through the conflict created by Peter's demands on Marian, the novel emphasises femininity as a social concept:

> Femininity is supposedly the 'natural' essence of womanhood itself: to be feminine is to be a woman. By contrast, Conboy et al. argue that femininity is just another social mechanism which is based on male desires and used to curtail the freedom of women (Sanchez-Grant, 2008: 79).

Marian's rebellious behaviours towards him provoke Peter's wish of shaping her in accordance with his needs. His intention of recontroling her is expressed with the hunting symbolism that goes throughout the novel: "He glanced quickly over at me, his eyes narrowed as though he was taking aim. Then he gritted his teeth together and stepped murderously hard on the accelerator" (**EW**: 83). The male gaze as both behind the gun and the camera, and the teeth as a consuming tool stress toxic masculinity that dominates both women and animals.

As a feature of this toxic masculinity, Peter tries to gain his authority over Marian back through using his control in the car. He drives irresponsibly and scares her. Adams' arguments about the motivations and consequences of male violence can be observed in Peter's behaviours.

> When a man hits a woman, he has not lost control- he achieves and maintains control: *It is not so much what is done but what is accomplished*. Not only is he achieving and maintaining control, but he is reminding the woman of her subordinate status in the world (Adams, 1995: 57).

Although he does not literally batter Marian, he still reaches the accomplishments of the battering: the sense of control. Marian says ""You'll get us all killed!" I must have been thinking of myself as plural" (**EW**: 83-84), which refers to the segmentation in her perception of her identity. She experiences a dilemma between the submissive feminine identity imposed on her and her inner journey of finding her autonomous identity. Further, her position drives her to identify herself with the

objectified animals. The symbolically intertwined destiny of Marian and the rabbit could have been literal: Peter goes further in his power thirst and risks their life. He is confident and proud with himself for his action of using physical force to construct certain authority: “His satisfaction with what he considered a forceful display of muscle was obvious” (**EW**: 84). His gaze as a symbolic power is again emphasised: “his eyes gleaming like an animal’s in the beam from a car headlight. His stare was intent, faintly ominous” (**EW**: 85). It signifies that he has regained his hegemonic masculinity. His proposal is not an act that manifests his love. On the contrary, it derives from the instincts of power, functioning as having his total control over Marian. As Adams mentions, as a man, after Marian’s warring behaviours, he re-establishes his order by using physical force:

> Men who batter not only believe they have the right to use violence, but receive rewards for behaving in this manner- namely, obedience and loyalty. Battering guarantees that the man “wins” disputes, that the status quo in the relationship is maintained, and that the woman will not leave him” (**qtd. in** Adams, 1995: 57).

Marian sees her reflection in him: “As we stared at each other in that brief light I could see myself, small and oval, mirrored in his eyes” (**EW**: 85). It reinforces the identity of the ideal wife he has always imposing into her to maintain his patriarchal order.

The power of gaze has a significant function in constructing subjectivity as it is discussed widely under the feminist theoretical frame. John Berger discusses how women are represented as always being looked at by men in **Ways of Seeing** (Berger, 2008). Whereas women are objectified by the male gaze, the owner of the gaze asserts himself as subject as Adams argues: “Within patriarchal culture, constituting oneself as a subject involves having an object who is looked at” (Adams, 2018:15). Power relations between men and women are reinforced through the act of looking:

> In a world ordered by sexual imbalance, pleasure in looking has been split between active/male and passive/female. The determining male gaze projects its fantasy onto the female figure, which is styled accordingly. In their traditional exhibitionist role women are simultaneously looked at and displayed, with their appearance coded for strong visual and erotic impact so that they can be said to connote *to-be-looked-at-ness* (Mulvey,1975:11).

Mulvey goes further in her analysis of the male gaze. She uses psychoanalytic theory to explain pleasures of the cinema. She expresses that since women lack a penis, they trigger the castration complex of the male subject. She argues women are subjected to two forms of the male gaze to annihilate the threat: one is fetishistic that uses their beauty as a tool of pleasure and the other one is sadistic that aims control on them (Mulvey, 1975: 15). In her article "Why Look at Women" Susanne Kappeler reads Berger's article "Why Look at Animals?", which discusses animals as an object of the human gaze, by substituting women for animals and concludes that just like animals that are being looked at in the zoo, women are also deprived of subjectivity and reduced to an object of sight in pornography (Kappeler, 1986). This idea of objectifying male gaze towards women and animals has a substantial place in **The Edible Woman.**

A scene that marks the equivalent male gaze behind the gun and the camera occurs at the party where Marian is dressed as Peter wants. Significantly, she frequently looks into the mirror with a certain feeling of alienation. She is practically a doll that is shaped and owned by Peter:

> He had made her turn around so he could see the back, and he had liked that too. Now she wondered whether or not she did look absolutely marvellous. She turned the phrase over in her mind: it had no specific shape or flavour. What should it feel like? She smiled at herself. No, that wouldn't do. She smiled a different smile, drooping her eyelids; that didn't quite work either. She turned her head and examined her profile out of the corner of her eye. The difficulty was that she couldn't grasp the total effect: her attention caught on the various details, the things

> she wasn't used to – the fingernails, the heavy earrings, the hair, the various parts of her face that Ainsley had added or altered. She was only able to see one thing at a time. What was it that lay beneath the surface these pieces were floating on, holding them all together? She held both of her naked arms out towards the mirror. They were the only portion of her flesh that was without a cloth or nylon or leather or varnish covering, but in the glass even they looked fake, like soft pinkish-white rubber or plastic, boneless, flexible.… (**EW**: 230-231).

The process of objectification of Marian by Peter reaches at its highest level when he wants to take her photograph. Marian already does not feel like her real self in that red dress and make up. Moreover, she senses that Peter reduces her to her body alone. Therefore, she does not feel comfortable with the camera that has the objectifying gaze behind it. Peter looks at Marian behind the machine, and Marian is being looked at by him: he sexualizes her with the use of the camera. Her being is reduced to her body metaphorically transforms her into meat by the male gaze behind the camera. As a photographer, symbolically a hunter, Peter gives her a series of instructions for posing. This is indicative of her being shaped like a doll. With the fear and anxiety of being in danger, Marian reacts to the hunter by freezing (**EW**: 234). Momentarily, Marian is saved from being objectified, symbolically hunted, with the interruption of the knock on the door.

Peter does not give up from the idea of taking a photo of Marian. Peter, with his camera aimed at her, is in the position of a hunter who aims a gun to an animal, which is described in the lines here: "he raised the camera and aimed it at her; his mouth opened in a snarl of teeth" (**EW**: 247). Peter's killing of the rabbit corresponds to his taking a photo of Marian. To be able to kill the animal you should first objectify it: he was looking at the animal and the animal was being looked at, through his gaze he brought it to a position of a piece of meat rather than a sensitive living creature. Then, with the gun he literally converts the rabbit to meat from being an alive animal. Marian reaches to a point of awakening which is seen in the description of Peter holding a camera: "That dark intent marksman with his aiming eye had been there all the time, hidden by the other layers, waiting for her at the dead

centre: a homicidal maniac with a lethal weapon in his hands" (**EW**: 249). Peter's aiming eye parallels his hunter gaze behind the gun, and the camera as a "lethal weapon" parallels the gun; both tools function as converting a subject to an object. As Rigney states camera is "an instrument Atwood frequently associates with guns or with psychological annihilation" (Rigney, 1987: 25). As such, it metaphorically kills Marian since it destroys her subjectivity and fixates the identity she has now with her exaggerated physical look that Peter inflicted on her. It is a significant detail that he asks her to pose near the guns (**EW**: 234):

> The photo that Peter would take of her leaning against the wall and framed by his guns suggests the similar image of a hunter holding his gun while he rests his foot on a newly killed animal, but instead of having a dead animal as the trophy, it is a sexualised version of Marian. In the objectification of Marian, a hunted animal is the absent referent, not present in body but suggested metaphorically. Marian is aware of this connection, and in that moment where she freezes, like a rabbit caught in lights, she recognises her role as prey, and that Peter's male gaze through the camera is akin to the hunter's gaze down the barrel of a gun. [...] Peter's gaze through the camera asserts his subjectivity and objectifies Marian, in the same way that a hunter's gaze asserts the subjectivity of the human and objectifies the animal. As both women and animals are recipients of the patriarchal gaze, their objectification and oppressions are interlinked (Drewett, 2016: 25).

Peter, as an active agent, has tools and gaze to objectify women and animals, whereas Marian and the rabbit are fellow sufferers under the survey of the tyrannical patriarch.

When she thinks he has taken a picture of her, she panics and the fact that she feels her face is distorted refers to the feeling of losing her subjectivity (**EW**: 247). It is important that she does not allow him to take her photo because if he takes her photo, she is afraid that she will become the victim irreversibly like the rabbit. "Once he pulled the trigger she would be stopped, fixed indissolubly in that gesture, that single stance, unable to move or change" (**EW**: 248). The photo will be evocative of

the sexualised version of Marian by Peter's gaze, just like the photo of the killed rabbit by Peter. How Marian is defined is also important: "She should never have worn red. It made her a perfect target" (**EW**: 247). Since the colour red is associated with intense emotions such as love, passion and anger, Marian feels her dress takes the attention of the hunter. Being a target refers to being a prey and the quote underlines the common technique of women to protect themselves from being a target of the male gaze which is dressing in a way that does not take attention. When she is escaping, she is "counting on her dress to act as a protective camouflage" (**EW** 248), being in camouflage is a way for a prey to protect itself from a predator. The camera and the male gaze trigger Marian's instinct of escaping from him and saving herself. Inwardly, her identity crisis reaches its peak in that scene. She rejects the objectified status that is imposed on her and leaves the party.

2.2. Eating Disorder and Vegetarianism

Critics have interpreted Marian's eating disorder as a protest to patriarchal culture that posits the female body as a consumable object. Bordo elaborates on eating disorders from a feminist perspective and concludes that it is related to being a female in patriarchal culture that invades, controls, and modifies the female body: "eating disorders, far from being "bizarre" and anomalous, are utterly continuous with a dominant element of the experience of being female in this culture" (Bordo, 1993: 57). Accordingly, Marian's eating disorder is also a reaction to the patriarchal construction of femininity: "Marian, in fact, in adopting what is essentially the parodic strategy of the anorectic, refuses silence and uses her body to articulate a caricature of patriarchal culture's image of femininity which involves both rejection and subversion of its requirements" (Waugh, 2012: 183). As Lecker argues it is a "rejection of a culture which tends to exploit women and treat them as edible objects" (**qtd. in** Rigney, 1987: 33). Moreover, specifically it is a reaction to the submissive wife identity that she will become, as Sceats articulates (Sceats, 2003: 96). It is a coherent interpretation; however, it should be enriched by pointing out the connection and the parallelism between the literal consuming of animals and the metaphorical consuming of women. The significance of Marian's perception of animals in her rejection of food and the potential ecofeminist interpretation the novel

provides should not be ignored. As Orela Vokes asserts Marian's inability to eat is illuminated as a motion displaying her problem with gender politics and traditional roles; furthermore, the criticism of the novel should also include the elaboration of her rejection of meat through an ecofeminist lens which sees it as a favourable act (Vokes, 2015: 14). Somasree Sarkar focuses on the ecofeminist approach of her vegetarianism:

> For Marian, the equation between meat and female body, defines the violence and oppression imposed by the male dominated consumerist society upon women and animals both. She is threatened by the fear of being consumed, when Marian realizes the striking similarity between a woman and an animal in terms of edibility (Sarkar, 2019: 49).

First, Marian only rejects meat; however, later she becomes unable to eat a variety of food and it turns out to an eating disorder. As a woman, she is treated as an object in patriarchal culture: her body is symbolically consumed by Peter who is an embodiment of patriarchal values. It is a situation that causes a reaction in her. While she is questioning her own objectified status, she also refuses to objectify others. She does not see animals as inert, useable body parts as patriarchal culture treats them, since she is also exposed to a similar treatment which she cannot accept easily and passively. Drewett points out "she identifies with the animals who become food" (Drewett, 2016: 10) and her position leads her to have empathy for them. Consequently, she reacts against the objectification of herself and animals. In this sense, her body's rejection of eating meat signifies the rejection of patriarchal order: revolting against the idea that women and animals are consumable. As Drewett reads it as a reaction to patriarchal domination (**Ibid**.), her vegetarianism can be interpreted as a rebellion towards male hegemony over animals and women. When Marian is unable to eat, "Peter smiled and chewed, pleasantly conscious of his own superior capacity" (**EW**: 153) which contributes to the symbolic meaning of eating as constructing domination. Peter says: "A good meal always makes you feel a little more human" (**Ibid**.), which explains that in that case hegemonic relation is between

humans and animals: animals are used to construct hegemonic identity of human through, not metaphorically, but literally, eating. Relevantly, Marian recognises like women, animals are also seen as tools of hegemonic masculinity; they are violated by patriarchal culture which also subordinates herself. Thus, she rejects being an agent of the victimisation of animals.

Marian experiences awakening concerning violation towards animals and herself; thus, she feels unease at the dinner which is a vivid visual scene of eating as a metaphor of domination as Sceats states: "an apparently peaceful setting – a romantic dinner for two – is suddenly tilted into a different frame, indicating savagery and ruthlessness" (Sceats, 2003: 97). Drewett realises the scene is an embodiment of gender politics and it provides an analysis of meat eating as well (Drewett, 2016: 10). While watching Peter cutting the meat, Marian reaches to a point of awakening about the masked violence towards animals. She defines it as a brutal act, although on the surface it may be odd to have such a perspective as Sceats notices that she perceives it as "a highly violent action, albeit disguised and decontaminated" (Sceats, 2003: 96). Marian refers to the advertisement of Moose Beer which includes the acts of hunting and fishing that are other normalised violent actions towards animals (**EW**: 152). She remembers that advertisement since it also whitewashes violent reality behind the picture. Thus, normalisation of violence towards animals through the tools of culture is emphasised in the novel. Consequently, Marian obtains a certain consciousness that uncovers the violent reality under the daily actions. Moreover, she remembers a newspaper about a killer who does not look like a killer and seems like watching everything from away (**Ibid**.). It creates an allegory for eating meat since people do not kill animals themselves, but violence occurs in distant places in a masked form without any blood seen by the meat eaters. Meat eating is just like how Marian depicts that violent act in the newspaper: "It was a violence of the mind, almost like magic: you thought it and it happened" (**Ibid**.). One thinks about eating meat and buys it from the market, without being involved in the violent process in the background. It arrives at a point where animals as living beings become absent referents and their killing is covered up; thus, eating meat becomes a seemingly unbloody act of daily life. However,

Marian is able to realise the harsh reality under it and put the absent referent to its place.

As Adams has argued since the bodies of animals are fragmented in the objectification process, Marian recognises that something is wrong with reducing animals to their body parts. In eating meat, animals are deprived of their integral identity and become fragmented inert body parts that are the objects of the kitchen. They are treated as objects even when they are alive, then they are literally converted to an object, a consumable body part, a piece of meat. Peter's cutting meat to its pieces provokes Marian to think of the diagram of the planned cow she has seen on a cookbook: "the cow with lines on it and labels to show you from which part of the cow all the different cuts were taken" (**EW**: 152). She accredits that animals are not seen as a living subject, but they are seen as a consumable body which is fragmented to its pieces; thus, their objectification gets stronger, and they become anonymous body parts. She thinks that maybe one day they will be born as "already ruled and measured" (**EW**: 153). She imagines butchers "cutting out steaks and ribs and roasts from the stacks of brown-paper cow-shapes before them" (**Ibid**.), which gives an idea of a mechanical production of meat like there is not a living subject that is killed in the background. However, Marian distinguishes the subject behind the picture, she mentions the nonedible parts of the cow: her "eyes and horns and an udder" (**Ibid**.). This implies that she does not see the cow as a body that can be consumed but acknowledges it as an independent living being.

As a woman, Marian experiences objectification generally by patriarchal culture and specifically by Peter which leads her to have empathy for the objectified animals. When thinking about the diagram of the planned cow, she comprehends the objectification process of the subject. She looks at the meat on her plate and her moment of awakening reaches at its most powerful point. She understands that the cow as a living agent is hidden, and it becomes a consumable product in the process of meat eating.

> She looked down at her own half-eaten steak and suddenly saw it as a hunk of muscle. Blood red. Part of a real cow that once moved and ate and was killed, knocked on the head as it stood in a queue like someone waiting for a streetcar. Of course everyone knew that. But most of the time you never thought about it. In the supermarket they had it all pre-packaged in cellophane, with name labels and price labels stuck on it, and it was just like buying a jar of peanut butter or a can of beans, and even when you went into a butcher shop they wrapped it up so efficiently and quickly that it was made clean, official (**EW***:* 153).

She puts the absent referent to its place by acknowledging the subject and revealing the violent death of the living subject behind the phenomenon of meat. Vokes underlines the fact that although Marian cannot really acknowledge her urges under her body's refusal of food, she comprehends the process of social construction of meat which erases animals (Vokes, 2015: 11). In the marketing process the animal is converted to a product and consumed without regarding the subject behind it. Once Marian has seen the animal behind the steak, she starts to perceive it as a dead body part of a once living animal rather than an edible component. When the mask that hides the violent reality is uncovered, she experiences a moment of epiphany: "But now it was suddenly there in front of her with no intervening paper, it was flesh and blood, rare, and she had been devouring it. Gorging herself on it" (**EW**: 153). It causes her to be unable to eat meat. What she feels about the chicken demonstrates the change in her perspective towards meat: "it came with an unpleasantly complete skeletal structure, and the skin, she predicted, would be too much like an arm with goose bumps" (**EW***:* 155). The boundary between human and animal body is removed; she has recognised the similarity. From now on, the animal is not absent for Marian anymore, she has crossed the cultural barriers that conceal the living animal and produce an object from it. She has realised that it is not an object to consume but a part of a dead body. Moreover, As Sarkar asserts, through recognising the absent referent she has realised that her body is also metaphorically butchered (Sarkar, 2019: 49), and the butchered animal body is no different than hers.

2.3. The Role of the Female Body and Marian's Perception

Madeliene Davies states that Atwood uses the female body attached to subversive expressions as a means of telling the stories of women within a certain political atmosphere (Davies, 2006: 60). Accordingly, In Marian's case her body has a profound role. Since she experiences her awakening process mostly unconsciously, it is her body that decides to eliminate meat from her diet, not her mind. "Whatever it was that had been making these decisions, not her mind certainly, rejected anything that had an indication of bone or tendon or fibre" **(EW:** 155). Atwood, by giving a power of rebellion and an autonomy to the female body, deconstructs the concept of body as an inert passive thing and challenges hierarchal body/mind dualism. As Fiona Tolan notes "Atwood … depicts the body as a locus of intelligence, overturning the notion of a hierarchical divide (Tolan, 2007: 22). Atwood gives an autonomy to Marian's body to create a reaction towards the oppression: "against her rational will, Marian's body becomes an unconscious site of protest against Peter's metaphorical consumption of her" (Tolan, 2007: 21). Sceats has also noted that "the body is given its own, subversive, voice" (Sceats, 2003: 95). Moreover, critics have stated that when women have no means of rebellion, their body is used as an instrument of protest manifesting hysterical behaviours. Bordo claims that both hysteria and eating disorders are "culturally and historically situated" (Bordo, 1993: 50). Hysteria can be interpreted from a feminist cultural frame: it is read as a means of protest in a patriarchal discourse that excludes women and reduces them to their sexuality alone (Tolan, 2007: 23). Patricia Waugh gives examples from women of the nineteenth century novels and states: "having no public voice, they can 'speak' only through their visual appearance" (Waugh, 2012: 180). Accordingly, Tolan explains Marian's escape from Peter as an unconscious hysterical behaviour of protest along with her eating disorder (Tolan, 2007: 25). Therefore, Marian's body becomes an instrument of rebellion which gains its own agency.

It is significant that her body rather than her mind boycotts dominant social norms, since it is her body that shares the metaphorically equivalent destiny with animals which is being objectified and consumed. Another important point is that since in male discourse the mind and culture are associated with men, it is essential

that Atwood gives the power of standing against male oriented cultural norms to the female body whereas Marian's mind accredits them. She is unable to eat meat because of her bodily reactions, her mind's conditioning to social conventions is seen in the quote below: ""This is ridiculous," she lectured herself. "Everyone eats cows, it's natural; you have to eat to stay alive, meat is good for you, it has lots of proteins and minerals."" (**EW**: 153). Drewett remarks that she wants to adapt to dominant ideology in which meat eating is a social norm, and that results as an inner conflict (Drewett, 2016: 21). As Tolan states: "the novel becomes a battle between her mind's rational desire for normality, and her body's irrational refusal to be cured" (Tolan, 2007: 25-26). The battle is not only limited to her perception of meat, but it is also about Peter; thus, her rejection of meat is an embodiment of a wider ongoing struggle that her complex experiences as a woman have caused. As Sceats notices while she submits to Peter on the surface, her body rejects that submission (Sceats, 2003: 96). Her inner struggle comes from a dilemma in between revolting against the social norms of male rationality or adjusting to them just as her previous actions towards Peter have demonstrated. She experiences an inner conflict, which her complex attitude towards Peter and meat-eating displays strikingly.

Through her perspective towards her friend Clara's pregnancy, it is understood that Marian has internalised patriarchal dualistic thinking which has been criticised by ecofeminist theorists mentioned above. Sanchez-Grant argues that she has a binary perspective towards Clara's pregnancy (Sanchez-Grant, 2008: 82), and Rigney also points out her negative attitude (Rigney, 1987: 21) which is demonstrated throughout the novel. Perceiving Clara as lacking intellectual capacity (**EW**: 131) is indicative of how she associates Clara with the body alone and her viewing the mind as opposed to the body. Her dualistic mindset prevents her from seeing Clara as an actual human being when she is pregnant. Ainsley reveals her binary thinking in which work life contrasts with pregnancy (**EW**: 43), and that derives from nature/culture dualism. Marian's mobile life is positioned as opposed to Clara's inert life which is portrayed as overwhelming and limited because of children and pregnancy (**EW**: 34). Marian sees Clara as a victim of a biological destiny which cannot be falsified since her pregnancies are unintended. It triggers Marian's aim of

transcendency of the body which she sees as a mechanism of biological limitations. Marian's negative attitude towards pregnancy shows itself in grotesque descriptions of Clara's body that resemble it to animals or plants, and that empowers the nature/culture dualism. She is pictured as "a strange vegetable growth, a bulbous tuber that had sent out four thin white roots and a tiny pale-yellow flower" (**EW**: 34) or "a boa constrictor that has swallowed a watermelon" (**EW**: 33). Her belly is "gigantic pumpkin-like growth that was enveloping her body" (**EW***:* 116), and the fetus is imagined as an unusual organism: "Maybe it's got three heads," … a kind of parasitic growth, like galls on trees, or elephantiasis of the navel, or a huge bunion" (**Ibid**.). Marian's depiction of Clara demonstrates how she detests the female body because of her internalisation of patriarchal binary thinking. Clearly, the outcome is alienating from her body: her body announcing her own agency and Marian's being unable to control or understand her bodily reactions show how her mind-body integrity is broken.

It is important to mention the feminist debate over the female body situated in a patriarchal world when analysing Marian's perception of her own body. Barbara Brook explains the mentality of some of the second wave feminist theorists who promote disassociating with the body. For instance, Simone de Beauvoir believes that women should avoid pregnancy as much as possible, or Shulamith Firestone, more radically, opposes pregnancy (Brook, 2014: 6). Tolan states that Marian's actions are coherent with de Beauvoir's binary view (Tolan, 2007: 14). Within this context, a consistent interpretation is that Marian feels antipathy towards the adult female body and erases the possibility of pregnancy by sabotaging her own body. Bordo states that there is an approach to eating disorders which centres the "resistance to developing a female body" (Bordo, 1993: 46) due to "fear of pregnancy or of attracting the sexual attention of men" (**Ibid**.). Accordingly, Rigney interprets Marian's eating disorder as rejecting the adult female body which has an ability to get pregnant (Rigney, 1987: 23-24); Tolan also shares the same idea, expressing that she destructs her body to escape pregnancy (Tolan, 2007: 15). Ecofeminism takes a different direction here: it promotes accepting and celebrating the body. As Sanchez-Grant argues it is also what Marian's body craves for (Sanchez-Grant, 2008: 81).

Marian should listen to her body's voice and decline the patriarchal dualistic thinking. She feels the pressure of the culturally constructed femininity which imprisons women to their body and her way of rejection ends up being alienated from her body. As Sanchez-Grant states: "Marian's response to gendered binaries is to detach herself from her body; by enabling Marian's body to protest against that detachment, Atwood denounces the repressive dichotomies that order society" (**Ibid**.). Women should not accept being reduced to their bodily functions such as fertility; however, despising the female body as patriarchal ideology does will not work as liberalising from patriarchal exploitations over the body.

The novel examines the female body as a site of patriarchal oppression which affects women's perspective towards their own body and female identity as in the debate on pregnancy. It triggers further discussions about evaluations of the female body in patriarchal culture. While Marian experiences an inner struggle and identifies with the objectified animals due to her position in her relationship, she also observes how women are widely situated as consumable objects. The objectification of women is emphasised by mentioning the acts of sexual assault that women are exposed to. Marian is harassed when she makes an interview for the company she is working for (**EW**: 50). Also, there is an Underwear Man who verbally harasses women on the phone. Marian images him as a respectful looking man (**EW**: 119). He is not a marginalised freak, but he is just an ordinary individual that belongs to the society. Indeed, Marian thinks he becomes a pervert because of the objectified women images that he is exposed to (**Ibid**.). She blames patriarchal society for the victimization of women. Sexual harassment is not regarded as a personal guilt in the novel; rather it is seen as part of a bigger patriarchal structure that enables, triggers, and normalises sexual violation.

Beauty standards shaped by male desires that women are expected to comply with are also referred to as a part of the objectification of the female body. Marian's comment about the woman in the advertisement of a girdle is significant: "The female form, I thought, is supposed to appeal to men, not to women, and men don't usually buy girdles" (**EW**: 96), implying the violation of women's body by turning it to an object of the male gaze. Moreover, since the function of the girdle is shaping

women's body, it serves the ideal female body image that patriarchy has artificially created and imposed upon women. Accordingly, Marian acknowledges the technique of the advertisement: by displaying an ideal female body it cajoles women into believing that buying the girdle makes them fit beauty standards (**EW***:* 96). While interpreting how women become consumable products in a consumerist culture, Tolan states that in advertisements it is the ideal image of the women that are being sold (Tolan, 2007: 30). Moreover, as it is mentioned above, the beauty salon is the embodiment of the objectification of women as Marian expresses her feelings in the place: "she didn't enjoy feeling like a slab of flesh, an object" (**EW**: 212). She feels an intense antipathy towards the place: resembling it to a hospital and perceiving women as totally immobile creatures that wait to be operated (**EW**: 211-212). Sanchez-Grant interprets the hospital metaphor as "a reflection of the scrutiny patriarchy inflicts on the female body" (Sanchez-Grant, 2008: 85). The reduction of women to their body is depicted and practiced intensely in the beauty salon as Sanchez-Grant expresses: "The ostensibly headless bodies visually encapsulate the gendered mind/body dichotomy that is so central to women's oppression" (Sanchez-Grant, 2008: 85). Marian's experience of the beauty salon evokes Adam's ideas about the metaphorical butchering of women, which means the conversion of women to a piece of meat. Furthermore, Marian sees a text in a magazine that addresses young girls to have a breast enlargement as a way of success (**EW**: 212) which contributes to patriarchal mentality. By pointing out the conversion of women to consumable products, the novel provides a ground for the analysis of the conjoint objectification of women and animals.

2.4. The Ambiguous Ending

In the end, Marian arrives at a conclusion in her inner struggle and decides to leave Peter, at the same time she gains her ability to eat food including meat. It is ambiguous. Since she saves herself from being an edible object of Peter, she loses her ability of having an empathy for the animals who are still in that position of being edible. Adams agrees to this perspective: expressing that when she is not a victim of the patriarchal oppression anymore, she ignores the suffering of the other oppressed ones (Adams, 1990: 175). From this perspective, her regaining of the

ability of eating can be interpreted as a negative motion which epitomizes internalising patriarchal ideology, indeed becoming a perpetrator of it. It is coherent to see eating meat as an unprogressive action in the ecofeminist ethical frame; however, her overcoming of the eating disorder can be seen as a positive achievement. More optimistic interpretation of the ending is Marian's eventually listening to the subversive voice of her body which manifests a revolt as an eating disorder against being an object of Peter. Marian gains her facility of consuming as a subject and stops being an object of consuming when she finally has the determination to leave Peter and the "normative" path that he represents. In this regard, the ending has a symbolic connection with Milton's **Paradise Lost** (Milton, 2003) which Shari A. Zimmerman interprets by focusing on the psychological motives for Eve's wish of eating the forbidden fruit. She states that the common analysis of Adam and Eve's story emphasises that in the story femininity is constructed as seductive and incontinent; however, the story has another dimension (Zimmerman, 1981: 247). Although it is not on purpose, it depicts Eve's search for her autonomous self apart from Adam (**Ibid**., p. 267). Zimmerman reads Eve's eating of the forbidden fruit as a reflection of her quest for subjectivity which mirrors Marian's story. Just as Marian, Eve also "grows uncomfortable with their relationship as it begins to stifle her selfhood" (**Ibid**., p. 251) and it is this disturbing feeling that drives her to eat the fruit which, in effect, gives her wisdom and reason (**Ibid**., p. 262). Eating it also helps her to be a full functioning human being and provides her a sense of independence (**Ibid**., p. 263). However, it means loneliness and separation from Adam. Moreover, carried away with a strong sense of jealousy, she seduces Adam into eating the forbidden fruit to find a sense of union. (**Ibid**., p. 264). When Peter does not eat the cake Marian has made, she herself eats it. Duncan, another man she has an affair with who does not carry the conventions of ideal masculinity unlike Peter, also eats a piece of the cake. Although Duncan does not look like he is enjoying, Marian feels comfort (**EW***:* 283). Just as Eve, Marian gains her selfhood back through eating, and finds her need of union by making Duncan eat.

The narrative voice differs in the last part of the novel. Part two is a third person narrative which "underlines Marian's loss of an independent sense of self"

(Howells, 1996: 50). In part three it turns to a first-person narrative which highlights Marian's agency. Her cleaning of the apartment after a long time also signifies that she has finally gained the mobility to take action. However, it also refers to controversial points in her regaining her subjectivity. Before she was "unable to destroy the lowest form of life – mould" (Pundir, 2012: 3). She was unable to clean her kitchen since she thought "Perhaps the mould had as much right to life as she had" (**EW**: 220). She has lost her sensitivity to other creatures that even included mould. Teeth have been associated with men throughout the novel; however, now it is Marian who is "showing her teeth" (**EW**: 273) and she can feel hunger (**EW**: 276). It indicates that she is no longer an edible object, she has gained her agency back; however, it is problematic since it also symbolises being a hunter. When she regains her subjectivity, she goes back to victimising the others. Laura Wright interprets her vegetarianism only as an expression of her passive situation in her relationship rather than an ethical choice since she loses her empathy towards animals when she leaves Peter (Wright, 2022: 176). Her vegetarianism is important within the ecofeminist context since it underlines her similar experiences with animals; however, she does not sustain her vegetarianism when she frees herself from her victimised position in her relationship. Therefore, Marian fails to practice what Adams and Plumwood promotes as an ecofeminist ideal: dismantling the human identity that is constructed as a master and based on male values (Plumwood, 1986: 134) (Adams, 2018: xxxviii). Ecofeminists bring a criticism to the first wave and the second wave of feminism that aim the emancipation of women without taking human/animal dualism into consideration. Marian's regaining her subjectivity involves becoming symbolically a hunter as an embodiment of male values. Within this context, Atwood criticises the first wave and second wave feminist movements that aim to make women fit human identity as a master, ignoring that it is based on hegemonic masculine values that oppresses both women and animals.

Marian prepares a substitute for her older self to give Peter, a cake shaped like a woman which is the embodiment of the ideal woman formed in accordance with male expectations. Marian deforming her hair that the hairdresser has done implies she leaves the beauty standards that make her feel unease; instead, she

applies it to the cake: “She made a smiling lush-lipped pink mouth and pink shoes to match” and “put five pink fingernails” (**EW**: 274). After making her hair, body, and dress, she finally makes her eyes. It indicates that they carry less importance compared to her other physical qualities. Eyes are the medium of the male gaze: she is there to be looked at not to look at. When Marian decides to eat it, she starts with the feet (**EW***:* 276). The cake woman is deprived of her feet which are the organs of mobility and that empowers her passive situation. Marian also severs her body from her head (**EW**: 277) as an indication of the body/mind split that dehumanises the female. She is an “elegant antique china figurine” (**EW***:* 274) sculpted by Marian as a consumable object that is a symbol of the ideal femininity she has rejected.

Marian finally understands that she does not want to have the conventional life that Peter represents or be the conventional female that Peter wants her to be. Her inner rebellion comes to the surface. She stands up against Peter, expressing that he aims to consume her metaphorically:

> “You’ve been trying to destroy me, haven’t you,” she said. “You’ve been trying to assimilate me. But I’ve made you a substitute, something you’ll like much better. This is what you really wanted all along, isn’t it? I’ll get you a fork” (**EW**: 274-275).

Giving Peter a cake shaped like a woman to consume bothers Peter drastically. Marian is aware that the problem is not specific to Peter, he is just a man who has internalised patriarchal norms: “Peter was not the enemy after all, he was just a normal human being like most other people” (**EW**: 275). It indicates how Marian acknowledges patriarchy as a system that consumes women. Marian’s devouring of the cake strikes Ainsley: since consuming is associated with men, Marian’s action goes against the gender norms. Thus, Ainsley utters the same words with Peter: “You’re rejecting your femininity” (**EW**: 277). As Marian thinks, Ainsley’s anxious reaction is conservative (**Ibid**.) because what Marian rejects are patriarchal conventions that put women into the position of passive and submissive objects that are served to men. Accordingly, Waugh interprets the conclusion positively,

celebrating Marian's emancipation from being consumable (Waugh, 2012: 179). However, the ending does not provide clear answers and does not solve the conflict. In accordance with Adams' interpretation, Tolan also draws attention to the problem: she rejects being consumed yet she herself becomes a consumer as Duncan expresses it (Tolan, 2007: 34). Sceats sees the positive meaning of Marian's regaining her ability to consume as indicative of her subjectivity but cannot ignore the symbolic meaning of it as establishing domination that goes throughout the novel (Sceats, 2003: 99).

Marian's eating disorder was both an expression and protest for losing her subjectivity, which was started as vegetarianism since her objectified position enables her to empathize with animals. As Drewett states, the interpretations of her eating disorder and her vegetarianism are connected to each other since both emerge because of her edible situation that signifies intersectional oppression of women and animals (Drewett, 2016: 22). The fact that she goes back to eating meat is an unexpected ending, there would be an ideal conclusion if she would overcome her eating disorder but still be a vegetarian. The positive conclusion is Marian's stopping being an edible object, but becoming an agent eating others is the hedge that dismantles a comforting and complete ending. Atwood provides an ambiguous ending: Marian asserts her subjectivity back; however, it is irritating to see that when she claims her power she goes back to objectifying, consuming other oppressed ones and being a part of the patriarchal system again. The novel does not provide reader with an ideal, positive, clear closure; on the contrary, it draws a bothering reality and multiple endings that leave the discussion to the readers as it is a tenet of a postmodern novel. Brain McHale expresses that different from "endings that are closed, as in Victorian novels" or "those that are open, as in many modernist novels", postmodern fiction has multiple endings which "are obviously related to the forking-path narratives in which mutually-exclusive possibilities have been jointly realized" (McHale, 2004: 109). Within this context, it is possible to argue that interrelatedness of her eating disorder and vegetarianism continues at the end and contributes to the ambiguous meanings that go throughout the novel, which is her inability of eating as a symbol and protest for her passive situation. McHale, also, states that "this

multiplication of beginnings and endings occurs not in the "real" world of this novel, but in the subjective subworld or domain of the character-narrator" (**Ibid**.). Accordingly, the multiple conclusions of the ending are about Marian's inner conflict that is discussed throughout the novel. In addition, since postmodernism is based on "ontological uncertainty and epistemological scepticism" (Waugh, 2006: 408), it is typical that a postmodern novel does not provide answers. Adams states that "Within a framework of the interlocking systems of domination, privilege and oppression co-exist" (**EW***:* 61). Accordingly, Marian, as a victim, also becomes a victimiser; it conveys that the world is not black and white but there are grey areas and that signify the postmodern idea of uncertainty, and the impossibility of achieving a unified truth.

CHAPTER THREE

THE SHOOTING PARTY

The Shooting Party, published in 1980, is a novel set in the Edwardian era before World War I; it bears the tension of the upcoming war while providing a parallelism between hunting scenes and warfare. The novel narrates the events that have taken place in a shooting party, which is the leisure activity of the white upper-class men. It tells the conflicts and the relations between people as well as the political ideas and changes of the time. Sir Randolph is an aristocrat who hosts most famous shooting parties; however, this one ends with a tragic event of Tom's death. The accidental shooting of Tom, a working-class man, draws attention to the struggle of the working classes. Tom is one of the beaters, his job is to scare the birds by making noise and flushing them out for shooters to shot. He is accidently shot by Lord Gilbert Hartlip who ambitiously tries to have better score than Lionel Stephens. Lord Gilbert Hartlip is known for his talent and success in the shooting parties and Lionel Stephens has physical power. Olivia is wife of Bob Lilburn, another shooter, but she has an affair with Lionel Stephens. In dialogues of Stephens and Olivia, Colegate presents the criticism of Olivia, to war and hunting by designating both as manifestations of male violence. Colegate also gives place to the perspective of Sir Randolph's grandson, Osbert, who is trying to protect his duck. There are important parts in the novel that trigger discussion about animal rights, mostly by the vegetarian character, Cardew. Cardew comes across to the shooting party and tries to stop it. In this chapter, the secondary position of women, animals and the lower classes under patriarchy will be elaborated by ecofeminist idea of intersectionality and by highlighting the discussion of hunting and war represented in the novel.

3.1. Hunting, War and Masculinity

The Shooting Party puts emphasis on masculinity that dominates both women and animals. It uses the disadvantaged position of animals to bring social criticism. However, it also gives a place to the issue of animal rights; thus, animals are not regarded as tools, but they are attributed subjectivity. The act of hunting, as an activity of the privileged men, is used as a metaphor to criticise war which is also

a violent activity that is motivated by the thirst of power. Hunting is a logical choice as a metaphor for war; the connection between hunting and war as practices of male violence can be interpreted through an ecofeminist intersectional perspective. As Catherine Bates states: "The hunt has been associated with heroic masculinity" (Bates, 2013: 1), which is its common point with the idea of war. Both actions involve violence culturally coded as masculine. As part of hegemonic masculinity, it gives harm to women, nature, and animals that ecofeminist criticism emphasises. Within this context, **The Shooting Party** provides a significant material for an ecofeminist critique towards the patriarch that constructs his power and identity by applying violence. Considering that the novel criticises the two acts of violence that are regarded as male activities; it should be explained how and why these acts contribute to the construction of hegemonic masculinity, and what their significance is in the ecofeminist discourse. Certain theorists have discussed why hunting and war are regarded as male activities which are mentioned in the first chapter. Their analysis has a significant place in ecofeminist discourse since it deals with the relation between men and nature/women.

Colegate depicts the shooting party as a foreshadowing of the Great War. In her review of the novel, she expresses her publisher's suggestion and her reaction to it:

> He suggested a family saga set in the First World War. I said that unlike God I was reluctant to kill off so many of my characters, but that a story about an Edwardian shooting party might throw some sideways light on the subject (Colegate, 2003: 11).

Thus, the shooting party functions as a representation of war. In the opening of the novel, it is directly mentioned: "It was an error of judgement which resulted in a death. It took place in the autumn before the outbreak of what used to be known as the Great War" (**SP**: 1).[*] Colegate displays the dominant narrative of war which consists of heroic attributes, however; she does not promote it. On the contrary, she

[*] From then on, **The Shooting Party** will be referred to as **SP**.

underlines the competitive ambition as a destructive masculine tendency. As Adams articulates: “Indeed, male competition, culminating in the accidental death of a beater, who propelled the frightened pheasants forth to their slaughter at the guns of the upper-class shooters, represents the eternal cause of war” (Adams, 1990: 172). The gloomy and depressive tone of the narrative coincides with the melancholy of the war which is discussed from a critical perspective rather than praising it. In the novel, tragic consequences of war are highlighted by focusing on the fatal environment of the battlefield which is represented by the portrayal of the shooting party. As Adams illustrates, it is the representation of war:

> But the shooting party—with its army of uniformed beaters following campaign plans, moving from the bivouac of lunch to the front line of the shooting, with the loaders scurrying in a no-man’s-land retrieving the thickly strewn corpses—is not a mere intimation of things to come, but a depiction of a war itself (Adams, 1990: 172).

The imagery used in the catastrophic illustration of the shooting party functions as reminiscent of the upcoming war. The shooting of the birds is portrayed in detail and in a graphic tone in which they become representatives of the dead soldiers: “The sacrifice now was not of men but of birds” (**SP**: 81-82), as Jeffrey Meyers points out: “She draws a parallel between the dead birds and the young soldiers who are ordered (sometimes at gunpoint) to charge out of the trenches and into machine-gun fire, and are meaninglessly slaughtered by their cruel masters” (Meyers, 2017: 31). The inevitable result of war, death, dominates the narrative which brings a distressing tone and operates as highlighting the critical look towards war. The thundering setting of the shooting party recalls the battlefield, in which dead bodies of the birds are emphasised as it is seen in the quotation below: “The noise of the beaters grew louder; the air was full of falling birds and gunfire, the smell of cordite, the sound of shot raining on the leaves, the thump of bodies on the ground” (**SP**: 166). Indeed, the beaters are directly associated with an army: “The beaters moved off first, the others followed. It’s like an army, Olivia thought, we have bivouacked and are moving off

now to the front line" (**Ibid**., p. 128). Further, Olivia, wife of Bob Lilburn who is one of the shooters, creates an analogy between war and the shooting party: "War might be like this, casual, friendly and frightening" (**Ibid**.). Colegate draws the fatal and catastrophic outcomes of the war by using the shooting party as a metaphor. The novel brings an ecofeminist criticism by focusing on the traits of hegemonic masculinity which constitutes the values of both hunting and war.

The love letter of Lionel Stephens to Olivia consists of his thoughts about the possibility of war and reveals the relation between war and masculinity. His perspective contrasts with Olivia's critical look, he has the urge to fight if a war breaks out: "If there were to be a war I should want to fight in it" (**SP**: 49). Reasons and motivations under his wish to fight conform to Llyod's reading of masculine identity and war. Stephens attributes positive qualities to war: regarding it as a functional thing for a social development. As it is mentioned above, Llyod explains that being a citizenship is associated with men, which is achieved by sacrificing natural feelings in war for the public good. Accordingly, Stephens justifies war by believing the beneficial outcomes that it could potentially bring to the community.:

> Supposing it did come, some great trial, might it not cleanse us of our materialism, our cynicism, our lax lazy hypocrisies, make us gird our sinews and find simplicity again? And then should we not be fitter afterwards to make a better world? For that we must be what we are here for, to leave the world a better place than we found it (**SP**: 49).

French's explanation that different from animals and women, men should pursue a celestial purpose which is also a justification of suffering (French, 1985: 272- 273) finds its reflection in the quote of Stephens. He believes that he should have a divine transcendent purpose such as changing the world for the better which could be achieved by participating in war. Therefore, Stephens is a proper example of the masculine values corresponded in the battlefield. Moreover, he is enthusiastic about the idea of fighting for women: "And if it came, you see, my dear, it would be you I

should be fighting for" (**SP**: 49-50). When John, the footman, finds this letter, he experiences the same feelings with Stephens: "-but as for fighting for her and for a better world, with a touch of personal glory no doubt thrown in – well, if there was a war and Mr Stephens went to it, he would go with him" (**SP**: 50). Just as Bates' research comes to the conclusion that men hunt for women, it is seen in here that they fight in war for women too. After Olivia's confession that she loves him, he shoots in a more enthusiastic and joyful manner when Olivia stands beside him (**SP**: 133), as Brett T. Averitt also notices he "begins to shoot with complete carelessness and complete accuracy, breaking record after record, stirring up Hartlip's hatred to a frenzy that is equally careless and suddenly deadly" (Averitt, 1993: 94). It refers to the idea that men show their power to women by killing. As General Robert H. Borrow states: "… the male, who wants to think that he's fighting for that woman somewhere behind, not up there in the same foxhole with him. It tramples the male ego" (**qtd. in** Llyod, 1987: 63). The idea of fighting for women dates to the concept of chivalry in the Middle Ages. Richard W. Kaeuper and Montgomery Bohna expresses that love plays an important role in chivalric behaviour: "If love inspires knightly prowess, prowess inspires love from the lady" (Kaeuper & Bohna, 2007: 280). It is noticeable that Stephen's words and actions exemplify the chivalric code. Further, women are situated as a trophy for knights: "Any sample of chivalric literature shows, moreover, how regularly even elite women appear as prizes to be won" (**Ibid**., p. 279). Women are excluded from the battlefield; however, they are positioned as tools of men's reasons and motivations to fight. Just as animals' position in hunting, women also become objects in men's quest and process of constructing their masculine self.

Like war, the shooting party is also represented as a male activity throughout the novel. It is practiced by men; women are only included as spectators. The exclusion of women from the actual movement is clear. Since it is based on masculine values, women are not entitled to hunting. Furthermore, it is stated that: "it was uncivilized to talk about sport when the ladies were there" (**SP***:* 54). It refers to how actually they know that it is a cruel activity; and since they regard women as the weaker sex, they do not want women to be involved in hunting. Moreover, hunting is

referred to as a sport in this sentence, and it reveals the elimination of women from public activities. It is depicted as a sport of men who have social power: "a big shoot in which well-known sportsmen were taking part" (**SP**: 7). As Bates argues hunting is associated with good status (Bates, 2013: 7), and the shooting party is performed as indicative of social power: "Shooting was something one did for purely social reasons" (**SP**: 75). The shooting party takes place in Sir Randolph's house, who is an aristocrat, well known for his shooting parties. Although there are working class people who serve them in the event, the shooting is practiced by the white upper-class men. It is "the pastimes of the rich class" (**SP**: 30). Tom, a lower-class man, also kills a rabbit to eat; however, he is not a shooter in the shooting party. Bates explains two types of hunting, one is heroic activity of the upper-class men and the other is primitive:

> This alone was 'holy' hunting (good, proper, and true) and the kind in which young men of the aristocratic class should engage. Any other form was insufficiently distant from proscribed activities and so relegated to the mere food-getters—peasants and slaves—who might just as well have been primitive hunter-gatherers as far as the social elite were concerned (Bates, 2013: 14).

Tom's hunting should be analysed from an ecofeminist point of view since it evokes the sexual objectification of women. However, as Bates explains, since he hunts to eat, his hunting is classified differently from the sport of the upper-class men. Therefore, one can argue that this violent activity, significantly, belongs to the patriarch in the centre. As Rose argues, the sport of hunting here serves for hegemonic masculinity: "Lifestyles and norms – even those that are considered leisure activities and sports – reproduce standardized hegemonic masculinity through narratives and tropes of domination" (Rose, 2023: 325). It creates an image of the ideal masculinity which is based on destructive power as Rose interprets: "The ideal masculine prototype of the weaponized hunter is very much unattainable by most men and women, but valorizing the ideal serves as a means by which hegemonic masculinity is continually reproduced and sustained" (**Ibid**.). Consequently, the

shooting party in the novel should be elaborated by a critical perspective of ecofeminism which focuses on the political outcomes and the underlying messages of it that contribute to the domination of men over women and nature.

In a similar vein, motivations under the shooting, as an embodiment of war, should be considered from a critical perspective towards masculinity. Averitt defines the structure of the shooting party as: "The intense competitive spirit and the easy recourse to violence that characterize social life among men is transformed into an emphasis on personal skill in shooting and the slaughter of birds" (Averitt, 1993: 93). As discussed, competition for status is the motivation under killing which French puts it as: "The emphasis on competition as a proper way of life for a man means that murderousness is at its most fierce between brothers, whether biological or spiritual" (French, 1985: 279). Thirst of power, a quality of masculinity, that war is based on is embodied by the competition between the two characters, Lionel Stephens and Lord Gilbert Hartlip. Lord Hartlip is well known for his success in shooting, he has a certain social power; he is referred to as "a superlative sportsman" (***SP***: 54). On the other hand, Stephens is depicted as the ideal strong man: "being a strongly built, fit, physically well-balanced young man" (**Ibid**., p. 112). This accords with Elshtain's underlining of the strong male body which is built for fighting (Elshtain, 1987: 164-165). Their competition for a better score is constantly emphasised which is the urge under shooting. Percy, the loader of Lionel, declares: "the notions of gentlemanly sport were inimical to him. The object of shooting parties, he considered, should be to shoot more game than anyone else" (**SP**: 76). It becomes a fight based on an ambition rather than a gentlemanly sport as Sir Randolph wishes it to be. As it is stated "they was (were) practically at each other's throats" (**SP**: 148); thus, it turns out to be a rivalry rather than a social entertainment. The dialogue between Aline, wife of Gilbert, and Sir Reuben also reveals this competitive mindset:

> 'And the spirit of competition. Are we proud and competitive, would you say?' 'Probably. Like racehorses. That's why I enjoy racing so much.' … 'They're very highly bred. Proud, competitive and mad. Those are

> aristocratic attributes.' 'Oh we're certainly aristocratic' said Aline gaily (**SP**: 130-131).

Unlike Sir Randolph's idea of the aristocracy with courteous values, the aristocracy is defined here as a class of people who are in race to display their power. French's emphasis that boys are taught to hate to turn them to killers (French, 1985: 280) can be observed as Gilbert remembers his coaches' words back in school: "Hate him. If you want to win you've got to hate that boy's guts before you go into the ring" (**SP**: 164). Hate is the malignant feeling that the competition both in war and in shooting party is based on. As a conclusion, the shooting party creates a parallelism with war as a power struggle of men. It has a significant role in the construction of masculinity; destructive feelings of the violent actions, war and hunting, become the strong marks of masculinity.

The novel, like **The Edible Woman**, draws an analogy between sexual violence and hunting by revealing the objectification process of animals that are being shot. Tom is not a perpetrator of sexual objectification, and his hunting is classified differently than white upper-class men's. However, in all types of hunting, the hunter should first objectify an animal to kill it. Thus, his hunting scenes also reveal the objectification process of animals related to the objectification of women. The scene where Tom kills a rabbit unveils the offensive reality:

> The rabbit was struggling vigorously, each kick entangling it more closely in the loose net. It was just beginning to scream. Seizing it firmly at the back of the neck, Tom knifed it once, hard, through the net. It was immediately still (**SP***:* 22).

The rabbit was a subject who was struggling for its life and showing strong reactions against Tom; however, it is converted to a passive inert object by Tom. Tom's preparing the rabbit to eat includes the fragmentation of animals:

> His sharp knife moved with precision. Soon he could remove the skin like a jacket and lay it flat to be salted. The bare, bloody rabbit was quickly disembowelled, cut into joints (**SP**: 55).

The rabbit turns into fragmented body parts; its existence as a living subject is eradicated, it is an object to use for the dinner. It can be "put into a pot with some onions and carrots" (**Ibid**.). Therefore, Adams's concept of fragmentation in objectification process can be observed in the novel (Adams, 1990: 73). In both scenes, the knife functions as a phallic symbol that converts animals to objects, evoking the sexual violence towards women. The images of rabbit's objectification through violence refers to the objectification of women. The novel, thus, provides an ecofeminist point of view by linking these two forms of violation to each other. Kheel emphasises that hunting has a symbolic connection with rape; she articulates that motivation of hunting is the same with the motivation of rape which is proclaiming control: "Similarly, hunting may be seen as a symbolic attempt to assert mastery and control over the natural world" (Kheel, 1996: 39). Collard, too, links the forms of violation of women and animals to each other:

> In patriarchy, nature, animals and women are objectified, hunted, invaded, colonised, owned, consumed and forced to yield and to produce (or not). This violation of the integrity of wild, spontaneous Being is rape (Collard, 1989: 1).

Intertwined forms of violation can be noted in the novel; when Tom violates the rabbit's right to live, he also violates its subjectivity and the integrity of its body. Likewise, it is what rape means for a woman. As Collard calls the violation of nature and animals as rape, one can see that Tom metaphorically rapes the rabbit. However, one should not reinforce the secondary status of animals and women by embracing this symbolic connection on a subconscious level. It should be exposed to bring an intersectional criticism. As it is explained above, Adams signifies that women and animals are overlapping metaphors for each other and their objectification is linked:

"Sexual violence and meat eating, which appear to be discrete forms of violence, find a point of intersection in the absent referent" (Adams, 1990: 68). In the depiction of Tom's killing of the rabbit, women are absent referents. Adams states the connection based on absent referents constructs a strong ground for the intertwined oppression (Adams, 1990: 69); thus, these absent referents should be uncovered to point to the connection and fight against the intertwined violence. Therefore, it is necessary to make women and their experiences visible and not allowing them to stay in dark shadows through being absent referents in the depiction and practice of violation of animals. Another conjoint point of hunting and reification of women is signified by the act of gaze: "the shooter himself never moved his gaze from the oncoming birds" (**SP***:* 7). The shooter's gaze is emphasised: "Never look at your gun or your loader. Keep your eyes forwards" (**Ibid.**, p. 83). The male gaze that objectifies women functions similarly in the shooting of the animals. Berger explains the implication of looking at animals as such; "Other animals are held by the look. Man becomes aware of himself returning the look" (Berger, 1991: 3). It signifies the power relation between the shooter and the animal; whereas the shooter is the active subject, the animal is being objectified by him. Consequently, the novel draws a connection between objectification of animals and women by patriarchal ideology which is practiced as hunting or as sexual violation of women.

In terms of ecofeminist critical look, the most crucial part of the novel is when Oliva directly questions the norms of masculinity. She undermines patriarchal conventions that regard violence as indicative of masculine power in her dialogue with Stephens: "Of course, but who invents the rules of manly behaviour? Who says it's the height of heroism to kill? For every hero does there have to be a living sacrifice?" (**SP**: 19). She does not see killing as a positive attribute. On the contrary, she is able to destruct the anthropocentric ideology by questioning the necessity of killing: "I can't help feeling the added solemnity the whole thing gets from that sacrificial note, the note of death, of blood. Why do we have to have that, to complete our pleasure?" (**SP**: 20). She suggests a different world view that does not value and promote violence as she says: "we don't have to love it, and seek it out and long for war so we can have more of it" (**Ibid**.). Moreover, her words can be seen as

the core of ecofeminism since she clarifies that she has this critical look towards violent activities that are based on patriarchal values because she is a woman: "I am often aware at shooting parties how differently I feel from a man and how, more than that, I really would like to rebel against the world men have made, if I knew how to" (**SP**: 20). Her criticism conveys the idea that women have a different perspective since they, like animals, are positioned as the inferior objects of patriarchal culture. She does not identify herself with the male agent of hunting, since as a woman, she is excluded from the set of values that creates the identity of transcendent hunter man as distinct from nature. She is positioned as closer to animals, rather than the hunter as Adams states: "Women are allied with animals because they too are objects of use and possession" (Adams, 1990: 171). This makes her see male violence, such as hunting from a questioning perspective. She does not accept the passive situation in which women are situated, she opposes to male oppression over both women and animals. As Collard argues since women are against the destruction of the planet (Collard, 1989: 45), Olivia stands against violence. Olivia's comments should not be seen as essentialist: they are not based on the idea that women are naturally more compassionate, they are based on the criticism of social norms that are constructed by men. As it is asserted by Adams: "Olivia articulates Colegate's theme of rejection of male violence. In Colegate's novel, women's presence in, but opposition to, the violent world men have made is constantly reiterated" (Adams, 1990: 172).

Olivia's criticism of the shooting party includes criticism of war since it is a metaphor for war. It is explicitly demonstrated in the following dialogue: "'Have you never wanted a war?' 'I suppose there is something in every man that answers to the call of battle.'" 'There you are then'" (**SP**: 20). It can be noted that Lionel's expression reveals how men carry the values of patriarchal culture that associates combat with masculinity, whereas Olivia as a woman interiorizes an opponent view against male violence. She is not socialised to fight as she says, "It's my lack of competitive spirit" (**SP**: 20). She is not expected to display acts of heroism that are based on violence, she is not regarded as an agent of these activities. Thus, she does not develop this destructive competitive spirit; on the contrary, she stands against it. Woolf underlines what Olivia has realised: "Obviously there is for you some glory,

some necessity, some satisfaction in fighting which we have never felt or enjoyed" (Woolf, 1943: 14). Thus, Woolf points out to the problem of how women cannot make interpretations about war if they are not part of it (**Ibid**.). Elshtain states that war is the activity of men and women only respond to it (Elshtain, 1987:164). Accordingly, Adams articulates that women are not seen as capable of criticising war since they are not part of it; however, Colegate, by associating the shooting party with the battlefield, provides a ground to judge the violence of war (Adams, 1990: 172). She remarks that the novel, by linking hunting and war, gives space for women to speak against male violence (**Ibid**., p. 173). Since both hunting and war involve killing and are based on the same masculine qualities, when criticising the shooting party, Olivia also speaks against the violent outcomes of the upcoming war. Adams' concept of the expanded front revolves around the idea of intersectionality between various acts of male violence that supress women, animals, nature and other marginalised groups. The novel contributes to the idea of the expanded front, since the parallelism between hunting and war underlines the intersectional male violence.

3.2. Osbert as an Unconditioned Child

As well as emphasising Olivia's critical standpoint, the novel also portrays the perspective of a child through Osbert, who is Sir Randolph's grandson. He has built a sentimental connection with the duck he cares of. He perceives it as a sensible intelligent loving being rather than as a utilizable commodity. That is just the opposite of how animals are positioned in the anthropocentric narrative. He acknowledges its existence as a subject and passionately defends its life: "'If you kill her,' said Osbert, whiter than ever, 'I will kill you.'" (**SP**: 19). The duck has been lost and it is in danger of being shot in the shooting party. Osbert worries for her life, his struggle to save the duck is further suggested in the quote: "the footprints in the snow showed that she was in danger, but he did not doubt that he would find her in time to save her" (**SP**: 47). He cares for the duck's needs: feeds her and provides better grass for her (**Ibid**., p. 60). One can see that he does not consider the duck as his belonging but as a separate being. The novel reveals animals' struggle to live through Osbert's perspective. In Osbert's observation, animals are not passive inert tools that are willing to die for human sport or needs; they are affectionate beings who claim their

life.: “Osbert had seen duck shoots and knew how deadly the slaughter in the dusk could be; he had seen a female mallard turn back into the fire towards her wounded mate, veering from side to side bewildered as he fluttered on the ground for the moment before both were killed” (**SP***:* 114). These mallards are not absent referents in this narrative; they are visible subjects who go through a painful experience. Osbert asks if he can shoot only pheasants when he will go shooting (**Ibid**.). He will not be able to shoot mallards because he has recognised them as autonomous living beings that want to live as he does not objectify them. Significantly, he also sees nature different than how anthropocentric ideology has constructed it as a being that needs to be tamed by human culture. This attitude echoes with the subordinate position of the female kind. On the contrary of the dominant approach, he senses that nature is an independent subject and finds its imprisonment under the human dominance alarming.: “its bends and beaches, deeps and swamps more extensive, its life more self-sufficient, the threat of unseen guns accordingly more darkly terrifying” (**SP**: 114). By perceiving nature and animals as self-governing presences that deserve respect and believing the possibility of constructing an alternative, mutual, sentimental connection instead of a hegemonic relation, Osbert represents an ecocritical look as opposed to the anthropocentric perspective of the white upper-class men.

In analysing Osbert’s elaborating on the treatment of animals, it is significant to emphasise that he has an unconditioned mind. He has not been socialised enough to internalise social norms; thus, he is not shaped by anthropocentric patriarchal ideology yet. Coherent with Ferguson’s emphasis of socialisation that leads boys to perform violent actions, it is seen that Osbert has not been taught the dominant views yet. French, too, underlines the role of socialisation: “Yet it is obvious, if one cares to look, that man is not a killer by nature. If he were, it would not be necessary to train him in competition, mistrust, and murder” (French, 1985: 280). Her notion that boys are taught to supress their emotions except hate (**Ibid**.) is asserted by Olivia as well: “you can see he has such strong emotions, and he will have to be educated and taught the ways of the world and made to be on the side of the guns and against the ducks. It seems such a pity” (**SP**: 19). Suggesting that masculine identity is a social construct,

she is worried that he will be exposed to the dominant ideology that devalues women, animals, and nature. He will develop his masculine identity by being a participant of violence, such as hunting and war. As Kheel notes boys develop their masculine identity by disengaging from nature. Osbert, as an emotional child, has not interiorised patriarchal values that only glorify the mind and devalue sentimentality. Averitt expresses that Osbert is a dreamy child and his grandmother, Minnie, is able to accept him as he is (Averitt, 1993: 100). He is depicted as different from other boys of his age.: "He liked being alone, but Ellen thought he should have friends, other boys with whom to wander round the woods, or fish, or make spears, or throw stones at squirrels, as her brothers had done when they were that age, walking to and from school" (**SP**: 138). As opposed to Osbert, Marcus is a boy on whom traditional masculine norms are imposed. He says: "I may be going into the Army. It might be more fun" (**Ibid**., p. 162). What he says is illustrative of the fact that he is willing to practice violent behaviours that are accepted and gendered as masculine. Ragnhild Sollund's study regarding wildlife crimes illustrates that hunting is an expression of masculine values and it marks the transition of a boy to a man (Rose, 2023: 326) which, along with Kheel's theory, can be applied to Marcus. Marcus wants to "explore the unmapped wild and all that sort of thing" (**SP**: 162), which can be seen as a necessity of developing masculine identity. His relation to nature differs from Osbert's respectful attitude towards nature, since his interest in exploring nature involves the urge to construct domination on it. He wants to "go tiger-shooting" (**Ibid**.), which is indicative of the fact that he does not perceive nature as an entity that he should appreciate, but it is a tool for him to dominate as a requirement of becoming a man, as Kheel points out. Whereas Osbert, as an introverted child who has not accomplished his socialisation process properly, represents the opponent view, Marcus acquires patriarchal anthropocentric values and develops his masculine identity.

Interestingly enough, it is women who show their support to Osbert's wish to protect the duck. Olivia also wants the duck to be saved (**SP**: 97) and Ellen helps him to find the duck (**Ibid**., p. 139). Moreover, Ellen has anger towards the shooters:

> Her hands were shaking with anger. The tears which momentarily filled her eyes were tears of tremendous rage. How dared they? What right had they? All those men with guns after one poor little duck (**SP**: 159).

In the given quote, Ellen, just as Oliva who undermines the norms of masculinity, shows an angry reaction to male violence against animals. Another woman, Aline, also worries for the duck's life and shows sympathy to Osbert (**Ibid**., p. 173). Whereas other people laugh at Osbert and find his protective feelings towards the duck entertaining, Oliva does not join them, she says: "How I wish we had not laughed" (**Ibid**., p. 19). Both women and Osbert are portrayed as opponents of this socially accepted violence. Specially, Olivia expresses her challenging ideas. She is a woman who claims her right to speak, she does not allow herself to be excluded from intellectual discussions. She has an interest in reading and is enthusiastic about discovering new ideas: "and this open-mindedness, or openness to the possibilities of things seemed to Olivia a very attractive quality" (**SP**: 37). She is not satisfied with her life which "did not freely provide" (**Ibid**.) intellectual improvement that she needs. Julian Fellowes points out her dissatisfaction with aristocratic life: "she has been cursed with the realization that the whole business is meaningless" (Fellowes, 2007: XIV). Therefore, she is portrayed as a challenging character who looks for new experiences and ideas. She does not accept to live passively within the boundaries of her marriage as it is conventionally expected from a woman. Thus, she is brave enough to bring a critical perspective as it is seen in her dialogue with Stephens. When Olivia emphasises Osbert's emotions and worries that he will be changed, Stephens makes a comment about how it is necessary to be shaped in accordance with social norms that are based on rationality. He says: "We all have to learn to school our emotions to some extent" (**SP**: 19). Ferguson's theory of socialisation can be noticed in his words as it conveys the idea that that requires patriarchal ideology sharpens one to become a killer. French and Lloyd's emphasis on being a warrior that requires overcoming natural feelings can be observed as well. The dichotomy of reason/emotion and its functioning is clearly asserted in this specific scene. It's role in constructing masculinity which is based on violence and dominating nature and

animals is presented in the dialogue between Olivia and Lionel Stephens. Whereas Stephens' mind is conditioned to think dualistically, Olivia as a woman has an opposing view. She gives importance to feelings as well: "it seemed to her very important that people should understand about feelings and recognise them in themselves. By studying feeling, she thought, you would get better at it" (**SP**: 72). It is declared that she does not have this dominant binary outlook that undermines feelings: "It seemed to her as important to feel truthfully as to think truthfully" (**Ibid**.). By rejecting the dichotomies which are the basis of the patriarchal domination, she develops a critical perspective towards patriarchal practices, such as hunting and war. Since she challenges the mindset that glorifies killing and hegemonic masculinity, she maintains a stance against patriarchal anthropocentric ideology.

3.3. Representation of Animal Rights

The issue of animal rights has a specific place in **The Shooting Party**. First, it is discussed through Osbert's duck. Since it is Osbert's pet, they do not want it to be shot. Thus, they warn Osbert: "Keep her in tomorrow, Os. Don't forget" (**SP**: 19). The duck is referred to as "her" and not as "it". Adams expresses that the pronouns of animals have political meanings: "André Joly observes that the use of the word "it" "signifies basically that the animal is excluded from the human sphere and that no personal relationship of any kind is established with the speaker" (Adams, 1990: 102). Since she has a relationship with humans, she is not referred to as "it"; however, that relationship is hierarchical as she is still owned. Thus, just like it is observed in **The Edible Woman** calling an animal as "her" may refer to the passive position of women as Adams articulates (Ibid.); since a domesticated animal recalls the stereotype of domestic women shaped by patriarchal culture. Moreover, she has a name: Elfrida Beetle. These facts indicate that the duck is visible as a living being rather than being a tool of human sport, it is not objectified and converted to an absent referent like other animals that are being shot. However, the only reason of this is that it is categorised as a pet. It is said that if the duck will be among wild ducks, it may be killed during the shooting party (**SP**: 18-19). The novel opens a discussion about the categorisation of animals. The reader is triggered to ask where

the line between animals that deserve love and animals that can be killed can be drawn. What makes Elfrida Beetle's life valuable whereas wild ducks are regarded as objects of human entertainment? Osbert's duck is actually not different from wild ducks. It is humans that categorise animals in accordance with their own needs and aims. The duck's life is only perceived as important because of its relation to a human. However, it is still not worth enough to cancel "shooting at wild duck just because a child's tame duck might have chanced to be among them" (**SP**: 61). As such, by portraying the inconsistency of dominant anthropocentric views, the novel makes the reader think about the value of animals' life.

Although the experiences of animals are used as a metaphor for war in the novel, they do not become instruments in telling the experience of humanity. This argument is supported by Adams when she maintains that animals usually become absent referents in the human story (Adams, 1990: 67). The struggle of animals is graphically depicted; thus, readers can recognise their suffering. Their painful experience is not hidden under the human centred narrative. Colegate gives place to their story and demonstrates their unethical treatment. Objectification of animals and the dynamics of anthropocentric ideology are presented throughout the novel. Nevertheless, the novel does not reinforce the secondary status of animals. On the contrary, it brings a critical point of view by the scenes that underline the importance of the subjectivity of animals. In addition to Osbert's sentimental perspective towards animals and nature, there are also other scenes that emphasise animals are sensible beings that should be respected. For instance, Tom Harker observes that "yellowish ferret's pink eyes stared at him without blinking" (**SP**: 55). Given that gaze represents subjectivity and the power of the one who looks at, by accentuating its gaze, the objectified status of animal is undermined. In another part, the roe deer and its movements are expressed in detail:

> The silence had just begun to give way to the sound of the approaching beaters when a roe deer suddenly appeared at one end of the wood, crashing noisily out of the undergrowth where it had been hiding. It ran towards the line of guns, saw them and turned back towards the woods. When it heard the beaters it hesitated, head high,

> eyes and nostrils dilated, then with occasional long leaps ran the whole length of the line and away across the Park to the boundary of beech trees (**Ibid**., p. 83).

The roe deer has recognised the threat and tries to save itself; it is portrayed as a sensitive and intelligent creature that wishes to remain alive. Likewise, in the following quote, it is again seen that animals are depicted as conscious subjects that worry for their life: "a blackbird flew across his path with a loud alarm call, and a jay, flying higher, gave its own raucous warning" (**Ibid**., p. 156).

As above arguments indicate falling birds stand for dead soldiers; however, their own suffering and pain is also visible. The death of animals, as an irritating fact, is not concealed. It is presented to the reader in an obtrusive way; the details of the shooting of the birds are given.: "the pheasants he had carried over to the game cart and which had left a smear or two of blood behind" (**SP**: 102). While man-authored narratives ignore the agonizing experiences of animals, Colegate graphically presents them in her novel. The theme of death surrounds the novel; the unpleasant reality is frequently uncovered and highlighted:

> It was crowded with corpses in varying degrees of decomposition. The topmost rail held a row of small mammals, some of them hardly more than a leaf-like shape of dried skin or a bedraggling tail, moles mostly or squirrels, and next to them, some obviously more recently killed and still smelling powerfully of rotting flesh, were weasels and stoats, five or six of each. Below these were the black feathers and evil beaks of crows, magpies with their tail feathers gone and a couple of brightly coloured jays which could not have been there for more than a day or two" (**Ibid**., p. 88).

One of the functions of the novel is to give voice for the voiceless animals. As it is seen in the quote, suffering of animals is a visible fact depicted in a disturbing way.: "Shot in the hindquarters it rolled over and began to scream" (**Ibid**., p. 90). By emphasising their scream, inert, objectified, passive image of the animals is

deconstructed. Seen in the explanations above, animals are fragmented in the objectification process and the novel draws attention to it in the quote: “Such had been its impetus that the lifeless bundle of ruffled feathers seemed momentarily suspended in the air before it fell with a thump to the ground” (**Ibid**.). Splitting of animals into their body parts is brought into the fore to give a gloomy tone to the depiction of their death. The tragic reality of becoming lifeless ruffled feathers is highlighted.

The novel gives an important place to the issue of animal rights through a different character from other men in the novel, Cornelius Cardew. As an embodiment of an alternative masculinity, he is constantly mocked by the men in the shooting party who are the representatives of hegemonic masculinity. Fellowes represents Cardew as a failed character because he is satirised (Fellowes, 2007: XVI); however, it is reactions of the other characters that put him in a marginalised position. He is ridiculed because he has unconventional ideas. One of the changes of the time is “screaming suffragettes” (**SP**: 108) as Sir Randolph calls them and he sarcastically makes fun of Cardew’s ideas by calling them as “Votes for pheasants” (**Ibid**.). Women’s rights are seen as a threat for the patriarchal system and the fact that animal rights are mocked by referring to women rights signifies the need of intersectional emancipation. Although Cardew does not succeed in stopping the shooting party, he still has an important place in the novel. He is a socialist and a defender of animal rights, and that makes him an opponent of the anthropocentric patriarchal and classist cultural atmosphere of the novel. As Woolf gives Wilfred Owen as an example of a man who is critical of war on the contrary of the dominant patriarchal ideology (Woolf, 1943: 16), Cardew is the representative of vegetarian men as opposed to the patriarchal norms. Through portraying a vegetarian man, Colegate presents the possibility of a different man who does not carry most of the qualities of hegemonic masculinity and that is the dominant phenomenon criticised in the novel. Whereas the novel protests patriarchal anthropocentric ideology through women and a child, it also manifests animal rights via Cardew’s utterances. He calls the shooting party as “murder” (**SP**: 29) and promotes vegetarian diet in his dialogue with Tom Harker: “All we need for our daily sustenance are the fruits of field and

orchard" (**Ibid**., p. 30). He challenges the idea that strength requires eating meat: "It is quite unnecessary to eat flesh. I have walked a good twenty miles today and I could go on for another ten. No flesh has passed my lips for five years" (**Ibid**.). On the contrary of anthropocentric thinking that posits animals as inert tools, Cardew perceives them as creatures that we can have a mutual relationship with. He believes the possibility of developing an equal relationship between non-human animals and humans as he says: "The birds are our sisters, the beasts our brothers" (**Ibid**.). When the objectification of animals is broken and they are viewed as equal individuals, eating them becomes an absurd idea as Cardew asks: "Must we kill our brothers and sisters in order to eat?" (**Ibid**.). He also brings an intersectional look on the subject as he says: "Until we can recgonize the universal kinship of all living creatures we shall remain in outer darkness. In outer darkness" (**Ibid.**). His speech recalls Henry Salt's words, who is the founder of Humanitarian League that promotes animal rights: "Only when the great sense of the universal kinship has been realized among us, will love cast out hatred" (Salt, 1921: 246). Therefore, one can see that Cardew is the embodiment of the intersectional vegetarian voice. As ecofeminist view states, the dominant ideology that provides the justification for exploitation of animals, also presents the ground for the hegemonic relations between humans. Accordingly, Cardew conveys the idea that the injustice and inequality in human society could not end when they direct violence to animals. Humans should acknowledge the rights of the most marginalised group, animals, to create a more peaceful society.

Cardew expresses his reaction to the shooting party: "'Enough of this,' he said loudly" (**SP**: 90) and he rejects the concept of hunting as a sport unlike Sir Randolph for whom it is a sport: "'It is not my idea of sport. It is my idea of murder.'" (**Ibid**., p. 92). He also protests against the shooting party by holding a "cardboard on which was written in large red letters THOU SHALT NOT KILL" (**Ibid**., p. 89). He even tries to disrupt the shooting: he "began to march straight down the line in front of the guns" (**Ibid**., p. 90). Yet they do not stop. He gives a leaflet to Tom regarding vindication of animal rights; however, his doctrine is not taken seriously. He is called as "madman" (**Ibid**., p. 30) and as "bloody lunatic" (**Ibid**., p. 31) by Tom Harker. Sir Randolph, as a supporter of rural traditions, defends the

shooting party by classifying it as a traditional sport (**Ibid**., p. 93). His comments about his pamphlet of "The Rights of Animals, a Vindication of the Doctrine of Universal Kinship" summarises the dominant anthropocentric perspective towards animals:

> These pheasants of course, if one wanted to be legalistic about it, wouldn't be here at all if we hadn't put them there, got the eggs, hatched them out, reared the chicks – you might say we give them life and then after a bit we take it away again – abrogating to ourselves somewhat God-like powers I must admit (**Ibid**., p. 92).

In the quote above the ownership and dominance of humans over animals is illustrated; animals are seen as pragmatic objects that humans can totally control and use. In that political environment Cardew functions as a representative of vegetarian doctrine by his reactionary behaviours and words. People ignoring and mocking Cardew shows how the vegetarian point of view is not considered as a serious thought in the dominant ideology.

3.4. Subordination of the Lower Classes

Ecofeminism accredits that forms of oppression over nature and marginalised groups are twined together as Rose states: "Structural practices of colonialism, imperialism, and capitalism are supported by patriarchal values, norms, and beliefs, creating an ideological superstructure that views many oppressive practices as normal and expected" (Rose, 2023: 322). Appropriately, Colegate gives a place to the lower classes and make their work visible:

> Alongside this glittering throng, we have the other section of the novel: the servants, the keepers, the beaters, the cooks and maids and footmen and valets, who made this life possible. Isabel Colegate is one of the first writers to treat these people equally as a part of the narrative (Fellowes, 2007: XV).

The novel deals with the class struggle by linking it with the subordination of animals and women; thus, bringing an ecofeminist light to the issue. The fact that Cardew, beside being a vegetarian, is a socialist is significant in terms of the intersectional perspective. As it is explained above, the shooting party is the activity of the white upper-class men. As Adams points out while the worst labour is done by the marginalised people in meat marketing (Adams, 2018: 63), lower class people are serving the white upper-class men in the shooting party. They only function as tools just as animals and women. Thus, the subjects of the shooting party are the white upper-class men; lower class people, women and animals are objects used in the quest for realising a masculine self. Accordingly, Cardew links the subordination of animals with the class conflict: "the labouring poor, exploited by the rich, should connect themselves by sympathetic alliance with the animals, exploited by all men" (**SP**: 32). He utters the intersectional idea that marginalised groups, including both non-humans and humans, should stand in solidarity in their emancipation movement against the patriarchal force as it is what ecofeminist theory emphasises. As Adams underlines it: "We are talking about solidarity against an 'othering' that motivates and justifies oppression" (Adams, 2018: 61).

Henry Salt, equates killing animals to killing in warfare:

> It is useless to hope that warfare, which is but one of many savage survivals, can be abolished, until the mind of man is humanized in other respects also – until all savage survivals are at least seen in their true light. As long as man kills the lower races for food or sport, he will be ready to kill his own race for enmity. It is not *this* bloodshed, or *that* bloodshed, that must cease, but *all* needles bloodshed – all wanton infliction of pain or death upon our fellow beings (Salt, 1921: 246).

Cardew, as a vegetarian voice in the novel, makes an important foreshadowing related to the quote given above in terms of categorising both killing animals and humans as murder: "It was hard for a moment to remember that the keen concentration of their hunting instinct was not directed at their fellow man" (**SP***:*

89). As it is discussed killing in war and hunting are the same violent performances of hegemonic masculinity, it is crucial that Tom Harker, a lower-class man is accidentally shot at the end. Thus, one can see that Salt's comment is proven; the killer of animals killed a man too. Their hunting instinct is directed to their fellow man; a man is shot like a bird. As a lower-class man, Tom Harker, is not interested in class conflict which Cardew emphasises frequently, however; his death plays an important role in the debate of class. It is ironic what Tom has said: Animals haven't got rights, have they?' … 'Except to hunt and be hunted" (**SP**: 31). As Adams states that one may be both a victim and a victimiser in the interlocking systems of domination (Adams, 2018: 61), Tom, who hunts occasionally, was a victimiser of animals. Thus, he was a part of the system that eventually kills him. Although he himself is not a supporter of animal rights and does not have the intersectional consciousness, he is hunted like animals. Tom Harker becoming a victim of the shooting party and sharing the same destiny with animals emphasises the necessity of the intersectional solidarity.

Tom Harker is accidentally shot by Gilbert Hartlip in the ambitious rivalry between Lionel Stephens and Gilbert Hartlip. One can see that their hunting instinct that Cardew emphasises is a masculine ambition of having power that has no limits. As he has underlined it, their hunting instinct has turned to each other. Metaphorically, Stephens and Hartlip were trying to hunt each other, and their competitive desire has caused the death of a man. Stephens notices how unhinged they have become and articulates that the reason of Tom's death is their irrational competition (**SP***:* 178). When the price of their competition is someone's life, their ambition for glory becomes even more ridiculous as Percy states: "His man had won, had beaten the champion; but who was going to remember that now?" (**Ibid**., p. 179). Tom has been shot in his eyes which may refer to how their ambition makes them blind and turns them to killers. Their way of shooting is not the ideal of Sir Randolph as he believes a gentlemanly competition which is described as: "The traditional shooting party speaks worlds as a typical Edwardian idea - of elegance, privilege, skill, snobbery, banality, smugness and fatuity" (Averitt, 1993: 90). Sir Randolph says to Gilbert: "You were not shooting like a gentleman, Gilbert" (**SP**: 171). As Sir

Randolph realises, their desire to fight has led them to a lunatic state of mind that causes devastating consequences:

> At the same time he was very angry; not only did all transgressions against the rules of safety in shooting make him angry, but one glance at the wound had told him that the shot which made it had been fired from far too close to have been anything but the shot of a fool or a mad man. Since he knew that Gilbert was not the first he must believe him to have been however temporarily the second (**Ibid**.).

The shooting party becomes a bloody activity that does not fit with Sir Randloph's conventions of aristocracy. The change in the social structure is also emphasised throughout the novel as Averitt expresses: "Urban politics, industrialization, and new money are eroding the values of conservative power vested in the landlord classes; Randolph fears that the succession of values from his generation to the next is at an end" (Averitt, 1993: 92). Colegate, in her review of the novel, also declares that: "The slow process by which the landed gentry became a redundant class had begun" (**SP**: 11). Sir Randolph notices that aristocracy is losing power and the traditions he believes have weakened: "The politicians are determined to turn this country into an urban society instead of a rural one and in the course of the change they think they've got to take away the power of the landed proprietor" (**SP**: 28). Within this light, the shooting party that should be a sport event but turns to a bloody competition, can be seen as a reflection of the power struggle of the aristocracy as Sir Randolph comments: "If you take away the proper functions of an aristocracy, what can it do but play games too seriously?" (**Ibid**.). The shooting party becomes the recreation of the hierarchy that aristocracy has begun to lose its place. The novel points out that the ambition for glory that motivates both war and hunting, is a devastating characteristic that is attributed to masculinity. The shooting of the birds and the shooting of Tom are not different acts, they come from the same ambitious desire to construct masculine hegemony. Furthermore, the fact that Tom is from lower classes emphasises the idea of hegemonic masculinity that marginalises other identities.

Tom's death scene reveals the structure of the class-conscious society. Glass, another man of the working classes, warns him when he says his last words to Sir Randolph: "'Come on now, Tom,' said Glass heartily. 'Remember who you're talking to.'" (**SP**: 176). It points to how the working classes have internalised their subordinate position. Tom refers to the class distinction in his last words, but he also believes there is something in common in all humanity as he says to Sir Randolph: "You and I sir, we may not be always on the same side of things, you are a gentleman and I have always been a poor man but we share one thing sir, we share a God. Say a prayer for me, sir, before I go" (**Ibid**., p. 177). Although he is not familiar with socialist theory like Cardew; since he is a subject of the lower classes, from his experiences, he is aware of the fact that he is in a different and disadvantaged position from Sir Randolph. Therefore, his words contribute to the bitter truth of his dying. The insensible reaction of the upper-class men to his death displays the hegemony that they are trying to preserve even when they have caused the death of a man. One can see that they are trying to normalise the killing of Tom since they do not want to question their traditions and hegemony. However, Tom's death is something that cracks the system; it is an uncomfortable reality that they do not want to accept but still cannot escape.

The novel brings an ecofeminist perspective to the class injustice as it is a woman, Cicely, who shows a genuine reaction to Tom's death. She has a compassion towards Tom's dog; however, she recognises that a dog is not considered as worthy of taking care of in the anthropocentric atmosphere.: "'I know it it's not really important.' Cicely said to Glass. 'But I promised Osbert I would ask you to make sure someone looked after Tom's dog.'" (**SP**: 180). It is significant from an ecofeminist perspective since as a woman she shows mercy and tenderness to an animal which nobody would think of its fate. It should not be elaborated from an essentialist perspective which believes women naturally have these qualities. Rather, it should be understood by a social constructionist type of ecofeminism which sheds light on the subject from a social perspective. Her outraged reaction to Tom's death displays that she brings a critical perspective and has empathy with the marginalised ones, since she herself is marginalised as a woman. Their dialogue with Tibor, the

Hungarian Count, is important since it underlines the class based patriarchal society that Cicely, just like Olivia, stands against. Tibor says: "Such a scene is not suitable for a young girl" (**SP**: 183) which shows that he perceives women as weak creatures that cannot handle harsh realities. However, Cicely reacts to it: "'As a matter of fact,' said Cicely, speaking rather distinctly. 'There is nothing that is not suitable for a young girl.'" (**Ibid**.). Cicely rejects being excluded from anything that is seen as a male realm. She is able to develop her own political ideas as she calls the incident as murder (**Ibid**). Yet Tibor, as a man, rejects to see it as a murder and says: "This was an accident" (**Ibid**.). It is highly crucial that he tries to justify killing of Tom by saying "He was only a peasant" (**Ibid**., p. 184). It frustrates Cicely: "It appeared that she was angry, rather than shocked or distressed as he had anticipated" (**Ibid**.). She does not perform the expected roles from a young girl as she does not cry. As Tibor also believes, being emotionally weak is considered to be one of the essential qualities of women. Nevertheless, Cicely's reaction does not fit into the fragile female image that patriarchy has constructed; she experiences the feeling of anger against the social injustice. She rejects to normalise the death of Tom because he is a lower-class man, she answers Tibor: "Yes, he was only a peasant. But we all knew him, you see.'" (**Ibid**.). Whereas Tibor is a supporter of the class-based society, Cicely as a woman brings a critical look towards the system that is established by men.

Tibor's emphasis that Tom is a peasant is figurative since the word peasant evokes the word pheasant. Adams points out that black people are animalised to justify their suffering which is a fact that shows oppression works in an intertwined way (Adams, 2018: 60). She also underlines that labour is bestialised (Adams, 2018: 62). Thus, as a labourer of the shooting party, Tom's symbolic equation with pheasant marks his otherised position as Adams states: "In a hierarchical social order, being associated with animals functions as a marker of a group's disempowerment and their availability for economic and social exploitation" (Adams, 2018, 56). Both the lower classes and animals are in the same victimised position in the shooting party of the white upper-class men as Tom literally dies just like animals. His death is intertwined with the death of animals, as a lower-class man

he experiences the same destiny with animals and women. Lower class people are also disenfranchised by the same patriarchal force that otherises and dominates nature, animals, and women. The novel triggers the readers to question the hegemony that the white upper-class men in the novel perceives as a norm. Since the aristocratic men have always otherised Cardew by labelling him as a mad man, it is ironic that they act irrational by causing someone's death whereas Cardew shows a sensible reaction:

> 'Oh,' gasped Cornelius again, clasping and unclasping his hands more furiously than ever, and moving from one foot to the other in an ecstasy of embarrassment, excitement, horror and apprehension of revelation. 'If only I could make you see how utterly absurd you all are!' (**SP**: 171).

Tom's death is also a reference to war. They have killed a man in the same way as killing an animal which empowers the analogy between hunting and war throughout the novel. As asserted in Wilfred Owen's poem "Anthem for Doomed Youth": "What passing-bells for these who die as cattle?" (Owen, 1931: 80); people are killed without feeling guilt in war like animals are killed in slaughterhouses, since war is justified by social and political reasons. **The Shooting Party** uses hunted animals as a metaphor for dead soldiers, just as cattle is used in the same way in Owen's poem. As it is asserted since Colegate shows the pain of animals too, she does not posit them only as tools to narrate human experiences; but she takes attention to the linked experiences of humans and animals. Tom's death reinforces the idea that killing of animals and humans are no different than each other. Thus, by making connection between hunting and war, the novel underlines that the boundary between humans and animals is artificial and in reality, we are the same. As Adams notes women are not seen to speak up against war since they are not participants; in the same manner Cardew feels desperate. He feels passive as he could not prevent the incident since he is not a participant of the shooting party, but he is a "helpless spectator" (**SP**: 183) As an observer of a bloody activity, he articulates his criticism

to both hunting and war that are based on the same desire of power. He calls it as a wrong rule: “for how could a mere spectator be expected to be listened to when he wanted to tell the players not just that they were using the wrong rules but they were playing the wrong game?” (**Ibid**.). What he names as the wrong game is not just the shooting party, but it is also a label for the World War I that the novel has aimed to criticise.

CONCLUSION

Ecofeminism focuses on the association of women and nature by focusing on how both the subordination of women and nature reinforce each other. The conceptual link between women and nature should be approached by a critical look to reject justification of their subordinate position under patriarchy. Ecofeminism explains how dichotomies work as a justifying source of the hegemony of the white upper-class men. It underlines the idea of intersectional emancipation and sees the striking connection between the subordination of women, animals, nature, non-European people and the lower classes. Patriarchy has objectified both women and animals by reducing them to their body whereas the realm of the mind is attributed to men and masculinity. Ecofeminist theorists such as Carol J. Adams uncovers the linked patriarchal ideology of the sexual violation of women and the butchering of animals. Further, ecofeminists bring an intersectional perspective that involves other marginalised groups too, arguing that the lower classes and non-European people are animalised to justify their subordination. In this thesis, the selected novels have been interpreted by an ecofeminist perspective as they underline the conjoint victimisation of otherised groups by hegemonic masculinity and draw attention to animals as victims of patriarchal violence.

Ecofeminist theory aims to decentre the white upper-class men. Accordingly, the selected novels mark hegemonic masculinity as a force that dominates marginalised groups which is discussed in the light of ecofeminism. Whereas male characters are presented as an embodiment of patriarchal ideology, women are strongly contrasted with them. Rachel Blau DuPlesis states that since women are marginalised, they tend to bring an opponent perspective to dominant ideology: "They are, however, less integrated into the dominant orders than are men of their class. Women are a muted or subordinate part of a hegemonic process" (DuPlesis, 1985: 41). Accordingly, the selected novels provide Olivia and Marian's rejection of patriarchal violence. In **The Edible Woman**, Marian's refusal of male violence manifests itself in her bodily reactions. She expresses her discomfort with marriage, the objectification of the female body, and meat eating through her certain reactions and behaviours. Her vegetarianism is caused by her identification with animals as she

is also positioned as an edible object. Her eating disorder symbolises how she loses her agency. Thus, she rejects the idea of objectifying animals and shows reaction to her own objectification as well. In **The Shooting Party**, Olivia rejects patriarchal practices such as hunting and war. She also recognises that Osbert is a different child, but he will be conditioned under patriarchal culture that is based on dichotomies. As a woman, Olivia gives value to emotions as well as rationality. In addition, Ellen is angry to the shooters; Aline shows mercy to Osbert's duck. Cicely recognizes the unfair structure of classes. The novels show women can have empathy with animals and other marginalised groups since they are also otherised in patriarchy.

This thesis has evaluated how, traditionally, killing is attributed to the male kind. It is the topic of ecofeminist discussion since it is related to nature/culture dichotomy that ecofeminism challenges. In patriarchy, the fertility and menstrual cycle of the female body are associated with nature whereas men are seen as part of culture. Killing and hunting mark the distinction of men from the natural and female realm, and it helps the male to develop a masculine identity that dominates otherised groups. Both novels represent men as killers and analyse the construction of masculinity. Since the novels direct criticism to hunting as a male violence and put women in an opponent position, they contribute to ecofeminist criticism of masculinity as a force that dominates women, animals, nature and other marginalised groups. In **The Edible Woman**, hunting contributes to Peter's masculine identity, and in **The Shooting Party**, the competitive spirit of the white upper-class men is underlined. As a woman, Marian identifies herself with hunted and eaten animals since she herself is also objectified by patriarchal culture. It underlines the mutual objectification of women and animals. **The Shooting Party** criticises war as a masculine act, it also puts hunting on par with war which contributes to ecofeminist reading. Olivia, as a woman, conveys the idea that both killing in hunting and killing in war is unethical and as such she challenges the heroic narrative of masculinity. Further, the fact that they accidentally kill Tom, a member of the working classes, in the shooting party shows how male violence is also directed to the lower classes. It gives the idea that just as animals, working class people are also victimised by

patriarchal violence. It also underlines that killing humans does not differ from killing animals, both are the behaviours of toxic masculinity. This thesis has come to the conclusion that the traditional patriarchal understanding that glorifies hunting as a masculine act should be undermined.

The main idea of ecofeminism is that dichotomies such as nature/culture, body/mind construct the patriarchal ideology that dominates otherised groups. In the reading of the selected novels, it is seen that dichotomies take a significant place. Marian is alienated from her body because she embraces the patriarchal conception of the female body. She is exposed to constant objectification that distorts her perspective as regards her own body. She detests pregnancy since she internalises the reductive idea that because of their biological phases women are excluded from the realm of rationality. **The Shooting Party** also shows the dichotomous thinking of patriarchy through Olivia and Lionel's dialogue about Osbert. Different from Marian, Olivia rejects dichotomous thinking and underlines the need of embracing emotions just as thoughts. **The Edible Woman** depicts the character development of a woman who is imposed on patriarchal ideology and experiences the conflicts and struggles of being a female. This leads her to revolt. **The Shooting Party** tells Olivia's challenging, strong, and confident ideas. Whereas Olivia brings a strong criticism in her speech; Marian goes through an inner journey that she cannot even fully recognise at the beginning, but her body becomes the subject of her disobedience. Although there are differences, both women refute patriarchal violence.

This thesis has revolved around how both novels uncover the silent struggles of animals. They portray hunting as a male violence; thus, they consider animals as victims of patriarchal violence too. As animals are silent victims of patriarchy, their pain is usually not seen or used only as a metaphor. However, the selected novels allude to their painful experiences as an ecofeminist theme. Marian starts to see the individual behind the meat; thus, the objectification process of the animal is subverted. Likewise, in **The Shooting Party** the reader witnesses the struggle and pain of the animals that are hunted; thus, animals become subjects in the reader's eye. The novel also makes the reader think about animal rights through showing the

struggles of Osbert's duck and Cardew's speech. The victimisation of animals in hunting is drawn attention in both novels.

The novels under scrutiny underscore the need of intersectional emancipation. This study shows how the victimisation of women and animals are interrelated in patriarchal society. Furthermore, the subordination of the lower classes is also closely linked to the subordination of animals. By depicting Marian's identification with animals and using eating symbolism throughout the novel, **The Edible Woman** highlights how the female body is situated as a consumable object just as animals. By revealing the harmful competitive behaviour of men and challenging the heroic narrative of war and hunting, **The Shooting Party** underlines the need of destroying hegemonic masculinity. It uncovers the process of how and with which values masculinity is constructed and marks that it does not only harm women but also animals and the lower classes too. Both novels challenge the hegemonic masculinity and embrace the idea of solidarity of marginalised groups. As the novels underline it, animals are also part of the victimised groups, and their struggle should also be taken into consideration. This study has displayed how the conjoint victimisation of women and animals, the need of solidarity between marginalised groups under the patriarchal domination, and the construction and the values of hegemonic masculinity are represented in the selected novels.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Adams, Carol J., Lori Gruen: "Ecofeminist Footings," **Ecofeminism: Feminist Intersections with Other Animals & Earth**, Ed. by. Carol J. Adams, Lori Gruen, New York, Bloomsbury Academic, 2022, pp. 1-43

Adams, Carol J.: "Woman-Battering and Harm to Animals," **Animals and Women: Feminist Theoretical Explorations**, Durham, Duke University Press, 1995, pp. 55-84.

Adams, Carol J.: **Neither Man nor Beast: Feminism and the Defense of Animals**, New York, Bloomsbury Academic, 2018.

Adams, Carol J.: **The Sexual Politics of Meat: A Feminist-Vegetarian Critical Theory,** New York, Continuum, 1990.

Atwood, Margaret: **The Edible Woman,** Toronto, Emblem McClelland & Stewart, 2010.

Averitt, Brett. T.: "The Strange Clarity of Distance: History, Myth, and Imagination in the Novels of Isabel Colegate," **Contemporary British Women Writers**, Ed. by. Robert E. Hosmer. Jr., New York, Palgrave Macmillan, 1993.

Akın, Haydar: **Ortaçağ Avrupası'nda Cadılar ve Cadı Avı,** İstanbul, Alfa, 2024.

Bates, Catherine: **Masculinity and the Hunt: Wyatt to Spenser,** Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2013.

Berger, John: **About Looking,** New York, Vintage Books, 1991.

Berger, John: **Ways of Seeing,** London, Penguin Books, 2008.

Biehl, Janet: **Rethinking Ecofeminist Politics**, Boston, South End Press, 1991.

Bordo, Susan: **Unbearable Weight, Feminism, Western Culture, and the Body,** Berkeley, University of California Press, 1993.

Brigid, Brophy: "The Rights of Animals," **Don't Never Forget: Collected Views and Reviews**, London, Jonathan Cape, 1966, pp. 15-21.

Brook, Barbara: **Feminist Perspectives on the Body,** London, Routledge, 2014.

Christensen Ann-Dorte, Palle Rasmussen: "War, Violence and Masculinities: Introduction and Perspectives," **Norma,** vol.10, no.3-4, 2015, pp. 189-202.

Colegate, Isabel: "The Shooting Party Reconsidered," **The Threepenny Review**, no. 94, 2003, p.11.

Colegate, Isabel: **The Shooting Party,** London, Penguin, 2007.

Collard, Andre: **Rape of the Wild: Man's Violence Against Animals and the Earth**, Bloomington, Indiana University Press, 1989.

Davies, Madeline: "Margaret Atwood's Female Bodies," **The Cambridge Companion to Margaret Atwood,** Ed. by. Carol Ann Howells, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2006.

de Beauvoir, Simone: **The Second Sex,** Trans. by. H. M. Parshley, London, Jonathan Cape, 1956.

Derrida, Jacques: "The Animal That Therefore I am (More to Follow)," **Critical Inquiry**, vol. 28, no. 2, Winter 2002, (Online), http://links.jstor.org/sici?sici=0093-1896%28200224%2928%3A2%3C369%3ATATTIA%3E2.0.CO%3B2-9, 10 February 2024, pp. 369-418.

Descartes, René: **Descartes' Philosophical Writings,** Trans. by. Norman Kemp Smith, London, Macmillan, 1952.

Donovan, Josephine: "Animal Rights and Feminist Theory," **Ecofeminism: Women, Animals Nature,** Ed. by. Greta Gaard, Philadelphia, Temple University Press, 1993, pp. 167-194.

Drewett, Anne: "Women, Animals and Meat: A Feminist-Vegetarian Critical Approach to Margaret Atwood's The Edible Woman and Michel Faber's Under the Skin," **Diva**, 2016, (Online) https://www.diva-portal.org/smash/record.jsf?pid=diva2%3A908233&dswid=-893, 19 October 2023.

DuPlesis, Rachel Blau: **Writing Beyond the Ending: Narrative Strategies of Twentieth-Century Women Writers,** Bloomington,

Indiana University Press, 1985.

Eagly Alice H., Wendy Wood: "The Origins of Sex Differences in Human Behavior: Evolved Dispositions Versus Social Roles," **American Psychologist**, June 1999, (Online) https://www.researchgate.net/publication/232520455, 19 October 2023.

Elsthain, Jean Bethke: **Women and War,** New York, Basic Books, 1987.

Fellowes, Julian: "Introduction," **The Shooting Party,** London, Penguin, 2007.

Feminists For Animal Rights, vol.1, no.1, w.date, (Online) http://www.farinc.org/FAR_Newsletter_1.html, 19 October 2023.

Ferguson, Brain R.,: "Masculinity and War," **Current Anthroplogy,** vol. 62, no.23, 2021, pp.112-124.

French, Marilyn: **Beyond Power: On Men, Women and Morals,** New York, Summit Books, 1985.

Freud, Sigmund: **Civilization and Its Discontents**, Trans. By. James Strachey, New York, W.W. Norton Company, 1962.

Gaard, Greta: **Critical Ecofeminism**, Maryland, Lexington Books, 2017.

Gaard, Greta: "Ecofeminism and Native American Cultures: Pushing the Limits of Cultural Imperialism?," **Ecofeminism: Women, Animals, Nature**, Ed. by. Greta Gaard, Philadelphia, Temple University Press, 1993, pp. 295-314.

Gaard, Greta: "Living Interconnections with Animals and Nature," **Ecofeminism: Women, Animals, Nature**, Ed. by. Greta Gaard, Philadelphia, Temple University Press, 1993, pp. 1-12.

Gaard, Greta: "Vegetarian Ecofeminism: A Review Essay," **Frontiers A Journal of Women Studies**, January 2002, (Online) https://www.researchgate.net/publication/249903564, 22 October 2023.

Griffin, Susan: **Women and Nature**, New York, Harper & Row, 1978.

Gruen, Lori: "Dismantling Oppression: An Analysis of the Connection Between Women and Animals," **Ecofeminism: Women, Animals Nature**, Ed. by. Greta Gaard, Philadelphia, Temple University Press, 1993, pp. 60-90.

Hans Patrick, Flavia Hodges: **A Dictionary of First Names,** Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1990.

Hartsock, Nancy: "Foucault on Power: A Theory for Women," **Feminism/Postmodernism**, Ed. by. Linda J. Nicholson, New York, Routledge, 1990, pp.157-175.

Heller, Chaia: "For the Love of Nature: Ecology and the Cult of the Romantic," **Ecofeminism: Women, Animals, Nature**, Ed. by. Greta Gaard, Philadelphia, Temple University Press, 1993, pp. 219-242.

Higgins, Jean M.: "The Myth of Eve: The Temptress," **Journal of the American Academy of Religion**, vol. 44 no. 4, 1976, pp. 639-647.

Howells, Carol Ann: **Margaret Atwood,** New York, St. Martin's Press, 1996.

Kappeler, Susan: **The Pornography of Presentation,** Minneapolis, University of Minnesota Press, 1986.

Kaeuper Richard W., Montgomery Bohna: "War and Chivalry," **A Companion to Medieval English Literature and Culture C.1350- C.1500**, Ed. by. Peter Brown, Oxford, Blackwell Publishing, 2007.

Kean, Hilda: "The 'Smooth Cool Men of Science': The Feminist and Socialist Response to Vivisection," **History Workshop Journal**, Autumn 1995, (Online) https://www.jstor.org/stable/4289385, 31 Augustus 2023.

Kemmerer, Lisa: **Sister Species: Women, Animals, and Social Justice**, Urbana, University of Illinois Press, 2011.

Kheel, Marti: "License to Kill: An Ecofeminist Critique of Hunters' Discourse," **Animals and Women: Feminist Theoretical Explorations**, Ed. by. Carol J. Adams, Josephine Donovan, Durham, Duke University Press, 1995, pp. 85-125.

Kheel, Marti: "The Killing Game: An Ecofeminist Critique of Hunting," **Journal of the Philosophy of Sport,** vol. 23, no. 1, 1996, pp. 30-44.

King, Ynestra: "Healing the Wounds: Feminism, Ecology, and the Nature/Culture Dualism," **Reweaving the World: The Emergence of Ecofeminsm,** Ed. by Irene Diamond and Gloria Feman Orenstein, San Francisco, Sierra Club Books, 1990.

Kordecki, Lesley: "Animal Studies and Ecofeminist Literature," **The Routledge Handbook of Ecofeminism and Literature**, Ed. by. Douglas A. Vakoch, New York, Routledge, 2023, pp. 282- 289.

Lacan, Jacques: **Ecrits,** Trans. by Bruce Fink, New York, W.W. Norton & Company, 2006.

Leneman, Leah: "The Awakened Instinct: Vegetarianism and the Women's Suffrage Movement in Britain," **Women's History Review**, 1997, (Online) https://doi.org/10.1080/09612029700200144, 31 Augustus 2023.

Llyod, Genevieve: "Selfhood, War and Masculinity," **Feminist Challenges: Social and Political Theory,** Ed. by. Carole Pateman, Elizabeth Gross, Boston, Northeastern University Press, 1987.

McHale, Brian: **Postmodernist Fiction,** London, Routledge, 2004.

Mellor, Mary: **Feminism & Ecology**, Washington, New York University Press, 1997.

Merchant, Carolyn: **The Death of Nature: Women, Ecology, and the Scientific Revolution**, New York, Harper & Row Publishers, 1989.

Meyers, Jeffrey: "Lady Chatterley's Gamekeeper," **Style,** vol.51, no.1, 2017, pp. 25-33.

Mijomanović, Stevan: "Cannibalism, Fertility, and the role of Food in Margaret Atwood's *The Edible Woman*," **Academia,** (Online) **https://www.academia.edu/31072433/Cannibalism_Fertility_and_the_Role_of_Food_in_Margaret_Atwood_s_The_Edible_Woman,** 19 October 2023.

Millet, Kate: **Sexual Politics**, Urbana, University of Illinois Press, 2000.

Milton, John: **Paradise Lost**, Ed. by John Leonard, New York, Penguin Books, 2003.

Mulvey, Laura: "Visual Pleasure and Narrative Cinema," **Screen,** vol. 16, no. 13, 1975, pp. 6-18.

Ortner, Sherry B.: "Is Female to Male as Nature Is to Culture," **Feminist Studies,** vol.1, no.2, 1972, pp. 5-31.

Ostriker, Alicia: "The Thieves of Language: Women Poets and Revisionist Mythmaking," Coming to Light: **Signs**, vol. 8, no. 1, 1982, pp. 68-90.

Owen, Wilfred: "Anthem for Doomed Youth," **The Poems of Wilfred Owen**, London, Chatto & Windus, 1931, p. 80.

Parker, Emma: "You Are What You Eat: The Politics of Eating in the Novels of Margaret Atwood," **Twentieth Century Literature,** vol.41, no.3, 1995, pp.349-368.

Patel, Aloka: "Representation of Women and Nature in English Literary Texts," **Contemporary Literary Review India,** vol.8, no.1, February 2021, pp. 1-22.

Plato: **Phaedo**, Trans. By. David Gallop, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 2002.

Plumwood, Val: "Ecofeminism: An Overview and Discussion of Positions and Arguments," **Australasian Journal of Philosophy**, June 1986, (Online) https://doi.org/10.1080/00048402.1986.9755430, 31 Augustus 2023.

Plumwood, Val: "Women Humanity and Nature," **Radical Philosophy**, Spring 1988, (Online) https://www.radicalphilosophy.com/, 31 Augustus 2023.

Plumwood, Val: **Feminism and Mastery of Nature**, London, Routledge, 1993.

Pundir, Leena: "Marian's Search for Self in Margaret Atwood's *The Edible Woman*," **The Criterion**, vol. 3, no. 4, December 2012 (Online), https://www.the-criterion.com/V3/n4/Leena.pdf , 19 October 2023.

Quinn Emelia, Benjamin Westwood: "Introduction: Thinking Through Veganism," **Thinking Veganism in Literature and Culture: Towards a Vegan Theory,** Cham, Palgrave Macmillan, 2018, pp.1-24.

Quinn Emelia, Laura Wright: "Introduction," **The Edinburgh Companion to Vegan Literary Studies**, Edinburgh, Edinburgh University Press, 2022, pp. 1-15.

Regan, Tom: **The Case for Animal Rights,** Berkeley, University of California Press, 1983.

Rigney, Barbara Hill: **Women Writers: Margaret Atwood,** London, The Macmillan Press, 1987.

Rose, Lydia: "Hegemonic Masculinity and Ecofeminist Literature," **The Routledge Handbook of Ecofeminism and Literature,** Ed. by. Douglas A. Vakoch, New York, Routledge, 2023, pp. 321-330.

Ruether, Rosemary R.: **New Woman New Earth: Sexist Ideologies and Human Liberation**, New York, The Seabury Press, 1975.

Ruether, Rosemary R.: "Ecofeminism: Symbolic and Social Connections of the Oppression of Women and the Domination of Nature," **Ecofeminism and the Sacred**, Ed. by. Carol J. Adams, New York, Continuum, 1993, pp. 13-23.

Salt, Henry S.: **Seventy Years Among Savages,** London, George Allen & Unwin, 1921.

Sanchez-Grant, Sofia: "The Female Body in Margaret Atwood's *The Edible Woman* and *Lady Oracle*," **Journal of International Woman Studies**, March 2008, (Online) https://vc.bridgew.edu/jiws/vol9/iss2/7/, 19 October 2023.

Sarkar, Somasree: "Female and Animal in Margaret Atwood's *The Edible Woman* and *Surfacing*" **Asian Review of Social Sciences**, vol.8 no.2, 2019, pp.48-52.

Sceats, Sarah: **Food, Consumption, and The Body in Contemporary Women's Fiction**, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2003.

Singer, Peter: **Animal Liberation,** New York, The New York Review, 1975.

Spelman, Elizabeth V.: "Woman as Body: Ancient and Contemporary Views," **Feminist Theory and The Body**, Ed. by. Janet Price, Margrit Shildrick, New York, Routledge, 1999.

Stanković, Vladimir Lj., Biljana R. Vlašković Ilić: "Food, Power and Body: Margaret Atwood's *The Edible Woman*," **Academia,** w. date, (Online) https://www.academia.edu/51016728/Food_Power_and_Body_Margaret_Atwoods_The_Edible_Woman, 19 October 2023.

Thakur, Pallavi: "Atwood's The Edible Woman: A Saga of Identity Crisis," **International Journal of English Language, Literature and Translation Studies**, 2015 (Online) https://www.academia.edu/69845015/Atwood_s_the_Edible_Woman_A_Saga_of_Identity_Crisis, 19 October 2023.

Tolan, Fiona: **Margaret Atwood: Feminism and Fiction,** Amsterdam, Rodopi, 2007.

Urgan, Mina: **İngiliz Edebiyatı Tarihi,** İstanbul, Yapı Kredi Yayınları, 2010.

Vokes, Orela: "Revelling in Food: An Ecofeminist Reading of Margaret Atwood's *The Edible Woman*," **Gupea,** 2015, (Online) gupea.ub.gu.se/handle/2077/40655, 30 October 2022.

Warren, Karen J. : "Nature Is a Feminist Issue: Motivating Ecofeminism by Taking Empirical Data Seriously," **Ecofeminist Philosophy: A Western Perspective on What it is and Why it Matters**, Lanham, Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, 2000, pp. 1-19.

Waugh, Patricia: **Feminine Fictions: Revisiting the Postmodern,** New York, Routledge, 2012.

Waugh, Patricia: **Literary Theory and Criticism,** Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2006.

Wiseman, Taylor Rebekah: "English Literature and Ecofeminism," **The Routledge Handbook of Ecofeminism and Literature,** Ed. by. Douglas A. Vakoch, New York, Routledge, 2023, pp. 244- 255.

Wollstonecraft, Mary: **A Vindication of the Rights of Women**, New York, Penguin Books, 2006.

Woolf, Virginia: **Three Guineas,** London, The Hogarth Press, 1943.

Wright, Laura: "Framing Vegan Studies: Vegetarianism, Veganism, Animal studies, Ecofeminism," **The Routledge Handbook of Vegan Studies**, Oxon, Routledge, 2021, pp. 3-14.

Wright, Laura: "The 'Planned Cow' and 'No end to Meat': Veganism and Disordered Eating," **The Edinburgh Companion to Vegan Literary Studies**, Ed. By. Laura Wright, Emelia Quinn, Edinburgh, Edinburgh University Press, 2022, pp. 167- 182.

Zimmerman, Shari A.: "Milton's 'Paradise Lost' Eve's Struggle for Identity," **American Imago,** vol. 38, no.3, 1981, pp. 247-267.