

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

YÜKSEK LİSANS TEZİ

**THE MARGINALIZED FEMALE
CHARACTERS IN THREE CONTEMPORARY
BRITISH PLAYS**

YALÇIN ERDEN

2501130406

TEZ DANIŞMANI

YRD. DOÇ. DR. ARPİNE MIZIKYAN AKFIÇICI

İSTANBUL, 2017



T.C.
İSTANBUL ÜNİVERSİTESİ
SOSYAL BİLİMLER ENSTİTÜSÜ



YÜKSEK LİSANS
TEZ ONAYI

ÖĞRENCİNİN;

Adı ve Soyadı : Yalçın ERDEN Numarası : 2501130406
Anabilim Dalı / Anasanat Dalı / Programı : Batı Dilleri ve Ed. Anabilim Dalı
İngiliz Dili ve Ed. Bilim Dalı Danışmanı : Yrd. Doç. Dr. Arpine MIZIKYAN
AKFIÇICI
Tez Savunma Tarihi : 13.12.2017 Saati : 11:30
Tez Başlığı : "THE MARGINALIZED FEMALE CHARACTERS IN THREE CONTEMPORARY
BRITISH PLAYS "

TEZ SAVUNMA SINAVI, İÜ Lisansüstü Eğitim-Öğretim Yönetmeliği'nin 36. Maddesi uyarınca yapılmış, sorulan sorulara alınan cevaplar sonunda adayın tezinin KABULÜNE OYBİRLİĞİ / OYÇOKLUĞUYLA karar verilmiştir.

JÜRİ ÜYESİ	İMZA	KANAATI (KABUL / RED / DÜZELTME)
1- YRD. DOÇ. DR. ARPİNE MIZIKYAN AKFIÇICI		KABUL
2- YRD. DOÇ. DR. FERAH İNCESU		KABUL
3- YRD. DOÇ. DR. SEVAL ARSLAN		KABUL

YEDEK JÜRİ ÜYESİ	İMZA	KANAATI (KABUL / RED / DÜZELTME)
1- YRD. DOÇ. DR. ÖZLEM KARADAĞ		
2- YRD. DOÇ. DR. ZEYNEP BİLGE		

ÖZ

ÜÇ ÇAĞDAŞ İNGİLİZ OYUNUNDA ÖTEKİLEŞTİRİLEN KADIN KARAKTERLER

YALÇIN ERDEN

Bu tezin amacı Timberlake Wertenbaker'ın **The Ant and the Cicada**, Alice Birch' ün **Revolt. She said. Revolt again.** ve E.V. Crowe'un **I Can Hear You** adlı oyunlarını feminist kuramlar açısından incelemek ve 21. yüzyılda bile kadınları öteki konumuna taşıyan ataerkil araçları ve faktörleri sorgulamaktır.

Bu tezin Giriş kısmı bahsi geçen çağdaş feminist yazarların oyunları ile William Shakespeare'in **A Midsummer Night's Dream**'i arasındaki metinler arası benzerliklere işaret etmektedir. Birinci Bölüm Wertenbaker'ın **The Ant and the Cicada** oyunundaki kapitalist zulme karşı mücadele veren Zoe karakterine odaklanmakta, kapitalizm ve ataerkil sistem arasındaki işbirliği tartışılmaktadır. Ayrıca, kız kardeşler Zoe ve Selina arasındaki kıskançlık ve ihanet örnekleri vasıtası ile kadınları birbirlerini kıskanmaya iten sebepler sorgulanmaktadır. İkinci Bölümde, Birch'ün **Revolt. She said. Revolt again.** oyunundaki ataerkil topluma karşı başkaldıran **yaramaz** kadın karakterler üzerinde durulmakta ve dil, tecavüz ve pornografinin kadınları ötekileştirmedeki işlevi gözler önüne serilmektedir. Üçüncü Bölümde, Crowe'un **I Can Hear You** oyunundaki özel alana sıkışmış kalmış bir kadın olan Ruth'un deneyimleri ve vefat etmiş annesi Marie'den gönderilen mesajlar incelenmektedir ve ayrıca annelik ve ev hanımlığı gibi geleneksel rollerin kadınların ikincil konuma itilmesinde nasıl önemli bir rol oynadığı dile getirilmektedir. Sonuç Bölümünde ise ataerkil sistemin günümüz dünyasında bile çeşitli enstrümanlarla gücünü koruduğu vurgulanmaktadır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Öteki Kadın, Kapitalizm, Kıskançlık, Dil, Tecavüz, Pornografi, Annelik, Ev Hanımlığı

ABSTRACT
**THE MARGINALIZED FEMALE CHARACTERS IN THREE
CONTEMPORARY BRITISH PLAYS**

YALÇIN ERDEN

The aim of this thesis is to scrutinize Timberlake Wertenbaker's **The Ant and the Cicada**, Alice Birch's **Revolt. She said. Revolt again.** and E.V. Crowe's **I Can Hear You** with regard to feminist theories, and to interrogate the factors and tools of patriarchy that marginalize women even in the 21st century.

The Introduction of this dissertation refers to intertextual similarities between the plays by contemporary feminist authors and William Shakespeare's **A Midsummer Night's Dream**. Chapter 1 focuses on Zoe who struggles against capitalist brutality in Wertenbaker's **The Ant and the Cicada**, and the cooperation between capitalism and patriarchy is discussed. Besides, the reasons that force women to envy each other are questioned through the examples of envy and betrayal between the sisters, Zoe and Selina. In Chapter 2, the **mischievous** female characters who revolt against patriarchal society in Birch's **Revolt. She said. Revolt again.** are examined, and the function of language, rape and pornography in the marginalization of women is displayed. In Chapter 3, the experiences of Ruth who is confined in the private sphere and her dead mother Marie's messages sent from the other world in Crowe's **I Can Hear You** are perused, and also how traditional roles such as motherhood and housewifery play a crucial role in the subordination of women is pointed out. In the Conclusion, it is highlighted that patriarchal system still preserves its power even in the present-day world through its various instruments.

Key Words: The Marginalized Woman, Capitalism, Envy, Language, Rape, Pornography, Motherhood, Housewifery.

PREFACE

This study demonstrates that women are made to survive under patriarchal boundaries even within the present-day world through Wertenbaker's **The Ant and the Cicada**, Birch's **Revolt. She said. Revolt again.** and E.V. Crowe's **I Can Hear You**. Despite the fact that women of the century have faced certain economic, social and political changes or improvements, male-supremacy has not weakened significantly: capitalist system employs patriarchal tools and exploits women much more severely compared to men; restricted by patriarchal boundaries women are stigmatised as envious more frequently; language that devalues women still shapes the perceptions of people; rape continues to control women's choices and lifestyles; pornography degrades and objectifies women through disseminated female images; a great number of women are still confined within the private sphere. Yet, the feminist authors with their mischievous female characters help the readers and audience to become conscious of the unjust patriarchal order, and lead them to awaken from their deep slumber with their glimmers of hope. Therefore, both the conditions women suffer from and the writers' revolts against the unjust order are analysed in this thesis.

Firstly, I would really like to thank my supervisor Asst. Prof. Arpine Mızıkyan Akfiçici for her kind assistance, great support and tremendous encouragement. I would also like to thank my former supervisor Asst. Prof. Buket Akgün for her remarkable support and advice. Furthermore, I would like to thank my colleague Rıza Çimen who never withheld his support and recommendations throughout the writing process of this thesis. Finally, I would like to thank my beloved wife Gamze Erden for her endless patience and support.

İstanbul, 2017

Yalçın ERDEN

CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
ÖZ.....	iii
ABSTRACT.....	iv
PREFACE.....	v
KISALTMALAR LİSTESİ.....	vii
INTRODUCTION.....	1

CHAPTER 1

AN ANALYSIS OF THE MARGINALIZED WOMEN WITHIN CAPITALIST AND PATRIARCHAL BOUNDARIES IN THE ANT AND THE CICADA.....	10
---	----

CHAPTER 2

REVOLT AGAINST LANGUAGE, RAPE AND PORNOGRAPHY IN REVOLT. SHE SAID. REVOLT AGAIN.....	35
---	----

CHAPTER 3

DOMESTIC BURDEN OF WOMEN UNDER PATRIARCHY: MOTHERHOOD, HOUSEWIFERY, AND WOMANHOOD IN I CAN HEAR YOU.....	64
--	----

CONCLUSION.....	88
-----------------	----

BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	95
-------------------	----

KISALTMALAR LİSTESİ

- Ed. By.** : Editor
Ibid : Aynı Eser
p./pp. : Sayfa/ Sayfalar
Trans. by. : Çeviren



INTRODUCTION

Midsummer Mischief: Four Radical New Plays (2014) published by Oberon Books contains four plays by four women playwrights which were firstly presented by The Royal Shakespeare Company in Midsummer Mischief Festival in 2014, and as Holly Williams underlines in her interview with the playwrights of the festival, Royal Shakespeare Company “[...] is always likely to programme work weighted towards men and one male writer in particular, of course” (2017); however, as she further clarifies, deputy artistic director Erica Whyman wanted to break gender imbalance. Accordingly, the playwrights of the festival- Timberlake Wertenbaker, Alice Birch, E.V. Crowe, Abi Zakarian- are requested to create their works of art considering the provocative statement “well-behaved women seldom make history” (2007: xiii) which was also used as the title of her book by historian Laurel Thatcher Ulrich. Thus, the plays in the book are composed of **the mischievous female characters** that do not comply with the existing male-centred society’s allowable roles and raise their voices against abuses in such a social order.

Main focus of this study will be the analysis of the first three playwrights’ plays in the book **Midsummer Mischief: The Ant and the Cicada** by Timberlake Wertenbaker, **Revolt. She said. Revolt again.** by Alice Birch and **I Can Hear You** by E.V. Crowe in order to question the factors that subordinate and dehumanize women within male-centred social order. Furthermore, remarkable similarities between the plays and Shakespeare’s **A Midsummer Night’s Dream** will briefly be underlined, and in each chapter, patriarchal boundaries that limit women even in today’s world will be studied from different angles via feminist theoreticians.

The Royal Shakespeare Company makes it clear in the introductory part of **Midsummer Mischief** that they “commission playwrights to engage with the muscularity and ambition of the classics and to set Shakespeare’s world in the context of their own” (2014). Therefore, the plays which will be analysed in **Midsummer Mischief** have intertextual references to Shakespeare’s **A**

Midsummer Night's Dream as it could be perceived even through the title of the book.

Intertextuality, today, is one of the most significant literary devices, especially in postmodernist literature through which interconnectedness of literary texts is emphasized. Julia Kristeva states in "Word, Dialogue and Novel" that "any text is constructed as a mosaic of quotations: any text is the absorption and transformation of another" (1986: 37), and she underlines the interdependence of texts to each other. Roland Barthes argues in "From Work to Text" that the word "text" means "a tissue, a woven fabric" (1977: 159). Hence, the intertwined threads of the fabric or text indicate the interconnectedness of old and new texts. Barthes also points out in "The Death of the Author" that "a text is a multidimensional space in which a variety of writings, none of them original, blend and clash" (1977: 146). In that case, the creation of a pure text is impossible, and this impossibility leads postmodernist authors to construct intertextual references to various works of art which creates the interrogation of the notion of the text "as an autonomous entity, with its immanent meaning" (2004: 126) as Linda Hutcheon points out in **A Poetics of Postmodernism**. Through intertextuality certain similarities are constructed with different works of art, but they are deliberately disrupted and parodied via consciously created differences. As Hutcheon argues both intertexts of history and fiction become useful in rebuilding the centres of societies in a parodic way, but she also underlines that postmodernist parody distinguishes itself with incessant ironic signalling of the difference within the intertextual similarities (2004: 124). In this way, the centres of societies that are taken for granted could be questioned and this opportunity provided by intertextuality becomes quite significant for feminist authors to challenge the patriarchal order.

In the plays **The Ant and The Cicada, Revolt. She Said. Revolt Again.** and **I Can Hear You**, a postmodernist intertextuality is employed, and certain similarities concerning the characters and the storyline are drawn with Shakespeare's **A Midsummer Night's Dream**, but these similarities are disrupted by the playwrights in order to challenge the existing centre called patriarchy.

In **A Midsummer Night's Dream**, for instance, Hermia and Helena are depicted as close friends who have known each other for a long time, but their friendly ties are about to be split for the sake of a man called Demetrius, whom Helena is deeply in love with, and to whom Egeus, Hermia's father, promises to make her daughter get married. Although Hermia does not love Demetrius, Helena considers Hermia as the source of the problem that hinders her possible marriage to Demetrius. Therefore, she envies Hermia and cannot even tolerate her being happy with her lover Lysander. Hermia is ready to be subordinated to Demetrius who never hesitates to humiliate her. Thus, Helena betrays her close friend Hermia in order to win the affection of Demetrius. She tells Demetrius the secret of her friend, and reveals the elopement plan of Hermia and Lysander who aim to get rid of restricting rules of Athens that do not allow them to get married:

Helena: I will go tell him of fair Hermia's flight

Then to the wood will be to-morrow night

Pursue her; and for this intelligence

If I have thanks, it is a dear expense: (Shakespeare, 2014: 19)

Helena exchanges her bond with Hermia for the appreciation of Demetrius. Confined within patriarchal conventions, Helena considers the only way for happiness, and satisfaction should be through **catching** a man. Even if he hates and humiliates Helena, she dares to hurt her old friend. Because of a man, the relationship between the two women deteriorates, and through Hermia, Helena and their experiences Shakespeare displays how women envy and betray each other as they are made to survive within patriarchal boundaries.

In **The Ant and the Cicada** by Timberlake Wertenbaker, it is also possible to discover a similar experience between the sisters, Zoe and Selina. The sisters are depicted as two women figures that have envied each other since their childhood. Wertenbaker also displays how they become rivals and envious figures whose choices are restricted by patriarchy. In the play, the sisters do not fall out

with each other due to a love affair as it is for Hermia and Helena. However, a capitalist man, Alex causes a great trouble for the sisters' relationship. Like Helena, the younger sister Selina, who fiercely envies her successful and artistic sister, betrays Zoe and sets a plot against her with the cooperation of opportunist Alex. In order to commoditize the land which is inherited from the sisters' grandmother, Alex and Selina try to make Zoe sell her share on the land, and they achieve it to some extent. As it could be observed, the two plays have intertextual thematic similarities, and Wertebaker questions patriarchal boundaries inflicted upon women through Zoe and Selina who could be considered as modern versions of Hermia and Helena. Nevertheless, Wertebaker challenges the patriarchal order which is in cooperation with capitalism through the unruly character Zoe who stands against the plot set against her, and the playwright does not let Zoe become a victim like Hermia. In other words, she not only displays the patriarchal system, but also resists the system via her mischievous female character.

In Alice Birch's **Revolt. She said. Revolt again.**, it is also possible to observe intertextual similarities with **A Midsummer Night's Dream**. In Shakespeare's play, Hippolyta, the queen of the Amazons who are known for their fondness for freedom, is understood to be taken as a prisoner after a war, and she is going to get married to Theseus, the duke of Athens. For Theseus, Hippolyta is not different from a trophy or a decorative object that will garnish his crown as he reveals it:

Theseus: Hippolyta, I woo'd thee with my sword
And won thy love doing these injuries
But I will wed thee in another key
With Pomp, with triumph and with revelling. (Shakespeare, 2014: 11)

Using the word **sword** which connotes the penis he declares and highlights his victory over a rebellious woman according to the patriarchal order. Through his

statements, in fact, Shakespeare displays how women are considered as objects to be possessed within patriarchy.

In her play, Alice Birch also employs a nameless male character whose wording is reminiscent of Theseus. Before and during the sexual intercourse with his female partner, he addresses her like a sex toy and he considers his partner as a kind of chattel to reinforce his masculinity. Assuming her body as a battlefield, he wants to use his big penis like a sword to conquer and to be superior to her partner, but everything does not go as expected. Different from the victimized Hippolyta who becomes obliged to get married to Theseus in the end of the play, Birch makes her nameless woman character subvert the objectifying and dehumanizing language of her partner, and brings him into line. By her nameless mischievous woman character, she prevents the victimization of the woman and challenges patriarchal language through her.

Finally, certain intertextual similarities could be discovered between E.V. Crowe's **I Can Hear You** and Shakespeare's play, too. In **A Midsummer Night's Dream**, a father figure Egeus who dominates and controls his daughter Hermia is displayed. At the very beginning of the play, Egeus appears on the stage with Hermia and the two young men, Demetrius and Lysander. In the presence of the duke, Theseus, they endeavour to settle the conflict about the marriage of Hermia. Although Hermia desires to get married to Lysander, her father consents her to marry with Demetrius. Reminding the rules of Athens, he states that:

Egeus: [...] As she is mine I may dispose of her:

Which shall be either to this gentleman

Or to death; according to our law

Immediately provided in that case. (Shakespeare, 2014: 12)

He even contemplates death sentence for her daughter if she continues to disobey her father's will. Egeus underlines that Hermia is his possession and limits her

choices using his patriarchal power as a father. The power he holds is so great that as Theseus reminds Hermia a father is a God-like figure who assumes godlike omnipotence and omniscience, and Shakespeare clearly reveals what patriarchy or the rule of the father means through the attitude of Egeus and helplessness of Hermia.

E.V. Crowe also employs a father figure like Egeus in **I Can Hear You**. The father figure, David might not ask death sentence for her daughter, Ruth, but he is also an authoritative patriarch who does not pay respect to her daughter's decisions and will. She must be subjected to the central ideology of paternalism. For instance, Ruth's desire to play a game with her father is declined by David since he does not wish to seem a feeble masculine figure, and as an economically dependent woman Ruth is expected to act according to her father's permission. To sum up, through the relationship between David and Ruth, Crowe displays that the influence of the patriarchal order is still prevalent in the 21st century as it was in the Shakespearean period. Nonetheless, different from Hermia who is subordinated to a man through marriage at the end of the play, Ruth who could also be considered as a victim of the patriarchal order is depicted by the playwright as a woman who doubts and questions certain institutions of patriarchy such as motherhood and marriage towards the end of the play.

It needs to be noted that in **A Midsummer Night's Dream**, Shakespeare courageously displays what women experienced in the constructed patriarchal order of the late 1500s and early 1600s. As Theresa D. Kemp underlines in **Women in the Age of Shakespeare** (2010), women in the early modern age had very limited rights in society, and the patriarchal system expected them to act out their roles. Kemp further clarifies this condition as follows:

The roles of early modern women included daughters and wives, sisters and mothers; they learned and worked and played. But for the most part, they were not expected to be schoolgirls (whining or otherwise). As women, they were expected to be the silently beautiful beloved and not the balladeer (who gazes

upon her eyebrow rather than engaging her intellect)[...] Then, as now, social and economic class as much as sex determined the range of roles available to a woman during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. (2010: 29)

Women were expected to be passive, objects to be shaped and consumed in that period as Kemp underlines, but as a playwright ahead of his time Shakespeare could challenge the system to some extent. As Lisa Walters underlines in “Oberon and masculinity in Shakespeare’s *A Midsummer Night’s Dream*,” it is possible to see fluctuations in gender roles through Helena’s pursuance of Demetrius aggressively, Bottom’s being silenced by Titania and Oberon’s causing a kind of chaos in Titania’s realm (2013: 158). Furthermore, Hermia’s determined stance against her father’s will and Titania’s rejection of giving the Indian boy to Oberon might also be considered as gender-transgressive acts of that time. However, all the women characters are either subordinated to the men through multiple marriages at the end of the play or punished by their husbands. Therefore, patriarchy is maintained and consolidated through the final scene of **A Midsummer Night’s Dream** despite the displayed gender traversing female characters.

Modern playwrights construct intertextual similarities with Shakespeare’s play as it is displayed through the given examples, and they reveal the acute fact that very little has changed in terms of perception of woman and influence of patriarchy in modern society compared to that of the Shakespearean period. Yet, via intentional changes and disruptions within these similarities and mischievous women characters, they raise their voices against the subordination, degradation and objectification of women in the 21st century.

In the first chapter of this study focusing on Timberlake Wertenbaker’s **The Ant and the Cicada**, the capitalist system will be analysed, and how capitalism and patriarchy go hand in hand will be displayed through the experiences of the sisters, Zoe and Selina, and their interaction with the capitalist invader, Alex. In the end, how Zoe stands against capitalist patriarchal invasion

by not allowing the land to be commoditized by Alex and his collaborator, Selina, will be displayed. It will also be demonstrated that patriarchy still pervades the modern world collaborating with capitalism and tools of patriarchy serve for the continuation of the capitalist system. In addition, the examples of betrayal and envy observed between the sisters will be explored and the reasons that turn the sisters and women in broader sense into enemies in the patriarchal order will be interrogated underlining the fact that women are restricted more profoundly in patriarchy compared to men, and with their gendered identities women employ different methods in coping with the feeling of envy. Finally, especially focusing on artistic and anti-capitalist Zoe's uprising fury against the unjust constructed order, how the capitalist patriarchal system is challenged will be displayed.

In the second chapter of this study, through Alice Birch's **Revolt. She said. Revolt again.** three crucial tools of patriarchy-language, rape and pornography- will be analysed. Firstly, how language is loaded with male bias and how androcentric language used in everyday lives of people others women in society will be displayed through the dialogues of a couple who have heterosexual relationship. Furthermore, in what ways loaded meanings on words shape the perceptions of people and degrade women will be studied through the dialogues of a couple who plan to get married. Moreover, the feminine discourse which is expected from women to comply with will be discussed via the attitudes and dialogues of a grandmother, her daughter, Dinah, and her granddaughter, Agnes. Next, how rape and rape culture serve for the patriarchal order keeping women under the control of men will be examined. Furthermore, through a very young girl who is a victim of rape and a police officer's dialogues what women face after the crime of rape will be displayed. Despite the fact that women have no intention to be subjected to sexual violence, how they are considered as responsible for that crime by patriarchal culture, policing, and law will be pointed out. What is more, interrelation between the heterosexual marriages and the concept of rape will be interrogated focusing on the grandmother's past experiences with her husband. Finally, pornography which leads to rape culture will be questioned. Normalized violence against women, the commodification of women's bodies through

pornography, and its becoming more widespread with the use of the internet will be displayed with several examples from the play. In Birch's play the function of certain tools of patriarchy will be underlined, but most importantly how the playwright revolts against male supremacy and the patriarchal system will be demonstrated through mostly unnamed, unfeminine, misbehaving revolutionary female characters.

In the third chapter, through E.V. Crowe's **I Can Hear You** how women's self-actualization and gaining autonomous identities are hindered by male-centred society even in the 21st century will be studied. The condition of the women confined in the private sphere will be discussed especially focusing on the protagonist, Ruth and her relationship with the male characters, her father, David, her husband, Jim, and her dead brother Tommy's summoned spirit. In addition, the roles that subordinate women such as motherhood and housewifery will be interrogated and how magic realism is employed by the playwright with the aim of unravelling the sufferings of women will be studied. Through inclusion of the supernatural incidents such as the dead mother Marie's summoning trial and her brother's summoned spirit the acute facts and irregularities of patriarchal society will be displayed. While Tommy's spirit easily comes back to the world, Marie is not eager to come back. The reasons for such reluctance and the reasons for Ruth's searching for the crystal ball will be explored. In Conclusion Part, patriarchal tools that reproduce and consolidate the male dominance will be displayed briefly focusing on the examples from the plays which have been analysed throughout this study, and how these three plays function to question the patriarchal order will be discussed.

CHAPTER 1

AN ANALYSIS OF THE MARGINALIZED WOMEN WITHIN CAPITALIST AND PATRIARCHAL BOUNDARIES IN THE ANT AND THE CICADA

The Ant and the Cicada by Timberlake Wertenbaker, which consists of three scenes, could be considered as an outcry of women for salvation from patriarchal and capitalist violence. Elaine Aston argues in **Feminist Views on the English Stage Women Playwrights, 1990-2000** that Wertenbaker tackles big subjects (2003: 150), and the playwright proves it dwelling on various issues ranging from moribund democracy to loss of humanly values in the play. In this chapter of the thesis, three weighty points will mainly be discussed among numerous points she touches on. Firstly, what capitalism is, and in what ways the playwright displays this system will be analysed. Next, how women are affected negatively within the displayed capitalist environment will be chewed over. Finally, the reasons that create hostility and envy among women will be questioned with certain examples from the play.

The plot of **The Ant and the Cicada** is not developed in a fragmented way since it retains a traditional storyline on the whole without disrupting the sequencing of the story. Wendeline Philpott notes in the thesis “Deconstructing the Gender Paradigm: The Theatre of Timberlake Wertenbaker” that story is among the crucial tools for Wertenbaker to deconstruct gender (1992: 2). Thus, the playwright chooses to employ a plot which includes a typical story of the two sisters, Zoe and Selina in the play, too. The protagonist Zoe, who is fond of art and theatre, lives in a neglected estate inherited from her grandmother. She is really concerned with the current issues the world suffers from such as migration problem, capitalist brutality or collapsing democracy. She is a wise, anti-capitalist artist who does not believe in private ownership, and is in trouble with her urgent tax debts. However, she is just a self-absorbed, irresponsible, impractical person like a cicada singing all summer according to her sister Selina. Contrary to her

sister, Selina is in pursuit of gaining no end profit, and prefers to be on the side of miser ant (Wertebaker, 2014: 18). She is an admirer and supporter of capitalist investor Alex, and she is ready to sacrifice anything for practical use including her sister. The main capitalist figure and hedge funder, Alex, who manifests himself with John Lobb shoes and disapproves of strikes, seeks a way of commoditizing the sisters' land.

In order to activate the capitalist project- to make Zoe sell her share on the land, and turn that place into a commodity by building a complex- Alex and Selina as partners arrive in Greece, and meet Zoe. They pretend to offer Zoe an innocent help to pay her debts, but their real intention is a far cry from it. They get Zoe to sign the contract about the sale when she is drunk, and they feel closer to implement their capitalist plans. However, Zoe realizes the plan set against her, and struggles to stop it. Wertebaker making use of play-within-a play device lets Zoe overcome capitalist invasion despite the fact that she seemed to be with hands biding at first. In the last scene of the play, Zoe, her daughter Irina, and the students of theatre act a performance¹ which was organized earlier about a historical character Bouboulina, a very crucial heroine during the independence of Greece under the rule of the Ottomans. Zoe makes Alex and Selina act in this performance as hostages. Zoe, mixing the performance with reality, asks for the contract, but Selina hesitates to relinquish it. Despite having doubts about resorting to violence, Zoe aims her gun at her sister Selina and the invader Alex, and the play ends.

As it could be perceived, Timberlake Wertebaker uses binary opposed characters and images in her play such as capitalists/anti-capitalists, Selina/Zoe and the ant/the cicada. She tries to discuss her arguments more clearly, and let the reader interrogate accepted oppositions by doing so. For instance, the playwright, reminding the well-known fable of La Fontaine, associates the characteristics of the ant with Selina and supporters of capitalism. In addition, she associates the

¹ The performance arranged by Zoe and others is reminiscent of the performance organized in Shakespeare's **Hamlet**. Shakespeare makes the protagonist Hamlet discover the truth about his father's death and avenge by the help of the play "The Murder of Ganzago" acted in the play. Similarly, Wertebaker makes Zoe get her revenge through a performance within the play.

cicada with Zoe and the ones who are on the side of art throughout the play. In this way, making the reader question the justness of the ant's attitude towards the cicada in the fable, the playwright manages to discuss the brutality of capitalism.

Wertenbaker also displays the opposing mentality between the sisters at the very beginning of the play. While Selina considered the small amphitheatre on their land as a chance to lure a lot of American students, and have them pay a lot of money to study Greek tragedy, Zoe states that she built it just to act in (Wertenbaker, 2014: 10-11). Artistic value is vital for Zoe; on the other hand, monetary value and practical use stand as the meaning of life for Selina. Clashes of ideas also continue between Alex and Zoe, especially about the future use of the land.

In addition to the use of binary opposed figures, certain comparisons are made to clarify negative sides of capitalism. For example, bullfighting and capitalist violence are compared, and capitalism's being more violent is indicated by the playwright. It is implied in the play that devastating force of capitalism tries to control and exploit human beings, their lifestyles, language, freedom and all humanly values. They are all sacrificed for the sake of capitalist class' desire for gaining more and more profit. When viewed from this perspective, the playwright lets the reader discover that capitalism is more "subtle" and "well cooked" (Wertenbaker, 2014: 21) than seemingly violent bullfighting. Accordingly, it is possible to argue that most of the binary oppositions and comparisons prepare the battleground for Wertenbaker to point out and develop her ideas about capitalism efficaciously.

Capitalism is a constructed system rather than a natural one, and the lifestyle of the bourgeois class is imposed as the ideal one in capitalist societies. Capitalism naturalises itself, and makes people believe in its naturalness. Karl Marx encapsulates these facts with the lines below in **The Economic & Philosophic Manuscripts of 1844**:

We have accepted its language and its laws. We presupposed private property, the separation of labour, capital and the land, and of wages, profit of capital, and the rent of land-likewise division of labour, competition, the concept of exchange value, etc. (1959: 28)

Marx displays that the capitalist system is just a creation using the verbs **accept** and **presuppose**. Furthermore, the elements of capitalist ideology Marx juxtaposes have been imbedded in people's minds, and what humanity means has been wiped out. In other words, as Wertenbaker points out through the furious speech of Zoe, human beings are convinced by capitalism that they are not human beings, but economic entities (2014: 32). The playwright unfolds crucial rings of the capitalist system's chains one by one, especially with the stance of Zoe.

One of the rings of its chains, the language used in capitalist culture becomes the target of Wertenbaker's criticism. Capitalist mentality's values could be transmitted and recreated through language, and Wertenbaker draws the readers' attention to the fact that words are taken as hostages by capitalism. To the claims of Alex and Selina that "[...] the real world is economic" and that anti-capitalists "[...] keep the world afloat" (**Ibid., p. 32**), Zoe's response shows how capitalism has influenced the language people use:

ZOE: I have listened to people like you work at wiping out the language over the last forty years. The new words come in, like some new species that proliferates and suppresses the native ones. You've convinced us that we aren't human, but economic entities. (**Ibid., p. 32**)

Especially, with the use of mass media via TVs and the booming prosperity in Western societies in the 1950s, people have been subtly manipulated in accordance with culture and choices of the bourgeois class. Hence, Wertenbaker emphasizes that cultural and linguistic massacre have been on stage over forty years. The new words are introduced to the market and people are

persuaded to be capital accumulators. As Zoe later exemplifies, even the words such as art is transformed as creative industry (Wertenbaker, 2014: 33) to serve capitalist mentality.

The aim of capitalism is to acquire maximum profit from any object or entity. Rosemary Hennessy also emphasizes this fact in **Concise Companion to Feminist Theory** by stating that “the accumulation of profit is the motor of capitalism [...]” (2003: 61). Therefore, every entity that is considered as usable by the capitalist system is turned into commodities to have more profit. Wertenbaker also seems to be disturbed by capitalism’s commoditizing policy, and makes clear capitalist mentality’s principle of profit hunting through the characters, Alex and Selina.

In the play, it is clearly demonstrated that the ultimate value is monetary value for Alex. Even an artistic production: a tragedy may have price for him (Wertenbaker, 2014: 19). Not only a tragedy, but also the land is valuable for him as long as it is profitable. Furthermore, the olive trees, which are sacred in Greek culture and associated with the Goddess Athena, are sources of life for anti-capitalist Zoe, but they are trivial things to be destroyed in order to have a huge return for the capitalist invader Alex (**Ibid.**, p.30). For this goal, the well in the land must be turned into a swimming pool, the oil grove must be destroyed, and a Greek style, large complex must be built to have huge profits. In short, the land needs to be sold off, and developed for Alex to turn it into a commodity (**Ibid.**, p. 39). Selina also cares for nothing other than buying and selling and at every turn she tries to have more profit as she proves it with her attitude towards American students of theatre and sale of the land. The playwright depicting these characters whose aim is no other than accumulation of the capital reveals commoditizing side of capitalism, and she criticises the mentality which puts monetary value and profit gaining at the centre of life.

Capital owner group of people, whom Wertenbaker calls global economic yoke or the bourgeois class in Marxist terms, controls the governments or the systems of governance using its economic power. Nancy Fraser also underlines

this point in her article “Feminism, Capitalism and the Cunning of History” by stating that there has been a significant shift in the character of capitalism, and the shift from state-organized variant to neoliberalism enabled the capitalist system to use markets to tame politics (2009: 107). Thus, it is possible to argue that politics is also under the heavy influence of capitalism. Furthermore, democracy is exclusively identified with the bounded political community within this system (**Ibid.**, p.116), and the ones who do not obey the market’s standards cannot benefit from what democracy offers. In her play, Wertebaker also shows how democracy is prisoned by the market and the capitalist class through Zoe’s sentences:

ZOE: But your prize hostage is Democracy. Democracy can only exist if it obeys god the market. Your irrational and capricious God. Challenge the market, democracy will collapse, you say. (Wertebaker, 2014: 33)

Unfortunately, justice, fairness or democratic rights are valid for a certain group of people from higher society within the capitalist system. Power of the market is so great that it also controls liberalistic way of governance: democracy. As Zoe clarifies it later, democracy is expected to give power to people (**Ibid.**, p.32-34), but unfortunately the power is allocated to the capitalist bourgeoisie through controlled democracy. Furthermore, as Rosemary Hennessey signifies, the notion that an alternative to capitalism cannot exist has been promoted (2000: 55) so much that challenging or protesting irregularities brought by capitalism is prevented. For this reason, the playwright emphasizes that human beings are forced to live in such a constructed socio economic environment of capitalism that fairness, equality, and security cannot be questioned. Owing to the fact that a fact is what capitalist class dictates, people are banned from protest, forced to work in labour system and even the systems of governance are under the control of that capitalist class (Wertebaker, 2014: 33). The ones who question the laws of the capitalist system, the ones who do not comply with it are threatened to face the

wrath of the system just like Zoe experiences it as an anti-capitalist individual who rejects being a pawn of capitalist games. The playwright through Zoe's stance and indignant sentences questions the existing condition of governance and displays how even the liberalistic systems are chained by capitalism.

In capitalist societies, people consider themselves as free individuals. They are persuaded that they can do or have whatever they want. However, as Maria Mies points out in her book **Patriarchy and Accumulation on a World Scale**, capitalist commodity market creates the illusion that the person is free to fulfil her/his needs, desires (2014: 40). Marx also underlines that numerous indispensable freedoms of human beings have been replaced with free trade and it is presented as false freedom by the bourgeoisie (1959: 16). In this case, it could be argued that illusionary freedom within the limits of capitalist market is nothing more than the freedom of buying and consuming. Wertebaker also questions this **illusionary or false freedom** through Zoe's thought provoking sentence: "I can choose what kind of shoes I want, but I can't choose to have them" (2014: 33). She displays that even people's right to choose has been restricted in the capitalist system, and they are enslaved to be modern slaves who do not care about anything other than buying and selling like Selina.

Through Zoe and her struggle with Alex and Selina, the playwright makes the reader aware that the capitalist world, which is called as real, is just a creation. She demonstrates that capitalism is a set of artificial regulations which limit freedom, language, lifestyles of people, and in such a limiting environment women are also affected negatively. In the constructed capitalist system, it is even possible to argue that women suffer much more compared to men due to the fact that capitalism is in cooperation with the patriarchal system. As Zillah Eisenstein, one of the prominent socialist feminists who is among the first users of the term **capitalist patriarchy**, underlines in **Capitalist Patriarchy and the Case for Socialist Feminism**, there is no doubt male hegemony and patriarchy have existed long before the appearance of capitalism, but it is vital to note that the relationship between capitalism and patriarchy creates the existing oppression of women in society (1979: 5). Patriarchal ideology and its tools are modified in capitalism. In

this way, hierarchal control over women and the process of capital accumulation go hand in hand (Eisenstein, 1979: 51; Mies, 2014: 38). For example, the existing division of labour between men and women in patriarchal social structure continues or has even deteriorated with the advent of capitalism; the mentality that sees women as a kind of commodity or a sexual object has been consolidated and also male hegemony in many spheres of society has maintained itself on mass scale with capitalism.

Timberlake Wertenbaker is also of the opinion that capitalism and patriarchy are closely linked with each other. The parallelism drawn by the playwright between patriarchal religions and capitalism is one of the cogent evidence of this argument. Zoe, referring to Alex and capitalists in general, states that:

Zoe: [...] you brought your God. A very male God. A god as testosterone-filled, unpredictable and cruel as the God of the Old Testament with his chosen people. And as delusional as the God of the New Testament, promising a beatific afterlife. (Wertenbaker, 2014: 32-33)

Putting emphasis on the new God's being **male** and **testosterone filled**, Wertenbaker displays that capitalism is constructed on a patriarchal social structure. Furthermore, the old corrupted patriarchal religions' promise of "beatific afterlife," is likened to capitalism's promise of "economic heaven" (**Ibid., p. 33**). Hence, it is implied that the religions that promote male values, abuse human beings' belief are not dissimilar from capitalism which exploits women's rights, labour and body much more compared to men's. The capital stands to be the new God of the modern world, and women are still marginalized as it was the case within the creed of patriarchal religions.

In patriarchal societies, men can retain political and economic power in the public sphere, and that culturally constructed superior identity leads up to the

subjugation and exploitation of the ones-women- who cannot have access to that kind of power. As Kate Millet emphasizes in **Sexual Politics**, every corner of power within society is allocated to men in patriarchal society (1977: 25). Especially, the public sphere is occupied by men because women are made to act feminine roles which include domestic tasks and being obedient to men (fathers or husbands). Ann Fergusson and Nancy Folbre state in their article, “The Unhappy Marriage of Patriarchy and Capitalism,” that through capitalism male hegemony of patriarchal leaders- feudal lords, fathers- is transferred to a bourgeois class (1981: 322); on the other hand, patriarchal social structure is still preserved. For example, certain oppressive, patriarchal elements that Heidi Hartmann emphasizes in the leading essay of **Women and Revolution** such as heterosexual marriages, economic dependence on men, myriad institutions based on social relations among men-professions, clubs, sports, corporations- (1981: 18-19) do not come to an end in the capitalist system. Thus, it could be argued that capitalism, which cannot survive without exploitation and capital accumulation, maintains the existing oppressive social structure of patriarchy.

Having a close look on the characters that are active in the public sphere, it is possible to witness male hegemony in the play, too. From donkey driver who helped Alex and Selina when they first arrived in Greece to Stavros whom Selina handed in the contracts that show the land was sold are all men. Although it is not stated in the play, members of Golden Dawn² whom Zoe becomes obliged to ask for help are probably composed mostly of men. Even Bouboulina, a historical heroine acted by Irina, points out in her speech that she has ships and some money, but they are inherited from her dead husbands and a Russian called Count Stroganov³(Wertenbaker, 2014: 37). Moreover, Alex arrives in Greece seemingly as an investor with economic power, yet it is understood that he is a capitalist invader. As it is clear from the given examples, most of the spheres in social relations have been under male control, and within such a social structure women

² This political party is known for anti-immigrant policy and radical nationalist attitude. It has got 7% of the votes in Greece as Helena Smith underlines in “The Guardian” (2015).

³ A member of Russian Stroganov family that was famous for being quite rich, influential and colonizing activities as it is noted on the website named “Encyclopædia Britannica.”

like Zoe and Selina could easily be exposed to the exploitation of capitalism and patriarchy.

The industrial developments and wage labour system enabled male hegemony to be carried onto a greater extent in capitalism because, as Hartmann points out in “Capitalism Patriarchy, and Job Segregation by Sex,” capitalist patriarchy maintains sexual divisions of labour accepted in patriarchal societies (1979: 29). As Mies further underlines, women are turned into housewives whose generative power is limited to breeding and domestic service (2014: 69) or they are allowed to work in the public sphere, but only as labourers who are “economically dependent on men” (Hartmann, 1979: 208). Although it seems that women have employment opportunities as labourers in the capitalist system, they are considered as secondary workforce, they are underpaid due to the fact that capitalism is set on patriarchal mentality. As Rosemary Hennessy points out in **Profit and Pleasure**, “women are contradictorily positioned in capitalism as free workers and citizens, yet devalued as females” (2000: 5). Furthermore, single women’s having less wage compared to single men even lead women to get married (Fergusson and Folbre, 1981: 322), and these marriages contribute to the construction of families which are perfect tools to imbue the members of society with patriarchal ideology. Considering these facts, it is possible to state that capitalism seems to present forged economic freedom for women, but by making women economically dependent, it consolidates patriarchy indeed.

In the play, it is not possible to discover an explicit female oppression because of marriage. However, considering the relationship between Alex and Selina, an example of the exploitation of the women could be observed. Alex refers to Selina as a business partner (Wertenbaker, 2014: 23). Normally, a partner is expected to have equal rights and power with the other one. Nevertheless, Selina appears as a figure that serves for Alex’s aim and implicitly serves for capitalistic whims. While Alex has a title of clever businessman, Selina is just the sister of Zoe. In addition, because of being- especially economically- dependent, she is even made to lay a plot against her sister. Remembering the fact that women are considered as secondary workforce, and they are in general underpaid

in capitalist patriarchy, Selina is somehow a tool for Alex rather than a partner likewise unconscious women are useful objects to be exploited in the capitalist patriarchal system.

Considering the economic trouble that Zoe is experiencing- she has some urgent debts, her electricity was cut, she needs to pay the taxes, and she does not have any money even to pay for the boat which will carry the students that come for theatrical education- it is possible to state that she suffers from lacking economic power to earn her living. In spite of her botching Alex's capitalist plan of commoditizing the land through the end of the play, she was almost convinced by capitalist promises of Alex due to the fact that she was in need of urgent economic help. As it is seen from the given examples of Zoe and Selina, women's being economically dependent on men makes women unarmoured against exploitative policy of capitalism, which is under the control of men. Wertebaker, demonstrating a rich capitalist character as a man who tries to commoditize the land of women, emphasizes that the clothes of capitalism are attired on male body, and thereby unearthing the close relationship between capitalism and patriarchy.

In patriarchal societies women are considered as useful objects to be controlled. As Luce Irigaray points out in **This Sex Which is not One**, women have traditionally been a use value for men as well as an exchange value among them (1985: 31). Hence, in patriarchal cultures men retain a status as subjects while women are excluded, and they are taught to serve for men's desires through patriarchal ideology. In capitalism, women's exclusion as subjects and traces of patriarchal ideology still continue, especially through targeted profit hunts on their bodies.

In the article "Gender, Sexuality and Commodity Culture," Desiree Lewis and Mary Hames emphasize second wave feminists' contention that many women are indoctrinated to have perfection, to be desirable and accepted feminine figures in capitalism (2011: 3). In order to achieve that objective, capitalism uses certain tools such as diet, fashion and cosmetics as Sandra Lee Bartky, a feminist

philosopher, explains in her article “Foucault, Femininity, and the Modernization of Patriarchal Power” (1998). Through these tools, women are forced to transform their bodies and faces in accordance with the dominant patriarchal standards. During this transformation process, consumption is fuelled due to the fact that “capitalism promises desired or idealized body through consuming more” (2007: 123) as Neşe Öztimur points out in her article “Women as Strategic Agents of Capitalism.” Therefore, it is obvious that capitalism without dismantling patriarchal ideology targets at both women’s bodies and their economic potential. In order to reach that target, mass media, which is also under the control of capitalist patriarchy, ensures the continuation of constructed feminine identity of patriarchy on global scale through “the use, consumption and circulation of their (women’s) sexualized bodies” (Irigaray, 1985: 84). Susan Bordo also points out in **Unbearable Weight Feminism, Western Culture and the Body** that the rules of femininity and the products of capitalist industries are transmitted pervasively with the advent of TVs, films, magazines, advertisements (2003: 169). Thus, it could be argued that women are tried to be persuaded as sexual or desired objects for men, and they are made to consume more beautifying products via the media.

In the play, there are not direct references to the use of abusive mass media or exploitation of women’s bodies. However, Wertebaker uses a cage image to signify prisoned women in capitalist patriarchal society, and the conversation between Alex and Zoe nearby the bamboo cage is quite useful to discover the current statue of women in the capitalist world:

ALEX: Who goes in the cage?

ZOE: I think I start in there [...] Whats interesting is that when people see you through bars, even a few bamboo pieces, you lose all your trappings of power. Do you want to try it?

ALEX: Not really.

ZOE: There are all kinds of stripteases with women in cages. It’s very sexy, it seems. Shall I show you?

ALEX: It's not my sort of thing Zoe. (Wertenbaker, 2014: 22)

With Zoe's answer "I start in there," Wertenbaker underlines how women in capitalist patriarchal society are restricted by oppressive regulations of the system just as the bars of the cage imprison a prisoner⁴. Fashion, diets and beautifying products are all like the bars of a cage for women. Alex as a powerful masculine figure is not accustomed to become an object to be watched and confined, so he has hesitations in entering that cage. However, women start there as it is the case in non-fictional world. In fact, Wertenbaker indicates how the woman body, which is fashioned in line with male subjects' demands, is marketed like a showcase product within the capitalist system through this scene.

The act of striptease that Wertenbaker remarks in the cage has a symbolic value, too. Alan G. Johnson states in **Gender Knot** that a woman's body and a woman's stripping in front of a man means more than a mere satisfaction in patriarchal culture. Through striptease the woman is presented in a passive, obedient sexy way, and it settles women's position in that culture as a woman who pleases and meets male standards of attractiveness (Johnson, 2005: 171). Similarly, it could be argued that exhibited **sexy woman body** in media, magazines, and advertisements redefines women's position as a sexual toy in the capitalist system. Jean Baudrillard points out in **Consumer Society: Myths and Structures** that women are targeted much more in capitalist consumerist society, and made to redefine themselves as the finest object or the most valuable exchange material during the process of gaining profit (1998: 135). Therefore, Zoe's sentences "there are all kinds of stripteases with women in cages" and "it is very sexy, it seems"(Wertenbaker, 2014: 22) emphasize the fact that women are devalued as objects to be looked at and traded.

⁴ What Zoe experiences as a woman in a cage is reminiscent of the experience of the female character who is confined within a room covered with yellow wallpapers in Charlotte Perkins Gilman's "The Yellow Wallpaper". Like Zoe and women in the patriarchal order, she is expected to survive in a cage surrounded by men's choices and decisions.

During the commoditizing process or transformation to be the finest object, share of cosmetics, which appeal to women mostly in capitalist market, cannot be undermined. Through incentive cosmetic products and make up activity, women as active consumers and with their commoditized faces turn into kinds of useful tools in the capitalist system. In the play, how women internalize capitalist patriarchy's imposition related to make up is also questioned through the conversation between the sisters:

SELINA: I don't know. Nothing means much. I'm tired. It's not retail by the way, it's marketing.

ZOE: Sorry, what's the difference?

SELINA: It is the difference between the thing and the package. Improving the appeal by establishing a dialogue with public. It's extremely complex and subtle actually. And competitive.

ZOE: That's what it is. Your face. You've improved it.

SELINA: Only a little, around the eyes.

ZOE: I can't read it anymore⁵. Why do it?

SELINA: Because everyone else does it. Because that's the market [...]
(Wertenbaker, 2014: 28)

While explaining the difference between marketing and retail, Selina uses two words **thing** and **package**. As mentioned before, tools like cosmetics mostly target at women, and commoditized women are tried to be put into packages through these tools. As a capitalist and practical character, Selina also makes up and tries to improve her appeal because within capitalist patriarchal culture it is imposed that a woman must make up. As Bartky states, a woman is tried to be

⁵ In the play, Zoe cannot read Selina's face due to Selina's make up, so it is understood that Zoe has critical viewpoint on make up. Sandra Lee Bartky, contrary to cosmetic advertisements' fake promise of individuality, also considers make up as "highly stylized activity that gives little rein to self-expression" (1998: 33).

made over so that her lips become more kissable, her eyes seem more mysterious (1998: 33). In short, just like the strategies of using colourful packages to sell certain products, women are employed to beautify themselves to serve men as objects of male desire.

As it is clearly displayed through the experiences of the sisters, Zoe and Selina, the capitalist system is ready to oppress and exploit all possible sources of surplus value. Women stand to be one of the major exploited group in this system due to the fact that oppressive tools of patriarchy are not abandoned, and male hegemony which has been on women throughout the patriarchal history continue on global scale with capitalism. Women- as economically dependent figures, with their commoditized bodies or faces and as targeted consumers- suffer acutely from the capitalist patriarchal system. Timberlake Wertenbaker clashing the mentalities of Zoe and Selina displays the current condition of women under the control of capitalism, and criticizes this exploitative system making Zoe a spokesperson for herself.

In addition to focusing on women's being marginalized in the capitalist patriarchal system, Timberlake Wertenbaker leans on another problematic issue that is mostly associated with women. She creates a setting in which women envy and betray each other throughout the play. The playwright mostly employing two sisters, Zoe and Selina who have not seen each other for a long time, discusses the problem of envy, hatred and hostility among women.

It needs to be noted that human beings are social entities who interact with each other in a certain social environment. Therefore, as Nicole Gali-Alfanzo emphasizes in the thesis "The Experience of Envy Between Young Women and Their Female Friends: A Psychological Perspective," it is natural to see people compare each other during their interactions (2005: 21) with respect to their physical appearances, accomplishments, families, economic conditions and so on. Through these comparisons, people may try to designate their status or value in their environment. As Aaron Ben-Ze'ev, a professor of philosophy, emphasizes in his article "Envy and Inequality," people may endeavour to reduce uncertainty

about their selves or to improve their self-esteem (1992: 5) via these comparisons. However, comparisons of the self with the others may lead to the feeling of superiority or inferiority. Especially, if the outcomes of the comparisons are unfavourable or if the differences are beyond recovery in the eye of the self, (Ben-Zeév, 1992: 5) one deduces that he or she lacks something (an object, a feeling or an accomplishment) which the other does not, and envy arises.

Avi Berman in the first chapter of **Envy, Competition and Gender** defines envy as an unpleasant emotion resulting from the perceived difference between a person's state and that of the other (2007: 16). Envy, a natural emotion based on comparisons, may cause a kind of pain for the envier, and the pain needs to be killed. Rosemary H. Balsam, an associate clinical professor of psychiatry, states in **Jealousy and Envy** that the pain of envy felt by the envier can only be eliminated by redressing the balance with the envied one (2011: 192), and this can be accomplished by diminishing or even destroying the object of envy (Berman, 2007: 29). In the play **The Ant and the Cicada**, the sisters, mostly Selina, also seem to have compared themselves with each other. Negative results of these comparisons, envy or hatred and the attempts to redress the balance between them are quite prevalent throughout the play as they will be analysed in detail.

In patriarchal societies, it is believed that women envy each other much more compared to men. It could be asserted that men may envy each other as much as women. However, restrictive social structure causes a kind of envious atmosphere among women. Furthermore, the fact that women and men employ different methods in redressing the balance with the envied ones creates a difference between envy of men and women, and in the end, it leads women to be labelled as more envious.

Women try to survive in a world in which the phallus is at ultimate value. The value of women is defined by men, and women are made to be convicted of male superiority in patriarchal cultures. As Simon de Beauvoir states in **The Second Sex**:

Everything tells the young girl that it is for her best interest to become their (men's) vassal. Her parents urge her to it; the father is proud of her daughter's success, the mother sees a prosperous future in it; friends envy and admire one who gets the masculine attention [...]. (1956: 327)

Consequently, in order not to fall out with social inculcation, women automatically become rival figures in patriarchal society. Noam Shpancer, a professor of psychology, also puts forward in an online article named "Feminine Foes: New Science Explores Female Competition" (2014) that as women are made to believe that the source of success and power lies in being prized by men, they are forced to put up a struggle with other women to reach that source. Likewise, Luce Irigaray emphasizes that as commodities of male-oriented social structure women can only have a relationship which is full of envy (1985: 32). In that case, it could be observed that restrictions women experience and men's being ultimate power in male-centred society render women to compete and envy each other to get a chance to have power.

Wertenbaker displays such a case in the play **The Ant and the Cicada**, too. The younger sister Selina tries to persuade her sister to sell her share on the land, and she even cooks Zoe's goose through making her sister sign the contract when she is drunk. Noticing the plot set against her, Zoe has a row with her sister Selina due to the fact that she has betrayed her, collaborating with another man. Especially, Selina as a woman, who seems to have internalized patriarchal ideology so powerfully, does not hesitate to betray her sister. What is more, the sisters are confined in patriarchal society so firmly that they even become obliged to betray their dead grandmother. Their grandmother "[...] was interned in a camp as a communist" (Wertenbaker, 2014: 18). However, Selina serves Alex's capitalist goals of spoiling her grandmother's land. In order to get rid of tax inspectors, Zoe becomes obliged to get help from the members of the Golden Dawn who are fascists, and lets them organize a meeting in her grandmother's land without informing Selina. Depicting the sisters who become obliged to betray

each other and even their dead grandmother's memories, the playwright underlines the gravity of the problem.

Although it is Alex who causes the great disagreement between the sisters about the land, and who causes Selina's betrayal to her sister, neither of the sisters obviously considers Alex as the source of the problem if Zoe's being suspicious of Alex is not taken into consideration. These two sisters and women in broader sense try to derogate each other throughout the play while Alex laughs at their struggle (Wertenbaker, 2014: 18) as a man who controls power. Alex destroys the bond between the sisters, and he deepens the hostility between them. Via creating such a scene, the playwright illustrates how men and their patriarchal restrictions lead women to become rivals rather than be in solidarity.

Gendered identities and performances that Judith Butler underlines in *Gender Trouble* (1999) also play a crucial role in the formation of the label: envious for women. In coping with the feeling of envy, men may maintain their self-esteem through direct confrontation with their rivals thanks to the traits loaded on masculinity. Men are able to deaden envy by diminishing or destroying the threat (envied object) openly in competitive arenas allocated mostly for men. As Hylene Dublin in "The Evolution of the Female Self: Attachment, Identification, Individuation, Competition, Collaboration, and Mentoring" and Phyllis Chesler in **Woman's Inhumanity to Woman** point out, men are brought up and encouraged to be fearless, strong, and independent while women are taught to avoid aggression and to seek approval of others for fulfilling feminine roles (2007: 61; 2009: 95). In addition, men have access to valued domains in society; they are supported in patriarchal culture. Thus, a man in the patriarchal world can at least compensate his lack or failure in one domain through a success in another valued domain. For instance, a man who envies another man due to his being handsome may compensate his feeling of envy through his own success in his career. In other words, men can act and prove themselves in numerous domains, and regain their self-esteem or prestige in public. On the contrary, cultural limitations of patriarchal society make women unable to struggle with that feeling as directly and openly as men do. Women are made to suppress their competitive,

envious, aggressive feelings for the sake of being a perfect feminine figure which is deemed suitable for women. They are expected to be modest and nice in their relationships, and they are not awarded just like men for being physically aggressive (Chesler, 2009: 94). They also do not have cultural support to prove themselves in a valued public domain. Even women's being successful is hindered by reproachful eyes in patriarchal society (Gali-Alfanzo, 2005: 36). Hence, women employ indirect methods to feed the feeling called envy. Internalized patriarchal values and feminine roles inflicted upon women lead them to reveal their aggression or envy indirectly. Leyla Navaro also underlines it in **Envy, Gender and Competition:**

[...] a tacit, gender- bound contract inhibits most women from competing openly among themselves, leading female competition into stifled, indirect, camouflaged manipulations. (2007: 68)

In that case, women confront their perceived opponents indirectly in contrast to men. While confronting the envied one, spreading gossips, social exclusion of the envied, breaking confidences, criticising the other's appearance (Chesler, 2009: 117; Navaro, 2007: 128) or disguised tricks appear to be common tools. Through them, they try to diminish the rival's superiority, and it is possible to witness such **camouflaged manipulations** between the sisters, too.

For instance, Selina allows Alex- seemingly a helper but indeed an invader- to see the plans of the land without telling her sister. Furthermore, she urges Zoe to sign the contract about the sale of the land when she is drunk, and she achieves it in the end. She also gives the contracts to Stavros who is a crook for Zoe. What is more, she votes against her own sister about constructing buildings on the oil grove. In addition to her traitorous deeds and collaborations, she also tries to derogate her sister through gossip. After the sisters' heated argument about the unpaid taxes of the land and each other's characteristics, Zoe

leaves. Selina taking advantage of Zoe's absence, starts to talk to Alex- a stranger compared to her bond with Zoe- about her sister.

SELINA: We're very different, my sister and I. Of course there's the age difference, she's much older.

She was my parents' favourite.

Even if she was always in trouble. Like now. Totally self-absorbed and irresponsible. Look at this place. (Wertenbaker, 2014: 13)

It would not be true to state that Selina tries to exclude her sister from society through gossiping with Alex. Yet, it is possible to state that she tries to diminish probable value or image of Zoe that may arise in Alex's mind. Considering that women are made to be commodities in the competitive market of men in which youthful appearance and beauty of women are of great value, it is not surprising to see Selina attacking her sister's age. She tries to devalue Zoe as a woman in patriarchal culture through her emphasis on Zoe's age. By attacking on her age, Selina tries to compensate her feelings of hatred and envy against Zoe because of her being more sophisticated and her being the favourite daughter of their parents. Following the first punch on appearance, Selina focuses on Zoe's personality and tries to uncloak the defects that she considers to exist in Zoe such as her being irresponsible. In this way, she endeavours to diminish her envied object- her sister- in an indirect way.

Zoe does not use indirect manipulations so subtly as Selina does, yet she tries to undermine Selina verbally whenever it is possible. She tries to show Selina's insufficiency in every occasion. For instance, misspelling of Betty Friedan's book as "Feminine Mystics" is immediately corrected in a sarcastic tone by Zoe as such: "I think you mean the feminine mystique" (**Ibid.**, p. 27). When Selina refers to her forced role as "vicious jellyfish" in a performance she acted in their childhood, Zoe immediately corrects her mistake, and she humiliates her

underlining that “viscous jellyfish” was a proper role for her sister (**Ibid., p. 25**). Furthermore, it is discovered through the dialogues between the sisters that Zoe made her sister act a policeman with a truncheon when she was only eight. She caused her friends’ shouting at Selina as fascist pig while Selina, as a child, supposed to act Piglet in Winnie the Pooh (**Ibid., p. 27**).

Zoe continues making Selina feel inferior during a conversation about the sale of the land, too:

SELINA: The problem is you’re in trouble, you have no money, we owe a lot of taxes on this house and Alex is here to help. Can we focus?

ZOE: I am focusing. I’m focusing on the problems of invasion and democracy and national identity. I’m focusing on a local historical heroine called Bouboulina. That’s what I do. Focus. But I don’t suppose you understand.

SELINA: You always do that to me, don’t you? It’s what you always did. Tell me you wouldn’t understand, I was too little to understand you. Too stupid, too narrow-minded. Make me feel inadequate. That mysterious, superior, faraway look when you would put on your Creative Face. (**Ibid., p. 17**)

It is clearly observed that Zoe also attacks her sister verbally and she intends to make her feel ignorant or inadequate. It is also seen that these are long lasting attacks which have started in their childhood years and still continues up to the present time. In that case, the hostility or envy between the sisters (women) may have deep roots in their early childhood.

The relationship between a mother and a daughter may play an important role in the formation of envious atmosphere among women. Nancy Chodorow, a feminist psychoanalyst, points out in **The Reproduction of Mothering** that due to mothering of women by women, the girls feel less separate compared to boys who are supported to have separate characters both by parents and culture (1978: 93). Furthermore, the mother who is unable to recognize the daughter as a

separate person may lead to the daughter's feeling empty of herself (**Ibid.**, p. 101). Hence, the mother who imbues the rules of femininity to her daughter may affect the girl negatively. As Paula J. Caplan states in **Barriers between Women**, teaching young women nurturant role may terminate their nurtured role, and this termination may lead them to feel insecure and inadequately loved in their later lives as well (1981: 43). Thus, the reason why Selina hates her mother and considers her as "embarrassment" (Wertenbaker, 2014: 14) may be hidden in her relationship with her mother.

The learnings during the mother-daughter relationship continue to shape women's future lives, and "suppressed competition in order to preserve relationality" (Navaro, 2007: 73) becomes apparent in their relationships with women. They feel insecure in their relationships and also want to have close relationships with other women. As Phyllis Chesler points out "women long for intimacy with other women, but fear that a female intimate is also, potentially a betrayer" (2009: 317). Similarly, the characters Zoe and Selina have a very volatile and unstable relationship. On the one hand, they must both suffer under the tyranny of patriarchy; on the other hand, they are rivals in their cage for recognition.

ZOE: When you were little, I used to threaten you with terrible punishments if you betrayed me.

SELINA: You never even told me what they were but I was so afraid I never did betray you, did I? I wouldn't have anyway because you were my big sister and even though you generally ruined my life, I loved you and admired you [...]
(Wertenbaker: 2014: 26)

As it is clear from the dialogue between the sisters, since women are brought up to be rival commodities in the patriarchal world, they are afraid of being betrayed. Despite being afraid of betrayal, they cannot bear to lose each

other. Therefore, they experience a dilemma in their relationships as they experience with their mothers in their path to womanhood in patriarchal society.

Considering the hostility and struggle between Zoe and Selina, it is possible to state that women are made to be rivals in the patriarchal order since power is controlled mostly by men like Alex. In addition to this, because women are not supported and taught to confront their envied objects directly just like men, they are easily labelled as envious plotters. As Wertebaker underlines in the play, the hatred, envy and hostility among women seem to be examined very little, but “[...] the world that gives them little space” (2014: 18) stand to be the main cause of such feelings.

The playwright depicts the inconveniences of the capitalist and patriarchal world order, yet it is not possible to argue that she is hopeless for the future. There is no doubt that the limping world needs to be reshaped in order to free women from oppressive patriarchal mentality, culture, language and economic system. Timberlake Wertebaker indicates the possibility of reshaping the world making use of a play-within-a-play device in the last scene of **The Ant and the Cicada**. Historical heroine Laskarine Bouboulina, rehearsed to be staged by Zoe’s daughter Irina, takes the stage as the protagonist in this scene. Bringing a historical character to the present time, mixing the past with the present Wertebaker emphasizes the fact that revolutions cannot be anchored in the past. Bouboulina fought for freedom of Greece against the Ottoman Empire in 1821, and was a powerful and revolutionist woman who could stand against the corrupted Turkish Yoke (Wertebaker, 2014: 35). Similarly, Zoe stands against the brutal economic yoke through putting their representatives Alex and Selina into a cage as hostages and protecting the land from commoditization. She prevents the capitalist invasion and makes the victimizers victims in the end likewise an effeminate bullfighter terminates the violence of a brutal bull. By these drawn parallelisms, the playwright shows that just as Boubaolina lit the fire of independence in 1821, women like Zoe at present can outwit the inflicted abusive regulations of the capitalist patriarchal society. Reminding the women’s potential power through these misbehaving women against the patriarchal limits,

the playwright shrieks her hope for renovating “the world which is weary of its past” (Wertenbaker, 2014: 38) putting emphasis on the liberation of language and through inclusion of various walks of life with the help of the students’ roles including humanists, feminists, even fascists, old fashioned socialists and the poets such as Lord Byron and Percy Bysshe Shelley.

All in all, Wertenbaker tries to make the reader aware of brutality of the capitalist system, how it is constructed and presented as an indispensable system. The playwright displays what capitalism is in reality through Zoe’s challenging stance and statements, and she is able to criticize the capitalist system through the characters Alex and Selina. Furthermore, she emphasizes how the tools of oppression in patriarchal mentality are employed on a global scale within capitalism. Especially, employing a male figure Alex who tries to exploit the land and the women landowners, drawing parallelism between the patriarchal religions and capitalism, and displaying the current condition of the sisters because of the male-oriented societal system the playwright scrutinizes the connection between capitalist and patriarchal systems.

The playwright is also aware that women are dragged to be the other in the restrictive patriarchal system. They are expected to act feminine roles in society and directed to struggle in an intra-sexual manner within that restrictive social order. Due to the fact that women have very limited valued domains to prove themselves in the patriarchal system, rivalry among them also becomes more apparent. Also, they are taught to struggle within the boundaries of femininity as they learn it during the mother-daughter relationship. Displaying the problematic relationship and scenes of betrayal between the two sisters, Selina and Zoe, Wertenbaker questions the feeling of envy, hatred and hostility among women.

Timberlake Wertenbaker discusses, criticizes and finally presents her hope for the future. Shattering the idea of heroism which is associated with patriarchal manhood (Johnson, 2005: 84), reclaiming the sold land from a capitalist man and his accomplice; she deconstructs the gender bounds and defeats capitalist patriarchal violence. By displaying revolutionary and misbehaving women like Zoe and Bouboulina as victorious, she reveals her hopes for a change and

liberation from the boundaries of patriarchal society, and she takes a considerable step in order to fulfil her hopes by way of the play: **The Ant and the Cicada.**



CHAPTER 2

REVOLT AGAINST LANGUAGE, RAPE AND PORNOGRAHY IN REVOLT. SHE SAID. REVOLT AGAIN.

Revolt. She said. Revolt again. by Alice Birch presents sources of the sufferings of women in the 21st century patriarchal order ranging from marriage to pornography, unfair working conditions to the constrained female body. Creating a kind of discomfort through language, violence and sex scenes, the play gives glimpses of In-Yer-Face Theatre, and both the reader and the male characters in the play end up with concussion and confusion.

Julia Kristeva in **Revolt, She said**, whose title reminds one of Birch's **Revolt. She said. Revolt again.**, considers revolt as an act of interrogation, discovering and unfolding the accepted truth. According to her, a narrative, pictorial or musical creation could be considered as a part of revolt (2002: 85). Thus, Alice Birch's **Revolt. She said. Revolt again.** stands to be a revolt as an artistic creation. Furthermore, the playwright offers the reader to witness a radical revolt against the oppressive tools of patriarchy through the women characters' daring attitudes. Therefore, the play both as a work of art and in terms of its context could be considered as uprising fury against the patriarchal order.

The play, which is composed of four acts, is a collection of fragmented stories and experiences. As Alex Sierz states in an online review, the playwright "throws off the conventional constraints of setting, character and plot [...]" (2016). She thereby prevents the reader from being engulfed in the magic of the story. In addition, radical subheadings such as Revolutionize the World. (Do not Marry.) are used by the playwright throughout the play, and the keys to the door of revolution are displayed one by one through them. In act one, the playwright discusses how women suffer from the language used in everyday life, marriage, the working conditions in which they are not considered as equals of men and patriarchal mentality that try to shape woman's body with the help of the dialogues between couples, a male employer, a female employee, and a woman

who protests with her half naked body in the supermarket and two male owners of the supermarket. In Act Two, the playwright mainly questions the image of happy family life and motherhood through a grandma, her daughter Dinah and her granddaughter Agnes. In Act Three, Birch raises her concerns related to commoditized women images, porn and rape culture in a confusing way with overlapping conversations. In Act Four, the playwright declares an invitation to revolt through the dialogues between two women characters, but a heavyhearted atmosphere prevails in it.

Alice Birch forewarning “the play should not be well behaved” (2014: 45) commences with the first radical subheading Revolutionize the Language. (Invert It.). She surely deals with many problems modern women face, but the language stands to be one of the most influential issues for her. Therefore, she starts hammering away with the language.

Language is a significant regulative tool that consolidates and reproduces the existing social system. As Sally Johnson states in “Theorizing Language and Masculinity,” rather than being independent of external factors just as it is accepted in Saussurean approach, language is a living creature affected by external factors such as culture and social relations (1997: 14). In fact, language is, as Norman Fairclough underlines in **Language and Power**, socially produced and internalized by human beings (2001: 17). Therefore, a language which is shaped within patriarchal societal structure is also **produced** in accordance with dominant group’s (men) values, and this production automatically devalues the repressed group (women) as **the other**.

Most feminist philosophers and linguists accept that the existing language of the West is occupied by phallogocentric values. Judith Butler in **Gender Trouble** also emphasizes that power regimes of heterosexism and phallogocentrism constantly try to repeat their logic and metaphysics (1999: 44). Repetition of them enables the continuity of their mentality, and it could be argued that language is one of the most influential tools that provide such a repetition in social relations.

Furthermore, she puts forward that binary relations that could be discovered in language play crucial roles in women's exclusion in patriarchy:

The binary relation between culture and nature promotes a relationship of hierarchy in which culture freely "imposes" meaning on nature, and, hence, renders it into an "Other" to be appropriated to its own limitless uses, safeguarding the ideality of the signifier and the structure of signification on the model of domination. (*Ibid.*, p. 50)

Remembering that culture is associated with masculinity and nature with femininity, men- as the controllers of power and the patriarchal system- freely designates meanings (often negative or passive ones) both for nature and women.

In order to stop negative designations in language, what is presented as normal and natural needs to be questioned. All semantic, syntactical and grammatical boundaries that exclude women from actively taking part in language must be examined. For this goal, feminist philosophers such as Luce Irigaray in **The Speculum of the Other Woman** and Hélène Cixous in "The Laugh of the Medusa" advocate transformation or invention of a new language- even taking radical steps such as overthrowing syntax of the existing language that does not alienate them (1987: 142; 1976: 886). Dale Spender further argues in **Man Made Language** that redefinition of women in the language which is shaped by the patriarchal order is essential (1990: 131). In her play, Alice Birch first describes male-oriented perspective encoded in language and reveals constructed binary oppositions through the male characters. Next, she revolutionizes language by making women characters subvert the oppressive language, and it is even possible to state that Birch makes an explosion in language, which Cixous recommends, apparent throughout her play.

In the first act of **Revolt. She Said. Revolt again.**, it is discovered that most scenes start with the sentences "I don't understand[...]" (2014: Birch: 47,56,62,69) of the male characters. Only in the second act, Dinah as a woman could tell her mother that "[she] wanted to tell [her] that [she] understood" (*Ibid.*, p. 77). Creating such a detail, Alice Birch tries to display how men from

privileged position in society have problems in sympathizing with women. It is also reminiscent of Hélène Cixous' detection that the language women use may not be heard by the dead men's ears, which are accustomed to male-biased language (1976: 881). Then, it is possible to state that women are not understood in the patriarchal order which consolidates itself through the language used in everyday life, and it is interrogated thoroughly through the conversations between male and female characters in the play.

Firstly, the playwright sheds light on male bias in language through a long lasting conversation between a nameless man and a woman after dinner and during their sexual intercourse. At the very beginning of the play, the man articulates his love to his lover. While complementing on the woman's beauty, the language he uses unravels how women is considered as objects in patriarchal mentality. He states that:

You are a Brilliant Bright Bright thing- do you have any idea what your shoulders, bare like that, do to me, do my structure, to my insides – I want to make a brooch out of your hair and your pupils and your ribs – and I know that sounds fucking[...] (Birch, 2014: 47)

Using the word **thing**, he reduces her partner to an object. Despite the fact that his sentences may seem romantic, they reveal how the female body as a decorative object is fantasied by males.

After expressing his great desire of love making, he wants her not to move and to stay where she is. For him, she “look[s] completely and utterly perfect” (**Ibid.**, p. 48) with her body when she does not move. The playwright making the man use these expressions displays how women are considered as “[...] beautiful object of contemplation” (Irigaray, 1985: 26), and reveals the dichotomies prevalent in language which exalt man as active, controller and powerful while abasing women as passive, controlled and powerless.

Designation of negative meanings also exists in defining sexuality. In phallogentric discourse, which enables scientific support for the **culture** that Butler describes, women are defined as passive and receptive objects. Dale Spender points out that the patriarchal order wants to keep women sexually dependent, and female sexuality is falsely named in order to achieve it (1990: 175). At this point, inflicted phallogentric values which undermine femininity stands to be quite influential. It is even possible to state that through phallogentrism women are converted to a discourse that rejects women's own pleasures (Irigaray, 1987: 141), and by describing feminine sexuality as dependent, male hegemony becomes prevalent in sexual representations. Sexually passive female representations and active male representations give men powerful, demanding decision-maker roles; on the other hand, women become obliging attendants for male fantasies (Irigaray, 1985: 25). However, female sexuality is not so passive as described in phallogentric discourse. As Irigaray exemplifies, ovum is very active while choosing a spermatozoon and it is even more indispensable in the reproduction process (**Ibid.**, p. 71). Furthermore, Alan G. Johnson states "[...] the muscles in the vaginal wall are quite active" (2005: 87) during a sexual intercourse. As it is perceived, phallogentric mentality encodes male bias in the language used in everyday life, and binary oppositions that other women during acquisition or internalization of the language are reproduced. In this way, women are put on the other side not only sexually but also culturally through language.

False representation and negative meanings inflicted upon women welcome the reader at the very beginning of the play, too. The man wants to lay her partner down upon the bed, and have sexual intercourse with her. Having a close look on the verbs he uses, it could be argued the man considers himself as the ultimate source of power about the use of the woman's body and active participant of the sexual intercourse. In a bossy tone, he tells what he will do during the intercourse. The sentences he uses such as "I want to make Love to you [...] I am going to peel your dress [...] I am going to spread your legs [...] I want to lick you [...] I'm going to fuck you" (Birch, 2014: 50, 51, 52, 53) all show that

the man does not regard her partner as his equal. As it is perceived through the verbs he uses, the woman is no other than a sex doll that serves for the man's sexual pleasure. His incessant use of the subject pronoun **I** also displays that the man considers himself as a superior and indispensable figure while he deems the woman as an object to be shaped and consumed. Although the language of the man is male-biased, it seems as the normal or natural one. Its naturalness is so heavily internalized by the man that he does not accept using another expression other than his bossy phrases as it is clear from the dialogue with his partner.

- Laying you down. And making love to you.
- Or
- No or
- Or
- There is no Or - there is no other option
- Yes but
- I want to make Love to you
- Or
- With? (**Ibid.**, p. 49-50)

The man as an owner of the phallus is valued in patriarchal societal order, and he does not accept that there is **or** in language. Especially, his sentence "I want to make Love to you" declares the mentality that the man is an indispensable one compared to the woman who is allocated to survive in the object position.

What the woman revolutionize at the very beginning of the scene is that she teaches the man there is **or**. The man, who does not accept any other option in the language he uses, is taught that it is also possible to use the expression **make love with** rather than **make love to**. In this way, the playwright disturbs the monolithic structure of the language and gives a nod to plurality in language which does not objectify women.

After this seemingly inefficacious but a very profound step to revolutionize the language, the man tries to titivate his language because he seems to be convinced that there is **or**. He even asks his partner whether using certain expressions is problematic or not during their sexual intercourse. It is even

described in a humorous way by the playwright considering the man's endeavour to express his will of kissing as such: "I want to kiss you- With you. I want to kiss With/you" (**Ibid.**, p. 50).

The language used by the man is improved and put into question with the help of his partner. For example, the expression of **peeling** clothes is criticized by the woman and it is emphasized that the woman is not a kind of potato (**Ibid.**, p. 51). Similarly, the use of the verb **spread** is not welcomed and it is replaced with a less irritating verb **open** (**Ibid.**, p. 52). Even the use of the words such as **arse** and **bum** (**Ibid.**, p. 53) which have the potential of subjugating the woman are abandoned.

Especially, when the couple starts their sexual intercourse, the conventional language which reproduces the male authority during making love is distorted and challenged by the playwright. The throne of the phallus is shattered by the language the woman uses, and she revolts by not mimicking, copying celebrated phallogocentric models in language (Irigaray, 1985: 191). To the man's surprise, the woman states that "[...] I am on you before you are in me" (Birch, 2014: 54). She dares to "take [her] vagina" (**Ibid.**, p. 54) which baffles the man further as vagina is considered as gap or hollow rather than a sexual organ in patriarchal mentality. Furthermore, attributing certain verbs to the vagina, Birch invents new phrases that are not possible to see in patriarchal language. The verbs ranging from **surrounding** to **suffocate**, **scissoring** to **spannering** and **blanketing** to **locking** (**Ibid.**, p. 55) deconstruct the sexually passive woman image constructed in the patriarchal order. The man's authoritative discourse that derives its power from "[his] Big Hard Organ" (**Ibid.**, p. 54) is challenged by the woman transgressing the accepted borders and reclaiming her "Beautifully built Almighty Vagina" (**Ibid.**, p. 55). The man who expects to have sex with a **baby** is made a kind of **dildo** (**Ibid.**, p. 55) at the end of the scene.

Displaying such a scene, Alice Birch crosses the accepted borders in language that renders women to objects in society. Reclaiming female sexuality and transforming the language used in everyday life, the playwright revolts

against the oppressive tool of the patriarchal order that hinders women from expressing what they feel, experience and contributing to the construction of society without being the other. Nevertheless, it is not possible to argue that the playwright aims at the victimization of men through that scene. In fact, she attains to mirror how male-biased language- seemingly natural- oppresses and victimizes women.

The words and attributed meanings to them shape people's perception of the world, and it could be argued that they are controlled and shaped by patriarchal culture. The meanings that these words acquire could not be expected to be independent from the cultural limitations and pressure. As Susan Ehrlich and Ruth King in "Gender -Based Language Reform and the Social Construction of Meaning" underline both at the level of grammar and semantically language derogates women. They argue that "linguistic meanings, to a large extent, are determined by the dominant culture's social values and attitudes [...]" (1998: 164). Dale Spender further underlines "words help to structure the world we live, and the words help to structure a sexist world in which women are assigned a subordinate position" (1990: 31). She suggests that the meaning of the words used in everyday language needs to be questioned in order to stop alienation and muting of women. Hence, it could be emphasized that the words and their meanings under the control of patriarchy constitute and reproduce cages for women.

Alice Birch also focuses on and questions the meanings loaded on the words or concepts such as marriage and love. Through the perspective of the man, she displays the accepted meaning in patriarchal discourse related to marriage. The man wants to get married to the woman claiming he loves her. For him, marriage is spending a life with the beloved one, having a wife that makes him happy all the time, having a partner to go shopping or go on holidays, sharing what he has, including dinners, making babies and attaining security (Birch, 2014: 59-60). However, such words were not uttered by the man according to the woman. She emphasizes that by marriage he has meant reducing his income tax and inheriting her wage, deciding what to do with her body in case she dies in

another country, making her sign away her surname. Most importantly, she puts forward that the man wants to turn her into a kind of “chattel” and “a thing to be traded” (**Ibid.**, p. 61). She thinks that she will be made the man’s **possession** and **property** through marriage. In short, decoding the term she displays what is meant by marriage and what marriage is for women confined within patriarchy.

The playwright also questions the ceremony of wedding. Putting aside the associations of wedding with happiness, joy and flare of a magnificent heterosexual coupling, Alice Birch shatters the meanings related to wedding. In other words the playwright demythologizes wedding as phantasmagoria of middle-class hell. For instance, she likens wedding to a suicide bombing and the wedding dress to a suicide vest. She tries to imply that similar to a suicide bomber, a woman who gets married in the patriarchal order may lose what she has before. As she underlines, a woman during the wedding ceremony becomes a figure that “waltz[es] like a poppet (Ibid., p 57). She also likens the craze of shopping for the upcoming wedding and marriage to a kind of blowing up of a supermarket. As it could be perceived from the given examples, Alice Birch subverts the romantic discourse which is ornamented by patriarchal impositions. Unravelling the cloak of patriarchy from such concepts, she enables the reader to question what is normal and how language shapes people’s perception of the world. She challenges the patriarchal discourse through the metaphors like suicide bombing and chattel in women’s speech.

Dale Spender argues that words used for women carry the negative connotations while it is the opposite for men. She gives examples of certain words such as bachelor/spinster, lord/lady, master/mistress. She argues that the adjectives or names for the male still connote positively; on the other hand, the ones for the female either has acquired negative meanings or has long been used to derogate female selves (1990: 17-19). Similarly, Luce Irigaray in “Linguistic Sexes and Codes” emphasizes that valorised conceptions are masculine while devalorised ones are feminine (1998: 123). She emphasizes men are codified on the side of rationality while women are codified as irrational. Therefore, the words

that describe women have or have had negative meanings in the patriarchal order and it shows the male bias which is prevalent in language.

In the play, the words and phrases used by the boss for his woman employee under the subheading *Revolutinize the Work. (Engage with it.)* also reveal male bias in language. The man being unable to understand why the woman does not want to work on Mondays and wants to sleep more, asks irritating questions such as “are you pregnant?” (Birch, 2014: 63). Especially, his next question “you are a career girl?” (**Ibid.**, p. 64) needs to be analysed further. The phrase **career girl** itself reveals male bias apparent in language. It is not possible to see a phrase like career boy in language as doing career is considered as natural and normal activity for men. However, when it comes to women- who are tried to be confined into certain feminine roles as mother and wife- **career girl** is used to undermine or mock women who transgress the accepted boundaries of patriarchy. Employing a self-confident female character who is able to say courageously what she wants or does not want, and making her baffle the male boss, Birch takes a revolutionary step. The playwright not only displays male bias in language, but also interrogates and subverts it.

The words that are used during verbal violence also reveal male bias in language and they recreate the male dominance and control over women. For instance, aggression and power is heterosexualized through the expression **fuck you** (Johnson, 2005: 149). Furthermore, as Deborah Cameron states in **Feminism and Linguistic Theory**, “[...] taboo words tend to refer to women bodies rather than men’s” (1985: 76). She further emphasizes that the terms that describe women as sexual prey such as ass and crumpet are prevalent while it is not possible to see male counterparts of these words. In her play, Alice Birch reveals this fact through the speech of male characters. For example, the male characters in the play during the conversations about working conditions and undressing in the supermarket use the word **fuck** as regnant figures in society. As soon as the boss gets a bit angry during his conversation with the woman employee, he asks the question “are you having a Mental Fucking Breakdown?” (Birch, 2014: 65). Using the expression **fucking**, he reconstructs his authority. In addition, the

phrase **mental breakdown** reveals the mentality that confines women to the pole of the moon and irrationality for ages (Irigaray, 1998: 120). As Irigaray further clarifies, men are associated with the sun which is considered as the source of life while women are associated with the moon which is considered as harmful and enigmatic. Thereby, male-oriented rationality predominates in various agents of society including religion and women could easily be labelled as the other or the lunatic which enables the patriarchal system to control them conveniently.

In the supermarket scene, similar expressions are used by the men as well. A woman takes off her clothes in Aisle Seven where dairy products are sold. Exposure of the female body under capitalist patriarchal control creates no problem as it enables profit; nevertheless, the woman exposing her body on her choice perplexes both the customers and the male owners of the supermarket. In this scene, after the woman's undressing in the supermarket even if no one asked to see her body, one of the baffled male bosses states "[...] what the fuck you were doing" (Birch, 2014: 69), and they somehow try to dominate the speech. Despite the fact that both the boss and the male owners of the supermarket apologize for their languages, they also continue to dominate women through it. No matter how the men are challenged by the gender traversing women's deeds later, the men's use of such expressions is a clear example of the reproduction of male dominance through language. Moreover, the bosses in the supermarket insult at the woman focusing on the physical appearance of her. Although it may also be possible to witness a man's being insulted focusing on his body, the women, who are considered as sexual objects of male desire in patriarchy, are attacked much more. In the play, the male bosses using the phrases like "little sausage legs [...]" "curdled flab [...]" "muffin top [...]" "porky belly [...]" "fucking chicken thighs [...]" (Ibid., p. 74) derogate the women through attacking her body. Variedness of the expressions used for the female body and also the absence of such variedness for men reveals the androcentredness in language. Alice Birch displays a woman who suffered a lot from the capitalist patriarchal system's shaping her body, but she makes the woman protest with her half naked body and show that "[her] body is not a battleground" (Ibid., p. 76). In short, Birch does not allow the men to

subjugate the women in the play, but she also displays how severely the language used in everyday life affects the women negatively. What is more, she challenges and subverts patriarchal language if necessary by revolutionary women characters' speech and attitudes.

The language which is occupied with patriarchal mentality makes it difficult for women to express their experience and feelings, or they become obliged to conceive the world from the constructed masculinist perspective if such a language is not interrogated subtly. Therefore, as Irigaray emphasizes, language is too limited for women (1985: 214). Cameron also emphasizes that many women feel inhibited by the inadequacy of the words that enable them to express themselves (1985: 6). In the play, Birch also dwells on that problem through the conversation that is displayed under the subheading Revolutionize the World (Do not marry.). While the woman is trying to explain to the man how inappropriate it was to propose during her own mother's funeral, she experiences great difficulty in expressing herself:

- It was.
It was – I'm trying to find a
Words to.
.
What just happened was like
Was like.
It was like [...]. (Birch, 2014: 57)

Displaying the woman who could barely express what she feels or thinks, the playwright reveals how inadequate the language forged by patriarchal mentality is for women.

Women are doomed to a languageless presence in the patriarchal order and they become an absence or exclusion. In the play, the granddaughter Agnes, a girl

who cannot adopt such an order, is displayed as a character that has stopped talking and has been scratching her mouth until it bleeds. Remembering Cora Kaplan's detection in "Language and Gender" that male or female speech does not differ from each other considerably until puberty, but then females are muted in society (1998: 59), Agnes could also be considered as an example of silenced women. Presenting such a young woman figure, the playwright also emphasizes how difficult it is to adopt and survive through the androcentric language.

Language inhibits women from expressing themselves, but feminine roles inflicted upon women also mute their voices in society. The women who have long been alienated from the public sphere are made silent and as Cameron points out "[...] men speak, women are spoken for [...]" (1985: 154). In the play, while the couple in the first act are sharing their ideas about wedding, the woman's reproachful sentence also reveals what Cameron emphasizes:

- [...] I am supposed to be Silent Symbol of virginity yet simultaneously be Totally Relaxed about all sex we are having whilst you get to walk around Doing All The Talking in a suit. (Birch, 2014: 61)

The playwright is aware that women are even ritually made silent similar to the children under the control of their parents and criticizes the muting of women in the patriarchal order which becomes problematic with imposed "wifely silence" (Cameron, 1985: 154).

Deborah Cameron in "Performing Gender Identity: Young Men's Talk and the Construction of Heterosexual Masculinity" considers language or speech as a "performative model of gender" (1997: 49) that both reproduces and consolidates femininity. Like the traits of femininity such as being kind and obedient, the language which is deemed suitable for women in the patriarchal order requires kindness and softness. Robin Lakoff, one of the pioneers who questions patriarchal language, also emphasizes in **Language and Woman's Place** that women are taught to use weak expressions in their conversations, and it

restrains them from expressing themselves freely (1975: 7). Although she is criticized by linguists such as Deborah Cameron and Sally Johnson for being too refined, it could not be denied that kindness is expected from women in their speech.

While the playwright mainly puts the family and motherhood into question through a family picnic in the second act, she also displays what is expected from women in their speech, and then subverts those expectations employing the granddaughter, Agnes. Grandma, who does not have a name, represents the women who suffer physically and psychologically from men within the institution of family. As her daughter Dinah puts forward- who seems to have internalized patriarchal values- she got so depressed during her marriage that she even contemplated committing suicide (Birch, 2014: 83). She also tried to get rid of everything that reminds her of her marriage, and she does not want to remember or accept that she has a daughter. No matter how she suffers from the oppressive patriarchal order, the language she uses still reveals inscribed patriarchal mentality. Her use of imperatives “[...] there is wine on that shelf. Pour it [...] cut some of that bread [...] put salt on potatoes” (**Ibid.**, p. 80) shows that she expects her granddaughter to serve as it is typically expected from a woman in patriarchy. Consciously or unconsciously she contributes to the reproduction of femininity through the language she uses.

Dinah has forgotten what happiness means after having a child and has sleeping problems. She is concerned about her daughter who does not talk, eat and have energy to do anything, As Dinah sums up “she is starting to disappear entirely” (**Ibid.**, p. 78). In order to find happiness and help her daughter, she tries to evoke her memories. However, what she remembers is quite ironic. She states that “we always used to say Grace” (**Ibid.**, p. 80) emphasizing the excitement that she feels about it. Grace⁶ is expected from women in the patriarchal order, and there is a threat of disgrace for women while there is not such a risk for men.

⁶ The word grace which is used intentionally by the playwright is reminiscent of Timberlake Wertenbaker's **The Grace of Mary Traverse** (1985). Wertenbaker also questions the roles assigned for women and through the disgrace of Mary the playwright traverses gender boundaries.

Despite the fact that Grace is a name of a song, the playwright deliberately chooses that word to display what is expected from women in their speech.

Agnes as a young girl cannot adapt to the patriarchal order and cannot fulfil the feminine role that her grandmother and mother try to teach. Grandma asks her to sign Grace. Agnes tries to sign that song, but it hurts and she stops singing (*Ibid.*, p. 80). After her first trying, the conversation among these women is worth pondering on:

GRANDMA: I said Grace. That wasn't Grace.

AGNES: Grayce, Graysss. Grace.sssss. I

DINAH: It was beautiful, it was like a

AGNES: Buuuuuutiful I don't

DINAH: Little nightingale, it was lovely and perfect and

AGNES: Luv luvvv luvl I I'm sorry I don't [understand]

DINAH: She

GRANDMA: I said Grace not.

DINAH: Be kind. Be kind, please. Be kind.

AGNES: Kynd, Kiiind. Kind. Kind. I don't. I'm sorry. I don't understand...
(*Ibid.*, p. 81)

Through Agnes, the playwright mocks and subverts the words which are supposed to be used in typical feminine discourse that constitutes women as loving, dutiful, passive (1998: 305) as Jenifer Coates emphasizes in "Thank God I'm a Woman: The Construction of Differing Femininities."

In short, the playwright questions the language that reproduces male dominance over women. Birch employs male characters and their speech to display what is considered to be the norm of patriarchal society and underlines how language is in fact intervened by patriarchal and phallogocentric values. In other words, she shows how "the dices are loaded against women" (Spender, 1990: 159) in language. Furthermore, she revolts against the oppressive language

of patriarchy with the help of female characters' speech and acts. She questions phallogocentric and the semantic base of the words used in language, criticises the muting of women in society and reveals how language is refined for women. Irigaray underlines that "if we keep on speaking the same language together, we're going to reproduce the same history" (1985: 205). Being aware of this fact, the playwright makes her women characters interrogate language and she unearths how "language conceals an inevitable adversary" (Cixous, 1976: 887) in **Revolt. She Said. Revolt again.**

In addition to androcentric language that others women, Alice Birch with a feminist consciousness interrogates how rape and pornography function in the reproduction of the patriarchal order. Especially, through the confusing and overlapping dialogues of the characters and an unnamed little girl who was raped in Act Three the playwright both displays and criticises rape culture and its adjuvant tool: pornography.

Rape, which has been historically on stage, has enormous negative effects on women and is quite practical in consolidating the existing oppressive structure of patriarchy. As Susan Brownmiller states in **Against Our Will: Men, Women and Rape** "[...] from prehistoric times to present [...] rape has played a critical function" (1975: 15). The function of rape in reproducing the existing order, what rape is in reality and how it is perceived in legal procedures will be analysed to display the oppression of women through certain examples from the play.

Rape as a sexual assault could not be considered as mere act of crime or trespassing that happens between the perpetrator and the victim. It carries messages beyond its dimension of sexual and physical violence. Through a rape experience of a victim, grand messages are transmitted to women and society in general. Thus, as Holly Henderson puts it in "Feminism, Foucault and Rape: A Theory and Politics of Rape Prevention," "[...] rape is not simply a matter of violence. Rather, it is a concrete example of gendered violence that reinforces social structuring and gender oppression" (2007: 249). Rape functions as one of the pillars that help to prove male dominance over women in the patriarchal order.

As Jean Hampton points out in “Defining Wrong and Defining Rape” rape could be considered as a moral injury to women by which male supremacy is maintained, and women’s status as dominated and usable objects is reconstructed (1999: 135). Similarly, Brownmiller considers rape as a vehicle that enable men privilege and she continues that rape is “[...] a conscious process of intimidation by which all men keep women in fear” (1975: 15). In that case, it could be contended that rape functions politically causing fear among women and implementing the non-articulated rules of patriarchy freely. Susan Griffin in “Rape: The All- American Crime” goes far and defines rape as a kind of terrorism which severely limits freedom of women and makes them dependent figures to be protected by men (1971: 35). If it is accepted as terrorism, it is possible to state that rape plays a crucial role in alienating women from the public sphere and restricting their behaviours. Similar to suicide bombing that refrains individuals from continuing their social lives, rape makes women obey patriarchal boundaries and hinders them from **misbehaving**.

Elucidating what rape is, it is vital to put into question the reasons and the culture that paves the way for rape. In the patriarchal order, individuals perform their roles in accordance with musts of the constructed gender identities. As it was underlined earlier in the previous chapter, men are advocated to play the masculine role which requires being aggressive, commanding, and powerful while women are expected to act as passive, obeying and fragile figures in society. Moreover, the female body is controlled by patriarchal ideology which is collaborating with capitalism, and the female body is fashioned in line with men’s desire and will. In the end, as Henderson puts forward “discourses of power presents female body as violable and weak” (2007: 229), and considering the fact that male body is constructed as powerful and penetrator, it could be claimed that “social production of gendered female body [...] imbued with social meaning” (**Ibid.**, p. 248) may be seen as one of the influential factors that set the stage for rape.

Alice Birch also puts the constrained female body into question under the subheading Revolutionize the Body (Make it Sexually available constantly.)

through a misbehaving woman character who got undressed in the middle of a supermarket. The woman's long speech at the end of Act I needs to be pondered:

I have cut my eyelashes off. I have covered myself in coal and mud. I have bandaged my body up and made myself a collection of straight edges. Fortify. I have rubbed iodine, bleach and the gut of a rabbit into my skin until it began to burn. I have nearly emptied my body of its organs. I stopped eating for one year and three days, my body a bouquet of shell bone. I have eaten only animal fat until I rolled, bubbled and whaled and came quite close to popping. Fortify. Make my edges clear. Where I begin and air stops is my motherland. No? I have sat under sun lamps until my skin crackled, spat and blistered. I have pulled my hair out with my fingers and my teeth out with pliers. I have wrapped myself in clingfilm, foil, clothes, make-up and barbed wire.

No fortification strong enough.

Nothing to stop them wanting to come in.

Lie down.

Lie down and become available. Constantly. Want to be entered. Constantly. It cannot be Invasion, if you want it. They Cannot Invade you if you Want it. Open your legs and throw your dress over your head, pull your knickers down and want it and they can invade you no longer.[...] My body is no battleground, there is no longer a line of defense – I Am Open. There are borders here no more. This body is unattackable, unprotected, unconquerable, unclaimable, no different from air around it or bodies coming in because there Is no in come into, you cannot overpower it because I have given it you cannot rape it because I chose it you cannot take because I give it and because I choose it I choose it I choose it[...] (Birch, 2014: 75-76)

Giving examples from capitalist patriarchal impositions on the female body, she displays what modern women face under the bombardment of capitalist regulations. She baffles the male owners of the supermarket and stands against invasive mentality of men that considers the female body as a battleground. Emphasizing that her body is **unattackable, unprotected, unconquerable and unclaimable**, she frees her body from the restrictions set on the female body by patriarchy. Repeating the sentence **I choose it**, she also rejects the decisions made for women by men and puts her (women's in general) choice at the centre. In short, the playwright subverts the constructed image of docile and rapable women, and making the woman character acquire her self-autonomy revolts against oppressive regulations of patriarchy on the female body that lead to rape.

The mentality that considers women as sexual objects and private properties of men is also one of the influential factors that lead to rape. Giving examples ranging from ancient Hebrew culture to Celtic myths, romantic stories of Crusaders to religious stories, Brownmiller emphasizes that women were considered as properties to be exchanged and their virginity would determine or increase the value of women (1975: 19-24). Such a mentality indirectly leads men to see the right of abusing women's body either to get revenge on other male figures or to prove domination over women. Hence, the consideration of women as private property of men puts them into a very disadvantageous position. As properties of their husbands or fathers they are used as battlegrounds or any sexual assault against them by their **owners** goes unpunished. Catharina Alice Mackinnon states in **Toward a Feminist Theory of the State** that "rape should be defined as sex by compulsion, of which physical force is one form" (1989, 245) including the ones experienced between married couples. She implies that rape could not be understood fully without the confinements of heterosexuality, and its seeds are planted in heterosexual relations (**Ibid.**, p. 174).

Alice Birch also remarks this issue through Dinah's sentences about her mother's relationship with her father in Act II:

Dinah: You got trapped. You were completely trapped. Dady beat you up. He kicked the living shit out of you.

My Daddy – the man you lived with and had sex with and children produced- He used to Jump. With Boots on.

Upon your neck.

He used to hold a lit match between your leg and if you flinched he would punch upwards, breaking the walls of your cunt.

He used to bite your breast until they bled. He used to kick your knees for hours, not particularly hard, not this hardest, but kick until his back was drenched in sweat and your bones were shattered.

He used to rape you [...] (Birch, 2014: 82)

As it is clear from Dinah's description, the grandma was sexually abused, and she was raped many times under the cloak of marriage. It is understood that her husband has dominated her sexually and physically. While such kind of a sexual relationship may be considered as normal in society, her daughter dares to state that she was raped. Furthermore, displaying the granddaughter Agnes vomit when she hears her mother's description, the playwright emphasizes how disgusting it is to experience such an act. To sum up, it could be argued that Birch questions hidden form of rape prevalent in heterosexual relationships and subverts the exalted meaning loaded on the institution of marriage.

In addition to the interrogation of the image of the female body as rapable and rape in marriage the playwright displays that culturally rape and rapists are normalised and supported while what women feel is not taken into account. In the play, the raped little girl is later made to get married to her rapist, and it is suggested by the priest who solemnizes that:

[...] it really Is Better and Safer for everyone if You stay Indoors because otherwise you might get attacked and we can all go Outdoors but because none of You will be Outdoors then none of Us will be able to attack you so that's Nicest (Birch, 2014: 96)

Through the perspective of the priest traditional male perspective is reflected by the playwright and she shows how absurd it is to constrain women's choices while the source of the problem enlivens in patriarchal mentality. Making a man of religion articulate these sentences, Birch, moreover, emphasizes that rape and restrictions on women have a religious background. Furthermore, making the raped little girl repeat the phrase, **my choice**, during the marriage ceremony, the playwright underlines how a traumatic experience it is for women. More importantly, Birch questions what women's choice is and how their choices are scythed down for the sake of the continuance of the patriarchal order.

In addition to women's being restricted significantly through rape, the act of rape has become ordinary of patriarchy. In patriarchal culture, rape is merely

considered as a probable act performed by an **aggressive** man against a woman who does not take into account patriarchal boundaries. Birch criticises such kind of normalization in society through the conversation between the two male characters:

- Dolphins rape other dolphins of course
- Of course
- It happens in the natural world all the time which is probably why humans do it because nature does it first and I don't think it's that we're anthropomorphising their behaviour to justify our behaviour[...] (Birch, 2014: 98)

Although it is known that in nature it is not possible to observe animal rape (Brownmiller, 1975: 12), the man, in fact, tries to justify and neutralize the dehumanizing act of rape through misleading information. Similar to the mentality of these two men, rape is naturalized in patriarchal culture, and all the time rather than violators the victims face great troubles before and after the act of rape.

The influence of patriarchal mentality could also be observed in prosecutions, legal definition of rape and the rapist/victim. Brownmiller argues that rape could be defined as a criminal act when “[...] a woman chooses not to have intercourse with specific man and the man chooses to proceed against her will” (1975: 18). However, rape is defined from male perspective in legal procedure and due to problematic definition and perspective, not the perpetrator, but the victim (mostly women) is believed to be responsible for this act (Spender, 1989: 180). Mary White Stewart and others in “‘Real Rapes’ and ‘Real Victims’: The Shared Reliance on Common Cultural Definition of Rape” emphasize that cultural myths and stereotypes about rape in the patriarchal order become very functional and influential in legal definitions of rape (Stewart, Dobbin, Gatowski, 1996: 174). Remembering the fact that rape is a crime against men’s property in the patriarchal order, it could be asserted that in the process of policing, judging

and law male bias is quite prevalent⁷, too (Stewart, Dobbin, Gatowski, 1996: 165) Furthermore, as Jane Kim⁸ clarifies in “Taking Rape Seriously: Rape as Slavery” conviction rates of reported rapists are also very low (2012: 272), and it is one of the prominent evidence that displays male bias and rape supportive attitude in law and juridical operations.

Holy Henderson emphasizes that the burden of rape prevention is placed on the shoulders of women (2007: 233). Despite the fact that women are not the committers of the crime, in prosecutions and legal proceedings the victims’ (women’s) attitudes, behaviour and physical appearance are brought to the foreground. Both culturally and legally women are expected to be **virtuous** and women’s credibility is questioned when they testify. Whether they have consented or not is doubted and whether they have had **risky and inappropriate** behaviours that are probable to **provoke** the perpetrator and their sexual history is also put into question (Stewart et al., 1996: 161-172). In short, women are not allowed to experience freedom and autonomy within patriarchal boundaries, but when it comes to the crime of rape women are made a kind of scapegoat.

The playwright also leans on the problems women face during prosecution and legal proceeding. Birch unravels how the members of law and policing contribute to the crime of rape through displaying the experience of an unnamed little female character and with the help of conversations between the girl and the police officer.

Twelve-year-old girl was raped by a man, but the penalty the man got is quite ironic. The rapist was only asked to do community service: moving the lawn. Emphasizing the penalty he got, Birch touches on the law and unfair judgement. Moreover, the police officer who is called to the scene of the crime retains traditional woman blaming attitude and places the burden of rape on the little girl’s shoulders. Although the girl states that her windows are all broken, she

⁷ They also emphasize that women who have experienced a sexual assault do not report it with fear of social and legal condemnation.

⁸ Her study was mainly conducted on American society, but it is helpful to grasp how legal proceedings are profoundly affected by patriarchy.

has got blood all over her legs and she is extremely tired (Birch, 2014: 92), the police officer is not satisfied. He wants to see **real evidence** that shows she was raped. What is more, he thinks that the act might be “a choice that [she] made in terms of [her] living arrangement” (**Ibid.**, p. 92). Although the girl is the victim, she becomes obliged to prove that she was innocent and did not incite the rapist emphasizing that she had no make-up on (**Ibid.**, p. 89). In spite of the fact that it is not so clear, the girl is subsequently raped by the police officer. Displaying such a scene, Birch examines how policing and legislations serve for rape and the rapists.

Alice Birch also reveals how the threat and terror of rape shapes and controls women’s lives and restricts their freedom through the dialogue between the girl and the police officer.

- What are you Doing?
- None of your beeswax
- Think it is my beeswax
- Just cos you’re wearing A Uniform does not mean it is your beeswax.
- This is Exactly what it means
- You know you’re not supposed to be down here.
- Who says?
- Law.
- This alley back onto my house
- Right
- Not that it Is any of your beeswax, but this alley backs onto my property.
- Still can’t be down here
- Why not?
- For your own safety. Not allowed in alleys. You know that. (Birch, 2014:88)

The playwright clearly unravels women are dominated and controlled through the law which imposes musts of patriarchal culture and is full of male bias. It is emphasized that power of the threat of rape is disguised in the concept of **safety**. Furthermore, using the metaphoric term alley, the playwright also draws attention to women’s being alienated from the public sphere in the patriarchal order.

Apart from the interrogation of rape that controls women in patriarchy, Alice Birch questions pornography which feeds and is fed by rape culture.

Pornography, which has become widespread through common use of the internet, is one of the crucial tools that constructs and consolidates gender roles and male superiority in society. Through sexual, physical and verbal violence against women in pornographic contents what patriarchy supposes from women and men in the patriarchal order is subtly imbued. Furthermore as a profitable business it also exploits women and serves for the capitalist patriarchal ideology. In other words, pornography becomes functional in maintaining patriarchy similar to the act of rape.

Andrea Dworkin in **Pornography: Men Possessing Women** puts forward that power is allocated to men and they dominate in the patriarchal order through physical strength, their capacity to terrorize, power of naming, the power of owning and power of sex (1989: 13-23). Dworkin concludes that such kind of strains of power are reified in pornography's form and content (1989: 25). Thus, pornography could be considered as a tool that serves as a compact representation of patriarchal ideology and it perpetuates the objectification of women on global scale.

In pornography women are depicted as passive and receptive objects that serve for the pleasure and desire of men. On the other hand, men are depicted as aggressive, powerful and penetrating punishers. As Gail Dines underlines in **Pornland: How Porn Hijacked Our Sexuality**, porn transmits certain messages: women are ready to have sex and do what men ask, like to be verbally insulted (called as slut, whore, cunt and so on) and like to be physically and sexually abused (cum-shots, eating semen, slapping, double penetration, coercive sex and so on) (2010: xviii). Certain recent studies conducted on pornography also prove that men are dominating and women are displayed as targets or passive obedient figures in pornographic contents (Klaassen and Peter, 2015: 728; Wright et. al.: 254). Hence, male power is exercised and celebrated while women are degraded through pornography (Dworkin, 1989: 25). Furthermore, although it is not possible to reach a hundred per cent neat conclusion, Molcolm Cowburn and Keith Pringle state in "Pornography and Men's Practices" that pornography fuels

violence and aggression against women (2000: 54). To sum up, through pornography women are objectified, subordinated and dehumanized.

Alice Birch, who describes pornography as a “monster issue” (2015) in an interview with Andrew Dickson, also leans on this issue in the play. She starts Act III with a scene in which the characters either watch or comment on a pornographic content. There is no doubt she is well aware that pornography dehumanizes, objectifies and commoditizes women, but she questions pornography through the ironic sentences or slogan like phrases of the characters. For instance, she makes the male characters question whether the pornographic content, which is full of humiliation of women, passes the Bechdel⁹ test or not.

Pornographic messages and contents have been rather common in recent years and as Dines puts forward pornography, which desensitizes individuals to pornography, has become a normal of modern society (2010: ix). Therefore, pornography industry seeks to release hard-core contents in which male aggression and violence is greater (**Ibid.**, p.142) to appeal to its male consumers who expects “penile erection” (Dworkin, 1989: 124).

Gail Dines underlines in a review in response to Ronald Weitzer that gonzo which retains violent scenes, has become the most profitable and popular type of porn nowadays (2012). The male consumers’ booming interest in such kind of contents might demonstrate their desire to do these acts in their real lives, too. In the play Birch also questions such tendency of men. One of the nameless characters instantly states that “I am never aroused by porn [...]” (Birch, 2014: 86), but that character later remarks porn is not arousing “[...] except when it is horse porn” (**Ibid.**, p. 97). The sentence he utters clearly shows how individuals particularly men got used to pornographic contents and desire to see more violent scenes. Getting used to such contents neutralizes dehumanizing violence against women after a while and feed misogyny in society.

⁹ Bechdel test is a test put forward by American cartoonist Alison Bechdel to see whether a film or video includes sexism asking three simple questions related to women characters.

In addition to the man's statements about horse porn, the dialogue between the police officer and the raped girl also shows how violence and rape is normalized through pornography due to the fact that as Catherine Itzin states in "Pornography and Construction of Misogyny," "all pornography and prostitution is conceptualized as sex" (2002: 28).

- I just- I wanted to just as if you could not do that
- Do what
- That thing you're about to do – be fucked in your arsehole by that dog whilst those men jizz on your face till you vomit and they make you eat it up again- could you not do that?
- .
- Umm. It's sort of the Main Action of the scene.
- Totally appreciate that- really do. Bills – Um. To pay and and that. It's just that everyone thinks that's sex now. (Birch, 2014: 92-93)

As it clear from the dialogue, rape is justified and normalized through pornography, and it directly serves for the reproduction of rape culture. People are persuaded that pornography is sex and sex is pornography. Most probably the raped girl has experienced these dehumanizing acts by force. Catherine Itzin's detection based on certain studies on pornography that the great majority of rapists and child molesters are active users of hard-core or rape/child pornography (2002: 9) is very crucial evidence that verifies the bond between the act of rape and pornography, too. Accordingly, pornography not only displays women as degraded and subordinated but also it contributes to the act of rape and leads men to consider physical/sexual violence against women as normal.

The internet, which has become an indispensable part of modern life, is a very crucial shelter for the industry of pornography. Ronald Weitzer, who does not have a feminist stance, also does not deny in **Sex for Sale: Prostitution, Pornography and the Sex Industry** that growing internet facilitated sex work as a sector (2010: 1). Furthermore, Marleen J. E. Klaassen and Jochen Peter put forward in "Gender (In)equality in Internet Pornography: A Content Analysis of Popular Pornographic Internet Videos" that "internet pornography has been

accessible, affordable and internet has become the main source of pornography consumption (2015, 721). In other words, pornography is one click away for the consumers. Birch also draws the readers' attention to the close relationship between the internet and pornography through a very short dialogue:

- [...] Please click on About Me for more info and feedback.
- I will close my eyes if I see a pornographic picture[...]. (Birch, 2014: 86)

The playwright shows that it is possible to encounter any kind of pornography by means of the internet without much effort and underlines how easy it is to be exposed to pornography.

Pornography as a sector has been growing uncontrollably. Despite the fact that feminists like Andrea Dworkin and Catharina Alice Mackinnon have had great influence on the definition and restriction of pornography¹⁰, especially the governments controlled by neoliberalism cannot be influential in the termination and control of pornography. As Itzin states governments have had “[...] no real intention to prevent publication and distribution of pornography” (2002: 9). Certain legislations such as obscenity legislation have been ineffective in preventing pornography, too (**Ibid.**, p. 6). Alice Birch making one of the male characters state “I will be compiling a petition. In Relation.To it. And a survey. And yes, I will probably run for the parliament [...]” (Birch, 2014: 86) in case he

¹⁰ They define pornography in a very extensive way in **Pornography and Civil Rights: A New Day for Women's Equality**:

Pornography is the graphic sexually explicit subordination of women through pictures and/or words that also includes one or more of the following: (i) women are presented dehumanized as sexual objects, things, or commodities; or (ii) women are presented as sexual objects who enjoy pain or humiliation; or (iii) women are presented as sexual objects who experience sexual pleasure in being raped; or (iv) women are presented as sexual objects tied up or cut up or mutilated or bruised or physically hurt; or (v) women are presented in postures or positions of sexual submission, servility, or display; or (vi) women's body parts—including but not limited to vaginas, breasts, or buttocks—are exhibited such that women are reduced to those parts; or (vii) women are presented as whores by nature; or (viii) women are presented being penetrated by ob-jects or animals; or (ix) women are presented in sce-narios of degradation, injury, torture, shown as filthy or inferior, bleeding, bruised, or hurt in a context that makes these conditions sexual(1988: 36)

sees a pornographic content, implies in an ironic way that the governments and legislations are not influential to stop pornography.

It needs to be underlined that pornography has become a multi-million dollars business, and it is fuelled by the degradation and abuse of women (Dines, 2010: 51; Itzin, 2002: 8). Robert Jensen also considers pornography in **Getting Off: Pornography and the End of Masculinity** as the material sold in pornography shops and websites targeting mostly male consumers (2007: 53). The woman image depicted as a chattel or an object to be abused stereotyped the woman and the female body as submissive slave of the male desire. Thereby, women are sacrificed for the capitalist goals through pornography. Furthermore women are exploited much more compared to men due to the social factors they face. As Pala Molisa emphasizes in the thesis “Accounting for Pornography, Prostitution and Patriarchy,” economically dependent position of women, sexual assaults at very early ages, violence of men and pimps disadvantage women who become bit players in the industry of pornography (w.date: 45). Alice Birch also criticises women’s turning into stereotyped chattels through slogan like sentences:

- Hymens! Unruptured hymens for sale. Perfectly intact. Hymens come and buy our hymens- carefully removed, perfectly intact, utterly unravished [...]
- WOMAN FOR SALE! WHOLE HUMAN FOR SALE! IN THE NAME OF AHM SOMETHING REALLY BIG- WOMAN FOR SALE, ENTIRE WOMAN FOR SALE (Birch,2014: 87,96)

Emphasizing that women and their bodies are for sale, she criticises the industry of pornography which displays women as sexual preys and turn them into commodities as sex toys.

Alice Birch helps the reader to witness pornography’s influence on women and society using irony from time to time. She question how pornography normalizes violence against women and degrades them. Furthermore, she interrogates its unstoppable booming and how it turns women into commodities to be abused and sold. In the end, she announces her woe stating that human beings

“[...] stopped watching and checking and nurturing the thought to become the action at some point [...],” and end up with dry and arid wastelands (Birch, 2014: 99). What is more, in the final act, although she makes the women characters express their radical plans such as dismantling the monetary system, overthrowing the government, taking over the airwaves and the internet, and eradicating all men, she ends the play in a very sad tone emphasizing that “the whole world failed [...]” (Ibid., 101) to bring joy, fairness and equality into the 21st century society.

All in all, Alice Birch in her play **Revolt. She Said. Revolt Again.** courageously presents patriarchal boundaries and examines these boundaries ranging from androcentric language to the institution of family, rape culture to pornography with a critical perspective. Moreover, she makes her daring and rebellious women characters subvert and revolutionize what is taken for granted in the patriarchal order if necessary. Using irony, humour and shocking scenes throughout her play, she achieves to revolt against patriarchy and patriarchal mentality which objectify, subordinate and other women.

CHAPTER 3

DOMESTIC BURDEN OF WOMEN UNDER PATRIARCHY: MOTHERHOOD, HOUSEWIFERY, AND WOMANHOOD IN I CAN HEAR YOU

Patriarchy continues to subjugate women through various tools even in the present-day world, and **I Can Hear You** by E.V. Crowe displays the current condition of modern women who are constrained within the domestic sphere of the patriarchal order. Unlike the previous plays, it does not suggest radical steps to end patriarchal oppression. It rather serenely questions the patriarchal order using a very domestic setting such as a living room throughout the play.

The tension in Crowe's play, which is composed of four scenes, is largely triggered by the dialogues of the family members which are at first concerning the funeral of Tommy who is the brother of the protagonist, Ruth, and has died fairly recent. His unexpected death due to a traffic accident probably caused by Sandra, his girlfriend, brings all the family members together including Ruth. While Ruth normally lives in Dubai and married to a man called Jim, Ruth and Tommy's mother, Marie, is understood to have passed away earlier. Furthermore, their father David is introduced as a classical patriarchal father figure who likes to patronize and control the family members, especially the female ones.

In the first scene of the play, the characters especially Ruth and David have conversations related to the preparations for the funeral, the food served during the funeral, and make assumptions about Sandra's mood after her lover's death. Through the end of the scene, Sandra asks Ruth and David to let her summon the spirit of Tommy via a crystal gazer woman Ellie using his lock of hair. The scene comes to an end after the sarcastic sentences of Ruth about the chores. The second scene starts with Ruth's and David's comparisons of the number of the attendants in Tommy's and Marie's funerals. Ruth is torn between going back to take care of her husband and staying with her father to look after him. After a while, Ellie who stays in the room silently is noticed. Informed

earlier by Sandra, she underlines that she is really impressed by their lovely family, and she further points out that the endeavours of the family members for the funeral of Tommy were quite moving. Afterwards, Sandra comes in and surprises Ruth via her newly made decision about working as a teacher. Sandra underlines that she has missed Tommy through the end of the scene, and she also implies that she will try to communicate with Tommy's spirit with the help of Ellie.

In the next scene, Ruth is on the telephone and as a woman who feels responsible for her husband gives advice to Jim to get protected from boiling hot weather in Dubai. After having a short quarrel with her father about the phone call and the bill, they talk about a game that was played by Tommy and David in the past. Ruth questions the reasons that hinder her from playing the same game. Then, the doorbell rings, and a big surprise awaits Ruth and David when Sandra comes in with a guest and it is no other than the spirit of Tommy. As soon as he comes in, he mocks Ruth and Sandra from time to time; he gives orders and wants to get served food and drink. He even patronizes Sandra and tries to discourage her from taking the job. What Ruth experiences until this moment makes her question the concept of motherhood. In the final scene, Ellie is back again, and they try to communicate with Marie. She asks them to bring certain items, which shows that they value Marie. However, what they bring is a recipe book, a ring which was not worn by Marie, a postcard which was not sent. Their first trial does not seem to be successful as the pendulum- whose movement gives a message- does not move. The second trial works, but there is a problem. Although Marie hears them, she does not want to come back. The question of Ellie "Marie, do you wish to come back to us?" (Crowe, 2014: 133) is answered negatively as "the pendulum swings clearly to the right" (*Ibid.*, p. 133), which means obviously no. Following the summoning session, the spirit of Tommy continues to behave irrespectively and gives commands just as her father does, but this session leads Ruth to have doubts about whether her mother heard them, and whether she had a happy life or not. Although David is aware that Marie answered Ellie's question negatively, he gets off the subject stating "maybe she didn't hear us" (Crowe,

2014: 135). Afterwards, the phone rings and Jim is on the phone. Ruth is asked to talk to him, but patting the floor she searches for “the little blue crystal” (*Ibid.*, p. 135), and the play ends.

As it can be perceived from the summary, a seemingly humdrum plot attains a very lively atmosphere and monotony of realistic descriptions is broken through the inclusion of supernatural elements such as crystal gazing and summoned spirits. Considering the plot of the play revolving around calling up spirits, Michael Billington underlines in his review that the play could be considered as the modern version of **Blithe Spirit** (1945)¹¹ by Noel Coward (2014). Although a thematic correlation between the plays is not possible to observe, it could not be denied that both plays include fantastic, extraordinary and supernatural elements, and have similar plot structures. In an interview in “The Independent,” E.V. Crowe herself describes the play as “supernatural naturalistic play” (Williams, 2017). Without ignoring the playwright’s definition, it could also be argued that the play bears the characteristics of magic realism which is renowned as a literary mode for blending ordinary everyday life and the fantastic following the 1940s.

Angel Flores underlines in his article “Magic Realism in Sothern American Fiction” that “novelty of magical realism lies in amalgamation of realism and fantasy” (1955: 189). Accordingly, it could be deduced that the mixture of realism and fantasy is a defining factor for a work of art to be assumed as magic realist. Likewise, Maggie Ann Bowers puts forward in **Magi(cal) Realism** that “its[magic realism] distinguishing feature from literary realism is that it fuses the two opposing aspects of the oxymoron (the magical and the realist) together to form one new perspective” (2004: 3). Magic realism’s function of having a fresh and uncontaminated perspective is achieved via a pinch of

¹¹ The plot of **I Can Hear You** is very identical to Coward’s comedy. In **Blithe Spirit** the protagonist Charles Condomine invites the medium Mademe Arcati in order to help him inspire his new novel which will be about a spiritualist. However, unintentionally Charles’ previous wife Elvira is summoned. Charles’ present wife Ruth and Elvira cannot share Charles, and immensely comic elements exist in the play. In the end Charles gets rid of both of his wives and spends his life lonely but more free. As it could be discovered the main structure of the plots are approximately the same except for amendments that might serve Crowe’s intention.

fantasy which is put into mundane realistic plot and setting. This new perspective, as Lovis P. Zamora and Wendy Faris note in **Magical Realism: Theory, History, Community**, allows the reader to question the assumptions of dominant culture, and magic realism explores and traverses the logical and political limits of a society (1995: 5-6). In that case, it could be put forward that magic realism stands to be as a very instrumental tool for the interrogation of the truth or reality that is taken for granted in a certain society.

E. V. Crowe uses magic realism as a tool to interrogate patriarchal boundaries and lets both the readers and characters get rid of the false illusion created by dominant culture: patriarchy. It needs to be underlined that after the inefficacious spirit summoning process, Ruth starts to question whether her mother had a joyful life or not. Furthermore, Ellie who contemplated on the family members stating “you’re a family family” (Crowe, 2014: 117) also notices that the family is not so lovely as it seemed to be. David observing Marie’s negative answer sees how her wife really felt as a “devoted mother and wife” (*Ibid.*, p. 116). What is more, Sandra is shocked by Tommy’s restricting and selfish attitude although she was in agony after his death. In short, what is not discovered on the surface is unearthed, and what the family, motherhood and housewifery mean is revealed by the help of Ellie’s summoning ritual. In other words, by the inclusion of supernatural, the playwright gets the chance to display the acute facts women face in the crippling hegemonic ideologies in the family and society at large.

The patriarchal order or patriarchy could simply be considered as a constructed social system in which male authority and rule are essential. Adrienne Rich defines patriarchy in **Of Woman Born: Motherhood as Experience and as Institution** in a comprehensive way:

Patriarchy is the power of fathers: a familial- social system in which men by force, direct pressure, or through rituals, tradition, law, and the language, customs, etiquette, education and the division of labor, determine what women shall or shall not play, and in which the female is subsumed under the male. (1986: 57)

Rich clearly outlines and displays how women are systematically dominated and marginalized within society. It is discovered that male authority is secured through many different tools such as law, tradition and the division of labour. Thus, Dimple Godiwala regards patriarchy in her **Breaking the Bounds: British Feminist Dramatists Writing in the Mainstream since c.1980** as “a complex, interactive web of intermingling [...] discursive and post-discursive cultural practices, acts, techniques and methods” (2003: 3). She implies that cultural practices or ideals have been shaped in accordance with patriarchal authorities’ desires, and the normal has been defined within the limitations of male oriented values. She further continues that there are certain unarticulated rules within society that are highly active in the formation of the patriarchal system, and claims that patriarchal impulse or its effects have been pervading throughout social, political, economic and intellectual frame of Western communities (**Ibid., p. 5**).

Within patriarchal social structure, certain gender roles are assigned to individuals, and they are expected to perform those roles throughout their lives. Feminist thinkers such as Gayle Rubin, Kate Millet, and Simone de Beauvoir all reject biological determinism which automatically render a woman as **the other** by nature (Rubin, 1975: 179, Millet, 1971: 28-29, Beauvoir, 1956: 18) and remark the necessity of questioning the social roles because these socially constructed roles are so subtly imbued from early childhood to death that they are normalized in time. Judith Butler underlines in “Performative Acts and Gender Constitution: An Essay in Phenomenology and Feminist Theory” that gender is:

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. (1988: 520)

Hence, it could be argued that through certain roles in society, gendered identities occur and as Butler further points out in **Gender Trouble**, gender appears as “[...] a performance with clearly punitive consequences” (1999: 190), and “through stylized repetition of acts” (**Ibid.**, p. 191) gendered self is consolidated while violators are labelled as deviants. In the end, women are allowed to act their restricted roles within restricted spheres, and the patriarchal societal order is accordingly maintained.

Heterosexual marriages and thereby families have been quite instrumental in the frame of patriarchy to construct gendered identities. Within family, which is considered by Gerda Lerner in **The Creation of Patriarchy** as the basic unit of patriarchy that regenerates the system (1986: 222), certain roles are assigned for women such as motherhood and housewifery, and they all contribute to the continuation of the patriarchal order and gendered identities.

Motherhood and housewifery are very significant roles which are designated for women in patriarchy. Repetitive acts of child care and domestic service stabilize women’s position as to be controlled by husbands or fathers. Especially through marriage and family which are culturally and legally supported to recreate male-oriented order, aforementioned roles are attributed to women as their **natural tasks** while they are the products of patriarchal culture.

Motherhood is widely accepted and considered as the natural responsibility of women, and a strong correlation between women and their biological characteristics is built not only in society but also in certain fields of science. However, feminist psychoanalyst Nancy Chodorow rejects such an acceptance in her **Reproduction of Mothering**. She notes that:

In spite of the apparently close tie between women’s capacities for childbearing and lactation on the one hand and their responsibilities for child care on the other, and in spite of the probable prehistoric convenience (and perhaps survival necessity) of sexual division of labor in which women mothered, biology and instinct do not provide adequate explanations for how women come to mother. (1978: 205)

She further underlines that rather than biological factors, social factors such as classical mother-daughter relationship and upbringing of boys and girls in different ways contribute to mothering of women in society. Therefore, it should be pointed out that motherhood cannot be considered as the anatomical destiny of women, but as a product of social conditioning.

Motherhood plays a very crucial role in the reproduction of the patriarchal order. Through motherhood women are subordinated to men both individually and as a social group. Adrienne Rich considers motherhood in a two-fold frame: as women's potential of reproduction and also as an institution of patriarchy. She states that "especially motherhood as institution creates a clear cut distinction between private and public life [...]" (1986: 13) and emphasizes motherhood's not being a natural role, but being a constructed institution that serves for the patriarchal order via limiting women to the private sphere. Likewise, Chodorow points out that women's mothering provides sexual and familial division of labour keeping women busy with nurturing and caring for children (1978: 209). Accordingly, it could be argued that women's potential of bearing a baby is expropriated, and the institution of motherhood becomes a quite useful tool to keep women in the private sphere which isolates them from the construction and production of culture and society.

Women internalizing the role of motherhood also become influential in social reproduction through the children they bring up. It needs to be underlined that the children who have been taught to be feminine and masculine figures since their early childhood grow up in accordance with the dominant culture's rules and values (Chodorow, 1978: 209). Furthermore, as Adrienne Rich points out "a mother's victimization does not merely humiliate her, it mutilates the daughter who watches her [...]" (1986: 243). In that case, it could be argued that women are taught how to be proper women in patriarchy indirectly through motherhood. Lerner, moreover, emphasizes that the system of patriarchy can function only with

the cooperation of women” (1986: 217), and motherhood could be considered as an institution that enables such a cooperation to come into existence.

It needs to be noted that only women who conform to patriarchal boundaries and rules are considered as respected mothers. A woman who bears a child through extramarital affair is not considered as a proper mother; on the contrary, she is banished from society. Thus, a mother needs to be a legitimate wife of a man through heterosexual marriages. In line with this argument, Simone de Beauvoir states that “the mother is glorified when she is subordinated to a husband” (1956: 503). In short, not only the act of motherhood, but also even the path to motherhood subjugates women.

In addition to women’s subordination as a social group, they are exploited individually through motherhood. Adrienne Rich points out that motherhood gives women an illusionary respect in society, but it impoverishes their choices and potential (1986: 13). Accordingly, women’s energy and capacity are canalized into motherhood, and they are not allowed to prove their potentials and real selves.

Rather than independent individuals, mothers are considered in the patriarchal order as human beings who are expected to sacrifice their lives for the sake of their children and family. Beauvoir also underlines that women are not allowed to be complete individuals (1956: 466), and motherhood has been loaded on the shoulders of the women like a kind of burden that inhibits women from self-actualization. “Nurturing, selfless, self-sacrificing” (Rich, 1986: 114) mother image is idealized, and as Rich underlines, patriarchal monotheism allows women to be mother without mana amputating their magical power and divinity (**Ibid., p. 119**). Religion, law and patriarchal conventions stabilize such a mother image that women are made to renounce from their lives and dreams. The proper mother image is subtly disseminated, and as Simone de Beauvoir underlines, women are persuaded that “maternity is enough in all cases to crown woman’s life” (1956: 499), but the reality is far from it. Indeed, there are numerous unhappy and unsatisfied mothers in society (**Ibid., p. 499**).

E. V. Crowe employs Marie to display what motherhood is and is not. Marie is understood to have died at the age of 64, and very little is known about her personal life. Despite limited information about her, it is clear that Marie was a married woman and analysing her husband David's attitude it is not so difficult to discover what she experienced throughout her life.¹²

David, the father and husband figure in the play, does not give value to what her daughter Ruth says and finds talking to a woman as trivial. While Ruth is talking about the organization and the preparations for Tommy's funeral, David's irrelevant question also proves it:

RUTH: Well, we've thought it through a bit more this time. And we know what we know what we're doing a bit more. We've been a bit more organized. And it cost a bit more. We have cleaned the house. And. We know what we were doing this time. Don't we? We're first back, then everyone else comes back over in about half an hour.

DAVID: Don't you like the cake? (Crowe, 2014: 107-108)

The question he asks makes no sense, and he just utters something to continue the conversation without listening to what her daughter tries to tell. He despises what Ruth tries to explain within another conversation with her, too.

RUTH: You'll never guess what she asked me for. A bit of Tommy's hair. A lock of Tommy's hair.

DAVID: What?

RUTH: Mum kept one of us both. It's in her drawer, next to her dresser.

DAVID: Did you give it to her?

¹² E. V. Crowe selects the name of the characters carefully. For example, she chooses the name David for the father figure. According to **Oxford Dictionary of First Names**, it is the name of the greatest king who is known for killing giant Palestinian Goliath and establishing his people's security. (2003, Hanks and Hodges: 5255)The playwright deliberately makes correlations with a king and a father figure using the name David. The mother figure Marie's name is also emphasized as "the most popular and enduring of all female Christian names, being the name of Virgin Mary [...]" (2003, Hanks and Hodges:15473). The playwright giving the name Marie to a mother figure correlates her with the Virgin Mary, the mother of Jesus Christ, who is respected and idealized in patriarchy.

RUTH: I said later. She will forget with any luck.

DAVID: I don't like this kind of talk.

RUTH: Dad!

DAVID: It's girl talk isn't it?

RUTH: We're talking about Sandra.

DAVID: Exactly. Talk to someone else about it. You can talk to someone else.
(Crowe, 2014: 112)

Stating that it is a kind of girl talk, he considers himself obviously superior to the women and cannot even tolerate to listen to her daughter. A father who rejects to talk to her daughter and give value to her experiences, feelings and ideas could not be expected to consider his own wife as a real individual, either.

David as an authoritative father and husband always wants to get served and goes after his own desires even after his son's death. For instance, he seeks an opportunity to watch a football match even if Ruth and Sandra do not approve of watching it, and he never bothers to help his daughter do the chores. As the ruler of the family, he refuses to assume any responsibilities because as Naomi R. Cahn remarks in "Gendered Identities: Women and Household Work," "[his] male status could be jeopardized through taking responsibility for housework" (1999: 536), and he could be feminized. On the other hand, he uses the first person plural pronoun **we** as the subject of these acts whenever he talks about these tasks. A dialogue between Ruth and David also clearly reveals how he sees himself and what he expected from Marie:

DAVID: We used to do the sandwiches that's all.

RUTH: Did you?

DAVID: We did yes.

RUTH: How many did you normally make?

DAVID: A few. We did it every year. Except last year.

RUTH: Eggs and cress or tuna mayonnaise?

DAVID: I don't know.

RUTH: So you played and did the sandwiches did you?

DAVID: Well, I played, your mum made the sandwiches. (Crowe, 2014: 122)

As a mother, Marie was expected to serve her husband and prepare the sandwiches so that David as a man and a husband could play his game. In fact, through David's statement the playwright summarizes the roles assigned for men and women in the patriarchal order and shows that women are supposed to be subsidiary figures while men play, decide, and rule. As it is revealed with Ruth's questions, Marie's effort and labour are also tried to be made lost in the shuffle by David as it is the common case of patriarchy in which women's labour and energy are exploited subtly.

David as the boss of the family also controls how much and where to spend, and the women's economic dependence on him makes David even more powerful. The women in the house are so economically dependent that even a simple phone call may create a problem and lead Ruth to make explanations for it. After Ruth's phone call with her husband, David comes in, and the dialogue between the father and the daughter needs to be pondered on:

RUTH: So how big is it? The notice board?

DAVID: It's big. Was that an international call?

RUTH: He called me. How big? Big as what?

DAVID: It's is the whole wall. I didn't hear it ring.

RUTH: You won't be charged for the call. Nothing is going to show up on your bill. Don't worry [...]. (*Ibid.*, p. 121)

As a woman of 40s, who does not have her economic independence, she becomes obliged to make excuses for the phone call like a teenager, who talks to his/her lover. Being confined to the private sphere and being an obedient servant of his father and brother earlier, she has no autonomy or control over anything. She

could be questioned by her father like a child in a very humiliating way irrespective of her being, for she is not given the opportunity to grow up and become an independent woman.

The examples given related to David's attitude may seem ordinary examples from father-daughter relationship. However, these examples of David's attitudes avail to understand what kind of person David is as a masculine figure in the family. In this way, it could be discerned that Marie as a woman who was also economically dependent, confined within the private sphere, and under the rule of her husband must have experienced far worse than what Ruth experiences as a mother candidate who starts to take up the role of her mother¹³. Therefore, it is possible to state that Marie before all must have had a great burden on her shoulders even before giving birth to a baby through her marriage with a stereotypical patriarchal husband and father figure, David.

It is discovered that Marie's life was not better after giving birth to her children. Despite the fact that Ruth thinks that her mother had a very joyful life without any doubt in the beginning of the play, Marie could be described as a selfless woman who sacrificed her life for the sake of others' lives. Thus, it is not possible to argue that she had a happy life owing to the fact that she was not allowed to live her own life as an individual. Contrary to the fake prescription created by patriarchy that is underlined by Betty Friedan in **The Feminine Mystique**; motherhood is the only way for a woman to be heroine and content (1974: 39), and Marie was a kind of victim rather than a heroine. The dialogue between the crystal gazer Ellie and David also clearly reveals this fact:

ELLIE: How old was she when she died? If it's OK to ask.

DAVID: 64. 'Devoted mother and wife'.

ELLIE: 64's young isn't it?

¹³ Sandra's reaction "everything looks 'Marie'" (Crowe, 2014: 113) when she comes in the house after the funeral also indicates this fact. Then, Ruth could also be considered as flashback of her mother Marie, and Marie as foreshadowing of Ruth if Ruth continues to behave like her mother through the end of the play.

RUTH: What does that mean?

ELLIE: Nothing. I don't know. 64.

DAVID: That's what we got engraved on the... inscribed on the...stone. Devoted mother and wife. (Crowe, 2014: 116)

There is no doubt that illusionary respect that Adrienne Rich underlines is paid to Marie as well, but it needs to be emphasized that even after her death, the gravestone suggests what her role is rather than who she is. Rather than being Marie, an individual in society, she was described as a devoted mother and wife similar to the devoted nuns in medieval ages. Her self and identity were ignored; her dreams, capacity and her life were indeed stolen from Marie. Furthermore, as Ellie implies she also seems to have passed away very young considering the life span of modern people, which also indicates something problematic in her life.

While summoning the spirit of Marie, it is also discovered that she is no one, but only a mother.

ELLIE: OK. So what I need everyone to do is to close your eyes, and think of a memory of your mother. What was her name? Marie?

DAVID: Mum!.

ELLIE: Mum?

DAVID: We all... yes. Mum.

Pause

ELLIE: Think of your mother, mother-in-law, wife, 'Mum'. (*Ibid.*, p. 132)

Despite the fact that Ellie underlines that her name is Marie, David insists on calling her as Mum due to the fact that she has no name in the eye of him except her roles and functions. Unfortunately, Ellie becomes obliged to summon Marie emphasizing her roles and degree of affinity without using her name. They endeavour to make contact with Marie's soul and they fail to accomplish it. After a short discussion about the failure, Ellie underlines significant points about the summoning process:

ELLIE: Um. I know you've all tried really hard but, I did actually sort of specifically say that I wanted you to bring things that showed the universe that you believed that your mum mattered and was 'of importance' on a bigger scale. That she mattered sort of generally. That was the... I was under impression.

You've brought a recipe book that she used to cook for you with, a ring she does not wear, a necklace you maybe sort of stole, a post card from your holiday you couldn't be... you didn't send. I'm not being funny. But when Sandra wanted Tommy back- there was hair, clothing, awards, photos, newspaper clippings. (Crowe, 2014: 133)

Although Ellie asked them earlier to bring certain objects such as letters, photographs which show that Marie was special in the universe, what they brought was a real disappointment. A recipe book was brought by Ruth for her beloved mother, and it underlines Marie's role as a mother, her wedding ring brought by David highlights that before all she is a wife, most probably a stolen necklace of her and a postcard which was forgotten to be sent from Spain- the holiday destination of Sandra and Tommy- clearly show that she is of no importance and what matters is Marie's roles and function, not Marie herself.

Marie does not communicate with them as Tommy has done due to the fact that Tommy is valued much more compared to Marie as the objects to summon his spirit also prove. Furthermore, he has more reasons to come back to the world since he had a successful career as a footballer; he was supported and considered as an important individual both in the private sphere and the public. For instance, the number of people's attending Tommy's funeral was double compared to Marie's. The memorial arranged at the football house for Tommy and a great number of messages on his social media accounts also indicate that Tommy was a respected figure in society. As a man in the patriarchal order, he was allowed to prove himself through his success in the public sphere, but Marie could only be the mother of a successful footballer, Tommy. Not only throughout her life but also even after her death, she could not find any support and respect she has really deserved. She was subjected to the central idea of paternalism.

Marie communicates with them at last only when Ellie calls her with her own name through the end of the spirit summoning scene. To her question “Marie, do you wish to come back with us?” (Crowe, 2014: 133) Marie’s answer is a clear no as the sign pendulum shows. Marie’s straight no indeed displays that as a woman she is more peaceful and content to be in the other world compared to the patriarchal world in which women are exploited, abused, and confined within feminine roles. The playwright via the help of crystal gazer Ellie who could be considered as an unruly woman figure uses supernatural elements to prove that motherhood is not a crown that ennobles women as the patriarchal ideology powerfully imposes. Depicting Marie as a kind of victim, Crowe emphasizes that women’s potentials are wrecked through motherhood, and she also unravels how womanhood is taught by mothers in society displaying her daughter Ruth in the midst of domestic service.

Domestic service or housewifery which is not even possible to dissociate from motherhood also stands to be another significant factor that leads to the subordination of women. Similar to motherhood, domestic service is considered as women’s responsibility and role, and this consideration leads to the perpetuation of the patriarchal structure. Repetition of domestic works such as cooking, nurturing and cleaning, women’s gendered role as domestic servants in patriarchy is consolidated. Furthermore, on the plea of domestic work women are not allowed to participate in the public sphere which Jürgen Habermas describes in “The Public Sphere: An Encyclopedia Article” as “a realm of our social life” (1974: 49). Although Habermas emphasizes that “access [to the public sphere], is guaranteed to all citizens” (**Ibid.**, p. 49), most women who are not considered as autonomous individuals in the patriarchal system have not been able to benefit from such a guarantee. Confinement of women into the private sphere, which begins with the pretext of motherhood, continues and even deteriorates with the domestic service of women. As Ruth A. Wienclaw states in “Gender&Domestic Responsibilities,” “[...] there has been little change in the division of labour for domestic responsibilities across cultures [...]” (2011: 82). It is even possible to argue that through certain social and economic changes in history such as,

industrialism and capitalism, sexual division of labour becomes more apparent, and thereby women's confinement in the private sphere is more acutely felt.

Patriarchal mentality accomplishes to protect its power subtly despite social changes. For instance, as it is discussed in the previous chapters, through collaboration with capitalism and the power of media its ideology is more profoundly disseminated in society. Despite economic and social improvements women face in the modern world, patriarchal mentality still remains to be the dominant one. Therefore, in spite of a great number of women working in the public sphere, being unable to get rid of traditional roles such as mothers, wives and domestic servants, women do the great majority of domestic work even today (Wienclaw, 2011: 79). Linda L. Lindsey also points out in **Gender Roles** that technological developments have not reduced the amount of time women spend in the domestic sphere compared to the past (2016: 230). In short, no matter how women's condition may improve, what is expected from women in society has not changed much as the patriarchal ideology is not abandoned

Domestic service of women which reconsolidates men as powerful figures destroys the potentials of women as well. In addition to allowing them to survive in a rather worthless sphere compared to the public sphere, domestic service restricts women's capacity and skills so that they devote to the service of their husbands, fathers and children. Betty Friedan notes this confinement with these sentences:

What is there in this recital of comfortable domestic detail that could possibly cause such a feeling of desperation? Is she trapped simply by enormous demands of her role as modern housewife: wife, mistress, mother, nurse, consumer, cook, chauffeur; expert on the interior decoration, child care, appliance repair, furniture refinishing, nutrition, and education? Her day is fragmented as she rushes from dishwasher to washing machine to telephone to dryer station wagon to supermarket, and delivers Johnny to Little League field, takes Janey to dancing class, gets the lawnmower fixed and meets the 6:45. She can never spend more than 15 minutes on any one thing; she has no time to read books, only magazines; even if she had time, she has lost the power to concentrate (Friedan, 1974: 25)

As Friedan implies women are trapped by the role deemed suitable for them. She emphasizes that the women who are made to perform domestic roles have difficulty in finding time for themselves, and one way or another possibility of women's self-actualization is hindered. Through incessant and various house chores women become fragmented in the end.

Women cannot benefit from certain privileges such as education and work in the public sphere as much as men when they are restricted within the private sphere with domestic tasks. Despite the fact that men, who are culturally supported in patriarchy, could actualize and prove themselves in public, as de Beauvoir underlines domestic work prevents women from having autonomy, and they cannot acquire a recognition as a complete person in society (1956: 442-443). While women are considered as mothers or wives of men before any other titles, men stand to be as real citizens and producers of society in the patriarchal order (**Ibid.**, p. 443). Therefore, domestic work becomes an influential factor that makes women's wings clipped (**Ibid.**, p. 574), in Simone de Beauvoir's terms, for the women who cannot have equal opportunities of education, cultural support, and time of their own.

In the play, the playwright mostly employs Ruth to clarify what women experience within the private sphere of patriarchy. Ruth is depicted by the playwright as a woman who is considered as a domestic servant by her father and also by her brother's spirit. Ruth talks most of the time about domestic tasks, and she deals with them considering these tasks as her own responsibility. For instance, while she is talking about her mother's funeral, what she cares is the marks on the wall of hallway caused by the crowd. Even the type of food served for her mother's funeral bothers Ruth since she thinks that cake for the funeral was not a good choice as it is reminiscent of a party while his father never cares for such details. The dialogue between Sandra and Ruth also displays how Ruth is engaged with domestic tasks:

RUTH: When mum died, we had a bunch there, a bunch there, and then only one in the hallway. Largely lilies, I got some on my top. It never comes off.

SANDRA: The pollen

RUTH: You have to Hoover it off your top apparently. Don't wipe it. But guess what?

SANDRA: You wiped it.

RUTH: It just smears. So there is a top from Mum's funeral. I can't even wear again. (Crowe, 2014: 109)

Considering the fact that this dialogue takes place soon after Tommy's funeral, it is discovered that domestic service has become a very crucial part of her life. As a woman in the private sphere, although Ruth is not so aware, as Simone de Beauvoir subtly outlines "her life is not directed towards ends, she is absorbed in producing or caring for things that are never more than means, such as food, clothing and shelter (1956: 574). She is not able to discover her potential and capacity because she hardly finds time to breathe due to the domestic tasks. She also experiences the fragmentation that Friedan underlines and her fate does not seem to be so different from her mother's.

In addition to never ending chores, her father's attitude also plays a pivotal role in Ruth's being confined in the domestic sphere. Women are not supported to participate in the public sphere; on the contrary, they are discouraged in case they might be a threat to the wheels of patriarchy. It is possible to argue that Ruth also suffers from it due to the fact that not only her father but also her brother's summoned spirit look down even on Ruth's suggestion to play a game which was used to be played by the father and the son. The dialogue between Ruth and David is a clear example of this fact:

DAVID: No, I mean. Yes they'll want them. I just... It's the game coming up so they want a few more. Tommy and I always used to play.

Pause.

RUTH: I could play this year.

Silence.

RUTH: I used to play at school. I'd be a lot faster than half of those fatties who run around now.

David looks at her.

RUTH: I will wear shorts.

DAVID: I don't want to look sippy do I? Asking my daughter to play.

RUTH: What's sippy about that? (Crowe, 2014: 121)

David considers playing with her daughter as a kind of insult or weakness to his manhood, and if the game- most probably a football game- is perceived as a kind of metaphor for active participation of individuals in the public sphere, it could be underlined that women are systematically alienated from it through patriarchal culture and customs. Like her mother, she is expected to **make sandwiches** while the male ones play the games.

Ruth who is taught to act proper feminine roles in society also feels responsible for taking care of her husband even if he is very far away from her. For example, at the very beginning of the play, without having any information about the weather condition of the place where she is, she knows how hot it is in Dubai, where her husband stays. Furthermore, whenever she talks on the phone with her husband she advises him just as a mother advises her child. In one of her phone talks; for instance, she states that:

You should make sure you put some factor 30 on...

Well if you do go outside...

Alright...

[...]. Yes we'll speak later. I might be busy but OK. Later on.Bye.
(**Ibid.**, p. 120-121)

It is clear from her statements that she cares for her husband rather than her own self. In addition to the relentless chores that she tries to overcome, she loads another burden on her shoulders. In other words, she sacrifices herself for the

goodness of her husband, her father, and the family as her mother did until her death.

The playwright employing Ruth displays what it means to be a woman who becomes obliged to act the role of housewifery in the patriarchal order and clearly shows how such women's labour, energy and potentials are exploited within the patriarchal order. As it is clear from the given examples throughout the play, she is not supported to become a self-actualized individual and due to the various roles she is expected to act, she cannot even find time to take care of her own self. Crowe emphasizes through Ruth that patriarchy swallows women's identities and capacities by means of domestic tasks and roles within the private sphere.

It could be discovered through the experiences of Marie and Ruth that through motherhood and housewifery women are subordinated and their potential is castrated. As Friedan underlines "the question of who am I is answered as "Tommy's wife... Mary's mother" (1974: 64), and their identities become problematic. In short, the roles that women are expected to perform in patriarchy become key factors in women's subjugation, and Crowe subtly displays them in her play.

In addition to the traditional roles of women as mothers and housewives, women are still subordinated to male-centred system. As Adrienne Rich underlines "whatever the women's status or economic class or sexual preference, women live under the power of fathers" (1986: 58). Therefore, even if the power of fathers may be transmitted to the husbands or brothers; the power still seems to be under the control of males since it is consolidated and recreated through many elements such as customs, religions and law.

In the play, Sandra, for example, is not even married to Tommy and she is depicted as a girlfriend of him. However, it is understood that she feels herself better and free rather than sorrowful after her boyfriend's death. As Ruth discovers after the funeral of Tommy, "she has got widow's flush" (Crowe, 2014: 111), which shows she feels better due to the fact that she has no one to look

after. Ruth even argues that “she’s less depressed today” (*Ibid.*, p. 112) compared to yesterday when he was alive. Furthermore, Sandra applies to do a teaching course a few days after Tommy’s death although she told Ruth earlier that she would stay nearby so that she could visit the grave of Tommy. Thus, it could be deducted that even if a woman is not a wife of a man or a mother figure in society, she is still confined within patriarchy. Therefore, Tommy’s death seems to be a kind of freedom for her to actualize her dreams and to live her own life. Nevertheless, her sense of freedom does not last long due to the fact that after Tommy’s spirit comes back to the world, he continues to direct and manipulate her girlfriend’s life. He asks her to forget about the course and continue her life as it used to be, which frustrates Sandra. He threatens to go back and tries to manipulate Sandra. He does a similar manipulation to dissuade Ruth from turning back to Dubai.

Bringing the spirit of Tommy back via magical realist elements, E. V. Crowe allows the characters, especially Ruth and Sandra, to remember how life was with Tommy and employs his spirit to display patriarchal restrictions imposed upon them. Furthermore, his disrespectful attitude, patronizing utterances such as “budge up”(Crowe, 2014: 134) and restricting requests all help Ruth on her way to a kind of Joycean epiphanic revelation¹⁴. Her mother’s not communicating with her puts another brick on the wall of her consciousness, and she starts to have doubts about the image of happy home and family and a content mother. The playwright makes her take the first crucial step: doubt which is essential for the interrogation of the existing patriarchal order:

RUTH: [...] Mum would do anything for us. (Pause.) Dad do you think Mum didn’t want to speak to us? Do you think she feels a bit down by us? Is she annoyed with us? Didn’t she have a nice life? Wasn’t she happy here? Why doesn’t she want to talk to us? What have done wrong? Does she think I should stay and...? Does she think I’m selfish? Why doesn’t she want to come back?

¹⁴ Mundane lives, experiences and impressions of individuals are highly valued by James Joyce. Therefore, without carrying any divine connotations Joycean epiphanic revelation is a kind of enlightenment acquired after a very ordinary experience or a moment which may enable a person or a character to realize certain facts.

We can't assume that she even heard us. Do you think she heard us? What does it mean if she doesn't want to come back? (*Ibid.*, p. 135)

She is no more of the opinion that her mother Marie had a nice life as she assumed earlier. She starts to ask the question **why** that might get her out of the jam her mother experienced. The false illusion of happy mother which is reinforced within patriarchy is shattered in the mind of Ruth. Also, her last words and attitude through the very end of the play imply that nothing will be the same for Ruth anymore owing to the fact that her perspective has changed, and she has started to unearth the patriarchal cloak that lies like a shroud over her mother and her life.

TOMMY: Seriously, can you move all this crap off the floor please I've got nowhere to put my feet. Have you talked to Jim yet Ruth, have you told him you're staying?

RUTH slides off the sofa onto her knees on the floor and gathers the book, postcard, the necklace and the ring to her chest with one arm. The phone rings. David picks up

DAVID: Yes?

He looks at RUTH, covers the mouthpiece with his hand.

RUTH: The blue crystal...

DAVID: Ruth, it's Jim again. Here you are, speak to him.

She searches the floor with her hand, patting it repeatedly.

RUTH: Hang on. I can't find it. (Crowe, 2014: 135)

Despite the fact that Ruth has been described as a perfect feminine figure who is loyal and self-sacrificing to her family members from her husband to her father and brother, the playwright displays that Ruth does not care what her brother says, does not listen to her father's calling and does not answer to her husband's call whom she feels responsible in the end of the play. In short, maybe for the first time in her life she rejects her roles and responsibilities for the family members as a woman who seems to take up the role of her mother. Instead of

doing whatever the others desire, Ruth does what she herself wants. Searching for the crystal, what she desires to do is to communicate with her mother in order to learn the truth about her mother's life and to learn whether it is worth being a mother and whether it is worth sacrificing one's own life for the sake of others. The playwright does not make Ruth take a radical step against the patriarchal impositions, but displays that Ruth is suspicious of the rightness of the system, and she is on the verge of interrogating through the supernatural incidents of spirit summoning.

All in all, E. V. Crowe displays how women are confined within the private sphere using a domestic setting, the house which stands for a man-made institution that incarcerates women and how they are subordinated to men in the patriarchal order. She underlines that women's identities and potentials are obscured by the patriarchal order through traditional roles which are considered as appropriate for women such as motherhood as it was acted by Marie until the very end of her life and housewifery which has been acted properly by Ruth throughout the play. In other words, Crowe shows that patriarchal culture does not allow women to fulfil their capacities and potentials like Victorian culture that regarded a wife merely as part of her husband's property (Friedan, 1974: 69). Furthermore, through a seemingly natural or normal attitude of the male characters, David and Tommy, the playwright finds chance to highlight how men intentionally or unintentionally abuse and exploit women even in mundane everyday life. What is more, via creating the character, Sandra, who has not had traditional feminine roles yet, the playwright shows that a woman in the patriarchal order suffers without even being obliged to act such roles.

The playwright, most importantly, through a set of supernatural incidents which could be considered as magic realist elements and the crystal gazer Ellie who does not fit to the stereotypical feminine figure in patriarchy allows not only the reader or the audience of the play but also Ruth- a probable future victim of motherhood- to perceive patriarchal boundaries on women. Moreover, displaying the proper feminine figure, Ruth, as a woman who has doubts about the experiences of her mother and motherhood in the end of the play, the playwright

reveals her hopes for a change in the patriarchal order which will be possible through women's gaining consciousness. In short, E. V. Crowe does not display radical steps against the patriarchal order in her play, but focusing on the experiences of the members of a family she carefully manifests the acute facts women face even in the 21st century. Yet, through the female character, Ruth, who awakens in the end of the play Crowe creates a glimmer of light for a better world in which women are not subordinated.



CONCLUSION

This study has aimed at interrogating the patriarchal order that subjugates and oppresses women in modern society while enabling men various opportunities to be dominant over women. Through this study, how the instruments of patriarchy such as language, capitalism, rape culture, and socially constructed feminine roles force women to take up subordinate positions in society has been displayed focusing on the three modern plays: **The Ant and the Cicada** by Timberlake Wertenbaker, **Revolt. She said. Revolt again.** by Alice Birch and **I Can Hear You** by E. V. Crowe.

Analysing the current condition and the experiences of the present-day female characters, it has been underlined that patriarchy preserves its power through its modified tools such as the current economic system, technology and the language of the patriarchal world. Unfortunately, the subordination of women has not altered greatly since the Shakespearean period as it has been revealed through the intertextual similarities between the modern plays and **A Midsummer Night's Dream**. In that period, women were made to be rivals under patriarchal restrictions. Likewise, modern women become rivals and enemies within the capitalist patriarchal system as Wertenbaker unfolds it through the two sisters, Zoe and Selina. Patriarchal mentality that considers women as chattels in the Shakespearean period is still prevalent in the current century as Birch dauntlessly displays through the nameless male character who desires to have sex with his female partner. Women have not been able to get away from being confined to the private sphere, and fathers, as the controllers and rulers of the families which could be considered as the cores of patriarchal societies, still dominate women in the patriarchal world as Crowe plainly illustrates through the father figure, David. Therefore, despite the fact that many centuries have passed, women still suffer enormously from patriarchy.

In addition to this fact, it has been underlined that male supremacy over women accepted in the phallogocentric societal structure is a systematic construction of perception rather than being a natural phenomenon, and how women are tried

to be shaped in accordance with the norms of patriarchy has been illustrated. It needs to be noted that not only have the sufferings of women been emphasized, but also mostly radical and influential steps to end the unjust order that degrades women have been displayed in the end of each chapter.

Firstly, it has been proved through socialist feminists such as Maria Mies, Zillah Eisenstein and Heidi Hartmann that the existing oppression of women is the result of the cooperation of capitalism with patriarchy. Women are allowed to enjoy a restricted freedom through consumption and finding chance to work in the public sphere through capitalism, but the capitalist system which is founded on the roots of patriarchy does not abandon patriarchal mentality. Therefore, the subjugation of women in the local scale in the patriarchal order has been carried to mass scale through capitalism. In the capitalist system, labour division becomes much more profound through wage labour system and industrial developments. Although women are allowed to work in the public sphere, they are considered as secondary workforce and they are underpaid. What is more, their labour in the private sphere is also exploited as it is not considered as a profession that deserves to be paid. Through the cosmetic market women are also targeted as consumers, and they are economically exploited in order to appeal to male desire. Moreover, through the commoditized images of the female bodies, especially in media, capitalism turns women into kinds of chattels to be consumed, and patriarchal mentality that considers women as sexual objects is consolidated.

In **The Ant and the Cicada**, Timberlake Wertenbaker using diametrically opposed characters and images such as anti-capitalist Zoe and capitalist Selina, the oil grove and complexes which are planned to be built on the grove discusses capitalist brutality freely and reveals the messages she intends to transmit. She also uses certain concepts such as bullfighting to elucidate what capitalism is. Furthermore, she displays the cooperation of capitalism with patriarchy through drawing a parallel with patriarchal religions and capitalism, and underlines that the new God of the modern world is the capital, but also implies that it will face what old religions faced. There is no doubt that instead of employing a male figure, Alex, Wertenbaker could have employed a female character as a capitalist

invader who tries to commoditize the land of the sisters and the oil grove which could be considered as a realm protected from the capitalist patriarchal civilization. Nevertheless, as the playwright is of the opinion that capitalism is not independent of patriarchy, she displays Alex trying to victimize Zoe and indirectly Selina, and emphasizes the interdependence of the systems. Moreover, a cage image used in the play lets the playwright display how women are sexually exploited in capitalism, and focusing on the make-up of Selina through Zoe, the cosmetic market is criticized. Through examples and the scenes from the play, it has been proved in this study that the traces of the patriarchal order still pervades modern society and women are among the major exploited groups in the capitalist world order due to its bond with patriarchy.

In this thesis, envy and how it occurs particularly among women have been questioned through feminist psychoanalysts like Nancy Chodorow and psychologists like Leyla Navoro and Paula J. Caplan. There is no doubt that the restrictive social structure in which women are supposed to survive might cause envy. Furthermore, it has been argued in this study that different methods used by men and women to overcome envy as a result of the social learning of gendered identities lead women to be labelled as envious. As they are taught to compete with their rivals covertly for the sake of being a proper feminine figure, they cannot overcome envy openly like men who are not jammed in the limited domains and have cultural support. Focusing on Wertebaker's play, the examples of envy and betrayal between the sisters, Zoe and Selina, who are fuelled by the intruder male character, Alex, have been displayed, and the reasons that lead them to such feelings have been interrogated, as well. While displaying what the women face within capitalist patriarchal environment of the play, how the playwright challenges the male-centred abusive order has also been displayed. Bringing a historical heroine Bouboulina and Zoe together in a theatre show, the playwright reveals her hopes for a change. Making Zoe reclaim the sold land from Alex and his collaborator Selina, the playwright, moreover, takes a radical step to prevent capitalist patriarchal brutality. In the end, the function of the mischief of Wertebaker's unruly female characters has been questioned.

Language which is an indispensable tool for communication is socially constructed and plays a crucial role in the reproduction of the dominant societal system: patriarchy. In the second chapter of the thesis, through feminist philosophers and linguists such as Luce Irigaray, Hélène Cixous, Dale Spender and Deborah Cameron how the language used in everyday lives of present-day people is filled with phallogocentric values has been demonstrated, and how women are systematically alienated from language or defined on the negative poles of the constructed dichotomies is revealed. Individuals growing up amidst these dichotomies associate themselves either with the positive or negative pole. Consequently, their perceptions, systems of thought and identities are all affected from such associations. Therefore, how language is constructed rather than being natural has been emphasized, and how women suffer from male bias that exists in language has been analysed in this study.

Especially focusing on Alice Birch's **Revolt. She said. Revolt again.**, how language is occupied with patriarchal values has been explored. Furthermore, language's being shaped under the control of patriarchy has been proven via elucidating certain facts which are apparent in the play. For instance, the words that describe women in language mostly have negative meanings, and it is emphasized through the speech of an inconsiderate male boss in the play. Moreover, women are not able to express their feelings and experiences due to language's being too limited for them, and it is revealed via a nameless female character who can hardly express her feelings and ideas about a marriage proposal. Also, various expressions that humiliate the female body exist while the reverse is not possible to be observed, and it has been illustrated through rebarbative speech of the male supermarket owners. In addition, the feminine discourse scythes women's speech, and it has been exemplified through the conversations of Agnes and her grandmother. It has also been shown how Birch revolts against male-biased language through a nameless female character who subverts her partner's objectifying language, a woman who unearths the hidden meanings in the romantic discourse while talking about their marriage plans with her partner, a naked woman who baffles the male market owners' humiliating

language and Agnes who mocks the feminine discourse that inflicted upon women. There is no doubt that the playwright tackles various issues that other women, but the problematic language that perpetuates the formation of gendered identities has been the primary tool of patriarchy to be analysed in this study.

In addition to language, through the feminist authors like Susan Brownmiller, Holly Henderson and Susan Griffin it has been shown that rape which is a crime of violence against women committed mostly by men plays a significant role in consolidating the patriarchal order. Although the committers of the crime are all men, responsibility for the occurrence of such a crime is burdened on women. In this way, women could be controlled, shaped and male dominance is reconstructed and perpetuated. What is more, it has been emphasized that the law and cultural assumptions are interwoven with patriarchal mentality, women's credibility is questioned, and they cannot find any support even after being abused. To sum up, women are systematically forced to be proper feminine figures of patriarchy and their choices are constrained greatly not to be **punished** either by the threat of rape or the act of rape. Alice Birch also criticizes rape supportive societal order via displaying experiences of twelve-year-old raped girl in her play. Furthermore, how rape culture constraints and victimizes women has been analysed through the dialogues between the girl and a police officer who represents policing and the law of the patriarchal system.

Besides the analysis of rape, it has been highlighted in this study through feminist authors like Andrew Dworkin and Gail Dines that pornography, which gives the message that women like being exposed to sexual violence, serves for the perpetuation of male supremacy. Displaying women as the helpless slaves of male sexual desire, hungry for violence and as sexual prays or commodities pornography- an economically growing and widespread sector through the use of the internet- contributes greatly to gender stereotyping and dehumanization of women. Focusing on the male characters' conversation about pornography in Birch's play, how this sector and its contents lead to the subjugation of women have also been disclosed.

Finally, it has been underlined in the last chapter of this study through crucial feminist authors like Simone de Beauvoir, Adrienne Rich and Betty Friedan that domestic service of women and traditional roles inflicted on them such as motherhood and housewifery are among the significant factors that subordinate women to men in the male-oriented social order, especially confining them to the private sphere. The roles prescribed for women by patriarchy isolate them and they hinder women's having autonomous identities. They are made to survive under the rule of men, and women are described or valued in relation to men with their roles. For instance, women's capacity to give birth is abused and through motherhood women's energy, identity and capacity have been absorbed. Similarly, domestic service or housewifery makes women struggle with endless chores and the constructed responsibilities of women for their family confine them into the private sphere which means being deprived of certain opportunities such as education, economic independence, career, and autonomous identities. Therefore, like motherhood, domestic service limits women's capacities and freedom allowing women to exist merely by their sexual roles in spite of certain social improvements attained by women thanks to feminist approaches.

Focusing on E.V. Crowe's **I Can Hear You**, the experiences of Ruth who is like a banner woman of domestic service and her dead mother, Marie's messages sent from the other world have been examined, and whether the mothers and housewives like Marie and Ruth indulge in fulfilling their duties as patriarchy imposes have been questioned. In addition, how these roles other women is revealed through Crowe's use of magic realist elements and the mischievous female character, Ellie. In the end, the significance and the function of Ruth's having doubts about motherhood and patriarchy have been discussed.

The conclusion arrived in this thesis is that despite social changes and improvements, even in the 21st century modern world, patriarchal mentality and order still preserve its power. Various modified tools of patriarchy such as language, the capitalist practices, rape, and traditional roles still function to dominate and subjugate women in patriarchy as it is clearly displayed through the three modern plays. Nevertheless, it needs to be remarked that patriarchy that

others women is challenged through the mischief created by the playwrights. Despite highlighting the factors that subjugate women, the playwrights do not draw bleak pictures in their plays. On the contrary, through their mischievous female characters, who both interrogate and help the reader or the audience to question imposed male supremacy, they revolt against the unjust system. Most importantly, they light the torches to break the boundaries on women and to witness a change for a world without patriarchal subjugation.



BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Aston, Elaine: **Feminist Views on the English Stage Women Playwrights, 1900-2000**, New York, Cambridge University Press, 2003.
- Balsam, Rosemary H.: “Envy and Admiration among Women,” **Jealousy and Envy**, Ed. by. Léon Wurmser and Heidrun Jarass, New York, The Analytic Press, 2011, pp. 189-199.
- Barthes, Roland: “The Death of the Author,” **Image Music Text**, Trans. by. Stephen Heath, London, Fontona Press, 1977, pp. 142-148.
- Barthes, Roland: “From Work to Text,” **Image Music Text**, Trans. by. Stephen Heath, London, Fontona Press, 1977, pp. 155-164.
- Bartky, Sandra L.: “Foucault, Femininity and the Modernization of Patriarchal Power,” **The Politics of Women’s Bodies: Sexuality, Appearance and Behavior**, Ed. by. Rose Weitz, New York, Oxford University Press, 1998, pp. 25-45.

Baudrillard, Jean: **Consumer Society: Myths & Structures**, London, Sage Publications, 1998.

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

Ben-Ze'ev, Aaron: "Envy and Inequality," **The Journal of Philosophy**, Vol.89, No. 11, 1992, pp. 551-581.

Berman, Avi: "Envy at the Crossroad between Destruction, Self-Actualization, and Avoidance," **Envy, Competition and Gender**, Ed. by. Leyla Navaro, Sharan L.Schwartzberg, London, Routledge, 2007, pp. 15-29.

Billington, Michael: "Midsummer Mischief Review- RSC's radical billing is witty and inventive," (Online)
<https://www.theguardian.com/stage/2014/jun/23/midsummer-mischief-royal-shakespeare-company-stratford-review>, 5 May 2017.

Birch, Alice: "Revolt. She Said. Revolt Again.," **Midsummer Mischief: Four Radical New Plays**, London, Oberon Books, 2014, pp. 43-102.

Bordo, Susan: **Unbearable Weight: Feminism, Western Culture, and the Body**, Berkeley, University of California Press, 2003.

Bowers Maggie A.: **Magic(al) Realism**, London, Routledge Taylor& Francis Group, 2004.

Brownmiller, Susan: **Against Our Will: Men, Women, and Rape**, New York, Simon and Schuster, 1975.

Butler, Judith: "Performative Acts and Gender Constitution: An Essay in Phenomenology and Feminist Theory," **Theatre Journal**, Vol. 40, No. 4, December 1989, pp. 519-531.

Butler, Judith: **Gender Trouble**, New York, Routledge, 1999.

Cahn, Naomi R.: "Gendered Identities: Women and Household Work," **Villanova Law Review**, Vol. 44, No. 3, 1999, pp. 525-545.

Cameron, Deborah: **Feminism and Linguistic Theory**, London, The Macmillan Press LTD., 1985.

Cameron, Deborah: "Performing Gender Identity: Young Men's Talk and the Construction of Heterosexual Masculinity," **Language and Masculinity**, Ed. by. Sally Johnson and Ulrike Hanna Meinhof, Oxford, Blackwell Publishing LTD, 1997, pp. 47-65.

Caplan, Paula J.: **Barriers Between Women**, Lancaster, MTP Press Limited, 1981.

Chesler, Phyllis: **Woman's Inhumanity to Woman**, Chicago, Lawrence Hill Books, 2009.

Chodorow, Nancy: **The Reproduction of Mothering: Psychoanalysis and the Sociology of Gender**, Los Angeles, University of California Press, 1978.

Cixous, Hélène: "The Laugh of the Medusa," Trans.by. Keith Cohen, Paula Cohen, **Signs**, Vol. 1, No. 4, Summer 1976, pp. 875-893.

Coates, Jennifer: "Thank God I'm a Woman: The Construction of Differing Femininities," **The Feminist Critique of Language: A Reader**, Ed. by.

Deborah Cameron, London, Routledge, 1998, pp. 295-321.

Coward, Noel: **Three Plays: Blithe Spirit, Hay Fever, Private Lives**, New York, Vintage Books, 1999.

Cowburn, Malcolm, Keith Pringle: "Pornography and Men's Practices," **Journal of Sexual Aggression**, Vol.6, No.1-2, 2000, pp. 52-66.

Crowe, E. V.: "I Can Hear You," **Midsummer Mischief: Four Radical New Plays**, London, Oberon Books, 2014, pp. 103-136.

Dickson, Andrew: "Alice Birch: Being called an armchair feminist made me furious," (Online), <https://www.theguardian.com/stage/2015/jan/22/alice-birch-playwright-interview-we-want-you-to-watch>, 15 August 2017.

Dines, Gail: **Pornland: How Porn Has Hijacked Our Sexuality**, Boston, Beacon Press, 2010.

Dines, Gail: "A Feminist Response to Weitzer," **Violence Against Women**, Vol. 18, No. 4, 2012, pp. 512-520.

Dublin, Hylene: "The Evolution of the Female Self: Attachment, Identification, Individuation, Competition, Collaboration, and Mentoring," **Envy, Competition and Gender**, Ed. by. Leyla Navaro and Sharan L.Schwartzberg, London, Routledge, 2007, pp. 52-67.

Dworkin, Andrea: **Pornography: Men Possessing Women**, New York, Penguin Group, 1989.

Dworkin, Andrea,
Catherina A. MacKinnon: **Pornography and Civil Rights: A New Day for Women's Equality**, Minneapolis, Organizing Against Pornography, 1988.

Ehrlich, Susan, Ruth King: "Gender-Based Language Reform and the Social Construction of Meaning," **The Feminist Critique of Language: A Reader**, Ed. by. Deborah Cameron, London, Routledge, 1998, pp. 164-183.

Eisenstein, Zillah R.: "Developing a Theory of Capitalist Patriarchy and Socialist Feminism," "Some Notes on the Relations of Capitalist

Patriarchy,” **Capitalist Patriarchy and the Case for Socialist Feminism**, Ed. by. Zillah R. Eisenstein, New York, Monthly Review Press, 1979, pp. 5-46.

Fairclough, Norman: **Language and Power**, Harlow, Longman, 2001.

Fergusson, Ann, Nancy Folbre: “The Unhappy Marriage of Patriarchy and Capitalism,” **Women and Revolution: A Discussion of the unhappy marriage of Marxism and Feminism**, Ed by. Lydia Sargent, Montreal, Black Rose Books Ltd., 1981, pp. 313-338.

Flores, Angel: “Magic Realism in Sothern American Fiction,” American Association of Teachers of Spanish and Portuguese, *Hispania*, Vol. 38, No. 2, 1955, pp. 187-192.

Fraser, Nancy: “Feminism Capitalism and the Cunning of History,” **New Left Review**, Vol. 56, March-April 2009, pp. 97-117.

Friedan, Betty: **The Feminine Mystique**, New York, Dell Publishing, 1974.

Gali-Alfanzo, Nicole: "The Experience of Envy between Young Women and Their Female Friends: A Psychological Perspective," w. place, Massachusetts School of Professional Psychology, 2005.

Godiwala, Dimple: **Breaking the Bounds: British Feminist Dramatists Writing in the Mainstream since c.1980**, New York, Peter Lang Publishing, 2003.

Griffin, Susan: "Rape: The All- American Crime," **Ramparts Magazine**, September 1971, pp. 26-35.

Habermas, Jürgen: "The Public Sphere: An Encyclopedia Article (1964)," **New German Critique**, Trans. by Sara Lennox, Frank Lennox, Vol. 3, 1974, pp. 49-55.

Hampton, Jean: "Defining Wrong and Defining Rape," **Most Desirable Crime: New Philosophical Essays on Rape**, Ed. by. Keith Burgess- Jackson, New York: Oxford University Press, 1999, pp. 118-156.

Hanks, Patrick, Flavia Hodges: **Oxford Dictionary of First Names**, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2003.Digital.

Hartmann, Heidi: “Capitalism Patriarchy, and Job Segregation by Sex,” **Capitalist Patriarchy and the Case for Socialist Feminism**, Ed. by. Zillah R. Eisenstein, New York, Monthly Review Press, 1979, pp. 206-247.

Hartmann, Heidi: “The Unhappy Marriage of Marxism and Feminism: Towards a More Progressive Union,” **Women and Revolution: A Discussion of the unhappy marriage of Marxism and Feminism**, Ed. by. Lydia Sargent, Montreal, Black Rose Books Ltd., 1981, pp. 1-42.

Henderson, Holly: “Feminism, Foucault, and Rape: A Theory and Politics of Rape Prevention,” **Berkeley Journal of Gender, Law & Justice**, Vol. 22, No. 1, 2007, pp. 225-252.

Hennessy, Rosemary: **Profit and Pleasure: Sexual Identities in Late Capitalism**, New York, Routledge, 2000.

Hennessy, Rosemary: "Class," **A Concise Companion to Feminist Theory**, Ed. by. Mary Eagleton, Malden, Blackwell Publishing, 2003, pp. 53-72.

Hutcheon, Linda: **A Poetics of Postmodernism: History, Theory Fiction**, New York, Routledge, 2004.

Irigaray, Luce: **This Sex Which is not One**, Trans. by. Catherine Porter, Carolyn Burke, New York, Cornwell University Press, 1985.

Irigaray, Luce: **The Speculum of the Other Woman**, Trans. by. Gillian C. Gill, New York, Cornell University Press, 1987.

Irigaray, Luce: "Linguistic Sexes and Codes," **The Feminist Critique of Language: A Reader**, Ed. by. Deborah Cameron, London, Routledge, 1998, pp. 119-124.

Itzin, Catherine: "Pornography and the Construction of Misogyny," **Journal of Sexual Aggression**, Vol. 8, No. 3, 2002, pp. 4-42.

Jensen, Robert: **Getting Off: Pornography and the End of Masculinity**, Cambridge, South End Press, 2007.

Johnson, Alan G.: **The Gender Knot: Unravelling Our Patriarchal Legacy**, Philadelphia, Temple University Press, 2005.

Johnson, Sally: "Theorizing Language and Masculinity," **Language and Masculinity** Ed. by. Sally Johnson and Ulrike Hanna Meinhof, Oxford, Blackwell Publishing LTD, 1997, pp. 8-27.

Kaplan, Cora: "Language and Gender," **The Feminist Critique of Language: A Reader**, Ed. by. Deborah Cameron, London, Routledge, 1998, pp. 54-65.

Kemp, Theresa D.: **Women in the Age of Shakespeare**, Santa Barbara, Greenwood Press, 2010.

Kim, Jane: "Taking Rape Seriously: Rape as Slavery," **Howard Journal of Law & Gender**, Vol.35, 2012, pp. 263-310.

Klaassen, Marleen J. E., "Gender (In)equality in Internet Pornography

Jochen Peter: : A Content Analysis of Internet Videos,”
The Journal of Sex Research, Vol. 52, No.
7, 2015, pp. 721-735.

Kristeva, Julia: “Word, dialogue and novel,” **The Kristeva
Reader**, Ed. by. Toril Moi, New York,
Columbia University Press, 1986, pp. 34-
37.

Kristeva, Julia: **Revolt, She Said**, Trans. by. Brian O'Keeffe,
Ed. by. Sylvere Lotringer, Los Angeles,
Semiotext(e) Foreign Agents Series, 2002.

Lakoff, Robin: **Language and Woman's Place**, New York,
Harper & Row Publishers, 1975.

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

Lewis, Desiree, Mary Hames: “Gender, Sexuality and Commodity
Culture,” **Agenda**, Vol.25, No.4, 2011, pp. 2-
7.

Lindsey, Linda L.: **Gender Roles: A Sociological Perspective**,
London and New York, Routledge Taylor&
Francis Group, 2016.

MacKinnon, Catharina A.: **Toward a Feminist Theory of the State**, Cambridge, Harvard University Press, 1989.

Marx, Karl: **Economic & Philosophic Manuscripts of 1844**, Trans. by. Martin Milligan, Moscow, Progress Publisher, 1959.

Mies, Maria: **Patriarchy and Accumulation on a World Scale: Women in the International Division of Labour**, London, Zed Books Ltd, 2014.

Millett, Kate: **Sexual Politics**, London, Granada Publishing Ltd., 1971.

Molisa, Pala: "Accounting for Pornography, Prostitution and Patriarchy," New Zealand, Victoria University of Wellington, w. date.

Navaro, Leyla: "Snow Whites, Stepmothers, and Hunters: Gender Dynamics in Envy and Competition in the Family," **Envy, Competition and Gender**, Ed. by. Leyla Navaro and Sharan L.Schwartzberg, London, Routledge, 2007, pp. 68-82.

Öztimur, Neşe: “Women as Strategic Agents of Global Capitalism,” **International Review of Modern Sociology**, Vol. 33, No. 1, Spring 2007, 117-128.

Philpott, Wendeline: “Deconstructing the Gender Paradigm: The theatre of Timberlake Wertenbaker,” Alberta, National Library of Canada, 1992.

Rich, Adrienne: **Of Woman Born: Motherhood as Experience and as Institution**, New York and London, W.W. Norton & Company, 1986.

Rubin, Gayle: “The Traffic in Women: Notes on the ‘Political Economy’ of Sex,” **Toward an Anthropology of Women**, Ed. by. Rayna R. Reiter, New York, Monthly Review Press, 1975, pp. 157-210.

Shpancer, Noam: “Feminine Foes: New Science Explores Female Competition,” (Online) <https://www.psychologytoday.com/blog/insight-therapy/201401/feminine-foes-new-science-explores-female-competition>, 10 October 2016

Shakespeare, William: "A Midsummer Night's Dream," **Shakespeare Comedies**, İstanbul, Sis Publishing, 2014, pp.7-90.

Sierz, Alex: "Revolt. She Said. Revolt Again." (Online) <http://www.sierz.co.uk/reviews/revolt-she-said-revolt-again-shoreditch-town-hall/>, 30 July 2017.

Smith, Helena: "Neo-fascist Greek party takes third place in wave of voter fury," (Online) <https://www.theguardian.com/world/2015/sep/21/neo-fascist-greek-party-election-golden-dawn-third-place>, 15 September 2016.

Spender, Dale: **Man Made Language**, London, Pandora Press, 1990.

Stewart, Mary W., Shirley A. Dobbin, Sophia I. Gatowski: "'Real Rapes' and 'Real Victims': The Shared Reliance on Common Cultural Definition of Rape," **Feminist Legal Studies**, Vol. 4, No, 2, 1996, pp. 159-177.

Stroganov, Family: "Stroganov Family," (Online) <https://global.britannica.com/topic/Stroganov-family>, 25 September 2016.

- Ulrich, Laurel T.: **Well-Behaved Women Seldom Make History**, New York, Vintage Books, 2007.
- Walters, Lisa: "Oberon and Masculinity in Shakespeare's A Midsummer Night's Dream," **ANQ: A Quarterly Journal of Short Articles**, Vol. 26, No. 3, September 2013, pp. 157-160.
- Weitzer, Ronald: **Sex for Sale: Prostitution, Pornography and the Sex Industry**, Ed. by. Ronald Weitzer, New York, Routledge, 2010.
- Wertenbaker, Timberlake: "The Ant and the Cicada," **Midsummer Mischief: Four Radical New Plays**, London, Oberon Books, 2014, pp. 5- 42.
- Wienclaw, Ruth A.: "Gender& Domestic Responsibilities," **Sociology Reference Guide: Gender Roles& Equality**, Ed. by Salem Press Editors, California and New Jersey, Salem Press, 2011, pp. 77-84.
- Williams, Holly: "Women behaving badly at the RSC, (Online) <http://www.independent.co.uk/arts-entertainment/theatre-dance/features/women-behaving-badly-at-the-rsc-9553820.html>, 30 June 2017.

Wright, Paul J. et.al.: "Pornography, Alcohol, and Male Sexual Dominance," **Communication Monographs**, Vol. 82, No. 2, 2015, pp. 252-270.

Zamora, Louis P., Wendy B. Faris: **Magical Realism: Theory, History, Community**, New York, Duke University Press, 1995.

