AKDENIZ UNIVERSITY
THE INSTITUTE OF SOCIAL SCIENCES

Elif ÇELEN

CONSTRUCTION OF FEMININITY AND MASCULINITY THROUGH LANGUAGE IN CHARLOTTE PERKINS GILMAN'S *HERLAND* AND DORIS LESSING'S *THE CLEFT*

Department of English Language and Literature

Master's Thesis

Antalya, 2021

AKDENIZ UNIVERSITY
THE INSTITUTE OF SOCIAL SCIENCES

Elif ÇELEN

CONSTRUCTION OF FEMININITY AND MASCULINITY THROUGH LANGUAGE IN CHARLOTTE PERKINS GILMAN'S *HERLAND* AND DORIS LESSING'S *THE CLEFT*

Supervisor
Assoc. Prof. Dr. Hatice Sezgi SARAÇ DURGUN

Department of English Language and Literature

Master's Thesis

Antalya, 2021

Akdeniz Üniversitesi

Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Müdürlüğüne,

Elif ÇELEN'in bu çalışması, jürimiz tarafından İngiliz Dili ve Edebiyatı Ana Bilim Dalı Yüksek Lisans Programı tezi olarak kabul edilmiştir.

Başkan	: Doç. Dr. Mustafa Zeki ÇIRAKLI	(İmza)
Üye (Danışmanı)	: Doç. Dr. Hatice Sezgi SARAÇ DURGUN	(İmza)
Üye	: Prof. Dr. Arda ARIKAN	(İmza)

Tez Başlığı:	Construction of Femininity and Masculinity through Language in Charlotte Perkins Gilman's *Herland* and Doris Lessing's *The Cleft*

Onay : Yukarıdaki imzaların, adı geçen öğretim üyelerine ait olduğunu onaylarım.

Tez Savunma Tarihi : 09/07/2021

Mezuniyet Tarihi : 02/09/2021

(İmza)

Prof. Dr. Suat KOLUKIRIK

Müdür

AKADEMİK BEYAN

Yüksek Lisans Tezi olarak sunduğum “Construction of Femininity and Masculinity through Language in Charlotte Perkins Gilman's *Herland* and Doris Lessing's *The Cleft*” adlı bu çalışmanın, akademik kural ve etik değerlere uygun bir biçimde tarafımca yazıldığını, yararlandığım bütün eserlerin kaynakçada gösterildiğini ve çalışma içerisinde bu eserlere atıf yapıldığını belirtir; bunu şerefimle doğrularım.

19/08/2021

Elif ÇELEN

T.C.
AKDENİZ ÜNİVERSİTESİ
SOSYAL BİLİMLER ENSTİTÜSÜ
TEZ ÇALIŞMASI ORİJİNALLİK RAPORU
BEYAN BELGESİ

SOSYAL BİLİMLER ENSTİTÜSÜ MÜDÜRLÜĞÜ'NE

ÖĞRENCİ BİLGİLERİ	
Adı-Soyadı	**Elif ÇELEN**
Öğrenci Numarası	**201952003007**
Enstitü Ana Bilim Dalı	**Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü**
Programı	**Tezli Yüksek Lisans**
Programın Türü	**(X) Tezli Yüksek Lisans ( ) Doktora ( ) Tezsiz Yüksek Lisans**
Danışmanının Unvanı, Adı-Soyadı	**Doç. Dr. Hatice Sezgi SARAÇ DURGUN**
Tez Başlığı	**Construction of Femininity and Masculinity through Language in Charlotte Perkins Gilman's *Herland* and Doris Lessing's *The Cleft***
Turnitin Ödev Numarası	**1602081344**

Yukarıda başlığı belirtilen tez çalışmasının a) Kapak sayfası, b) Giriş, c) Ana Bölümler ve d) Sonuç kısımlarından oluşan toplam 81 sayfalık kısmına ilişkin olarak, 19/08/2021 tarihinde tarafımdan Turnitin adlı intihal tespit programından Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Tez Çalışması Orijinallik Raporu Alınması ve Kullanılması Uygulama Esasları'nda belirlenen filtrelemeler uygulanarak alınmış olan ve ekte sunulan rapora göre, tezin/dönem projesinin benzerlik oranı;

alıntılar hariç % 4

alıntılar dahil % 29 'dur.

Danışman tarafından uygun olan seçenek işaretlenmelidir:

(X) Benzerlik oranları belirlenen limitleri aşmıyor ise;
Yukarıda yer alan beyanın ve ekte sunulan Tez Çalışması Orijinallik Raporu'nun doğruluğunu onaylarım.

( ) Benzerlik oranları belirlenen limitleri aşıyor, ancak tez/dönem projesi danışmanı intihal yapılmadığı kanısında ise;

Yukarıda yer alan beyanın ve ekte sunulan Tez Çalışması Orijinallik Raporu'nun doğruluğunu onaylar ve Uygulama Esasları'nda öngörülen yüzdelik sınırlarının aşılmasına karşın, aşağıda belirtilen gerekçe ile intihal yapılmadığı kanısında olduğumu beyan ederim.

Gerekçe:

Benzerlik taraması yukarıda verilen ölçütlerin ışığı altında tarafımca yapılmıştır. İlgili tezin orijinallik raporunun uygun olduğunu beyan ederim.

19/08/2021

Doç. Dr. Hatice Sezgi SARAÇ DURGUN

(imzası)

C O N T E N T S

LIST OF TABLES ..... **ii**

SUMMARY ..... **iii**

ÖZET ..... **iv**

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS ..... **v**

INTRODUCTION **1**

CHAPTER I

SPEECH ACT THEORY AND GENDER PERFORMATIVITY

1.1. Austinian Speech Act Theory 5

1.2. Butler and Speech Act Theory 12

CHAPTER II

FEMININITY AND MASCULINITY

2.1. Major Theories on Femininity and Masculinity 24

CHAPTER III

CONSTRUCTION OF FEMININITY AND MASCULINITY IN *THE CLEFT*

3.1. A Summary of *The Cleft* 34

3.2. Findings 35

3.3. Discussion 46

CHAPTER IV

CONSTRUCTION OF FEMININITY AND MASCULINITY IN *HERLAND*

4.1. A Summary of *Herland* 53

4.2. Findings 53

4.3. Discussion 61

CONCLUSION **66**

REFERENCES **70**

CURRICULUM VITAE **77**

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1.1. An Adapted Version of Approaches to Illocutionary Acts 11

SUMMARY

Language is essential for the construction of individuals' gender behaviours. Built upon dichotomies, gender behaviours ensure that female and male characters remain within the boundaries of femininity and masculinity through language. Charlotte Perkins Gilman's *Herland* (1915) and Doris Lessing's *The Cleft* (2009) depict female-only societies that the qualities of femininity and masculinity are attributed to the members of society through language. Even though the selected novels depict different eras of civilisation, in both novels, male-authorised history conveys and interprets women's stories through speech acts that shape feminine and masculine gender behaviours. An analysis of the novels shows that the characters in the novels perform their gender to fit into society. This thesis aims to analyse femininity and masculinity in the select novels through the theoretical framework of John L. Austin's speech act theory, Judith Butler's theory on gender performativity, and the findings of this analysis are further discussed with the major theories on gender behaviours. Consequently, the results of these examinations are used to reveal how the dynamics of being a female and a male are dictated through the language within the texts rather than sex. In light of these, it is concluded that language plays a prominent role in gender attributes compared to sex within the selected literary texts.

Keywords: Gender, Speech Act Theory, Performativity, *Herland*, *The Cleft*

ÖZET

CHARLOTTE PERKINS GILMAN'IN *HERLAND* VE DORIS LESSING'İN *THE CLEFT* ESERLERINDE DİL YOLU İLE KADINLIK VE ERKEKLİĞİN İNŞASI

Bireylerin ve toplumun cinsiyet davranışları üzerinde dilin etkisi oldukça önemlidir. Temel zıtlıklar üzerinden kurgulanan cinsiyet davranışları, dil aracılığıyla kadın ve erkek karakterlerin kadınlık ve erkeklik sınırları içerisinde kalmasını sağlar. Charlotte Perkins Gilman'ın *Herland* (1915) ve Doris Lessing'in *The Cleft* (2009) adlı eserleri, kadınlık ve erkeklik niteliklerinin toplum üyelerine dil aracılığıyla atfedildiği kadın temelli toplumları betimler. Her ne kadar bu seçili eserler farklı uygarlık dönemlerini tasvir etseler de, her iki romanda da erkek egemen anlatıcılar kadınlık ve erkeklik cinsiyet davranışlarını şekillendiren söz eylemler yoluyla kadınların hikayelerini toplumsal cinsiyet davranışlarının sınırlarına uygun olarak aktarır ve yorumlarlar. Romanların analizleri eserlerdeki karakterler cinsiyetlerini topluma uyum sağlamak adına icra ettiklerini gösterir. Bu tezin amacı, seçili eserlerinin John. L. Austin'in söz eylem teorisi ve Judith Butler'ın performatif cinsiyet üzerine olan teorisinin kuramsal çerçevesi aracılığıyla analizini yapmak ve daha sonra bu analizin bulgularını temel cinsiyet kuramlarıyla tartışmaktır. Dolayısıyla bu incelemelerin bulguları kadın ve erkek olma dinamiklerinin nasıl cinsiyetten ziyade metin dahilindeki dil aracılığıyla dikte edildiğini ortaya çıkarmak için kullanılacaktır. Bunların ışığında, seçilen edebi metinlerde cinsel kimlikle karşılaştırıldığında cinsiyet yöneliminde dilin öncül bir rol oynadığı sonucu çıkarılmıştır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Cinsiyet, Söz Eylem Kuramı, Performatif Cinsiyet, *Herland, The Cleft*

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I am indebted to my supervisor Assoc. Prof. Dr. Hatice Sezgi Saraç Durgun, who always encouraged me, answered my questions, gave detailed feedback, and helped me to write this thesis. It was a great pleasure to discuss and share my opinions with her. I am grateful to the jury members, Prof. Dr. Arda Arıkan and Assoc. Prof. Dr. Mustafa Zeki Çıraklı for their valuable criticism and advice. Also, I am thankful for my professors Mustafa Şahiner, Aras Burak Yiğit, Emine Şentürk, Mehmet Galip Zorba, Orkun Kocabıyık at Akdeniz University and my precious friends Beril, Esra, Gökçe, and Sinem.

I want to thank my family Orkide, Yaren, and Gürsel Çelen for their endless love and support. Their belief in me made it possible for writing this thesis. Last but not least, I want to thank my significant other Onur Tarıkcı, who has always supported me and believed in me. He has always been a comfort to me with his generous help.

INTRODUCTION

The concept of femininity and masculinity has been debated and studied for many years. However, these two poles have played a crucial role in the formation of understanding human sexuality as binaries. Fundamentally, these concepts result from "the belief that masculinity is what males do and femininity is what females do" (Deaux, 1987: 297). One of the earliest discussions recorded on the origin of sexes can be found around the 4th century B.C in Plato's *Symposium*. Aristophanes, the protagonist of this discussion, narrates a myth about the original sexes: female, male and androgynous. According to this myth, all people were androgynous or hermaphrodites. However, "[d]ue to the jealousy of the father of gods, Zeus, who could not stand their happiness, they were split into two parts and condemned to look for the lost 'other half' for the rest of their lives" (Cereda and Ross, 2012: vii). Hence, the myth of Hermaphrodites is an explanation of the heterosexual relationship that normalises such gender dichotomy from a mythological perspective.

Lessing's (2007) novel, *The Cleft*, displays a different myth about the origins of women and men. Lessing won the Nobel Prize for Literature after the publication of *The Cleft*. The novel retells human history by providing "an alternative view of the origins of 'man'" (Jansen, 2011: 150). Gilman's (1999) *Herland*, on the other hand, represents the invasion of an all-female society by three men. Hence, femininity and masculinity in *The Cleft* and *Herland* are constructed and transmitted through "male-authorised history" (Jansen, 2011: 109). Thus, in this study, it is argued that an inductive reading of these two texts reveals that the male language is constructed through speech acts in which mainly implicit performatives are foregrounded. The effects of these utterances allow masculinity to preserve its dominance over femininity by verbally restricting women.

This thesis uses Austin's speech act theory and Butler's theory on gender performativity to present an inductive reading of Lessing's *The Cleft* and Gilman's *Herland*. According to Butler (1990: 25), "There is no gender identity behind the expressions of gender; that identity is performatively constituted by the very 'expressions' that are said to be its results." The relation between gender behaviours and language use in the selected texts displays that masculinity is mainly reflected through speech acts. As a result of the implicit performatives, masculinity preserves its domination over femininity.

In *How to Do Things with Words*, Austin (1962: 6) explains that "to utter the sentence is not to describe my doing of what I should be said in so uttering to be doing or to state that I am doing it: it is to do it." Therefore, the inquiry of how saying something is doing something is the focus of the first chapter. The main goal of the chapter is to examine speech acts through various examples to unveil the primal motive behind 'doing something' via language. In addition, Butler, Searle, Bach, and Harnish's studies on speech acts are briefly explained. Hence, it is discussed that speech acts are essential to construct the force behind actions and/or behaviours.

In the second chapter, Butler's theory on gender performativity is examined concerning gender behaviours and language. Butler (1993) argues that the process of naming constitutes a restriction that evolves into a norm in time. This chapter aims to display the social and discursive constructions of gender and their results that constrain individuals to make them 'do' their gender.

In chapter three, femininity and masculinity are studied using the major theories such as Bourdieu's (2001) masculine habitus theory, Kohlberg's (1966) cognitive-developmental theory, Bem's (1983) gender schema theory, Weitzman's (1972) learning theory and Freud's (2010) psychoanalytic theory. Therefore, the social constructions of gender behaviours are displayed. This chapter aims to illustrate the significance of social environment on gender construction within these theoretical frameworks. As a result, the significance of the environment is argued in constructing an individual's gender from birth.

In chapter four, Lessing's (2007) *The Cleft* is explored using Austin's speech act theory and Butler's gender performativity. It is argued that in the novel, the speech acts play a significant role in displaying how gender-based roles are constructed and how they force individuals to fit in the gender-based labels. Moreover, the speech acts used in the male voices are examined and claimed that the masculine voice maintains and transmits masculine domination. In the discussion part, the major theories on gender are applied to the selected novels to underline the motives behind femininity and masculinity. It is discussed that the social dichotomy of femininity and masculinity is observed from infancy. Therefore, individuals are forced to perform their feminine domestic duties or masculine heroic duties in society through speech acts.

In the final chapter, Gilman's (1999) *Herland* is analysed using Butler's gender performativity and Austin's speech act theory. It is claimed that femininity and masculinity are constructed and conveyed via speech acts in the novel. It is also argued that the characters in

Herland are forced to adapt to feminine and masculine gender behaviours through gender performativity to fit into society. In the discussion part, the major theories on femininity and masculinity are applied to the characters; as a result, the social restrictions over the characters are discussed. In sum, through speech acts of male voices, the construction of femininity and masculinity in these novels are analysed.

In this thesis, the construction of femininity and masculinity in Lessing's *Cleft* and Gilman's *Herland* is analysed within the framework of Austin's speech act theory, Butler's gender performativity, and the major theories on gender behaviours. The main motive behind this study is to offer a different approach to the selected texts that are commonly analysed within the frameworks of feminism and ecofeminism. Nevertheless, none of these previous studies have examined the novels within Austin's and/or Butler's theoretical frameworks. Hence, besides the representations of women and men in the novels, the reasons behind the men's dominant presence in heteronormative society are explained by evaluating the construction of femininity and masculinity. In the selected novels, the Clefts and Herlanders' stories are narrated by male narrators who highlight and legitimise their masculine dominance over femininity via speech acts. Therefore, an inductive reading of the novels focuses on the narrators' and characters' speech and behaviours to display the social gender constructions.

CHAPTER I

SPEECH ACT THEORY AND GENDER PERFORMATIVITY

At the beginning of the 1970s, many linguists' focus shifted from "an abstract grammatical system" to "everyday situations," and this shift has led to the questioning of the purpose and function of language, which forms the basis of discourse analysis (Gibbons and Whiteley, 2018: 83). The aim and function of language, as Vanderveken and Kubo (2001: 1) point out, has a crucial place in sciences such as literature along with "philosophy, psychology, and linguistics." Therefore, "...any study of communication must take into account the nature of speech acts that agents perform in discourse as well as the structure of their language games, the forms of life into which they are engaged and the conversational background" (1). Hence, discourse and speech have been discussed for many years to comprehend the nature and motive of communication.

One of the earliest discussions of language includes Aristotle's claim that only declarative utterances can be true or false and the rest of them are "the interrogative" and/or "optative" types of utterances. Thus, Aristotle was the first known philosopher who thought all sentences could not be valued for their falsifiability (as cited in Chapman and Routledge, 2009: 213). Hence, the philosophers interested in language in the classical era established a way of seeing communication that includes orders, thoughts, and commands (Vanderveken and Kubo, 2001).

Since the classical age, philosophical thoughts about language have developed and shaped the reasoning in literature studies. Wittgenstein's (1953: 23*) Philosophical Investigations* can be regarded as one of the turning points of identifications on language and linguistics with the term "language game" that "is meant to bring into prominence the fact that the speaking of language is part of an activity, of a form of life." Wittgenstein's (1953) theoretical discussions on language influenced many academics, including J. Austin (1962) and his viewpoints on language in his work *How to Do Things with Words.* Starting from Austin's (1962) lectures in Oxford, the speech act theory has been developed and applied in many fields such as sociology and literature. The relevance between speech acts and literature is significant since "[a]ny literary discourse is a series of speech acts, and can be analysed accordingly" (Bollobas, 1980: 40). In narrative studies, many academics have used Austin's (1962: 12) statement that "to say something is to do something; or in which by saying or in saying

something we are doing something." The main point here is to show how the words create action and how they also affect conversations resting silently in literary works.

Analysing the narrator's and different characters' speech acts, the social and individual interactions with others might be inferred and studied (Short, 1996: 195). For instance, Nischik (1993: 306) analyses a short story taken from Margaret Atwood's (1983) novel *Bluebeard's Egg* by using the narrative transmission of direct and indirect speech acts of illocutionary such as directive acts to examine the dynamics between characters' dialogues. Moreover, in "Interactions in *Cuckoo's Nest*: Elements of a Narrative Speech-Act Analysis," Bernaerts (2010: 282) focuses on the illocutionary forces in the text by showing the satirical criticism hidden in characters' dialogues. Hannan (2005), on the other hand, uses the Searlean approach to speech acts to analyse Ali's (2003) *Brick Lane.* In that study, Hannan (2005: 142) states that "speech-acts are partly constitutive of human communities and that, to better understand a given community, it is imperative to understand its basic stock of speech-acts and the conventions that govern their performance." Accordingly, he aims to examine the moral codes in the literary work by using the illocutionary acts to show that moral codes are constructed; therefore, they can be deconstructed by discourses as well. Therefore, the literary analysis of speech acts might explain how they "change the world we inhabit" because of their apparent effects on individuals that "make them do things" (Short, 1996: 197).

Applying the speech act theory has recently been developed in literary analysis, especially in text analysis, and its focus is usually on the illocutionary acts in literary works. Perlocutionary acts, "which is the achieving of certain effects by saying something," on the other hand, are commonly neglected because of their versatile or "the parasitic uses of language" (Austin, 1962: 110-20). Nevertheless, this thesis attempts to reveal how speech acts, specifically implicit performatives, play a vital part in governing perlocutionary effects in constructing the gender codes in literature and society. Hence, the characters' dialogues and narrators' descriptions will be analysed in the selected texts. In the following section, Austin's (1962) speech act theory will be examined to discuss how language affects individuals, society, and power relations. In addition to Austin's (1962) study, Searle's (1980) speech act theory, and Butler's gender performativity will be explored to offer a more detailed analysis of the Austinian speech act theory.

1.1. Austinian Speech Act Theory

An utterance not only declares a statement, but it also acts as a tool of communication that demands knowledge of the language while requiring the knowledge of culture of a given society (Chapman and Routledge, 2009). Austin's (1952-1954) lectures on philosophy and language questions "[w]hat can we do with words?" (Claeys, 2007: 6). The main motive behind Austin's speech act theory is to revolt against the "logical positivist who argued that the meaning of a sentence is reducible to its verifiability, that is to an analysis which verifies if utterances are true or false" (Chapman and Routledge, 2009: 213). Even though many philosophers and linguists have declared that all statements cannot be true or false, this aspect of language still remains unexplored to Austin in many ways (Claeys, 2007).

According to Austin (1962), making statements is not the only purpose of utterances, and therefore, all statements cannot be generalised according to their falsifiability; on the contrary, they are tools that lead to actions in many circumstances. The main focus of his study, *How to Do Things with Words* (1962), is speakers' medium, but in the last chapter, he underlines the abilities of speakers' words which are shaped by social conventions (Eckert and Ginet, 2003). The declarations such as giving names or ordering may result in actions through speech, and examining this language process, then, may help comprehend communication functions.

Influenced by Aristotle's (1979) division between "apophantic," declaratory, and "non-apophantic," non-declaratory, statements, Austin (1962) mainly divides the utterances as constative and performative (cited in Chapman and Routledge, 2009). Relatedly, Austin (1962: 3) states that "not all true or false statements are descriptions, and for this reason I prefer to use the word 'Constative.'" The term constative means declarative (or true/false) statements. Unlike the constative utterances, performative utterances lead to actions, and therefore, "to utter the sentence is not to describe my doing of what I should be said in so uttering to be doing or to state that I am doing it: it is to do it" (Austin, 1962: 6). Hence, the performative utterances such as "I do" in a wedding ceremony or "I name this ship the Queen Elizabeth" as throwing a bottle against it are not true or false statements, according to Austin (5-6). Most of the performatives are "contractual (I bet) or declaratory (I declare war)," but the main issue for Austin is the results of these performative utterances (7). Moreover, the speech act conditions are significant as the quotation indicates:

> To circumscribe the conditions under which a pure performative, a speech act, would be definable by laws and would be impervious to what [Austin] calls "infelicities" [or] conditions that prevent a speech act from being successfully carried out according to appropriate conventions and a certain purpose (Hewitt, 1987: 33).

Infelicities are significant in Austin's theory since "it is always necessary that the circumstances in which the words are uttered should be in some way, or ways, appropriate," so each speaker should perform further actions that are uttered whether physically or not (Austin, 1962: 8). If the acts of "marrying, betting, bequeathing, christening, etc." through utterances do 'fail,' their results would not be false, but 'unhappy outcomes' or the infelicities (14). There are many types of infelicities such as "misfires, misinvocations, misexecutions, abuses, insincerities, etc." and all of them should be avoided, as he underlines in his study on speech act theory (18). As stated before, in a wedding ceremony, the statement of 'I do,' which is told by a bride and groom, is performative since it causes the act of marriage by accepting the promises about the event. However, the expressions should be appropriate according to the law since providing that it is told for a 'monkey,' the sentence would be considered as 'infelicity' or unhappy due to the invalidity of the promises and constitution of marriage as Petrey (1990: 7) states, "[f]or there to be a marriage, there must exist a conventional procedure known as marriage with conventional effects accepted by the newlyweds and their fellow citizens." In other words, the conditions should be accomplished to receive the intended outcomes of speech.

Even though Austin (1962) divides utterances as constative and performative, he underlines that there is no clear distinction between these utterances. For instance, if someone says, 'there is a spider in your hair' it does not only describe a fact, it may also give a warning to the audience; hence, he "abandoned the dichotomy and contended that to say something equals to perform something" (Chapman and Routledge, 2009: 216). Furthermore, Austin (1962) categorising these sentences as 'explicit' and 'implicit' utterances. Also, Austin (1962) states that:

> The performative utterances I have taken as examples are all of them highly developed affairs, of the kind that we shall later call explicit performatives, by contrast with merely implicit performatives. That is to say, they (all) begin with or include some highly significant and unambiguous expression such as 'I bet', 'I promise', 'I bequeath'-an expression very commonly also used in naming the act which, in making such an utterance, I am performing-for example betting, promising, bequeathing, &c. But, of course, it is both obvious and important that we can on occasion use the utterance 'go' to achieve practically the same as we achieve by the utterance 'I order you to go' : and we should say cheerfully in either case, describing subsequently what someone did, that he ordered me to go (32).

Therefore, implicit performatives "do not contain the performative verb naming the illocutionary force of the utterance" (Holtgraves, 2005: 2025). The examples such as 'I do,' 'I promise,' 'I name' clearly perform the actions without any implications; on the other hand, the implicit utterances denote various meanings as in the statement; 'There is a dog in the garden'

may also warn you besides giving you information (Claeys and Keunen, 2007: 8-9). In that sense, according to Austin, "saying something is always doing something" (cited in Claeys, 2007: 8-9).

In *How to Do Things with Words*, Austin (1962) further divides performatives into three parts: locutionary, illocutionary, and perlocutionary acts. Austin (1962) gives these examples for clarification:

> Act (A) or Locution
>
> He said to me 'Shoot her!' meaning by 'shoot' shoot and referring by 'her' to *her*.
>
> Act (B) or Illocution
>
> He urged (or advised, ordered, etc.) me to shoot her.
>
> Act (C) or Perlocution
>
> He persuaded me to shoot her.
>
> Act (C.*b*)
>
> He got me to (or made me, etc.) shoot her. (Austin, 1962: 101-2)

These examples present "the consequential effects" of perlocutionary acts, and unlike the locutionary and illocutionary acts, they do not bound to the conventional effects (102). Also, the example of Act (B) is associated with infelicities. If he urged her/him to shoot her, the result should point to the fact that this utterance is successful. Nevertheless, Act (C) and Act (C.*b*) are not attached to any happy or unhappy results since they do not explicitly give the 'required' means. Thus, the 'implicit intentionality' is another significant factor for the perlocutionary acts since it also differs from the locutionary and illocutionary acts. Perlocutionary acts, in this sense, are divided into "the intended perlocutionary effect" and "the actual perlocutionary effect" (Gibbons and Whiteley, 2018: 86).

Any result of a speech act might be divided as intended and actual effects of perlocutionary acts. However, the intended and actual effects of an utterance might not be the same. Furthermore, even though a speaker/narrator aims to convey an intended perlocutionary effect to a listener, such as an apology, the perlocutionary effect might never be accomplished because of the unintended results of the communication. Claeys (2007: 10) gives the example of "You look a bit ill" to highlight the significance of an intention and its result. In this example, the interlocutor might feel insulted even though the speaker does not mean it; therefore, this example "is a locutionary act with the perlocutionary effect of an insult" and Felman (1983)

calls this situation "failed performatives" (Claeys, 2007: 10). As the infelicities, the failed performatives restrain the intended and actual perlocutionary acts in a speech. Since speech acts are not limited only to words "…but to the whole communicative situation, including the context of the utterance," it might be challenging to identify the infelicities of perlocutionary effects (Black, 2006: 17). Furthermore, Austin (1962) explains the illocutionary acts as:

1.) Verdictives (exercises of judgement): They consist of a finding in the light of objective or subjective evaluations such as valuing, interpreting, characterising.
2.) Exercitives (exercising of power): They offer a decision on a particular course of action or advocate a particular course of action such as degrading, commanding, announcing.
3.) Commissives (declaring of an intention): They bound the speaker to a specific action to take such as promising, planning, intending.
4.) Behabitives (adopting of an attitude): They contain the concepts of response to other people's behaviour and assets, as well as behaviours and signs of attitudes about someone else's past or prospective behaviour such as apologising and thanking.
5.) Expositives (clarifying of reasons): They are used in exhibitions containing exposure of opinions, claims and clarification of purposes and references such as affirming, answering, and accepting (Austin, 1962: 152-162)

As illustrated in the classifications above, the categorisations of illocutionary acts refer to various circumstances in speech. In *Excitable Speech*, which is "some sort of deconstruction of Austin's work," Butler (1997) conceptualises the term 'performativity' based on Austin's (1962) speech act theory (Claeys, 2007: 12). Moreover, Butler (1997) also underlines that to comprehend the effectiveness of an utterance, which is called "the total speech situations" by Austin (1962), should be located since the grammatical structure of the utterances might not be adequate to understand the intended meanings as it is stated:

> We must consider the total situation in which the utterance is issued 'the total speech act' if we are to see the parallel between performative utterances, and how each can go wrong. So, the total speech act in the total speech situation is emerging from logic piecemeal as important in special cases; and thus, we are assimilating the supposed constative utterance to the performative (Austin, 1962: 52).

Even though both Austin (1962) and Butler (1997) claim that the distinctions between statements are not easily defined in daily language or literature, Austin's classifications of constative and performative utterances endeavour to provide a clear view in some cases, especially with the distinctions between illocutionary and perlocutionary acts. Furthermore, Butler (1997:3) indicates that the main difference between illocutionary and perlocutionary acts is that "[t]he illocutionary speech act is itself the deed that it effects; the perlocutionary merely leads to certain effects that are not the same as the speech act itself." However, perlocutionary acts may create intense and long-lasting reactions even after the dialogue comes to an end.

According to Austin (1962), another difference between the illocutionary and perlocutionary acts is that the illocutionary acts "are not only conventional" but also "ritual and ceremonial" (as cited in Butler, 1997: 3). Relatedly, for Butler (1997:3), illocutionary acts are presented in the context of a ritual and they retain a field of activity that is not limited to the moment of any conversation. Hence, the repetition of an illocutionary act enables a persistent authority in society. For instance:

> The illocutionary act is one in which is saying something, one is at the same time doing something; the judge who says, 'I sentence you' does not state an intention to do something or describe what he is doing: his saying is itself a kind of doing. Illocutionary speech acts produce effects. They are supported, Austin tells us, by linguistic and social conventions (Butler, 1997: 17).

Therefore, the effects of the illocutionary acts might be observed as they are uttered. On the other hand, perlocutionary acts enacts various consequences; thus, "[w]hereas illocutionary acts proceed by way of conventions, perlocutionary acts proceed by way of consequences" (Butler, 1997: 17). Moreover, the perlocutionary acts such as "convincing, persuading, annoying, amusing, and frightening" are the result of the instrumentalisation of words to 'do' the actions but, unlike the illocutionary acts, their results might not be observed as soon as they are uttered (Searle et al, 1980: vii; Butler, 1997: 44). Relatedly it can be stated that:

> The perlocutionary field includes ail objects, sounds, gestures, and signs, even silences and gaps, that have the effect of changing people's thoughts, feelings, and actions, whether or not these changes are intended by anyone, and whether or not they were ever meant to be used communicatively in the first place (Mason, 1994: 411).

One of the main results of the perlocutionary acts includes prejudices and stereotypes in society. Therefore, the perlocutionary acts should be examined to reveal the main motives behind the collective prejudices and norms, especially gender norms.

Even though "[t]he modern study of speech acts begins with Austin's (1962) work," the studies on speech act theory has been developed by many linguists such as Searle (1969), Bach and Harnish (1979) (Sadock, 2008: 54). As a former student of Austin, Searle (1962) develops Austin's (1962) speech act theory after his death. In that way, he "…covers speech acts less rigidly tied to set scripts and ceremonial circumstances, such as promising, requesting, ordering, etc." (Pollio, 2002: 18). Even though Searle (1980) underlines some unexplained parts in Austin's (1962) work, he also admits that Austin's study is a cornerstone for comprehending the forces behind the language. Searle (1980: vii) explains the main motive behind the speech act theory by suggesting that "the minimal unit of human communication is not a sentence or other expression, but rather the performance of certain kinds of acts, such as making statements,

asking questions, giving orders, describing, explaining, apologising, thanking, congratulating, etc." However, these expressions might be observed in each assertion, realising that communication is not only accomplished by constative or true/false statements; instead, the motive behind the actions led by language is also the result of the performative acts. Thus, Searle (2011:16) focuses on the performative acts to examine "the minimal units of linguistic communication" in both daily language and literature.

By developing Austin's approach, Searle (2002) divides illocutionary acts into five categories: assertives, commissives, expressives, directives, and declarations. In assertive acts "the speaker commits himself in varying degrees to the truth of the expressed proposition," by stating, explaining, and asserting (Searle, 2002: 5). Directive acts "attempt to get the hearers to do something" such as asking, ordering, commanding, requesting (5). Commissive speech acts aim to get something in the future as intending or favouring. The speakers use expressives to articulate their feelings and/or attitudes within the social context such as thanking, congratulating, apologising. Finally, declarations create effective changes such as firing, excommunicating, christening. In addition to the Austinian approach, Searle (2002) also focuses on Grice's (1987) studies on speech acts. The Gricean approach to the speech acts centres around the idea of making meaningful utterances mainly through the intentionality factor.

According to Bach and Harnish (1979), the main motive of a statement relies on not only the verbal and contextual meanings but also the mental state of a speaker in communication. In literary texts, speakers' illocutionary acts tend to fail if hearers cannot react to the utterance. In other words, "it is pointless for S [speaker] to tell H [hearer] it is raining, warn H of danger, or offer H condolences, if H fails to react appropriately to what S says" (Bach and Harnish, 1979: 449). Therefore, interpersonality is significant for Bach and Harnish's speech act theory and they divide illocutionary acts accordingly. Allan (1997: 450) illustrates the parallel construction of the identifications on the acts by Austin (1962), Searle (1980) and Bach and Harnish as in the adapted table given below:

Table 1.1 An Adapted Version of Approaches to Illocutionary Acts

Austin	**Searle**	**Bach and Harnish**
Expositives	Assertives	Assertives
Commissives	Commissives	Commissives
Behabitives	Expressives	Acknowledgements
Exercitives	Directives	Directives
Verdictives	Declarations	Verdictives
		Effectives

As pointed out in table 1, there are significant similarities in the illocutionary acts' classifications of Austin, Searle, Bach, and Harnish. Significantly, the contents are considerably similar to one another even though the names of classifications change. Therefore, the table above highlights the similar divisions of illocutionary acts. Nevertheless, speakers' motives behind their illocutionary speech acts differ in each of these academics' theoretical frameworks. To Bach and Harnish, the classification of illocutionary acts differs from the others with "pre-dominant emphasis to S's [speaker's] psychological state" (Allan, 1997: 449). On the other hand, Searle highlights the intentionality factor in illocutionary acts and re-defines Austin's classification of illocutionary acts accordingly. Austin's approach to the classification is rather lexical, and therefore, more intuitive than Searle, Bach, and Harnish's classifications. Austin's lexical focus on speech acts provides a proper perspective for literary texts because such focus enables articulating the functions and meanings of descriptions and dialogues.

1.2. Butler and Speech Act Theory

By indicating that gender is unstable and unfixed, Butler's (1988: 519) discussions on gender performativity are dramatically inspired by Austin's speech act theory. According to Butler, an examination speech acts display how gender, consciously and/or unconsciously, is perceived and transmitted through language. Butler (1993: 11) claims that "the constative claim is always to some degree performative." Austin's (1962) speech act theory, then, is a critical approach to support Butler's (1997) theorization of gender performativity by means of linguistics. Accordingly, it can be inserted that:

> Butler develops Austin's important insight that performativity is not just a matter of an individual's wanting to do something by saying something. Verbal as well as other performances come off, acquire their meaning, and do their work, because they draw on discourse histories of similar performances, reiterating elements that have worked similarly in the past (Eckert and Ginet, 2003: 131).

Therefore, to understand Butler's gender performativity, the relation among linguistics, discourse, and gender should be examined. The Austinian approach enables the observation of the major types of speech to differentiate the motives and effects. Hence, gender performativity is crucial since "[t]his is where Austin stops and where Butler begins" (McKinlay, 2010: 134). As Eckert and Ginet (2003) state above, Butler's viewpoints on gender performativity are influenced by Austin's speech act theory not only linguistically but also Austin's emphasis on discourse histories affected Butler to shape her theory on gender as "a social grammar" (134).

Applying Austin's (1962) "performative utterances" on gender theory is coherent through Butler's (1988) theory on gender performativity since Butler's theory is dramatically affected by performative language (Austin, 1962: 6). Besides, speech acts display the force and motives of society while "illuminating insights into characters' social relationships" (Gibbons and Whiteley, 2018: 89). Thus, comprehending the nature of language may explain the process of social constructions. As a part of a social construct, femininity and masculinity might be seen as a consequence of performative utterances. Hence, Austin (1962) states that language is an act, and Butler (1988) develops Austin's claim by stating that gender results from society's transmission of gender dichotomy through performative utterances. Butler's (1997) linguistic inspiration mainly derives from Austin's (1962) study *How to Do Things with Words*. This study might be regarded as one of the most significant linguistic studies of speech act theory.

Butler (1997: 14) defines language as "a ritual chain of resignifications whose origin and end remain unfixed and unfixable." As "a patriarchal signifying system which constructs 'woman' [or non-male] as 'Other' and 'invisible,'" the 'unfixed' and 'unfixable' nature of language is an essential part of Butler's studies on gender theory (McLean, 2001: 62). Butler (1997: 8) asserts that "[w]e do things with language, produce effects with language, and we do things to language, but language is also the thing that we do. Language is a name for our doing: both 'what' we do and that which we effect, the act and its consequences." Thus, Butler's (1997) performativity is also a linguistic study because, as she claims, language is unsettled; she also declares that gender, which is transferred through language, is unsettled as well. The quotation below explains how language cannot be separated from the body as:

> Language sustains the body not by bringing it into being or feeding it in a literal way; rather, it is by being interpellated within the terms of language that a certain social existence of the body first becomes possible. To understand this, one must imagine an impossible scene, that of a body that has not yet been given social definition, a body that is, strictly speaking, not accessible to us that nevertheless becomes accessible on the occasion of an address, a call, an interpellation that does not 'discover' this body, but constitutes it fundamentally (Butler, 1997: 5).

Thus, language and its labels on the body constitute its presence and make it 'visible' in society. This labelling process creates numerous stereotypes and obligations; consequently, Butler (1997: 5) mainly focuses on 'the hate speech' culture in a heteronormative society in her study, and she writes, "[i]f language can sustain the body, it can also threaten its existence." Even though hate speech for 'the gender abnormalities' and its politics are highlighted throughout the study, the uncontrollable and unfixed power of language must be examined while

researching the relation of language and Butler's concept of gender performativity.[1] Therefore, in her study, Butler (1997: 2) investigates how language affects people as she says, "If we are formed in language, then that formative power precedes and conditions any decision we might make about it, insulting us from the start, as it were, by its prior power." It might be stated that language's power has unavoidable dominance on individuals while shaping and hurting (as an insult) each of them from the very beginning. Consequently, according to Butler (1997), it would be naïve to consider language without the influences of the politics of the heteronormative matrix. Therefore, in *Excitable Speech,* which "stakes out a vigorously polemical and positive position," she asks; "What is this force, and how might we come to understand its faultlines?" (Miller, 2011: 223; Butler, 1997: 2). This inquiry underlines the central issue of both language and gender studies, which may lead to new perspectives in the academic field. Since "…knowledge exists through language, the power structure it creates is not to be found 'outside the system' but rather by reiterating sex/gender roles in ways that stretch and strain normative laws" (Schroyer, 2001: 14). Hence, as a mediator of knowledge, language establishes a power structure by regulating the norms on behalf of these 'owners' or heteronormative and patriarchal societies. The power structure of language, then, outcasts the ones who do not 'obey' the constructed norms and obligations.

According to Chapman and Routledge (2009), Butler develops Austin's ideas on language since Butler claims that one's gender is not constative; rather performative. Hence, constative utterances such as 'the door is red' or 'the bird is blue' cannot be applied to gender much as 'she is a girl' or 'he is a boy' since these statements are considered as performatives. Nevertheless, there is no clear division between constative; descriptive, and performative; non-descriptive) utterances since the constative utterances may cause performative outcomes such as warnings, compliments or insults. For Butler (1997), this issue is at the core of hate speech. Calling someone names, consciously or unconsciously, might be considered as a constative utterance; a description of the person without noticing the result of the act. Therefore, by combining performative utterances and her thoughts on gender, Butler has theorized the construction of gender via language since "Butler considers language a primary way of constructing gender, but performativity now encompasses both words and actions that contribute to gender formation" (Douglas, 2007: 13). In this way, the traditional and fixed

[1] In "Performance Act and Gender Constitution," Butler (1988) states that the materiality of bodies, patriarchal system, or language cannot define gender since "[g]ender is what is put on" (531). Even though this chapter of the dissertation underlines the significance of language, it cannot be concluded that the patriarchal system and/or language is the only reason for gender construction. Language cannot be separated from gender construction but still, according to Butler, their consequences are not enough for the overall reasoning.

ideals, alongside norms transmitted through language and actions, about gender have been deconstructed with the theory of gender performativity. Therefore, the announcements of gender such as 'she is a girl' or 'he is a boy' maintains "a cycle of repeated performative interpellations that impose the preferred values determining a girl's behaviour" for gender performativity (Izurieta, 2008: 756).

In addition to Austin, Butler (1988) questions the presence or existence of gender identity in the heterosexual matrix based on Nietzsche (1968) and Foucault's (1978) studies by claiming that "identity is not an essence but a process of construction in discourse" (as cited in Claeys, 2007: 43). Moreover, this claim is partially inspired by Beauvoir's (2010: 283) statement, "One is not born, but rather becomes, a woman." Hence, the process of being a woman (or a man) is not a natural or biological development; on the contrary:

> Gender is in no way a stable identity or locus of agency from which various acts proceed; rather, it is an identity tenuously constituted in time – an identity instituted through a stylized repetition of acts; …a constructed identity, a performative accomplishment which the mundane social audience, including the actors themselves, come to believe and to perform in the mode of belief (Butler, 1988: 519).

In other words, gender is linked with repetitive and constructed acts which result as a natural occurrence in time. According to these gender acts and norms, gender might preserve its stable form, and only by obeying gender norms, one could 'fit in' the heteronormative society. In this way, by urging upon 'naturality' traditional gender norms are preserved and transferred to the next generation. Butler's (1988) arguments against heteronormative norms of gender provide a postmodern view by underlining the individual identity's significance rather than a collective one. Butler (1999:33) contradicts the concept of gender's naturality as claiming that gender identity is closely related to linguistic expressions that normalised through repetitions. Butler (1997) underlines the significance of language since she is highly interested in "what can be done by using words" (Claeys, 2007: 6).

Butler's theory on gender performativity has been applied in many literary works to reveal the emergence of the heterosexual matrix. As a portrayal of heteronormative society, her theory decodes the constructions of femininity and masculinity. For instance, Kenlon (2014) analyses the eighteen-century English theatre and novels using Butler's frameworks on gender performativity in her study. According to Kenlon (2014), gender codes define the representations of women ever since they have been created by patriarchy, and the theatre and novels of the eighteen-century allow the continuation of gender-based roles, especially for women.

Chen (2016) analyses Shakespeare's *Hamlet* to examine the construction of sexed-body by using Butler's (1993) work. Chen (2016:58) states that "[t]he feminine and the sexed matter of body are positioned to be subjugated to the power of the masculine in the heterosexual hegemony, in the interpellation law, in the repetition of sign, and the fictional position which existed prior to constructing the subject." Hence, in *Hamlet*, she focuses on the clothes and gestures of women on the stage. Thus, Butler's (1999: xv) study conceptualises the term 'doing gender' with gender performativity, which "is not a singular act, but a repetition and a ritual, which achieves its effects through its naturalisation in the context of a body, understood, in part, as a culturally sustained temporal duration." Nevertheless, the term performativity should not be confused with the theatrical term performance:

> The act that one does, that act that one performs, is, in a sense, an act that has been going on before one arrived on the scene. Hence, gender is an act which has been rehearsed, much as a script survives the particular actors who make use of it, but which requires individual actors in order to be actualised and reproduced as reality once again (Butler, 1998: 526).

Butler underlines the distinctions of these two terms by claiming that "performativity does not apply to theatrical situations because the audience can think, 'this is just an act,' and de-realise the act, make acting into something quite distinct from what is real" (Douglas, 2007: 16). Butler (1999) also underlines the fact that gender is in a constant movement, and the fixed norms and ideals about gender are not considered adequate in a postmodern society:

> That gender reality is created through sustained social performances means that the very notions of an essential sex and a true or abiding masculinity or femininity are also constituted as part of the strategy that conceals gender's performative character and the performative possibilities for proliferating gender configurations outside the restricting frames of masculinist domination and compulsory heterosexuality (Butler, 1999: 180).

Therefore, for Butler (1999), social performances such as femininity and masculinity are constructed to sustain the domination of men in society. The 'unnatural' bias for the gender norms constitutes obligatory relations in society. In these constructions, discourse and language carry significant importance since "[g]ender is an act that brings into being what it names: in this context, a 'masculine' man or a 'feminine' woman" and "[g]ender identities are constructed and constituted by language, which means that there is no gender identity that precedes language" (Salih, 2002: 64). Consequently, language has an enormous effect on forming gender identity since it delivers the norms and obligations to the heteronormative society. To sustain these norms and obligations, repetition in language and discourse might be crucial since "[it] is the only way to shape subjectivity within the set of constraints that have been established within

the dominant ideology," and "as subjects, we are forced to constantly repeat discursive norms so that we will not slip into the realm of the unimagined boundary, so performativity becomes a kind of constraint placed upon us" (Salih, 2002: 64).

Moreover, Butler's (1988) concept of gender performativity on femininity and masculinity is crucial because, according to her, the social and bodily stereotypes associated with masculinity are re-imposed on society on the basis of repetitive events and thus "performed" by individuals. Also, according to Butler (1988: 526):

> This repetition is at once a reenactment and reexperiencing of a set of meanings already socially established; it is the mundane and ritualised form of their legitimation.9 When this conception of social performance is applied to gender, it is clear that although there are individual bodies that enact these significations by becoming stylised into gendered modes, this "action" is immediately public as well. There are temporal and collective dimensions to these actions, and their public nature is not inconsequential; indeed, the performance is effected with the strategic aim of maintaining gender within its binary frame. Understood in pedagogical terms, the performance renders social laws explicit.

Nevertheless, Butler (1997: 179) underlines the fact that gender norms such as femininity or masculinity cannot be utterly internalised since gender norms are fictitious; therefore cannot be embodied completely. Individuals who want to adapt to society become a part of the male domination process by performing these built norms.

Butler (1993: 31) claims that the fixed connotation of sex and gender is open to discussions as she says the masculine or feminine body is "neither a simple, brute positivity or referent nor a blank surface or slate awaiting an external signification, but it is always in some sense temporalised." It can also be stated:

> When the constructed status of gender is theorised as radically independent of sex, gender itself becomes a free floating artifice, with the consequence that *man* and *masculine* might just as easily signify a female body as a male one, and a *woman* and *feminine* a male body as easily as a female one (Butler, 1999: 10).

Therefore, distinguishing gender from sex normalises feminine and masculine gender behaviours based on anatomy. Even though Butler (1993) does not entirely object to "the biological materiality of the body," she underlines "the vulnerability of this materiality to redefinition" (Greening, 2009: 36). This distinction might be taken as a way to reinforce the heteronormative system as Butler (1999: 11) states, "gender is not to culture as sex is to nature; gender is also the discursive/cultural means by which 'sexed nature' or 'a natural sex' is produced and established as 'prediscursive,' prior to culture, a politically neutral surface on which culture acts." To put this claim differently, the primary division between nature and

nurture of sex is a heteronormative society's construction according to Butler's (1999) gender performativity. Therefore, Butler's views on gender construction propose deconstruction of its dynamics. For instance, people can perform their feminine and/or masculine presences as their will; however, she/he commonly is punished by society if she/he performs her/his gender in the opposite way (Pitt and Fox, 2012: 41). Therefore, it might be stated that the individual preferences or orientations are precluded by heteronormativity to 'remain' this continuous system as Sterling (1985: 270) claims, "Male and female babies may be born. But those complex, gender-loaded individuals we call men and women are produced." Sterling (1985: 270) also states that biological discussions cannot be separated from their environment because these discussions are linked to politics and society. The distinction between nature and nurture has dramatically emerged from such power relations, and as a result, the gender norms are normalised. The relationship between gender norms and power might be observed in this paragraph:

> Individuals 'do' gender, and it is conceived 'as an emergent feature of social situations: as both an outcome and a rationale for various social arrangements and as a means of legitimising one of the most fundamental divisions in society;' the subordinate position women hold in relationship to men (Pitt and Fox, 2012: 40-1).

Henceforth, a heteronormative society's fundamental division of 'women' and 'men' is a well-preserved system that sustains the dominance of men over women by systematising social events and their norms to justify its 'legitimate' presence.

Butler's (1988) study on binary oppositions of gender is another essential part of her linguistic frameworks. Inspired by Foucault's (1978) Butler (1988: 524) states, "the association of a natural sex with a discrete gender and with an ostensibly natural 'attraction' to the opposing sex/gender is an unnatural conjunction of cultural constructs in the service of reproductive interests." Hence, the cultural constructs of gender and gender-based attributions such as femininity and masculinity through language might also affect literature.

Butler (1993) displays the construction of sexed bodies through language by emphasising how "a person's sexed identity is allocated to him/her at the scene of birth by the doctor's interpellative call 'It's a boy/girl' which immediately shifts the infant from an 'it' to a 'she' or a 'he'" (as cited in Claeys, 2007). Moreover, Eckert and Ginet (2003: 131) state that "'It's a girl,' pronounces the medical professional at the moment of birth, and indeed it is thereby made a girl and kept a girl by subsequent verbal and nonverbal performances of itself and others." The naming process, according to Butler (1993), is a performative utterance. Butler

(1993) does not disregard the biological entity of human beings even though she persists on the fact that "matter can only come into existence through language" (Claeys, 2007: 37).

It might be stated that Beauvoir's (2010: 283) famous statement, "One is not born, but rather becomes, a woman" turns into "a woman/man is not born, but rather is called as a woman/man," according to Butler's (1993) views on gender performativity (Claeys, 2007; Salih, 2002). The process of girling/boying is "transitive" and it condemns the symbolic power by regulating a force on every individual from birth (Butler, 1993: 232). The cornerstone of this circular relationship starts with the naming process as:

> Consider the medical interpellation which shifts an infant from an 'it' to a 'she' or a 'he,' and naming the girl is 'girled,' brought into the domain of language and kinship through the interpellation of gender. But 'girling' of the girl does not end there; on the contrary, founding interpellation[2] is reiterated by various authorities and throughout the various intervals of time to reinforce or contest this naturalised effect. The naming is at once the setting of a boundary, and also the repeated inculcation of a norm (Butler, 1993: 7-8).

Butler (1988: 526) claims that the cultural norms that embedded to bodies are not fixed. Therefore, people may not embody the given codes in all cases since these cultural norms and codes are constructed, they are not naturally given to people. In this case, the naming processes are the first and crucial parts of gender construction and performativity with categorisation and labelling results. The constructed binary of 'girl' and 'boy,' then, is "not a radical choice or project that reflects a merely individual choice," rather it is a result of heteronormative society (526).

Butler (1988) also combines the dilemma of performativity and performance to display the unnatural existence of gender. According to Butler (1988), the actors perform according to the given scripts of the play by providing 'suitable' performances related to their assigned roles. These roles may include being a woman or a man with certain stereotypes in society. Similarly, human bodies are receiving a script according to their biological entity and these "already existing directives" shape the bodies' identities and roles from the very beginning (Butler, 1988: 526). This paragraph highlights the claim that gender as an act:

---

[2] In *Lenin, Philosophy and Other Essays,* Althusser (1972) uses the term "interpellation" to explain the internalization of cultural norms and values. According to Althusser (1972) thoughts are the products of society and the ultimate goal of this process to sustain its power in society. In the end of this process, people accept the norms and ultimately, they assume that these thoughts are originated by them. Therefore, Butler (1988) was highly influenced by Althusser's term interpellation to deconstruct the dualism of gender roles and norms of heteronormative society.

> The act that one does, the act that one performs, is, in a sense, an act that has been going on before one arrived on the scene. Hence, gender is an act which has been rehearsed, much as a script survives the particular actors who make use of it, but which requires individual actors in order to be actualised and reproduced as reality once again (Butler, 1988; 526).

Therefore, the process of girling and boying are culturally given scripts to individuals. The naming processes and repetitions of these acts enable the control mechanism held by patriarchal and heteronormative societies. Also, by performing the gender acts on many occasions, such acts become repetitive and, in time, become the norms of society. The masculine women and feminine men become a threat to social codes. Nevertheless, conceptualising gender performativity presents a new viewpoint for unearthing gender stereotypes in terms of heteronormativity in literary works.

In conclusion, Butler (1988) claims that gender is performative, and language is the cornerstone of the constructed feminine and masculine gender behaviours. This construction is maintained with repetition and naturalisation of the gender norms. The naming process, insults, and gender stereotypes maintain gender performativity in heteronormative societies. To 'fit in' a heteronormative society, individuals perform their gender, and they are thought to stay within the gender limitations from birth. Therefore, such theoretical constructs emphasise the significance of language since it establishes dominance by regulating the norms to strengthen heteronormativity.

CHAPTER II

FEMININITY AND MASCULINITY

The so-called dichotomy between women and men has been investigated for many years. Behavioural and physical differences constitute femininity and masculinity, and their limitations turn into norms in time. Individuals attribute feminine or masculine qualities based on their anatomy. Moreover, people are often limited within gender norms, and these constructed norms are often justified in various ways. So, on what grounds femininity and masculinity become the equivalent of womanhood and manhood with numerous norms and obligations? Why are the distinctions between gender-based roles dramatically attributed to human anatomy? The dynamics of sexes and gender-based roles have various effects which should be examined since societies and even languages are formed through gender hegemony. Accordingly, in this chapter, the divisions and naturality of femininity and masculinity are discussed using multiple theoretical frameworks mentioned before.

It is generally accepted that femininity and masculinity consist of various stereotypes that “represents and judges other people in fixed, unyielding terms” (Pickering, 2015: 1). Mosse (1996:78) states that “[s]tereotypes are difficult to change, and the process of stereotyping, with its emphasis upon set looks and comportment forms a mental picture that cuts deep.” Therefore, one of the primary drawbacks of stereotypes is their almost fixed images that reduce subjective perspectives on individuals in society (Mosse, 1996: 6).

Reinisch and Rosenblum (1987: 3) argue that the examples of feminine stereotypes are “soft, delicate, gentle, tender, docile, submissive, amenable, deferential, etc.,” while certain masculine stereotypes are “robust, strong, lusty, energetic, potent, brave, bold, fearless, etc.” Also, Ventress (1975:13) asserts that “[m]asculinity is associated with values of strength, competence and power, and for the boy, acquiring this stereotype produces motivation to enact the masculine role.” The societal process of stereotyping, therefore, is associated with a biological entity.

According to Strathern (1976: 68), "[m]yths about masculinity and femininity endure and change, as language endures and changes, because of their usefulness as symbols in the society at large." Myths are the literary sources transmitted orally and during this transmission, they might change due to the social and collective memories. Hence, analysing the literary sources might enable comprehending how societies and the primary dichotomy between social

hierarchy as women and men are shaped and constituted for sustaining patriarchy. Moreover, "[f]or centuries, gender has been constructed in accordance with the patriarchal system and the fact that up to now there has been little change in societal power structures, on the whole, proves that the patriarchal order has been astonishingly stable" (Cereda and Ross, 2012: xxii). In this matter, the construction of femininity and masculinity is derived from the biological conditions of the body, but it is also a pragmatic system in which individuals have to obey the norms of these concepts to be accepted in their community.

The stereotypical attributions of femininity and masculinity cannot be taken as immutable nor indisputable since "these positions, movements and expressions are culturally coded-that what is viewed as masculine in one culture may be regarded as feminine in another" (Birdwhistell, 1970: 44). However, the connection between biological conditions, gender-based behaviours, and sexual preference have been assumed as a fact for 'normal' people; for instance, "the healthy and normal girl or woman identified herself as female, conformed to cultural expectations for appropriate feminine personality and demeanor, and was heterosexual" (Shields and Dicicco, 2011: 491). Shields and Dicicco also claim that femininity and masculinity have been built on pre-existent judgement with long-term impacts. Hence, Bem's (1987: 305) question in her study, "[h]ow does the culture transform male and female infants into masculine and feminine adults?" is crucial to examine the process and significance of constructed norms. In order to give a proper answer to these fundamental questions, first of all, the power relations are examined.

Power is closely associated with influencing others. Thus, power can be "conceptualised as an attribute of individuals whose status grants them position and resources to influence others" (Shields and Dicicco, 2011: 496). When power is considered in turns of masculinity and femininity, it can be said that in comparison to masculinity, femininity is generally accepted as the passive, submissive, weak, and powerless attribution in many societies since "[t]he stereotype of masculinity was conceived as a totality based upon the nature of man's body" (Mosse, 1996, 5). Conventionally, the differences between these two concepts are related to historical stereotyping as:

> The man who fights for two or more in the struggle for existence, who has all the responsibility and the cares of tomorrow, who is constantly active in combatting the environment and human rivals, needs more brain than the woman whom he must protect and nourish, than the sedentary woman, lacking any interior occupations, whose role is to raise children, love, and be passive (Topinard, 1988: 104).

The historical and anatomical justifications of male and female individuals construct gender roles and norms. The theories on femininity and masculinity have been dramatically changed; therefore, the debate on nature's influence over gender behaviours under any circumstances has also been questioned. For instance, Goffman (1976: 75) claims that "[f]emininity and masculinity are in a sense the prototypes of essential expression -something that can be conveyed fleetingly in any social situation and yet something that strikes at the most basic characterisation of the individual." To put it another way, he justifies these classifications of femininity and masculinity by claiming that they are valid at the core of human existence. Nevertheless, the claim that femininity and masculinity are entirely dependent on nature and biology is not sufficient for social constitutions and human relations. Relatedly, Deaux (1987: 292) states, "the evidence suggests that male and female, or femininity and masculinity, are not simple unidimensional concepts. Instead, they are loosely constructed categories that contain, with varying degrees of probability, a variety of characteristics and associations." Hence, the 'unidimensional' understanding of the binaries and roots of femininity and masculinity are variable and exchangeable in time. Correspondingly, in *Masculine Domination,* one of the recent studies on femininity and masculinity can be interpreted as follows:

> The social world constructs the body as a sexually defined reality and as the depository of sexually defining principles of vision and division. This embodied social programme of perception is applied to all the things of the world and firstly to the body itself in its biological reality. It is this programme which constructs the difference between the biological sexes in conformity with the principles of a mythic vision of the world rooted in the arbitrary relationship of domination of men over women, itself inscribed, with the division of labour, in the reality of the social order (Bourdieu, 2001: 11).

Hence, Bourdieu (2001: 11) also agrees with the stereotypical existence of femininity and masculinity for the sake of social order by claiming that the biological sexes' unchangeable nature is "a mythic vision." Even though the strength of the body is considered a result of man's biology, the powerful and higher position in society does not justify the domination of masculinity. Rather, it is an outcome of rooted stereotypes with long-term effects on humanity. Relatedly, Mosse (1998: 6) indicates that "[t]he stereotype of true manliness was so powerful precisely because unlike abstract ideas or ideals it could be seen, touched, or even talked to, a living reminder of human beauty, of the proper morals, and of a longed-for utopia." Still, these overpowering stereotypes affect almost every field in human relationships; therefore, the results of stereotyping should be examined. One of the main reasons for stereotyping can be explained as:

> Men deemed feminine (or effeminate) are seen as inferior men. While women deemed masculine may sometimes be seen as inferior women, they are also seen as striving (if misguidedly) for what is in fact a valued persona. This is one reason that masculine behaviour in women is often less stigmatised than feminine behaviour in men (Eckert and Ginet, 2003: 37).

Therefore, the stereotypes for men do not empower them in all instances. Men's feminine attributes are usually identified as weakness, defectiveness, and unnatural occurrences, while masculine women, in limited space, are often considered powerful ones. To put it another way, the stereotypical characteristics of femininity are mainly associated with maternity and sexuality to preserve their passive and repressed roles in society.

The dichotomy of gender and its social and practical outcome, 'femininity and masculinity,' results from social pragmatism and imposition. Cereda and Ross (2012: viii) emphasise the value of western society and its mass culture since they "have constructed 'gender' to signify one set of 'values,' behaviours, and expectations." In addition to these ideas, Bettie (2003:195) points out that "[e]xamining the process of identity formation, the ways in which girls construct themselves in and are constructed by discourse, was in part a process of discovering what preexisting cultural discourses girls tap into to narrate their identities." In other words, the process of gender identity development is a consequence of the discursive construction of former cultural norms and common behaviours. Consequently, "[f]emininity and masculinity are rooted in the social (one's gender) rather than the biological (one's sex)," and therefore, "femininity and masculinity are not innate but are based upon social and cultural conditions" (Stets and Burke, 2000: 1-3). Similarly, Reichardt and Sielke (1998: 566) indicate that unlike sex, "…gender no longer refers to a biological binarism, but is conceived of as a multi-dimensional political, social, and cultural construct." However, under these obligations, society ensures the permanence of constructed norms by ostracising individuals whose behaviours do not fit these norms.

2.1. Major Theories on Femininity and Masculinity

Various discussions about the origin, development, and process of femininity and masculinity have led to different theories in many fields. There are several major theories on femininity and masculinity such as Bourdieu's (2001) masculine habitus theory, the cognitive-developmental theory of Kohlberg (1966), Bem's (1983) gender schema theory, Weitzman's (1972) learning theories that emphasise direct reinforcement, Connell's (1995) masculine theory, and finally, Freud's (2010) and Chodorow's (1978) psychoanalytic theory (Stets and

Burke, 2000: 4). In this part of the study, these theories on gender behaviours are briefly explained.

Coined by Bourdieu (2001), the term masculine habitus is accepted as a sociological construction. The term "habitus" is crucial since it "accounts for the reproduction of social and cultural domination because the thoughts and actions it generates are in conformity with objective regularities, or empirically observable regularities in social action" (Mander, 1987: 428). Past experiences and history collaborate in forming men's collective identity, so masculine habitus is internalised consciously as well as unconsciously. Thus, Bourdieu (2001) initially accepts that gender roles are constructed and based on individual and communal experiences. The arbitrary social structures are considered "self-evident and natural," and consequently, they remained unquestioned (Mander, 1987: 429). Moreover, Bourdieu (2001: 11) claims that "[t]he social world constructs the body as a sexually defined reality and as the depository of sexually defining principles of vision and division." Nevertheless, the constructed nature of femininity is not influential enough to sustain domination among individuals in the patriarchal system. The vital reason for masculine domination is patriarchal continuity with conscious and unconscious acts in society, such as the binary connotations between femininity and masculinity.

Interestingly, according to Bourdieu (2001), habitus is the social programme that affects the image of the body and its pleasure mechanism. For this reason, it is "a component of a living organism, works as a living system" (Krais and William, 2000: 57). This living organism has been existing in people's unconscious by polarising women and men. The polarisation of sexes highlights the dominance of masculinity in masculine habitus using 'symbolic violence' which is "a gentle violence, imperceptible and invisible even to its victims, exerted for the most part through the purely symbolic channels of communication and cognition (more precisely, misrecognition), recognition, or even feeling" (Bourdieu, 2000: 1-2). Symbolic violence provides masculine domination through language, behaviours, attitudes, actions, gestures, and symbols. Consequently, Reeser and Seifert (2003: 89) indicate that "[m]en dominate women through symbolic violence, whose effects are real whether they be physical and individual or symbolic and collective." As Bourdieu (2001) claimed, femininity cannot exist in habitus since it has no domination in patriarchal societies. Hence, symbolic violence of femininity does not reign over masculinity in society since "men dominate social structures, every gender habitus functions to legitimise masculine domination" (Reeser and Seifert, 2003: 89). Unavoidably,

under the name of masculinity, men's behaviours are likely to be unquestioned and seen as "natural" in numerous events (88).

The construction of gender roles and their consequences is related to society as Kohlberg (1966: 12) asserts, "I am a boy, therefore I want to do boy things, therefore the opportunity to do boy things (and to gain approval for doing them) is rewarding"; hence, masculinity's privileged constructions award the masculine executions of boys and men while downgrading femininity of manhood. Kohlberg (1966: 89) also states, "[o]nce the boy has stably identified himself as male, he then values positively those objects and acts consistent with his gender identity." This cognitive system might also be applied to femininity; for instance, girls should behave in a feminine way to be awarded as 'good girls' by society. The concept of femininity differs from masculinity in numerous ways, but the 'passiveness' can be considered an essential distinction.

The normalisation of gender-based roles usually ends with self-categorisation (boy and girl), and this process is considered a natural process rather than a constructed one by society. Relatedly, Albert and Porter (1988: 188) state, "…the cognitive developmental model assumes that all children demonstrate a universal pattern of development in the manner in which they begin to stereotype the sexes." The universal pattern of gender constructs feminine and masculine stereotypes, and children are exposed to these labels from birth. As it is stated before, stereotypes are inevitable consequences of the gendered body, as the paragraph claims:

> With further cognitive development [Kohlberg] acquires a number of cross-cultural stereotypes of masculine and feminine behaviour of male as active, dominant and powerful and aggressive, and females as more nurturant. These are not derived from parental behaviour or direct tuition, but rather stern from universal perceived sex differences in bodily structure and capacities (Ventress, 1975: 12).

Even if these stereotypes are avoided in children's families or environment, as Ventress (1975) claims above, the universal understanding of gender roles still has the authority on children's gender identity developments. Hence, according to cognitive-developmental theory, children's feminine and masculine gender roles result from universal body-based parameters rather than biological instinct (Kohlberg, 1966: 82). The universal parameters of gender emerge with the words 'boy' and 'girl,' and a child can label herself/himself by the age of three. After this labelling process, the children begin to label people according to the fixed stereotypes (Ventress, 1975: 11). As a consequence, Albert and Porter (1988: 189) state that "the perception of the male as larger and physically stronger than the female and the observation that men play the aggressive and high-power roles in society lead children in this age group to conclude that

men are more aggressive than women and higher in social power." Consequently, the universal limitations and stereotypes of gender constitute society's structural presence, and this process starts from infancy.

Considered as "an extension of the cognitive developmental theory," gender schema theory displays the constructed features of femininity and masculinity (Jehan and Kirmani, 2015: 192). Relatedly, Bem's (1987) article "Femininity and Masculinity Exist Only in the Mind of the Perceiver" is significant since it demonstrates gender schema theory. According to Bem (1987: 307), "[g]ender schema theory begins its account of sex typing with the observation that the developing child invariably learns his or her society's cultural definitions of femaleness and maleness." In other words, gender schema theory provides a theoretical framework for male and female behaviour and their origins or cultural myths by considering gender appropriateness (308). To examine various codes of gender roles, the motivation behind the system should be studied. For instance:

> Gender-schematic processing in particular thus involves spontaneously sorting persons, attributes, and behaviours into masculine and feminine categories or "equivalence classes" regardless of their differences on a variety of dimensions unrelated to gender-for example, spontaneously placing items like "tender" and "nightingale" into a feminine category and items like "assertive" and "eagle" into a masculine category. (Bem, 1987: 30).

Thus, the attributed behaviours and symbolisms of femininity and masculinity might not display any coherent or consistent meanings in both society and literature. Consequently, Bem (1987: 309-311) summarises her study by claiming that "...femininity and masculinity exist only in the mind of the perceiver," and "if the culture were to temper its ubiquitous insistence on the functional importance of the gender dichotomy, individuals would probably be far less likely to encode so much of the world as masculine or feminine, and many gender differences would thereby be diminished or eliminated." In addition to Bem's studies, Martin and Ruble's (2004) study on gender schema theory focuses on young individuals. According to Martin and Ruble (2004: 67) "gender schema theory is based on the idea that children form organised knowledge structures, or schemas, which are gender-related conceptions of themselves and others, and that these schemas influence children's thinking and behaviour." They also attempt to explain the strong bound between social surroundings and categorisation for children as:

> Gender identity develops as children realise that they belong to one gender group, and the consequences include increased motivation to be similar to other members of their group, preferences for members of their own group, selective attention to and memory for information relevant to their own sex, and increased interest in activities relevant to their own sex (Martin and Ruble, 2004: 67).

Hence, gender norms in any society, consciously or unconsciously, affect children at a very young age, and they perform these feminine or masculine constitutions to imitate the normality of their society since "[o]nce children could label their own gender and that of others, they were expected to behave in ways consistent with traditional gender roles" (Bussey and Bandura, 1992: 1237). According to Weitzman's (1972) study, sex-role identifications are generalised and normalised in family and school by rewarding the accepted norms of gender-based behaviours. This implies that families might establish children's sex-role socialisation by rewarding sex-appropriate behaviours and discouraging inappropriate acts (Katz et al., 1977: 6). Thus, female and male models construct children's understanding of gender and affect their identity as they grow up.

Connell underlines the influence of social environment on individuals. For Connell, "hegemonic masculinity" (1987) and "multiple masculinities" (1995) are considered fundamental for gender studies in social sciences and literature (Demetriou, 2001; Schippers, 2007: 85). According to Connell (1995: 71), masculinity is "... simultaneously a place in gender relations, the practices through which men and women engage that place in gender, and the effects of these practices on bodily experience, personality." In her study "Recovering the Feminine Other: Masculinity, Femininity, and Gender Hegemony," Schippers (2007) summarizes Connell's framework of masculinity in three components:

> First, it is social location that individuals, regardless of gender, can move into through practice. Second, it is a set of practices and characteristics understood to be "masculine". Third, when these practices are embodied especially by men, but also by women, they have widespread cultural and social effects (Schippers, 2007: 86).

It should be considered that Connell's theoretical framework of gender, masculinity and femininity are generalised as gender projects; hence, they do not refer to any individual characteristics. The concept of masculinity not only signifies manhood or men's body; it also embodies domination and social practices. Moreover, this type of masculinity is an "identifiable set of practices that occur across space and over time and are taken up and enacted collectively," and its dynamics shape the social positions of women and men (as cited in Schippers, 2007: 86).

For Connell (1995: 77), the cornerstone of this masculine theory, hegemonic masculinity is "the configuration of gender practice which embodies the currently accepted answer to the problem of the legitimacy of patriarchy, which guarantees (or is taken to guarantee) the dominant position of men and the subordination of women." The domination of

men against women is secured through hegemonic masculinity, which is a product of patriarchal society. Nevertheless, this hegemonic presence of masculinity cannot exist in femininity since "gender hegemony is so inextricably tied to heterosexual, middle-class, and white status" while ensuring "the hegemonic scaffolding for relationships between men and women as 'naturally' and inevitably a relationship of dominance and submission" (Schippers, 2007: 88-91). In other words, femininity's authority, not grounded in biology, is insufficient to ensure a hegemonic apparatus to predominate masculinity.

Connell (1987) confronts the sex role theory due to its primal focus on constituting two-dimensional gender roles. Moreover, Demetriou (2001: 388) indicates, "[b]y identifying the social structure with biological difference, sex role theory reduces gender to two homogeneous and complementary categories and thus underplays social inequality and power." Based on anatomical and biological differences, sex role theory justifies men's dominance over women, which is an unfair and inadequate approach. Hence, Connell (1987) conceptualises hegemonic masculinity theory to expose "…not only the complex nature of femininities and masculinities, not merely the power relationships between genders and within genders, but also the possibility of internally generated change" (Demetriou, 2001: 339). The inevitable consequence of the complex nature of Connell's methodology is that "…gender is not a fixed set of social norms that are passively internalised and enacted, but it is constantly produced and reproduced in social practice," and therefore, femininity, along with masculinity, are social products of the heterosexual environment (340).

Furthermore, Connell's hegemonic masculinity theory is akin to Butler's gender performativity. Butler (1988: 33) states, "there is no gender identity behind the expression of gender." For this reason, Connell argues that masculinity is the dominant part in society by isolating it from the male body is parallel to Butler's not basing the identity of femininity and masculinity on gender expressions. According to both theories, femininity and masculinity are social structures that are not based on bodily separation.

Psychoanalytic theory is used in many fields to observe and comprehend the 'nature' of individuals. In that sense, this chapter on femininity and masculinity under the concept of gender identity might be considered as a deficient one without psychoanalytic analysis. As a key figure of psychoanalytic theory, Freud (2010) originates individuals' masculine gender behaviours as "natural states for both sexes" by claiming that girls abandon their masculinity and develop their femininity after the realisation that they have no penis (as cited in Reis and Grossmark, 2009: 5). Nevertheless, unlike the Freudian approach to gender behaviours, further

studies on psychoanalytic theory argue that femininity and masculinity depend on social criteria rather than anatomical criteria by discussing how childhood events deeply affect their identity. To Chodorow (1978: 9), for instance, the concept of masculinity is a phenomenon used for the community rather than an individual definition depending on the social situation of men. Considering the studies of femininity and masculinity in psychoanalytic theory, Chodorow's (1978) work might be seen quite influential in the light of the theoretical framework of the relationship between psychoanalysis and gender. As a result, it can be argued that the difference of femininity and masculinity is a social construction that is unconsciously embedded in individuals as gender labels.

For Chodorow (1978: 40), psychoanalytic theory "[c]oncentrates on unconscious mental processes, affects, and psychic structure" and it "[p]rovides an analysis and critique of the reproduction of sex and gender." Moreover, she also indicates, "[t]he fundamental contribution of psychoanalysis lies in its demonstration of the existence and mode of operation of unconscious mental processes" (41). This unconscious mental process shapes individuals' behaviours, attitudes, and identity in general. Thus, this theory highlights the significance of infancy since individuals' conscious and primary unconscious states start to form in early childhood.

For psychoanalytic theory, "[o]ne's gender identity develops through identification with the same-sex parent. This identification emerges out of the conflict inherent in the oedipal stage of psychosexual development" (Stets and Burke, 2000: 4). So, heteronormative family structures create the first idea of gender in infants' minds as:

> Public institutions are assumed to be defined according to normative, hence social, criteria, and not biologically or naturally. It is therefore assumed that the public sphere, and not the domestic sphere, forms "society" and "culture"—those intended, constructed forms and ideas that take humanity beyond nature and biology and institute political control. Men's location in the public sphere, then, defines society itself as masculine (Chodorow, 1978: 9).

The 'male-made' institution of heteronormativity inevitably exerts enormous power over women and queer individuals. As such, various institutions have been used by male-centred ideologies such as marriage. In society, males "control marriage as an institution that both expresses men's rights in women's sexual and reproductive capacities and reinforces these rights" (Chodorow, 1978: 9). So, the politics of androcentric idealism for power and control are maintained via public institutions and political control. At this point, one can ask, then, how males come to use this power over others. According to psychoanalytic theory, the

appropriation of a boy's masculinity and a girl's femininity is first given in the family. Children impersonate their same-sex parents and thus, normalise feminine subordination and masculine domination. To secure the proper and constructed role in a heteronormative society, a boy attempts to imitate the behaviours and appearance of his father and "[t]hrough identification with their father, boys learn masculinity" (Stets and Burke, 2000: 5). In his father's absence, a boy imitates any masculine role model to prove his normality (Stets and Burke, 2000: 176). Hence, the performance of masculinity is ensured by male-dominant societies. On the other hand, girls' femininity is not mainly environmental since "[m]ales tend to identify with a cultural stereotype of the masculine role; whereas females tend to identify with aspects of their own mother's role specifically" (Chodorow, 1978: 176). A mother's attitude towards her husband and son(s) plays an essential part in constructing a girl's femininity. The accepted and normalised male-dominant family structure requires fathers' significant and influential role while obligating mothers to obey and focus on their husbands and domestic duties.

The only reason for the imitation and internalisation of femininity and masculinity is not the approval of sought from society. Electra and Oedipus complexes are highly significant in psychoanalytic theory to justify the reasons behind femininity and masculinity. Coined by Freud (2010: 282) in *Interpretation of Dreams*, "Oedipus complex" refers "the hostility of the son toward his father has caused certain major psychocultural factors that enter into the broader competitive configurations of human social life" (Herkovits, 1958: 1). Firstly used in Jung's (1961) study *Theory of Psychoanalysis* "Electra complex" on the other hand, is "a psychoanalytic term used to depict a young lady's feeling of rivalry with her mom for the adoration of her dad" (Khan and Haider, 2015: 2).

Psychoanalytic theory claims that feminine and masculine behaviours result from the rivalry of mother and father figures. As Bussey and Bandura (1999: 3) state, "[i]dentification with the same-sex parent is presumed to resolve the conflict children experience as a result of erotic attachment to the opposite-sex parent and jealousy toward the same-sex parent. This attachment causes children much anxiety as they fear retaliation from the same-sex parent." By imitating the mother's femininity and father's masculinity, children learn the constructed behaviours, appearances, and attitudes to earn the affection of their opposite-sex parents. As mentioned before, the main reason for their attempt is their connection and the sense of resemblance with their same-sex parent or model figure. So, heteronormative and male-dominant societies may secure the power relations by securing the heteronormative family

structure. Thus, children have to sustain their place in their family and society by learning and performing femininity and masculinity.

To sum, the emergence of gender behaviours is a consequence of the former cultural norms and common behaviours' discursive constructions. In these constructions, femininity is generally associated with inferiority, submissiveness, and weakness to maintain their passive and repressed roles in a patriarchal society. However, the naturalisation of gender behaviours not only depends on nature and biology. Bourdieu's masculine habitus theory argues that masculine domination results from the social and cultural reproduction of thoughts that impose their authority in society. In the cognitive-developmental theory of Kohlberg, it is argued that children's feminine and masculine gender roles result from universal body-based parameters rather than biological instincts. Relatedly, Bem's gender schema theory highlights the significance of sex typing in children's gender development. According to Weizman's learning theory, gender labels are learned and normalised in family and school within the process of reward or punishment. As a result of this process, children are forced to imitate their same-sex models. Moreover, in his masculine theory, Connell also argues that gender is not a passive fixation but a constant reproduction; therefore, they are social products. In that sense, the feminine and masculine characteristics are not fixed; they can change over time. Finally, Chodorow's psychoanalytic theory argues that gender roles result from the attempt to resemble the same-sex parent or model figure; however, masculinity is associated with dominance over femininity due to political and social institutions.

Even though the main reasons for gender constructions differ in the mentioned gender theories, the central focus of these theories is to highlight the significance of society when it comes to gender. Thus, analysing the selected literary texts may unveil the motives behind the dichotomy of femininity and masculinity. In both Lessing’s (2007) *The Cleft* and Gilman’s (1915) *Herland*, male-authorised history narrates women’s stories, and the characters perform their gender to fit such feminine and masculine gender labels. Thus, the following chapters examine the dynamics of being feminine and masculine that are dictated through language rather than sex via mentioned theoretical frameworks.

CHAPTER III

CONSTRUCTION OF FEMININITY AND MASCULINITY IN *THE CLEFT*

Lessing is widely known for her rebellion against labels, and understandably, her personal life is not an exception. Born in Persia (Iran) in 1919, Lessing grew up in Zimbabwe. Then she moved to Britain in 1949 and died in 2013. Lessing's mother, McVeagh, was a nurse, and her father, Tayler, was a World War I Captain in the British military (Maslen, 2014). Dramatically affected by the First World War and the culture of Southern Africa, Lessing's semi-autobiographical works generally display her experiences (Ridout and Watkins, 2011). In 2007, Lessing won the Nobel Prize for Literature. One of her latest works, *The Cleft*, was regarded revolutionary with the retelling of human history and "an alternative view of the origins of 'man'" (Jansen, 2011: 150). This novel portrays an all-female society "in which men are depicted as beings endangering women with their overwhelming power exertion" (Lalbakhsh, 2014: 17). In *The Cleft*, Lessing (2007) creates a myth that shows the origin of men and women by reflecting the norms of femininity and masculinity. According to this myth, women existed before men. The story narrates what happens after the first male is born in a society composed entirely of women. Hence, *The Cleft* provides a different point of view to examine gender relations from the beginning in literary analysis.

Lalbakhsh (2014: 17) argues that in *The Cleft*, Lessing portrays the dominant male existence in Rome, which was constituted by "a fake history and male-defined ideology." To Lalbakhsh (2014: 17), the male-made history misrepresented history and covered the truths about women to preserve women's inferior positions in society; therefore, "*The Cleft* is Lessing's invitation to refresh women's historical consciousness, to understand and believe that most personal problems and suffering have their equivalent in others' lives, even in the lives of the ancestral mothers a long time before history begins." Alongside feminism, the ecofeminist theory has been recently utilised to analyse men's domination over women and nature in *The Cleft.*

Bilgen (2008: ix) analyses *The Cleft* using ecofeminism to underline "the parallelism between man's exploitation of women and nature"; therefore, the goal of this exploitation is to display the objectification of both women and nature. According to Bilgen (2008: 44), Lessing objectively narrates "…the first interaction and enmity between the two genders" to illustrate the first men's abuse of women and nature. Baysal (2013: 2) further highlights the patriarchal

influence of men that has led women and nature's inferiority and alienation in society. Lastly, Hani (2017: 1) analyses the patriarchal structures in the novel using ecofeminism since "[i]t interrogates patriarchy and questions the various ways patriarchal structures have been used to undermine women and the environment, with the view of establishing a change." Due to the noticeable power struggle between women and nature, ecofeminism is used in the studies to illustrate the oppressions and destructions of the patriarchal system.

In this chapter, it is argued that femininity and masculinity in *The Cleft* are constructed and transmitted through speech acts. These speech acts in the linguistic form of implicit performatives usually restrict women in order to allow masculine domination in the novel. Furthermore, it is discussed that the dichotomy of femininity and masculinity is imposed from birth; therefore, individuals are forced to perform their feminine domestic duties or masculine heroic duties in society. In order to support this claim, a summary of the novel is presented; then, the selected utterances from the novel are analysed via the speech act theory and gender performativity. In the discussion part, the major theories on gender are applied to the selected examples from the novel. Hence, an inductive reading of *The Cleft* reveals that the male characters' utterances are constructed through implicit performatives which are foregrounded.

3.1. A Summary of *The Cleft*

The novel opens with the narrator Transit describing an incident between a slave girl and boy by commenting on relationships in general. Then, as a historian and the narrator of the story, Transit compares women and men in the Roman and the first heteronormative society, the latter being composed of the Clefts, who were the first women, and Squirts, the first men. Transit, by collecting and commenting on the descriptions of the Clefts, narrates the origin of people. In the society of Cleft, which "refers both to the rocky outcrop where they live and to their own genitalia," women are far from movement, subjectivity, and emotions in general, and they condemn the male babies they do not reconcile to death by putting them at the tip of the hill they live on (Bedell, 2007: 30). However, these babies are picked up by an eagle and taken down a valley. For this reason, two different societies, unaware of each other, continue their existence for a while. Then, the Clefts and the Squirts gradually form a heterogeneous structure that has not been seen before in the Cleft. This process starts with bodily differences and continues with language and sex. Marie is one of the first women who eagerly leaves her home, the Cleft, to live with the Squirts, and she triggers the change in the so-called monotonous society of the Cleft. Nevertheless, the elderly women of the Cleft declare war against the

Squirts, who disrupted their communal order. After the unification of these two societies, under the command of Maronna and Horsa, this society, once again, is divided into two categories: women and men. By rejecting the commands of the Clefts, the Squirts aim to keep the distance; thus, they lay the foundations of a tradition. In order to join the Squirts, the boys run away from their mothers at a certain age and risk their lives to join the men's community; hence, the dispute between the two societies escalates. However, after the Squirts destroy the Cleft, these two societies have to compose a new one using the old collective behaviours created by men.

3.2. Findings

In the novel, the speech acts play a significant part in displaying how gender-based roles are constructed and how they force individuals to fit into the gender-based labels while pushing women to depend on men. The dialogues in the novel are limited; therefore, the narrator's comments throughout the plot are significant, and the limited direct quotations are worth a closer examination via speech acts.

Even though defining the results of the implicit statements in the literary texts are relatively challenging since they are based on the implied and/or hidden effects, their outcomes generally construct gender dynamics between sexes. For instance, the novel starts with a line from Graves' (1964) poem "Man Does, Woman Is"[3] to indicate the gender dichotomy. This statement is a verdict or judgement with an implicit meaning. While naming women passive and stable and men active and unstable, this line also labels sexes by constituting a dichotomy and boundary. As seen in male-dominated societies, the systematic desire to maintain power creates a language in which men are relatively active.

Accordingly, "male-authorised history" preserves masculine power by claiming women's dependency on men in various circumstances (Jansen, 2011: 29). The term "male-authorised history" is significant since the origins of women and men are narrated by, commented on and illustrated by Transit who is authorised to narrate the story as a wealthy Roman man. The story of the Cleft is narrated by Maire, the Squirt's ancient verbal records, and Transit. Before Maire's narration, Transit expresses his decision as "People wishing to avoid offence to their sensibilities may start the story on p. 29"[4] to implicitly warn readers (7). By suggesting the sensitive readers can ignore her, Transit causes Maire's speech to be disregarded. Moreover, the Squirts' narration of their point of view is titled "The History" in

[3] Verdictive.
[4] Exercitive.

the novel (29). Therefore, even though both the Clefts and Squirts experience the same story, Transit announces the males' point of view as a trustworthy source. On the other hand, Transit implies that the female point of view in writing history should be ignored. In other words, the male-authorised history is transmitted for further generations as a trustworthy source. Moreover, Transit's external focalisation shifts from the Clefts to the Squirts. At the beginning of the novel, Transit centres the Clefts' prejudices toward the Squirts as "They [the Squirts] were able to live though they were so deformed and ugly. That is how we thought then. Everyone was afraid, and shocked, and didn't know what to do"[5] (15). In this statement, Transit delivers Maire's descriptions while implying the Clefts' prejudices toward the Squirts. However, as the Squirts claim their masculine authority, Transit focuses on the Squirts' perception of the Clefts as he states, "The female kept records— and I cannot bring myself to write down all that is there; and the male kept records: and I do bring myself to write down what is there"[6] (49). In this statement, Transit distinguishes the female and male's narration of history. Also, Transit implies that men's depiction of history ensures men's perceptions of women are passed on to the next generations to secure masculine domination over femininity. In this way, Transit admits that history is distorted and the justification for the female inferiority and masculine heroism does not depend on nature but the masculine habitus' authority on narration. This masculine heroism is a result of the male-authorised history's implicit utterances. Hence, this chapter attempts to reveal the construction of gender roles by examining the characters' dialogues and the narrator's male-authorised comments in *The Cleft*.

The novel starts with Transit's statement "I saw this today,"[7] referring to an incident between a girl, Lolla, and a boy, Marcus (Lessing, 2007: 3). In this example, Transit values his narration while implying to the reader that he is a wealthy Roman man. The masculine confidence behind the 'I' voice might be seen throughout the novel, as outlined by Butler (2011):

> Where there is an "I" who utters or speaks and thereby produces an effect in discourse, there is first a discourse which precedes and enables that "I" and forms in language the constraining trajectory of its will. Thus, there is no "I" who stands behind discourse and executes its volition or will through discourse (171).

In other words, the 'I' voice cannot be separated from the existence of the cumulative and commonly masculine, 'we' voice. Hence, Transit's narration and commentaries on the incidents

[5] Verdictive.
[6] Expositive.
[7] Verdictive.

also present how speech acts maintain gender behaviours. For instance, in the incident told by Transit, when Marcus, a young and handsome slave, comes from the village exhausted while Lolla, the young slave girl he used to know, approaches him. Marcus overlooks Lolla, and she finally says "Marcus" in her normal voice. Again, unable to get any reaction from Marcus, Lolla coaxingly says "Marcus," and then she says "Marcus" tearfully (Lessing, 2007: 5). Marcus turns contemptuously to Lolla and walks away without looking back at her. Then, Lolla follows Marcus. This event is a failed performative since Lolla's speech is not successful enough to communicate with Marcus. This incident also shows that Lolla is a passive character who cannot even get a reaction from a male character.

According to the speech act theory, the phrase "Marcus"[8] is a performative act since the speaker aims to attract others' attention as calling the hearer by his name. However, even if she changes her attitude to be heard in each expression, the listener does not answer her speech, so this sentence is unsuccessful; thus, it is an infelicity utterance. As a woman, Lolla is ignored and insulted by Marcus, and it is a 'normal' conversation dynamic between sexes as Transit states:

> I did not need to watch any longer. I knew she would find an excuse to hang about the courtyard— perhaps petting and patting the oxen, giving them figs, or pretended the well needed attention. She would be waiting for him. I knew that he would want to go off into the streets with other boys, for an evening's fun— he was not often here in this house in Rome itself. But I knew too that these two would spend tonight together, no matter what he would have preferred. This little scene to me to sum up a truth in the relations between men and women (Lessing, 2007: 5-6).

This interpretation of Transit is crucial since it summarizes the stereotypes attributed to the gender norms in the patriarchal society in which he lives. Moreover, Transit uses implicit utterances to reveal the hidden gender norms in his society.

The male-authorised history is mainly achieved through speech acts in the novel. For Jansen (2011:105), "the dominant view of an all-female society has been expressed in a chorus of disapproving, sometimes even horrified, male voice." This male voice reflects the historical records and interferes with the records with his biased thoughts on gender behaviours. Furthermore, the male voice uses implications to impose his masculine thoughts on readers. In this way, he shapes the myth of the Clefts and displays the process of how male-authored history is transmitted. A point which is echoed by Jansen:

[8] Expositive.

> We are forced to rely on our narrator's memory rather than on any evidence he can produce…we must take a leap of faith—at the very beginning of the novel, we are asked to trust our narrator's memory, even though we have no reason for doing so. And we must go on believing him, even though he tells us 'I never was good at descriptions anyhow' (2011: 107).

In this sense, the 'I' voice introduces the male-authorised history from the very beginning of the novel. The narrator provides a basis for the justification of women's dependency on men by implying that even the history of the Clefts "has become the property of men" (Jansen, 2011: 110). Relatedly, Transit makes the following statement:

> We all know that in the telling and retelling of an event, or series of events, there will be as many accounts as there are tellers. An event should be recorded. Then it must be agreed by whoever's task it is that this version rather than that must be committed to memory. The tale must be rehearsed— and we may amuse ourselves imagining how these must have been, often, acrimonious, or at least in dispute… Who made the decision that this and that Cleft, and not another or others, should hold the history in her mind? And the same is true for our people, the boys. Our records were full of anecdotes, sharply remembered events involving the Old Females, who certainly would not agree with one single word agreed on by us. We have to account for the fact that both Clefts, and we, kept records, with all the attention and care it involved, for— and here I go— for ages. For a long time (136-7).

In the novel, the social limitations are sealed through repetitive and collective history. The commentaries on the same situation are divided into female and male perspectives. For instance, when the Clefts oppose Squirts' ideas, the male-authorised history narrates the Clefts as "hysterical" while the women's history narrates themselves as "indignant" (Lessing, 2007: 193-4). This dichotomy displays how male-authorised history narrates an incident by stereotyping and humiliating the Clefts via implications. Starting with generalisation, individuals become an embodiment of these gender labels normalised and naturalised through one-sided narration.

Before the arrival of the Squirts, the Cleft society had Memories; that is, people who transmit their history to the next generation. Even though Transit states, "[w]e Romans have measured, charted, taken possession of time" the selectiveness of memories might have cumulatively shaped individuals' social roles (101). Hence, the repetitive expression of being a soldier or a wife might result from these cumulative memories encoded to individuals from the moment they are born. Moreover, Transit lives in a society in which masculinity has grown stronger and heroic over time. The transition, however, is rather selective as Transit indicates, "we are a defining people, but then all we know of events is what was said of them by the appointed Memories, the repeaters, who spoke to those who spoke again, again, what had been agreed long ago should be remembered" (101). In this way, people have transmitted their history via repetitious language use to the next generation, which inevitably influences their social consciousness. This collective consciousness is commonly shaped as the narrators use 'we' vs. 'they' pronouns to illustrate gender dichotomies via language. For instance, Transit

frequently uses the pronoun 'we' to associate his masculine habitus with Roman heroism, while Maire uses the pronoun 'we' to point out her community.

Closely related to the speech act theory and performativity, discourse studies reveal the power dynamics of utterances in literary texts. As Wodak (1996: 17) states, "[d]iscourse is a social practice that implies a dialectical relationship between a particular discursive event and the situation, institution and social structure that frame it" and since discourse is constituted by the environment, it is also a social construct. The close relationship between discourse and power is a cornerstone in analysing the further examples from the novel using both speech acts and performativity.

In the novel, while men play an active role in dominating society, they also limit women by ordering and stereotyping them with negative connotations and imperatives such as commands. Transit's commentaries on gender are usually framed through declarative structures of implicit utterances. For instance, Transit says, "[m]y sister is ever ready to ascribe to herself the more delicate of female attributes— a not uncommon trait, I think" (7). In this example, the narrator is expounding his views on her sister's attitude by stating that her attitude is "a not uncommon trait."[9] On a discursive level, Transit indicates that normally and naturally, women have/should have feminine behaviours. In addition, the gender-based stereotypes in society sustain the continuity of the gender norms by indicating the points that demarcate femininity and masculinity.

Transit narrates that his sister feels closer to feminine qualities, and this is considered normal. Social normalisation is a gender stereotype as it obligates women to behave according to such feminine qualities. This common understanding is transferred via implicit performatives and Transit expounds his views on his sister's attitude. Even though he claims that he is an objective narrator in the beginning of the novel, he makes the following statement:

> To make a history from this kind of material is not easy, but I have to say in justification that seldom did the Memories of the Clefts and Monsters differ very much. Often the tone was different, and once it was believed that different events were being recorded. But on the whole Clefts and Monsters (or Squirts) lived the same story. Now I again begin my tale (30).

He does not avoid commenting on the incidents. Furthermore, the dichotomy of 'man does, woman is' is reflected in Transit's speech. While he describes her sister as "my sister is," he uses the 'I' voice as "I think" (7). Therefore, he enforces his active masculinity upon her sister's

[9] Expositive.

stable descriptions. Moreover, Transit uses stable descriptions for his wife, Julia, as "she has a good heart, she is a kind woman," and "she was such a picture of vulnerability" (149).

Exercising power is also articulated in the language used in the novel. Transit continues as "[b]ut as I remind her, anyone who has watched her screaming her head off as the blood flows in the arena is not likely easily to be persuaded of female fastidiousness"[10] (7). This statement exercises power since the narrator warns her sister to behave 'womanly' in public. The implied meaning of this example is to remind that women should act in a feminine way to fit in the social norms. Her sister, who sees herself closer to femininity, behaves 'unwomanly.'

The speech acts function as a reminder in society to sustain the constructed gender roles transmitted by male-authorised history. According to speech act theory, this situation is closely related to "positive face," which is the requirement for being desirable to people (Short, 1996: 213). The Roman society, consciously or not, obey the expected duties such as motherhood or heroism. As a result, to fit into society, they perform and sustain the accepted and normalised gender roles through positive face. Negative face, which is "the wish that our actions should be unimpeded by others," might be related to the characters' behaviours without the limitation of social constructs such as Transit's sister's 'unfeminine' behaviours in the arena (Short, 1996: 213). Positive and negative faces are often related to feminine and masculine gender behaviours. The characters' speech, therefore, reflects the inner comprehension of gender roles which set limitations by linguistic directives. Hence, Transit feels the necessity to warn his sister, and more importantly, he chooses to narrate this incident in his historical work. His male-authoritarian voice is reflected through statements warning the female figure both during the event and his work.

The limitations based on gender are drawn through speech as Transit states, "[m]ales are always put first, in our practice. They are first in our society, despite the influence of certain great ladies of the noble Houses,"[11] and he adds, "Yet, I suspect this priority was a later invention" (28). The narrator states the masculine and feminine norms in his society by identifying their dichotomy as passive/active. Hence, this assertion implies that men have superiority over women no matter what women accomplish. In the novel, the descriptions of men commonly affirm their masculine domination, as is shown in the example below:

> Yes, I do go to the games, usually with my sister Marcella, who will never miss an exciting event. She likes me to go with her, because that proves she is not the sensation lover I tell her she is. My being there, by her side, proves to her she is a sane and civilised person. It is not possible to sit there as the beasts are

[10] Exercitives.
[11] Expositive.

> brought in to fight, or to attack their criminal victims without one's blood beating and the heart pounding. I've tried to sit beside her and remain unmoved. At some point you find yourself shouting, rising to your feet, calling out, and the smell of blood drives you wild. Why do I go? (185).

In this excerpt, Transit points out the outcomes of the stereotypical descriptions. His sister, Marcella, needs a male figure to claim her sanity in public. As a result, the descriptive sentences of women mainly restrain them within the norms of femininity.

The social seal of gendered speech might be seen at an early age as Transit narrates the incident between a young girl and boy. As they examine their physical differences, the girl asks her little brother why he has got a penis, and the boy says, "[b]ecause I am a boy"[12] while dictating masculine positions such as frowning at an imaginary male antagonist (53). In this example, the boy affirms his gender to distinguish himself from his sister in a social context. Hence, this language use suggests that boys value their bodies by dictating that they have more rights, rewards, and supposedly, enemies than their sister through implicit performatives. After the boy's statement, Transit narrates the girl's answer as "The little girl, seeing all these achievements, none of which are possible to her, frowns, looks down at her centre and says, 'But I am nicer than you'" (54). The girl's answer is vital since she responds to her brother's implicit utterance by confronting him with her 'feminine' quality as valuing her appearance. In this way, the children perform gender dichotomies which compose of stereotypes. By perceiving the lack of male genitalia, the girl emphasises her 'feminine' quality which has been imposed on her from infancy. When the two women in the room intervene in the children's dialogue, Transit narrates the incident as: "At the little boy's thrusting and showing off, they exchange what-do-you-expect-from-a-male smiles, and both show signs of wanting to shield the girl, who after all has a hymen to protect"[13] (54). Transit interprets the women's facial gestures by implying that boys can do such actions, while girls should behave to protect their virginity. Therefore, the women construct a social barrier between the children, especially for the girl, to impose the girl that she should protect her hymen, in other words, her virginity. To carry this, one of the women tells them that "Your mother'll be cross if she sees you"[14] (54). This expression seals the social dichotomy between the boy and girl through speech acts since the speakers warn the children. The usage of this utterance, in this case, is different between the male-authorised speech and female speech because while the men do the act of warning or ordering directly, the female voice warns the children by exerting power by redirecting the

[12] Verdictive.
[13] Verdictive.
[14] Exercitive

other's authoritative position. Furthermore, the woman's utterance turns into "a ritual close to the play" (54). Relatedly, Butler (1997) argues the following point:

> As utterances, they work to the extent that they are given in the form of a ritual, that is, repeated in time, and, hence, maintain a sphere of operation that is not restricted to the moment of the utterance itself. As utterances, they work to the extent that they are given in the form of a ritual, that is, repeated in time, and, hence, maintain a sphere of operation that is not restricted to the moment of the utterance itself (3).

This incident between the girl and the boy, therefore, represents how the gendered rituals are constructed via speech acts. Though performative utterances actively direct the children, their implicit effects constitute their social diversity based on their gender. Butler's (1997) term 'visibility through performance' might be applied to the given examples as well. The visible differences between sexes are the first step to label bodies while constituting boundaries on them. Thus, the declaration of "It's a boy/girl immediately shifts the infant from an 'it' to a 'she' or a 'he'" (as cited in Claeys and Keunen, 2007). In this case, Transit narrates the process of how the children identify themselves as a boy and girl. Relatedly, Transit claims, "Take a half-grown Squirt and half-grown Cleft, and if their middle parts were covered, no one could tell the difference" (87). Therefore, the identification of being a girl or boy is also a cultural process.

Through Transit's narration, the women are limited in both the social and linguistic spheres within masculine domination. For instance, this incident is also significant: "She had asked her mother why she was always ordered to feed and wash the babies, but her brothers were not. Her mother simply said that this was how things were"[15] (58). In this example, the mother convicts her daughter that she should obey the duties. Also, she ranks children's social positions based on gender. The statement's implicit meaning displays that women ought to perform their domestic duties and not question these orders.

Men's responsibility is associated with heroism as Transit comments, "He gave three of his sons to die for the empire, he was a true Roman"[16] (64). Here the narrator adheres to or affirms the normative standards of being a true Roman. The implied mea ning of this sentence is that men are expected to put their masculine duties over their self-interest. The implicit performatives constitute and normalise feminine and masculine behaviours in the long term. Therefore, the microcosmic story of femininity and masculinity in the novel displays how language provides a collective identity on gender while dominating one side in social positions

[15] Expositive.
[16] Expositive.

based on bodies. While male-authorised history determines women's social and individual roles with femininity, masculinity is associated with men's powerful and even heroic positions to rule society. As a result, the speech rewards men and masculinity through active social empowerment while limiting women with passive domestic duties. It also rewards men through religion, stories and myths in which men 'naturally' come first as Transit says, "[i]n Rome now, a sect— the Christians— insist that the first female was brought forth from the body of a male" (27). Many stories are told about the first people in time, but "all more credible than that females came first" (143). Though Transit disagrees that men (the Squirts) came first, he blames women (the Clefts) for their cruel actions against baby boys by using adjective clauses such as "poor Monsters" and "the poor boys" (116). He also justifies the Squirts' careless actions by saying, "…if they did *this*, then *that* would follow" (107). Again, this statement is similar to the example, "this was how things were" (58). Both of these utterances unveil how the normalisation of these gender norms are reflected in speech.

According to Baron and Kotthoff (2001), femininity and masculinity are closely related not only to events, but also to social consciousness. The social consciousness is often shaped by the negative results of the implicit utterances. For example, as Transit declares in the novel, "[w]ithout males, or Monsters, no need ever to think that they were Clefts; without the opposite, no need to claim what they were. When the first baby Monster was born, Male and Female were born too, because before that were simply, the people" (78). In this case, Transit consciously or unconsciously reflects the structures of femininity and masculinity in both the Cleft and his society. This implicit meaning of Transit's statement degrades the existence of the Clefts' by claiming that before the arrival of men, women's identifications of themselves do not matter. Transit also displays how the dichotomy arises from the anatomical differences to behavioural changes such as femininity and masculinity over time.

As the example below points out, the Squirts order the Clefts to go their own place. The Squirts use speech acts to imply their requirements of staying away from the women. Starting with a statement of staying away from the women; thus, the Squirts imply their dominant presence in the novel. As a result, a confrontation begins between the women and men:

> 'Back to your own place,' they had been told, though some did not want to go. The women's shore, with so many pregnant females, babies, small children, was not peaceful, though there was plenty of entertainment for the babes and infants, in and out of the waves, water babies, like the young of seabirds or like sea pups. The cold slapping and slicing waves could never lose their allure for the adults. But the contrast between the women's shore and the men's valley was hard for some females, hard to bear. It was not that the men did not come to visit the women in their airy caves, or that the women did not go to see the men. Then occurred the confrontation which sent the males out of their valley into the forests (162-3).

As the passage from the novel illustrates, the separation between the Squirts and Clefts occurs via speech acts. However, the implied meaning of the Squirts' expression "back to your own place" eventuates in social splitting in time (162). Even though both the Clefts and Squirts use speech acts in the novel, their implicit meanings differ in usage. With the performative utterance of "back to your place,"[17] the women are ordered to go back to their places, and they obey this command even though some of them do not want to (162). The implied meanings of the statements below confirm that men exercise power to dominate social positions while drawing social boundaries and giving orders to women. Hence, the Squirts frequently use implicit performatives to exert and claim power for putting restrictions on the Clefts. Accordingly, the Squirts' actions to survive, or their carelessness for the babies and children to be injured or even killed, are mainly embedded in their consciousness. Based on their anatomical differences, the boys are neglected and alienated from the Cleft society. Relatedly, Transit says, "[n]one [of the Squirts] had ever been loved by a mother. They were hungry for touch and tenderness; and the girls, who on their own shore did not go in much for this kind of affection, were surprised and pleased" (75-6). Having never received any love and attention throughout their lives, the Squirts construct different behaviours in time. Nevertheless, Transit's commentary reveals the masculine expectations on the Clefts by implying their domestic duties as a natural behaviour:

> Those poor Monsters lived in their sheds and shelters, which were always full of rubbish and smelled bad, because they simply did not have the knack of keeping order. There they were on the very edge of the great forest from where at any moment (and this had happened much more than once) a beast could leap out and grab a babe or even a half grown boy (116).

In this way, Transit blames the Clefts for their 'unfeminine' attitudes towards the Squirts; however, he does not accuse the Squirt of reckless behaviours.

While condemning the Clefts, Transit glorifies the process of the Squirts' survival from their mothers and how they make the Clefts depend on them by stealing their power of asexual reproduction. Relatedly, within Chodorow's (1978) framework, it might be stated that the Squirts' collective and reckless behaviours towards the Clefts are not naturally coded in their consciousness; on the contrary, they produce their masculine behaviours based on the long-term implicit performatives and vice versa.

After the Clefts lose their capability of asexual reproduction, the Squirts say, "[t]he girls can't have babies without us," and furthermore, Transit narrates their sentence by ending with "they concluded" (242). This expression is the man's declaration to value their presence. The

[17] Expositive.

implicit meaning of this utterance is that women depend on men; therefore, they should obey men's rules for the next generation's sake. The Clefts, who have the ability to give birth to human beings independently of men, lose this ability when they pass to a heteronormative society, causing them to become dependent on men not only to give birth to a new generation but also to sustain their communal life. Transit says on this subject, "The females found the males lacking, and we have now perhaps to wonder if this expressed a deeper dissatisfaction - because females were so fundamentally dependent on the males" (145). Through the male gaze, the women's constant dissatisfaction with men symbolises their deep dependence on men, but like all other sexual roles, it is a social construction. The fact that the Clefts, who have lived for generations in a society where men do not exist, lose their ability to reproduce alone due to heteronormative unification has created the impression that women are dependent on them in all matters.

According to Butler (1999), these restrictive boundaries built by the masculine structure have made masculinity a dominant position in society. For instance, the Roman women are limited within their domestic duties and feminine stereotypes. They cannot be the heroines of Rome; therefore, there is no room for women in Transit's "us" pronouns. Outcasted by the men's society, the women are expected to perform these boundaries such as treating the boys, giving birth to babies, having intercourse with the Squirts, and nothing more.

The Squirts often use statement as "[t]he girls are so angry with us, they are so moody" (249). The Squirts' statement characterizes the Clefts while implying that women are sensitive, so they tend to show extreme reactions to men. Moreover, they add, "[t]hey'll only crab and complain" to generalise the Clefts to create reasonable grounds for their dominance over them. This expression indicates that women's reactions are limited and irrational (249). Hence, the Squirts describe and identify the women with negative connotations. Also, Transit envisages the women's responses to justify their dependence on men:

> Together with the constant fretting and perturbation about the fewness of the children, and how vulnerable they all were, went – in the tales of the males, and of us – complaints about the females' continual nagging at them. The females found the males lacking, and we have now perhaps to wonder if this expressed a deeper dissatisfaction – because females were so fundamentally dependent on the males (145).

As emphasising the dichotomy of us/them or the Clefts/Squirts, the Squirts use language to constitute a collective masculine identity to claim that the Clefts are sensitive, so they tend to demonstrate extreme reactions to men since their responses are limited and irrational.

In the past, the Squirts were a primitive community that feared the Clefts, but they created the social order over time by establishing superiority over women. The main reason for this is the traditions created and maintained by men in the first heteronormative society in *The Cleft*. Growing without maternal love and attention, the Squirts do not tend to protect and care for their baby boys brought to them by the eagles. As women who left the Cleft community create a new society with the Squirts, the babies die due to the indifference of the men. The Cleft, who insist on keeping them safe and their caves clean, create trouble for the Squirts, and they think, "...as always, came the complaints about the messy and smelly caves" (141). That is why Transit says, "[i]t is recorded that they could not stand the supervision and the regime of the women," and thus they continued their social traditions, preferring to stay away from the Clefts (141). In this way, Transit justifies the masculine hegemony and the social inferiority of women using speech acts. Therefore, without the classifications based on genders, the social division between femininity and masculinity would not impact individuals' behaviours. The long-term effects of implicit performatives can also construct the gender reality:

> Gender reality is created through sustained social performances means that the very notions of an essential sex and a true or abiding masculinity or femininity are also constituted as part of the strategy that conceals gender's performative character and the performative possibilities for proliferating gender configurations outside the restricting frames of masculinist domination and compulsory heterosexuality (Butler, 1999: 180).

In light of Butler's commentary on masculinity's fundamental reasoning and femininity's artificiality, it can be stated that one of the main reasons for masculine dominance is socially constructed norms. Indispensably, the authority of masculinity attempts to justify its power in society by downgrading women's bodies; as Butler (1999: 48) claims, "the body and nature are considered to be the mute facticity of the feminine, awaiting signification from an opposing masculine subject." Therefore, 'masculine' man and 'feminine' woman still display the constructed normality of their existence in a heteronormative society, and the attributions for these concepts create an obligation on their behaviours and/or bodies via language.

3.3. Discussion

According to Transit, what will happen in the continuation of the event between Lolla and Marcus is clear since the gender stereotypes such as women's passivity and male-oriented behaviours in society are generally accepted as heteronormativity. Hence, there is no need to watch the scene any longer. To Transit, Lolla would "pretend the well needed attention" as

women commonly perform (5-6). This symbolic violence might be seen in the first heteronormative society of the Clefts and Squirts as follows:

> The young men were taking no notice of Horsa, who was trying to stagger around on his crooked stick. The girls were no better. They had fewer infants, for some had died, and there were no girls swelling up with pregnancy. They kept apart from the men, when they could, in a group, though they got their share of food. The little boys sometimes joined in the general evening feasts, but mostly they were off somewhere: their voices could at times be heard echoing from the forest. There was no question now of controlling them. Children they might be, but if they had not achieved their men's bodies they were as brave and skilled as the men who, the truth was, were afraid to tackle them. Some kind of central command or authority, it seemed, the girls were demanding and when they tried to assume control of the young boys, they were told they were just Clefts, and must shut up (221).

The fact that Clefts not being listened to and silenced by the Squirts is an example of symbolic violence. The symbolic violence is seen in Lolla and Marcus' relationship. Therefore, this scene is one of the earliest examples of Transit's narration in which women are dependent on men's attention, and in this way, the young couple performs their parts assigned by society.

The Cleft fundamentally reveals how the concepts of femininity and masculinity are built in this sense, with one side becoming dominant in the social environment, naturalised, and maintains power and control over time. In Reinish and Roseblum's (1978: 3) study, while feminine stereotypes are described as "soft, delicate and tender," the main masculine stereotypes are generally the opposite. Hence, it is important for Transit to define its social environment for the characteristics of femininity and masculinity that become stereotyped over time in society. To Bem (1987), the enforced behaviours derived from anatomical differences constitute unnecessary conflicts between women and men.

The speech, therefore, is a social seal that puts limitations on the individuals' minds. Moreover, having more power and authority than women, men considerably benefit from the gender-based stereotypes in society. Relatedly, Cereda and Ross (2012: xxii) argue that the stereotypes brought about by femininity and masculinity benefit the male-dominated system. Nevertheless, the strong, fearless, and successful masculinity stereotypes in society justify their solid social position. For instance, Transit says, "It is much easier to believe that eagles, or even deer, were our progenitors, than that the people were in their beginnings entirely female, and the males a later achievement" (143). Hence, masculine habitus claims its dominance through stories told by men via stories and myths for the next generations. As a result, their verbal fixations of gender are attributed to nature for the sake of masculine hegemony, so masculinity continues to be a power by commonly disregarding women's verbal responses and their presence at the end.

The stereotypes that are innately attributed to women by society constrain them in many ways and often make them inferior to men. Therefore, while the young girl indicates the unfair domestic responsibilities in her family, she also portrays how these roles are commonly in favour of patriarchy. In response to the question, her mother's answer displays how the constructed gender roles are naturalised and accepted in society, and how these stereotypical roles subject individuals to constraints. More importantly, the fact that the girl does not have any sense of motherhood may indicate that this feeling might be unusual in heteronormative society. According to Bourdieu's masculine habitus theory, "The social world constructs the body as a sexually defined reality and as the depository of sexually defining principles of vision and division" (Bourdieu, 2001: 11). In other words, at first, the girl is labelled as a girl, then gender labels are attributed to her and expected her obedience to these restrictions. The process of normalisation of these gender norms is a social construction that sustains masculine dominance over femininity.

As cognitive development theory claims, gender-based labels constantly pressure individuals to perform gender behaviours. In other words, femininity and masculinity are the masks that are consciously or unconsciously worn to be accepted in the social environment and cannot be wholly internalised. Hence, these gender-based roles affect all social life and play a primal role in constructing people's identity.

Language, in this part, is the primary medium for the persistency and normalisation of gender stereotypes. Performativity is on the other hand, is the part where individuals act according to social limitations. The boy is aware at a young age that having a penis will bring him some opportunities in society and that he must also have potential rivals. The social structures related to femininity and masculinity begin to shape individuals from childhood. Transit associates the Roman boy and the Squirt boy by highlighting their similarities as he says, "[s]kinny little boys, but strong and fearless, improbably surviving," and he characterises the Roman boys as strong and fearless (36-7). As a result, even though Transit describes himself as an objective historian, he favours the Squirts, and more importantly, he considers them as the Romans by relating these two societies' similar characteristics. The gender stereotypes mentioned by Reinish and Roseblum (1978) are seen in the following depiction by Transit:

> The boy is energetic, brave, full of manly games and feats and endurances – and everything we would expect of a Roman boy at his best. He wants to go into the army. He thinks perhaps he could be one of the Praetorian Guards. And why not? The Guard is made up of handsome young men like him (Lessing, 2007: 64).

Transit depicts the firstborn male children as strong, tough, and courageous, just as expected of a boy in his society. The concepts of femininity and masculinity are as follows according to

Transit, "women did mean comfort, warmth, kindness" and "[t]enderness is not a quality we associate easily with young men. Life has to beat it into us, beat us softer and more malleable than our early pride allows" (255-7). Hence, differences between women and men in society are built, and both sexes are expected to stay within those built boundaries. Therefore, this example might display how individuals shape language as it shapes society in time.

It becomes clear that the sacred masculinity of the male-dominated society existed even before the heteronormative society that was established by the Clefts. The songs of the first men to isolate themselves from women with a collective consciousness are as follows, "We are the children of the eagle, You are our fathers" (182). The eagles, which protected them from torture and death, became both a masculine figure and sanctified in their communities by ensuring the continuation of the generation of men. Transit describes how important the eagle figure is in his society, "[t]here's an eagle nest on a rocky outcrop on my country estate and some of my slaves take food as offerings to the place. There's something in me that applauds this gift, as if it were due" (182). This gratitude to the eagles might be a representation of how traditions, prejudices, and social values are transmitted among men since the earliest times. Bourdieu's concept of "mythic vision" therefore explains how masculinity is glorified and continued without relying solely on the bodily structure of men.

According to Ventress (1975: 13-4), stereotypes that exist for men in society encourage boys to imitate and practice them. Therefore, Transit states that many young men like him in the military indicate how gender structures shape children from an early age. Thus, boys try to conform to the stereotypes that society ascribes to them to join the strong male class that exists in society. For example, Transit says, "[n]o boy could be part of the 'fleet', join the men, if he had not achieved his man's body" (197). The statement of "his man's body" mentioned here refers to the whole structure of masculinity beyond physical properties. This situation can also be applied to girls as, "[s]he will be into maternal and nurturing games" (55). Therefore, while the act of being a mother is expected for girls, the thought of being a soldier is a situation that is considered appropriate for boys. Therefore, Transit's commentaries on the characters generally reflect Romans' patriarchal values by reminding them what is accepted and what is inappropriate.

To sum, *The Cleft*, an alternative myth of men's creation, is examined via speech act theory, gender performativity, and the findings are discussed via major gender theories in this chapter. It is claimed that femininity and masculinity in the novel are constructed and transmitted through speech acts. As a result, masculine domination and its perception of history are conveyed and transmitted as trustworthy. In *The Cleft*, direct quotations and dialogues are

limited; therefore, the selected examples from the novel are essential for the speech act analysis. These examples indicate that the adverse effects of implicit performatives on individuals force them to fit into feminine and masculine gender behaviours. Hence, the implicit utterances maintain the constructed gender roles transmitted by that specific male-authorised history. The social dichotomy of femininity and masculinity can be observed from infancy, and both females and males are forced to perform their feminine domestic duties or masculine heroic duties in society.

CHAPTER IV

CONSTRUCTION OF FEMININITY AND MASCULINITY IN *HERLAND*

Considered as "the leading intellectual in the women's movement in the United States during the first two decades of the twentieth century," Charlotte Perkins Gilman has been an influential journalist, sociologist, and writer (Degler, 1966: xiii). Gilman (1860-1935) was born in Connecticut, U.S., and she experienced poverty because of her father's abandonment when she was an infant (Knight, 2011: 27; Brown, 2011: 205). Nevertheless, Gilman "…possessed the cultural capital of her racial status, ethnic and regional identity, and family connections" while idealising motherhood in her life and literary works (Brown, 2011: 205). Nevertheless, it can also be stated that:

> From 1898 to the mid-1910s, Gilman was the most prominent feminist theorist in America… No woman of her time wrote with more insight about the very real barriers white women faced in their quest to participate productively in the world outside their homes (Bederman, 1995: 122-167).

Even though Gilman is commonly regarded as a prominent feminist, the characters and descriptions she created are, understandably, written under the influence of patriarchal dominance. For instance, in 1915, Gilman partially published one of her most significant novels, *Herland*, in a journal titled *The Forerunner*, and its book-length version was published in 1979 (Hausman, 1998: 490). *Herland* is "a mirror image of human society, a kind of alternative reality," and "an ideal female state that has developed parallel to but completely isolated from the 'real' world, dominated by men" (Jansen, 2011: 105). The novel depicts an all-female society of almost 2000 years without any connections with men and the rest of the world.

In her study, Bowers (2018: 1325) argues that considering *Herland* as an entirely feminist novel is problematic since "…it perpetuates many ethnocentric views of race and femininity." Bowers (2018: 1315) also claims that Gilman was highly affected by "the Progressive movement," which entails scientific principles to social issues. Gilman's (1915) *Herland* is a product of this movement since the novel argues that a better society is possible only "if Progressive principles were also applied to the management of family life and domestic labour" (Bowers, 2018: 1315). Nevertheless, even though Gilman (1915) blurs the lines of gender norms in many ways in the novel, the Herlanders and three visitors cannot form a non-binary society altogether in *Herland*.

According to Waryck (2003: 31), *Herland* is a valuable novel that displays the inequalities between women and men in the early 1900s; however, "Gilman falls victim to the very thing that she is trying so hard to destroy; she falls victim to the patriarchy under which she writes and which compromises the message in her narrative." Waryck (2003) argues that Gilman's attempt to create an equal place for both women and men results in masculinising women to empower them. On the other hand, Gilman (1915) glorifies motherhood as the most valuable responsibility in *Herland*, and to Waryck (2003: 35), it might indicate that "a woman never truly belongs to herself; she belongs to Nature and to her child." Thus, by using "Darwinian notions of biosocial change," Gilman might attempt to form a higher and more practical society without eliminating women's maternal limitations (Hausman, 1998: 491).

Hudson (2002: 1) analyses the gendered language in *Herland* by focusing on "the French theory of *écriture féminine*" in her thesis. Hudson (2002: 7) argues that "in androcentric culture, a human being's identity is relegated to that of either 'masculine' or 'feminine.'" The androcentric discourse similarly divides individuals to maintain dominance by highlighting "women's maternal nature as one basis for inscribing women's subordination and social conditions" (27). Therefore, Hudson (2002: v) examines how Gilman (1915) creates a narrator who accomplishes *écriture féminine* by "de-centring the phallus and merging masculine and feminine discourses" to offer an alteration for the phallogocentrism.

In this chapter, the construction of femininity and masculinity is analysed in *Herland* via speech act theory, gender performativity, and the major theories on gender behaviours by offering a complementary analysis to the aforementioned studies. Relatedly, it is argued that femininity and masculinity are constructed and conveyed via speech acts. In the novel, the male characters commonly use implicit performatives to preserve their masculine domination over femininity. Similar to *The Cleft*, in *Herland* male-authorised history portrays women's stories through speech acts within the restrictions of femininity and masculinity; therefore, the characters in the novel perform their gender to fit into society. As a result, the male characters perform their masculinity through implicit performatives. In order to support this argument, at first, the plot is briefly explained; then, the speech acts and gender performativity in the novel is analysed via the narrator's and character's speech. Finally, in the discussion part, the gender behaviours are discussed by focusing on the major theories on femininity and masculinity.

4.1 The Summary of *Herland*

Herland describes the discovery of an all-female society by three men. The main characters are Terry, a wealthy womanizer and engineer; Jeff, a botanist, poet, and doctor; Van, a sociologist and the narrator. They all want to explore this hidden and all-female country. While Terry, who sees women as objects, makes sexist predictions during the journey, Jeff is quite romantic and assumes that the women in the land should be an example to "a peaceful, harmonious sisterhood" (Gilman, 1999: 15). Van predicts events from a more realistic point of view. Seeing the organised and developed country at the end of their travels, they all think that there should be men in the country. They are amazed when they see strong and physically different women who are not afraid of them. Soon enough, they are caught and imprisoned while trying to capture the first women they see. In captivity, Somel, Zava, and Moadine teach men their language, history, and culture. Unable to accept being captured by women, Terry tries to escape by persuading Jeff and Van, but they are caught again. After six months, they are allowed to move freely in the land and provide information to the other Herlanders about their country. In this process, the similarities and differences between the two different societies are revealed. After a while, Terry, Jeff, and Van begin to have romantic interest in the Herlanders. Then, Van marries Ellador; Terry marries Alima, and Jeff marries Celis. Sexuality is problematic for the Herlanders since they reproduce asexually; however, Terry attempts to rape his wife, Alima. After this incident, Terry is expelled from the country. Van and Ellador accompany him as promising to keep Herland secret while returning to America.

4.2 Findings

Herland consists mainly of dialogues; therefore, speech acts play a significant role in constructing and transmitting femininity and masculinity. Although Terry, Van, and Jeff's thoughts on the heteronormative gender norms dramatically change throughout the novel, it might be observed that implicit performatives cause the persistence of these heteronormative thoughts. Hence, this novel argues that women can peacefully live without the limitations of patriarchy. Without the restrictions of the patriarchal society’s gender stereotypes, the Herlanders combine the feminine and masculine attributions in their society. However, the Herlanders are dependent on men for their connection with the outside world, and they remain restricted within the boundaries of masculinity which implies its superiority through speech acts.

This construction begins with the first sentence in *Herland* as "This is written from memory, unfortunately" (Gilman, 1999: 7). At the beginning of the novel, this sentence reveals

that the narrator, Van, will narrate events from his perspective and judgement while delivering his value. Gilman uses a male gaze and presents a novel based on a man's memory and his judgements, as Jansen (2011: 107) indicates, “We are forced to rely on our narrator’s memory rather than on any evidence he can produce.” Van narrates the characters’ direct speeches through reporting clauses such as s/he said, and therefore, these reporting clauses signify the implicit utterances’ effects on the hearers. Moreover, Gilman uses “external focalisation” in the narration, which causes “a separation from the characters” and “little insight into the characters of the story” (Gibbons and Whiteley, 2018: 100). In this way, Gilman offers a closer look into masculine habitus in a matriarchal society.

By using such statements, Van, Terry, and Jeff display their dominant presence over the Herlanders. A superficial examination of these utterances might present the characters’ opinions on the Herlanders; however, through implicit utterances, their speech presents the social constructions of gender and how they shape their understanding of femininity and masculinity. Van’s first-person commentaries on the Herlanders are also critical. For instance, he says, “[w]omen have always been spinsters. But there they stop— you’ll see”[18] (15). By using such a statement, Van speaks his mind about the typical characteristics of women. Also, he estimates their limitations in a generalising sense. The implicit meaning of this utterance is that women have limited potentials, and they cannot expand them. Furthermore, the word “always” generalises women and naturalises their limitations which are constructed by society.

Moreover, the term ‘civilisation’ is usually associated with men and patriarchy in the novel. Van states that “…this is a civilised country,” therefore, “[t]here must be men” (19). This utterance claims the necessity of men in a civilised country or community. The narrator estimates that there must be men in the country. This statement has a negative implicit effect on women since it disregards the contribution of women in civilisation. In other words, women depend on men to build a civilisation. This dependence is not given individually but as a social contract. As a result of this cumulative understanding, the limitations of femininity are more restrictive in the novel on the implicit level. For instance, the reflections of stereotypes in the novel can be observed in the following excerpt:

> I remember how long Terry balked at the evident unanimity of these women—the most conspicuous feature of their whole culture. “It’s impossible!” he would insist. “Women cannot cooperate—it’s against nature.” When we urged the obvious facts he would say: “Fiddlesticks!” or “Hang your facts—I tell you it can’t be done!” And we never succeeded in shutting him up till Jeff dragged in the hymenoptera. “‘Go

[18] Verdictive.

> to the ant, thou sluggard'—and learn something," he said triumphantly. "Don't they cooperate pretty well? You can't beat it. This place is just like an enormous anthill—you know an anthill is nothing but a nursery. And how about bees? Don't they manage to cooperate and love one another? 'As the birds do love the Spring or the bees their careful king,' as that precious constable had it. Just show me a combination of male creatures, bird, bug, or beast, that works as well, will you? Or one of our masculine countries where the people work together as well as they do here! I tell you, women are the natural cooperators, not men!" (100).

In the passage above, male-authorised history's implicit performatives are displayed. As underlining the civilisation before the loss of men, Van normalises the feminine collaboration of the Herlanders. Therefore, both Terry and Jeff commentate the Herlanders in a stereotypical way as a result of the cumulative implicit utterances. Consequently, the Herlanders are restricted within these long-term stereotypes. As a result of these restrictions, women are objectified. As Terry asserts, "[w]omen like to be run after" (25). Terry commonly uses stereotypes to emphasise his masculine domination in both among men and the Herlanders. His claims on this matter display how he regards himself as an authoritative figure and the women as objects by implying that women enjoy such misogynistic behaviours. Moreover, the male characters associate the Herlanders with prey as Terry says, "Have to use bait," while attempting to lure the Herlanders with a necklace (50). Terry's statement generalises women as if they could be captured like an animal in turn of jewellery. In addition, when they first see the Herlanders, Jeff says, "Girls!" (49). Van says, "…under his breath, as if they might fly if he spoke aloud" (49). Van, on the other hand, resemblances the girls with "wild antelopes" (51). All these resemblances implicitly generalise women as if they were objects or preys. These interpretations turn into a norm, and they are imposed upon individuals in time.

As a result of the generalisations in the novel, gender stereotypes turn into statements. For instance, Terry generalises women and puts a limitation on men as he says, "[f]aint heart ne'er won fair lady"[19] (26). Using such an utterance, Terry recommends that the men should be brave if they want to gain a lady's attention or love. The implicit effect of Terry's statement reveals the masculine codes in society. Put it differently, men should be brave and 'manly' to be accepted by both men and women. This leads individuals to perform their gender identity to be accepted in society. To fit in society, individuals both perform and maintain these gender norms, and in this process, these norms are normalised via speech. Hence, the stereotypes are transmitted by speech acts such as Terry's this utterance.

[19] Verdictive.

To describe women, Terry commonly uses utterances such as "[w]e all know women can't organise—that they scrap like anything—are frightfully jealous" (71). In this statement, Terry degrades the Herlanders via a generalisation. The implied meaning of this utterance asserts that women are not capable of governing because of their feminine nature. Terry also uses the "we" pronoun in this example. This pronoun might refer to masculine habitus since Terry commonly expects support from both Van and Jeff. Terry also says, "We mustn't let them get us in this, boys. All together, now—" (55). Furthermore, he frequently uses the 'we' pronoun while speaking to both Jeff and Van as if he knows what they think or feel. By underlining the dichotomy of 'we' versus 'they,' Terry attempts to maintain the dichotomy between genders and protect his position in his masculine habitus via language.

Terry also degrades any feminine connotations upon men as "[w]hat's the good of talking sentiment when we are just men together?"[20] (71). By using this statement, Terry interprets their masculine habitus as unsentimental and/or down-to-earth. The implicit effect of this example denotes that sentimentality is appropriate only for women; therefore, men should not talk about their feelings in their masculine habitus. Once again, Terry reminds Jeff and Van of the limitations of masculinity. According to Terry, speaking sentimentally or talking about feelings are feminine qualities. While degrading this kind of speech, Terry insists on using their masculine or non-sentimental address as it is expected in the outside world.

Terry has a specific and stereotypical understanding of women, and in his world, he is the one who determines the limitations of women as a white man. Encountering with the Herlanders, who are capable of living without men, Terry's masculine domination is threatened. This is why he constantly needs to remind his authority on the women by reminding their passive femininity as he claims that "[t]hese women aren't womanly. You know they aren't" (71). By uttering this statement, Transit expounds his view on women by degrading women. This example is also an embodiment of Terry's idealisation of women. For Terry, women are divided as womanly and unwomanly, and Terry is the one who decides on the labels. Terry implies that women should behave in a feminine manner if they want to be accepted by males. More importantly, he needs approval from Jeff and Van as he says, "You know they aren't" (71). Therefore, he rejects calling the Herlanders women since they do not perform their femininity except in motherhood.

[20] Verdictive.

In the novel, the Herlanders are commonly associated with motherhood, and they all call themselves mothers with a statement; “We are mothers— all of us” (79). Van describes the Herlanders’ focus on motherhood:

> The religion they had to begin with was much like that of old Greece—a number of gods and goddesses; but they lost all interest in deities of war and plunder, and gradually centred on their Mother Goddess altogether. Then, as they grew more intelligent, this had turned into a sort of Maternal Pantheism. Here was Mother Earth, bearing fruit. All that they ate was fruit of motherhood, from seed or egg or their product. By motherhood they were born and by motherhood they lived—life was, to them, just the long cycle of motherhood (93).

Nevertheless, Terry opposes their extreme focus on motherhood as “[w]hat a man wants of women is a good deal more than all this ‘motherhood!’” (71). Terry assesses the qualities of the Herlanders with this utterance, and he indicates that besides being mothers, women should be aware of their responsibilities to men. So, the Herlanders calling themselves mothers and only caring for their babies disturb Terry’s masculine domination. Nevertheless, Van contradicts Terry’s this opinion:

> These women, whose essential distinction of motherhood was the dominant note of their whole culture, were strikingly deficient in what we call “femininity.” This led me very promptly to the conviction that those “feminine charms” we are so fond of are not feminine at all, but mere reflected masculinity—developed to please us because they had to please us, and in no way essential to the real fulfilment of their great process. But Terry came to no such conclusion (Gilman, 1999: 92).

In this part, Van admits that motherhood cannot be associated with femininity in all circumstances. To Van, the feminine charms are not related to femininity but the requirements of masculinity. Hence, the constructed gender norms are imposed on individuals via language to satisfy the requirements of masculine domination on women. On the other hand, Jeff sacrifices motherhood as he says, “We assume that motherhood is a sufficient burden—that men should carry all the others” (125). This utterance assesses the women as mothers and dismisses their other duties for the sake of motherhood. Therefore, it is stated that women have fundamental responsibilities; hence, they should leave the rest to men. Unlike Terry, Jeff does not underrate the Herlanders’ sacrament of motherhood; however, he limits and undermines women as if motherhood is the only valuable thing in women’s lives. In both cases, women are limited and restricted via language.

In another example, Terry states that "Women cannot cooperate—it's against nature"[21] (100). In this statement, Terry claims and announces women's incapability. The implicature of this utterance gives a compelling force that it is men's responsibility to bring an order for women. Putting his masculinity first, Terry cannot comprehend a community without the presence of men. Therefore, he judges this as an 'unreasonable' circumstance as if he is the one in charge. He attempts to reverse this situation using his verdict and changing the Herlanders' community into a patriarchal system through his words. Moreover, Terry also says, "There never was a woman yet that did not enjoy being *mastered*" (161). Using this statement, Terry claims that women are pleased to be mastered. Therefore, Terry maintains masculine domination as Van states, "Terry put in practice his pet conviction that a woman loves to be mastered, and by sheer brute force, in all the pride and passion of his intense masculinity, he tried to master this woman" (162). As their interaction with the Herlanders progressed, Terry feels more outcasted since he cannot receive any 'feminine' reaction from the women. Therefore, his utterance becomes more hostile and misogynistic against the Herlanders.

Terry says, "Of course they can't understand a Man's World! They aren't human—they're just a pack of Fe-Fe-Females!" (113). Terry degrades the Herlanders in this statement. The implicit meaning of this utterance is that the world belongs to men, and women should be aware of their inferior nature. The significant part is the implied meaning of this utterance cannot prove a sudden effect by the listeners. Also, Terry's comments on women are not momentary; his comments combine the cumulative implied effects. Terry cannot receive the same response from the Herlanders as the women of the outside world since the Herlanders have not been exposed to the repetitive gender norms of any heteronormative society for a long time. Therefore, consciously or not, Terry feels threatened and wants to regain his masculine power through hate speech. Moreover, he uses gestures such as pointing a finger or muttering between his teeth while speaking with Herlanders. Unlike the outside world, the women do not perform any gender behaviours according to Terry's implied expressions since he is the only one who attempts to dominate the women in the microcosmic masculine habitus.

In the novel, Terry frequently uses gender stereotypes. For instance, Terry identifies Herlanders as: "They've no modesty," and adds "[n]o patience, no submissiveness, none of that natural yielding which is woman's greatest charm" (131). By using such an utterance exposing his view, Terry implies that women's charm comes with traditional feminine qualities. The implicit meaning of this statement is that women should stay within the limitations constituted

[21] Verdictive.

by men. When Herlanders do not perform the expected gender norms, Terry, once again, uses hate speech to display his reaction. He also calls the Herlanders "fiddlesticks, morbid one-side cripples, sexless, epicene and undeveloped neuters" (64-172). Nevertheless, Transit does not receive any counterattack from the women, which makes him use more aggressive speech.

As exaggerating and caricaturing Terry and Jeff's attitudes towards women, Gilman (1999) also criticises the central dichotomy on women as they are either objects/prostitutes or sacred angels/Mary mother of God. However, Gilman applies this dichotomy on men via speech acts as if they were either womanisers or worshippers. Terry's masculine identity is associated with wealth, power, and charm, mainly reflected through speech acts. Through adverse effects of such utterances, Terry aims to maintain his masculine dominance among the Herlanders and the men. This is why Terry supports the idea that men are naturally superior to women. On the other hand, Jeff is represented as "a tender soul" in the novel (14). Van summarises the difference between Terry and Jeff as "Jeff's ideas and Terry's were so far apart that sometimes it was all I could do to keep the peace between them. Jeff idealised women in the best Southern style. He was full of chivalry and sentiment, and all that. And he was a good boy; he lived up to his ideals" (Gilman, 1999: 16). In addition to this, Van illustrates Jeff:

> Jeff—well, Jeff always had a streak that was too good for this world! He's the kind that would have made a saintly priest in earlier times. He accepted the Angel theory, swallowed it whole, tried to force it on us—with varying effect. He so worshipped Celis, and not only Celis, but what she represented; he had become so deeply convinced of the almost supernatural advantages of this country and people, that he took his medicine like a—I cannot say "like a man," but more as if he wasn't one (Gilman, 1999: 154).

As illustrated in the passage above, Van highlights Jeff's romantic side. The vital part is Van's comment after his representation, "Don't misunderstand me for a moment. Dear old Jeff was no milksop or molly-coddle either. He was a strong, brave, efficient man, and an excellent fighter when fighting was necessary" (154). Van needs to remind Jeff of his masculine features even though he worships women. One of the primary motives behind Van's statement is his potential concern for Jeff's representation. Hence, Van constitutes a positive face for Jeff to make him more acceptable in a heteronormative society. In this sense, Van does not intend to describe his friend in an unmasculine way. Although Van renders Jeff within his masculine features, his speech does not 'conform' with an authoritative masculine address. Nevertheless, female talk is described as 'musical' and appealing. The Herlanders' speech, therefore, is projected as soft, calm, smoothly, evenly, gently, and motherly as Van states, "…there was a torrent of soft talk, tossed back and forth; no savage sing-song, but clear musical fluent speech" (23). In this way, the Herlanders are still relatable among the men even though they look rather

masculine. Therefore, the implied meanings in the novel play a significant part in revealing how the gender norms also affect the writers in their act of narration.

Butler (1999: 33) indicates that "there is no gender identity behind the expressions of gender." This claim can be observed in the novel since the male characters need to perform their gender in the story, and they expect the same from the Herlanders. For instance, Terry asks the Herlanders "are there no men in this country?" (78). Somel, Van's tutor, answers as "Men?" and continues, "Like you?" (78). In return, Terry says, "Yes, men," while "indicating his beard, and throwing back his broad shoulders," he adds, "[m]en, real men" (79). This example displays that gender is performative while indicating his beard. Also, he uses bodily language such as pointing or clenching to express his masculinity.

The Herlanders' appearances do not conform to the traditionally feminine qualities as Van states, "They were not young. They were not old. They were not, in the girl sense, beautiful" (53). Therefore, they feel uncomfortable associating these women with the outside world. For example, Jeff complains as he says, "If their hair was only long," and adds, "they would look so much more feminine" (64). Moreover, Terry says, "When I see them knit, I can almost call them feminine" (65). Butler (1999: xv) states that gender "is not a singular act, but a repetition and a ritual, which achieves its effects through its naturalisation in the context of a body, understood, in part, as a culturally sustained temporal duration." Hence, long hair or knitting is not the 'natural' or essential qualities for femininity. These gender norms are the result of a repetition that turns into a ritual, then a norm. Individuals are expected to do their gender based on their sex. The Herlanders, whose only connection to femininity is motherhood, are first founded and judged by the masculine habitus. According to Butler (1997: 18), "…such speech reinvokes and reinscribes a structural relation of domination, and constitutes the linguistic occasion for the reconstitution of that structural domination." The masculine domination commonly expresses its higher position in society via speech. Hence, language conveys this domination while it constructs society through speech acts.

In the novel, individuals are defined via language. Relatedly, Butler (1997: 2) states that "If we are formed in language, then that formative power precedes and conditions any decision we might make about it, insulting us from the start, as it were, by its prior power." Thus, this power entails the men's speech in the novel, so the characters, including the narrator, cannot be abstracted from its restraints. During the story, they perform and teach the heteronormative gender norms. Relatedly, Terry states that, "This is no savage country, my friend. But no men? Boys, it behoves us to go forward most politely" (52). Consequently, Van, Jeff, and Terry

constantly need to remind themselves of their masculine habitus while comparing Herland with the outside world.

Moreover, Butler (1997: 160) asserts that "If hate speech constitutes the kind of act that seeks to silence the one to whom it is addressed, but which might revive within the vocabulary of the silenced as its unexpected rejoinder, then the response to hate speech constitutes the 'de-officialisation' of the performative." Unlike "the officialisation strategies," de-officialisation refers the language which does not "produce certain kinds of binding social effects" (Butler, 1997: 153). In the novel, it can be observed that Terry's hate speech ends with de-officialisation, which makes threats to his masculinity since he does not 'do' gender anymore. To empower his masculine domination, Terry needs repetition and support from the men. Nevertheless, he cannot receive enough support on this matter; thus, he attempts to perform his 'dominance' by raping his wife, Alima. This incident causes his exile from Herland; hence, he turns back to the outside world where his thoughts on women are more acceptable.

4.3 Discussion

In *Herland*, the construction of femininity and masculinity are represented through dialogues and the narrator's comments on gender behaviours. Before their arrival, Terry, Jeff, and Van discuss the Herlanders and what kind of women they will face. Terry says, "They would fight among themselves" because "women always do," and he adds, "We mustn't look to find any sort of order and organisation" (42). Then, Jeff says, "It will be like a nunnery under an abbess" (42). In response, Van states that they will face "a peaceful, harmonious sisterhood" (42). In that sense, they all have an idealised image of women in their minds, and they do not visualise an all-female society without the limitations of a heteronormative society. This early dialogue among Terry, Jeff, and Van displays that they are prejudiced before their arrival of Herland.

As they communicate with the Herlanders, the differences between the Herlanders and the outside world become more visible. The idea that women can construct and maintain a developed society without men is quite surprising to men. Thus, the restrictive rules of the heteronormative society, especially on women, are actually a construction that is normalised over time. Relatedly, Van states:

> We have two life cycles: the man's and the woman's. To the man there is growth, struggle, conquest, the establishment of his family, and as much further success in gain or ambition as he can achieve. To the

> woman, growth, the securing of a husband, the subordinate activities of family life, and afterward such "social" or charitable interests as her position allows (Gilman, 1999: 134).

As Van narrates, society is divided into men's and women's cycles that put mainly social restrictions. Henceforth, each individual is exposed to these restrictions and stereotypes based on their anatomical presence. Also, Terry says, "The men do everything, with us," and adds, "[w]e do not allow our women to work. Women are loved—idolized—honored—kept in the home to care for the children" (94). While men 'do' everything in society, women are expected to do their domestic duties, and in return, they will be loved, idolised, and honoured as a repayment. The masculine habitus intends to preserve women's femininity since "we see to it that when we turn to them we find the thing we want always in evidence" as Van states (160). In that sense, feminine and masculine gender norms are normalised and justified, and the limitations of femininity are generally constrained on behalf of patriarchy. Relatedly, Bauer-Gatsos (2002: 18) indicate that "…repetition is the only way to shape subjectivity within the set of constraints that have been established within the dominant ideology." As a result of these cumulative and repetitive stereotypes, Terry assumes that land full of women cannot be developed as he claims "…we mustn't look for inventions and progress; it'll be awfully primitive" (42). Thus, Terry is an embodiment of masculine domination in the novel.

Throughout the novel, Terry insults Herlanders as "fiddlesticks, morbid one-side cripples, sexless, epicene and undeveloped neuters" (64-172). According to Bourdieu's masculine habitus theory, these insults are the parts of symbolic violence. To display his dominance, Terry uses not only insults but also body language to legitimise his masculinity by pointing his finger while he is talking. Moreover, Connell's hegemonic masculinity argues that the domination of men against women is secured through hegemonic masculinity, which is a product of patriarchal society. In the novel, Van explains his thoughts on masculinity:

> When we say men, man, manly, manhood, and all the other masculine derivatives, we have in the background of our minds a huge vague crowded picture of the world and all its activities. To grow up and 'be a man,' to 'act like a man'—the meaning and connotation is wide indeed. That vast background is full of marching columns of men, of changing lines of men, of long processions of men; of men steering their ships into new seas, exploring unknown mountains, breaking horses, herding cattle, ploughing and sowing and reaping, toiling at the forge and furnace, digging in the mine, building roads and bridges and high cathedrals, managing great businesses, teaching in all the colleges, preaching in all the churches; of men everywhere, doing everything—'the world.' And when we say Women, we think Female—the sex (Gilman, 1999: 166-7).

Therefore, according to Connell's (1995) hegemonic masculinity, gender behaviours are gender projects referring to social constructions. This is why, Van associates men with the terms of manly, manhood, and finally the world while associating women with their gendered body. In addition to the masculine habitus, Gilman's "feminisia" describes the Herlanders in a different appearance and physical strength (14). Van paints a mental picture of the woman:

> We saw short hair, hatless, loose, and shining; a suit of some light firm stuff, the closest of tunics and kneebreeches, met by trim gaiters; as bright and smooth as parrots and as unaware of danger, they swung there before us, wholly at ease, staring as we stared, till first one, and then all of them burst into peals of delighted laughter (Gilman, 1999: 23).

Van's first impression of the Herlanders is significant since the women are represented as "not womanly" (71). Since the Herlanders lack "a woman's crown of hair," none of the men perceives the women as feminine at first sight. This social construction based on bodily appearances put a restriction on women in a heteronormative society.

The novel, a "male-authorised history," reveals gender stereotypes that are prejudiced to the image of "independent" women (Jansen, 2011: 109). Terry's speech in which he shows his ambition exemplifies this argument: "I'll get solid with them all—and play one bunch against another. I'll get myself elected King in no time—whew!" (Gilman, 1999: 42). As can be seen here, Terry fantasises about a place full of women where he is the king. The masculine domination behind Van and Terry's speeches unveils men's ambition for ruling. As this study concludes, this male domination is realised through language in the novel. The dialogues between the Herlanders and the male characters display how the people embody the gendered bodies and how this embodiment constitutes limitations through language.

Terry's speech has significant associations in the novel. Van focuses on Terry's utterances and points at Terry's misogynistic views. He displays sympathy for Terry because of his irreplaceable role as they "never could have done the thing at all without Terry," as "He was a man's man, very much so, generous and brave and clever" (35-42). Van's biased narration can be observed even after Terry attempts to rape Alima. As Ellador calls this incident as a "crime," Van answers, "Oh, come, that's a pretty hard for it. After all, Alima was his wife, you know," and he urges a feeling of "a sudden burst of sympathy for poor Terry. For a man of his temperament -and habits- it must have been an unbearable situation" (168-9). In this way, Van normalises Terry's attempt to rape his wife, and he urges the necessity to narrate his thoughts to support Terry in his manly deeds. This incident is a microcosmic example of how masculine domination is naturalised through historical narrations. In addition to the normalisation of rape,

Van justifies Terry's crime by saying, "But the more she [Alima] kept away from him, the more he wanted her-naturally" (162). Reeser and Seifert (2003: 89) state that "…men dominate social structures"; therefore, their symbolic or physical attacks are commonly taken as "natural occurrences of men's body." In essence, Van's narration normalizes Terry's attempt to rape Alima by blaming the victim because Alima's 'unwomanly' attitudes encourage and justify Terry's aggression.

Even though Van admits that some of the social labels on women are constructed by men, he maintains the gender dichotomies based on the body. For instance, Somel says, "We like you the best" and adds, "because you seem more like us," he means "More like a lot of women!" as he finds this resemblance disgusting (Gilman, 1999: 121). Thus, Somel considers himself a masculine man. Jeff, on the other hand, is depicted as a romantic man. Van articulates that Jeff "was no milksop or molly-coddle either. He was a strong, brave, efficient man, and an excellent fighter when fighting was necessary" (154). Therefore, throughout the novel, Gilman underlines that all the male characters stay within the constraints of masculinity though they display different types of masculine qualities. Accordingly, Pitt and Fox (2012: 38) indicate that "…multiple masculinities exist, and, as with relations of alliance, dominance, and subordination, these multiple masculinities act to demarcate the inside from the outside or the empowered from the powerless."

Gilman displays different masculinities in the novel. While Terry represents the manly man, Jeff is portrayed as the chivalric one. Hence, Terry frequently dominates Jeff, Van, and the Herlanders, while Jeff is illustrated as a passive man, albeit a chivalric one. Terry's treatment of others alone supports the view that, as Eckert and Ginet (2003: 37) state, "Men deemed feminine (or effeminate) are seen as inferior men. While women deemed masculine may sometimes be seen as inferior women, they are also seen as striving (if misguidedly) for what is in fact a valued persona." While those masculine appearances of women are commonly belittled, the effeminate associations are avoided in the novel. Hence, even in the slightest violation of gender norms, individuals' masculine identity is threatened.

In conclusion, *Herland* is analysed via speech act theory, gender performativity, and the major gender theories in this chapter. In *Herland*, feminine and masculine gender roles are constructed via speech acts. The language use forces individuals to fit into feminine and masculine gender roles; therefore, the characters perform their masculinity throughout the novel. Even though *Herland* assures that women can peacefully live without the limitations of patriarchy, it also displays that the Herlanders are defined with their maternal and domestic

responsibilities. As the Herlanders, male characters are limited within their idealisation of women, although, in the novel, male characters' masculine domination is illustrated via language.

CONCLUSION

In this study, speech act theory, gender performativity theory, and the major gender theories were used to create a theoretical framework to understand how the superior/inferior relation between women and men sustains itself in the selected literary works. As Butler points out, gender is a performative act that mainly results from performative speech acts. In this study, the construction of femininity and masculinity is analysed in *The Cleft* and *Herland* via Austin's (1962) speech act theory and Butler's (1988) gender performativity to display how the characters are compelled to conform to the feminine and masculine gender behaviours through speech acts. Thus, the male speakers' statements are analysed to reveal the speech acts in the form of implicit performatives, and their effects on constructing how femininity and masculinity should be performed. The main finding of this thesis is that in both texts, the male narrators' statements are composed of mainly implicit utterances to sustain the masculine domination over femininity. In both texts, the women's history is narrated by the men; therefore, readers are forced to depend on the men's perspective in the stories. The judgements of the male-authorised history normalise masculine dominance while restricting women to maternal or domestic duties of constructed femininity through the implicit performatives. As a result of speech acts, individuals perform femininity or masculinity to fit into society.

In the second chapter, Austin's speech act theory is explained. The primary purpose of this chapter is to reveal the significance of language in constructing and maintaining gender behaviours. The speech act theory, which emerged from Austin's lectures at Oxford, focuses on language functions. Austin's speech act theory, which has also been utilised in literary texts in recent years, provides an alternative method of analysis on language use by focusing on the dialogues and narration. Austin (1962) claims that each word creates an action; thus, language is a source of power rather than a tool. Inspired by Austin, Butler underlines speech acts' essential role in the construction of femininity and masculinity and broadly establishes her theory on gender performativity upon Austin's speech act theory. Furthermore, Butler's gender performativity and its relation to language are explained to support the argument of feminine and masculine constructions in the selected novels. Butler (1997) claims that there is no gender beyond expressions. These expressions require repetitions, and they are normalised as a ritual in return. As a result, femininity and masculinity are social constructions rather than biological labels. Therefore, language constructs feminine and masculine limitations and forces individuals to perform these gender behaviours. In the selected novels, Butler's gender

performativity is applied to unveil how gender behaviours are constructed for the sake of patriarchy. In these novels, the male narrators perform their masculinity while putting social limitations on the female characters. Thus, masculine domination is justified in both novels.

In the third chapter, femininity and masculinity are evaluated with the frameworks of Bourdieu's (2001) masculine habitus theory, Kohlberg's (1966) cognitive-developmental theory, Bem's (1983) gender schema theory, Weitzman's (1972) learning theory, and Freud's (2010) psychoanalytic theory. In the light of these theories, it is asserted that the gender roles of femininity and masculinity are normalised by environmental factors. This process, which starts with bodily differences, forces individuals to conform to certain gender stereotypes. As a result, social differences between men and women are naturalised, and masculinity becomes more dominant compared to femininity. If individuals act according to their gender behaviours from childhood, they are accepted by society. Therefore, individuals perform their gender roles in order to be recognised by society. The reason for using these theories alongside Butler and Austin is that the construction of femininity and masculinity is endorsed by these behavioural theories, in addition to examining the selected examples via speech acts and gender performativity. As a result, in both novels, speech acts turn into behaviours in society, and these behaviours normalise gender boundaries.

In the fourth chapter, the transition from an all-female society of Cleft to male domination in Roman society is observed while revealing the shift of power dynamics between genders. The gender dichotomy begins with detecting the physical diversities resulting in the Clefts' torturing the boys verbally and physically. Rescued from their tormentors, the boys survive without any attachment to the Cleft, and finally, a mandatory heteronormative society is developed after the destruction of the Cleft's mountain. In the novel, three different points of view narrate the Clefts' history. The first narrator is Transit, a Roman man; the second narrator is Maire, a Cleft woman, and the third narrator is a Squirt. Nevertheless, the masculine domination on narrating history is observed as Transit advises readers to overlook Maire's narration. On the other hand, Transit comments on the Squirt's story as a trustworthy source. The constructed gender norms are transmitted to the next generations through language; therefore, male-authorised history decides what will be narrated to the next generations. Moreover, the concept of masculinity, which is associated with heroism in Roman society, results from the male narrators' language use. For this reason, Transit's comments on gender norms are of great significance. In the novel, language is the primary medium for the persistency and normalisation of gender stereotypes to ritualise the heteronormative gender

norms. These norms are not totally based on nature but result from the environment using the major theories on femininity and masculinity. Henceforth, individuals separated as women and men based on their bodily differences perform their gender in order to fit into society.

In the fifth chapter, *Herland* is analysed using Austin's and Butler's theoretical framework. In the study, it is argued that femininity and masculinity are constructed and conveyed via speech acts. Throughout the novel, the incidents in Herland are narrated through Van's memory. Therefore, the masculine point of view and the male characters' judgements are reflected in the novel. Accordingly, gender stereotypes are commonly represented. As a result, the characters in *Herlan*d are obligated to adapt to feminine and masculine gender behaviours due to the reverse impact of implicit statements. To support this claim, firstly, the male characters' utterances are examined. Terry's masculine domination is associated with his usage of performative utterances. Hence, the male characters commonly use speech acts to display and legitimise their masculine dominance among the Herlanders. In doing so, Van avoids any effeminate attributions in their masculine habitus. Moreover, it is argued that women can peacefully live without the limitations of patriarchy; however, they cannot abandon the constraints of motherhood. Therefore, the feminine stereotypes in the novel are not utterly forsaken. The Herlanders are dependent on men for their connection with the outside world. They are exposed to the restrictive labels of patriarchy that imply masculine domination through speech acts.

To conclude, in both *The Cleft* and *Herland*, women's stories are narrated by male narrators who emphasise and legitimise masculine dominance over femininity via speech acts. The implicit meanings of these speech acts function as constant reminders in society. In both novels, the emergence of men in an all-female society is illustrated. The construction of femininity and masculinity, which is shaped by dichotomies, is examined through speech acts. *The Cleft*, which describes the transition from a female-dominated society to a male-dominated society, reveals how gender stereotypes restrict women to maternity and domestic responsibilities while associating masculinity with heroism. On the other hand, in *Herland*, three male characters encounter the image of independent women, and during their journey, they project gender stereotypes imposed on them by patriarchal society to Herlanders. Through implicit performatives, the male characters perform their masculine dominance over Herlanders. As a result, the male characters frequently use speech acts to describe, make a decision, and expound their views to normalise their masculine domination over femininity in the selected novels. They also legitimise their dominant presence in society by narrating and

commenting on the women's stories. The implicit meaning of these utterances function as a reminder that maintains masculine domination. Hence, femininity and masculinity are constructed by performative speech acts that entail gender performativity on individuals. The gender-based labels constantly pressure individuals to perform gender behaviours. In other words, femininity and masculinity are the masks that are consciously or unconsciously worn to be accepted in the social environment and cannot be wholly internalised. Hence, these gender-based roles affect all social life and play a primal role in constructing people's identity. Considered natural, the characters perform and transmit their feminine/masculine gender behaviours via speech acts in both *The Cleft* and *Herland*.

This study focuses on the male characters' speech to display the construction of femininity and masculinity in *The Cleft* and *Herland*. Hence, for further studies, an extensive analysis of literary texts by using speech act theory and aforementioned theoretical frameworks may reveal the dynamics behind gender dichotomies.

REFERENCES

PRIMARY SOURCES

Gilman, C. P. (1999). *Herland.* Penguin Books.

Lessing, D. (1997). *The Cleft*. Harper Parennial.

SECONDARY SOURCES

Albert, A.& Porter, J. (1988). Children's gender-role stereotypes: A sociological investigation of psychological models. *Sociological Forum, 3*(2), 184-210.

Allan, K. (1997). Speech act classification. In V. Lamarque & R. E. Asher (Eds.), *Concise encyclopaedia of philosophy of language*. BPC Wheatons Ltd.

Althusser, L. (1972). *Lenin and philosophy, and other essays* (B. Brewster, Trans.). Monthly Review Press.

Atwood, M. (1983). *Bluebeard's Egg*. McClelland and Stewart.

Austin, J. L. (1962). *How to do things with words*. Clarendon Press.

Bach, K. & Harnish, R. M. (1979). *Linguistic communication and speech acts*. MIT Press.

Baron, B. & Kotthoff, H. (Eds.). (2001). *Gender in interaction: Perspectives on femininity and masculinity in ethnography and discourse*. John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Bauer-Gatsos, S. (2002). *Reiteration as resistance: Performativity in the novels of Charlotte Yonge, George Eliot, and Margaret Oliphant* (Publication No. 3073950) [Doctoral dissertation, Lehigh University. ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global.

Baysal, K. (2013). *Reflections of ecofeminism in Doris Lessing's The Cleft* [Unpublished master's thesis]. Atatürk University.

Beauvoir, S. de. (2010). *The second sex* (C. Borde & S. M. Chevallier, Trans.). Alfred A. Knopf.

Bedell, G. (2007). Women and children first. *The Guardian*. https://www.theguardian.com/books/2007/jan/07/fiction.dorislessing

Bederman, G. (1995). *Manliness and civilization: A cultural history of gender and race in the United States, 1880–1917*. University of Chicago Press.

Bem, S. L. (1983). Gender schema theory and its implications for child development: Raising gender-aschematic children in a gender-schematic society. *Signs, 8*(4), 598-616.

Bem, S. L. (1987). Femininity and masculinity exist only in the mind of the perceiver. In J. M. Reinisch, L.A. Rosenblum & S. A. Sanders (eds.), *Masculinity/femininity: Basic perspectives.* Oxford University Press.

Bernaerts, L. (2010). Interactions in *Cuckoo's Nest*: Elements of a narrative speech-act analysis. *Narrative, 18*(3), 276-299.

Bettie, J. (2003). *Women without class: Girls, race, and identity*. University of California Press.

Bilgen, F. (2008). *An ecofeminist approach to Atwood's Surfacing, Lessing's The Cleft and Winterson's The Stone Gods* [Unpublished master's thesis]. Middle East Technical University.

Birdwhistell, R. L. (1970). *Kinesics and context: Essays on body motion communication*. University of Pennsylvania Press.

Black, E. (2006). *Pragmatic Stylistic*. Edinburgh University Press.

Bollobas, E. (1980). Speech acts in literature. *Hungarian Studies in English, 13*, 39-47.

Bourdieu, P. (1977). *Outline of a theory of practice* (R. Nice, Trans.). Cambridge University Press.

Bourdieu, P. (2001). *Masculine domination* (R. Nice, Trans.). Stanford University Press.

Bowers, E. (2018). An exploration of femininity, masculinity, and racial prejudices in Herland. *American Journal of Economics and Sociology*, 77(5).

Brown, C. (2011). The madwoman's other sisters: Charlotte Perkins Gilman, Gloria Naylor, and the re-inscription of loss. In J. S. Tuttle & C. F. Kessler (Eds.), *Charlotte Perkins Gilman: New texts, new contexts.* Ohio State University Press.

Budgeon, S. (2014). The dynamics of gender hegemony: Femininities, masculinities and social change. *Sociology, 48*(2), 317-334.

Bussey, K. & Bandura, A. (1992). Self-regulatory mechanisms governing gender development. *Child Development*, 63(5), 1236-1250.

Bussey, K. & Bandura, A. (1999). Social cognitive theory of gender development and differentiation. *Psychological Review*, 106, 676-713.

Butler, J. (1988). Performative acts and gender constitution: An essay in phenomenology and feminist theory. *Theatre Journal*, 40(4), 519-531. doi:10.2307/3207893

Butler, J. (1993). *Bodies that matter: On the discursive limits of sex*. Routledge.

Butler, J. (1997). *Excitable speech: A politics of the performative*. Routledge.

Butler, J. (1999). *Gender trouble: Feminism and the subversion of identity*. Routledge.

Candace, W. & Zimmerman, D. (1987). Doing gender. *Gender and Society* 1, 125–151.

Candace, W. & Zimmerman, D. (2009). Accounting for doing gender. *Gender and Society, 23*(1), 112-122.

Cereda, A. & Ross, J. (2012). *Masculinity/femininity: Re-framing a fragmented debate*. Inter-Disciplinary Press, Oxford.

Chapman, S. & Routledge, C. (Eds.). (2009*). Key ideas in linguistics and the philosophy of language*. Edinburgh University Press.

Chen, W. (2016). *The role of women in Thomas Ostermeier's production of Hamlet* [Unpublished master's thesis]. Free University of Berlin.

Chodorow, N. (1978). *The reproduction of mothering: Psychoanalysis and the sociology of gender*. University of California Press.

Claeys, S. (2007). *How to do things with Butler: An inquiry on the origin, citation and application of Judith Butler's theory of performativity* [Unpublished master's thesis]. University of Gert.

Connell, R. W. (1979). The concept of 'role' and what to do with it. *Australian and New Zealand Journal of Sociology,* 15, 7-17.

Connell, R. W. (1987). *Gender and power: Society, the person and sexual politics*. Polity Press.

Connell, R. W. (1995). *Masculinities*. Allen and Unwin.

Degler, C. (1966). Introduction. In *Women and Economics.* Harper and Row.

Demetriou, D. (2001). Connell's concept of hegemonic masculinity: A critique. *Theory and Society, 30*(3), 337-361.

Deaux, K. (1987). Psychological constructions of femininity and masculinity. In J. M. Reinisch, L.A. Rosenblum and S. A. Sanders (Eds.), *Masculinity/ femininity: Basic perspectives*. Oxford University Press.

Douglas, J. D. (2007). *Like a natural woman: Constructing gender from performance to performativity* [Unpublished master's thesis]. University of Rochester.

Eckert, P. & McConnell-Ginet, S. (2003). *Language and gender*. Cambridge University Press.

Felman, S. (1983). *The literary speech act: Don Juan with J.L. Austin, or seduction in two languages* (C. Porter, Trans.). Cornell University Press.

Foucault, M. (1978). *The history of sexuality* (R. Hurley, Trans.). Random House.

Freud, S. & Strachey, J. (2010). *The interpretation of dreams*. A Member of the Perseus Books Group.

Gibbons, A. & Whiteley, S. (2018). *Contemporary stylistics: Language, cognition, interpretation.* Edinburgh University Press.

Goffman, E. (1976). Gender display. *Studies in the Anthropology of Visual Communication*. Harper and Row.

Graves, R. (1964). *Man does, woman is*. Cassell.

Greening, C. M. (2009). *Develop yourself: Anxiety and performative masculinity in Robert Baden-Powell's Scouting for Boys* [Unpublished master's thesis]. Memorial University of Newfoundland.

Grice, H. (1987). *Studies in the way of words*. Harvard University Press.

Hani, H. (2017). *An ecofeminist approach to Margaret Atwood's Surfacing and Doris Lessing's The Cleft* [Unpublished master's thesis]. Atılım University.

Hannan, J. (2005). *How to do things with Fish and MacIntyre: Speech act theory, dramatic narrative, and the interpretation of moral utterance* [Unpublished master's thesis]. University of Carleton.

Hausman, B. (1998). Sex before gender: Charlotte Perkins Gilman and the evolutionary paradigm of utopia. *Feminist Studies, 24*(3), 489-510. doi:10.2307/3178576

Herskovits, F., & Herskovits, M. (1958). Sibling rivalry, the Oedipus complex, and myth. *The Journal of American Folklore*, 71(279), 1-15.

Hewitt, L. (1987). Getting into the speech act: Autobiography as theory and performance. *SubStance, 16*(1), 32-44.

Holtgraves, T. The production and perception of implicit performatives. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 37, 2024-2025.

Hudson, J. A. (2002). *She said, he said: Ecriture féminine and the mediation of masculine and feminine discourses in Charlotte Perkins Gilman's fiction* [Unpublished master's thesis]. Southern Connecticut State University.

Izurieta, I. (2008). Performativity in Buñuel's the phantom of liberty and the discreet charm of the Bourgeoisie. *The Modern Language Review*, 103(3), 753-766.

Jansen, S. (2011). *Reading women's worlds from Christine de Pizan to Doris Lessing: A guide to six centuries of women writers imagining rooms of their own*. Palgrave Macmillan.

Jehan, F. & Kirmani, M. N. (2015). Psychosocial models of gender development. *The International Journal of Indian Psychology*, 2(4), 192.

Jung, C. G., Shamdasani, S. & Hull, R. F. C. (1961). *Jung contra Freud: The 1912 New York lectures on the theory of psychoanalysis*. Princeton University Press.

Katz, L. G., et al. (1977). *Sex role socialization in early childhood education*. University of Illinois Press.

Kenlon, T. (2014). *Performances of womanhood in the eighteenth-century English theatre and novel* [Unpublished doctoral dissertation]. Northeastern University.

Khan, M. & Haider, K. (2015). Girls' first love; their fathers: Freudian theory Electra complex. *Research Journal of Language, Literature and Humanities*, 2(11), 1-4.

Knight, D. D. (2011). That pure New England stock: Charlotte Perkins Gilman and the construction of identity. In J. S. Tuttle & C. F. Kessler (Eds.), *Charlotte Perkins Gilman: New Texts, New Contexts.* Ohio State University Press.

Kohlberg, L. (1966). A cognitive-developmental analysis of children's sex-role concepts and attitudes. In E. E. Maccoby (Ed.), *The Development of Sex Differences*, Stanford University Press.

Krais, B. & William, J. (2000). The gender relationship in Bourdieu's sociology. *SubStance*, 29(3), 53-67.

Lalbakhsh, P. (2014). Subverting masculine ideology and monstrous power exertion in Doris Lessing's The Cleft. *3L: Language, Linguistics, Literature*, 20(3), 17.

Mander, M. S. (1987). Bourdieu, the sociology of culture and cultural studies: A critique. *European Journal of Communication*, 2(4), 427–453.

Marcus, D. & Overton, W. (1978). The development of cognitive gender constancy and sex role preferences. *Child Development, 49*(2), 434-444.

Martin, C. & Ruble, D. (2004). Children's search for gender cues: Cognitive perspectives on gender development. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 13(2), 67-70.

Martin, C. L., Ruble, D. N. & Szkrybalo, J. (2002). Cognitive theories of early gender development. *Psychological Bulletin, 128*(6), 903–933.

Maslen, E. (2014). *Doris Lessing* (2nd ed.). Oxford University Press.

Mason, J. (1994). Rhetoric and the perlocutionary field. *Philosophy and Rhetoric, 27*(4), 410-414.

McKinlay, A. (2010). Performativity and the politics of identity: Putting Butler to work. *Critical Perspectives on Accounting*, 21(3), 134-242.

McLean, T. J. (2001). *Ladies who refuse to be inconsequential: Body, gender, and national identity construction in three late-twentieth-century novels.* University of New Brunswick.

Miller, J. (2011). Resignifying excitable speech. *Women's Studies Quarterly, 39*(1/2), 223-226.

Mosse, G. L. (1996). *Image of man: The creation of modern masculinity*. Oxford University Press.

Nietzsche, F. (1968). *The will to power* (W. Kaufmann & R.J. Hollingdale, Trans.). Vintage Books.

Nischik, R. M. (1993). Speech act theory, speech acts, and the analysis of fiction. *The Modern Language Review, 88*(2), 297-306.

Petrey, S. (1990). *Speech acts and literary theory*. Routledge, London.

Pickering, M. (2015). Stereotyping and stereotypes. *The Wiley Blackwell Encyclopedia of Race, Ethnicity, and Nationalism.* doi: 10.1002/9781118663202.wberen046

Pitt, S. L. & Fox, C. A. (2012). Performative masculinity: A new theory on masculinity. In A. Cereda, and J. Ross. (Eds.), *Masculinity/femininity: Re-framing a fragmented debate*. Inter-Disciplinary Press.

Pollio, D. M. J. (2002). *How Vergil does things with words: A speech act approach to persuasive speech in the Aeneid* [Unpublished doctoral dissertation]. Bryn Mawr University.

Reeser, T. & Seifert, L. (2003). Oscillating masculinity in Bourdieu's La Domination Masculine. *L'Esprit Créateur*, 43(3), 87-97.

Reichardt, U. & Sielke, S. (1998). What does man want? The recent debates on manhood and masculinities. *Amerikastudien / American Studies*, 43(4), 563-575.

Reinisch, J. M., Rosenblum, L. A. & Sanders, S. A. (Eds.). (1987). *Masculinity/ femininity: basic perspectives*, 1(12), 3. Oxford University Press.

Reis, B. & Glossmark, R. (Eds.). (2009). *Heterosexual masculinities: Contemporary perspectives from psychoanalytic gender theory*. Routledge.

Ridout, A., Rubenstein, R., Watkins, S., Becket, F., Bentley, N., Frampton, E., Louw, C., Perrakis, S., Ridout, A. & Robbins, R. (2009). *Doris Lessing: Border crossings*. Continuum.

Sadock, J. (2008). *Speech acts*. In L. R. Horn and G. Ward (Eds.), *The handbook of pragmatics.* Blackwell Publishing.

Salih, S. (2002). *Judith Butler*. Routledge.

Schippers, M. (2007). Recovering the feminine other: Masculinity, femininity, and gender hegemony. *Theory and Society, 36*(1), 85-102.

Schroyer, A. (2001). *There was always something better which she might have done: Performativity and Victorian gender ideology in East Lynne, Miss Marjoribanks and Middlemarch* [Unpublished master's thesis]. University of Lehigh.

Searle, J. R. (2011). *Speech acts: An essay in the philosophy of language*. Cambridge University Press.

Searle, J. R., Kiefer, F. & Bierwisch, M. (Eds.). (1980). *Speech act theory and pragmatics*. Dordrecht.

Shakespeare, W. (1996). *Hamlet.* In T. J. Spencer (Ed.), *The new penguin Shakespeare.* Penguin Books.

Shields, S. & Dicicco, E. (2011). The social psychology of sex and gender: From gender differences to doing gender. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*. 3, 491-499.

Short, M. (1996). *Exploring the language of poems, plays and prose*. Routledge.

Sterling, A. F. (1985). *Myths of gender: Biological theories about women and men.* Basic Books.

Stets, J. E. & Burke, P. J. (2000). Femininity/masculinity. In E. F. Borgatta and R. J. V. Montgomery (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of Sociology, Revised Edition*. Macmillan.

Strathern, M. (1976). An anthropological perspective. In B. Lloyd and J. Archer (Eds.), *Exploring sex differences.* Academic Press.

Topinard, P. (1888). Le poids de l'encéphale d'après les registres de Paul Broca (S. J. Gould, Trans.). *Mémoires Société d'Anthropologie*, 3, 104.

Vanderveken, D. & Kubo, S. (Eds.). (2001). *Essays in speech act theory*. John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Ventress, K. (1975). *A cognitive developmental study of children's sex-role development* [Unpublished master's thesis]. University of Cape Town.

Waryck, J. J. (2003). *We were free—but where was a string: The struggle of nineteenth century women writers to escape the patriarchy on the page* [Unpublished master's thesis]. Roosevelt University.

Weitzman, L., Eifler, D., Hokada, E. & Ross, C. (1972). Sex-role socialization in picture books for preschool children. *American Journal of Sociology, 77*(6), 1125-1150.

Wittgenstein, L. (1953). *Philosophical investigations* (J. Schulte, Trans.). Basil Blackwell.

Wodak, R. (1996). *Disorders of discourse*. Longman.

CURRICULUM VITAE

Name and Surname:	Elif ÇELEN
EDUCATIONAL STATUS	
Graduated High School	Akhisar Anadolu Lisesi
Graduated University	Akdeniz University
Foreign Languages	English (C2), German (A2), French (A2)