



T.R.  
MUSTAFA KEMAL UNIVERSITY  
INSTITUTE OF SOCIAL SCIENCES  
THE DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH LANGUAGE AND EDUCATION

**FEMALE CHARACTERS AS VICTIMS OF DRIVES AND  
PREJUDICE:  
A STUDY ON HARDY'S *TESS OF THE D'URBERVILLES* AND  
*JUDE THE OBSCURE***

Manolya HARNUBOĞLU

A MASTER'S THESIS

HATAY/2008

T.R.  
MUSTAFA KEMAL UNIVERSITY  
INSTITUTE OF SOCIAL SCIENCES  
THE DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH LANGUAGE AND EDUCATION

**FEMALE CHARACTERS AS VICTIMS OF DRIVES AND  
PREJUDICE:  
A STUDY ON HARDY'S *TESS OF THE D'URBERVILLES* AND  
*JUDE THE OBSCURE***

Manolya HARNUBOĞLU

A MASTER'S THESIS

Supervisor  
Assist. Prof. Dr. Rıza ÖZTÜRK

HATAY/2008

**MUSTAFA KEMAL ÜNİVERSİTESİ**  
**SOSYAL BİLİMLER ENSTİTÜSÜ MÜDÜRLÜĞÜNE**

Yabancı Diller Eğitimi Anabilim Dalı/ İngilizce Öğretmenliği Bölümü öğrencisi  
Manolya Harnuboğlu tarafından hazırlanan “Female Characters As Victims of Drives  
an Prejudice: A Study on Hardy’s *Tess of the D’Urbervilles* and *Jude the Obscure*”  
başlıklı çalışma, 25/ 07/ 2008 tarihinde yapılan savunma sınavı sonucunda başarılı  
bulunarak jürimiz tarafından **YÜKSEK LİSANS TEZİ** olarak kabul edilmiştir.

Tez Danışmanı  
(Başkan)

Yrd. Doç. Dr. Rıza ÖZTÜRK

Üye

Yrd. Doç. Dr. Abdurrahman KILINCI

Üye

Yrd. Doç. Dr. Cem CAN

Onay

Yukarıdaki imzaların, adı geçen öğretim üyelerine ait olduğunu onaylım.

.../.../.....

Prof. Dr. Ertuğrul Baltacıoğlu  
Enstitü Müdür Vekili

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to express my indebtedness and deepest gratitude to my thesis supervisor Assist. Prof. Dr. Rıza ÖZTÜRK, who patiently and kindly guided me throughout this study. Without his invaluable encouragement and guidance, this study would not have been possible.

I also express my sincere thanks to Assist. Prof. Dr. Abdurrahman KİLİMCİ, Assist. Prof. Dr. Cem CAN, Assist. Prof. Dr. Nurcan KÖSE, Dr. Fırat KARADAŞ for their invaluable guidance, suggestions and comments.

Thanks also go to my teachers at ELTT Department in Mustafa Kemal University and my friends for their support and suggestions. Additional thanks go to Süleyman YALÇIN, who is completing a Ph.D. thesis at Çukurova University at present for his friendly support and encouragement throughout my study.

And finally I would also like to express my deep and warm gratitude to my family for the continual support and encouragement they have given me, and especially to my mother and father for their patience, understanding and invaluable help. Their great love and affection made me believe in myself, and in my study. Their contribution to this study is invaluable.

**DÜRTÜ VE ÖNYARGILARIN KURBANI OLAN KADIN KARAKTERLER:  
HARDY’NİN *TESS OF THE D’URBERVILLES* VE *JUDE THE OBSCURE*  
ROMANLARI ÜZERİNE BİR ÇALIŞMA**

**Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Manolya HARNUBOĞLU  
Yabancı Diller Eğitimi Anabilim Dalı Yüksek Lisans  
Danışman: Yrd. Doç. Dr. Rıza ÖZTÜRK**

**ÖZET**

Romanlarının çoğunda olduğu gibi, özellikle son iki romanı *Tess of the D’Urbervilles* (1891) ve *Jude the Obscure* (1896)’da da Thomas Hardy, özellikle kadın karakterlerini, toplumun değerleri ve kurumlarının kurbanı olarak tasvir eder. Bunu yaparken Hardy, bireyin dışında var olan hayatın gerçek yüzünü yansıtan bir tablo ortaya koyar.

Söz konusu romanlarda kadın karakterlerin, erkek egemen toplum tarafından nasıl kurban edildikleri incelenmiştir. Ayrıca, bu çalışma, sosyal gereklilik ışığı altında kadın karakterlerin “dürtülerine” ve toplumun “önyargılarına” odaklanmıştır. Bu durum, kadın karakterlerin kurban edilmiş süreçlerinde rol oynayan etkenleri göstermektedir. Bu, çok açık bir şekilde, erkek egemen toplumda “Ötekiler” olarak görülen kadın karakterleri gözlemlememize yardımcı olmaktadır.

Çalışma, kadın karakterlere yapılan haksızlıklar üzerinde yoğunlaşmayı öngörürken, onlara yönelik önyargıların olumsuz etkileri otomatik olarak ön plana çıkmaktadır. Bu olumsuz etkilerin nedeni, kısmen, kadın karakterlerin kendi dürtülerini ellerinde olmadan toplumsal yasaların öngörülerinin aksine tatmin etmeleridir.

Sonuç olarak, bu çalışma, genelde İngiltere’de Viktorya çağında yaşayan kadınların durumunu, özelde ise, Tess ve Sue’nun içinde bulunduğu koşulları ve onları olumsuz etkileyen etkenleri daha iyi anlamamızı sağlaması açısından önem taşımaktadır.

**ANAHTAR SÖZCÜKLER**

**Kurban, Dürtü, Önyargı, Sosyal Gereklilik, Öteki**

**FEMALE CHARACTERS AS VICTIMS OF DRIVES AND PREJUDICE:  
A STUDY ON HARDY'S *TESS OF THE D'URBERVILLES* AND *JUDE THE  
OBSCURE***

**Manolya HARNUBOĞLU  
English Language Teaching Department, Master of Arts  
Supervisor: Assist. Prof. Dr. Rıza ÖZTÜRK**

**ABSTRACT**

As almost in all his novels and particularly in *Tess of the D'Urbervilles* (1891) and *Jude the Obscure* (1896), Thomas Hardy narrates the condition of his characters especially the female characters as victims of the society, its values, and institutions. While doing that, Hardy creates an overall picture of the actual face of life as it is existing outside of the individual.

The female characters in the above-mentioned novels are studied so as to point out the way they are victimized by the patriarchal society. The study also focuses on the terms “drive” of the female characters and “prejudice” of the society under the light of social determinism. This shows us the way the factors contribute to the development of the victimization of the female characters. This, very openly, helps us to observe the female characters as “Others” in a male-dominated society.

While the study throws light upon the inequalities done to the female characters, the negative effects of the prejudice against them automatically come to the fore. The reason of these negative effects is partly the female characters' unavoidably satisfying their own drives in opposition to the rules of the society.

Finally, the study is expected to lead us to a better understanding of the state of the females in the Victorian Period of England in general, the state of Tess and Sue in specific, and the factors affecting them negatively.

**KEY WORDS**

**Victim, Drive, Prejudice, Social Determinism, Other**

To my parents, Nazire and İbrahim Harnubođlu

**FEMALE CHARACTERS AS VICTIMS OF DRIVES AND PREJUDICE:  
A STUDY ON HARDY'S *TESS OF THE D'URBERVILLES* AND *JUDE THE  
OBSCURE***

**Manolya HARNUBOĞLU**

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

	<b>Page Number</b>
Acknowledgments .....	i
Özet ve Anahtar Sözcükler .....	ii
Abstract and Key Words .....	iii
Dedication .....	iv
Table of Contents .....	v
Abbreviations .....	vii
 <b>CHAPTER I</b> 	
<b>1. INTRODUCTION .....</b>	<b>1</b>
 <b>CHAPTER II</b> 	
<b>2. THEORETICAL BACKGROUND.....</b>	<b>6</b>
2. 1. Determinism .....	8
2. 2. Prejudice .....	16
2. 3. Drive .....	28
 <b>CHAPTER III</b> 	
<b>3. <i>TESS OF THE D'URBERVILLES</i>.....</b>	<b>35</b>
3. 1. The Concept of Drive in <i>Tess of the D'Urbervilles</i> .....	37
3. 2. The Concept of Prejudice in <i>Tess of the D'Urbervilles</i> .....	53
 <b>CHAPTER IV</b> 	
<b>4. <i>JUDE THE OBSCURE</i>.....</b>	<b>68</b>
4. 1. The Concept of Drive in <i>Jude the Obscure</i> .....	71
4. 2. The Concept of Prejudice in <i>Jude the Obscure</i> .....	87



**CHAPTER V**

**5. CONCLUSION..... 109**

**WORKS CITED..... 112**

**ABBREVIATIONS**

*Tess: Tess of the D'Urbervilles*

*Jude: Jude the Obscure*

## CHAPTER I

### 1. INTRODUCTION

Thomas Hardy is a great English novelist, whose realist depiction of actual face of life leads him to shed light upon the victimization of women by the prejudicial reactions of the patriarchal society against women because of their being involved in pre-marital sexual experiences. Victimization of women appears in the form of “Otherness” ( in G. Wotton’s terminology) because the basis of the male-dominated society is the man himself, not the woman. While the women who behave in accordance with the rules and stereotypes of the society are in the framework of purity, the remainders are wicked creatures in the eye of the society. For, they behave in opposition to the socially determined codes, rules, and conventions by having pre-marital sexual experiences.

The significance of this study results from the correlation among the terms “victim”, “drive”, and “prejudice” in terms of social determinism. To focus on the victimization of Hardy’s female characters under the light of social determinism changes our point of view related to his style in depicting the controversy between the women who are regarded as “Others”, and the social conventions and codes. So, it might be stated that the negative consequences that the female characters come face to face with are the result of the impact of the socially determined rules on them.

The purpose of this study is to appreciate the victimization of Hardy’s very popular female characters Tess, and Sue, who are considered as “Others” by the male-dominated society. The terms “drive” of the female characters and “prejudice” of the society against the women who are trapped by men, and who have been exposed to pre-marital sexual experiences are considered under the light of social determinism. What is wrong here is that the women who have sexual histories are considered as fallen wicked creatures who do not deserve their own rights offered by the patriarchal society, its rules and conventions.

Thus, the study is mainly considered to cover the following terms: “Victim, Other, Drive, Prejudice, Stereotype, Prejudgment, Determinism, and Social Determinism”.

**Victim:** In Cambridge Advanced Learner's Dictionary (2007: 1441), victim is defined as “[s]omeone or something which has been hurt, damaged or killed or has suffered, either because of the actions of someone or something else, or because of illness or chance”.

**Other:** As Felman (1996: 7-8) asserts, “[t]heoretically subordinated to the concept of masculinity”, that is, to the man as the basis of the patriarchal society, “the woman is viewed by the man as *his* opposite, that is to say, as *his* other, the negative of the positive, and not, in her own right, different, other. Otherness itself”. In other words, “Man is the Self, woman is the Other; man leads, woman follows; and so on” (Tong, 2007: 32).

**Drive:** Deci, Ryan (1985: 32) give the definition of the concept of drive comparing it with “intrinsic needs” as follows: “Like drives, however, intrinsic needs are innate to the human organism and function as an important energizer of behavior”. From this definition it might be inferred that drive is an indispensable motive which triggers the behaviours of the human organism. After giving the definition of the concept at hand, it is useful to note the main characteristic of all the drives in general. According to Deci, Ryan (1985: 232), “[o]ne feature of all the drives (except for the avoidance of pain)” is as follows: “they operate cyclically”. Namely, satisfying of a drive does not mean that it does not occur again. The drive may appear again if the human organism is deprived of anything. At this point, it might be emphasized that “[w]hen a drive is satisfied, the organism is said to be in equilibrium in relation to that drive” (Deci, Ryan, 1985: 232). But, from then on, “[g]radually, with the passage of time, the organism moves into disequilibrium, and at some point the information about this condition breaks into awareness”, and “[t]his leads to behavior that restores the equilibrium, and the cyclical process continues” (Deci, Ryan, 1985: 232). In a different expression, it might be stated that there is a circulation of the needs, and subsequent behaviours. First, the needs come out. Then, they are satisfied. And the same process goes on while the human organism leads his/her life.

**Prejudice:** In Allport's (1979: 7) definition, prejudice is “an overtive or hostile attitude toward a person who belongs to a group, simply because he belongs to that group, and” this person “is therefore presumed to have the objectionable

qualities ascribed to the group”. What is important here is the negativity of the concept of the prejudice though there may be positive prejudice as well. To clarify, it should be emphasized that the negative prejudice is at the scope of the study. For the sake of fortification, Allport (1979: 516) asserts that “prejudice is an existing psychological fact”, which should also be taken into consideration from this perspective.

**Stereotype:** Allport (1979: 191), in his book *The Nature of Prejudice*, includes the definition of stereotype as in the following: “Whether favorable or unfavorable, a *stereotype is an exaggerated belief associated with a category*”. As for the function of stereotype, Allport (1979: 191) states, “[i]ts function is to justify (rationalize) our conduct in relation to that category” . In addition to this, Allport’s (1979: 191) claim goes on as follows: “A stereotype is not identical with a category; it is rather a fixed idea that accompanies the category”. Its being fixed is a dominant theme in all its definitions. In other words, as Allport (1979: 192) expresses, “[a] stereotype, then, is not a category, but often exists as a fixed mark upon the category”.

**Prejudgment:** It is necessary to include the definition of prejudgment so as to avoid misinterpretation of the concept of prejudice with prejudgment. An attitude which might turn into prejudice is the “prejudgment” itself, but we are not able to claim that prejudgments by all means convert into prejudice. In other words, “[p]rejudgments become prejudices only if they are not reversible when exposed to *new knowledge*” (Allport, 1979: 9). So, comparing and contrasting the terms “prejudgment” and “prejudice”, Allport (1979: 9) claims, “the difference between ordinary prejudgments and prejudice is that one can discuss and rectify a prejudgment without emotional resistance”. At this point, it is necessary to add that prejudgment is out of scope of the study.

**Determinism:** According to Phemister (2001: 6), determinism “likens humans to highly sophisticated and complex machines who are totally determined by internal (hereditary) and/ or external (environmental) forces beyond their control”. Another definition of determinism coming from Phemister (2001: 7) is that “everything in the universe is dependent upon, and necessitated by, an outside causal agent or influence”.

**Social Determinism:** An implication of social determinism coming from Peile (1993: 132) is as follows: “Society has become dominated by all sorts of controlling structures and by an increasing role specialization”. When the society becomes dominated by some rules, then it appears to be almost impossible for members of the society to resist to these rules. However, if some people are drifted to react otherwise, then they are alienated from the society. In the study, social determinism is regarded so as to indicate the correlation between the female characters’ drives and the society’s prejudice to their experiences in parallel with their drives. Social determinism sheds light upon the way the society punishes women because in social determinism, some fixed rules are determined by the society to indicate the criteria of the purity and morality of women, and to judge women according to these fixed, man-made rules of the patriarchal society. Women are judged unjustly because of these firm and old-fashioned rules of the male-dominated society.

As for the framework of the study, it should be noted that the first chapter which is the “Introduction” of the study introduces the subject, its prominence and purpose, the key terms as well as the framework of the study.

In the second chapter which is the theoretical background of the study, the appreciation of determinism, prejudice, and drive is presented accordingly so as to indicate the correlation among them.

The third chapter deals with the connection among the concepts of determinism, prejudice, and drive in *Tess of the D’Urbervilles*.

The fourth chapter is concerned with the correlation among the concepts of determinism, prejudice, and drive in *Jude the Obscure*.

In the last chapter which is the “Conclusion” of the study, the female characters’ pre-marital sexual experiences, their being considered as “Others” and immoral women, and their victimization by the society are concluded under the light of social determinism in Hardy’s *Tess of the D’Urbervilles* and *Jude the Obscure*.

To conclude, it might be emphasized that drive is not a fault. Man is gifted with drives. So it is a phenomenon. What is wrong here is that the reaction of the society results in the misjudging and misdirecting of the individual. What comes out as a result of the reaction is prejudice. And this automatically contributes to the

development of victimization. Thus, the element of drive plays not a direct but an indirect role in the victimization process. It is, in a sense, the starter of the victimization process because everything is almost always generated with the push or provocation of the drives themselves. When they are interpreted in the societies depicted in Hardy's novels, the prejudice leading to victimization comes out.

## CHAPTER II

### 2. THEORETICAL BACKGROUND

Many authorities share the idea that Thomas Hardy's female characters are the victims of the attitudes of their patriarchal society. The implication behind this idea is that women's living their natural drives leads men, who are the basis of the male-dominated society, to have prejudice against women. That is, "the dominant order originally victimized them [women]" (Kristeva, 1996: 456). As a fortification, it might be added that it is possible to witness "the socio-sexual victimization of women" (Felman, 1996: 9).

Hardy, who handles the happenings of his time and the state of the women with great care, portrays this problem of the Victorian Period in general with a focus upon two of his famous literary characters, Tess and Sue. Considering Hardy's female characters, it might be stated that almost all of his female characters are destroyed by the harsh demands of the society itself. To sum up, it might be added that "[t]he common way of interpreting Hardy's works in terms of characters and what happens to them is to see them as primarily victims of ... circumstance" (Longo, 1993: 11). In other words, Hardy's female characters are the victims of their sexuality because of the prejudicial reactions of the society to their having pre-marital sexual experiences.

From that point onwards, we point out that the women who behave according to the stereotypes of the society are considered loyal by the society. In Felman's (1996: 6-7) words:

From her initial family upbringing throughout her subsequent development, the social role assigned to the woman is that of *servicing* an image, authoritative and central, of man: a woman is first and foremost a daughter/ a mother/ a wife.

In other words, the women who show conformity with some fixed stereotypes are in great accord with the society, and its conventions. In contrast, the women who do not behave in this manner are alienated from the society.



In addition to Felman, Westcott (1989: 241) claims, “the very devalued traits assigned to women” are “care, cooperation, empathy, and sense of responsibility for others”. That is, there are some characteristics which are adhered only to women, and these characteristics are considered as insignificant. In contrast, the women who, willingly or unwillingly, are not able to meet these demands of the stereotypes of the society are excluded from the society. In fact, all women are labelled as “ “other women”, outsiders” or “Other” (Herndl, 1996: 5). In other words, Felman (1996: 7-8) asserts:

Theoretically subordinated to the concept of masculinity, the woman is viewed by the man as *his* opposite, that is to say, as *his* other, the negative of the positive, and not, in her own right, different, other. Otherness itself.

To sum up, “[m]an is the Self, woman is the Other; man leads, woman follows; and so on” (Tong, 2007: 32). As in the words of Gatens (1993: 51), who refers to Simone de Beauvoir (1975) in her book *Feminism and Philosophy*, “woman consistently occupies the position of Other”. The main typical examples for this type of woman in Hardy’s novels are Tess and Sue. For that reason, we would refer to them as the victims of the prejudicial reactions of the society towards their being involved in pre-marital sexual love because the fate of these women is determined by the society, its rules, and institutions such as “pedagogy, marriage, commerce”, which “necessarily exclude women, but are unquestioned because sublimated” (Gallop, 1996: 418). The reason of women’s exclusion from society, and its institutions is that:

... inequality is embedded within and reinforced (and sometimes enforced) by society\_\_ by popular culture, government, and political processes; in organizations and corporations; and within institutions such as the church/ temple/ mosque, the educational system, and the family (Brisolara, 2003: 29-30).

Therefore, it might be stated that the society and its institutions may include some harsh treatments for women. That is, while the society and its institutions may protect man who is stronger, they may put a great pressure upon the weaker, namely the woman. So, it might be added that:

Schools, the educational system, religious institutions, various forms of media, pop culture, government and political processes, corporations, and multinational organizations all significantly affect which genders have greater power and access and which have less (Sielbeck-Bowen, and et al., 2002: 4-5).

Women's socially determined lives automatically lead us to determinism in general, and social determinism in specific, which is the method to be used in the analysis of Hardy's portrayal of his female characters and their socially determined fates.

Considering whether Hardy's female characters conform to the stereotypes designed for only women or not, it can be said that "[m]any female characters in Hardy's novels clearly illustrate one of the Victorian stereotypes of women", namely, "the proper, submissive housewife or the rebellious, independent dreamer" (Notgrass, 2004: 2). In other words, the things that happen to any female character are the result of the impact of the socially determined rules, and stereotypes on the female characters.

To conclude, if women live according to their drives, then they come face to face with the prejudice of the society, and this result becomes the socially determined fate of the women, which might be termed as social determinism. Hardy depicts the profundity of the impact of prejudicial consequences of women's experiencing their natural drives in opposition to the socially determined rules. Namely, Hardy portrays the way women's drives and society's prejudices cooperation to play role in the development of their fate. In conclusion, it is appropriate to emphasize that the general "exploitation of women is still too great and the traditional prejudices against them too violent for one to be able to envision this phenomenon with sufficient distance" (Kristeva, 1996: 454). As a consequence of this, it becomes clear that the female characters in Hardy's novels are the victims of their society's prejudicial point of view of their living their drives in contrast to the stereotypes, social codes and rules.

## **2.1. Determinism**

Determinism and free will are subjects of debate among philosophers throughout history (Bolles, and the like). The reason of this dilemma, according to

Vaughn, Schick (1998: 46), lies behind the fact that “[t]he problem of free will and determinism arises because free will appears to be incompatible with causal determinism”. That is, “[i]f every event has a cause, it seems that nothing we do is up to us” (Vaughn, Schick, 1998: 46), which constructs the core of the debate. Philosophers, who admit the problematic nature of determinism and free will, struggle to find proper answers to the question whether people are truly able to determine their behaviours or not. Therefore, authorities develop some sort of definitions to this never-ending problem so as to reach the core of this uncertainty.

As a starting point, while determinism is defined, its problematic structure is highlighted as an introductory attitude because it has often been extremely complicated. Stressing this point, Levi (2007: 399) asserts, “[d]eterminism, as the thesis that given the state of the world at a moment there is only one way it can be at the next moment, is problematic”. Regarding all the definitions composed by the authorities, we hold the idea that all the definitions move around almost similar contours with the expectation of adding originality to the treatment of the old-time issue. Here, we include some critics’ definitions of determinism to present the similarities between the main points constructing the content of the definitions as well as some other additions which differ one explanation from the other in terms of the point of view of the critic him/herself.

Similarly, Koons (2002: 81), in his article “Is Hard Determinism a Form of Compatibilism?”, explains “determinist thesis” as: Each “event (including human actions) has a cause, and the chain of causes leading to any given action by an agent extends back in time to some point before the agent was born”. In this definition, the leading points are the “causality” of events, which means that the event that occurs is the result of an unknown cause, and that people lack free will in their actions. Similar to the above-mentioned definition, Haji (2003: 242) expresses:

... if determinism is true, every one of our psychological as well as our physical attributes, and every one of our actions, mental or otherwise, is the determined outcome of the distant past and the laws of nature over which no one has any control.

The main point, here, is beforehand “determined” actions, and people’s exerting no control on their own behaviours because of the nature of determinism for

each behaviour and event. From another perspective, Haji (2003: 246) asserts, “no act can be right, wrong, or obligatory for a person unless that person had the freedom to do otherwise”. Haji stresses that man should not be considered responsible for his/her acts if some unwanted event happens because these are organized without his/her awareness.

From a contributing point of view to the definitions above, Baumeister (2008: 34) ascribes many deterministic theories as in the following: “[m]ost deterministic theories conclude that whatever happens is inevitable, and so alternatives were not really possible”. Therefore, if the deterministic point of view is kept in mind, it might be added that there is the “inevitability” of only one and fixed happening.

Spurrett’s (1997: 2) definition of determinism runs in parallel with the previous ones as follows: “[d]eterminism, in general, is the philosophical thesis that the properties of the future are uniquely fixed arbitrarily before the future itself heaves into view”. The point, here, is the “fixed state” of determinism.

According to Phemister (2001: 6), determinism “likens humans to highly sophisticated and complex machines who are totally determined by internal (hereditary) and/ or external (environmental) forces beyond their control”. Another definition of determinism coming from Phemister (2001: 7) is that “everything in the universe is dependent upon, and necessiated by, an outside causal agent or influence”. At this point, Phemister (2001: 7) refers to May (1967), and expresses that “when such a deterministic view of an individual is used, the person is likely to conclude that he or she is the victim of instinctual drives or other outside forces,” such as society, its rules and institutions, “both of which are considered beyond personal control”. However, in her reference to May’s (1967) view, Phemister (2001: 7) expresses the state of the people with free will as follows: “as a person seeks to control his or her future then he or she clearly does not feel like a powerless victim”. So, philosophers consider determinism as a dangerous term because of its complexity. To conclude, Peile (1993: 127) discusses that “[i]t has been argued that determinism is not only outmoded but dangerous” because of its deep and surrounding meaning.

One of the authorities, Sherman does not employ the term “social determinism”. Instead, he makes some sort of implications throughout his study

holding the marxist perspective. For that reason, the main reminder is that although Sherman does not prefer to employ social determinism as a term, his implication leads us to contain his explanation in the social determinism section. In addition to this, his appreciating the society by way of the inclusion of marxist theory in his article drifts us to regard his sayings as a crucial starting point.

The basis of Sherman's (1981: 62) assertion comes from the explanation that "[d]eterminism means explaining events in the matrix of relationships and regularities of human behavior". In this definition, the implication of "social determinism" is the result of the critic's Marxist point of view because in Marxism, the society is at the fore, not the individual. Sherman (1981: 62) adds:

... unlike the fatalists, a social scientist includes human beings and their decisions among the factors causing any social event, even though our behavior is conditioned by our social and biological inheritances and environments.

In this explanation, Sherman explains the impact of the society which might contain prejudice, and the individuals' biology which includes the drives. Now that social influences affect people's behavior, this means that social determinism is a crucial factor in people's lives. For, the society determines some rules for people to obey in their interaction with other people.

Baumeister's (2008: 35) claim leads us to face the reality of social determinism as in "[c]ulture can influence behavior" and in "[t]aken literally, that indicates that a nonphysical reality (culture) can cause a change in physical reality (behavior)". In other words, the society has the potentiality of changing people's behaviours in positive or negative ways. It is possible to dictate what is right or wrong even if, in reality, it is wrong. The rules of the society may determine the fate of the individuals. So, the individuals become puppets at the hands of the society. Especially, this brings harm to the individual because the members of the society desire other people to conform to the stereotypes of the society, which, in most cases are outmoded.

Sherman (1981: 62), referring to Mill (1959), goes on in his explanation as: "social change is determined by "laws" or regularities, and quite another to say that "therefore, human actions have no effect on history" ". Here, Mill (1959) takes into

consideration socially determined rules, that is, social determinism. The main determining element for social change is the society itself. At this point, Vaughn, Schick (1998: 45) claim that “[i]f casual determinism is true- if every event has a cause- then we cannot act freely because everthing we do is caused by forces beyond our control”. Here, the people are puppets at the hands of fate. In addition to this, they put emphasis on whether free will should be admitted as one of the determiner in our behaviours or not. In contrast, “if causal indeterminism is true- if some events are uncaused- then again we cannot act freely because nothing we do is up to us” (Vaughn, Schick, 1998: 45). Their implication is that the opposite of determinism alone cannot be defended because it does not solve the determinism-free will problem.

If people have power upon the others, the effect of this power might be affirmative or negative. If this power is used for evil purposes, then this becomes the destruction of the people who are under the influence of this power. In parallel with this, it might be added that:

It is the very belief in a deterministic, causal world that enables and justifies the dominance of one person over another and of people over the environment, regardless of whether that dominance or control has a benevolent or exploitive intention (Peile, 1993: 129).

This dominance, in some examples, turns out to be negative. In short, Peile (1993: 130) puts a strong emphasis on the fact that “[t]he belief in causality and determinism is thus not only dangerous for others, it is also potentially self-destructive”. If the society determines the lives of all individuals, then the result of this behavior is likely to destroy individuals, their lives, expectations, and their psychological, economical and social stance in the society.

Another implication of social determinism coming from Peile (1993: 132) is as follows: “Society has become dominated by all sorts of controlling structures and by an increasing role specialization”. When the society becomes dominated by some rules, then it appears to be almost impossible for members of the society to resist to these rules. However, if some people are drifted to react otherwise, then they are alienated from the society.

De Melo-Martin, in his article, “Biological Explanations and Social Responsibility” mentions “genetic determinism” by highlighting the role of the society in reacting negatively to some genetically determined behaviours, one of which might be the drive itself. De Melo- Martin (2003: 345) argues:

... what constitutes a problem for those who are concerned with social justice is not the fact that particular behaviours may be genetically determined, but the fact that our value system and social institutions create the conditions that make such behaviours problematic. ... I will argue that even if genetic determinism were correct, the requirement of assessing and transforming our social practices and institutions would be far from superfluous.

According to him, it is necessary to change the ongoing harmful function of the society. De Melo-Martin (2003: 355), considering the reaction of the society to individual, especially to women advises that “we can promote systems of tenure and promotion that do not penalize women for doing what is presumably in their nature to do: having children and caring for them”, which is the implication of the sex drive. In other words, the society should not impede with women’s living their drives, and should not grow prejudice against them.

At this point, it might be emphasized that the subject of determinism is a vast area, and it might be associated with all fields of life. In the thesis, social determinism is at the fore. For, the main aim is to reflect prejudicial society’s reactions to female characters’ living their drives under the light of the social determinism. Lastly, it might be concluded that the female characters who have pre-marital sexual love are considered as the victims of the prejudicial society because of the socially determined rules, that is, social determinism. In addition to the definitions of determinism and social determinism, it is useful to include the definitions of free will from different authorities.

For Wilks (2003: 278), “[d]efinitions of free will, however, have been more ambiguous, with free will being defined in opposition to determinism”. Similarly, Koons (2002: 81) asserts, “[m]ost philosophers ... are convinced that the opposite of determinism is not freedom, but indeterminism”. For that reason, some authorities handle “indeterminism” as a contrast term of determinism, but some others advocate that “free will” is the opposite of determinism. Wilks (2003: 280) refers to Howard

(1993) to state the correlation between these terms as follows: “Howard (1993) argued that free will is not the opposite of determinism”.

Another authority Baumeister scrutinizes free will so as to make it more clear considering determinism. Baumeister starts his article referring to each theorist who is in the debate of determinism and free will. In the opening paragraphs, Baumeister (2008: 34) discusses that “[p]robably every theorist who addresses the question of free will takes a position on whether ... a person could do something other than what he or she eventually does”. Then, Baumeister (2008: 34) adds that “[t]o those who accept the idea of free will in any sense, its function is to select among those alternatives so that one is enacted and the others are not”. The verb “select” is the crucial word which indicates the freedom of the person who acts according to his/her free will. At this point, Baumeister highlights the connection between “free will” and “choice”. “To believe in free will is to believe that people really make choices. A choice means that more than one outcome is possible” (Baumeister, 2008: 34). After that, Baumeister (2008: 34-35) handles determinism to indicate the contrast among the terms in question as follows:

Otherwise, choice is just a figure of speech because whatever the person does is inevitable and nothing else was possible- that is, nothing gets unchosen, so no actual choice gets made.

By contrasting determinism and free will, Baumeister (2008: 37) puts emphasis on free will as: “[f]ree will is something that people understand widely and that moreover is an important component of human social life” and adds that “[i]t is a basic assumption in legal, economic, and other affairs”. In his handling the problem of free will, Baumeister strengthens his assertion giving the definition of free will from a critical point of view. According to Baumeister (2008: 37):

Free will is genuinely free in the sense that action is not entirely dictated by physical, material causality. It is not free in the sense of being independent of all causes and influences.

According to Koons (2002: 82), the explanation of “freedom thesis” is as in the following: “[s]ome human actions are free”. After this emphasis, Sherman’s



claim goes in parallel with the previous one. According to Sherman (1981: 61), in free will “humans are at liberty to do whatever they will”.

Sherman (1981: 65), from the Marxist point of view, argues that “[t]here are those who deny determinism in history” and adds to his explanation that “[t]hey point out that men and women make decisions, that they have the “free will” to do what they will in many cases”. Sherman (1981: 65) highlights his expression by way of examples as:

One can choose to vote for candidate X or for candidate Y. They therefore conclude human actions are not determined in any way, that each of us has the free will to do as he or she pleases.

Sherman (1981: 66), from the point of Marxist theory, evaluates “free will” and presents some information related to free will as in the following: “The “free will” attitude was dominant in the early eighteenth century, when it was thought that there was no determined course of history”. This was the reaction to “theological fatalism” which means “that historical events were decided by natural accidents” (Sherman, 1981: 66). One of such examples is “the storm which destroyed the Spanish Armada” (Sherman, 1981: 66). As a subsequent action:

The nineteenth-century reaction to this view was the theory of Hegel and others that everything is determined by history (or abstract ideas or the “absolute spirit”), that humans play no role, except as puppets, and must accept their destiny with fatalism (Sherman, 1981: 66).

According to Smilansky (2005: 248), the focus of “free will problem” is “on people’s *control over their own actions* rather than on their political or economic freedom”. In other words, “the free will problem is about respect for persons insofar as it involves concern for people’s control over their actions” (Smilansky, 2005: 249). Finally, Smilansky (2005: 260) concludes that “[i]t is correct then to say that the people are victims of the circumstances that constituted them and determined their choices”. Here, Smilansky defends free will because, according to him, free will is a way of treating people humanely, and its lack causes people to become victims. Not to help these people is an inhumane action.

Furbank (2006: 86), who indicates the connection between determinism and free will, asserts that “[u]sually, free will figures prominently in the doctrine of

determinism”. Here, the contrast between determinism and free will is stressed so as to differentiate between them. Considering the difference between determinism, and free will, it might be stated that there is a contrastive element between these two terms. While in determinism everything is determined beforehand, in free will people determine their course of life by way of their willpower. So, this contrastive element makes them different from one another. The female characters experience some sort of sexual intercourse. After this experience, socially determined rules become dominant upon them. Their lives are determined by the social conventions, rules, and institutions. They are not able to use their own free will any more. For, society and its institutions are at the fore. The reason of the society’s prejudice to women’s being involved in pre-marital sexual experiences is the intrusion of socially constructed rules into the lives of the female characters. Social codes, rules, and institutions intensify the prejudice against the female characters with sexual histories. This prejudice activates the victimization process of the female characters.

From a different perspective, Phemister (2001: 6), referring to Furlong (1981), discusses that free will, which is termed as “free choice” or “freedom”, “considers humans to be responsible beings having the power to control their own lives through choices which can influence the environment and other within it”. Free will is a means for people to direct their lives as they want.

To conclude, social determinism and free will are closely related to the study. For, socially determined rules determine the lives of the female characters, and destroy their lives. Being involved in pre-marital sexual love, the female characters who are regarded as “Others” are exposed to some harsh treatments related to their drives. Having unconventional sexual experiences, the female characters come face to face with prejudicial reactions of the society because of the dominancy of the social determinism.

## **2.2. Prejudice**

Philosophers have always dealt with the nature of prejudice throughout history. Although some authorities have defined prejudice as well as explaining its types one by one, prejudice has remained as a controversial issue, and is handled in

all doctrines and disciplines such as politics, economics, sociology, psychology, literature, and the like. The reason is that knowing the nature of prejudice does not abolish the practice of prejudicial attitudes in all parts of the world. For instance, though people claim that they have no prejudice for any group, their attitudes towards them are unconsciously shaped in the opposite direction. Therefore, as one of the types of prejudice, racial prejudice, for instance, is an unsolved problem in our time as well.

Because of the rarity of the studies and researches in the field of prejudice, Gordon W. Allport, “as one of America’s preeminent social psychologists” (Clark, 1979: ix), handles this untouched subject in his book *The Nature of Prejudice* (1954).

But the clues to the quality of this person who dared to discuss the emotionally laden problem- the pathos and dilemmas of human prejudices- from the perspective of a social scientist are found as early as 1937 (Clark, 1979: ix).

From this information, we are able to notice “the legacy in *The Nature of Prejudice*” and also “his other contributions to social-psychological theory, research, and insights” (Clark, 1979: ix).

In the book *On the Nature of Prejudice*, Dovidio, and et al. (2005: 1) assert that “[t]here is no debate that Gordon W. Allport’s (1954/ 1979) *The Nature of Prejudice* is the foundational work for the social psychology of prejudice”. Dovidio, and et al. (2005: 3) add that “Gordon Allport is widely recognized for his significant insights into prejudice” and “[h]is expertise on the topic was clearly deep and broad, but he also had a unique capacity for integration” and that “[h]e [Allport] organized many disparate views on prejudice and synthesized them around three basic themes, concerning cognitive, motivational, and sociocultural processes”. While taking into consideration both prejudice and culture, it might be functional to emphasize that:

Allport believed that sociocultural influences- from parental influence, to peer pressure, to laws- could both create and maintain prejudice and be a fundamental key to eliminating prejudice (Dovidio, and et al., 2005: 9).

Apart from this explanation, Eagly, Diekman (2005: 23) present a method to understand the concept of prejudice as: “The best way to understand the nature of

prejudice is to take both the structure of the social environment and the psychological structure of the individual into account”. Because prejudice is related to individual’s attitudes, the characteristics of the individual are a determining factor in their reactions to the outer world.

While handling the concept of prejudice, the main concern is to point out the prejudice against women who have come across unwanted sexual experiences before marriage. Therefore, it might be said that although the concept of prejudice is a vast area, the focal point is to appreciate the prejudice against women who do not conform to the stereotypes of the patriarchal society.

Prejudice is somehow related to socially determined rules because these fixed rules drift people to intensify prejudice against women considering their pre-marital sexual experiences. Social determinism as well as social institutions lead the society to react negatively against women who have sexual experiences in an unconventional way. If the sex drive is experienced in parallel with the socially constructed rules, then no problem occurs because women are in the framework of purity conforming to the man-made rules, and stereotypes. In contrast, if women are involved in pre-marital sexual love, they are excluded from the society because these women are not able to conform to the socially determined rules, codes, and conventions.

For the sake of laying the basis for the subject in question, it might be stated that in the concept of prejudice “the two sexes”, that is, male and female are the crucial component of the “cluster that are also the victims of prejudice” (Allport, 1953: xviii). As has been pointed out above, in this study, only female characters’ being the victim of prejudice is scrutinized so as to paint the picture of the inequality between males and females in a detailed way.

In his book *The Nature of Prejudice*, Allport (1979: 109), while comparing men and women, notes, “the vast proportion of human physical, physiological, psychological traits are not sex linked”. Allport (1979: 109) goes on his explanation focusing on women as: “in most cultures the position of women is demarcated in an exaggerated way from that of man”. For instance, women “are regarded as inferior, kept in the home, dressed differently, denied many of the rights and privileges of men”, and it is necessary to add that “[t]he special roles assigned to them are far in excess of what sexual genetic difference would justify” (Allport, 1979: 109).

Allport (1979: 3), in *The Nature of Prejudice*, begins to handle the subject defining the nature of prejudice in the first chapter called “What is the problem?”. Here, Allport gives the definition of the concept of prejudice showing the steps of its derivation. According to Allport (1979: 6), “[t]he word *prejudice*, derived from the Latin noun *praejudicium*, has, like most words, undergone a change of meaning since classical times”. In addition to this basic definition, the concept of prejudice has naturally taken its place in theory books.

In the glossary of Allen’s (1997: 474) book *Personality Theories*, prejudice is defined as that it “is felt or expressed antipathy based on a faulty and inflexible generalization”, and it is added that it “may be directed toward a group as a whole, or toward an individual because he is a member of the group”. At this point, it should be stated that prejudice may be both positive and negative, but only the negative aspect of prejudice is at the scope of the study.

In Allport’s (1979: 7) definition, prejudice is “an overtive or hostile attitude toward a person who belongs to a group, simply because he belongs to that group, and” this person “is therefore presumed to have the objectionable qualities ascribed to the group”. Here, one of the most important things is the negativity of the concept of the prejudice though there may be positive prejudice as well. For the sake of fortification, Allport (1979: 516) asserts that “prejudice is an existing psychological fact”, which should also be taken into consideration from this perspective.

From the same perspective, Billig (1991: 126), in his book *Ideology and Opinions* argues, “it has been suggested that the prejudiced themes exist at a psychologically deeper level than the denial of prejudice”. Billig puts emphasis upon the prejudice from the psychological aspect because psychology determines our reactions towards other people. For that reason, “the prejudiced themes are held to indicate the ‘genuine’ attitudinal structure” (Billig, 1991: 126). With more emphasis on culture, Billig (1991: 129) claims, “ ‘prejudice’, as an everyday concept, as well as a social-scientific one, represents a strong cultural value”. At this point, “overcategorization” should be handled so as to reach to a better understanding of the concept of prejudice.

An important component of prejudice is “the *overcategorization*” which “is perhaps the commonest trick of the human mind” (Allport, 1979: 8). In “the

overcategorization” some people may not take into consideration the individual characteristics of the members of some groups. Instead, they may categorize them according to the group they belong to. In other words, the characteristics of the group are at the fore, not the characteristics of the members of the group. As a result of this, “[g]iven a thimbleful of facts we rush to make generalizations as large as a tub” (Allport, 1979: 8). Namely, some people come face to face with prejudice according to the group they belong to because some negative impressions are attached to their group ignoring their own characteristics. But, at this point, it is crucial to remind the nuance that “[n]ot every overblown generalization is a prejudice” (Allport, 1979: 9). For instance, “[s]ome are simply *misconceptions*, wherein we organize wrong information” (Allport, 1979: 9). This means that when the new information is acquired, the current wrong thoughts and attitudes may be abandoned. In addition to this, it is necessary to include the definitions of stereotype because prejudice and stereotype are closely related to each other, and they might be confused to one another.

As a starting point, in connection with prejudice, it is necessary to state that “[t]he term “stereotype” was coined by American journalist Walter Lippman in his 1922 book entitled *Public Opinion*” (Stangor, 2000: 6), which indicates the first usage of the term.

Stereotype, in Oxford Advanced Learner’s Dictionary (1994: 1259), is defined as an “image, idea, character, etc that has become fixed or standardized in a conventional form without individuality (and is therefore perhaps false)”. Again, it is evident that stereotypes are some fixed frames for people to conform, and they have negativity in their nature due to the lack of the alteration. In addition to this, Allen’s (1997: 479) glossary includes this term as “an exaggerated belief that members of a group possess a certain trait”. Here, the concepts of stereotype and prejudice are closely related to each other. For, stereotypes are fixed structures which are socially designed especially for women. While the women conform to these man-made fixed stereotypes, then no problem occurs. In contrast, while the women behave in opposition to these stereotypes, they are exposed to prejudicial reactions of the society, and its institutions. For, everything is designed according to these

stereotypes, and all women are expected to lead their lives in great harmony with them.

Allport (1979: 191), in his book *The Nature of Prejudice*, includes the definition of stereotype as in the following: “Whether favorable or unfavorable, a stereotype is an exaggerated belief associated with a category”. As for the function of stereotype, Allport (1979: 191) states that “[i]ts function is to justify (rationalize) our conduct in relation to that category”. In addition to this, Allport’s (1979: 191) claim goes on in these lines: “A stereotype is not identical with a category; it is rather a fixed idea that accompanies the category”. Its being fixed is a dominant theme in all its definitions. In other words, as Allport (1979: 192) expresses, “[a] stereotype, then, is not a category, but often exists as a fixed mark upon the category”.

Stangor, in the section “Volume Overview” in his book *Stereotypes and Prejudice: Essential Readings* scrutinizes prejudice and stereotypes giving examples about them. Firstly, Stangor (2000: 1) starts his comment with the assertion that “[t]here is perhaps no topic that has so engaged the interest of social psychologists as that of stereotypes, prejudice, and discrimination”. Stangor (2000: 1) explains why these topics are so popular around the circles of social psychology in these lines: “Interest in studying stereotyping and prejudice comes in part from its immense practical importance”. And Stangor (2000: 1), referring to some authorities, attaches additional and complementary information to the above-mentioned idea as:

Social psychologists are thus interested in stereotyping and prejudice because these beliefs can have negative outcomes both for the individuals who are the targets of prejudice (Crocker&Major, 1989; Jones, 1996; Steele&Aronson, 1994; J. T. Swim&Stangor, 1998) and for society at large.

Although “stereotyping and prejudice” are dealt with by social psychologists, in fact, they “are integrally related to the most central topics in psychology” such as “attitudes, social cognition, person perception, conformity, group behavior, and aggression” (Stangor, 2000: 1).

In addition to Allport’s definition of prejudice and stereotypes, it is necessary to include Stangor’s definitions of both prejudice and stereotypes because these two terms are closely related to each other. So, while Stangor (2000: 1) defines “prejudice” as “a negative feeling or negative attitude toward the members of a

group”, he gives the definition of stereotypes as that “[s]tereotypes are beliefs about the characteristics of groups of individuals (for instance, that women are emotional or that college professors are absent-minded)” as well as the definition of stereotyping as in the following: “*stereotyping* is the application of these stereotypes when we interact with people from a given social group”.

At this point, Stangor (2000: 2), who mentions the foundation of prejudice and stereotyping notes, “[s]tereotypes and prejudice are the result of *social categorization*” which “occurs when, rather than thinking another person as a unique individual, we instead think of the person as a member of a group of people”. The important thing is not the individual him/herself. Instead, the group to which he/she belongs is the most important think to have prejudice against that person in question.

Stangor (2000: 8), in his attempt to interrelate the terms “prejudice” and “stereotype”, acknowledges, “having stereotypes does not necessarily mean that we are prejudiced”. While comparing prejudice and stereotypes, Stangor (2000: 8) describes, “[i]n contrast to stereotypes, which involve thoughts or beliefs about the group, prejudice has an emotional component” which is negative. Moreover, “[a]s with stereotypes, one of the characteristics that makes prejudice so insidious is that it often occurs quickly and without our awareness” (Stangor, 2000: 8). Lastly, Stangor (2008: 17) acknowledges:

... the formal empirical study of stereotyping and prejudice has only begun in the 20th century, as an outgrowth of the increased interest in the study of social behavior, particularly in the field of psychology.

This constructs a crucial part of the historical background for the concepts of prejudice and stereotype. At this point, it is necessary to include the definition of prejudgment so as to avoid misinterpretation of the concept of prejudice with prejudgment.

An attitude which might turn into prejudice is the “prejudgment” itself, but we cannot claim that prejudgments by all means convert into prejudice. In other words, “[p]rejudgments become prejudices only if they are not reversible when exposed to *new knowledge*” (Allport, 1979: 9). As having a strong basis, “[a] prejudice, unlike a simple misconception, is actively resistant to all evidence that



would unseat it” (Allport, 1979: 9). The change that happens in a prejudiced person’s mood when he/she is challenged is that “[w]e tend to grow emotional when a prejudice is threatened with contradiction” (Allport, 1979: 9). So, comparing and contrasting the terms “prejudgment” and “prejudice”, Allport (1979: 9) claims that “the difference between ordinary prejudgments and prejudice is that one can discuss and rectify a prejudgment without emotional resistance”. Going on reading Allport’s explanations and comments on the concept of prejudice, we realize Allport’s connecting the concept of prejudice to the culture, that is, the totality of people and from this mixture, a new type of definition of prejudice comes out. According to Allport (1979: 11), “[p]rejudice is the *moral evaluation* placed by a culture on some of its own practices. It is a designation of attitudes that are disapproved”. For the sake of clarification, we should add that prejudgment is out of scope of the study.

As for the types of people, Allport (1979: 175) argue, “[w]e are not, of course, implying that there are only two types of people (to do so would be unjustified dichotomization)” and adds:

There are all degrees and shadings of the prejudice-syndrome and of the tolerance-syndrome. What we are saying is not that mixed types of personality do not occur, but rather that whenever prejudice is found it is unlikely to stand isolated from the process of cognition in general, or from the dynamics of the person’s whole style of life.

Although the main types of people are prejudiced and tolerant people, it is not possible to claim that there are no other types because there may be some mixtures of both the prejudiced and tolerant people. In addition to this, the emphasis above is the connection of the prejudice with cognitive processes and with the person’s point of view of life.

Duckitt attracts our attention to the relation between the main types of people and the nature of prejudice. Duckitt (2005: 396) writes, “[w]hile the core of the authoritarian personality was threat, insecurity, and ego weakness, the core of the tolerant personality was the exact opposite” such as “a sense of inner security, freedom from threat, ego maturity, and therefore the inner confidence and strength to cope adequately with threat”. The prejudiced people have the authoritarian personality because their egos are threatened by the outer world, and they have no

choice but to develop some sort of defensive strategies such as prejudicial attitudes to protect their own selves. At this point, it is necessary to focus on the general characteristics of a prejudiced person.

As a general reality, “[i]t is not easy to say how much fact is required in order to justify a judgement” (Allport, 1979: 7). For that reason, a person might easily acquire a prejudicial opinion about any person or thing. As a consequence of this liability to acquire prejudice, the characteristics of a prejudiced person differ from that of an unprejudiced person. For instance, “[a] prejudiced person will almost certainly claim that he has sufficient warrant for his views” (Allport, 1979: 7). This mistakenly constructed attitude is often difficult to change, that is, it is almost always fixed.

In addition to this, it is necessary to add that “in most cases, it is evident that his facts are scanty and strained” and that the prejudiced person “resorts to a selective sorting of his own few memories, mixes them up with hearsay, and overgeneralizes” (Allport, 1979: 7). Moreover, “[s]ometimes, the ill-thinker has no first-hand experience on which to base his judgment” (Allport, 1979: 7). In other words, in some cases there may be no justifiable basis for acquiring prejudice. When we question how and in what cases prejudice brings out, we come across with the fact that “[o]rdinarily, prejudice manifests itself in dealing with individual members of rejected groups” (Allport, 1979: 7).

At this point, it might be said that “[t]he individual cannot face the world unflinchingly and in a forthright manner” (Allport, 1979: 396). In other words, the prejudiced individual “seems fearful of himself, of his own instincts, of his own consciousness, of change, and of his social environment” (Allport, 1979: 396). Namely, the prejudiced person is anxious of whatever he/she encounters, and tries to find ways to protect him/herself, one of which is, unconsciously, to have prejudicial attitudes. He/She tries to fix his/her state so as not to lose anything from him/herself.

In addition to the general information mentioned above, for Allport (1979: 397), the characteristics of prejudiced people are “ambivalence toward parents, moralism, dichotomization, a need for definiteness, externalization of conflict, institutionalism, authoritarianism”. Those characteristics “are accordingly the earmarks of a personality in whom prejudice is functionally important” (Allport,

1979: 397). For the sake of clearness, the characteristics of prejudiced people are explained below.

The first characteristic of prejudiced people is ambivalence toward parents. If “a relationship of power rather than love prevails” at home, in these conditions “it is often difficult for the child to identify fully with the parent because his affectional needs are not met” (Allport, 1979: 398). This deprived state of the child causes him not to know how he/she behaves. He/She does not have an exact knowledge about himself/herself, and the outer world. In other words, as Allport (1979: 398) notes, “[h]e learns through imitation, coerced by reward, punishment, reproof” and “[h]e cannot fully accept himself and his failings, but must be ever on guard against slips from grace”. This isolated child does not know what to do, and he/she is always in danger. Namely, “[i]n such a family situation a child never knows just where he stands. A threat hangs over him at every step” (Allport, 1979: 398).

The second one is moralism. In a research conducted, “[w]hen asked the question, “[w]hat is the most embarrassing experience?””, the prejudiced “responded in terms of violations of mores and conventions in public” (Allport, 1979: 398). In contrast, the non-prejudiced “spoke more often of inadequacy in personal relations, such as failing to live up to a friend’s expectation” (Allport, 1979: 398). As a result of this, according to Allport (1979: 399), “[h]aving had to fight unholy impulses in himself,” a person “cannot be permissive and lenient toward others”. In contrast to the prejudiced person, “[t]he tolerant individual ... seems to have learned how to accept socially tabooed impulses early in life. He is not afraid of his own instincts”. For instance, “he is not a prude; he views bodily functions” such as drives “in a natural way” (Allport, 1979: 399). As a non-prejudiced person, “[t]he tolerant individual, having learned to accept the evil in his nature, does not grow anxious and fearful whenever he sees (or imagines) similar evils in others”. In short, “[h]is view is humane, compassionate, understanding”, which are demanded features (Allport, 1979: 399).

The other characteristic of people with prejudice is dichotomization. Prejudiced children think that only two kinds of people- the strong and the weak ones- exist in the world. Similarly, there is one right answer to each problem. That is, they separate right from wrong with definite borders. The same approach is valid for

the state of women, too. For example, a woman is either spotless or wicked. She cannot be in the middle of them both. So, the reflection of this type of prejudiced person may be realized easily in everyday life. In Allport's (1979: 400) words, "[t]he functional significance of "two-valued logic" for the prejudiced person is not far to seek". Allport (1979: 400) goes on his explanations as:

We have noted his failure to accept the crisscross of good and bad in his own nature. He is therefore chronically sensitized to right and wrong. This inner bifurcation becomes projected upon the outer world.

In other words, "[h]e gives approval and disapproval categorically" (Allport, 1979: 400). As a critic of Allport, Allen (1997: 448), in the section "Personality Development and Prejudice: Gordon Allport" of his book *Personality Theories* summarizes Allport's view of "dichotomization" in these lines: "Highly prejudiced people literally see in black and white". That is, "[t]here is good and there is bad; there is right and there is wrong". (Allen, 1997: 448). For instance, "[e]verything the child did was either right or it was wrong, there was no middle ground" (Allen, 1997: 448).

Another characteristic of prejudiced people is need for definiteness. The prejudiced want to maintain definiteness while facing with any problem. To solve problems "prejudiced persons cling to past solution" (Allport, 1979: 402). The result of the experiment conducted indicates this same conclusion that "prejudiced people are more given to *perseveration*, which means that old and tried solutions are considered to provide safe anchorage" (Allport, 1979: 402). Another striking result of the experiment is that "[p]rejudiced people seem afraid to say "I don't know" " (Allport, 1979: 402). As a contributing element to the idea stated above, it might be added that "[p]rejudiced people, it seems, feel more secure when they "know the answers" " (Allport, 1979: 402). The expressions "[p]rejudiced people demand clear-cut structure in their world, even if it is a narrow and inadequate structure. Where there is no order they impose it" and "[w]hen new solutions are called for they cling to tried and tested habits" are the implication of the fact that "[t]here is no inner definiteness" (Allport, 1979: 403). They are not sure of themselves and their own potentialities.

The fifth feature of prejudiced people is externalization. In this type, the prejudiced person externalizes him/herself from the negative happenings around him/her. Allport (1979: 404) portrays this characteristic in the expression: “To the prejudiced person things seem to happen “out there”. He has no control over his destiny”. Namely, they have a deterministic point of view of life. They think that everything is already governed beyond their will. In addition to this, “[i]t is easier and safer for a person in inner conflict to avoid self-reference” (Allport, 1979: 404). The prejudiced person believes that the negative events that happen to him/her are not his/her own fault, but the fault of the others outside of him/her. He/She does not question himself. Instead, he/she almost always finds other people faulty. “It is better to think of things happening *to* him rather than as caused *by* him” (Allport, 1979: 404). To emphasize, it might be added that the prejudiced person does not find his/her personality or his/her wrong attitudes faulty. He/She puts blame upon others. He/She claims, “it is not *I* who hates and injures others; it is *they* who hate and injure me” (Allport, 1979: 404).

Allen (1997: 448) comments on this type of characteristic as: “Rather than believing that they [very prejudiced people] control what happens to them by use of their own resources, they believe that fate controls them”. They have a strong belief in fate. So, they try to externalize themselves from unpleasant happenings.

The sixth one is institutionalism. The prejudiced person likes institutions, for he/she believes that these institutions protect him/her. Allport (1979: 404) describes, “[t]he person with character-conditioned prejudice likes order, but especially *social* order”, and “[i]n his clear-cut institutional memberships, he finds the safety and the definiteness he needs”. In addition to this, “[I]odges, schools, churches, the nation, may serve as a defense against the disquiet in his personal life. To lean on them saves him from leaning on himself”, which is the expression of that the prejudiced person uses some of his/her own defenses not to harm his/her own self (Allport, 1979: 404). As an impressive fact, the result of the conducted research, in general, is that: “... by and large, prejudiced people are more devoted to institutions than are the unprejudiced” (Allport, 1979: 404).

The last feature of prejudiced people is authoritarianism. The prejudiced person does not like democracy. Instead, he/she likes hierarchy. The reason is that in

hierarchy everything is defined, fixed and unchangable. So, there is no threat from outside. In Allport's (1979: 406) words:

The consequences of personal freedom they find unpredictable. Individuality makes for indefiniteness, disorderliness, and change. It is easier to live in a defined hierarchy where people are types, and where groups are not constantly shifting and dissolving.

It is more appropriate for the prejudiced person to be in a stable ground. For the prejudiced person, hierarchy is a means of supplying this stable situation. According to Allport (1979: 406), "[t]o avoid such slipperiness the prejudiced person looks for hierarchy in society" and "[p]ower arrangements are definite- something he can understand and count on. He likes authority". Lastly, it might be said that "[t]o the prejudiced person the best way to control these suspicions is to have an orderly, authoritative, powerful society. Strong nationalism is a good thing" (Allport, 1979: 407). Authoritarianism is a crucial fact in the prejudiced person's life.

In conclusion, it is appropriate to state that although the concept of prejudice seems to be difficult for people to develop it, it is so easy and sneaky that people might change their attitudes unconsciously, which is the result of cognitive processes. The reason is that people have a tendency to have prejudice.

### **2.3. Drive**

The concept of drive is the subject of debate in almost all disciplines especially psychoanalysis, behaviorism or empirical psychology, and social psychology. The prominent authorities of these disciplines have always tried to define the concept of drive by way of drive theories so as to understand its place in our behaviour. In other words, "[f]or several decades theorists and researchers worked to develop systems for the explanation of behavior that were based in drive theories" (Deci, Ryan, 1985: 4). While dealing with this subject, theorists have developed prominent drive theories considering the drives which have a focal function in all aspects of life. Despite these attempts of describing the concept of drive and its function, there is still some sort of ambivalence in some fields. For this

reason, it might be stated that some sort of vagueness is a prevailing characteristic in the definitions of the concept of drive existing in drive theories.

To start with, Deci, Ryan (1985: 32) give the definition of the concept of drive by comparing it with “intrinsic needs” as follows: “Like drives, however, intrinsic needs are innate to the human organism and function as an important energizer of behavior”. From this definition it might be inferred that drive is an indispensable motive which triggers the behaviours of the human organism. After giving the definition of the concept in hand, it is useful to note the characteristic of all the drives in general.

According to Deci, Ryan (1985: 232), “[o]ne feature of all the drives (except for the avoidance of pain)” is as follows: “they operate cyclically”. Namely, satisfying of a drive does not mean that it does not occur again. The drive may appear again if the human organism is deprived of anything. At this point, it might be emphasized that “[w]hen a drive is satisfied, the organism is said to be in equilibrium in relation to that drive” (Deci, Ryan, 1985: 232). But, from then on:

Gradually, with the passage of time, the organism moves into disequilibrium, and at some point the information about this condition breaks into awareness as a motive. This leads to behavior that restores the equilibrium, and the cyclical process continues (Deci, Ryan, 1985: 232).

In a different expression, it might be said that there is a circulation of the needs, and subsequent behaviours. First, the needs come out. Then, they are satisfied. And the same process goes on while the human organism leads his/her life.

At this point, it is necessary to deal with the concept of drive and drive theories from the aspects of behaviorism, psychoanalysis, and social psychology. It is generally believed that:

Within psychoanalytic psychology, motivation theory began with Freud’s (1914, 1915) drive theory (often called instinct theory), whereas within empirical psychology it can be said to have begun with Hull’s (1943) drive theory (although motivation had previously been discussed by a number of important empirical psychologists) (Deci, Ryan, 1985: 4).

Although various theorists deal with the same issue, their theories naturally have different directions, methodologies, and conclusions. One of the differences for the types of drives among these disciplines is as in the following: “Freud (1917)

asserted that there are two important drives- sex and aggression- whereas Hull (1943) asserted that there are four- hunger, thirst, sex, and the avoidance of pain” (Deci, Ryan, 1985: 4). In contrast, in terms of similarity, Hull is influenced by Freud’s theory of drive (Deci, Ryan, 1985: 18). However, as for the difference in the method handled in their studies, it might be added that while “[p]sychoanalytic scholars organized their investigations around the role of drives, particularly the sexual drive, in the development of pathology,” such “empirically oriented researchers” as Hull “studied the role of drives in animal learning” (Deci, Ryan, 1985: 4). At this point, it should be pointed out that only sex drive is at the scope of the study because the involvement of women in the experiences of sex drive before marriage is likely to create some sort of destroying prejudice against women in the patriarchal society. That is, this prejudice is likely to victimize all the women who are considered as “Others” in the society in general. In Hardy’s novels the pre-marital sexual experiences between Tess and Alec as well as Sue and Jude are taken into consideration throughout the study.

Deci, Ryan, in “Drive Theories” section of their book *Intrinsic Motivation and Self-Determination in Human Behavior*, handle the concept of drive itself by indicating the studies being conducted from the past to the present, which construct a short summary of the history of the concept in question. As Deci, Ryan (1985: 4) assert:

For decades, theories of motivation, whether based on data from clinical interviews with people or on laboratory experiments with rats, were focused on drives and their vicissitudes.

After indicating the focus placed on the concept of drive, Deci, Ryan (1985: 4) go on their discussion handling the studies conducted in psychoanalysis and empirical psychology, and explaining the function and prominence of the concept of drive in all behaviours as follows:

In the psychoanalytic and the empirical traditions, for example, theories began with the postulate that behavior can, ultimately, be reduced to a small number of physiological drives. All behaviors were said to be motivated either directly by a drive or by some derivative thereof.



After some general definitions and explanations of the concept of drive, it is necessary to handle the drive theories constructed by the theorists of different disciplines. By scrutinizing the drive theory, we are likely to understand the concept of drive more fully.

In the field of psychoanalysis, many studies have been conducted. For instance, Deci, Ryan (1985: 18), in the part “Psychodynamic Drive Theory”, discuss the concept in hand by indicating the connection between the behaviour and the concept of drive in these lines: “As in Hullian theory all behavior was said to be either a direct or derivative function of drive energies”. In their discussion of the subject in question, Deci, Ryan scrutinize Freud’s drive theory as well as its components and functions in determining a person’s behaviours.

As one of the influential theorists, “Freud proposed the other major drive theory three decades prior to Hull’s” (Deci, Ryan, 1985: 18). While handling the drive theory, Freud points out the components of this theory as well as the functions of the drives in reacting to the outer world. So, it might be expressed that:

Freud’s pioneering work with the clinical method allowed him to uncover the importance of the sexual and aggressive drives- drives that are so often frustrated by sociocultural inhibitions- and to comprehend their psychodynamic activity (Deci, Ryan, 1985: 18).

This shows Freud’s labeling the drives as both sexual and aggressive ones as well as his emphasizing their dissatisfaction in the society with strict rules, and prohibition. As a result of this:

Focusing particularly on the sexual drive, Freud outlined a theory of personality development in which he proposed that the core of one’s personality develops from a series of conflicts between the sexual drive and the socializing environment (Deci, Ryan, 1985: 18).

As has been understood from the expression above, there may be some conflict between the sexual drive and the society because of the strict rules and conventional point of view of the society. If this conflict cannot be solved, then the distraction of the person is an inevitable result. In other words, “[a]dequate resolution of these conflicts was implicated in the development of a healthy personality, whereas inadequate resolution was the basis for neuroses” (Deci, Ryan, 1985: 18).

In empirical psychology, in other words, behaviorism, the subject of drive is handled with great care. “The general motivational theory”, one component of which is the various drive theories:

... begins with the organismic assumptions of activity and structure, recognizing that human beings attempt actively to master the forces in the environment and the forces of drives and emotions in themselves. In mastering these forces, human beings integrate them into the internal, unified structure called self (Deci, Ryan, 1985: 8).

While human beings sometimes become successful in directing their own drives, some other times they are affected badly.

In the article “Multifaceted Nature of Intrinsic Motivation”, Reiss (2004: 180) starts “the discussion by considering the behaviorist concept of drive”. At this point, it should be emphasized that the relation between drive and behaviour should be expressed from the point of the empirical doctrine. So, it is necessary to add that “[b]ehavior was said to occur because a drive was operative and an association had developed between the drive stimulation and an object or a response” (Deci, Ryan, 1985: 6).

In social facilitation as well as in social psychology, drive plays an important role. For, it is the basis of human behaviours. In the opening paragraph of the book *Social Facilitation* by Guerin (1993) “social facilitation” is defined as: “[h]uman may run fast, read less, type more quickly, simply because someone else is present” and “[t]he presence of one person affects the behaviour of another: this is known as social facilitation”. This indicates the impact of the audience upon the individual. As an additional information to the definition given above, it is necessary to add that social facilitation “is one of the oldest topics in social psychology, first studied in 1898” (Guerin, 1993).

In the “Introduction” part of the above-mentioned book, Guerin (1993: 1) presents a broader view of the issue emphasizing these lines:

... social facilitation is said to occur when humans run faster, read less, type quicker, or do fewer arithmetic problems in the presence of another person, but only if the other person does not reinforce the behaviour, show how it is done, set a performance standard, or compete.

This means that social facilitation is a different phenomenon from performance, competition and the like.

As the historical background of social facilitation which includes drive theory, Guerin (1993: 7) explains, “[t]he major seminal paper on social facilitation were written in 1898 by Norman Triplett, in 1920 by Floyd Allport, and by Robert Zajonc in 1965”. From these three prominent figures, Zajonc’s influence dominates the other subsequent authorities’ drive theories in specific as well as the field of social psychology in general.

While Guerin describes the content of his book, he states that he has included both traditional approach and the modern one, the representator of the latter, as has been expressed above, is Zajonc himself. According to Guerin (1993: 3), the work of Zajonc “revitalized research and had a huge impact in producing new theories and experimental studies”.

Guerin (1993: 30), in the part “The drive model of Zajonc (1965)” indicates how the field of social facilitation has undergone a change from the past to the present. As for Zajonc’s attitude in constructing his drive theory, it might be emphasized that “[w]hat is interesting from the standpoint of social facilitation is that as late as 1965, Zajonc used a Hullian framework to explain social facilitation, rather than a cognitive one” (Guerin, 1993: 32). His preference in doing this “was probably that cognitive psychologists had not quite finalized how to deal with drive mechanisms and dominance hierarchies in their new models” (Guerin, 1993: 32). From these expressions, it is clear that Zajonc has constructed his drive theory considering the studies conducted in those days as well as their results. Robert Zajonc’s nine points construct his drive theory.

As for Zajonc’s definition of the concept of drive, we may state that there is not any definite definition of drive. Instead, “the term ‘arousal’ turns out to be as vague as ‘drive’ and can refer to a number of different processes”, which constitutes the foundation of the criticisms done for Zajonc’s drive theory (Guerin, 1993: 37). For the sake of indicating the ambivalence of the concept of drive, Guerin (1993: 42) asserts:

Zajonc's final claim for the simplicity and parsimony of his drive model is correct, but only in so far as a number of terms are left vague and a number of phenomena are not considered.

In this expression above, the main point is that although there are some strong aspects of Zajonc's drive theory, the vagueness of some terms forms some sort of deficiency.

In his drive theory, Zajonc mainly asserts, "for complex or learning tasks, audiences will inhibit performance" (Guerin, 1993: 33). This means that if the task is difficult, the presence of the audiences will give harm to the quality of the performance, but "for simple or well-learned tasks, audiences will facilitate performance" (Guerin, 1993: 33). Here, the emphasis is on the opposite of the point expressed above. Namely, if the task is simple, the presence of the audiences will contribute to the performance.

It might be said that although there are some deficiencies in Zajonc's drive theory, it is an inspiring theory which constitutes a model for the subsequent theories. In fact, other drive theories are constructed under the light of Zajonc's drive theory. For this reason, as an illuminating theory, Zajonc's drive theory has a special place in social facilitation as well as in social psychology.

In conclusion, it might be stated that determinism, social determinism, free will, drive and prejudice are closely related to each other in the interpretation of the state of Hardy's female characters who are tossed by the conventional society. For, the correlation among them indicates the way the female characters are drifted to victimization process by the socially determined rules, conventions, and institutions.

## CHAPTER III

### 3. *TESS OF THE D'URBERVILLES*

Thomas Hardy is one of the great authors of his time. His greatness lies under the fact that he portrays the elements of victimization of women as well as the negative consequences of these elements upon the women in the society. Victimization of women appears in the form of "Otherness", as Wotton (1985: 177) argues in his book *Thomas Hardy: Towards a Materialist Criticism*, which contains the fact that:

In the purifying repetition of the critical commentary Hardy's female characters are (re)produced in the image of an ideological construction of woman. Frail, weak, irrational, dominated by her passions she appears as man's fateful or idealized Other.

Apart from Hardy's prose writing, it is also possible to argue that the condition of the individual is the central focus "[i]n Hardy's best poems," in which "the central meter-making argument is what might be called a skeptical lament for the hopeless incongruity of ends and means in all human acts", and "[I]ove and the means of love cannot be brought together, and the truest name for the human condition is simply that it is loss" (Bloom, 2000: 225).

In *Tess of the D'Urbervilles* and *Jude the Obscure*, Hardy examines the paradox between female characters' drives, and patriarchal society's prejudicial point of view of women. As Goode (1990: 22) puts it, "Hardy wrote about the world he saw in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries". Hardy's portrayal of female characters as victims of the society in his novels enables the reader to deduct the situation of the women in the 19th century. From another perspective, Gose (1990: 219) tries to shed light upon Hardy's realist point of view as in the following:

The novels of Thomas Hardy have often been praised for their concern with the issues which the Victorian era was forced to face by developments in philosophy and science, and by social change.

As has been stated above, Hardy tries to contribute to the social change existing in the society itself. To achieve this mission, he criticizes the artificiality of

the social institutions and man-made mechanisms of the society, which hinders individuals from realizing their own potentialities.

Morgan, who is one of the great advocates of women's rights, sheds light upon the potentialities hidden in women's own selves to trigger their development in the direction of self-actualization and realization as well as the obstacles originated in a male-dominated society. Morgan (1991: 58) asserts:

With the advent of adulthood and a fully awakened sexual consciousness, every exploratory move towards self-discovery, self-realisation and sexual understanding, meets with obstruction in a male-dominated world intent upon high-ranking the docile woman over the daring, the meek over the assertive, the compliant over the self-determining, the submissive over the dynamic.

The women who conform to the stereotypes attributed to them are moral women while those who do not meet the demands of the society especially morally are considered as fallen wicked creatures. Conscious of all these inequalities to women in his own time, Hardy lays claim upon the point that "it is evident that the world would *not* have the benefit of the best faculties of its inhabitants because half of it, the female half, is denied the right to prove them" (Morgan, 1991: 58).

Generally speaking, women have some necessities, and they can naturally feel hunger, thirst, pain, and the necessity of sex. As has been handled in the "Theoretical Background", Deci, Ryan (1985: 12), under the title "Empirical Drive Theory", argue, "[a]ccording to Hull all behaviors are based in our primary drives" which are "hunger, thirst, sex, and the avoidance of pain", and explain the function of these drives as: "These drives, which are non-nervous-system tissue deficits, activate consummatory behaviors that have previously been successful in reducing drives". In the study, the focus is put upon the sex drive which is likely to contribute to the development of social prejudice that results in the victimization of Hardy's female characters. In other words, only sex drive is at the scope of the study at hand. Here, the female characters are considered as victims of the patriarchal society itself.

In fact, Hardy opposes to the injustice done to women in general. According to Morgan (1991: 4), "channelling the erotic life to an end short of actual sexual fulfilment, the maiden possessing sexual knowledge is labelled fallen and denied, thereafter, sexual existence". In her appreciation of female characters' situation,

Morgan (1991: 4) lays claim as, “[a]gain, sexuality becomes a means to an end, not an end in itself”, and adds how women are excluded from every aspect of the society as follows: “Having fallen, she is effectively cast out, excluded from love relationships”. For instance, Angel excludes Tess from his whole life including love and sexuality. Therefore, in Hardy’s novels, “his most polemical attack upon Victorian sexual codes and practices and their institutionalisation in marriage” is the sign of his being in behalf of women (Morgan, 1991: 137).

As is clear in the expressions above, Hardy gives way to live according to the laws of nature. In nature, there are not institutionalised conventions, only nature’s own laws. Considering women’s pre-marital sexual experiences, Hardy takes into consideration the nature and natural needs of women, not artificially constructed institutions, and conventions. For this reason, Hardy’s works, especially novels attack society’s unjust applications such as “a male privilege” especially affecting women negatively (Cixous, 2000: 265).

### **3.1. The Concept of Drive in *Tess of the D’Urbervilles***

Hardy is singled out as a prominent literary figure in terms of portraying the situation of his female characters minutely in the Victorian society because “[t]here is no other writing in English which elaborates a more profound contemplation of women than Hardy’s” (Wotton, 1985: 122). Hardy’s fiction is a means of revealing the prominence of women as individuals. Thus, “[i]n every novel”, it is possible to realize “women are minutely observed” (Wotton, 1985: 122). For instance:

... their actions, appearance, motives, views, desires, hopes and fears are ceaselessly reflected on by the author, an onlooking character, the woman herself, or by another text, usually literary or biblical, and always by the reader, in a complex structure of perceptions (Wotton, 1985: 122).

To start with, Tess is the victim of the male-dominated society because she has a pre-marital sexual intercourse, the result of which has brought out her own downfall. The reason is that having an illegitimate baby, Tess is shot at mercilessly by the Victorian codes, and beliefs. Having provoked by so-called relative Alec, Tess

reaches, later in her life, the level of consciousness of her being the victim of the society.

Towards the end of the novel, in her anger to Alec's destroying her life, Tess cries: " '[n]ow, punish me!' ... 'Whip me, crush me; you need not mind those people under the rick! I shall not cry out. Once victim, always victim\_\_ that's the law' " (Hardy, *Tess*: 423). These words of Tess have the influential impact which touches at the heart of the matter. Tess is the victim of the prejudice of the society, which leads her to the destruction. She cries out this truth. In fact, she is the victim of her natural drives because of the prejudicial attitudes and reactions of the society. While the representative of her natural drives is Alec himself, the representative of the prejudice is Angel himself. They both contribute to the development of her destruction, but especially Angel, as the representative of the society, destroys Tess's life because he has a prejudicial point of view for women who have pre-marital sexual experiences. In fact Tess is so innocent that she does not deserve these harsh and unjust treatments both from Angel and the society. At this point, Gose (1990: 224) asserts:

Although Tess says that once victim, always victim is the law (of nature), she has actually taken the first step toward denying the dominance *Alec* gained when he sealed their relation with her blood. When she finally kills him, she draws all his blood.

In these lines, it might be understood that though Tess seems to be under the influence and dominance of Alec, then she is to rescue herself from him by killing him, but the social conventions execute her for her deed. Tess's comment comes true because:

Justice' was done, and the President of the Immortals, in AEschylean phrase, had ended his sport with Tess. And the d'Urberville knights and dames slept on in their tombs unknowing. The two speechless gazers bent themselves down to the earth, as if in prayer, and remained thus a long time, absolutely motionless: the flag continued to wave silently. As soon as they had strength they arose, joined hands again, and went on (Hardy, *Tess*: 508).

According to the laws of the society, the right event has happened. Tess becomes the victim of the prejudice of the society. Her end is the result of socially determined rules, and the institutions of the society. Tess is dead now, and Angel



goes with Tess's sister Liza-Lu because Tess wants him to get married with Liza-Lu after her execution.

In his dissertation titled *Hardy's Tragic Vision: A Study of The Mayor of Casterbridge, Tess of the D'Urbervilles and Jude the Obscure*, Öztürk (1996: 104) highlights the aforementioned emphasis of Tess's being victim of the prejudice of the patriarchal society as:

Along with the tragic stature that Tess maintains, her victimization by men, society, nature and the notion of belonging to a noble ancestry in history as well as her survival at specific time and place distinguishes her as a significant tragic figure similar to that of the traditional tragic figure.

The novel's opening scene contains all girls in the village including Hardy's heroine Tess among them. All these girls attend club-walking to meet with their future husbands. Their drives lead them to be involved in some social activities. They want to show their beauty to the men around them, but their inexperience hinders their showing their affirmative characteristics. They are too young to have aspects of growth in their personalities. Many eyes of men make them feel nervous, and they bespeak their inexperienced attitudes awkwardly.

Though Tess is a member of this young group, she is a bit more mature than her counterparts. In spite of this, she is a pure country girl with no experience, but with great potentiality to realize her own attributes. All the girls in the club enjoy to gather together despite their shyness for the opposite sex. Thus:

... either the natural shyness of the softer sex, or a sarcastic attitude on the part of male relatives, had denuded such women's clubs as remained (if any did) of this their glory and consummation (Hardy, *Tess*: 10).

Here, the most important thing is "softer sex", that is, woman, and "male relatives". The first one is the implication of the position of the women in those days, which is closely related to the drive itself because of the nature itself. This "shyness" might be the expression of the sex drive on the part of women. In addition to this, the behaviours of men are the focal point in hindering women from the things that they want to do. This might be the implication of the prejudice of men against women.

In the club-walking, the girls' showing themselves to the male leads them to behave in accordance with the atmosphere. Because this is a social activity uniting

the opposite sexes for future marital arrangements, it accelerates their pulses. They try to show their conformity for marriage, and there is a secret contest among them. For this reason, “[t]he banded ones were all dressed in white gowns”, which is the symbol of sexual purity, and the appropriateness of these girls for marriage (Hardy, *Tess*: 11). For, they are ready to conform to the stereotypes of the society. Girls imply their submission to the expectations of the society because “[t]heir first exhibition of themselves was in a processional march of two round the parish” (Hardy, *Tess*: 11).

“White gowns” are the symbol of the purity of the young girls. They all wear white because they all deserve an appropriate marriage. This, again, might be the implication of drive. This is a habit from the past to the present. Appreciating the position of Hardy’s woman in terms of her readiness to conform to the conventions of the society, Wotton (1985: 173) asserts, “[i]nterpelled as as subject, subjected to the myth of being the weaker sex, internalizing and recognizing herself in that image, she behaves accordingly”. This is the implication of the fact that the girls are grown without adequate education for the institution of marriage. The result of this attitude of the society is that “[f]rom infancy women were kept in ignorance of their own bodies to experience puberty, defloration and sexual intercourse as *mystery*” (Morgan, 1991: xi).

Tess, as one of the girls in the club, “wore a red ribbon in her hair, and was the only one of the white company who could boast of such a pronounced adornment” (Hardy, *Tess*: 12). An indicator of her end is Angel’s not dancing with her in the club dancing. Angel, as a member of the middle-class, walks with his brothers for their job. His brothers do not want to merge with country girls, who are members of the lower-class. Angel stays and dances with a girl who is not Tess herself. He realizes Tess, but does not dance with her. After his departure from the club, “[t]his white shape stood apart by the hedge alone. From her position he knew it to be the pretty maiden with whom he had not danced” (Hardy, *Tess*: 16). Then, “he yet instinctively felt that she was hurt by his oversight. He wished that he had asked her; he wished that he had inquired her name... he felt he had acted stupidly” (Hardy, *Tess*: 16-17). This is one of the contributing element to the development of her downfall. In her destruction, she is the victim of the society. This point prepares

the background for her downfall.

At the very beginning of the novel, Tess's father learns from the parson that they belong to the noble D'Urberville family. To celebrate this news, he drinks a lot, and cannot get up to take the hives to the market. So, Tess's sense of responsibility leads her to take this mission upon herself. She sets off to carry out the mission that her father has to do. She drives her father's cart to get to the market. Her brother Abraham accompanies her very early in the morning. While Tess is driving the cart, Abraham is not able to stay awake. Then, Tess sleeps involuntarily, and:

The pointed shaft of the cart had entered the breast of the unhappy Prince like a sword, and from the wound his life's blood was spouting in a stream, and falling with a hiss into the road (Hardy, *Tess*: 35).

This is one of the turning points of the novel. At the end of the novel, Tess becomes Alec's murderess. So, it might be concluded that "Just as Prince is the victim of the battering ram of the mail coach, and Tess is of Alec, so the postilion is of the "aristocratic carriage-poles" " (Gose, 1990: 225).

After Alec's compliments and promises given to support her poor family financially, Tess accepts to live with Alec, but after Angel's return to her she is furious with Alec because he deceives her claiming that Angel will not come back to her. Therefore, Tess commits a crime stabbing Alec at the heart. She does this because after Angel's departure from her house she becomes very miserable. She cries, but Alec shouts at her and speaks ill of Angel. Hearing these things, Tess becomes too furious to him. She kills him so as to escape to Angel. She reaches at Angel informing him that she is the murderess of Alec. Now there is no hindrance for their love except for the laws of the society, but this situation brings out her end.

Tess becomes the victim of the society because she is considered as a guilty woman after her being trapped by Alec. The result of this experience of Tess is that:

Upon the cornice of the tower a tall staff was fixed. Their eyes were riveted on it. A few minutes after the hour had struck something moved slowly up the staff, and extended itself upon the breeze. It was a black flag (Hardy, *Tess*: 508).

Tess is arrested because of the murder. Before the police come, she wants Angel to marry her sister Liza-Lu. Angel opposes to this idea, but he has to accept it.

Then, Tess is executed. Tess's victimization brings the end of her life as a destructed figure who is innocent.

Generally speaking, there is a correlation between the concept of drive and prejudice. For, having some experiences in terms of the sex drive triggers the prejudicial reactions to it. Therefore, in case drives are satisfied in an unconventional way, prejudicial attitudes occur. For this reason, after extracting some events containing drives, prejudice against Hardy's female characters is handled so as to show the relation between these two terms.

As for Tess, her blaming herself for the death of Prince drifts her to find some solution to contribute to her family financially. Because they have a noble relative in the name of D'Urberville, she decides to apply for the job there. Going to the D'Urberville family, Tess comes across with Alec's blind mother as well as Alec, who would injure Tess's purity later. While she tells him the true intention of her coming there, that is, their being relative, "her rosy lips curved towards a smile, much to the attraction of the swarthy Alexander" (Hardy, *Tess*: 45). From this point onwards, Tess knows Alec, at least she goes to his house in order to make herself acquainted with the so-called D'Urberville family. She wants to earn money to assist her family because she has caused the death of their own horse Prince in an accident when she takes the hives to the city for sale. Her sense of responsibility leads her to go to Alec's house. She does not know what will happen to her. She does not exactly like Alec, but some of her behaviours mean a lot to Alec. From now onwards, the concept of drive influence the whole text, and by way of its existence, it is likely to trigger society's prejudicial response as well as Tess's downfall as a victim of the society.

Tess is not aware of the men folk. For that reason, she is not able to appreciate the meaning of her words and gestures when she speaks to Alec. Alec realizes Tess's inexperienced situation. He observes her minutely. The sentence "Alec looked at Tess as he spoke, in a way that made her blush a little" is the implication of the point that though not in large proportions, Tess is affected by Alec, and she blushes when he makes her realize him as a future sexual partner (Hardy, *Tess*: 46). Tess attracts Alec's attention unconsciously. She feels ashamed due to his looks. This shows her inexperienced attitudes. She does not know the truth of life

and mankind, and the harm that is likely to come from them both. Then, after he learns that Tess has come as a relative to “claim kin” (Hardy, *Tess*: 39), Alec leads her to the gardens to welcome her.

He conducted her about the lawns, and flower-beds, and conservatories; and thence to the fruit-garden and greenhouses... D’Urberville began gathering specimens of the fruit for her, handing them back to her as he stooped; and, presently, selecting a specially fine product of the ‘British Queen’ variety, he stood up and held it by the stem to her mouth... he insisted; and in a slight distress she parted her lips and took it in (Hardy, *Tess*: 46-47).

As has been understood from the expression above, Alec courts Tess, and his behaviours imply that he tries to dominate and direct her throughout her life. Although Tess is reluctant in her reactions to Alec, she consents to him. Maybe she is attracted by him, and this might be considered as the effect of her drives. As Wotton (1985: 92) puts it, “[p]erceived by Alec as a sexual object she [Tess] is treated accordingly”. As a fortification of Tess’s being considered as “a sexual object” by Alec, it might be added:

They had spent some time wandering desultorily thus, Tess eating in a half pleased, half reluctant state whatever d’Urberville offered her. ... he gathered blossoms and gave her to put in her bosom. She obeyed like one in a dream, and when she could affix no more he himself tucked a bud or two into her hat, and heaped her basket with others in the prodigality of his bounty (Hardy, *Tess*: 47).

The phrase “[s]he obeyed like one in a dream” is the explicit expression of the effects of her drives on her reaction to Alec (Hardy, *Tess*: 47). She behaves naturally. She is attracted by him. He is a would-be mate for her, and she is unconsciously give way to him obeying whatever Alec wants her to do. Tess is a young girl with high ambitions for her family. Her considering herself guilty for destroying the means of their livelihood, that is, Prince leads her to the situations in which she is not able to foresee what is waiting for her. She is both innocent and inexperienced. For this reason, when she has the maturity to decode the meaning of Alec’s behaviours, it is probably too late for her to cure her life. Though Tess is mature bodily, she has no idea about how men may destroy women’s lives. For that reason:

... she innocently looked down at the roses in her bosom, ... She had an attribute which amounted to a disadvantage just now; and it was attribute which amounted to a disadvantage just now; and it was this that caused Alec d’Urberville’s eyes to rivet themselves upon her. It was a luxuriance

of aspect, a fullness of growth, which made her appear more of a woman than she really was (Hardy, *Tess*: 47- 48).

Tess's bodily maturity attracts Alec's attention. This becomes a disadvantage for her. The flowers are the symbol of the future sadness. Though they are good now as her own purity, and innocence, they will, one day, fade as her own self.

Hardy describes and emphasizes Tess's feminine attributes on purpose because Tess's society-oriented downfall results from her feminine beauty. For that reason, "throughout the novel Hardy makes a point of emphasizing Tess's profoundly physical presence" (Wotton, 1985: 89). Tess exists both physically and mentally, but the main emphasis is upon her sexuality which makes her a true feminine.

Tess is accepted to work in D'Urberville family. Alec always courts Tess because Tess is a sexual being for himself. He always tries to hear from Tess that she loves him, but Tess's reactions to him are not in balance. While Alec asks some questions to Tess, she tries to answer them as follows:

'Tess, why do you always dislike my kissing you?'  
 'I suppose\_\_ because I don't love you.'  
 'You are quite sure?'  
 'I am angry with you sometimes!'  
 'Ah, I half feared as much.' ...  
 'I haven't offended you often by love-making?'  
 'You have sometimes.'  
 'How many times?'  
 'You know as well as I\_\_ too many times.'  
 'Every time I have tried.'  
 She was silent (Hardy, *Tess*: 85).

In this conversation, it is easy to realize Alec's pressure upon Tess. Apart from this, we may understand that though Tess does not love Alec, she is not able to oppose to him strongly. Therefore, Alec is still hopeful for Tess to accept him. Tess's being silent probably makes Alec more courageous to have a sexual intercourse with Tess.

One day, Tess goes with her friends to have a good time, but a quarrel breaks out. Late at night, she does not want to return home with them due to this quarrel. Alec is ready there. She accepts to come back with Alec so as to escape from the quarrel. In their way, Alec asks Tess, " '[m]ayn't I treat you as a lover?' " (Hardy,

*Tess*: 87). Tess is not clear in mind. She does not know how to behave against him. The impact of her inexperience appears again: “She drew a quick pettish breath of objection, writhing uneasily on her seat, looked for ahead, and murmured, “ ‘I don’t know\_\_ I wish\_\_ how can I say yes or no when\_\_’ ” (Hardy, *Tess*: 87). Her unbalanced reaction to Alec’s desire of love-making is so clear that we are able to see her inexperienced state in the lines above. Alec thinks that Tess wants him as a sexual partner because there is no clear objection on the part of Tess. That is why, “[h]e settled the matter by clasping his arm round her as he desired, and Tess expressed no further negative” (Hardy, *Tess*: 87). This is one of the most striking examples of Tess’s acting according to her drives because she consents to his being too close to her. When he embraces her, she says nothing. This situation gives courage to Alec because this is a natural thing.

At that night, Alec owns Tess’s sexual purity. Her “beautiful feminine tissue” has been her downfall. Nobody rescues her from this situation (Hardy, *Tess*: 91). Hardy rebels at that moment for the event happened to Tess, and he tries to indicate Tess’s helplessness in this situation. He shows her pure state. After this event, Tess and Alec argue for this matter. Alec wants Tess to love him, but Tess does not have good terms with him at this point. Alec claims, “ ‘[y]ou didn’t come for love of me, that I’ll swear’ ” (Hardy, *Tess*: 97). Tess cries:

“‘Tis quite true. If I had gone for love o’ you, if I had ever sincerely loved you, if I loved you still, I should not so loathe and hate myself for my weakness as I do now! ... My eyes were dazed by you for a little, and that was all’ (Hardy, *Tess*: 97).

Tess, at first, is affected by Alec himself, but then she dislikes him. Her momentary liking him gives him the courage to approach her. The main emphasis, here, is that Tess is conscious that she does not love Alec, and she expresses her feelings and thoughts directly with a strong emphasis, which she could not do at that manner in the past. Wotton (1985: 91) sheds light on this part of the matter in these lines: “... as far as Tess (and Hardy) is concerned the only thing wrong with her relationship with Alec is that she does not love him”. Hardy does not judge her as the society does. He only advocates her own feelings showing sympathy and compassion to his heroine, that is, the fallen woman in the eyes of the society. Hardy advocates Tess because she is an individual with natural drives.

While Tess and Alec speak their situation, Tess says, “ ‘I didn’t understand your meaning till it was too late’ ” (Hardy, *Tess*: 97). His reply is a harsh one: “ ‘That’s what every woman says’ ” (Hardy, *Tess*: 97). On this matter Morgan (1991: 98) writes: “To Alec she [Tess] is Everywoman and Eve-temptress”. Tess’s distressful cry is that: “ ‘How can you dare to use such words!’ ... ‘My God! I could knock you out of the gig! Did it never strike your mind that what every woman says some women may feel?’ ” (Hardy, *Tess*: 97). Tess, here, is aggressive because Alec blames her for their own sexual union. She thinks that he has mistaken her. For Alec, Tess is a sexual entity who tempts him because he is not able to realize her as a whole personality. Tess reacts aggressively to him, which is the implication of the point that she may, one day, behave him in aggressive manner due to the trap he has set for her.

After Alec’s provocation of her drives, Tess is “an almost standard woman” (Hardy, *Tess*: 114). After these experiences, Hardy describes her physical attributes adding her change in a short time. She is now very beautiful, and grown-up as for her feminine characteristics. Tess is pregnant to an illegitimate child of Alec. She leaves the D’Urberville family after her pre-marital sexual intercourse with Alec. At a very young age, she has a premature baby. Though she sometimes hates the child, her maternal instincts lead her to protect her own child from the threat of death caused by weakness. She feeds her baby.

The baby’s offence against society in coming into the world was forgotten by the girl-mother; her soul’s desire was to continue that offence by preserving the life of the child (Hardy, *Tess*: 116).

Her maternal instincts enable Tess to feed her own helpless little baby. Here, though Tess is aware that the baby is considered as the sin of illegal sexual union between her and Alec, she forgets this situation because of her own maternal instincts. This baby is the violation of the socially determined rules, conventions, and institutions. There is a determined norm in the society, and the baby is the sign of breaking the rules of the conventional society. To clarify this point, Goode (1990: 33) argues, “[t]here is first of all a complex and contradictory discourse about Nature, and human nature. The overall pattern of the novel denies that Nature has a holy plan”.



Then, Tess baptizes her child. She names him as Sorrow, who is the symbol of the sin. Sorrow dies because he is a premature baby. After a while, she recovers herself. Although some negative events take place in a person's life, then there become some days which bring the cure for the person. In parallel with this, Gose (1990: 221) claims, "Tess' passivity is emphasized heavily in the first two sections of the book and, as this incident indicates, is an important ingredient in her becoming Alec's victim" and adds, "[a]lthough the victim of a ritual sacrifice and the aspirant in a ritual initiation can be easily distinguished by intellectual analysis, in this novel" in specific "we shall find Hardy tying the two together in an emotionally convincing manner".

After a while, Tess goes to Talbothays to work as a dairymaid. She prefers a distant place for work so as not to be known there. She comes across with Angel. They fall in love with one another. Thus:

Clare continued to observe her. She soon finished her eating, and having a consciousness that Clare was regarding her, began to trace imaginary patterns on the table-cloth with her forefinger with the constraint of a domestic animal that perceives itself to be watched (Hardy, *Tess*: 155).

The love between Tess and Angel begins at that stage. Her behaving in indifferent manner to Angel's looks, in fact, is the implication of her admiring him. This behaviour, that is, the theme of love contains the sex drive in itself. Though Angel's love for Tess contains sex drive in itself, "[t]o Angel, predictably, she is first stereotypical Goddess and later stereotypical fallen woman" (Morgan, 1991: 98). For, he has affinity to religious affairs though he thinks he does not have any.

At one time, Angel plays harp. Tess listens to Angel "like a fascinated bird" (Hardy, *Tess*: 158). While Angel plays the harp, Tess is fascinated from the tunes coming from the instrument. Thus, she cannot move to go far away from Angel. She tries to hide herself from him, but fails. Her not being able to go away is the result of her sex drive because she loves him. After these events, it is apparent that Tess has fallen in love with Angel because "Tess was conscious of neither time nor space" (Hardy, *Tess*: 158). She is not able to dominate her feelings. Her being in love with him is the key factor in her behaviours. Tess's behaviours make her love more apparent to the reader as in the following: "But, tired of playing, he had desultorily come round the fence, and was rambling up behind her. Tess, her cheeks on fire,

moved away furtively, as if hardly moving at all” (Hardy, *Tess*: 159). Her not being able to move is the sign of her excitement. This excitement includes the sex drive in itself. She is greatly affected by Angel. Their affinity to each other becomes so strong that they are not able to realize other events outside of them. One time:

Tess and Clare unconsciously studied each other, ever balanced on the edge of a passion, yet apparently keeping out of it. All the while they were converging, under an irresistible law, as surely as two streams in one vale (Hardy, *Tess*: 165).

The word “passion” is the key word indicating their love and desire to each other. They want to be together all the time because of their love. Love contains sex drive. For this reason, this paragraph shows the mutual feelings and understanding in both sides. Their nature contains this drive, and the effect of it is reflected in their behaviours to each other. They begin to suppose themselves as “Adam and Eve” (Hardy, *Tess*: 167). Though they seem to conform an ideal matching mentally, physically, and ideologically at the moment, this is not as true as the genuine union of their love with a clear mind purified from prejudicial point of view of the society.

At the end of the novel, when Tess stabs Alec because he has deceived her to be his mistress, and abused her weakness as a helpless woman, Tess runs behind her true love Angel so as to unite with him. On the part of Angel, too, this is their true fusion into one another. Angel realizes his desperate wife Tess as follows:

... here was this deserted wife of his, this passionately fond woman, clinging to him without suspicion that he would be anything to her but a protector. He saw that for him to be otherwise was not, in her mind, within the region of the possible. Tenderness was absolutely dominant in Clare at last (Hardy, *Tess*: 493).

At this moment, Tess and Angel disclose their true love to one another without any prejudice. His experience in Brazil teaches Angel to give importance to Tess because of her pure personality. Reaching the top of his maturity, Angel accepts Tess as a person with her own faults. To show his sympathy as well as his passion for her femininity:

He kissed her endlessly with his white lips, and held her hand, and said ‘I will not desert you! I will protect you by every means in my power, dearest love, whatever you may have done or not have done!’ (Hardy, *Tess*: 493).

Angel is mature to accept Tess with her past experiences. Though he is aware of the value of Tess, “[w]hen Alec and Angel give way to desire, it is to destroy another being”, that is, Tess herself (Goode, 1990: 33). Hardy always sheds light on Tess’s feminine quality because this is the motive which contributes to her downfall caused by two men who are her sexual partner Alec, and her legal husband Angel. When Angel has “called her Artemis, Demeter, and other fanciful names”, Tess shows objection to him (Hardy, *Tess*: 167). Angel wants to accept her as a spotless young woman. When he calls her with her own name, “her features would become simply feminine” (Hardy, *Tess*: 168). Hardy refers to Tess as “the deeper- passionate Tess” due to her passionate love for Angel (Hardy, *Tess*: 176). Therefore, it is possible to state Hardy’s insistence and emphasis of describing Tess’s femininity as follows: “To Hardy, ... she is complex, diverse, unique: fierce and gentle, regenerative and destructive, trusting and suspicious, philosophical, mystical and sexy” (Morgan, 1991: 98).

It is possible to realize how passionately Tess loves Angel in giving way to him for getting married with her. Hardy, again, sheds light on her passionate love for Angel so as to put emphasis on the way Angel is to be a factor drifting her to her ultimate downfall. As Hardy discloses Tess’s feelings:

She loved him so passionately, and he was so godlike in her eyes; and being, though untrained, instinctively refined, her nature cried for his tutelary guidance. And thus, though Tess kept repeating to herself, ‘I can never be his wife’, the words were vain (Hardy, *Tess*: 233).

The contrast between her rebellious objection to get married with him for the sake of the society, and the fact that “[e]very sound of his voice beginning on the old subject stirred her with a terrifying bliss” is an exact indication of her emotional turbulence (Hardy, *Tess*: 233). Her mind and feelings are in a sharp contradiction. Then, she is to follow her inner feelings giving an affirmative reply to his proposal of marriage.

At last, the words that Angel looks forward to passionately come out of Tess’s rosy lips. Tess accepts Angel’s proposal with these words: “ ‘I mean, that it is only your wanting me very much, and being hardly able to keep alive without me, whatever my offences, that would make me feel I ought to say I will’ ” (Hardy, *Tess*: 243). This scene is the best moment in terms of the possibility of her living her

genuine love, but it is to become the worst moment of her life because of the influence of the social conventions upon her relationship. At last, Tess cannot resist him, and accepts to marry him. Then, as a passionate lover, who has treated in cold manner to Angel before due to her inner conflicts as to her past offences:

She clasped his neck, and for the first time Clare learnt what an impassioned woman's kisses were like upon the lips of one whom she loved with all her heart and soul, as Tess loved him (Hardy, *Tess*: 244).

Tess, after a while, asks, “ [t]here\_\_ now do you believe? ”, and hear the answer she craves for as in the following: “ ‘Yes. I never really doubted- never, never!’ ” (Hardy, *Tess*: 244). These words indicate the passion of their love to each other.

Before his proposal to Tess, Angel courts her very much, which is a naturally desired phenomenon for Tess because her femininity is at the fore at that moment. Her feelings are in great accord with Angel's flirtation. Once, when:

... she ... became conscious that he was observing her; ... she would not show it by any change of position, though the curious dream-like fixity dissappeared, and a close eye might easily have discerned that the rosiness of her face deepened (Hardy, *Tess*: 192-193).

While Angel looks at Tess, Tess blushes. This shows her passion for him. Suddenly, Angel comes and embraces Tess. Tess yields to him. Her reactions are the result of the sex drive in herself. As a reaction to his behavior, “she yielded to his embrace with unreflecting inevitableness. Having seen that it was really her lover who had advanced, and no one else, her lips parted, and” then “she sank upon him in her momentary joy, with something very like an ecstatic cry” (Hardy, *Tess*: 193). At this point, Hardy highlights Tess's sexuality so as to contribute to the development of her destruction. In Wotton's (1985: 181) words, “Tess appears as the guilty victim of her own sexuality” because her feminine qualities attract both Alec's and Angel's attention. After a while, they both bring destruction to her. As Goode (1990: 33) asserts, “Tess is like a fly upon a billiard table. Her very excellence as a natural phenomenon, her sexual attractiveness, is her downfall”.

At this point, Wotton (1985: 179), referring to Webster (1947), notes, “[i]t is, however, in this critic's reading of Tess as the subject of two antithetical but equally powerful laws-” namely “the law of Nature and the law of society- and her status as

the helpless victim of the conflict between these which constitutes the critical work's dominant perception", which is the base of the study at hand.

Towards the end of the novel, it is easy to realize that the man who triggers Tess's sex drive comes out immediately. After Angel leaves Tess, Alec appears in the novel again. So, one day, "her seducer confronted her" (Hardy, *Tess*: 386). After Tess's attempt to visit her father-in-law for her financial troubles and inquiry for Angel's health, she comes across with Angel's brothers, who speak harsh about Tess and Angel without noticing her presence. So, without disclosing her troubles, Tess goes back to her work at Flintcomb Ash. On the way to work, Tess sees Alec, who is preaching in front of all the people. After he notices her, Alec follows her wherever she goes, and tries to dissuade Tess from waiting for Angel, and he becomes successful in his effort.

While Alec and Tess speak, Alec says that he has devoted himself to the religious affairs, and Alec blames Tess for affecting him sexually. He claims that Tess seduces him. She feels guilty, and apologizes for her undeliberate looks. She thinks that she should not give way to her drives. From now on, Alec resumes his role in Tess's sexual life. Confronting Alec:

Tess... instantly withdrew the large dark gaze of her eyes, .... And there was revived in her the wretched sentiment which had often come to her before, that in inhabiting the fleshly tabernacle with which nature had endowed her she was somehow doing wrong (Hardy, *Tess*: 395).

Alec always follows her. He even goes to her workplace and recognizes the harsh working conditions she is in. He tries to persuade Tess for not waiting for Angel any more. He offers Tess to live as his mistress. He always speaks ill of Angel. He puts a great pressure upon her while she is working in a field work with harsh conditions. Tess's reply to Alec's constraint for her living with him is as follows: " 'O\_\_ I don't know!'... 'I have no husband!' " (Hardy, *Tess*: 446). After this speech, Tess becomes inclined to give way to Alec because her family is homeless, and she submits to Alec on her own.

After a serious illness, Angel returns back to his home, and begins to search for Tess. At last, he finds her at Sandbourne, which is a great and nice place. Angel startles at the very beginning, but then, he thinks that she works there. After seeing

Tess, Angel proposes her to go with him, but it is too late for them to rearrange the matter. Tess declares to Angel she has come back to Alec. She lives with him as his mistress. Angel realizes his fault, but there is nothing to do. Tess's shocking sentence pointing to Alec " '[h]e has won me back to him' " is one of the climaxes of the novel (Hardy, *Tess*: 484).

Tess is a pure woman who is destroyed by the society. Though she has had a pre-marital sexual experience with Alec, she has a moral integrity. According to Lindley (1992: 58), "[w]e have just seen how conventional values form part of the pressure of Tess's inheritance upon her life". In addition to this, as Lindley (1992: 58) asserts, "society's morality is contrasted in the novel as a whole with the more instinctive values of nature".

Apart from Lindley, Goode and Morgan bring different perspectives to the criticisms done for Tess. Referring to Ellis and Morris, Goode (1990: 33) lays claim upon the point that "Tess's downfall is only the product of a repressive attitude toward natural sexuality". As one of the prominent authorities, Morgan approaches the matter from two perspectives: First, she indicates the injustice done to Tess because of her femininity. The second one is that though she is sexually involved in a relationship with Alec, she is morally pure. In Morgan's (1991: 84) words:

I include under this heading the sexual double-standard that would not deny to the sexually active male the power of will and reason, the self-responsibility and moral integrity that is so often denied to the sexually active female.

After this general comment on the situation of the woman, Morgan (1991: 84) comments on Tess as in the following: "Hardy's Tess is a sexually vital consciousness and, without any shadow of doubt, to my mind, she owns each and every one of" affirmative "qualities". At last, Morgan concludes Tess's place in English literature emphasizing her greatness. Morgan (1991: 85) claims, "[i]t is ... the combination of sexual vigour and moral rigour that makes Tess not just one of the greatest but also one of the strongest women in the annals of English literature".

### 3.2. The Concept of Prejudice in *Tess of the D'Urbervilles*

The concept of prejudice has been discussed from the past to the present because this concept keeps its integrity and continuity in the point of the relationship occurring among people. One of the prominent authorities, Allport realizes the impact of prejudice upon the behaviours and reactions of people, and therefore, he has created his book entitled *The Nature of Prejudice* (1954). Though there are both positive and negative prejudice among people, the negative one is unwanted and harmful. For that reason, negative prejudice has already attracted the attention of philosophers like Allport himself.

Considering the destructive impact of negative prejudice, while the concept of prejudice is used, its negative side is referred throughout the study at hand. To sum up, negative prejudice is taken into consideration because positive prejudice is not likely to create any trouble in the relationships among people. As for Tess, negative prejudice which is included as only prejudice during the study is the apparent one which invites downfall to Tess's life. In other words, the prejudicial point of view of society which might be termed as social determinism in different terminology brings destruction to Tess herself. Though Tess's being involved in an experience related to her sex drive is naturally necessary and appropriate according to the laws of nature, it does not conform to the strictly designed rules and conventions of the society. For this reason, as one of the main destructive element, the concept of prejudice is considered in this part of the study.

The first prejudicial point of view of the society appears at the very beginning of the novel when Tess's friends at the club realizes the foolish behaviours of Tess's father, and mocks him. Thus, "[t]he clubbists tittered, except the girl called Tess\_\_ in whom a slow heat seemed to rise at the sense that her father was making himself foolish in their eyes" (Hardy, *Tess*: 12- 13). Tess is angry at her friends. They talk in a prejudicial way against her father because he goes to his house with a carriage. This is an unexpected event because he is poor. He shouts that he has a noble family but he is a drunken man. This is a reason for people to laugh at him. She notices their prejudicial attitude toward her father. One girl's comment is worth including because she says " '[b]less thy simplicity, Tess'... 'He's got his market-nitch. Haw-haw!' "

(Hardy, *Tess*: 13). At this scene, we realize how Tess meets firstly with prejudicial point of view of her companions. In addition to this, the girls' attitude contains the theme of prejudice, and some sort of sarcasm because Tess's father is not known as a rich and noble person.

One of the most prominent and striking episodes in the novel is Alec's provoking Tess. Tess's victimization by the society is dealt with the leading theme of society's prejudicial reactions against people's unconventional satisfaction of sex drive. After the commitment of the sin of Tess in the eye of the society, everybody begins to put forward prejudicial comments for her in a deterministic way as follows:

As Tess's own people down in those retreats are never tired of saying among each other in their fatalistic way: 'It was to be'. There lay the pity of it. An immeasurable social chasm was to divide our heroine's personality thereafter from that previous self of hers who stepped from her mother's door to try her fortune at Trantridge poultry-farm (Hardy, *Tess*: 91).

In the expressions above, Tess is considered as the victim of Fate by the members of the society. Here, deterministic point of view is dominant. While some happenings take place, people explain them saying that they are determined beforehand. This is the expression of determinism. The key expressions are "fatalistic", and " 'It was to be'", and "social chasm". After this experience, Tess is a different person in the eye of the society. In the eye of the society she loses her purity and charm because she has had a sexual relationship with Alec. Though Alec is equally involved in this situation, we, as readers, do not hear people criticize him because man is the dominant figure in the patriarchal society. Whereas, woman is the "Other" of man. She is the outsider in everything. She exists for the sake of man himself. The woman's slavery develop at the hands of the man. For that reason, it is always woman's turn to be victimized for the sake of man. The woman makes sacrifices, and in the end there is nothing for her to lead her life in an honourable way. Therefore, Tess, as the symbol of the enslaved womankind appears as a destroyed figure in her young age despite her moral integrity and purity.

Tess, again, becomes a victim at the hands of Angel. After Tess's disclosure of her secret which includes her sexual union with Alec, Angel's reactions become too negative to bear on the part of Tess. Tess cries out for forgiveness, but it is useless. Though Angel has the same experience, he does not forgive Tess. That is



why, “ [i]n the name of our love, forgive me!’she whispered with a dry mouth. ‘I have forgiven you for the same!’ ” (Hardy, *Tess*: 292). Angel’s reply is a harsh one:

‘O Tess, forgiveness does not apply to the case! You were one person; now you are another. My God\_\_ how can forgiveness meet such a grotesque\_\_ prestidigitation as that!’ (Hardy, *Tess*: 292).

Tess discloses everything about her past, that is, her sexual union with Alec D’Urberville, her child Sorrow, and her child’s death. Angel is not able to believe in Tess and in fact he does not want to believe in her words, but after he realizes the gravity in her face, he says that he cannot forgive her. In Angel’s words we might clearly see the prejudicial attitudes towards Tess.

At this point, we realize Angel’s prejudice apparently because his words are the reflections of the male-dominated society. In the patriarchal society, the main figure is the man himself. In contrast, the woman is considered as “Other”. She is the outsider of the society. The prejudicial emphasis intensifies more and more in these words of Angel: “ ‘I repeat, the woman I have been loving is not you’ ” (Hardy, *Tess*: 293). After Tess asks, “ ‘But who?’ ”, Angel replies, “ ‘Another woman in your shape’ ” (Hardy, *Tess*: 293). Tess cannot meet his demands of purity. She is not virgin. Moreover, her husband in the eye of nature is still alive. The theme of prejudice intensifies in this part of the novel. Angel loves purity, spotlessness, morality, and the like. Though Tess is pure in nature, he realizes her as a wicked person. For that reason, he does not want to stay with her. Morgan (1991: 109) appreciates the attitudes of Angel as well as the situation of Tess in these lines:

Hardy retains ... for Tess, with her emotional generosity, sexual vitality and moral strength, the capacity to rise above her fall and, ultimately, to redeem the man who, bearing the values and sexual prejudices and double- standards of the society, fails to rise above them in the hour of need. ... In knifing the heart of the man who so remorselessly hunts her down, she turns her own life around yet again; but this time with readiness, she says, to face her executioner.

After her last loss of Angel, Tess stabs Alec. Tess struggles desperately to convince Angel of her inexperienced state when this event has occurred, but it is a useless effort. At this point, we put ourselves into her state when we hear her lamentation in these lines: “ ‘Angel!\_\_ Angel! I was a child\_\_ a child when it happened! I knew nothing of men.’ ” (Hardy, *Tess*: 297). Angel’s reply is as follows: “ ‘You were more sinned against than sinning, that I admit.’ ” (Hardy, *Tess*: 297).

Tess asks in curiosity, “ ‘[t]hen will you not forgive me?’ ” (Hardy, *Tess*: 297). Angel’s reply is startling because he says, “ ‘I do forgive you, but forgiveness is not all.’ ” (Hardy, *Tess*: 297). Tess, in a state of praying for forgiveness, asks, “ ‘[a]nd love me?’ ” (Hardy, *Tess*: 297). But “[t]o this question he did not answer” (Hardy, *Tess*: 297). Tess tries to persuade Angel to forgive her. He says that he has forgiven her, but then he goes away without her. Tess entreats Angel to forgive her, but having a prejudicial point of view, Angel scorns Tess, and her lower-level class, namely, status as:

‘Different societies, different manners. You almost make me say you are an unapprehending peasant woman, who have never been initiated into the proportions of social things. You don’t know what you say’ (Hardy, *Tess*: 297).

For Angel, Tess is a worthless woman because of her loss of her own virginity. Tess does not deserve Angel’s love in his eyes because though he is not aware of the influence of the society upon his very self, Angel is under the pressure of social conventions which praise only spotless woman, not woman who is sexually involved in a sexual relationship with a man who is not her legal husband.

Pre-marital sexual intercourse is considered as a wicked happening, which creates some sort of prejudice. No matter how the man is involved in this relationship, the woman is regarded as a wicked creature due to her “Otherness”. Gatens (1993: 51) questions the system of the patriarchal society which places women at the state of “Other” as well as men as the major figures in the society as in the following: “What requires explanation is woman’s fixed status as the absolute Other and man’s occupation of the position of absolute Subject”, and asks a striking question such as “why is there no reciprocity in the relation between the sexes?”. After this question, Gatens indicates the required regulation of the relationship between man and woman, but the present state shows the inequality done to women by ignoring them as free individuals with great potentialities in their inner personalities. Gatens’s assertion (1993: 59) goes on like this: “Man and woman may, at the level of consciousness, each be the other’s other but the absolute Other remains essentially feminine”. This means that it is not possible to regard women as mature individuals with high status due to the values and beliefs of the male-dominated society. The same situation applies for Tess.

While Tess expresses what happens to the other girls in terms of pre-marital sexual love, and how they tell lies to their husbands, Angel becomes angry at her. He puts emphasis upon the class difference, and conventions. He displays his conventional and prejudicial manner in appreciating a critical point related to the morality. As a reaction to Angel's reprimand as well as scorn, Tess knows her role in the society, and remains silent. Her role against an angry man leads her to accept this situation as a natural event. That is why, "[s]he took these reproaches in their bulk simply, not in their particulars; he did not love her as he had loved her hitherto, and to all else she was indifferent" (Hardy, *Tess*: 298). Angel reproaches her and behaves her unjustly. His point of view of life is so strict that he cannot escape from his conventional type of thinking.

Pointing out Angel's prejudicial point of view of life, Lindley (1992: 53) claims, "[h]e [Angel] is a man whose personality is torn by conflicts". For the sake of clarity, it might be added that Blake's (1990: 211) assertion "Angel typecasts Tess in terms of class, family, nature, and sex, but sexual typing exercises the most powerful sway" runs in parallel with Lindley's (1992: 53) claim as:

He is capable of thinking and feeling differently at different times, for though he places all his faith in his intellect and reason, he falls prey both to his passions and to his irrational, inherited prejudices.

Hardy focuses on the description of the newly-married couple so as to intensify the quality of Tess's story. Tess is behaved badly by Angel. Hardy's description of Angel's prejudice as well as Tess's sorrow goes like that: "The pair were, in truth, but the ashes of their former fires" and "[t]o the hot sorrow of the previous night had succeeded heaviness; it seemed as if nothing could kindle either of them to fervour of sensation any more" (Hardy, *Tess*: 303).

The push of their drives does not exist now. Instead, the ashes are the remaining of the passionate love between them. Angel's adherence to the social conventions makes him a prejudiced person towards Tess. Angel's prejudicial personality leads them to the separation and to the lack of satisfaction of their drives.

After Angel's shock for Tess's previous sexual life with Alec, Angel tries to get rid of his marriage without disclosing it to their relatives, and other people around them. He tries to solve this problem silently. Considering the possible prejudicial

reaction of the people around them in case he divorces her, Angel produces a short-term solution. Angel's emphasis on social conventions might be realized easily from his own words as:

‘You know, I have to think of a course. It was imperative that we should stay together a little while, to avoid the scandal to you that would have resulted from our immediate parting. But you must see it is only for form's sake’ (Hardy, *Tess*: 309).

He wants to leave her, but he cannot do this because of the conventional society destroys unconventional individuals. His keeping her near him is the result of the effects of the society upon the individual. If he leaves her, Tess is to be considered as a wicked woman who does not conform to the rules and conventions of the society, and its institutions.

The key words indicating conventional society are “scandal”, and “form's sake”. These words are the symbols of the destruction of the weak individuals in the society in opposition to elevation of the strong ones from the aspects of gender, status, class, and the like in the society. Though Tess is in great effort to convince Angel for her helpless situation in the past, Angel insists on saying “ ‘[h]ow can we live together while that man lives?\_\_ he being your husband in Nature, and not I’ ”, and adds, “ ‘[i]f he were dead it might be different... Don't you think we had better endure the ills we have than fly to others’ ” (Hardy, *Tess*: 310-311).

The main themes are the prejudicial point of view of the society, and the impact of the society upon the reactions of the individuals towards the outer world. Wotton (1985: 91) sheds light on Tess's purity as: “Tess's sexual relationship (but not the manner of its commencement) was, ... ‘natural’ ”. Wotton (1985: 91) explains Angel's point of view of woman as well as the origin of the wrong in these sentences: “The harm comes from the ideological equation of sexuality with ownership”. Touching the core of the problem, Wotton (1985: 91) asserts, “[t]he idea of a woman ‘belonging’ to the man who first ‘possesses’ her- which is the way Angel sees it- depends upon the ambiguity of the word possession”. For instance; “Tess ‘belongs’ to Alec because he ‘took’ her in the Chase and ‘made her his’ ” (Wotton, 1985: 91). In all these expressions, the emphasis is upon woman's being a free individual in the society despite her sexual relationship. The woman should not be

regarded as a wicked sexual object. Like all women in the society, Tess “wants to be loved for herself and not for the image superimposed on her” (Blake, 1990: 211-2).

Angel makes this mistake because he has unreachable image in his mind, which he tries to match with Tess’s own self. While he learns her past, he realizes that he is not successful in matching his artificial woman image and real Tess. Instead of choosing Tess for her pure personality, Angel forces himself to choose the conventionality which brings unhappiness to them both. But, “[i]t is when real suffering hits Angel in Brazil” where he plans to go for farming with Tess, but goes without her “that he becomes aware for the first time of the limitations both of his intellectual ideas and of the emotional prejudices he had never recognized before” (Lindley, 1992: 54). Angel becomes so mature after his departure to Brazil to think over Tess’s confession of her past. “When he returns, ... though he is shocked at the murder of Alec, he can offer Tess his love without reservation” (Lindley, 1992: 54). This indicates Tess’s influence upon him, but it means nothing on the part of Tess. For, she loses her life.

At this point, it might be emphasized that “[t]he event of Tess Durbeyfield’s return from the manor of her bogus kinsfolk was rumoured abroad” (Hardy, *Tess*: 105). The gossip done is the symbol of people’s reaction to any event, and it is closely connected with prejudice. From now onwards, the prejudice of people against Tess might be traced towards the end of the novel. People’s intensified prejudice is to lead her to destruction, which is the expression of her victimization by the society.

In parallel with this, Tess’s being a victim at the hands of the society despite her purity creates some sort of affection on the part of reader. Hardy portrays Tess as a victim so as to lay emphasis on her true nature and society’s wrong attitudes. Therefore, though it is possible to realize the reason of Hardy’s portrayal of Tess as a victim, the prevailing view is her rightness as well as society’s attributing superfluous judgements to Tess. Though Tess is pure in nature, she is a wicked woman who requires aversion from people around her in the eye of the society. Due to this obstinate and perverse point of view of the society, Tess is precluded from every day life situations such as visiting the church to satisfy her religious beliefs. After her entrance to the church:

The people who had turned their heads turned them again as the service proceeded; and at last observing her they whispered to each other. She knew what their whispers were about, grew sick at heart, and felt that she could come to church no more (Hardy, *Tess*: 107).

As has been understood from the expression above, Tess is discredited by the conventional society. Considering the impact of society's prejudicial system of judgement, Gose (1990: 227), in his article "Psychic Evolution", comments upon Tess's stance in the society as follows: "A combination of social pressure, mischance, and willfulness have put Tess in a position where she can gain temporary happiness only by discarding civilized self-restraint". In this expression, it is easy to realize the paradox between nature and society. While the nature of a person requires satisfaction in terms of drives, the conventional structure of the society requires people to conform to the stereotypical roles determined by the social codes, and conventions beforehand. As a member of the society, Tess considers herself guilty. For, she is not in harmony with the social codes. Hardy describes her inner conflict with an emphasis upon the contrastive elements between nature and society.

As Lindley (1992: 21) sheds light on this point, "Tess spends most of her time alone, walking at evening and feeling a guilt for what she has done which Hardy tells us is guilt only in the eyes of society, not of nature". As has been understood from this point, we may come to some conclusion that the sanctions of social institutions do not conform to nature because social codes which are constructed under the light of the social institutions do not conform the nature of human beings, which is consisted of drives, passions, needs, and the like. Human nature needs the satisfaction of the natural needs of the body, but society forms some artificial rules so as to rule the nature of the individual by way of a deterministic point of view. Socially determined artificial rules do not reach at the level of appropriateness to meet the expectations of individual from the aspects of their nature and the life. So, the individuals who do not conform to this enslaved type of life are subject to victimization as in Tess's own situation.

Hardy's emphasis is put upon the above-mentioned paradox between nature and society. Alec is the representative of nature while Angel is the representative of the society. Hardy, as an advocator of Tess, describes Tess's conflict with the artificial rules in these lines:

... this encompassment of her own characterization, based on shreds of convention, peopled by phantoms and voices antipathetic to her, was a sorry and mistaken creation of Tess's fancy\_\_ a cloud of moral hobgoblins by which she was terrified without reason. It was they that were out of harmony with the actual world, not she (Hardy, *Tess*: 108).

Because of the society's distortion of female's sexuality according to socially determined rules, Tess is the victim of the society including socially determined conventions, codes, institutions, and the like. As Tess questions her state in the society:

... she looked upon herself as a figure of Guilt intruding into the haunts of Innocence. But all the while she was making a distinction where there was no difference. Feeling herself in antagonism she was quite in accord. She had been made to break an accepted social law, but no law known to the environment in which she fancied herself such an anomaly (Hardy, *Tess*: 108).

The concept of social determinism is made apparent in these philosophical lines. Regarding the laws of nature, it might be stated that Tess is innocent. In contrast, according to socially determined rules and conventions, Tess is guilty because she is not able to protect her innocence. She has a pre-marital sexual experience with Alec.

One woman among the workers is the symbol of reflecting society's reactions against the woman who has an illegal sexual relationship as well as an illegal baby like Tess. The woman's gossip originates from her observation " '[s]he's fond of that there child, though she mid pretend to hate en, and say she wishes the baby and her too were in the church-yard' " (Hardy, *Tess*: 114). Hardy's depiction of Tess's condition is likely the sign of his strong observation of the actual face of life. For, the situation of women in the 19th century is similar to Tess's own situation. As Wotton (1985: 5) argues, " 'womankind' is perceived as 'mankind's' lesser Other". For more specification, Wotton (1985: 5) handles Hardy's style of writing in these lines:

In Hardy's writing the harmonizing ideological discourses of the Victorian bourgeoisie are brought into head-on conflict with the alter-ideology of women as ... the inferior, or in its genteel Victorian version, weaker sex.

Though Tess is sometimes silent to the outer world, she struggles to apply whatever she finds correct. In this determination of Tess, we might say that she has the potentiality of actualizing her real self, but she is forced to face hindrances for self-actualization by the society because the society persists in its so-called truths.

Morgan (1991: 161), in her book *Women and Sexuality in the Novels of Thomas Hardy*, asserts:

Tess seems to be exceptional. As a fully realised 'pure woman', a fully actualised self, she is autonomous from the outset, a physical, not to say moral, force in a tale that re-aligns the Edenic myth to have woman gain ascendancy over the fallen Angel.

As Morgan points out, Tess is different from the women who behave according to stereotypes determined for them. She realizes the truth, but she is not able to resist the whole society. For, she remains alone in her struggle. Even Angel leaves her alone.

Tess's illegitimate baby Sorrow dies, and he should be buried in the churchyard, but prejudice appears again. Tess goes near the vicar, and asks, "[t]hen will you give him a Christian burial?" (Hardy, *Tess*: 121). The vicar replies, "[a]h\_\_ that's another matter," (Hardy, *Tess*: 122), which is the implication of the influence of society on the individual. After baptizing her child Sorrow, Tess wants to know if her baptizing her own child is the same as the vicar's baptizing. After the pressure coming from Tess, the vicar says that it is the same. But as for the burial of the little baby, the vicar reminds her of the rules, but after the pressure of Tess, his conscience makes him reply in affirmative. The main point is put upon the rules of the society, and religion.

In the end, Hardy refers to Roger Ascham so as to summarize Tess's situation as in the following expressions: "At last she had learned what to do; but who would now accept her doing?" (Hardy, *Tess*: 124). The prevailing theme is the prejudice of the society. Tess knows how to behave now, but everybody knows her as a wicked person. So, there is no use in her being experienced in life. Tess learns life itself by her experiences, but these experiences mark her as a fallen woman. In other words, Tess "has achieved a premature maturity" (Lindley, 1992: 38).

One point indicating the prejudice of Angel's parents might be noticed from the question of Angel's mother: "'Is she of a family such as you would care to marry into- a lady, in short?'" (Hardy, *Tess*: 210). This sentence fortifies the prejudicial point of view of the society. The conflict of class which leads the individuals to the prejudicial reactions is apparent here. His mother shows her own opinions as to the



lower class in these lines. Coming across some oppositions for Tess despite his parents:

Angel therefore refrained from declaring more particulars now. He felt that, single-minded and self-sacrificing as his parents were, there yet existed certain latent prejudices of theirs, as middle-class people, which it would require some tact to overcome (Hardy, *Tess*: 211).

Angel realizes that the concept of prejudice is the dominant theme in the speech of his parents. He does not want to persuade them because this might hurt them. He thinks that he and Tess are likely to live far away from his family. So, this might be the solution of the problem.

At the wedding night, Tess determines to disclose the truth to her legal husband Angel. At this point, her victimization by the social conventions, rules and institutions becomes apparent. Though Angel has a sexual experience with a woman in the past like Tess, he excludes himself from judgement. Hardy puts emphasis upon “erotic purity, which is definitive for women but not for men- Angel’s own un-intact state bothers him very little” (Blake, 1990: 211). In contrast, Angel’s “horror of Tess’s un-intactness bespeaks his allegiance to the purity of the generic as such, as well as to the feminine principle of erotic purity that furnishes the dramatic test” (Blake, 1990: 211).

At this point, Blake reflects Angel’s thoughts and beliefs when he appreciates Tess’s past. Blake (1990: 211) asserts:

... the crisis of their relationship reveals his habit of generalization when it comes to Tess and his commitment to her purity in the erotic sense *and* as a being so summed up by his conception of her that she must remain pure of any particular experience worth mentioning.

Angel creates some sort of stereotype in his mind for Tess, and he is not able to put up with coming across any other woman image with bad sexual experiences. The reason might be expressed like that: “Seeing Tess as essence and type, Angel cannot admit the relevance of experience for her, and so he refuses to hear her confession about her past affair with Alec” (Blake, 1990: 211). Angel’s affinity with conformity is so strong that this makes him paralyzed in terms of expressing his feelings to Tess.

Thus, it might be emphasized that in some parts of the novel, “[t]he conventional nature of Angel’s prejudices is pointed out, and Hardy insists on Tess’s

essential purity” (Lindley, 1992: 36). Here, the prevailing and the most prominent theme is Angel’s prejudice against Tess due to her being involved in a sexual experience with Alec. But he does not question his sexual relationship with a foreign woman in London. The reason is that he is one of the basic components of the male-dominated society. Man is the leading figure in the society, not woman.

Tess experiences hard time after her husband Angel goes to Brazil. Though he loves her dearly, and he hardly keep away from her, he has no flexibility to change his conventions. In spite of his rigidity, he does not disclose Tess’s situation as well as the reason of their departure. Angel plans to go to his parents first, then he wants to go to Brazil to find a farm. He is a farmer now, but Tess upsets him. Having these plans in his mind, he changes the flow of his life. In fact:

His original plan had been ... to refrain from bringing her there for some little while not to wound their prejudices\_\_ feelings\_\_ in any way; and for other reasons he had adhered to it (Hardy, *Tess*: 334).

After Angel’s leaving Tess, he goes to his mother’s house to see them because he has formerly said to them that he and his wife Tess are to visit them. Then, the plan changes, and he does not want to bring Tess because of their separation, and he cannot say the truth to his family so as not to give harm to them.

Being confused of Angel’s not bringing his wife to his parents’ house to introduce her to his family, Angel’s mother asks, “ ‘Angel\_\_ is she a young woman whose history will bear investigation?’ ” (Hardy, *Tess*: 337). Though Angel leaves Tess, he cannot tell the truth to his mother. Instead, he answers, “ ‘[s]he is spotless!’ ” (Hardy, *Tess*: 337). In fact, Tess is morally pure, but Angel is not able to see her purity. When Angel visits his parents alone, his mother instinctively asks him if she has a sexual history or not. Angel says that Tess is pure. Angel’s mother is the symbol of the prejudicial society because she only considers the results of the happenings. The factors which lead the person to experience an unwanted event are not taken into consideration. It is necessary to describe Angel for his behaviours as:

With all his attempted independence of judgment this advanced and well meaning young man, a sample product of the last five-and-twenty years, was yet the slave to custom and conventionality when surprised back into his early teachings (Hardy, *Tess*: 338).

The key words are the “custom” and “conventionality” which are the root of the themes of prejudice and stereotypes. If a person, especially a woman behaves different from these customs and conventionalities, then the concept of prejudice is formed by the society.

Angel has affinity to conventions, customs, rules, and stereotypical point of view. Although Angel loves Tess very much, the factors mentioned above are hindrances for him to share his love with her. Angel is the slave of conventionality. Lindley’s (1992: 54) comment goes in parallel with the point at hand: “Hardy unambiguously makes the reader aware that Angel still has much to learn”. Angel’s manners are emphasized as in the following: “He was incensed against his fate, bitterly disposed towards social ordinances; for they had cooped him up in a corner, out of which there was no legitimate pathway”, and “[w]hy not be revenged on society by shaping his future domesticities loosely, instead of kissing the pedagogic rod of convention in this ensnaring manner” (Hardy, *Tess*: 343). There is the impact of the society on Angel. Social order is the necessity for the society. He behaves in accordance with the society. Angel, then, learns how to stand against social conventions because of Tess’s moral purity, but it will be too late for them to protect their love.

Tess’s giving up speaking to her father-in-law about her poor state as well as harsh working conditions after Angel’s going to Brazil triggers her end. Tess is in a distorted situation:

Then she grieved for the beloved man whose conventional standard of judgement had caused her all these latter sorrows; and she went her way without knowing that the greatest misfortune of her life was this feminine loss of courage at the last and critical moment through her estimating her father-in-law by his sons (Hardy, *Tess*: 384).

Tess’s not talking to old Mr. Clare is a great loss and misfortune in her life. She is ultimately defenceless now, which is likely to put her at the hands of Alec later. Here, Angel’s prejudicial point of view as a member of the society is highlighted. Tess realizes that the origin of her sorrow results from Angel’s conventional thoughts and behaviours. Her not talking to Angel’s father is the turning point in Tess’s life, which leads her to destruction, namely, the end of her life. But she does not know this truth, and decides to go back to work which has

severe working conditions.

In her way to work, Tess comes across Alec. Alec tries to persuade Tess to live with him as his mistress. Tess's reaction to Alec's tricks is harsh: " 'Don't speak against him\_\_ he is absent!' ", and she adds, " '[t]reat him honourably- he has never wronged you! O leave his wife before any scandal spreads that may do harm to his honest name!' " (Hardy, *Tess*: 412). Tess's aggression is at work here. Alec tells lies about Angel. Tess becomes aggressive as a reaction to Alec's speech. According to Gose (1990: 226), Tess is "a potential victim".

Another turning point in the novel is the death of Tess's father. After her father's death, Tess and her family become miserable. The people around them do not want them to stay in their house because they are not pure enough. Their prejudicial point of view forces Tess to leave the house with her family. There is no place to stay at that moment. Tess's family is not wanted to stay in the village after their father's death because "[t]he father, and even the mother, had got drunk at times, the younger children seldom had gone to church, and the eldest daughter had made queer unions", and "[b]y some means the village had to be kept pure" (Hardy, *Tess*: 450).

This prejudicial point of view hastens the ultimate victimization of Tess. Tess's "eyes rested on the web of a spider" (Hardy, *Tess*: 451). The web of a spider turns out to be the web of Fate, which is likely to swallow Tess due to conventional society. Tess, again, blames herself because she considers herself as the reason for the destruction of her family. "Tess was reflecting on the position of the household, in which she perceived her own evil influence", and "[h]ad she not come home her mother and the children might probably have been allowed to stay on as weekly tenants" (Hardy, *Tess*: 451). Tess becomes a great hindrance for her family. Her mother opens her house whenever Tess needs to stay at her mother's house.

That is why, "her mother was scolded for 'harbouring' her; sharp retorts had ensued from Joan, who had independently offered to leave at once" and then, "she had been taken at her word; and here was the result" (Hardy, *Tess*: 451). In these lines the prejudice of the society is at its extreme because they cannot tolerate Tess's being protected by her mother. They scold Tess's mother. Tess's staying at her mother's house is the turning point for Tess and her family. They are dismissed from

their house. Tess's father has already died. That is why, there is no reason for them to stay there. The people around them do not want them to stay in the village.

In conclusion, Tess does not deserve harsh treatments and exclusion from the society, but the values of the Victorian Period lead her to experience these wicked events with victimization, that is, her execution. Tess's life undergoes many differences as follows:

After leaving Angel, Tess undergoes a reversal of psychic evolution. Having lost her chance of breaking free of Alec's seal, of becoming a fuller individual guided by Angel's high spiritual nature, she reverts first to the peasant level with her family, and then below that to the animal level after she leaves them (Gose, 1990: 226).

As in Gose's words, it is easy to realize how Tess is given harm by the social codes, conventions, and institutions because she is an unconventional type of person who is labelled as "Other" by the male-dominated society.

## CHAPTER IV

### 4. *JUDE THE OBSCURE*

Thomas Hardy deals with women, the harsh attitudes of the Victorian society to them, and the destruction of unconventional women in his novels because of socially determined rules, namely, social determinism. What is wrong in the attitudes of the patriarchal society is that though drives are the phenomena of the men and women, women who are considered as “Others” in the male-dominated society are treated in a prejudicial way because of their being involved in pre-marital sexual experiences. So, this prejudicial reactions bring out the victimization of women. Considering Hardy’s way of handling his female characters in his last novels, it should be noted that:

... the next three novels after *The Mayor of Casterbridge* rest upon Hardy’s remarkable empathy with female characters, not overlooking the harsh angularity of male treatment of females (Kramer, 1990: 3).

It is appropriate to state that Hardy shows a great sympathy to women, but he also depicts the harsh treatment of the Victorian mode of behaviour. Though female characters suffer from the socially determined rules, conventions, and codes, Hardy advocates that they should be free individuals in the society. In *Tess of the D’Urbervilles*, Tess is attacked by the society due to her past sexual experience with Alec. That is why, her victimization becomes inevitable. In *Jude the Obscure*, it is possible to realize the same attack of society upon Sue because she, using her own free will, gives birth to Jude’s children without a marriage bond. So, she is drifted to victimization by the social codes, conventions, and institutions which are determined beforehand ignoring the requirement of change in social life and in the nature of the individuals.

Considering Hardy’s way of handling the situation of his female characters, it might be emphasized that “the women’s dilemma is seriously treated in Hardy’s last two novels *Tess of the D’Urbervilles* and *Jude the Obscure*” (Öztürk, 1996: 106). For this reason, Hardy’s last novels attract the attention of both readers and critics considering the intensity of women’s paradox between their own selves and the

society. In these novels, Hardy's heroines are at the core of the debate. For, they try to put up with the Victorian modes of behaviour. Their struggle is so intense that this makes them stand as noble figures. As a result of this, it might be stressed that "both Tess and Sue have a very strong presence in contemporary English studies" (Wotton, 1985: 173). That is why, the novels *Tess of the D'Urbervilles* and *Jude the Obscure* are handled considering Hardy's major female characters one by one. While "*Tess of the d'Urbervilles* really scrutinizes the sexual typing that plays havoc with a woman's life" (Blake, 1990: 214), it is possible to realize that:

In Hardy's *Jude the Obscure* the issues of gender formation, the relationship between the sexes and marriage are inflected with the gendered discourses of degeneration and hereditarian determinism (Struzziero, 2006: 462).

From the point of view of Goode (1990: 35), the same point might be emphasized as follows: "... it is clear that the gender issue, particularly marriage, is the focus Hardy moves toward after *Tess of the d'Urbervilles*, because it is there that he has had most response". As has been understood from the expressions above, while Hardy handles woman as a fallen individual in the eye of the society due to her pre-marital sexual experience and her illegitimate child in *Tess of the D'Urbervilles*, he similarly focuses on woman's fallen state due to her illegal sexual relationship with a man, and her children from him as well as the institution of marriage which brings destruction to his hero and heroine in *Jude the Obscure*. That is why, "[p]eople often view *Jude* as a work of ultimate pessimism and Hardy as despairing of the human condition" (Stonyk, 1986: 42).

Hardy's novels *Tess of the D'Urbervilles* and *Jude the Obscure* are considered as prominent by authorities. This point is also supported by Blake (1990: 212) who, in her article "Pure Tess: Hardy on Knowing a Woman", asserts, "*Tess* is the greatest among a number of Hardy's works concerned with the loose fit between type and individual", and by Adelman's (1992: 12) book *Jude the Obscure: A Paradise of Despair*, which includes:

*Jude* is the most ambitious and complex of his novels: it is remarkable for its haunting pathos, complexity of narrative voice and perspective, characterization of Sue, and for its sense of intimate disclosure, of our being present with the private man in his paradise of despair.

*Jude the Obscure* focuses on the sexual oppression against Sue as well as Jude. Hardy intensifies the pressure of social codes, conventions, and institutions so as to indicate the destructive effects of the institution of marriage upon the individuals, especially women. *Jude the Obscure* “reflects Hardy’s ambivalence about the dilemmas of his time” especially about women “more powerfully than anything else he wrote”, which results in Hardy’s declaration “that marriage is usually unhappy” (Adelman, 1992: 10). Moreover, Adelman (1992: 10) argues that Hardy “blamed society ... for the tragic consequences of Jude and Sue’s love”. Here, it should be added that socially determined rules bring destruction to Sue as well as Jude because though it is appropriate to satisfy one’s own drives according to the laws of nature, this unconventional type of satisfying drives, especially sex drive is prevented by the moulds, codes, and rules determined artificially by the society, and its values.

To sum up, it might be emphasized that Hardy’s last novel *Jude the Obscure* “is intimately concerned with class and sex oppression- with a rapidly changing society” as well as “with the effects of different levels of education on the community, and with a search for a form of life tolerable to an intelligent, sensitive woman” (Adelman, 1992: 11). In this novel, Hardy tries to indicate the inequalities to women because of their sex. Women are forced to conform to the stereotypes which are constructed artificially by the society. The women who do not behave in accordance with socially determined rules are subject to oppression because prejudice is at the fore. This prejudice which is hand in hand with oppression drifts women to victimization.

Adelman (1992: 6), referring to Boumelha (1982), presents the state of women as well as the ongoing debate on the part of feminists as follows:

The marriage question, women’s rights, the idea that women like workingmen were victims of oppression (women because of sex rather than class) were very much in the air when Hardy was writing *Jude*.

Adelman’s (1992: 6) assertion goes on like that:



The feminists' mission to overthrow the double standard had become in the last twenty years of the nineteenth century almost a crusade. Female sexuality and the woman's role in marriage had become so much a matter of discussion that unself-conscious writing about these subjects was impossible.

As a realist writer, Hardy observes the happenings around him so as to create stories inspired from the experiences in the actual face of life. For this reason, it is possible to trace popular trends of his time such as feminism and the like in Hardy's last novels.

#### **4.1. The Concept of Drive in *Jude the Obscure***

As in *Tess of the D'Urbervilles*, in *Jude the Obscure* Hardy sheds light on the injustice to women due to their sex. Women who are considered as "Other" of the society are forced to conform to the stereotypes of the society. While women conforming to these stereotypes are regarded as pure, women who behave unconventionally, namely, according to their drives without taking into consideration the prejudicial point of view of the society are subject to victimization. For, the oppression of the society upon the women is so intense that they are not able to stand the harsh treatments of the society. In the state of Tess and Sue, we realize that though they are pure in their inner selves, they cannot put up with the prejudice originating from conventional codes, modes, and institutions. Furthermore, they become the victim of conventionality which includes strict and artificial rules determined by the society.

At the end of the novel, it is possible to notice that Sue as well as Jude become the victims of their patriarchal society. For, a male-dominated society requires women to conform to the stereotypes determined for them beforehand. Women who obey the conventions lead their lives silently. In contrast, women who adopt an unconventional way of life experience destruction. Sue's choice is unconventional because she considers herself as a free individual. But though she has a strong personality at the beginning of the novel, the situation reverses while she transforms into a highly conventional type of woman. Hardy succeeds in attracting our attention to the inevitable impact of the society upon the individual. That is why,

we agree with Arabella, who comments on Sue's psychological condition after she leaves Jude, and begins to live with her former legal husband Mr. Phillotson for the sake of conventionality. Jude is dead now. Arabella's words are the implication of Jude's and especially Sue's being the victims of the male-dominated society as follows: Sue " 'may swear that on her knees to the holy cross upon her necklace till she's hoarse, but it won't be true!' ", and " 'She's never found peace since she left his [Jude's] arms, and never will again till she's as he is now!' " (Hardy, *Jude*: 490). Though Sue loves Jude, she chooses conventionality.

Throughout the novel, it is possible to notice turning points which contribute to Sue's victimization by the society. At the outset of the novel *Jude the Obscure*, we are informed about the family curse related to the Fawleys as well as the characteristics of both Jude and Sue one by one. In the opening parts of the novel, the family curse is handled so as to imply the future problems which might appear in parallel with the institution of marriage. The protagonists are probably to feel the impact of the prejudicial attitudes of the patriarchal society due to the strict rules arranged for the marriage institution which regulates the satisfaction of drives accordingly. This shows the dominance of the patriarchal society. In other words, as Cixous (2000: 265) asserts, "[t]heory of culture, theory of society, the ensemble of symbolic systems - art, religion, family, language, - everything elaborates" the patriarchal "systems. And the movement by which each opposition is set up to produce meaning is the movement by which the couple is destroyed" like Sue and Jude, and "[a] universal battlefield" exists. Similarly, "[e]ach time a war breaks out" between the couple and society (Cixous, 2000: 265). And "[d]eath is always at work" (Cixous, 2000: 265).

Aunt Drusilla plays a functional role in the turning points of the novel. One of them is her describing Jude's cousin Sue's characteristics indicating the similarities between Sue and Jude. According to Miss Fawley, Jude:

... is crazy for books, that he is. It runs in our family rather. His cousin Sue is just the same\_\_ so I've heard; but I have not seen the child for years, though she was born in this place, within these four walls, as it happened (Hardy, *Jude*: 9).

Then, Aunt Drusilla gives some advices to Jude regarding that the married couples in their family have not been happy due to the nature of the marriage institution. In her advice, Jude's great Aunt includes, " 'Jude, my child, don't you ever marry. 'Tisn't for the Fawleys to take that step any more' " (Hardy, *Jude*: 9). Though Aunt Drusilla advises Jude not to get married because he is likely to be unhappy, Jude gets married with Arabella giving way to his passions.

Arabella, who inflames what already existing in Jude's deep unconscious, flings a part of the pig, which symbolizes the meaning of sexuality in the novel. She does this on purpose because she wants to attract his attention. He is a young man, and she is a young woman. There might be some relationship between them. So, she flings this piece as a symbol for the wish of sexuality. She reminds him of this part of life. She tries to awaken him. In the meanwhile, "[a] glance told him [Jude] what it was", namely, it was "a piece of flesh, the characteristic part of a barrow-pig, which the countrymen used for greasing their boots, as it was useless for any other purpose" (Hardy, *Jude*: 41). The implication running through these lines refers to the sexuality. Every person has some drives, and needs containing sexuality. Here, we are given some clues as to the future destruction resulting from the society's reactions to the satisfaction of the sex drive unconventionally. Hardy attracts our attention to this aspect of life by way of Arabella, and her behaviours. At this point, Hardy describes Arabella highlighting her feminine features as in the following:

She whom he [Jude] addressed was a fine dark-eyed girl, not exactly handsome, but capable of passing as such at a little distance, despite some coarseness of skin and fibre. She had a round and prominent bosom, full lips, perfect teeth, and the rich complexion of a Cochin hen's egg (*Jude*: 42).

Hardy goes on his description so as to depict her real personality which is based on sexuality as: Arabella "was a complete and substantial female animal\_\_ no more, no less" (Hardy, *Jude*: 42). The impact of the sexual drive is at work at that moment. First, they like each other. Then, this replaces with the sexual dimension in their lives. Their intimacy is the natural need existing in all human beings, but this brings destruction to Jude. One time, Jude's aunt feels sick. Jude visits her. They talk about Sue, and his aunt warns him again for Sue. He asks lots of questions about Sue. His aunt becomes angry with him. Then, a neighbour comes and tells Sue's

characteristics to them. This speech intensifies Jude's tender feelings to Sue because she is really a different and intellectual young woman with a bright mind. He loves Sue passionately.

In sharp contrast with Arabella, Sue is described by a neighbour as in the following: " 'She was not exactly a tomboy, ... but she could do things that only boys do, as a rule' " (Hardy, *Jude*: 134). In parallel with this, we are introduced with Sue's characteristic from her own voice. After Sue and Jude meet with each other, Sue discloses her inner characteristics to Jude. When they speak, Jude asks her some questions. He wants to learn how she has become so intellectual, and how she has read all her books. She answers him disclosing her point of view of life. Sue speaks like a philosopher, and she defines herself perfectly. She is a different woman. Conventional rules mean nothing to her. Sue describes herself in these lines: " 'My life has been entirely shaped by what people call a peculiarity in me. I have no fear of men, as such, nor of their books' " and " 'I have not felt about them as most women are taught to feel\_\_ to be on their guard against attacks on their virtue' " (Hardy, *Jude*: 177).

Similarly, it is possible to come across with the same description coming from Phillotson later. After Phillotson accepts her departure from his home to Jude's house, he becomes very miserable. While Mr. Phillotson speaks to his friend Mr. Gillingham, he comments on the passionate love of the pair. She is so intellectual that everybody can easily perceive her intelligence from her comments on life and behaviours. Mr. Phillotson respects and loves her very much. He is her admirer. Phillotson's words show his admiration of both Sue's characteristics and the similarities between Sue and Jude as follows: " 'They seem to be one person split in two!' ... 'I can't answer her arguments\_\_ she has read ten times as much as I' " and " 'Her intellect sparkles like diamonds, while mine smoulders like brown paper' ... 'She's one too many for me!' " (Hardy, *Jude*: 274).

As is clear in the expressions above, Sue is a perfect woman who is unconventional, but toward the end of the novel, she is victimized by the socially determined rules. Wotton comments on Sue's characteristics so as to make us notice how positive she is in the middle of the prejudicial society. Wotton (1985: 126) argues:

Sue is the most powerful image in Hardy's writing of the way in which women are determined by the masculine gaze, a determination which is manifested in the strongly epicene quality of her character, appearance and 'presence'.

Sue is ruled by socially determined rules which are not in harmony with her inner potentialities. This situation leads her to be unconventional in terms of stereotypes constructed artificially by the social institutions, one of which is the institution of marriage.

In addition to this, Struzziero's point of view of Sue runs in parallel with Wotton's comments on Sue. As Struzziero (2006: 469-470) puts it, Sue's "peculiarity" is not sexlessness" in almost all examples throughout the novel, "she unconsciously rejects the clichés of gender stereotyping and affirms her need for independence" and "[s]he fears that being possessed sexually also entails being denied an autonomous identity". Having these characteristics in her personality, Sue "is one of the first women in fiction to have had her private sexual history so carefully and sympathetically documented" (Stonyk: 1986: 67). In parallel with this, Adelman (1992: 11-12), in his book *Jude the Obscure: A Paradise of Despair*, asserts, "[t]he heart of the novel is a love story that fascinates the reader although there is something repellent about it" and adds, "[p]ossibly Sue is the most successful representation in Victorian literature of the dilemmas of women trying to escape their victimization".

Though Sue struggles to rescue herself from being the victim of the society, she cannot resist the prejudicial attitudes of the society, and she admits defeat by being conventional due to her return to her legal husband Mr. Phillotson in spite of her true feelings for Jude. Hardy creates Sue so as to show his reaction to the Victorian society which is harsh in treatment towards women. Appreciating the main reason behind Hardy's attitude in creating this type of woman, Adelman (1992: 7) puts forward his assertion as follows: "Hardy's attack on society's sexual codes and customs, his interest in the "new woman", and particularly his attempts to idealize in Jude and Sue a love that is passionate", in fact, "derive ... from his own peculiar personal history".

In contrast, Arabella's characteristics form a sharp contrast with Sue's

characteristics. For instance; Struzziero (2006: 465) claims, “[t]he other female character, Arabella, bears clear marks of the fallen woman being both adulterous and bigamous, driven by an open, animal sexual drive” and adds, “[s]he is utterly coarse, has no maternal feelings, behaves dishonestly and displays degraded tastes”. So, it might be added that Arabella is implied to be a turning point in the destruction of Sue and Jude’s lives. For, Arabella’s tricky sexuality leads Jude to get married with her, which enables the institution of marriage to destroy their lives for the sake of conventional codes of social institutions.

While Arabella and Jude discuss, Arabella discloses the secret in his family. Marriage is not an appropriate thing for the members of Jude’s family. She talks about the disagreement between the married couples. He is shocked at her speech. Jude inquires about this. His aunt says that it is true, but she is angry with Arabella. Arabella reminds Jude of a curse upon his family for marriage saying: “ ‘Going to ill-use me on principle, as your father ill-used your mother, and your father’s sister ill-used her husband?’ ... ‘All you be a queer lot as husbands and wives!’ ” (Hardy, *Jude*: 81). As has been understood from the expression, Arabella tries to protect herself as a woman. Aunt Drusilla discloses the truth with all its details to Jude. She says that his mother and father have not get on well with each other. For that reason, they have ended their marriage. According to her, marriage is not good for their family. She says that Jude has done wrong by getting married to Arabella. His aunt says, “ ‘[t]he Fawleys were not made for wedlock’ ”, namely, “ ‘it never seemed to sit well upon us. There’s sommat in our blood that won’t take kindly to the notion of being bound to do what we do readily enough if not bound’ ” (Hardy, *Jude*: 82). Aunt Drusilla admits that marriage is bad for all the family members, and adds that he should not have got married with Arabella. But the truth does not change. Though he has learned the secret of his family, he is still Arabella’s husband.

The marriage institution is questioned to show its destructive effects upon the couples. Socially determined rules destroy people though they have willpower when they choose their partners. One of the main paradoxes is built upon the institution of marriage as well as its negative impact especially upon women because women are considered as “Other” in the male-dominated society. This is also the implication of the point that the Fawleys want to direct their lives with their own free will. They

want to be free to lead their lives as they wish it to be. For this reason, the logic of the marriage bond is in sharp opposition to their way of life.

After Sue and Jude's acquaintance and intimacy, we are informed that Sue is in a Training School where girls are trained in accordance with the ongoing Victorian modes, and conventions. As a young woman with free will as well as the love of freedom, Sue does not put up with and conform to the conventional rules of the institution. That is why:

Suddenly ... quite a passionate letter arrived from Sue. She was quite lonely and miserable. She hated the place she was in; ... could he come immediately?\_\_though when he did come she would only be able to see him at limited times, the rules of the establishment she found herself in being strict to a degree (Hardy, *Jude*: 155).

While she stays at this school, she becomes very depressed, and sends Jude a letter. Here, the word "passionate" is the focal point in that while she feels herself lonely, she writes to Jude, not to Mr. Phillotson. The letter's being passionate might be the indication that she is ready to show her feelings to Jude, whether her feelings are conventional or not. Sue's calling Jude is the basis of the prejudice considering the strict rules of the social institutions. Then, the blame will be put upon them. For, they are the opposite sex, and they stay together almost all the time.

Towards the end of the novel, Jude's words after Sue's losing her babies are the implication of the point that Sue is victimized by the conventional institutions of the male-dominated society. After the destruction of her little babies at the hands of Little Father Time, who is the symbol of the social codes and legality of the marriage, Sue experiences some sort of mental disorder which causes her putting blame for her willingly satisfying her sexuality with Jude unconventionally and illegally. That is why, she leaves Jude, and goes back to her legal husband Mr. Phillotson. She believes that she should regulate her private life in accordance with the conventionality. We cannot see her former unconventional way of life. Instead, she adopts a highly conventional type of behaviour.

Jude, who is worried about Sue's blaming herself for nothing shows his affection to his destructed lover at the hands of the society, and tries to convince her in these words: " 'Sue \_\_ my own too suffering dear!\_\_ there's no evil woman in you. Your natural instincts are perfectly healthy; ... good, and dear, and pure' "

(Hardy, *Jude*: 412). Despite Jude's attempts to convince Sue for her innocence, Sue goes on accusing herself of pleasing herself sexually all the time by living with Jude as his partner. She does not want to give way to her sex drive because she thinks that it is wicked. She tries to keep away from Jude. This is the result of the oppression of the conventional society. She is pure. Then she gets a conventional way of thinking. In fact, she has had the opposite of this conventional point of view existing after the disaster of her children. Due to her bad situation, it might be stated that Sue's victimization results from the patriarchal Victorian society.

Sue, due to the strict rules of the Training School as an institution of education, feels depressed from restriction, and escapes from the school to go to Jude. Jude is really interested in her coming to his home late at night. She is wet because she crosses a river so as to escape without being seen by the authorities of the school. She changes her wet clothes by taking Jude's Sunday suit. When they speak, "[s]he blushed as he sat down beside her, but only for a moment" (Hardy, *Jude*: 173). She feels embarrassed because her wet clothes are on the chair. She feels so ill that Jude arranges the clothes so as to make them dry near the fire. Her embarrassment might be some sort of drive expression because Jude sits near her. She is in a miserable state. They begin to question life itself. They realize the conflict between their thoughts and points of view of life. They cannot share the same idea, but Sue tries to get on well with Jude. She begins to open her inner feelings as:

'I won't disturb your convictions\_\_ I really won't!' ... 'But I did want and long to ennoble some man to high aims; and when I saw you, and knew you wanted to be my comrade, I\_\_ shall I confess it?\_\_ thought that man might be you. But you take so much tradition on trust that I don't know what to say' (Hardy, *Jude*: 183).

She expresses her thoughts about him. While she is unconventional, he is conventional, but this difference brings them together. They argue about daily life easily. She is more close to him than anybody else. She adds that she shows respect to his personal thoughts.

At a critical point, Sue confesses that she has realized Jude's intentions for her. She discovers his love for her, but she finds herself guilty for his love. She discloses her feelings and thoughts as follows:



'I don't think of you like that means! It did just *occur* to me to regard you in the way they think I do, but I hadn't begun to. I *have* recognized that the cousinship was merely nominal, since we met as total strangers. But my marrying you, dear Jude\_\_ why, of course, if I had reckoned upon marrying you I shouldn't have come to you so often! And I never supposed you thought of such a thing as marrying me till the other evening; when I began to fancy you did love me a little. Perhaps I ought not to have been so intimate with you. It is all my fault. Everything is my fault always!' (Hardy, *Jude*: 188-9).

Sue expresses how she has been blind to realize Jude's feelings towards her. According to Sue, her being so intimate with him even in the name of friendship or relative gives harm to him due to his feelings. She accuses herself of these happenings from the beginning to the end. Then, she accuses Jude of not telling her the truth as to his feelings towards her. His attitudes are appreciated as they are, and the people have begun to think ill of them. Sue adds to her disclosure the striking words for their relationship, which is the turning point of the novel. Sue goes on her speech:

'I was so blind at first!' ... 'I didn't see what you felt at all. O you have been unkind to me\_\_ you have\_\_ to look upon me as a sweetheart without saying a word, and leaving me to discover it myself! Your attitude to me has become known; and naturally they think we've been doing wrong! I'll never trust you again!' (Hardy, *Jude*: 189).

Her disclosure is a triggering one which requires sympathetic reactions from Jude, but it is not possible for Jude to show the type of reaction as follows:

By every law of nature and sex a kiss was the only rejoinder that fitted the mood and the moment, under the suasion of which Sue's undemonstrative regard of him might not inconceivably have changed its temperature (Hardy, *Jude*: 189).

Sex drive is an important factor here. A kiss is an innocent sign of the theme of love. If he was able to kiss her, there would be no problem between them, but he is not able to reply her speech with his reactions due to his marriage.

At this point, Adelman comments on the novel in general so as to depict a whole picture containing Sue as victim of her sexuality as well as the society. Adelman argues the situation of Sue and Jude from the aspect of Hardy as well as his own literary style of writing. In Adelman's (1992: 11) words:

Hardy was at the same time uneasy about displacing the old codes of life, and while he raises philosophical and religious questions and is concerned with the problems of class and social mobility, as well as with the question of a woman's place in society, he undermines Jude and Sue, subverting his novel's heterodoxy by constantly shifting the point of view from high seriousness to satire and farce.

In addition to this, Adelman (1992: 11) presents a striking claim as that Sue and Jude “are the victims of sexual and economic exploitation”. Sexuality plays an important role in triggering the prejudicial reactions of the society. For, the way of satisfying sexuality is not in accordance with the determined values and rules of the society. In other words, women are expected to live their sexuality with a legal husband after the marriage. Women who do not conform to this rule are automatically accepted as wicked “Others”. They are excluded from the society. Struzziero (2006: 466) handles the subject in terms of the stereotypes attached to the individual by the society as well as the failure in escaping from them in these words: “Hardy presents the man and the woman’s failure to move out of the suffocating roles that society makes accessible to them”. Women have no right to ignore the stereotypes of the social institutions because they are fixed structures to accept without questioning them.

In contrast, Tess and Sue behave in opposition to these stereotypes such as a sexually pure woman, a housewife, and the like. Their behaviours in opposite direction bring them victimization, which Hardy “illustrates how impossible it is to take an optimistic view of life when tragedy grows so naturally out of our biological existence”, namely, “women are born to be broken by marriage and childbirth” (Stonyk, 1986: 65). For women, victimization is inevitable because of their sexual structures. The same is valid for Sue because she has a pre-marital sexual relationship with Jude and she adopts the role of mother to her babies as well as Arabella’s boy Little Father Time. For the same point, as Morgan (1991:112) notes:

Victorian marriage codes are an anachronism to Sue. The notion strikes her as outrageous that a married woman should be regarded as a man’s property, or that sexual relationships should still require institutionalisation in a modern society pioneering in its radical quarters the dissolution of rigid role demarcations and sexual inequality.

Considering Sue’s fight against the marriage institution, Morgan (1991: 111) highlights Sue’s positive characteristics as in the following: “Sue’s campaign against the Institution of Marriage is rigorous, radical and militant”. Though Sue shows a powerful reaction to the conventions of the society, she is defeated by the socially determined codes, conventions, and institutions. Morgan (1991: 111) also sheds light on Hardy’s attitudes towards Sue’s unconventionality as in these words: “Sue’s

resistance to the notion that marriage should be the expressed goal of her sexuality is of central importance to the novel”, and adds, “Hardy, now adopting a more openly heterodox stance than he had felt permissible in earlier works, stands openly and defiantly behind her”. Though she fights against the social institutions so as to prove her freedom as a young woman, “Sue Bridehead’s fight against the tyranny of man-made institutions” ends in failure (Morgan, 1991: 58).

A different point of view for Sue’s victimization by the society comes from Adelman (1992: 111), whose assertion is that: “There is good evidence for seeing Sue as coequal to Jude, a sympathetic victim crushed by forces more insidious than those Jude encounters” and that Sue “is not coquettish or frigid, ... and ... her active sexuality is a decisive element in her collapse”. She does not have frigidity in her femininity, but she is pressed by the rules of the society. That is why, she goes away from Jude at the end of the novel.

After a while, Sue learns that Jude is a married man. She is furious with Jude for not telling her the truth before. Due to her anger to him and her helplessness, she decides to get married with Mr. Phillotson, who has proposed her before. After her escaping from her school to come to Jude’s house late at night, everybody gossips about Sue and Jude. Sue is not able to stand these gossips as well as Jude’s belonging to another woman. That is why, she gets married with Mr. Phillotson, who is twenty years older than her.

Jude comes near his beloved Sue. Now, she is married to Mr. Phillotson. While Jude plays the piano at the classroom, she enters the room. He wants her to play the melody they both enjoy. Then their feelings are intensified because of the hymn. They resemble to each other. They know that they love each other very much, but there is no way out for them when they take into consideration the society. Socially determined rules are at the fore. When they are together, Sue “played on and suddenly turned round; and by an unpremeditated instinct each clasped the other’s hand again. She uttered a forced little laugh as she relinquished his quickly” (Hardy, *Jude*: 241). Then, she says, “ ‘How funny!’ ”, and adds, “ ‘I wonder what we both did that for?’ ” (Hardy, *Jude*: 241). Jude replies, “ ‘I suppose because we are both alike, as I said before’ ” (Hardy, *Jude*: 241). Sue says, “ ‘Not in our thoughts! Perhaps a little in our feelings’ ” (Hardy, *Jude*: 241). Jude’s latter reply is as follows:

“ ‘And they rule thoughts’ ” (Hardy, *Jude*: 241). This is a clear manifestation of their love to one another. After a while, Sue, remembering the conventions and codes of the society, says in a victimized state:

‘I can’t talk to you any longer, Jude!’ ... ‘It is getting too dark to stay together like this, after playing morbid Good Friday tunes that make one feel what one shouldn’t! ... We mustn’t sit and talk in this way any more. Yes\_\_ you must go away, for you mistake me! ... I can’t tell you the truth\_\_ I should shock you by letting you know how I give way to my impulses, and how much I feel that I shouldn’t have been provided with attractiveness unless it were meant to be exercised! ... Now you must go. I am sorry my husband is not at home’ (Hardy, *Jude*: 243-4).

These lines make it clear that Sue is not conventional, but she feels that she should be conventional in the eye of the society. She wants to give way to her drives, but this is not easy enough for her when there is so intense a pressure upon her. Namely, she has the conflict between nature and society within her. The society requires her to conform to her social roles as a woman. Sue tends to show her love, but she is restricted by the conventional codes of the society. It might be said that she is in a paradox between her true feelings and the conventionality of the society.

Sue wants Jude to go to his home. She does not speak freely when he is near her, but when he goes out, she feels herself relieved. The reason is that when he is near her, it is difficult to dominate her drives, but when he is out, she is able to dominate her drives. She discloses some hints for her love to him as: “ ‘Where you are, I can talk to you better like this than when you were inside. ... It was so kind and tender of you to give up half a day’s work to come to see me!’ ” and adds strikingly “ ‘O my poor friend and comrade, you’ll suffer yet!’ ” (Hardy, *Jude*: 244). She is afraid of her own drives including sexuality. For, she is in love with Jude, but she is not allowed to disclose this truth by the socially determined rules.

Sue’s distortion between her own love and social codes, one of which is marriage code might be traced in these lines easily: Sue’s “face soon began a pensive smile, which lasted till, having descended a little way, he met her” (Hardy, *Jude*: 249). She says, “ ‘I thought’ ... ‘that it would be so sad to let you attend the funeral alone! And so \_\_ at the last moment \_\_ I came’ ” (Hardy, *Jude*: 249). Her smile to Jude is the indication of her love to him. Sue comes to see her beloved lover. She is happy in his presence though this feeling might be considered as the violation of the social rules. In short, “their lives united at least in this last attention to the dead”

(Hardy, *Jude*: 249). The death of their aunt has become a means of the union of their lives. After their decision of not having an intention for living their love, they behave in a tricky way to one another. One of them is Jude's putting his hand upon hers when they talk about Sue's marriage with Phillotson. Sue questions Jude as: "Well\_\_ are you sure you mean it only as my cousin?" for his behaviour (Hardy, *Jude*: 252). Jude's reply is strikingly as follows: " 'Absolutely sure. I have no feelings of love left in me' " (Hardy, *Jude*: 252). Sue startles against this unexpected answer. While Sue says, " 'That's news. How has it come to be?' ", Jude replies, " 'I've seen Arabella' " (Hardy, *Jude*: 252). Then, Sue, in a curious manner, asks him " '[w]hen did you see her?' ... 'So she's come back; and you never told me! I suppose you will live with her now?' " (Hardy, *Jude*: 252). Jude sets a trap for Sue as in the following: " 'Of course \_\_ just as you live with your husband' " (Hardy, *Jude*: 252). Jude's tricky attitudes form one of the prominent turning points of the novel. For, after this event, they live together. Jude is a clever chap who plays a trick on Sue by telling a lie about his relation with Arabella. By this way, he aims to make her jealous of him, and he succeeds in his plan. Sue is very jealous of him because Sue learns that he does not love her, and Arabella comes to live with Jude as his wife. He does this on purpose. Sue's jealousy is so intense that she questions his thoughts and feelings. She falls into Jude's trap as Jude wants to do. After this trap, she discloses her own unhappiness in her private life to Jude using her own free will.

At this point, it is possible to realize one of the influential climaxes of the novel after their intimacy as lovers. Sue claims that while she leaves him to go to her home, he should not kiss her. Then, she adds that if he kisses her as a cousin, then she will permit him. He kisses her, and then:

... they had turned from each other in estrangement, and gone their several ways, till at a distance of twenty or thirty yards both had looked round simultaneously. That look behind was fatal to the reserve hitherto more or less maintained. They had quickly run back, and met, and embracing most unpremeditatedly, kissed close and long. When they parted for good it was with flushed cheeks on her side, and a beating heart on his (Hardy, *Jude*: 258-9).

This behaviour of them is the expression of their sex drive because they love each other so intensely and dearly. Because of their love to each other, their alienation from one another does not last long. They disclose their feelings. This is

the first real disclosure of their love openly. From then on, they decide to live together using their own willpower. In other words, they both decide to live for themselves taking into consideration their own needs and feelings. While doing this, they ignore the socially determined rules of the society. Their free will which is in parallel with the satisfaction of their drives unconventionally leads them to be against the patriarchal society. This type of behaviour, then, intensifies the prejudicial reactions of the society toward Sue because of her “Otherness” as a woman, which drifts her to her victimization at the hands of the male-dominated society.

By the way, it is necessary to shed light upon the point of marriage, in the way it is discussed by Sue and Jude. While Sue and Jude discuss the institution of marriage, they speak philosophically. Knowing Sue’s point of view of not having the wish for marriage, Jude replies Sue commenting on the nature of marriage institution as follows:

People go on marrying because they can't resist natural forces, although many of them may know perfectly well that they are possibly buying a month's pleasure with a life's discomfort. No doubt my father and mother, and your father and mother, saw it, if they at all resembled us in habits of observation. But then they went and married just the same, because they had ordinary passions (Hardy, *Jude*: 308).

Another important point triggering Sue’s sexuality is Arabella’s appearing again after Sue and Jude begin to live together. Arabella comes to their lodgings. Sue understands that she is Arabella. Arabella wants to speak to Jude, but he is not at his own home. Sue is jealous of Arabella. When Jude comes to his lodgings, Sue talks about Arabella’s visit. Sue’s words are filled with jealousy: “ ‘I feel perfectly certain it was \_\_\_ by the light in her eyes as she looked at me. She was a fleshy, coarse woman’ ” (Hardy, *Jude*: 312). Sue is right in her description of Arabella. Arabella is a wild woman who is selfish and greedy for sexual love.

This matter continues at night, too. Then, Sue says that she wants to be Jude’s wife. The theme of jealousy gives way to sex drive. In other words, jealousy triggers the sex drive in Sue. We can easily notice Sue’s jealous attitudes in these lines: “ ‘you can go and see her to-morrow, Jude! Don’t go now, Jude!’ ”, and Sue adds, “ ‘O, it is only to entrap you, I know it is, as she did before! Don’t go, dear! She is such a low-passioned woman \_\_\_ I can see it in her shape, and hear it in her voice!’ ”

(Hardy, *Jude*: 314). Jude, in a tricky way, says to Sue that she is not a wife to him, and that he can go to Arabella freely. Sue agrees to be his wife at the end of their debate so as to prevent him from going to Arabella. She succeeds in her obstinacy. Then, she, using her own freedom, “went off under cloak and umbrella letting Jude kiss her freely, and returning his kisses in a way she had never done before” (Hardy, *Jude*: 318). This reaction of jealousy of Sue against Jude’s tricky escape to Arabella is another prominent turning point, which changes the flow of the novel in an opposite way. Firstly, Sue becomes jealous of Arabella. Then, she experiences her drives with Jude on her own will.

Arabella informs Jude that she has a child from their marriage. That is, Jude has a boy from Arabella. Sue and Jude accept him, but Sue becomes a bit jealousy. After this event:

Sue jumped up and kissed Jude with passionate devotion. ... ‘And we’ll have him here! And if he isn’t yours it makes it all the better. I do hope he isn’t\_\_ though perhaps I ought not to feel quite that! If he isn’t, I should like so much for us to have him as an adopted child!’ (Hardy, *Jude*: 326).

Sue is so intimate to Jude. Therefore, she is jealous of him. Sue and Jude are at the Great Wessex Agricultural Show. Here, they behave according to their wishes. They live their feelings as they want in front of the strangers. So, it might be stated that:

Not regardful of themselves alone, they had taken to bring Father Time, to try every means of making him kindle and laugh like other boys, though he was to some extent a hindrance to the delightfully unreserved intercourse in their pilgrimages which they so much enjoyed. But they soon ceased to consider him an observer, and went alone with that tender attention to each other which the shyest can scarcely disguise, and which these, among entire strangers as they imagined, took less trouble to disguise than they might have done at home (Hardy, *Jude*: 346-7).

They begin to show their feelings as the implication of their sexuality freely. From now on, they come across with the prejudicial point of view of the society because they are not married legally.

After the death of her babies at the hand of Little Father Time, Sue discloses her thoughts about Jude and her sex drive. She, now, thinks that Jude and her drives should not be in her life any more. She adopts a conventional way of life, which results from her own mental breakdown as a reaction to the loss of her babies. Sue

explains her former thoughts and feelings to Jude so as to leave him as in the following:

‘At first I did not love you, Jude; ... I merely wanted you to love me. ... but that inborn craving which undermines some women’s morals almost more than unbridled passion \_\_ the craving to attack and captivate, regardless of the injury it may do the man \_\_ was in me; and when I found I had caught you, I was frightened. And then\_\_ I don’t know how it was\_\_ I couldn’t bear to let you go\_\_ possibly to Arabella again\_\_ and so I got to love you, Jude. ... it began in the selfish and cruel wish to make your heart ache for me without letting mine ache for you’ (Hardy, *Jude*: 422).

From now onwards, Sue becomes a conventional type of person. Sue leaves Jude, and goes back to her legal husband Mr. Phillotson. Due to her mental disorder, she chooses conventionality which she has not chosen before. Jude goes to her house in which Sue lives with her husband Mr. Phillotson. Sue and Jude talk about conventionality which has departed them so cruelly. Jude accuses Sue of changing her mind, and of choosing conventionality because of their children’s death. As a reaction to Jude’s accusing Sue of her conformity to social and marriage codes:

Her bosom began to go up and down. ‘I can’t endure you to say that!’ she burst out, and her eye resting on him a moment, she turned back impulsively. ‘Don’t, don’t scorn me! Kiss me, O kiss me lots of times, and say I am not a coward and a contemptible humbug\_\_ I can’t bear it!’ She rushed up to him and, with her mouth on his, continued: ‘I must tell you\_\_ O I must\_\_ my darling Love! It has been\_\_ only a church marriage\_\_ an apparent marriage I mean! He suggested it at the very first!’ (Hardy, *Jude*: 466-7).

Sue is so inconsistent that while Jude speaks about their children, she remembers her resolution, and runs away from him. Jude also goes away without any hope. Sue goes near her husband Mr. Phillotson, and discloses him how she has kissed Jude, and how she has let him kiss her. She states that she has done wrong and wants to cure her fault. She says that she is ready to be his wife, and although she dislikes Mr. Phillotson, she becomes his wife for the sake of conventionality, and socially determined rules.

Sue is a woman who firstly includes love and sexuality in her life, but then she begins to be a conventional type of person. As a conclusion of her conventionality, she forces herself to have sexual experiences with Phillotson. When we question Sue’s genuine intention for her own private life, we may realize, “Sue wants to be loved” by Jude, “but she cannot bear to lose her freedom” (Adelman,



1992: 93). Despite her struggle to stand as a free individual, she, then, obeys the marriage code by presenting her own body to Mr. Phillotson as his wife. So, conformity destroys Sue, and her life. Due to the negative impact of the marriage institution upon her, Hardy “attacks the institution of marriage and the narrow letter of Christianity” (Adelman, 1992: 31).

Adelman (1992: 88), regarding Hardy’s style of portrayal of Sue, shows the connection between Hardy and feminism in these words: “In his depiction of Sue, Hardy shows remarkable sensitivity to feminist issues”, and he sheds light on the negative influence of the marriage code upon women as: “The novel’s tragedy turns on marriage, and it is a double tragedy. This view is augmented by looking into the historical context of women’s issues”. This means that the institution of marriage has a negative and destructive impact on women. For, women are forced to have sexuality according to the socially determined rules and conventions, which does not conform with their own genuine feelings. This truth transforms women into the victim of the patriarchal society.

#### **4.2. The Concept of Prejudice in *Jude the Obscure***

As in *Tess of the D’Urbervilles*, in *Jude the Obscure*, too, it is possible to come face to face with prejudicial point of view of the society. For, Sue has pre-marital sexual experiences with Jude as well as two illegitimate children. She is pregnant for the third one. This episode intensifies people’s negative reactions to them. As Allport claims, because prejudicial thoughts cannot be changed easily, people with prejudice are not likely to change their point of view of Sue because of the fixity of their values and beliefs. The society’s meaningless and baseless affinity to prejudice creates the basis of Sue’s downfall in her life in general. Therefore, as Adelman (1992: 63-4), referring to Ingham (1985), notes, “[w]omen are victimized through sex and suffer, like workingmen, from self-devaluation and humiliating inferiority” with the addition of the fact “[o]bviously permitting women autonomy radically subverts the Christian ideal that a woman’s self-fulfillment is rooted in self-denial”. In other words, in the eye of the patriarchal society the women should be alienated from their real selves containing drives so as to conform to the stereotyping

of the society and to be accepted to the social affairs that are suitable for them.

As a crucial example, Sue does not conform to the society at first, but then she obeys the social codes, which results in Sue's probably being "the most interesting of Hardy's female characters" (Adelman, 1992: 23). Sue's peculiarity is the reason of the fact that "[s]he has been endlessly analyzed, most recently by feminists who interpret the novel as a tragedy in which Sue is the central figure, not Jude" (Adelman, 1992: 23). In addition to Sue's being analyzed by critics, "[t]o feminists, the pathos does not lie in a heroic view of Jude; instead the tragedy derives from Sue's failure to live as a sexual being" (Adelman, 1992: 23). Sue, at last, is in harmony with the conventionality of the society.

Highlighting the basis of the novel as the marriage and sexual codes, Struzziero (2006: 463) argues, "[t]he text's subversiveness is located in its treatment of the institution of marriage and of the Victorian sexual codes within it" and adds strikingly:

Hardy engages with some major revolutionary themes: women's growing unease with their entrapment in roles that contemporary ideologies forced on them ... the church's influential moral hold even in private domains, such as sexuality and marriage.

Lastly, Struzziero's (2006: 463) emphasis is upon the fact that "Hardy's concern is about the authority of those institutions". Hardy stands against social and sexual codes, and regards women as free individuals. Hardy wants women to use their own free will, but it is not almost always possible for women to behave in accordance with their own willpower because of the patriarchal society.

After Sue lives with Jude without legality, they question whether they should get married legally or not. While Jude is willing to legalize their relationship, Sue cannot get accustomed to this idea of marriage. Her hatred of legality is so intense that her words show her opposition with social institutions, especially the institution of marriage as in the following:

'Should be two dissatisfied ones linked together, which would be twice as bad as before. ... I think I should begin to be afraid of you, Jude, the moment you had contracted to cherish me under a Government stamp, and I was licensed to be loved on the premises by you\_\_ Ugh, how horrible and sordid! Although, as you are, free, I trust you more than any other man in the world' (Hardy, *Jude*: 308).

These lines show Sue's point of view of marriage. She does not want to get married to Jude legally. She only wants to live with him as his lover. Her ideas do not conform to the conventions of the social institutions. She decides to adopt this way of life using her own freedom.

Sue leaves Jude after the death of her babies, and prefers living with her legal husband Mr. Phillotson by way of her own willpower. Arabella learns this truth. Once in a while, Mr. Phillotson encounters Arabella. Arabella gossips about Sue and Jude. She discloses that Sue has left Jude, and that Sue thinks that her true husband is Mr. Phillotson himself. Mr. Phillotson becomes confused. Arabella says:

'He's not her husband ... She has never really married him although they have passed as man and wife so long. And now, instead of this sad event making 'em hurry up, and get the thing done legally, she's took in a queer religious way ... hers is of a more 'sterical sort than mine. And she says ... that she's your wife in the eye of Heaven and the Church\_\_ yours only; and can't be anybody else's by any act of man' (Hardy, *Jude*: 427).

Arabella, here, is a means of intensifying and hastening Sue's victimization at the hands of the society because she informs Mr. Phillotson about Sue and her relationship with Jude.

Jude does not find any job because their gossip spreads all over the villages. He is not able to work in some sort of jobs such as "railway stations, bridges, theatres, music-halls, hotels", and the like (Hardy, *Jude*: 364). These type of jobs might not require the boss to inquire the past experiences of the applicants. He tries to find a job in which the past experiences are not scrutinized. At last, Jude thinks that he might be a baker. Jude and Sue move to another place. Jude says, " 'I am not skilled in those' " jobs, so " 'I ought to take to bread-baking. I grew up in the baking business with aunt, you know. But even a baker must be conventional, to get customers' " (Hardy, *Jude*: 364). The main emphasis is that every kind of job is closely related to conventionality. The order is built upon conventional face of life. Unconventional elements are subject to disappear from the society. From the perspective of Struzziero (2006: 463), it might be highlighted that Hardy:

... uses contemporary ideological discourses on determinism and degeneracy to flout their cultural "authority" and actually expose the oppressiveness of social institutions, moving a trenchant attack on contemporary views of sexual morality and on the marriage laws.

The impact of socially determined rules, and unavoidable social institutions on individuals, both men and especially women, is evident in the Victorian thought and modes of behaviour. As a reaction to this pressure, “Hardy’s attack on convention, the obstructive prejudice that thwarts Jude at every turn”, which is the dominant theme in our study, “has the effect of intensifying our sympathy for his desires even when they are delusory and unworthy” (Adelman, 1992: 32). The same sympathy is valid for his female characters, one of whom is Sue herself. Scrutinizing Hardy’s style of handling his female characters, we may state that:

Hardy was regarded as the greatest living English novelist during his lifetime, a reputation based on his power to create sensuous illusions of people and physical settings, to relate a tragic story of passion and make the settings its metaphor, and to enchant the scene with an extraordinary character, usually a woman (Adelman, 1992: 12).

Though Hardy shows his sympathy for his male and female characters, this attitude of Hardy does not rescue them from victimization.

As Adelman (1992: 23), referring to Widdowson (1989), puts forward, Jude and Sue “are ... victimized by social and sexual repression”. Though Jude is a male component of the society, he is also exposed to the harsh treatments of the society. Sue, as a female figure, comes face to face with intensified unjust treatments of the Victorian society. These pessimist circumstances lead them to their victimization. Especially Sue’s mental breakdown is a reaction to the unbearable pressures of the society. Sue’s breakdown occurs after she loses her babies. Arabella and Jude’s son Little Father Time hangs Sue’s children, and then himself as a reaction to the society’s excluding illegitimate children of Sue and Jude. Sue becomes mad. Sue and Jude’s obstinacy not to get married with each other is the expression of their being unconventional. So, conventionality destroys their lives.

After her children’s death distressfully, Sue cries out, “ ‘O, O my babies! They had done no harm! Why should they have been taken away, and not I!’ ” (Hardy, *Jude*: 403). Sue gives birth to a premature baby, who is dead. Sue’s way of thinking changes so much that she becomes inclined to conventionality. In other words, she submits to the conventionality of the society. Arabella’s legal child kills Sue’s illegitimate children. She is not able to put up with the suffering of the disaster of her own children. She tries to conform to social rules wanting to go back to Mr.

Phyllotson, and urging Jude to return to Arabella. Sue's conventional way of thinking appears as follows: " 'I see marriage differently now. My babies have been taken from me to show me this! Arabella's child killing mine was a judgement' ", and adds miserably " 'the right slaying the wrong. What, *what* shall I do! I am such a vile creature\_\_ too worthless to mix with ordinary human beings!' " (Hardy, *Jude*: 419). Sue and Jude change their roles. As a contrast to the past, Sue becomes conventional, but Jude is unconventional.

After this disaster, Sue submits to the conventions of the society because she has no power at this moment. Her losing her dear children makes her like a mad person. For that reason, she begins to be the opposite of her old state considering her thoughts and beliefs. Sue's comments on conventionality change. While Sue says, " '[w]e must conform!' ... 'All the ancient wrath of the Power above us has been vented upon us' ", and adds, " 'His poor creatures, and we must submit. There is no choice. We must. It is no use fighting against God!' ", Jude replies, " '[i]t is only against man and senseless circumstance' " (Hardy, *Jude*: 409-10). In spite of Sue's regression after the disaster of her children, Jude becomes more mature because of the prejudice of the society. He realizes the vanity of the conventionality after the pressure of the society. Jude "was mentally approaching the position which Sue had occupied when he first met her" (Hardy, *Jude*: 368). Though Sue and Jude are innocent, people are so cruel and strict for them that they cannot tolerate all these conditions. Jude begins to get Sue's former way of thinking. He does not give importance to the subjects which have been crucial for him once upon a time. He begins to hate what he admires in the past.

At the very beginning of his love for Sue, Jude questions himself. Jude notices that he loves Sue deeply and passionately, but he could not help loving her. Here the laws and conventions of his society are considered as prominent points in determining the relations between man and woman. According to these rules, Jude should not approach to Sue. As a result of this questioning:

There was not the least doubt that from his own orthodox point of view the situation was growing immoral. For Sue to be the loved one of a man who was licensed by the laws of his country to love Arabella and none other unto his life's end, was a pretty bad second beginning when the man was bent on such a course as Jude purposed (Hardy, *Jude*: 116).

Jude's former conventionality is evident here. But then, he transforms into an unconventional type of person.

While Sue is single, she attends to the Melchester Normal School because she decides to be a teacher in the school. Up till now, she helps Mr. Phillotson in teaching. After finishing this school, she will be able to help him more professionally. At this point, it is necessary to handle the basis of the society's prejudice. Before Sue and Mr. Phillotson get married, Sue escapes from her school, and comes to Jude's house late at night. Sue speaks to Jude slowly: " 'Jude!' (from below). 'Sue!' 'Yes\_\_ it is! Can I come up without being seen?' 'O yes!' 'Then don't come down. Shut the window' " (Hardy, *Jude*: 171). Sue tries to go in secretly because she knows that if anyone realizes her entrance to Jude's house, this can cause some gossips and prejudices. She tries to be careful in her entrance to Jude's house.

In the morning, Sue repents her escape from the school. She is afraid of the people in the school, and especially Mr. Phillotson. She is conscious that they have prejudicial thoughts about her because she has spent the night outside of the school. Sue says:

'I fear I ought not to have run away from that school! Things seem so different in the cold light of morning, don't they? What Mr. Phillotson will say I don't know! It was quite by his wish that I went there. He is the only man in the world for whom I have any respect or fear. I hope he'll forgive me; but he'll scold me dreadfully, I expect!' (Hardy, *Jude*: 185).

Sue begins to change her mind because she feels the pressure of the society upon herself. She is affected badly by the socially determined rules, and conventions.

Before Sue's escape from her school, Jude comes to Training-School at Melchester to take Sue outside of the school. In the evening the girls sit in a room at their school and gossip that "Sue Bridehead had not come in at closing-time" (Hardy, *Jude*: 167). One of the girls says, " '[s]he went out with her young man' " and adds, " 'Miss Traceley saw her at the station with him. She'll have it hot when she does come' " (Hardy, *Jude*: 167). These expressions indicate how strict the school, its students, and teachers are. Their prejudicial views are so apparent that the students openly comment on Sue's situation. The other girl replies, " '[s]he said he was her cousin' " (Hardy, *Jude*: 167). At last, another girl gives a harsh answer for these

comments as: “ ‘That excuse has been made a little too often in this school to be effectual in saving our souls’ ” (Hardy, *Jude*: 167). Although the girls are not old enough, their comments are so much in harmony with the conventional attitudes of people that they conform to the socially determined laws. Because of her being late to the school dormitory, she takes a harsh punishment. She cannot tolerate to this one, and escapes from the school in parallel with her will.

Sue is under the great pressure at school. Conventionality and prejudicial point of view are dominant in that school. These strict rules of the school do not conform to Sue’s personality because she wants to be free. She describes the harsh treatments of the school while she is in Jude’s house. She explains to Jude, “ ‘[w]alked through the largest river in the county\_\_ that’s what I’ve done! They locked me up for being out with you; and’ ” she adds, “ ‘it seemed so unjust that I couldn’t bear it, so I got out of the window and escaped across the stream!’ ” (Hardy, *Jude*: 172). After a while, “[s]he had begun the explanation in her usual slightly independent tones, but before she had finished the thin pink lips trembled, and” then, “she could hardly refrain from crying” (Hardy, *Jude*: 172). It is, here, possible to notice prejudicial attitudes to Sue’s going out with Jude. She is treated harshly. She is not able to put up with this pressure. Sue adds:

‘I suppose, Jude, it is odd that you should see me like this and all my things hanging there? Yet what nonsense! They are only a woman’s clothes\_\_ sexless cloth and linen ... I wish I didn’t feel so ill and sick! Will you dry my clothes now?’ (Hardy, *Jude*: 173).

Sue thinks that it is a bit strange that Jude sees all her clothes, but she needs his help due to her illness. Sue feels sick because of her wetness, and she adds that she will not stay near him. The reason is that she tries to avoid prejudicial comments for her and Jude. She is afraid of prejudicial point of view.

Sue informs Jude that the school will not accept her as a student any more. That is, she is dismissed from the school because she has stayed in Jude’s house at night. This reason causes her not to write to Jude again. Here, it is clear that the members of the education unit, namely, the school have prejudicial point of view, and their reaction conforms to their way of thinking. Her explanation for not writing to Jude is as follows: “ ‘I had decided not to write to you any more. They won’t have me back at the school\_\_ that’s why I couldn’t write. Not the fact, but the reason’ ”

(Hardy, *Jude*: 188). The prejudice resulting from the institution of education is apparent here. Sue does not obey the rules of the school. Social institutions interfere with the private lives of women. For this reason, Sue is dismissed from the school. She is “Other” in the society because she is a woman and she is a type of person who does not conform to the strict demands of the social institutions. Her obstinacy in destroying the rules causes her to have prejudicial attack and hindrances in her life. For, society tries to create homogeneous people who accept everything without questioning anything. According to Wotton (1985: 127), “[w]omen live their subjection in ideology through the roles which have been assigned to them as the Other”, and he adds, “[c]aptured by the masculine gaze, interpellated as subjects, subjected to the myth of being the weaker sex and” then, “recognizing themselves in that image, they behave accordingly”. Sue is unconventional at the very beginning of the novel, but then, she is transformed into a type of person who conforms the conventionality of the social institutions, codes, and rules.

At last, Sue discloses the truth to Jude. She says that people think they should get married because they have stayed at the same house all night long. She states the following with hesitation: “ [w]ell\_\_ somebody has sent them baseless reports about us, and they say you and I ought to marry as soon as possible, for the sake of my reputation!’ ” and adds, “ ‘There\_\_ now I have told you, and I wish I hadn’t!’ ” (Hardy, *Jude*: 188). She expects Jude to answer her in affirmative, but Jude is not able to meet her demands. He discloses his marriage with Arabella. Sue is shocked at the news. She is furious now. Sue’s aggressive reply is: “ ‘I ... don’t regard marriage as a sacrament. Your theories are not so advanced as your practice!’ ” (Hardy, *Jude*: 199). They argue for Jude’s marriage. She is aggressive because he has not informed her for his marriage before. This is a great shock for her. She criticizes Jude because of his conventional type of thinking about marriage. Then, she tries to appear cheerful.

After she learns Jude’s marriage, she tries to show that she is not affected too much, and she questions social institutions as follows:

‘And then we are cousins, and it is bad for cousins to marry. And\_\_ I am engaged to somebody else. As to our going on together as we were going, in a sort of friendly way, the people round us would have made it unable to continue. Their views of the relations of man and woman are



limited, as is proved by their expelling me from the school. Their philosophy only recognizes relations based on animal desire. The wide field of strong attachment where desire plays, at least, only a secondary part, is ignored by them' (Hardy, *Jude*: 200-1).

Sue criticizes the society, its rules, conventions and the like because she realizes some faulty aspects in the construction of social institutions. People have prejudicial points of view of the friendship between man and woman.

Sue is inclined to be tempted while she is near Jude. She is afraid of her drives because if she behaves according to her drives, she will oppose to the social rules, and conventions. She explains to him how she feels about her state in the society, and how she wants to live. There is a sharp contrast between these two poles. The society expects conventionality from an unconventional, intellectual, and bright young woman. She is married with Mr. Phillotson on her own will in the eye of the society, but this means nothing to Sue. This marriage does not conform to her point of view of life. She discloses her heart to Jude.

While Sue comes for the funeral of her great aunt, her striking words imply her unhappiness. For, she does not love Mr. Phillotson. In contrast, she is disgusted at him. She cannot put up with living as his wife. She discloses to Jude, “ ‘[w]e are rather a sad family, don't you think, Jude?’ ‘...we made bad husbands and wives. Certainly we make unhappy ones’ ” and “ ‘Is it wrong, Jude, ... for a husband or wife to tell a third person that they are unhappy in their marriage?’ ” (Hardy, *Jude*: 249-50). Then, she continues:

‘If a marriage ceremony is a religious thing, it is possibly wrong; but if it is only a sordid contract, based on material convenience in householding, rating, and taxing, and the inheritance of land and money by children, making it necessary that the male parent should be known\_\_ which it seems to be\_\_ why surely a person may say, even proclaim upon the housetops, that it hurts and grieves him or her?’ (Hardy, *Jude*: 250).

In these lines, the emphasis is put upon the conflict between nature and society. Sue questions the institution of marriage. She has original ideas, but social institutions are constructed in opposition to her intellectual capacity. She tries to accept them as right, but she fails, and in the end she discloses her inner conflicts in her own self, that is, how she is unhappy with Mr. Phillotson. She is not able to put up with this situation because after her marriage she realizes the truth. From the point of view of the society, there is no way out, but according to her intellectuality and

feelings, her salvation is hidden under the fact that she should arrange her life as she wants it to be. She is sure that she does not want to accept Mr. Phillotson as her husband though he gives no harm to her. In her eyes, Mr. Phillotson can only be her friend or teacher. She discloses her own feelings to Jude because she has no ability to tolerate her marriage life with Mr. Phillotson any more. She has sharp conflicts in her inner self. She is distorted between what she has considered as right throughout her life, and the conventions of the society. Learning Sue's true situation as a married woman, Jude says hastily, " '[i]t is horrible how we are circumstanced, Sue-horrible!' " (Hardy, *Jude*: 251). Jude has the intellectual capacity for realizing Sue's distortion between her truths and those of the society. Jude's point of view of life is also philosophical like Sue, and indicates how people destroy everything for the sake of conventionality. In Jude's words:

'Is it ... that the women are to blame; or is it the artificial system of things, under which the normal sex-impulses are turned into devilish domestic gins and springs to noose and hold back those who want to progress?' (Hardy, *Jude*: 259).

The key phrases are "the artificial systems of things", which is the implication of the conventional and prejudicial society, and "sex-impulses", which is the expression of man's sex drive. He questions the point of view of the society, and claims that the society hinders sex drive which is normal, and places some other artificial rules instead of it. It is time for Sue to go to Phillotson's house, but it is very difficult for her to return to her husband's house.

Meanwhile Sue, after parting from him earlier in the day, had gone along to the station, with tears in her eyes for having run back and let him kiss her. Jude ought not to have pretended that he was not a lover, and made her give way to an impulse to act unconventionally, if not wrongly. She was inclined to call it the latter; for Sue's logic was extraordinarily compounded, and seemed to maintain that before a thing was done it might be right to do, but that being done it became wrong; or, in other words, that things which were right in theory were wrong in practice (Hardy, *Jude*: 260-1).

Sue's conflict is so apparent that she has some sort of questioning in her inner self. She does not want to do a wrong thing. What she knows in theory does not conform to the happenings in practice.

Sue speaks to her husband Mr. Phillotson. She wants to leave him, and discloses how she loves Jude. She asks him to let her go to her lover Jude freely. She decides for herself. Mr. Phillotson accepts this offer though he is unwilling to show

approval for this. He is deeply affected because he loves her. Sue goes to Jude willingly and freely. Sue challenges the social conventions, rules, and institutions. But before leaving Mr. Phillotson, Sue makes some explanations about her inner self. She does not want to get married with Mr. Phillotson, but she has to get married with him because of her promise to him. She wants to invalidate the engagement between them, but she cannot do this. Then, the scandal of her being with Jude comes out. This scandal and the attitudes of people make her frightened. So, she does not leave Mr. Phillotson. She asserts that although her thoughts are very unconventional, she behaves in opposition to her own thoughts. She is not able to stand against the prejudicial attitudes of people. She tells her husband the following: “ ‘Of course I, of all people, ought not to have cared what was said, for it was just what I fancied I never did care for’ ”, and adds, “ ‘But I was a coward\_\_ as so many women are\_\_ and my theoretic unconventionality broke down’ ” (Hardy, *Jude*: 265). Sue blames herself. Sue’s discussion of marriage code with Phillotson becomes in a philosophical way. Sue defends unconventionality. Therefore, she questions conventionality.

Mr. Phillotson speaks to his friend Mr. Gillingham about Sue’s wish of going away from him. Because Mr. Gillingham is a conventional type of man, his comments are in great accord with his thoughts. Meanwhile, “ ‘[b]ut\_\_ you see, there’s the question of neighbours and society\_\_ what will happen if everybody\_\_’ ” says Mr. Gillingham to Mr. Phillotson so as to attract his attention to the possible prejudicial point of view of people around them (Hardy, *Jude*: 275). But Mr. Phillotson is determined to place trust to his own intuitions to react to Sue’s unconventional offer instead of automatically performing the conventional rules of the social institutions. Mr. Gillingham’s conventional reply to Mr. Phillotson’s being at the side of Sue is an interesting one. “ ‘It will upset all received opinion hereabout. Good God\_\_ what will Shaston say!’ ” says Mr. Gillingham (Hardy, *Jude*: 277). This is another sign of the prejudicial point of view of people, and the effects of society’s influence upon the people who have this sort of experience. The society is so harsh and strict that everybody- conventional or unconventional- feels the impact of the society to some extent. Mr. Phillotson permits Sue to go to Jude. Sue goes to Jude.

After Sue’s leaving Mr. Phillotson is known to everybody, the attitudes of the

people change. For instance, the authorities of the school where Mr. Phillotson works as a teacher learn Sue's running away with his lover with the permission of Mr. Phillotson. So, they want him to resign from his job. Mr. Phillotson talks about all the things that have happened at school to his friend Mr. Gillingham because of this episode. The dimension and harm of prejudice become larger and larger. Mr. Phillotson says that " 'I won't. It is no business of theirs. It doesn't affect me in my public capacity at all. They may expel me if they like' " (Hardy, *Jude*: 295). Mr. Phillotson is dismissed from his job. Now, he is poor.

After Sue and Jude start to live together, they decide to get married legally. For, they get divorced from their former partners. Sue and Jude go to the office to get married, but they see a couple in a wedding ceremony. She questions the marriage institution. Sue's disgust for legality in marriage as well as at any other dimension of life might be recognized in her own words:

'The expression in that flabby woman's face, leading her on to give herself to that gaol\_\_bird, not for a few hours, as she would, but for a lifetime, as she must. And the other poor soul\_\_ to escape a nominal shame which was owing to the weakness of her character, degrading herself to the real shame of bondage to a tyrant who scorned her\_\_ a man whom to avoid for ever was her only chance of salvation. ... This is our parish church, isn't it? This is where it would have to be, if we did it in the usual way?' (Hardy, *Jude*: 339).

Sue decides not to get married with Jude legally using her own will. She wants to stay as his lover. This indicates Sue's unconventionality. While they observe other pairs who are getting married, Jude says:

'Still, Sue, it is no worse for the woman than for the man. That's what some women fail to see, and instead of protesting against the conditions they protest against the man, the other victim; just as a woman in a crowd will abuse the man who crushes against her, when he is only the helpless transmitter of the pressure put upon him' (Hardy, *Jude*: 342).

Here, the key word "victim" is crucial because according to Jude, both women and men are the victims of the social conventions, codes, and rules.

Sue's leaving her legal husband is the expression of that "Sue tries to explain how her natural instincts and 'Mrs Richard Phillotson' are at odds" (Stonyk, 1986: 26). She does not accept the stereotypes of the society. She revolts against the conventional rules of the society. In short, Sue is a different type of person who does not show any respect for "the moral and social codes which she has scorned and

resisted with her unconventional ideas” (Struzziero, 2006: 469). From the perspective of the patriarchal society, it is also necessary to note that, as Adelman (1992: 83) writes, “because society with its ordinances and prejudices lacks charity, individuals are destroyed” like Sue herself. The social institutions have a great impact upon individual, especially women. For this reason, it is not difficult to notice the negative effects of the male-dominated society upon women.

Sue and Jude are husband and wife now, but they are not able to transform their relationship into a legal marriage. At first, they give importance not to behave unconventionally in front of other people. They are careful at not showing their love to one another in front of other. In contrast, at the Agricultural Show, they do not pay attention to their behaviours. They are very close to each other. This situation attracts people’s attention. When Sue and Jude are at the Agricultural Show, Arabella sees them and comments about them. More important than that, the prejudice of the society becomes clearer and more intense because they live together with Jude’s son Little Father Time. In contrast, they are not legally married. It is easy to recognize the prejudicial point of view of the people for Sue and Jude’s unconventional situation. For instance, “[t]he unnoticed lives that the pair had hitherto led began, from the day of the suspended wedding onwards, to be observed and discusses by other persons than Arabella” (Hardy, *Jude*: 354). In addition to this, it might be added that:

The society of Spring Street and the neighbourhood generally did not understand, and probably could not have been made to understand, Sue and Jude’s private minds, emotions, positions, and fears. The curious facts of a child coming to them unexpectedly, who called Jude father, and Sue mother, and a hitch in a marriage ceremony intended for quietness to be performed at a registrar’s office, together with rumours of the undefended cases in the law-courts, bore only one translation to plain minds (Hardy, *Jude*: 354).

In other words, these people are not flexible in evaluating morality. They have fixed thoughts because they conform to the socially determined rules, and conventions.

As another example of prejudice, it might be noted that prejudicial behaviours come from the people who disturb Little Father Time at school. For instance:

Little Time\_\_ for though he was formally turned into ‘Jude’, the apt nickname stuck to him\_\_ would come home from school in the evening, and repeat inquiries and remarks that had been made to

him by the other boys; and cause Sue, and Jude when he heard them, a great deal of pain and sadness (Hardy, *Jude*: 354).

As a member of the Fawley family, Little Father Time also feel the prejudice deeply. For, he is disturbed at school for living with Sue and Jude by calling them mother and father. In the eye of the society, he has no right to consider them as his parents because they are not married legally. This situation is a big hindrance for his psychology. Society's prejudice leads Little Father Time to kill his brothers, which is the striking climax of the novel. This turning point reverses everything in the lives of Sue and Jude. They turn to the state they have been before. This is the vicious circle. At this point, it should be noted that society has an influential pressure upon the members of the society. Women and children, as the weaker ones, cannot stand this pressure resulted from a prejudicial point of view of people. So, they are drifted to victimization.

Sue and Jude's going to London to get married becomes so silent that it makes people even more curious. This is the implication of the fact that people are so prejudiced that they search for episodes to talk about. This shows the miserable situation of the society. In the eye of the society:

... the mistake (as it was called) of their going away so secretly to do the business, kept up much of the mystery of their lives; and they found that they made not such advances with their neighbours as they had expected to do thereby. A living mystery was not much less interesting than a dead scandal (Hardy, *Jude*: 355).

The people around them are ready to gossip immediately. This shows their prejudice against Sue and Jude. For instance:

The baker's lad and the grocer's boy, who at first had used to lift their hats gallantly to Sue when they come to execute their errands, in these days no longer took the trouble to render her that homage, and the neighbouring artizans' wives looked straight along the pavement when they encountered her (Hardy, *Jude*: 355).

Sue is regarded as a wicked woman. As a result of this, the people who formerly greet her do not look at her. A prejudicial point of view exists in all people surrounding them. As has been seen in the previous example, the prejudice against Sue and Jude intensifies among people around them. This situation becomes unbearable for them. When they are not disturbed, they live together very well, but when the people around them mingle with their lives, then they are not able to

continue their relationship. The negative influence hinders their lives. Sue and Jude are victimized because they are not ready financially and psychologically to the harsh attacks of the society. They are inexperienced at that point. They do not conceal their not being married from people. Instead, they disclose their situation in terms of illegality. Society excludes them. Sue is “Other” in the society at first, but now she is wicked in the eye of the society. In addition to the previous example, it should be noted that:

Nobody molested them, it is true; but an oppressive atmosphere began to encircle their souls, particularly after their excursion to the show, as if that visit had brought some evil influence to bear on them. And their temperaments were precisely of a kind to suffer from this atmosphere, and to be indisposed to lighten it by vigorous and open statements. Their apparent attempt at reparation had come too late to be effective (Hardy, *Jude*: 355).

Prejudice increases higher and higher. The key phrase “oppressive atmosphere” indicates the nature of the theme of prejudice openly. Prejudiced people begin to press Sue and Jude especially after their visit to the show. People indicate their prejudicial attitudes to the pair, and they exclude them from the society.

As a reaction to the happenings, Sue revolts to these events a bit, but Jude tries to soothe her. The pressure from their surrounding is so intense that they become very uneasy. Little Father Time is also affected very badly. They are dismissed from their job by the contractor. They begin to paint the letters and materials in the church. Then, before they finish their job, they lose their job. The prejudiced people around them react to the unconventionality of Sue and Jude. They are not able to understand and put up with Sue and Jude. Their harsh manners are so evident that this atmosphere makes the pair anxious. So, Sue says, “ ‘I can’t *bear* that they, and everybody, should think people wicked because they may have chosen to live their own way!’ ”, and adds, “ ‘It is really these opinions that make the best intentioned people reckless, and actually become immoral!’ ” (Hardy, *Jude*: 360).

Sue and Jude are aware that they are not able to stay at the same place. For this reason, they move to a place where nobody knows them. They bring their furniture to be sold by auction. While they stay in an unseen place, they hear the prejudicial speeches of the people visiting there. The people gossip about Sue and Jude, the existence of their marriage, past experiences, the state of Little Father Time

and the like. At that moment, Sue and Jude reach to an ultimate realization as to how they are considered by the people in their surroundings. They are now horrified. Sue and Jude:

... soon found that, instead of the furniture, their own personal histories and past conduct began to be discussed to an unexpected and intolerable extent by the intending bidders. It was not till now that they really discovered what a fools' paradise of supposed unrecognition they had been living in of late. ... At length the auction began in the room below, whence they could hear each familiar article knocked down, the highly prized ones cheaply, the unconsidered at an unexpected price (Hardy, *Jude*: 363).

There is a fair at Kennetbridge. Arabella is at this fair, and she comes across with her friend, Anny. Arabella sees Sue, who is selling all kinds of cakes though she is pregnant. Arabella speaks to Sue, and learns some particularities such as Jude's illness, their poverty, their having two children, her pregnancy, her not able to return to teaching at school because of her divorce from Mr. Phillotson, and the like. After a while, Arabella comes across with Mr. Phillotson. They talk about how Sue has left him. He is miserable now due to Sue's divorce. While speaking to Arabella, who try to activate his feelings for Sue, Mr. Phillotson uses philosophical words which are related to the harshness of both the nature, and the society as follows: " 'Cruelty is the law pervading all nature and society; and we can't get out of it if we would!' " (Hardy, *Jude*: 379). Goode (1990: 35), who appreciates the financial stance of the protagonists in the novel as a result of the prejudice of the society, argues, "Sue and Jude are released from their marital bondage, but only into deeper economic oppression".

Sue and Jude are in Christminster. They try to find a house to live in, but prejudicial point of view is at the fore. Sue tries to convince the landladies, but she is not able to convince them. For, she has a large family with husband and children, and she does not have a legal marriage with Jude. In one of her trial of finding a house, "[t]he householder scrutinized Sue's figure a moment. 'We haven't any to let', said she, shutting the door" and then "[t]he small child squared its mouth and cried silently, with an instinct that trouble loomed. The boy sighed. 'I don't like Christminster!' he said" (Hardy, *Jude*: 393). The prejudicial attitudes go on in Christminster, too. They are not able to find a shelter to all of them. While the landladies realize Sue with her husband and children, they do not want to give her



any rooms.

While Sue comes to find some rooms to stay in, the landlady accepts to give her a room, but there is no place for Jude. Jude goes to another place to stay alone. Then, the landlady asks Sue if she is married or not. Sue discloses the truth. As a critical point, “though in her own sense of the words she was a married woman, in the landlady’s sense she was not” (Hardy, *Jude*: 394). While landlady’s husband comes, he becomes furious with his wife. For, he does not want a family with children as tenants in his house. So:

His voice rose in sudden anger. ‘Now who wants such a woman here? and perhaps a confinement! ... Besides, didn’t I say I wouldn’t have children? The hall and stairs fresh painted, to be kicked about by them! You must have known all was not straight with ‘em\_\_ coming like that. Taking in a family when I said a single man’ (Hardy, *Jude*: 395).

Little Father Time is so affected from the difficulties of finding a lodging that he speaks odd things such as death. He does not want to live any more. He says that all children should be killed. He believes in the following idea: “ ‘ ‘Tis because of us children, too, isn’t it, that you can’t get a good lodging?’ ” (Hardy, *Jude*: 398). Sue’s answer is as follows: “ ‘Well\_\_ people do object to children sometimes’ ” (Hardy, *Jude*: 398).

Little Father Time’s hanging Sue’s own children and himself is a distressful end of the children. Little Father Time is drifted to behave like this. For, he feels the influence of the society upon himself and his family. This event is one of the most important turning points, which leads the Fawley family to destruction as a whole. Sue, Jude, and their children’s lives are destroyed by “the mechanistically determined laws” (Adelman, 1992: 103).

After the death of her babies, Sue begins to think conventionally. At this point, it is possible to mention the victory of her conventional side over her unconventional side. In other words, the main point, here, is the victory of prejudice over drive. In broader terms, it should be noted that the victory of society over nature comes to the fore in Sue’s life. Her new version is not in accordance with her former state. Though she is affected badly by the conventionality of the society, Sue, on her own will, decides to leave Jude, and to return to Mr. Phillotson. She urges Jude to return to his former wife, Arabella. The dialogue between Sue and Jude make Sue’s

mental breakdown apparent. Sue puts forward, “ ‘I have had dreadful fears, a dreadful sense of my own insolence of action. I have thought\_\_ that I am still his wife!’ ” (Hardy, *Jude*: 411). Jude asks, “ ‘[w]hose?’ ” before Sue’s reply as, “ ‘Richard’s’ ” (Hardy, *Jude*: 411). Jude, realizing Sue’s mental breakdown after the death of her children, rebels to his condition. He hates conventionality. He is so much confused that he cannot believe in the drastic change happened to Sue. Meanwhile, Jude:

... returned vehemently: ... ‘You make me hate Christianity, or mysticism, ... or whatever it may be called, if it’s that which has caused this deterioration in you. That a woman-poet, a woman-seer, a woman whose soul shone like a diamond\_\_ whom all the wise of the world would have been proud of, if they could have known you\_\_ should degrade herself like this! I am glad I had nothing to do with Divinity\_\_ damn glad\_\_ if it’s going to ruin you in this way!’ (Hardy, *Jude*: 419).

Jude objects to Sue. He does not want her to destroy herself by returning to Mr. Phillotson. For, Jude knows that Sue loves his own self very much. He tries to divert her from her decision of going to Mr. Phillotson. In his struggle to dissuade her from her own conventional decision, Jude cries out, “ ‘[y]ou threw off old husks of prejudices, and taught me to do it; and now you go back upon yourself. I confess I am utterly stultified in my estimate of you’ ” (Hardy, *Jude*: 420). The key phrase “old husks of prejudices” is so crucial that it contains the core of the subject. Sue formerly teaches Jude the right things, but in the end she becomes so much alienated to her own teachings. At last, while Sue insistently wants to go back to Mr. Phillotson, Jude revolts her saying the following: “ ‘Do not do an immoral thing for moral reasons! You have been my social salvation’ ” (Hardy, *Jude*: 423). Though Sue is an intellectual at first, she, now, experiences a nervous breakdown.

Morgan’s (1991: 160) assertion proves this situation of Sue as follows: “Sue, following the death of her babies, suffers a severe nervous breakdown”. From a different perspective for Sue’s mental breakdown, while Struzziero (2006: 462), in general, asserts, “[a]round those who failed to conform were activated the scientific discourses that led to the medicalization of sexuality and the hysterization of women’s bodies”, Morgan’s (1991: 152) handling Sue’s situation is as follows: “Sexless she is not. Sexually frustrated she may be”. Women as well as Sue are considered as “Other” in the society, and the impact of the prejudice of the society is

clearly realized upon them. For, they are transformed into a hysterical type of person in the society. Sue is one of the prominent examples of this type of person who “embodies a different sign of degeneracy”, namely, “she is a city woman, and London, where she lived for some time, was the place where it was almost inevitable to fall victim to” the prejudicial point of view of people (Struzziero, 2006: 464).

While Mr. Gillingham and Mr. Phillotson speak about Sue, Mr. Gillingham says that her return to Mr. Phillotson is a very good thing for him to cure his name. Now, Mr. Phillotson is selfish. He thinks of purifying himself from the prejudice created after Sue’s running away from him. Mr. Phillotson states:

‘I confess there seems a touch of selfishness in it. Apart from her being what she is, of course, a luxury for a fogy like me, it will set me right in the eyes of the clergy and orthodox laity, who have never forgiven me for letting her go. So I may get back in some degree into my old track’ (Hardy, *Jude*: 438).

Then, the narrator describes the marriage ceremony of Sue and Mr. Phillotson in these lines: “When the books were signed the vicar congratulated the husband and wife on having performed a noble, and righteous, and mutually forgiving act” (Hardy, *Jude*: 442). After that, the parson, as the representative of conventionality, says, “ ‘[a]ll’s well that ends well’ ... ‘May you long be happy together after thus having been “saved as by fire” ’ ” with a smile on his face (Hardy, *Jude*: 442). In these lines, the conventionality of the social institutions such as marriage is apparent. Sue and Mr. Phillotson get married again. Another marriage ceremony comes true between Arabella and Jude.

After his second marriage with Arabella, Jude goes to see Sue. She comes near him, but does not want him to approach her. Jude tries to solve Sue’s dilemma between her past and present. He tries to remind her of her old unconventionality, but she is too strict to accept his thoughts, and sayings. Seeing her in this situation, Jude says, “ ‘[y]ou dear, sad soft, most melancholy wreck of a promising human intellect that it has ever been my lot to behold!’ ”, and asks, “ ‘Where is your scorn of convention gone? I *would* have died game!’ ” (Hardy, *Jude*: 466). She does not want him to behave unconventionally. She thinks that she is insulted. Therefore, she wants him to go. As a reaction to her, Jude says, “ ‘I will. I would never come to see you again, even if I had the strength to come, which I shall not have any more. Sue, Sue,

you are not worth a man's love!' ” (Hardy, *Jude*: 466). Jude's revolt may also be seen in these lines:

‘... she was once a woman whose intellect was to mine like a star to a benzoline lamp: who saw all *my* superstitions as cobwebs that she could brush away with a word. Then bitter affliction came to us, and her intellect broke, and she veered round to darkness. Strange difference of sex, that time and circumstance, which enlarge the views of most men, narrow the views of women almost invariably. ... Our ideas were fifty years too soon to be any good to us. And so the resistance they met with brought reaction in her, and recklessness and ruin on me!’ (Hardy, *Jude*: 480).

He is not able to put up with this situation. He knows that he has lost his dear little Sue forever. He also loses his health. Jude begins to swear at the “social conventions” (Hardy, *Jude*: 480). In the end, Jude dies, and Sue becomes completely a miserable woman.

Here, it might be useful to ask Adelman's (1992: 71) question as in: “Can it be wrong to follow the bent of one's nature and attempt to try to cross social barriers?”. Women who do not conform social codes are destroyed on purpose so as not to allow them continue their acts. Prejudiced society causes women's victimization as in the case of Sue. In other words, “patriarchal Symbolic Order” drifts women to the victimization (Struzziero, 2006: 462). Appreciating the downfall of Sue and Jude, Adelman (1992:11) argues that Hardy “bitterly indicts the obstructive prejudice of his society”.

In addition to this, Sue and Jude's financial situation is one of the determining factors of their victimization. From the perspective of Goode (1990: 33), it might be pointed out that “there is no cultural home for them, no articulated class experience except that of the class from which they are by their economic position excluded”. Apart from this, Hardy believes that the drives of women affect their lives negatively in case they do not conform to the social institutions. In other words, Hardy points out, “biological drives derives which will shape the lives of ... girls and make new social customs trivial” (Stonyk, 1986: 22).

Regarding the features of the 19th century, it might be expressed that social prejudice is dominant in the society. This might hinder unconventional people's plans for life, and drift them to a victimized end. In the case of Sue and Jude, we come across with this conclusion. Though they are defeated from this point, they are able to understand the world around them. In other words, in the “nineteenth-century

thought, with its oppressive institutions, conventions, and morality”, and the like (Adelman, 1992: 42), “[d]espite their final silencing, Jude and Sue”, as the protagonists of the novel at hand, “in their struggle for independent self-assertion against stifling institutions and hypocritical moral codes, develop a heightened state of awareness” (Struzziero, 2006: 476). This awareness singles them out as an example couple for people despite their victimization.

As has been handled previously, Sue’s destruction comes from her sexuality and social prejudice in succession. In other words, drive is the starter of the process of the victimization of the female characters. As a result of the society’s reactions to the female characters’ experiencing their drives illegally, prejudice which leads the female characters to victimization comes out. Adelman (1992: 91) handles the reason of Sue’s victimization referring to Boumelha (1982) as: “Sue’s sexuality destroys her”. As a subsequent element, prejudice is resulted from not conforming to the socially determined rules. In Adelman’s (1992: 41) terminology, this type of prejudice is handled as “social prejudice”, which results from the prejudice of the members of the society. This prejudice drifts them to “clash with the resistance they meet from a hostile environment and the authority of its institutions” (Struzziero, 2006: 475-6). At this point, it should be noted that “[s]ociety, not an angry Providence, has uprooted the family” (Adelman, 1992: 74). This is the implication of the negativity, and the destructive force of the socially determined rules, and social institutions.

Lastly, considering the characteristics of Sue, it should be added that at first “[i]ntellectually she is a total unbeliever. She thinks she is a liberated thinker, a neopagan” (Adelman, 1992: 45). Then, “she turns out to be like Christminster, a prisoner of convention, deadlocked between the old world and the new” (Adelman, 1992: 45). For Sue, who has these characteristics, “[m]arrying Jude would invite oppression, yet loving him without marriage would invite the penalties reserved for sinners” (Adelman, 1992: 93). In the end, Sue and Jude’s lives are destroyed by the socially determined rules, codes, and conventions because they experience their drives unconventionally, and they come face to face with the prejudicial point of view of the society. So, Jude and especially Sue become the victims of the prejudice of the patriarchal society. Generally speaking, the woman who is considered as

“Other” in the society is exposed to pressure by the society. Sue feels social pressure upon her deeply, and as a result of the prejudicial attitudes of conventional people, her victimization by the male-dominated society becomes inevitable.

## CHAPTER V

### 5. CONCLUSION

Thomas Hardy is a realist writer who portrays the happenings occurring around as they are in a great care. The reason which leads Hardy to reflect the problems and hindrances of the individuals resulted from the attitudes of the society is “the social atmosphere of the late 1800s” which “stimulated” him “to explore in *Jude* the marriage question and especially (in Sue) the dilemmas of the woman’s position in the social structure” (Adelman, 1992: 6-7).

Hardy has always depicted the controversy between the women who are regarded as “Others”, and the social conventions and codes. Therefore, it might be added that Hardy’s “books reflect the changes the region was undergoing as well as the ideological contradictions of the late nineteenth century” and that “[s]ocial innovation made Hardy uneasy”, namely, “by the time he wrote *Jude* he questioned all social conventions\_\_ the sanctity of the marriage contract as well as faith in progress and modernity” (Adelman, 1992: 10).

So, it might be expressed that Hardy puts the emphasis on the deficiencies of the society as well as the paradox between women’s drives, and social codes and institutions which are the basis of the social prejudice. To Wotton (1985: 24), “Hardy’s writing ... is rooted in a unique historical conjuncture”.

Both in *Tess of the D’Urbervilles* and *Jude the Obscure*, Hardy illuminates the negative impact of the society upon the women, and their lives. The women who are frequently contradicting with the social rules, codes and conventions are drifted to victimization. In other words, the women are expected to behave in accordance with the stereotypes designed for them by the society. Yet, those who conform to these stereotypes are considered as pure and right. In contrast, those who behave in opposition to these stereotypes are considered as wicked, and socially determined rules and conventions lead them to their victimization at the hands of the society itself. In parallel with this, Wotton (1985:131) asserts:

Every man demands that she [each of Hardy's women] should be seen only by him and treats her according to his vision of her\_\_ sexual object, idealized virgin, dutiful daughter, passive wife, prized possession, willing helpmeet, respectable lady. Unable to reconcile these conflicting visions of herself, she experiences her subjection as guilt in expiation of which she must suffer the remorse of seeing the suffering of those who 'love' her, suffering of which she is held to be the cause.

Both Tess and Sue are destroyed because they have pre-marital sexual experiences. The violation of the socially determined rules lead people to react in a prejudicial way. For, social institutions are regarded as sacred structures. While Tess is hanged by the authorities owing to her killing Alec, Sue chooses conventionality and forces herself to accept Mr. Phillotson as her legal husband though she does not love him.

Both Tess and Sue behave well while the society does not interfere with their acts. However, when the society interferes with their private lives, they become unsuccessful. For, they are not made ready for the harsh treatments of the society. Their purity and frankness contribute to the development of their victimized and destructed end. In Kramer's (1990: 3) words, "[t]he most obvious area of Hardy's independence is in the treatment of "morality" or of sensitive issues of human relations".

In *Tess of the D'Urbervilles*, the heroine Tess is the victim of her sexuality as the seed of the social prejudice regarding socially determined rules, and social institutions. In contrast, she does not deserve this end. Blake (1990: 205) notes, "[t]he novel's title names the particular and attaches it to the universal in the subtitle" and adds, "Tess bears a proper name as a unique person, while she is universalized as a pure woman". In *Jude the Obscure*, Sue comes to the fore with her dilemma between conventionality and unconventionality.

In fact, Jude and Sue's "openness to a different identity shows a willingness to collapse distinctions which are merely imposed on human beings by social/historical conventions" (Struzziero, 2006: 475). Though they struggle to create their own way of life, they are always exposed to the conventions of the society, and this leads them to their own downfall. This case is championed as "the working-class fallen woman, with her wilful sexual appetite" by Struzziero (2006: 462).

As the case happens for Sue and Tess, the female characters are almost always destroyed mercilessly in most of Hardy's novels. That is why, in terms of



giving their due, Hardy's female characters have the potentiality for self-actualization. Apart from this, they are the victims of the prejudice resulting from their not complying with the socially and mechanistically determined rules. This conflict of women with the social codes leads them to victimization. Though Tess is pure and Sue is intellectual, they are treated as "Others" with no right to share their own thoughts and feelings with other people. Yet, Hardy is so compassionate to women that he portrays Tess and Sue perfectly so as to create the representatives of the nineteenth century fallen women.

In conclusion, Wotton (1985: 129) argues Hardy's philosophy of life concerning the uniqueness of women as follows: At one hand, "if women are unconscious creatures of instinct then universal consciousness is an impossibility, but", on the other hand, "if universal consciousness is indeed the goal of progress then women cannot be the inferior second sex". Hardy's message of protecting women's rights as well as his successful portrayal of women in actual face of life singles him out as an outstanding writer, and places his novels as literary classics in literature.

## WORKS CITED

- ADELMAN, Gary (1992), **Jude the Obscure: A Paradise of Despair**, New York: Twayne Publishers.
- ALLEN, Bem P. (1997), **Personality Theories**, Needham Heights: Allyn & Bacon.
- ALLPORT, Gordon W. (1953), "Preface to the 1954 Edition", Gordon W. Allport, **The Nature of Prejudice**, United States of America: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, Inc., p. xv-xx.
- ALLPORT, Gordon W. (1979), **The Nature of Prejudice**, United States of America: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, Inc.
- BAUMEISTER, Roy F. (2008), "Social Reality and The Hole in Determinism", **Journal of Consumer Psychology**, Volume 18, p. 34-38.
- BILLIG, Michael (1991), **Ideology and Opinions: Studies in Rhetorical Psychology**, Great Britain, Worcester: Billing and Sons Ltd.
- BLAKE, Kathleen (1990), "Pure Tess: Hardy on Knowing a Woman", Dale Kramer with the assistance of Nancy Marck (Ed.), **Critical Essays on Thomas Hardy: The Novels**, Boston, Massachusetts: G. K. Hall & Co., p. 204-219.
- BLOOM, Harold (2000), "Poetic Origins and Final Phases", David Lodge (Ed.), **Modern Criticism and Theory: A Reader**, Singapore: Addison Wesley Longman Singapore (Pte) Ltd., p. 217-229.
- BOLLES, Robert C. ( - ), "Psychological Determinism and the Problem of Morality", **Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion**, Blackwell Publishing Limited, p.182-189.

BRISOLARA, Sharon (2003), "Invited Reaction: Feminist Inquiry, Frameworks, Feminisms, and Other "F" Words", **Human Resource Development Quarterly**, Volume 14, No.1, p. 27-34.

Cambridge Advanced Learner's Dictionary, (2007), **Cambridge University Press**,  
Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

CIXOUS, Helene (2000), "Sorties", David Lodge (Ed.), **Modern Criticism and Theory: A Reader**, Singapore: Addison Wesley Longman Singapore (Pte) Ltd., p. 263-286.

CLARK, Kenneth B. (1979), "Introduction", Gordon W. Allport, **The Nature of Prejudice**, United States of America: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, Inc., p. ix-xi.

DECI, Edward, L., Richard M. Ryan, (1985) **Intrinsic Motivation and Self-Determination in Human Behavior**, New York: Plenum Press.

DE MELO-MARTIN, Inmaculada (2003), "Biological Explanations and Social Responsibility", **Studies in History and Philosophy of Biological and Biomedical Sciences**, Volume 34, p. 345-358.

DOVIDIO, John F., Peter Glick, Laurie A. Rudman (2005), "Introduction: Reflecting on *The Nature of Prejudice*: Fifty Years after Allport", John F. Dovidio, Peter Glick and Laurie A. Rudman (Ed.), **On the Nature of Prejudice: Fifty Years after Allport**, Malden: Blackwell Publishing Ltd., p. 1-16.

DUCKITT, John (2005), "Personality and Prejudice" John F. Dovidio, Peter Glick and Laurie A. Rudman (Ed.), **On the Nature of Prejudice: Fifty Years after Allport**, Malden: Blackwell Publishing Ltd., p. 395-412.

- EAGLY, Alice H., Amanda B. Diekman (2005), "What is the Problem? Prejudice as an Attitude-in-Context", John F. Dovidio, Peter Glick and Laurie A. Rudman (Ed.), **On the Nature of Prejudice: Fifty Years after Allport**, Malden: Blackwell Publishing Ltd., p. 1-16.
- FELMAN, Shoshana (1996), "Women and Madness: The Critical Phallacy", Robyn R. Warhol and Diane Price Herndl (Ed.), **Feminisms: An Anthology of Literary Theory and Criticism**, New Brunswick, New Jersey: Rutgers University Press, p. 6-19.
- FURBANK, P. N. (2006), "The Myth of Determinism", **Raritan**, Volume 26, No. 2, p. 79-87.
- GALLOP, Jane (1996), "The Father's Seduction", Robyn R. Warhol and Diane Price Herndl (Ed.), **Feminisms: An Anthology of Literary Theory and Criticism**, New Brunswick, New Jersey: Rutgers University Press, p. 413-431.
- GATENS, Moira (1993), **Feminism and Philosophy: Perspectives on Difference and Equality**, Cambridge: Polity Press.
- GOODE, John (1990), "Hardy and Marxism", Dale Kramer with the assistance of Nancy Marck (Ed.), **Critical Essays on Thomas Hardy: The Novels**, Boston, Massachusetts: G. K. Hall & Co., p. 21-38.
- GOSE, Elliott B., Jr. (1990), "Psychic Evolution: Darwinism and Initiation in *Tess of the d'Urbervilles*", Dale Kramer with the assistance of Nancy Marck (Ed.), **Critical Essays on Thomas Hardy: The Novels**, Boston, Massachusetts: G. K. Hall & Co., p. 219-228.
- GUERIN, Bernard (1993), **Social Facilitation**, Paris: Editions De La Maison Des Sciences De L'Homme and Cambridge University Press.

- HAJI, Ishtiyaque (2003), "Determinism and its Treat to the Moral Sentiment", **The Monist**, Volume 86, No. 2, p. 242-260.
- HARDY, Thomas (1994), *Jude the Obscure*, London: The Penguin Group.
- HARDY, Thomas (1994), *Tess of the D'Urbervilles*, London: The Penguin Group.
- HERNDL, Diane P. (1996), "Institutions", Robyn R. Warhol and Diane Price Herndl (Ed.), **Feminisms: An Anthology of Literary Theory and Criticism**, New Brunswick, New Jersey: Rutgers University Press, p. 3-5.
- KOONS, Jeremy R. (2002), "Is Hard Determinism a Form of Compatibilism?", **The Philosophical Forum**, Volume XXXIII, No. 1, p. 81-99.
- KRAMER, Dale (1990), "Introduction: "Thomas Hardy" Then to Now", Dale Kramer with the assistance of Nancy Marck (Ed.), **Critical Essays on Thomas Hardy: The Novels**, Boston, Massachusetts: G. K. Hall & Co., p. 1-20.
- KRISTEVA, Julia (1996), "Women's Time", Robyn R. Warhol and Diane Price Herndl (Ed.), **Feminisms: An Anthology of Literary Theory and Criticism**, New Brunswick, New Jersey: Rutgers University Press, p. 443-462.
- LEVI, Don S. (2007), "Determinism As a Thesis About the State of the World from Moment to Moment", **The Royal Institute of Philosophy**, Volume 82, p. 399-419.
- LINDLEY, David (1992), **Thomas Hardy: Tess of the D'Urbervilles**, Hong Kong: Longman York Press.

- LONGO, Mary A. T. (1993), **Dysfunctional Families and Determinism in the Fiction of Thomas Hardy**, Lincoln: The University of Nebraska.
- MORGAN, Rosemarie (1991), **Women and Sexuality in the Novels of Thomas Hardy**, London: Routledge.
- NOTGRASS, Jessica D. (2004), **Social Influences on the Female in the Novels of Thomas Hardy**, Tennessee: East Tennessee State University.
- Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary, (1994), **Oxford University Press**, Oxford: Oxford University Press
- ÖZTÜRK, Rıza (1996), **Hardy's Tragic Vision: A Study of *The Mayor of Casterbridge*, *Tess of the D'Urbervilles* and *Jude the Obscure***, Ankara: Hacettepe University.
- PEILE, Colin (1993), "Determinism versus Creativity: Which Way for Social Work?", **Social Work**, Volume 38, No. 2, p. 127-134.
- PHEMISTER, Andrew A. (2001), "Revisiting the Principles of Free Will and Determinism: Exploring Conceptions of Disability and Counseling Theory", **Journal of Rehabilitation**, Volume 67, No. 3, p. 5-12.
- REISS, Steven (2004), "Multifaceted Nature of Intrinsic Motivation: The Theory of 16 Basic Desires", **Review of General Psychology**, Volume 8, No. 3, p. 179-193.
- RUDMAN, Laurie A. (2005), "Rejection of Women? Beyond Prejudice as Antipathy" John F. Dovidio, Peter Glick and Laurie A. Rudman (Ed.), **On the Nature of Prejudice: Fifty Years after Allport**, Malden: Blackwell Publishing Ltd., p. 106-120.

- SHERMAN, Howard (1981), "Marx and Determinism", **Journal of Economic Issues**, Volume XV, No. 1, p. 61-71.
- SIELBECK-BOWEN, Kathryn A., Sharon Brisolara, Denise Seigart, Camille Tischler, Elizabeth Whitmore (2002), "Exploring Feminist Evolution: The Ground from Which We Rise", **New Directions For Evaluation**, No. 96, p. 3-8.
- SMILANSKY, Saul (2005), "Free Will and Respect for Persons", **Midwest Studies in Philosophy**, Volume XXIX, p. 248-261.
- SPURRETT, David (1997), "Beyond Determinism", **South African Journal of Philosophy**, Volume 16, No. 1.
- STANGOR, Charles (2000), "Volume Overview", Charles Stangor (Ed.), **Stereotypes and Prejudice: Essential Readings**, United States of America: Taylor & Francis, p. 1-16.
- STANGOR, Charles (2000), "Conceptualizing Stereotypes and Prejudice", Charles Stangor (Ed.), **Stereotypes and Prejudice: Essential Readings**, United States of America: Taylor & Francis, p. 17-19.
- STONYK, Margaret (1986), **Thomas Hardy: Jude the Obscure**, Hong Kong: Longman York Press.
- STRUZZIERO, Maria A. (2006), "Degeneration/ Regeneration Narrative, Gender and the Cosmic Perspective in Thomas Hardy's Jude the Obscure", **Textus**, Volume XIX, p. 461-478.
- TONG, Rosemarie (2007), "Feminist Thought in Transition: Never a Dull Moment", **The Social Science Journal**, Volume 44, p. 23-39.

VAUGHN, Lewis, Theodore Schick, Jr. (1998), "Do We Have Free Will?", **Free Inquiry**, Volume 18, No. 2, p. 43-47.

WESTKOTT, Marcia (1989), "Female Relationality & the Idealized Self", **The American Journal of Psychoanalysis**, Volume 49, No. 3, p. 239-250.

WILKS, Duffy (2003), "A Historical Review of Counseling Theory Development in Relation to Definitions of Free Will and Determinism", **Journal of Counseling and Development**, Volume 81, p. 278-284.

WOTTON, George (1985), **Thomas Hardy: Towards a Materialist Criticism**, Ireland: Gill and Macmillan Ltd.