T. C.
EGE ÜNİVERSİTESİ
SOSYAL BİLİMLER ENSTİTÜSÜ
İngiliz Dili ve Edebiyatı Anabilim Dalı

A KRISTEVAN READING OF GEORGE ELIOT'S EARLY NOVELS

YÜKSEK LİSANS TEZİ

Yasemin BAYSAL

DANIŞMAN: Yrd. Doç. Dr. Aylin ATİLLA

İZMİR-2016

T. C.
EGE ÜNİVERSİTESİ
SOSYAL BİLİMLER ENSTİTÜSÜ
İngiliz Dili ve Edebiyatı Anabilim Dalı

A KRISTEVAN READING OF GEORGE ELIOT'S EARLY NOVELS

YÜKSEK LİSANS TEZİ

Yasemin BAYSAL

JÜRİ ÜYELERİ

Yrd. Doç. Dr. Aylin ATİLLA (Danışman)
Prof. Dr. Rezzan KOCAÖNER SİLKÜ
Doç. Dr. Atalay GÜNDÜZ

İZMİR-2016

Ege Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Müdürlüğü'ne sunduğum **A Kristevan Reading of George Eliot's Early Novels** adlı yüksek lisans tezinin tarafımdan bilimsel, ahlak ve normlara uygun bir şekilde hazırlandığını, tezimde yararlandığım kaynakları bibliyografyada ve dipnotlarda gösterdiğimi onurumla doğrularım.

Yasemin BAYSAL

T.C.EGE ÜNİVERSİTESİ
SOSYAL BİLİMLER ENSTİTÜSÜ

YÜKSEK LİSANS

TEZ SAVUNMA TUTANAĞI

ÖĞRENCİNİN

Adı Soyadı : **Yasemin BAYSAL**

Numarası : **92120000657**

Anabilim Dalı : **İngiliz Dili ve Edebiyatı**

Tez Başlığı (Türkçe) : **George Eliot'ın Erken Dönem Romanlarının Kristeva'nın Teorileri Işığında İncelenmesi**

Tez Başlığı (İngilizce) : **A Kristevan Reading of George Eliot's Early Novels**

Tez Savunma Tarihi : **25.01.2016**

Tez Başlığı Değişikliği Varsa Yeni Başlık:

JÜRİ ÜYELERİ

Jüri Başkanı

Unvan, Adı, Soyadı : Yrd. Doç. Dr. Aylin ATİLLA

Karar : ✓ Başarılı O Başarısız O Düzeltme

İmza : .....

Jüri Üyesi

Unvan, Adı, Soyadı : Prof. Dr. Rezzan KOCAÖNER SİLKÜ

Karar : X Başarılı O Başarısız O Düzeltme

İmza : .....

Jüri Üyesi

Unvan, Adı, Soyadı : Doç. Dr. Atalay GÜNDÜZ

Karar : X Başarılı O Başarısız O Düzeltme

İmza : .....

TEZ HAKKINDA JÜRİNİN GENEL GÖRÜŞÜ

(Jüri Başkanı Tarafından Doldurulacaktır)

Tez savunması sonucunda öğrenci tarafından hazırlanan çalışma;

Oybirliğiyle **O** ✓

Oy çokluğuyla **O**

Başarılıdır	**Düzeltilmelidir**	**Başarısızdır**

- Bu tutanak üç (3) işgünü içerisinde jüri üyelerinin raporlarıyla beraber Anabilim Dalı Başkanlığı üst yazısıyla Enstitü Müdürlüğüne gönderilmelidir.
- Tezli yüksek lisans programlarında düzeltme alan öğrencinin 3 (üç) ay içerisinde yeniden savunmaya girmesi zorunludur.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I remain immensely grateful to my advisor Assist. Prof. Dr. Aylin Atilla for her illuminating suggestions, guidance, patience, and encouragement through the writing process of this study. I also want to express my gratitude to my friends and colleagues at Ege University for their encouragement and support. Finally, I would like to thank my family for all the love, generosity, and endless patience they have shown me.

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

The Victorian period was an age which consisted of various changes with the beginning of modernity. The growth of urbanisation, the industrial revolution and the technological developments gave rise to the changes of the period. With respect to these changes, in *The Emergence of Victorian Consciousness: The Spirit of the Age,* George Levine states: "in the first quarter of the nineteenth century politically, socially, intellectually, and spiritually a new society was growing up in England" (2). Owing to these changes and circumstances, the structure of the society was not fixed or stable and they had great impacts on the issues of gender and the formation of identity concerning taking a part of the society. These considerable changes and significant issues were revealed by the writers through the literature of the period. Thus, the Victorian literature reflected the unstable structure of the Victorian society. Regarding the Victorian literature, there were various genres such as prose, poetry and drama; however, it was the novel that was the most influential and reflective genre in terms of the changes and the conditions of the Victorian society. The novelists reflected their perspectives and attitudes to the social structures and circumstances of the period. Mary Ann Evans, who wrote under the pseudonym of George Eliot, is one of the leading writers of the Victorian literature.

Regarding the Victorian literature, George Eliot had a great influence as a novelist, a translator and a journalist. In "Silly Novels by Lady Novelists", Eliot criticised the frivolity of female writing in 1856. Furthermore, in this article, she criticised most of the novels by female novelists due to their lack of realism. Therefore, Eliot makes use of realism through her novels. She makes her protagonists accept their limitations by returning to the ordinariness. With respect to Eliot's usage of realism through her fiction, in "Surprising Realism," Caroline Levine states that

> Eliot's realism entails something subtly different from self-denial in the service of sympathetic community. It involves surprising people into proper degrees of sympathy in relation to new and revelatory knowledge. In the process, it does not necessarily require a punishing negation of the self but rather an abrupt modification to an existing understanding of the self in relation to a world of others. Realist surprises are moments of sudden knowledge that compel two kinds of readjustment: changes in feeling towards others, on the one hand, and a newly proportionate grasp of the relation between the self and the world, on the other. (71-2)

Levine emphasizes that Eliot represents the relation between the self and the society. Through her fiction, Eliot creates sympathy with the influence of an understanding of the self in terms of a world of others.

In addition to her success in the deployment of realism, Eliot makes use of psychology in order to display the complex state of mind and the complex emotional lives of her characters. James Sully, one of significant nineteenth century English psychologists, was interested in various aspects of Eliot's characters. Concerning the psychological insights of Eliot's fiction, in "George Eliot's Art" (1881), Sully maintains that Eliot's characters

> include obscure moral tendencies, nascent forces, which, though they mingle with and help to colour the currents of thought and action, never come into the distinct light of self- consciousness, because circumstances have never supplied the stimulus needed to develop their full energy . . . Eliot lays so much stress on the sub-conscious region of mental life, the domain of vague emotion and rapid fugitive thought. (382)

Sully describes Eliot's fiction as "psychological analysis in fiction," which he explains: "the unfolding of the inner germs of action, the spreading out before the eye those complicated activities of imagination and desire, impulse and counter-impulse, which are conduct in process of becoming" (388). Sully underlines Eliot's success in reflecting

the psychological aspects of the individual in terms of the process of identity formation. With respect to Eliot's psychological analysis, Sully further proposes: "she holds the mirror up to nature in such a way as to disclose to view the finer threads which bind together the inner and the outer life" (390). The quotation emphasizes Eliot's ability to reveal the conditions of internal and external life through her fiction.

With respect to the value and the function of fiction, the nineteenth century novel represented the mind concerning the usage of the novel and psychology simultaneously. George Eliot's novels can be considered as psychological novel. In "The Withering of the Individual: Psychology in the Victorian Novel," Nicholas Dames proposes,

> That the terms 'psychology' and 'novel' are first explicitly allied in the nineteenth century should come as no surprise, given that the Victorian era saw the gradual codification and institutionalization of both psychology and the novel alike. That their initial combination, however, occurs in the context of a wittily self-ironizing slur by George Eliot, one of the Victorian era's leading practitioners of what came to be called 'psychological novels,' is a less predictable fact. (91)

As a leading figure, Eliot depicted the aspects of the human psychology in the nineteenth century by combining the novel and psychology through her writing career. George Eliot's personal experiences, preferences and inner conflicts contribute to her powerful depictions of the human psyche. With respect to Eliot's creative nature as a novelist, in *George Eliot,* Jan Jędrzejewski describes Eliot as "a genuine insight" in the development of her creative self (112). Jędrzejewski futher proposes: "It is the joys, dilemmas, and fears of the writer's past that provide the key to the understanding of the sources of her inspiration and of the nature of the creative process that transformed them into works of literary art" (112). Eliot's personal experiences that include her joys, dilemmas, and fears contribute to her creative self as a writer with the influence of her profound awareness.

Another significant contribution to Eliot's powerful depiction of human psyche is her ability to reveal "the otherness." Within this frame, George Levine underlines Eliot's ability to reflect "the otherness of things and people,"

> The intensity and formal complexity of George Eliot's novels, even in the relatively expansive mode of her early works, must be credited in part to her refusal to disentangle representational precision, psychological states, formal coherence, and moral significance. Getting it right was for her no simple matter of recording external fact precisely, but of making herself capable of the most complete possible honesty by opening her mind and feelings to the otherness of things and people. (9)

Levine emphasizes that Eliot's usage of realism and psychology helps her open her mind and feelings in order to understand the concept of otherness. With respect to this feature of Eliot's fiction, her early novels are suitable for rereading in the light of Kristevan terms and theories, particularly the theory of subjectivity that refers to "abjection."

According to Julia Kristeva, a person is always in a position of the "subject in process," in which the person searches for the identity through language which contains the notions of "the semiotic" and "the symbolic." Linguistic changes reveal the changes in the subject's status regarding his relation to others. Unlike a unitary being, Kristeva's understanding of language is based on the speaking subject as a heterogeneous self. In *Revolution in Poetic Language*, Kristeva states: "the speaking subject *makes* and *unmakes* himself" via language (272). Therefore, Kristeva's theory of language cannot be separated from her theory of subjectivity since they are related one another in terms of their notions and functions. Regarding the theory of language, Kristeva explains two modalities as the semiotic and the symbolic. The semiotic is the way in which physical energy and impulses exist in language. The semiotic consists of both the drives and utterances of the subject. The semiotic might be conveyed orally; however, it is not bound to the systematic rules of syntax (*Revolution* 27). On the contrary, the symbolic is the mode that is made up of a sign system, systematic syntactic rules and grammar

(*Revolution* 29-30). These modes of the theory of language constitute the basis of Kristeva's theory of subjectivity.

The first indication of the theory of subjectivity is the infant's recognition itself from the other and this notion is called variously by Freud, Lacan and Kristeva. Freud calls this phenomenon as the "fear of castration" while Lacan calls it the "mirror stage." Kristeva calls this point as abjection in terms of the formation of subjectivity. In *Powers of Horror: An Essay on Abjection*, Kristeva explains "abjection" as "not lack of cleanliness or health that causes abjection but what disturbs identity, system, order. What does not respect borders, positions, rules. The in between, the ambiguous, the composite" (4). In other words, the abject is the one who has the characteristics of in-betweenness and ambiguity and disturbs the boundaries, orders and laws unlike the majority of society. In terms of the theory of language, including the semiotic and the symbolic and the theory of abjection, Eliot's early novels, *The Mill on the Floss* (1860) and *Silas Marner* (1861), can be reread through their major characters and central themes.

In spite of the realistic and psychological aspects of Eliot's fiction, she became the target of criticism by various critics, especially by the feminist critics with respect to the twentieth century criticism of the Victorian novel. Regarding the twentieth century criticism of Eliot and the Victorian novel, in "Critical Responses: 1970-Present," Juliette Atkinson states that

> The Victorian novel as a whole was put under intense scrutiny in the 1970s by feminist, Marxist, and postcolonial critics, but George Eliot was dealt with more harshly than most. This was partly because of the pre-eminent status that nineteenth-century critics had granted her, but above all because the boldness of her personal choices did not seem to tally with the ideologies displayed in her novels. Feminist critics of the 1970s bitterly reproached her for her failure to demonstrate greater female solidarity. (83)

Atkinson emphasizes the harsh criticism of the lack of relationship between Eliot's fiction and her personal preferences since this deficiency is considered as Eliot's failure

to construct a larger solidarity among women. Within this frame, in *The Cambridge Companion to George Eliot,* George Levine states,

> Feminist criticism has long complained that George Eliot never created a heroine like Marian Evans, that is, a woman who resisted the conventions of society and made a creative and original life for herself, even living outside of wedlock with moral confidence in her choice. Such resistance, within George Eliot's determined realist resistance to focusing on the extraordinary, is inevitably thwarted by conditions. Only someone of genuinely heroic stature . . . could have sustained and justified such a life. (12)

Levine emphasizes that Eliot never created a character like herself; in other words, she never tried to justify her preferences and way of life that were not suitable for the conservative conventions of the Victorian society.

Some feminist critics consider that Eliot's vision and fiction are examined in terms of gender issues not the "Woman Question." In "George Eliot and Gender," Kate Flint calls Eliot as "the appellation– a feminist" (139). Flint further suggests that this appellation

> allows her to see the part which conventions, both literary and social, have played in constructing the stories which cultures have been narrating about themselves, and to show how such stories are increasingly insufficient to carry the weight both of social injustices and of the stultifying effects, on both women and men, of gender-based expectations. Compensatory as well as critical, George Eliot's portrayal of gender relations demonstrates what must change and be thought afresh if new plots, in both life and literature, are to be written. (179).

Flint underlines Eliot's attitudes and sensitivity to the feminist movement in terms of gender issues not merely via the "Woman Question" as she is sensitive not only to the rights and responsibilities of the females but also to the rights and responsibilities of the males. In *Women's Writing*, Caroline Levine proposes to 'broaden the debate about

Eliot and gender, to move beyond the task of establishing Eliot definitively as either feminist or anti-feminist" (qtd. in Atkinson 84). On the other hand, George Eliot is considered as a feminist writer by some critics. For instance, in *George Eliot,* Uglow argues that Eliot was partly a feminist writer in 1850s owing to her fundamental themes of her works:

> The nature of womanhood; the fear of change; the exclusion of women from the realm of the intellect and from effective power; the alliance in oppression of women, workers and slaves which gives them a shared rhetoric of freedom and resistance; the conflict between the new drive for autonomy and the older ethic of self-sacrifice; the difficulty of achieving independence without losing the possibility of sexual passion and family life. (80)

Eliot deals with the problems of women as the central issues through her works. In addition, she is sensitive to the excluded and oppressed groups such as workers and slaves. Besides, Eliot explores "the complementary nature of masculine and feminine qualities (within individuals of both sexes as well as within societies)" (Uglow 250). With regard to Eliot's perception and reflection of the relationships of two sexes and gender roles in society, her novels can be disturbing for women readers. Uglow states,

> She uses the metaphors of separate spheres, not to justify women's restriction to the realm of 'feeling' and domesticity, but to argue that the sympathy and sense of responsibility for others traditionally associated with 'maternity,' and the passion and intuitive vision associated with 'female irrationality' should be brought to bear in the 'masculine' spheres of action and judgement. (250)

Uglow underlines Eliot's perception and reflection of female roles and male roles. Eliot criticises the traditional feminine and masculine spheres and the restrictions of gender roles in her works. Uglow further proposes that

> While women will be better able to achieve their full potential if they are given access to good education and to professional work, so men will grow if they are free to nurture and care - like Silas . . . If this could be achieved, society might replace a repressive, rule-bound ethic with one that is flexible, imaginative, and able to cater for humanity in its infinite variety. (250)

For Eliot, if the restrictions of gender roles could be annihilated, an imaginative and flexible society would evolve for humanity. In other words, Eliot rejects essentialism and biologism by criticising the traditional gender roles.

Regarding the feminist literary theory, Kristeva also refuses both essentialism and biologism. Kristeva summarizes the feminist struggle as three phases. In the first phase, women want equal entrance into the symbolic order as liberal feminism. In the second phase, women reject the symbolic order of the male as radical feminism and femininity is praised enthusiastically. In the third phase, which Kristeva includes herself, women refuse the distinction between masculine and feminine as metaphysical (Moi 12). In other words, Kristeva does not support the differences between men and women as opposed to liberal feminism and radical feminism. At this point, Kristeva and Eliot share similar attitudes and views about the woman question and traditional gender roles.

Kristeva wrote her important article "Le Temps des Femmes" that was translated into English as "Women's Time" in 1981. In this article, Kristeva explains her opinions about the question of feminism, femininity, and the symbolic order. Regarding Kristeva's "Women's Time," in *Julia Kristeva*, Noelle McAfee explains that Kristeva locates first generation prior to 1968 and it is called equal rights and equal treatment. There should be equal treatment to both men and women as there are not any important differences between the sexes. The first generation does not want to reverse the system; it wants to participate in it. Besides, Kristeva borrows James Joyce's phrase, "father's time, mother's species," to indicate two distinct domains that humans have experienced. "Father's time" associates with the linear time that men have traditionally occupied in terms of progress, history, and destiny. "Mother's species" refers to the space that produces the human kinds, in which time is repetitive in a circle and the species are

eternal (93-4). In other words, women are entrapped within the limited place and the cyclical time by being excluded from the public sphere and linear time. According to Kristeva's periodization, Eliot's novels can be placed within the notion of "father's time, mother's species."

Hence, this study attempts to evaluate Eliot's early novels, *The Mill on the Floss* and *Silas Marner*, in the light of the Kristevan theories and terms to indicate the construction of gender and identity with respect to the structures and conventions of Victorian society. It comprises of two chapters. Chapter I sets up the theoretical framework of the study regarding the feminist literary criticism and the theories and terms of Julia Kristeva. This chapter is divided into three parts as early feminist criticism, modern feminist criticism and the theories and terms of Julia Kristeva. The first part will examine the early feminist criticism via two leading figures as Virginia Woolf and Simone de Beauvoir. In the second part, the modern feminism will be explored as American, British and French feminism in terms of their basis, purposes and methods. In the third part, Julia Kristeva's theory of language that refers to the semiotic and the symbolic, the theory of abjection, women's time, melancholia, revolt and strangeness will be examined through her writings.

Chapter II overviews the historical background of Victorian period and attempts to evaluate Eliot's works and circumstances as a female novelist in the Victorian period. In addition, in this chapter, Eliot's early novels, *The Mill on the Floss* and *Silas Marner*, will be investigated in the light of Kristevan theories and terms. In the second part of the chapter, *The Mill on the Floss* will be discussed in view of Kristeva since this novel reflects the protagonist Maggie's familial relations, gender dilemmas, ambivalence of identity, and social pressure in terms of the circumstances and conventions of the conservative Victorian society. Eliot criticises the traditional gender roles and the social construction and the position of the sexes. Therefore, *The Mill on the Floss* will be examined with regard to the theory of language that includes the semiotic and the symbolic, the theory of subjectivity, women's time, melancholia and revolt. In the third part of the chapter, *Silas Marner* will be examined in view of Kristeva. *Silas Marner* reveals the protagonist Silas's dilemma of religion, ambivalence of identity and social pressure concerning the circumstances and conventions of Victorian patriarchal society.

Eliot criticises traditional gender roles and social construction and position of two sexes. As *Silas Marner* reflects the contradictions and oppositions between the social positioning of the character and the needs of the character to show his imaginations, feelings and drives, *Silas Marner* will be examined within the frame of the notion of strangeness, the theory of language as the semiotic and the symbolic, the theory of subjectivity and women's time in the light of Kristeva's work. Both novels will be investigated with respect to Kristevan criticism by underlining Eliot's depictions and attitudes to her protagonists.

CHAPTER I

FEMINIST LITERARY CRITICISM AND KRISTEVAN THEORIES & TERMS

Concerning the historical development of feminism, gender discrimination towards women have long been rooted in Western culture from the Ancient Greeks as it was thought that women were submissive to men in terms of physicality, intellectuality and professionality. In the fourteenth century, Christine de Pisan challenges gender discrimination with her *Epistre au Dieu D'amours* (1399) by criticising Jean de Meun's representation of woman in his *Roman de La Rose*. In her *La Cite des Dames* (1405), Pisan asserts men and women were created as equal beings by God (Bressler 171). This means that the starting point of feminist movement was not the "women's movement" in the 1960s. It was the regeneration of old thought and tradition which was embedded in classics portraying the unequal treatment to women owing to gender discrimination. These classic books are Mary Wollstonecraft's *A Vindication of the Rights of Women* (1792) discussing male authors such as Milton, Pope and Rousseau; Virginia Woolf's *A Room of One's Own* (1929) describing the unjust treatment to women in terms of marriage and maternity; and Simone de Beauvoir's *The Second Sex* (1949) examining the description of women in D.H. Lawrence's novels. Male authors such as John Stuart Mill's *The Subjection of Woman* (1869) and Friedrich Engels' *The Origin of the Family* (1884) contributed to this feminist writing tradition (Barry 121). Within this frame, feminist movement examines power relations between men and women socially, culturally, politically, economically and psychologically in terms of the power of masculinity and the lack of power of femininity. Feminist literary criticism deals with

women's roles, women's rights and gender constructions in order to eliminate the oppression and repression of women through literature.

Feminist literary theory that starts with Mary Wollstonecraft's *A Vindication of the Rights of Women* (1972) is also classified as first wave, second wave and third wave feminism. The first wave is interested in the matter of suffrage. The second wave of feminism, reaching its top in the 1960, dwells on human rights, particularly being equal socially and economically. Lastly, the third wave feminism, arising in the late 1970s, examines a wide and different range of issues such as gender, sexuality and subjectivity regarding Freudian, Lacanian and Derridean point of view (Castle 94-99). However, in this study, feminist literary theory will be investigated in two periods of time as early feminist criticism and modern feminist criticism through several significant philosophers, intellectuals, and literary critics.

1.1. Early Feminist Criticism

Feminism has many anterior events and practices that date back to Ancient Greek in Aristophanes' play *Lysistrata*, which described women as acquiring treasury in the Acropolis and using sexuality as a weapon in order to end the Peloponnesian War. Feminism also arose in Chaucer's "Wife of Bath" that appraises "experience" over authority. In the Middle Ages, Christine de Pisan was courageous to discuss about gender issues with the important male critics of her time. In the seventeenth century, the poets like Aphra Behn and Anne Bradstreet were precursors that entered into the literary profession. After the French Revolution, Mary Wollstonecraft maintained that the Revolution and Enlightenment's ideals ought to be expanded into women, particularly through gaining access to education. During the nineteenth century, a number of primary female figures appeared such as Madame de Stael, the Brontes, Jane Austen, George Eliot, Elizabeth Barrett Browning, Margaret Fuller and Emily Dickinson. Modernist female authors were Hilda Doolittle, Gertrude Stein, Katherine Mansfield and Virginia Woolf (Habib 42-43). In other words, feminism has come into existence from ancient Greek to the present, and there have been significant female pioneers in the profession of literature through history. Early feminist criticism will be re-evaluated via two important figures as Virginia Woolf and Simone de Beauvoir.

The British scholar and teacher Virginia Woolf (1882-1941) improved and expanded Mary Wollstonecraft's ideas, related to the foundation of present-day feminist criticism in her seminal work, *A Room of One's Own* (1929). Woolf notified that men treated women as inferiors. Men defined women through masculine criteria and identified themselves the controller of the political social, economic and literary structures. Concurring with Samuel T. Coleridge that great minds own both male and female characteristics, Woolf hypothesizes that Shakespeare has a sister that is as gifted an author as Shakespeare. However, her gender prevents her from possessing "a room of her own". Since she is a woman, she cannot be educated or employed profitably. Being economically incapable of affording her own room, her inborn artistic skills will never develop. The ability to have her own room economically symbolizes the

loneliness and self-determination to separate herself from the world and its social restrictions by aiming at thinking and writing. Being unaware of her personal artistic talents, Shakespeare's sister dies lonely in Woolf's text. She is buried in an unmarked grave for being a female (Bressler 172). Woolf states, whether a woman had had a genius potential, she "would certainly have gone crazed, shot herself, or ended her days in some lonely cottage" (A *Room* 49). Shakespeare's sister, Judith, kills herself owing to her tenderness and disappointment that root in her father's rage and men's abuse in the theatre (Habib 48). According to Woolf, the reason of this situation is the society's thought that insults women intellectually. Woolf declares that women must challenge the social construction of femaleness and establish their own identity. For this reason, they must reject false cultural notions of their gender identity and improve a female discourse. Nevertheless, the disasters such as the Great Depression in the 1930s and World War II in the 1940s replaced the focus of humans' attention and resulted in the delay of the improvement of these feminist ideals (Bressler 172). In other words, Woolf exemplifies social restrictions and unequal treatment to women with Shakespeare's genius sister that dies alone although she is also as talented as Shakespeare.

The French intellectual and philosopher Simone de Beauvoir explained that she never suffered from her sex. Through academic success, she persistently refused traditional female roles and domesticity. Her relationship with Jean-Paul Sartre was significant for her life. With a suggestion from Sartre, she decided to understand what it meant to be a woman. The result was her prominent work, *The Second Sex* (1949). De Beauvoir expressed various obstacles for women's freedom that are psychological, philosophical, historical, anthropological and economic. She maintains the real obstacle is the process in which femininity is produced in society (Bryson 150-151). De Beauvoir's famous sentence in *The Second Sex* "One is not born but rather becomes a woman" (297) supports how women are manufactured in society.

Simone de Beauvoir reveals the relationship between male and female in *The Second Sex*: "she is defined and differentiated with reference to man and not he with reference to her; she is the incidental, the inessential as opposed to the essential. He is the subject, he is the Absolute - she is the Other" (16). Influenced by existentialism that stresses responsibility and freedom for each person, De Beauvoir investigates femininity

by beginning with German philosopher Hegel's proposition that "each conscious being enters into a struggle for recognition with every other conscious being and each concludes that he or she is the essential subjects (the 'self'), whilst all others are the inessential objects (the 'other')". De Beauvoir declares the man is invariable "the subject-self", the "I"; however, the woman is routinely the object, the other. This kind of belief pervades through the Western philosophical world (Tolan 321). In other words, the relationship between male and female resembles the relation between the centre and the margin. While males are at the centre as subjects, females are on the margin as objects (the other).

De Beauvoir's conclusion in *The Second Sex* is that the situation of woman must be transformed economically, socially, culturally, morally and psychologically. Not only man but also woman will finally come into being as self and the other by reciprocally identifying one another as subject, and each one will become an "other" in view of the other. In this mutual identification, there is no room for the slavery, submission, or inferiority of women (Habib 53-54). In other words, when the centre/margin relationship between males and females is distorted, there becomes mutual identification as an "other" in view of the other. In this way, the inferiority of women and the superiority of men will be annihilated.

1.2. Modern Feminist Criticism

Modern feminism can be categorized geographically as American, British and French. These geographical divisions do not serve as various theoretical or practical limitations. However, they have made primary historical markers in the development of feminism. Elaine Showalter states American feminism was essentially textual, emphasizing repression; British feminism was essentially Marxist, emphasizing oppression; and French feminism was essentially psychoanalytic, emphasizing repression like American feminism. Nevertheless, the goal of all these groups was the same: in order to rescue women from being considered as "the other" (Bressler 177). The aim of this division is not to constitute geographical strains among modern feminist movements but to constitute feminist schools in terms of their basis, purposes and methods.

Feminist Criticism in America was deeply influenced from the Civil Rights Movement of the 1960s, and it was different from its counterparts in Britain and France. Betty Friedan's *The Feminine Mystique* (1963) described American women's entrapment in domestic life and the exclusion of women from public careers. Other primary feminist works of this time are Mary Ellman's *Thinking about Women* (1968), Kate Millett's *Sexual Politics* (1969) Germaine Greer's *The Female Eunuch* (1970), and Shulamith Frestone's *The Dialectic of Sex* (1970). These texts make use of gender instead of class as the principal category of historical scrutiny. Other feminist texts that analyse substitute and ignored attitudes of female writing have contained Patricia Meyer Spacks' *The Female Imagination* (1975), Ellen Moers' *Literary Women* (1976), and Sandra Gilbert and Susan Gubar's *The Madwoman in the Attic* (1979) and Elaine Showalter's *A Literature of their Own* (1977). Showalter identifies three phases of women's writing. First is a "feminine" phase (1840-1880), in which male authors were imitated by woman authors. Second is a "feminist" phase (1880-1920), in which male models and values are challenged by women authors. Last is the "female" phase (from 1920), in which women defend their own point of view. American feminists such as Showalter, Lillian, Robinson, Kolodny and Marcus have been interested in the requirement for a female language and feminist theory, the relation of female authors to

male theories, and the relationship between feminism and post-structuralism (Habib 128-129). In other words, modern feminist criticism in America stresses the repression of women within domesticity, and the exclusion of women from professional domains such as writing.

Instead of stressing repression, British feminism emphasizes oppression. In British feminism, art, literature and life cannot be divided in the light of Marxist theory. Some British feminists consider that reading, writing and publishing are a kind of material reality or being part of real life. That a woman is described in literature influences on treating women in real life. These critics assert that the traditional Western family structure exploits women through literature as well as economic and social exploitation. Thus, these critics aim not simply to criticise the society but to change the economic and social status of women in this society (Bressler 178). British feminists realize the relationship among art, literature and real life owing to the influence of Marxist theory, so their purpose is to alter the women's social status in the society in order to prevent the exploitation of women by traditional Western families.

Twentieth- century British feminist criticism may be said to start with Virginia Woolf. Her significant work "Women: The Longest Revolution" was broadened and produced as *Women's Estate* (1971) by Juliet Mitchell analysing patriarchy with respect to Marxist categories of production and personal estate along with psychoanalytic theories of gender. Later, she carries on attempting to integrate Marxism and psychoanalysis. Other significant critics are Jacqueline Rose and Rosalind Coward, who have merged particular insights of Jacques Lacan with a materialist feminism. In addition, Catherine Belsey has also dwelled on Lacan in order to evaluate Renaissance drama through a materialist feminist point of view. Toril Moi has improved insights from Woolf, humanism and implicit essentialism of some American feminists. Besides, Judith Newton and Deborah Rosenfelt have struggled with male stereotypes and retrieve female traditions. Lastly, some critics such or Cora Kaplan, Mary Jacobus and Penny Boumelha have constituted the UK Marxist feminist collective in order to constitute a materialist aesthetics, and they have dwelled on unifying Marxist class analysis with feminism in examining and affecting gender representation (Habib 129-130). The British feminism that starts with Virginia Woolf is expanded by other feminist literary

critics with the integration of Marxism and psychoanalysis in order to analyse and influence the representation of gender.

French Feminism foregrounds social and political activism in order to supply equal occasion and equal justice for women. Even though French feminism has been progressively noticeable in Anglo-American feminism, French feminists have focussed more powerfully on the philosophical aspect of women's matters than British and American feminists The focus of French feminism has had two distinct forms as materialist feminism and psychoanalytic feminism. Materialist feminism concerns with the economic and social oppression of women whereas psychoanalytic feminism focuses on the psychological experiences of women. French materialist feminism analyses the conditions and constitutions of patriarchy which oppresses women within the frame of rules and traditions that manipulate marriage and maternity. Simone de Beauvoir didn't name herself as a materialist feminist, but her work *The Second Sex* (1949) constituted a theoretical ground for materialist feminism for upcoming decades (Tyson 96). All in all, instead of concerning psychological circumstances of women, French materialist feminism opposes cruel unjust treatment to women economically and socially.

One of the thinkers affected by Beauvoir, Christine Delphy puts forward to a feminist critique of patriarchy concerning Marxist principles. Coining the phrase materialist feminism in the 1970s, Delphy analyses the family as economic unit. She declares that women are the subordinates in families like the oppressed lower classes abused by the upper classes in society regardless of their socio-economic class and conditions. According to Delphy, marriage is a kind of labour connection that restricts women to unpaid household work that is underestimated as "housework." The reason of this situation is not housework is trivial or it needs less time or effort, but the reason is that women are defined as non-workers by patriarchy; thus, non-workers ought not to be paid (Tyson 97-98). In other words, women do household works, and they may work longer hours than men in domestic sphere. However, they are unpaid workers owing to their gender roles defined by patriarchy.

As opposed to materialist feminism, French feminist psychoanalytic theory is concerned with patriarchy's effect on women's psychological experience and ingenuity.

It dwells not on group experience but on the individual psyche because women oppression is not restricted to economic, political, and social dimensions; it also refers to the psychological repression. For this reason, many French psychological feminists consider that the possibilities of women's psychological liberation must be examined in terms of the ground of their psychological subjugation. The ground refers to language as it is within language that includes destructive patriarchal notions of sexual differences that are believed as essential or inborn differences between men and women (Tyson 99-100). In other words, French feminist psychoanalytic theory concerns the experience and oppression of the individual with the influence of devastating aspects of sexual differences in language. Thus, French feminist psychoanalytic critics such as Helene Cixous, Luce Irigaray, and Julia Kristeva value language and the relations between language and patriarchy.

French intellectuals like Roland Barthes, Jacques Derrida, Jaques Lacan, and Julia Kristeva re-evaluated some basic classes and assumptions of Western thought, particularly in the structure of language. These intellectuals defied conventional views of language; they examined Saussure's discrepancy and distance between signifier and signified, and they developed the notions of writing or écriture which emphasize the connectional, sensory, physical, and traditional-historical aspects of language. The radical structure and influence of Helene Cixous' work is based on the social and political turbulence of the 1960s. Cixous contributed to this radical project by promoting "écriture feminine" or feminine writing, as in her strong work "Le Rire de la Méduse" (1975) ("The Laugh of Medusa") (Habib 132). In this article, Cixous proposes laugher, sex and writing might have liberating impacts. As she is conscious of the consolidating effects of patriarchal power, Cixous suggests "écriture feminine" (a feminine or female writing) that escapes the restraints of phallocentric system (Berten 130). Cixous' recurring point through "The Laugh of Medusa" is to encourage women to create a female language; she states: "Women must write herself . . . Women must put herself into the text - as into the world and into history - by her own movement" (279). Cixous underlines the importance and the indirect indications of female writing in terms of text, world and history (Habib 134). These radical assumptions and

evaluations about the structure of Western thinking, especially the structure of language, root in the basic distinction of male/female in patriarchal society.

With respect to the structure of Western thinking, Cixous maintains that language elicits polar opposites which she calls "patriarchal binary thought." This can be described as seeing the world concerning binary opposites, and one of them is superior to the other. These hierarchical binary oppositions include head and heart, father and mother, culture and nature, intelligible and palpable or mind and body, sun and moon and activity and passivity. For each opposition, Cixous asks in "Sorties:" "Where is the woman?" For patriarchal thinking, the woman is associated with inferior terms on the right side of the oppositions while the man is associated with the superior terms on the left side (Tyson 100). These binary oppositions are intertwined in the patriarchal system and each opposition can be examined as hierarchy where the "feminine" side is always considered as negative and powerless.

According to Cixous, Western philosophy and literary thought have always been caught up in these limitless hierarchical binaries that always return to the principal "couple" of male and female. Cixous claims that one of the terms must destroy the other in order to acquire meaning. Finally, victory is paired with activity and defeat is equated with passivity. Under patriarchy, the victory always belongs to the male. The equation of femininity with passivity shows that there is no positive space for women. However, Cixous suggests plural heterogeneous difference as opposed to hierarchical binary thinking (Moi 104). In other words, the dual structure of binary oppositions places one in the centre and the other on the margin. The one at the centre is superior to the other which is on the margin. As opposed to this hierarchical distinction, Cixous proposes plural heterogeneous difference. These binary structures are not only utilized by Cixous but also utilized by Luce Irigaray.

Luce Irigaray, as another French feminist, uses these binary oppositions in her article, "This Sex Which is Not One" (1977), a powerfully loaded pun. That means the woman is not the self (one or I) in masculine language. However, by maintaining that the female is not a unified position, Irigaray undermines the binary structure of positive/negative in masculine language. She thinks that the female is not one but many. The multiplicity of femininity challenges the masculine enforcement in order to create

rigid limits between self and the other for a stable, unified self like the plural perspectives in écriture feminine that distort the sole unified voice and the unique truth of the one God/father/writer. The distinction between femininity and masculinity is explained as the difference between the unified phallus and the "two lips which embrace continually" by Irigaray. Femininity is not just the opposite of masculinity as the primary idea of binary opposites stems from masculine logic and desire to separate, to classify and to create hierarchies, and instead of this, femininity is completely a different way of thinking (Tolan 336). In "This Sex Which is Not One," Irigaray states: "A woman "touches herself" constantly without any one being able to forbid her to do so, for her sex is composed of two lips which embrace continually. Thus, within herself she is already two- but not divisible into ones- who stimulate each other" (24). In other words, Irigaray associates the multiplicity of women language with the different parts of their sexual organs as opposed to the unified structure of the men's sexual organs.

According to Irigaray, women get only two options. The first is to keep quiet and the second is to imitate her representation in patriarchy that wants to see her in the inferior position in terms of sexual differences. For Irigaray, patriarchal power is clear due to "the male gaze" that means the woman is looked at and the man looks. Then, it is the one who looks, controls, gets the power to name the things, describes the world, and governs the world. And the one who is looked at is just an object to be seen. Therefore, in patriarchy, women are only tokens and properties that function to perform men's relations to other men. Irigaray names her concept of woman's language as "womanspeak" that is based on the female body, particularly the contradiction between male and female sexual pleasure. According to Irigaray, female sexual pleasure is more varied, more multiple, and more complicated. For this reason, womanspeak is more varied, multiple and complicated than masculine language (Tyson 101-2). In other words, in male world, women are bridges between men in order to interact with each other. Irigaray connects language with sexual pleasure, and she maintains that female sexual pleasure is more diverse and complex than male sexual pleasure, so feminine language is more diverse and complex than masculine language. All in all, Irigaray approaches language, patriarchal power and femininity via a different perspective in terms of feminist thought.

Another French feminist Julia Kristeva has become one of the fundamental figures of French intellectuality from the late twentieth to early twenty-first century as a linguist, literary critic, and psychoanalyst. Kristeva primarily contributes to the contemporary theory by associating bodily drives and affects with language. Kristeva has been interested in the relation between subjectivity and language like other structuralism and post-structuralism theorists such as Jacques Lacan, Roland Barthes and Jacques Derrida. Kristeva has stressed the priority of preverbal, instinctive, and sensorial elements of signification and subjectivity (Leitch 2165). In other words, Kristeva makes use of various domains in order to contribute to the contemporary theory, and she integrates linguistics, psychoanalysis, and post-structuralism with the influence of other important figures in these disciplines.

Within the frame of the feminist literary theory, Julia Kristeva rejects essentialism and biologism. Kristeva summarizes the feminist struggle as three phases. First, women want to equal entrance into the symbolic order as liberal feminism. Second, women refuse the symbolic order of the male as radical feminism and femininity is praised enthusiastically. Last, including Kristeva's point of view, women refuse the distinction between masculine and feminine as metaphysical (Moi 12). In other words, Kristeva does not support liberal feminism that demands equality and radical feminism that extols femininity.

As opposed to Helene Cixous and Luce Irigaray, Julia Kristeva does not assert "écriture feminine" or "womanspeak" since she considers that a theory which "essentializes" women is not accurately representative for their infinite variety; thus, women become susceptible to the patriarchy's "essentialization". In fact, Kristeva does not believe in defining femininity as she defines femininity as unique for each woman. However, for Kristeva, femininity is "marginalized, oppressed" like proletariat. (Tyson 102-103). In other words, Kristeva does not accept the notions of "écriture feminine" and "womanspeak" because she considers that these notions essentialize women, and she is opposed to the essentialization of women. Instead of "womanspeak" or "écriture feminine", Kristeva affirms two different dimensions of language as the semiotic and the symbolic.

1.3. Kristevan Theories and Terms

1.3.1. The Theory of Language

Julia Kristeva first introduced the theory of language that contains the notions of the semiotic and the symbolic in her doctorate dissertation, *Revolution in Poetic Language,* in 1984. Kristeva's understanding of language is based on the speaking subject as a heterogeneous self unlike a unitary being. According to Kristeva, "the speaking subject *makes* and *unmakes* himself" via language (*Revolution* 272). As a result, the theory of language cannot be separated from the theory of subjectivity as they are mingled together regarding their concepts and functions. When Kristeva compares her understanding of language to other theories accepted; she states: "Our philosophies of language, embodiments of the Idea, are nothing more than the thoughts of archivists, archaeologists, and necrophiliacs" (*Revolution* 13). Besides, she explains the archivistic, archaeological, and necrophilic methods "show that the capitalist mode of production has statisfied language into idiolects and divided it into self-contained, isolated islands" (*Revolution* 13). In other words, language is treated as a formal object and the dynamic and mutual relation between language and the speaking subject is abnegated by "denying what is repressed in the social mechanism: the generating of significance" (*Revolution* 13). The dynamism of language shows that language is not a static but an active existence owing to the aspect of the generating of the significance.

In Kristeva's theory, the term "poetic language" is not well-defined by herself. This terms is defined by Léon Roudiez, in the "Introduction" part of *Revolution in Poetic Language,* as "stands for the infinite possibilities of all language, and all other language acts are merely partial realizations of the possibilities inherent in poetic language"(2). Kristeva's use of "poetic language" is not the same as the concept and the function of the word "poetic." According to Kristeva, the poetic is a characteristic of the whole language; it is not merely related to a part of language that is rhythmic literary works described as poetry. Instead of this, Joyce and Sollers' novels, Lautréamont's prose instances, and the sign systems of music are qualified as poetic language (Becker-

Leckrone 161). Then, all kinds of entities that are related to language are also included in poetic language by Kristeva even though they are not in the scope of traditional poetry.

Julia Kristeva borrows and changes several concepts from Freud, Lacan, anthropology, philosophy, linguistics, and phenomenology improving a new science, which is "semanalysis" that refers to the dynamic aspect of language rather than a static entity. Kristeva uses some concerns of Freud by intentionally ignoring his patriarchal culture and understanding. "The semiotique" is described by Kristeva as an emotional force that is bound with the instincts of people. Lacan asserts that the semiotique comes into being in language prosody on its own, not in symbols. This signification process is a continuous procedure that utilizes diverse notions from Freud, Lacan, and linguistics. Kristeva carries on exploring the junction of language, culture, and the written word in terms of psychoanalysis in her recent writings (Bressler 159-60). In other words, Kristeva continues to explore the relationships among psychology, language, and culture concerning the human psyche, linguistics, and society.

Signifying process is actually not a well-defined term by Kristeva; however, it is a significant concept regarding the theory of language. Linguistic changes demonstrate the changes in the "status of the subject" in terms of his/her relation to the body, to others, and to objects. Besides, it displays that "normalized language" is merely a way of expressing the signifying process that covers "the body, the material referent, and language itself" (*Revolution* 15-16). As Kristeva explains, there is a close relation between language and the speaking subject via the signifying process. The signifying process makes the unified self the speaking subject by changing the subject's status. Kelly Oliver explains Kristeva's signifying process in the "Introduction" of *The Portable Kristeva* (1997):

> Instead of lamenting what is lost, absent, or impossible in language, Kristeva marvels at this other realm [bodily experience] that makes its way into language. The force of language is [a] living driving force transferred into language. Signification is like a transfusion of the living body into language. (xx)

For Kristeva, signifying process is a kind of tool in order to convey the energy and impulses that are tied to body as well as the subject's status and language.

Kristeva coins the term "signifiance" from the word significance. It is used to describe "the heterogeneous signifying practices that attest to a "crisis" in representation and in the structure of the human subject." Signifiance is not just a synonymous word for significance (Becker-Leckrone 163). Kristeva describes signifiance,

> What we call *signifiance,* then, is precisely this unlimited and unbounded generating process, this unceasing operation of the drives toward, in, and through language; toward, in, and through the exchange system and its protagonists- the subject and his institutions. This heterogeneous process, neither anarchic, fragmented foundation nor schizophrenic blockage, is a structuring and de-structuring *practice,* a passage to the outer *boundaries* of the subject and society. Then- and only then- can it be jouissance and revolution. (*Revolution* 17)

In Kristeva's theory, signifying process and signifiance reveal the generating process of language within the frame of the relationship between language and the speaking subject, and it results in a transition to the subject and society's external borders as well as the formation of jouissance and revolution.

Kristeva explains the signifying process via two modalities as the semiotic and the symbolic. The semiotic that means semiotics- the study of signs- is the way in which physical energy and impulses come into language. The semiotic contains not only the drives but also utterances of the subject. The semiotic might be conveyed orally, it is not liable to syntax's systematic rules (*Revolution* 27). On the contrary, the symbolic is the mode of signifying process that is bound up with language made up of a sign system, systematic syntactic rules and grammar (*Revolution* 29-30). It is a modality of signifying process in which speaking beings achieve to convey meaning with little ambiguity. The scientists and logicians' explanations are the instances of symbolic language while the expressions included in poetry, music and dance are the instances of the semiotic. The symbolic might be considered as the conscious practice in which a person attempts to convey the meaning by using an established sign system such as

written, spoken or gestured sign language; whereas the semiotic might be seen as the unconscious mode of conveying the meaning. However, these two modalities are not entirely unconnected. A position can be stated by being used the symbolic mode of the signifying process; however, this position can be bothered or weakened by the semiotic mode of the signifying process such as articulations and drives (McAfee 17). Even before the subject starts to utilize language concerning its morphology, syntax, grammar, it makes use of various sounds and gestures. Kristeva explains the semiotic: "We understand the term 'semiotic' in its Greek sense: σημεν=distinctive mark, trace, index, precursory sign, proof, engraved or written sign, imprint, trace, figuration" (*Revolution* 25). Regarding the semiotic aspect of signifying process, she further explains,

> Discrete quantities of energy move through the body of the subject who is not yet constituted as such and, in the course of his development, they are arranged according to the various constraints imposed on this body – always already involved in a semiotic process – by family and social structures. In this way the drives, which are "energy" charges as well as "psychical" marks, articulate what we call a *chora*: a nonexpressive totality formed by the drives and their stases in a motility that is as full of movement as it is regulated. (*Revolution* 25)

The semiotic is associated with bodily drives and energy by Kristeva, and these drives and energy are constraint by social structures. Kristeva correlates the semiotic with "the chora."

Kristeva borrows the chora from Plato and, in *Desire in Language,* she states: "Plato's *Timeus* speaks of a *chora,* receptacle, unnamable, improbable, hybrid, anterior to naming, to the One, to the father, and consequently, maternally connoted to such an extent that it merits 'not even the rank of syllable'"(133). In related with the semiotic, the chora is a mode of significance in which the linguistic sign is not articulated yet as the absence of an object and the distinction between the real and the symbolic. Kristeva stresses the organized notion of the chora. The vocal and gestural constitution of the chora depends on an objective *ordering* that is prescribed by the restrictions related to

natural or socio-historical reasons like the biological difference between the family structure and the sexes. Thus, it can be considered that social constitution is consistently symbolic, it may be posited that social organization is always symbolic, and it imprints its restriction with a mediator that regulates the chora via an ordering not a law- a term reserved for the symbolic (*Revolution* 26-7). Initially, in the semiotic *chora*, the child conveys its feelings by cooing and babbling via sounds and gestures for energy discharging. It does not recognize the utterances and their meanings, and it does not separate itself from diverse things surrounding. However, as it starts to be aware of its difference from the things surrounding, everything alters. At this point, the child starts to grasp that language can be used to signify things and incidents. Meanwhile, the child becomes conscious of the distinction between the self (subject) and the "other" (object). It perceives that language can signify the things surrounding and language is possibly "referential." This phenomenon is called as "the thetic break" by Kristeva (McAfee 20-21). In other words, without being aware of the difference between the subject and the object, the child discharges its energy by babbling and cooing to express itself in terms of the semiotic chora. Following the semiotic chora, there is a phase that is called as thetic break reflecting the distinction between the self and the other regarding the signifying process.

Kristeva borrows the notion of the "thetic phase" from Edmund Husserl, the theorist that endeavours to define the establishing construction of consciousness in terms of the theory of phenomenology. Within this frame, Husserl assumes the existence of the world as a fact by suspecting everything. Thetic refers to the state of being active of the act with its opening, placing, and constituting aspects. However, Kristeva develops this term concerning the psychoanalytic theory. She underlines that the thetic phase refers to the dynamic structure of subjectivity and signification (Becker-Leckrone 166). In *Revolution in Poetic Language,* Kristeva states,

> We shall call this break, which produces the positing of signification, a *thetic* phase. All enunciation, whether of a word or of a sentence, is thetic. It requires an identification; in other words, the subject must separate from and through his image, from and through his objects. This image and objects

> must first be posited in a space that becomes symbolic because it connects the two separated positions, recording them or redistributing them in an open combinatorial system. (43)

Kristeva develops the thetic phase making use of the work of the psychoanalysts Freud and Lacan as the thetic phase is significant not only for the signifying process but also for the development of a child's subjectivity:

> In our view, the Freudian theory of the unconscious and its Lacanian development show, precisely, that thetic signification is a stage attained under certain precise conditions during the signifying process, and that it constitutes the subject without being reduced to process precisely because it is the threshold of language. Such a standpoint constitutes neither a reduction of the subject to the transcendental ego, nor a denial [*denegation*] of the thetic phase that establishes signification. (*Revolution* 44-45)

At this point, Freud's "oedipal stage" and Lacan's "mirror stage" should be remembered since both result in a kind of awareness for the child. In oedipal stage, the child notices its mother does not have a penis, so it might lack its penis, too. This incident is associated with the fear of castration, and the oedipal stage increases the fear of castration naturally in the male child; thus, its adherence to its mother moves to its father. Lacan's mirror stage includes the loss of the perfect unity or perfect oneness between the mother and the child with its recognition of its appearance in the mirror (McAfee 21-22). Being aware of the realization of its appearance in the mirror, the child separates itself from the other its surrounding. Within this frame, Kristeva explains,

> We view the thetic phase- the positing of the *imago,* castration, and the positing of semiotic motility- as the place of the Other, as the precondition for signification, i.e., the precondition for the positing of language. The thetic phase marks a threshold between two heterogeneous realms: the semiotic and the symbolic. (*Revolution* 48)

As it is understood from the quotation above, the child is expected to enter into the symbolic from the semiotic chora by using language that includes the rules and structures as a sign system via the thetic phase. In other words, the thetic phase is the prerequisite for the constituting and situating of language.

In *The Seminar Book III, The Psychoses,* Lacan states: "the unconscious is structured like a language" (167). Language forms and eventually shapes and ultimately constructs the "conscious and unconscious minds" and forms the self-identity (Bressler 153). Lacan gives great importance his project, the "return to Freud." He accepts the significance of structure and language in the unconscious. Lacan generally compiles his works on Freudian theory with his articles, collected in *Écrits* (1966). In *Écrits*, Lacan assumes a structural language theory which influences the ego's relations with the world, which structures the ego as subjectivity. Lacan describes the forming of the subject as a process, and in this process the subject becomes formed by his/her act of rising to "the symbolic order of language, law, and representation." In the Symbolic, demand is removed by desire and "lack" is initiated as the basis of subjectivity. Besides, Lacan postulates an "imaginary order," which is qualified by "narcissistic desire and fantasy," and a "real order" where basic needs require and get to be fulfilled. The Real is an entirely outer to the Symbolic and Imaginary orders, which is the foundation of human experience that cannot be representable (Castle 236-237). Concerning the concept of Lacan's human psyche model that is related to the structural theory of language, it may be possible to find a correlation not only between Lacan's imaginary and Kristeva's semiotic but also Lacan's symbolic and Kristeva's symbolic. Within this frame, Kristeva makes use of Lacan's imaginary and symbolic order for her theory of language not the real order as the real order cannot be representable for the subject's experience.

Kristeva associates not only the semiotic but also the symbolic components with Lacan's Symbolic order. She maintains that Lacan decreases the Symbolic order to its symbolic components; he explains the Symbolic order with regard to the symbolic function. However, Kristeva postulates entering signification is not only to enter the domain of the symbolic element but also to enter the Symbolic order that is formed

heterogeneously. Entering the Symbolic order is to get a location that is solely probable by means of the symbolic function. Nevertheless, not the whole signification contains getting a position, or the conception of signification is more than getting a position. Kristeva defines the Symbolic a more sophisticated way than Lacan. Kristeva suggests that the symbolic function, the ability to get a position or to judge is just one characteristic of signification. However, she affirms that Lacan's signification has the same meaning and concept with the symbolic function (Oliver 39). It is obvious that all signification process cannot be related with merely the symbolic function for Kristeva unlike Lacan's attitudes. In other words, Kristeva describes the symbolic order as both the symbolic and the semiotic aspects of language as opposed to Lacan.

With regard to the comprehension of the difference between the semiotic and the symbolic, the reader can consider more common dichotomies: "nature and culture," "body and mind," "the unconscious and consciousness" and "feeling and reason." These dichotomies are generally described as extreme opposites through the history of Western thinking. One becomes either a brutal barbarian or a cultured human; one is taking action either with lust or with mind; one is acting out either by emotion or by reason. Kristeva's assertion about the distinction between these polarities is different from other preceding perspectives because she asserts that the first poles that are the semiotic, nature, body (lust as a bodily drive), and the unconscious consistently make themselves felt into the second poles that are the symbolic, culture, mind, and consciousness. In this way, Kristeva does not aim at holding the dual structure of Western thinking; she aims to show the intertwined structure of these dichotomies (McAfee 16-17). In other words, Kristeva does not intend to find the domination of one pole; on the contrary, she analyses how these poles intermingles within the frame of dualistic structure of thinking in the West.

Kristeva explains an offer to examine literary texts in *Revolution in Poetic Language*. She uses "genotext" and "phenotext" to express the aspects of literary texts. The distinction of the semiotic and the symbolic can also be utilized in literary criticism as genotext and phenotext. Kristeva connects the distinction between the genotext and the phenotext with the distinction between semiotic and symbolic:

> What we shall call a *genotext* will include semiotic processes but also the advent of the symbolic. The former includes drives, their disposition, and their division of the body, plus the ecological and social system surrounding the body, such as objects and pre-Oedipal relations with parents. The latter encompasses the emergence of object and subject, and the constitution of nuclei of meaning involving categories: semantic and categorial fields. (*Revolution* 86)

The genotext is associated with the semiotic while the phenotext is associated with the symbolic by Kristeva. It is the phenotext that covers the semantic and syntactic features of the text. With respect to the semiotic feature of the genotext, Kristeva further explains,

> Designating the genotext in a text requires pointing out the transfers of drive energy that can be detected in phonematic devices (such as the accumulation and repetition of phonemes or rhyme) and melodic devices (such as intonation or rhythm), in the way semantic and categorial fields are set out in syntactic and logical features, or in the economy of mimesis (fantasy, the deferment of denotation, narrative, etc.). (*Revolution* 86)

The semiotic characterization of the genotext refers to the tools that are related to phonemes and melody in the text. Kristeva further asserts,

> The genotext is thus the only transfer of drive energies that organizes a space in which the subject is not *yet* a split unity that will become blurred, giving rise to the symbolic. Instead, the space it organizes is one in which the subject will be *generated* as such by a process of facilitations and marks within the constraints of the biological and social structure. (*Revolution* 86)

The genotext reveals the semiotic energy and drives of the writer through the text, whereas the phenotext reflects the syntactic and semantic features within the frame of the symbolic; therefore, a text can be examined in terms of two dimensions as genotext and phenotext.

1.3.2. Theory of Subjectivity: Abjection

As a French feminist literary critic, Julia Kristeva presented "theory of abjection," in *Powers of Horror: An Essay on Abjection* in 1984. "Abjection," the state of being "neither subject nor object," is one of the primary processes of the subject in process. Within this frame, the relation between the subject and language that is constituted by the signifying process should be explained. In Kristeva's theory, the signifying process has two intersections: the semiotic and the symbolic. The semiotic is the "extra-verbal" way in which the energy and impulses related with the body bring into language. The semiotic contains the subject's drives and articulations. It can be expressed in the form of words, but it may not be formed in terms of the regular syntactic rules. On the contrary, the symbolic is a way of signifying based on language as a sign system made up of its grammatical structures and syntactic rules (McAfee 17). Regarding the semiotic and the symbolic, in *Revolution in Poetic Language*, Kristeva states that

> These two modalities are inseparable within the *signifying process* that constitutes language, and the dialectic between them determines the type of discourse (narrative, metalanguage, theory, poetry, etc.) involved; in other words, so-called "natural" language allows for different modes of articulation of the semiotic and the symbolic. (24)

These components are significant for the development of subjectivity in view of Kristeva. The semiotic, which is a type of language before language, is profoundly associated with the mother. Conversely, the symbolic is closely related to the father, actually the phallus (Becker-Leckrone 163). Thus, the symbolic and the semiotic are interdependent in the process of development of subjectivity and in language. The subject that does not refer to a unified self is the speaking being with two modes of language. Like language, the subject is not homogenous but heterogeneous. The speaking being is an unstable subject that refers to the state of subject in process.

Regarding language and the speaking subject, Kristeva explains her term "semanalysis," in *The Kristeva Reader* (1986). She states "semanalysis conceives of meaning not as a sign-system but as a signifying process" (28). Through semanalysis, language constituted by the signifying process is not a stable system owing to the effects of speaking subject. Instead of the rules or structures of a sign system, semanalysis seeks specifically meanings.

Freud and Lacan's psychological theories have profoundly influenced Kristeva's views on the theories of identity formation. For instance, Kristeva borrows Freud's view that "primary narcissism" is a structure in which the infant thinks that its mother's breast belongs to itself. As Kelly Oliver states in *Reading Kristeva* (1993),

> Kristeva compares the infant's incorporation of the breast to the subsequent incorporation of "the speech of the other." She explains that through incorporating the speech of the other the infant incorporates the pattern of language and thereby identifies with the other. In fact, it is the incorporation of the patterns of language through the speech of the other that enables the infant to communicate and thus commune with others. And through the ability to "assimilate, repeat, and reproduce" words, the infant becomes like the other: a subject. (72)

The child's possession of its mother's breast is compared to the child's upcoming integration of the other's speech. It can be understood that the child tries to enter into the symbolic via the patterns of language even when it is in the semiotic chora before it becomes a subject.

With regard to the theory of subjectivity, Freud states that the child distinguishes between the self and the Other as the child notices that its mother does not have a phallus. According to Lacan, the child realizes its difference from its mother as the child recognizes its reflection in the mirror during a time from six to eighteen months of age, which Lacan refers to "the mirror stage" of the subject development. Kristeva does not agree with Lacan about the time at which the infant starts to separate itself from its mother. She maintains that this break occurs before the mirror stage when the infant starts to get rid of the unpleasant things it has. This process is called as abjection by

Kristeva (McAfee 35). In other words, for Kristeva, abjection is an initiating point in subjectivity for an infant. The infant's recognition itself from the other is called variously from Freud, Lacan and Kristeva. Freud calls this phenomenon as the fear of castration while Lacan calls it the mirror stage. Kristeva calls this point as abjection in terms of the formation of subjectivity.

The term "abjection" literally means the state of being cast out or a state of misery. With respect to abjection, in *Powers of Horror* (1982), Kristeva explains and exemplifies,

> Food loathing is perhaps the most elementary and most archaic form of abjection. When the eyes see or the lips touch that skin on the surface of milk – harmless, thin as a sheet of cigarette paper, pitiful as a nail paring – I experience a gagging sensation and, still farther down, spasms in the stomach, the belly; and all the organs shrivel up the body, provoke tears and bile, increase heartbeat, cause forehead and hands to perspire. Along with sight-clouding dizziness, *nausea* makes me balk at that milk cream, separates me from the mother and father who proffer it. "I" want none of that element, sign of their desire; "I" do not want to listen, "I" do not assimilate it, "I" expel it. But since the food is not an "other" for "me," who am only in their desire, I *expel* myself, I spit *myself* out, I abject *myself* within the same motion through which "I" claim to establish *myself*. (2-3)

In Kristeva's theory, abjection is "not lack of cleanliness or health that causes abjection but what disturbs identity, system, order. What does not respect borders, positions, rules. The in between, the ambiguous, the composite" (*Powers* 4). In other words, the abject is the one who has the characteristics of in-betweenness and ambiguity and disturbs the boundaries, orders and laws unlike the majority of society.

Kristeva asserts that subjectivity is a perpetual work, and her theory of subjectivity does not have certain initiations and endings. The dynamics she defines in the subjectivity formation remove from the father-centred structures that Lacan and Freud stand on: the Oedipus complex, castration, the phallus and the appropriation of the "Name of the Father." Her early works alter the role of the maternal body in the

process of the subject's formation (Becker-Leckrone 27). Therefore, it is not surprising that "the abject mother" is the most appropriate case of abjection as focussing on the maternal body.

The most definite incident of abjection is "the abject mother." In order to identify the abject mother, the relation between the semiotic chora and the maternal body should be revised in view of Kristeva. Kristeva associates the semiotic chora with the position of the mother. In *Revolution in Poetic Language,* Kristeva describes the semiotic chora as "a nonexpressive totality formed by the drives and their stases in a motility that is as full of movement as it is regulated" (25). In "Le Sujet en Proces," Kristeva writes,

> the chora is a womb or a nurse in which elements are without identity and without reason. The chora is a place of a chaos which is and which becomes, preliminary to the constitution of the first measurable body the chora plays with the body of the mother of woman, but in the signifying process. (qtd. in Oliver 46)

The chora is linked with the semiotic, particularly the position of the mother. In *Reading Kristeva,* Kelly Oliver explains that when the infant is in the semiotic chora, it is away from the Symbolic and Name of the father. The mother regulates the infant's body. Firstly, the infant learns the social regulation via the mother's breast because she gives and gets back the breast. The infant is not familiar with the paternal regulation, so this process is the law before law (46-47). In other words, the infant is in the space of the mother, so the regulator is the maternal body.

When the infant is in the semiotic chora, it is also in the space of the mother that refers to the imaginary union of the other and the infant until the child recognizes its image in the mirror. When it recognizes its image in the mirror, abjection initially emerges, and the infant starts to learn language by entering the symbolic domain of Lacan. However, the infant is not still a subject, and it is not even on the borders of subjectivity. Abjection helps the infant reach there, and the first thing that the child abjects is its mother's body in which it is generated (McAfee 47). In *Reading Kristeva,* Oliver further states,

> On the level of personal archaeology, abjection becomes a kind of perverse protection in the face of primal repression. The not-yet-subject with its not-yet, or no-longer, object maintains "itself" as the abject. Abjection is a way of denying the primal narcissistic identification with the mother, almost. The child becomes the abject in order to avoid both separation from, and identification with, the maternal body both equally painful, both equally impossible. If the abject "is a jettisoned object, it is so from the mother." The child is this jettisoned object, the waste violently expelled from the mother's body. The "subject" discovers itself as the impossible separation/identity of the maternal body. It hates that body but only because it can't be free of it. That body, the body without borders, the body out of which this abject subject came, is impossible. (60)

To be a subject, the child is obliged to abandon its narcissistic identification with the mother. Besides, it has to make a distinction between itself and its mother, whereas it is so hard for it to determine the borders between itself and the mother as it is outside her mother at that moment, but it was previously in her that it came from. That is to say, the acceptance of separation from the maternal body is not a practical situation for the child; nevertheless, for its subjectivity, it has to reject its identification with the mother.

Regarding the relation among abjection, repressed, and uncanny, Kristeva's "abject" differs from Freud's "repressed." Freud considers that a great number of the subject's desires must be abnegated and declined for the improvement of the social organisation, culture and subjectivity. Freud deals with the permanent probability of the "return of the repressed;" nonetheless, on condition that the repressed doesn't turn back, it is not seen. This is not possible for the abject. The abject continues to exist on the periphery of consciousness like the situations of death and filth. Indeed, losing identity that refers to the fear of falling back into the mother's body is described as the ultimate source of the feeling of uncanniness, in German, das *Unheimliche* by Freud (McAfee 48). In "Unheimliche," Freud states: "We can understand why linguistic usage has extended *das Heimliche* into its opposite, *das Unheimliche*; for this uncanny is in reality nothing new or alien, but something which is familiar and old-established in the mind"

(241). Freud describes the most prominent unheimliche place as "the entrance to the former *Heim* [home] of all human beings, to the place where each one of us lived once upon a time and in the beginning . . . mother's genitals or her body" (368). Freud discovers the sense of uncanniness as "particular phases in the evolution of the self-regarding feeling, a regression to a time when the ego had not yet marked itself off sharply from the external world and from other people" (236). Freud further states: "the uncanny is something which is secretly familiar, which has undergone repression and then returned from it" (245). This occurrence is named as "the return of the repressed" in view of Freud. Concerning the concept of abjection, this occurrence is named as "maternal abjection" in view of Kristeva. In terms of the formation of subjectivity, both the return of the repressed and the maternal abjection are associated with the fear of returning to the maternal body, actually the probability of losing identity (McAfee 49). In other words, the conception of the return of the repressed is the same as the conception of the maternal abjection concerning the subjectivity formation.

Regarding the relationships among subject, abject and object, in *Powers of Horror,* Kristeva explains the dynamics of their relations,

> When I am beset by abjection, the twisted braid of affects and thoughts I call by such a name does not have, properly speaking, a definable *object.* The abject is not an ob-ject facing me, which I name or imagine. Nor is it an ob-jest, an otherness ceaselessly fleeing in a systematic quest of desire. What is abject is not my correlative, which, providing me with someone or something else as support, would allow me to be more or less detached and autonomous. The abject has only one quality of the object- that of being opposed to I. If the object, however, through its opposition, settles me within the fragile texture of a desire for meaning, which, as a matter of fact, makes me ceaselessly and infinitely homologous to it, what is *abject,* on the contrary, the jettisoned object, is radically excluded and draws me toward the place where meaning collapses. (*Powers* 1-2)

It can be inferred that the abject does not directly refer to the subject or the object. The abject is qualified as the object merely in one aspect in which the abject is also opposed to I/the subject like the object.

For Kristeva, various abject identities are performed through literature. Thus, Kristeva establishes a relation between the conception of abjection and literature in terms of the cathartic influences on the abnormal identities:

> On close inspection, all literature is probably a version of the apocalypse that seems to me rooted, no matter what its socio-historical conditions might be, on the fragile border (borderline cases) where identities (subject/object, etc.) do not exist or only barely so-double, fuzzy, heterogeneous, animal, metamorphosed, altered, abject. (*Powers* 207)

Kristeva considers that literature is a way of disclosure for various identities, so it reveals diverse maladies and sufferings of mind such as the incidents of depression and abjection. Kristeva further maintains,

> By suggesting that literature is [abjection's] privileged signifier, I wish to point out that, far from being a minor, marginal activity in our culture, as a general consensus seems to have it, this kind of literature, or even literature as such, represents the ultimate coding of our crises, of our most intimate and most serious apocalypses. Hence its nocturnal power. (*Powers* 208)

Identity and literature are reciprocally influential in terms of the relation between the signifier and the signified. Abjection can be the signified that is pointed out by literature, the preferential signifier. As a literary critic, Kristeva makes sense of nocturnal power of writing by discovering the veiled meaning; and as a psychoanalyst, she makes sense of the author's crises evaluating him or her as the subject.

1.3.3. Revolt

Julia Kristeva calls the concept of the subject as "the speaking being." The speaking being is shaped regarding the signifying process that includes the semiotic and the symbolic. Thus, the speaking being is not a stable unified self but a subject in process. In *Revolution in Poetic Language,* Kristeva maintains,

> Because of its specific isolation within the discursive totality of our time, this shattering of discourse reveals that linguistic changes constitute changes in the *status of the subject*– his relation to the body, to others, and to objects; it also reveals that normalized language is just one of the ways of articulating the signifying process that encompasses the body, the material referent, and language itself. (15–16)

The speaking being is not a stable subject but a subject in process with the influence of language because the alterations in language result in the alterations in the subject's status. In *Julia Kristeva,* McAfee explains the notion of the subject in process in Kristevan theory. That the speaking being is a subject in process shows the identity is never fixed at a certain point. The semiotic and the symbolic are on duty at the same time as the two modes of the speaking being. The symbolic mode is generally more remarkable; however, it does not always triumphs. The semiotic energy is so vital that everyone must possess it sufficiently; nevertheless, somebody commanded solely by semiotic drives is psychotic. The subject in process must travel through an unreliable region, vitalized by "destabilizing biological and psychological charges," but s/he can consult successfully in the symbolic. However, semiotic drives and energy distort his/her efforts to be a subject who has a stable self-identity, but s/he has to continue as if s/he had. The subject must protect the semiotic chora, but it must be controlled (105). In other words, as the subject is in process as a speaking being that speaks, acts, and thinks; s/he is not able to keep away from the semiotic charges. The semiotic and the symbolic work simultaneously, but the subject still tries to be a stable self in spite of his/her biological and psychological charges. With regard to the conception of revolt,

borderline subjects are in a state of revolt against the symbolic order owing to their semiotic charges since they are not able to maintain a stable identity or unified self.

Kristeva first evaluates the term "revolt" regarding its etymology. In *The Sense and Non-sense of Revolt: The Powers and Limits of Psychoanalysis*, she defines the term,

> The Latin verb *volvere*, which is at the origin of "revolt," was initially far removed from politics. It produced derivatives with meanings- semes- such as "curve," "entourage," "turn," "return." In Old French, it can mean "to envelop," "curvature," "vault," and even "omelet," "to roll," and "to roll oneself in;" the extensions go as far as "to loaf about" (*galvauder*), "to repair," and "vaudeville" (*vaudevire*, "refrain"). (1)

Kristeva approaches the conception of revolt regarding different connotations. It gives rise to a turning point in the concept of the term. Moreover, Kristeva adds the conception of revolt in European culture:

> Europeans are cultured in the sense that culture is their critical conscience; it suffices to think of Cartesian doubt, the freethinking of the Enlightenment, Hegelian negativity, Marx's thought, Freud's unconscious, not to mention Zola's *J'accuse* and formal revolts such as Bauhaus and surrealism, Artaud and Stockhausen, Picasso, Pollock, and Francis Bacon. The great moments of twentieth-century art and culture are moments of formal and metaphysical revolt. (*Sense* 6–7)

The quotation above shows that how Europeans are cultured in terms of the analytical conscience. However, Kristeva states that this tradition of revolt may disappear since it is found in the situation "the failure of rebellious ideologies, on the one hand, and the surge of consumer culture, on the other" (*Sense* 7). Kristeva believes in the need for the revolt and explains the necessity of this need through her writings even though the revolt culture is in danger of disappearing.

With respect to the necessity of revolt, Kristeva considers that revolt is necessary not only for the subject but also for the society in order to be transformed through external restrictions. In *Revolution in Poetic Language*, Kristeva states: "the text is a practice that could be compared to political revolution: the one brings about in the subject what the other introduces into society. The historical and political experiences of the twentieth century have demonstrated that one cannot be transformed without the other;" with language, revolt is a "structuring and de-structuring *practice*, a passage to the outer *boundaries* of the subject and society. Then- and only then- can it be jouissance and revolution" (17). In other words, revolt is necessary not only for the subject but also for the society to be transformed in terms of outer restrictions. The transformation of the subject ensures the transformation of the society or vice versa. Revolt is the construction and destruction practice that results in pleasure and upheaval.
In *The Sense and Nonsense of Revolt*, Kristeva explains the requirement of revolt culture,

> Happiness exists only at the price of a revolt. None of us has pleasure without confronting an obstacle, prohibition, authority, or law that allows us to realize ourselves as autonomous and free. The revolt revealed to accompany the private experience of happiness is an integral part of the pleasure principle. Furthermore, on the social level, the normalizing order is far from perfect and fails to support the excluded: jobless youth, the poor in the projects, the homeless, the unemployed, and foreigners, among many others. When the excluded have no culture of revolt and must content themselves with ideologies, with shows and entertainments that far from satisfy the demand of pleasure, they become rioters. (7)

Kristeva associates the revolt with happiness that takes place after an incident restricting to the subject's freedom. The culture of revolt is the determinant between being a revolutionist and being a rioter because the revolt culture is distinct from the culture of shows and entertainments. If the excluded are content with the culture of shows and entertainments, they become rioters that are far from being autonomous and free subjects.

The transformation of the subject and meaning is not far from the transformation of language, it is a revolution in poetic language owing to the socio-historical changes. Within this frame, Kristeva asks what kind of revolt we can have today. She starts her three works with this question: "What revolt today?" (*Quelle révolte aujourd'hui?*). She asks the question in the mid-1990s, in *The Sense and Non-sense of Revolt*; then in 1996, in *Intimate Revolt*; and lastly in 1997, in *The Future of Revolt*. In each asking this question, she discusses it in terms of various aspects. In *The Sense and Non-sense of Revolt,* she dwells on the requirement of revolt in order to improve and continue a psychic life. In *Intimate Revolt*, she examines the requirement of revolt for the experience of intimacy. And finally, in *The Future of Revolt*, she focuses on revolt with regard to the experiences of liberty through literature and psychoanalysis (McAfee 113-4). In these works, Kristeva emphasizes the culture of revolt instead of the culture of shows and entertainments, and she devotes her three works to the revolt in terms of the requirements related with the development and the maintenance of a psychic life, the intimacy experience, and liberty experiences via literature and psychoanalysis. These works show Kristeva's different perspectives to the conception of the revolt.

Regarding the themes of the revolt, Kristeva describes the term as "the transgression of a prohibition; as repetition, working-through, working-out; and as displacement, combinatives, games." Kristeva uses them to examine three authors of twentieth-century: the existentialist Jean-Paul Sartre (1905–1980), the surrealist poet Louis Aragon (1897–1982), and the theorist Roland Barthes (1915-1980). These significant figures are excellent models of a rebel culture which is faced with becoming extinct. All three authors produce the revolutionary texts: "a revolt against identity, of sex and meaning, ideas and politics, being and the other." For instance, Kristeva realizes a revolution in Barthes owing to the way he looks for resolving and replacing the sense of texts that others think natural. Barthes gets the subject matter in terms of alleged naturalness of sense. He questions the probability of the sense itself in addition to the union of any commentator. Barthes' revolt is opposed to the unity of any sense (McAfee 116). These significant figures of twentieth-century make Kristeva hopeful due to their rebellion culture with respect to the structuring of subjectivity. Kristeva points out,

> Another humanity, we might say peremptorily, can be heard not only in their thought but also- and this is essential, for it signals the depth of the phenomenon- in their language: a humanity that takes the risk of confronting religion and the metaphysics that nourishes it, confronting the meaning of language. (*Sense* 18)

Above quotation emphasizes the necessity of revolt culture even for the structuring of subjectivity. She considers a humanity in which a subject is able to explain their opinions in their language, and this humanity faces with the risky matter such as religion and the metaphysics.

Kristeva separates the psychological revolt from the societal revolt in her recent writings. McAfee explains that, for Kristeva, both psychological and societal revolts are essentially significant even though these are different from each other. As opposed to many critics of the political revolution, Kristeva emphasizes the primary requirement of the psychological revolt that refers to the revolt against identity, homogenization, the spectacle, and the law. If an internal district is not kept alive, we do not keep alive an inner zone. If the individual does not protect their particularity, a revolution will result in the bureaucratization and terror. Many revolutions of the twentieth century exemplify this situation as the recent nationalist and ethnic upheavals (118). In other words, if the individuals do not have the concept of the revolt in their minds, it may not be possible for a meaningful political revolt.

Revolt refers to different phases of psychic development. It is the reconstruction of the initial stages of subjectivation through psychoanalysis. These are "the identification with the father of individual prehistory, the separation from the mother, the Oedipal prohibition of incest and the final revolt against the Oedipal father which establishes the autonomy of the self." Subjectivation allows the reconstruction of the restrictions and bans to our state as speaking beings, and it not only heals the subjects and provide them "a capacity for contestation and creation"(Brant 34). From the perspective of speaking subject, the society also can have a capacity to contest and create by disengaging fixation in any situation by means of the various stages of psyhic development.

1.3.4. Women's Time

Kristeva wrote her important essay "Le Temps des Femmes" that was translated in English as "Women's Time" in 1981. With respect to this article, in the "Introduction" of *The Kristeva Reader,* Moi writes: "From a feminist perspective, this is one of Kristeva's most important essays, not least because she here explicitly addresses the question of feminism and its relations to femininity on the one hand, and the symbolic order on the other" (187). In other words, in "Women's Time," Kristeva explains her opinions and attitudes about the question of feminism, the relations between feminism and femininity, and the relations between feminism and the symbolic order.

Kristeva categorizes European feminism as three "generations" in "Women's Time." She identifies the first generation of European feminism in *The Kristeva Reader*,

> In the beginnings, the women's movement, as the struggle of suffragists and of existential feminists, aspired to gain a place in linear time as the time of project and history. In this sense, the movement, while immediately universalist, is also deeply rooted in the socio-political life of nations. The political demands of women; the struggles for equal pay for equal work, for taking power in social institutions on an equal footing with men; the rejection, when necessary, of the attributes traditionally considered feminine or maternal in so far as they are deemed incompatible with insertion in that history – all are part of the logic of identification with certain values; not with the ideological(these are combated, and rightly so, as reactionary) but, rather, logical and ontological values of a rationality dominant in the nation-state. (193-4)

The first phase of feminist movement is associated with the political demands of women. Concerning Kristeva's opinion about the first generation, in *Julia Kristeva,* McAfee notes that the first generation is located prior to 1968 by Kristeva, and it is called equal rights and equal treatment. There should be equal treatment to both men

and women because there are not any significant differences between the sexes. The first generation does not want to reverse the system; it wants to participate in it. It wants all the rights that men have. In "Women's Time," Kristeva borrows James Joyce's phrase, "father's time, mother's species," in order to indicate two distinct domains that humans have experienced. "Father's time" associates with the linear time that men have traditionally occupied in terms of progress, history, and destiny. "Mother's species" refers to the space that produces the human kinds, in which time is repetitive in a circle, and the species are eternal (93-4). Kristeva's notion of "mother's species" refers to the non-linear female subjectivity with regard to the space or place rather than linear time. With regard to this reference of the place or space to the woman, Kristeva remembers the hypothesis of Freud that the stereotypical malady of women, hysteria, was tied to place, and she also recalls her theory of chora that she relates with the maternity (Becker-Leckrone 116-7). In other words, women are entrapped within the limited place and the cyclical time by being excluded from public sphere and the linear time.

In terms of the notion of maternity, Sara Beardsworth writes about Kristeva's attitude in *Julia Kristeva* (2004). Kristeva tries to stress the revision of the discourse of motherhood is not the revision of the sense of maternity. Kristeva's own term "maternality" purposes to subvert the opposition between femininity and maternity. This opposition includes in patriarchy, in which the maternity refers to the entrapment or domesticity of women (264). In other words, Kristeva tries to subvert the opposition between femininity and motherhood, and she tries to constitute a kind of parallel relation between them as opposed to the first generation of the European feminism.

The generation that comes after 1968 is called the second generation by Kristeva. She notes in "Women's Time", "a difference in the relationship of subjects to the symbolic contract which is the social contract: a difference, then, in the relationship to power, language, and meaning" (196). Kristeva argues that women feel to be rejected from power, language, and meaning in the psycho-symbolic structure as following

> They have been left out of the socio-symbolic contract, of language as the fundamental social bond. They find no affect there, no more than they find the fluid and infinitesimal significations of their relationships with the

> nature of their own bodies, that of the child, another woman or man. This frustration, which to a certain extent belongs to man also, is being voiced today principally by women, to the point of becoming the essence of the new feminist ideology. A therefore difficult, if not impossible, identification with the sacrificial logic of separation and syntactical sequence at the rejection of the symbolic – lived as the rejection of the paternal function and ultimately generating psychoses. ("Women's" 199)

The second generation of European feminism re-values the difference that the first generation struggles to minimize. Keeping away from the first generation's focus on the linear time, the second generation has looked for taking back to both the cyclical time and monumental time of the species (McAfee 97). In terms of the activity of maternity, the first and second generation's attitudes are also different. The first generation of European feminism rejects the conception of maternity. Kristeva states,

> The refusal of maternity cannot be a mass policy and that the majority of women today see the possibility for fulfilment, if not entirely as least to a large degree, in bringing a child into the world. What does this desire for motherhood correspond to? This is one of the new questions for the new generation, a question the preceding generation had foreclosed. For want of an answer to this question, feminist ideology leaves the door open to the return of religion, whose discourse, tried and proved over thousands of years, provides the necessary ingredients for satisfying the anguish, the suffering and the hopes of mothers. ("Women's" 206)

As opposed to the rejection of motherhood in the first generation of European feminism, the second generation embraces the activity of motherhood. The problematic point is that the notion of women resembles the mythic memory of archaic mother. In this way, the uniqueness, specificity and individuality of the actual women are in danger of being lost owing to the monolith of Woman (McAfee 99). In other words, the second generation mythicizes the memory of archaic mother, and for this reason, women lose

their singularity, particularity, and personality as actual human beings. In terms of the myth of the archaic mother, Kristeva states,

> If the archetypal belief in a good and pure substance, that of utopias, is the belief in the omnipotence of an archaic, full, total englobing mother with no frustration, no separation, with no break-producing symbolism (with no castration, in other words), then it becomes evident that we will never be able to defuse the violences mobilized through the counter-investment necessary to carrying out this phantasm, unless one challenges precisely this myth of the archaic mother. ("Women's" 205)

For Kristeva, the second generation of the European feminism has tended to associate "good substance" with the archaic mother owing to her fulfilled, complete, and unified being.

As opposed to the second generation's notion of the monolith of Woman, the purpose of the third generation is to achieve the particularity of every woman. Kristeva defines the purpose of the third generation in order to conjunct "the sexual and the symbolic, in order to try to discover, first, the specificity of the female, and then, in the end, that of each individual woman ("Women's" 196). The conjunction of the sexual and the symbolic initially contributes to the female particularity, then, the individuality of every woman. In terms of the activity of motherhood, Kristeva writes about the attitude of the third generation,

> The arrival of the child . . . the slow, difficult and delightful apprenticeship in attentiveness, gentleness, forgetting oneself. The ability to succeed in this path without masochism and without annihilating one's affective, intellectual and professional personality – such would seem to be the stakes to be won through guiltless maternity. It then becomes a creation in the strong sense of the term. For this moment, utopian? ("Women's" 206)

The third generation of European feminism values the desires of women to have children and to join in the male world at the same time. In other words, they become the

producers of not only the species but also the culture (McAfee 100). When motherhood is not harmful to one's affective, professional, and intellectual characterization, it really becomes a true creation; however, at this moment, it cannot be made possible.

Kristeva explains her opinions about identity, sexual identity, and difference within the frame of the third generation of feminism,

> In this third attitude, which I strongly advocate – which I imagine? – the very dichotomy man/woman as an opposition between two rival entities may be understood as belonging to *metaphysics*. What can 'identity', even 'sexual identity', mean in a new theoretical and scientific space where the very notion of identity is challenged? I am not simply suggesting a very hypothetical bisexuality which, even if it existed, would only, in fact, be the aspiration towards the totality of one of the sexes and thus an effacing of difference. What I mean is, first of all, the demassification of the problematic of difference, which would imply, in a first phase, an apparent de-dramatization of the 'fight to the death' between rival groups and thus between the sexes. And this not in the name of some reconciliation – feminism has at least had the merit of showing what is irreducible and even deadly in the social contract – but in order that the struggle, the implacable difference, the violence be conceived in the very place where it operates with the maximum intransigence, in other words, in personal and sexual identity itself, so as to make it disintegrate in its very nucleus. ("Women's" 209)

According to Kristeva, the distinction between man and woman roots in the social contract, in which these entities are rivals for each other. Kristeva suggests internalizing this socio-symbolic structure instead of avoiding it. She calls this process "interiorization of the founding separation of the socio-symbolic contract." Regarding this process, the other that is from another race, class, sex, or nation is not evil or a scapegoat (McAfee 101). In other words, another personal or sexual identity shows the diverse structure of the socio-symbolic contract. Therefore, instead of refusing the other, it should be internalized.

1.3.5. Melancholia

Kristeva explains melancholia/depression and love in *Black Sun* (1989) as two dimensions of psychic space which forms the relation of the subject to language, to self and to the social order (Barrett 4). In *Black Sun*, Kristeva defines melancholia as the "impossible mourning for the maternal object (9). Kristeva's fundamental examination suggests a loss theory of melancholia in Freud's tradition "Mourning and Melancholia". Like Freud and Melanie Klein, Kristeva maintains that early development ends with a separation of the infant–mother bonds. Kristeva describes this state of depression as "a mourning for the lost other (mother, breast)", which is called as "objectal" depression (Radden 335). For Kristeva, the distinction between depression and melancholia is blurred; she uses these terms instead of each other. Melancholia is generally thought as a state which is not reversible without antidepressants as it is related to internal trauma while depression is thought as a state that comes out as a result of external incidents in a subject's life. The boundaries between these terms are blurred because the same impossible mourning emerges in both situations for the maternal object (Barrett 71). In other words, Kristeva uses melancholia and depression in terms of the same conception in her works.

For Kristeva, there is no rigid opposition between mourning and melancholia, but for Freud, such opposition is at the centre of his text "Mourning and Melancholia" (1917), in which the melancholic does not move beyond how he has lost an other while the mourning one is able to move beyond the grief and sadness of loss. With regard to this opposition, Freud explains changes on his opinion that the ego subverts this opposition in an implicit way in his "The Ego and The Id" (1923); however, he does not draw attention to the changes about the opposition of mourning and melancholia. For this reason, Kristeva does not make a rigid distinction between mourning and melancholia. In *Black Sun*, Kristeva shows psychoanalysis is a method in which the problem of loss that is forgotten emerges with a psychoanalytic experience of melancholy/depression (Beardworth 96). Unlike Freud, Kristeva does not strictly

distinguish melancholia and mourning; instead, she emphasizes the psychoanalytic experience of the melancholia and depression.

According to Kristeva, there are two kinds of depression as "objectal depression" and "narcissistic depression." Objectal depression refers to the loss of an "internal object" not a real person as Melanie Klein explains. The subject feels not only love but also hate to that internal object. He loves it because he cannot do without it, and he hates it as its absence undermines him. He might think about suicide in order to kill the hated object within. This kind of depression can be a better instance for psychoanalysis as the subject may realize that he internalizes the loss of something outside. On the other hand, narcissistic depression emerges when there is a loss taking place at the primary level (in the chora). The narcissistic depression signifies the importance of the mother and the imaginary for the child's language acquisition. A loss in the semiotic chora prevents the child's entry in the symbolic and the child can never make a distinction between the subject and the object before the thetic phase. For this reason, the child is not able to call what he loses. It is not an object but an unnameable thing for the child. Thus, the melancholic feels wounded; he is entrapped within his sadness, and he has something that he is not able to share in the symbolic (McAfee 60-1). As Kristeva explains in *Black Sun* (1989),

> Far from being a hidden attack on an other who is thought to be hostile because he is frustrating, sadness would point to a primitive self – wounded, incomplete, empty. Persons thus affected do not consider themselves wronged but afflicted with a fundamental flaw, a congenital deficiency. Their sorrow doesn't conceal the guilt or the sin felt because of having secretly plotted revenge on the ambivalent object. Their sadness would be rather the most archaic expression of an unsymbolizable, unnameable narcissistic wound, so precocious that no outside agent (subject or agent) can be used as referent. For such narcissistic depressed persons, sadness is really the sole object; more precisely it is a substitute object they become attached to, an object they tame and cherish for lack of another. In such a case, suicide is not a

> disguised act of war but a merging with sadness and, beyond it, with that impossible love, never reached, always elsewhere, such as the promises of nothingness, of death. (12–13)

As opposed to the hostility of objectal depressed towards an internal object, the narcissist depressed feels wounded and flawed since there is no subject or agent outside. It is something within, and this state shows that narcissistic depression occurs before the thetic break because there is not a break between the subject and the object for the child in the semiotic chora.

According to Kristeva, the narcissistic structure provides the child for becoming a subject. The child starts to identify itself with an imaginary father while it starts to lose its mother in the imaginary realm. When this structure becomes successful, the child is going to separate itself from its mother by learning how to use words to name its loss. When this structure becomes unsuccessful, the child is going to be entrapped between loss and identification. Therefore, the melancholic (the narcissistic depressed) needs to do something to come over his sadness. He must complete his separation from the unnameable Thing and identify with the image of the logic of identification, which is called "Imaginary Father" by Kristeva. She states: "Primary identification initiates a compensation for the Thing and at the same time secures the subject to another dimension, that of imaginary adherence, reminding one of the bond of faith, which is just what disintegrates in the depressed person" (*Black* 13–14). The subject's identification with the Imaginary Father shows the subject's distinction from the object, and in this way, the subject can name the Thing that is unnameable for the depressed person.

Kristeva associates melancholy with writing, "For those who are racked by melancholia, writing about it would have meaning only if writing sprang out of that very melancholia" (*Black* 3). Melancholy has formed the activation of the grief in creating literature and emerged as the influential basement for the reflection of philosophy in terms of the structure of Being, in which the philosopher considers the meaning and the meaninglessness of Being (Beardsworth 131-2). In *Black Sun*, Kristeva devotes a chapter to the poet Gérard de Nerval's poem, "The Disinherited,"

involving the phrase “black sun” (soleil noir). Kristeva evaluates this poem as an attempt of the melancholic to achieve the realm of signs and to name the Thing that he mourns for (McAfee 70). Kristeva sees Nerval “on the divide between appearance and disappearance, abolishment and song, non-meaning and signs” (*Black* 151). Kristeva also suggests, “a firm identity remains a fiction” (*Black* 257). These quotations above emphasize the melancholic poet Nerval’s divided self and the subject in process. Nerval could have only temporarily come over his depression, but he could not come over his depression, and he committed suicide (McAfee73). Kristeva examines the conception of melancholia and depression in terms of the relation with other disciplines such as literature and art.

1.3.6. Strangeness

The terms "strangeness" and "foreignness" are used interchangeably by Kristeva as in "stranger" and "foreigner." In *Strangers to Ourselves*, Kristeva describes a foreigner as "the one who does not belong to the group, who is not one of them, the other" (95). Within the frame of the background of foreignness through time and social structures, the foreigner was described primarily in terms of two legal systems: "*jus soli* and *jus sanguinis*, the law according to soil and the law according to blood" (*Strangers* 95). The children who are born on the same soil or who are born of native parents are considered to belong to the same group. Regarding the definition of foreigner in the modern, clear and acceptable way, Kristeva states: "the foreigner is the one who does not belong to the state where we are, the one that does not have the same nationality" (*Strangers* 96). Furthermore, differences which are related to sex, age, profession, and religion might come together in the conception of foreignness. The foreigner is perceived as "beneficial or harmful to the social group and its power and, on that account, he is to be assimilated or rejected" (*Strangers* 96). In terms of the definition of "strange," Kristeva further states that

> Strange is the encounter with the other- whom we perceive by means of sight, hearing, smell, but do not "frame" within our consciousness. The other leaves us separate, incoherent; even more so, he can make us feel that we are not in touch with our own feelings, that we reject them or, on the contrary, that we refuse to judge them. (*Strangers* 187)

The quotations above indicate that the notion of strangeness and strange is either assimilated or refused when it is faced with in a society.

CHAPTER II

KRISTEVAN READING OF GEORGE ELIOT'S EARLY NOVELS: *THE MILL ON THE FLOSS* AND *SILAS MARNER*

2.1. The Victorian Period and George Eliot

The Victorian period is an age that includes the continuation of modernity, since it is an age of change with the influence of the growth of urbanization and the development of technology. Within the frame of these changes, Levine, in *The Emergence of Victorian Consciousness: The Spirit of the Age,* states: "in the first quarter of the nineteenth century politically, socially, intellectually, and spiritually a new society was growing up in England" (2). In terms of primary characteristics of the Victorian period, John Stuart Mill, in *The Spirit of the Age*, states: "mankind have outgrown old institutions and old doctrines, and have not yet acquired new ones" (qtd. in Houghton 1). Houghton also proposes,

> To Mill and The Victorians the past which they had outgrown was not the Romantic Period and not even the eighteenth century. It was the Middle Ages. They recognized, of course, that there were differences between themselves and their immediate predecessors but from their perspective it was the medieval tradition from which they had irrevocably broken-

> Christian orthodoxy under the rule of the church and civil government under the rule of the king and nobility; the social structures of fixed classes each with its recognized rights and duties; and the economic organization of village agriculture and town guilds. (1-2)

With regard to the comparison of the Victorian period with the Middle Ages, Houghton further states: "By definition an age of transition in which change is revolutionary has a dual aspect: destruction and reconstruction. As the old order of doctrines and institutions is being attacked or modified or discarded, at one point and then another, a new order is being proposed or inaugurated" (3). The emergence of new set of institutions, doctrines and orders are constituted during the Victorian period when they are compared to the order and the circumstances of the Middle Ages.

The Victorian period is divided into three phases, as early Victorian (1830-48), mid-Victorian (1848-70) and late Victorian (1870-1901), and each phase has various social, economic, and political aspects with respect to the urbanization and industrialization. In the early Victorian period, two historical incidents took place in England with significant consequences. First, British railway expanded with a burst of construction. Second, the 1832 Reform Bill was passed by British parliament in order to gratify the desires of the middle class that began to take over the control of the economy in England. Working conditions in new industrial and coal-mining areas were terrible; thus, the Chartists, an organisation of workers, fought for workers' rights and their efforts gave rise to upcoming reforms for workers. Another significant reform was the Corn Laws, the abolition of the high tariffs upon imported grains. These tariffs protected landowners and farmers while the rest of population suffered terribly from the high prices of bread. In this period, the "Condition of England" novels reveal the industrial and political scene by novelists such as Charles Kingsley (1819-75), Elizabeth Gaskell (1810-65) and Benjamin Disraeli (1804-81), and this early Victorian literature dwelled on the divided structure of England as the rich and the poor. All in all, the social and economic hardships and depression have characterized the 1830s and 1840s as a "Time of Troubles" with the influence of widespread unemployment, hopeless poverty and provocative rioting (Abrams 982-4).

In the mid-Victorian period, although there were many harassing problems, it was a time of prosperity because the institutions worked well. The queen and her husband become the models of the middle-class domesticity and devotion to duty. In 1851, Prince Albert opened the Great Exhibition, where the Crystal Palace was designed in order to display the progress of England with regard to modern industry and science. The technological progress and prosperity made England expand through the world. Many English people saw the expansion of the empire as a moral responsibility and missionary societies expanded by spreading Christianity; however, there was a growing debate about religious beliefs. The Church of England was divided into three groups as Low Church (Evangelical), Broad Church and High Church. The scientific discoveries gave rise to new studies of the Bible; thus, the rational challenging attitudes appeared toward religion with the influence of science and philosophy. For instance, Biology decreased mankind into "nothingness". With the impacts of scientific works such as Darwin's *The Origin of Species* (1859) and *The Descent of Man* (1871), the concept of creation in the Bible and the established assumptions of the values related to man's special role in the world were questioned (Abrams 984-7). Briefly, the mid-Victorian Period was a phase of "economic prosperity, the growth of empire, and religious controversy" (Abrams 984).

The third phase of the Victorian period is more difficult to classify. At first sight, it seems only an extension of mid-Victorianism. For many Victorians, this phase was a time of serenity and security. However, the sudden emergence of Bismarck's Germany confronted England with powerful threats to her naval and military position and her outstanding superiority in industry and trade. Another threat was the growth of labour as a political and economic force. Within this frame, the revolutionary theories of Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels influenced the working class to consider itself as the controller of the industry and government. In brief, the third phase of the Victorian period is described as "the decay of Victorian values" (Abrams 988-9).

Regarding gender ideology, the Victorian period had various paradoxical conditions. Women were traditionally described physically and intellectually as the degraded sex; therefore, they were subordinate to the male authority such as fathers,

husbands, brothers. Men dominated all decisions in political, legal and economic subjects. In other words, woman was to be valued for qualities considered to be particularly characteristic of her sex: tenderness of understanding, domestic affection, unworldliness and innocence, and submissiveness (Abrams 1581). Thus, women were confined in certain areas as the degraded sex. In "Masculinities in an Industrializing Society: Britain, 1800-1914," Tosh describes Victorian society: "it was a society characterized by increasingly sharp category distinctions of gender" (330). Within the frame of the strict definition of gender roles by Victorian society, Tyson, in *Critical Theory Today*, states

> Traditional gender roles cast men as rational, strong, protective, and decisive; they cast women as emotional (irrational), weak, nurturing, and submissive. These gender roles have been used very successfully to justify inequities, which still occur today, such as excluding women from equal access to leadership and decision making positions (in the family as well as in politics, academia, and the corporate world), paying men higher wages than women for doing the same job (if women are even able to obtain the job), and convincing women that they are not fit for careers in such areas as mathematics and engineering. (85)

Tyson emphasizes the hypocrisy of gender roles. The Victorian society was male centred, particularly patriarchal "to oppress females of all ages and to elevate males to positions of dominance in all spheres of human activity" (Tyson 26).

In spite of the social, economic and political changes in the Victorian period, there was little progress for the rights of women. Women were not able to hold political office or were not able to vote. For women, employment and education opportunities were restricted. Married women were not able to possess their own property. These inequalities about women's rights and gender roles are known as "Woman Question." Victorian society was concerned with not only economic and legal restrictions on women's rights and lives but also the woman's nature. With regard to the traditional gender roles of females, there was an ideology which claimed that woman had a special nature peculiarly fit for her domestic role like Coventry Patmore's popular poem *The*

Angel in the House which emphasizes the purity and selflessness of woman. In other words, the role and the duty of woman were to create a peaceful place in which men was protected from the hardships of modern life (Abrams 990-2). In "Victorian Working Women," Neff states: "Women ought to marry. There ought to be husbands for them. Women were potential mothers" (14). In Victorian society, women did not have any status apart from their roles as a mother and a wife.

Regarding the stratification of the Victorian society, it was made up of three kinds of people in terms of their position in society as the upper class, the middle class and the lower class. However, with the influence of "the social forces, wealth, and outraged pride, which demanded the Reform Bill," the middle class achieved both financial and political power and pre-eminence and they became decisive in society. Thus, "the Victorian frame of mind is largely composed of their characteristic mode of thought and feeling" (Houghton 5). In *A Victorian Woman's Place: Public Culture in the Nineteenth Century*, Morgan describes the middle class as

> a man of business and thus distinguished from the leisured aristocrat, who lacked such a training ground in which to develop the virtues of 'energy, prudence and integrity'. He was also patriotic and benevolent, always ready to take an active part in the political and social life of his town and nation. He was also civilized, able to enrich the society in which he moved and to fulfil the offices of husband and father, so providing the perfect example to another generation of active citizens. (33)

Morgan underlines the social, economic and political dominancy of the middle class; therefore, the middle class were influential on the mode of thought and feeling of the Victorian society.

With respect to the aspects of the Victorian literature, social, economic, and political changes, class stratification, and the Victorian customs and traditions had a great influence on the Victorian literature. Thus, the Victorian literature revealed the unstable structure of society. There were various genres such as prose, poetry and drama; however, it was the novel that was the most powerful and reflective genre in terms of the changes and the conditions of the Victorian society. George Eliot describes

the novel as "the mysterious mixture behaves under the varying experiments of Time" (qtd. in Abrams 994). The topics of the novel were diverse in terms of the three phases of the Victorian period. Regarding the early Victorian phase, novels reveal marriage, moral issues and the traditional gender roles of the males and the females in their separate domains within the frame of the rural life. Like the novels of the early Victorian phase, the novels of the mid-Victorian phase also reflect marriage, moral issues and the traditional gender roles of the males and the females. However, the late Victorian novels differ from the novels in the early and mid-Victorian phases since the image of woman and the conditions of marriage begin to change with the image of "New Woman." In addition to this, people become pessimistic due to the influences of industrialisation, urbanization and science. Abrams describes the Victorian people,

> Although many Victorians shared a sense of satisfaction in the industrial and political pre-eminence of England during the period, they also suffered from an anxious sense of something lost, a sense too of being displaced persons in a world made alien by technological changes that had been exploited too quickly for the adaptive powers of the human psyche. (980)

The quotation underlines the sense of alienation and displacement of the human psyche owing to the industrialisation and technology. Within the frame of the relation between the individual and the society, isolation, loneliness, and nostalgia emerged in the Victorian period. Houghton states,

> The feeling of isolation and loneliness, so characteristic of modern man, first appeared in the nineteenth century. With the breakup of a long-established order and the resulting fragmentation of both society and thought, the old ties were snapped, and men became acutely conscious of separation. They felt isolated by dividing barriers; lonely for a lost companionship, human and divine; nostalgic for an earlier world of country peace and unifying belief. (77)

Houghton underlines that the industrialisation and urbanization gave rise to the sense of loneliness and isolation in the Victorian period like the state of modern man. Morley states in his *Recollections*: "it was the age of science, new knowledge, searching criticism, followed by multiplied doubts and shaken beliefs" (100). In other words, in terms of the transition to the modern world, a new age occurred with its new order.

With regard to the relation between the characteristics and the model of the literary history Victorian literature, Gilbert and Gubar, in *The Mad Woman in the Attic*, states: ''Western literary history is overwhelmingly male- or, more accurately, patriarchal'' to show the lack of gender balance in European literary history (47). In "Feminism, Journalism and Public Debate," Caine proposes,

> The 'woman question' was a staple of nineteenth-century serious journals. In the early part of the century, interest centred on women's nature and appropriate activities, and on the characteristics of women as writers. By the middle of the century, the issues covered were becoming more extensive as questions about women's work, their political and legal rights, the need for reform of the marriage laws and of girls' education assumed greater and greater prominence. The problems with marriage and the advantages of female celibacy, domestic violence, the iniquities of the sexual double standard and of prostitution, the desires of women for ever greater independence were all matters written about in major journals. (102)

Caine underlines the primary topics of the early and the mid-Victorian novels and the inequalities between men and women. Caine further proposes,

> Women writers had always participated in these debates, but in the first half of the century they mostly used male pseudonyms or published their work anonymously. In the mid-century, women writers became more and more visible as they published under their own names and thus brought an explicitly female voice to bear on these various debates. (102)

Caine emphasizes the inequalities between the male and female writers. Within the frame of the inequalities between male and female writers, in "Women, Fiction and the Marketplace," Sanders states: "Many first novels by women were either published anonymously or under pseudonyms, to protect them from prejudiced judgments by reviewers" (147). Mary Anne Evans is one of these women novelists that wrote under the pseudonym of George Eliot.

George Eliot is a significant English novelist, translator and journalist of the Victorian period. She was born in Warwickshire on November 22, 1819. In 1836, her mother died and she returned home to help her father as his housekeeper. In 1841, Eliot moved to Coventry with her father and till her father's death, she lived with him in Coventry. In 1850, Eliot moved to London and began to work for *The Westminster Review,* in which she met George Henry Lewes, a philosopher and a critic. Lewes encouraged Eliot to write, and then she wrote in various genres such as short stories, novels and poems. After Lewes's death, Eliot married John Cross. After seven months of marriage, Eliot died on December 22, 1880 and was buried next to Lewes in Highgate Cemetery in north London.

Before starting to write novels, Eliot writes an article, "Silly Novels by Lady Novelists" (1856) in order to criticise female writing in terms of their lack of seriousness. In addition, Eliot criticises most of the novels owing to their lack of realism. McCaw states, in *George Eliot and Victorian Historiography*,

> Eliot uses what was a typical narrative device of formal realism, but in a way that was qualitatively different from other authors. The degree to which Eliot's works are enmeshed in historical research, and as a result in the prevailing discourses of historiography, is striking. And, her obsessive research process and profound and overriding interest in the philosophy of history highlight a unique literary methodology. (11)

McCaw emphasizes Eliot's sensitivity to the realistic perspective to the historical background of the formation of her fiction by differing from the majority of the women writers in the Victorian period. Within this frame, Eliot unites her realism with psychology and she describes her characters in terms of their inner conflicts and

struggles which stem from the contradictions between the circumstances and expectations of the external world and the internal motives and desires of the characters with the influence of the psychological realism. In "The Withering of the Individual': Psychology in the Victorian Novel," Nicholas Dames proposes

> That the terms 'psychology' and 'novel' are first explicitly allied in the nineteenth century should come as no surprise, given that the Victorian era saw the gradual codification and institutionalization of both psychology and the novel alike. That their initial combination, however, occurs in the context of a wittily self-ironizing slur by George Eliot, one of the Victorian era's leading practitioners of what came to be called 'psychological novels', is a less predictable fact. (91)

Dames underlines that Eliot describes the aspects of the human psychology in nineteenth century as a leading figure. In "George Eliot's Art", Sully states "in the eyes of the psychologist the works of George Eliot . . . always possess a high value by reason of their large scientific insight into character and life" (378).

There are various significant biographical studies in terms of George Eliot's life, conditions, and works. One of them is Redinger's *George Eliot: The Emergent Self.* In this study, Ruby Redinger describes Eliot,

> An exploration of the causes of her long period of frustration and her release from it provides considerable insight into her career as a writer; it also illumines, as individuated in her, the unfolding self- its power and uncanny strategy, whether or not it leads, as in her instance, to the tangible production of genius . . . The more one is aware of the depth and power of her frustration, the more remarkable does it seem that she triumphed over it. That triumph was not achieved by one leap into fiction writing: rather, hers was a gradual and tenuous history, which might well have been fatally interrupted at any time during the period of her writing. (4–5)

Redinger underlines Eliot's characteristics as a writer in terms of her present self-development upon her past. Within this frame, Jan Jędrzejewski states in his work *George Eliot,*

> A genuine insight into the process of the development of George Eliot's creative self can be gained only through a sustained effort to probe the personal experience that lies at the heart of her artistic impulse. It is the joys, dilemmas, and fears of the writer's past that provide the key to the understanding of the sources of her inspiration and of the nature of the creative process that transformed them into works of literary art. (112)

Eliot's personal experiences that include her joys, dilemmas, and fears contribute to her creative self as an author with the influence of her profound awareness and frustrated power. Another significant detailed general biography about George Eliot was written by Rosemary Ashton in 1996. In *George Eliot: A Life*, Ashton states that

> If any writer of the age captures sympathetically the discontinuities, contradictions, and bewilderments of the Victorian age and its immediate predecessor, it is George Eliot, born . . . More than any other novelist- even Dickens- she gives imaginative expression to the excitement and the pain of being caught up in a society in flux. Her career as a novelist began relatively late, when she was in her late thirties. By that time she had piety to metropolitan scepticism, from scholarly spinsterhood to stimulating partnership, from sexual frustration to sexual fulfilment, from Church-and-State Toryism to liberalism of a conservative kind. (9)

Ashton stresses Eliot's divided sense of self owing to her personal enthusiasm and societal pressure. In other words, Eliot perceives the oppressive traditions and social and cultural complexities of the Victorian period; thus, she reveals them in her fiction in an influential and efficient way. In Eliot's terms of human identity, "Man is an animal who evolves in the context of the polis. Individually discernible as is a single cell in an organism, man is nevertheless as inextricably inherent in his environment and as

incapable of being analysed independently (Bonaparte 77). Eliot's description of man emphasizes her approach to the relation between man and society. In other words, the subject cannot evolve without his society; therefore, he cannot be examined without the circumstances and background of the society. In *Will and Destiny: Morality and Tragedy in George Eliot's novels*, Felicia Bonaparte suggests,

> In a fundamental sense, Eliot maintains, every individual is born in complete isolation and in vital respects remains insular throughout his life. Irrevocably bound to the limits of his own consciousness . . . each man finds himself unable to participate directly in the equally isolated consciousness of another or to understand, even indirectly, its true nature. Each man sees, as a result, only from his point of view, and can never know either the point of view of another or the objective fact as it really is. (102-3)

Bonaparte emphasizes the restrictions of the individual imagination; thus, each self is in isolation with his/her own point of view. In other words, these restrictions give rise to the distinction between the community and the individual owing to diverse unimaginable perspectives.

Morality is a significant and recurrent theme for George Eliot's fiction. Within the frame of morality, Bernard J. Paris, in *Experiments in Life: George Eliot's Quest for Values*, states

> Moral development, for George Eliot, consists in a movement from the subjective to the objective approach to reality. The three stages of moral development take place within the indifferent but orderly cosmos of positive science; a discovery of the true nature of the cosmos is part of the science; a discovery of the true nature of the cosmos is part of the process of maturation. In the course of moral evolution, experience of suffering (the second stage) leads to vision and vision intensifies sympathy. In the third stage of moral development, George Eliot's characters arrive at some version of Feuerbach's religion of humanity. (128-9)

Paris underlines the three phases of moral development for Eliot. Paris examines Eliot's characters, especially Adam Bede in *Adam Bede*, Maggie Tulliver in *The Mill on the Floss* and Dorothea Brooke in *Middlemarch*. With respect to Eliot's moral philosophy, Jędrzejewski states: "the novels gradually build up a system of values in which subjective feelings of other men and women become a composite measure of the moral value of an individual's actions and therefore, an objective rationale for morality" (120).

With respect to the criticism of the Victorian novel, George Eliot is criticised severely by different critics, especially by the feminist critics. In "Critical Responses: 1970- Present," Atkinson proposes that

> The Victorian novel as a whole was put under intense scrutiny in the 1970s by feminist . . . but George Eliot was dealt with more harshly than most. This was partly because of the pre-eminent status that nineteenth-century critics had granted her, but above all because the boldness of her personal choices did not seem to tally with the ideologies displayed in her novels. Feminist critics of the 1970s bitterly reproached her for her failure to demonstrate greater female solidarity. (83)

Atkinson emphasizes the severe criticism of Eliot's fiction and personal preferences. With respect to this kind of criticism, in *Sexual Politics*, Millet explained her despondency: "George Eliot lived the revolution as well perhaps, but she did not write of it" (139). Although Eliot is criticised harshly by some feminist critics, some critics think that Eliot's opinions and fiction are examined in terms of the issues of gender not "Woman Question." Within this frame, in "Gender and the Woman Question," Kyriaki Hadjiafxendi maintains,

> For George Eliot, gender could never be reduced to the Woman Question. With her commitment to a relational understanding of gender equality, she understood female enfranchisement as both a gender and a gendered question. For her the Woman Question was an already loaded term which made women, rather than patriarchal structures, the problem. (138)

Hadjiafxendi highlights that Eliot's attitudes and sensitivity to the individual cannot be restricted to "Woman Question" since she is sensitive both to the rights and responsibilities of the males and to the rights and responsibilities of the females. Thus, In *Women's Writing*, Levine invited critics to 'broaden the debate about Eliot and gender, to move beyond the task of establishing Eliot definitively as either feminist or anti-feminist" (qtd. in Atkinson 84). On the other hand, in *George Eliot,* Jennifer Uglow proposes that the primary themes of Eliot's works can be identified with the feminist themes in 1850s:

> The nature of womanhood; the fear of change; the exclusion of women from the realm of the intellect and from effective power; the alliance in oppression of women, workers and slaves which gives them a shared rhetoric of freedom and resistance; the conflict between the new drive for autonomy and the older ethic of self-sacrifice; the difficulty of achieving independence without losing the possibility of sexual passion and family life. (80)

Uglow emphasizes the central issues of Eliot's works which are related to the problems of women. In addition, Eliot's vulnerability to excluded and oppressed groups such as workers and slaves are stressed. Uglow further states in terms of Eliot's perception and reflection of the relationships of biological sexes and gender roles in society,

> It is because of her exploration of the complementary nature of masculine and feminine qualities . . . and her subtle re-working of the images of the good daughter, sister, wife and mother, that her novels remain so suggestive and disturbing, particularly to women readers. She uses the metaphors of separate spheres, not to justify women's restriction to the realm of 'feeling' and domesticity, but to argue that the sympathy and sense of responsibility for others traditionally associated with 'maternity', and the passion and intuitive vision associated with 'female irrationality' should be brought to bear in the 'masculine' spheres of action and judgement. (250)

The quotation above shows Eliot's perception and reflection of female roles and male roles. Eliot criticises the traditional feminine and masculine spheres and the restrictions of gender roles in her works. If the restrictions of gender roles could be annihilated, "society might replace a repressive, rule-bound ethic with one that is flexible, imaginative, and able to cater for humanity in its infinite variety" (Uglow 250). In other words, without the restrictions of gender roles, an imaginative and flexible society would evolve for humanity.

Eliot's works are divided into three groups as the early, the middle and the late works in terms of their various themes and features. With respect to Eliot's works, Jędrzejewski states,

> All the early novels and stories, from *Scenes of Clerical Life* to *Silas Marner*, are seen as demonstrating different forms of the sacrifice, or silencing, of the female voice by the dominating systems of patriarchal structures; the works of the middle period, from *Romola* to *The Spanish Gypsy*, use historical distancing as their seemingly powerful feminist voices are ultimately contained and muted; finally, *Middlemarch* and *Daniel Deronda* describe the modern world of pre-defined gender roles which are, in themselves, a form of oppression. (134)

Jędrzejewski proposes that Eliot's early works including *Scenes of Clerical Life*, *Adam Bede*, *The Mill on the Floss* and *Silas Marner* are the examples of various kinds of the sacrifice and silencing of women by the patriarchal society, and Eliot's middle works including *Romola*, *Felix Holt*, *the Radical, and the Spanish Gypsy* consist of strong female voices that are muted. Last, Eliot's late works which comprise of *Middlemarch* and *Daniel Deronda* define the gender roles of modern world as a type of oppression.

In conclusion, the Victorian period is an age of change with the beginning of modernity, which includes the growth of urbanisation and technological developments. In spite of the changes and progress in society, economy and policy of the Victorian period, there were many inequalities between men and woman, namely "Woman Question". In terms of the class structure of the Victorian society, the middle class achieved the dominancy with their financial and political power. All of these changes

and circumstances were revealed through the Victorian literature, particularly the Victorian novel. The Victorian society was male-centred and patriarchal due to the lack of gender balance; thus, female writers preferred male pseudonyms in order to preserve their works from biased judgements. Mary Anne Evans is one of these Victorian female writers. Eliot is one of the leading figures of the Victorian period as a novelist, a translator and a journalist. Through her works, Eliot describes the aspects of human psychology by uniting realism with psychology since she perceives the oppressive traditions and restrictive social complexities of the Victorian period.

2.2. The "Gypsy" in *The Mill on the Floss*

In *The Mill on the Floss*, Maggie and Tom Tulliver are two children that grow up at Dorlcote Mill on the River Floss and the relationship of these children is very close and complex. Their father wants them to be educated but in different ways and different places owing to their sex and gender. However, the Tulliver family has several crises; for instance, their father goes bankrupt and he becomes deadly sick. In addition, the children leave their schools. While Tom starts to work in order to pay for his father's debts, Maggie makes herself isolated merely by reading Thomas à Kempis and walking through the Red Deeps in her leisure time on her own. One day, Maggie comes across Philip, the deformed son of her father's enemy Mr Wakem and Philip persuades Maggie to meet him secretly. Meanwhile, Philip confesses his love to Maggie and Maggie does, too. When Tom discovers their secret meetings, he makes Maggie swear not to meet Philip any more. Then, Mr Tulliver dies untimely and Maggie starts to work at a school away from St. Ogg's. Two years later, Maggie's cousin Lucy Deane invites Maggie and introduces her to her suitor Stephen Guest. A mutual attraction begins between Maggie and Stephen. Philip, one of Stephen's friends, joins Maggie, Lucy and Stephen's meetings, and he recognizes Maggie and Stephen's mutual attraction. After Lucy learns Philip and Maggie's earlier secret relationship, she wants to leave them alone for a boat trip down the Floss. Philip feels depressed and sends Stephen for the trip without knowing Lucy's plan, so Maggie and Stephen are being left alone. During this trip, they pass their stopping point; then, Stephen convinces Maggie to elope with him. The next day, Maggie recognizes that she cannot marry Stephen owing to Philip and Lucy's disappointment and turns back to St. Ogg's. Maggie goes to Dorlcote Mill to see Tom; however, Tom does not forgive Maggie and sends her away. Towards the end of the novel, Maggie is obliged to live as an outcast in St Ogg's because of the attitudes and behaviours of society. Maggie's outcast state ends with a flood of the River Floss and she rescues Tom who is trapped at Dorlcote Mill. Meanwhile, there becomes an unspoken resolution between Maggie and Tom. While they are rowing down the river in order to rescue Lucy, the boat capsizes and Tom and Maggie are

drown together. They are buried next to each other with a tombstone which is written: "In their death they were not divided" (*Mill* 544).

Through the novel, Eliot performs a marked tendency to treat characters in pairs. The most typical pair is Maggie and Tom that have a hard relationship owing to their differences. Other significant pairs that Eliot represents through the novel are Maggie and Lucy, Tom and Stephen, Philip and Stephen, and Tom and Philip. The contrast and the conflict between Tom and Philip is a reflection of the contrast and the conflict between their fathers Mr Tulliver and Mr Wakem (Edwards 33). Eliot represents the duality between the characters by making use of their similarities and differences through the novel.

Eliot's novel, *The Mill on the Floss,* reveals the protagonist Maggie's familial relations, gender dilemmas, ambivalence of identity, and social pressure within the frame of the circumstances of the conservative Victorian society. Eliot criticises the traditional gender roles and the social construction and the position of biological sexes. For this reason, *The Mill on the Floss* reveals the contradictions and oppositions between the social position of the character in the novel and the need of the character to perform her emotions, imaginations, and drives. In this part of the chapter, *The Mill on the Floss* is going to be investigated with regard to the theory of language that refers to the semiotic and the symbolic, the theory of abjection, women's time, melancholia and revolt in the light of Julia Kristeva's works.

Kristeva explains the opposite conditions of the "semiotic" and the "symbolic." The phase of the semiotic takes place within "the pre-linguistic and pre-Oedipal state of maternal closeness." It is the period before language. In other words, the child does not know language, so it does not know any borders that distinguish self from other. When the child grows up, it experiences a socializing process, diversely theorized by Freud as Oedipal complex, by Lacan as Mirror Phase, and by Kristeva as the entry into the symbolic realm. On the other hand, the symbolic is the social state that includes the controlled and repressed bodily desires and the recognition of the father authority. Like Freud's notion of the "unconscious," the semiotic might be repressed; however, it is not

completely exterminated, and the semiotic distorts the symbolic when it comes to the surface. The symbolic is always trying to carry on repressing the semiotic. The irrepressible unconscious was important for feminism since it indicated that the conscious or the symbolic state was not natural and stable as it would be thought; therefore, patriarchal order and control could be eliminated (Tolan 335). The semiotic and the symbolic are significant components for the development of subjectivity in view of Kristeva. The semiotic which is a kind of language before language is associated with the mother. Unlike the maternal semiotic, the symbolic is associated with the father, particularly the phallus (Becker-Leckrone 163). Therefore, the symbolic and the semiotic are interdependent in the process of development of subjectivity and in language.

Regarding the notion of the semiotic, through the representations of the characters of the novel, Eliot represents Maggie as more imaginative, enthusiastic, and interesting than her brother Tom. Maggie is an unusual girl not only her physical appearance but also her behaviours and intelligence. Even in her childhood, she is an extraordinary girl in her environment. She has a dark complexion, black hair and eyes in contrast to her family. She is felt to be too intelligent for a girl, her interests are not those of a normal young lady, and her passionate and "wild" nature makes her uncontrollable. Regarding Maggie's physical appearance, her mother Mrs Tulliver is not pleased as she is not a blonde girl like herself, Tom, and Lucy. She complains, "but her hair won't curl all I can do it with it and she is so frenzy about having it put i' paper, an' I've such work as never make her stand and have it pinched with th' irons' (*Mill* 15). Maggie is compared with Lucy in terms of their physical appearance,

> Their tete-a-tete was curtailed by the appearance of Mrs Deane with little Lucy; and Mrs Tulliver had to look on with a silent pang while Lucy's blond curls were adjusted. It was quite unaccountable that Mrs Deane, the thinnest and sallowest of all the Miss Dodsons, should have had this child, who might have been taken for Mrs Tulliver's any day. And Maggie always looked twice as dark as usual when she was by the side of Lucy. (*Mill* 65)

Maggie's appearance is always contrasted by Lucy's. Throughout the novel, it is obvious that Maggie's physical appearance is compared with Lucy's, and the contrast between them is described as "it was like the contrast between a rough, dark, overgrown puppy and a white kitten" (*Mill* 66).

In *Tales of Love*, Kristeva explains the dilemma of all children between their struggle with the desires to return to the perfect oneness of the mother's body, particularly the womb, and their desires to establish their own distinct identity. The establishment their own distinct identity gives rise to complete isolation and alienation while returning to the womb means complete reunion without a separate identity for the individual by losing of the self. Kristeva suggests a model in which the subject experiences this conflict with the maternal space into adulthood, which takes place in terms of closeness and ties with others, especially in romantic affairs. It happens as the desire to merge, and then it is followed by fear, after that it is followed by a desire for union once again. Whenever Maggie confronts a crisis at home, she runs away from everybody and retreats an attic:

> Before this remonstrance was finished, Maggie was already out of hearing making her way toward the great attic that run under the old high-pinched roof, shaking the water from her black locks as she run, like a Skye terrier escaped from his bath. This attic was Maggie's favourite retreat on a wet day, when the weather was not too cold; here she fretted out all her ill humours, and talked aloud to the worm-eaten floors and the worm-eaten shelves, and the dark rafters festooned with cobwebs. (*Mill* 31)

Concerning Maggie's life, she struggles with her desire to establish her separate identity by running away to the attic from her mother and everyone surrounding during a crisis. The attic can symbolize the maternal body, in particular the womb. In this case, a desire occurs to return to the perfect oneness of the maternal body without a distinct identity. This desire makes Maggie alienated and isolated even during her childhood.

Regarding Maggie's escapes, Maggie had been so often told that she was like a "gypsy" and "half wild" owing to her distinct physical appearance and unconventional intelligence and activeness. She is not able to be in harmony with her environment. She

runs away and goes to gypsies in order to be their queen. However, due to the gypsies' "incomprehensible chattering," she feels so lonely: "the gypsies didn't seem to mind her at all, and she felt quite weak among them" (*Mill* 118). Maggie tells her father, "I ran away because I was so unhappy" (*Mill* 123). Maggie is so unhappy that she does not have the sense of belonging not only to her family but also to her environment.

Concerning the semiotic, Maggie's nature and intelligence are compared with Tom's. Maggie has "unmodifiable characters," and she is "the dark-eyed, demonstrative, rebellious girl" when she is compared with Tom's "pink-and-white bit of masculinity with indeterminate features" (*Mill* 37). Maggie is generally described by her parents, especially Mr Tulliver, about her intelligence. He says, 'the little un takes after my side, now: she's twice as cute as Tom. Too cute for a woman, I'm afraid it's no mischief much while she is a little un, but an over cute woman's no better nor a long-tailed sheep- she will fetch none the bigger price for that' (*Mill* 15). Maggie's father is aware of his daughter's intelligence; however, he is indifferent to her intelligence.

Apart from the physical appearance and intelligence, gender is also an important factor regarding the Victorian norms and Kristeva's theory. According to Kristeva, language is the domination of patriarchy, which controls its symbolic dimension. On the other hand, the semiotic remains under the control of patriarchy. When patriarchy is not able to control something, it is repressed by patriarchy (Tyson 104). Within this perspective, while the symbolic is linked to the masculinity and paternity, the semiotic is associated with femininity and maternity. The semiotic refers to Maggie's self-identification, unusual desires and free drives. Thus, Maggie' semiotic is confined and intruded by the symbolic as Maggie's environment, especially her brother Tom who signifies the patriarchy. Similarly, Maggie's unusual desires and unconventional nature intrude the symbolic, in particular meaning-making patriarchy.

Barbara Creed makes use of Kristeva's conception of abjection in *Powers of Horrors,* which does not "respect borders, positions, rules" and "disturbs identity, system, order" *(*4). In "Kristeva, Femininity, and Abjection," Creed states,

> In general terms, Kristeva is attempting to explore the different ways in which abjection works within human societies, as a means of separating out

> the human from the non-human and the fully constituted subject from the partially formed subject. Ritual becomes a means by which societies both renew their initial contact with the abject element and then exclude that element. (64)

From the social-critical point of view, Creed draws attention primarily to the theory of abjection in terms of the concept of the border, the mother-child relationship, and the feminine body. Creed utilizes the incidents of abjection as "abominations: sexual immorality and perversion; corporeal alteration, decay and death; human sacrifice; murder; the corpse; bodily wastes; the feminine body and incest." In other words, abjection is often used to describe the state of the marginalized such as women including unwed mothers and prostitutes, religious minorities, convicts, poor and disabled people (64).

Regarding the patriarchal Victorian society, Maggie is in-between regarding her passions and her "duties." First, Maggie gives up her friendship with Philip in harmony with her brother's decision. Tom tells about Maggie and her relationship with Philip,

> 'Now, then, Maggie, there are but two courses for you to take,-either you vow solemnly to me, with your hand on my father's Bible, that you will never have another meeting or speak another word in private with Philip Wakem, or you refuse, and I tell my father everything; and this month, when by my exertions he might be made happy once more, you will cause him the blow of knowing that you are a disobedient, deceitful daughter, who throws away her own respectability by clandestine meetings with the son of a man that has helped to ruin her father. Choose!' (*Mill* 356)

Eliot reflects the Victorian society's point of view about Maggie's relationship with Philip. Second, after Maggie's elopement with Stephen, Tom represents the Victorian dominant ideology again by saying,

> 'You will find no home with me…You have disgraced us all-you have disgraced my father's name. You have been a curse for your best friends… I

> washed my hands of you forever. You don't belong to me… You have been carrying on a clandestine relation with Stephen Guest- as you did before with another.' (*Mill* 503-4)

Above quotations represent the symbolic concerning the dominant patriarchal ideology. Maggie's unconventional nature, unusual intelligence, and extraordinary energy result in the abjection concerning the clash between the semiotic and the symbolic. Indeed, she "disturbs system, order." In *Industrialization, Modernity, and the Woman Question,* Rezzan Kocaöner Silkü maintains that Maggie becomes a "menace" for the patriarchal ideology. She should be tamed owing to being more intelligent than Tom. Thus, Eliot lets Maggie face the reality and suffer from both her fanciful and rebellious character wherever she stays. Therefore, Maggie does not find any place and relief among relatives because of her dark complexion and unusual intelligence and she does not have a sense of belonging among the gypsies (123). Therefore, Maggie's abjection does not end with her return to her environment. She continues to feel herself the abject owing to her in-betweenness and loneliness having a fluid identity.

In the last chapter of the novel, Maggie's hope for something which "softens" Tom happens at the end and he starts to recognize the greatness of Maggie's soul and to reply her love. This recognition takes place because Maggie sacrifices herself to rescue Tom. This incident emphasizes the significance of Tom's selfishness since they are killed by "floating machinery" and this symbolizes the destructive influences of Maggie's father's and brother's uninspired materialism. The epitaph that was written on their tombstone: "In death they were not divided," means certainly how much Tom and Maggie were divided in life. Maggie's whole story should be considered in terms of her tragic relationship with Tom and Mr Tulliver. The central concept of the novel is "division"- the division between the "large-souled woman" and the "narrow-souled father and brother." Mr Tulliver and Tom are not able to reciprocate Maggie's profound love for them (Hagan 62). In other words, Maggie feels the division between herself and her brother from childhood to adulthood. This divided relationship between Maggie and her brother and her father also influences Maggie's characterization in terms of the sense of abjection.

With regard to the feminist literary theory, Julia Kristeva does not accept biologism and essentialism, and she evaluates the feminist struggle as three "generations" or phases. In the first phase, the desire of women is to enter into the symbolic order. In the second phase, the aim of women is to reject the symbolic order of the male, and femininity is extolled radically. In the third phase that includes Kristeva's own point of view about the feminist struggle, women reject the differences between masculine and feminine as metaphysical (Moi 12). In other words, Kristeva's approach to the feminist struggle is included in the third phase; however, in her significant essay "Women's Time", Kristeva explains her opinions and attitudes about all three phases of the feminist struggle. About the first phase of feminism, Kristeva states that

> The political demands of women; the struggles for equal pay for equal work, for taking power in social institutions on an equal footing with men; the rejection, when necessary, of the attributes traditionally considered feminine or maternal in so far as they are deemed incompatible with insertion in that history – all are part of the logic of identification with certain values; not with the ideological(these are combated, and rightly so, as reactionary) but, rather, logical and ontological values of a rationality dominant in the nation-state. (194)

Within the frame of Kristeva's thoughts about the first generation, in *Julia Kristeva*, McAfee states that the first generation is located prior to 1968 by Kristeva, and it is called as equal rights and equal treatment. The first generation does not disrupt the symbolic system of the male; however, they want to be treated equally in social platforms because they think that there are not any important differences between the biological sexes. In "Women's Time," Kristeva borrows James Joyce's phrase, "father's time, mother's species," in order to show two different dimensions that human beings have experienced. The conception of "father's time" refers to the linear time in which men have conventionally existed in terms of progress, history, and destiny. On the other hand, the conception of "mother's species" is associated with the space in which the humankinds are produced, the time is repetitive in a circle, and the species are infinite (93-4). For Kristeva, the notion of "mother's species" indicates the nonlinear

subjectivity of female with regard to the space as opposed to the notion of father's time that refers to the linear time. Regarding this reference of the woman space, Kristeva remembers Freud's hypothesis that hysteria, the stereotypical malady of women, was linked to the space, and she also remembers her theory of the chora that she associates with the maternity and the semiotic (Becker-Leckrone 116-7). In other words, women are captured within the restricted space and cyclical time by being excluded from the patriarchal public domains and linear time.

In regard with the historical background and social circumstances of Victorian period, George Eliot reflects sexual differences between women and men through the novel in an explicit and clear way, which is associated with the first generation of feminist struggle that suggests equal rights and equal treatment. The fact that *The Mill on the Floss* was first published in 1860 proves why it can reflect sexual differences effectively since Julia Kristeva locates the first generation prior to 1968. Sexual differences are obviously revealed through the novel from the childhood of the protagonist to her adolescence. In terms of the education of his children, Mr Tulliver is more susceptible to his son Tom's education than his daughter Maggie's although he is aware of his daughter Maggie's bright intelligence. He tells about his son's education,

> What I want is to give Tom a good eddication; an eddication as'll be a bread to him . . . I mean to put him to a downright good school at Midsummer. The two years at th' academy 'ud ha' done well enough, if I'd meant to make a miller and farmer of him, for he's had a fine sight more schoolin' nor I ever got. All the learnin' my father ever paid for was a bit o' birch at one end and the alphabet at th' other. But I should like Tom to be a bit of a scholard, so as he might be up to the tricks o' these fellows as talk fine and write with a flourish. It 'ud be a help to me wi' these lawsuits, and arbitrations, and things. I wouldn't make a downright lawyer o' the lad,- I should be sorry for him to be a raskill,- but a sort o' engineer, or a surveyor, or an auctioneer and vallyer, like Riley, or one o' them smartish businesses as are all profits and no outlay, only for a big watch-chain and a high stool. (*Mill* 14)

Mr Tulliver is more susceptible to Tom's education although he knows Maggie is "twice as cute as Tom," his prior plan is his son's education as he is going to be a man in the symbolic world of the male. Regarding Kristeva's notion "father's time" in the first generation, the public spheres belong to the male, so the priority also belongs to the male. Even as a little boy, Tom is also aware these sexual distinctions between him and his sister, "I don't want your money, you silly thing. I've got a great deal more money than you, because I'm a boy. I always have half sovereigns and sovereigns for my Christmas boxes because I shall be a man, and you only have five-shilling pieces, because you're only a girl" (*Mill* 49). This quotation also shows Tom's humiliating attitudes to his sister owing to her sex. Furthermore, even though Maggie wants to help Tom for his courses, Tom insults her by showing her a page of Euclid, "You help me, you silly little thing! I should like to see you doing one of my lessons! Why, I learn Latin too! Girls never learn such things. They're too silly (*Mill* 188). Owing to Tom's insulting attitudes and behaviours, Maggie asks Tom's tutor Mr Stelling whether she could do Euclid and all other lessons, Tom replies, "Girls can't do Euclid; can they, sir?" Mr Sterling adds, "They can pick up a little of everything, I dare say. They've a great deal of superficial cleverness; but they couldn't go far into anything. They're quick and shallow" (*Mill* 195). Tom is so pleased with such kind of instances; however, Maggie always feels so oppressed by these instances of inferiority.

In addition to Mr Tulliver is indifferent to his daughter's intelligence, Mrs Tulliver humiliates her own daughter by saying, "I'm sure the child's half an idiot i' some things; for if I send her upstairs to fetch anything, she forgets what she's gone for, an 'perhaps 'ull sit down on the floor i' the sunshine an' plait her hair an' sing to herself like a Bedlam creatur', all the while I'm waiting for her downstairs" (*Mill* 19). It is concluded that Mrs Tulliver also uses the male discourse since her attitudes and behaviours are also humiliating to her daughter.

The differences between Maggie and Tom are intensified by the distinct spheres of female and male experiences. Both of them love stories; however, Tom enjoys merely the martial tales of determined characters such as Robert the Bruce that extols the virtues of the action world. Later, unlike Tom, Maggie becomes withdrawn and meditative denying the involvement in the world of action, which is associated with

business and commerce. While Tom involves in the public sphere, Maggie has to struggle with the clashes within her psyche (Uglow 133). Regarding the different outward conditions of the lives of women and men, Eliot writes,

> While Maggie's life-struggles had lain almost entirely within her own soul, one shadowy army fighting another, and the slain shadows forever rising again, Tom was engaged in a dustier, noisier warfare, grappling with more substantial obstacles, and gaining more definite conquests. So it has been since the days of Hecuba, and of Hector, Tamer of horses; inside the gates, the women with streaming hair and uplifted hands offering prayers, watching the world's combat from afar, filling their long, empty days with memories and fears; outside, the men, in fierce struggle with things divine and human, quenching memory in the stronger light of purpose, losing the sense of dread and even of wounds in the hurrying ardour of action. (*Mill* 320)

The various life circumstances of women and men differ from their perception of the world; therefore, their language is also different from each other. For this reason, Kristeva's distinction of language as the semiotic and the symbolic is reflected through the novel in terms of "Women's Time" because the semiotic refers to the introverted and meditative state of Maggie while the symbolic refers to the extroverted and active state of Tom.

Through the novel, Eliot describes merely one character as prolific; and she is Mrs Moss, Maggie's aunt. Her prolificacy stems from her regeneration as a woman since Mrs Moss has eight children. Mrs Moss is one of the weakest characters socially and economically through the novel. Mrs Tulliver also feels superior to Mrs Moss even though she is not a strong character as a wife and a sister,

> Being always on the defensive toward her own sisters, it was natural that she should be keenly conscious of her superiority, even as the weakest Dodson, over a husband's sister, who, besides being poorly off, and inclined to 'hang on' her brother, had the good-natured submissiveness of a large, easy-tempered, untidy, prolific woman, with affection enough in her not

> only for her own husband and abundant children, but for any number of collateral relations. (*Mill* 165)

Regarding Kristeva's notion of "mother's species," the ability and capability of women are restricted to the domestic sphere as the regeneration of children, and their prolificacy is limited to giving birth them. Within this frame, the most prolific woman in the novel is humiliated even by her congeneric.

The Mill on the Floss is a tragedy of repression and regression. Maggie Tulliver's life ends with her downfall, and she is responsible for this because she is damaged by a diseased, infantile obsession on her father and brother; both failures pull against her legitimate desire and need for a total fulfilment of life (Hagan 53). This is not only because of "the need of being loved, the strongest need in poor Maggie's nature" but also because of "the desire for knowledge" (*Mill* 41).

Simone de Beauvoir expresses her feelings and opinions about Maggie in her *Memoirs of a Dutiful Daughters*:

> About this time I read a novel which seem to me translate my spiritual exile into words . . . Maggie Tulliver, like myself, was torn between others and herself; I recognized myself in her. She too was dark, loved nature, and books and life, was too headstrong to be able to observe the conventions of her respectable surroundings and yet was very sensitive to the criticism of a brother she adored . . . I felt my heart blaze with sympathy for her. I wept over her sorry fate for hours. The others condemned her because she was superior to them; I resembled her, and henceforward I saw my isolation not as a proof of infamy but as a sign of my uniqueness . . . Through the heroine I identified myself with the author; one day other adolescents would bathe their tears a novel in which I would tell my own sad story. (140)

Like Simone de Beauvoir, Eliot reflects some realities of her past. The autobiographical elements stress the sense of pain owing to her familial relationship in terms of her closeness to her brother and her father. In spite of some personal elements, this novel is not Eliot's own story since the autobiographical elements is restricted to childhood.

Maggie never writes a novel. In terms of provincial narrowness, she experiences her internal drama with "religious yearning, longing for beauty and the desire for love" (Uglow 128).

Within the frame of representations of childhood in Victorian novel, Victorian authors supplied complex writings of the emotional life and psychological development of children by following their characters' growing from the childhood to the adulthood. These authors utilized the relationships between past and present, affections, grudges, desires, and fears. Like other Victorian novelists such as Bronte and Dickens, Eliot represents the instances of childhood in terms of emotional intensity and psychological grief. The strong emotions and childhood experiences form the character of the adult. Besides, the unforgettable strength of memory that is traumatic or satisfying supplies a tie between the childhood and the adulthood. The construction of the personal identity is based on memory. This condition was a primary psychological element of the perceptual reality of an individual. Eliot made use of this psychology of childhood by examining the direct impulses of childhood experiences of the construction of an adult character by discovering the temporary persistence between various versions of the self and exploring the role of memory in the formation of interiority and consciousness (Vrettos 73-4).

Bonnie Hoover Braendlin proposes that the feminist movement of 1960s and 1970s results in feminist Bildungsromane which is close to the male model of the Bildungsroman in "their delineation of the education, reassessment, rebellion, and departure of their respective female protagonists" (qtd. in Goodman 30). In Victorian novels, a pair of protagonists evolves as a male and a female unlike the prototypical male Bildungsroman. This is male-female Bildungsroman in which the design is circular and the structure contains three parts. First, the male and the female protagonists share their childhood experiences. Second, they separate from each other as male and female in their adolescence and in their adulthood because the male looks for his fortune while the female remains behind. Third, the novel ends with the reunion of the male and the female protagonists. The dual form of bildungsroman that focuses on two protagonists is used by women novelists in order to emphasize that a society discriminates male and female owing to gender roles which restrict to the development

of women. Female characters represent the authors' identification owing to the traditional gender roles as opposed to the desire of the authors for learning, strength and autonomy. The male-female Bildungsroman indicates that "a harmonious and balanced androgynous self" is destroyed by a culture or patriarchal society. Merely in the last scene of the novel, the fragmentation of the self is ended with the reunion of the male and female protagonists. In *The Mill on the Floss*, Eliot depicts the childhood sharing, the adolescent separation and the male and female protagonists' reunion at the end in harmony with the structure of the male-female Bildungsroman. During their childhood, Maggie and Tom are in a garden world until they have to pass through the "golden gates." Then, they separate from each other because of their education and work experiences. Eliot's description as the drowning of Maggie and Tom in a flood is not harmonious with the traditional ending of nineteenth century novels; however, it conforms to the ending pattern of the male-female double Bildungsroman as Maggie and Tom are reunited in the flood (Goodman 30-34).

In *Black Sun*, Kristeva explains melancholia/depression and love as two domains of psychic zone that establishes the relation of the subject to language, to self and to society (Barret 4). Kristeva defines melancholia as the "impossible mourning for the maternal object (*Black* 9). According to Kristeva, the conception of melancholia and depression is blurred and she uses these terms instead of each other. Melancholia is thought as a state that is related to internal trauma whereas depression is thought as a state that takes place as a result of external incidents in a subject's life. However, the same mourning for the maternal object surfaces in both states, so these terms are blurred (Barrett 71). Within the frame of this conception of melancholia and depression, it is possible to suggest that both terms are observed in Eliot's character Philip in terms of his loss of mother and his deformed body owing to an accident. Philip's loss of mother is associated with his internal trauma whereas his physical deformity is associated with the result of an external incident, and both states results in Philip's mourning. However, for Kristeva, there is no need to make a distinction between melancholia and depression due to the blurred borders between their conceptions.

For Kristeva, there are two types of depression as "objectal depression" and "narcissistic depression." Objectal depression is associated with the loss of an "internal

object" not a real person. The subject internalizes the loss of an external thing that he not only loves but also hates. He loves it as he cannot become without it, and he hates it since its absence subverts him. On the other hand, the narcissistic depression emerges when a loss takes place at the primary level, particularly in the chora. The narcissistic depression points out the significance of the mother and the imaginary realm for the child's language acquisition. The child's loss in the semiotic chora prevents him from entering into the symbolic and the child cannot recognize the distinction between the object and the subject. Therefore, the child cannot name his loss. It is not an object but an unnameable thing for the child. The narcissistic depressed is melancholic. Thus, the melancholic feels wounded as melancholia is a "noncommunicable grief" and the melancholic is entrapped within his sadness. He has something which he is not able to share in the symbolic domain and he may be even incapable of speaking (McAfee 60-1). Kristeva examines the conception of the melancholic depression in terms of the relation with other disciplines such as literature and art. Kristeva states,

> Moods are inscriptions, energy disruptions, and not simply raw energies. They lead us toward a modality of significance that, on the threshold of bioenergetics stability, insures the preconditions for (or manifests the disintegration of) the imaginary and the symbolic. On the frontier between animality and symbol formation, moods- and particularly sadness- are the ultimate reactions to our traumas, they are our basic homeostatic recourses. For if it true that those who are slaves to their moods, beings drowned in their sorrows, reveal a number of psychic or cognitive frailties, it is equally true that a diversification of moods, variety in sadness, refinement in sorrow or mourning are the imprint of a humankind that is surely not triumphant but subtle, ready to fight, and creative… (*Black* 22)

The creative melancholic subject are the participants in "that adventure of the body and signs that bears witness to the affect- to sadness as imprint of separation and beginning of the symbol's sway"(*Black* 22). These are novelists; poets, artists that have been motivated to create by melancholia's black sun. Kristeva explains the way of the depressed artist to attain the realm of signs. The melancholic has to do something in

order to overcome his sadness. He needs to start to identify with the "Imaginary Father" by separating himself from the unnameable thing. The identification provides the subject for one thing that stands for another. In this way, the subject believes that there is going to be any relief or comfort in the realm of signs (McAfee 66-7). Within this frame, Philip undoubtedly fits the description of the melancholic. He loses his mother. Eliot describes Philip and his conditions,

> Philip had never been soothed by that mother's love which flows out to us in the greater abundance because our need is greater, which clings to us the more tenderly because we are the less likely to be winners in the game of life; and the sense of his father's affection and indulgence toward him was marred by the keener perception of his father's faults. Kept aloof from all practical life as Philip had been, and by nature half feminine in sensitiveness, he had some of the woman's intolerant repulsion toward worldliness and the deliberate pursuit of sensual enjoyment; and this one strong natural tie in his life,- his relation as a son- was like an aching limb to him. (*Mill* 344)

Philip loses his mother and he is considered as "the son of a bad man" in St. Ogg's society. Thus, Philip suffers from a lack of love owing to the familial relations. When he confesses his love of Maggie to his father, Mr Wakem says,

> 'The girl's father was an ignorant mad brute, who was within an inch of murdering me. The whole town knows it. And the brother is just as insolent, only in a cooler way. He forbade her seeing you, you say; he'll break every bone in your body, for your greater happiness, if you don't take care. But you seem to have made up your mind; you have counted the consequences, I suppose. Of course you are independent of me; you can marry this girl tomorrow, if you like; you are a man of five-and-twenty- you can go your way, and I can go mine. We need have no more to do with each other.' (*Mill* 442)

This quotation above indicates his indifference to his son as a first reaction when he learns his feelings about his enemy's daughter. Philip suffers from a lack of love because he thinks "it is very sweet to have people love us" (*Mill* 319).

Within the frame of the subject's entry into the realm of signs, Philip devotes his time to painting, reading and music:

> 'I think of too many things- sow all sorts of seeds, and get no great harvest from any one of them. I'm cursed with susceptibility in every direction, and effective faculty in none. I care for painting and music; I care for classic literature, and mediaeval literature, and modern literature; I flutter all ways, and fly in none.' (*Mill* 339)

Philip is interested in different realms of signs in order to overcome his sadness; however, he cannot overcome his melancholic state. He sees himself "a pitiable object" (*Mill* 444).

Kristeva expresses a dilemma of all children either to establish a separate identity or to return to the perfect unity with the mother's body, especially the womb. The establishment of the separate identity results in total isolation and alienation while returning to the mother's body means losing the self. Kristeva proposes a model in which the subject confronts this conflict with the maternal zone into adulthood and this conflict surfaces in closeness and bonds with others, especially in romantic affairs. In *Mill on the Floss*, Philip is an introvert person; therefore, he is not integrated into society. He lives in a room on the roof in his father's house and Philip describes his room as "sanctum" (*Mill* 440). In other words, it is described as a private place for Philip in order to keep himself away from others. Within this frame, it resembles the maternal zone, particularly the womb. Eliot describes him, "Philip had never been soothed by that mother's love" (*Mill* 344). With the absence of his mother, his "sanctum" gives the security and the warmth of the womb because his father says Philip, "This is a nice place for you, isn't it, Phil? – a capital light that from the roof, eh?" (*Mill* 441) Like Maggie, Philip keeps himself away from everyone and retreats his "sanctum" in the quest of the security and the warmth.

Kristeva calls the subject as "speaking being." The speaking being is formed concerning the signifying process, in particular the semiotic and the symbolic. Therefore, the speaking being is not a stable unified self but a subject in process. For Kristeva, "linguistic changes constitute changes in the status of the subject" (*Revolution* 15). In other words, the alterations in language, especially the signifying process, give rise to the alternations in the status of the subject.

McAfee explains the conception of the subject in process in Kristevan theory, in *Julia Kristeva*. This process indicates that the identity of the subject is not fixed. The signifying process works as the semiotic and the symbolic simultaneously. The semiotic energy is so significant that everyone must own it for life; however, when someone is commanded only by the semiotic drives and energy, she becomes psychotic. The subject tries to have a stable unified identify; however, the semiotic drives distorts her efforts for a unified self. In other words, the subject needs to have the semiotic drives and energy, but it must be controlled. If the subject is not able to control her semiotic chora, she is a borderline subject that has difficulties in achieving a stable identity, and her semiotic charges are in a permanent state of the revolt against the symbolic order (105-6).

Within the conception of revolt, Eliot presents Maggie as "the dark-eyed, demonstrative, rebellious girl" (*Mill* 37). Maggie has unconventional nature and unusual intelligence when she is compared with her fellows. Even as a little girl, she behaves in a different way, and her mother Mrs Tulliver is never satisfied with Maggie's nature and behaviours. Mrs Tulliver talks to Maggie:

> 'Oh, dear, oh, dear, Maggie, what are you thinkin' of, to throw your bonnet down there? Take it upstairs, there's a good gell, an' let your hair be brushed, an' put your other pinafore on, an' change your shoes, do, for shame; an' come an' go on with your patchwork, like a little lady.'
>
> 'Oh, mother,' said Maggie, in a vehemently cross tone, 'I don't want to do my patchwork.'
>
> 'What! not your pretty patchwork, to make a counterpane for your aunt Glegg?'

> ‘It’s foolish work,’ said Maggie, with a toss of her mane,--‘tearing things to pieces to sew ‘em together again.’ (*Mill* 16)

Maggie is not like other little ladies. Indeed, her passionate nature is not suitable for this kind of work, and her semiotic drives and energy are in a perpetual position of revolt as opposed to the symbolic order. Therefore, she rebels against her mother’s expectation. Eliot describes her world and her mood,

> The poor child, with her soul’s hunger and her illusions of self-flattery, began to nibble at this thick-rinded fruit of the tree of knowledge, filling her vacant hours with Latin, geometry, and the forms of the syllogism, and feeling a gleam of triumph now and then that her understanding was quite equal to these peculiarly masculine studies. (*Mill* 299)

Maggie’s soul is hungry for knowledge because of her semiotic drives and energy. Her characterization, nature and frame of mind are suitable for intellectual domains such as Latin and geometry rather than doing the patchwork. However, the expectation and the permission of the social/symbolic order are distinct from Maggie’s semiotic drives and energy,

> This living world was extremely remote for her. The discouragement deepened as the days went on, and the eager heart gained faster and faster on the patient mind. Somehow, when she sat at the window with her book, her eyes would fix themselves blankly on the outdoor sunshine; then they would fill with tears, and sometimes, if her mother was not in the room, the studies would all end in sobbing. She rebelled against her lot, she fainted under its loneliness, and fits even of anger and hatred toward her father and mother, who were so unlike what she would have them to be; toward Tom, who checked her, and met her thought or feeling always by some thwarting difference-would flow out over her affections and conscience like a lava stream, and frighten her with a sense that it was not difficult for her to become a demon. (*Mill* 299)

Regarding the kinds of revolt, Kristeva separates psychological revolt from societal revolt. Even though these are different from each other, Kristeva thinks that both are significant. However, she emphasizes the primary requirement of psychological revolt– "revolt against identity, homogenization, the spectacle, and the law." If an internal district is not kept alive, the subject does not keep alive an inner zone (McAfee 118). Maggie psychologically revolts against her family members since she is discouraged by them owing to her tendencies that are devoted to the masculine spheres. Maggie's revolts is always followed by humiliation,

> There was a terrible cutting truth in Tom's words- that hard rind of truth which is discerned by unimaginative, unsympathetic minds. Maggie always writhed under this judgment of Tom's; she rebelled and was humiliated in the same moment; it seemed as if he held a glass before her to show her her own folly and weakness, as if he were a prophetic voice predicting her future fallings; and yet, all the while, she judged him in return; she said inwardly that he was narrow and unjust, that he was below feeling those mental needs which were often the source of the wrong-doing or absurdity that made her life a planless riddle to him. (*Mill* 409)

When Maggie wants to meet Philip again, Tom humiliates Maggie as usual. Philip is the only person that respects Maggie's unusual intelligence and unconventional nature. Maggie rebels and meets Philip again. However, Maggie never feels free herself from her ties to her past and her family, in particular her brother Tom. Tom, the symbol of the social/symbolic order through the novel, tries to repress, oppress and humiliate Maggie owing to her desires, temptations, and tendencies in terms of the conservative Victorian norms. Nonetheless, Maggie achieves partially to form her semiotic desires and drives with the influence of the revolutionary side of her psyche. Within this frame, in *The English Novel*, Eagleton states that

> The novel is determined to grant its heroine her victory, even if it has to go to the death for it. This includes a triumph over Tom, who in his dying moments acknowledges his sister's moral superiority. Maggie thus crushes

> him and wins him over at the same time, establishing equality with her brother which is also a kind of power. Most of Eliot's novels only just manage to fend off tragedy, and the ending of this one can be read as both tragic and anti-tragic. Or perhaps it is an example of the ambiguity of all authentic tragedy, in which the very act of submitting to your destiny reveals a courage which transcends it. (177)

Eagleton underlines that the revolutionary side of Maggie gives rise to a triumph over his brother. In other words, Maggie may be seen an "anti-tragic" character due to her establishment of her equality with the symbol of the semiotic system, in particular his brother.

In conclusion, according to Kristeva, the social position of the character in the novel refers to the symbolic while the feelings, imaginations, and drives of the character refer to the semiotic. The revelation of the semiotic and the symbolic emphasizes gender dilemma and the ambivalence of identity through the novel. This state refers to the difficulty in attaining the right model for identification with the female sex or male sex in terms of the mother and the father. As a result, she is not able to become a "uniary subject . . . where the self is seen as a homogeneous, consistent whole" (*Desire* 33). This state of the subject refers to the divided self. Regarding Maggie's conditions from childhood to adulthood, *The Mill on the Floss* reflects the familial relations, gender dilemma, the ambivalence of identity, the patriarchal pressure of conservative Victorian society that results in the contradictions and oppositions between the semiotic and the symbolic. Eliot criticises the traditional gender roles and the social construction and the position of biological sexes. Therefore, *The Mill on the Floss* reveals the contradictions and oppositions between the social position of the character in the novel and the need of the character to perform her emotions, imaginations, and drives. The characters of the novel are examined in terms of Kristevan concepts as the theory of language (the semiotic and the symbolic), the theory of abjection, women's time, melancholia and the revolt. One of the protagonist of the novel, Maggie, is examined in terms of the theory of language (the semiotic and the symbolic), the theory of abjection, women's time and the revolt while the other protagonist, Tom, is examined in terms of the theory of

language (the semiotic and the symbolic) and women's time. In addition, Mrs Moss, Maggie's aunt, is examined within the frame of women's time whereas Philip, the most perceptive character towards Maggie, is examined through the conception of melancholia.

2.3. The "Spinning Insect" in *Silas Marner*

George Eliot describes the early years of the nineteenth century in *Silas Marner*. Silas is a weaver in Raveloe, an English rural village, and he is seen as an outsider due to his occupation, his strange physical appearance, and his cataleptic fits. Before coming to Raveloe, Silas was a young member of a congregation that does not belong to Anglican Church, the dominant ideology in England at that time. He is accused of stealing the money of this congregation. Indeed, William Dane, Silas's best friend in Lantern Yard, steals the money and puts the blame on Silas. As soon as Silas is proclaimed as guilty and is excommunicated, his fiancée Sarah breaks their engagement. In a month, William and Sarah marry, and Silas leaves Lantern Yard by losing his faith to God and human beings. While he is living in Raveloe, he does not contact with the villagers. For fifteen years, he weaves like a "spinning insect" and hoards his gold which he earns (*Silas* 24). Meanwhile, he starts to adore the increasing hoard of gold. At every night, he counts his gold with a great pleasure and hides them beneath the floor of his cottage. One day, his gold is stolen by Dunstan Cass, the younger son of Squire Cass, the leading landowner of the town. The elder son of Squire Cass, Godfrey Cass, secretly marries Molly Farren who is addicted to opium; however, he falls in love with Nancy Lammeter, a young woman from a high social position. At a winter night, Molly sets out to come to Squire Cass to announce their secret marriage. However, Molly dies under a bush near Silas's cottage owing to opium on the road. The child comes to the light of Silas's cottage during Silas's cataleptic fit. With Molly's death, Godfrey becomes free to marry Nancy. Silas adopts the child and gives her his mother and his sister's name Hephzibah, the long form of Eppie. Eppie replaces Silas's gold as the object of his love and Silas starts to contact with the community while raising Eppie such as Mrs Winthrop. A period of sixteen years passes and Eppie is now eighteen years old. Silas and Eppie are pleased with their family and their life style whereas Godfrey and Nancy mourn for their childless marriage for sixteen years. One

day, Godfey decides to confess all truths to Nancy with the influence of an incident in which the skeleton of Dunstan Cass is found lying drowned in the land with Silas's gold. He tells Nancy about his secret wife and his daughter Eppie. In the end, Godfrey and Nancy want to adopt Eppie; however, she does not want to leave Silas. The novel ends with the marriage of Eppie and Aaron, Mrs Winthrop's son.

Eliot's *Silas Marner* reveals the protagonist Silas's dilemma of religion, ambivalence of identity and social pressure with regard to the circumstances and conventions of Victorian patriarchal society. Eliot criticises traditional gender roles and social construction and position of two sexes. Thus, *Silas Marner* reflects the contradictions between the social positioning of the character and the needs of the character in order to show his imaginations, feelings and drives. Therefore, in this part of the chapter, *Silas Marner* will be examined with regard to the notion of strangeness, the theory of language as the semiotic and the symbolic, the theory of abjection and women's time in the light of Kristeva's work.

Kristeva uses the terms "strangeness" and "foreignness" interchangeably as in "stranger" and "foreigner." She defines a foreigner as "the one who does not belong to the group, who is not one of them, the other." Regarding the background of foreignness through time and social structures, the foreigner was described primarily in terms of two legal systems: "*jus soli* and *jus sanguinis*, the law according to soil and the law according to blood" (*Strangers* 95). The children who are born on the same soil or who are born of native parents are considered to belong to the same group. The modern, clear, and acceptable definition of foreigner is that "the one who does not belong to the state where we are, the one that does not have the same nationality" (*Strangers* 95). Furthermore, differences which involve sex, age, profession, and religion might come together on the state of foreignness. The foreigner is perceived as beneficial or destructive to the social group and in this case, he must be assimilated or refused (*Strangers* 96). Kristeva defines "strange" as the following,

> Strange is the encounter with the other- whom we perceive by means of sight, hearing, smell, but do not "frame" within our consciousness. The

> other leaves us separate, incoherent; even more so, he can make us feel that we are not in touch with our own feelings, that we reject them or, on the contrary, that we refuse to judge them. (*Strangers* 187)

Kristeva underlines that the notion of strangeness and strange is either assimilated or refused when it is faced with in society. Regarding the representations of the character throughout the novel *Silas Marner*, Eliot represents Silas Marner as a passive, antisocial, and isolated man. He is an unusual man because of not only his physical appearance but also his way of life:

> It was fifteen years since Silas Marner had first come to Raveloe; he was then simply a pallid young man, with prominent short-sighted brown eyes, whose appearance would have had nothing strange for people of average culture and experience, but for the villagers near whom he had come to settle it had mysterious peculiarities which corresponded with the exceptional nature of his occupation, and his advent from an unknown region called "North'ard". So had his way of life: - he invited no comer to step across his door-sill, and he never strolled into the village to drink a pint at the Rainbow, or to gossip at the wheelwright's: he sought no man or woman, save for the purposes of his calling, or in order to supply himself with necessaries. (*Silas* 12)

Eliot depicts Silas via both his physical appearance and way of life. His physical appearance is regarded strange owing to "his pale face, strange straining eyes, and meagre form" (*Silas* 54). Silas has some peculiarities with his physical appearance and his way of life for the villagers as well as his occupation.

Silas's occupation contributes to his strangeness: "in this way it came to pass that those scattered linen weavers- emigrants from the town into the country- were to the last regarded as aliens by their rustic neighbours, and usually contracted the eccentric habits which belong to a state of loneliness" (*Silas* 10). In "The Theme of Alienation in *Silas Marner*," Fred C. Thomson states,

> The solitary figure is a weaver . . . Society cannot get along without the weavers, nor could the weavers survive without a society to buy their products. Yet in rural areas the position of these weavers is anomalous. They are both indispensable and distrusted, the very bag containing the stuff for their looms increasing their suspiciousness in local eyes. Business is transacted with them almost as if in furtive pact with the Evil One. George Eliot has thus chosen a protagonist whose trade combines the familiar and the strange, whose way of life is both continuous and discontinuous with established society. The whole story is based upon a pattern of these dichotomies. (74-5)

Thomson emphasizes Silas's state of solitude. The position of weavers is aberrant in rural areas. They are seen as both essential and unreliable owing to the suspicion of local people. Thus, Silas's profession causes his strangeness as well as his physical appearance and way of life.

Within the frame of the notion of the semiotic, the characterization of Silas is the typical example of the discontinuity of society. He is busy with meeting his biological needs and weaving by minimally contacting with the villagers of Raveloe. Silas is represented as following,

> Then there were the calls of hunger; and Silas, in his solitude, had to provide his own breakfast, dinner and supper, to fetch his own water from the well, and put his own kettle on the fire; and all these immediate promptings helped, along with the weaving, to reduce his life to the unquestioning activity of a spinning insect. (*Silas* 24)

Silas is likened "a spinning insect." The fact that Silas is depicted as an insect has an importance related to the social discontinuity. Thomson points out that the web image in *Silas Marner* can be interpreted both metaphorically and objectively. Silas is a professional weaver; however, his capability in his work has become his disaster instead of becoming a useful function of social continuity. The mere purpose of his work for

him is to feed his isolating fixations because Silas is not economically tied to Raveloe; thus, the gold does not mean a kind of tool to trade or to negotiate with the villagers. On the contrary, Silas sees his gold as his companions and his gold makes Silas alienated and isolated day by day (Thomson 79). In other words, Silas removes the gold from circulation just like removing himself from society. He withdraws himself from society in his cottage that is far from the village; similarly, he hides his gold beneath the floor of his cottage. Metaphorically, the web image refers to an obstruction for Silas to integrate into the society since he works at his loom like "a spinning insect" in an isolating way. Realistically, many weavers like Silas are outsiders of the society due to the conditions of their occupation; therefore, the web image refers to the isolating circumstances of weaving as a profession.

Another function of weaving through the novel represents the relation between the automatic activity and the narrowing of consciousness. In "George Eliot and the Sciences of Mind: The Silence that Lies on the Other Side of Roar," Jill L. Matus explains this relation:

> Narrow tenacity and unquestioning activity are symptoms of automatic behavior. While their opposite would seem to be an "active" life of choice and reason, if we think of the novel's drift, it is not the capacity to reason but the emotional life which makes the difference. In *Silas Marner*, the shock of betrayal and false accusation prompts a withdrawal from community life and affective bonds. Though Silas suffers from lapses in consciousness, it is not his cataleptic trances that are the cause of his reduced life. "Stunned" by despair, his faith "benumbed," Marner's consciousness narrows and habitual, repetitive, mechanical behavior replaces conscious activity. (465-6)

Matus underlines that Silas's spinning activity is recurrent and thoughtless; similarly, his constricted determination and his unconditional activity are the manifestations of his mechanical behaviour. Silas's trauma which stems from his best friend and his fiancée's infidelity and unjust indictment results in a withdrawal from society and emotive ties.

Silas's consciousness is restricted by his character owing to his desperate and faithless state and his automatic, habitual and recurrent behaviour substitutes for conscious activity. In terms of Silas's circumstances and experiences, Matus further explains,

> Both emotion and cognition suffer as a result of the shock of betrayal. The novel proceeds by way of chiasmic substitutions and withdrawals, the gold Silas is accused of stealing becoming the gold he amasses through his insect-like weaving activity, which is then replaced by the golden-haired child. When the theft of his hoarded gold propels him to the town's tavern to seek help from the inhabitants of Raveloe, his slow integration into the community begins. The primary role of affect in his expanding consciousness of himself as a community member, friend, and father is repeatedly emphasized. (466)

Matus emphasizes that the shock of infidelity gives rise to the suffering of both emotive state and cognitive state of Silas. The concepts of substitutions and withdrawals are significant through the novel because the gold that causes Silas's exclusion from his congregation replaces the gold which he hoards by his insect-like activity, and then, it is also replaced by the golden-haired child. Silas firstly attempts to integrate into society in order to look for help for his stolen gold. Besides, Eppie's arrival gives rise to Silas's attempts to integrate into society and his narrow consciousness begins to expand for himself as a member of community, a father, and a friend.

The fact that the subject supposes the semiotic components in a language may be related to his experience as a foreigner or a stranger in a place. The stranger has been fixated on part of his loss, particularly the loss of the maternal language. Within this frame, there is a relation between the notion of strangeness and the conception of fetishism. In *Reading Kristeva,* Oliver explains the similarities between a stranger and a fetishist with Kristeva:

> Her supposition of the semiotic element in language could be related to her experience as a foreigner in France. Like the fetishist, she becomes fixated

> on part of her loss, the loss of her maternal language. Like the fetishist, with her theory of the semiotic Kristeva both admits and denies the loss of maternal language. The theory of the semiotic allows her to postulate the existence of the maternal language within her new language even while she admits that this maternal element is always out of reach of the new language. (137)

Kristeva defines fetishism as a solution in order to overcome the depression of the loss of the mother through a denial of the father's function (*Beginning* 45). In *Revolution in Poetic Language*, Kristeva maintains, "fetishism is a displacement of the thetic onto the realm of drives" (64). Therefore, Kristeva proposes, "the subject may imagine the thetic at the place of an object or a partner" by negating or denying the symbolic (*Revolution* 63). In other words, the imagined object or partner as the thetic are a kind of substitution in the symbolic owing to his fixation on part of his loss. Concerning Silas's fetish objects, Eliot describes "a brown earthenware pot,"

> It had been his companion for twelve years, always standing on the same spot, always lending its handle to him in the early morning, so that its form had an expression for him of willing helpfulness, and the impress of its handle on his palm gave a satisfaction mingled with that of having the fresh clear water. One day as he was returning from the well, he stumbled against the step of the stile, and his brown pot, falling with force against the stones that overarched the ditch below him, was broken in three pieces. Silas picked up the pieces and carried them home with grief in his heart. The brown pot could never be of use to him any more, but he stuck the bits together and propped the ruin in its old place for a memorial. (*Silas* 29)

The pot is not a mere object for Silas since it becomes a substitute for his symbolic, especially for his loss of his mother, his sister and his father. As a subject, Silas may imagine the thetic at the place of an object by denying or negating the symbolic and this object refers to his pot since Silas glues the pieces of the broken pot due to his fixation on it. Besides, Eliot describes how Silas is fond of his "old brick hearth:" "Silas would

not consent to have a grate and oven added to his conveniences: he loved the old brick hearth as he had loved his brown pot (*Silas* 171). Like his fixation on his pot, Silas is fixated on his old brick hearth. Moreover, another fetish object for Silas is his gold through the novel. Eliot describes his love for his gold,

> He loved the guineas best, but he would not change the silver--the crowns and half-crowns that were his own earnings, begotten by his labour; he loved them all. He spread them out in heaps and bathed his hands in them; then he counted them and set them up in regular piles, and felt their rounded outline between his thumb and fingers, and thought fondly of the guineas that were only half-earned by the work in his loom, as if they had been unborn children. (*Silas* 30)

Silas is obsessed with his gold; for this reason, handling and counting them are satisfying activities for Silas like a kind of companionship. There is a relationship between Silas and his gold that resembles a kind of child-parent relationship because he sees his gold like his "unborn children." In addition, his last fetish is not an object but a person unlike his aforementioned fetishes. Eliot describes Silas's sensitivity and fixation on Eppie as following,

> The tender and peculiar love with which Silas had reared her in almost inseparable companionship with himself, aided by the seclusion of their dwelling, had preserved her from the lowering influences of the village talk and habits, and had kept her mind in that freshness which is sometimes falsely supposed to be an invariable attribute of rusticity. (*Silas* 176)

The above quotation indicates Silas's vulnerability and obsession with Eppie. Silas thinks that his gold has turned into the golden-haired child. Therefore, his fixation on his gold is replaced by his fixation on Eppie. With regard to Silas's fetishism, David Carroll, in *George Eliot and The Conflict of Interpretations*, explains,

> Through this account of Silas's early life and his fifteen-year exile, George Eliot is establishing the basic rhythm of the novel, the metamorphosis of one

> world-view into its opposite: in this case, absolute trust in the divine is replaced by fetishism, the miraculous by the materialistic, trust by self-dependence, the believing community by a world of solitary utility. . . In neither phase, George Eliot implies, is Silas fully human. In Lantern Yard, he is defenceless, naive, and with his 'deer-like gaze' disengaged from the world. Now, in contrast, in his embittered reaction he simply becomes the energy that drives his loom in the work a day world as his physique changes and his face and figure shrank and bent themselves into a constant mechanical relation to the objects of his life. (150-1)

Caroll stresses that during his early life, Silas has unquestioning trust in the divine. On the contrary, during his exile, he has lost his unquestioning trust and owing to this loss, he has become a fetishist, particularly material fetishist, with his public service on his own. In Lantern Yard, Silas is vulnerable and inexperienced and he is emotionally detached to the world and the people surrounding. In contrast, in Raveloe, he is full of energy in order to weave and hoard his gold, and he has not been emotionally detached to the world for fifteen years. Within this frame, Silas is engaged with his own semiotic drives in terms of material fetishism. Silas has some substitutions for the symbolic such as his brown pot, his old brick hearth, his gold, and his adopted child and these become his fetishes owing to his fixations on them.

As the semiotic refers to the dimension of language related to the embodied experience, material and biological processes, effects and emotions, Silas' motives and drives can be regarded as the semiotic. Concerning the desire, satisfaction, and substitution, in "Loss, Revelry, and the Temporal Measures of *Silas Marner*: Performance, Regret, Recollection," Kate E. Brown points out,

> Eppie is not a restoration but a recollection of loss and in whom the faculty for grief becomes at last the novel's ethical stance. Significantly, the sixteen-year gap in the narrative excises Silas's story at the point that he enters into public time, and it thereby associates his domestic fulfillment with narrative rupture, the interregnum of meaning

> characterizing trauma. Indeed, seen after a gap of sixteen years . . . The weaver's bent shoulders and white hair give him almost the look of advanced age, though he is not more than five-and-fifty. In the stead of the maternal woman, we are offered Silas, the figure at once of time out of joint and of the fostering gaze. Silas perceives the orphan child neither as the restoration of his gold nor as the crop of his seed, but as the very embodiment of loss- the loss of his sister, his community, and the revelrous gold itself. (246)

Brown emphasizes that there is no other relation to any other being until Silas' gold is stolen. He fills up with grief and mourns for his gold until Eppie comes to him. With Eppie's arrival, Silas enters into public sphere, and he is described as a maternal figure; thus, Silas perceives the child as a substitution of loss, especially the loss of his sister, his community, and his stolen gold.

In terms of the significant events in Silas's life, his life is full of traumatic incidents such as his loss of his mother, his sister, his best friend, his fiancée, his religious faith, and his gold. Silas mourns for these people and things; however, he is not a melancholic character because the melancholic has a grief that cannot be shared in the symbolic and he is entrapped within his grief and sadness. He is not able to name his loss and he possesses something which he cannot explain in the symbolic sphere through language. The melancholic is even incapable of speaking in the symbolic realm. These symptoms of the melancholic state are not observed in Silas's characteristics through the novel; thus, it is not possible to conclude that Silas is a melancholic character in spite of his traumatic losses.

Regarding the symbolic, the contrasts between the religious based society of Lantern Yard and the secular based society of Raveloe are explicitly observed in Eliot's description of these places. Eliot describes Lantern Yard,

> The whitewashed walls; the little pews where well-known figures entered with a subdued rustling, and where first one well-known voice and then another, pitched in a peculiar key of petition, uttered phrases at once occult

> and familiar, like the amulet worn on the heart; the pulpit where the minister delivered unquestioned doctrine, and swayed to and fro, and handled the book in a long accustomed manner; the very pauses between the couplets of the hymn, as it was given out, and the recurrent swell of voices in song: these things had been the channel of divine influences to Marner- they were the fostering home of his religious emotions- they were Christianity and God's kingdom upon earth. (*Silas* 22-3)

Unlike the description of Lantern Yard as a religious based place and community, Eliot describes Raveloe as a secular place and community,

> orchards looking lazy with neglected plenty; the large church in the wide churchyard, which men gazed at lounging at their own doors in service time; the purple-faced farmers jogging along the lanes or turning in at the Rainbow; homesteads, where men supped heavily and slept in the light of the evening hearth, and where women seemed to be laying up a stock of linen for the life to come. There were no lips in Raveloe from which a word could fall that would stir Silas Marner's benumbed faith to a sense of pain . . . It seemed to him that the Power he had vainly trusted in among the streets and at the prayer-meetings, was very far away from this land in which he had taken refuge, where men lived in careless abundance, knowing and needing nothing of that trust, which, for him, had been turned to bitterness. (*Silas* 23)

The quotation above indicates the features of secular mundane life, secular people and secular atmosphere of Raveloe. When Silas comes to Raveloe, he has lost his faith to the divine. In Raveloe, he observes that men do not know or need the unconditional trust in the divine owing to the secularity of the community. In his article, "The Theme of Alienation in *Silas Marner*," Thomson explains the differences between Lantern Yard and Raveloe in terms of their essential spiritual opposition. Lantern Yard is an internal, ecclesiastical world, which is surrounded by the white chapel walls, for spiritual yearning. Silas perceives that the instant tangible environment of Lantern Yard

is familiar like the sounds and hymns that are reminders of the supreme, invisible, reliable realities. In contrast, Raveloe is an external secular world and the environment is not for spiritual yearning; conversely, the desires, the satisfactions, and the lives of the villagers are not religiously bounded but earthly bounded. These details of two described places are observed in terms of their visual differences in order to reflect their essential spiritual contrariness (Thomson 76-7). In other words, Silas confronts diverse social circumstances, ways of life and set of values owing to the distinctions and oppositions between Lantern Yard and Raveloe.

Regarding the symbolic, Raveloe society is described by Eliot in a detailed way. Eliot reveals the conditions of the rich and the poor during the Napoleonic wars by emphasizing the oppositions between them:

> It was still that glorious war-time . . . the rich ate and drank freely, accepting gout and apoplexy as things that ran mysteriously in respectable families, and the poor thought that the rich were entirely in the right of it to lead a jolly life; besides, their feasting caused a multiplication of orts, which were the heir looms of the poor. (*Silas* 31)

Eliot underlines the manifestations of the contrasts of the economic conditions between the rich and the poor during a winter festivity. In *George Eliot: The Novels*, Mike Edwards explains the divided description of English rural village through the novel:

> a series of violent but latent oppositions. The rich parasitise the poor but have yet to be found out. This 'glorious' era of the Napoleonic wars shows rural England ailing, with a deep-seated social sickness that has developed from the days of feudalism, but unaware of it. The extravagant life lived by the squires and yeomen is moribund, but they do not yet know it: they happily eat and drink their way to their own demise. As for the poor, they exist in a state approaching serfdom in this period, nearly half a century before the publication of the *Communist Manifesto*, unaware of their chains and with no thought of uniting against their oppressors. (100)

Edward emphasizes that Eliot establishes a revelation of social discrepancy and disunity in that period in terms of the conception of the symbolic. In other words, the rich and the poor are strictly divided in terms of their circumstances in the symbolic sphere such as in a winter festivity.

Regarding the theory of abjection, Kristeva defines abjection in *Powers of Horrors* as which does not "respect borders, positions, rules" and "disturbs identity, system, order" (4). Barbara Creed makes use of Kristeva's conception of abjection. In "Kristeva, Femininity, and Abjection," Creed states,

> In general terms, Kristeva is attempting to explore the different ways in which abjection works within human societies, as a means of separating out the human from the non-human and the fully constituted subject from the partially formed subject. Ritual becomes a means by which societies both renew their initial contact with the abject element and then exclude that element. (64)

Within the frame of social-critical perspective, Creed points primarily to the theory of abjection in terms of the concept of the border, the mother-child relationship, and the feminine body in her work. Creed makes use of the incidents of abjection to describe the state of the marginalized such as women including unwed mothers and prostitutes, religious minorities, convicts, poor and disabled people (64).

With regard to the theory of abjection, Silas represents the manifestations of the abject subject through the novel. First, Silas's cataleptic fits are interpreted in various ways by the members of his religious group, his best friend William Dane, and his fiancée Sarah:

> It was at this point in their history that Silas's cataleptic fit occurred during the prayer-meeting; and amidst the various queries and expressions of interest addressed to him by his fellow-members, William's suggestion alone jarred with the general sympathy towards a brother thus singled out for special dealings. He observed that, to him, this trance looked more like a

> visitation of Satan than a proof of divine favour, and exhorted his friend to see that he hid no accursed thing within his soul. Silas, feeling bound to accept rebuke and admonition as a brotherly office, felt no resentment, but only pain, at his friend's doubts concerning him; and to this was soon added some anxiety at the perception that Sarah's manner towards him began to exhibit a strange fluctuation between an effort at an increased manifestation of regard and involuntary signs of shrinking and dislike. (*Silas* 16-7)

Silas's fellows from his congregation in Lantern Yard consider that these cataleptic fits are spiritual divine dealings for him; however, for his best friend, these fits are not related to the divine; he looks to be visited by Satan during his trance. Similarly, Silas perceives that Sarah starts to recede and hate him owing to these cataleptic fits. Indeed, Silas becomes "the partially formed subject" by keeping away from "the fully constituted subjects" owing to his state of trance. This state can be seen as a kind of disability for Silas's physical health, and from the social-critical point of view, he may be considered as an abject subject. In Raveloe, his cataleptic fits are suspicious and ambiguous for the villagers and Mr Macey considers asking him: "Had he not always said that when Silas Marner was in that strange trance of his, his soul went loose from his body?" (*Silas* 69). He is aware of his strange state and the villagers' suspicion of his trance; therefore, he does not talk about his trance during Eppie's coming to his home.

Regarding the participation of abject subject in the rituals of societies, Silas does not participate in any rituals in order to integrate into society. Eliot describes Silas as a solitary being,

> year after year, Silas Marner had lived in this solitude, his guineas rising in the iron pot, and his life narrowing and hardening itself more and more into a mere pulsation of desire and satisfaction that had no relation to any other being. His life had reduced itself to the functions of weaving and hoarding, without any contemplation of an end towards which the functions tended. (*Silas* 28)

Silas is excluded from the communal life of Raveloe like his exclusion from the congregation in Lantern Yard, and he does not have any desire and pleasure in order to contact with any villagers there.

Concerning the differences between Lanterns Yard and Raveloe, Silas's sense of unbelonging results in the sense of abjection. Eliot describes Silas's ambivalence,

> Even people whose lives have been made various by learning, sometimes find it hard to keep a fast hold on their habitual views of life, on their faith in the Invisible, nay, on the sense that their past joys and sorrows are a real experience, when they are suddenly transported to a new land, where the beings around them know nothing of their history, and share none of their ideas . . . influence of exile, in which the past becomes dreamy because its symbols have all vanished, and the present too is dreamy because it is linked with no memories. But even their experience may hardly enable them thoroughly to imagine what was the effect on a simple weaver like Silas Marner, when he left his own country and people and came to settle in Raveloe. Nothing could be more unlike his native town. (*Silas* 22)

Silas perceives the distinctions between Lantern Yard and Raveloe, and he has lost his sense of unity in terms of the discontinuity between the past and the present. In order to maintain his life, Silas should be aware of a new set of values and customs after coming to Raveloe. Within this frame, Thomson states: "Silas must learn to live not only in an entirely different region but with an entirely new set of values, or rather with the shards of his old ones"(75). However, he does not integrate into society, and he has lost his faith in the divine and humans. Therefore, he has lost in discontinuity due to the absence of unity of the past and the present.

In *Tales of Love*, Kristeva expresses the dilemma of all children between their forceful efforts to return to the perfect unity with the maternal body, in particular the womb, and their desires to achieve their own separate identity. Returning to the mother's body means losing the self due to the perfect oneness without a district identity whereas achieving a distinct identity results in total isolation and alienation.

Kristeva proposes a model in which the subject encounters this conflict with the maternal zone into adulthood during his closeness and ties with others, especially in romantic relationships. Concerning the relationship with others, the subject desires to merge; however, his desire is followed by his fear, and then, a desire for re-union surfaces again. In *Silas Marner*, Silas has only one friend and a fiancée while he lives with his own society. In other words, he is not totally integrated into even his own society. When he is excluded from his congregation, he comes to Raveloe. However, he prefers to keep himself away from the villagers of Raveloe. His cottage is described as "a store cottage that stood among nutty hedgerows near the village, and not far from the edge of a deserted stone-pit" (*Silas* 10). As emigrants from the town to the country, the disconnected linen-weavers "were to the last regarded as aliens by their rustic neighbours and usually contracted the eccentric habits which belong to a state of loneliness" (*Silas* 10). Silas is lonely like his cottage between the village and the deserted stone pit. With regard to Silas's life, he struggles with his desire to achieve his district identity by preferring a cottage that is not in the village. After his traumatic experiences, he does not integrate into society. The cottage can symbolize the maternal space, in particular the womb. In this case, a desire arises to return to the perfect unity with the maternal body without a separate identity. This desire makes Silas isolated and alienated from society. Within this frame, Silas and Maggie are very similar to one another since Maggie runs away from everyone and retreats an attic during her crises.

Regarding the feminist literary theory, Kristeva refuses biologism and essentialism, and she considers the feminist struggle as three phases. The first phase is considered as the desire of women to enter into the symbolic order. The second phase is considered as women's radical rejection of the symbolic order of the male. The third phase is considered as the women's rejection of the differences between masculine and feminine (Moi 12). In other words, Kristeva expresses her opinions and attitudes about the phases of the feminist struggle. Kristeva describes the first phase of the feminist struggle as "the struggles for equal pay for equal work" (*Women's* 194). In *Julia Kristeva*, McAfee proposes that the first phase is located prior to 1968 by Kristeva and it is called as equal rights and equal treatment. The first phase does not distort the

symbolic order of the male; however, the aim is to be equal in the symbolic spheres since it is considered that there are not any significant distinctions between two sexes. Kristeva makes use of James Joyce's phrase, "father's time, mother's species," in order to indicate two distinct domains that humans have experienced. The notion of "father's time" indicates the linear time in which man have existed concerning "progress, history and destiny." On the other hand, the notion of "mother's species" indicates the place in which humans are generated, time is recurrent in a circle, and the species are endless (93-4). In other words, women are entrapped within constricted place and cyclical time by being excluded from the symbolic spheres and linear time of the male.

Within the frame of the social requirements and historical background of Victorian period, Eliot reveals gender differences between women and men through the novel, which refers to the first phase of feminist struggle that includes equal rights and equal treatment. The fact that *Silas Marner* was first published in 1861 shows why the novel can reveal gender differences in an influential and efficient way as Kristeva locates the first phase prior to 1968. Within the frame of the notion of "father's time, mother's species," domesticity is a significant and recurrent theme through the novel. Three domestic spaces are primarily described as the domestic spaces of Squire Cass, Nancy Lammater and Silas Marner in terms of the manifestations of the gender differences. Eliot describes the domestic space of Squire Cass,

> For the Squire's wife had died long ago, and the Red House was without that presence of the wife and mother which is the fountain of wholesome love and fear in parlour and kitchen; and this helped to account not only for there being more profusion than finished excellence in the holiday provisions, but also for the frequency with which the proud Squire condescended to preside in the parlour of the Rainbow rather than under the shadow of his own dark wainscot; perhaps, also, for the fact that his sons had turned out rather ill. (*Silas* 32)

Eliot emphasizes the absence of the wife and the mother in the Red House. Houghton suggests, in *The Victorian Frame of Mind*, the bad habits of Squire Cass's sons are

ascribed primarily to "their growing up in a home without a mother" (350). Within this frame, the domestic space of Squire Cass is contrasted with the domestic space of Nancy Lammater. Eliot describes the domestic space of Nancy, "the neatness, purity, and liberal orderliness of the Lammater household, sunned by the smile of Nancy" (*Silas* 41). This contrast is showed from Godfrey's point of view: "For four years he had thought of Nancy Lammeter, and wooed her with tacit patient worship, as the woman who made him think of the future with joy: she would be his wife, and would make home lovely to him, as his father's home had never been" (*Silas* 41). The presence of women in domestic sphere is associated with the notion of mother's species. Another domestic space is Silas's cottage. It is not located in the village and it is near a desolate stone. His cottage is gloomy and closed to the external world. The conditions of Silas's domestic space can be stemmed from the absence of a woman because when Eppie comes to his cottage, the cottage is filled with bright of life and the door of the cottage is always open to the visitors unlike its old state.

Eliot makes use of Eppie's arrival to Silas's cottage in order to reveal the masculine and feminine characteristics with regard to child care. Silas and Mrs. Winthrop, a neighbour that helps Silas for Eppie, talk about child care:

> 'Thank you... kindly,' said Silas, hesitating a little. 'I'll be glad if you'll tell me things. But,' he added, uneasily, leaning forward to look at Baby with some jealousy, as she was resting her head backward against Dolly's arm, and eyeing him contentedly from a distance- 'But I want to do things for it myself, else it may get fond o' somebody else, and not fond o' me. I've been used to fending for myself in the house- I can learn, I can learn.'
>
> 'Eh, to be sure,' said Dolly, gently. 'I've seen men as are wonderful handy wi' children. The men are awk'ard and contrairy mostly, God help 'em- but when the drink's out of 'em, they aren't unsensible, though they're bad for leeching and bandaging- so fiery and unpatient. You see this goes first, next the skin,' proceeded Dolly, taking up the little shirt, and putting it on. (*Silas* 149)

Eliot subverts traditional gender roles in terms of masculine and feminine characteristics. The child care duties that are attributed to women are associated with the symbolic order of the male as opposed to stereotypes. Within this frame, in "Growing Old: Age," Mangum explains a relation between gender and old age through literature. A male character that accepts the state of being old finds himself in a state of losing sexual identity. Then, his state is very similar to helpless femininity. The feminization of "the youthful, virile, assertive man of action" indicates "moral, spiritual and domestic fulfilment". In other words, maternal masculinity occurs in old age with the tolerance as in *Silas Marner* (99). Silas's maternal masculinity is observed through the novel,

> Eppie was reared without punishment, the burden of her misdeeds being borne vicariously by father Silas. The stone hut was made a soft nest for her, lined with downy patience: and also in the world that lay beyond the stone hut she knew nothing of frowns and denials. (*Silas* 158)

Eliot emphasizes Silas's self-sacrificing attitudes and tolerance to Eppie. In *George Eliot,* Jennifer Uglow proposes: "Silas's real spiritual growth . . . comes from his own response to a child's demand for 'refuge and nurture.'"(149) With respect to Silas's softness to Eppie, Uglow further proposes: This is a kind of softness that we associate with the stereotype of maternal love" (150). Besides, in "Growing up: Childhood," Claudia Nelson states that Victorian adult fiction sometimes uses the conception of the child in which the protagonist is the adult and the child serves primarily as a tool to express a radical change in the character. In *Silas Marner*, the child accomplishes the reformation of the protagonist serving as a device rather than the object of the radical change in the character. Indeed, although Silas becomes a devoted father, the central point is different through the novel because in Victorian fiction, "children were still often contemplated in light of what they could do for the adult world and not merely what the adult world could or should do for them" (79).

George Eliot writes about *Silas Marner* in *Letters III*: "It came to me first all quite suddenly, as a sort of legendry tale, suggested by my recollection of having once, in early childhood, seen a linen weaver with a bag on his back; but, as my mind dwelt

on the subject, I become inclined to a more realistic treatment" (382). Eliot describes the legendary tale of a linen weaver of her childhood with a realistic perspective. In "*Scenes of Clerical Life* and *Silas Marner*: Moral Fables," Stefanie Markovits states that *Silas Marner* has a mixed nature that includes "legendary" and "realistic" elements:

> Silas's tale of loss and recovery becomes the stuff of legend, while the parallel tale of Godfrey Cass's escape from an unwanted wife and child and regret for this choice when he and his new wife, Nancy Lammeter, find themselves childless, is considered realistic. Choice proves crucial to distinguishing between the two plotlines and their methods of representation. (100)

This combined nature is observed in the double plotting of the novel. The tale of Silas's loss and substitutions becomes the legendary part of the novel while the tale of Godfrey's escape from Molly and Eppie and remorse after his childless marriage with Nancy becomes the realistic part of the novel. Markovits maintains that Silas's story is governed by bad luck and good luck respectively. His exclusion from the Calvinist society in Lantern Yard by lots and his cataleptic fits are exemplified the governance of Silas's life by an unlucky sequence. However, Eppie's arrival instead of gold and Silas's happy life with Eppie in Raveloe are exemplified the governance of Silas's life by a lucky sequence. The mixing of realistic and legendary becomes obvious through the end of the book. When Godfrey and Nancy want to adopt Eppie, he says, "God gave her to me" (*Silas* 209). Within this frame, Silas can be considered "a creature of chance" for many significant incidents through the novel, Besides, Silas can be considered "a creature of habit" regarding realistic agency and allegory of fable and fairy tale with "the unquestioning activity of a spinning insect" (*Silas* 24). Markovits underlines that *Silas Marner* exhibits "the confrontation between the real (death, the outside world) and the ideal (Eppie's Edenic garden)" (103). Regarding the mingling of realistic and legendary elements, in *The English Novel*, Terry Eagleton states,

> *Silas Marner* may be a charming folk legend, but it is also full of complex reflections on chance, providence, causality and the nature of historical

> evidence. Silas himself moves from religious faith to the cloistered egoism of a miserly existence, and from there to what Eliot called the "truth of feeling," as he discovers the love of little Eppie and through her a whole human fellowship. If this is the simplest of moral fables, it is also an allegory of the historical progression from religious superstition to modern-day materialism, and from there to the Religion of Humanity of the future. (167-8)

Eagleton emphasizes the mixed structure of the novel in terms of the simultaneous usage of the realistic and legendary elements.

In *Silas Marner*, Eliot reiterates the principal crisis of *Adam Bede* as both Molly and Hetty are seduced by dreams of marriage to men of substance and status, Regarding the similar characters in these novels, Uglow, in *George Eliot*, explains,

> Molly's final bitterness is material rather than emotional: 'he was well off; if she had her rights she would be well of too.' Although Godfrey marries Molly, it makes no difference: she is still reduced to misery and like Hetty, wanders across the countyside in a vain search for the father of her child, in a state of wilful self-annihilation. Her fate is a mirror image of Hetty's . . . In each case the mother's suffering allows the hero to achieve a new emotional life- Adam through sharing Hetty's suffering and Silas through accepting Molly's child. (148)

Uglow underlines the similarities between two characters; however, the final message of *Silas Marner* is more positive and compromising than the final messages of *Adam Bede* and *The Mill on the Floss*. As her epigraph from Wordsworth indicates the survival of the child is a "gift" from the earth for the "declining man" because it means expectations and desires for the future (148). Eliot describes Molly's death,

> There was a pauper's burial that week in Raveloe, and up Kench Yard at Batherley it was known that the dark-haired woman with the fair child, who had lately come to lodge there, was gone away again. That was all the

> express note taken that Molly had disappeared from the eyes of men. But the unwept death which, to the general lot, seemed as trivial as the summer-shed leaf, was charged with the force of destiny to certain human lives that we know of, shaping their joys and sorrows even to the end. (*Silas* 147)

Molly's death is as insignificant as "the summer shed leaf." However, Molly Farren is significant for the flow of the novel because her death is the central point of the novel in terms of the moral choices of the individuals, particularly Silas and Godfrey, through the novel.

In conclusion, the protagonist of the novel, Silas, is examined concerning Kristeva's terms and theories as the notion of strangeness, the theory of language that includes the semiotic and the symbolic, the theory of abjection and women's time. With regard to the notion of strangeness, Silas's physical appearance, way of life and profession give rise to his strangeness through the novel. In terms of the theory of language, for Kristeva, the emotions, imaginations and drives of the character are associated with the semiotic whereas the social circumstances of society and social position of the character are associated with the symbolic. Silas's desires and satisfactions are related to the scope of the semiotic such as his fetishes while the attitudes and the circumstances of society are related to the scope of the symbolic such as the exclusion of Silas from society. Regarding the theory of abjection, the contradictions and oppositions between the semiotic and the symbolic cause the strangeness and the ambivalence of identity. This state is associated with the difficulty in attaining the right model for identification with the male or female sex with either the mother or the father. Thus, he is not able to become a "uniary subject . . . where the self is seen as a homogeneous, consistent whole" (*Desire* 33). This condition of the subject refers to the divided self, particularly the state of abject subject. Last, in terms of the conception of women's time, Eliot criticises traditional gender roles and the social construction and position of biological sexes by attributing to the protagonist of the novel the feminine and masculine characteristics simultaneously.

CONCLUSION

This study has been an attempt to re-evaluate the construction of the nineteenth century femininity and masculinity through the critical reading of George Eliot's early novels, *The Mill on the Floss* and *Silas Marner,* in the light of Julia Kristeva's theories and terms. It has focussed on the issues of gender and identity that were profoundly influenced by the conservative conventions of the Victorian society. The Victorian period is an age of change with the beginning of modernity, which includes the growth of urbanisation, the industrial revolution and technological developments. Despite the changes and progress in society, economy and policy of the period, there were many inequities between women and men, which prepare the discussions under the title of "Woman Question". Concerning the class structure of the Victorian society, the middle class attained the dominancy with their financial and political power. All of these changes and circumstances were reflected through the Victorian novel.

The Victorian society was male-centred due to the lack of gender balance; therefore, women writers preferred male pseudonyms in order to protect their works from biased judgements. Mary Anne Evans, who wrote under the pseudonym of George Eliot, is one of these Victorian women writers. Through her works, Eliot depicted the aspects of the human psychology by making use of realism and psychology simultaneously as she perceived the conservative traditions and restrictive social complexities of the Victorian period.

Kristeva's opinion about the relation between literature and psychology focuses on the issues of gender and the ambivalence of identity with the influence of the circumstances and conventions of the Victorian society. The novels that have been chosen intentionally about female and male protagonists reveal the changes and circumstances of the period in terms of gender issues and identity formation. While *The Mill on the Floss* reflects the social and cultural conventions towards femininity, *Silas*

Marner displays the social and cultural conventions towards masculinity via the female and male protagonists of the novels.

According to Kristeva, the theory of subjectivity is based on the theory of language that comprises of the semiotic and the symbolic. The semiotic includes the instinctual drives, feelings and imaginations, and it is profoundly associated with the mother. On the contrary, the symbolic includes the grammatical structures and syntactic rules and it is closely connected with the father, especially the phallus (Becker-Leckrone 163). Therefore, the symbolic and the semiotic are interdependent in the process of development of subjectivity and in language. Unlike a unified self, the subject is the speaking being with two modes of language. Like language, the subject is heterogeneous not homogenous. The speaking being is an unstable subject that refers to the state of the subject in process. Through this process, the subject can explain his/her emotions, imaginations and drives which are repressed by the symbolic.

For Kristeva's theory of language, the emotions, imaginations and drives of the character are associated with the semiotic while the social conditions of the society and the social position of the character are associated with the symbolic. The revelation of the semiotic and the symbolic brings about gender dilemma and the ambivalence of identity through the novel. The dilemma and ambivalence of the character are associated with the difficulty in attaining the right model for identification with the female sex or the male sex in terms of the mother and the father. As a result, s/he is not able to become a "uniary subject . . . where the self is seen as a homogeneous, consistent whole" (Kristeva, *Desire* 33). In other words, a divided self appears as a consequence of the lack of the uniary subject. Regarding Maggie's conditions from childhood to adulthood, *The Mill on the Floss* reflects the familial relations, gender dilemma, the ambivalence of identity, the patriarchal pressure of the Victorian society that results in the contradictions and oppositions between the semiotic and the symbolic. Eliot criticises the traditional gender roles and the social construction and the position of the sexes. Thus, *The Mill on the Floss* reveals the contradictions and oppositions between the social expectations, positions and conditions of the society and the needs of the character to perform her emotions, imaginations, and drives. The female protagonist of *The Mill on the Floss*, Maggie, expresses her emotions, imaginations, and instinctual

drives; however, it is hard for her to obey the rules and expectations of the symbolic and to act with her free will in harmony with her drives and emotions simultaneously. Therefore, her endeavours to achieve a stable identity intrude into the norms and conventions of the symbolic and this intrusion gives rise to her gender dilemma due to the traditional gender roles. From her childhood to adulthood, she has experienced the persistent intrusion of the semiotic into the symbolic and the constant pressure of the symbolic upon the semiotic. For instance, even as a little girl, she rejects to do the domestic duties that are seen as a duty for a little girl, and she has a tendency to learn Latin and geometry since her nature and frame of mind are suitable for the intellectual domains such as Latin and geometry rather than doing the domestic duties. Nevertheless, the expectations and the permissions of the social/symbolic order are distinct from Maggie's semiotic drives and energy. Thus, Maggie cannot achieve a stable or fixed identity owing to the contradictions between the semiotic and the symbolic.

On the other hand, with respect to the semiotic and the symbolic through *Silas Marner*, Silas's desires and satisfactions are connected with the semiotic such as his fetishes while the attitudes and the circumstances of society toward Silas are associated with the symbolic such as the exclusion of Silas from the society. Within the frame of the notion of the semiotic, the characterization of Silas reflects his discontinuity of society. He is engaged with meeting his biological needs and weaving by rarely communicate with the villagers of Raveloe. Eliot depicts Silas as "a spinning insect" (*Silas* 24). The fact that he is depicted as an insect is associated with his status with regard to the social discontinuity. Silas is engaged with his own semiotic drives in terms of the material fetishism. He has several substitutions for the symbolic such as his brown pot, his old brick hearth, his gold, and his adopted child; and these become his fetishes owing to his fixations on them. Within the frame of the symbolic, the contrasts between the religious based society of Lantern Yard and the secular based society of Raveloe are explicitly observed in Eliot's description of these places. Silas faces with different social circumstances, ways of life and sets of values due to the oppositions between Lantern Yard and Raveloe. These oppositions increase his sense of

unbelonging, and he becomes a divided self since a revelation of the social discrepancy and disunity is established between Silas and the society regarding the conception of the symbolic.

The contradictions and oppositions between the semiotic and the symbolic bring about gender dilemma and the ambivalence of identity in terms of the status of the subject. Thus, the subject is not able to become "a uniary subject." This condition of the subject refers to the divided self, particularly the state of the abject subject.

Through the nineteenth century fiction, women were represented in two different ways by writers. In "Women Writing Woman: Nineteenth-Century Representations of Gender and Sexuality," Pykett argues about the representations of women as "normal femininity" and "unruly, disruptive femininity" through the Victorian period. With respect to the representations of women, Pykett states,

> Although the concepts of instinctive maternal feeling and passionlessness were central to nineteenth-century representations of Woman, these representations were also haunted by the spectre of an unruly, disruptive female sexuality. From the 1850s onwards the figures of the prostitute, the mad or bad mother, and the degenerate or hysterical female who is unable to marry, refuses marriage or, having married, refuses maternity or rejects her children. (81)

Pykett emphasizes two various representations of women through the nineteenth century literature. The former refers to the passionless womanhood and devoted maternity whereas the latter is associated with the excluded and oppressed by society in terms of their disharmony with the conventions of the patriarchal society. With regard to Maggie's circumstances and preferences, she is not an instance of the normal femininity owing to her semiotic drives, energy and passion. She refuses to marry both Philip and Stephen due to her familial bonds, and she becomes a divided subject due to her in-betweenness. In *Industrialization, Modernity, and the Woman Question*, Silkü states,

> *The Mill on the Floss* is a novel which questions a woman's duty to herself and to her family. Maggie, a young girl with a rebellious nature like George Eliot, protests against the unfair treatment of the sexes while Tom, as the future heir of the Tulliver family, is sent away to get a classical education under the tutorship of Mr. Stelling. Maggie realizes that she has to comply with her assigned role as a submissive woman. Contrary to that, the dominant patriarchal ideology never encourages women to educate themselves as they are supposed to be shallow in mind. For example, Maggie, despite her better intellectual capacity than her brother Tom, has always been neglected and deprived of the chance to improve herself. (138)

Silkü emphasizes Maggie's divided self between her duty to herself and her duty to her family. Besides, Maggie is divided between her semiotic desires and the traditional gender roles which the society attributes to the femininity. In other words, Maggie is entrapped within her semiotic desires and drives and the symbolic norms and expectations, and she becomes an abject subject.

In the analysis of *Silas Marner* in the second chapter, Silas represents the manifestations of the abject subject through the novel. First, Silas's cataleptic fits are interpreted in various ways by the members of his congregation, his best friend William Dane, and his fiancée Sarah. His fellows from his congregation in Lantern Yard consider that these cataleptic fits are spiritual divine dealings for Silas; nevertheless, for his best friend, these fits are not connected with the divine as he seems to be visited by Satan during his trance. Similarly, Sarah starts to recede and hate Silas owing to these cataleptic fits. In fact, Silas becomes "the partially formed subject" by keeping away from "the fully constituted subjects" because of his cataleptic fits (Creed 64). It is concluded that Silas's cataleptic fits are a kind of disability for his physical health, and he becomes an abject subject from the social-critical point of view. Regarding the participation of the abject subject in the rituals of societies, Silas does not participate in any rituals to integrate into society. Silas is depicted as a solitary being by Eliot. He is excluded from the communal life of Raveloe like his exclusion from the congregation in

Lantern Yard; thus, he never has any desires and pleasures in order to communicate with any villagers there.

With regard to the oppositions between Lanterns Yard and Raveloe, Silas's sense of unbelonging gives rise to his sense of abjection. Silas perceives the distinctions between Lantern Yard and Raveloe, and he has lost his sense of unity owing to the discontinuity between his past and present. To maintain his life, Silas ought to be aware of a new set of values and conventions after coming to Raveloe. In "The Theme of Alienation in Silas Marner," Fred C. Thomson states: "Silas must learn to live not only in an entirely different region but with an entirely new set of values, or rather with the shards of his old ones"(75). Silas does not integrate into society, and he has lost his faith in the divine and humans. Therefore, he has lost in the discontinuity due to the absence of unity of the past and the present.

In spite of their losses, neither Maggie nor Silas exemplifies the notion of melancholia. They mourn for the people and things that they have lost; however, they are not melancholic characters since the melancholic has a grief that cannot be shared in the symbolic, and he is entrapped within his grief and sadness. He cannot name his loss, and he owns something which he cannot explain in the symbolic sphere through language. The melancholic is even incapable of speaking in the symbolic realm. These symptoms of the melancholic are not observed in Maggie's and Silas's characterizations through the novels; therefore, it is concluded that Maggie and Silas are not melancholic characters despite their traumatic losses.

With respect to the notion of women's time, Kristeva refuses both essentialism and biologism in "Women's Time." She also refuses the differences between masculinity and femininity. In the analyses of both novels, it is concluded that Kristeva and Eliot share similar attitudes and views about the woman question and traditional gender roles. Kristeva's "father's time, mother's species," indicates two distinct domains that humans have experienced. "Father's time" links with the linear time that men have traditionally occupied in terms of progress, history, and destiny. "Mother's species" links with the space which generates humans, and within this concept, time is

repetitive in a circle, and the species are eternal. In other words, women are entrapped within the cyclical time and the limited place by being excluded from the linear time and the public sphere. According to Kristeva's periodization, both novels are located in the first phase of the feminist movement. In *The Mill on the Floss*, the differences between Maggie and Tom are intensified by the different spheres of the female and the male experiences. In *George Eliot*, Uglow states that both of them love stories; nevertheless, Tom loves only the martial tales of the determined characters such as Robert the Bruce that extols the virtues of the action world. Unlike Tom, Maggie becomes withdrawn and meditative denying the involvement in the world of action, which is associated with business and commerce. While Maggie has to struggle with the confusions within her psyche, Tom involves in the public sphere (Uglow 133). Another important detail to show the notion of women's time in *The Mill on the Floss* is Eliot's depiction of Mrs Moss, Maggie's aunt. Eliot depicts only one character as prolific through the novel; and she is Mrs Moss. Her prolificacy stems from her regeneration as a woman since Mrs Moss has eight children. Although Mrs Moss is one of the weakest characters socially and economically through the novel, her regeneration is an instance of the notion of "mother's species."

On the other hand, through *Silas Marner*, within the frame of the notion of "father's time, mother's species," domesticity is an important and recurrent theme. Three domestic spaces are mainly described as the domestic spaces of Squire Cass, Nancy Lammater and Silas Marner regarding the manifestations of the gender differences. With respect to these descriptions, if there are any women in domestic sphere, the space is neat, orderly, and full of life. Besides, Eliot makes use of Eppie's arrival to Silas's cottage to reveal the masculine and feminine characteristics with regard to child care. As opposed to the stereotypes, the child care duties that are attributed to women are linked with the symbolic order of the males. Silas's maternal masculinity is described via Eppie's arrival. Eliot emphasizes that the self-sacrificing attitudes, devoted maternity and tolerance to a child can attribute to masculinity unlike the stereotypes. In *George Eliot,* Uglow underlines: "Silas's real spiritual growth . . . comes from his own response to a child's demand for 'refuge and nurture'" (149).

Concerning the concept of revolt, Maggie is represented as "the dark-eyed, demonstrative, rebellious girl" (*Mill* 37). She has unusual intelligence and unconventional nature. Even as a little girl, she behaves in unusual ways, and her mother, Mrs Tulliver, is never pleased with Maggie's nature and behaviours. Her semiotic drives and energy are in a perpetual position of revolt as opposed to the symbolic order. Therefore, she rebels against the expectations and the norms of the symbolic. Regarding the kinds of revolt, Kristeva separates the psychological revolt from the societal revolt. Even though these are different from each other, Kristeva considers that both of them are significant. Nevertheless, she emphasizes that the major requirement of psychological revolt is to be "against identity, homogenization, the spectacle, and the law" (McAfee 118). If an internal district is not kept alive for the subject, s/he does not keep alive owing to the lack of an inner zone. In *The Mill on the Floss*, Maggie psychologically revolts against her family members since she is discouraged by them due to her tendencies which are attributed to the masculine domains. Maggie achieves partially to attain her semiotic desires and drives with the influence of the revolutionary side of her psyche. Within this frame, in *The English Novel*, Terry Eagleton states,

> The novel is determined to grant its heroine her victory, even if it has to go to the death for it. This includes a triumph over Tom, who in his dying moments acknowledges his sister's moral superiority. Maggie thus crushes him and wins him over at the same time, establishing equality with her brother which is also a kind of power. Most of Eliot's novels only just manage to fend off tragedy, and the ending of this one can be read as both tragic and anti-tragic. (177)

The revolutionary side of Maggie gives rise to a triumph over his brother. In other words, Maggie can be considered as an "anti-tragic" character owing to her establishment of her equality with the semiotic to the symbolic, particularly his brother.

Eliot deals with attentively qualified societies that have personalized norms, routines, and effects with respect to the relationship between the individual and the society through both novels. Both protagonists of these novels are in relation with a

society to integrate into it or to resist it. Nevertheless, the nature of the societies is different through the novels. While the family is the central theme of *The Mill on the Floss*, religion is crucial in *Silas Marner*.

Within the frame of Kristeva's notion of strangeness, Eliot's depictions of the community reveal the relationship between the community and the protagonists through the novels. In *The Mill on the Floss*, Eliot depicts Maggie as a member of her society. Thomson proposes: "Maggie inhabits a relatively integrated world in which she may be an insurgent but not an alien. At times confused and rebellious in her hazy aspirations for a better life, she is always presented as a member of her society, whether in its favor or disfavour" (70). Thomson underlines that Maggie is not an outsider in the community of the novel; however, Silas is an outsider in the community. Thomson further proposes: "Silas is virtually independent of Raveloe . . . Eliot was here studying in simplified and diagrammatic form the mutual relationship of an indigenous society and an outsider"(77). Thomson emphasizes the distinct status of the protagonists in both novels. While Maggie is a member of the community, Silas is not a member of the community. From this point of view, Silas Marner has been examined in terms of Kristeva's notion of strangeness owing to his outsider status. With regard to the notion of strangeness, Silas's physical appearance, way of life and profession give rise to his strangeness through the novel.

To sum up, this study has attempted to examine George Eliot's two early novels, *The Mill on the Floss* and *Silas Marner* in the light of Julia Kristeva's theories and terms. According to Kristeva, the theory of subjectivity is based on the theory of language which includes the semiotic and the symbolic. The semiotic comprises of the instinctual drives, feelings and imaginations whereas the symbolic includes the grammatical structures and syntactic rules. Through the novels, the emotions, imaginations and drives of the character are linked with the semiotic while the social conditions of the society and the social position of the character are connected with the symbolic. The revelation and the intrusion of the semiotic and the symbolic bring about gender dilemma and the ambivalence of identity through the novel. Therefore, s/he is not able to become a "uniary subject." In other words, a divided self emerges as an abject subject. Eliot's two early novels, *The Mill on the Floss* and *Silas Marner* reveal

the primary problematic issues during the Victorian period as the dilemma of gender and the ambivalence of identity. Hence, dealing with these primary issues, these novels question the conservative conventions of the period and subvert the traditional gender roles by criticising the social construction and the position of the issues of sex, gender and identity.

WORKS CITED

Abrams, M.H and Stephen Greenblatt. *The Norton Anthology of English Literature*. New York: W.W Norton and Company Inc., 2002. Print.

Ashton, Rosemary. *George Eliot: A Life*. London: Hamish Hamilton, 1996. Print.

Atkinson, Juliette. "Critical responses: 1970-Present." *George Eliot in Context*. Ed. Margaret Harris. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2013. 83-93. Print.

Barret, Estelle. *Kristeva Reframed*. London: I. B. Tauris & Co. Ltd, 2011. Print.

Barry, Peter. *Beginning Theory: An Introduction to Literary and Cultural Theory*. Manchester: Manchester UP, 1995. Print.

Beardsworth, Sara. *Julia Kristeva: Psyhoanalysis and Modernity*. New York: State U of New York, 2004. Print.

Beardsworth, Sara. "Love's Lost Labors: Subjectivity, Art, and Politics." *Psychoanalysis, Aesthetics, and Politics in the Work of Julia Kristeva* New York: State U of New York, 2009. Print.

Beauvoir, Simone de. *Memoirs of a Dutiful Daughter*. Trans. J. Kirkup. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1963. Print.

---. *The Second Sex*. Trans. H. M. Parsley. New York: Bantam/Alfred A. Knoph, 1961. Print.

Becker- Leckrone, Megan. *Julia Kristeva and Literary Theory*. London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005. Print.

Berten, Hans. *Literary Theory*. London and New York: Taylor & Francis Group, 2008. Print.

Bonaparte, Felicia. *Will and Destiny: Morality and Tragedy in George Eliot's Novels*. New York: New York UP, 1975. Print.

Brandt, Joan. "Julia Kristeva and Revolutionary Politics of *Tel Que.*" *Revolt, Affect, Collectivity: The Unstable Boundaries of Kristeva's Polis.* Eds. Tina Chanter and Ewa Ziarek. New York: State U of New York P, 2005. Print.

Bressler, Charles E. *Literary Criticism: An Introduction to Theory and Practice*. New Jersey: Pearson, 2007. Print.

Brown, Kate E. “Loss, Revelry, and the Temporal Measures of “Silas Marner”: Performance, Regret, Recollection.” *Novel: A Forum on Fiction*. 32. 2 (Spring, 1999): 222-249. *JSTOR*. Web. 16 August 2014.

Bryson, Valeria. *Feminist Political Theory: An Introduction*. New York: Paragon House, 1992. Print.

Caine, Barbara. “Feminism, Journalism and Public Debate.” *Women and Literature in Britain: 1800-1900*. Joanne Shattock. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2001. 99-118. Print.

Carroll, David. *George Eliot and the Conflict of Interpretations: A Reading of the Novels*. New York: Cambridge UP, 1992. Print.

Castle, Gregory. *The Blackwell Guide to Literary Theory*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 2007. Print.

Cixous, Helene, “The Laugh of Medusa.” Trans. Keith Cohen and Paula Cohen. *The Signs Reader: Women, Gender, and Scholarship*. Ed. Elizabeth Abel and Emily K. Abel. Chicago and London: U of Chicago P, 1983. Print.

Creed, Barbara. “Kristeva, Femininity, and Abjection.” *The Horror Readers*. Ed. Ken Gelder. London and New York: Routledge, 2000. 64-70. Print.

Dames, Nicholas. “The Withering of the Individual: Psychology in the Victorian Novel.” *A Concise Companion to the Victorian Novel*. Ed. Francis O’Gorman. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 2005. Print.

Eagleton, Terry. *The English Novel: An Introduction*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 2005. Print.

Edwards, Mike. *George Eliot: The Novels*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003. Print.

Eliot, George. *Silas Marner*. London: Penguin Popular Classics,1994. Print.

---. *The George Eliot Letters*. Ed. Gordon S. Haight. 9 vols. New Haeven: Yale UP, 1954-78. Print.

---. *The Mill on the Floss*. London: Penguin Books, 2003. Print.

Flint, Kate. “George Eliot and Gender.” *The Cambridge Companion to George Eliot*. Ed. George Levine. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2001. 159-180. Print.

Freud, Sigmund. “The Uncanny,” in *Complete Works: Standard Edition*. London: Hogarth, 217–252. Print.

Gilbert, Sandra and Susan Gubar. *The Madwoman in the Attic: The Woman Writer and the Nineteenth-Century Literary Imagination*. New Haven and London: Yale UP, 1979. Print.

Goodman, Charlotte. "The Lost Brother, the Twin: Women Novelists and the Male-Female Double Bildungsroman." *Novel: A Forum on Fiction*. 17. 1 (Autumn, 1983): 28-43. *JSTOR*. Web. 16 August 2014.

Habib, M.A.R. *A History of Literary Criticism: From Plato to the Present.* Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 2005. Print.

Hadjiafxendi, Kyriaki. "Gender and the Woman Question." *George Eliot in Context*. Ed. Margaret Harris. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2013. 137-144. Print.

Hagan, John. "A Reinterpretation of The Mill on the Floss." *PMLA*. 87. 1 (Jan., 1972): 53-63. *JSTOR*. Web. 16 August 2014.

Houghton, Walter E. *The Victorian Frame of Mind 1830-1870*. New Haven and London: Yale UP, 1957. Print.

Irigaray, Luce. *Ce sexe qui n'en est pas un*. Trans. Claudia Reeder. Paris: Minuit, 1980. Print.

Jędrzejewski. Jan. *George Eliot*. New York: Routledge, 2007. Print.

Kristeva, Julia. *Black Sun: Depression and Melancholia*. Trans. Leon S. Roudiez. New York: Columbia UP, 1989. Print.

---. *Desire in Language*. Ed. Roudiez, Leon S. Columbia UP, 1980. Print.

---. *In the Beginning Was Love: Psychoanalysis and Faith*. Trans. Author Goldhammer. New York: Columbia UP, 1988. Print.

---. *Intimate Revolt: The Powers and Limits of Psychoanalysis*. Trans. Jeanine Herman. New York: Columbia UP, 2002. Print.

---. *New Maladies of the Soul*. Trans. Ross Guberman. New York: Columbia UP, 1995. Print.

---. *Powers of Horror: An Essay on Abjection*. Trans. Leon S. Roudiez. New York: Columbia UP, 1982. Print.

---. *Revolution in Poetic Language*. Trans. Margaret Waller. New York. Columbia UP, 1984. Print.

---. *Strangers to Ourselves*. Trans. Leon Roudiez. New York: Columbia UP, 1991. Print.

---. *Tales of Love*. Trans. Leon S. Roudiez. New York: Columbia UP, 1987. Print.

---. "The Future of Revolt." *Intimate Revolt: The Powers and Limits of Psychoanalysis*. Trans. Jeanine Herman. New York: Columbia UP, 2002. Print.

---. *The Kristeva Reader.* Ed. Moi, Toril. Oxford: Blackwell, 1986. Print.

---. *The Portable Kristeva*. Ed. Kelly Oliver. New York: Columbia UP, 1997. Print.

---. *The Sense and Non-sense of Revolt: The Powers and Limits of Psychoanalysis*. Trans. Jeanine Herman. New York: Columbia UP, 2000. Print.

Lacan, Jacques. *The Seminar. Book III. The Psychoses*. Trans. Russell Grigg. London: Routledge, 1993. Print.

Leitch, Vincent B. *The Norton Anthology of Theory and Criticism*. London and New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 2001. Print.

Levine, Caroline. "Surprising Realism." *A Companion to George Eliot*. Eds. Amanda Anderson and Harry E. Shaw. Oxford: Wiley Blackwell, 2013. 93-104. Print.

Levine, George. "Introduction: George Eliot and Art of Realism." *The Cambridge Companion to George Eliot*. Ed. George Levine. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2001. Print.

---. *The Emergence of Victorian Consciousness: The Spirit of the Age*. New York: The Free Press, 1967. Print.

Mangum, Teresa. "Growing Old: Age." *A Companion to Victorian Literature & Culture*. Ed. Herbert F. Tucker. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 1999. 97-109. Print.

Markovits, Stefanie. "*Scenes of Clergical Life* and *Silas Marner*: Moral Fables." *A Companion to George Eliot*. Eds. Amanda Anderson and Harry E. Shaw. Oxford: Wiley Blackwell, 2013. 93-104. Print.

Matus, Jill L. "George Eliot and the Sciences of Mind: The Silence that Lies on the Other Side of Roar." *A Companion to George Eliot*. Eds. Amanda Anderson and Harry E. Shaw. Oxford: Wiley Blackwell, 2013. 457-470. Print.

McAfee, Noelle. *Julia Kristeva.* New York: Routledge Press, 2004. Print.

McCaw, Neil. *George Eliot and Victorian Historiography: Imagining the National Past*. Basingstoke: Macmillan, 2000. Print.

Millett, Kate. *Sexual Politics*. New York: Doubleday, 1970. Print.

Moi, Toril. *Sexual/Textual Politics: Feminist Literary Theory*. London and New York: Routledge, 1985. Print.

Morgan, Simon. *A Victorian Woman's Place: Public Culture in the Nineteenth Century*. India: Replika Press, 2007. Print.

Morley, John and Viscount Morley. *Recollections*. London: Macmillan Press, 1917. Print.

Neff, Wanda Fraiken. *Victorian Working Women: An Historical and Literary Study of Women in British Industries and Professions 1832-1850*. New York: Columbia UP, 1929. Print.

Nelson, Claudia. "Growing Up: Childhood." *A Companion to Victorian Literature & Culture*. Ed. Herbert F. Tucker. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 1999. 69-81. Print.

Oliver, Kelly. "Introduction." *The Portable Kristeva*. New York: Columbia UP. 1979. Print.

---. *Reading Kristeva: Unraveling the Double-bind*. Bloomington: Indiana UP. 1993. Print.

Paris, Bernard J. *Experiments in Life: George Eliot's Quest for Values*. Detroit, Mich.: Wayne State UP, 1965. Print.

Pykett, Lyn. "Women Writing Woman: Nineteenth Century Representations of Gender and Sexuality." *Women and Literature in Britain: 1800-1900*. Ed. Joanne Shattock. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2001. 142-161. Print.

Radden, Jennifer. *The Nature of Melancholy: From Aristotle to Kristeva*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2000. Print.

Redinger, Ruby. *George Eliot: The Emergent Self*. London: Bodley Head, 1976. Print.

Sanders, Valerie. "Women, Fiction and the Marketplace." *Women and Literature in Britain: 1800-1900*. Ed. Joanne Shattock. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2001. 142-161. Print.

Silkü, Rezzan Kocaöner. *Industrialization, Modernity, and the Woman Question*. İzmir: Ege UP, 2004. Print.

Sjöholm, Cecilia. "Fear of Intimacy? Psychoanalysis and the Resistance to Commodification." *Psychoanalysis, Aesthetics, and Politics in the Work of Julia Kristeva* New York: State U of New York P, 2009. Print.

Sully, James. "George Eliot's Art." *Mind*. 6. 23 (Jul., 1881): 378-394. *JSTOR*. Web. 16 August 2014.

Thomson, Fred C. "The Theme of Alienation in Silas Marner." *Nineteenth-Century Fiction*. 20. 1 (Jun., 1965): 69-84. *JSTOR*. Web. 16 August 2014.

Tolan, Fiona. "Feminisms." *Literary Theory and Criticism: An Oxford Guide*. Ed. Patricia Waugh. New York: Oxford UP, 2006. Print.

Tosh, J. (2006). "Masculinities in an Industrializing Society: Britain, 1800-1914." *Journal of British Studies*. 44. 2 (April 2005): 330-342. *JSTOR*. Web. 16 August 2014.

Tyson, Lois. *Critical Theory Today A User-Friendly Guide*. New York: Routledge Taylor & Francis Group, 2006. Print.

Uglow, Jennifer. *George Eliot*. New York: Pantheon Books, 1987. Print.

Vrettos, Athena. "Victorian Psychology." *A Companion to The Victorian Novel*. Eds. Patrick Brantlinger and William B. Thesing. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 2002. 67-83. Print.

Woolf, Virginia. *A Room of One's Own*. San Diego, New York, London: Harvest/Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1989. Print.

ÖZGEÇMİŞ

Yasemin Baysal, 2010 yılında Mersin Üniversitesi Fen-Edebiyat Fakültesi İngiliz Dili ve Edebiyatı Bölümü, İngiliz Dil Bilimi programından mezun oldu. 2013 yılında, Ege Üniversitesi, İngiliz Dili ve Edebiyatı Anabilim Dalı'nda yüksek lisans yapmaya ve Araştırma Görevlisi olarak çalışmaya başladı.

ABSTRACT

This study attempts to evaluate Eliot's early novels, *The Mill on the Floss* and *Silas Marner*, in the light of the Kristevan theories and terms to indicate the construction of gender and identity with respect to the structures and conventions of Victorian society. It comprises of two chapters. Chapter I sets up the theoretical framework of the study regarding the feminist literary criticism and Kristevan criticism. This chapter is divided into three parts as early feminist criticism, modern feminist criticism and the theories and terms of Julia Kristeva. Chapter II overviews the historical background of Victorian period and attempts to evaluate Eliot as a woman novelist in the Victorian period. Besides, in this chapter, Eliot's early novels, *The Mill on the Floss* and *Silas Marner*, will be examined in the light of Kristevan criticism. In the second part of the chapter, *The Mill on the Floss* will be discussed since this novel reveals the protagonist Maggie's familial relations, gender dilemmas, ambivalence of identity, and social pressure. Therefore, *The Mill on the Floss* will be examined with regard to the semiotic, the symbolic, the theory of subjectivity, women's time, melancholia and revolt. In the third part of the chapter, *Silas Marner* will be investigated. This novel reveals the protagonist Silas's dilemma of religion, ambivalence of identity and social pressure concerning the circumstances and conventions of Victorian patriarchal society. *Silas Marner* reflects the contradictions and oppositions between the characters' position in the society and the subjective needs of the character to show his imaginations, feelings and drives. It will be examined within the frame of the notion of strangeness, the semiotic, the symbolic, the theory of subjectivity and women's time in the light of Kristeva's work. Through both novels, Eliot criticises traditional gender roles and social construction and position of two sexes. Both novels will be investigated with respect to Kristevan criticism by underlining Eliot's depictions and attitudes to her protagonists.

Key Words: George Eliot, Julia Kristeva, the semiotic, the symbolic, melancholia, revolt

ÖZET

Bu çalışma, Eliot'ın erken dönem romanlarından *Kıyıdaki Değirmen* (*The Mill on the Floss)* ve *Silas Marner* romanlarında, Victorya toplum yapısı ve gelenekleri çerçevesinde cinsiyet ve benlik oluşumunu, Kristeva'nın kuram ve terimleri ışığında değerlendirmeyi amaçlamaktadır. Birinci bölüm, feminist eleştiri kuramı ve Kristevacı eleştiri ile kuramsal çerçeveyi oluşturmaktadır. Bu bölüm, erken feminist eleştiri, modern feminist eleştiri ve Kristeva'nın kuram ve terimleri olmak üzere üç bölüme ayrılmıştır. İkinci bölüm, Viktorya döneminin tarihsel arka planını ve Eliot'ı bu dönemdeki bir kadın yazar olarak ele almaktadır. Ayrıca, Eliot'ın erken dönem romanlarından *Kıyıdaki Değirmen* (*The Mill on the Floss)* ve *Silas Marner,* Kristevacı eleştiri ışığında incelenmektedir. *Kıyıdaki Değirmen,* romanın baş karakterlerinden biri olan Maggie'nin ailevi ilişkilerini, cinsiyet ikilemlerini, benlik karmaşası ve sosyal baskıyı ortaya koyduğundan, cinsiyet ve benlik oluşumu bağlamında tartışılmaktadır. Bu yüzden, roman sembolik, semiyotik, benlik kuramı, melankoli ve isyan kavramları çerçevesinde incelenmektedir. *Silas Marner* ise Silas'ın din ikilemini, benlik karmaşasını ve toplum baskısını etkili bir biçimde yansıtır. Bu roman, Silas'ın birey olarak toplumdaki yerini ve kendi hayalleri, hisleri ve dürtüleri arasındaki çelişkileri ve zıtlıkları ortaya koyduğundan, yabancılaşma, semiyotik, sembolik ve öznellik teorisi çerçevesinde incelenmektedir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: George Eliot, Julia Kristeva, semiyotik, sembolik, melankoli, isyan