

1. Women and Their Dollification

Woman is only the creature on earth who keeps every creature united to each other and there is no comparison of anything with woman. In Neo- pagan Witchcraft the goddess is the very essence or central figure of the craft and worship. She is the great mother, representing the fertility which brings forth all life as Mother Nature. In *Woman and Violence* David Miranda tries to define woman:

A woman is an adult female human being. The term woman usually is used for an adult, with the term girl being the usual term for a female child or adolescent however, the term woman is also sometimes used to identify a female human, regardless of age, as in phrase such as “Woman’s rights.” (56)

The word women can be used generally, to mean any female, or specifically, to mean an adult female human as contrasted with girl. The word girl originally meant young person of either sex in English; it was only around the beginning of the 16th century that it came to mean specifically a female child. Girl is used colloquially to refer to a young or unmarried woman.

Conversely, in certain culture which links family honor with female virginity, the word girl is still used to refer to a never-married woman; in this sense it is used in fashion roughly analogous to the obsolete English maid or maiden. Referring to an unmarried female as a woman may, in such a culture, imply that she is sexually experienced, which would be an insult to her family. David further states:

There are various words used to refer to the quality of being a woman. The term “womanhood” merely means the state of being a woman, having passed the menarche; “Femininity” is used to refer to a set of

supposedly typical female qualities associated with a certain attitude to gender roles. (45)

Traditionally, woman was subordinated since the origin of early human civilization. Bible defined that the creation of Eve was out of Adam's ribs. Because of this Christian belief woman is segregated even the advanced society. In Aristotelian sentence, "The female is female by the virtues of certain lack of qualities and we should regard the female nature as afflicted with natural defectiveness" (qtd. in Schneir 8). Bibles and scriptures played great role to define women in ancient era:

In the ancient Greek law, women were not treated equally as men. They had secondary role in religion and government. They had no control over family, children and private property. Their duty was to serve family and children remaining under the society's laws. Women were under the sever constraints of law and watched over special magistrates. Their lives remained as a perpetual minor under the control of guardians. The existence of slave and women are same. In this context, Aristotle further says, "inferiority of slaves and women were innate. It could not be cured." (qtd. in Doren 44)

The Middle Age (1066-1500) started with the new ideology of Christianity. Everything was defined by the Christianity. Everything was defined by the Christian ideology including culture, religion and tradition which had contributed no little to the oppression of women. They were treated with relative honor when they submitted themselves the Yoke of the Church. But they could take only a secondary place as participates in worship. They were authorized to carry out certain lay tasks as caring for sick and aiding the poor. Marriage was held to be an institution demanding mutual fidelity the expected women's subordination which was described in Old and New

Testament by St. Paul. According to him, “For the husband is the head of the wife, even as Christ is the head of the church Therefore as the church is subject unto Christ, so let the wife be to their own husband in everything”(Wayne 58).

In the Renaissance time (1500-1700), all ancient art, culture, traditions and laws were revived with the cultural thoughts of Christianity which played dominant role to guide women. Churches, Bibles, and Holy scriptures were important to judge women’s position in the society and family. The demand for morality and chastity constrained women and narrowed their existence.

Women had no legal status as men in Renaissance time. The code denied woman’s access to masculine position, depriving them from all civil capacities, kept them, while unmarried under the guardianship of father, who sent into the convent if she failed to marry later. If she married her property would be completely under the authority of her husband. Depicting woman’s social position, Helen Wilcox writes:

Women severely constrained in social and legal position. In law, women had no status what so ever but only daughter wives or widows of men; according to the Church, they were to be silent and listen to the advice of husbands or pastors; in religion and cultural patterns of thought, they were daughter of Eve with a continuing proneness to temptation and disproportionate burden of guilty. (4)

In the same way, women had same predicament in the 18th century as in earlier era. They lacked professional position in the society. They were treated as servants in home and outside. They got independence while working outside home. The young girls got only sketchy education under strict supervision with motives of civilizing value. Education they received was likely to be carefully restricted version

of curriculum. In the profession, peasant women took considerable part in the labor firm and burden of maternity added them to fatigue. They were married off or sent to convent without consultation. The rising middle class imposed strict morality upon wives. But women of the world led extremely like licentious lives and upper middle class was contemned by such example. But the legal position of woman was crucially affected depending on whatever she was single (female sole) or married (female covert). According to Vivien Jones, “. . . a married woman had no separate legal identity, her existence was figuratively ‘covered’ subsumed into her husband” (92). They had no private property and control over family. The object, the values and the being she created were not of her but belong to family. In public law, there was no place for them except on throne. They sat neither council nor in the House of Common or the House of Lords. Neither did they serve on vote nor juries.

Women remained confined in Victorian society also. Though they were willing to escape from the network of patriarchal hegemony since early 18th century, they were still entrapped inside it. However, women’s freedom, individuality and right all were under the grip of male power. Moreover, industrial revolution brought the great upheaval in England and laid great impact on women’s lives.

Before the industrial revolution, women were valued in domestic duties for nursing the babies caring the aged making food and planting herbals and flowers. They were confined to domesticity and motherhood idealized as “angles in the house” (Bargielowska 8). But after the revolution, they left domestic duties and entered into public sphere as the demand of workers increased. However, she earned, her property belongs to her husband. The husband was legal guardian of children and wife. They could not sign on legal document without husband’s consent. Women are deprived in social, legal, economical, political and genital privilege; they are discontent, as they

have no self assertion and ownership of their body. They quest for the equal opportunities in all the matter. Their role has been so minimized that they have still been struggling for gender equality. The frustration and pity of woman-being can be noticed in several literary works.

Though the women had silent history of long time, they were launching feminist movement politically in the reform movement of the days. Abolitionists such as Mary Weston Chapman, Lucretia Mott and Grimke Sister raised voices and stirred a hot debate against anti slavery in 1833 and formed anti-slavery society the ended the slavery in London. Woman fighter, Mary Weston Chapman supported libertarian, William Lloyed Garrison (1807-79), the strongest advocate of women's right who campaigned against slavery editing *The Liberator*. She supported him by writing journal *The Liberty Bell* to help him economically. He including women abolitionist marched headed of giving place to women's delegation in international anti-slavery convention in London because British reformers had refused to receive women's delegation in 1840s. They were not accepted to enter the convention. With the help of Garrison, they got access in the fist suffrage organization in the United State, The Seneca Falls Convention. On the occasion, Elizabethan Candy Stanton expressed her experiences to the America Anti-Slavery meeting in 1860:

Here in women are more fully identify with the slave than men can possibly, she can take the subjective view. She early learns the misfortune of being born an heir to the crown of thrones, to martyrdom, to womanhood. For while, man is born to do whatever he can, for the woman and negro there is no such privilege. (Clinton 75)

Women were interested in politics specially the basic rights to vote. They campaigned for the suffering movement in 1848 in Seneca Falls Convention in New

York where declaration of sentiment was issued and argued that women's rights are natural rights. They merged two organizations to empower themselves and finally push for vote. But they had to wait till 1920 to get voting rights and citizenship.

The transformation in the position of women during the 20th century justified by the changes such as the reduction in fertility rate, removal of frontier barriers towards women's participation in education, works, politics and public life. Though some changes occurred in the society to look at women, they continued to be under-represented in many areas, subjected to domestic violence and sexual discrimination. However, some changes occurred in the lives and living of women, the dominant perceptions about gender relations and cultural ideologies were constant even in this era.

Throughout the early human civilization, woman is fighting for her existence and to save her existence crisis as woman is even the creator of man. But male is treating her like a doll. Women are suppressed by the male psychic. Women are fighting for her self respect and for the proper place in society. But ironically even after thousand of centuries she has not been able to get herself the place she deserves. In the male dominated society her desire, to be equally important, valued, powerful and respectful like men, were suppressed. And even today in well educated modern world it can be seen. Although liberty is there for them and they are being given opportunities in most of centuries. Till today male and female are not equally treated and respected. The male's psychic is enjoying making woman doll. Man is not acknowledging woman's psyche and not behaving her as an individual and autonomous entity. They are treated as a personal property and a slave. They are not experiencing self sufficiency and independence of choice. Women are dollified by super psychic of male. Male is in favor of dollification. Dollification can be used to

describe exactly what's occurring in the writer's imagination. On online version of *New Princeton Encyclopedia of poetry & Poetics*, dollification has been defined as:

Dollification: the process of evolving, mentally and physically, into a "living doll." Individual who desires this process as those who is in the midst of the process or have already achieved and end result-may be described as "dolls," are desire as well to be owned. The partner involved in dollification is referred to as "Owner" and "doll"; this compare Master/slave or Dom/sub relationship. (203)

Dolls are desire of human beings. Dollification is the process of desire for doll to get pleasure mentally and physically. Dolls are imagination to fulfill the desire inhabited in spirit of anyone. Dollification is objectification and natural subservience of human beings which is constructed in mind of a master to be an owner of doll for his satisfaction. Dolls live in the deadly world for peace. The nude to be transformed through one's own or outside force into living doll, ultimately, the capacity to feel or see one dollific manner, which the doll with continually strive to achieve or improve. While not all who possess these qualities will embrace them, it will not change that it is part of which they are nature.

Considering the doll, Walter Benjamin discusses in his *On Mimetic Faculty*; Of course, dolls have neither mechanism nor organism to make them 'go'. Even when a wind-up is present the doll does not present itself as an autonomous agent. No amount of mechanism or organism could make doll 'go'. The uncanny presents itself as just that sort of autonomous self organization which has just be severed form its 'primary'. In an uncanny instant, the double has taken on a life of its own and has thrown off the mere 'appearance' of life. The languages which have brought doll to existence. Wherever there are doll there are incantations; wherever there is language

there are 'dolls'. All dolls/things come –to-life—without having life—through this naming- by virtue of its mental being, is a medium of communication, and what is communicated in it is—in accordance with its mediating relationship—precisely the medium (language) itself. “Language is thus the mental being of things” (320).

Benjamin still makes the idea clear, how would a doll messiah come into existence? What pronunciation, what incantation would facilitate the emergence? A doll's apocalypse would be configured or on different chiasmatic stem opposite (while still contained within) the human: a plunging form the equilibrium of stasis to a chaotic, 'noisy' dynamics while still maintaining deadness, a living death. The doll messiah's call as it attempts to pronounce the liberation of chaos and hence its fellow members (will there be any difference/ identity between these members? Or will they finally have realized that chiliastic quest of all churches throughout of all history for the One Body? “The nature of the doll may be such that once one has 'arrived' so have they all. Human history naming that supercedes once and for all mechanism/organism” (321).

Cheatham states, dolls are constellations of both symbolic and imaginary systems, symbolic because they are products of certain 'law' of (pro)(re) creation, the order of which is determined by cultural codings concerning the value and place of mimetic structuration, 'family' resemblances', dicta concerning 'present absence' and the artificial in general; and the imaginary because of the self-sustaining/supporting nature; of the imaginal and its virtually 'pneumatic' nature (in the exact analog with sprits, geist, as a 'breathing into' as a necessity of the body to become animate-and to speak). “Likewise the doll nothing more that the 'law and order' of craftsmanship and culturally encoded mimesis” (67).

Cheatham further forwards his idea, “Dolls are purely inhibited by spirit even than are the humans who are considered and inextricable amalgam of spirit. A moment of relapse of attention and the doll sinks back into that object terror of inanimate mimesis (hence always on the verge of animation), of the horror of daemonic possession of matter by matter and not human imagination: the doll becoming a puppet whose master is nowhere is to be seen. The horror is that in the doll’s mix of symbolic and imaginary, the imaginary of falls away, leaving the stark, unblinking eye of material adjudication, judging, weighing, balancing form a point outside of human history” (68). His idea of dollification in *The Ante Millennial Doll House*:

The closer to human figure, the more doll- like we say the ‘object’ is (“Was heist das ding?”), i.e., the more subject-like it becomes, but a subject without substance (dressing animals in clothes being a process of ‘dollification’). Dolls confuse boundary condition of ‘living’/ ‘not-living’ (although notice that the boundary is not between living/dead).
(48)

Dolls are product of dollification of human beings. Languages have brought the doll to existence. When a human condition becomes the condition of lifeless like a pet, they sometimes transform themselves into non living beings in the hope of their life playing with dolls for their happiness. In the deadlike condition such language is created and gets existence. Dolls are emerged in the chaotic boundary of living and non living world which suppresses individuality. Male always dominate society and society is constructed by super psychic of male where women are being remained suppressed. Woman’s question of equality and freedom has become a global issue. The social and religious ideologies have been formed on the basis of patriarchal structure. Women have found themselves in the dark abyss of male-exploitation. The

women are silenced by the men and depriving them from the fundamental rights to speak, question and protest. The male represents the upper class and the female the lower class. The patriarchal ideology and social and religious institution makes women submissive, subordinate. The women class is ruled and the male's class is the ruler. The ruling class has made women merely a doll.

In Ibsen's play *A Doll's House*, the male protagonist, Helmer, who is dealing with Nora, suppressing her individuality as a doll and innocent wife, makes her vulnerable and insecure member of family and society. The Victorian ideology treats her only as doll wife that veils her individual personality and feminine dignity. It confines her sentimentality and makes her insecure. Nora's increasing consciousness points out each and every move of her husband realizes own insecure position in the family and society. Helmer tries to take her still in his grip but Nora starts to question herself about her social position and status and gets too much conscious about her value in society.

Women are always guided by male's ideologies. They are always silenced and made dumb and doll because the society is patriarchal. They have no personal vision and perspective to judge anything and take any decision independently. Free will is the key of feminist but that is not respected by the male made society and culture. The society is always against women that watches each and every activities of women from the perspective of males.

Women have become victim of male counterparts because culture is constructed in such a way that women must always be guided by male. They are not independent and secure economically, socially and sexually in the society.

Nora was celebrating womanhood playing dual role. On the one hand, she was playing as a child with Helmer, she was playing a consciousness and aware woman on the other hand from the beginning of the drama. Regarding these, John Grassner observed:

The woman in *A Doll's House* was not intrinsically a doll; bearing the initial forgery, she only pretends to be one because this was expected of her. She plays dual role- that of a child and heroic woman in one. If we do not take Nora as childish and thoughtless as she appears to be, her action will appear far less improbable. She could very well pretend her ignorance of law as she could play the role of a 'doll'. (370)

Women existence is in dilemma today. On the one hand they want to reclaim equal social status and they are compelled to accept 'otherness and objectness' on the other. Their independent success is in contradiction with their femininity. Assimilating these facts, Beauvoir proclaims:

The women of today are not women at all In sexuality and maternity women as subject can claim autonomy The men of today show certain duplicity of attitude which is painfully lacerating to women; they are still requiring her to remain the inessential With man there is no break between public and private life Whereas women's independence and successes are in contradiction with her femininity, since the truth woman is required to make herself object, to be the other. (276)

Virginia Woolf, an important precursor of feminist criticism who wrote *A Room of One's Own* (1992) on woman authors and on the cultural economic and educational

disabilities within what she called a “patriarchal” society that has prevented women from realizing their creative possibilities. She clearly depicts the condition of women of the 19th century and claims for social reform:

Millions are condemned to a stiller doom than mine and millions are in silent revolt against their lot. Women are supposed to be very calm generally: but women feel just as men feel; they need exercised for their faculties and a field for their efforts as much as their brothers do; they suffer from too rigid a restraint, too absolute a stagnation precisely as men would suffer; and it is narrow minded in their more privileged fellow- creature to say that they ought to confine themselves to making puddings and knitting stockings, to playing on the piano and embroidering bags. It is thought less to condemn and laugh at them
(75-76)

Society is male centered, controlled, organized and conducted in such a way to subordinate women in all domains: familial, religious, political, economic, social and legal. Women were made as heroines and angles decorative and luxurious commodities of house. Women of the contemporary era were beginning to realize their equal position and individual identity in the society and world. So, Women in the nineteenth century England were protesting against the custom, culture and tradition and trying to escape from the male-made world.

All the major critics of *A Doll's House* seem to focus on the study of women's assertion for freedom and social position. Ibsen's drama is an intense protest against the socio-cultural network and its limitation and that stand as a barrier in women's progresses and purposes. In fact, Nora comes to realize that male's love, protection and possession are all lies clad in beautiful frame or fabric. She feels that she is

misbehaved and treated as with a doll both by her husband as well as by her father. She becomes conscious that she is an individual and she must have own position in society. Her being the prisoner of life circumstances weakness in her great awareness. Now, she just can not get on with what she has for years been getting or with of course, the home, relation, children etc. are very dear but continuing to live for them would mean living aside the most sacred duty of life-the search for individual social position and identify.

There was definite background against which Ibsen wrote *A Doll's House*. He had become interested in women's independence, and already in his play, *The Pillars of Society* in which he had drawn two women, Lona and Dina, both of whom had minds of their own. He has also felt much impressed by a book written by his friend, Camilla Collett on the status of women. The first real step towards an independent tradition came with the established permanent theatre buildings and professional acting companies during the 19th century. During the life time of Ibsen, the whole Norway gave experience to him and *A Doll's House* was not exception form it. There was the seed of consciousness, which was probably utilized by Ibsen and reflected in his plays. The seeds of this play may be found in *The League of Youth* (1869) where Selma's outburst in the third act almost epitomizes the theme of later play:

How I've longed to share your troubles! But if ever I asked about anything I was sent about my business with a clever joke. You dressed me like a doll and played with me as the play with a child, oh, it would have been so wonderful to suffer with you. I'm serious person, with a longing for all the higher, more inspiring things in life.

(31)

However, it took Ibsen ten years to work out this theme and gave it a suitable dramatic form. Ibsen made the following note for *A Doll's House* which clearly shows how Ibsen conceived it at first:

There are two kinds of spiritual law, two kinds of conscience, one in man and another, altogether different, in women. They do not understand each other; but in practical life the woman is judged by man's law as though she were not a woman but a man A woman cannot be herself in the society of present day, which is an exclusively masculine society, with laws framed by men and with a judicial system that judges feminine conduct from a masculine point of view (qtd. in Jacobus 635-36)

Nora is valuable possession of Helmer as he says, 'My precious little songbird' (35). Helmer's treatment makes her innocent-doll and static wife of him who hides whole feminine entities and existence. Nora is keep on playing as a child doll by her father and lovely dolly by her husband before getting aware of male desire for women dollification which suppressed the very natural right of Nora. Nora is only confined into house and made captive in the ideology of her husband. Her natural rights are badly guided by her husband as male's desire of woman dollification. She cannot feel her own value in society.

Thus, physically appealing female subject may become dollifeid when desirable human psychic qualities are projected onto her by an admirer. This admirer projects a psychological profile onto her in order to establish certain social and emotional relations between the self and the doll that is highly personal. Indeed, though imagination, the admirer can conjure up a desired degree of passive femininity in the subject to render her more or less lovely than before. Thus, within this

figurative state of mind her physical appeal is combined with a greater or lesser to seduce and captivate.

2. Gender Movement and Women Enhancement

Gender is a complex social construct based upon biological sex, but it is not the same as sex. It can also be argued that gender alone drives us, and that sex is an incidental feature. Gender facilitates sexual interaction and reproduction. Gender is intertwined with identity, expression, presentation, relationship, child rearing, societal role and structure, pairing, games, and eroticism. We are a sexually dimorphic species, where physical appearance is the number one gender maker. Gender becomes fixed in infancy, but it remains remarkably fluid, full of twists and surprise. Janet Saltzman Chafetz defines gender as in the perspective of role and relationship:

Gender refers to the roles and responsibilities of men and women that are created in our families, our societies and our cultures. The concept of gender also includes the expectations held about the characteristics, aptitudes and likely behaviors of both women and men (femininity and masculinity). Gender roles and expectations are learned. They can change over time and they vary within and between cultures. Systems of social differentiation such a political status, class, ethnicity, physical and mental disability, age and more, modify gender roles. The concept of gender is vital because, applied to social analysis; it reveals how women's subordination (or men's domination) is socially constructed. As such, the subordination can be changed or ended. It is not biologically predetermined nor is it fixed forever. (201)

Gender inequality is ubiquitous. This notion of male supremacy has been justified, sustained, and continued through different institutions, historically. However, the notion was challenged from time to time through different ways, e.g. writing songs, and dance. In early 19th century, different types of knowledge emerged in

understanding social realities. Critical perspective emerged to look at social realities. The functional perspective, which explains everything as functional and beneficial, has been challenged by the critical perspective. Karl Marx is regarded as the pioneer of the perspective. He explained the inequality that prevailed in the society in terms of production and distribution of resources. However, even he was not able to explain inequality in terms of gender. Women's position was explained on the basis of their biology and biology was used to justify male supremacy in the society. However, the notion could not remain static. Writings from different fields, particularly; from the research work of an anthropologist, Margaret Mead challenged the concept of the male as superior and females as inferior in early 1930s. Worldwide, women's relatively lower position in the society that was considered theological started to be analyzed in depth. Collective challenge to the notion of male's supremacy, at international level, was started in the 1960s. It was started by breaking the silence about women's oppression, subordination and subjugation. Issues of violence, dichotomization of public and private domain, systematic exclusion of women from public arena, and devaluation of women's work started uncovering and put forward for public debate and discussion. As a result, the new concepts and approaches emerged and continued to be emerging and developing to analyze social realities. Women in development (WID), Women and development (WAD) and Gender development (GAD) are among the other powerful approaches, which provide new perspective to analyze existing hierarchical unequal gender relation.

Exclusion of women from the public area has been highly realized for a long time. It was also realized that their subordination is embedded in their role as care taker and nurturer. Therefore, WID approaches, which focused primarily on women's practical needs, were in the center of development discourse in late 1960s. Moreover,

those who believe in WID approaches did not question ‘why’ about women and continued to focus only on how women could be better integrated into mainstream development. This approach, in one way created ample opportunities for women to participate in the public arena. In other words, it contributed multiple responsibilities for women. Later, mainly Marxist feminist, who believe that structural inequality is the ‘root cause of women’s subordination, heavily criticized this approach. They blamed liberal feminist who advocate for WID approach, for ignoring real issues as women’s least access to resources, and their contribution to economy. During early 1980, WAD approach was developed, which assumes that women are already in the development field. Only their contribution are not properly recognized or even devalued. GAD approach emerged in the late 1980s, focusing both on productive and reproductive role of women and integrating both women and men at the same time. According to Kate Yough (1987), “The GAD approach starts from a holistic perspective, looking at the totality of social organization, economic and political life in order to understand the shaping of particular aspects of society” (qtd. in Visvanathan).

According to Miriam- Webster’s *Third New International Dictionary*, *status* accommodates the condition of a person that determine the nature of legal personality, his legal capacities and the nature of legal to rebellion to the state or the other person into which he may enter:

Gender has root in culture and the culture has root in society. Sex is determined biologically as male and female but gender is psychological concept which refers to culturally acquired sexual identity. And the word ‘women’ is socially constructed. As French feminist, Simone de Beauvoir says, “One is not born rather becomes a

woman. No biological, psychological or economic fate determine the figure that the human female present in society; it is civilization as a whole that produces this creatures, intermediate between male and eunuch, which is described as feminine.” (281)

A woman to be recognized in association with men’s appellation is the most deplorable person. In our society, according to Beauvoir, “She is sex absolute sex, no less. She is defined and differentiated with reference to men, not she with reference to her” (qtd. Sydie138).

The tendencies make woman inferior and humiliated. Culture and society are powerful that always differentiate and look down upon women. These factors are failure also to analyze that women have humanity and self i.e. a separate autonomous identity. Supporting women’s role and gender diversity, Nalini Visvnathan asserted, “Women’s roles are multifaceted, women’s identities are multilinked. There is strength in gender diversity; there is also strength in women’s shared cultures and values” (41).

Gender differences were constructed through cultural and historical practices. So does the subordination of women to men. Existing approaches and attitudes in many societies have excluded women form the public sphere and access to the mean of production; and become one of the chief hindrances to human progress. Gender discourse, therefore, explores why men’s association with the superior domain of power, production, culture and knowledge continuously socialized women into accepting an ascribed status of inequality, asymmetry and privatized life. Regarding gender Krishna B. Bhattachan gives his opinion:

The ongoing gender discourse thus challenges the notion of men and women as “universally given,” and predetermined. It admits the sex is “biological given” and “pre-social” but gender is socially and culturally constructed and, consequently, cannot be universal in nature. Gender disparity differs from one culture to another. It can be changed by the use of rational laws. Gender difference can be reformed to increase their participation in public life and set their struggle for recognition on firm ground. (79)

Enhancement and equal gender progress are inter-related. The term enhance meant to increase or further improve the good qualities, values, status of somebody. A society cannot be progressive without enhancing the marginal issues. Woman’s issues are marginalized by super male psychic. Gender issues must be enhanced equally. The discrimination based on gender is deeply rooted in society. Women enhancement is possible treating gender equally, expanding the women participation in all political, economic, social, cultural fields. A gender analysis considers that women and men have differential access to resources, that they have different needs and interests within a context of unequal power relation. It implies recognizing the nature of exclusion and enhancement in terms of gender ideologies. There is continuous struggle between the society’s demand and feminist’s psyche. Her mind wants to enhance form the influence of accepted models and guide itself by its own impulses. Instead accepting women beings as an equal partner of society, men always enjoy upon feeble female self by suppressing upon their sprouting womanhood. In the drama, *The Doll’s House*, Nora wants equally to be responsible woman. She takes loan form Krogstand to help her husband but the act stands against the Victorian idealism of male dominated society. She falls in double networks of Krogstand and

Helmer because of her secret loan. Helmer's treatment quarrel and Krogstand's threatening make her compel to raise question and revolt against traditional culture.

Nora says:

. . . . It's not easy to say. I really don't know- I am all at sea about these things. I only know that I think quite differently from you about them. I hear, too that the laws are different from what I thought; but I can't believe that they can be right. It appears that a woman has no right to spare her dying father to save her husband's life. I don't believe that.

(104)

Thus, the culture is an output of society that devalues and interiorize women where as men's superiority is highlighted. There is no gender equality. Women are regarded as 'second sex'. Gender discrimination is deeply rooted in society. Women issues are marginalized by the super male's psyche. Nora further challenges the possessive attitudes of looking at women and says to Helmer, "Don't look at me in that way" (90). They are differentiated as subordinate groups as man are dominated groups.

Arundhati Roy depicts the picture of gender discrimination in the *God of Small Things*. In her work, she pictured the cultural aspects of Indian life in an artistic way. She raised the problems of women dominated in a patriarchal society. Women are highly discriminated in Indian society. They are not given equal opportunity of education, social participation and property right. Patriarchal society generally thinks that the higher education is unnecessary expense for them. They are considered as second sex or of lower class. As narrator says:

Papachi insisted that a college education was an unnecessary expense for girl, so, Ammu had no choice but leave Delhi and move with them.

There was very little in a young girl to do in Ayemenem at her than to wait for marriage proposals while she helped her mother with the housework. (38)

It is generally thought in Indian society that the women should remain inside house and their works also are bound to the periphery of the household. On the one hand, they have to remain and work inside the house without crossing the threshold. On the other hand, they are deprived of making decision inside the house. So the women are treated as second sex.

Ammu, the main character of the novel, lives in her maternal home with her two children after having divorce form a Bengali husband. They live in sufferance in the Ayemenem House with Mamachi, children's grandmother, uncle Chacko and grandaunt, Baby Kochamma. When she develops physical relationship with Velutha, an untouchable family carpenter; that is beyond imagination in such a tough religious society and it is supposed to be a great crime against God.

Being a divorce, she is not allowed to take part in her niece's funeral ceremony with her other family members. Though Ammu, Estha and Rahel were allowed to attend to the funeral, they were made to stand separately, not with the rest of the family. Nobody would look at them.

(5)

Ammu, a divorcee returns her patent's house, but she is not welcomed wholeheartedly. She is supposed to be lowered downed having a divorce amongst them. There is even the risk that the presence of divorced woman would affect possible marriage for other daughter within the household. The narrator, through the

example of Baby Kochamma, an archetype of conservative Indian women, vividly describes the attitude of the family towards a divorce. The narrator says:

As for a divorced daughter-according to Baby Kochamma, she had no position anywhere at all. And as for divorced daughter from a love marriage, well words could not describe Baby Kochamma's outrage. As for divorced daughter from a inter community love marriage-Baby Kochamma chose to remain quivering silent on the subject. (45-46)

So, Ammu is exploited and dominated in the society on two ways: on the one hand she is victimized in patriarchal society due to her identity as divorcee. She is socially segregated because she is husbandless after marriage and living in maternal house. To live in parent's house permanently after marriage is not positively accepted in the society. On the other hand, she is supposed to be an outcast when her sexual relationship with Velutha is known to all.

For woman there is no right to be equal in social ceremonies and functions, no rights to get the opportunities as the males do have, no rights to get education, and no rights to get social prestige-what can they do then? Are the women only the property of male or what? Many philosophers raise the questions against the injustice done upon female in the society. They argue that there is no sex hierarchy as it is considered in our society. Arundhoty Roy also visualizes the picture of Indian society where women are considered in the lower rank although they can do as male can.

Kamala Visweswaran's opinion is different when she opines in her essay *Gender and Subalternity, Gendered Subalternity* that is not only the domination of male in the society that makes women inferior. She further writes:

. . . for women became women not only in relation to men, but also in opposition to other women. Thus the subject of position of the middle class or elite nationalist 'woman' must be counter posed to that of Subaltern women. The gendered relation of subalternity means that with regard to the nominal male subject of nationalist ideology, the figure of women is subaltern. (87)

She believes that the idea that gender is a separate category is equivalent to caste and class, rather than a structuring principle of naturalism and its historiography. Talking about women, she writes: "The question of women must be formed first by the recovery of non-originary of 'dependent' subject in the understanding autonomy as relational" (88).

The patriarchal society is biased and prejudiced which never accepts the female enhancement wholeheartedly. Women are affected in the society because they cannot revolt and uplift their status. Their voices are under shadow. Their history is fragmented and episodic. They are subject to male. If the women try to get freedom they will be victimized because it will be against the rules and system of male domain society who creates the truth and discourse to suppress the women. The discourse created by males, norms and values are supportive for the dominance. To develop human progress male, female must be equally treated and respected in society.

Feminism is concerned with gender inequalities in society and the equal rights for woman. This encases social, cultural and political movements. Theories and moral philosophies that affect women in everyday life. Feminism also takes up the fight against other form of discrimination.

Feminists argued that gendered and sexed identities such as man and woman are social construct, meaning that some gender roles are socially conditioned rather than innate. The first wave occurred between the 19th century and early 20th century, starting in the United Kingdom and United States. Their main concerns were equal contract and property right of women.

It is a critical and theoretical practice committed to the struggle against patriarchy and sexism. 'Feminism', is a belief in the principle that women should have some rights and opportunities (legal, political, social, economic etc) as men. "Feminism literary criticism continues in our time to be closely interrelated with the movement by political feminist for social, political, economic and cultural freedom and equality. (Abrams 234) The various feminism, however, share same assumptions and concepts that constitute a common ground for the diverse ways that individual critic explores the factors of sexual difference and privilege in the production, the form and content, the reception, and the critical analysis and evaluation of works of literature. Thus, 'feminism' is not only a political word but also a literary movement and trend in modern era.

The basic view is that western civilization is pervasively patriarchal i.e. ruled by father that is, it is male-centered and controlled and is organized and conducted in such a way as to subordinate women to men in all cultural domains: religious, cultural, political, economic, legal and artistic. From the Hebrew Bible and Greek philosophy to the present, the female trends to be defined by negative reference to the male as the human norm, her lack of the identifying male organ, of male power, and of the male characteristics that are presumed, in the patriarchal view, to have achieved the most important inventions and work of civilization and culture. Many feminist critics have described the literature written by male for its depiction of women as

marginal docile, and subservient to male writers, who in their view, have managed to rise above the sexual prejudices of their time sufficiently to understand and represent the cultural pressures that have shaped the characters of women and forced them their negative or subsidiary social roles.

The gynocritics express their disgust against patriarchic form of writing and underline a need of such writing that would be based on woman's body. It is a criticism that concerns women's psycho- sexual language in literary work and other forms of writing. The word 'gynocriticism' is coined by Elaine Showalter. This criticism seems to be biased because it focuses the biological aspect of womanhood in the form of writing. Showalter rejects the biological inferiority and metaphorical implication of female difference in writing.

Elaine Showalter calls gynocriticism- a criticism which concerns itself with developing a specifically female framework for dealing with works written by women, in all aspects of their production, motivation, analysis, interpretation and in all literary forms, including journals and letters. Sandra Gilbert and Susan Gubar's *The Mad women in the Attic* (1979) stresses especially the psychodynamic of women writers in the nineteenth century. The authors propose the anxiety of authorship that resulted from the stereotype that literary creativity is and exclusively male prerogative, effected in women writer a psychological duplicity that projected a monstrous counter figure to the heroine, as typified by Bertha Rochester, the mad women in Charlotte Bronte's *Jane Eyre*; such a figure is usually in some sense the author's double an image of her own anxiety and rage.

Different feminists depicted the feministic issues and women status in different ways. Feminist critic, Toril Moi defines the feminine entities as: 'feminism', 'femaleness', and 'femininity'. According to her, "feminism is a political position,

femaleness is matter of biology and femininity a set of culturally acquired characteristics” (qtd. in Jefferson and Robey 204).

Thus, in brief, all the feminist critics as well as writers have sympathetically stressed to enhance the women’s status in society to equalize them with the men. Their intention is to bring the women in the mainstream of education, administration, judiciary, politics and making them independent and autonomous individual.

3. Revolt against Archetypal Womanhood.

The term revolt is refusal of obedience. It signifies the unwillingness to obey the rules and regulation of someone or something else. Revolt is early stage of change. Revolt is creation, exploration of new things. Revolt is horrific condition in which all have to feel change and undergoes many troubles. Salman Rushdie's fury is product of his inner revolt against archetypal womanhood to change the outer world of feminine through which he depicts his inner wilderness, the horrific condition, the desirous condition, desire for dolls. His dolls run wild, of living women turned into dolls and then broken, and of a revolt on the planet's far side led by an army of living dolls. *Fury* is a novel of furious energy to create favorable desire of own. It a study of the passionate love and a novel of an old, deep love gone wrong, of a second, twisted passion rooted in wrongness, and of a third, passionate love that just might turn out right. It is a study of the working of fury at the heart of human lives: the personal fury that poisons human relations, the psychotic fury that fuels murderers, the social fury born of our raised and disappointed hopes, the creative fury that sets free our greatest gifts, the political fury that starts revolutions and burns whole cities down. *Fury* is a novel of today, an utterly contemporary portrait of life at the beginning of the third millennium, life in New York during an apparently endless time of prosperity that is paradoxically also a time of barrenness in many people's lives.

It is a work of explosive energy, at once a pitiless and pitch-black comedy and a profoundly disturbing inquiry into the darkest side of human nature, human animalism in us and a love story of mesmerizing force. It is also an astonishing portrait of New York. Salman Rushdie brilliantly entwines moments of anger and frenzy with those of humor, honesty, and intimacy. *Fury* is, above all, a masterly chronicle of the human condition. *Fury*, is exploration of male rage through

archetypal femininity and Online Version of *New Princeton Encyclopedia of Poetry & Poetics* definition of *Archetype*:

Archetype generally, a prototype or original pattern or a paradigm or abstract idea of a class of things that represents the typical and essential element shared by all varieties of that class. In literature, myth, folklore, and religion the term can be applied to images, themes, symbols, ideas, characters and situations that appeal to our unconscious racial memory. T.S. Eliot explains this memory as civilized man's "pre-logical mentality." The psychology of Carl Jung and the comparative anthropology of J.G. Frazer have given the study of archetypal patterns greater usefulness in literary criticism. (243)

Archetypes can be primitive and universal and consist of general themes like birth, death coming of age, love guilt, redemption, and destiny, rivalry between members of the family, fertility rites; of characters like hero rebel, the wanderer, the devil, and the buffoon. The term can be appeal to uncoil racial memory of human being in literature, myth folklore and religion. Archetype speaks in a voice of stronger than her or his own. He raises the idea he is trying to express above the occasional and the transitory into the sphere of the ever-existing. He transmutes personal destiny into the destiny of mankind. That is the secret of effective art.

Rushdie's title attains multiple valences over the course of his text. It refers to the fury active in society and the corresponding fury of his protagonist, Malik Solanka; it also alludes to the furies of Greek tragedy and myth, with which he eventually identifies the triad formed by his wife, a former lover, and his current lover. This paper presents the idea, how Rushdie narrates the interconnection of the feminine fury and the source and agency of this seemingly-ubiquitous social fury.

Rushdie immigrant writer has a love-hate relationship with both his homeland and his adopted country. He suffers yearning and the torments of the furies and pain yet such is inherent in artistic creation:

America's pain, its head pain, its gas pain, its heartache, its loneliness, the pain of babyhood and old age, of being a parent and being a child, the pain of manhood and women's pain, the pain of success and that of failure, the good pain of the athlete and the bad pain of the guilty, the anguish of loneliness and of ignorance, the needle-sharp torments of the cities and the dull, mad ache of the empty plains, the pain of waiting without knowing what was wanted, the agony of the howling void within each watching, semi-conscious self. No wonder advertising was popular. It made things better. (34)

Professor Solanka has made a lot money of inventing and marketing a puppet but he is not satisfied in his life. His inside pain does not allow him to remain quiet. The hidden pain makes him rebellious and too furious. His deadlike condition is the energy of his revolt against his family and society but the revolt increases much pain inside him. He finds not peace but only universal fury and pain. He is in search of peace to hold his life in peaceful way. He wants to set him free from pain forgetting his past, his identity and his root.

The narrative begins in America, we have picture of his life in London and childhood in Bombay through the narrative technique of flash back. Solanka leading an ideal family life, one night; he comes into grip of his own fury that puts him for a moment in Othello's dilemma. Othello immediately succumbs to it, kills his wife and ultimately commits suicide. Solanka hovers over his sleeping wife knife in his hand. He had sat in his kitchen in the middle of the night with murder on the brain. He had

even brought a carving knife upstairs and stood for a terrible minute over the body of his sleeping wife. Then he turned away, slept in the spare bedroom, and in the morning packed his bags and caught the first plane to New York without saying a word. “He needed to put an ocean, at least an ocean, between himself and what he had almost done” (3). But he is ever since haunted by his own Othello’s image that drives him to seek cure in running away to America. So Malik runs away not from his family but from himself as well as from the possibility of such terrific impulse in future. To the world his behavior appears abnormal. But inside the exploration of his fury, tries to regain his normal self and starts a new life in New York:

Malik Solanka, historian of ideas and world-famous doll-maker, steps out of his life one day, abandons his family in London without a word of explanation, and flees for New York. There is a fury within him, and he fears he has become dangerous to those he loves. He arrives in New York at a time of unprecedented plenty, in the highest hour of America’s wealth and power, seeking to “erase” himself. (9)

Solanka is a Cambridge philosopher-turned-dollmaker who has unwillingly created pop culture phenomenon that represents almost everything he despises about modern world culture. His pop-culture heroine, a BBC-TV star named Little Brain, originates as an intelligent, if irreverent, girl-doll that travels through time to have discussions with people like Galileo. However, Solanka loses control over Little Brain and the TV programme becomes internationalized. Solanka has frequently fits of fury overtaken him in that condition he loses hold over himself.

The first part of the novel partly concerns Solanka’s relationship with Mila Milo, a young Slavic-American girl who is a sort of fashion-chic guru to a consortium of young computer-technology wizards. He is drawn to her and develops habit for a

woman's touch to get ride of his fury and to be peaceful. He does realize that Mila is feeding off his furies. What he needs at that time is the release of his fury. Mila is also driven to him by his fury:

What if she was hungriest for what he feared most, the goblin anger within? For she was driven by fury also, he knew that by the wild imperative fury of her hidden need. At that moment of revelation Solanka could easily have believed that this beautiful, accursed girl, whose weight was moving with such suggestive languor on his lap, whose fingertips touched his chest hair as faintly as a summer breeze and whose lips were working softly at his throat, might actually be the very incarnation of a fury, one of the three deadly sisters, the scourges of mankind. Fury was their divine nature and boiling human wrath their favorite food. He could have persuaded himself that behind her low whispers, beneath her unfailingly even-tempered tones, he could hear the Erinnyes shrieks. (134)

When Solanka comes to the company of Neela Mahendra which causes fury in Mila Milo who is left unsatisfied or rather offended by Solanka when he leaves her alone in his flat and goes to attend Neela Mahendra on her desperate call. But the same night Eddie comes to Solanka's flat and quenches Mila's sexual thirst. Mila justifies her act and accuses Solanka of being another fool:

“You're telling yourself what we did was wrong,” she said. “I know you. You are using guilt to set yourself free. So now you think you can walk away from me and tell yourself it's the moral thing to do. But what we did wasn't wrong,” and here her eyes filled with tears. “Not wrong at all. We were just comforting each other form our terrible

feelings of loss. The doll thing was just a way of getting there. What, you really think I fucked my father, you imagine I wriggled my ass on his lap and pushed my nail into his nipple and licked his poor sweet throat? That's what you are telling yourself to give yourself an out, or was that also the in? Was that the turn-on, to be my father ghost? Professor, you are the one who's sick. It was a play. Serious play, dangerous play, maybe but play." (173)

Mila is key to the later development of Solanka's new creation. Solanka seems good creator of dolls. Who creates doll one after another to get mental peace and physical pleasure. He creates and abandons his creations like objects. Females are play things in the hand of Solanka. Solanka presents his rebellious attitude through archetypal femininity to fulfill his unfulfilled desire for dolls. Solanka makes 'Valley of Dolly Birds' to please himself playing with other self. Solanka's fury is the cause of playing with feminine subjects. He makes belief in himself:

Yet, like Perry Pincus, he believed himself to be a good person. Women believed it too. Women had often allowed themselves to fall in love with him, surprising themselves--these wised up, cautious women!--by the speed with which they charged outward into the really deep emotional water. And he didn't let them down. He was kind, understanding, generous, and clever, funny, grown-up, and the sex was good. It was always good. This is forever, he thought, because they could see him thinking it too; they felt loved, treasured, told them--each of his women in turn--that friendship is what he has instead ties and, more than friendship, love. That sounded right. So they dropped their and relaxed into all the good stuff, and never saw the hidden

twisting in him, the dreadful torque of his doubt, until the day he snapped and the alien burst out of stomach, bearing multiple rows of teeth. They never saw the end coming until them. His first wife, Sara, the one with the graphic verbal gift, put it thus: "It is as-murder." (34)

The story continues to become more interesting when Neela, the most beautiful Indian girl gives company in his life. The novel begins to develop beyond their meeting to deeply explore human desires and love lost. We may recall how he feels in Neela's arms:

In Neela's arms Solanka felt himself begin to change, felt the inner demons he feared so much growing weaker by the day, felt unpredictable rage give way to the miraculous predictability of this new love. Pack your bags, furies, he thought, you no longer reside at this address. If he was right, and the origin of fury lay in life's accumulating disappointments, then he had found the antidote that transformed the poison into its opposite. For furia could be ecstasy, too, and Neela's love was philosopher's stone that made possible the transmuting alchemy. Rage grew out of despair: but Neela was hope fulfilled. (206)

Malik's fury informs the narration: his neurosis pervasive, the narrator provides a free-indirect- discourse critique of his action. It becomes essential to interpreting the representation of women with Malik's revelation that he was sexually abused (by his step father who made him dress as a girl). Rushdie offer a critique of this objectification of women. He is making an individual a doll. He has chosen an appropriate setting in the overheated, overcharged city of New York, which anesthetizes its fury with material excess while various remote Balkan and Third

World countries explode into localized furies of their own. But Rushdie can never resist trying to ennoble his fiction with mystic pretensions, and here might have been a story. Even a rather honest one, given the surface similarities between Rushdie and his hero. It altered to fit his chosen myth: the story of the Eumenides, the furies. Ladies are given earthly shape in the persons of Malik's perfect but used up and middle-age wife, Eleanor, and his two New York babes, the Serbian Mila and the Indian Neela (qtd. in Schafer 62).

The author explores male rage through figure of archetypal femininity. The two central tropes in the novel are mythical "Furies" and "living dolls"-either cyborg creations or "real" women dollified and finally murdered by their male lovers. Charting the move from "doll" as representation of the "real" thing to "living women (who) wanted to be doll-like, to cross the frontier and look like toys" (74). Rushdie concludes: "Now the doll was the original, the woman the representation" (74).

The title refers to the somewhat inexplicable fury (part of it seems to stem from the 'Little Brain Saga') of the protagonist who at one point in time finds himself standing over his sleeping wife and son with a kitchen knife and at another point suspects himself of being the serial killer murdering women in NYC with a block of concrete. It is this fury which causes him to flee London, without a word of explanation to his family, for New York, seeking to define him or, rather, erase him. Fury is not just that of the protagonist, but of almost everyone in novel: Muslim taxi drivers curse mindlessly at the other traffic in Urdu. Solanka's black friend Jack Rhinehart turns from being one the harshest critics of WASPish Americans (one kind of 'racial fury') to trying to join their 'club' (and experiences another kind of 'racial' fury-frustration at not being fully 'admitted'). It also concerns the 'political' fury of one of the female, Neela Mahendra, at the treatment of Indian 'Lilliputians' by the

indigenous ‘Lilliput- Blenfuscians’. Also, the Greek furies themselves put in a sort of appearance at one point (qtd, in Ray).

In an essay on Salman Rushdie’s novel, Aijaz Ahmad claims, “the misogyny of Rushdie’s representation of women is misogynist because of the way in which the female characters are overwhelmingly characterized by madness, sexual frenzy, nullity of being and fevers of the brain in contradistinction to a representation wherein “women are not, in any fundamental sense, mere victims of history; much more centrally, women have survived against very heavy odds and have produced history” (150). “There is something fatally wrong with a novel in which virtually every woman,” Ahmad continues, “is to be pitied, most are to be laughed at, some are to be feared . . . but none may be understood in relation to those projects of survival and overcoming which none other than the production of history itself” (151).

The tone of the novel is very dark and bleak, yet artfully tasteful. For the first third of the novel, there is not much of plot. Professor Malik Solanka analyzes the American way of life at the dawn of the century in a chastising and malicious way. Explaining to the reader that we have, inadvertently, become a mindless hive rushing throughout the universe, unaware or uncaring about the effects we have on everything else. Gore Michale, comments as:

Capitalism, commercialist societies and mindless routines- these are just a few of the things Salman Rushdie rants and raves about his poignant, witty and charming novel, “Fury”. Set in New York City the first few years after the dawn of the 21st century, protagonist Malik Solanka is a former Columbia University professor, retired historian and world renowned doll maker. (123)

However, he does this all so poetically and beautifully that it is really hard to notice the malignant tone of the book. Rushdie lives, as the saying goes, in interesting times, and he has all the mental equipment necessary for skewering contemporary vanities and fears. But the book's promising beginning is soon drowned out by more typically Rushdiean overskill: the cacophony of voices, plots, opinions, allegory, puns, magic realism, multiculturalism mythology, historical clues, and pop-culture references he has never attempted to edit. He cannot trust the story he is telling to hold its own. The point, for him, is not the tale he tells but the sound of his own raucous and frequently hysterical voice raised in its telling.

Rushdie's depiction of female characters in his novel as either embodiment of monstrous fury, or as Goddesses able to assuage male fury by the sheer power of their sexuality. Does Rushdie's tale of cyborg women created by the great doll-maker (namely the author), still left straddling the boundary between "monster" and "angel"? (qtd, in Ruthven 98).

In *Fury*, Solanka as puppeteer and doll-maker can be seen as an addition to this series of artists and art forms, and is used by Rushdie to explore elements of control and autonomy in relationship between the artist and his creations. The potentialities of art as dollification are examined, but not necessarily endorsed by Rushdie. Rushdie in many respects ironies Solanka's dollifying art and his ambivalent attitude to his loss of control over that art once it has entered into the world of mass media and mass interpretation:

At the outset of his doll making career, Professor Solanka seeks to create 'living dolls' with "back stories"-works of art endowed with a creation degree of autonomous life. When he was bringing them into being, they were a real to him as anyone else he knew. Once he had

created them, however, once he knew their stories, he was happy to let them go. (96)

Solanka's rejection of the Rijksmuseum doll's houses reflects a desire to bring life and energy into works of art, not to leave the sterile and empty. The absence of independent, vitality in such artistic creation is, for the professor, deeply sinister in its associations:

After a few visits [. . .] it becomes clear that mere houses would not be enough for him. Without people there was no point. The Dutch doll's houses, for all their intricacy and beauty, and in spite of their ability to furnish and decorate his imagination, finally made him think of the end of the world, some strange cataclysm in which property been destroyed. (This was some years before the invention the neutron bomb). After he had this idea, the place began to revolt him. He started imagining back rooms in the museum filled with giant heaps of the miniature dead: birds, animals, children, servants, actors, ladies, lords. One day he walked out of the great museum and never went back to Amsterdam again. (15-16)

Mohit K. Roy comments, however, the autonomy of work of art can lead it to become something quite other than that intended by its creator. Works of art initially created in the image of and according to the tastes of the artist, are frequently re-invented by their audience. Once the strings of the artist puppet break once and for all-once Little Brain becomes a commercialized monstrosity, larger and more real than his creator, once the Puppet Kings step into the real world and carry out a military coup. The puppet master, like Kronos, seeks to destroy his creations. This repeated cycle of creation, liberation, desertion and destruction may perhaps be

typified by the following quotation from the novel's story-within-a-story, "The Puppet Kings, the homunculus turns its back on its maker and sets off to forge its own destiny, while Kronos, the abandoned creator, takes leave not only of his creation but of his senses, too" (46).

Solanka's desire to redollify his creation, bringing life and art back into manageable proportions, back under control, is repeatedly associated with sexual violence's and murder, as in the following diatribe by Solanka's first wife, Sara:

"Your trouble is," Sara incandescently said near the end of their quarrel, "that you're really only in love with those fucking dolls. The world in inanimate miniature is just about all you can handle. The world you can make, unmake and manipulate filled with women who don't answer back, women you don't have to fuck. Or are you making them with cunts now, wooden cunts, rubber cunts, fucking inflatable cunts that squeak like balloons as you slide in and out, do you have a life-size fuck-dolly are hidden in a shed somewhere, is that what they'll find when one day you're arrested for raping and chopping up some golden-haired eight-years-old, some poor fucking living doll you played with and then threw away? (30)

The passage in which Solanka describes his vengeance upon and exorcism of Little Brain is disturbing redolent of Sara's predictions. Upon his return home, after all traces of his creation have been removed, "The house felt emptied [. . .] voided, the way a house feels after death of a child" (103).

Before permanently leaving his home in London, Solanka wreaks a rather gruesome revenge upon the original "Little Brain" doll itself, which is yet stronger in

its associations with violence and murder, “Little Brain was on his lap as he finished speaking. Its garments were slashed and torn and you could see where the knife had made deep incisions in its body” (108).

Little Brain, seated on her creator-father’s “lap” much recalls the murdered child predicted by Sara.

“Dollification” abounds on all levels of the novel, and is repeatedly associated with brutality, abandonment and betrayal. Solanka was himself dollified as a child. He was abused by his stepfather, who dressed him as a girl, in the same way as one might dress a doll. As a child, Malik’s dolls, as a manageable, scaled-down, silent version of humanity were only family he could bring himself to trust (223).

Solanka abandons two wives and one child, when his domestic life ceases to comply with the criteria he has projected onto it---when it becomes more complex than his ideal doll world. He also abandons Mila. Solanka’s attraction to Mila stems from a desire to see in his incarnation of his rejected creation, “Little Brain”---a desire to dollify her:

At first he tried to resist thinking of Mila as Little Brain comes alive
[. . .] her forgotten original, the lost L.B. of his first imagining, the star of Adventures of Little Brain. At first he told himself it would be wrong to do this to Mila, to dollify her thus, but then---he argued to himself---had she not done it to herself, had she not by her own admission? Was she not quite plainly presenting herself to him in the role of the True One he had lost? [. . .]. Then a slip of the tongue let out his secret, but Mila seemed not at all put out. Instead she smiled a private little smile---a smile that, Solanka was obliged to concede, was

full of a strange erotic pleasure, in which there was something of the patient angler's satisfaction at the bait being finally taken. (124)

The reference to the bait being laid by Mila for Solanka which concludes this passage alludes to Mila's counter dollification of Solanka. Whilst Solanka projects the image of his original "Little Brain" creation onto Mila recreates, or "dollifies" Solanka in the image of her dead father. It is this loss of control that Solanka cannot stand, and it is for this reason that abandons Mila. The three murdered debutants, victims of the concrete killers, dollify themselves in order to conform to the dollifying impulses of society---its desire to eliminate messy humanity:

But now living women wanted to be doll-like, to cross the frontier, and look like toys. Now the doll was original, the woman the representation. These living dolls, stringless marionettes, were not just "dolloed up" on the outside. Behind their high-style exteriors, beneath that perfectly lucent skin, they were so stuffed full of behavioral chips, so thoroughly programmed for action, so perfectly groomed and wardrobed, that there was no need for messy humanity. Sky, Bindy and Ren thus represented the final step in the transformation of the cultural history of the doll. (74)

When these three "living dolls," in one way or another, go against the conceptions of their sadistic lovers they are murdered---reduced to an inanimate, doll-like state, "A dead body on a street thought Malik Solanka, coming down to earth, looks a lot like a broken doll" (74).

These true murders are, in a way, presented as a realization of Solanka's brutal revenge upon Little Brain. The girls' relationships are somewhat redolent of the

fucky-dolly imagined by Sara. Such associations by no means suggest that Solanka's tendency to seek to re-dollify his creations to remove messy reality is portrayed positively. However, there remains the issue that, in *Fury*, it seems impossible to create without the work of art spiraling out of control, often with destructive results both for the artist personally and for the world around him. The novel's central conception of artistic creation as Shivan fury, as expounded in the passage below:

Life is fury, he thought. Fury---sexual, Oedipal, political, magical brutal---drives us to our finest heights and coarsest depths. Out of furia come creation, inspiration, originality, passion, but also violence, pain, pure unafraid destruction, the giving and receiving of blows from which we never recover. The Furies pursue us; Shiva dances his furious dance to create and also to destroy [. . .] the exalted, transcendent, self destructive, untrammelled lord of creation. We raise each other to the heights of joy. We tear each other limb from limb.

(31)

Rushdie has given the surface similarities between Rushdie and his hero. Solanka, like Rushdie, abandons two nations and two families, and it is perhaps essentially for this reason that the furies pursue him. In Hesiod's *Theology*, the Furies are born when Kronos cuts off his father's genitals---i.e. as a result of a betrayal of family. In the majority of their incarnations, the Furies avenge offences against parents---Oedipus' killing of his father and copulation with his mother, Orestes' murder of his mother, etc. The abandonment of the country India might easily be equated with such a crime. However, as Rushdie argues in *Notes on Writing and the Nation*, such a desertion, and the adoption of a rootless state of exile, is instrumental to a good writing:

Good writing assumes a frontierless nation. Writers who serve frontiers have become border guards [. . .]. There is great loss, and much yearning, in such rootlessness. But there is also gain. The frontierless nation is not a fantasy. (67)

Rushdie may thus indeed be seen to resemble Solanka in bringing may thus indeed be seen to resemble Solanka in bringing forth homunculi which catalyze mayhem in both personal and public spheres. However, in his persistent attempts to re-dollify or re-homunculise his creation---in his vacillation between the roles of Prometheus and Kronos, Solanka is perhaps ionized. What we are left with on Rushdie's part is an ambiguous sense of inevitability mixed with pain and regrets---perhaps typified by the mystery surrounding the true last word of Kronos:

The so-called last word from Kronos exists only in the form of an electronic message to his usurper, the cyborg Dollmaker. It is a rambling, incoherent text, self-exculpatory and full of accusations of ingratitude, threats and curses. However, there lies good reason to suppose that this text is a forgery, perhaps the work of the Dollmaker himself [. . .]. Lately, the discovery of fragments of Professor Kronos's journals has shed new light on his state of mind. A very different Kronos emerges from these fragments, whose authenticity seems beyond dispute: the handwriting is clearly the professor's. "The gods, too, murdered the Titans who made them [. . .]. Yet this Kronos, so free from bitterness, seems too good to be true. The professor, a master of dissimulation, may have plotting his vengeance behind a screen of fatalism." (166-67)

Solanka's point of view, as given in *Fury*, in many respect self-exculpatory and full of accusations of ingratitude. An ambivalent sense of the inextricability of creation and destruction, of the power of art and its potentially damaging autonomy, is manifest throughout the work.

Fury is a revolt against archetypal womanhood which causes form dissatisfaction which is the underlying aspect of fury. Solanka's fury has dollified women. There is resemblance between Solanka and Rushdie. *Fury* is murderous revolt for dollification to fulfill needs of author. Rushdie's high use of feminine psycho-sexual language suggests that he is not satisfied in his life. Rushdie tries to recreate woman history for his own satisfaction. It focuses the biological aspect of womanhood in the form of writing which is the biological inferiority and implication of woman. The experience of fifty five years and three marriages notwithstanding, he still seems to think that somewhere out there is perfect woman for every man, perfectly beautiful; whose love will set him free. Furies could be ecstasy, too, and Neela's love was the philosopher's stone that made possible the transmuting alchemy. *Fury* is product of anguished psyche of Rushdie. Rushdie presents females characters overwhelmingly in madness, sexual frenzy. He is frequently in favors of Brain. (Little Brain) in contradistinction to a representation wherein women are not, in any fundamental sense, merely victims of history as Aijaz Ahmad claimed.

4. Conclusion

Male's psyche is very complex to understand. From the early human civilization, the super psyche of male is trying to suppress the feminine in different forms such as culturally, socially, politically, legally even though female is believed as creator even the male. Women are made believed as Second Sex, marginalized group. The patriarchal construct is deeply rooted in society which is enabling feminist and behaving them as a doll. A living being is changed into non living being through this complex psychic of male.

Feminist's consciousness claims that all women share common experiences of their suppression. Along with the oppressed status, the feminist aim to empower woman through the legacy of struggle. However, a woman, though she is biologically feebler than man, should not consider herself to be mentally incapacitated. In the beginning of Ibsen's drama *The Doll's House*, Nora is made doll by her husband's psychic. Helmer enjoys and plays with her as a doll but when Nora gets consciousness, she revolts against his super psyche of her husband to claim her social, legal, economic status in society.

This super psyche always wants feminine suppress. He wants her under his governance and accepts his authority so that male can enjoy dollifying woman which is the major cause of gender inequality and delay in human progress. Still, woman is not sensing the sense of gender equality. Feminists are raising voices and taking lead to empower woman position in society for gender equality. Arundhoti Roy, a feminist, depicts gender discrimination in *The God in Small Things*. Being divorced, Ammu is not allowed to take part in the funeral ceremony. Being female, Ammu is facing gender inequality. She is not equally allowed taken part in social ceremony.

Gender discrimination is a social and cultural construct not biological one which is deeply rooted in culture and culture has root in society.

The patriarchal society is biased and prejudiced which never accepts the female enhancement and freedom wholeheartedly. Their voices are under shadow. Their history is fragmented and episodic. They are subject to male. If the women try to get freedom they will be victimized because it will be against the rules and system of male domain society who creates the truth and discourse to suppress the women. The discourse created by males, norms and values are supportive for the dominance. To develop human progress, male, female must be equally treated and respected in society. A sense of gender respect must be developed. Their freedom must not be restricted. If women are controlled unnecessarily in every petty point, the clash arises. It makes delay in human development.

Men are exposing feminine negatively making woman body as a topic. Gynocriticism are against such super psychic form of writing. The gynocritics express their disgust against patriarchic form of writing and underline a need of such writing that would be based on woman's body. It is a criticism that concerns women's psycho- sexual language in literary work and other forms of writing.

Rushdie's *Fury* is dollification of woman. It is revolt against archetypal womanhood to recreate woman history through art. *Fury* is hidden aspect of women dollification. *Fury* the unfulfilled desired which dollified women. *Fury* is a murderous attempt of feminine self. Rushdie is misogynist because of the way in which the feminine and female characters are overwhelmingly characterized by madness, sexual frenzy, nullity of being. Rushdie is fevers of the "brain" in contradistinction to a representation wherein women are not, in any fundamental sense, mere victims of history; much more centrally, women have survived against very heavy odds and

have produced history. The author explores male rage through figure of archetypal femininity. His dolls run wild, of living women turned into dolls and then broken, and of a revolt on the planet's far side led by an army of living dolls. *Fury* is a novel of furious energy, a study of the passionate love that just might turn out right. It is a novel of an old, deep love gone wrong, of a second, twisted passion rooted in wrongness, and of a third, passionate love that just might turn out right. Rushdie's highly uses sexual words which suggest he is neurotic and misogynist.

Fury is masterly attempt to dollify women. Rushdie has played feminine self to fulfill his own hunger. It focuses the biological aspect of womanhood in the form of writing which is the biological inferiority and implication of woman. The experience of fifty five years and three marriages notwithstanding, he still seems to think that somewhere out there is perfect woman for every man, perfectly beautiful; whose love will set him free.

Works Cited

- Abhrams, M.H. *A Glossary of Literary Terms*. Nodia: Harcourt College
 Publisher, 2000.
- Adams, Hazard. *Critical Theory Since Plato*. London: Yale University Press, 1989.
- Ahmad, Aijaz. *In Theory*. Cambridge: Oxford University Press, 1995.
- Bargielowska, Ina Zweiniger, ed. *Women in Twentieth Century Britain*. London:
 Pearson Education, 2001.
- Beauvoir, Simone de. *The Second Sex*. London: A Millennium Project, 1993.
- Benjamin, Walter. *On the Mimetic Faculty*. Mountain Mayfield, 1998.
- Bhattachan, Krishna. ed. *Gender and Democracy in Nepal*. Kantipath: Modern
 Printing Press, 2001.
- Chafetz, Janet Saltzman. *Personal Relationship and Gender Role Playing. Masculine
 or Human?* 2nd ed. Illinois: F.E Peacock Publisher, 1982. (173-217).
- Cheatham, Robert. *The Ante Millennial Doll House*. Boston: Allied Publisher Pvt.
 Ltd., 1969.
- Clinton, Cathrine. *The Other Civil War*. New York: Hill and Wang, 1984.
- Doren, Charles Van, ed. *A History of Knowledge*. New York: Ballantine Books, 1991.
- Dorne, Brina W. *Ibsen: The Intellectual Background*. Cambridge: Oxford University
 Press, 1949.
- Gorra, Michael. *After Empire: Scott, Naipaul, Rushdie*. Chicago: University of
 Chicago Press, 1979.
- Grassner, John. *Master's of the Drama*. USA: Dover Publications, Inc. 1954.

<http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=lfh&AN=18911570&site=lrc-live>.

Ibsen, Henrik. *A Doll's House*. Trans. William Archer. London: Henrietta Street, 1997.

Jacobus, Lee A., ed. *The Bedford Introduction to Drama*. 2nd ed. Boston: St. Martin's Press, 1993.

Jefferson, Ann and David Roy, eds. *Modern Literary Theory: A Comparative Introduction*. London: Batsford, 1986.

Jones, Vivien, ed. *Women and Literature in Britain, 1700-1800*. London: Cambridge University Press, 2000.

May/Jun, 2002. <http://proquest.umi.com/pqdweb?did=115559997&sid=4&Fmt=4?&contentId=19371&RQT=309&VName=PQD>

Miranda, David, ed. *Women and Violence*. London: Zed Books Ltd., 1994.

Roy, Arundhati. *The God of Small Things*. Indian: Penguin Books, 2002.

Rushdie, Salman. *Fury*. Vintage, Honathan Cape: London. 2001.

---. *Critical Essay*. ed. Mohit K. Ray & Rama Kundu. Delhi: Atlantic publisher & distributors, 2006.

Ruthven, Malise. *A Satanic Affair: Salman Rushdie and the Rage of Islam*. London:

Schafer, David. "Islam and Terrorism: A Humanist View". *The Humanist*. 2002. 62-63.

Schnier, Miriam, ed. *The Vantage Book of Feminism*. London: Vintage, 1994.

- Spivak, Gayatri Chakravorty. *A Literary Representation of the Subaltern: Mahasweta Devi's Standayani: Subaltern Studies V.* ed. Ranajit Guha. Delhi: Oxford University Press, 1987. 91-133.
- Stanton, Elizabeth Candy. *The Solitude of Self.* New York: Schocken, 1981.
- Sydie, R.A. *Natural Women Cultured Men: A feminist Perspective on Sociological Theory.* London: Open University Press, 1993.
- Vishweswaran, Kamala. *Gender and Subalternity, Gendered Subalternity. Subaltern Studies VII.* ed. Sahid Amin and Dipesh Chakraborty. Delhi: Oxford University press, 1996.
- Visvanathan, Nalini, et al., eds. *The Women, Gender and Development: Reader.* New York: New Jersey, 1995.
- Wayne, Valerie. "Advice for Women from Mothers and Patriarchs." *Women and Literature in Britain.* New York: Cambridge University Press, 1994. 1500-1700.
- Wilcox, Helen, ed. *Women and Literature in Britain.* New York: Cambridge University Press, 1994. 1500-1700.
- Wollstonecraft, Mary. *A Vindication of the Right of Woman.* ed. Carol H. Poston. New York: Norton, 1975.
- Woof, Virginia. *A Room of One's Own.* ed. Jennifer Smith London: Cambridge University Press, 1928.