

I. The Subjugation of Female Characters in *The Death of Ivan Ilyich* and *The Kreutzer Sonata*

Sonata

This thesis has paid its best efforts to explore the subjugation of female characters in two novellas of Leo Tolstoy: *The Death of Ivan Ilyich* and *The Kreutzer Sonata*. The writer of novellas is biased in terms of gender issues. Though in these texts, writer denounces the existing marital system, this thesis with a feministic approach, analyzes that subordination of female characters is the underlying motif of such denouncement.

The narrators, in these novellas, have presented female characters in an inferior situation in comparison to the males. This type of underrepresentation of women is because of the suppressive mentality of the narrator to the females. Fyodorovna Praskovya and Madame Pozdnyshev are main female protagonists of *The Death of Ivan Ilyich* and *The Kreutzer Sonata* respectively. These characters play the role of housewife in the story, which is a traditional gender role. Instead, Ivan Ilyich and Vasalya Pozdnyshev are male protagonists who are juxtaposed with female protagonists in terms of identity and role. It is because these males are not limited in household, rather first is a job holder, which can be justified from narrator's following remarks: "In the large building of the law court [...] Ivan Ilyich had been a colleague of the gentlemen gathered there" (230-31). As well, protagonist of second novella was an aristocrat whom can be justified from his saying that "I am landlord with master's degree from the university" (315). Such different presentation of male and female is discrimination; hence it is injustice of male narrator to the female.

This kind of representation justifies and supports conventional role division, which is discriminatory and oppressive, monolithic and authoritarian to the female's identity. More, it highlights the inequality and inferiorizes relegating women to a lower status in comparison to the men. Female characters are dependant on their husbands. They are not free to exercise power in their husbands' reign. When they got married, their physical beauty was at count

but their intellectuality was neglected at all. This type of inferiorization in presentation of women at story is against the liberty and equality of women; hence it is, according to feminism, oppression of women.

All of the female characters are oppressed. The daughter of the Ivan is presented with physical beauty. She has been exposed with her fiancé. The narrator exposes this scene as: “[H]e also saw the pretty daughter of Ivan Ilyich [...] who was said to be the young lady’s fiancé” (239). This type of presentation teaches females that marriage is their ultimate goal and physical beauty can guarantee marriage with the suitable fiancé. These types of assumptions developed by the presentation of the story arise no interest in education; hence it deprives the girls from the field of intellectuality because they don’t see any importance of education.

Instead, the presentation of Ivan’s son is completely opposite with his sister. He is neither presented in term of physicality nor is with his fiancée. But he is a student; that means he is gaining knowledge so that he can be a job holder in future and he can perform his male role as bread owner. The narrator says, “Ivan Ilyich’s son, a gymnasium student [...] came down the staircase” (239). This type of bias presentation justifies the conventional role division of male and female, which always relegates female in inferior position. Hence it helps to perpetuate the suppression of females. Therefore, feminism takes such discrimination as harmful to the liberty and equality of females. So they oppose it.

The writer explores the marital relation in these novellas. Main motif of him to do it is to relegate, subordinate and humiliate women by blaming them as responsible for the deterioration of the family happiness. Most of the marriages were resulting into dispute between the spouses in his time. Thus, he thinks that marriage is burdensome, so sexuality is sinful, sexual passion is degrading and undermining to the human beings’ spiritual self. The writer has presented one family story in each novella, which has been resulted in family

failure. The plot in *The Death of Ivan Ilyich* ends in untimely demise of the protagonist Ivan Ilyich. And in *The Kreutzer Sonata* the protagonist kills his wife. The narrators credit female characters for these consequences. But they neglect the faults of the male characters. The narrator of *The Death of Ivan Ilyich* presents the story in a way that his wife Fyodorovna is responsible for the untimely demise of Ivan. It is because, in the story, she is quarrelous, nagging at beginning period of marriage and indifference at the latter period. Thus Ivan was victim of her nature all over the world. He even died because of the eternal repent of her negligence. Similarly, next story also ends in marital failure because Pozdnyshev murders his wife in the suspense of adultery.

No doubt, both novellas persuade reader easily that the female characters are liable for the failure of these families. Misogynistic presentations of women taint their images. Narrators have generalized females as cause of family and marital crises; hence they alarm of bitter consequences: failure of family, untimely death and so on. Fyodorovna in the first and Madame Pozdnyshev in the second novella have been reinforced as the cause of family destruction. Therefore, these literatures have been the medium of imposition of male ideology. Fiona Tolan says about literature: "Literature [is] tool of political ideology because it re-create[s] sexual inequalities and cement[s] the patriarchal values of society" (327). For her literature creates inequalities and sets them as norm in the society. But feminism sees hidden politics in these warnings. The narrators are exclusively concerned with weakness of females.

The concept conveyed in the novellas about the female education and child birth are also repressive to the females' freedom and equality. In the second novella, through the mouth of old man, the narrator puts his regret about the female education. He has an opinion that because of the education, women cross the boundary of morality and social norms; hence it promotes divorce rate. If so, what would be remedy of divorce? Obviously, he meant to

have restriction from education. But feminism denounces it because this remedy is political. It is easy to subordinate a illiterate female than a literate. Thus they take women's education in negative sense. This is suppressive to the females' freedom.

As well, the narrator takes child birth in positive sense. For feminism, it restricts them from free exercise of their creativity. Firstly, it weakens the health of mother in the stage of pregnancy; secondly, it keeps them busy in nursing of child. Both prevent them from their struggle so that they cannot uplift them from inferior status. Thus, revisiting Simone de Beauvoir, Fiona Tolan says, “[R]eproductive function has placed woman at a disadvantage” (321). Thus the protagonist upbraids the doctor when he prevents her from bearing more children. He thinks that it will be easy to control her with children. Thus his assumption about child birth is repressive to the female.

We can justify above claims with numerous examples from the text where the female characters are subjugated either by narrator or by male characters of the text. The discrimination between males and females begins with the beginning of the each story. In the first paragraph of *The Death of Ivan Ilyich*, where the setting is court, there are five male characters including two criminals, but there is no single female at all. It begins, “[T]he Melvinsky case, member of the court gathered in the office of Ivan Yegorovich and talk centered on Krasov case. Fyodor Vasilyvich hotly denied [...]. Pyotr Ivanovich [...] been delivered” (320). Such beginning is very discriminating because it excludes female representation. The society presented in the novella, is patriarchal because there is no any female who is working in the court. As they were all males, females were, we can conclude that, limited at home.

Although, the meditative narrator of *The Kreutzer Sonata* presents a female character at the first paragraph, he also privileges male to female; and highlights patriarchy with prejudicial presentation. He exposes beginning of plot as:

[L]ike myself, had been traveling since the train set out. One of them was an unattractive middle-aged woman with a haggard look, who smoked cigarettes and wore a mannish coat and hat; another was an acquaintance of hers, a loquacious man of about forty, with tidy new luggage; the third was a gentleman who held himself aloof. (303)

In this abstract, the narrator has presented a female character juxtaposing her physical ugliness with gentleness of gentleman. This type of attitude of the narrator toward two sexes is only because of his fondness towards them. He likes the concept of gentle man whereas he hates, of her. This is misogynistic presentation of female that humiliates them and relegates them to the inferior status.

The Death of Ivan Ilyich has pictured women characters as ambitious. Protagonist Ivan was irritated by his wife. She was querulous, nagging, greedy, and more demanding. Because of these qualities, she had destructed family relation. She always used to pressure him to earn more. But when he got appointment in high post, she automatically got changed. The narrator exposes her in a courtly appointment where she is shown greedy and emotional: “[...] Ivan unexpectedly received an appointment in his ministry [...]. Praskovya Fyodorovna’s spirits rose too and peace reigned for the time being” (252). These lines justify the exposition of narrator to Fyodorovna as greedy, ambitious, because nascent cause of misunderstanding and quarrel of Ivan family was property. When there was no sufficient income, Fyodorovna was less cooperative, querulous, indifference toward her husband; but as soon as he had got better job, she transformed into a loyal wife. It justifies that she was as such.

The concept of Tolstoy about marriage system is subjugative to the female. He praises traditional system, yet problematizes and trivializes new system, which is based on mutual affection. His hatred proves his cry for past. He put it:

A girl came of age and her parents found a husband for her. [...] That is done among at least ninety percent of the people of the world. But one percent of people, profligate creatures like us have decided that this is wrong and have thought of new system. The new system consists in having the girls sit down while the men walk up and down in front of them and as at a fair, making their choice. (326)

In this extract, the speaker privileges old system to new. He trivializes the new system of marriage based on the mutual affection comparing it with fair mechanism. This inclination is explicitly political because in traditional system male can suppress woman as an animal. So father would find her husband but at new system female were free to choose their husband. In the words of narrator they speak like: "Me not her" (326). It means that they themselves would be participated at choosing their partner.

The narrator of *The Death of Ivan Ilyich* suppresses female by distorting their images. He presents Fyodorovna as corrupt and moral less because she was indifferent about her husband's condition when he was ill. It can be justified from following lines where the narrator says, "Praskovya Fyodorovna came looking please with her, yet, with a slightly guilty air. She sat down and asked how he was feeling, merely as he should see for the sake of asking and not because she wanted to find out anything, for there was nothing to find out" (287). Here, the narrator shows how she had taken the death of her husband. She, according to these lines, takes it slightly.

This research has taken feminism as a methodology to approach these two novellas. It has tried its best to explore the discriminations and suppressions made by a male writer in his texts. It examines the presentation of female characters in male author work. These texts are subjected to implicit social ideas about the role of men and women. This practice of approaching male author from feministic perspective is phallogocentric criticism in the words of

Fiona Tolan. She says, “The practice of approaching male author from feministic perspective became known as a phallogocentric criticism because it sought to expose the masculine biases of the work” (326). It has sought to expose a feminist masculine bias of political ideology because they have recreated sexual inequalities and cemented patriarchal values of the society. Feminism believes in equality and freedom of all people. For it brings the discrimination in surface and tries to erase them, dismantle them.

First and foremost issue of feminism approaching the text is its bias presentation and modeling of characters. The writer has given male name to the title of each novella and matches it with corresponding narrator. More, the male figure as main protagonist adds paradigm of malenism in each novellas. All females who have been brought in the stories are given secondary position and have only been brought to complete the story of male protagonist. Entire story centers at him. Feminism opposes such bias presentation and seeks equal position of women in the story.

Objectification of females in these novellas is another concerning of feminism. The protagonists of both novellas marry their wives only because they are physically beautiful. On the other hand, novellas reckon protagonists in terms of economic level and social position. First exposes Ivan as a job holder, and second introduce Pozdnyshev as an aristocrat. Here feminism tries to rupture the conventional role division. For it suggests females to neglect the concept of beauty.

Perpetuation of traditional role division in these texts is another issue of this research. Both novellas present male and female characters in traditional roles; male as bread winner and female as bread baker. Feminism sees political interest in this division. Traditional roles gives unequal position for female in comparison to male, hence males take this to justify their superiority over female. Here, stories highlight same role so the speaker wants to prolong male supremacy. More he teaches same role to the children. This is male’s practice to survive

gender role in the novel. Nancy e. McGlen says, “In theory, if not always in practice, husbands continued to be the main breadwinners and wives remained the primary parent and homemaker” (328). The same thing has happened in these novellas because both have practiced to highlight traditional roles in the text.

Feminism asks for equal status of both sexes in a text. It raises the voice against the murderer of Madame Pozdnyshev. There is not any concrete evidence of her adultery, husband murders her in suspicion. A male kills a female is an example of physical violence; hence is suppression of female. If the protagonist had conscious about the rights and the freedom of the females, he would look for other ways of solution.

This research has explored the presentation of female characters in Tolstoy’s novellas. These literary pieces were written in nineteenth century by male writer. This research has made all possible exercises to discern all implicit and explicit biases, discriminations, injustices, subjugations and suppression impose upon female characters. For it has borrowed several feministic ideas, logic and philosophy from different feminists. Thus, here some feminists have sketched with their ideas and texts. “A Vindication of Rights of Women” by Mary Wollstonecraft dictates patriarchy as determinant factor of women’s inferiority because it deprives women from education. Catherine Mac away, in her writing “Letter on Education” claims that the difference between sexes is product of education and environment. Virginia Woolf has an opinion that patriarchy prevents women from proper environment. It is conveyed in her “A Room of One’s Own”. Simone de Beauvoir’s *The Second Sex* criticizes cultural identification of women as object and men as dominating subject. It also objects myth making factors. *Sexual Politics* by Kate Chopin suggests that the relation between male and female must be understood as a deeply embedded power structure with political implication. But Elaine Showalter in her *Literature of Their Own* sees urgency of women

theory to give justice women's literature since male theory never does. Kate Chopin's *The Awakening* sees fierce urgency of revelation of a great awakening.

Several critics have gone through these novellas with different methodology and perspectives, and have drawn different meanings. Most of them are patriarchal reading because they neglect the feministic issues. Some highlight the patriarchal concept to conceal the discrimination and subjugation of females.

WR Hirschberg takes final sufferings physical death of Ivan as a process of giving birth to a new consciousness. Thus, he seems to draw a new philosophy of death and life. He puts it: "The final expulsion through the hole at the end in to the world of truth and in to new consciousness coincides with the end of Ivan's earthly life. If death coincides with birth then Ivan's struggles in to the sack are those of a human being in labor; the uterus of Ivan's mind is about to give birth to a new consciousness" (26).

Michael v. Williams comments the death of Ivan Ilyich in corresponding way to Hirschberg, and takes the death as fortunate fall. He opines that several falls of Ivan in his life are significant. Therefore, he justifies this significant of his falls paralleling them with Miltonic fall and romantic fall. He says:

In Milton, the fall from innocence in to guilt and morality means the loss of Eden, [...] eventual gain of heaven through Christ. [...]. [A] Subsequent fall in to a false relation to life based on a mendacious denial of mortality and ironically coinciding with Ivan's rise in the professional world; a second fall, marked by Ivan's physical fall from a stepladder, in to conscious awareness of his low estate; and a final reintegration and moral regeneration enabled by his awareness. (230)

Milton took fall as both negatively and positively because there was loss of Eden which regained by Christ. Similarly, several falls in the life of Ivan also gave him both types of impact. Lastly he got his awareness.

This thesis, as feministic study of *The Death of Ivan Ilyich*, concerns with those types of patriarchal reading. It is because these have completely neglected the distortion of women's image in the text. These both reading observe final part of text and draw a philosophy of human life that, physical death is spiritual rebirth. But, death of protagonist taints the image of Fyodorovna because her jealous, nagging behavior caused to break family relation first, and her indifference caused his untimely death latter. But above readings have not touched such meaning which the text has implicitly conveyed.

David Herman condemns adultery as vicious corresponding to the attitude of Tolstoy. Thus he incorporates the ideal of human purity. He puts it: "Tolstoy's almost paranoid discovery of adultery on all side isn't entirely perverse. Tolstoy is, in fact, waging war against adulterousness, in the name of powerful ideal" (21). Here, Herman adds his ideal and says:

It is an ideal of human purity and hovering in the back ground a still more inclusive ideal of what might be called semiotic purity, where people things concepts and categories remain what they are, where they are, with their psychic means and their logical locations, rather than sliding about loosely wherever they choose. This is the safer clear universe where adultery is the model of all impurity and vice [...] Universe where right is still right and wrong is still wrong. (21)

Herman, here justifies the ideal of patriarchy. When Tolstoy is waging war against the adultery, He gets his protagonist to kill his wife in the name of infidelity. But there is not any punishment to him although he is also as such which his past account has exposed clearly. Therefore, above Herman's lines try to expose that adultery should remain as it was in the

past. It means a male can do it likewise all men are doing since history and a female can't do it. They must remain similar to past: submissive, chaste and so on. Feminism does not mean females also should get to violate norms but it means that bias should be uprooted.

Steven Carter takes the presentation of Ivan by the narrator as mundane. Therefore, he evaluates it as presentation with use of threadbare of French phrase. This type of exposition, for him, is only because of the simplicity of the plot and subject matter. But what Carter sees of importance and praises it for is final transformation of Ivan. Otherwise, why does he present a dying man with happiness: "As he physically weakens Ivan's self awaking – 'yes, it was not all the right things [...] alienates him from his family, which continues to treat him differently to the end. [...] no longer a human cliché, Ivan achieves selfhood in last few seconds of his life. For the transformed Ivan, death is a blessed: what joy" (Carter 16).

Gerhard Brand advocates the concept of Tolstoy's concept marriage and sex. Thus, he praises Tolstoy and says, "Tolstoy presents the nature of marriage more directly and comprehensively than any other writer. [...] in *The Kreutzer Sonata*, he denounces it vehemently. In exploration of marriage, Tolstoy concludes marriage as sinful, burdensome (7). Brand internalizes this concept because he puts it: "Despite the deranged character of Pozdnyshv and manifest injustice of his views, the story is disturbing, forceful and gripping, as he shows his sexual lust degraded his character and ruined his marriage" (8).

David shepherd gives Marxist touch to the death of Ivan Ilyich. He thinks that the text has credited Gerasim, a male peasant servant, as source of inspiration for Ivan's conversion. He says,

Ivan Ilyich's servant, the young peasant Gerasim is generally acknowledged to hold the key to his master's conversion [...]. What Gerasim knows is that the task of life is not to seek place after place, but to see his task in his place [...].

From Gerasim, Ivan learns that to live does not mean to be loved but to love [...]. What must be done is to take pity of others. (406)

When Ivan is persuaded by Gerasim, he starts to reject all his previous assumptions and starts to think reversely. For changed Ivan, there is pleasure and expresses: “[W]hat happiness” (301). According to Shepherd, such an idealization of a simple peasant servant is oppression. It is because it motivates him to stay as it is forever; not only in thinking, but also in his status too. Thus, he wants to fix his status always in peasant or slave. Shepherd comments,

If Gerasim is some kind of ideal, this because he is produced as such by Ivan Ilyich- just as Tolstoy in his fictional and non-fictional or theoretical works alike, makes peasants his ideal by projecting certain qualities upon them in a gesture which paradoxically, is made possible by and helps perpetuate the very social inequalities and oppression which, it is supposed to undermined. (406)

Shepherd’s idea has been both means of praise and criticism. Since he brings the marginal issue of class, it is obviously praise worthy. But he excludes another issue of marginality; that is of female; because female are also suppressed under the patriarchal convention in the text. Feminism pays due respect to all above readings of *The Death of Ivan Ilyich* and *The Kreutzer Sonata*. But as these readings issue of female oppression this thesis departs from them and centers on the female issues.

II. Issues of Repression of Women Voices and Representation in Feminism

Feminism is a socio-political movement. It works for the welfare and progress of entire women who are in marginal situation in comparison to male counter-parts. Women are supposed to be weaker and inferior race to men. Thus, feminism not only exercises for the empowerment of women, but also tries to dismantle and deconstruct the underlying causes of determinants of female's inferiority. According to feminism, their condition is not innate or accidental rather it is because of the intentional project of patriarchy which articulates and conducts the culture in a way to subordinate and subjugate female as a secondary object.

As inferiority of women is result of men's exploitation, feminism negates the male supremacy and believes in equality between male and female. According to *Advance Learner Dictionary*, "Feminism is the belief and aim that women should have the same rights and opportunities as men." Since men are exercising rights and opportunities excluding women, such mal-practice has undersized and relegated female to margin, so feminism emphasizes of equality.

Feminism is a philosophical discourse. As a philosophy it makes efforts to enlarge the boundary of sphere of female knowledge. Likely, it is also a female discourse. So it tries to promote and acquire new vision related to female. As well, it challenges and opposes other discourses which are authoritarian, monolithic and limitating to female. Therefore, it is a counter discourse. It aims to aware women about their dominated situation, and to make conscious about rights and freedom. It constructs power that constructs knowledge and truth about the reality of women. It addresses several issues of female. So it can be said as Fiona Tolan says, "Feminism should be understood as discourse; a discussion of multiple related ideas" (319). Hence, it consults many ideas of female sphere.

Feminism raises several issues related to women. Fore and foremost, it raises the issue of gender equality. Women are in bias position from the ancient time. More it raises the

issues like woman's right, domestic violence and confinement, exploitation, stereotyping, oppression, freedom of women and so on. Feminism raises these feministic issues for the empowerment and progress of women. They are in inferiorized marginal situation in the society. Hence, they are obliged to tolerate difficulties and exploitation; and live in tyrannical oppressive male culture.

Grand sacred and auspicious purpose of feminism is to emancipate women from patriarchal confining culture, and create an environment where they can freely exercise their rights and freedom for their development. Women are in marginal situation. To bring them out from the vicious circle of their object like wretched condition, two things are essential to be done: first, women should be enlightened and awake from their situation; second, patriarchal culture which is determinant of women's inferiority should be dismantled. Therefore, feminism campaigns to educate and aware them awakening them about their rights and responsibilities. More, it defies patriarchal male chauvinistic monolithic convention which is bias to the autonomy and rights of women.

Feminism aims, thus, by awakening women, to approach them to the power. It practices to access their representation in every sphere of stream like economy, politics, religion, arts and so on. Louis Tyson thinks the aim of feminism is to change the world. She says, "All feminist activity, including feminist theory and criticism, has as its ultimate goal to change the world by promoting women's equality" (92). She believes in the new world that would promote and guarantee women's equality. Similarly, Sheila Ruth also takes the aim of feminism in the sense of construction of new society. Here, she emphasizes on the access of women's representation in mainstream of power. She says, "If new goals, values and vision are to be infused into society, we must win for women access to all centers of power and policy from science and industry to art and communication" (13). According to her, women's

access in each field is inevitable for the emancipation and autonomy of women. So, aim of feminism, for her, is increasement in capacity of women.

Feminism attacks, ruptures and opposes patriarchy. Main theme and gist of feminism is the creation of female's autonomy. But it concludes that underlying reason of deteriorated condition of women is patriarchy. Therefore, feminism takes it essential to attack and rupture the patriarchal values and norms which are suppressive and authoritarian to women. Farrell opines the inferiority and poor condition of women is impact of patriarchy. She says, "Women operating in masculine system are often looked for their effectiveness because their effectiveness just piles up credit for the man they are supporting. The indirect power of women has another limitation-its minimal scope. The woman is usually limited to influencing one man" (59). She thinks that whatever the thing woman does is undersized and supposed to be the supplementary act to male's act. Such supposition never accepts woman's superiority; hence, female remain inferior forever. Shiela Ruth takes feminism as deconstructive and rebellious to patriarchy. She says, "Now here are women not only unredeemed by their utility in service, but questioning convention, rebelling , refusing, their appointed labors , lusting after male job, intruding on male territory, demanding prosperous freedom and worst of all , making headway" (151). Here, what she presents is challenge of woman to patriarchy.

Feminism defies and challenges patriarchy because patriarchy subordinates female under its territory and oppresses them by seizing their autonomy and exploits them. Patriarchy is pervasive from the beginning of history. M. h. Abraham concludes that authority is in male hand from earlier. He says, "[W]estern civilization is pervasively patriarchal that is , it is male centered and controlled , and is organized and conducted in such a way as to subordinate women to men in all cultural domains: familial, religious, political, economic,

legal , and artistic” (94). He believes that patriarchal civilization enables man to rein woman by capturing all domains of power.

Male ideology others women as inferior and subordinates them. Feminism as movement observes the life style of women in the society; and its determinants from very beginning of human civilization. Hither to existed social culture and norms which are pervasively male centered, creates myths, archetypes, stereotypes by relegating women as other or object, that is secondary. Systems and rules are male centered. This mainstream continually constructed myths, stereotypes to dominate, exploit women, to use them as per their will and necessity, and to justify their doing as rational. Here, they totally neglected, forgot women as human being; hence they dealt women as commodity: means of supportive thing for their everyday praxis. As males do not accept their counterpart equal to them, they construct stereotypes so that they can side, devalue, undermine women.

Sex is a biological trait that refers to certain categories, male and female. But, in patriarchal convention, on the basis of sex, prevailing concept of gender is developed. Therefore, masculinity and femininity are generated by the pervasive patriarchal biases of civilization. Different traditional roles are prescribed and implemented for each sex then, a complex set of characteristics and behaviours prescribed for particular sex by society and learned through the socialization experience. Here, women are given such traits and behaviours which keep them to at the bottom of hierarchy. Tyson puts it:

Traditional gender roles cast men as a rational, strong, protective, and decisive; they cast women as emotional, irrational, weak, nurturing, and submissive. These gender roles have been used very successfully to justify inequities, which still occur today such as excluding from equal access to leadership, and decision making position. (95)

For her, role division on the basis of traits of sex is highly political, because masculine civilization gives such characters to female that posits them to inferior position where as, to male at superior ruling position.

Female characteristics like docile, passive, emotional, weak, nurturing, and so on are social construct. Fiona Tolan accompanies with this belief and borrows Simone de Beauvoir and says to supports it as, “One is not born, but rather becomes a women” (319). Society teaches each and every woman such feministic behaviors from very beginning of life. About it Sheila Ruth says, “A little girl, given dolls to play with, prohibited from engaging in wild play, dressed in frilly or constricting, clothing and rebuked in these behaviour pattern her called feminine, and learns to be passive, fragile, nurturing” (17). Here, she presents how a girl is taught to be feminine in behaviours and characters which show femininity as social construction. This patriarchal norm of role division is self contradictory because it provides negative traits of women. Then it defines women with such traits, which are negative of male, as ideal women.

Woman, who is brought up in patriarchy, internalizes male ideology and acts as per the direction of patriarchy, thinking it as universal. But Fiona Tolan opposes this feminine nature as universal. Here, she brings Beauvoir and says, “The second sex argued that there was no such thing as ‘feminine nature’. There was no psychological reason why women should be inferior to men and yet, throughout history and across cultures, women had always been second class citizen” (320). Characters provided to women are baseless. But on the basis of these same reasons, they are judged and practiced as second class.

Feminism supposes ‘equality’ and ‘freedom’ as pre-requisition among all human beings. Though men and women are the product of the same society, man is called a ‘cultural being’ and woman is called a ‘wild being’. Men are always overpowered with the sense of “I as man; she is woman. I am strong; she is weak. I am tough; she is tender. I am self

sufficient; she is needful” (Ruth 55). Hence, women are overlooked by the society. Their place in the patriarchal system is unstable. Men thought that it was their right to rule over women. They make rule in every aspect of society as per their choice and their benefit. Their egotistic ideology has taught and compelled women to internalize them as weak and valueless object naturally inferior and unequal to men. Jean Jack Rousseau claims male’s superiority over female is logical. He says, “Women do wrong to complain the inequality of man-made laws; this inequality is not of man’s making or at any rate it is not the result of mere prejudice but of reason” (116). He tries to justice male bias laws and proves women as inferior. Women occupy hardly countable or let say, no place at all in social, cultural, economic, legal or political sphere. They are remained usurped, dominated, invisible, insignificant, and worthless being before so-called male supremacy.

From the male made discourse to great religious and philosophical discourse of everyday use conceal reality, distort it as per the convenience of male chauvinism According to the myth of Bible, great respected religious book, woman was created from the rib of man. When god saw loneliness of man, he thought to have a companion of man, thus he made woman out of man’s rib: “[H]e took one of rib, and closed the flesh instead thereof; [...], which the lord God had taken from man made him a woman and brought her unto the man” (qtd. in Lohani 118). Male centered religious book, like Bible justifies man’s origin as glorious, but it shows origin of women as secondary and valueless. Such myths are made against the women in the word of Simone de Beauvoir. She says, “In the legend Eve and Pandora men have taken up arms against women. They have made use of philosophy-theology” (145). She claims that these myths are weapon of patriarchy to fire female to the second sex, which is justified by manmade philosophy and theology.

The Bible also highlights women’s stereotypes: women as emotional, timid and easily convincing. It concludes that the disloyalty of woman is cause of man’s fall from immortality

to mortality. Women are inherently emotional. Hence serpent found it easy to tempt them than men. It convinced woman to eat forbidden fruit. Feminism tries to blur such myth of origin. It insists that two aspects of human being can not have two different origins. If it really happens, it should not be taken as grant proof to justify one as glorious and next as valueless; rather woman should credited for gaining and finding knowledge which human being was restricted from. Instead, bible concludes emotionality of women as cause of fall from the Garden of Eden. It also presents woman as disobedient, which is very cause of loss of immortality. These kinds of imaginative transcendental assumptions: Garden of Eden, Heaven, Immortality have left unavoidable scar in the image of women. Nobody can guarantee the existence of those transcendental things, but the black scar in the face of women remains forever. About forbidden fruit's myth, Bible says, "And when the woman saw that the tree was good for food, and that it was pleasant to the eyes, and a tree to be desired to make one wise, she took of the fruit thereof, and did eat, and gave also unto her husband with her; and he did eat" (qtd. in Lohani 119). Woman in the garden took a fruit and ate, which work was forbidden to do. It pictures woman as disobedient and greedy.

All existed myth making tendency are guided by male ideology. Thus, myths are created on the basis of binary opposition. They always trivialize women's identity. Male system creates negative stereotypical images of woman, and justifies them by creating parallel myths matching with their images; woman as irresponsible, emotional, passive, timid, and sentimental. Greek and Rome myth 'Demeter' portraits mother Demeter as sentimental and irresponsible, though she was given prestigious duty of farming nature to keep it evergreen. She totally forgot and became indifference in her duty when her daughter was abducted. Another myth shows even goddess of the beauty, Venus was jealous about the beauty of other woman. She ordered her son Cupid to destroy the beauty of a king's daughter Psyche because her beauty was challenging to her beauty. The story tells:

So lovely was Psyche; indeed, that she was often mistaken for Venus and even adored by certain mortals as that fair divinity; and this so offended the goddess of beauty who was ever jealous of her charms- that she commanded her son Cupid to visit the audacious princess who dared to rival herself in beauty and, by shorting one of his unerring darts into her heart to inspire her with love for some monster or other unworthy object. (qtd. in Lohani 19)

This abstract shows the jealousy of Goddess Venus in the charm of Psyche. Venus tricks to destroy her beauty, so she sends her son toward her.

Religious celebrated books from occidental to oriental civilization, myths picture woman as thing like being. Book from Hindu religion like Vedas, Mahabharata, mistreat them, and make them inferior. They create dichotomy in human being in basis of binary opposition. They put women and men in hierarchical order: men at the top and women at the bottom. This type of ordering is fully bias and groundless. According to the Vedas, son is compulsory and prerequisite to open the door of heaven. Without son a man cannot enter into the heaven. Here, Vedas neglects the existence of daughter as human being.

Similarly, Mahabharata also blames woman as cause of Great War and its destruction. Ramayana shows Sita as the cause of war between Ram and Raman. Philosophers, scientist and researcher from western civilization always take and picture women as object, secondary and non-human. Their claiming is baseless and highly questionable.

Aristotle says that women do have less number of teeth than men; hence they are inferior to men. He has created hierarchy between the man and woman, and has put woman at the bottom and man at the top of the hierarchy. Charles Van Doren quotes Aristotle's idea and says, "Women were inferior –else they would not be the ones to run house hold, while man runs the city state" (44). For him, such inferiority was not curable rather innate. He prohibited intermarrying because, according to him, the virus of inferiority infects the

superior race. He opines that females are weaker and colder in nature and we must look upon the female character as being a sort of natural deficiency. Aquinas evaluates that since women were at least necessary for procreation, god had not after all made some terrible monster in creating female. Feminism brings such baseless claiming in the surface, and tries to disclose the hidden purpose of male culture. More, it concludes that women should not be studied by male because male norms are not applicable in female. As Sheila Ruth says, “We were studied by Aristotle, who concluded that we were misbegotten males, conceived instead of men. [...] We are looked at” (3). Here, she claims that male made descriptions about female are bias. So they always underestimate female.

Feminism runs campaign to aware women for their rights, to object tyrannical imposition over them. Here, it opposes patriarchal culture; so it can be said as revolution like Shulamith Firestone. She says, “If there were another word all-embracing than revolution, we would use it” (01). Here, she means that feminism is revolution against patriarchy. The word ‘revolution’ hardly represents anger of feminism for her. Patriarchy continually exerts forces to undermine women’s self confidence and assertiveness. It, then, takes the absence of these qualities as proof and concludes that women are naturally self-effacing and submissive. Feminism conjures various images and ideas regarding the women’s issues. In spite of diversity, feminism is often represented as a jingle entity and some hoe concerned with gender and freedom ; as *Penguin Dictionary of Sociology* defined it-“Feminism as a doctrine suggesting that women are systematically disadvantage in modern society and advocating equal opportunities for men an and women.” It insists on the gender base equality.

Patriarchal convention makes different myths about female body. These myths are used to justify and show male’s superiority. According to H.R. Hays, women’s genital is biological but men set norms in it. She says:

The phenomenon itself is frequently explained as a supernatural wound, the result of an attack by a bird, a snake, or a lizard. The origin of female genital is also illustrated in myths concerning the creation of women, since male fantasy is dominant in human institutions. A very early time is often referred to on which there were only men and no women. (101)

Above extracts claims that women were from men. Their genital is the result of an attack by a bird, or a snake, or a lizard. Before it, there was not any woman. She presents a myth from Malay Peninsula as: “The Negritos of the Malay Peninsula maintain that there was once an ancestral creature entirely, the monitor lizard. Since his contemporaries were all men, the lizard caught one of them, cut off his genitals and made him into a woman who became the lizard’s wife and the ancestor of the Negritos” (101-2).

In this way, numerous of myths about the creation of woman are created to expose different origin of women to men. Males as constructors of myths think themselves superior, mainstream, and females are created to support them. For them, their origin is lofty, glorious, whereas, women’s is secondary and trifle. Hence, they present female’s biological process with the sense of heartedness.

Women’s menstruation is biological, but patriarchy in different parts sets different norms about it. H.R Hays presents some examples about it: “Hindu culture, such woman must not weep, mount horse, ox or elephant, be carried in a palanquin or drive in a vehicle. Hebrew forbids them to work in the kitchen, sit at meal with other people, and drink from a glass used by others” (103). Each culture forbids women to act several works at the period of menstruation.

Society dissects woman in ‘good’ and ‘bad’ girl. The very base of this division is the serviceability of female to male. Good girl, who even refers to Madonna, angel, always, should be submissive; if not would be whore or witch. Such categorization is patriarchal

policy to control women's body, culture and every domain of life. Therefore, Tyson says about it that: "[B]oth images are projections of patriarchal male desire: for example, the desire to own 'valuable' women suited to be wives and mothers. The desire to control woman's sexuality, so that men's sexuality cannot be threatened in a way, and the desire to dominate in all financial matters" (86). Here, she believes that the division of only for the empowerment of male so that they can easily impose male monopoly. Thus, feminists take both types of good and bad images destructive, bias, hence counterproductive. Even in male's praise, approval and veneration the ideals themselves actually disparage women and cause women to disparage themselves, and assisting the domination of female lives.

Attractiveness and beauty are socially defined. Feminism takes them as patriarchal construct that is why if a female is evaluated regarding her physical beauty, shape, skin, color, then her subjectivity is totally neglected. Her inner self, skill, ability, talent are not reckoned. Such observation is, firstly subjective that is fully guided by male psychology, secondly those conclusion leads to define female as 'object' that lacks of their own subjectivity. Sheila Ruth presents the lack of female autonomy in this way:

In patriarchy, men construct the ideal in their own interests, and women whose lives have no purpose outside of being chosen, whose identities and fortunes have been made subject to their appeal to men, have little choice but to struggle with the imperious requirements of beauty even though the ideal is impossible. For no human being can be perfect in hair, skin, teeth, shape proportion, and scent and furthermore be so 'naturally' and endlessly. (161)

Society defines women's duty to beautify. To follow their traditional role is not the violation of culture. Therefore, they can stay for hours under a hair drier and for slathering cream on the skin. But they are ridiculed for their act. Such radicalization is contradictory.

Feminism revolts against the traditional concept of marriage; in which a husband is found by her parents for a girl. Here, her freedom and personal choice does not work because she must accept the person whoever her parents choose for. Thus the result of such marriage is suppressed life of the girl. Feminism protests such types of deprivation of women's right, commodification of women's body; hence emphasizes on the marriage based on mutual affection. It also voices for the right to divorce if she is not satisfied with her marital relation and her husband. Feminism also criticizes the traditional system of education for girl because it supposes marriage as the goal of women's education. Thus, they are taught as per that purpose. Emma Goldman says:

From infancy, almost, the average girl is told that marriage is her ultimate goal; therefore her training and education must be directed towards that end. Like the mute beast fattened for slaughter, she is prepared for that. [...] Thus she enters into lifelong relation with a man only to find herself shocked, repelled, outraged beyond the measure by the most natural and healthy instinct-sex. (503)

She insists that traditional thinking about female education mutes the women as beast.

Marital institution has legally inferiorized women to men in the course of history. Under common law, women lost all legal capacity. Nancy and Karen quoted the history and say, "A married women ceased to be a person in the eyes of law because her legal identity merged with that of her husband" (272). They think that female's identity is lost in marriage and she is to be known under husband's identity. Kanowitz clears it saying, "By marriage, the husband and wife is one person in law; that the very being, or legal existence of the women is suspended during the marriage or at least is incorporated or consolidated" (312). She thinks that woman loses her individual identity in marriage. It is the impact of patriarchal culture.

Feminism questions with the concept of 'modern family'. It means: less numbers of children, a submissive wife with perfection in household work, and a husband with handsome income. A wife, a member of such family is expected to care for her children and husband, only their interests are counted and praised for the construction of sound family, but important decision about economy and family policy is made by husband. Jain argues that in the name of woman's ideal, they are confined to the house. She says, "It is not enough merely to perform household chores but it is essential to do so in a humble manner, by bending the waist" (83). She thinks that women not only limited inside home, patriarchy sets norm of manner. A husband marries her with expectation of several advantages. In this point she is taken as a slave. She must satisfy his sexual desires, but it is not concerned whether she is satisfied or not. Society permits him to marry another one if he likes. Feminism interestingly concerns with these issues and double existence of woman in the family. Society legitimizes such male's tyrannical roles. Feminism ridicules these types of injustices. Judy Syfers surprises in the pathetic condition of wife and says, "My God, who wouldn't want a wife?" (166). For her if one can enslave wife, everybody would want wife.

Feminism struggles for the creation of self autonomy, and right in husband's property. It takes divorce as response of husband's suppression in the family; but it is not ultimate solution. Stanton awakes women for revolt against their drunkard husbands. She says: "Let no women remain in the relation of wife with a drunkard. Let no drunkard be the father of her child. Let us petition or state government so to modify laws affecting the marriage and custody of children that the drunkard shall have no claim on his wife or child" (qtd. in Harper 67).

Here, she appeals colleagues to take action against tyrannical behaviors of husband. She calls for the correction of existing law.

Property rights and mutual marriage do not guarantee all other rights and women's emancipation. Feminists think that reproduction also the hindrance of women's freedom; thus they emphasized on birth control, that is, to keep control in their own body and reproductive freedom. About reproduction, Margaret Sanger says, "Even the birth control is the means which women attain basic freedom, so it is the means by which she must and will uproot the evil she has brought through her submission" (Sanger 508). She believes that birth control also can provide freedom for females by destroying evil of patriarchy.

Feminism advocates for women's right within and outside the family; hence it first challenges traditional role division: woman as bread baker and man as bread winner. In the practice of right, according to Nancy e. McGlen, women can cross the boundary of traditional roles. She says, "Women were free to take responsibilities outside the home and less emphasis was placed on parental and homemaker roles" (325). For her, each fields is female's responsibility, they can perform everywhere, so woman gave less emphasis on traditional field.

Feminism concerns with the nature of marriage, relationship; ideal role of each spouse: marital and family, house work, childrearing, and decision making. Feminism protests biases made upon women. About patriarchal biases related to adultery, John Demos says, "Only married women, not men could be found guilty of adultery and summarily divorced or punished" (32). She complains that culture blames only woman as guilty in adultery, but similar crime in man is never seen. She does not mean that woman should be given the right of adultery; rather, if it is crime, then both sexes should be condemned. Carl N. Delger says, "A new emphasis on love or mutual attraction rather than economic necessity meant that not marrying and /or divorcing became increasing more acceptable option to an unhappy marriage" (151). Marriage is insisted on mutual affection; yet, woman's place was strongly conditioned by inequality of sexes by patriarchy. Thus, Karen O'Connor says, "A

woman was expected to obey, revere and submit to her husband's will" (O'Conner 325).

Woman's submissiveness was always counted even in mutual marriage.

More feminism further dealt with the issue of sexual satisfaction and emphasized in mutuality. Feminists campaign for the women's sexual right which benefited them in this field. Nancy E. McGlen analyzes the history and says, "As early as 1910, there began to develop a growing recognition that women had sexual needs above and beyond the desire to have children" (327). Even though continual fight able them to grow their access to the job, continual discrimination in wage and their deprivation in some especially in better job drew them back to challenge the economic superiority of male, though it supported in their economy. They continually kept them to increase their access in job; hence they kept their motherhood in bit.

They accepted and followed abortion, contraception and collective childrearing, first, to make them easy to join the job, second, to challenge the conventional role. Nancy e McGlen borrows Freud psychology who says, "[W]oman must have children to be fulfilled" (328). He thinks the inevitability children for a mother, which is limitating to woman at home prison. Feminists challenge such false assumptions. So, Karen O'Conner says, "[T]hat getting married was considered less important to them than getting a job" (331). Here, she emphasizes on job privileging it to marriage. It is challenging to the patriarchal norms.

Feminism ruptures the traditional concept of beauty. Women are considered thing of beauty. Traditional concept of beauty teaches women that beauty is absolute means of their happy lives. With this weapon, they can capture a man, can live happily. Jean jack Rousseau praises women's beauty. He says, "Her strength is in her charm, by their means she should compel him to discover and use his strength" (116). He believes that woman's charm is strength and she can find man through it. His manipulation is destructive for female because it praises females to focus on physical beauty. It messages them that body is everything, so

they totally forget about mind. Instead, men identify them in term of both mind and body. Jenet Price cites Foucault, to see the traits of construction of meaning through which we know the bodies consistently privilege the male for his supposed capacity. He says, “Men then are both in and out of their bodies, while women simply are their bodies, to be subjected, used, transformed and improved” (136). It means that men are reckoned from mind and body perspectives but women are, only from body. It is because of the patriarchal prejudice. This type of notion kills the autonomy and creativity of female. Mary Wollstonecraft says, “False notion of beauty and delicacy stop the growth of their limbs and produce a sickly soreness, rather than delicacy of organs; and thus weakened” (395). For her notion of beauty is harmful to female’s autonomy and creativity.

Feminist literary theory and feminist criticism are subsets of the feminism, which on the one hand observes the position of the women in the society, economics, religion, politics; how women are represented in arts especially literature, their role, voice; on the other hand, they protest the discrimination, aware women for their rights, liberty and freedom; hence campaign for women’s emancipation from oppressive restrains especially cultural which fixes women’s identity with narrow boundaries, interests to reconstruct the way of dealing with literature, to develop own style, point of view, and emphasis on creation of women’s own agency. Here, Louis Tyson says that “Feminist criticism examines the ways in which literature and other cultural productions reinforce or undermine the economic, political, social and psychological oppression of women” (81). These theory and criticisms have their own goals to change the world by promoting gender equality. Thus all feminist activists can be seen as a form of feminist activism. This activism campaigns on the issues as reproductive rights, domestic violence, maternity, equal pay, sexual harassment, discriminations, prejudices, sexual violence, biasness, suppression and so on.

Feminist criticism concerns with the biases of patriarchal ideologies that pervades those literature only which are considered as great literature; by men for men. According to MH Abraham, these literatures plot the story of male protagonists where female are brought only for complement of their story. He says:

[H]ighly regarded literary works focuses on male protagonists: Oedipus, Ulysses, [...] - all who embody masculine traits and ways of feeling and pursue masculine interests in masculine fields of action. To these males, the female characters, when they play a role, are marginal and subordinate, and are represented either as complementary or subservient to, or in opposition to masculine desires and enterprises. (94)

Here, he pictures the marginalization of female characters on literature. According to feminism, it is the impact of bias male tradition.

Notwithstanding the contribution of revolutionary nineteenth and early twentieth century authors such as Mary Wollstonecraft, Mary Shelly, George Eliot, Charlotte Perkins Gilman, and Virginia Woolf, feminist literary criticism developed mostly since the beginning of the late twentieth century women's movement. The movement included Simone de Beauvoir, Kate Millet, Michele Barret, Betty Friden who examined a female 'self constructed in literature by male authors to embody various male fears and anxieties. They researched the social realities through the writing of male authors of contemporary era. Their main concern is on the contemporary social reality which deals with the female issues. Though these late twentieth century feminists are not standing on the base of earlier feminist directly; those earlier feminists' contribution helped them to specify their field. They paved way for modern feminist's research or study.

Feminist criticism avoids the inevitability of male model of writing, and focuses on language, theme, style, structure, model of female writing that is essentially for female. It

concludes the criticisms that are propounded by male cannot do justice for female writings, because they are patriarchal and male centered. Beerendra Pandey revisits *The Mad Woman in the Attic* by Gilbert and Gubar and says, “Gilbert and Gubar’s mad woman is one who can break free from the male-marked boundary to tell her own story” (Pandey 90). He emphasizes on the rupturing of male model. The danger in use of these criticisms is that female sufferings, pains, value, experiences, thought and alike will be buried under these criticisms. In other word, male model criticism fails to give appropriate expression to female experiences and values. There fore they see the necessity of criticism that does justice to the female writings. It tries to explain how power imbalances due to gender in a given culture is reflected in or challenged by literary text. Feminist critic attempt to expose patriarchal premises and resulting prejudices, examine social, cultural and psychosexual contexts of literature and literary criticism.

Women lived life internalizing male culture for long time. After long span of time they critically started to examine their situation. They found male domination, exploitation and their submission over patriarchal values as per the choice of male. All imposed customs and cultures determined by patriarchy were oriented to undermine and relegate feminine values and female subjectivity so as to objectify them. Women became aware the exploitation and started to react against tyrannical and commodifying male culture. Kate Chopin’s novel *The Awakening* (1899) became popular text of the early years; that spoke to female lived and literary experience with the fierce urgency of revelation or a great awakening. Sandra Gilbert compared the beginning of feminist critical awareness to a conversion experience, nothing that:

Most feminist critic speak[...] like people who must bear witness, people who must enact and express in their own lives and words the revisionary sense of transformation that seems inevitably to attend the apparently simple discovery

that the experiences of women in and with literature are different from those of men. (40)

The movement of feminist criticism can be categorized in three sections on the basis of time, nature and their pervasiveness. In its earliest years, feminist criticism concerned in Exposition of the misogyny of literary practice: stereotypical images of women in literature like Madonna or whore, literary abuse, textual harassment in male literature, exclusion of women from convention of literary history. By insisting on the correction of literary and social discrimination and injustices over female they reinforced the necessity and importance of female enterprises. This phase questioned male canonicity, patriarchal convention as Lawrence Kipling puts, “Something peculiar has been happening lately to the classics. Some of them seem less heroic and some of them less funny” (10). This phase can be taken as imitation of male tradition.

Next phase of this criticism is the discovering of women literature. By challenging male convention, this phase tried to expose women’s creativity insisting on women’s own literature, even though, their efforts were challenged, dominated and also obscured by patriarchal norms. Here feminist paid high effort to map feminist territory of own imagination and structure. This practice was completely new that led to the recovery and rereading of women’s literatures which were marginalized, neglected up to that period. Letters and journals were brought to light since lot women writers were rediscovered. Feminist literary criticism is often a political attack on other modes of criticism and theory. And its social orientation moves beyond traditional criticisms.

The recognition of female literary writing helped to highlight the literary aesthetic, which tried to bring neglected and marginalizes culture in to the center. They interested to emphasis on female aesthetic because it spoke of female culture that was to be revived of a women’s language, literary style and form.

From the recognition of women's writing, third phase of feminist criticism proceeded. As a phase of self discovery, this phase was radical rethinking of the conceptual grounds of literary study, a version of the accepted theoretical assumptions about reading and writing that had been based entirely on male literary experiences and culture; as Carolyn G. Heilbrun says that "[F]eminist criticism offers a vital alternative, recognizable among the old texts waiting for exploration and enlightenment" (21). These types of tendency in feminism are the effect of several feminists from different part of the world. They emphasize on disruptive and submissive writings. They suggested female writer to ally herself with everything in their culture, which was silenced, muted or unrepresented, othered to challenge and subvert the existing system that represses feminine difference. This phase is known as female phase, a progressed form of feminism.

On the basis of nature they deal with the women's issues, and theoretical orientation feminism can be categorized in four sections. First, 'Liberal feminism' essentially seeks opportunities for women's advancement in the existed society through institutional changes in education and workplace. Marxist feminism locates source of women oppression in the general problem a capitalist society and remedy therefore, is its dissolution. Third, Radical feminism locates sources of oppression on the nature and implication of gender, whereas socialist feminism, an amalgam of above two, holds both economic and gender factors equally responsible for women's oppression.

Mary Wollstonecraft's "A Vindication of Rights of Women" (1792), "The Subjection of Women" (1869) by John Stuart Mill, and Margaret Fuller's "Women in the Nineteenth Century" are pioneering books to map the history of feminist criticism. Women's first text with feminine spirit was Mary Wollstonecraft's "A Vindication of Rights of Women" (1792). In it, she blames patriarchy as the real cause of backwardness of women. She concluded that women were inferior not because of their gender as female, but because of the deprivation of

women from gaining education. She propounded strong premise that the mind does not know sex. Thus she emphasized on women's education rather than traditional ways of women's lifestyle and education, because for her women are capable of reasoning. In her "Letters on Education" (1970), Catherine Mac away, English historian, claimed that differences between sexes are products of education and environment. She criticized the way in which women's mind and bodies had been distorted to please men; and she demanded for equal education to the boys and girls for equal development of knowledge. Virginia Woolf thinks that the lack of separate room is the real cause the less numbers and canonic women writers in her "A Room of One's Own". But she denies the lack of creativity in women. Patriarchy aims to interiorize women; hence prevents them from proper environment. Therefore, she insists on women's a 'room' of 'one's own' in this essay "A Room of One's Own". Further she emphasize that women have to develop separate sector of art and literature to express the feelings and emotions which are quite different from a male experiences.

Bryson opines that William Thompson's book *Appeal on Behold of Women* attacks J. S. Mills. Bryson bringing Mills says that women have no interests separate from those of their husband or father; they have no need of independent political representation. Bryson defends women and says that their intellectual capacities are, at least as great as men; and biological difference can never be an argument against political rights.

Mary Ellman's "Thinking about Women" (1968) reveals the application of gender stereotypes to almost everything. She attacks what she calls the 'phallic criticism'. In this context, I. P. Indreni writes that she associates the maleness with a certain style of writing which is oriented towards fixity of meaning and which is rigid, definite and closed. In her views, not all men write male ways, nor do all women writers adopt a female writing style" (96).

“Modern Women: The Lost Sex” (1947), by Ferdinand Lund berg and Marynia Farnham embodies another trend in thinking about women which has produced some recent examples. Women are here seen as one of modern civilization’s major unsolved problems. They are taken as crime, vice, poverty, epidemic disease, juvenile delinquency, racial hatred, divorce, neurosis and even periodic unemployment. Neurotic mother creates neurotic children.

Carolyn Heilbrun in “Toward a Recognition of Androgyny” (1973) goes beyond the effort to establish definition of women’s literature and to examine its origins. She is looking towards a future in which the old tradition and the new will have become one: ‘androgynous’ in her terminology can be equated with ‘universal’ as used in this essay “Toward a Recognition of Androgyny”. She looks back to myth for examples of common felling between men and women.

“*The Second Sex*” (1949) by Simone de Beauvoir mapped and launched second wave of feminism, and played an important roles in changing outlook of women’s thought and established clear idea of the fundamental questions of modern feminism in the fifties. This is critique of the cultural identification of women as merely the negative object, or other to men as the dominating subject: representative of humanity in general. Very book also deals with great collective myths of women in the male writer’s works. Myths are created by patriarchal ideology to dominate women. She brings the reference of DH Lawrence who opines, “Female cannot exist without male, since they are junior to male, and female has to come under the clutch of male”. According to her, to be true women she must accept herself as other and inferior in patriarchy. So she warns, “The myth should not be confused with recognition of signification” (997).

According to Kate millet’s book *The Sexual Politics* (1969), politics signifies mechanisms that express and enforce the relation of power in society. For her social

arrangements and institutions as covert ways of manipulating power so as to establish and perpetuate the dominance of men, and the subordination of women. Therefore the relationship between men and women must be understood as a deeply embedded power structure with political implication. Women have negligible representation; the biological sciences legitimize chauvinistic belief in female inferiority; and social system. Particularly the family entrench political and social inequality in the private sphere. She also criticizes the male bias in Sigmund Freud's psychoanalytical theory and many male novelists for their fantasization and degradation of women as submissive sexual object.

The Madwoman in the Attic by S. Gilbert and S. Gubar presented situation of nineteenth century women writers, their anxiety of authorship as unwomanly activity that transgressed cultural boundaries. This book is a reply to Harold Bloom's *Theory of Anxiety of Influence*. They believe that women do not fit into his patriarchal model. They have not any identity of authorship because they do not have literary tradition unlike Bloom's attitude. They say anxiety is prior to influence. Women are now well aware of patriarchal norms and values as male dominate over female. The concept of patriarchy has been revealed as manmade idea according to masculine purpose. They are capable of exposing the true identity of patriarchy realizing the significance of their own identity. A book *The Female Imagination* (1975) by Patricia Meyer Speck first began to define women's writings in feminist term, whereas "A Literature of Their Own" by Elaine Showalter outlines a literary history of women writers in nineteenth and twentieth century as she says:

These insights have been tested, supplemented and extended so that we now have a coherent, if still incomplete, narrative of female literary history which describes the evolutionary stages of women's writings during the last 250 years from imitation through protest to self self-definition and defines and traces the connections through history and across national boundaries of the

recurring images, themes and plot that emerged from women's social, psychological, and aesthetic experience in male dominated culture. (6)

She opines that feministic perspective is experimented one, so it is rational and just. Yet, it is incomplete in its goal. Feminist criticism has journeyed from imitation of male model to its protest.

This book examines British women novelists since Victorian period from women's point of view. Women writers did not get proper respect as males. Some of them change their female name in to male's name; some did not publish their work due to the lack of courage of competency to compete with males in the male dominated and patriarchal society. This book inspires women to take strength in their act of independent in the world and constructs a reliable map of the achievement of English women writers. She says, "Women write differently not because they are different psychologically from men but because their social experience is different" (7).

In the essay "The Laugh of Medusa" (1976) Helen Cixous tries to establish female superiority over male. In it she asks women writers to put their body in their writing. She tries to escape from the pleasure of male and wants to seek her own pleasure. Her view is that women must be free to feel herself as independent considering her rebellion against traditional values. Helena was revisited by Rosemary Tong where she says: "Applying Derrida's notion of difference of writing she constructed feminine writing (portraiture famine) with masculine writing (literature) understood psychoanalytically, masculine writing is rooted in a men's genital and liberal economy, which is emphasized by the phallus" (224). Helena believes that Rosemary has applied the notion of deconstruction; and founded new tradition of writing. It is feminine writing; distinct from male writing. She concludes that male writing is rooted in men's genital, so it cannot justice to female writing.

Both Cixous and Irigary agree feminine sexuality and the female body are sources of female writing. Irigary tries to liberate women from the male³ philosophical thoughts but Cixous tries to liberate from male behaviors. Irigary focuses on liberal economy, as Tong reveals for her and says, “Patriarchy is[...] the manifestations of masculine liberal economy and will remain the order of the day until the repressed ‘feminine ‘is set free’” (Irigary 228).

Julia Kristiva challenges the rigidity of the symbolic order. She brings Lacanian version of psychoanalysis and feminism together. She feels that female sexuality is open, subversive and characterized by certain fluidity against rigorous male determinism. She challenges the symbolic order of language and culture based upon the phallic idea of Lacan which is against the feminist ideology because it revolves around the phallus and father.

All in all, feminism is a philosophical socio-political cultural movement. It studies the situation of the women in the society and tries to uplift it from the prevailing wretched condition. It tries to aware women about their situation and causes of it. By it, feminism moves the revolutionary campaign to guarantee the rights and freedom of women. It aims to create women’s agency in every field by deconstructing the patriarchal stereotypes about women. It opposes traditional concepts of marriage, reproduction, beauty, gender, role, education, and so on; and tries to establish new vision about it questioning so called canonic norms and values. Feministic criticism and literary theory are application of female perspective in literature. It discerns the injustice of misogynistic representation of female in patriarchal literature; and exposes male biases. More, it concludes that male model of writing and criticism can’t justice female feelings and autonomy; hence insists on separate female theory and criticism that include separate language, style, point of view, and theme and so on.

III. Repression of Women's Voices in *The Death of the Ivan Ilyich* and *The Kreutzer Sonata*

Sonata

In the novellas *The Death of the Ivan Ilyich* and *The Kreutzer Sonata*, the narrators make high efforts to suppress the women characters so that they stand according to given by the rank of patriarchy. They justify male values by presenting male characters with positive images; and justify false assumption about women created by male as true and rational. They are exclusively concerned about the issues of male; hence, their male ego is pictured all over the novellas. In first artistic creations, the narrator deals with untimely demise of the protagonist, and he blames the cause of this result to female character. Similarly, the second presents the murder of female character but she herself was responsible for the result.

The discrimination between male and female is not limited in the presentation of the characters; it is also founded in the structure of novellas, and the relation between and among the characters. In these sense both novellas tries to present the realistic images of the nineteenth century Russian society. Real like characters in the spectrum of real like setting and events of these novellas fulfill the intension of speaker to define these creations as realistic creation. Here, hidden intension of writer is highly political because nineteenth century Russian society was full of patriarchy. Women were highly marginalized by gender discrimination. Tolstoy makes extreme efforts to take the snapshots of such bias society as it is. As well, he seems to be worrying about the disobediences of females. But there is no any single event where female did not accept her husband. Thus, the female characters in these novellas are marginalized and excluded in the parallel way as they were in real world of contemporary era.

As both novellas depict the picture of nineteenth century Russian society, they are real like. This claim can be justified borrowing the idea from David Shepherd about *The Death of*

the Ivan Ilyich. About it he says, “For most Soviet critics Ivan Ilyich was, in the words of Mark Shchegliv from beginning to end completely the product of his time and class” (401). Focus of novelist over realism is only because of his focus and support over patriarchy and male govern culture which he wants to idealize and continue. Thus, though it is not directly exposed or expressed through the mouth of narrator that writer does have such idea, but nascent form of his patriarchal inclination can be seen in the subject matter and way of presentation of these both writings.

Presentation style and subject matter of these novellas highlight the stream of patriarchal convention. They gloriously take male name in the title and male oriented events. So both novellas exclusively take title from male name; first *The Death of Ivan Ilyich* and second *The Kreutzer Sonata*. Although the first title presents sadistic image of death, it directly refers to male figure because the story talks about the death of male figure: Ivan Ilyich; not of any female. Similarly, the second one also talks about sonata, which is created by Kreutzer: a male figure. Tolstoy, though brings the female characters in the story, they are secondary and are brought only to complete the story of male. It was existing literary trend in the word of Abraham because most of all literature used to take male as protagonist. He says, “To these males, the females characters, when they play a role, are marginal and subordinate and are represented either as complementary and subservient to, or in opposition to masculine desires and enterprises” (94). For him, female characters are spare of male story. These types of presentation of story with the patriarchal title are not accidental happening rather thoughtful intension with the idea of gender politics because his presentation of women in the story is sufficient for this claim.

Female characters in these novellas have been marginalized in practice of freedom and rights. They have to be ruled by male figures in the hand of patriarchy. They have internalized patriarchy as per the wish of male ideology. Most of time they are submissive to

male governed system, and occasionally they are represented with negative images. These types of female's representations are male projections which are full of male prejudices and selfishness to rule them over. Speakers of these novellas say stories in grand conventional way. They never try to violate the convention of storytelling. It is because of the intentional grand design of the writer who has anticipated surviving derogative male culture to suppress women forever.

Female protagonists of these novellas are relegated and devalued because they are presented as moral less greedy and ambitious. They are credited for entire result of novellas.

There are numerous examples and incidents in these texts which show gender discrimination. Male who thinks themselves superior to females always suppress them so that they can justify their superiority over female. We can take an incident as an example from the beginning part of the novella *The Death of the Ivan Ilyich* where protagonist husband Ivan Ilyich is already dead. Here Widow Praskovya Fyodorovna is not seriously haunted and shocked by untimely demise of her husband. She deals a friend of her husband in a way as if she is in love with him. She repents in his death not because love that she does for him but because of hardship she was to face and cope with after his death. Thus she asks a friend of her husband that how she could get a grant of money from the government:

‘Give me your arm.’ [...] Pyotr Ivanovich sighed more deeply and sorrowfully and Praskovya Fyodorovna squeezed his fingers gratefully. [...] [A]h Pyotr, how hard it is for me, how terribly, terribly hard.’ [...] She asked him in connection with her husband's death, she could get a grant of money from the government.’ [...] [S]he knew exactly the amount of money this death entitled her to, but she wanted to find out if there were not some means by which she could increase it. (239)

These lines try to portray Fyodorovna as disloyal and infidel to her husband. It suggests to the reader that she was a similar woman from the past. Therefore, the speaker of the novella has tried to prove her as a morally less character because a woman, who is as such in such a critical moment, cannot be far from it in her previous life.

Feminism takes this type of negative presentation of a woman in a text because of patriarchal politics. According to feminism, the speaker of the novella is a product of a patriarchal system, who wants to relegate the values of a woman by presenting them as morally less, selfish, greedy, and jealous and so on. By presenting a woman with such images, the speaker aims to draw the boundary between male and female: male as superior and female as secondary; valueless who lacks the norms and rules of daily life. Secondly, these lines have pictured her as a dependent woman on her husband's income. She has no income and source to run the family after the death of her husband. Here the death of her husband is the death of sources from where she used to get survive and run the family. In this state the narrator presents her as a greedy woman who concerns only property, but neglects family love and relations. After the death of her husband, she is only worried about the money that she would get from the government, but not about love and affection that she is missing in the absence of her husband. Such presentation of a woman is suppression of female which is highly influenced by male politics. By it, the narrator wants to derogate a woman. For feminism, such ideas of Fyodorovna are not irrational because she was a woman brought up in patriarchy. McGlen and O'Connor opine, "Without economic opportunities to earn a living wage outside the home, few women had any options in life other than to marry and remain at home under the protection of their husband" (McGlen 267). For them, women's imprisonment at the home is a result of lack of economic opportunities. In such a condition, a female had no option except marriage. In marriage, they would be under the protection of their husband. In a similar way, the culture did not teach Fyodorovna about independency; instead, it limited her within the

home, and taught that she was bread baker. Breadwinning role was of her husband, so with his death source of her kitchen also died. Therefore, her concern with expectation of more money is rational. To present her as materialist woman who privileges money over husband is misrepresentation of the narrator. In surface, it looks as if she is doing wrong because she is not regretting in death of her husband. But, she is worrying about money that how she could get high stipend. It shows her as greedy and money loving but it was not her fault. Patriarchy taught her in such way therefore, it is fault of hither to existed convention that is guided by male ideology.

Both novellas are full of the patriarchal domination over female. These dominations are pervasive in each and every field where masculine culture reigns, frames and limits woman's right and freedom as per the welfare of the male world. So this research focuses its efforts to explore such bias discrimination. *Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary* defines marriage as a legal relationship between husband and wife. It is based on equality and cooperation. Male centered Russian society of these novellas does not take it as legal union. Rather it is full of discriminations, biases, political and exploiting to female race. Here brides and bridegroom have not been chosen by mutual affection. Both protagonists Ivan Ilyich and Pozdnyshv marry in traditionally. Being men, they have been judged from materialistic perspective because the stories tell that Ivan was job holder with sound salary, and Pozdnyshv was a landlord. Whereas female characters Fyodorovna and Madame Pozdnyshv were judged from physical appearance. The narrator in *The Death of Ivan Ilyich* says:

Praskovya Fyodorovna came from a good family and was attractive; she also had a little money. Ivan Ilyich could have counted on making better money, but this was not a bad one. He had his salary. [...] He would acquire worth

while in laws. She was a sweet, pretty, well-bred young woman. [...] [H]e married her because the people of his set approved of the match. (246)

These lines present biasness of the male governed culture. Pre-requisite of male and female for marriage is antithetical: male is counted on the basis of economy whereas female, appearance.

Feminism protests marriage in patriarchy where female are taken as object of beauty that she casts charming from her body. For female, this physical beauty guarantees that she can marry a well-bred man with sound income, so it is prerequisite. But for male, his income and economy are sufficient bases to be judged. Simon de Beavoir says that these types of evaluations and relegation of woman from a human being to a trifle object is because of male governed culture which has captured all domains of knowledge. Thus, according to her, male culture does not take female as a human being rather females are judged as 'others' or 'objects' for male who think them as subjective 'I'. Fyodorovna has also been othered by male culture as a thing to look. Such judgment happens in marriage where female's appearance is privileged over her inner talent.

Similar discriminatory male projection can be found in second novella *The Kreutzer sonata* where protagonist Pozdnyshev married Madame Pozdnyshev following grand tradition of marriage. This claim is sufficient from his saying before his marriage. He says, "I kept my eyes for suitable girl. [...] I was looking for a girl, whose purity would make her worthy of being my wife" (320). Here, his concern was purity, which is only product of his culture. Like previous in this marriage too, Pozdnyshev has regarded exclusively outward beauty of Madame Pozdnyshev, but never concerned whether she deserved creativity, talent or had or had not any job. So when he met his future wife, he says, "I not only found that she was the acme of perfection, I found that I, too, during my engagement, was the acme of perfection" (329). Similarly, Madame Pozdnyshev married him because he was a man of high

economy; a landlord. She also did not interest whether he did have vile records in his past life. It was only because of the culture she had brought up, which had taught her in that way. Here Tyson says, “[M]arriage to the right person is a guarantee of happiness and the proper reward for a right minded young woman” (89). When they were taught in that way, they followed the culture accordingly.

In the period of speaker’s marriage, males were free. So they could keep illegal adulterous relation with other woman and even could go to brothel. Male with such vices were not concerned when they would go to marry. But for female her chastity was compulsory. Pozdnyshev says:

[G]entle man comes to see my sister or daughter, I, who know what sorts of life he leads, where and with whom you spend your nights. This is no place for you. There are pure and innocent here. Go away.’ That is how it ought to be. [...] when such a gentle man turns up and begins to dance with my daughter or sister [...] we rejoice if he is a gentleman with means and connections. It makes no difference if he is tainted or diseased. (320)

Here, the speaker exposes how the patriarchy excuses misconducts of male. For girls who are innocent and pure, their counterparts are not necessary to be similar. Although, their guardians know the immoral activities of counterparts, they would neglect such vices and allow their girls to marry with those males. Innocent girls would also happily accept such males. For feminism, it is only because of pervasive masculine culture, which is rooted in the society from very beginning of human civilization. It lets freedom and excuses to do adulterous activity to male only because they are inborn male. But for female, her innocency is compulsory. She must be virgin, beautiful and morally undoubful.

Men themselves manage brothel but they always treat prostitute with negative perception and spot them with black taint forever. Pozdnyshev himself was not a man of

morality because he had visited brothel several times in his past life. But this lack of morality did not matter and was not counted when he got married. Podznyshev's expression shows female's beauty as inevitable in marriage. He says, "A beautiful woman may talk rot and you listen and fancy she is saying claver things instead of rot" (621). It is highly political because patriarchy never accepts the existence of woman as human being. Females know this politics well but they internalize and accept it happily. For it Pozdnyshev says, "Female knows very well that the most exalted and poetic so-called love is inspired not by moral virtues but by physical proximity, by coiffures, by the color and cut of frock. What we want is the body and therefore will forgive her sins but never an ugly ill fitting tasteless gown" (323). In these lines speaker pozdnyshev: a male chauvinist, a product of male culture treats female with physical and materialistic judgment.

Objectification of women can be approved from the marriage system, which has been presented in *The Kreutzer Sonata*. In most cases, parents of a girl would found the life partner for her. But in rare cases, girls themselves would choose their husband. Here, speaker says:

A girl came of age and her parents found a husband for her. That is how it is done among at least ninety-nine percent of people of the world and one percent of the people have thought of a new system. New system consists in having the girls sit down while the man walk up and down in front of them as at a fair making their choice. The girls sit there and say to them, 'Here take me! Me! Not her but me! Look what fine shoulder. (326)

In these both cases, females lack of autonomy about their marriage. In the first case, they are compelled to obey parent's decision. In the second case too, though they choose themselves, they are relegated to the object level. So, marriage for female is sale like of commodity in the word of Showalter. She says, "Patriarchal society don't sell their sons, but their daughters are all for sale sooner or later" (Showalter 1226). She claims that females were captivated

by patriarchy where they could not decide for themselves. Society had deprived them off from women's rights and liberty.

In the system of marriage that the novella presents, marriage is ultimate goal for female. No woman in this text is concerned about independent future. There is no any information about the childhood of female protagonists if they were taught in a way so that they could build up their knowledge advanced. Similarly, it also happens to other female characters but they are happy in their status. The societies of the novellas that the plots present are highly patriarchal. Feministic activist Emma Goldman takes such prevail tradition as superstition because such tradition was initiated by patriarchal thought which had and has covered all the domains and academies of knowledge. Females themselves are submissive in such discriminating and derogatory culture because patriarchy has taught them to internalize culture as per the direction of male ideology. She opines, "From infancy, almost, the average girl is told that marriage is her ultimate goal: therefore, her training and education must be directed towards that end. Like the mute beast fatten for slaughter, she is prepared for that" (Goldman 503). She means that female children are taught that marriage is their ultimate goal. They are like a beast who cannot think other things except marriage just as death for beasts. Therefore everybody follows it but nobody dares to question or criticize. Mary Wollstonecraft says that woman concerns only about physical beauty because tradition teaches them that beauty guarantees their better future. She opines that women are taught in a way that rake prostrates beauty so other things are secondary for them. Therefore they leave other exercises to gain knowledge and start to beautify them.

These novellas suppress women characters not only in terms of marriage system but also they are equally bias in presentation of family members and their role in the family. Each novella *The Death of Ivan Ilyich* and *The Kreutzer Sonata* has developed the story of single family. First deals with family issues of Ivan's family where second of pozdnyshev family.

Both of these families are under patriarchal system where families are under guidance and take care of husband (father). Since the father is center pivot of family all member moves around and under his control and command. There were seven members in Golovin family: five off springs and parent. Out of them three were already dead; and remaining were a son and a daughter. If we noticed the past history of his family Ivan was a son of a Privy Councilor. The way the narrator has exposed character and identity that each of them deserve is full of discrimination with patriarchal politics. One has been presented positively if he or she is in the frame of patriarchy but rest is negatively presented. The speaker talks about Ivan and his family members as:

Such was Privy Councilor Ilya Yefimovich Golovin, [...] The eldest made for himself a career similar to his father's only in a different ministry and third son was a failure. [...] [A]nd was now working for railway department. [...] Their sister was married to Baron Greff, the same sort of St. Petersburg as his father in law. (241)

This abstract presents bias exposition of the members of Golovin family. Here, the father and son are identified with their occupation whereas the identity of daughter is connected with her husband. She is happy not because she possesses a job but because she is wife of a famous job holder. Thus, this exposition though is short but is full of gender discrimination as it presents male and female in traditional role. Simone de Beauvoir says, "Now, woman has always been man's dependent, in not his slave; the two sexes never shared the world in equality. [...] Almost no where is her legal status the same as man's" (144). Therefore above portrait of daughter in relation to her husband is patriarchal. Feminism remarks it as a product of big culture that is patriarchal culture. The convention and culture in the novellas is product of patriarchal ideology which was also in use at that time of author. This ideology has divided gender role that male as bread owner and female as bread baker. Here in this novella too the

role division is alike to the patriarchal division. Such division is highly criticized able for feminism. Male characters in the story have dignified identity that is under definition of male culture. Though they earn more or less comparatively, all are engaged in job; hence they have justified traditional role of male. On the other hand, females are either ignored to be introduced, or if they are, they are with female role inside home. McGlen and O'Connor say, "[A] traditional marriage in which the husband is the breadwinner and the wife stays at home with the children" (McGlen 333). According to them, the role of male and female is patriarchal tradition. These novellas also develop same type of role division. No female is gaining education so that she can have a job in the future or having job so that she is outside the capture of patriarchy; but all are inside home internalizing patriarchy. The sister of Ivan has not violated the norms of patriarchy because she has got married with man who is possessing job. Here her identity is not distinct from her husband because she hasn't been introduced individually rather with husband.

This type of presentation of female character is highly political. It is continuation of patriarchal culture which always limits and imprisons female within the boundary of home where female's creativity and autonomy are hindered and destructed. McGlen says, "[I]n the present era men have shown a greater tendency to cling to traditional views about marriage and family life [...]. Among teenagers as well boys tend to be more traditional in their views about the role and task sharing decision making and working mothers" (340-41). According to them, males always prefer traditional role division so that they can undermine females. Both of these novellas present such role. Therefore the speakers are in favor of such roles. If the narrator had interested to raise the voice or was in favor female rights, he would present at least one female struggling outside family either studying or in possession of job. Instead, it has been in this way because of the intentional desire of the speaker to suppress the voices of female. In the word of Simone de Beavoir, it is intension to other woman as object by

thinking object speaker. Beautifully presentation of characters fitting them in their role is justification of male dominance in the name of male and female role. Therefore such treatment for female is sexist for Lois Tyson. For her male and female are biological but gender is highly political because the role that is defined as male or female is product of culture; not natural. But to justify it patriarchy has set norms and system.

Female characters in the story are satisfied with the role that given them. For her such happens in the society but it is not fault of woman who has internalized male culture. According to her women are weaker than men. Patriarchy takes this biological truth to justify women as inferior to men; and this inferiority is also strengthened to rationalize cultural role as masculine and feminine. Louis Tyson says, “[A] biological essentialism has supported male to set the norms” (52). When females are physically weaker than males, it is used to justify males’ superiority.

Similar prejudicial presentation can be found in the family of Ivan Ilyich. In beginning scene where Ivan is dead, narrator has exposed brief description of Ivan’s family, especially of son and daughter. This presentation also challenges the big system because it has exposed daughter as thing or object and son as male figure: heading towards good future; studying. The narrator says:

And he also saw the pretty daughter of Ivan Ilyich. She was dressed all in black, which made her slender waist seem slenderer than ever. She wore a gloomy, determined, and almost angry too. [...] He was a rich young man, an examining magistrate, who was said to be the young lady’s fiancé. [...] When Ivan Ilyich’s son, a gymnasium student, who greatly resembled his father, came down the staircase. (239)

These lines present contradictory identity of daughter and son. The son is engaged in gaining knowledge but the daughter is introduced with physical appearance. Such antithetical identity

is because of the gender politics. They are doing their business in similar way which convention taught them. Bias presentation of male and female highlights gender discrimination. Gender politics dissects and justifies roles between male and female. For feminism it is because of dominating tendency of patriarchy. In novel both son and daughter are product of same parent but each of their minds was fulfilled with patriarchal notion that is, a girl should marry a wealthy man and boy should find role of bread owner. The daughter of Ivan is fully satisfied because she has got a wealthy fiancé. She is unable think that she is also a human being and she should struggle to gain some knowledge. Instead she is taught in a way that marriage is ultimate goal of her life. Such nature of female is male projection because male culture has captured female in a way that they cannot think themselves, so happily internalize big culture. Virginia Woolf declares that sex is social construction. She says, “Mind does not know sex. But sex is the creation of men to empower themselves” (245). She thinks sex is constructed to gain power.

Fyodorovna is female protagonist in *The Death of Ivan Ilyich*. The narrator has presented her with antithetical images: a good wife with physical attraction and at the same time as bad woman disloyal to her husband who has violated the norms of sound family environment. Up to her first pregnancy, she was average good woman but after that the narrator twists her image. The new character she possesses leads their family to destruction. The speaker blames her showing “[t]he period up to his wife’s first pregnancy passed very well [...] but during the first months of her pregnancy, he was confronted by something new. [...] She began to spoil the pleasantness and the decorum of their living; for no reason at all she began to be jealous of him and demand that he pay her more” (246). These lines picture her dual image. She was a good, co-operative at beginning but she became completely changed after first pregnancy. When Ivan was assistant public prosecutor, his income was not sufficient enough to cope with family budget. They lose three children. Wife blamed all

for husband. Such condition pushed him to find new income so that he can resume his family decorum. Luckily he got a job two ranks above his colleagues. New job resumed family happiness because all were satisfied with income. But it did not last for long time because their relation gradually started to decline parallel with decline of his health. When Ivan was excellent wife was positive towards him but when he fell ill she again became jealous to him. Such presentation of Fyodorovna is because of the patriarchal literary trend which gives double existence to a female character. About juxtaposed image of female in literature M.H.Abraham says, "On the one side we find idealized projections of men's desires, on the other side, are demonic projections of men's sexual resentments and terrors" (95). These above lines also present Fyodorovna both negatively and positively.

Patriarchal assumption in the text expects a husband as husband till the death whether he is good or bad, sick or healthy. It was her responsibility to take care of Ivan when he was sick, but she was duty less. Therefore, she thinks, "He had made her life a misery. She began to pity herself. And the more she pitied herself, the more she hated her husband. She began to hope he would die, but she could not hope for such a thing because then there would be no income" (260). These lines lead to draw conclusion that she was not rigid to fulfill her responsibilities. As a wife she was to take care of husband quietly when he was disable, but she empathized herself in the problem she had got from his sickness. No woman could expect or wish of her husband's death but she had done it. Such expectation proves her as a selfish. So every body condemns her for her mean hateful wish and expectation. Here, she is presented totally in contradiction with above presentation. This is because of the patriarchal politics according to Sheila Ruth. She says, "The images of women in our culture are fraught with contradiction. [...] Women are presented as having dual natures, of being all that is desirable, fascinating, and wonderful, yet extremely destructive and dangerous" (Ruth 87). This type of duality could be found at Fyodorovna.

When Ivan was ill, his wife occasionally had helped him; but rest of time had been busy in her own way. How a patient dealt was not important matter for a responsible family member. About her negligence to husband the narrator says, “she had been up for a long time and it was just because some misunderstanding that she had not been in the sick man’s room when doctor arrived” (285). It shows her indifference which hints reader to sympathy Ivan and to curse to wife. As she was not serious about the health of husband she used to go to the theatre or anywhere leaving him alone. She was not haunted by the husband’s sufferings. It has undersized her image negatively. Feminism takes these all representations as means of delegating woman’s image and value. Male ideology wants to resign over female world by relegating woman as mean, corrupt character so that they can proudly keep them in the position of ruler. For Ruth good and bad images of female are male projection. She says, “Women’s images are male projection. [...] An image may be judged good at one time, bad another depending on its serviceability to the man making judgment” (90). She means that good or bad should be distinguished from one’s deed but patriarchy does it on the basis of benefit they get from women. So the judgment made about Fyodorovna is result of biasness.

These texts are misogynistic in representation of female characters negative images. The intentional projection of writer to explore woman as creature without responsibility can be seen in bias presentation of male and female character by narrator. For instance, Ivan family can be taken as example where male characters like Gerasim, son Vasily Ivanovich have been presented with positive traits; wife and daughter Liza have been presented with negative images. Protagonist Ivan also favors males and hates females because he is irritated by his wife as well he hates Liza which is clear in speaker saying. He puts it: “He looked at her just as he had looked at his wife and when she asked him how he felt he answered dryly that they would soon be rid of him” (296). It shows Ivan’s hatred to his wife and daughter. Instead, he favors his son. His positive attitude towards male can be justified from following

statement. The speaker says, “He opened his eyes and looked at his son. He was filled with pity for him” (300). Here, he extremely likes his son. Similarly, the narrator has presented Gerasim with man of mortality. He deserves humanly feelings so he is ready to help a sick person. He is innocent, so Ivan likens him. Such antithetical bias judgments are result of gender politics.

Subjugation of female is also in *The Kreutzer Sonata*. The protagonist Pozdnyshev, who is also second narrator of story, is a typical male chauvinist. He wants to suppress and rule female similar to the past. He regrets about the modern concept of marriage so he wishes for past. So, the speaker in novella *The Kreutzer Sonata* regrets about the modern concept of marriage and prays for past. The centre of novel is sexual love, infidelity, jealousy, chastity and marriage which are themes of modern marriage.

The protagonist does not have trust in marital institution. His distrust upon marriage can be clear from his remarks because he says, “Russian married only for sexual reasons and that marriage was a hell for most of them unless they like him, secured release by killing the other party to the marriage” (337). These lines reveal the motif of unhappy marriage. For him, when a husband could not lead wife like that of past when ancestors used to do; marriage becomes hell. It was common problem for that society but still the society had let free this tradition to be continued because women had sanctioned such thoughts by openly marrying men who had become libertines; the older by allowing their daughters to be married to men whose habits were known to be of a shameful nature.

The write has used train as a symbol to signify change in culture by the span of time; especially at marriage. He repents at the change. In the past, it was easy to control female but not at present. The protagonist of novella Vasyla Pozdnyshev is mouth piece character of writer, thus through his mouth writer mourns about the contemporary concept of marriage. Writer is overwhelmed by nostalgia of the past, when there was spiritual love between

spouses and no was victimized by each other's activities. But contemporary period was haunted by trustlessness and deception. Following exposition of the narrator says about journey. He says, "We had been traveling for almost two days. Passengers who were going short distance kept entering and leaving the carriage, but three, like myself, had been traveling since the train set out" (302). Here the writer brings 'train' as symbol of change. A train can run from one place to another. Likewise the culture has traveled from past to present; that is past: age of spirituality and present: age of trustlessness.

This story journeys from autobiographical aspect of writer where he himself was irritated by existing marital convention as well as his family environment because not only society of his era but also he himself was victimized by such trends. Thus he condemns the present and cries for past. Following lines shows nostalgia. The old man says, "Formerly no such distinctions were made. [...] You never used to hear her say, 'I up and leave you'. [...] 'Here' she says, take your shirt and breeches; I am going off with Vanya – his hair is curlier" (307). These lines expose modern woman. They are out of limit; hence the speaker contradicts them with women of past. His nostalgia for past is highly political and sexist. Because his spiritual love is under the definition of patriarchy, where a female behaves and survives under the norms and values of patriarchy.

Male and female roles were determined by existing tradition, which never count women's existence as equal of all human beings. And there they could rule exclusively. Then, women were fit with such system who had internalized patriarchy inborn Sheila Ruth says, "The seed planted in our infancy and constantly tended has so taken root, becomes so much a part of us, that to reject it has almost the force of rejecting ourselves"(85). Because of it, patriarchy had not got any resist or challenge everywhere. This type of monopoly had addicted male figure so that they had thought and wished for it forever. But in nineteenth century with the impact of growing feminist movement and awareness achieved by women

because of their involvement in education gradually started to consider biases and gender discrimination by male figure and male made convention, they started to oppose it, challenge it and revolt against it. Hence, the entire monopoly of male shattered and their suppression started to be resisted. In this point, patriarchal agent started to worry about the prevailing existence and cry for past that is cry for the ruined monopoly.

Divorce is one of the crucial issues of discussion in *The Kreutzer Sonata*. The story talks about growing rate of divorce; and it directly attributes female as the cause of this problem. The old man in the train journey blames women as cause of growing divorce. According to him this growth is because of the education that the women get. He says, “Its great deal of education they are getting these days, [...] Education brings a lot of foolishness with it” (306). Here, he discriminatingly dictates women’s education as motive of divorce; but he avoids the reality. He has of opinion that education brings foolishness and corrupts people. When women are corrupted, for him, and shattered from the norms, it causes divorce. Therefore, women should be controlled for the solution of this problem. He says, “Animals are beast; human being have the law to go by” (306). He contradicts women from animals. Animals don’t need law but female should follow the rule and regulation. It suggests that women should not get divorce rather should obey the law and tolerate male tyranny. Divorce is, according to feminist, really challenge for women who is living at patriarchy. Ruth says:

Passivity, economic and psychological dependence on one’s mate withdraws from confrontation with public life and the discouragement from developing resources outside of marriage that do not bode well for life outside marriage, that is, after marriage. To live life alone well and happy, requires a person strength, preparation and experience, none of which are encouraged in women in patriarchal marriage. (261)

From her point, it is clear that alone life after divorce is really hard to cope with for females. Therefore, divorce is not choice of female rather obligation. Though it drives them to the crisis in patriarchal tradition, they are ready to take risk of it because they tired of male suppression and domination.

The old man in the novella *The Kreutzer Sonata* suppressive the female. He wants to perpetuate male reign forever. For him, female should remain and should be kept under control of rules. His vision justifies his saying because he says, “No my good woman, that time will never be past. Eve was made out of rib of man, and she will remain to the end of time. [...] No body gives us right, but there is no increase in the house hold from what a man does while a woman’s creature to be handled with care” (307). Here, he does not feel that women are also human beings. Rather he dictates women to be remained under the claw of patriarchy. Such assumption can be justified from following remarks: “Don’t trust the horse in the pasture and wife in the home” (309). It means that female should be kept in doubt. These remarks not only mythify females’ existence but also justify origin myths. As well, it also justifies the stereotypes of women that they are deceptive. According to Simon de Beavoir, males create myth and that is institutionalized and accepted by the society. These myths are created to derogate and dominate women and rule over them.

Such images of women negatively present them because they are not trustworthy. Myth making intension of male is othering of female for Beauvoir. It transcends woman from human beings, different from man, to something object or natural things. She says,

We have seen women as flesh. The flesh of male is produced in the mother’s body and recreated in the embrace of the woman in love. Thus, woman is related to nature, [...]. In any case she appears as the privileged Other, through whom the subject fulfills himself. On the measure of man his counterbalance his salvation, his adventure, his happiness. (994)

According to her male assumes females as flesh of something other 'thing'. The old man thus, brings the origin myth of woman which superiorize man to woman. It is only because as Beauvoir says, "myths have been more advantages to the ruling caste than the myth of woman" (997). As myth is beneficial to man more than female, above reference are brought to suppress women.

Pozdnyshv takes marriage negatively. He says, "These days marriage is nothing but deception" (312). His deductive generalization of marriage based on his personal vision is directly related to the oppression of female. How it is as such is that he blames female as responsible for failure of marriage if it happens. Here, he neglects the mistake of male that is also equally responsible for failure. Hence, he claims, though a marriage is based on mutual affection, results in failure. He argues, "If we admit the possibility of a man's proffering a certain woman all his life, it is more than probable that the woman prefers someone else" (309). For him, if a man prefers woman all over his life, woman deceives him and marriage dissolves.

The text is product of male projection and tries to undermine and hinder female voices so that it happens to stand in patriarchal category. In the second part of novella the protagonist flashes back to his past. His past was full of disorder, that is, conflict between male and female: patriarchal domination and feministic challenge to patriarchy. The protagonist Pozdnyshv is the representative of patriarchal agent who has assumption that females are secondary for male. This part of text is full of biases. Feminism sees inequalities between the male and female characters; male domination over female and suppression of male culture over female characters.

Pozdnyshv freely exercises power over female from his early phase of life. Values, norms and framework of morality are determined by male convention and they are full of biasness, prejudicial and derogatory. This protagonist murders his wife in doubt of adultery

but if we observed him from his early childhood, he himself is violator of norms, values of morality. He remarks, "I lived like everyone else" (315). It exposes that he is no different from all male figures in living style.

Pozdnyshev has totally patrimonial frame of morality and discipline. Hence, he opines adulterous activities, which he performs, are rational. He puts,

I lived a life of profligacy and like all the people of our class I was sure that in living such a life I was doing the right thing? [...] And I not only looked up on this as highly moral' I was even proud of it. Depravity does not lie in the physical act; [...] true depravity lies in the shaking off of al moral responsibility in respect to the women with whom you enter in to physical relation. (315)

In these lines the protagonist claims that he is man of morality and responsible but for him, untimely adulterous relationship is not moral less; so not a violation of rule and morality for male of his time. Moreover, his claim shows all of male of his time use to flirt before marriage.

For him, moral responsibility is proper payment for sexual counterpart. Payment for sexual counterparts can be responsibility but never moral responsibility. The concept that he has about morality is typical. Therefore, his self defined morality is only because of monopoly of patriarchy. He does not feel guilty for his misbehaviors. About his illegal relation he says "I remember the pangs of conscience I once suffered because I had forgotten to pay a woman, who having fallen in love with me, gave her to me. I regained my equanimity only when I had sent her the money thereby releasing myself from all moral responsibility in respect to her" (315). In these lines he justifies his flirtious deeds as moral. For him, illegal relation is rational if he paid them. Here, he first exposes the biasness of male system, secondly, devalues woman from humanity to an object for sale. Here the speaker

does not concern about woman's intention. Whether she is doing it intentionally or was it her obligation, not confirmed. According to feminist like Kate Millet, it is not new and odd to define and justify male's moral less activities as rational. In her opinion, according to the principle of sexual politics, males impose their power over female. Thus, anything males do is proper and rational in the sense their morality and ethics. She says, "[T]he ethics and values, the philosophy and art of our culture-it's very civilization-as TS Eliot once observed, is of male manufacture" (526). Thus, above mentioned boundary of male morality is the result patriarchal culture. Such gender discriminations have been institutionalized and perpetuated by male oriented society.

Another issue of female suppression in this text is issue of brothel. It presents brothel in positive sense. For a man, to go brothel is legal and profligacy is legal and rational. The meditative narrator of *The Kreutzer Sonata* says, "Since it assumed that profligacy was good for the health, it had to create conditions insuring a nice, clean sort of profligacy. I have known mothers who sent to these matters for their sons. Science itself sends man to brothel" (318). For feminism, brothel is a means of exploitation of female. Women's self is neglected and their identity is commodified as if they are things of pleasure, where a male comes and satisfies himself. Females are compelled to bear such inhuman activities so that brothel is real hell for female. But this text presents brothel in a dignified way; that means it does not take women's freedom seriously, rather undermines, and humiliates women by rationalizing brothel going as good for health. Here, the woman is nothing more than an object; that is component of male pleasure. About othering of woman by male Beauvoir says, "He is the subject, he is absolute she is the Other" (141). According to her, when male think him absolute, he forgets the existence of female. Hence, they relegate female to an object. The speaker generalizes all women outside similar to the women of brothel. This generalization is abusive and relegation of woman which is avoiding of female autonomy. This devaluation of

female can be clarified from Podznyshev's remarks. He says, "You say the women of our class have other interests than the women in brothel but I say you are wrong and will prove that you are wrong" (323). For him, according to these lines, both types of women do have same interest; that is to attract men or fulfill their passion.

The text highlights the stereotypes of woman as ambitious and beauty lover. It concludes the sole aim of women is nothing other than beautify and keep them happy.

Podznyshev says-

If people have different aims in life, if their inner lives are different, the outer forms of their lives will be different too. But look[...]; the same toilettes, the same fashions, the same perfumes, the same bare arms, shoulders and passion for precious stone and expensive, glittering ornaments, the same amusements, dancing, music and singing. (324)

These lines suggest that women are inborn ambitious and beauty lover. But for feminists like Ruth and Tyson, such nature of female is their gender role, which is social construct. Tyson says, "Traditional gender roles cast woman as emotional, irrational, weak, nurturing and submissive" (85). For her, if the system teaches them in such way, it is not their weakness to behave in that way. Ruth says, "[E]vidence of feminine gender identity as wanting babies and having a great interest in clothes, cooking, make up, ornamentation, and the like. These are clearly not all the product of heredity or of anatomy" (34). Therefore, these lines are highly political and contradictory themselves. According to Mary Wollstonecraft, culture makes hierarchal difference between male and female. Both gender role and education system are construction of male governed society. The gender role divides the duties of male and female on the basis of physical strength. Then the same role given to women by the society becomes the base of creating women's stereotypes; as weak, fragile, emotional and so on. More, education system shapes women's psychology. Male glorifies women's beauty. Education

and patriarchal system give false notion of beauty and delicacy, teaches to beautify and be obedient to be sentimental but not to be intellectual. When female do in such a way, they can attract a rake and with him they can live happily. The speaker blames that the females outside brothel beautify them and want to become showy, naked. But according to Mary all is because of male ideology. When male ideology teaches them to practice in that way, their activity is not blameful. Rather, this credit goes for male who teaches them in that way. Pozdnyshv says, "To make a very strict distinction between them, we can only say that short term prostitutes are usually despised whereas long-term are esteemed" (324). Here he concludes that both women from inside and outside the brothel are prostitute.

Contradictory vision of spouse about marriage ruins married life. The protagonist of this novella regrets about his unhappy marriage because his patriarchal vision about marriage and family life differs from the vision of wife. He as a male tries to impose male chauvinism over female, but females of his period are conscious about their rights and freedom. On the hand he wishes for patriarchal monopoly, on the other wife does not behave according to his will. Therefore his marital life is full conflict, dishonesty and lack respect for each other.

Pozdnyshv presents his wife negatively. In his belief, his marital life was full of chaos and unhappy. As madam Pozdnyshv was cunning, quarrelous, more demanding and adulterous, he hated her from beginning of married life. It can be justified from his remark. He says, "My honeymoon embarrassing, shameful [...]. On the third perhaps the fourth day I found my wife depressed [...]" (331). Here, he regrets about his life marriage. His life, which was conflicting, was only because of his wife.

He has patriarchal concept about female education. He opposes the necessity of female education. Like old concept, his thinking is suppressive to the female. He thinks woman as only means of pleasure. He says:

We hear much talk about the modern education. Empty words. [...] The education of woman will always correspond with men's attitude towards them. The knights were first who professed to worship woman as something above them, [...] Today men profess to respect her. [...] [B]ut their attitude towards her remains the same. She is means of enjoyment. (343)

Here, the protagonist has presented his distrust about female education. For him, women are things from which male gets enjoy. This concept of the speaker is extremely political. As a male, he denies the equality between male and female. Instead, he wants to perpetuate male dominance over female forever. He has an opinion whether women are educated or not, they are inferior to man because men look upon them as a means of pleasure. According to Mary Wollstonecraft, women are either restricted from education, or taught as per the benefit of patriarchy. When women are said that beauty is sole medium of their happy life, they leave rest of the efforts to gain the knowledge. She says, "Everything that they see or hear seems to fix impression, call forth emotions, and associate ideas that give a sexual character to the mind" (395). Women internalize the system in the way they are taught. So, they are intellectually weaker and incomplete in comparison to male. When females are less intellect than males, it would be easy to control and suppress them for males.

His derogative attitude towards female education becomes clearer from his successive remark. He says, "They emancipate women in college and courts. [...] schools and college can do nothing about this" (344). He claims that women can't be emancipated in practice. So he discourages females for education. It is because of patriarchal domination where male does not accept woman too is similar to him. Thus, feminism tries to deconstruct this patriarchal assumption about female education. According to Mary Wollstonecraft, will of male to rule female restricts woman from education, so they can easily marginalize them as inferior. Males look upon females, that is subjugation of females and it can only be

challenged with the help of education because it makes females conscious about tyranny of male ideology and motivates them for continual struggle against it. Woman deprived of education can not estimate the value of education and they are compelled to internalize patriarchy. Pozdnyshov is also biased so he doesn't believe in woman's education. She opines that when women are othered from education, their intellectual capacity does not develop properly and they become puppets in the hand of male. After that male fills the mind of female with false notions that beauty is everything for them and guarantees their bright future. Women taught in this way start to beautify them neglecting other efforts of knowledge.

The protagonist takes marriage with a proper person as ultimate goal of females. He privileges it to the female education. He puts it:

Until such a time, the inspiration of every girl, no matter what her education, will be to attract as many men as she can so that she will have a chance to choose from among them. The fact she knows mathematics or can perform on the harp will change matters in the least. A woman is happy and achieved her highest aim when she has captivated a man. So her principal aim in life is to be able to captivate men. It has been so in the past, will be so in the future.

(344-45)

In these lines, the speaker undervalues women because he takes them in patriarchal sense, women, who are equal to men, can perform equally, but patriarchy gives them feminine role and limits them inside home. And male governed culture teaches marriage as their ultimate goal. Therefore, feminist Emma Goldman says, "From infancy, the average girl is told that marriage is her ultimate goal. [...] Like the mute beast fattened for slaughter, she is prepared for that" (503). In her opinion, women are prepared for marriage from their childhood. They learn nothing more than it. Therefore, their situation falls into beastlike. So she says, "If

however, woman's premium is a husband, she prays for it with her name, her privacy, herself respect, her very life until death doth part. Moreover, the marriage insurance condemns her to lifelong dependency, to parasitism, to complete uselessness, individual as well as social" (502). She means that though female rejects everything in marriage, what, in return, they get is only their dependency on husband. The narrator of above remark, therefore, wants to keep female under male's reign. So marriage is sole aim of female for him. The aim of woman should not be gaining knowledge.

Likely, his intension of perpetuating male supremacy over female can be justified from his opinion about children. His concept about children is patriarchal. About children he says, "How awe-inspiring is the women's act of bearing the fruit of her womb and nursing the child [...] Who are to prolong the human race? And what is it that breaks in upon this sacred act? [...] Talk of emancipation, of rights of women" (341). In this abstract, he praises female's act of child bearing. But he thinks that talk of emancipation and rights of women obstacle this sacred act. Here, he wants to perpetuate male suppression for female so he resists women's right and emancipation and appreciates women's act of child bearing, which is the hindrance of women's autonomy.

According to feminism, women are limited and imprisoned at home with arrival of children. So child is harmful for the liberty and creativity of women. Nancy McGlen and Karen O'Connor say, "When women had little or no control over reproduction, [...], women were made even more dependent of men for their livelihood and that of their children. And, a woman's options to living in the patriarchal family was further limited with the arrival of children" (267). According to these feminists, child bearing and nursing are additional means of limiting women within the house. This limitation helps to increase women's dependency over their husband. They would deprive of from their access to the outer world. When women's rights and emancipation movement tries to dismantle obstacle of female like

childbearing, patriarchy gets challenge. So the protagonist has anxiety about emancipation and female education. Patriarchy takes child bearing as weapon to limit female. Tyson says, “Patriarchy tells them that they are unfulfilled women if they don’t have children, and there is great deal of pressure brought to bear upon women in order to recruit them for motherhood” (Tyson 97). In her view, patriarchy pressures female to bear children. It is only because of the male intension to oppress female. Above narrator alludes child bearing as sacred act; therefore, his intension is clear that he wants to suppress female. He privileges child breeding as primary act to women’s freedom and right.

His concept about the children, that is subjugative to female, can be further justified from his next remark. He wants to trap and stun intellectual growth and freedom of his wife by the means of keeping her busy at child bearing and nursing them. But, when the doctor suggested her to refrain it for the betterment of her fragile health, he rebuked and cursed doctor in this way. He says, “She was not well, and those rascals declared she must not have children. [...] I found it very repulsive. I did everything I could prevent it but insisted of it with frivolous obstinacy and I gave in” (356). According to these lines, he had intension to continue child bearing. But doctors suggested in contrary to his opinion. So he condemns those doctors. It directly justifies his concept of children.

Both novellas superiorize male characters excluding their faults and weakness. Hence, they attribute all bad consequences of novellas to female characters. This happens only because suppressive mentality of male writer to the females. These novellas portray the nineteenth century Russian society, in which time patriarchal society was gradually getting challenge from female right movement. Therefore, these both novellas develop story of such society, but there is not any clearcut feminist voice against patriarchy. The writer has practiced to suppress the female voices. But, on the basis of the narrators’ presentation of characters and developed issues in the story, we can guess that patriarchal male protagonists

regret about their failure of ruling females as per their choice. Both novellas, let free to guess that there were nascent form of conflict between male and female, that is, between feminism and patriarchy in general. But, the writer tactic fully privilege patriarchy.

In the ending of the first novella, *The Death of the Ivan Ilyich* is political. The narrator intentionally kills the protagonist Ivan, and taints the image of Fyodorovna negatively.

Eternal practices were made by doctors to cure the undiagnosed disease of Ivan; but failed in sacred act. On the other hand, his wife was completely indifference about his problem.

This eases us to guess that it was she whose negligence was his unsolved suffering.

Presenting her as a guilty person, the text under presents her.

This assumption becomes wrong when the narrator twisted the flow of story, where the dying Ivan asked excuse and showed confident to revive. He says, "I am torturing them.

[...] There was no fear because there was no death, there was light instead of death" (300

-1). Here, he seemed to excuse his wife. Also, we guess that hi is not dying. These his

remarks avoid deteriorated image of wife. But the narrator again twisted the plot. He first

made pronunciation 'forget' instead of 'forgive' when Ivan wanted to speak. He gave no

courage to correct it. Second, he killed him instead of readers' expectation that he would

alive. It imprinted taint of deception and indifference in Fyodorovna forever.

The second novella, *The Kreutzer Sonata* is highly suppressive to the female

characters because protagonist Pozdnyshev killed wife Madame Pozdnyshev in doubt of

adultery and infidelity. He was a male chauvinist who had wanted to limit his wife under his

territory, but, at last, he become unable to do it. Then, he murdered her.

There was not any crystal proof that his wife was infidel to him. She was fond of music. But, he suspected her because, according to him, music field was origin of adultery.

He says, "And yet everyone knows that is it precisely these, especially music, that give rise to

adultery among people of our set" (371). Because of this supposition, he became jealous. His

tension about the loss of control over can be justified from another view. He says, “There was no rein on her at all, as there is no rein on ninety-nine percent of our women” (358). Thus, a male with a patriarchal mentality was worried about the loss of male superiority. She was not a hen sure woman, so he was unable to subjugate her derogatively. There was incessant quarrel between spouses. After failing to impose his monopoly, he was irritated. It raised distrust about marriage in him. So he says, “Marriage is nothing but deception. It results in unspeakable torture and that drives people to drink, to commit suicide, to kill and poison themselves and each other” (312-3). From lines, it is clear that when he had failed to capture and control wife, marriage had been deception for him.

He murdered wife in doubt of profligacy. Murder is oppression of female His dominating tendency was failed to suppress his wife practically. Then, he used physical means of oppression that is, murder. The protagonist says, “I killed her on the 5th of October with a knife” (339). These lines talk about her murder. Her untimely demise is result of male violence. According to Kate Millet, females are pathetic in male violence because they are culturally and physically weaker than males. She says, “Force itself is restricted to the male who alone is psychologically and technically equipped to perpetuate physical violence. [...] [B]efore assault, she is almost universally defenseless both by her physical and emotional training” (530). For her, females are inborn weaker than males. If the narrator had not suppressive to female, he would think another way out for the solution of problem.

Suppression of female is also justified and supported by patriarchal convention in the novella. It is only because patriarchal ruling system excuses murderer deciding him innocent. Pozdnyshov was criminal; therefore, he was to be punished by government to maintain the law and order. Yet, he was acquitted. He says, “At the trial it was decided that I was wronged husband who had killed my wife in defense of my honor. (That is the name they gave to it). And so I was acquitted” (361). This abstract shows acquisition that is given to a criminal and

punishment, to a innocent woman. It is only because of gender politics because sexist law was made by male who knew only male sentiment but not of females. The murderer himself was adulterous but killed wife in doubt of infidelity. He had antithetical assumption about the morality. Elizabeth Candy Stanton says, “Men had created a different code of morality for men and women” (71). According to her, male, as creator of morality, created bias norms. About adultery Kate Millet says, “[N]eedless to say, there was and is no penalty imposed upon the male correspondent. Same in recent times or exceptional cases adultery was not generally recognized in males” (550). From these feminists, we can conclude that males, who were creator of law, created bias law that acquitted adulterous male but did not gave justice to an innocent female.

Further, strategical model of *The Death of Ivan Ilyich* and *The Kreutzer Sonata* is oppressive to the female characters. The literary tradition that the writer has applied and followed in these novellas is highly conventional masculine, which has marginalized female characters in the novellas. The writer has used male names to the title of each novella. As long as point of view is concerned, he has used “third person point of view” in first novella, and the “first person meditative”, that is dramatic monologue, in second. These are male centered because narrators are male in both. Both develop the story of male protagonists. As males are pivot of the stories, females are brought around the male figures so they are supplementary to the story of male protagonists. Narrators have depicted females as marginal, docile and subservient to males’ interest and emotional needs and fears. Thus, these novellas have pervaded the concept of literature, which is traditionally considered great. Abraham says, “Typically, the most highly regarded literary works focus on male protagonist- Oedipus, Ulysses, Hamlet, [...] who embody masculine traits and ways of feeling and pursue masculine interests in masculine fields of action” (94). Tolstoy adds Ivan and Pozdnyshev in this tradition of protagonists and sustains it.

The use of language in these texts is also masculine because there are several masculine words which have been used to signify both sexes male and female. The writer has used several masculine words like 'he', 'him', 'his', 'man', 'mankind' and so on to represent both male and female sex. For instance, we can take an example from *The Kreutzer Sonata*, where the speaker says that: "And how do you propose that a person is to live with one he does not love?" (307). In this line, the word 'he' has been used to represent both man and woman. Such kind of masculine words blend female with male and seize the freedom and autonomy of females. This is subordination of females through the means of language. Therefore, about language use, Tyson says:

[W]e should not use the masculine pronoun he to represent both sexes men and women. [...] [R]eflects and perpetuates a habit of seeing a way of looking at life, that uses male experience as the standard by which the experience of both sexes is evaluated. Inclusive he claims to represent both men and women, in reality it is part of a deeply, rooted cultural attitude that ignores women's experience and blinds us to women's point of view. (84)

For her this type presentation is result of patriarchal literary convention. It under estimates female and imposes male convention over females. According to her, the use of such language is male projection to dominate women and perpetuate their domination. Therefore, she appeals to reject such language, which blinds woman's point of view.

To sum up, these novellas *The Death of the Ivan Ilyich* and *The Kreutzer Sonata* are misogynistic pieces of literature because they intentionally inferiorize female characters in terms of their representation and the message conveyed about them. in female characters' representation. Therefore, they are patriarchal literatures which are usually unconscious of the sexist ideology they promote, or perhaps more precisely, they see nothing with their own sexism. Here, the ways in which female characters function are tokens of male status. They

are only brought to complete the story of male. Feminist reading also note the internalization of patriarchy in female characters. They are quiet about the male suppression and discrimination. They silently play the female role as per the directions of patriarchy.

IV. Summarization of Women's Oppression in Tolstoy's Novellas

This feministic study of *The Death of Ivan Ilyich* and *The Kreutzer Sonata* by Leo Tolstoy has explored the issue of oppression on women. The writer has relegated female characters in relegated inferior form and position in comparison to the male characters. They are in lower hierarchy in each and every field than males. Such presentation of females is thoughtful projection of novelist who has highlighted patriarchal system and has suppressed female voices.

The writer has given traditional role to Fyodorovna and Madame Pozdnyshev. They are house wives. Text does not give any clear information about their education. Therefore, we can guess that they are either illiterate or if they are literate they do not have sufficient education. It means that they do not have sufficient education so that they are neither in high position in the society nor possess any job. Rather they are limited within the territory of husband and household.

Similarly, both female protagonists are attributed to the final tragic ending of story. In the first story, the husband dies of undiagnosed disease, whereas Pozdnyshev kills his wife in the second. Tragedy of first story, according to the text, is because of wife. There was misunderstanding between all over the life. She was greedy, ambitious and nagging which brought clash at the beginning of marital life. When the husband falls down and becomes ill, the wife becomes totally indifference toward him. Her habits, negligence and his illness collectively haunt him and he dies. Next story also attributes the tragedy of Pozdnyshev's family to his wife. He kills her because, according to the text, she is infidel to her husband. Her adulterous behavior is sole cause of her murder. In this way, both novellas have pictured female characters negatively. This distortion of the image of female is biased presentation. The narrators have relegated the value of females by presenting them with negative attitude. Therefore such presentation of females is suppression of them.

In the texts, discrimination between female and male is not limited in female protagonists, but it furthers up to almost all female characters. They are also either suppressed by the writer's bias presentation or by male characters within the text. Some females are brought in the text without any proper name or identity. The narrator has time and again mentioned the son and daughter of Ivan with antithetical identity. He presents son of Ivan Ilyich as a student, and his daughter with her fiancé and physical appearance in *The Death of Ivan Ilyich*. Similarly, Ivan himself has contradictory concept about the son and the daughter because he hates daughter and fascinates son at the hazardous period of his life. There is no woman who has challenged the imposed patriarchy except one woman in *The Kreutzer Sonata*. But the writer does not give her any name, and refutes her through the mouth of an old man.

There is no woman who has possessed any job or is in high status. In the first novella, the narrator taints the image of Fyodorovna with nagging ambitious, dutiless woman. In the second novella, the protagonist murders wife in doubt of adultery. But the writer does not punish Pozdnyshev, who himself was adulterous in his past life. Her murder is extremely tyrannical example of female's oppression, because it shows how the autonomy of female is in the hand of male. There is no any freedom for female. They can't live in their will but they are captivated by the hand of patriarchy. The ruling system was also patriarchal because it acquitted the murderer instead of legal punishment. It proves that women are really puppets for patriarchy and its convention.

The concept of Pozdnyshev about the child bearing and rearing is also repressive to the females. He wants to make his wife to bear more children. He himself declares that the children are burden and torture. Again, contradictorily he wishes to have more children because he does not trust his wife. So he takes children as rein to control wife. For him, when female breeds and rears more children, she keeps her busy and physically becomes weak.

Instead, if she is free, she becomes healthy and could be adulterous. He has an opinion to control wife at any cost, and anyhow. Such thinking is oppressive to females. It proves that he wants to subordinate female as an animal.

The idea that is conveyed in *The Kreutzer Sonata* about the female education is also oppressive. No doubt, education helps to uplift and broaden the boundary of knowledge and intelligence. But an old man in *The Kreutzer Sonata* takes women's education negatively. For him education is the cause of increase in divorce. Obviously, education enables females to protest the unequal marriage and challenges patriarchal man, who wants to suppress women. But the old man in the text is not ready to give equality to the female. He opines that man should control woman. Thus, until the patriarchy does not become ready to give freedom to the women, it takes women's education always negatively.

Works Cited

- Abrahams, M.H. *A Glossary of Literary Terms*. 8th ed. Boston: Thomson, 2005.
- Brand, Gerhand. "Leo Tolstoy: Critical Survey of Short Fiction." Bakersfield: Salem, 2001.
- Beauvoir, Simone de. *The Second Sex*. Trans. and ed. H. M. Parsley. New York: Vintage, 1974.
- - -. "Woman as Other." *Issues in Feminism: A First Course in Women's Studies*. Ed. Sheila Ruth. Boston: Houghton, 1980. 139-49.
- Carter, Steven. "Tolstoy's The Death of Ivan Ilyich." *Explicator* 62.1 (2003): 15-16.
- Cixous, Helene. "The Laugh of the Medusa." Trans. Keith Cohen and Paul. *Sign* 1(Summer 1976).
- Delger, Carl N. *At Odds: Women and the Family in America from the Revolution to the Present*. New York: Oxford, 1976.
- Demos, John. "Husbands and Wife." *Our American Sisters: Women in American Life and Thought*. Eds. Jean E. Friedman and William G. Shade. Boston: Allyn, 1973. 32-33.
- Doren, Charles Van. *A History of Knowledge: Past, Present and Future*. New York: Ballantine, 1991.
- Farrell, Warren. "The Masculine Value System: Men Defining Reality." *Issues in Feminism: A First Course in Women's Studies*. Ed. Sheila Ruth. Boston: Houghton, 1980. 56-62.
- Firestone, Shulamith. *The Dialectic of Sex*. New York: Bantam, 1971.
- Gilbert, Sandra M. "Life Studies, or, Speech After Long Silence: Feminist Critics Today." *College English* 40 (April 1970):850
- Gilbert, Sandra M. and Susan Gubar. *The Mad Woman in the Attic: The Woman Writer and the Nineteenth Century Literary Imagination*. New Heaven: Vale, 1979.
- Goldman, Emma. "Marriage and Love." *Issues in Feminism: A First Course in Women's Studies*. Ed. Sheila Ruth. Boston: Houghton, 1980. 501-5.

- Harper, Ida Husted. *The Life and Work of Susan B. Anthony*. Vol. I. Kansas: Bowen, 1899.
- Hays, H. R. "I am Unclean..." *Issues in Feminism: A First Course in Women's Studies*. Ed. Sheila Ruth. Boston: Houghton, 1980. 101-7.
- Heilbrun, Carolyn G. "Bringing the Spirit Back to English Studies." *The New Feminist Criticism: Essays on Women, Literature and Theory*. Ed. Elaine Showalter. New York: Pantheon, 1985. 21-28.
- Herman, David. *Striken by Infection: Art and Adultery in Anna Karenina and Kreutzer Sonata*. *Slavic* 56. 1(Spring 1997): 15-36.
- Hirschberg, W.R. Rev. of Tolstoy's *The Death of Ivan Ilyich*. *Explicator* 28 (Nov. 1969): 26.
- Kanowitz, Leo. *Women and the Law: The Unfinished Revolution*. Albuquerque: U. of N. Mexico, 1969.
- Kristeva, Julia. *Desire in Language: A Semiotic Approach to Literature and Art*. Trans. Leon S. Roudiez et al. New York: Columbia, 1982.
- Lapking, Lawrence. "Aristotle's Sister: A Poetics of Abandonment." *Critical Inquiry* 10 (Sep. 1983): 79.
- Lohani, Shridhar P et al, eds. and comps. *Ancient Tales*. Katmandu: Educational, 1996.
- Mc Glen, Nancy E and Karen O'Connor. *Women's Rights: The Struggle for Equality in the Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries*. New York: Praeger, 1983.
- Millet, Kate. "The Theory of Sexual Politics." *Issues in Feminism: A First Course in Women's Studies*. Ed. Sheila Ruth. Boston: Houghton, 1980. 524-32.
- Pandey, Beerendra. *Movements in Cognitive Methodologies: New Boundary of English Literary Studies*. Katmandu: Sunlight, 2007. 89-91.
- Price, Jenet, and Margarit Shildrick. "Mapping the Colonial Body." *Gender and Colonialism*. Eds. T. Foley et al. Galway: Galway up, 1995. 388-98.

- Rousseau, Jean Jacques. "Sophy" or "Woman." *Issues in Feminism: A First Course in Women's Studies*. Ed. Sheila Ruth. Boston: Houghton, 1980. 115-124.
- Ruth, Sheila, ed. *Issues in Feminism: A First Course in Women's Studies*. Boston: Houghton, 1980.
- Sanger, Margaret. "Woman and the New Race." *Issues in Feminism: A First Course in Women's Studies*. Ed. Sheila Ruth. Boston: Houghton, 1980. 506-10.
- Shepherd, David. *Conversion, Reversion and Subversion in Tolstoy's The Death of Ivan Ilyich*. *Mhrass* 71.3 (Jul. 1993): 401-416.
- Showalter, Elaine. *A Literature of Their Own: British Women Novelists from Bronte to Lessing*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton, 1977.
- , ed and comp. *The New Feminist Criticism: Essays on Women, Literature and Theory*. New York: Pantheon, 1980.
- . "Towards a Feminist Poetics." *Critical Theory Since Plato*. Ed. Hazard Adams. Philadelphia: Harcourt, 1992. 1223-1224.
- Spack, Patricia Meyer. *The Female Imagination*. New York: Alfred 1975.
- Stanton, Elizabeth Candy, and et al eds. *History of Women Suffarage*. vol.1. Rochester: Charles, 1887. 70-71.
- Syfer, Judy. "I Want a Wife." *Motives of Writing*. Eds. Robert Keith Miller and Suzanne Webb. California: Mayfield, 1992. 165-68.
- Tolan, Fiona. "Feminisms." *Literary Theory and Criticism*. Ed. Patricia Waugh. New York: Oxford, 2006. 319-339.
- Tolstoi, Lev Nikolayevich. *Short Stories*. Trans. by Margaret Wettlin. Mosko: Foreign Language, 1934.
- Tyson, Lois. "Feminist Criticism." *Critical Theory Today: User-Friendly Guide*. New York: Rou Hedge, 2006. 83-131.

Wehmeier, Sally, ed. *Oxford Advance Learner's Dictionary of Current English*. 6th ed. New York: Oxford, 2007.

Williams, Michael V. "Tolstoy's *The Death of Ivan Ilyich*: After fall." *Studies in Short Fiction* 21(1984): 229-34.

Wollstonecraft, Mary. "A Vindication of the Rights of Women." *Critical Theory Since Plato*. Ed. Hazard Adams. Philadelphia: Harcourt, 1992. 394-399.

Woolf, Virginia. "A Room of One's Own." *Issues in Feminism: A Complete Course in Women's Studies*. Ed. Sheila Ruth. Boston: Houghton, 1980. 176-180.