Two nineteenth-century women; Charlotte Brontë (1818 - 1848) and Srpuhi Dussap (1840-1901). Both were woman novelists... Yet, they initiated a female language through their writings, even though they came from different socio-historical, cultural and geographical backgrounds. It is known that Srpuhi Dussap, the first Ottoman-Armenian woman novelist, was highly influenced by French literature and particularly by a French woman writer Georges Sand who was the most influential name affecting her as a writer. Still, if writings, as mere literary discursive productions, are concerned, Bronte and Dussap, reveal an intriguing fact on the ground of feminist literature. Despite the fact that they did not seem to have influenced one another, what they have in common is that both attempted to find out a female language. And since woman was a victim of the patriarchal construct and had no right to write as a woman, any woman writer in the nineteenth century had to use a cryptical language in order to narrate something out of the patriarchal context.

As the main theme of my thesis, I preferred to use the term *palimpsest* in order to display how they wrote their forbidden texts under the conventional style of literature. Through this style of writing, both could challenge the patriarchal impositions on women writers and succeeded to create their own discourse and mind. At the same time, with this style, although cryptic, they enabled to present the woman as subject instead of object and an individual.

Both writers used Romanticism in their novels for a certain common reason. Charlotte Brontë’s novel *Jane Eyre* seems at first sight to be a story of a governess within the background of the nineteenth century England. The protagonist experiences numerous hardships and her romantic affair with the landlord ends happily after various social and sexual frustrations and conflicts. Similarly, Mayda, though not a governess, but a widow with a daughter, falls in love and in the end, after similar conflicts, marries the man she loves and sadly dies just after such a happy ending. In spite of this romantic background, both writers applied romantic pattern to their works in order to make it appear ‘light literature’ in front of the ‘white men of letters’ and their conventional literature. Through such approach, both women managed to narrate their actual minds underneath the standard and well-accepted pattern of feminine romantic surface-text. In other words, Jane Eyre shows her anger and frustration through Bertha, the madwoman in the attic. Likewise, Mayda escapes the patriarchal ‘nets’ via the evil woman character, Herika.

Since this thesis has been studied in the light of Structuralism, the last word was favourably accomplished with a Structuralist comment. In other words, by using the myth of Arachne, it is intended to show how the cryptic (or palimpsestic) writings of Brontë and Dussap can be resembled to weaving with
two kinds; namely conventional writing that is expected from patriarchal system and forbidden, controversial and individualistic text against the patriarch that talks about woman’s independence, identity and subjectivity.

The mythic pattern is the basic level on which both novels rely upon structurally. In other words, the analysis of this particular myth provides a plot structure for both novels in terms of feminist discourse. Then, the style of palimpsest follows and elaborates the same discourse through several devices. Therefore, I intend to display other similarities and distinctions between the two novels this style includes.

Both Jane Eyre and Mayda are orphans who experience exclusion though to different extent. Thus, although a father figure is absent from the start, both heroines suffer from patriarchal figures. As for the loss of the mother, both find surrogates for their guidance and survival. However, beyond the pain of their exclusion within the social stance of orphanhood, there rests a medium for individualism. In other words, although they seem to be anxious (Mayda) or angry (Jane) about the constant exclusion they undergo in society, it is actually the impediments on the way of their quests that make them feel restless and furious. Both female reactions are supported and consolidated by the doubles they are provided with. The structure never differs: the doubles enact things that both heroines are not supposed to do. However, Jane’s relation with her double does not possess the unitariness of Mayda, who only acts in accordance with Herika. The multiplicity in *Jane Eyre* stems from the fact that the female community in the novel consists of more than two women unlike *Mayda*. In other words, at every step Jane encounters pairs of women who show her what to do or not to do. Even Jane’s most important double, Bertha, who is the only one that conforms to the rule of acting for the heroine, is introduced into the same pattern of pair, namely with Grace Poole. Both heroines are plain and never strive to better their appearances. However, the main doubles are portrayed by inexorably sensual, exotic and even wild beauties, like the monstrous Bertha or satanic Herika. Both demonic women have the effect of petrification upon the heroines either through their voices (Bertha’s) or appearances (Herika’s). Apart from the main helpers, who are disguised as troublesome “opponents”, other helpers in both novels provide, the essential maternity heroines need. Although what these maternal figures provide seems to be just maternal love and compassion on the surface, it has on the contrary a lot to do with a special education or initiation the heroine should receive for her development and struggles. Exemplifying it, Miss Temple and Helen Burns teach Jane how to tell/narrate her story and even “lie” about it. They show the ways to take the “pen” from male hands for the purpose of “weaving” her story. As for Mayda, she is constantly reminded to work and to act, which is particularly used for its pun in Armenian and conceals the message: “Weave Mayda!”. Both heroines disgust and reject their doubles instead of arranging a relationship based on solidarity and the palimpsest underneath reverses the appearance in a way that solidarity becomes the actual bond between doubles.
and heroines while the rejection is in both cases projected towards men. Last but not least, poverty is another common issue that is similarly shaped by both heroines. Mayda never complains about her modest life after losing her parents and husband and therefore her understanding of destitution likens to Jane’s attitude to poverty. Jane equates poverty with degradation (18) and her chiding Hannah the housekeeper of Rivers’ house on the subject saying “Some of the best people that ever lived have been as destitute as I am; and if you are a Christian, you ought not to consider poverty a crime” (326) is strikingly similar to Dussap’s notion of poverty which she fervently criticises in her articles as well as her novels.

Stylistically, the structures of both novels are at odds since Mayda is an epistolary novel while Jane Eyre uses first person narration and an attempt at the novel as a female Bildungsroman. Although the distinction is clear-cut, there is an intrinsic parallel between the two types of narration. That is, although Mayda’s discourse – openly as well as covertly- is posited upon the epistolary, still as a whole the novel suggests how it cannot be a Bildungsroman, or, in other words, exemplifies how/why the Armenian woman cannot have or gain a voice, a story, an identity, an authorship on/of her own. On the contrary, Brontë is said to have attempted to write a novel in the epistolary style, in hopes that she could allude to Richardson’s Pamela but eventually her failure made her write in the first person. Her use of “Reader” ceases to serve conventional narrative rules and functions as a substitute form of an epistolary novel. Thus, mirror reflections of both novels’ styles overlap each other in a reversal that the reader of palimpsest is much accustomed to.

Proceeding with the two plots, we can argue that they are by all means contrasted to each other, since Jane Eyre tells her own story of how she received her voice while Mayda tells, through her letters she wrote and received, her story that although her helpers worked for her victory and freedom she has no choice but death as the indispensable ending. Hence, both endings could be said to be the most differing points in plot structure. Remembering Patricia Ingham’s analysis of Victorian novels through signs and narrative syntaxes, meaning patriarchal notions and plot structure respectively, it is possible to apply the same pattern to Jane Eyre and Mayda. Such a structurisation reveals that although both novels advocate the same feminist ends and discourse Mayda rests upon a predicate (to ‘weave’) due to its simple and unitary plot. However, Jane Eyre’s structural palimpsestic level is miniaturized into a sentence form: “I look, I see, I weave” (derived from Woolf’s example). There are surprising similarities of these explicitly different structured plots. Above all, both novels, however different plots they present, are narratives roughly proceeding over identical steps: each heroine starts a quest after a cruel or destructive event, then a female community teaches them how to handle the “Until you can speak pleasantly, remain silent” rule (1). In other words, they train the heroine’s voice
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1 All the references are taken from Jane Eyre. New York: Bantam Books, 1981.
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and her notion of palimpsest. The heroine either wins the fight, as Jane does, or leaves the battlefield, like Mayda.

There are also similar scenes in both novels. For example, in both novels there is a scene in which men are threatened by women’s use of the water element. Jane Eyre “baptized the couch afresh, and, by God’s aid, succeeded in extinguishing the flames which were devouring it” (139). “It”, as her object of desire, had to be endangered by her “opponent” Bertha and rescued by the angelic heroine. Similarly, Mayda almost drowns Dikran by “accidentally” dropping her fan into the sea. Another one of the most conspicuous elements is the emergence of the evil woman who has a haunting quality. Jane Eyre questions Mrs. Fairfax about possible ghosts in the manor, and in the whole of the Thornfield chapter, Jane is indeed haunted by the “ghostly” figure of Bertha Mason, the madwoman whenever she needs her. Similarly, Mayda’s realisation of Herika’s witnessing the marriage proposal of Dikran is more than a coincidence, an intentional or “wishful”-thinking of her cry for help. In addition to that, Herika’s fierce and furious gaze does more than horrify Mayda as if she has seen a “ghost”. The gaze is another common characteristic in both novels, since both writers present the gaze mainly through the females. In Mayda, it exclusively belongs to the Mayda-Herika pair. The mutual use of gaze is restricted by the two and thus almost turns into a silent language between both women that could only be deciphered in palimpsest. Jane Eyre uses the gaze as well but only for her authorship. In this sense, Jane’s almost obsessive gaze upon Blanche Ingram is very much the same gaze of Mayda that is pointed at Herika. Blanche’s pride and beauty enchant Jane’s eyes in the same way Herika’s perfection and rebellious existence enchant Mayda. Apart from the female gaze, the laugh of the mad/bad woman is the other significant theme common to both novels. As mentioned earlier, transformation from Temple and Helen Burn’s subdued smiles to subversive and defiant maddening laughs of Bertha becomes one of the linguistic signs of palimpsest as female discourse. The equivalent of Bertha’s disturbing laughs appears through Mayda’s nightmare at the end of the novel in which Herika “threatens him [Dikran] with swords in her hand and a frightful smile on her face” (117)².

Another similarity is the fact that both heroines faint only when they suggest a change, an escape, a new move toward a beginning. Strikingly, the “secondary man”, St. John and the Count as rivals appear after the incidents of passing out. Furthermore, these two men bear other similarities as well: both are passionate personalities and yet contradictory statements are exclusive to them. Both Jane Eyre and Mayda at one point realise that they are not truly loved but in danger to be turned into objects for male ends. Jane Eyre would go with St. John without marrying him but she realises his missionary idea of converting Indians into Christianity will suffocate her identity and mind since he only wishes her to

² All the references are taken from Սրբուհի Սրբուհի Սրբուհի Սրբուհի, Երկեր, Ե., «Սովետական գրող», 1981:
join him as his wife for the purpose of using her for his “service”. In short, she would be worse than a fallen woman by obeying St John as it would mean to become the “slave of the slave”, which is another version of patriarchy’s conviction of woman as the “copy of the copy”. Mayda also chooses not to fall in love with the Count when she realises that she is loved because of her resemblance to the girl he loved desperately and lost. Mayda perceives from his narration that their union would be fake since he only looks for a substitute, a mere copy of his dead love. Like St John, the Count chooses to go east for missionary purposes, when like Jane’s intentional hearing of Rochester’s cry, Mayda finds a way out – or nudges the reader of the palimpsest- by getting gradually ill.

Ending the novel in male voice is common to both novels since the surface text has to pay tribute to patriarchy. By quoting St. John at the end of her story, Jane actually takes her revenge as Carolyn Williams notes, by quoting “these last words of the book about last things, which is itself the last book of the Book of Books- this is having the last word, with a vengeance” (80). In other words, the ending voice seems to be a man’s, but in fact quoting from the Revelation Jane shows that after the judgment day Thornfield experienced Jane, reminiscent of Christ in Revelation, returns to Rochester and “idyllic life in their new home” (Sternlieb 22). However, in Mayda the last letter, and naturally the last voice belongs to Dikran, who informs Sira about Mayda’s death. Although Dussap’s ulterior design is similar to Brontë’s, her way of mocking patriarchy is different. Dikran could talk/write only when Mayda is absent or in other words only when she refuses to live according to men and dies.

Both novels appear as romances with various styles and devices. However, “determined refusal of the romantic” is what they hide between the lines since they seem to tell/write romantic pieces but actually show/write their rejections and uncompromising voices underneath (Rich 94). What they celebrate is subversiveness under the protective loom of the palimpsest. Or to close with Beauvoir “ ‘all knowledge of fate comes from the female depths; none of the surface powers knows it. Whoever wants to know about Fate must go down to the woman’ meaning the Great Mother, the Weaver Woman who weaves ‘the world tapestry out of genesis and demise’ in her cave of power” [qtd. in Gilbert and Gubar 95]. So, here we have two female stories: Jane’s of genesis and Mayda’s of demise.

Both Jane Eyre and Mayda could paradigmatically be grounded on the interpretive terrain of the myth of Arachne. The tale of Arachne is the model pattern for these novels in terms of gender politics that the style of palimpsest uncovers. The mythic tale of Arachne is a story based on thread/threat, the first on the surface while the second underneath it, functioning against patriarchy. Thereby, male authorship and his right for pen are destroyed by this new alternative of female writing. To clear it up, if male authorship and therefore, existence are accomplished by the equivalence between male genital and the
pen, then female has the loom, which is equated with pen and paper, and the tapestry, that is the text for the right to create her-story and thus identity.

The reason this study is concluded with a discussion of a particular myth and its discourse is because both *Jane Eyre* and *Mayda* share the same mythic paradigm circling the feminist discourse they advocate. With the conflation of the mythic pattern the palimpsestic style reaches a clearer understanding and the celebration of female writing can thus be acknowledged.

It is a known fact that myths, like tales, are subjected to patriarchal manipulation and consequently utilised for the victimization of woman as the Other by its discourse. Arachne’s myth forms no exception and hence serves for the patriarchal order of the world. In this manner, patriarchal attitude and interference into the text reminds us of the rules palimpsest works with. In other words, having been patriarchal weapons, the mythic realm of discourse are the very works of male-oriented palimpsest. Although masculine type is characteristically based on tyrannically subduing the female, the feminine palimpsest mainly works for the sake of constructing her speech securely. Against such a male trap, the female writer/reader has nothing to do but “look” underneath the text, and act which is followed by “see”ing and “unfold”ing. This last attempt is also known as telling or narrating. Secondly, the female act of “unfold”ing the masculine palimpsest is also closely connected with the signification of the myth of Arachne. Yet, paradoxically, this particular myth “knits”/narrates woman’s authorship of herself while it simultaneously “unfolds” the masculine level. Last but not least, the masculine two-levels of narration unalterably circle around the aspect of visibility. In other words, the told and the shown are both posited on the surface level by the male writer – the microcosm of Western metaphysics- who fails to go deeper and into dark obscure lines and levels. The female writer/reader, on the other hand, is free to disseminate into various levels, and she manages her surface propriety while burying her authority in darkness. Referring to Gilbert and Gubar, she fights against the “anxiety of authorship” while simultaneously “schizophrenising” her sense of reality for the sham and true society of readers.

To give a brief account of the myth: Arachne’s gift of weaving is challenged by goddess Athena, the patron of the art of weaving. Arachne offends the goddess by undermining her, and continues to defy her in spite of her warnings. This results in a weaving competition between the two. While Athena weaves the scene in which she shows Poseidon and herself with an olive tree, Arachne prefers to picture Zeus’s infidelities in her tapestry. Outraged by her disrespectful choice of subject, Athena destroys Arachne’s tapestry and loom, a fact which drives the young girl to suicide. Then Athena takes pity on her and does not let her die; instead she turns her into a spider which only weaves webs instead of weaving on looms. Changing Arachne into a spider is the way Athena takes her revenge.

In the interpretation of the myth of Arachne, one finds out striking similarities with the style of palimpsest and the psychology of the woman
writer. In *Speculum*, Irigaray argues that woman is “the other of the same” through numerous patriarchal—phallogocentric—psychoanalytic structures. She analyses the truth linking it with the concept of castration. Deconstructing Nietzsche’s critique of truth, she concludes that “Truth depends upon the “other of the same”, on the “naturalization” and therefore surreptitious incorporation of what is supposed to be excluded” (Whitford 114). The final conclusion that “the symbolic is completely inadequate for representing the woman” (118) is displayed through the myth of Athena. For Irigaray, Athena represents the patriarchal woman as, first of all, she is born from Zeus’s head instead of a woman’s womb; therefore she is born as a “father’s daughter”. Secondly, Irigaray postulates Athena as the “other of the same” relating the head of Medusa on her shield with male’s fear of castration. In this manner, Athena the woman becomes the very object of male symbolic level since “it is his fears that he turns away from and projects on to woman” (115) and woman is eventually turned into the representative of death. Since death signifies “the other of the other”, by embodying it through “woman”, male sets out to govern both “the other of the same”/woman and “the other of the other”/death. All in all, it is the woman who is twice reduced to nothingness while the male strives to master his fears of castration/death over her.

With the elaboration of Irigaray’s interpretation of goddess Athena as the conventional woman with respect to full patriarchal exploitation of woman, Arachne’s myth becomes easier to decipher. We see that the rivalry of Arachne and Athena over the talent of “weaving” is, though at a more symbolic level, synonymous with the battle between the angelic and the demonic. A competition of weaving between two oppositional women is above all a most engaging issue since the act of writing/weaving a text/tapestry by two different female threads collide in conflict. The goddess figure, as the name suggests, draws the parallel that patriarchy looks on the proper traditional woman as someone who deserves to be on a pedestal, be treated as a “goddess” or as an angel—dead or alive or as a supernatural being. As it is expected, her loom never fails to tell and show the glorification of her agents. Unlike her, Arachne’s threads turned out to be “threats” since she blatantly mocks and humiliates Athena’s realm on the whole. Such an act not only elevates her as the advocate of truth—in terms of feminism—and the critic of man but also promotes her to the authorship she yearns. Athena’s use of her power for the destruction of such subversiveness represents her firm stance as the advocate of patriarchal convictions. The angelic woman is never expected to subvert the existing male order. However, the end of the story does not glorify the patriarchal order since Athena the goddess brings Arachne back to life. Turning Arachne into a spider instead of a woman is the only way for the “father’s daughter” to let the demonic woman continue to weave/narrate female secrets.
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fears, hatred and anger. The cobwebs, consequently, represent the medium of palimpsestic deeper structures unlike the tapestries, the texts which are –and must be!- under male domination.

The apparent rivalry and opposition between Athena and Arachne are embodied in the form of the writer/narrator in both Jane Eyre and Mayda. In this manner, apart from providing clues for the two texts within the mythic level, the pattern that the myth suggests, both with manifest and latent structures, Charlotte Brontë and Srpuhi Dussap are also analyzed as cautious writers. In other words, the mythic paradigm answers the questions how and why a woman writer needs to be a palimpsestic writer, how a palimpsestic work of a woman functions, or how must the palimpsestic writer tell her own truth? Palimpsest thus could be interpreted as the grammar of female plots and narrations as seen in Jane Eyre and Mayda.

On a level of phrases, Jane Eyre is literally too filled with relevant words of the myth. Namely, knitting and sewing are present almost everywhere in the novel. Apart from being one of the most conventional activities of Victorian women, knitting and sewing of particular women in the novel reinforce what this dissertation advocates. It is significant that Jane learns about the facts and truth of her past and parents eavesdropping on Bessie and Abbot while they are knitting. Servants, as inferior as Arachne in terms of class, hold the hidden truths that are uncovered during the action of knitting. Intriguingly, there seems to be a distinction between knitting and sewing in terms of the degrees of authorial power of each woman. In this sense, although both activities have phallic connotations, knitting holds a rather passive role of narrating; however sewing refers to dominant and assertive female impulses on truth-telling. Accordingly, Mrs. Fairfax occupies herself with knitting and yet it is not coincidental that her particular activity fits in the passive qualifications of her deafness and inability of narrating events. Hannah, the servant in Rivers’s home, also knits and indeed holds a passive position in the place. On the other hand, there are women like Grace Poole who, as Jane notes, “she sat and sewed-as companionless as a prisoner in his dungeon” (153). Such an observation reinforces the idea that there is more potential danger in the activity of sewing, which matches with subversiveness and brings on exclusion like Arachne’s. It is obvious that needlework as a female pursuit is much more threatening for the male as it implies strong phallic assertion of the female. Similar needling activity with perilous connotations is also familiar with Rosemary Oliver, the girl St. John falls in love with. Jane’s observation that “she knew her power” accordingly implies that she can use her beauty competently for the use of manipulating men. In other words, sewing as a female activity turns out to be synonymous with female power of overcoming men by using female crafts such as appearances as Rosemary does. As for Bertha Mason, her dwelling instead of her activity, namely the third floor is narrated by Jane with the help of allusions of spider and weaving: “I saw a room I remembered to have seen before, the day Mrs. Fairfax showed me over the house: it was hung with
tapestry; but the tapestry was now looped up in one part, and there was a door apparent, which had been concealed” (196).

When Jane is told to look after the attacked Mr. Mason on the third floor, her thoughts about the place are again proceeded over the imagery of spider: “And this man I bent over-this commonplace, quite stranger- how had he become involved in the web of horror?” (198). It is not a coincidence once again that while Bertha’s third floor represents Jane’s restless mind, its portrayal with tapestry and webs also reinforces Brontë/Jane’s obscure approval of the emergence of female discordance. Lastly, the activity of walking is the spider imagery on behalf of Jane’s restless and upset female mind. Her statement saying “restlessness was in my nature; it agitated me to pain sometimes. Then my sole relief was to walk along the corridor of the third story, backwards and forwards” (101) is strikingly reminiscent of subdued woman/spider Arachne as the activity of walking back and forth is directly equated with “weaving” the – third- story.

In Mayda also, the verb “to weave” is posited so crucially that the novel’s content and form rest on the very same predicate. As in Jane Eyre, the predicate form of the myth in Mayda points to the heroine’s desperate yearning for action and Herika’s help for constructing their text/tapestry. In the light of Irigaray’s interpretation of “truth”, the employment of the mythic tale within the literary frame of Jane Eyre and Mayda elucidates the efficiency of the palimpsestic style. The patriarchal woman or father’s daughter is the only alternative for the woman in order to appear, or more precisely to be visible in male discourse, history, or “truth”. In the patriarchal surface text, Mayda fulfills or seems to fulfill her role likewise. Although Sira and Herika emerge as two “Arachne” figures who are acknowledged as outcast or fallen, it is Herika who accomplishes the role of Arachne through her defiant character. While Mayda hardly becomes a “threat”, since she does not rebel against patriarchal requirements, Herika goes on with weaving her “thread” for herself and her double, Mayda. Remembering Herika’s liberating dance, it is worth mentioning that quite like the death dance of the wicked queen of the tale of Snow White analyzed by Gilbert and Gubar, Herika constantly informs her potential of “too much of storytelling” and eventually does her death dance against Dikran (55). The style of palimpsest reveals that female doubles are nothing but patriarchal trap through binary opposition. In other words, what is seen as double on the surface is actually sisterhood in the buried text. Solidarity ventures to weave female stories, her-story for the sake of truth even if the patriarchal rules force to weave spider webs.


**СРАВНИТЕЛЬНЫЙ АНАЛИЗ РОМАНОВ**

"ДЖЕЙН ЭЙР" (Ш. БРОНТЕ) и "МАЙТА" (С. ТЮССАБ)

АКТОМКАКЯН МАРАЛ (Турция, г. Стамбул)

Резюме

Как Ш. Бронте, так и С. Тюссаб являлись последователями феминистского направления в литературе. Будучи жертвой патриархального общества, женщина лишена была возможности открыто выражать свои мысли и чаяния. В силу сказанного писательницы в своих произведениях использовали закодированный язык. Несмотря на стилевые различия, творчество обеих писательниц отмечено их ярким дарованием. Созданные ими образы – это личности с их неповторимым внутренним миром, определяющим их линию поведения в контексте времени и самого произведения.

Обращаясь к бесправному положению женщин, писательницы выдвигают идею о том, что женщина может обрести свободу лишь благодаря образованию и труду.