

Bibliotekarstudentens nettleksikon om litteratur og medier

Av Helge Ridderstrøm (førsteamanuensis ved OsloMet – storbyuniversitetet)

Sist oppdatert 25.03.19

Dette dokumentets nettadresse (URL) er:

https://www.litteraturogmedieleksikon.no/cm4all/uproc.php/0/feministisk_litteraturteori.pdf

Feministisk litteraturteori

Litteraturteori og -forskning som vil avsløre kvinneundertrykkende mønstre i all litteratur, som analyserer/tolker kvinners litterære tekster, som vil vise kvalitetene i ikke påaktede kvinnelige forfatterskap, m.m. Forskningen studerer både stereotype (fastlagte) kjønnsoppfatninger og alternative kvinneroller, og har en kvinnefrigjørende agenda. Feministisk litteraturteori er politisk (i vid forstand) og kjennetegnes ved sin hensikt (og bruker derfor en eksplisitt interesseorientert hermeneutikk).

Forskningen avslører patriarkalske og sexistiske maktmidler og strukturer, f.eks. hvordan kvinner behandles som objekter på mennenes premisser. Forskningen angår institusjonelle, sosiale og personlige maktrelasjoner mellom kvinner og menn. Den viser bl.a. hvordan menn tilegner seg og utøver kontroll over kvinner. Dette er dermed en form for kulturkritikk. Forskerne har et ønske om rettferdighet og like rettigheter. De påviser hvordan litteratur rommer forestillinger om kjønn og kjønnsroller, og ofte opprettholder tradisjonelle, undertrykkende tankemønstre.

Den amerikanske litteraturkritikeren Elaine Showalter skiller mellom feministisk kritikk, som er ideologikritisk og særlig gjelder menns tekster, og gynokritikk som gjelder kvinners perspektiv i kvinners tekster.

Forskningen undersøker “ways in which literature (and other cultural productions) reinforce or undermine the economic, political, social, and psychological oppression of women [...] Feminist criticism is also concerned with less obvious forms of marginalization such as the exclusion of women writers from the traditional literary canon [...] [and] strives to expose the explicit and implicit misogyny in male writing about women [...] Feminist literary critics try to explain how power imbalances due to gender in a given culture are reflected in or challenged by literary texts” (N. W. Swardhani i <http://wayanswardhani.lecture.ub.ac.id/files/2013/05/Feminist-Literary-Criticism.pdf>; lesedato 11.08.15). På engelsk skilles det mellom “sex” (biologisk kjønn) og “gender” (kulturelt-sosialt kjønn).

“If feminisms continually transform themselves by making connections across disciplines, they also encourage the redefinition of academic and professional specialisms. In the arts, feminist theories have played a crucial role in dismantling traditional hierarchies between artists, theorists, critics, historians, curators, dealers and patrons. In practical terms, these hierarchies maintained masculine institutional privilege and changing their structures encouraged women’s increased participation in visual culture. [...] Despite some recent gains within mainstream academic circles, feminisms continue to dispute the very concept of fixed and static parameters, operating at the interstices of professional, political and theoretical demarcations. To critique marginalization, feminisms rethink the boundaries between the centre and its peripheries, delineating paradigms which operate differently.” (Marsha Meskimmon i Smith og Wilde 2002 s. 382)

“Hva er det vi lærer at er en god tekst? Et viktig kriterium for god kunst har vært at den ikke må oppfattes som personlig. Dette ligger i den litteraturhistoriske tradisjonen, utviklet av menn på 1920-tallet i et fagfelleskap preget av menn. Det vil si ideen om at litteraturen må løfte seg utover de personlige erfaringene, slik T.S. Eliot skrev. [...] Litteratur med tema som oppfattes som personlig og kvinnespesifikt blir slik ansett for å mangle litterære ambisjoner, for ikke å være kunst. Dette er selvfølgelig ikke riktig. Disse teoriene er ikke utviklet i forhold til tekster skrevet av kvinner. Det at man tar utgangspunkt i personlige erfaringer betyr ikke at det man skriver er uinteressant for andre, og at det er kunstnerisk mindre ambisiøst. Noen av Hanne Ørstaviks tekster tar opp noe som jeg ville se som kvinneproblematikk, men det betyr ikke at hennes bøker ikke har allmenn interesse. [...] Tanken om at kvinner er partikulære, mens menn er universelle finnes fremdeles, og derfor trenger vi også å fokusere på kvinnelige forfatterskap og løfte frem disse. Men målet er selvfølgelig å oppheve skillene, slik at kvinnelige forfattere ikke lengre blir oppfattet som spesielle.” (Christine Hamm i <http://fortellingeromhenne.no/artikkel/vis.html?tid=62177>; lesedato 08.05.18)

Gjennom tidene har patriarkalske institusjoner og undertrykkelsesmekanismer forsøkt å bringe kvinner til taushet. Forskningen inkluderer institusjonsanalyser av den litterære offentlighet (institusjonelt forankrede maktstrategier og -strukturer, inkluderings- og ekskluderingsmekanismer). Det å løfte fram kvinneperspektiver skal hindre at kvinner marginaliseres og tingliggjøres (når de blir objekter for menns blikk), i det hele tatt hindre “marginalisering av kvinners problemstillinger, framstillings- og uttrykksmåte” (Iversen 1989 s. 10). Kvinner vet bedre enn menn hva som er et godt kvinnelig.

Forskjellsfeminisme innebærer at det kvinnelige oppfattes som noe fundamentalt forskjellig fra det mannlige (spesifikke kvinneerfaringer, kvinners måter å oppleve og føle på osv.), mens likhetsfeminisme er basert på at det er stor grad av likhet mellom kjønnene (kjønnsforskjeller er i stor grad sosiale konstruksjoner som kan endres kulturelt).

Det er en oppgave for feministiske litteraturforskere å bidra til å synliggjøre kvinners rolle og tematisere kvinneerfaringer i et frigjøringsperspektiv. Kritikken skal blant annet avsløre mannlige forfatteres undertrykkende og falske kvinnebilder, og forklare hvordan disse fungerer i de litterære tekstene. Taushet og brudd i menns tekster kan avsløre dimensjoner ved kvinner som de mannlige forfatterne ikke klarte å snakke om eller ønsket å kommunisere. Dette avsløres bl.a. gjennom kjønnsrolleanalyser av hvordan menn og kvinner er framstilt (kjønnsrollemønstre, kvinnesyn osv.), og særlig studiet av forholdet mellom kjønnene. Slik avdekkes patriarkalske maktstrukturer og menns sexistiske blikk på kvinner.

Feminitet og maskulinitet er kvinner og menns tradisjonsbaserte og kulturelt skapte kjønnssegenskaper. Disse egenskapene er produkter av sosiale normer, dvs. av samfunnspåvirkning. De er ikke identiske med menns og kvinners biologiske egenskaper. Fenomenet "kvinnelig" er noe relasjonelt (i relasjon til menn, kultur, tradisjonelle omsorgsfunksjoner osv.), ikke essensielt/naturlig. I de fleste kulturer er det derimot en tydelig fastlåsing av kvinne- og mannsperspektiver som det er vanskelig å forandre på.

"In the feminist theories and practices of the 1960s, 1970s, and 1980s, the notion of gender *as* sexual difference was central to the critique of the oppression of women by men. Feminists such as Mary Daly and Adrienne Rich insisted on a difference of women from men, female from male, and saw the (re)appropriation and valuation of a hitherto distorted or concealed female nature or essence based in biology as key to combating patriarchal oppression. They argued that the oppression of women is rooted in the biological lack of the male (his inability to give birth, his lack of connection with the Earth and its energy flows, for example). This lack spurs men to persecute and parasitically feed on women by socially constructing and maintaining "the patriarchy," a system of male social, ideological, sexual, political and economic dominance over women." (Connock 1999 s. 29)

"Though the feminist struggle was in many ways furthered by the action of feminists affirming a view of gender as sexual difference, this view has nevertheless significant limitations – limitations which were drawn out by feminists like Teresa de Lauretis and Judith Butler in the mid-1980s and 1990s. Continuing to pose the question of gender in terms of sexual difference(s) keeps feminist thinking bound to the terms and conceptual frames of Western patriarchy, they argued. It keeps feminists from examining the myriad of ways that patriarchy's binary gender system is inscribed in the political unconscious of dominant cultural discourses and practices, providing its logic for the organization of systematic social inequality. For Judith Butler, the chief problem resulting from the positioning of "woman" as a unified, exclusive category (and as the subject of feminism) is that it takes up and perpetuates a *metaphysics of substance*, a belief in a prediscursive body that determines, in part, how it is culturally inscribed with meaning. The "strategic aim" of the regulatory norms that produce our

understandings of material bodies as fitting into one of two discrete, binary categories is concealed, therefore, by the postulation of “sex” as “a cause” of bodily experience, behaviour and desire. Butler argues, instead, that feminists should now move away from the assumption that the terms “woman” and “women” denote a common identity:

“Rather than a stable signifier that commands the assent of those whom it purports to describe and represent, *women*, even in the plural, has become a troublesome term, a site of contest, a cause for anxiety. [...] If one “is” a woman, that is surely not all one is; the term fails to be exhaustive, not because a pregendered “person” transcends the specific paraphernalia of its gender, but because gender is not always constituted coherently or consistently in different historical contexts, and because gender intersects with racial, class, ethnic, sexual, and regional modalities of discursively constituted identities.”

Teresa de Lauretis has similarly argued that a serious limit of “sexual difference(s)” is that it makes it very difficult, if not impossible, to articulate the differences *among* women or, perhaps more exactly, the differences *within* women. She maintains that “the radical epistemological potential of feminist thought” lives in its conception of the social subject as “not unified but rather multiple, and not so much divided as contradicted” since she is multiply constituted in gender as well as in the experiencing of race, class, and sexuality.” (Connock 1999 s. 31-32)

“It is central that feminists identify and critique the first principle in this patriarchal mythic thought which holds “that *women* must be *domesticated* – that is to say, tamed, trained to live with and be of use to *men*; trained to be *wo-men*. The domestication of women in achieved, albeit tenuously and incompletely, through the mapping of the gender category “woman” onto female subjects; and essential to the gender identity “woman” is the heterosexual contract, the ideological belief that women are the necessary compliment of/for men. “The institution of a compulsory and naturalized heterosexuality requires and regulates gender as a binary relation in which the masculine term is differentiated from a feminine term, and this differentiation is accomplished through the practices of heterosexual desire. The act of differentiating the two oppositional moments of the binary results in a consolidation of each term, the respective internal coherence of sex, gender, and desire.” (Connock 1999 s. 33)

Stereotype oppfatninger av kjønnene innebærer at menn ofte framstilles som jegg-sentrerte, med liten evne til empati, at de er selvmedlidende, aggressive og voldelige, mens kvinnene er tålmodige, tilpasningsdyktige, myke, villige til å underordne seg, ettertenksomme og meningssøkende (Heinze m.fl. 2012 s. 234). Kvinner skal være beskyttende og omhegnende i sin omsorgsrolle, altså omsorgsorienterte, og være myke og lydige, altså mer selvutslettende enn selvhverdende. Det finnes et enormt antall språklige motsetninger som synes å stamme fra den kulturelt overleverte motsetningen kvinne/mann: måne/sol,

mørke/lys, passiv/aktiv, svak/sterk, følelse/fornuft, immanens/transcendens osv. Den kvinnelige siden er den negative, den mannlige den positive.

“Den moderne romanen har lenge vært assosiert med kvinner, og kvinner har lenge vært assosiert med kroppen og følelsene og naturen og det sanselige, alt sammen ting som er blitt regnet som lave og rotete og i direkte motsetning til høyverdige ting, tanken og intellektet og kulturen, som er assosiert med menn. Platon takket himmelen for at han ikke var født som kvinne eller slave. Aristoteles befestet fordømmen ved å identifisere det mannlige med besjelende form og det kvinnelige med treg materie. [...] Grekerne vanæret sin erkefiende, perserne, ved å feminisere dem, ved å fremstille hele den persiske kulturen som en myk, svak, dekorativ, tåpelig affære. [...] Kunstnere som tilfeldigvis er kvinner, må forholde seg til det jeg kaller “æsj-faktoren”; i kulturen er det en utbredt avsky for kroppen som feminin og opphøyelse av sinnet som maskulint, den gjenstridige ideen om at litteratur av kvinner på en eller annen måte er både mindre og mer enn verk av menn – mer emosjonelle og mindre kontrollerte, mer personlige, mer selvbiografiske, men også mindre intellektuelle og selvfølgelig mindre allmenngyldige.” (Siri Hustvedt i *Morgenbladet* 16. – 22. februar 2018 s. 27-28)

“With femininity are associated traits such as emotionality, prudence, co-operation, a communal sense, and compliance. Masculinity tends to be associated with such traits as rationality, efficiency, competition, individualism and ruthlessness. [...] ‘good’ women are presented as submissive, sensitive and domesticated; ‘bad’ women are rebellious, independent and selfish. The ‘dream-girl’ stereotype is gentle, demure, sensitive, submissive, non-competitive, sweetnatured and dependent. The male hero tends to be physically strong, aggressive, and assertive, takes the initiative, is independent, competitive and ambitious.” (Aaliya Ahmed i http://www.ijsrp.org/research_paper_jun2012/ijsrp-June-2012-47.pdf; lesedato 27.09.18)

Vanlige kvinnetyper i populærkulturen er den beskyttende kvinne (moderlig og traust), den uskyldige kvinne (jomfruelig og snill) og den utspekulerte kvinne (upålitelig og slem). En femme fatale er en svært vakker og forførerisk kvinne som manipulerer menn.

Den britiske dikteren Alfred Tennyson skrev i det episke diktet “The Princess” (1847) om kjønnsroller på en måte som nesten parodierer holdninger i hans samtid:

“Man for the field and woman for the hearth:
Man for the sword and for the needle she:
Man with the head and woman with the heart:
Man to command and woman to obey;
All else confusion.”

Den prostituerede hovedpersonen i den franske forfatteren Émile Zolas roman *Nana* (1880) “does not need a man’s approving gaze to validate her; she herself will acknowledge the beauty of her own body with a kiss. Men use women as mirrors, explains Mary Donaldson Evans in her study of Guy de Maupassant; *his* identity is fragile unless affirmed by *her* (Evans 1986: 125-8). When, as here, the mirror is impervious and impenetrable, full of her own image, she plunges him [hennes elsker] into the depths of despair.” (Chitnis 1991 s. 26)

“Feminist Literary Approach examines the experiences of women from all races and classes and cultures, including, for example, African American, Latina, Asian American, American Indian, lesbian, handicapped, elderly and Third World subjects [...] Feminist critics generally agree that their goals are to expose patriarchal premises and resulting prejudices, to promote discovery and re-evaluation of literature by women, and to examine social, cultural, and psycho-sexual contexts of literature and literary criticism [...] Gender is socially/culturally constructed. It is learned and performed; it involves the myriad and often normative *meanings* given to sexual difference by various cultures.” (N. W. Swardhani i <http://wayanswardhani.lecture.ub.ac.id/files/2013/05/Feminist-Literary-Criticism.pdf>; lesedato 11.08.15)

“Women are “inside” gender to the extent that their minds and bodies are marked by patriarchal representations of women as Woman, as Mythical Other. Simone de Beauvoir’s cornerstone feminist text *Le deuxième sexe* [1949] was pivotal in the elucidation of this gendering of women as Mythical Other. She argues that due to an inability to authentically assume their embodiment and inevitable finitude, men (re)invented themselves as Pure, Transcendent Minds and projected onto women their fears and hatreds of and desires for, the carnal, the natural, the finite. They defined humanity as male and defined women as derivative, as vehicles for the self-conceptualizations and activities of men, and not as autonomous, self-identified subjects. Men became “the subject” and women “the other” [...] Woman is both Nature negatively defined (chaotic, out of men’s control, destructive) and positively defined (passive, nurturing); she is Mother and Whore, Muse and Soul-Sucking Temptress. De Beauvoir suggests that this ambivalence of the figure of Woman is an intrinsic property of the “Eternal Feminine” [...] This desire that women embody all that is good and bad feed a related myth – that of Woman as Mystery.” (Connock 1999 s. 35-36)

“As Molly Haskell points out, the mutual exclusivity of good and evil in masculine portrayals of women is a “way of converting women from their ambiguous reality into metaphors” (199). The three women of the *Falcon* [Dashiell Hammetts krimroman *The Maltese Falcon*, 1930] are such metaphors.” (Redmond 2014 s. 23)

“Although the construction of women as Woman, as mysterious and contradictory Other, has occurred since antiquity and is very powerful, this representation is not wholly determining. It has been able to neither fully capture and mask women nor

erase women's subjectivity. Women are able to move "outside" of gender, outside of their representation as Mysterious, Inessential Other. For Butler, this incomplete domestication of women is due to the nature of the patriarchal ideological myths themselves. Because these myths do not refer to a "real," "authentic" condition but rather, are the *effects* of discursive practices, they must be continuously reproduced and reiterated: "If there is something right in Beauvoir's claim that one is not born, but rather becomes a woman, it follows that *woman* itself is a term in process, a becoming, a constructing that cannot be rightfully be said to originate or to end. As an ongoing discursive practice, it is open to intervention and resignification. [...] Gender is the repeated stylization of the body, a set of repeated acts within a highly rigid regulatory frame that congeal over time to produce the appearance of substance, or a natural sort being." " (Connock 1999 s. 36-37)

"In her theoretical writings, Teresa de Lauretis calls to our attention the central role played by textual (self)representations in the production (and counter-production) of social subjects and systems. She argues that modes of cultural production (such as literature, cinema, television, and visual art) are at once material apparatuses and signifying practices in which subjects are implicated, constructed, but not exhausted. [...] If cultural representations are sites of the continued subjugation of women in reified gender relations, they are also potential sites of gender contestation and subversion. "Strategies of writing *and* of reading [cultural texts] are forms of cultural resistance. Not only can they work to turn dominant discourses inside out (and show that it can be done), to undercut their enunciation and address, to unearth the archeological stratifications on which they are built; but in affirming the historical existence of irreducible contradictions for women in discourse, they also challenge theory in its own terms, the terms of a semiotic space constructed in language, its power based on social validation and well-established modes of enunciation and address." " (Connock 1999 s. 44-45)

Psykologene Deborah S. David og Robert Brannon har i boka *The Forty-Nine Percent Majority: The Male Sex Role* (1976) beskrevet de fire "pilarene" i en paradoksal norm for maskulinitet: "The first and perhaps the most important rule [of manliness] is "No Sissy Stuff": One can never do anything that even remotely hints of the feminine. The second rule, "Be a Big Wheel," indicates that masculinity is measured by power, wealth, success. The third rule reminds men to "Be a Sturdy Oak," since real men show no emotions, are emotionally reliable by being emotionally inexpressive. And finally, "Give 'em Hell" meant to exude an aura of manly daring and aggression. These four rules sum up the masculine predicament, and men "have been limited and diverted from whatever our real potential might have been by the prefabricated mold of the male sex role." " (gjengitt og sitert fra Mullen 2013 s. 125-126) Det kvinnelige – som menn må unngå – er primært følelser, verbal kommunikasjon, forståelsesfullhet og kompromisser (Mullen 2013 s. 126).

Mye av kvinnelitteraturforskningen har hatt et “dekonstruerende prosjekt”, dvs. ønsket å dekonstruere bl.a. “de mannsdominerte vitenskapelige kategoriene og tradisjonene” (Iversen 1989 s. 10). Dekonstruksjon innebærer bl.a. å oppløse faste motsetningspar. Denne forskningen vil bringe mannssamfunnets verdisystem ut av balanse og undergrave de stereotype motsetningene mellom det mannlige og det kvinnelige (nedfelt i motsetningspar som logos/patos, kultur/natur, aktiv/passiv, styrke/svakhet, orden/kaos osv.). Forskningen vil også undergrave såkalt fallosentrisme, dvs. undergrave ideene om at det mannlige er kilden til innsikt, sannhet, objektivitet, godhet, framskritt osv. Det gjelder å underminere menns tro på at deres eget ståsted er “objektivt” og “nøytralt”, og vise at det tvert imot er en ideologisk posisjon.

Særlig i populærlitteratur har kvinner tradisjonelt vært stereotype (i høyere grad enn menn). I mange krimbøker skrevet av menn er kvinnene “sanselighetens kilde og opphav. Mannen er uten kjønn – inntil han møter *henne*. [...] Utallige er de mannlige helter som har snappet etter pusten, stirret stumt, hørt klokker i ørene, – og merket noe våkne “der inne”, noe irrasjonelt, uforklarlig, søtt og skremmende. *Han* er blitt overrasket, *hun* derimot forstår med en gang hva som skjer. Hun er vant til det, hun er på hjemmebane. Den verdensvante mann vet imidlertid at sex er et våpen som kan vendes *mot* den forføreriske kvinnen” skriver Dahl og Nordberg (1982 s. 233).

Også undertrykkende kvinner avsløres, f.eks. eldre kvinner som falske rollemodeller for unge kvinner. Mødres undertrykkelsesmåter kan studeres f.eks. i romaner av Camilla Collett og Amalie Skram. Kvinner inntar ofte en mellomposisjon mellom offer og medskyldig.

Nesten alt som er historisk overlevert fra eldre tider, er filtrert gjennom en mannlig dominert offentlighet. Mennene har usynliggjort og fortiet kvinner og kvinners erfaringer og perspektiver. Men kvinner har likevel gjort sine stemmer hørt, f.eks. i romansjangeren, spesielt tydelig fra 1800-tallet. Mange kvinnelige forfattere gjennom tidene “har ikke som mannlige kolleger blitt en viktig del av den litterære arv. Man har heller betraktet det uferdige, fragmentariske, hysteriske, underlivsfokuserte og eksalterte som sykdomstegn, enn naturlige og “realistiske” uttrykk for den kvinnelige kunstnerens sinn og situasjon. Er hennes produkter mindre verdige? Sanseligheten, lysten og plikten slåss om plassen i hennes diktning. Angsten for ikke å være kvinnelige nok rir dem som en mare.” (Inger-Margrethe Lunde i *Aftenposten* 9. juni 1986 s. 5)

“[W]omen often wrote not in the genres that were considered especially important and lofty (such as Epic poetry, philosophical treatises, or sublime lyric such as the ode), but in genres that were marginal (such as the novel; see the book *Edging Women out* by Gaye Tuchman and Nina E. Fortin [...]), or the texts they wrote were not considered to be literature at all because they were diaries, letters, or similar personal documents. Hence, a revision of the canon could not mean merely

to look for texts written by women which might fit into this traditional canon, it also had to entail a fundamental debate about the criteria for belonging to this canon.” (Thomas A. Schmitz i www.researchgate.net/file.PostFileLoader.html; lesedato 15.10.15)

“Taking the patriarchal discourse into consideration, we could discover that a male perspective claims the ownership of the language by both excluding women from using the language and making them into the object of the language, and it forces writers to obey certain conventions (such as the double bind of good and evil women and the plot of woman’s fall), which reveals and reinforces how power is distributed in this symbolic system. In this sense, the patriarchal language could be deemed as a strategy. Like the colonized people who use the laws, practices and representations that are imposed on them to a totally different end, nineteenth-century women writers are creatively maneuvering patriarchal conventions according to their own female perspective. As is mentioned above, they alternately identify themselves with angel-women and monster-women as well as making dark doubles of themselves and their heroines to complicate the women figures and thus redefine themselves; they also revise the myth of woman’s fall to present woman’s experience of being repressed. In so doing, these women writers introduce a female language into the field of male discourse while obeying patriarchal laws. In this sense, nineteenth-century women writers are using the actions of male discourse to a totally different end; they are using tactics to resist patriarchal strategy.” (Jia Shi i http://www.ieit-web.org/apscj/articles/2011_1_3_3.pdf; lesedato 07.08.13)

“Feminist literary criticism has been very successful especially in reclaiming the lost literary women and in documenting the sources. In this respect, feminist criticism has successfully directed attention to the female intellectual tradition. Many early works on women writers before the 1960s usually focus on the female literary tradition. [...] Female writing can be taken as the special female expression of women’s perspectives on a variety of social, cultural and political issues without being committed to the feminist position. [...] Since the 1970s feminist criticism also engaged itself in extensive discussions about the representations of women in literary tradition and the discovery of the impressive tradition of female writing, because the novel was actually represented almost wholly by women. Many critics like Dale Spender, Elaine Showalter, Juliet Mitchell, among others, have investigated the reason why “To be seen as a woman writer” was “to be seen in a subcategory” (Spender 166). Thus women began to resent the imposed literary categories and judgements by openly challenging and disrupting the logocentric tradition. This disruption of the dominant discourses of the literary establishment actually started with a number of notable books in the 1970s. These include, Patricia Meyer Spacks’s *The Female Imagination* (1975) which dealt with English and American novels of the past three hundred years; Ellen Moer’s *Literary Women* (1976) which discusses the history of women’s writing and which is considered a landmark book; Elaine Showalter’s *A Literature of Their Own* (1977) which describes the female tradition in the English novel from the Brontës onward

as a development of subculture; and Sandra Gilbert and Susan Gubar's *The Madwoman in the Attic* (1979) which studies the major female writers of the 19th century. All these notable books have paved the path for further and more detailed studies of gender and sexism in literature." (Serpil T. Oppermann i <http://warlight.tripod.com/OPPERMANN.html>; lesedato 22.08.13)

I boka *The Resisting Reader: A Feminist Approach to American Fiction* (1978) undersøker Judith Fetterley "what it means to read a number of great books of American authors *as a woman*. Washington Irving's (1783-1859) famous short story "Rip van Winkle," for example, invites its readers, by subtle textual strategies, to identify with the male protagonist, against his wife. Female readers do not find a place of their own in this text [...]: "The consequence for the female reader is a divided self. She is asked to identify with Rip and against herself ..., to laugh at Dame Van Winkle and accept that she represents 'woman,' to be at once both repressor and repressed, and ultimately to realize that she is neither." Fetterley discovers similar strands of hatred against or fear of the female in other stories and novels. This makes reading such texts in an unproblematic, positive way impossible for women. Women, Fetterly argues, are excluded from large parts of American literature; if they want to read such works, they have to adopt a certain reading position [...]: "the first act of the feminist critic must be to become a resisting rather than an assenting reader and, by this refusal to assent, to begin the process of exorcizing the male mind that has been implanted in us." " (Thomas A. Schmitz i www.researchgate.net/file.PostFileLoader.html; lesedato 14.10.15)

"Fetterley's study demonstrates a problem that we have seen in a similar fashion in the attempts to define a specifically female language: apparently, the biological sex alone is not sufficient to define a reader as "female"; instead, a woman reading these texts must resist the mechanisms they implement and actively withstand their suggestions. Not every woman reading texts, then, is a female reader – if she does not resist, she will be reading like and as a man. Some feminist critics have taken this argument one step further: according to them, some strategies of reading are always and unavoidably patriarchal. If you read a text under the assumption that it offers only one legitimate meaning and that all approaches which do not arrive at this meaning must necessarily be illegitimate, you are, these scholars hold, following strategies of reading which must be called patriarchal." (Thomas A. Schmitz i www.researchgate.net/file.PostFileLoader.html; lesedato 14.10.15)

Sandra M. Gilbert and Susan Gubars bok *The Madwoman in the Attic: The Woman Writer and the Nineteenth-Century Literary Imagination* (1979) er et sentralt verk innen feministisk litteraturkritikk. "Under the disguise of patriarchal discourse, women writers are telling stories of their own – one may deem it as women's duplicity. Two of the typical maneuverings are palimpsest and parody. As Gilbert and Gubar put it: "women from Jane Austen and Mary Shelley to Emily Brontë and Emily Dickinson produced literary works that are in some sense palimpsestic, works whose surface designs conceal or obscure deeper, less accessible (and less

socially acceptable) levels of meaning.” (Gilbert & Gubar, 73) Taking the double bind of stereotypical female figures for example, the split between the innocent, quiet, selfless, good women (“mother goddess, merciful dispensers of salvation, female symbols of justice”) and the vicious, evil women (“witches, evil eye, menstrual pollution, castrating mothers”) is a male construction that women writer can never escape. Rather than demolishing the binary, women writers redefine themselves by travelling between the two extremes through “alternately defining themselves as angel-women or as monster-women” (Gilbert & Gubar, 44) and through “creating dark doubles for themselves and their heroines” (Gilbert & Gubar, 79). In so doing, they simultaneously conform to the patriarchal discourse and subvert it secretly with a female perspective. Parody works in a similar way as described by Gilbert and Gubar: “nineteenth-century women writers frequently both use and misuse (or subvert) a common male tradition or genre.... Mary Shelley, Emily Brontë, and George Eliot covertly reappraise and repudiate the misogyny implicit in Milton’s mythology by misreading and revising Milton’s story of woman’s fall.” (Gilbert & Gubar, 80) By restating or correcting the original patriarchal stories, women writers refer to and show respect to the masters while revising and distorting their tradition from a female perspective to build a new discourse.” (Jia Shi i http://www.ieit-web.org/apscj/articles/2011_1_3_3.pdf; lesedato 07.08.13)

“The Madwoman in the Attic: Angel or Monster? In “Jane Eyre,” the character of Bertha Mason serves as an ominous representation of uncontrollable passion and madness. [...] Bertha’s position as the “Madwoman in the Attic” also speaks to larger social questions of femininity and authorship during the Victorian period. [...] According to Gilbert and Gubar, all female characters in male-authored books can be categorized as either the “angel” or the “monster.” The “angel” character was pure, dispassionate, and submissive; in other words, the ideal female figure in a male-dominated society. Interestingly, the term “angel” stems directly from Coventry Patmore’s 1854 poem “The Angel in the House,” in which he described his meek and pious wife. In sharp contrast to the “angel” figure, the “monster” female character was sensual, passionate, rebellious, and decidedly uncontrollable: all qualities that caused a great deal of anxiety among men during the Victorian period. However, Charlotte Brontë (as well as many other contemporary female authors) did not limit her characterizations to this strict dichotomy between monster and angel. Jane Eyre possesses many of the qualities of the so-called angel: she is pure, moral, and controlled in her behavior. Yet, at the same time, she is extremely passionate, independent, and courageous. She refuses to submit to a position of inferiority to the men in her life, even when faced with a choice between love and autonomy, and ultimately triumphs over social expectations. Moreover, Jane’s childhood adventures demonstrate much of the same rebelliousness and anger that characterize the “monster.” It is clear that Jane’s appearance of control is only something that she learned during her time at Lowood School; she still maintains the same fiery spirit that defined her character as a child. [...] Although Bertha does serve as one of the seeming villains of the novel, she should be seen more as a

critique of a society in which passionate women are viewed as monsters or madwomen.” (<http://www.gradesaver.com/jane-eyre/study-guide/section8/>; lesedato 16.09.13)

“To achieve recognition of their works, women writers rely heavily on the blindness of the patriarchal standards. It seems that the only measure they can take is to take on a submissive disguise and secretly bury their own story beneath, which means to play tactics. At least, tactics lead women out of the vicious circle of silence and a lack of power, and introduce them into another more hopeful circle through which there is a possibility to obtain power and language, and that is the circle of the tactic and the strategy. [...] Putting Jane Austen, Mary Shelley, Emily Brontë and Emily Dickinson together to form a tradition of female double talk and parody, Gilbert and Gubar are also making these practices into conventions of women’s writing. It soon brings up questions. Should all women write in this style? Women writers have been trying so hard to subvert the male construction of stereotypical angel-women and monster-women figures, why should they flatten and reduce their writing into a single stereotype?” (Jia Shi i http://www.ieit-web.org/apscj/articles/2011_1_3_3.pdf; lesedato 05.08.13)

“Kvinnelitteraturforskningen er selvsagt ingen enhetlig eller en gang for alle gitt tradisjon eller metode.” (Iversen 1989 s. 14)

“For the feminist critics themselves, the most imminent danger was that of becoming completely ghettoized. It was understandable that women in academia emphasized the need to look, for example, at women in history and art, and feminists saw it as their own duty to carry out such research themselves. But it was all too easy for the idea that “only women will be able to do feminist research” to become reversed into “women can only do feminist research.” This is especially difficult for younger scholars at the beginning of their careers: understandably, they try to avoid becoming locked into such a niche of the academic system. However, this begets the danger that scholarship will return to “business as usual” and marginalize, neglect, or relegate all research about women and femininity to an irrelevant position.” (Thomas A. Schmitz i [www.researchgate.net/file.PostFile Loader.html](http://www.researchgate.net/file.PostFileLoader.html); lesedato 15.10.15)

“Akua Rugg’s *Brickbats and Bouquets* was the first volume of criticism by a Black woman in Britain and sets a propulsive tone for the rhetorical potency which I am calling border crossing (Rugg 1984). Rugg came to Britain from Lagos and the volume is a collection of her reviews for *Race Today* written in an engaging personal voice with its Black slang “rapping”. The scripto-centric focus of academic criticism is more energetically denied by Ogundipe-Leslie in her special edition of *Research in African Literature* “Women as Oral Artists” (Ogundipe-Leslie and Boyce Davis 1994). Ogundipe-Leslie has taught in Nigeria and American universities and argues that criticism must cross the borders of literature

to look at culture as “the total product of a people’s ‘being’ ” (“African woman” 81). The anthology focuses on feminine forms for example birth songs and the popular Kiganda radio songs. Ogundipe-Leslie debunks two major assumptions of traditional criticism: that men dominate African significations and that African women did not have a voice or space until they began writing in Roman script (Ogundipe-Leslie and Boyce Davis 1994). In her own earlier and fabulous example of critical border crossing, Ogundipe-Leslie attacks traditional criticism even more directly by writing “The Nigerian Literary Scene” as a long poem in the style of Pope’s heroic couplets chronicling the misogynist teaching of literature in Nigeria and sharply attacking the Nigerian writers Achebe and Soyinka” (Maggie Humm i [http://publica.webs.ull.es/upload/REV%20RECEI/48%20-%202004/04%20\(Maggie%20Humm\).pdf](http://publica.webs.ull.es/upload/REV%20RECEI/48%20-%202004/04%20(Maggie%20Humm).pdf); lesedato 09.09.15).

Noen feministiske kritikere “begins with political and social judgements and re-evaluates texts with a partisan, self-reflexive vision. The pre-eminent example is Toni Morrison’s dazzling *Playing in the Dark: Whiteness and the Literary Imagination* (1992). Morrison’s individual readings of classic American literature (Poe, Melville, Twain and Faulkner), by connecting racial realities with literary imaginations, decolonise literary criticism itself in an eloquent, compelling revision of the American canon. [...] VeVe Clark’s “Talking Shop: A Comparative Feminist Approach to Caribbean Literature by Women” (1994), which utilises the Haitian *Marasa* principle comparing dyadic texts to explore and transform binaries between these. This kind of pedagogy searches out historical repetitions and paradoxes to help students and readers create their own dialectics of difference.” (Maggie Humm i [http://publica.webs.ull.es/upload/REV%20RECEI/48%20-%202004/04%20\(Maggie%20Humm\).pdf](http://publica.webs.ull.es/upload/REV%20RECEI/48%20-%202004/04%20(Maggie%20Humm).pdf); lesedato 09.09.15)

“I august [2016] startede forfatterne Olga Ravn og Johanne Lykke Holm Hekseskolen på Akademin Valand i Göteborg. Kurset blev afholdt for første gang i København i foråret 2015, hvor formen var ni møder med tekstlæsninger og workshops. På Akademin Valands hjemmeside står der, at man på Hekseskolen kommer til at fordybe sig i litterære tekster, der berører temaer som tabu, vanvid og den unge kvindes identitetsskabelse. Hekseskolen vil undersøge poesi, som anvender ritualer og “the spell” som tekstgenererende praksis, og man vil læse om “det ødelagte værk”. Hekseskolen gør heksefiguren til en mulig feministisk position, en modstandsfigur, som ikke underkaster sig den herskende orden.” (<https://morgenbladet.no/2016/09/heksen-er-overalt>; lesedato 17.03.17)

Alle artiklene og litteraturlista til hele leksikonet er tilgængelig på <https://www.litteraturogmedieleksikon.no>