University of Lorestan
Faculty of Humanities
Department of English Language and Literature

**A Comparative New Historical Study of Language, Gender and Power
Relations in *Wuthering Heights* by Emily Bronte and
The Edrisis' House by Ghazaleh Alizadeh**

By:
Zohreh Daeizadeh

Supervisor:
Dr. Nozar Niazi

Advisor:
Dr. Mahmood Reza Moradian

**A Thesis Presented for the Degree of Master of Arts in English Language
and Literature**

February, 2013

To the sense and inspiration for my life,
The most beautiful angel on earth,
My husband

Acknowledgements

I wish to acknowledge my deepest gratitude to Dr. Nozar Niazi from whom my greatest support and constructive criticism have always come; the highly respected teacher of mine. My special thanks and love goes to him for his kindness, wide-ranging knowledge, and answering to my endless procedural questions. I am also indebted to dear Dr. Mahmood Reza Moradian not only for multiform assistance and advice but also for being my teacher in some of MA courses. I welcome the opportunity to thank him sincerely. I should also like to appreciate Dr. Majid Amerian who first inspired my initial enthusiasm in English Literature. I need to thank Mr. Seyyed Mohammad Hosseini for his help and providing me with some priceless books.

Further, I am really obliged to thank my dearest parents and brother for being so considerate and supportive. And finally, my fondest appreciation and love goes to my lovely husband for his patience and affection.

Abstract

Emily Bronte's Wuthering Heights and Ghazaleh Alizadeh's The Edrisis' House are analyzed and elaborated within the theoretical framework of New Historicism as propounded by Foucault. The investigation of various and several factors of New Historicism is limited to the major matters of gender, identity, women and men (feminity and masculinity), power, circulating discourses, Foucauldian discourses, institutions, violence and language. The examination of both novels demonstrates Bronte and Alizadeh's attitudes toward gender and power in their works. It also detects the link between the traditional and New Historical definition and comprehension of identity and gender roles. It signifies how the identity of men is dependent on women, and how women and feminity become a framework for evaluating and measuring power of men in the novels. This study also elaborates on the circulating and dominant discourses flowing in their societies such as the discourse of patriarchy and masculinity, feminism and capitalism. Various forms and causes of violence are investigated in the novels, too. Furthermore, the present study discusses the power relations, transformations and role-reversals in both novels, especially in The Edrisis' House. Moreover, the matter of verbal power and the significance of language, as an outstanding characteristic of both writers, are argued. In this thesis, the attempt is ventured to highlight and demonstrate how ordinary members of oppressive institutions are victimized within manipulative power systems, and how their individuality and freedom are ignored as the consequences of their involvement in the power relations.

Keywords: New Historicism, power, discourse, circulating discourse, gender, identity, language, violence, institution, power relation, resistance.

Table of Contents

Chapter One

Introduction

The present research is an attempt to analyze two popular novels, Emily Bronte's *Wuthering Heights* and Ghazaleh Alizadeh's *The Edrisis' House* within the theoretical framework of New Historicism as propounded by Foucault. Attempts will be made to examine the language in these novels by applying Foucauldian methodology. In this chapter, we will first have a short overview of the two writers and their principal works in general. Afterwards, the focus of the study will be on topics such as the review of literature, statement of the problem, the significance of the study, limitation of the study, research methodology and the outline of the thesis structure .Definition of the key terms will also be provided at the end of this chapter.

1.1.   General Overview

This study analyzes the relationship between gender, violence, power, discourse and resistance in Emily Bronte's *Wuthering Heights* and Ghazaleh Alizadeh's *The Edrisis' House* from the New Historical point of view as propounded by the French philosopher and theorist Michel Foucault.

Power for Foucault is what makes us what we are, operating on a quite different level from other theories. Foucault challenges the idea that power is wielded by people or groups by way of 'episodic' or 'sovereign' acts of domination or coercion, seeing it instead as dispersed and pervasive. "Power is everywhere" and "comes from everywhere" so in this sense it is neither an agency nor a structure (Foucault 1998: 63). Instead it is a kind of 'metapower' or 'regime of truth' that pervades society, and which is in constant flux and negotiation. Foucault uses the term 'power/knowledge' to signify that power is constituted through accepted forms of knowledge, scientific understanding and 'truth':

> "Truth is a thing of this world: it is produced only by virtue of multiple forms of constraint. And it induces regular effects of power. Each society has its regime of truth, its "general politics" of truth: that is, the types of discourse which it accepts and makes function as true; the mechanisms and instances which enable one to distinguish true and false statements, the means by which each is sanctioned; the techniques and procedures accorded value in the acquisition of truth; the status of those who are charged with saying what counts as true"
>
> (Rabinow 1991)

According to Foucault, power "must be understood in the first instance as the multiplicity of force relations immanent in the sphere in which they operate and which constitute their own organization . . . as the support which these force relations find in one another, thus forming a chain or system . . . and lastly, as the strategies in which they take effect" (Foucault 1978: 92).

Foucault is one of the few writers on power who recognizes that power is not just a negative, coercive or repressive thing that forces us to do things against our wishes, but can also be a necessary, productive and positive force in society (Gaventa 2003: 2):

> "We must cease once and for all to describe the effects of power in negative terms: it 'excludes', it 'represses', it 'censors', it 'abstracts', it 'masks', it 'conceals'. In fact power produces; it produces reality; it produces domains of objects and rituals of truth. The individual and the knowledge that may be gained of him belong to this production"
>
> (Foucault 1991: 194)

Power is also a major source of social discipline and conformity. In shifting attention away from the 'sovereign' and 'episodic' exercise of power, traditionally centered in feudal states to coerce their subjects, Foucault pointed to a new kind of 'disciplinary power' that could be observed in the administrative systems and social services that were created in 18th century Europe, such as prisons, schools and mental hospitals. Their systems of surveillance and assessment no longer required force or violence, as people learned to discipline themselves and behave in expected ways.

Foucault was fascinated by the mechanisms of prison surveillance, school discipline, systems for the administration and control of populations, and the promotion of norms about bodily conduct, including sex. He studied psychology, medicine and criminology and their roles as bodies of knowledge that define norms of behavior and deviance. Physical bodies are subjugated and made to behave in certain ways, as a microcosm of social control of the wider population, through what he called 'bio-power'. Disciplinary and bio-power create a 'discursive practice' or a body of knowledge and behavior that defines what is normal, acceptable, deviant, etc. – but it is a discursive practice that is nonetheless in constant flux (Foucault 1991).

Contrary to many interpretations, Foucault believed in possibilities for action and resistance. To challenge power is not a matter of seeking some 'absolute truth' (which is in any case a socially produced power), but "of detaching the power of truth from the forms of hegemony, social, economic, and cultural, within which it operates at the present time" (Foucault, in Rabinow 1991: 75). He acknowledges that "there is no power that is exercised without a series of aims and objectives. But this does not mean that it results from the choice or decision of an individual subject" (Foucault 1978: 94–95). He concedes that where "there is power, there is resistance, and yet . . . this resistance is never in a position of exteriority in relation to power". Discourse can be a site of both power and resistance, with scope to "evade, subvert or contest strategies of power" (Gaventa 2003: 3):

> "Discourses are not once and for all subservient to power or raised up against it… We must make allowances for the complex and unstable process whereby a discourse can be both an instrument and an effect of power, but also a hindrance, a stumbling point of resistance and a starting point for an opposing strategy. Discourse transmits and produces power; it reinforces it, but also undermines and exposes it, renders it fragile and makes it possible to thwart"
>
> (Foucault 1998: 100-1)

Foucault's approach has been widely used to critique development thinking and paradigms, and the ways in which development discourses are imbued with power

(Gaventa 2003, citing the work of Escobar, Castells and other 'post-development' critics).

In a series of recent studies of the origins and beginnings of the novel, power -- as issue and problem, theme and enigma — has become the magnetic north for critical inquiry and historical research. The novel, by inciting its readers into the pleasures of its narrative, becomes productively complicit with "power" in producing the modem subject and its most characteristic social forms — the domestic household and the penitentiary.

Emily Jane Bronte wrote the Gothic romance *Wuthering Heights*, one of the greatest novels in the English language. Aside from a smattering of beautiful poetry, Emily Bronte's singular gift to literature is *Wuthering Heights;* the rich, multi-layered tale of the Earnshaw family and the famous characters, Cathy and Heathcliff. Heathcliff gains authority through Capitalism, male discourse and his fellowmen's labors. The first Catherine tries to come along with the patriarchal discourse and seeks support from the males like her father, Heathcliff and Edgar. But her daughter doesn't follow her example. She opposes the patriarchal discourse through gaining her own voice and raising her position to the point of a male. She makes males like Hareton respect her as a human being.

Wuthering Heights, a mainstay of English literature classes, a complex novel of love and vengeance, is still controversial today. While it has been called one of the most carefully constructed novels in the English language, Charlotte referred to Emily as 'an unconscious artist who did not know what she had done;' in other words, a visionary genius.

Another novel in Persian literature written by Ghazaleh Alizadeh is *The Edrisis' House*, which has a lot in common with Bronte's only novel. Alizadeh is among the second generation of Persian women writers.

The Edrisis' House (2 vols., 1991-92), in which "love, dream, and mystical alchemy govern" (Sattari: 138), is set in Eshghabad in 1910s, and is the tale of a house confiscated by revolutionary authorities, and handed over to new residents, who are caught in a metaphorical clash between a decadent revolutionary state and a defiant emerging culture. The novel consists of four sections, and is narrated from four perspectives. Critics have traced elements of a religion-inspired "sacred architecture" (Anahi: 17-18), as well as the interplay of geometrical forms, the circle and the square, and number four in the structure of the novel (Yavari: 589). Written in exquisite detail in the tradition of 19th century European realism, the novel combines a critique of totalitarianism with mythological overtones (Sattari: 142; Mokhtari 1993: 75). The publication of *The Edrisis' House* earned Alizadeh high literary claim. It was the recipient of the "Twenty Years of Fiction Writing," awarded by the Ministry of Islamic Culture and Guidance in 1999, after her death. Her most famous novel, *The Edrisis' House* (1999) explores the individual's search for identity outside the restrictions of society and continued the allegorical-realist approach in a narrative form, with fictional historical characters caught in a metaphorical clash between a decadent revolutionary state and a defiant emerging culture set in a male-dominated society. Alizadeh helped to reshape the permissible boundaries of gender representation in the modern Persian literature of post-revolutionary Iran; her works also helped to advance the critical feminist discourses of the woman's movement. The novel's style and language, its having lots of characters without being a minor one each, the author's use of symbols, myths, numbers, shapes and intertextuality are worth studying.

1.2. Statement of the Problem

Considering Emily Bronte and Ghazaleh Alizadeh as famous women writers in the world of literature, the reasons that make the researcher intend to explore the selected works of the two writers are:

1- There is a total lack of proper understanding of Ghazaleh Alizadeh and her works in Iran, though she is an eminent Iranian writer. And although some scholars and people interested in literature know a little about her, it is just a shallow knowledge. One reason is that few critics have written and lectured on her works so far.

2- There is also no definite research on her usage of language as a modernist feature in advancing the theme of her novel.

3- 'Power relations' is a very important theme in Wuthering Heights, and since there is no specific work on this aspect of Bronte's novel, there is the need to explore this issue and acquire more knowledge from it.

4- There are common grounds in Emily Bronte's *Wuthering Heights* and Ghazaleh Alizadeh's *The Edrisis' House*, which so far have not been scrutinized and could be quite revealing.

1.3. Significance of the Study

Nowadays, Foucault's ideas of power relations, violence, surveillance and resistance are becoming popular not only in literature but also in many academic fields. As he believes, power circulates everywhere in every relationship through the network of the society. Among literary forms, novel has the capacity of containing a network of relationships among characters and their interactions with one another. Therefore, through the exploration of Foucault's ideas in the two novels under discussion, one could get a better understanding of the intricate relationships among their characters.

The two novels, an Iranian and English, have many features in common and can be compared and contrasted with each other in a meaningful way. Therefore this study can encourage comparative studies, particularly in modern literature, among Iranian students of English Literature.

1.4. Thesis Structure

The present study includes five chapters.

The first chapter, considers a general acquaintance with Bronte and Alizadeh's works, their styles, and their works to be analyzed in this thesis. This chapter also describes the significance of their works and the importance and place of this study along with the existing problems and the question of research. The methodology and approach to be applied, the scope of the thesis, and finally the definition of relevant terms are provided in this chapter.

Chapter two will deal with methodological and theoretical concern. In this chapter, firstly the researcher will elaborate on the characterization and description of New Historicism, its principal theories and standpoints, as well as its differentiation with Traditional Historicism. Then, the focus will be shifted to Michel Foucault and his major theories, specially his theories of power, discourse, violence, identity and gender. The chapter will also clarify the original stems of

Foucauldian ideology in New Historicism. As a final point, the chapter will discuss the application of New Historicism and Foucault in literature.

The third and fourth chapters will be concerned with the selected works. In these chapters, according to the methodology and approaches discussed in chapter two, the two novels will be analyzed. The focus will be on the matters of power, gender, identity, violence, and resistance. The issue of language will also be fully discussed since not only is it a main characteristic of the two writers' styles, but also it is a way by which characters dominate their discourse or lose their power.

The final chapter will provide a short summary and review of the previous chapters and the findings and outcomes resulting from the third and fourth chapters. Ultimately, a number of suggestions for further research in the field will be made for researches who would like to work in the same field.

1.5.   Methodology

The two authors make stylistic choices for the purpose of characterization and development of their themes. The focus of analysis, therefore, will be on the dialogs between characters, especially utterances which are highly charged with meaning, and which best reflect the kind of discourse each character employs strategically to get control over their conversational partners. After identifying such utterances, the researcher will then try to find the relation between gender identity and its relevance to discourse and struggle for dominance and power as is discussed by Foucault.

1.6.   A Review of Literature

Foucault's focus is upon questions of how some discourses have shaped and created meaning systems that have gained the status and currency of 'truth', and dominate how we define and organize both ourselves and our social world, whilst other alternative discourses are marginalized and subjugated, yet potentially 'offer' sites where hegemonic practices can be contested, challenged and 'resisted'. He has looked specifically at the social construction of madness, punishment and sexuality. In Foucault's view, there is no fixed and definitive structuring of either social (or personal) identity or practices, as there is in a socially determined view in which the subject is completely socialized. Rather, both the formation of identities and practices are related to, or are a function of, historically specific discourses. An understanding of how these and other discursive constructions are formed may open the way for change and contestation.

Foucault developed the concept of the 'discursive field' as part of his attempt to understand the relationship between language, social institutions, subjectivity and power. Discursive fields, such as the law or the family, contain a number of competing and contradictory discourses with varying degrees of power to give meaning to and organize social institutions and processes. They also 'offer' a range of modes of subjectivity. Foucault argues though, in *The Order of Discourse*, that the 'will to truth' is the major system of exclusion that forges discourse and which "tends to exert a sort of pressure and something like a power of constraint on other discourses", and goes on further to ask the question "what is at stake in the will to truth, in the will to utter this 'true' discourse, if not desire and power?" (Foucault 1970: 113-4). Thus, there are both discourses that constrain the production of knowledge, dissent and difference and some that enable 'new' knowledge and difference(s). The questions that arise within this framework, are to do with how

some discourses maintain their authority, how some 'voices' get heard whilst others are silenced, who benefits and how - that is, questions addressing issues of power/ empowerment/ disempowerment.

In *Wuthering Heights*, Catherine and Heathcliff's relationship is not necessarily one of love, but of vampirism. In "Vampiric Discourse in Emily Bronte's *Wuthering Heights*", Gillian Nelson attempts to reconcile various, sometimes conflicting, readings of vampiric discourse in the novel by suggesting that different forms of vampirism, symbiotic and monstrous, define Catherine and Heathcliff's relationship at different points in the text. Denied the fruitful effects of symbiotic consumption/empowerment, Catherine and Heathcliff turn their consumptive desires outward, ultimately destroying themselves and many others in their drive to re-establish their earlier connection. By the novel's end, this connection has been re-established, suggesting that the empowering potential of symbiotic vampirism cannot be realized in life, so long as the potential of human relationships remains thwarted by social restrictions.

Edward Chitman, in *The Birth of Wuthering Heights*, gives an account of how Emily Bronte entered the world of writing literature in general verse and novel. He gives a somehow New Historical stage-by-stage background to the novel. For example he clarifies the dates she has used and their actual history. Then he gives a full description of how and why each character, even the three housekeepers, in the novel has appeared.

Juliet Mitchel's article about this novel "Femininity, narrative and psychoanalysis" was published in *Modern Criticism and Theory: A Reader* by David Lodge and Nigel Wood. She views the relationship between Catherine and Heathcliff as a male and a female and the voice of some characters in the novel.

As mentioned before, Bronte's novel will be compared to Alizadeh's famous Persian novel *The Edrisis' House*. As Mahmood Motaghedi believes, "The Edrisis' House is a feminist impression of social resistance against power than a pure form of novel" (qtd. In Eshaghian). In this judgement a "pure novel" can mean that novel should not be contaminated with other forms of literature. Meanwhile, from the nineteenth century on, the evolution and completion of different forms of literature, especially novel, have not been defined in a certain way. The fact is that Alizadeh's novel is a combination of heterogeneous literary kinds such as "romance", "classic novel" and "new novel" on the one hand, and "epic" and "lyric" literary forms on the other. This work is not a romance, but undoubtedly, it has some features of this literary type.

Mutual connections between the reader's expectations, his attempt to understand the novel and discovery of the writer's aestheticism and finally, disappearance of the writer from the novel and narrating the story from the point of view of one of the four characters in the novel, make the novel seem close to "new novel". As Mohammad Mokhtari asserts:

> "Although Alizadeh has followed the past traditions in narrating the story, she has sometimes used the modern novel techniques ... and having the writing basics of Flaubert, Tolstoy, Chekov and Dostoyevski, she also has been impressed by Jamesean exactness and Nabokov's elegance, too"
>
> (Mokhtari 1993)

The Edrisis' House is also the meeting point for "lyric" and "epic" literature, too. It is an epic, because all the heroes and heroines who came from the public houses

to this house, have been fighting against the corrupted Russian government, too, and the title "hero" clarifies the meaning.

The Edrisis' House was published first in 1371, and then in 1377. In 1373, there was a leading heart-to-heart named *Ghazaleh Alizadeh* in *Mirrors* (first critical course in Persian Literature attempted by "Elham Mahvizani" with the presence of the writer) which is a methodological analysis of this masterpiece. Among the outstanding critiques because of its technical and aesthetic reliability and importance, one could name *"The Complexities of the Fate of a House"* by late Mohammad Mokhtari. There is a psychoanalytic critique of the novel by Jalal Sattari, named *"Immortality Pain"*, and both are published as appendices to the second publication of the novel by Toos. In spring 1375, there is a short introduction and analysis by Mahmood Motaghedi in *Book Review* magazine, named *"The Stormbound in The Edrisis' House"*. In spring 1377, The New Poetics anthology by Mansour Kooshan, has assigned a part to *The Rememberance of Ghazaleh Alizadeh*, which is a collection of her memories, letters, poems, and analysis of one of her short stories called *The Apocalypse of Dejection* by Hassan Asghari. In the third number of Baya magazine (Khordad 78), there are two articles, "The Edrisis' House" by Fattah Mohammadi and "The Holy Architecture of The Edrisis' House" by Ilia Anahi, and a note by Keyvandokht Keyvan called "I Must Go".

There was a seminar on the works of this Iranian woman writer, held by the Iranian Sociological Association on Tuesday 13 Jan. 2006, which attracted a large and eager audience. The first speaker, Leila Rahbar presented her research in three parts. In the first part, she talked about representation of women and women writers in contemporary Iranian literature – women who have challenged traditional perceptions and roles.

Leila Rahbar considers Alizadeh amongst the first generation of Iranian women writers. According to Rahbar: "Edrissis' House is Alizadeh's most outstanding work. Alizadeh's first work is After Summer and her last work is The Intersection. Her short story *Island* was awarded the best price, the Golden Pen, by the literary magazine Gardoun.

In her critique, Rahbar, who is a student of women's studies, maintained that this story represents the private, social and political position of women in a male-dominated society, a society in which most of 'us' have been raised and continue until today.

Alizadeh's divorce from her husband, her adoption of a child who had survived Boeen-Zahra earthquake, and her experiences of living in France, all influenced her work. Tavakoli believes that Alizadeh always sought to create an earthly and beautiful woman who dies an unusual and premature death. This is why Alizadeh joined the characters of her fiction after being diagnosed with cancer.

Tavakoli criticized Mirabedini's view of Alizadeh's female characters (Mirabedini is the author of *One Hundred Years of Short Story Writing in Iran*), and said: "Contrary to Mirabedini, who sees Alizadeh's female characters as dreamers, I believe it is not the women, but the men in Alizadeh's works who are dreamers, men like Vahab in *The Edrissis' House* or Behzad in *Island*".

The last speaker of the seminar, Dr Husseini, spoke about the role of love in Alizadeh's work, and emphasized that Alizadeh was aware of current political affairs. Many of her protagonists are political, such as Mehdi in Island who finds himself at the end and finds peace while chanting slogans
Himself amongst the demonstrators.

One of the characteristic features of Alizadeh's work is an equal attention to men and women. Dr Husseini supported this statement by quoting Alizadeh that 'two pieces of a bean are like twins, and they should find one another'.

After analyzing 13 couples in Alizadeh's stories, Leila Rahbar reached the conclusion that Alizadeh's couples are often in search of their other half – or the half they have lost – as if this is an impossible dream for Alizadeh.

Another salient feature of women's literature is the instinctive identification of the author with the character she creates. The writer views literature as a mirror whereby she can reflect all dark and bright aspects of her emotional and social life.

In the conference mentioned, Dr. Nayereh Tavakoli stated that in any of Alizadeh's works, this is not the women who live in their imaginations and then, in facing reality, would come out of delusion and become lonely, but it's the men who have such a fate in her stories.

"The Role of women in Two of Ghazaleh Alizadeh's works" is the title of an article by Fathollah Biniaz, in which the writer asserts in Alizadeh's works, women are of two types: ideal women and weak women which consist of a larger group of society. There is no moderate and sober example of a modern woman in her novels.

1.7.   The Scope of the Research

The present research restricts its domain to the analysis of power, violence, gender and discourse in the two mentioned novels. Although these novels can be discussed by employing other literary critical approaches such as Feminism, Structuralism, Post-Structuralism, Post-Colonialism, Marxism and Psychoanalysis, it has been limited to the application of the New Historical approach as propounded by Foucault.

1.8.   Definition of Key Terms

In this research, there are a number of particular terms which need to be clarified and well-defined to increase a chance of high perception for the reader:

1- **New Historicism:** a term applied to a trend in American academic literary studies in the 1980s that emphasized the historical nature of literary texts and at the same time (in contradistinction from 'old' historicisms) the 'textual' nature of history. As part of a wider reaction against purely formal or linguistic critical approaches such as the New Criticism and deconstruction, the New Historicists, led by Stephen Greenblatt, drew new connections between literary and non-literary texts, breaking down the familiar distinctions between a text and its historical 'background' as conceived in previous historical forms of criticism. Inspired by Foucault's concepts of discourse and power, they attempted to show in detail how literary works are entangled in the power relations of their time, not as secondary 'reflections' of any coherent world-view but as active participants in the continual remaking of meanings. New Historicism is less a system of interpretation than a set of shared assumptions about the relationship between literature and history, and an essayistic style that often develops general

reflections from a startling historical or anthropological anecdote (Drabble 2000: 719).

While American New Historicism, following Foucault, tends to argue that literary dissent is harmlessly contained by 'power', the otherwise similar movement in Britain known as 'cultural materialism' parts company with it on this point, insisting that no ruling authority can neutralize every form of cultural subversion (ibid, 719).

2- **Discipline:** Discipline is a way of controlling the movement and operations of the body in a constant way. It is a type of powerful that coerces the body by regulating and dividing up its movement, and space and time in which it moves. Timetables and the ranks into which soldiers are arranged are examples of this regulation. The disciplines are the methods by which this control became possible. Foucault traces the origins of discipline back to monasteries and armies. It is clear, however, that the concept changed in the eighteenth century. Discipline became a widely used technique to control whole populations. The modern prison, and indeed the modern state, is unthinkable without this idea of the mass control of bodies and movement (Mills 2005: 43-44).

3- **Power:** Foucault's conception of power is a central part of this study. Essentially, power is a relationship between people in which one affects another's actions. Power differs from force or violence, which affect the body physically. It involes making a free subject do something that he would not have done otherwise: power therefore involves restricting or altering someone's will. For Foucault, power is seen not as something which is imposed on another but as a network or web of relations which circulates through society; power is not simply a repressive, law-like force that controls and prohibits. Yet, power is productive as well as repressive. Power does not just come from those in authority: it manifests itself in many different ways and from many different points at once. Power directs the transmission of knowledge and discourses and shapes our concepts and self-image. Power is present in all human relationships, and penetrates throughout society. The state does not have a monopoly over power, because power relations are deeply unstable and changeable. Having said that, patterns of domination do exist in society; for example, the modern power to punish was established through the action of the human sciences (ibid, 34-37).

4- **Power Relations:** In the Marxist theory, we had a one-way traffic power from top to down (what that is called Heirarchy of Power), for example, from the State (the Oppressor) to the individuals (the Oppressed). Foucault believed that we have 'Power Relations' in which the power is in the hands of multiple forces. He claims that the power is employed by 'a range of different institutions' and social institutions are the sources of power. These institutions have some 'disciplinary practices in common'. The disciplines are internalized and normalized in the institutions. We do not have any punishment; instead we have 'surveillance' (ibid, 46).

Institution: Institution is the authority which is in charge of the power. It can be a hospital, a clinic, a university, a government, a family and etc. The power is in the hands of the institutions and the 'truth is in the hands of the power'. The institutions have their own discourse. They are also in charge of the 'surveillance' (ibid, 35-36).

5- **Archive:** Foucault's archaeological analysis is focused on the description of the archive, which is "the set of rules which at a given period and for a given society define . . . the limits and forms of the sayable" (Foucault 1991: 59). The term

'archive' is used by Foucault to refer to the unwritten rules which lead to the production of certain types of statements and the sum total of the discursive formations circulating at any one time (Mills 2005: 64). As Foucault explains, his "object is not language but the archive, that is to say the accumulated existence of discourse" (Lotringer 1989: 25).

6- **Discursive Formations:** The term 'discursive formation' is used by Foucault to refer to the regular associations and groupings of particular types of statements; these are groupings of statements which are often associated with particular institutions or sites of power and which have effects on individuals and their thinking. Discursive formations seem to have a solidity about them and yet they are subject to constant change. Discursive practices are characterized by groups of rules that define their respective specificities. In contrast to the analysis of Discourses as Systems of Signs, Foucault treats discourses as "practices that systematically form the objects of which they speak" (Payne and Barbara 2010: 192).

As Mills asserts, they may be groups of statements which are grouped together because of some institutional pressure or association, because of a similarity of origin, or because they have a similar function. They lead to the reproduction of other statements which are compatible with their underlying presuppositions (Mills 2005: 64).

7- **Discourse:** A linguistic or rhetorical term with a multitude of senses, ranging from a single extended speech to the whole realm of language in practical use. In linguistics, 'discourse analysis' is a formal study of the ways in which sentences are connected into larger units of speech or writing. In modern literary and cultural analysis, especially in the post-structuralist mode inaugurated by Michel Foucault, a particular discourse is understood to be a field of linguistic power in which certain authorities (e.g. judges or priests) define an object of expertise and a special vocabulary for discussing it, along with rules governing what is appropriate for each party to say in certain exchanges (e.g. sentencing, confession). Use of the term often indicates a desire to study specific contexts of linguistic and literary usage, rather than the abstract codes of 'language' in general (Drabble 2000: 284). Discourses should not be seen as wholly cohesive, since they always contain within them conflicting sets of statements (Mills 2005: 64). They should be seen as groups of statements which are associated with institutions, which are authorised in some sense and which have some unity of function at a fundamental level (Mills 2005: 65).

8- **Archeology:** Archaeology can be regarded as the analysis of the system of unwritten rules which produces, organises and distributes the 'statement' (that, is the authorised utterance) as it occurs in an archive (that is, an organised body of statements). Foucault describes the archive as 'the general system of the formation and transformation of statements' (Foucault 1972: 130).

Thus, this type of analysis is concerned with the relation between different statements, the way that they are grouped together and the conditions under which certain statements can emerge. Archaeological analysis is not interpretative; that is, it does not offer explanations of what happened in the past – it simply describes what happens and the discursive conditions under which it was possible for that to happen.

9- **Genealogy:** Genealogy is a development of archaeological analysis which is more concerned with the workings of power and with describing the 'history of the present'. It is a form of historical analysis which describes events in the past

but without explicitly making causal connections: as Donnelly states: "It may not satisfy a certain longing for explanations but that is exactly Foucault's intention, to starve that longing and provide only 'documentation'" (Donnelly 1986: 24).

Smart takes a slightly different slant on the differences between archaeological and genealogical analysis; he argues that: "the archaeological investigations are directed to an analysis of the unconscious rules of formation which regulate the emergence of discourses in the human sciences. In contrast, the genealogical analyses reveal the emergence of the human sciences, their conditions of existence, to be inextricably associated with particular technologies of power embodied in social practices" (Smart 1985: 48).

10- **Oppression:** The Social Work Dictionary, ed. Robert L. Barker defines oppression as: "The social act of placing severe restrictions on an individual, group or institution. Typically, a government or political organization that is in power places these restrictions formally or covertly on oppressed groups so that they may be exploited and less able to compete with other social groups. The oppressed individual or group is devalued, exploited and deprived of privileges by the individual or group which has more power" (Barker 2003).

Chapter Two

Methodological and Theoretical Considerations

In this chapter, attempts will be made to present the basic concepts and principles of the theoretical and methodlogical considerations based on which Emily Bronte's *Wuthering Heights* and Ghazaleh Alizadeh's *The Esrisis' House* are studied and analyzed. Firstly the definitions, descriptions and principal concepts and terms associated with New Historicism will be studied, initiating with a short account of Traditional Historicism and its differences with New Historicism. Afterwards, the chapter will continue with a brief familiarity with Michel Foucault and his key theories. Then it is explained that how New Historicism and Foucauldian philosophy and terminology are intermingled. This is finally followed by a concise account of the way New Historicism was and could be employed to examine, interpret and understand literature and literary works in general and the novels under discussion in particular.

2.1. Traditional Historicism, an Introduction

Sometimes critical theories overlap so much that it's too hard to distinguish between them; especially if the practitioners disagree on the bases and differences between the two. And sometimes a theory is considered as a preceding base and background for another one. Such can be the case for Traditional Historicism and New Historicism. The case under study in both is the subject matter of history.

However, the questions a Traditional historian may ask are quite different from those of a New Historicist's; because Traditional Historicism is likely to deal with questions such as, "What happened?" or "What does the event tell us about history?"; but New Historicism is mainly concerned about, "How can we interpret the event?" or "What do the interpretations tell us about the interpreters?"

One may say Traditional Historicism is about the causal and linear relationship between the events, for instance, event A caused event B, and event B caused event C and so on. Also Traditional Historicists divide history into periods, and consider the spirit of any age very important in knowing about the real causes of the events. They claim that they can *objectively* analyze the historical facts. They also believe human beings are advancing in moral, cultural and technological accomplishments over periods of time.

The language of Traditional Historicism "saw the literary work in the foreground and history in the background, and it considered the task of the critic to connect the two" (Rivkin and Ryan 2004: 505).

The critic would make sense of a literary work by searching into the history to which it referred. Thus the critic had to study about a variety of areas, such as politics, biology, different sciences, history, biography, etc. He was actually "an

early advocate of interdisciplinarity" (ibid, 505). Then through a Post-Structuralist critique, Traditional Historicism gives its place to New Historicism (ibid, 505).

2.2. New Historicism, an Introduction

New Historicism was a term coined by Stephen Greenblatt in the early 1980s, for the kind of criticism he was doing. Although later he went on to question the term and changed his own practice Cultural Poetics, the name had already stuck (ibid, 505). Actually this was "the first return of history after its concepts had passed through Post-Structuralism" (ibid, 506). A New Historical critique makes explicit "the textuality of history, claiming that history is only a collection of discourses" (ibid, 505). Historicists emphasize that texts do not originate in a historical vacuum; instead, they are produced in certain historical and social situations, and knowledge of these circumstances will at least not be detrimental to our interpretation of the text. Foucault is the Post-Structuralist who tries to create a new relationship between the historical and literary text. He believes neither one is closer to the "truth" of history, and that history is not a context. Rather, like the literary text itself, it's of a different genre, but "no less a discourse" (ibid, 506).

This critique is influenced by Foucauldian and Marxist theories of history and focuses on issues of power and it was "articulated in response to a critique from a more Marxist school of historiography" called Cultural Materialism. Cultural Materialists believed all power is "fragile, subject to undermining by dissident elements within a society", and that literature unintentionally "displays the fissures in power, the moments of subversion" where "the instability of power" is most tangible. Greenblatt opposed them by stating that "subversion" itself was a "deception of power" (ibid, 506).

Although this new form of historicism centers history as the subject of research, it differs from the "old" in its understanding of history. While traditional historicism regards history as "universal," new historicism considers it to be "cultural." According to Cox and Reynolds, "new" historicism can be differentiated from "old" historicism "by its lack of faith in 'objectivity' and 'permanence' and its stress not upon the direct recreation of the past, but rather the process by which the past is constructed or invented" (Cox and Reynolds 1993: 4). Traditional literary historicism holds that the proper aim of literary criticism is to attempt to reconstruct the past *objectively*, whereas new historicism suggests that history is only knowable in the same sense literature is—through subjective interpretation: our understanding of the past is always conducted by our present consciousnesses.

Another preoccupation of New Historicism would be the circulation of discourse both within and through various texts. In order to see the discourse circulating in an era, one has to see not only their literary manifestation, but also their presence in other sorts of cultural representations. New Historicists study not just literary texts by means of New Historical criteria, but other types of texts as well (Rivkin and Ryan, 506).

'New Historicists' are opposed to the pure formalism of the 'New Criticism, Structuralism, Post-Structuralism and Hermeneutics'. New Historicism is associated with research being done in two periods, especially in the English-speaking world: the Renaissance and Romantic period. In the U.S. Stephen Greenblatt was interested in the historical method in the Renaissance, and Jerome McGunn and Marjorie Levinson worked on the Romantic period (Cuddon 1999: 141).

Inspired by Foucault's concepts of discourse and power, New Historicists attempted to show how literary works are entangled in the power relations of their time, not as secondary 'reflections' of any coherent world-view but as active participants in the continual remaking of meanings (Drabble 2000: 719).

Contrary to many older interpretive methods and schools that tend to see historical and literary texts as autonomous entities, Poetics of Culture -termed by Greenblatt for New Historicism- seeks to reveal the relationship between texts and their sociohistorical contexts. Cultural Poetics assumes that "texts not only document the social forces that inform and constitute history and society but also feature prominently in the social processes themselves which fashion both individual identity and the sociohistorical situation" (Veenstra 1995). By means of an economic metaphor, Greenblatt explains how texts and other symbolic goods, by circulating in a society via channels of negotiation and exchange, contribute to the distribution of social energy, by which he means "the intensities of experience that give value and meaning to life and that are also indispensable to the construction of self-awareness and identity." The beating heart, as it were, of this whole process of circulation is identified as "a dialectics of totalization and differentiation, as a powerful social force that oscillates between the extremes of sameness and otherness." In several books Greenblatt has elaborated the various aspects of this Poetics of Culture, such as the circulation of social energy, the dialectics of totalization and differentiation, and the process of self-fashioning (ibid).

H. Aram Veeser, introducing an anthology of essays, *The New Historicism* (1989), noted some key assumptions that continually reappear in New Historicist discourse; they were:

- that every expressive act is embedded in a network of material practices;
- that every act of unmasking, critique and opposition uses the tools it condemns and risks falling prey to the practice it exposes;
- that literary and non-literary "texts" circulate inseparably;
- that no discourse, imaginative or archival, gives access to unchanging truths, nor expresses inalterable human nature;
- that a critical method and a language adequate to describe culture under capitalism participate in the economy they describe.

Rather than characterizing the present as an inevitable outcome of events in the past we must see the present as one possible outcome of those events: to analyze the present then, 'does not consist in a simple characterization of what we are but instead – by following lines of fragility in the present – in managing to grasp why and how that-which-is might no longer be that-which-is' (Foucault 1988c: 36). In a sense, what we have to bear in mind is that the present is both 'a time like any other' as well as 'a time which is never quite like any other' (ibid, 37). Perhaps, what Foucault's form of analysis teaches us is that in some senses the present is unanalyzable since it seems as if it is too complex to see clearly what is happening, and because it is too familiar. However, if we are to analyze it at all, and this does seem to be Foucault's aim, to analyze the present by discussing the past, then we must begin by treating it as if it were more like the past, in all its strangeness (Mills 2005: 79).

2.2.1. Interpretation and Truth: Differences between Traditional Historicism and New Historicism