

TRIBHUVAN UNIVERSITY

Failure of Female Independence in John Fowles's *The Collector*

**A thesis submitted to the Central Department of English
in the Partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of
Master of Arts in English**

By

Dil Bahadur Bista

Central Department of English

Kirtipur, Kathmandu

February, 2007

Tribhuvan University
Faculty of Humanities and Social Science

Letter of Approval

This thesis titled "Failure of Female Independence in John Fowles's *The Collector*", submitted to the Central Department of English, Tribhuvan University by Dil Bahadur Bista has been approved by the undersigned members of the research committee.

Members of the Research Committee:

Internal Examiner

External Examiner

Head
Central Department of English

Date: _____

Acknowledgement

I owe my heartfelt gratitude to the scholars, guardians and my friends who assisted me to give this thesis its present form. The completion of this thesis would not be possible without their fruitful encouragement, constructive insight, and assistance. I am heartily indebted to my advisor, Mr. Tika Lamsal, who, despite his busy schedule helped me to complete the dissertation. My sincere gratitude goes to Dr. Krishna Chandra Sharma, Head of the Central Department of English, T.U., the then Head Prof. Chandra Prakash Sharma and other professors and lecturers including the members of the Research Committee of the Department who not only permitted but also encouraged me to work in this field. My sincere thanks go to Mr. Raj Kumar Baral for his kind help in correcting the language lapses.

I want to thank Mr. Komal Prasad Phuyal, Mr. Dil Kumar Waiba, my family and all my friends who have relentlessly inspired me to complete this thesis.

February, 2007

Dil Bahadur Bista

Abstract

To read Fowles's *The Collector* is to explore the causes of women suppression and to prove patriarchal norms and values as the root causes of it. Miranda, the protagonist, who is the victim of male chauvinistic mindset, challenges patriarchy and struggles relentlessly for freedom by avoiding all the physical luxuries provided by Clegg. She attacks by all her means the male-controlled religions, myths and ideologies and wants to set herself free from all forms of domination, but her dream never comes true since patriarchal doctrines still prevail in the society as hindrances for her project.

Table of Content

S.N.		Page No.
I.	Introduction	1-14
	1.1 General Introduction	1
	1.2 Fowles and Fiction	2
	1.3 <i>The Collector</i> and Critics	8
II.	Feminism and Female Independence	15-32
III.	Patriarchy, an Obstacle to Female Independence	33-49
	3.1 Religion and Myth as Suppressive Elements	47
	3.2 Clegg, a Prototype of Caliban	48
IV.	Conclusion	50-51
	Works Cited	

I. Introduction

1.1 General Introduction

Women have suffered an age long pathos of men's suppression and restrictions though there is no innate rule or characteristics that could justify the natural hierarchy between sexes in the society. A woman dreams to live a life free from all forms of domination, confinement or oppression, but her wish always remains unfulfilled since there exist patriarchal norms as stumbling blocks. Self dignity is not felt unless freedom is perceived, and woman's lack of freedom has been the major issue of several male writers all over the world. John Fowles is one of those male novelists from Britain who has delved into the depth of woman's psycho-social realities and has examined her trauma caused due to lack of independence in life.

Fowles's first novel *The Collector* (1963) is a subtle representation of a tormented and repressed woman psychology and the consequences in her life that breed frustration, isolation, rebellion and finally culminate in a terrible action like death. The kidnap and imprisonment of a young college girl by a middle aged man in the beginning of the novel is in fact the manifestation of the repressed animalistic craze of male chauvinistic mindset. Miranda, the central female character, has simply been a thing instead of being in the hands of Clegg, the male protagonist. Miranda is held captive in a dark and cold underground cellar, which symbolically stands for the claustrophobic male dominated society. She is suppressed, oppressed, dominated and marginalized by her captor, Clegg. Miranda's struggle for freedom remains unfulfilled and her voice unheard in the world of Fredrick Clegg. Miranda's search for independence, one of the most dominant aspects of the novel, is shattered due to patriarchal socio-cultural frame. She continually revolts for freedom throughout her life but her dream to live a life of her own ends in her pathetic death. Having been unable to get independence in her real life she

searches freedom even in her imagination through art and painting. But her search for freedom remains incomplete since her creations too face the equal degree of restrictions as herself. Patriarchal norms and conventions not only restrict Miranda's life but also her creativity. Thus, in the novel, Fowles attempts to bring into light the female's failure of the struggle for independence.

1.2 Fowles and Fiction

John Fowles, born in 31st March, 1926 in Leigh-on-sea, a small town near London in the country of Essex, is an extremely well-read English novelist of twentieth century. He enjoys a justifiably high standing as both a novelist of outstanding imaginative power and as a highly self-conscious postmodernist author who fully registers the artifice inherent in the act of writing, the fictiveness of fiction itself. He is both a traditional writer and an innovative metafictionist. He draws upon past literature but changes the direction of the tradition in which he writes. He simultaneously "accepts and rejects the literary past and also questions the avant-garde attempts to redefine the novel genre" (Palmer 4). His fiction is "a centrifuge in which past and future, time and space, can warp together" (4).

Fowles emerged as a novelist at the start of the sixties with his original psychological thriller *The Collector* (1963). The immediate critical acclaim and commercial success of the book allowed Fowles to devote all his time to writing. It was followed by his other equally successful novels *The Aristos* (1965), *The Magus* (1966), *The French Lieutenant's Woman* (1969), *Daniel Martin* (1977) and *Mantissa* (1982).

The fictions of John Fowles seem to be highly influenced by the philosophical and literary trends of the past and at the same time "he rebels against the influence, reshapes it or redefines it in a modern context" (6). His first novel *The Collector* is a realistic novel which grew out of the mainstream realistic literary trend of England in

1950s. Fowles attempted to reinvigorate realism, the already exhausted novelistic trend, by publishing *The Collector*, a realistic novel that reflects the pathetic situation of females due to the imposition of a great deal of repressive conventions and norms of patriarchal society. Interviewed shortly after the publication of *The Collector* Fowles claimed that “contemporary writing in the country needed a return to the great tradition of the English novel- realism” (Binns 321). But in *The Magus* and *The French Lieutenant’s Woman*, Fowles breaks the realistic literary conventions and adopts the 20th century novelistic trends. William J Palmer writes:

“The *French Lieutenant’s Woman* is initially aligned with the eminent Victorian tradition of Dickens and Hardy, but soon it rebels against that tradition. *The French Lieutenant’s Woman* consciously recreates the Dickens world. . . . But it also brings those worlds up to date and portrays them with a reality that Dickens and Hardy, because of the Victorian restriction upon the novel, could not present”. (25)

Fowles in his novels “strives to unite the traditional influences which he cannot reject with the new fictional forms of his own conception which he cannot ignore” (4). In *The French Lieutenant’s Woman* he tries to bring together the Victorian past and the mid- twentieth century present in order to define a moral and existential stance for the future. It is a novel about the past and future of the novel genre. He constantly interrupts the narrative by making authorial comments with a twentieth century perspective. The narrative action digresses back and forth from the Victorian age to the twentieth century in time. Fowles is writing a novel set in the nineteenth century romantic literary genre but with a twentieth century perspective. He is interested in the literary genre of the 19th century romantic or gothic novel and succeeds in producing typical Victorian characters, situations and dialogue, but his perception of the genre is touched with typical 20th

century irony. His thematic concerns range from the relationship between life and art and the artist and his creation to the isolation that results from an individual struggling for selfhood. He aims to bring to light that aspect of Victorian society where women and working class were suppressed both economically and socially.

Furthermore, Fowles succeeds in “defeating in himself the aesthetic chauvinism that had ruled the novel genre since the Victorian age” (76). In *The French Lieutenant’s Woman*, he defeats the “catatonia of convention, the convention as a restriction upon human relationship, but more important, convention as a restriction upon art” by providing his readers three potential endings from which to choose (76). Thus, Fowles realizes that the 20th century novel cannot be content to accept the neatness of resolution of the conventional Victorian novel ending. That kind of acceptance rejects the often messy reality of the 20th century, a century in which paradox is most often the only possible explanation of reality. Fowles is an innovative novelist who attempts to dramatize his own ideas about how novels should be written. Fowles experimented with narrative form to some extent in *The Collector* and *The Magus*, but his third novel, *The French Lieutenant’s Woman*, is his first openly metafictional work--particularly in its multiple endings and in its use of a twentieth-century narrator for a novel set in the Victorian period.

In each of his novels Fowles establishes a pattern of recurring allusions to one or more prior works of literature. He is often quite explicit in the use of literary analogies which are usually fully developed rather than suggestive. While he parallels between the characters and the situations of his novel and the work of the past, he also often evokes the imagery and the moral themes of the previous works which he has chosen as his point of analogical focus. William J Palmer writes:

The Collector is connected by repeated analogical reference to Caliban of Shakespeare's *The Tempest*. Similarly, *The Magus* also reflects the eclectic influence of earlier novel writers like Dickens, Dostoevsky and Conrad. While Dostoevskian implications help define the nature of the world and the theme of freedom in *The Magus*, Fowles's narrative structure and the mythic implications present in the confrontation between Conchis and Nicholas are reminiscent of Conrad's novels. *The French Lieutenant's Woman* consciously imitates plot and characterization, image and idea from two basic Victorian fictional sources; Thomas Hardy's *A Pair of Blue Eyes* and Dickens's *Pickwick Papers* to create ambience of both the world and the literary style of the Victorian age, the novel genre's period of greatest accomplishment. (19)

Fowles, however, finally turns upon his own sources, parodies them and shows how the twentieth-century artist must rebel against the restrictions upon narrative technique, characterization and content that were established by the Victorian novel and had survived to plague the 20th century novelists. By means of the realistic modernization and de-sentimentalizing of some of the Dickens's best known character types, Fowles vividly demonstrates the differences between Victorian fiction and the mid-twentieth century novel. Fowles is a novelist at a "crossroads in his combination of the tradition of his genre with the experimental qualities of contemporary fiction" (29). In *The Collector* he is approaching the crossroad, but in *The Magus* and *The French Lieutenant's Woman* he strikes off in new experimental directions moving towards existential metafiction.

Besides the literary styles and conventions, the fictions of John Fowles are equally rich in their thematic aspects. "The relationship between art and life" is a

recurring theme throughout his fictions (30). Each of Fowles's central characters—Miranda, Nicholas, Smithson—tries to give form to the chaos of existence. In a sense, each of these characters is an artist trying to create a living work of art, trying to compose his or her own life. By means of “metaphor and metatheatre, art and life repeatedly complement each other in the metafiction of John Fowles” (77). In *The Collector* the art-life theme is overt, embedded in Fowles's characterization. Miranda is an embryonic artist while Clegg is anti artist and subconsciously intent upon perverting the art and beauty of life. In *The Magus*, descriptive references to visual and literary art repeatedly define the landscape, the characterizations and the events of the novel. The artistic dramatization of life, Conchis's elaborate masque, lures Nicholas into participation and awakens him to his potentiality for creating his own existence. And in *The French Lieutenant's Woman*, he explores “the abstract theme of art that unfolds simultaneously with the existential theme of the quest for selfhood” (30). While *The French Lieutenant's Woman* certainly concerns the tensions of a love triangle and certainly dramatizes the attempts of the central characters to find selfhood on a world that represses individuality, the plot and the characters also comprise a metaphor for Fowles's aesthetic theme. In each novel Fowles presents characters who try to create, as artists do, new existences out of the chaos of their lives. Thus, through characterization, metaphor and overt authorial comment Fowles develops his art-life theme in his fictions. For his characters, art becomes the primal stimulus to self definition, moral action and finally existential life.

In each of his novels Fowles consistently displays his mastery of the “art of objective correlation” (78). William J Palmer says:

Two basic themes complement each other in each novel: the aesthetic theme, which analyzes the relationship between art and life, is correlated

to the existential theme, which dramatizes the struggles of individuals to define themselves and to make moral decisions about the conduct of their lives in worlds which discourage self expression and deny existential freedom. Fowles's greatest strength as a novelist lies in his continuous and artful linking of these two themes. (78)

In the similar manner, Fowles embodies his philosophical and aesthetic themes in the “personal dilemmas of his characters and the imagistic representation of the world and society in which those characters must define their existences” (78). Because existentialism is concerned solely with individual lives in the physical world, those lives and that world must be brought to life before any philosophical lesson can be embodied in action. And Fowles, like the great Victorian pre-existential novelists— Dickens, Eliot, Hardy, and Conrad—creates an intensely realized world by means of detailed physical description. He accomplishes his characterizations by means of dramatized scenes in which real people enact their destinies and display their humanity, or lack of it. The theme of “isolation is represented both in human situations and in the images in each of Fowles's fictions” (79). The central characters- Miranda, Nicholas, Charles, and Smithson—are all questers for themselves, searchers trying to find their own existences. These protagonists are invariably trapped in claustrophobic rooms, often underground, and left in isolation to discover themselves. Just as they are physically forced inside, so are they mentally forced to look within to contemplate the depths of their own psyche. Fowles's landscape, however, also includes the other spatial pole in which the lessons learned, the selfhood found in the isolation to inner self, can be exercised in an outdoor world of human relationships. The Fowles's world is balanced between indoor scenes of isolation and occasional violence; and freer, healthier outdoor scenes of people trying to reach out, communicate and love each other. Thus, for Fowles the existential journey to

selfhood is a traveling out of the enclosure of isolation, a passage through the thick walls of loneliness. The questers traverse a landscape of inner and outer spaces that symbolically oppose each other. By means of “spatially symbolic settings and existential image patterns, the theme of the loneliness of selfhood is repeatedly symbolized in Fowles’s fictions” (103). But he makes even stronger definition of this theme of existential loneliness in the endings of the novels. Each novel ends in the isolation of the protagonist. Fowles’s novels provide open endings which are, in fact, not endings at all rather new beginnings. His novels move in a circle from loneliness to loneliness, and value lies in movement rather than in advancement. Just as Sisyphus always ends where he begins and yet finds value in his existence, so do Fowles’s characters develop into selfhood though they do not progress out of loneliness.

1.3 *The Collector* and Critics

The Collector, first novel by John Fowles, was published in the spring of 1963. British periodicals, in the beginning, treated the novel as a mere crime fiction. After publishing *The Magus* (1965) and *The French Lieutenant’s Woman* (1969) Fowles himself ignored the importance of *The Collector* calling it a cold-blooded book. *The Collector*, however, is popular nowadays mainly with critics and readers who like the novels with pronounced thematic and moralistic contents. Such critics classify the book variously as a class novel, or a novel about the struggle between good and evil, light and darkness, or creative impulse and destructive mentality.

In *The Collector*, Fowles has established a pattern of recurring allusion to the prior works of literature. He seems quite explicit in the use of literary analogies. Imagery, characterization and situation of *The Collector* have been influenced by the works of Shakespeare, Conrad and Dickens. Regarding the sources for *The Collector*, William J Palmer writes:

In *The Collector* Fowles juggles his literary source materials with the facility of a performer born and raised in a circus midway. As his hand touches upon one influence, the others remain tangibly present though temporarily suspended in mid-air. As one influence moves away, another descends to replace it in his hand. And thus the influences upon his novel revolve faster and faster by the juggler's art until they no longer are separate entities but rather become a pattern in motion, a whole composed of moving complementary parts, a new reality created by the combination and transformation of a number of old realities. In *The Collector*, Fowles alludes to situations and images from Conrad's *Lord Jim*, Dostoevsky's *Crime and Punishment*, Dickens's *Great Expectations* and Jane Austen's *Emma*, as well as Shakespeare's *The Tempest*. (13)

Fowles shifted his writing from realism to his own brand of metafiction. After publishing *The Collector* he emphasized the need of contemporary writing to return to the great tradition of the English novel- realism. Certainly his first novel is entirely credible at a realistic level to a large extent. According to Raymond Tallis, "*The Collector*, a sustained imagining of two utterly different consciousnesses, is a masterpiece of realism" (101). The novel reflects the life of the characters and the social world evoking the sense that the characters might in fact exist and such thing might well happen. The avoidance of prophecy, obvious characterizations, literary and linguistic allusions and symbols have also helped to make the novel more realistic. Following the same path, Shyamal Bagchee writes:

In this novel Fowles found the best compromise between his exacting sense of art and the age's demand for reality-oriented fiction. In treating an ostensibly topical theme Fowles was able to avoid being labeled an

“experimental” writer. The books are stably realized, and on the most obvious level the novel addresses itself to useful social and moral problems. The prophetic mode is entirely avoided. The book is not essentially symbolic; it uses symbols only of the most predictable kind: dead butterflies, paintings, photographs, sunlight, a cellar, and the old historical house in which most of the action takes place. The literary and linguistic allusions and hints are no less obvious: the references to Miranda, Caliban, and Ferdinand- ironical in the last sense- and the derivation of Clegg’s name from Clef, a key. *The Collector* tells a suspenseful story with considerable cleverness and control. (221)

Fowles, basically a postmodernist writer, expresses his preoccupation with renewing the novel genre without sacrificing intelligibility and the old humanist value of classic realism. Though he tries to break the old novelistic tradition, *The Collector* seems to grow out of the same old realistic trend of novel writing. Here Susana Onega points out:

In a very direct way, *The Collector* . . . may be said to grow out of the “movement”, the realistic trend . . . that constituted the literary mainstream in Britain in the 1950s. Fredrick Clegg, Miranda’s kidnapper and murderer . . . may be described as a parodic development of the inarticulate “Movement” hero, and the novel as a whole as Fowles’s attempt to renew the Movement’s “exhausted” form through the parodic mechanism of absorption and rejection. (N. pag.)

Though *The Collector* is considered as a realistic novel, Roland Binns examines the unity of Fowles’s fictions and emphasizes their generic similarities as romances. *The*

Collector, *The Magus* and *The French Lieutenant's Woman* inherit the characteristics of the tradition of romance fictions. Ronald Binns, emphasizing this issue, writes:

Both the gothic romance, beginning with Walpole's *Castle of Otranto* (1764) and the historical romance, beginning with Scott's *Waverly* (1814), evolved popular traditions which Fowles's three novels- despite their author's posture as a realist- can be seen as inheriting and revitalizing in order to recreate multi-leveled romance fictions of considerable complexity and depth. (318)

In the narrative technique *The Collector* is an epistolary novel, the form developed by Samuel Richardson in *Clarissa* in the eighteenth century. In epistolary novel, the narrative is conveyed entirely by an exchange of letters of the narrative point of view is limited to one or another single character. *The Collector* has four distinct narrative parts each limited to either Clegg or Miranda. William J Palmer focuses on it and writes:

Fowles fully exploits the potential for relativistic narrative of the epistolary form, as did Richardson. By means of juxtaposed first-person narratives that focus on the same events, both Richardson and Fowles create a psychological tension between the opposing male and female views. The reader thus can gauge the separation of sensibility and pinpoint the breakdown in communication that in both *The Collector* and *Clarissa* ultimately cause the tragic denouement. *The Collector*, with its concentration upon the inner lives and motivations of its characters as expressed in their own words, stands solidly in the epistolary-psychological tradition that Richardson began. (16)

The Collector gained popularity among the readers and created hot discussions among the critics mainly because of its rich and diverse thematic aspect. Soon after its publication critics leveled it a psychological novel dealing with the repressed obsessional desires of its characters. The male protagonist, Clegg, undergoes obsessively neurotic phase and, as a result, kidnaps a brilliant art student, Miranda. The slow degrees by which Clegg destroys Miranda make one of the most agonizing chapters in the whole literary history of obsession. According to Ian Ousby, “*The Collector* is a psychological thriller in which a girl Miranda is kidnapped by a psychotically possessive pools winner” (365).

The plot and the narrative technique of *The Collector* present such a terrifying scene that it can rightly be called a horror story. Fowles has painted an eerily plausible portrait of a psychopath who kidnaps a young woman out of what he calls love, telling the story from two characters’ opposing point of view until, at the end, the narratives converge with a shocking immediacy. Leveling *The Collector* as a horror tale Eliot Fermont Smith in an article entitled “Players of the Godgame” writes:

John Fowles’s first novel *The Collector* was a horror tale brightened by intelligence and insight and dulled by an intellectually rigid geometric scheme. The root of the tale’s horror lay not in the plot situation of the novel- a madman kidnaps a girl and holds her prison in his basement- but in the eventual merging of the two viewpoints, the villain’s and the victim’s. (N.pag.)

The Collector unfolds the underlying subtext of class conflict between Fredrick Clegg, a socially marginalized middle- class bank clerk, and Miranda, an upper class art student. Both Miranda and Clegg are complex characters with mixed motives who undergo plausible everyday modes of experience. Their physical and intellectual battle of

will is made more interesting by Fowles's technique of having Clegg tell his story first followed by Miranda's point of view via her diary. Raman K. Singh, therefore, calls it a class novel and opines that the novel presents "middle class dilemma" throughout the book. The catastrophe at the end is the result of class conflict between Clegg and Miranda.

On the other hand, *The Collector* contains in embryo the psychological and philosophical ideas which in the later two works appear as the mature expression of a personal and anglicized brand of existentialism. Ronald Binns comments:

The affirmative and optimistic attitude towards life distinguishes Fowles's novels from the existential fictions of Sartre and Camus, as well as from the chic pessimism of western mentality. In stead of nausea and disgust Fowles's existential characters experience moments of epiphany when they capture a sense both of the continuity of time alive in every moment (in Fowles's terminology the horizontality of existence) and of the richness and density of the contingent world; in stead of dramatizing despair or gratuitous acts of rebellion his novels propose a stoic endurance and a sharp recognition of the possibilities open to every individual at each moment when choices demand to be made. (325)

Thus, many critics have criticized the novel from various viewpoints. But the study remains incomplete unless it is viewed through the eye of feminism. John Fowles explores the situations of female in his novels. Fowles's works have so often been read from the perspective of the male protagonist that it has become a critical commonplace- assumed even in recent criticism and even by women critics- that his female characters function to activate male character development. This position has led to point that Fowles is almost exclusively concerned with the problems of men. But Fowles's call for

a society equally balanced in male and female ways of looking at life, his proclaimed sympathies for feminism and his female protagonists in his novels prove his strong position in favour of female independence. His novel *The Collector* very strongly presents the issue of female independence and the suppression upon it by the ideological constructs of patriarchal society. Many critical works center on the protagonist Miranda's death. A question arises: does she die of pneumonia, of mental disorder or due to excessive male domination? The issues like identity, selfhood, individuality and freedom have remained unearthed to the sufficient level. In almost all available critical works a major issue remains unaddressed i.e. why does Miranda die so prematurely in the cellar though she is provided with all the necessities she demands? Thus the research will have the critical analysis of Fowles's the most disputed novel *The Collector* on an issue: failure of female independence.

Fowles's *The Collector* will be textually analyzed and attempts will be made to explore the unprecedented issue as the focus of the novel which threatened her literary reputation. Fowles has chosen a female protagonist to explore her psychological turmoil in a patriarchal socio-cultural frame. The protagonist, Miranda's failure of the struggle for independence will require a detailed mention in this research. The research will center on the issues related to how the protagonist wages a psychological, social and intellectual war against the patriarchal system and ultimately fails to come out of the bondage.

II. Feminism and Female Independence

Feminism generally is a theoretical discourse advocating women's rights based on the belief in the equality of the sexes. It is a doctrine redefining women's activities and goals from a woman-centered point of view and refusing to accept the cult of masculine chauvinism and superiority that reduces women to a sex object, a second sex, and a submissive other. It conjures up various images and ideas regarding the woman's issues. In spite of diversity, feminism is often represented as a single entity and somehow concerned with gender equality and freedom.

Until recently, feminist criticism has not had a theoretical basis though it is a dominant force in the literary studies. It had been an empirical orphan in theoretical storm. Feminist thinkers regard feminism as somehow different from the mainstream – as innovative, inventive and rebellious. Beasley points out that “the point of view of feminist writers is that the western thought is ‘malestream’ and thus its authority needs to be questioned” (3). It is a doctrine which suggests that women are systematically disadvantaged in modern society and advocating equal opportunities for men and women. It shares the common theoretical assumption as shared by all branches of the movement that there has been a historical tradition of male exploitation of women.

E. Porter defines feminism as “a perspective that seeks to eliminate the subordination, oppression, inequalities and injustices women suffer because of their sex” (qtd. in Beasley 27). In the same way R. Delmer says:

It is certainly possible to construct a baseline definition of feminism

Many should agree that at the very least a feminist is someone who holds that women suffer discrimination because of their sex, that they have specific needs which remain negated and unsatisfied, and that the

satisfaction of these needs would require a radical change . . . in the social, economic and political order. (qtd. in Beasley 27-28)

More recently feminism has been defined not simply as a particular framework set of ideas or social analysis or form of critical questioning around a focus on women and power, but also as representing a specific way of experience. Thus it is clear that all feminists call for changes in the social, economic, political or cultural order, to reduce and eventually overcome this discrimination against women. The bottom-line of all this subordination is the lack of freedom. Of course, several theorists, writers and scholars have underlined this issue from varied perspectives. Marriage has become one of the bondages that restrict women from realizing her independent self. It has been defined by men as a legal authority over women. Feminist addresses this issue to instill a sense of human existence which is devoid of sexual biasness.

Feminist criticism was not inaugurated as a distinctive and concerted approach to literature until late in the 1960s. However, behind it lie two centuries of struggle for the recognition of women's cultural roles and achievements and their social and political rights. Mary Wollstonecraft's *A Vindication of the Rights of Women* (1792) is considered to be the first formal enhancement of feminist writing though many others had tried their hands before her too. Wollstonecraft in her book advocates for the political and social rights of women and argues that society never can retain women only in the role of convenient domestic slaves and alluring mistresses by denying their economic independence and encouraging them to be docile and attentive to their looks to the exclusion of all else. She stands as a whole against patriarchal society and its domination over female. She views that "patriarchal society, traditional education system and the sentimental novels teach female to be submissive, sentimental emotional, which restrict them from power of judgment and power of reason" (397).

The feminist revolutionary spirit implanted by Wollstonecraft could not accelerate so speedily for more than coming one century. *Women in the Nineteenth Century* (1845) by Margaret Fuller and *The Subjection of Women* (1869) by John Stuart Mill were only the two major works on feminism in the whole nineteenth century.

Virginia Woolf by writing *A Room of One's Own* (1929) and Simone de Beauvoir *The Second Sex* (1949) contributed greatly for the worldwide emergence of feminism in the first half of the twentieth century. Woolf focuses on situation of women authors throughout the history and their cultural, economic and educational disabilities within the patriarchal society which had prevented them from realizing their creative possibilities. The feminist trend of her time was concerned for “absolute equality and the erasure of differences” between the sexes (820). But Woolf voiced for radical change as women’s freedom and for their suppressed values affecting the concept of power, family and social life that had shaped by men in the past. Beauvoir, on the other hand, insists against “the cultural identification of women as merely the negative object, or ‘other’, to man as the defining and dominating ‘subject’ who is assumed to represent humanity in general” (qtd. in Abrams 234). She argues that one is not born, but rather becomes a woman. It is civilization as a whole that produces the creature which is described as feminine. She also attacks the patriarchal myths of women presuming the female essence prior to individual existence in the work of many male writers. She opines that females are free to choose to come out of void but paternalism regards women as other weaker sex. Women are considered absolutely as the “essential other”. Male is considered as ‘subject’ who, assuming to represent humanity in general, treats women as ‘object’. It is the social construction based on male domination which treats women as commodities. In fact, ‘male’ and ‘female’, the gender concept is created by patriarchal society. Similarly, though men and women are indeed mysterious to each other, men see the

world from their own point of view and regard women as mysterious. Patriarchal ideology creates myth about women and defines men as transcendental whereas women as immanent.

In the same manner, Delmer asserts that the early women's liberation movement of the 1960s and 1970s largely lacked a developed theoretical approach. Hence the movement could assert without much detailed analysis a notion of unity among women and regard feminism as a framework which reflected that unity. The intention was to find the explanation for women's oppression which could express women's commonality and thus bind all women together politically. However, pluralism and diversity have perpetually occurred between women as regards the issue of woman as subject and the challenge to the woman's oppression. Feminist theories have in fact developed at something of a remote from mainstream social and political thought. Feminists have argued that mainstream thought is simply a part of three ongoing processes: excluding, marginalizing and trivializing women and their accounts of social and political life.

Feminism in fact, only was established in the form of a theoretical discourse in the late 1960s as a part of the international women's movement. Establishing gender as a fundamental category of literary analysis it tried, then, to present women reader and critics with different perceptions to their literary experiences insisting that experiences of women in and with literature are different from those of men. Mary Ellman's *Thinking About Women* (1968) is the first book exposing the sexual stereotyping of women both in literature and literary criticism and demonstrating the inadequacy of established critical school and methods to deal fairly or sensitively with works written by women. In other words, the book disclosed the derogatory and stereotyped presentation of women in literature and in media. She further contends that western cultures contain a widespread application of gender stereotypes to almost everything. She attacks 'phallogocentrism' in

which certain manliness in art is upheld against the so called hysteric or works at random. Unlike Showalter, Ellman does not identify female writing with female experience, but relates it to certain literary styles. According to her, female writings establish a different perspective which “undermines the definiteness of judgment and fixity of focus”. Feminist criticism, then, very quickly moved beyond merely exposing sexism in one work of literature after another promising to begin to record new choices in a new literary history.

Kate Millet’s analysis of sexual politics of literature in her *Sexual Politics* (1969) added a note of urgency to the Ellman’s scornful anger. The acting out of roles in the unequal relation of domination and subordination is what Millet calls “sexual politics”. Defining politics as the oppression of power relations in society, Millet argues that “western institutions have manipulated power to establish the dominance of men and subordination of women in society” (36). She also criticizes Freud’s psychoanalytical theory for its male bias and analyzes the fiction of D.H. Lawrence, Henry Miller and Norman Mailer uncovering how they dignify their aggressive phallic shelves and degrade women as submissive sexual objects in their works. Sheldon considers Millet’s use of the term “patriarchy” described the cause of women’s oppression which is due to the power that is centered directly or indirectly on male so as to subordinate women. The feminist analysis of politics therefore rose from the fact that women have been excluded from the exercise of political power. Women are still underrepresented in formal political institutions and decision making bodies worldwide. Millet argues that women are impelled to a system of sex-role stereotyping from early age. She borrows from social sciences the distinction between sex and gender. Sex is determined by biology and gender is culturally constructed. She does not believe in the culturally acquired identity of woman who has been associated with such adjective: meek, conventional, emotional,

passive, submissive. She says “ideology has become the weapon to dominate women” (46). Since literary values, canons and standards are created and constructed by men; women have to struggle to express their experiences, grievances and concerns in appropriate forms. There is always misrepresentation of woman in media. For instance, the advertisement of electric shower presents a lady tantalizingly dropping her towel to make the male viewers gaze at her naked body which excludes female viewers. She exposes the oppressive representation of sexuality that is to be found in male fiction highlighting the male domination especially in the sexual description in novels by great writers such as D. H. Lawrence and Henry Miller. Hence, Millet makes a powerful critique of patriarchal culture in her *Sexual Politics*.

Elaine Showalter’s *A literature of their own: British women novelist from Bronte to Lessing* (1977) is a prominent masterpiece of the theoretical work of feminism. It describes the female literary tradition in the English novel form the Bronte onward as a development of subculture by arguing that “since women in general constitute a kind of subculture within the framework of a larger society” their work would demonstrate a unity of values, conventions, experiences, and behaviors encroaching on each individual (1225). Moreover, she introduces the term “gynocritics” as a program of rebuilding women’s position as literary writers and readers in order to ensure their independence from androcentric culture. The program of gynocritics is to construct a female framework for the analysis of women’s literature, to develop new models based on the study of female experience rather than to adopt male models and theories. Gynocritics “must take into account the different velocities and curves of political, social and personal histories in determining women’s literary choices and careers” (1228). Showalter defines gynocritics as:

. . . a concern with women as writers the history, styles, themes, genres and structure of writing by women, the psychodynamics of female creativity, the trajectory of the individual or collective female career; and the evolution and laws of a female literacy tradition. (qtd.in Ruthven 94)

Sandra Gilbert and Susan Gubar's *Madwoman in the Attic* (1979) is another brilliantly written massive book on historical study of feminism which stresses especially the psychodynamics of women writers in the nineteenth century. Gilbert and Gubar in this book, according to M.H Abrams,

propose that the 'anxiety of authorship' that resulted from the stereotype that literary creativity is an exclusively male prerogative, effected in women writers a psychological duplicity that projected a monstrous counter figure to the heroine . . . such a figure is usually in some sense the author's double, an image of her own anxiety and rage. (236)

Gilbert and Gubar's main argument is that artistic creativity of the nineteenth century tradition which is perceived basically as a male quality is in fact patriarchal superimposition upon the women writers who are imprisoned within it. In the image of 'Divine Creator' the male author fathers his text. But taking the same masculine cosmic author as their model, women end up copying or identifying with the dominant literary images of femininity which comes out of the phallogentric myth of creativity. They suggest the female writers first to struggle against the effect of socialization that becomes struggle against men's oppressive reading of women. But they further argue that the women can begin such struggle only by actively seeking a female precursor who, far from representing a threatening force to be denied or killed, proves by example that a revolt against patriarchal authority is possible. Gilbert and Gubar present a dilemma of woman writer in a malecentric authorship and make a clear position of the woman writer

who is squandering without fixity. The woman writer has an anxiety of authorship—a fear that she cannot create, the fear that she cannot fight a male precursor on his terms and, “the woman writer is victimized by the inferiorized and alternative psychology of women under patriarchy” (1237). Women suffer from mental illness because of the patriarchal socialization since they are likely to experience their education in docility, submissiveness, selflessness as in some sense sickening.

According to the above held discussions we can divide the development of whole feminist literary criticism into three distinct phases. The first phase was centered on “the misogyny of literary practice: the stereotyped images of women in literature as angels or monsters, the literary abuse or textual harassment of women in classic and popular male literature, and the exclusion of women from literary history” (Showalter, *The Feminist* 5). The second phase of it was the discovery that women writers had a literature of their own, whose historical and thematic, as well as artistic importance, had been obscured by the patriarchal values that dominate the culture. Hundreds of lost women writers were rediscovered and the territory of the female imagination and the structures of the female plot were constructed in this phase. And the third phase of feminist criticism demanded a radical rethinking of the conceptual ground of literary study, a revision of the accepted theoretical assumptions about reading and writing that have been entirely on male literary experiences.

Feminism has grown into a complex theoretical stream with numerous diversities depending on multiple orientations. It can therefore be sketched in a continuum in order to provide a generalized overview of its internal dimensions and to explore the possibilities. The positions within feminism stretch from those adopting more explicit and specific political commitments which demand less widely inclusive conception of feminism’s defining qualities, to those stressing flexibility and diversity related to an

emphasis upon historical, local and contextual specificity. In the left of the continuum, we find feminism defined as a definite set of ideas or social analysis. This is a relatively closed approach requiring a commitment to a revolutionary politics. In the middle of the continuum are broad definitions offered by dictionaries and other accounts. This is somewhat less likely to attend to political commitment described by the definite view. The most open definitions of feminism's scope are the right of the continuum. Provisional definitions believe that feminism is open to changing content and hence rejects singular political viewpoints. Feminists have offered widely different accounts of the ways in which they are divided. For example Karen Offen divides feminism into two: Relational and individualistic.

The first is said to include the feminists prior to 19th century who have focused on egalitarianism and liberalism in heterosexual familial settings. They are concerned with the notion of equality, which focus on women's distinct position as women. This asserts the point that women should be able to do what men do.

Individualistic feminism includes a group of feminists who focus on a quest for personal individual independence and downplay sex-linked qualities. According to Elizabeth Grosz feminists labeled under difference are concerned with autonomy and they support conceptions of difference without hierarchy. It is difficult to outline so many view points that may be included under the term without reducing them to more slogans. Although the various traditions do become more established over time, newer feminist trajectories are quite often messy and are not so straightforwardly summarized.

Showalter in her analysis of historical development of feminism presents three important stages of women writing according to their intensity of female voice: Feminine, Feminist and Female. The first dating from 1840 to 1880 marked the female voice rising in literature though buried in so-called feminine substance and got

immensely affected by male pedagogy. In this phase women writers like George Eliot and Bronte sisters imitated and internalized the dominant male aesthetic tradition and standards, which required that women writers remain gentlewomen. The main area of their work was their immediate domestic and social circle. The second phase dating from 1880 to 1920 clearly demonstrated the determined efforts for political and social equality and women's literature was able to advocate minority rights and protested against the unjust treatment of women. This includes writers like Elizabeth Robins, Olive Schreiner who remained dependent upon the prominent masculine aesthetics. Similarly, the third phase dating from 1920 onwards dawned with Dorothy Richardson, Katherine Mansfield and Virginia Woolf who ventured to counterbalance the male-dominated literary sphere and realized the historically sex-polarized tendency in literature. In this phase, the dependency on opposition is being replaced by a rediscovery of women's texts and aesthetics. However, they could not dispose the blames put upon them by male writers nor could they explore the actual physical experience of women. It was only with the coming of postwar novelists such as Iris Murdoch, Doris Lessing, Margaret Drabble that we see female aesthetics and the distinct female view of life. They have countercharged men for their taboos stamped on women and have focused on all areas of female experience.

As the term 'feminism' covers a broader scope and embraces different aspects of humanity despite its focus on the entire issues of women, several dimensions have been shown ranging from liberal attitude and the demand for equal rights for sexes to the radical one voicing out the extreme ideology that tends to theoretically turn the patriarchy upside down. Liberal and Radical feminism are distinguished in terms of their intensity of demand and the arrogance. While alongside them, other feminists have developed with their affiliation to certain theoretical backgrounds. They include political

feminism, Marxist/socialist feminism, psychoanalytic, French feminism, bio-feminism, postmodernist/ poststructuralist feminism, post colonial feminism and others. To move into the brief study of these dimensions, it is relevant to first deal with liberal and radical feminism.

Liberal Feminism is a moderate or mainstream face of feminism that explains women's position in society. It addresses the problems of unequal rights or artificial barriers to women's participation in the public world, beyond the family and household. It shows a critical concern with the value of individual autonomy and freedom from supposedly unwarranted restrictions by other. Public citizenship and the attainment of equality with men in the public arena are central to liberal feminism. By presuming the sameness between men and women it reflects the concept of a fundamentally and sexually undifferentiated human nature by emphasizing that women can do anything what men do. Unlike radical feminists, they emphasize reform of society rather than revolutionary changes. Liberal feminism draws on "welfare liberalism", though it started as "a form of liberal political thought influenced by writers as J.S. Mill" (78). They put forward their main agenda as collective responsibility for the formation and development of liberal society, which supports equal opportunity between sexes. They do not want to either prove women as superior to men folk or voice their slogans against men. They believe in reform not revolution.

Radical feminism appeared in Elaine Showalter's reinterpretation of gender studies and got nourished by her followers. It has been established as a feminist literary criticism, an extreme rebellious stream which appears as hostile to patriarchy unlike liberal feminism. It offers a real challenge to and rejection of the liberal orientation towards the public world of men. It gives a positive value to womanhood rather than supporting a notion of assimilation into arenas of activity associated with men. They

arrogantly focus on women's oppression as in a social order dominated by men. The notion of sexual oppression is intimately connected with a strong emphasis on the sisterhood of women. Chris Beasley reports Johnson as defining it as "one of the basic tenets of radical feminism is that any woman . . . has more in common with any other women- regardless of class, race, age, ethnic group, nationality than any woman has with any man" (54). It encourages some degree of separatism from men because it recommends putting women first making them a primary concern. Radical feminists demand in literature an expression of female sexuality which will burst through the bonds of male logic with a poetic power that defines the tyranny of logocentric meaning. Besides sexual oppression, radical feminists often view other forms of power for example, unequal power relations within capitalism—as derived from patriarchy. Radical feminism describes sexuality "as the or at least a fundamental form of oppression and the primary oppression for women" (34). This approach wants to bring about radical changes in the social configuration in which the position of women is not only redefined but also reestablished as a respectable and important, commonly suggesting that the position of man be in a position of power relative to all women, and possibly some men. They have a strong interest in recovering or discovering positive elements in femininity asserting in essence that it is good to be a woman and to form bonds with other women. Elizabeth Grosz calls it a feminism of difference. Radical feminism usually presents a historically continuous clear-cut difference between men and women. This theory generally advocates a revolutionary model of social change. The agenda of radical feminist writings is to counter women's supposedly natural, biological inferiority and subordination within patriarchal society by asserting their at least equal or superior status in relation to men. A crucial aspect of that agenda is for women to gain control over their own bodies, biology and to value and celebrate women's bodies.

Feminism has always been concerned in some way with women's participation or non-participation in paid employment. The activism of women in 19th century radical and socialist movement was principally for women's right to work and to be treated fairly and paid equally to men. Karl Marx underlined that the consciousness is the product of being which is determined by the socio-economic realities. Feminism embracing Marxism was developed as Marxist feminism in the western world in the 1960s and 70s. These feminist thinkers saw the main reason of gender inequality in the unequal distribution of capital. Starting from the issue of the underpayment of women, sexual harassment of female workers by male workers at factories and limited employment of women in income-generating sources, Marxist feminists go to the point of defining the position of women in terms of socio-economic basis. They argue that the secret of sexual oppression lies in the unanimous authority of men over property and capital. They place women as proletariat and men as bourgeois and propose to wage a war against that unequal distribution and disrupt the socio-economic structure and configure new which will institute equal opportunity to both sexes and economic hierarchy would be dismantled. Jane Freeman refers to Mariaros Dalla Costa and Selma James's book *The Power and the Subversion of the Community* and notes that women are exploited by the capitalist system as "unpaid workers, undertaking all the domestic works: childbearing and caring which are necessary for the continuation of the capitalist system"(86). By asserting that the class power and class oppression predate sexual oppression, Marxist feminists attack the prevailing capitalistic system of the West and advocate a revolutionary approach in which the overthrow of capitalization is viewed as the necessary precondition to dismantle male privilege. Thus they combine the study of class with that of gender. They wish to focus on class along with gender as crucial determinant of literary production.

Socialist feminism has combined Marxist and radical feminisms, the former emphasizing the causal role of labor and capital and the latter believing that sexual hierarchy is independent of economic class hierarchy. This theory offers therefore a dual system of social analysis: patriarchy and capitalism. Sometimes it describes a unified system referred to as capitalist patriarchy.

Published in the late 19th century but widely discussed in the early 20th century was Freud's psychoanalysis that centered on the issue of human neurosis. He has massively brought gender issues as he talks about the formation of unconscious of a woman. He further seems to discover the fundamental differences in dream images seen by man and woman and attributes egoist, ambitious dreams to man and erotic dreams to woman. Freud's analysis is gender biased. Psychoanalytic feminism draws from the Freudian and Lacanian arguments and argues against their depiction of woman psyche as neurotic, vulnerable to slightest stimulation and lacking rational faculty. Psychoanalytic feminists analyze the formation of sexed identities: masculinity and femininity. To oppose Freudian belief that the father shapes the psychic life of the child, they stress the prior importance of the mother. Such feminists examine the images in literature written by both male and female writers and claim that the male writers have a deep seated psychological bias against women characters that are thus represented as vile or psychologically inferior. Feminists call Freudian analysis a phallogocentrism and phallogocentrism.

The critics of French feminist schools are concerned with feminine writing from the position of woman accept Lacan's account of language/ culture as a masculine order but do not accept his positive affirmation of that masculine order as equivalent to civilization or sociality. They question the assumption that femininity can only be seen from the point of view of phallic culture. For the *écriture féminine* writers the notion of

woman exemplifies the cultural and linguistic principle of rendering inferior that which does not fit the masculine norm. They believe that femininity offers a possible procedure for subverting the marginalizing mechanisms of power, thereby breaking it up. A

Handbook of Critical Approaches to Literature mentions:

French feminists who follow Lacan, particularly Helene Cixous propose a utopian place, a primeval female space which is free of symbolic order, sex roles, otherness and the law of the father and in which the self is still linked with Cixous calls the voice of the Mother. (204)

Many psychoanalytical feminists have adopted myth criticism and have transformed it for the purposes of feminist criticism. Feminist myth critics tend to “center their discussion on the Great Mother and other female images and goddesses some of them being Medusa, Cassandra, and Isis” (122). They even criticize Northrop Frye for ignoring gender in his classification of myths. These critics reject Greco-Roman myths as male constructed and want to go to the study of pre-Greek myths which have abundant examples of matriarchal norms and values in the societies. Feminist myth critics opine that myths have been formed for the welfare of men and with a view to dominating women.

Some physiological explanations pointed at a notion that women were physically as well as mentally poor, for their brain size was considered to be smaller than man’s. So, women were thought to be fit for childbearing, breastfeeding and occupying themselves with domestic chores. But the bio-feminists often called corporeal feminists raise the issue of women’s body as an essential part of women’s writing because women for them have more biological experiences than men do. Experiences like menstruation, gestation, ovulation and childbirth are the mere women’s and there lie several important things which are *terra incognita* (unexplored subject) for men. They believe that

patriarchal thought has limited female biology to its own narrow specification and urge for the frank exposition of their body in their writing.

In 1960s a revolutionary phase emerged in literary arena to counter the age old western philosophy and linguistics led by a French philosopher Jacques Derrida. Taking advantage of the poststructuralist theory feminist thinkers argued against male-centrism—male as centre and female as margin. Some extremists started calling phallogocentrism to signify that men have dominated the word and have defined the world the way they like and thus they define women as subordinate and secondary. Though the idea of feminism itself seeks to study the existence of women in the patriarchal society, existentialist feminism founded and elaborated by Simone de Beauvoir primarily focuses on Sartrean notion of existentialism: existence precedes essence. Beauvoir raises this issue regarding woman who has been essentialised “in the society with certain stereotypes like woman as a flesh, related to nature, vale of blood, open rose, siren, the curve of a hill, the fertile soul, the sap, the material beauty and the soul of the world” (998). Men believe that women cannot transcend because transcendence is a spiritual sublimity which can only be attained by men. Paternalism claims woman for hearth and home and defines her as sentiment, inwardness and immanence. Women are projected as ‘other’ subordinate being. This ‘othering’, according to Beauvoir, “mystifies woman’s qualities and pushes her into isolation” (998).

Gender discrimination is practiced even at the level of language use. A woman’s socialization process teaches her a distinction between male and female in language. The linguistic feminists tend not only to discover the sexism in language but also to attack the sexist aspects in the language where they find oppressive aspects for women. Language seems to have paralyzed their gestures including their verbal gestures. The main problem

lies “in the fact that women have been denied the full resources of language and have been forced into silence, euphemism or circumlocution” (Lodge 341).

Post-colonial feminists are concerned with the “double colonization” of third world women under the imperial conditions. They argue that the third world women became victims of both imperial ideology and native and foreign patriarchies. They are ghettoized and secluded from the mainstream culture and suffered with their western sibling as well. Non-western woman suffer from a sense of isolation and have hard time to express their identity. They are sandwiched between two trends of dominations.

Gayatri Spivak puts it as:

. . . between patriarchy and imperialism, subject constitution and object formation. The figure of the woman disappears, not into a pristine nothingness, but a violent shuttling which is the displaced figuration of the ‘third world woman’ caught between tradition and modernization.
(qtd. in Gandhi 89)

The post-colonial feminists accuse of the mainstream feminists Eurocentric in their attitudes towards women in the countries of third world, trying to impose western model of feminism that is not always appropriate to the particular condition of third world countries.

Despite the adaptation of various critical modes in feminist critical theory, most of the writers and critics share some assumptions and concepts about patriarchal domination and sexual difference. Firstly, the western civilization is male-centered, that is, perversely dominated by patriarchal norms and values. All domains such as familial, religious, political, economic, social, legal and artistic are organized and conducted in such a way as to submit women to men. Women are brought up and socialized in such a way that patriarchal ideology is being instilled and internalized within them so that they

become co-operative in their own subordination. From the Hebrew Bible and Greek philosophy to the present it defines females by negative reference to the male—as an ‘other’ or kind of ‘non-man’. Secondly, sex is to determine by anatomy, whereas gender is constructed by culture, the omnipresent patriarchal biasness of our civilization. Simone de Beauvoir in *The Second Sex* says, “One is not born but rather becomes a woman” (7). So, the masculine is identified as active, dominating, rational and creative whereas the female is identified as passive, timid, emotional and conventional. Lastly, feminists claim that patriarchal ideology encroaches literature too. The great writings are written by men. The most highly regarded literary works such as *Oedipus*, *Ulysses*, *Hamlet*, *Tom Jones* and *Huckleberry Finn* focus on the male protagonist depicting masculine traits, feelings and interests whereas the female characters are created to submit to masculine desires and are presented from a male perspective. In such works no autonomous female models are created and only male readers are implicitly addressed. So, female readers have to identify themselves by taking up the position of the male subject and assuming male values and ways of feelings. In addition, the canon of literary criticism, the criteria and the standard for analyzing and appraising literary works are immune to total masculine assumption, interest and reason.

III. Patriarchy, an Obstacle to Female Independence

Fowles in *The Collector* has demonstrated the age-old repression of women in male-dominated socio-cultural structure. Women are restricted and confined within the claustrophobic patriarchal social setting which is a stumbling block for their independence. They, challenging the distasteful oppression of male, want to be free from such obstacles, but their efforts have been thwarted by male chauvinistic social norms and values.

In the novel, Fredrick Clegg, the male protagonist, imagines to be the master of Miranda, a college girl, as soon as his guilty eyes fall on her innocent body. His sense of superiority and the smell of exploitation take birth right in his imagination. He imagines:

She drew pictures and I looked after my collection (in my dream). It was always she loving me and my collection, drawing and coloring them; working together in a beautiful modern house in a big room with one of those huge glass windows; meetings there of the Bug Section, where instead of saying almost nothing in case I made mistakes we were the popular host and hostess. (Fowles 10)

The above extract exhibits the stereotypes inherent in the mind of male members of the society about woman. As Sigmund Freud proposes that dreams are the "royal road" to the unconscious and they reveal in disguised form the deepest elements of an individual's inner life, Clegg's thought of making Miranda paint the pictures is the outcome of his suppressive ego inbuilt in his mind. He plans in advance to exploit her by making her work in the house thinking that woman is merely for home and hearth. The house itself is a symbol of restriction of female independence. Furthermore, he expects Miranda not to utter anything even if he makes mistakes in the meeting which is the evidence of male's suppression upon the female's fundamental right to expression.

Women in the society are expected to accept blindly what male members say and do. Clegg even had some “bad dreams” in which the girl “cried” or usually “knelt” (10). Besides, he “hit her across the face as [he] saw it done by a chap in a telly play” (11). It is Clegg’s imitation of other male’s suppression and cruelty on woman. His dream of punishing the girl is also the manifestation of his sub-conscious mind. It is evident that males take it for granted that they are the master and females are simply their slaves whom they can use as per their will.

Henry Miller opines that ideology has become the weapon to dominate women in patriarchal society. By creating male discourse Clegg labels women as “vulgar” and shows his sense of hatred towards them (12). It shows the negative image of women present in Clegg’s mind. Clegg says, “I always hated vulgar women, especially girls” (12). This statement proves that when a girl or woman does not conform to the social dictations or tries to defy the constraints she is labeled as “vulgar”, indecent and characterless.

How marriage is one of the bondages that restrict women from realizing her independent self and how it has been defined by men as a legal authority over women can be seen in the narrative:

Then somehow I was the man that attacked her, only I didn’t hurt her; I captured her and drove her off in the van to a remote house and there I kept her captive in a nice way. Gradually she came to know me and the dream grew into the one about our living in a nice modern house, married, with kids and everything. (19)

The attack and capture of Miranda in the above quote is an evidence of males’ violence on women. “The Van” and “a remote house” symbolize an enclosed place appropriate for victimization. To keep Miranda in “a nice modern house” is no better

than keeping a parrot in a nice cage. To imagine marrying her is to get legal authority over her and thinking of kids shows males' conception of female as a child bearing machine.

Clegg's search for a house far away from the city in order to imprison Miranda is his plan to isolate her from the society and to prevent her from social rights. The house that matched his purpose was advertised in the newspaper as "old cottage, charming secluded situation, large garden, 1 hour by car, London, two miles from nearest village..."(19). After buying the house, he chose "The inner one" and "damp" room which had "walls like wet wood in winter" (22). The selection of the house and the room suggests Clegg's cruelty and brutality towards Miranda.

Disrespecting the feelings and sentiments, Clegg takes advantage of the physical weakness of Miranda and succeeds in using her as per his will. Clegg is successful to get Miranda not because he won her heart but because he was blessed with stronger muscles. He says, "She struggled like the dickens, but she wasn't strong, smaller than even I'd thought" (28). Thus, Miranda's struggle for freedom was slaughtered in front of the mighty muscular body of Clegg. How atrocious man appears to be just because of his physicality is apparent when Clegg narrates, "She wasn't so heavy as I thought; I got her down quite easily; we did have a bit of struggle at the door of her room, but there wasn't more she could do then" (30). As uttered in the above quote, patriarchy doesn't take the issue related to women as something "heavy" or important; rather they take it "quite easily". Patriarchal stereotypical conceptions of women have become so weighty or prejudiced that the females' "struggle" for rupturing them needs extraordinary sweat and valor. Rights are never granted they are to be seized. But Clegg's knocking down of Miranda and foiling her attempt to escape proves that males still believe in the war of

power rather than in the war of idea and females are not physically strong to grab their rights from the grip of patriarchy.

In the male-dominated society men do not pay due respect to the feelings of women. Women's prime duty is to act as per males' sentiments. Clegg's statement "I knew my love was worthy of her" hints that it was Miranda's responsibility, though she was quite troubled, to love and respect him simply because he loved her (31). Clegg wants to impose his will compellingly upon Miranda against her feelings.

Clegg's happiness knows no bounds at the time his plan to kidnap and imprison Miranda becomes successful as scheduled. After locking Miranda in the dark cold room Clegg expresses his joy as:

After, she was always telling me what a bad thing I did and how I ought to try and realize it more. I can only say that evening I was very happy . . . and it was more like I had done something very daring, like climbing Everest or doing something in my enemy territory. My feelings were very happy because my intentions were of the best. It was what she never understood.

. . . , that night was the best thing I ever did in my life It was like catching the Mazarine Blue again or a Queen of Spain Fritillary. I mean it was like something you only do once in a lifetime and even then often not; something you dream about more than you ever expect to see come true, in fact. (31)

How a male enjoys the pain and cry of a female is evident in the above extract. Clegg seems totally oblivious towards the sufferings and tortures Miranda had to undergo. Clegg articulates no sign of regret in kidnapping Miranda like an animal and shows no sympathy in her loneliness. Instead, he compares his misdeed with climbing

Everest or defeating an enemy. There is inborn antagonism between sexes in the mind of males and they at all times aim to destroy their enemies. The most hurting moment in Miranda's life becomes the most blissful minute in Clegg's life. Considering Miranda's life as his "enemy territory" Clegg transcends all norms of being a human and celebrates in making her life completely hellish. What can be a better example of Clegg's suppression, exploitation or domination upon Miranda than his rejoice in her heartbreaking entrapment?

Patriarchy has prevented females from their fundamental rights by simply giving them false assurances. Man shows his dual opportunistic nature in front of a female and acts quite tactfully so as to deceive her. He easily changes his form as per the situation just to take undue advantage of the females. Clegg pretends to be quite sensitive about each and every need of Miranda inside the underground cellar. He provides her cigarette, bread, coffee, meal and such other things and even reminds her to eat, drink and rest. In a very pretentious voice he says, "You haven't eaten anything" (33). He wants to engage her in one trivial work or the other so that she will get no time to think about herself and her freedom. Talking to her gives him immense pleasure, so he frequently visits her room in the pretext of asking what she wants like: "I came to ask you what you'd like for breakfast. . ." (34). But he leaves the room without any response when she replies; "I don't want any breakfast. This horrid little room. And that anaesthetic. I just want to be set free" (34-35). This vividly shows how Clegg avoids the important issues related to Miranda's freedom.

Clegg suddenly expresses his inner hollow egocentric feeling and tells Miranda, "I love you. It's driven me mad" (37). Though Clegg uses the word "love" to describe his emotion, it rather is merely his lust towards her physical attraction. He pretends to love her only because he wants to make her love him, which is obvious from his

narration “The only treatment I need is you to treat me like a friend” (70). Clegg leaves no room for Miranda to choose her friend; she is compelled even in the matter of friendship, which in fact is established spontaneously on mutual understanding rather than under compulsion. He puts the false mask of love just to quench his burning thirst of bodily lust. The words he utters do not represent the true picture of his mind.

Patriarchy discourages women to participate in any kind of public assembly and limits them in the position of domestic slaves. Being far from public participation causes lack of power of judgment and power of analysis in them. For the same purpose, Clegg assumes, “It would be better if she was cut off from the outside world” (43). In order to bring his plan into action he, “never let her see papers, [he] never let her have a radio or television” besides preventing her from leaving the underground cellar like hell (43). Male members in the society, like Clegg in the novel, fear the possible protest that females can wage against the patriarchal domination if they are given access to public knowledge.

What is more disappointing and surprising is Clegg’s expectation that trapping and depriving Miranda of the outside world will help to develop the feeling of love towards him in her heart. Emotions are not planned, they are natural. But in the case of Miranda she is forced to love him despite her uncontrollable sense of hatred towards him. When Clegg asks Miranda “to try to understand” him and “like” him she bursts out in anger and flows her true internal emotion: “I hate you, I hate you” (46-47).

Being an entomologist Clegg is fond of collecting different species of butterflies and decorating his room. Taking Miranda too as one of the species of butterflies he collects her and keeps her as an object of decoration. He leads her to the room where he had kept special models of butterflies and shows her “fellow victims” (54). Those butterflies, like Miranda, are “beautiful” but “sad” because they lack freedom (54).

Contemplating on the situation of butterflies, she puts forward her query, “. . . I’m thinking of all the butterflies that would have come from these if you’d let them live. I’m thinking of all the living beauty you’ve ended” (55). Here butterflies are the symbols of freedom and the killing of them is equal to the killing of women’s freedom. Clegg has taken lives of many butterflies which symbolizes that patriarchy has been thwarting the females’ struggle for independence throughout history.

Males consider themselves as the one, subject, superior, godlike, intellectual and females as the other, object, inferior, malleable and inert. In the course of argument Clegg proudly says, “I’m thinking of you as an object, not as a person” (58). Clegg has taken Miranda simply as an object of entertainment. He collected her just because he liked her and nothing else. In utter despair Miranda says, “You’re breaking every decent human law, every decent human relationship, every decent thing that’s ever happened between your sex and mine” (107). Clegg does not give Miranda the minimum human status and provides an undisputed illustration of patriarchal domination on the soul of humanity.

Miranda's activity is viewed through the eye of suspicion and scrutinized to a large extent. This is a deep insult to the sentiments of a woman. Female is not supposed to think and act beyond the parameters assigned to her by the conventional patriarchal dogmas. When Miranda asks Clegg that she needs some fresh air, has to take bath sometimes, needs magazines and some drawing materials, he takes it quite skeptically as her top secret plan to escape and replies, “If I let you go outside, you’ll escape” (47).

Women’s intelligence is supposed to be associated with the proper adjustment of their dresses. Patriarchy encourages women to be docile and attentive to their looks, says Wollstonecraft. Clegg too wants Miranda to look beautiful. So he provides her all the necessary means of beautification. “One of the great pleasures” for him “was seeing how

her hair was each day” (73). Thus, he derives pleasure from each organ of her body. He seems happier when she comes out applying the means of make-up. He remarks:

For a moment I thought it wasn't her, it looked so different. She had a lot of French scent which I gave her on and she was really made up for the first time since she was with me; she had the dress on and it really suited her, it was a creamy color very simple but elegant, leaving her arms and her neck bare. It wasn't a girl's dress at all, she looked a real woman. (80)

The above excerpt clarifies how Clegg wants to keep Miranda engaged in beautifying herself so that she will get less time to think about issues like her identity, her freedom and the like. Moreover, he praises her “very nice” and “beautiful” and wants “to look at her all the time” (80). Women, like Miranda, have been easily deceived in such exaggerated admiration of their outer appearances.

Miranda's wish to “go out into the other cellar and walk up and down” demonstrates her dissatisfaction with the world she is living. She is longing for the outside world of freedom, for which she needs “exercise” (57). On the other hand, Clegg is determined not to let her go anywhere.

. . . If she wanted to walk there in daytime she would have to have the gag on. I couldn't risk someone chancing to be round the back □ not that it was likely, of course the front gate and garage were locked always. But at night just the hands would do. I said I wouldn't promise more than one bath a week. And nothing about daylight. I thought for a moment she would go into one of her sulks again, but she began to understand about that time sulks didn't get her anywhere, so she accepted my rules. (57)

The commitments and the necessary precautions that Clegg has made in order not to let her leave the limited premises are obvious in the aforementioned extract. “The

front gate” symbolizes the ultimate outlet Miranda dreams, but it is always “locked”. She can never experience the “daylight”, i.e. the light of independence, and she is compelled to accept his “rules”, i.e. the patriarchal rules.

Social surroundings shape the mind and behavior of the people. Most members of the society are overwhelmed by old convictions and stereotypical notions. Male members in the society easily suspect women but they never accept any types of suspicions upon their activities by females. Clegg suspects Miranda whereas he virtually rejects when she comments his activities. He says, “You think I’m mad because of what I’ve done. I’m not mad. It’s just, well . . .” (52). This proves Clegg’s attempt to superimpose what he does is true.

Miranda’s ultimate aim is to be free from the restrictions of Clegg. She feels suffocated in the underground cellar. “That air was wonderful. You can’t imagine. Even this air. It’s free. It’s everything. I’m not”, says Miranda (53). It shows her strong desire for freedom. She wants to be as free as the air outside because she thinks freedom is “everything”.

Foucault argues, “What is true depends upon who controls the power or the discourse” (qtd. in Selden 136). Then it is reasonable to believe that men’s domination of discourses has trapped women inside a male ‘truth’. Power has made men blind and crazy. Clegg makes plan up to the extent that he is ready to kill Miranda in case the police come to arrest him in his house. He claims to possess some sort of power over her, which allows him to do what he thinks is true. The following extract exemplifies how power has corrupted the thought of Clegg and how he considers the killing of Miranda as his duty in order to be safe from the hands of law. It is also the outcome of his criminal mentality. He imagines:

. . . I thought I had some sort of power over her, she would do what I wanted. . . . I had a horrible dream one night when they came and I had to kill her before they came in the room. It seemed like a duty and I had only a cushion to kill her with. I hit and hit and she laughed and then I jumped on her and smothered her and she lay still . . . (77)

To marry someone is to become his possession for a woman in the patriarchal society. Woman loses her identity and has to adopt a new identity of another person after marriage. So, it has become a powerful weapon for woman's suppression. Clegg's strong desire to marry Miranda is his trick to make her his legal possession, which can be traced in Clegg's utterance: "While I was buying the necklace I saw some rings and that gave me the plan I could ask her to marry me and if she said no then it would mean I had to keep her. It would be a way out. I knew she wouldn't say yes. So I bought a ring. It was quite nice, but not very expensive. Just for show" (79). Miranda, however, boldly rejects his proposal calling it "horrible" and "inhuman" (84). In response she says, "Because I can't marry a man to whom I don't feel I belong in all ways. My mind must be his, my heart must be his, my body must be his. Just as I must feel he belongs to me" (85).

Miranda makes several attempts to escape from the prison house. Her revolution seems a bit decent at the initial days of abduction but it grows more violent afterwards. When all her civilized pleas for her release get crushed mercilessly she adopts some brutal and aggressive forms of protest. Her protest develops from sulking to fasting, from kissing to standing naked and finally from having sex to physical attack but all are in vain. She even decides to break the walls of the room with the help of "some tools" like "fork" and "teaspoons" (172). She plans "to have something strong and sharp to pick out the cement between the stones" and to "make a hole through them . . . to get round into the outer cellar" (172). Thus she actually wants to break the walls of patriarchy which

has blocked her independence. She thinks of seducing him: “She put her hand on my shoulders and lifted up a bit and kissed my cheek” (82). Then, when her rage intensifies, she scolds Clegg “disgusting filthy mean-minded bastard” and does not feel shy to stand naked in front of him (107).

. . . She stood back a step and unfastened her housecoat and she had nothing on beneath. She was stark. I didn't give no more than a quick look, she just stood there, smiling and waiting . . . for me to make a move. She put up her arms and began to undo her hair. It was deliberate provoking, standing there naked in the shadows and firelight. I couldn't believe it, rather I had to believe it, but I couldn't believe it was what it seemed. (99)

The above quote represents the overflow of Miranda's sense of rebellion caused due to the extreme suppression on her self. Being naked in front of a male is to go against the social decrees. Her revolutionary spirit gets strengthened with it; she finds sex as something ordinary and says, “Sex is just an activity, like anything else. It's not dirty, it's two people playing with each other's bodies. Like dancing. Like a game” (101). Here seduction of Clegg by Miranda is a powerful blow to the norms of patriarchy.

When Miranda's unconventional forms of protest fail to fulfill her dream of independence, she becomes wild and “beat[s] her fist against the wall” (66). Now there is no alternative left for her except the use of force. So, she makes up her mind to attack Clegg physically, which symbolizes her aggression to the patriarchal suppression on the sentiments of women. She first gives “a terrible blow on the side of [his] head” with “the old odd-jobs axe” but he manages to “escape the next attack” (91). She makes her second

attack in which Clegg gets “a terrible gashing blow in the temple” (91). It causes his “head ring and the blood seem[s] to gush out at once (91).

Understanding the meaning of some key images is vital to the full appreciation of the story. Within each narrative segment there is often a central and powerful symbol that serves to add meaning to the text and to underline some subtle points Fowles is making. Images are the implicit expressions of ideas and they carry more intense and more artistic perception of the issue. *The Collector* is replete with images all adding up to the central theme of Miranda’s failure of independence.

The images used in the novel also suggest the scene of restriction and confinement. The most frequently recurrent spatial images are the motifs of closed underground room and explicitly bounded settings which symbolize limitations that society can impose upon the life of an individual. Critic Stephen J. Burn has also viewed images like “dark room”, “underground vault”, “tunnel” as the symbol of restriction (187). Imprisonment is a threat to personal identity; and this is what exactly happens in Miranda’s life in the novel. At different times in the novel the underground room where Miranda is imprisoned has been described as a “lunatic asylum” and a “crypt” (102). The four walls of the prison are the repressive norms and principles of patriarchy which block women’s struggle for independence.

As phallic and womb symbols describe the different aspects of a character’s subconscious personality for the psychological novelist, so do the spatial images become the objective correlatives for the relationship between the individual self and the world in which that self can either exist or conflict or be lost. Miranda’s self, conflicting with the world inside the closed basement cellar, cannot exist as Clegg prevents her from the outer world. She wants desperately to escape just as a netted butterfly tries vainly to fly away. In fact the butterfly motif in *The Collector* stands for the symbolic representation

of Miranda's inner self struggling for independence. The victim of society's insane repression of the self can either die in prison or having found identity in prison be set free to express that newfound selfhood by means of social involvement in the outer world. In the same way the butterfly image is symbolic of rebirth out of the closed inner space. Miranda is the caterpillar who enters the cocoon to emerge later into a new mature self. Unfortunately the collector who with curiosity has been observing her growth in the cocoon decides to become the passive killer and destroys life. Miranda, as she emerges from the cocoon with a new identity, drops right into Clegg's killing bottle. At the moment Miranda finds existential self by going within herself she must face physical death by decree of the outer world of patriarchy.

The vast difference between the underground world where Miranda lives and the outer world of freedom is vividly imaged in the symbolic definition of setting. When Clegg allows Miranda outside she reveals in:

Great riches of clear sky, no moon, sprinkles of warm white stars
everywhere, like milky diamonds, and a beautiful wind. . . . The branches
rustling, an owl hooting in the woods. And the sky all wild, all free, all
wind and air and space and stars. . . .

Indoors it couldn't have been more different. (169)

The outer world in all of its variety and beauty symbolizes life and the expansiveness of self expression. But in the inner space of her underground prison Miranda's self-in-isolation must exist in "strange dead air" (120). Momentarily freed from her cell, in the lounge of the house after a walk outdoors, Miranda defines the spatial symbolism in terms of air image. She wants the same freedom of the outer air.

Similarly, as a sub-motif, the light imagery of *The Collector* complements the different uses of spatial imagery. Light imagery is especially appropriate because as an

artist Miranda is acutely aware of the shortcomings of artificial light. Thus, Miranda can deem her first escape attempts a success, though she reaches only the outer cellar, because she catches a glimpse of a “keyhole of light” (118). “The thing I miss most is the fresh light”, she admits in an epistolary paragraph to her sister Minny, “I can’t live without light. Artificial light, all the line lie” (117). Just as a keyhole is a small tunnel between a closed room and an open world, so are the changing images of air (fresh and dead) and light (natural, artificial and absent) passages between the two different and opposed worlds for Miranda. Alone in the darkness, Miranda is compelled to look within herself. She tries repeatedly to traverse the tunnel to the wider world. Each time, however, Clegg rolls a huge stone across the mouth of the tunnel, shutting off access to air and to light. Thus, Miranda’s life ends being trapped in the loneliness of selfhood.

Art becomes a symbol of both freedom and failure in the novel. It is through the process of art that Miranda reaches the highest point of her independence. Miranda sees art as a way of self expression and self assertion. She draws and paints pictures which help her to remove personal pain from the senses. But her dream of becoming an artist and to revolt through the medium of art remains incomplete owing to the unfavorable situation in the underground crypt.

Finally, Miranda suffers from pneumonia due to the extreme coldness in the underground cellar. She asks Clegg “to get a doctor” when she falls “terribly ill” but he blames her of pretense and tells her to “get up and go back to bed” (111). How easily Clegg neglects the critical situation like illness is clear in his statement: “. . . you’re not ill, if it was pneumonia you couldn’t stand up even” (111). Losing her hope of life, Miranda reveals her voice of anger “Not fetching a doctor is murder. You’re going to kill me” (112). Ultimately Miranda’s body lies on the floor “with her head to one side . . . her mouth open and her eyes . . . staring white like. . . [trying] to see out of the window one

last time” (274). But the death of Miranda does not hurt Clegg any more, it rather encourages him to capture another “ordinary girl who would respect” him more (282). Thus, Clegg is happy with Miranda’s death as he learns some useful tricks for the successful entrapment of another girl.

3.1 Religion and Myth as Suppressive Elements

Religion has been used as a powerful tool for the suppression of women in the society. All the religious doctrines, norms and values are the products of male-centric ideology, which restrict women from realizing their creative possibilities in different spheres of life. Religion for Miranda is “all the meanness and the selfishness and the lies” (255). Religion adds more suffering and pain to the wound of women. Miranda further says:

I hate God. I hate whatever made this world, I hate whatever made the human race, made men like Caliban possible and situations like this possible.

If there is a God he’s a great loathsome spider in the darkness. He *cannot be good*.

This pain, this terrible seeing-through that is in me now. It wasn’t necessary. It is all pain, and it buys nothing. Gives birth to nothing.

All in vain. All wasted. (255)

The above remark is the outcome of Miranda’s absolute loss of faith in the existence of God and the benevolence of religion. She says, “God is impotent. He can’t love us. He hates us because he can’t love us” (255). Male-centric religions of the world are doing nothing than imposing “more and more suffering for more and more” women (255). If only there was God he would not create Caliban and torture Miranda to that extreme. Similarly, myth, another form of domination, is in large part explained by its

usefulness to men. As critic Simone de Beauvoir opines, “The myth of women is a luxury. It can appear only if man escapes from the urgent demands of his needs; the more relationships are concretely lived, the less they are idealized” (999). Surely, most of the myths have roots in the spontaneous attitude of man toward his own existence and toward the world around him. Patriarchal society has deliberately used myth “for the purposes of self-justification” (999). Through the myths the society imposes its laws and customs upon individuals in an effective manner. It is under a mythical form that “the group-imperative is indoctrinated into each conscience. Through such intermediaries as religions, traditions and tales the myths penetrate even into such existences as are most harshly enslaved to material realities” (999). Miranda in the novel distastes myth and utters, “It was violence. It was all I hate and all I fear” (249). It proves that Miranda takes myth as a suppressive element which she not only hates but it causes fear in her mind.

3.2 Clegg, a Prototype of Caliban

Comparing Clegg’s nature with that of Caliban, a savage and deformed native of an island in Shakespeare’s *The Tempest*, Miranda remarks in anger, “They should have called you Caliban” (61). Clegg prefers to be called Ferdinand, the prince of Naples, whom Miranda, daughter of Prospero, loves. Clegg wants to obtain same degree of love and respect from Miranda as Ferdinand gets from Miranda in *The Tempest*. Caliban is presented as treacherous, violent, savage, merciless and evil worshipper who never learns anything from Prospero. In the same manner, Miranda in *The Collector* is unsuccessful in bringing any positive changes in Clegg’s nature. Being fed up in the attempt to teach Caliban, Prospero calls him a thing of darkness. Clegg too is a thing of darkness with not a single ray of humanity. Caliban attempts to seduce Miranda in *The Tempest*. Similarly, Clegg has seduced the freedom of Miranda in *The Collector*. Like Prospero, who

ultimately had to leave the island despite his magical power, Miranda fails to make her dream of freedom come true in the hostile world of sub-human Caliban of *The Collector*.

Thus, the pneumonia that takes Miranda's life is symbolic of the excessively unbearable suppression imposed by Clegg's patriarchal ideology and the coldness is the state of hopelessness to get independence. In other words, Miranda dies not because of physical illness but because of inner spiritual illness caused by unendurable domination. The failure of Miranda to come out of the ambush of Clegg proves the failure of female independence in the novel.

1V. Conclusion

The novel analyzed here challenges the deep-rooted patriarchal system and observes its subsequent effects on female race. It discusses the age-long male domination which acts as a hindrance in the path of female's freedom and independence.

The Collector is an account of Miranda's abduction and entrapment by Fredrick Clegg, who in order to take pleasure from her entrapment, imprisons her in an underground room till her death. She constantly struggles for freedom from claustrophobic underground cellar but her efforts end in vain because of Clegg's exploitative patriarchal ideology. Clegg, the captor, tries to provide all the facilities that Miranda needs and intends to prove the prison a luxurious one but, being disgruntled with the facilities in comparison to her seized freedom, she dies of pneumonia in the course of her struggle.

Since the human civilization that dawned and flourished in different parts of the world, human beings have been persistently endeavoring to explore new thing regarding independence. Everyone in one way or the other strives for freedom though the causes and the consequences of it remain unknown. In the same way, females like Miranda have been constantly revolting for independence against patriarchal domination imposed by males like Clegg. The activity like abduction, entrapment etc. is the outcome of the sense of so-called male superiority, but in real sense, they are severe attack upon women's rights for freedom. Every physical facility that Clegg provides to Miranda is trivial in comparison to the dream of independence of entire female race. To ignore all the physical luxury proves Miranda's well-built advocacy for women's independence. Patriarchy subordinates the female to the male or treats the female as an inferior male. Power is exerted directly or indirectly in civil and domestic life to constrain women from realizing their creativity. Patriarchal ideology produces stereotypes of strong men and

feeble women. Social values and conventions have been shaped by men to suit their own purposes and women have been struggling to express their concerns in male-made society. Religions and myths are heavily biased as both are the product of patriarchal mindset. So, simply physical pneumonia is not the cause of Miranda's death rather it is due to unwarranted suppression imposed upon her by male chauvinistic society. Ultimately, her death, before obtaining freedom, shows failure of female independence in the novel.

Thus, the achievement of freedom, for Miranda, is incomparable to anything else. Despite her constant struggle it is obvious that the real freedom for female is unimaginable until and unless patriarchy comes to an end.

Works Cited

- Abrams, M. H. *A Glossary of Literary Terms*. Bangalore: Prism Books Pvt. Ltd., 1993.
- Aubrey, James R., ed. *John Fowles and Nature*. London: Associated University Press, Inc., 1999.
- Bagchee, Shyamal. "The Collector: The Paradoxical Imagination of John Fowles." *Journal of Modern Literature* 8.2 (June 2006): 219-34.
- Beasley, Chris. *What is Feminism?* Sydney: SAGE Publication Ltd., 1999.
- Beauvoir, Simone de. "The Second Sex." *Critical Theory Since Plato*. Ed. Hazard Adams. Florida: Harcourt Brace Javanovich Inc., 1992.
- . -. *The Second Sex*. New York: Bantam Books, 1949.
- Binns, Ronald. "John Fowles: Radical Romancer." *Critical Quarterly* 36.3 (Summer 1965): 314-33.
- Burn, Stephen J. "Zahavi's Dirty Weekend." *Explicator* 62.3 (2004): 187-189.
- Cixous, Helen. "Sorties." *Modern Criticism and Theory*. Ed. David Lodge. New York: Longman Inc., 1998.
- Fowles, John. *The Collector*. London: Vintage-Random, 1998.
- Freedman, Jane. *Feminism*. New Delhi: Viva Books Pvt. Ltd., 2002.
- Gandhi, Leela. *Postcolonial Theory*. New Delhi: Oxford UP, 1999.
- Guerin, Wilsred L. et al., eds. *A Handbook of Critical Approaches to Literature*. 4th ed. New York: Oxford UP, 1999.
- Kristeva, Julia. "From One Identity to Another." Adams 1162-1173.
- Millet, Kate. *Sexual Politics*. London: Virago, 1977.
- Onega, Susan. "Self, World and Art in the Fiction of John Fowles." *Twentieth Century Literature* 42.1 (Spring 1996): 213-57.

Ousby, Ian. *The Cambridge Guide to Literature in English*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1992.

Palmer, William J. *The Fiction of John Fowles*. Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 1974.

Ruthven, K.K.. *Feminist Literary Studies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984.

Selden, Raman. *A Reader's Guide to Contemporary Literary Theory*. London: Harvester Wheatsheaf, 1988.

Showalter, Elaine. "Towards a Feminist Poetics." Adams 1224-1223.

Singh, Raman K. "An Encounter with John Fowles." *Journal of Modern Literature* 8.2 (June 2006): 181-202.

Smith, Eliot Fermont. "Players of the Godgame." *The New York Times on the Web* 17 Jan 1966. <<http://www.nytimes.com>>.

Stael, Germaine Necker de. "Literature in its Relation to Social Institutions." Adams 448-454.

Tallis, Ramond. *In Defence of Realism*. London: University of Nebraska Press, 1998.

Wollstonecraft, Mary. "A Vindication of the Rights of Woman." Adams 395-399.

Woolf, Virginia. "A Room of One's Own." Adams 818-825.

