

Chapter I

Introduction

The present research work attempts to analyze how the protagonist's sexual obsession, childhood deprivation, fear of castration, repressed desire cause his metamorphosis from a man into a giant female breast, and how his acceptance of new identity fragments his "self". The term "metamorphosis" means a process in which somebody or something changes completely into something different. In this sense, it is synonymous to the word transformation, alteration, change, transmogrification, transvestitism, or transgressive body; all of which signify the process of metamorphosis. So, body metamorphosis suggests transgression of the subjectivity. Regarding the notion of subjectivity, metamorphosis raises some anticipation like once after the event of metamorphosis, that leads its previous bodily traits remain human or not. The meaning of transformation begins from the very beginning of the physical transformation of the protagonist, and hence the transgression of the physical body leads to the conceptual meaning of transformation. Roth-a' la Kafka-portrays the metamorphosis in his protagonist interestingly no longer losing human traits in them. In this way, the novella *The Breast* makes no attempt to disguise its indebtedness to Kafka's *The Metamorphosis*. A Professor of Comparative Literature David Kepesh, familiar by trade with Gregor Samsa's transformation into a gigantic insect, concludes that he has with his own transformation "out- Kafkaed Kafka". And one of the strength of *The Breast* is the way in which Roth makes an absolutely implausible premise plausible. In this regard, Roth, like Kafka follows the process of metamorphosis reducing Kepesh's body into a giant female breast. So, this metamorphosis process also challenges the dominant social narrative about gender and subjectivity. Roth portrays metamorphosis in Kepesh at the very beginning of the

story as the latter "I have returned to the earliest hours of my human existence [...] when the breast is me and I am the breast, when all is oneself and oneself is all, when the concave is the convex and the convex the concave"(63-64).

This suggests that present researcher's attempt is not simply to demonstrate metamorphosed situation, but it is ultimately to present the causes and consequences of metamorphosis. The meaning of the body does not change in the way physicality is changed. It is consciousness and superiority of cognitive capacity and linguistic utterances in the protagonist through which we experience the narrative events and we know that they are human beings, no matter that their sensory perceptions suggest otherwise.

His metamorphosis surfaces out of his sexual obsession with Claire's breasts, his sexual repression, childhood deprivation and fear of castration as he could not maintain the balance between his intellectuality and instinctual lust. The protagonist David Alan Kepesh being a Professor of Jewish Comparative Literature tries to get love through lust and engages in extra-marital affairs. Doing so, Kepesh, through the novella *The Breast*, fights with himself as some part of him wishes to give bodily desires while other part of him wants to be rational. As a result, he gets entrapped into his libidinal desires. Kepesh, in the novella *The Breast*, is deprived sexually by his erstwhile lover Claire due to her unreadiness to perform certain sexual acts. She disappoints him by being sexually unadventurous during their "normal" life, that is, life before his metamorphosis. This sexual deprivation, to some extent, hints at Kepesh's childhood deprivation. Although Kepesh's mother is virtually absent from the text, Roth repeatedly refers to the maternal as it is displaced on to Kepesh's lover, Claire Ovington. Hence, Claire symbolically is associated with his mother in various ways. Due to both sexual and maternal deprivation of Kepesh, his mind is filled with

those desires and he can not think of anything else. But having the fear of castration and losing his Professorship, he can not satisfy his desire, and represses all his libidinal desires. As he represses his desires, they get exploded. Thus, he gets transformed into a giant female breast.

In this sense, Kepesh's metamorphosis is manifestation and fulfillment of his suppressed desire. However his identity after his metamorphosis into a female breast has become fragmented, he continues to maintain his identity as he can speak and hear through his nipple. He still can gratify his sexual desires through his nipple. In this way, his consciousness surprisingly remains constant. Nevertheless, Kepesh's metamorphosis into a huge mammary gland subverts his former identity –“a professor of literature, a lover, a son, a friend, a neighbor, a customer, a client and a citizen” and reconstructs another feminine identity that is a female breast (19).

Philip Roth's *The Breast* has elicited much criticism from different quarters, like gender, cultural and postmodern critics since its publication in 1972. Some critics have termed the novella as Roth's major aesthetic disaster, as David Kepesh, the protagonist wants never to pay any price for sexual indulgences and ego-centric behavior. He insists that desire continues; that sex can be an affirmation of life against the inevitability of decay and sex. In this respect, Harold Bloom says, "Against the error of *The Breast* it can be set in the funniest pages of *The Professor of Desire*, where the great dream concerning “Kafka's whore” is clearly the imaginative prelude to *The Prague Orgy*” (17). Irving Howe's criticism of *The Breast* also runs in the same line of Bloom. He, however, finds that *The Breast* “well enough written and reasonably ingenious, it is finally boring –tame, neither shocking nor outrageous and tasteless in both senses of the word” (qtd in Mikkonen, 13).

For many, *The Breast* is flawed as a literary work, a text that proves how

immature and whimsical a writer Roth was in the early 1970s. They assumed that the text was merely comical and, therefore, of low value. In this regard, Harold Pinsker claims that *The Breast* can only be described as "masochistic" (12). In the same vein, Louis Harp states that "Roth's obsession with sex and his satirical proclivities are fused in *The Breast*, which, despite its brevity, proves attenuates"(qtd in Mikkonen, 143). Kai Mikkonen, in his *The Metamorphosed Parodical Body in Roth's The Breast*, reads the novella through the Schlemiel tradition and the biblical character Zimiri. While doing so, he goes through ethnic element and sees the fiasco of the practice of multiculturalism at the heart of text. Underscoring on this essence, Mikkonen writes:

Kepesh's transformation into the breast may be read as metaphor for a doubly constricting anxiety of sexuality inscribed by ethnic identity. Kepesh's change accompanied though it is with new physical pleasure and possibilities in his relationship with his wife, suggests, by means of humor, the impossibility of truly satisfying relation between two cultures. (39)

Though Mikkonen raises the issue of Kepesh's metamorphosis, he comes to term it in different way. He, to some extent, deals with the issue of identity but he never clarifies the causes of Kepesh's metamorphosis. He also does not provide satisfactory answer to the question, why the protagonist gets changed into a huge female breast nor does he analyze the effect of the change in the identity of the protagonist.

Underscoring on the same issue another critic Debra Shostak reads in relation to the transvestism through the optic of gender theory:

David Kepesh's transformation is the cross dresser's nightmare where the transvestite retain the possibility of choosing when and how to represent or become the "Other", Kepesh in explicably and

uncontrollably dons the "garb" of the Other to find that it becomes his only representation of selves to the world, and that representation is effectively inextricable from the "real". Clothes –the outward show- maketh the man; we thereby construct ourselves through the mediation of other's apprehension of us. Kepesh's "inner" disjunction from this "outer" self is key, since he feels compelled to reject the mediated construction of his gendering. (328)

Likewise, Peter Brooks, hinting on the sexual ambiguity, writes "*The Breast*, like the theme of hermaphroditism in Mary Shelley's *Frankenstein*, creates a situation of sexual ambiguity that questions socially defined gender roles and thus transgresses the law of castration that defines sexual differences"(219).

From the above literature review it is deciphered that text has been analyzed through various perspectives. None of the critics, however, seem to be concerned with the effect of protagonist's metamorphosis into his self or identity. This shows that there exists a strong need to carry out research on this novella from new perspective. Therefore, the present research has been carried out in the light of Freudian and Lacanian psychoanalysis.

For this, the research has been divided into four chapters. The first chapter presents brief introduction of the thesis encompassing statement of problem, hypothesis and significance of the title. The very title "metamorphosis of the protagonist" suggests his transformation into a female breast. The second chapter deals with theoretical modality, that is, psychoanalysis including Freudian and Lacanian theoretical debates. The Freudian psychoanalysis includes sexual obsession, repressed desires, childhood deprivation and fear of castration, and Lacanian psychoanalysis deals with fragmentary nature of the "self". The third chapter will be

the application of theoretical modality for analyzing the text on the basis of protagonist's metamorphosis, and finally, the last chapter will conclude the whole dissertation, that is, Kepesh's metamorphosis into a massive female breast which comes into surfaces due to his sexual obsession with the breasts of Claire, his repressed desires, childhood deprivation and fear of castration, and that results in his fragmented "self".

CHAPTER 2

Psychoanalysis: Theoretical Modalities

The term "psychoanalysis" is coined, for the first time, by Sigmund Freud (1856-1939) in 1896 and used it to designate his theory of mind as well as a certain method of investigation, and again a certain therapeutic method. The primary aim was to deal with neuroses and psychoses. Freud held that these are caused by the repressed painful experiences, and by bringing them to awareness, relief or cure can be achieved. The method by which they are brought out consists of conversation sessions between analyst and patient in which the patient's resistance is gradually overcome.

The painful memories that have been repressed, according to Freud, are always the same or at least of the same kind, that is, childhood sex related traumas. Freud held that the mind has tripartite structure. The "id" consists of instinct and drives that are governed by the pleasure principle. It sets the young child on a collision course with reality and ego governed by the reality principle, comes into being controlling the id. The super ego exercises a censoring function. Its origin is in the internalization of parental prohibition. It is often unconscious but comes to expression in feelings of guilt and shame.

Later, Carl G. Jung, disagreeing with his master Sigmund Freud, propounded his theory of archetypes based on his own theory of collective unconscious. Jung's emphasis is not on the individual unconscious, but on what he calls the "collective unconscious" shared by all individuals in all cultures which he regards as the repository of "racial memories" - and of primordial images and patterns of experience that he calls archetypes. He does not, like Freud, view literature as disguised form of libidinal wish fulfillment that to a large extent parallels the fantasies of a neurotic

personality. Instead, Jung regards great literature as the myths whose patterns recur in diverse culture, an expression of the archetypes of the collective unconscious.

Since the development of structural and post structural theories, there has been a strong revival of Freud. Close attention to Freud's writing and frequently the assimilation of some version of Freud's ideas to their own views and procedures are features of the criticism of many current writers, whether they are Marxist, Foucauldian or Derridian in post-structuralist theoretical commitment or primary focus.

In recent years, Jacques Lacan, "the French Freud" reinterprets Freud in the light of structuralist and theories, turning psychoanalysis from an essentially humanist philosophy or theory of mind into post structuralist one. His concept of psychoanalysis aims to understand the unconscious of human mind in terms of language which he derives from the growth of infant to adulthood. He divides human growth into three phases: the mirror, the imaginary, and the symbolic (real). These are the phases in the constitution of the psychic subject. Lacan's notion of the inalienable split or 'difference', that inhabits the "self", and of the endless chain of displacement in the quest for meaning, has made him a prominent reference in post structural theories and his distinction between the pre- oedipal, maternal stage of the prelinguistic imaginary and the 'phallogocentric' stage of the symbolic language has been exploited at length by a number of French feminists.

In this way, though Freud first developed psychoanalysis as a form of psychology which is a means of therapy for neuroses, later it expanded to account for many developments in the history of civilization and practices including warfare mythology and religious as well as literature and other arts. Despite the wide spectrum

of criticisms in psychoanalysis, the present research work will be limited to Freud and Lacan.

Freudian Psychoanalysis

Freud, the most systematic exponent of psychoanalysis, divides mind into three levels: the conscious, preconscious and the unconscious (Contemporary Schools: 170). These divisions are convenient abstractions rather than the specific anatomical areas. Mental events and memories that the person is aware of at the moment constitute the conscious mind. The preconscious is the storehouse of surface memories and desires those are not conscious at the moment but are readily recallable. The unconscious is the repository of buried thoughts, emotions and impulses that are not readily accessible to voluntary control. (Abnormal Psychology: 184). The content of the conscious and preconscious mind are internally consistent, temporally arranged and adaptable to external events. But the unconscious is timeless, chaotic, infantile and primitive. It is the underworld of the personality that is concerned with reality or the rights and rules of society (Abnormal Psychology: 184). Therefore, he lays emphasis on unconscious mind.

In 1927, Freud introduced another important aspect, that is, the structure of human personality into psychoanalytic theory. He makes three divisions of personality: id, ego and the super ego (Psychodynamics 4). Though he often spoke of them as if they were actual parts of personality, he introduced and regarded them simply as the model of how the mind works. In other words, the id, the ego and the super ego do not refer to actual portions of the brain. Instead, they explain how the mind functions and how the instinctual energies are regulated.

The 'id' is a container of unconscious wishes and desires. In Freud's words, the id stands for "untamed passions" and is "a cauldron of seething excitement"

(Psychodynamics'). It is directly related to the instinctual drives which are considered to be of two types: destructive (thantos) and constructive (eros). Destructive drives tend towards aggression dissolution, and eventually death. But the constructive drives which primarily are of the sensual nature constitute the Libido or basic energy of life. Id is completely lawless, asocial, amoral, irrational and selfish part of human psyche, and is concerned only with the immediate gratification of instinctual needs without any reference to reality and, moral consideration. Id manifests through dreams, jumbles of thought and intoxication .It has no concern with logic, time sequence, morality and social man. It is governed by pleasure principle. It is the depository of the innate instinctual drives. If unbridled, the Id would always seek immediate gratification of primitive, irrational and pleasure seeking impulses. It is seen at an early stage of development but it becomes dominant in adult personality structure of normal people. Thus, Id is the underground store room of buried thoughts, feelings, desires, experiences that are repressed and prohibited to come on the surface of adult moral personality (Critical Approach: 136).

The ego, another aspect of human personality, is the "I" that thinks, feels, decides and wills. It may also be defined as that part of the Id that has been converted to the reality principle by its proximity to the outer world. As the administrative officer of the personality, it is mainly conscious, partly unconscious, and in contact with the Id and the superego (Abnormal Psychology 185).

The superego is the most developed Id. When a child becomes able to learn something, he comes in contact with rules, regulations, morality, standards, values and codes of the society; this develops another aspect of personality called superego. It is also known as conscience or the moral principle. It is partly conscious but mainly

unconscious and consists of inherited moral inclinations that have been intensified and modified by culturally acquired restraints, ethics, taboos, and ideas.

Another key concept introduced by Freud is “defense mechanism”. Defense mechanism is the technique that defends the ego from experiencing anxiety about failing in its task. Freud felt that these defense mechanisms stem mainly from the unconscious part of the ego and only ordinarily become conscious to the individual during a form of psychoanalysis. Defense, for Freud, is the process by which the contents of our unconscious are kept in the unconscious. A few defense mechanisms he identified have been discussed briefly.

According to Freud, dream which is the royal road to unconscious uses two mechanisms to disguise forbidden wishes: condensation and displacement.

Condensation, for Freud, is a whole set of images packed into a single image or statement when a complex meaning is condensed into another, and displacement occurs when the object of an unconscious wish provokes anxiety. This anxiety is reduced when the ego unconsciously shifts the wish to another object. The energy of Id is displaced from one object to another.

Another defense mechanism identified by Freud is repression. When a person has some thoughts or urge that causes too much anxiety, one may push that thought or urge out of consciousness down into unconsciousness. This process is called repression. In this regard, Freud defines repression as " the process by which a mental act capable of becoming conscious is made unconscious and forced back into unconscious system [and also] reversion to an earlier and lower stage in the development of mental act" (Introductory Lecturers on Psychoanalysis, 163). Repression begins since the very childhood as it is the age from when the growth of superego ensues more or less strong according to familial environment ones lives.

When a person experiences an instinctual impulses to behave in a manner which superego deems reprehensible then it is possible for the mind to push into unconscious. In this vein, Freud says that " the essence of repression lies in pushing something away and keeping at a distance from conscious mind"(Essential of Psychoanalysis, 437). If a person continues to repress the sexual urges for a long without giving them vent either through sublimation, dream or direct sex, those repressed wishes have pathogenic manifestation in his behavior. That is, either they outburst even temporarily or take the path of symptom formation or both may happen. The later case may happen if temporarily lifted repression without proper outlets to the long instinctual desire is promptly reinstated by the ego.

Other defense mechanisms discussed by Freud are reaction formation, projection and regression. Reaction formation involves an unacceptable feeling or urge with the opposite. Another way the ego avoids anxiety is to believe that impulses coming from within are really coming from other people. This mechanism is called projection because inner feelings are thrown or projected outside. It is common mechanism which we have probably observed in ourselves from time to time. Lastly, regression means going back to an earlier and less mature pattern. When a person is under severe pressure and his other defenses are not working, he may start acting in ways that helped him in the past. Transferring of feelings originally associated with the infantile object childhood trauma or other object of psychoanalytic investigation, from its sources to investigating psychoanalyst. That is why, transference activities are regression.

Many psychological experiences can function as defenses even when not formally defined as such. They are fear of intimacy, fear of abandonment, low-

esteem, fear of betrayal, an insecure or unstable sense of self confusion about one's sexuality and the like.

Freud, closely related to his discovery of the unconscious and his development of the first version of psychoanalytic theory and practice, identified the theory of transference which has been dealt with in *Studies on Hysteria*. In an effort to probe the unconscious mind, Freud found that his patients responses to him were, in many cases, distortions based on their earlier experiences with other, usually parents or associated with "images of the father and through transference patients unconsciously dramatize their relationship to the parental figures of the past in the analytic process therefore revealing oedipal structures" (The Dynamics of Transference II).

These transferences, defined as distortion of unconscious feelings, thoughts and behaviors from the past projected into the present figure of the analyst, become central to the psychoanalytic cure. According to Freud, transference is the process of exploration of the unconscious mind, exploration of the self experience of patients, which is referred to as self-object transferences. It reflects deprivation in the early childhood and early object. In the self object transference, the past emerges into the present.

In recent literary theory, the concept of transference is sometimes broadened to include any process whereby the analyst of a text becomes inextricably involved in the object of his or her process of analysis. This method of transference is becoming very popular in the research of literary text. Moreover, transference is acknowledged as ubiquitous in human interactions. Its meanings have provided a basis for life span development of psychology of the self.

Subsequently, Freud, on the basis of his theory of transference, developed another theory of counter transference. He regards it as a dangerous phenomenon that

jeopardizes the analytical process. In "The Future Prospect of Psychoanalytic Theory", Freud defines counter transference in terms of desires that arise in the analysis "as a result of patient's influence on [the physician's] unconscious feelings" (144-145). To keep the psychoanalytic discourse scientific and neutral, Freud insists that the analyst must resist analysand's unconscious transference towards him and overcome the analysand's influence or interference. He believes that all transference reactions are determined by unconscious, irrational wishes and desires based on person's own faculty of past and insignificant relationship. Likewise, counter transference is manifested through anxiety, inappropriate and defensive behaviors and distorted perception based on counselor's conflict. In this regard, counter transference is essentially an obstacle to be overcome. The physician unconsciously experiences the patient. Freud argues that this reaction is caused by unconscious and intolerable wish of the counselor to the love client which must be defended against through distancing and punishing behaviors.

In addition, Freud's psychosexual theories play the vital role for the development of psychoanalysis. Psychosexual development, in psychoanalytic theory, is the process by which libidinal energy is expressed at different erogenous zones during different stages of development (Adjustment and Growth 51). Psychoanalysis recognizes three principal stages in the sexual growth of the individual. The first extending from birth to about six year is the period of infantile sexuality, the second from six to twelve year is the latent period, and the final or genital stage starts with puberty and extends through adolescence to maturity. (Abnormal Psychology 181-183). A brief summary of these stages is given below:

First and foremost, infantile sexuality contains oral stage, anal stage and phallic stage. Oral stage consists of two phases: sucking and biting. During this auto

erotic period, birth to age two, the libido is fixated on the physical self and erotic pleasure is primarily derived from the sucking, swallowing and biting movements of the mouth organs. The pleasure principle, in this phase, is overwhelmingly dominant. Next to it, anal stage starts from one year and continues up to four years. During this age, the child is chiefly concerned with the satisfactions associated with his toilet habits. Pleasure is derived from expulsion and retention. Between the age of two and four the child becomes conscious of himself as an independent individual and proceeds to direct his libido upon himself as a psychological entity. This self love is termed as narcissism. The pleasure principle is beginning to be controlled by the growing reality principle. This stage is further followed by phallic stage which is the third stage of infantile sexuality. It is very much important from psychoanalytical point of view in the development of adult personality. It starts from four and continues up to six. At the phallic stage, the sex energy or libido is localized in the genital organs and children get pleasure in manipulating and stroking it. In this phase, libido object shifts from self to the parent of the opposite sex; this is called 'Oedipus Complex' in case of boy and 'Electra Complex' in case of girl. In this phase, the intensified interest of the child in the genital magnifies the psychosexual development. The boy is proud of having penis which his sister lacks and suffers with salient fear of losing or damaging it that is called castration fear. By castration anxiety the boy gives up his sexual feelings and desires for his mother and sex rivalry wishes toward his father. The girl discovers that she has not penis and develops strong desire to get penis, which is called 'penis envy' and it is desire of the girl to be masculine. The girl abandons her Electra complex slower and on a less complete way than the boy.

Latent stage, second important stage of psychosexual development, starts from six and continues up to puberty. During this period, child enters school and much of the developmental energy is used to absorb the cultural and intellectual experiences that are available. But sexuality does not extinct rather remains repressed in unconscious. In this connection, Brown writes: "The infantile sexuality is repressed and reaction formation strengthens this repression. The libidinal urges are sublimate to the process"(199).

The last stage of development known as genital stage beginning from thirteen year is marked by the revival of infantile sexuality. Romance is now major interest. Initially, the interest tends to be homosexual but because of the fear of castration the shift is to heterosexual relation, courting and thoughts of marriage. Thus, there is a marked revival of pleasure principle, but the reality principle eventually regains the upper hand.

Obsession, another equal important issues of psychoanalysis, is spontaneously recurring ideas and thought over which the individual has no voluntary control. Freud describes the neurotic obsession as a situation in which:

The patient's mind is occupied with thoughts that do not really interest him, he feels impulses which seem alien to him, and he is impelled to perform actions which not only afford him no pleasure but from which he is powerless to desist.(Introductory Lectures on Psychoanalysis,160)

In this connection, Page describes that "obsessions are concerned with unanswerable question pertaining to the existence of God and the meaning of truth, or morbid doubt concerning the correctness one's past action". Psychoanalysts often ascribe the origin of obsession to the strictness and poor guidance. To be specific,

obsessive concern of neurotic is seen as resulting from the unresolved conflict/repression occurring at infantile/anal stage.

Sigmund Freud's another great contribution to psychoanalytical theory is the systematic study and analysis of dream. Freud, in his classical book *The Interpretation of Dreams* (1900), explored the dynamic role of unconscious mind and he describes dreams as the "royal road to the unconscious". To Freud, dream represents disguised desires, wish fulfilling expression of unconsciousness and unacceptable thoughts. According to Freud (1900), dream represents those wishes, demands and desires which are repressed into unconscious and their instinctual gratification is fettered in conscious state of mind.

Thus, in terms of psychosexuality, the dream has both a manifest content and a latent content (repressed). In other words, dreams reappear in symbolic forms that what is repressed is symbolized through dreams. It is fruitful reason that symbolization as the term is used in psychosexual analysis, in a process, which serves not to represent but also to disguise the latent content of the dreams that the dreamer himself/herself may not know. In his tenth lecture; Freud discusses certain sexual symbols in the following words:

The penis is symbolized primarily by objects which resemble it in form, being long and upstanding. Such as sticks, umbrella, poles, trees the like, also by objects which like things symbolize; have the property of penetrating and consequently injuring the body that is to say, pointed weapons of all sorts: knives, daggers, lances, spears, fire-arms are similarly used ; guns, pistol and revolvers, their last being a very appropriate on account of their shape. (Introductory lectures: 29-130)

Similarly, female organs is symbolized by

All the objects as share with them the property of enclosing a space are capable of acting as receptacle; such as pits, hollows, and caves and also jars and bottles and boxes, of all sorts and sizes, chest, coffers, pockets, and so fort. Ships too come into this category [...] cupboard, stoves, [...] doors and gates represent the genital opening. [...] wood, paper, book table and mussel, mouth, churches and chapels.

(Introductory Lectures: 131)

Similarly, he argues that " the breast [...] the organs of the sex; as well as the larger hemisphere of the female, body are represented by apples, peaches, fruits in general (Introductory Lectures: 181).

Arguing in the same vein, he discusses room as representing females, windows and doors as opening of the female body, and key as representing the male sexual organs as also act of copulation. He regards dreams of flying as dreams of general sexual excitement while also interpreting dancing, climbing, riding as symbols of sexual intercourse.

Lacanian Psychoanalysis

Jacques Lacan (1901-1981) develops semiotic version of Freud converting the basic concept of psychoanalysis into formulations derived from the linguistic theory of Ferdinand de Saussure and applying this concept, not to human individual, but to the operations of the process of signification.

Lacan opposes the idea of "whole self" that serves as an agent of strength, synthesis, mastery, integration and adaptation to realistic norms. He has unflinchingly insisted that human subject is neither unified nor unifiable. But, Lacan delimits unconsciousness, and makes consciousness and language themselves defense against

unconscious meaning. The Lacanian subject is not unified in consciousness. The ego, however, is intrinsically unified except in dreams, psychosis and other unraveling manifestation and projects itself into consciousness at the principle of individuality. Because it emanates from the unconscious and yet must continually verify itself through the very means of its occultation- unconscious and language- the *moi* can not 'see' itself as it really is." The ego is function; the ego is synthesis, a synthesis of function, function of synthesis" (E'crits, 131-132).

As Freud, Lacan sees the subject as decentered and marked by a lack and moves from the individualist orientation of Freud to a more social views with the concept of big Other (the symbolic order). He does this by incorporating Saussurian insights concerning language into his work along with Freudian concept of conscious. In this connection, M H Abrams writes, "Lacan privileges the Saussurian signifier over the signified, thus decentering both unconscious and language and calling in question any old style, empirical analysis. Analysis cannot escape from the chain of signifiers to point of any origin beyond significations itself"(260-261).

Though we think Lacan as symposium of Freud, Saussure and some reasoning of Derrida, his main influence is Freud. He interprets Freud in the light of structuralist and poststructuralist theories. His concept of psychoanalysis aims to understand the unconscious of human mind in terms of language which he derives from the growth of infant to adulthood. For Lacan, the unconscious undermines the subject from any position of certainty and from any relation of and simultaneously reveals the fictional nature of the category to which every human subject is nonetheless assigned.

Lacan posits three stages of human development: the mirror stage, the imaginary stage and the symbolic stage (Critical Theory Since Plato, 897). These three are the constitution of the psychic subject. The first stage of human

development, for Lacan, is the mirror stage. Lacan states that the mirror stage is far from a mere phenomenon which occurs in the development of the child; it illustrates the conflictual nature of the dual relationship. The mirror stage describes the formation of the ego via the process of identification, the ego being result of identifying with one's own specular image. In this regards, Lacan opines, in his book *Ecrits* in this way:

The mirror stage is a drama whose internal thrust is precipitated from insufficiency to anticipation and which manufactures for the subject, caught up in the lure of spatial identification, the succession of phantasies that extends from a fragmented body image to a form of its totality that I shall call orthopaedic and, lastly, to the assumption of the armors of an alienating the identity, which will mark with its rigid structures the subject's entire mental development. (4)

At 6 months, the baby still lacks the coordination; however he/ she can recognizes himself / herself in the mirror before attaining control over his bodily movement. He/she sees his/her image as a whole and the synthesis of the image produces a sense of central with the coordination of the body; which is a perceived as a fragmented body. This contrast is first felt by the infant a rivalry with his/her own image, because the wholeness of image threatens him/her with fragmentation, and thus mirror stage gives rise an aggressive tension between the subject and image. To resolve this aggressive tension, the subject identifies with the image; this primary identification with the counterpart is what forms the ego. Thus, at first, the infant identifies with his mother. Gradually, he begins to see a visual image in his mother. The spatial distant is created between the child and the mother because of this reflection. Now, the child finds himself in the series of gesture. He looks his own

experience in the mirror (mother). So, the first phase in the mirror stage is called gaze phase. In this regards, Lacan points out:

[...] the mirror stage as an identification, in the full sense that analysis gives to the term namely, the transformation that take place in the subject, when he assumes an image, whose predestination to this phase- effect is sufficiently indicated by the use, in analytic theory, of the ancient term *imago*(Ecrits, 2)

This spatial distance between the child and the mother gives birth to illusion. He cannot distinguish himself and his [m]other.

The imaginary order is the formation of the ego in the mirror stage. In this phase, the child becomes jubilant. Jubilant phase is full of illusions and gazing activities. The child does not see the gap between him and his image. Later, the ego is constructed by identification with the specular image. The subject becomes aware of the spatial gap between him and his image. Then, the alienation phase begins. The relationship between the ego and the specular image means that the ego and the imaginary order itself are places of radical orientation. Therefore, alienation is constitutive of the imaginary order. In this context, Lacan states: “The spatial and the temporal categories in which the ego and the object are constituted experience as event in perspective of mirage, as affection with something stereotypical about them that suspends the working of the ego/ objects dialectic”(E’crits, 17).

As a result, ego is formed. Imaginary stage is filled up of images, imaginations and deception; the main illusion of this order is synthesis, autonomy, duality, similarity. The narcissistic relationship develops in this phase. The imaginary order is a realm of the subject's fantasy, a primarily narcissistic realm composed of images, of imagos, images of central importance in the life of subject, even we might say, the

world of the subject, seems, as Lacan mentions, the imago's function is "to establish a relation between the organism and its reality or as they say, between the *innenwelt* and the *omwelt*" (Ecrits, 4).

Imaginary stage, thus, overlaps with the mirror stage and forms a path to symbolic stage which starts from eighteen months of (child) but properly begins after two years. In this stage, infant comes across in his childhood. And the child arrives at a sense of identity. Gaps between the child and the mother, and signifier and signified is further disclosed.

Here, Lacan states that the desired effects may be obtained merely by placing the individual within the reach of the field of reflection of mirror"(Ecrits, 3). The child, indeed, enters into the world of 'lack', and 'anxiety'. Dreams, for him, become the patches of fragmentation. He, in this stage, recognizes his "father" and "law of his father", that is, language. To crystallize this concept of Lacan, Martin Jay states:

[A] difference between and psychotic behavior which depend on the partial transition from the imaginary to a further stage, which Lacan termed 'the symbolic'. Coincident with the resolution of the Oedipus complex,' the symbolic' meant the child's entry into language. (349-50)

The more an infant grows, the more fragmented his/her self (ego) becomes. In addition to this, the primal oneness with the mother's body becomes possible only at the cost of death. The child enters into language and finds bound by all man-made rules and regulation of morality, religion and social affairs. He maneuvers from "the 'I' to socially elaborated situations" (Ecrits, 5). This means there is existence of two 'I' individual or subjective and social. This process is, in other words," the deflection of the mirror I into the social I "(Salovej, 97).

Furthermore, regarding Freud's interpretation of condensation and displacement, Lacan opines:

verdichtung, or 'condensation', is the structure of the superimposition of the signifiers, which metaphor takes as its field, and whose name, condensing in itself the word *Dichtung*, shows how the mechanism is connatural with poetry to the point it envelops the traditional function proper to poetry[...] *Verchiesbung*, 'displacement', the German term is the closer to the idea of that veering off of signification that we see in metonymy, and which from its first appearance in Freud is represented as the most appropriate means used by the unconscious to foil censorship. (Ecrits, 160).

Lacan interprets Freud from the eye of linguistics." It is the world of words that creates the world of things" (Ecrits, 65). For him, Freudian interpretation of dream as condensation and displacement is linguistic in nature, thus corresponds to metaphor and metonymy respectively. But Lacan goes a step further and goes on proving that the so called stable structure is, in fact, fragmented. Thus, Lacan gives deconstructive study on Freud, that is, he decenters the "self" through linguistics.

Furthermore, Lacan revises Freudian notion of transference and argues for a symbolic relationship between the subject and the unconscious in his book, *The Four Fundamental Concepts of Psychoanalysis*. Hence, the "transference" is the actualization and dramatization of unconscious subject.

Lacanian revision of the Freudian transference eventually leads to the other present of the unconscious subject or total effect of speech on the subject. Therefore, it is a theory where we transfer our feelings and expectations for help onto another, (an analyst). Because we think they know something about who we are and who we

should become. Lacan argues that the analyst does not have the correct reality paradigm to help on analyze and with his/her impasses in knowledge and desire, but he maintains the phenomenon itself (including the feelings of love and hate) tells us more about an unstable base for knowledge in being, than it does about who actually has the correct theory. The analyst is like a role player who sits silent and the patient knows that he/she can speak only in the (logical) time it takes to unravel repressed traumata drop harmful to live by.

In *Seminar XI*, Lacan says that " through transference[...] the analysand "acts" out of the reality of unconscious" (158). It is essential to relocate Lacanian counter transference from the imaginary into symbolic realm, into the locus of the other. It involves not only the present of the analyst and analysand but also the co-presence of their different subject positions and repetitive unconscious. The subject is not a person but a position, and 'I' defined relatively, by his/her difference from the 'you', he/she addresses. In the counter transference, the analyst returns to the sum of the prejudices, embarrassments, even insufficient information which characterizes the analyst at a given moment in the dialectical process (xi-xii). In this connection, Lacan, in *Hysteria and Feminism*, discusses the concept of counter transference:

[T]he analyst does have passions, wishes, whims, prejudices and so forth, with regard to the analysand in treatment. The analyst has desires, as it were. But, the analyst also has a stronger desire, a desire brought about by the change in his desire through the very process of analysis, which has dubbed the desire of analyst. And, further, it is the desire of the analyst, a desire focused on the treatment-the exigencies of the treatment- that maintain the treatment purified, as it were, from these other more pedestrian desires. (viii)

Thus, Counter transference is partly determined by the therapist preexisting internal object world and partly influenced by feelings induced by patient. The concept is now regarded as inevitable and minor enactment of counter transference may provide valuable information about what is being recreated in the therapist-patient dyad.

Self disclosure of counter transference may be useful in some situation, but the sharing of some feelings will overwhelm patient and may even burden them, in a way, destructive to the therapeutic process. P.Heimann suggests that "the analyst's total emotional response to the patient is not simply an obstacle or hindrance based on the analyst's own past, but an important tool in understanding the patient's unconscious" (31). This view is often referred as the broad or totalistic perspective on counter transference.

In fact, Lacan implies that resistance comes primarily from the analyst who tries to reify the past and unconscious and to freeze the flow of the analytic dialogue into answer. The notion of projective identification enables the connection between intra-psychic and inter subjective field of analytic process. Grigoris Vasiamatzis opines, "The communicative aim of projective identification and the metaphor of the container- contained relationship between the mother and the infant" (116). When the infant is overwhelmed by unmodulated effects it tends to project them into mother. The mother receives the infant's feelings and her own capacity for reverie modulates, transforms, and finally returns to the infant in a more tolerable and structured experience. In this way, containment is not a passive reception of what is projected.

To wrap up, the present theory of psycho analysis especially Lacanian and Freudian psychoanalysis has been used to analyze the novel *The Breast* pensively. Understanding of their principle will help to analyze this novel. In case of Freudian psychoanalysis, the research will take help of Freud's concept of psychosexual

development (Infantile sexuality, latent stage and genital stage) to portray the condition of the protagonist's metamorphosis which ultimately resembles with Lacan's phase-wise development of child (mirror, imaginary and symbolic stage). Similarly, Freud's concepts of obsession and repressed desire will be applied for protagonist's obsession with breast of Claire and repressed desire to have sex with her.

Furthermore, transformation of the protagonist will be taken as a manifestation of his obsession, repressed desire, childhood deprivation, and fear of castration. Similarly, dream of the protagonist will be taken as his wish fulfillment and the objects described in the novella will be analyzed in the light of symbolism. In the same vein, Lacan's concept of counter transference will be applied in the light of therapeutic relationship of analyst and analysand. Use of language will also be viewed. The attempt in this research is to depict why the protagonist is transformed, and how his self gets transformed by analyzing his condition of transformation (before, during and after). Above mentioned ideas will help to accomplish this study.

Chapter III

Metamorphosis and the fragmentation of self

Kepesh, 38 Years old Professor of Jewish Comparative Literature, in *The Breast* recounts the changes that occurred in his life in the preceding two years, beginning with peculiar sensations he felt in his penis. These sensations of increased sensitivity, accompanied by increased sexual desire, lead him to become a six-foot, one hundred fifty five pound human female breast. The novella chronicles Kepesh's responses to his condition, which ranges from his acceptance to a conviction that he has become mad.

Kepesh feels "tingling sensation in the groin" (4) and discovers his "penis discolored" (4). His sexual feelings and desires for Claire whom he has been seeing for three years, are also cooling. His desire for her during the past year has changed right before his transformation: he feels excruciatingly sensitive while making love to her. Kepesh gets admitted to a hospital where he is accompanied by his ex-wife, Claire. Despite the physicians' utmost great effort, Kepesh's metamorphosis takes place as his penis turns into a nipple and areola, and the rest of his body becomes a huge breast, and gets converted into "a mammary gland disconnected from any human form"(12). Kepesh's life along with his metamorphosis becomes "stable [for] the first time [...] in more than a decade" (9). Ultimately, Kepesh becomes convinced that he is mad and his training as a professor of literature has brought him in this condition. He wonders whether his reading of surreal and fantastic literature by Franz Kafka, Nikolain Gogol, and Jonathan Swift have in some ways affected his mind. Nevertheless, Kepesh's metamorphosis surfaces out of his obsession, with the breast of Claire, his repressed desire to have sex with her, childhood deprivation and fear of castration. As he is metamorphosed into a female breast, his "self" gets fractured.

Kepesh tries to find out causes for his metamorphosis, and forwards different explanations for his change. He finds them useless because what happened to him is basically unexplainable, and "beyond understanding"(11). However, before and immediately after his transformation, the uniqueness of his situation is not clear to him, and he spends his energies refuting his doctor's accounts of his change and his claim that he is a large breast. His denial is understandable on a practical level: he cannot see himself nor can sense his body in the old way, thus, body must rely on the people around him. The first impression of his new body is troubling. In this regard, Kepesh says, " When my body was touched, I did not know what to make of it: the sensation was unexpectedly soothing, but far away, and reminded me of water lapping at a beach"(15).

The doctors offer various descriptions of his metamorphosis in pseudoscientific jargon: "a massive hormonal influx", "an endocrinopathic catastrophe," "a hermaphroditic explosion of chromosomes" (12). Kepesh, however, concludes that he must be a deaf and blind " quadruple amputee" mutilated by the explosion of the boiler " beneath the bedroom of my parlor- floor appointment "(9). Another explanation that he hints at but does not articulate directly is feeling of guilt from his lapsed sexual interest in his wife. Kepesh confesses: "We really did get on so easily [...]that it seemed to me something very like a disaster (little I knew about disaster) when, out of the blue, I began to take no pleasure at all in our lovemaking "(9). Another explanation given is Kepesh's infatuation with breasts, especially with those of his wife Claire. Kepesh describes Claire as "full breasted ", and remembers lying one day on the sand at the beach and sucking her breasts, "that strange thing" as he calls it, like Poseidon or Zeus would be sucking a "soft globe", until he turns green and Claire warns that the breast in his mouth would cut off his air (33). Kepesh

follows that recollection with an ambiguous reflection on his present condition. On the one hand, he admits that he actually wants to be breasted. In a fantastic way, his desire comes true. Kepesh has become the thing that he so badly wanted to be, or at least, wanted to have in his mouth, even to the point of endangering his well being. Kepesh finally rejects the reading of his story as a fantasy because his conception of "reality has style", and is "grander than" a fulfillment of a wish (34). The short paragraph that follows and ends Kepesh's discussion on wish fulfillment is truly paradoxical:

There, for these who prefer a fairy tale to life, a moral; "Reality" concludes the embittered professor who reasons unbeknown to himself become a female breast "has style". Go, you sleek, self-satisfied Houyhnhnms to whom nothing disgusting has yet happened go and moralize on that! (34)

Kepesh's argument that the story of transformation is not a fairy tale, because it has happened in the reality of his life, and because reality has style- whatever that means is clearly self contradictory. He claims that he knows what reality is but his changing explanations and mental instability prove the opposite; in fact, in the course of the story, Dr. Klinger classifies many of his explanations as delusions.

The next phase in the dynamic of explanations and counter- explanation occurs about six months after his transformation and consists of Kepesh's "crisis of faith" (49). Probably, the visit of his superior Arthur Schonbrunn, causes that crisis in which Kepesh exhibits repressive behavior and argues that he has not really turned into a breast. Through Schonbrunn, Kepesh faces his loss of social status in academics. The dean cannot help giggling, and finally, openly laughing, when he sees his former colleague. The reaction is inappropriate from an intelligent and sensitive

professor who has written a small book on Robert Musil- whose best known work *Der Mann Ohne Eigenschaften* (The Man Without Qualities 1903-43), corresponds to some extents with Kepesh's situation as a man who has lost all his previous qualities. A month after Schobrunn's visit, Kepesh suffers a nervous breakdown. Again, as immediately after his transformation, Kepesh refuses to believe that he is a breast. Kepesh can speak and hear through his nipple about his feeling. Here, the nipple is the symbol of phallus. Therefore, since he has still male quality, he cannot relinquish his male ego: "I am still very much a man" (38). Furthermore, Kepesh, even after his alternation, can fulfill his repressed sexual desires having sex with Claire by the help of his nipple. All these events make Kepesh feel, despite his Metamorphosis, that he has not turned into a female breast. He now argues that "a man cannot turn into a breast other than in his own imagination"(49). Therefore, he begins to think that he is still dreaming and then decides that he has gone mad. Dr. Klinger tries to convince him that he is not deluded but that he really is a breast. Kepesh defends his new theory so strongly that the narrator explains in retrospect. He takes Dr. Klinger's words and systematically gives them their opposite meaning. Nevertheless, the doctor's rhetorical skills and psychoanalytical training weakens Kepesh's arguments, and Kepesh must continually alter his own theory and produces new more complicated version of it.

Kepesh, thus, appears to imagine that he is imagining. He cannot differentiate between reality and structures of imagination. According to Kepesh, "fictions of transformation and tales of grotesque bodies like Gogol's *The Nose*, Kafka's *Verwandlung*, and Swift's *Gulliver's Travel* have caused this change"(55). He has often taught those books; indeed he has done so with conviction only a week before his own metamorphosis (55). If it was not simply the books themselves that caused his change, he surmises it was the power of imagination in them or his power as

reader to imagine these stories. Despite Dr. Klinger's warning, Kepesh convinces himself that those books have made him fantasize his transformation and forget reality. He should just break out of his delusion and get back to teaching literature and not to try to live through it or let his subjectivity be constructed in it. Kepesh tells his newest theory to his father explaining the central literary references, but Kepesh Senior does not respond- he does not understand what his son means just as earlier he did not understand the value of his son's work as a professor of literature. The narrative continues to circle, entrap, and avoid David Kepesh's metamorphosed state. In this way, Kepesh refuses to accept his metamorphosis into a female breast. He rejects his present state. While doing so, Kepesh, on the one hand, says I am not a breast, and gives counter arguments. He, on the other hand, declares of being "mad" (55). However, Kepesh gradually comes to know the reality of his metamorphosis and accepts his change "I am a breast"(12). As he accepts his transformation, his identity fragments.

Psychoanalysis is an important subtext, an allegory in the structuring of the dynamic, and a key text examining the relationship between reality and imagination. During his father's visit, Kepesh in desperation suggests still another explanation for his metamorphosis into a breast: early childhood deprivation. Kepesh had been deprived of both the maternal and sexual love. In his childhood, Kepesh's mother died. As a result, Kepesh neither gratified maternal love nor "good breast". In the same vein, Claire had disappointed him by being sexually unadventurous during their "normal" life before his metamorphosis. Hence, Kepesh could not gratify his sexual desire. There was no other alternative way for Kepesh to survive except repressing those desires. Therefore, he repressed his desire which obsessed him, and ultimately his desires outburst and he became a female breast. He asks himself why he identifies

"with the object of infantile veneration? What unfulfilled appetites what cradle confusions! What fragments out of my remotest past could have collided to spark a delusion of such classical simplicity?" (60)

Kepesh's questioning evokes psychoanalysis as the explanation of his condition but this time the central reference point appears to be oeuvre of Melanie Klein rather than that of Sigmund Freud, whose conception of the reality principle is evoked at several other points in the narrative.

Melanie Klein argues in her essay "Early stages of the Oedipus conflict" (1928) that the mother's body especially the breast, provides the original object of symbolization and the field for the child's developing urge to know. In her psychoanalytic theory, a subject first senses separateness very early before the so called mirror stage and the acquisition of language. The site for his devolvement is breast feeding in which the baby experiences his/her first satisfaction or its denial by an external force. When the breast gratifies the baby, he or she feels togetherness with the "good" breast; but when the baby is taken away not offered to the baby right away when he/she is hungry, the baby feels anxious and angry at "bad" breast. Klein argues that because of anxiety toward the "bad" breast, the body's ego is first formed. (1998, 285-95). When the breast and the caretaker, whom the child learns to know through the breast, is felt to be missing the baby must begin forming its own separate subjectivity as compensation.

A constructive way to deal with anxiety depriving from denied pleasure is to recreate the mother or the breast for oneself, to make the gratifying "good" and complete breast appears inside oneself. It may be said, then that David Kepesh, as he himself propose returns to the psycho symbolic space of alternating feeling of togetherness with an alienation from the mother through his transformation into a

breast. Through his metamorphosis, his body creates the physical sense of togetherness with the mother's breast but paradoxically, maintains the adult's capacity to speak and think as a distinctly separate subject. That explanation for Kepesh's breastedness alleviates his grief over his mother's death, and the sense of deprivation in his sex- life with his wife, Claire Ovington. Interestingly, Claire is associated with his mother in various ways. She is introduced in the text immediately after Kepesh's mother. She is said to be a "soothing antidote" to Kepesh mother's "palpitations" (30); her breasts are described as her most erogenous organs, and her surname 'Ovington' refers to the oval shape and the ovum. Perhaps, because of the close association between Claire and his mother and the uncontrollability of the mother's body, Kepesh is becoming impotent and -not because of any sexual deprivation caused by Claire's unreadiness to perform certain sexual acts. Klein argues that the connection of early childhood anxieties with castration fear and the causes of impotence can be seen "in the phantasy of losing the penis or having it destroyed inside the mother" (Klein 1986, 50). That is literally what happens to Kepesh when he becomes a female breast; he is stretched in opposite directions by his penis and his buttock (16). Miraculously, by destroying his penis in the transformations into his own mother his impotence is cured.

Melanie Klein's psychoanalytical theory on early childhood deprivation could be one metanarrative of *The Breast*, if one would like to speculate on why, from the point of view of the writer's psyche, this text has been written and what is the psychological nature of the metamorphosis described in it. Shortly after his outburst about deprivation and wish fulfillment, Kepesh ironically suggests that perhaps the whole changes in him or in his psyche is actually a post analytical collapse that has

been a year in the making. In that way, Kepesh tries to disturb his psychoanalyst Dr. Klinger whose clinic he has frequented for 5 years before his metamorphosis.

Although for Kepesh himself, his change remains a profoundly ambiguous event; in fact, it can be said that his metamorphosis is both a route of escape and a terrible accident. Kepesh concludes that he has both willed radical changes in his personality because of his aging, fear of impotence, obsession with breast and other reasons that are further elaborated in the sequel *The Professor of Desire* and that what happened was an unpredictable catastrophe that made him a man without qualities. Because of his transformation Kepesh does not have to feel guilty about his impotence or rather his lack of desire for and sense of failure regarding Claire, nor does he have to leave her and then feel guilty about having used and then left her. Instead, the change seems to have multiplied his sexual energy. In addition, the transformation into a breast, although it isolates him from the world, offers a cure for the kind of Portnoy's complaint that Kepesh has had about his life. In Roth's *Portnoy's Complaint*, Dr. Spielvogel, Alexander Portnoy's doctor, defines his patient's complaint as a "disorder in which strongly felt ethical and altruistic impulses are perpetually warring with extreme sexual longings, often of a perverse nature." Similarly, Kepesh has, as becomes clear in *The Professor of Desire*, confronted the limitations put on his body and his fantasies by moral authority, social restraint and regulation. In his change, Kepesh's struggle for control over his sexual obsessions is ironically resolved.

Psychoanalytical arguments are also tied up with many of the other explanations offered for Kepesh's transformation. The narrative implies that Kepesh entertains ideas about impotence, bisexuality, wish fulfillment, childhood deprivation, madness, hallucination, oversensitive imagination, escapism, unconscious obsessions, and dreaming. He discusses most of those topics with his psychoanalyst who argues

not for any specific psychoanalytical explanations but for the importance of the reality principle, which he understands as a kind of rational common sense attitude. For the most part, Dr. Klinger rejects Kepesh's explanations and instead asks Kepesh to accept his breastedness as a simple fact and base a new conception of reality on that insight. In fact, Dr. Klinger's opinion of the cause of his transformations is that "noting 'did it'" (66).

Kepesh's next proposal confirms the paradoxical role of psychoanalysis. He suggests that he could not take the success of his happy life and thus was transformed or punished (perhaps by himself) because he was pleased to hear about his ex-wife's continuous unhappiness. Dr. Klinger brushes aside all those speculations, again asking Kepesh simply to accept his breastness. However, at this point Kepesh's belief in his own interpretations seems to have weakened to some extent. Additional blows to his theories are his father's confirmation that he is a breast and not a mental patient and the new medical evidence from the doctors that, with appropriate hormonal stimulation, he could become a milk producing mammary gland. Nevertheless, in the last section of the text, Kepesh returns to his arguments that literature produced his state. Again, the quintessential question is whether literature may change one's subjectivity. Dr. Klinger insists that "hormones are hormones and art is art" and that they should be kept separate from each other (972). Kepesh still insists that books made him as he is now: "I took the leap. Made the word flesh. Don't you see, I have out Kafkaed Kafka" (73). Kepesh's new tactic is to accept himself as breast to thwart Dr. Klinger's criticism, but simultaneously to continue to talk of him as art work a product of artistic imagination. Kepesh asks; "who is the greatest artist he who imagines the marvelous transformation, or he who marvelously transforms

himself"(73). What he implies by that is that he himself is the great artist for having been transformed into an art work.

Roth's choice to transform Kepesh into a female breast allows him to uncover ways in which subjectivity is inextricable from the gendering of the body. Unlike most non facial body parts, the female breast has frequently been singled out for representation within western culture. It has tradition as the object of looking, burdened with the complex of meaning associated with the feminine as maternal and sexual being. In "Early stages of the Oedipus Conflict" (1928), Melanie Klein writes about the child's "epistemophilic impulse" that is first expressed in relation to the mother's breast:

The epistemophilic impulse ..., activated by the rise of the Oedipus tendencies, at first mainly concerns itself with the mother's body, which is assumed to be scene of all sexual processes and developments. The child [...] wishes to appropriate the contents of the body. He, thus, begins to be curious about what it contains what it is like etc. So, the epistemophilic instinct and the desire to take possession come quite early to be most intimately connected with one another and at the same time with the sense of guilt aroused by the incipient Oedipus conflict. (204)

The breast signifies Kepesh's entry into the symbolic order that names and begins to explain sexual difference as one of many differences in the world of human meaning. The breast, as Klein writes, brings into focus the "early feeling of not knowing ... [that] unites with the situation" (204). Kepesh's transformed body literally represent the desire to understand what the self is, a desire that centers on

distinguishing the subject from the object, the male from female, by way of the breast as both real object of gratification and signifier.

For Klein, the breast is the child's first object in a lifetime's epistemological project. Kepesh, then, in probing without success the mystery of his hideous metamorphosis, is, so to speak a naked representation of a project that can never find closure. The disremembered breast stands for the unsatisfied epistemophilic urge.

Klein posits that individual's sense of lack- of question that can not be answered and desires that cannot be satisfied -begins in relation to the mother's breast. Roth suggests this apprehension in several ways in the novella, with reference to the oedipal situation. Although Kepesh's mother is virtually absent from the text, Roth repeatedly refers to the maternal as it is displaced onto Kepesh's lover, Claire Ovington. Kepesh nostalgically recalls a trip with Claire to the beach during which he sucks on her ample breast and in jest, speaks a desire to appropriate it. "I don't want to cut off your air" she says." "You were turning green', with envy"" he replies (33). While Kepesh entertains the notion that his wish was to "become flesh" at the time of his transformation, he soon refuses to surrender [his] bewilderment to the wish fulfillment theory (34). But even though, and even because Kepesh denies that this episode provides a plausible explanation for this catastrophe, the scene leads to the conclusion- since denial often suggests repression that his condition stands in symbolic relation to his longing for the lost mother. Kepesh's father, in the novella relinquishes authority to the son (Kepesh).

David Kepesh demands "the truth" about his condition from his father and then refusing to accept the painful reality of his father's word; coerces him into lying: "what am I? You are a women's breast. That's not true...I am a mental patient! Tell me the truth ... You're mental patient" (62). Claire, furthermore frequently appears as

a figure more maternal than sexual, and in this regard, she represents the good "breast mother" of Melanie Klein's theories, "the ideal breast which never frustrates" (qtd. in Debra Shostak). She faithfully visits Kepesh in his hospital hammock every day. Though she has disappointed him by being sexually unadventurous during their normal life, she astonishes him by her willingness to satisfy his craving for her to suck at his nipple once he becomes a breast. Paradoxically, Claire is at her most maternal when she is in the position of a nursing child at Kepesh's breasts; the novella does not suggest that she gains erotic pleasure from the task but rather that she acts selflessly out of love and sympathy for his needs.

When, in the beginning of his narrative, Kepesh describes his loss of desire for Claire over the last of their three years together, the oedipal implications are tangled. His comment that their "life has become orderly and stable is juxtaposed to his confession that he has begun to take no pleasure at all in [...] love making" (9). A causal connection emerges between the serene order of the maternal and the quelling or repression of desires. It is as if Claire has filled the place of Kepesh's mother, and he has withdrawn from her as a taboo erotic object. The accompaniment in the oedipal plot to the senses of taboo is of course the boy's fear of castration, and it does not take much to see Kepesh's transformation as a realization-literally, an embodiment of castration anxiety. The doctors determine that "the metamorphosis originated in the genital and that Kepesh's penis formed itself into his nipple" (14-16). Roth thereby suggests in a fantasy made concrete, the male fear of being turned into a female breast. Kepesh's inability to say "I am a man" then, carries the additional weight of referring to the deprivation of his specifically masculine subjectivity.

When Kepesh awakes to find that he has metamorphosed into a six-foot mammary gland, the existential question of identity becomes painfully centered on his

physical condition. In spite of being the professor of English literature, he, in this novella is baptized as the breast. Roth himself bestows dual identity to his protagonist. In this connection, Kai Mikkonen in his criticism "The Metamorphosed Parodical Body in Philip Roth's *The Breast*" writes: "Kepesh's physical change obviously accentuates the senses of uncertainty about the status of reality. The new limitation put on and to a certain degree the new sensibilities found in his sensory organs restructure his senses of reality and affect his capacity to verbalize his subjectivity and its relationship with the world. As Kepesh puts it, his old self was that of "a professor of literature, a lover, a son, a friend, a neighbor customer, a client, and a citizen" (19). Most of that determinant disappears once he is a breast. Kepesh still tries to study literature and writes lecture but he is no longer professor. His sexuality has totally changed and he can no longer occupy the position of a neighbor, a customer or a client. Therefore, what happens after his metamorphosis is the conceptualization of his occupational position, sexuality and ethnicity as well as his concept of morality and the change in his relationship vis-à-vis his parents and his wife.

In regard to his senses, David Kepesh's physical change is profound. In his new form, he cannot see, smell, taste, or move (15). Lack of sight obviously restricts his capacity to understand the exterior world. It makes Kepesh paranoid, doubtful about what he hears from the others. Although he certainly is under the surveillance of the doctors and scientists who visit him, his fears of being constantly observed, viewed, and discussed in public and made in to a sort of media event are not fully confirmed, understandable. Therefore, Kepesh wonders. In a way, though, the fact that he could be ceaselessly watched, finally it doesn't matter. In his new body, Kepesh, without sight, dwells in a world of his own. At the end of the story it appears

that it is comforting to him to be always isolated at some level as he cannot see or sense in the same way as the people around him.

The deaths of the gods, the rupture of traditional bonds of moral and manners, the crisis in philosophy in its modern forms, the inroads of materialism all are causes and symptoms of the fragmentation in person's self, the uncoordinated self. The external facts potentially impact the psychology of any person. The person's identity lies in his unified self, when it becomes fragmented, he loses his identity. David Kepesh is the person who suffers identity crisis because he cannot maintain his self as unified whole. His instinctual drives go beyond his achieved intellectuality. His professorship is questioned repeatedly.

The narrator, David Kepesh describes his story of metamorphosis in first person narrative. Kepesh is the person who always wants to echo his identity through "Other" (beloved). He wants to be one with Claire. He, in her absence, feels isolated and difficult: "perhaps if Claire had been with me that night, instead of back at her own apartment preparing some sort of committee report, I would have had the courage of my fear and told the doctors to come running "(5-6). Moreover, he desires to be one with her by "fuck[ing] her "(32). Fucking suggests "unity", therefore, fucking for Kepesh, is "oneness". But he finds their "lovemaking boring and pleasure less"(9). This desire of Kepesh manifests through his metamorphosis into a female breast.

We can relate Kepesh's state of metamorphosis (breast) with Lacanian idea of metaphor and metonymy. Kepesh's metamorphosis into breast, in this novella, is working as metaphor and metonymy both. Kepesh consciously exploits the status of metamorphosis as a radical metaphor. The strategy becomes apparent as he poses the question of who is the greater artist; "he who imagines the marvelous transformation

or he who marvelously transforms himself" (55). That view is based on the conception of metamorphosis as a trope, as an expanded metaphor that includes a dimension of time and proposes an actual change between two things. Kepesh's arguments on the differences between imagination and actually metamorphosing, thus duplicates the differences between a regular metaphor, which is based on likeness or analogy and the figure of metamorphosis in, which in this case at least, is used to denote both sameness and change. Sameness, meaning Kepesh's conscious self and his memories that at least for some time appears to stay the same despite the transformation, and change meaning Kepesh's body and his unconscious desires.

An important aspect of the periodic signification in Kepesh's change is also the dynamic of metonymy but more precisely, synecdochical relationships that the change of a person into a part of body elaborates on the part body problematic that is already evident in the subtexts. Through those topological differentiations Kepesh can claim for his story the status of metanarrative in relation to Kafka, Gogol, and Swift. Kepesh's speculations about himself and literature indicate that Kepesh may not take the role of an author for himself and define as well as problematize his own transformation into a work of art.

Roth elaborates the theme of castration and the wide public interest in the transformed body. There is not metaphor for a "phallus", rather we witness the actual disappearance of a penis. Kepesh has cooled down sexually before his change, but after his metamorphosis his impotence is paradoxically cured as he loses his penis in the transformation. Here, Roth's story out-ridicules Gogol's: Kepesh relocates his penis in his nipple whereas Kovalyov's nose just returns to its place one day. This novella also simultaneously appropriates and turns around the synecdochical

dynamics in Gogol's texts. In this way, Kepesh as a breast is a metonymical in a sense that Kepesh as a breast is a whole man who turned into a part of a body.

The biography of the protagonist David Kepesh in *The Breast* is described before and after his metamorphosis into a "mammary gland"(12). His metamorphosis can be understood as his reincarnation. His old life is before his metamorphosis, but his new life embarks on from his metamorphosis. In this life, he has become a huge female breast. His period of transformation is period of "incubation period "(10) when his symptoms has been appeared. In his old life as described in *The Professor of Desire*, he is blind-folded by the fantasy of sex and turned his deaf ear to the voice of rationality that triggers him toward the shade of melancholia. As a result, he is now in this state as described in *The Breast*. Kepesh's life before and after his metamorphosis can be divided into, as Lacan puts on, mirror, imaginary, and symbolic. The mirror stage provides different kinds of illusions, desires, and infatuations of the professor Kepesh. Imaginary stage overlaps the mirror stage in which state Kepesh wants to be one with his beloved Claire. Kepesh, as in Lacanian imaginary stage, finds no clear distinction between himself (subject) and "other"(his beloved Claire). So, immediately after his metamorphosis, Kepesh declares "I am a breast"(12).Hence, his transformation refers to the manifestation of his desires to be breastedness and "breast" as Kepesh's beloved Claire, in one hand and his mother on the other. His declaration as a breast shows his fragmented self. He nearly becomes mirage, for Kepesh. The more mature he becomes; the more fragmented his self becomes. He, despite his metamorphosis, "days after the change [...] regains consciousness"(15). Therefore, he refuses his metamorphosis and his identity as a female breast. In this regard, Kepesh opines "what happened was this: I refused to believe that I had turned

into a breast... I was overcome with the realization that all this was impossible. A man cannot change into a breast other than in his own imagination"(49).

He further emphasizes on the same idea in his visit with his father. When his father comes to visit him on Sunday, he tells him the good news, even though he is certain that Dr Klinger and Claire must have notified him already. He tells him that "it is true, I no longer believe I am a breast" (59). In this visit, Kepesh, to find out reality of his metamorphosis, involves in the conversation with his father and denies his metamorphosis:

"Dad, where are we?"

"In your room", he answered.

"And have I turned into a breast?"

Well, that's what they say."

"By that's not true! I am a mental patient! Tell me again what am I?"

"Oh Davie".

"What am I?"

"You are a woman's breast."

"That's not true! What I heard you say is not true! I am a mental patient..."(62)

In this way, Kepesh, refusing to accept his metamorphosis into a female breast, discovers his image in a mirror, which becomes "other" to the self, thereby establishing his subjectivity. While doing so, he begins to develop a sense of separate self "Human I insist I am, but not that human "(21). Thus, Kepesh's ego is formed via the process of identification, the ego being result identifying with one's own image. Along with the formation of Kepesh's subjectivity, the narcissistic relationship

develops in his character. In this phase, he accepts his separate and finite existence as a breast: "I am David Alan Kepesh, the Breast, and I will live by my own lights!"(75).

Kepesh, at first, becomes conscious about his fragmented image of his body, after that he recognizes the desire to be one with his beloved is mere the way of fragmentation. In this way, the imaginary stage of Kepesh overlaps with the mirror stage and forms a path of symbolic stage.

In this stage, Kepesh comes to know his fragmented self. Due to which Kepesh enters into the world of "lack" and "anxiety". He says "I am sick or worrying about losing Claire" (74). In mirror stage, Kepesh's consciousness even after his transformation remains surprisingly constant. In other words, his consciousness does not change gradually as a result of the transformation, but as a condition of it. He recognizes his father with whom he interacts about his metamorphosis, and law of his father, that is, language. He can speak his feeling through nipple;"...I am able to make myself understood through my nipple, and faintly, to hear what is going on around me..."(14).

The novella exposes the degree to which mental experience is typically taken to be detachable from the physical, and constitute identity from the very convention Roth reproduces in the consistency of Kepesh's narrating voice. Kepesh's acceptance of this convention becomes obvious in his use of language, where the problem of identity is made manifest in the personal pronoun having declares "I am a breast"(12). Kepesh repeatedly must skirt the implications of his grammatical equation that the "I", the sign of subjectivity, has become an object, a thing that defined by its materiality, a dismembered body part that inevitable indicates its own lack. By the convention of reading, first person narrator who calls himself "David Kepesh "and who speaks through the textual "I" must be the (fictional) personage, David Kepesh and must also

be the consciousness through which we experience narrative events. We, like Kepesh, know that he is a human being, no matter that all his sensory perceptions suggest otherwise. Like Kepesh, too, we must constantly struggle to overlay the "fact" of his physical deformation upon our apprehension of a normative human voice, a voice that, by the laws of linguistic utterance, constitutes Kepesh as a human subject. In this regard, Debra Shostak singles out the idea of Emile Benveniste, that is, "language enables the speaker (Kepesh) to express the feeling he has of his irreducible subjectivity through the "unique but mobile sign, I "(qtd. in Debra Shostak, 319). What David Kepesh assumes in his narrative "I" is the sum of his sensations and perceptions across time-his history as a human that he hopes makes his self irreducible and impermeable consciousness and especially memory constitutes his "me", and in that sense Roth suggests through his use of Kepesh's narrating voice the continuity of a self as distinct from the body, an "identity" that bears the etymological trace of "sameness": "I" is the same as the voice that speaks "I"; language seems to speak to and speak from a stable center.

Kepesh's desire to fill the absence of being motivates his acts as a narrator, so that his declarative statements about how he feels and what he does, says, and thinks suggest efforts to declare a coherent self. His recurrent "I" is, however, more so than those of "normal" narrators reveal their illusoriness as sign of stability. The simple descriptive statement provides a powerful example. When Kepesh says, "I am a breast" (12), he attempts to provide information to state the "facts" as objectively as possible. But the echoes of the unstated and unstateable resound around the sentence. To state "I" requires a capacity for reflexiveness that we ascribe only to human beings. The predicate nominative "breast" however, cancels out other possible predicate nominatives "man" or "human" upon which that enunciation of "I" depends.

If Kepesh can state "I am a breast", he cannot state "I am a human being," and so that "I" becomes a very compromised and unstable marker, the sign of Kepesh's inability to say "I".

In undermining Kepesh's subjectivity, Roth unsettles the conventional cognitive ways we relate the body to human identity. Kepesh the breast has no limbs, not torso (unless he's all torso), no face – nothing to orient himself according to the conventions of the "human being." He feels as if the functions of hearing and speech both originate in the nipple that the nipple has replaced his head and when the doctors conclude that his voice actually emerges from a flap in his midsection, he cannot accommodate this information, which contradicts the prevailing metaphors of human selfhood: "my sense of internal landscape doggedly continues to associate the higher functions of consciousness with the body's topmost point" (15). Because the alienation from the human that Kepesh feels centers on the distance he perceives between conventional sensory experience and his own, he wants to think that he has gone mad:

That I could not see, that I could not taste, that I could not smell, that I could not faintly hear, that I experienced myself as speaking to others like one buried within, and very nearly strangulated by, his own adipose tissue were these symptoms to unusual in the trance world of psychosis?(52)

Kepesh possesses the reflexive consciousness to tell him that he is and is not his material body. He has entered the realm of indeterminacy. When he asserts that "his body was still a body!" (67), we have to ask what a body is and what a body is in relation to "the human ", not just what the mind's relation to the body is.

The question matters in large part because we conceive of consciousness as the seat of subjectivity while we tend to see the body as an object. When Kepesh awakes from his transformation, however, he feels that his status has slipped from subject to object, his "I" both estranged from and, he fears, absorbed by his body. For Kepesh, this doubt translates into whether he is a breast, a thing or an "I". Without the sensory faculties that enable him to perceive himself from the outside, he must, further, rely on other's accounts- "they tell me...I am said to be..."(13) which means that his self construction is inextricably mediated by the other. While Lacan argues that our desire—and hence our perceptions –are always so mediated, in that the unconscious is "the discourse of the other" our psyches after objects to fill the sense of facts in being. Kepesh however, must confront with this self alienation because he is unable to maintain the illusion of the coherent self.

After the formation of "self" and acquisition of language Kepesh acts as the "analysand" and his physician Dr. Gordon and his psychoanalyst Dr. Klinger both as "analyst". At First, Dr. Gordon becomes analyst of Kepesh (analysand) and admits him at hospital. To make his cure successful, Kepesh calls Dr. Gordon and transfers his past experience. Especially, Kepesh with Dr. Gordon recounts his symptoms before metamorphosis takes place. Dr. Gordon, further, analyzes the causes of Kepesh's metamorphosis and offers various descriptions of his metamorphosis in pseudoscientific Jargon: "a massive hormonal influx," "an endocrinopathic catastrophe," "a hermaphroditic explosion of chromosomes "(12). He further analyzes Kepesh's lapsed sexual interest in his wife as the cause of Kepesh's metamorphosis. Not only Dr. Gordon, but also Dr. Klinger plays the role of "analyst" of "analysand" Kepesh. The professor becomes the patient of psychoanalyst Klinger. He pours his lovelorn past experience to his therapist Fredrick Klinger. Past feeling re-emerge in

him once again during his cure session. Kepesh was hypnotized by the physical beauty of Claire, his ex-wife – in his by gone and he is still in the hangover of that:

I had so far associated it with a resurgence of my desire for her. From where and why I could not say to me she was no more or less Voluptuous and lovely a young woman than she had always been but I was delighted to have it back again. As it was, the strong lust that her physical beauty and aroused in me during the first two years of our affair..." (7).

In this situation, Klinger is analyzing Kepesh. So, Kepesh's role here is a patient. After losing his potency and transformation into a female breast, Kepesh is severely in tension about his future life. He is tortured by his past events. Kepesh transfers his feeling and expectations to help his therapist to cure. He thinks that Klinger knows something about whom he is and who he should become. However, the matter of fact is that Klinger does not have the correct reality paradigm to help Kepesh with his impasses in knowledge and desire. But he maintains. The phenomenon itself tells us more about an unstable base of knowledge in being, than it does about who actually has the correct theory. Klinger's role then is to sit silent only and Kepesh knows and he can speak in the logical time it takes to unravel repressed traumata, drop harmful to live by.

Chapter IV

Conclusion

Summing up, the present study attempts to show that *The Breast* as a novella dramatizes the story of metamorphosis through the character of David Alan Kepesh. The major character Kepesh, the Professor of Jewish -American Comparative Literature, is the developing character of the novella. His physical appearances and activities are in constant transformation; therefore, his identity is also constantly changing. He has different sexual orientation in different situations. The research work, therefore, gives its focus on how Kepesh behaves in different situations, what he speaks, what he does, and how and why he gets on changing. What is underlying causes of change in his identity and why he cannot fit himself into the identity categories like male/female; heterosexual/homosexual is the central issue of this research. By taking help of some theoretical insight from theorists like Freud and Lacan who contributed a lot to the psychoanalysis, the research work attempts to answer the question raised above. From analysis, the answer to why Kepesh can not fit himself into fixed identity categories is that the identity categories are simply constructed.

Moreover, the present research supplies the answer to the question: why and how does the protagonist change? While responding it, the research work presupposes his former changeable life, and presents the situation of Kepesh's metamorphosis, and at last, his fragmented self after his metamorphosis. Kepesh, Professor of Comparative Literature and a man of "hearty and bowel movements" engages in extra-marital sex with Helen and Claire. However, he is deprived of having sex. As he is deprived of, he is obsessed with it. Though Kepesh being a professor, tries to repress, it manifestes upon him and he gets metamorphosed into a six foot and one hundred

fifty five pound female breast. Though Claire, Dr Gordon, psychoanalyst Dr Klinger and his father try to convince him that he is a female breast, he, confronting with them declares himself of being a mad. To some extent, the research work is designed to begin answering the question of how Kepesh could have spent the whole year after his metamorphosis not knowing his identity as a woman's breast. So, the research examines the causes of identity problem of the character's sexuality.

In this way, this study is limited to the analysis of the causes and consequences of Kepesh's metamorphosis. But while doing so, the present research could not reflect the other aspects of the novella. The gender theory, existential theory, post modern theory and Foucauldian power discourse are in shadow. Deconstructive theory, in the novella *The Breast* subverts the dichotomy between fiction and reality, male and female, homosexual and heterosexual etc. Similarly, gender theory of Judith Butler proves that Kepesh's identity is the matter of his performativity. In the same way, Foucauldian theory analyzes the reversal of Kepesh's power position. Moreover, this research has missed to analyze the novella from existential perspective. Existential theory analyses Kepesh's identity crisis after his metamorphosis.

To conclude, this research, by the help of Freudian and Lacanian psychoanalysis as the device, shows the obsession of the protagonist with the breast of his erstwhile lover Claire, his repressed desire, childhood deprivation and fear of castration as the causes of his metamorphosis and fragmentation of his "self" as the consequence.

Works Cited

- Abrams, M.H. *A Glossary of literary Terms*. Australia, Canada et.al: Thomson Wardsworth, 2005.
- Adams, Hazard. *Int. Critical Theory Since Plato*. Rev. New York: Harcourt Brace, 1992.
- Baumgarten, Murray and Barbara Gottfried. *Understanding Philip Roth*. Columbia: U of South Carolina P, 1990.
- Bloom, Harold. *The Anxiety of Influence: A Theory of Poetry*. Oxford UP, 1973.
- Boyle, Kevin. *The Breast*. Magill's Guide to Science Fiction and Fantasy Literature. New York: Salem Press, 1996. 23-38.
- Brooks, Peter. *Psychoanalysis and Story Telling*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1994.
- Cohen, Josh. *How to Read Freud*. London: Granta Books, 2005.
- Freud, Sigmund. *Introductory Lectures on Psychoanalysis*. London: Penguin Books, 1952.
- . *Essentials of Psychoanalysis*. Trans. James Strachery. London: Penguin Books, 1991.
- . *Interpretation of Dream*. Trans. James Strachery. London: Penguin Books, 1976.
- . "The Dynamics of Transference". *Recommendation to Physician Practicing Psychoanalysis*. Ed. and Trans. James Strachery. London: Hogarth Press, 1986.
- . *The Future Prospect of Psychoanalytic Therapy*. Ed. and Trans. James Strachery. London: Hogarth Press, 1986.
- Harap, Louis. *In the Mainstream: The Jewish Presence in Twentieth Century American Literature*. West Port, CT: Greenwood, 1987.
- Heimann, P. "On Counter Transference". *International Journal of Psychoanalysis*. 31-42, 1950.

- Homer, Sean. *Jacques Lacan*. London and New York: Routledge, 2005.
- Kafka, Franz. "The Metamorphosis." *Metamorphosis and Other Stories*. New York: Penguin, 1984. 7-63.
- Klein, Melanie. *Contributions to Psychoanalysis*. London: Hogarth, 1948.
- . *Love, Guilt and Reparation and Other Works*. London: Virago, 1988.
- . *The Selected Melanie Klein*. Ed. Juliett Mitchell. London: Penguin, 1986.
- Lacan, Jacques. *Écrits: A Selection*. Trans. Alan Sheridan. Great Britain: Routledge, 1977.
- . The Four Fundamental Concepts of Psychoanalysis. Ed. Jacques-Alain Miller. Trans. Alan Sheridan. New York: W.N. Norton, 1978.
- . *Seminar XI*. New York: Norton, 1988. 32.
- . "Intervention and Transference." *In Dora's Case: Freud, Hysteria and Feminism*. Ed. Charles Bernheimer and Claire Cahane. New York: Columbia University Press. (1990): 92-104.
- Lee, Hermoine. *Philip Roth*. London: Methuen, 1982.
- Mikkonen, Kai. "The Metamorphosed Parodical Body in Philip Roth's *The Breast*". *Critique* 41.1(1999): 13-32.
- Nilson, Don L.F. *Humorous Contemporary Jewish American Authors: An Overview of the Criticism* *Melus*, 21. 4, (1996).
- Page, James D. *Abnormal Psychology*. New York and London: MC Graw – Hill Books Company, 1947.
- Rathus, Spencer and Nevid Jeffreys. *Adjustment and Growth: The Challenges of Life*. New York: Routledge, 1980.
- Roth, Philip. *The Breast*. 1972. London: Vintage, 1995.
- . *The Professor of Desire*. 1977. London: Vintage, 1995.

---. *Portnoy's Complaint*. 1969. New York: Facett, 1985.

Shcott Webster. "Speak, Mammary." *Life* 73(1972):12.

Shostak, Debra. "Return to *The Breast*: The Body, The Masculine Subject, and Philip Roth". *Twentieth Century Literature* 45.3(1999): 317-336.

Duffrense, Tod. *Returns to the "French Freud": Freud, Lacan and Beyond*. Ed. New York: Routledge, 1997.

Jay, Martin. *Downcast Eyes: The Denigration of Vision in Twentieth Century French Thought*. Berkley: University of California, 1993.

Skura, Meredith. "Psychoanalytic Criticism." *Redrawing the Boundaries*. ed. Stephen Greenblatt, and Giles Gunn. New York: MLA, 1992.

Shechner, Mark. "Jewish Writers." *Harward Guide to Contemporary American Writing*. Ed. Daniel Hoffman. New York: Oxford University Press, 1979.