


Date Received : 25.12.2023

Date Accepted : 25.04.2024

 <https://doi.org/10.20304/humanitas.1409912>

Genç, M. (2024). Comparative gynocriticism of Bronte's *Wuthering heights* and Roy's *The god of small things*. *HUMANITAS - Journal of Social Sciences*, 12 (24), 150-164. <https://doi.org/10.20304/humanitas.1409912>

COMPARATIVE GYNOCRITICISM OF BRONTE'S *WUTHERING HEIGHTS* AND ROY'S *THE GOD OF SMALL THINGS*

Melisa GENÇ¹

ABSTRACT


The present paper focuses on two influential female novelists and their ardent endeavours to claim a gender-specific structure and voice within the discourse of the novel. Emily Bronte and Arundhati Roy nauseated their contemporary readers and most of the critics by making use of bi-sexuality and incest as salient structural and thematic features of their narrative. In *Wuthering Heights*, both thematic and structural elements of Bronte's feminine narrative operate as meta-narratives reverberating with the becoming of Bronte as a female novelist. The particular impinge of Bronte's feminine narrative on the discourse of the novel reveals itself through the reversal of the oedipal projectile motion of history. Similarly, Arundhati Roy has weaponized her Indianized language to break from the strict linguistic laws of the symbolic so that the semiotic or the maternal realm has become blatant in *The God of Small Things*. Like Bronte, Roy wields incest and bi-sexuality to prevent the phallic development of the grand history; instead of the oedipal identity formation process, she displays the motif of incest as an opponent of a linear progression of the hero. Consequently, this study emphasises the differentiation of the two female novelists from the monolithic discourse in the novel. It also explains how feminine narrative structure owing to its immanent on-hand polyphony and bi-sexuality goes hand in hand with what Bakhtin calls heteroglossia and dialogic discourse in the novel.

Keywords: Feminism, Abject, Semiotics, Bi-sexuality, Gynocriticism

¹ PhD student, Tekirdag Namik Kemal University, Institute of Social Sciences. melisaesingenc@gmail.com, <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0313-1933>

Geliş Tarihi : 25.12.2023

Kabul Tarihi : 25.04.2024

 <https://doi.org/10.20304/humanitas.1409912>

Genç, M. (2024). Bronte'nin *Uğultulu tepeler*'i ve Roy'un *Küçük şeylerin tanrısı*'nin karşılaştırmalı jinoeleştirisi. *HUMANITAS - Uluslararası Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 12(24), 150-164. <https://doi.org/10.20304/humanitas.1409912>

BRONTE'NİN UĞULTULU TEPELER'İ VE ROY'UN KÜÇÜK ŞEYLERİN TANRISI'NIN KARŞILAŞTIRMALI JİNOELEŞTİRİSİ

Melisa GENÇ²

ÖZ

Bu makale iki etkili kadın romancıya ve onların romanın söyleminde cinsiyete özgü bir yapı ve ses iddia etme yönündeki ateşli çabalarına odaklanmaktadır. Emily Bronte ve Arundhati Roy, anlatılarının göze çarpan yapısal ve tematik özelliği olarak çift cinsiyetliliği ve ensesti öne çıkararak çağdaş okuyucularının ve eleştirmenlerin çoğunu şaşkınlığa uğratmışlardır. *Uğultulu Tepeler*'de Bronte'nin dişil anlatısının hem tematik hem de yapısal unsurları, Bronte'nin kadın romancı haline gelişini yansıtan meta-anlatı olarak işlemektedir. Bronte'nin dişil yazınının roman söylemi üzerindeki özel etkisi, tarihin ödipal itici hareketinin tersine çevrilmesiyle kendini gösterir. Benzer şekilde, Arundhati Roy, Hintlileşmiş dilini simgeselin katı dilsel yasalarından kopmak için silah haline getirir, böylece; *Küçük Şeylerin Tanrısı*'nda semiyotik veya annelik alanı bariz hale gelmektedir. Bronte gibi Roy da büyük tarihin fallik gelişimini engellemek için ensest ve çift cinsiyetliliği kullanır; Ödipal kimlik oluşum süreci yerine ensest motifini kahramanın doğrusal ilerlemesinin karşıtı olarak sergiler. Sonuç olarak bu çalışma, iki kadın romancının romandaki yekpare söylemden farklılaşmasını vurgulamaktadır. Aynı zamanda, içkin polifoni ve çift cinsiyetlilik nedeniyle dişil anlatı yapısının, romanda Bakhtin'in heteroglossia ve diyalojik söylem olarak adlandırdığı şeyle nasıl el ele gittiğini de açıklamaktadır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Feminizm, Abjekt, Semiyotik, Bi-seksüalite, Jinoeleştiri

² Doktora öğrencisi, Tekirdağ Namık Kemal Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü. melisaesingenc@gmail.com, <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0313-1933>

Introduction

According to David Lodge, the novelist renders his fiction real through language. In other words, the literary product we call a novel comes to realization through the particular use of language. Namely, language is the medium of the novelist (Lodge, 1996, p. 9). Therefore, it can be said that true analysis of a particular novel lies in its stylistic and formal examination since these figurative and literal elements are indispensable components of the relevant text and its author. If we hearken to the contemporary motto that the medium is the message, then the formal and stylistic examination of the novel becomes much more important than it is thought (Lodge, 1996, pp. 12, 15). The author achieves stylistics and aesthetics through his or her use of language. In this sense, the text unfolds its literary features with the help of an analysis of the language. The meaning of the novel finds its true genius expression through its language. In this sense, the use of language can be deemed a very specific literary tool of the author and thus reveals and provides significant clues about the author's literary and authorial persona. In addition to this, the specific use of language and narrative techniques can also provide a kind of freedom to the author, especially in the case of female authors who strive to shun patriarchal norms and institutions. For instance, Emily Bronte in *Wuthering Heights* wields a different language and narratology from her contemporaries (Daeizadeh, 2013, pp. 2-3). She deviates from the conventional realist Victorian novel by using unreliable narrators, vague language and doubling metaphors, which correspond to Bakhtinian polyphony and Freudian polyvalence of sexuality. Similarly, Roy, in her Booker Prized novel, *The God of Small Things*, can be said to facilitate the same language and narratology techniques as Emily Bronte. Namely, both Emily Bronte and Arundhati Roy, though they differ in period, reclaim their voice by deviating from the conventional narrative elements.

According to the 20th-century French wave of feminism, establishing female identity in literature requires a double struggle with both the patriarchal expectations of society from female narrative and the phallogocentric organisation of formal and stylistic features of textuality (Cixous, 2009, pp. 876, 879). Thus, the two famous female authors; Emily Bronte and Arundhati Roy have reclaimed a new brand language and narratology for themselves without being assimilated by the phallogocentric identity of writing and literature. It is important for female writers to balance the fragile relationship between the male gaze and objectification of female others in their writing process. Bronte and Roy achieve what Cixous calls *écriture féminine* by recreating narrative voice, wielding dialogic language and re-inventing hybrid words and expressions (Cixous, 2009, p. 883).

The Novelistic Discourse in *Wuthering Heights*

First, to begin with *Wuthering Heights*, Emily Bronte exercises the Bakhtinian carnivalesque of voices in her narrative technique in terms of her emphasis on the distinctive stylistic devices of each character's discourse. In the novel, we can detect the idiolect of the narrative voices as well as of the characters. In other words, in the novel, Bronte breaks from the monolithic language of the conventional narrative discourse; instead, she adroitly exercises dialogue and polyphony. Indeed, by doing so she perfectly fits in with the dialogic nature of the novel as a genre. For Bakhtin, the dialogic organization of language enables a novel to incorporate new artistic potentials (Bakhtin, 1981, p. 279). Namely, he emphasizes the

heteroglossial character of the novelistic discourse. Bakhtin also underlines new possibilities in the discourse of the novel concerning dialogical and polyphonic semantics of words. He states that in any concrete and monologic discourse language operates through singular and unitary organisation; however, in heteroglossia of this new novelistic discourse, monologic words emancipate from their singularity and intercourse with new, alien words and expression that culminates in the dialogic process in the novel (Bakhtin, 1981, pp. 276, 278). He also asserts that, the dialogized discourse can be also noticed in the poetic genres but it can fully and adroitly appear in the novel (Bakhtin, 1981, pp. 278-279). In Bronte's novel, we can easily detect such a hybrid coalesce between the semantic and the symbolic discourse in terms of the presence of heteroglossia in the narrative discourse. Another important feature of the narrative technique used in *Wuthering Heights* is Bronte's deviation from the one-sided, all-knowing narrative voice of the omniscient narrator. Instead, she facilitates dialogic heteroglossia by providing free space for her narrative voices so that articulation of how the plot is narrated becomes open to manipulations as well as new possibilities of reality. In doing so, the plot emancipates from the monologic discourse of singularity and coexists with the dialogic heteroglossia. Lata Marina Varghese in her elaborate study; *Stylistic Analysis of Emily Brontë's Wuthering Heights*, underlines the stylistic analysis of *Wuthering Heights*, in terms of Emily Bronte's distinctive dialogic discourse:

Wuthering Heights presents a variety of styles ranging from Catherine's poetic discourse, Heathcliff's verbal violence, Lockwood's superior literary tone and fashionable cliché, Nelly's homiletic rhetoric to Joseph's biblical Yorkshire dialect and unintelligible muttering--all producing an interplay of accents and idioms, giving rise to what Bakhtin terms as —dialogical heteroglossial. However, the single most distinctive feature of *Wuthering Heights* is its dialogue with Brontë's emphasis on personal idiolect. To make this possible she dismantles language in order to make the language of social behaviour in her fictional world intelligible to her readers (Varghese, 2012, p. 47).

In this paragraph, she points out that Emily Bronte's discourse in her novel incorporates different and alien words and idiolects that provide carnivalesque coexistence of speeches (Varghese, 2012, p. 47). In this respect, her novelistic discourse corresponds to what Bakhtin calls heteroglossia and the dialogized discourse in the novel. It can also be asserted that Emily Bronte's narrative choice complies with the birth of discourse in the novel as opposed to the poetic discourse. According to Bakhtin, the poet is limited to his stylistic discourse; thus, he is hedged by dogmatic and monologic language (Bakhtin, 1981, p. 287). However, thanks to its dialogized discourse, the novel provides a foundation for the emergence of a narrative voice and point of view. Bakhtin claims that heteroglossia is characterized by various languages which are unique in their immanent nature for bringing forward specific, idiosyncratic points of view (Bakhtin, 1981, p. 291). Moreover, he underlines the affluent capacity in heteroglossia to come up with energizing conflicts, clash of alien words and forming new relations (Bakhtin, 1981, pp. 270, 292). As a result, points of view in the novel develop into a specific discursive stance formed by the dialogized languages in heteroglossia. In this token, Emily Bronte's language in *Wuthering Heights* is permanently dynamic and perceptible in terms of its copious potential and contributes to the dialogic discourse by including contradictions and oppositions in each character's language:

...*Wuthering Heights* presents a plurality of styles. Language in the novel is full of contradictions. The specific tensions and paradoxes built into linguistic patterns are noticeable

in the word structure and sentence –structure which lend complexity and richness to the text. What is remarkable in Brontë's lexicon is the striking use of her verbs. It is full of violent movement and conflict and has momentum and energy as evident even in the speeches of her characters (Varghese, 2012, p. 50).

In this respect, the use of a remarkable amount of conflicts and contradictions in *Wuthering Heights* serves not only to divulge the dialogic nature of the narrative but also to reveal Emily Brontë's ardent urge to claim a voice for her characters. Bakhtin states that language cannot be impersonal and neutral but exists in the polyphony of voice (Bakhtin, 1981, pp. 292-293). Thus, one can only reclaim a language for himself by personalizing that language through his point of view, intention and his accent (Bakhtin, 1981, p. 293). In her novel, Brontë provides free space for her characters to exercise polyphony and the intersection of languages to be able to claim a specific language for their own. Namely, Emily Brontë makes use of the dialectic process in her novel by using a polyphony of voices and intersecting points of view. The intersection of discourses in the novel is an fundamental characteristic of Emily Brontë's narrative style because the novel is constituted by intersecting or doubling elements. Lata Marina Varghese asserts that the most distinctive narrative feature of *Wuthering Heights* is doubling repetitions:

Everything in the novel is a kind of double. There are not only verbal repetitions, but the plot, structure, narrators, and the characters themselves form a double to each other. There are even two diary accounts, Catherine's diary forming a kind of inner text to Lockwood's diary which forms the outer text. Most of the repeated words in the text are content words (Noun, Verb, Adjective and their derivatives). Words repeated tend to stick longer in the mind. But repetition is confined not only to words or sentences but extends to include even ideas (images) that express the theme(s) of the novel (Varghese, 2012, p. 47).

The Theme of Incest and Bi-Sexual Solipsism

Camille Paglia interprets recursive repetition in an artistic or literary work as allegorical repletion (Paglia, 2001, p. 110). She discovers incestuous mitotic division in the plot and of the characters in Brontë's novel: "Allegorical repletion is the filling up of fictive space with a single identity appearing simultaneously in different forms, juxtaposed like facets of a jewel. In allegorical repletion, a dominating personality is extended through psychological space" (Paglia, 2001, p. 295).

In this respect, she distinguishes *Wuthering Heights* from the established tradition of social novels. The conventional social novel requires monolithic differentiation of characters and empathizes with the idea of development. However, Brontë's novel seeks for high romantic incestuous confluence of the doubling characters. She emphasizes overt subjectivity and femininity radiating from each stylistic and narrative device of this novel. According to Paglia, the social novel that opposes the extravaganza of romantic poetry forms the nineteenth-century literature. The 19th-century social novel is shaped by realism, determinism and social milieu. However, Brontë's novel differs from her contemporaries in terms of its blatant subjectivity and autoeroticism (Paglia, 2001, pp. 110-111). Paglia recognizes Brontë's novel concerning its high romantic subjectivity and solipsistic, incestuous structure (Paglia, 2001, pp. 293-294). First, she takes the notorious love affair between Catherine and Heathcliff in respect of its turbulent, excessively ferocious nature. Here, the love affair between the two characters

surpasses the conventional norms and limits of Victorian society. Catherine and Heathcliff form a bi-sexual, autoerotic relationship that withdraws them back to the pre-oedipal stage of polyvalence sexuality. Namely, their love affair stands for something different from socially constructed cohabitation rules and norms. This is the reason why Catherine perseveringly underlines the autoerotic union between herself and Heathcliff (Bronte, 1992, p. 108). They represent a highly romantic concept of solipsistic ouroboros; “Such love, arising from a sense of identity rather than difference, is beyond gender. The resemblances between Heathcliff and Catherine are literal. She is as violent and vengeful as he” (Paglia, 2001, p. 294). So to speak, Catherine and Heathcliff constitute an incestuous love affair, which is beyond normative rules of sex and sexuality; instead, they represent a hybrid and bi-sexual twin monster (Paglia, 2001, p. 294). Therefore, it can be said that their relationship defiles long-established expectations of femininity and masculinity. It symbolizes the repudiation of oedipal sexual norms. Because of this, Catherine and Heathcliff descend to the pre-oedipal bi-sexuality by forming a hybrid and autoerotic relationship. In this respect, the autoerotic union between them reveals one of the major aspects of Bronte’s obsession with doubling images and solipsism (Bronte, 1992, p. 93). According to Paglia, Emily Bronte is highly influenced by the stylistic elements of high romanticism. In particular, she reflects on her fascination with the romantic auto-erotic consciousness in the conflation of fraternal twin intercourse between Heathcliff and Catherine (Paglia, 2001, p. 294). In doing so, Bronte aims to dismantle the phallic development process of patriarchal history. In the novel, the major characters as well as the narrative voices of Nelly and Lockwood contribute to the reversal of history because they exercise ouroboros-like circulation rather than the projectile motion of phallic history. Eric Solomon points out that “Emily Brontë casts a vague incestuous aura” over the whole story: “Heathcliff marries his lost love’s sister-in-law; his wife’s son marries her brother’s daughter; Cathy’s daughter marries her brother’s son” (Solomon, 1959, pp. 82-83). Paglia refers to this twin-incest theme in the novel as sexual claustrophobia (Paglia, 2001, p. 295). Moreover, sexual claustrophobia is not only represented by the major characters but also infuses the doubling structure of the narrative and stylistic elements because Bronte’s chief objective is to avert the linear progress of patriarchal narratology. This type of deflection is well explained by Juliet Mitchell.

The Inevitable Bi-Sexuality in the Feminine Writing

Juliet Mitchell in her conference held in 1972 merges literature, psychoanalysis, feminism and politics. Specifically, she studies the structural organization of the novel and how do female writers contribute to the discourse in the novel. According to Mitchell, female writers express themselves by creating a new, alternative history (Lodge, 1999, pp. 387-388). Otherwise, they would be assimilated by phallogocentric discourse. One type of creating disruptive history is literary narrative especially, the novel. She pays attention to the fact that at the beginning of the rise of the novel, the vast majority of early novelists were females although sometimes they had to cover themselves under male pseudonyms. In this respect, Mitchell tries to emphasize the process of becoming that the early female novelists had gone through (Lodge, 1999, p. 388). She believes that the becoming of the novel simultaneously corresponds to the becoming of female novelists in the 17th and 18th-century capitalist society (Lodge, 1999, p. 391). However, this process of becoming can also take “the discourse of the hysteric” (Showalter, 1993, p. 25). For Mitchell, the female novelist is destined to the hysteric discourse

because in the act of writing they have to both accept and refuse the expected notions of femininity (Lodge, 1999, p. 389). In other words, in the act of writing, female novelist incorporates the phallogocentric discourse but at the same time articulate their femininity in the process of becoming, which leads them to the discourse of the hysteric. In this tumult of contradictions, a new brand form of semiotic appears that is called the pre-oedipal polyphony because female novelists exercise both female and masculine discourse in their act of writing (Lodge, 1999, p. 391). Namely, the carnivalesque or the disruptive act of literary narrative is considerably salient to female novelist due to their hysteric discourse.

Although Mitchell regards Emily Bronte's novel not as carnivalesque but as phallogocentric, there are some arguments that we can adduce to prove the opposite. Mitchell deals with the problem of the definition of femininity in the patriarchal universe (Lodge, 1999, p. 390). Thus, in Bronte's novel, she criticizes the predicament of Catherine under the patriarchal capitalist society. She is given two choices; marriage or death (Lodge, 1999, p. 387, 389). Catherine as the portrait of female identity in the process of becoming has to choose to marry Linton and to accomplish her identity compatible with the Victorian societal rules or to follow her incestuous desire beyond all the limits, which ends up with her so-called annihilation. However, in the course of *Wuthering Heights*, there is more than the predicament of a poor female character suffering under patriarchal conditions. Instead, the discourse of *Wuthering Heights* incorporates pre-oedipal and pre-symbolic bi-sexuality, and reversal of patriarchal history. Emily Bronte as a female novelist strives to balance being feminine and masculine at the same time (Lodge, 1999, pp. 388-389). To illustrate, unlike the monologic narrative, Bronte facilitates two narrative voices; Lockwood and Nelly. In doing so, she creates carnivalesque and polyphony in her novel. In doing so, she deviates from the symbolic discourse and dives into the semiotic.

Kristeva adroitly distinguishes between the symbolic and the semiotic. Her emphasis on the difference between the two resembles Mitchell's arguments on the church and the carnival (Kristeva, 1982, p. 81). Mitchell refers to "anarchic carnival" to explain the disruptive reversal of history and to create a new and alternative history (Lodge, 1999, p. 386). Mitchell sees the early female novelists within the role of disruptive carnival. Thus, the act of novel writing offers "criticism of the novel within the novel" because the discourse of the novel confluences polyphony, polyvalence and carnival (Lodge, 1999, p. 390). Similarly, Kristeva recognizes the same split identity and dissolution of the symbolic order in the act of writing (Kristeva, 1982, p. 87).

Moreover, both Kristeva and Mitchell discern the process of becoming in the act of writing. For Kristeva, the novelist swings between the symbolic and the semiotic during the process of writing. He or she indulges in surpassing boundaries and emancipation of repressed, forbidden feelings by the symbolic law (Kristeva, 1982, p. 164). Likewise, Mitchell points out the heterogeneous discourse of the novel. According to Mitchell, the early female novelists express their deviation from the patriarchal order and they break off oneness and homogeneity with the symbolic (Lodge, 1999, p. 388). However, simultaneously, they accept their masculine definitions either. It leads to the discourse of the hysteric in the novel, which corresponds to the carnival and polyphony. Mitchell indicates that writing within the masculine discourse by carrying out femininity reverses the phallogocentric history (Lodge, 1999, p. 391, 392). For example, in *Wuthering Heights*, the use of polyphonic narrative voices complies with the bi-

sexuality of the major characters, the pre-oedipal polyvalence of Heathcliff and Catherine. Emily Bronte reverses the projectile motion of the phallogocentric development process to the pre-oedipal or the semiotic. However, according to both Mitchell and Kristeva, the state of carnival or the semiotic cannot be exercised for a long time. This is the reason why Catherine has to die because she experiences the semiotic more than the symbolic; not because of the patriarchal punishment of an independent female character. According to Kristeva, the subject when she loses her touch with the symbolic loses her identity and dissolves into plurality and abject (Kristeva, 1982, p. 164). In *Wuthering Heights*, Catherine's passion to form oneness with Heathcliff represents her turning to the maternal realm. In other words, the bisexual love affair between the two pulls them back to the state of pre-oedipal. However, lingering too much in the maternal realm brings about the final abjection of Catherine. She is torn apart between Linton and Heathcliff. Her final decision to turn back to Heathcliff takes apart her last connection with the symbolic order and exposes her to the vast void of the semiotic. In this respect, she becomes mentally sick and loses her identity causing her withdrawal to the pre-mirror stage; "Don't you see that face?" she inquired, gazing earnestly at the mirror" (Brontë, 1910, p. 101). Finally, her reunion with Heathcliff on the moors again is the final step of her reversal to the abject (Kristeva, 1982, p. 3). The maternal nature absorbs her. In this point, Emily Bronte does not describe Catherine as a victim of the patriarchal discourse; instead, Catherine returns in the form of an abject; in a cadaver-like state (Kristeva, 1982, p.3). Namely, she returns as an intimidating metaphor for the threatening other. Her presence threatens the long-established notions of object and abject; male gaze and female objectification. She preoccupies an undecidable position;

It is a frantic attempt made by a subject threatened with sinking into the void. A void that is not nothing but indicates, within its discourse, a challenge to symbolization. Whether we call it an affect or link it with infantile semiotization—for which pre-signifying articulations are merely equations rather than symbolic equivalents for objects (Kristeva, 1982, pp. 51, 53).

Thus, unlike Mitchell's argument on victimization of Catherine by the patriarchal discourse of Emily Bronte, it can be argued the opposite because far from being a victim, Catherine reunites with the maternal nature and becomes much more intimidating as a threat to the symbolic.

Overall, I submit that Emily Bronte presents her process of becoming a female novelist in *Wuthering Heights* by differing from the patriarchal discourse of phallogocentrism. To do so, she utilizes certain stylistic and narrative techniques that correspond to her polyphonic, hermaphrodite discourse (Paglia, 2001, p. 297). First, she narrates the plot by using two narrative voices. Namely, the structure of her novel reflects bisexuality that female novelists have to embrace in the act of writing. The absence of a trustful narrator represents the lack of a phallogocentric development process of narratology. Instead, multiple narrators contribute to plurality and polyphony in this novel. Especially, Nelly plays with the symbolic and comes up with her version of reality. She distorts reality and fabricates an alternative version: "and all the way from the Grange, I puzzled my brains how to put more heart into what he said, when I repeated it; and how to soften his refusal of even a few lines to console Isabella" (Bronte, 1992, p. 169). Secondly, the incestuous love affair between Heathcliff and Catherine transgresses the oedipal sexuality and enforces the limits of autoeroticism. In doing so, Emily Bronte again reflects on her process of becoming since the incestuous self-love for the doubling parts in the

case of Heathcliff and Catherine symbolizes Bronte's acceptance of her bisexuality in the act of writing. Finally, as Kristevan novelist, Emily Bronte indulges in the semiotic by pluralizing herself in the two major characters; Heathcliff and Catherine;

The text s/he writes will be sublimated and indicative of her/his experience. At the same time, due to being pluralized, this text will also provide her/him with a sense of fullness. She/he can be multiplied through the voices and the person of her/his characters. All the characters that speak are in fact her/him. This is what expands the writer; what gives her/him the sense of freedom (Ahmadzadeh, 2014, p. 2).

Emily Bronte merges the paternal and the maternal in the incest metaphor. Therefore, not only Catherine but also Heathcliff reflects the personification of the writer, herself; "Emily Brontë's sexual metathesis into Heathcliff is inseparable from the incestuous-twin theme. Heathcliff is conceived as one end of an erotic polarity. If Brontë enters her novel as a man, then her feeling for the vanished Catherine is homosexual" (Paglia, 2001, p. 300). In this respect, Emily Bronte exercises both the symbolic and the semiotic in her novel by multiplying herself through Catherine and Heathcliff. She experiments with gender-specific ouroboros-like recurrence within the discourse of her novel. She disrupts the projectile development of history by creating her gender-specific structure.

The God of Small Things

The second consideration of this paper concerns *The God of Small Things*. I have tried to pinpoint discursive similarities between *The God of Small Things* and *Wuthering Heights* in terms of specific use of language, the presence of incest and the reversal of the symbolic into the semiotic. In both novels, the use of gender-specific language acts upon non-phallogocentric discourse in the novel that corresponds to the process of becoming that both Bronte and Roy have gone through. Both of them adroitly use dialogic language and polyphony so that the symbolic that is structured by a particular use of phallogocentric language is reversed into the semiotic. Both Bronte and Roy indulge in plurality and dialogic discourse in their novel to be able to avert from monologic bildungsroman linearity. Thus, the particular impingement of feminine narrative on their novelistic discourse is understood through the non-linearity and gender-specific plot organization of both novels (Sharma et al., 2023, pp. 1280, 1282). In this respect, Roy and Bronte claim a voice for themselves by challenging the phallogocentric linearity of novelistic discourse. In other words, the symbolic that is structured by the oedipal projectile movement is reversed into the abjection of femininity in both *Wuthering Heights* and *The God of Small Things*. This is the reason why both incestuous intercourse is a salient characteristic of the plot within the context of identity formation. Roy, in her novel, underlines the solipsistic integrity between Estha and Rahel in their identity formation process. Their connection is so strong and impenetrable that it is hard to recognize one of them without the other. Bronte and Roy blatantly emphasize the incestuous reunion of the twin souls so that the oedipal projectile motion of the symbolic is withdrawn into the pre-oedipal polyvalence and solipsistic bisexuality as a distinguishable characteristic of feminine narrative. Namely, unlike the monolithic discourse of the bildungsroman, the literary counterpart of patriarchal narrative, Bronte and Roy endeavour to claim a gender-specific structure for their narrative by emphasizing solipsistic bi-sexuality and high romantic obsession with twin incest. To put it differently, the use of incest becomes a metanarrative in Roy and Bronte. As female novelists,

they reflect the influence of the feminine psyche in their novelistic discourse by making their narratology based on repetition and ouroboros-like reversal of history.

Especially, in *The God of Small Things*, Roy expresses her fractured female psyche by breaking the linearity of the novel (Waheed, 2009, p. 26). Unlike the bildungsroman and the identity formation process in the monologic novel, Roy brings her characters close to nature rather than history. In this sense, the structural elements such as non-linearity and polyphony reveal the dialogic nature of feminine narrative (Waheed, 2009, pp. 8, 11, 13). Namely, Roy consciously divides the grand meta-narrative of historiography and comes up with alternative literary history (Waheed, 2009, p. 15). In other words, the symbolic that operates through the grand historiography and phallogocentric language is distorted by Roy's literary semiotic. Rahel and Estha exercise the semiotic and swing between the semiotic and the symbolic, which makes them close to the abjection and pre-oedipal polyvalence. In doing so, Roy can trespass the discursive limits of the symbolic and she gives criticism of the novel within the novel (Lodge, 1999, p. 388). Another literary element that Roy wields to reverse history is the use of personal language; idiolect. For the use of language, the most distinguished peculiarity is that it reflects children's point of view. Namely, the specific use of language in this novel complies with the dialogic polyphony so that it leads to the emancipation of points of view. Besides, the specific use of language by Estha or Rahel reflects a particular point of view of the twins (Lodge, 1996, 8). For instance, Estha's reverse writing is a meta-symbol of the reversal of chronological order at which Roy specifically aims; "Red Sign on the road 'STOP'. 'POTS', Rahel said (p.58). Yellow hording said BE INDIAN, BUY INDIAN in red. 'NAIDNI YUB, NADNI EB,' Estha said. (p.58) 'ehT serutnevda fo eisuS lerriuuqS. (p.60) emocleW oT eht ecipS tsaoC fo aidnI'" (Roy, 1997, p. 139). Namely, Estha's reverse writing is not only an example of polyphony in the novel but also reflects the non-linearity of the narrative in general to swerve the projectile motion of phallogocentric discourse. In this respect, Roy plays with the reliability of truth and distorts the very idea of a single trustworthy version of reality by marginalizing the use of language. In other words, she illustrates the fact that history can be narrated by different stylistic devices as well as different usages of language and idiolect (Nagre, 2018, p. 75). Likewise, the multiplication of narrators in the novel distorts the authority of the omniscient third-person narrator. The phallogocentric projectile motion of development and linearity is disturbed by the emancipation of different and multiple points of view:

One has to bear in mind why the character uses language in a particular way. The novel introduces grown-up Rahel, who comes to see her long-parted twin brother, Estha, at her maternal house in Ayemenem, which is now an old empty. The wise reader understands that all the characters and the setting must be different in the past and has changed due to some incident in the past (Nagre, 2018, p. 74).

The dialogized discourse that Roy exercises in her novel undermines the monologic singularity of history. Rahel and the omniscient third-person narrator who reflects the inevitable bi-sexuality of feminine narrative mostly narrate the plot. According to Mitchell, female novelists have to embrace masculinity and femininity in the act of writing (Lodge, 1999, pp. 389, 391). Therefore, one of the distinguished characteristics of the feminine narrative is the blatant emphasis on the dialogized polyphony and disruptive carnival (Lodge, 1999, p. 391). In *The God of Small Things*, both structural and thematic elements contribute to the inevitable bi-sexuality of the semiotic. The symbolic relies on the singularity of the oedipal phase. It

impinges on the structure of language, narratology of history and identity formation process. On the contrary, the semiotic is close to the maternal abjection or the pre-oedipal polyvalence of non-differentiation (Kristeva, 1982, p. 153). In the pre-oedipal phase, non-differentiated sexuality lingers in polyphony and pluralism. Roy, in her alternative counter literary history, achieves to dismantle the monologic singularity of the symbolic; the oedipal linearity; and she loads her narrative with the polyphony of pre-oedipal bi-sexuality. The solipsistic bi-sexual polyvalence of the main characters Estha and Rahel is convenient to Roy's intention to reverse the projectile motion of history. In this sense, the incestuous intercourse between the twins indicates the ouroboros-like motion of the feminine narrative.

Reversal of History into the Semiotic

Secondly, the theme of incest plays an essential role in the structural and thematic organization of this novel (Waheed, 2009, p. 77). The main characters; Estha and Rahel commit incestuous intercourse just like Catherine and Heathcliff in *Wuthering Heights*. In both cases, incestuous intercourse stands for the reversal of the projectile motion of history because committing incest withdraws them into maternal nature. Namely, Roy and Bronte bring their characters closer to the abjection of semiotics through the incestuous reunion of fraternal twins. However, unlike the high romantic de-sexuality of Bronte's style since Catherine and Heathcliff never commit physical intercourse rather they aspire to reunite in a romantic way, Roy overtly expresses the physical incest between Rahel and Estha: "She saw her brother naked in the bathroom but she didn't move away from there because she had an old contact with that body. She was not unfamiliar of him because "he was the one that she had known before life began" (Roy, 1997, p. 93). So Rahel was not shy of her brother because he was the person who "led her through their lovely mother's cunt" (Roy, 1997, p. 93).

Physical or not, the incestuous reunion of the twins' souls reverses history and disrupts the symbolic. In *Wuthering Heights*, Bronte reflects her feminine psyche by using incest as a meta-narrative of the feminine carnivalesque. The incestuous love affair between Heathcliff and Catherine dismantles the oedipal projectile motion of history and provides a free space for the emancipation of the semiotic. Likewise, Estha and Rahel interrupt the linearity of oedipal history and form an alternative counter-history. Namely, Roy subtly challenges phallogocentric development and reflects the feminine psyche by forming a disruptive carnival within the novel. In this respect, Roy and Bronte exemplify the becoming of female novelists in the act of writing concerning inescapable bi-sexuality and heterogeneous narratology that the female novelists have to embrace. The use of incest is one of the major indicators of feminine narrative due to the hidden solipsism and bi-sexuality behind it (Lodge, 1999, p. 390). Speaking with Mitchell, female novelists reflect the hysteric discourse that is immanent in their act of writing because of simultaneous acceptance and refusal of phallogocentric discourse, through the abjection of incest. It gives them the freedom to indulge in playing with the symbolic and the semiotic. In other words, at the hands of differentiation of feminine narrative owing to its hysteria and on-hand abjection, the chronological and logical structure of patriarchal narrative is deconstructed by female novelists (Kristeva, 1982, p. 81). Thus, Bronte and Roy deviate from paternal discourse together with the phallogocentric discourse and the symbolic. Overall, Bronte and Roy adroitly exercise the heterogeneity of feminine narrative by indulging in ambiguities and abjections of the hysteric discourse (Kristeva, 1982, pp. 17-18). In *Wuthering Heights*, Catherine and Heathcliff represent the abjection of semiotics owing to their highly romantic,

passionate love affair as well as the ferocious, abominable character of each. Similarly, Estha and Rahel represent the abjection of the semiotic in terms of their specific use of language, incestuous intercourse and postcolonial identity.

Polyphony and Heteroglossia in Roy and Bronte

Another parallelism between Roy and Bronte is their meta-language. Bronte wields stylistically dynamic and plural language in *Wuthering Heights*, which acts upon her process of becoming. Roy also invents a new literary language to strengthen her narratology (Sharma et al., 2018, p. 243). In *Wuthering Heights*, there is a polyphony of stylistic discourses. Bronte creates authenticity in each discourse by specialising in word choices. For instance, Catherine and Heathcliff can be easily distinguished in terms of their passionate and violent-loaded language (Sharma et al., 2018, pp. 246-247). For Lockwood, his literary discourse is conspicuous concerning his contrived aristocratic manners. Nelly exercises the same pompous and hackneyed discourse in her speeches (Varghese, 2012, p. 49). Namely, Bronte doubles not only her characters but also their discourse. She reflects the inevitable coalescence of masculine and feminine discourse in the act of writing to the doubling confluence of her characters and their language. As for *The God of Small Things*, the most distinguished peculiarity of Roy's style is her contribution to language. The use of language in her novel in and of itself becomes the meta-narrative of Roy's novelistic discourse (Sharma et al., 2018, p. 251). She makes use of wrong spelling, oxymoron, reverse writing, puns and other stylistic devices to marginalize her language. Thus, she can dismantle the symbolic by making use of the semiotic. She also plays with the structural relationship between the signifier and the signified by coming up with neologisms such as: "History's smell. Like old roses on a breeze" (Roy, 1997, p. 55) "bottomless-bottomful feeling" (Roy, 1997, p. 83), "dinner-plate-eyed" (Roy, 1997, p. 135), "Wild. Sick. Sad" (Roy, 1997, p. 159). In the case of Roy, her stylistic language plays two-dimensional roles in terms of her becoming (Sharma et al., 2018, p. 253). First, just like Emily Bronte, her deviation from the linguistic laws of the symbolic refers to gender-specific narration. In doing so, Roy reclaims a voice of her own. The use of polyphony and carnivalesque provides her an opportunity to disrupt the grand narrative so that she can narrate an alternative narrative following feminine writing. Secondly, her linguistic dialogism is not only confined to the feminine narrative but also refers to the becoming of post-colonial identity. In other words, different from Emily Bronte whose carnivalesque narrative takes an issue with the patriarchal capitalist narrative, Roy extends the objective of her counter-narrative, which is no longer confined to the becoming of feminine narrative but also incorporates the becoming of post-colonial identity (Sharma et al., 2018, pp. 243, 245). Mitchell argues that female novelists have used disruptive, carnivalesque narratives in their works. Roy's novel uses these techniques alongside magical realism, eccentricism, and the marginalization of the feminine narrative. In the novel, the feminine perspective is infused into a patriarchal language, reflecting Roy's intention to challenge the constraints of meaning and discourse. (Sharma et al., 2018, p.247). Roy makes use of heteroglossia to emphasize the differentiation of feminine narrative together with post-colonial discourse.

Conclusion

Bronte and Roy, two renowned female novelists, captivate their readers and critics alike with their innovative style and dialogic narratology. Emily Bronte's use of multiple narrative voices and portrayal of solipsistic bi-sexuality through the incestuous love affair between siblings leaves Victorian readers bewildered. Her ability to differentiate from the traditional monologic discourse of bildungsroman adds an unexpected depth to her work. Instead of the projectile development of a narrative that reflects the general belief in human progress and the affluent capitalist society, she describes Catherine within the context of the return of the abject. Likewise, Heathcliff far from being a quintessential bildungsroman hero resembles the highly romantic concept of the wandering soul just like Coleridge's hero in *The Rime of the Ancient Mariner* (Paglia, 2001, p. 298). As for Bronte's literary discourse, she makes use of the reversal of history by creating the pre-oedipal polyvalence both in the major characters; Heathcliff and Catherine, and in the narrative voices. In this token, she reflects the becoming of the feminine narrative under the patriarchal capitalist discourse. Similarly, Roy puzzles the contemporary reader with the use of dialogic language and neologism. Just like Emily Bronte, she refuses the projectile movement of history and makes use of the incestuous intercourse of Estha and Rahel to emphasize deflection from the identity formation process in the symbolic law. Their incestuous affair symbolizes the return to the maternal realm instead of the oedipal formation of the symbolic. As for Roy's specific use of language, she transgresses the rigid linguistic rules of the symbolic order. She alters words, comes up with a new combination of collocations, and plays with the conventional relation between the signifier and the signified. In this sense, she claims a gender-specific and post-colonial voice for herself to express her becoming an Indian female novelist. Namely, her dialogic discourse refers to both her feminine writing and postcolonial identity. Her novel adroitly manifests heteroglossia constituted by different voices, stylistic speeches and individual points of view so that the monolithic discourse of grand history is reversed in her alternative literary narrative. Namely, Bronte and Roy have exemplified Bakhtin's theory on the novel by giving criticism of the novel within the novel since the novel is characterized by parody and criticism of the previous genres. Similarly, Bronte and Roy have exercised the carnivalesque disruption of the novel through their off-hand dialogue, polyphony and heteroglossia due to the gender-specific experience of writing. The most distinguishing peculiarity of their novels is the emphasis on the ouroboric incest and solipsistic hermaphroditism of both their protagonists and their plot structure. The stylistic organization of their formative elements, by the incest and the abjection of pre-oedipal bi-sexuality reveals the inevitable confluence of masculine and feminine attributes that both Bronte and Roy have to espouse as female novelists. In this paper, I have tried to explore the works of two influential female novelists and their efforts to claim a unique gender-specific meta-voice within the structure of the novel. Emily Bronte and Arundhati Roy challenged the phallic development scheme of the novel by incorporating bi-sexuality and incest, which are inevitable disruptions or carnival elements offhand in the feminine narrative. This study highlights these two female novelists have set an example for claiming a gender-specific meta-voice for one's own, and how their feminine narrative structure, characterized by polyvalence of sexuality and solipsistic bi-sexuality, aligns with Bakhtin's concept of heteroglossia and dialogic discourse.

References

- Ahmad, J. (2017). Revisiting Emily Bronte's *Wuthering heights*: A postmodern reading. *UGC-Approved Journal*, 3(1), 913-926.
- Bakhtin, M. M. (1981). *The dialogic imagination in the novel* (Trans. C. Emerson & M. Holquist). University of Texas Press.
- Bronte, E. (1992). *Wuthering heights*. Oxford University Press.
- Cixous, H. (2009). *The laugh of the Medusa* (Trans. K. Cohen & P. Cohen). The University of Chicago Press. (Original work published in 1976).
- Daeizadeh, Z. (2013). A foucauldian study of power, gender and violence in Emily Bronte's *Wuthering heights*. *An International Refereed Journal of Postmodern Studies*, 4(2), 53-62.
- Dibavar, S. S. (2014). Playing safe: The writer behind the text of *Wuthering heights*. *Advances in Language and Literary Studies*, 5(3), 1-8. <https://dx.doi.org/10.7575/aiac.all.s.v.5n.3p.1>
- Homans, M. (1978). Repression and sublimation of nature in *Wuthering heights*. *Modern Language Association*, 93(1), 9-19.
- Kristeva, J. (1982). *Powers of horror: An essay on abjection* (Trans. S. L. Roudiez). Columbia University Press. (Original work published in 1941).
- Levy, E. P. (1996). The psychology of loneliness in *Wuthering heights*. *The Johns Hopkins University Press*, 28(2), 158-177.
- Lodge, D. (1993). *The art of fiction*. Penguin Books.
- Lodge, D. (1999). *Modern criticism and theory*. Longman
- Maiti, P. (2000). History and counter history: Novels and politics. *Economic and Political Weekly*, 35(27), 2382-2385.
- Militonnyan, J. (2017). The use of simile in Emily Bronte's *Wuthering heights*. *Armenian Folia Anglistika*, 13(17), 37-46. <https://doi.org/10.46991/AFA/2017.13.1-2.037>
- Nagre, V. (2018). *The god of small things*: The game of words. *Chronicle of Humanities & Cultural Studies*, 4(2), 74-76.
- Newman, B. (1990). The situation of the looker-on: Gender, narration, and gaze in *Wuthering heights*. *Modern Language Association*, 105(5), 1029-1041.
- Roy, A. (1997). *The god of small things*. India Ink.
- Sharma, K. D., Mishra, B., & Kumar, N. (2018). Linguistic dialogism in *The god of small things*. *The Indian Journal of English Studies*, 55(1), 243-255.
- Sharma, V., Chauhan, I., & Bala, P. (2023). The filaments of intertextuality in *The god of small things*. *Journal of Survey in Fisheries Sciences*, 10(2), 1278-1283. <https://doi.org/10.17762/sfs.v10i2S.837>
- Showalter, E. (1993). On hysterical narrative. *Ohio State University Press*, 1(1), 24-35.

- Solomon, E. (1959). The incest theme in *Wuthering heights*. *University of California Press*, 14(1), 80-83.
- Stoneman, P. (1992). Feminist criticism of *Wuthering heights*. *Berghahn Books*, 4(2), 147-153.
- Varghese, L. M. (2012). Stylistic analysis of Emily Bronte's *Wuthering heights*. *Journal of Humanities and Social Science*, 2(5). 46-50. <https://doi.org/10.9790/0837-0254650>
- Varghese, L. M. (2013). Dancing words: A lexical analysis of *Wuthering heights* and *The god of small things*. *International Center for Research and Development*, 858(6), 73-78.
- Waheed, Q. (2012). *Struggle for identity: Incest and cross – caste love in Roy's The God of Small Things*. [Master's thesis, GC University]. https://www.academia.edu/94748251/Struggle_for_Identity_Incest_and_Cross_Caste_Love_in_Roys_The_God_of_Small_Things?uc-g-sw=81600230