

WOMEN'S SPACE, WOMEN'S PLACE: TOPOANALYSIS IN STEINBECK'S 'THE CHRYSANTHEMUMS'

Kari Meyers Skredsvig

RESUMEN

La siguiente discusión analiza las formas en que nuestros conceptos de espacio se transforman en criterios de lugar, especialmente en lo relacionado con esferas de género. En 'El Crisantemo', el contexto patriarcal circunscribe no sólo el espacio personal de Elisa Allen sino también su identidad personal y social en formas que limitan severamente su individualidad y satisfacción.

ABSTRACT

The following discussion analyzes the ways in which our concepts of space are transposed into issues of place, especially in the sense of gendered spheres. In "The Chrysanthemums," the patriarchal context circumscribes not only Elisa Allen's personal space, but also her personal and social identity in ways which severely limit her selfhood and satisfaction.

In *The Poetics of Space*, Gaston Bachelard suggests a new perspective from which to view the "setting" of mythic realities which are stored deep in our memory, a "systematic psychological study of the sites of our intimate lives" which he calls "topoanalysis" (8). Bachelard is interested in examining the ways in which we constitute, garner, and retrieve those psychic phenomena which give us a primal sense of personal space and place. He asserts that "all really inhabited space bears the essence of the notion of home" (5); we situate ourselves in the universe by grounding ourselves in images which reassure us that we exist, the primary one being that of "home." Home becomes a metaphor for selfhood, a touchstone which centers our identity, a paradoxically dynamic, ephemeral essence. Although Bachelard's discussion revolves around a very individualized concept of home and self, it suggests interesting possibilities for application at a collective level as well, a kind of shared idea of who we are both as a society and within a cultural context in terms of our concept of self, especially as defined through our relationships with others. In the following discussion, I will examine "the dialectics of outside and inside" (to use Bachelard's phrase) in John Steinbeck's short story "The Chrysanthemums" in terms of how public and private spaces are constituted and juxtaposed

in significantly gendered ways to both define and determine the attitudes, behavior, and representation of Elisa Allen.

The key "topoanalytical" issues in this story are all related to the question of "women's sphere," that is, to the culturally assigned space for women. Elizabeth Janeway, among others, reminds us that every society constructs its own social mythology in an "attempt to interpret, to justify the way things are . . . by enunciating beliefs and general assumptions" (295). Thus, "social truths are agreed-upon beliefs" which are constructed by and concomitantly construct all members of the society. As explained by Kate Millett, in her classic text *Sexual Politics*, these social "truths" are founded upon "sexual politics." Millett asserts that "the essence of politics is power" and defines politics in its largest sense as "power-structured relationships, arrangements whereby one group of persons is controlled by another" (23). From this perspective, "sex is a status category with political implications." According to Millett, the ideology and power of the hegemonic group are propagated through the socialization process:

Sexual politics obtains consent through the "socialization" of both sexes to basic patriarchal politics with regard to temperament, role, and status. As to status, a pervasive assent to the prejudice of male superiority guarantees superior status in the male, inferior in the female. The first item, temperament, involves the formation of human personality along stereotyped lines of sex category ("masculine" and "feminine") based on the needs and values of the dominant group and dictated by what its members cherish in themselves and find convenient in subordinates... This is complemented by... sex role, which decrees a consonant and highly elaborate code of conduct, gesture and attitude for each sex (26).

Millett finds these three aspects to be totally interdependent, with "status as the political component, role as the sociological, and temperament as the psychological" (26). In other words, the individual's personal and social identities are essentially founded upon biological sexual polarization and its repercussions.

This identity issue has also been argued in the guise of "nature versus nurture" considerations. The question here is whether the obvious biological differences, which center on reproductive organs, are necessarily accompanied by equally significant innate traits of a psychological order, a polemic which has raged continuously since at least Aristotle's time without no definitive resolution. Aristotle claimed that women were essentially lesser beings, members of the same species but possessing different potential in terms of their abilities to reason, reproduce, and govern. Through an elaborate series of logical maneuvers, Aristotle explains the reasons for women's intellectual, moral, and physical inferiority, which in turn "justifies" their subordinate position in society. As a philosophical father in every sense of the word, Aristotle laid the foundation for centuries of future patriarchs' claims of male superiority, a foundation which dominates to this day. The observation of sexual dichotomy is escalated to a polarization which in turn lends itself to social differentiation and political hierarchization. The results are readily evident in ongoing debates concerning education, psychology, linguistics, communication, politics, economics, work, religion, law, and every other aspect of human sociality.

Specifically in terms of gender, however, the polemics rage over different theories of sexual/gender difference. Stephen Jay Gould differentiates between "biological determinism, a theory of limits, and biology viewed as a range of expectations, a theory of 'biological potentiality,'" while others question "why men and women are classified in the social order

in ways unrelated to their biological differences and biological functioning—that is, by their intellectual, moral, and emotional makeup” (Epstein 6). Epstein states that we must “identify the ways in which only the female sex is identified in terms of biology while members of the male sex are regarded as social beings” (6), which is germinal to feminist issues. The discussions are as endless and the viewpoints as varied as those engaging in debate, and are likely to remain so, for as John Stuart Mill asserted, “I deny that anyone knows, or can know, the nature of the two sexes, so long as they have only been seen in their present relation to one another . . . What is now called the nature of woman is an eminently artificial thing” (qtd. in Millett, 94). How can we discover “human nature” when “human nurture” is unavoidably superimposed?

One unexpected similarity among all these theories, however, is that men and women are perceived as operating within different spheres, even though definitions of those spheres, not to mention attitudes towards them, vary radically. Historically and traditionally speaking, men's sphere has been construed as all that is public; women's sphere has consequently been defined as what is private, stemming from those biological realities which make the female the child-bearer and early caretaker and a patriarchal desire to differentiate. One especially intriguing theory which has developed from this debate is the “complementary but equal” theory, which suggests that “women's control over the private sphere compensated for the limitations on their participation elsewhere” (Epstein 111), with a curious logic not unlike Beelzebub's affirmation in Milton's *Paradise Lost* that it is “better to reign in Hell, than serve in Heaven.” While the complementation is evident, the claim of equality is significantly less so, given the inequality of the ascribed spheres. Janeway describes this as a bargain in which women receive “private power in return for public submission” (56), clearly a dubious exchange. As Simone de Beauvoir so eloquently affirms, “[Woman] is defined and differentiated with reference to man and not he with reference to her; she is the incidental, the inessential as opposed to the essential. He is the Subject, he is the Absolute—she is the Other” (xxii). The consequences of this in terms of women's sphere are devastating: women are removed not only from the public eye but also from public participation and relegated to the practical, private areas of homemaking and caretaking and to intangible areas of religion and morality, while men control all public and therefore power-related activities. And because this now carries the weight of centuries of tradition, this social structuration and its corollaries, gendered roles, have come to be seen as “natural.”

Steinbeck's “The Chrysanthemums” very clearly presents a setting in which “it's a man's world” and “a woman's place is in the home,” as folk wisdom instructs us. The farm where Elisa and Henry Allen live in the Salinas Valley is “Henry Allen's foothill ranch,” not “their” ranch. Henry is in charge of all the major work on the farm: plowing, planting and cutting the hay, tending to the orchards and the cattle. When the story opens, he is in the midst of a conversation with two other men out by the tractor shed, where they “smoked cigarettes and studied the machine as they talked” (1317). As he later explains to Elisa, the men were from the Western Meat Company and were negotiating to buy cattle from him; he proudly informs her that “I sold them those thirty head of three-year-old steers. Got nearly my own price, too.” The cattle, the price, and the right to do business are all “his,” while Elisa's only participation is that of observer.

The public nature of the men's sphere is even more evident in the situation of the tinker. He spends his entire life literally on the road, roaming up and down the west coast in

search of “fix-it” jobs, sleeping in his wagon. As he explains to Elisa, he “ain’t in any hurry” and can take as long or as little time as he likes in his travels. But when Elisa says it sounds like a nice life and expresses a desire—actually more a wishful thinking—that women could live likewise, his response is immediate and censorial: “It ain’t the right kind of life for a woman It would be a lonely life for a woman . . . and a scarey [sic] life, too . . .” (1322). The implications are clear: women need company, women need protection, women are not capable of taking care of themselves in potentially dangerous situations, and even if they were, it is not an acceptable lifestyle for a woman.

The tinker also asserts not only his authority but his superiority in terms of his job. The words painted on the canvas of his wagon, in “clumsy, crooked letters,” announce not only his lack of formal education but his work: “Pots, pans, knives, sisors, lawn mores, Fixed” (1319). The narrator carefully specifies that the list of articles is printed in two rows, with the “triumphantly definitive ‘Fixed’ below.” He is clearly proud of his skills: he claims that mending a copper-bottom washtub is “a hard job but I do it good.” He is proud of his knowledge and ability to use tools, as well: “Most people just ruin scissors trying to sharpen ‘em, but I know how. I got a special tool.” He is also proud of his reputation: “I know folks on the highway clear from Seattle to San Diego. They save their things for me to sharpen up because they know I do it so good and save them money” (1320). Every time he feels challenged by Elisa, he reacts defensively, in a situation which rather ludicrously parallels that of the confrontation between their dogs when he arrives. When Elisa expresses her opinion that the man’s team would be incapable of fording the river ahead, he replies “with some asperity” that “It might surprise you what them beasts can pull through” (1319). When she offers him advice about which road to take in order to save time, he responds that time is not an issue for him. Above all, when Elisa challenges him directly by claiming to be as competent as he is at fixing things, he retaliates. Elisa asserts “You might be surprised to have a rival some time. I can sharpen scissors, too. And I can beat the dents out of little pots. I could show you what a woman might do” (1322). Since by now he has mended her pots and been paid, he has no more vested interest in making her feel good about herself so she will be responsive to him, so he concentrates on “putting her in her place” by reminding her that as a woman she does not have the same freedom as men do, a reality with which she cannot argue. This is a man’s world, and as such, they appropriate the right to define women’s sphere.

Elisa’s space is essentially defined as the house and the garden. The description of the house serves as a metaphor for circumscribing her realm: it was a “neat white farm house with red geraniums close-banked around it” (1317). The flowers seem to serve as markers for her realm, hemming in the house in a manner analogous to the way women’s sphere is likewise delimited in this patriarchy. It is, of course, appropriate that flowers be used for this purpose, since they have traditionally been associated with women. Flowers represent many of the qualities ascribed to women in a patriarchy: delicacy, beauty, fragility, innocence (especially in the form of buds, symbolic of women’s virginity). They also are a tribute to women’s ability to create and nurture life. The fact that these geraniums are red reinforces the suggestion of life-giving, like blood, as well as a certain strength, although at a more subversive level, it could also be associated with passion and sexual desire. The house is “a hard-swept looking little house, with hard-polished windows, and a clean mud-mat on the front steps,” all of which render evidence of Elisa’s apparent acceptance of these responsibilities and competence in her

designated duties. There is also, however, a hint of obsessiveness, not to mention hysteria, in the repetition of the adjective "hard" and the irony of the fact that even the mud-mat is clean. Elisa clearly takes her duties seriously, but perhaps she also finds them rather too easy in terms of challenging her sufficiently or even filling her time adequately.

The flower garden constitutes an extension of the house in significant ways. It is clearly designated as Elisa's space: it is "her flower garden," not "theirs," and she does "her work" there, not just "work." In the same way that she takes care of her husband, as demonstrated in her making sure that he has hot water for his bath and in the way she lays out his clothes (including his "polished shoes" which, under the circumstances, one can only assume are polished as hard as the windows and by the same hands), she takes care of the plants in her garden. There are "no aphids, no sowbugs or snails or cutworms" among the shoots because her "terrier fingers destroyed such pests before they could get started" (1318). She knows exactly how to take the best care possible of the plants, and she does so conscientiously: "There was a little square sandy bed kept for rooting the chrysanthemums. With her trowel she turned the soil over and over, and smoothed it and patted it firm . . . Back at the chrysanthemum bed she pulled out the little crisp shoots, trimmed off the leaves of each one with her scissors and laid it on a small orderly pile" (1318). Her explicit instructions to the tinker about how his supposed client should care for the little pot of shoots also demonstrates her knowledge about these plants: "she must set them out, about a foot apart in good rich earth like this . . . They'll grow fast and tall . . . In July tell her to cut them down, about eight inches from the ground . . . before they bloom. About the last of September the buds will start" (1321). Her garden is an important part of her domain.

The fact that Elisa is an expert gardener is acknowledged by Elisa herself, demonstrated by her success in growing chrysanthemums, and significantly, reinforced by her husband's agreement. Elisa describes her talent for gardening as part of her female heritage: "I've a gift with things, all right. My mother had it. She could stick anything in the ground and make it grow. She said it was having planters' hands that knew how to do it" (1318). She tells the tinker that she raises chrysanthemums every year "bigger than anybody around here." Henry compliments her on her "gift," and remembers that "Some of those yellow chrysanthemums you had this year were ten inches across," which prompts him to say "I wish you'd work out in the orchard and raise some apples that big" (1318). She responds eagerly, more than willing to accept the challenge, but Henry does not pursue it; rather, he reminds her of her "place" by simply repeating that "it sure works with flowers." Even Elisa's apparently superior skill with plants is insufficient to break down the well-defined borders of their gendered spheres, in spite of the potential gains.

In keeping with the hereditary nature of Elisa's planting skills is the possibility that her gardening is a sublimation of her frustration over having no children and a projection of her "natural" role as mother. In other words, it is a manifestation of her "maternal instinct." Her skill, her pride, her nurturing, and her love of the chrysanthemums are all traditional attributes of "motherhood" which are easily transferable. The question here is whether Elisa gardens as a substitute for "real" mothering, or whether she gardens because that is the only activity permitted her outside of housework and caring for her husband in this rural patriarchy. At stake, of course, is the concept of motherhood as biologically determined or culturally defined. In the first instance, the fact that a woman's body can bear children is perceived as a

responsibility and as a given, as innate and undeniable, as a defining characteristic of what it means to be a woman. In the second instance, motherhood is perceived as contingent upon the cultural context, flexible in its characterization and simply one option which women have. Motherhood as essence suggests that Elisa "needs" to give life and nurture, while motherhood as option deflects attention away from her biological sex and onto the social conditions which circumscribe her life choices.

But as with the house, the gardening is apparently inadequate to Elisa's needs. Her work with the scissors is "over-eager, over-powerful," and "the chrysanthemum stems seemed too small and easy for her energy" (1317). There are other details throughout the story which also suggest that Elisa is far from fulfilling her potential. Elisa is described as a thirty-five-year-old woman whose "face was lean and strong and [whose] eyes were as clear as water" (1317); shortly after, she is again described as "eager and mature and handsome." From the evidence of the house and garden, it appears that her energy level and competence are equally high, even though her potential is less than fully developed. Even the path from the garden to the house is lined with geraniums, and the new chrysanthemum shoots are a veritable "forest." Her conversation with the tinker, her constant observation of her husband's business dealings, and her desire to "prove herself" with the orchards all seem to indicate unexploited potential. Even her bathing—especially her bathing—is an expression of lack of satisfaction: "she scrubbed herself with a little block of pumice, legs and thighs, loins and chest and arms, until her skin was scratched and red" (1322). That done, she stood in front of a mirror and "looked at her body," then "[a]fter a while she began to dress." Her rough treatment of her body, followed by her awareness of and interest in her own nudity, are followed by her putting on "her newest underclothing and her nicest stockings and the dress which was the symbol of her prettiness," after which she "worked carefully on her hair, penciled her eyebrows and rouged her lips" (1323). This intense emphasis on the physical, followed by her conscientious enhancement of her appearance, suggests that her frustration might be sexual as well.

There are other important signals that support the idea of sexual lack of fulfillment. Although there are few details about her relationship with Henry, the information given is significant. When Henry comes into the house to get ready, Elisa yells out that she is "in my room dressing." Once again, the possessive pronoun is a subtle clue that Elisa's space is well-defined at all times. One would expect Henry and Elisa, to share both a room and a bed, which might not be the case here. After Elisa gets dressed, she sits "primly and stiffly" on the porch, once again the proper lady. When Henry sees Elisa all dressed up, she "stiffened and her face grew tight," whether in anxiety or anticipation we cannot know, while he stops to take a second look. He says she looks "nice," and clarifies by saying she looks "different, strong, and happy" (1323). She boasts that she is strong: "I never knew before how strong." Henry is confused at this new behavior from his wife; he is unused to seeing her self-confident, almost arrogant, and playful. Quite obviously, their relationship has not been one of shared opinions and confidences, or even shared humor, much less of other types of intimacy. The encounter with the tinker, which comes between their earlier conversation about her planting skills and their evening in town, seems to have catalyzed Elisa's attitudes and demeanor.

The tinker himself is not an attractive man in any sense, but his attention and his lifestyle function almost like an aphrodisiac on Elisa. He is described as a "big stubble-bearded man" whose "hair and beard were graying" and whose "eyes were dark . . . and full

of the brooding that gets in the eyes of teamsters and of sailors" (1319). His "worn black suit was wrinkled and spotted with grease" and his "calloused hands . . . were cracked, and every crack was a black line" (1319). Although the way in which he manipulates Elisa into giving him work suggests he is clever in a devious sort of way, there is little to commend him. When Elisa is first confronted with him, she is working in her garden, dressed in a "a man's black hat . . . clodhopper shoes, a figured print dress almost completely covered by a big corduroy apron . . . [and] heavy leather gloves to protect her hands" (1317). It is almost as though she were using "masculine" clothing as protection, or perhaps as appropriate accompaniment to the "snips, the trowel and scratcher, . . . the knife" she worked with, the only tools allowed her within the garden domain.

Elisa's reactions escalate in direct proportion to the interest and proximity of the tinker. When the tinker appears, she "shoves the thick scissors in her apron pocket," then took off her gloves and "touched the under edge of her man's hat, searching for fugitive hairs" (1320), thus metaphorically letting down her guard. When he begins to show interest in her flowers, all "irritation and resistance melted from Elisa's face" and "her eyes grew alert and eager" (1320). When he asks for some flowers "for his customer," Elisa's "eyes shone" and she "tore off the battered hat and shook out her dark pretty hair," further exposing herself and her femininity. She runs "excitedly" to get a pot, and her "gloves were forgotten now" and she "dug up the sandy soil with her fingers and . . . [w]ith her strong fingers she pressed them into the sand and tamped around them with her knuckles" (1321). Having reached a very physical level, as she explains the care of the sprouts to the tinker, the details of her description seem to simulate sexual excitement as well: her face was "tight with eagerness . . . She looked deep into his eyes, searchingly. Her mouth opened a little . . . Her breast swelled passionately . . . Her voice grew husky." This culminates when she compares the act of planting with the night sky: "Why, you rise up and up! Every pointed star gets driven into your body. It's like that. Hot and sharp and—lovely" (1321). Elisa's movements parallel this graphic sexual imagery: "Kneeling there, her hand went out toward his legs in the greasy black trousers. Her hesitant fingers almost touched the cloth. The her hand dropped to the ground. She crouched low like a fawning dog." He is "self-conscious" but uninterested, and she is immediately "ashamed." Clearly Elisa has passed unspoken boundaries in taking the initiative and in exposing herself as a sexual being. In this rural patriarchy, it is not her place to do so; rather, she is not allowed to demonstrate sexual need or desire.

The Elisa we see in this scene is significantly different from the woman who quietly observes her husband talking with other men and the Elisa who sits "stiffly and primly" on the porch, passively waiting for her husband. She is vibrantly alive, active and enthusiastic, an agent taking on the world on her own terms. Needless to say, this moment—which from a patriarchal perspective should have never happened—is doomed to be short-lived. As a woman, it is Elisa's role to be decorous, proper, submissive, passive, and silent; her actions and words violate every restriction imposed upon her. She has unquestionably trespassed into men's sphere, and her ritual cleansing immediately afterwards suggests her awareness and acceptance of this transgression. Even if her relationship with her husband is unfulfilling, it is not her place to try to remedy the situation: passivity and silence are the two most highly prized traits of femininity as defined by a patriarchy. As has been amply discussed by a multitude of critics, perhaps most notably by Millett and de Beauvoir, women's proclivity for surpassing imposed

limits (or being disobedient, depending upon one's perspective) and the consequences of that behavior have been clearly recorded in a myriad of ways throughout history. The two prime examples of this, however, are Pandora and Eve. Pandora is credited with no less than all the miseries in the world because of her untempered curiosity, and Eve, of course, is blamed for the fall of all of humanity from a privileged state of grace. It is no wonder, then, that men have deemed it desirable to confine women to a sphere where their "natural" inferiority is unable to cause more damage, although others see it as an attempt to curb women's power.

From a patriarchal perspective, Elisa "deserves" her punishment, which comes in the final scene. On the way into town, Elisa sees the tinker's caravan up ahead, and her chrysanthemum sprouts on the ground beside the road. And although she tries to avoid both the sight of the plants and the unavoidable conclusion that what she values most highly about herself is of no consequence to anyone else, she is unsuccessful. At best, the tinker's careless discarding of the plants (he keeps the pot) implies indifference, at worst, disdain or rejection. Ironically, she is so distant from her husband that she cannot even share the experience, much less her feelings, with him, and she merely "whispered to herself sadly." There is a vestige of the newly self-aware, rebellious Elisa in her questions about the prize fights, however, a curiosity and interest which she would obviously like to indulge, but does not. When Henry asks her if she wants to go to the fights—after prefacing the question with his opinion that she will not like them—Elisa responds, "Oh, no. No. I don't want to go. I'm sure I don't . . . It will be enough if we can have wine. It will be plenty" (1324). Her refusal seems to signal resignation, a regression into her former sphere, her strength vanished, even though her insistent repetition belies the fact that she would like it to be otherwise. Her spirit vanquished, her initiative halted, her sphere clearly re-established, she even feels compelled to ask Henry's permission to have wine with dinner. Her docility and impotence are once again foremost as she turns from Henry and begins "crying weakly—like an old woman" (1324). She once again becomes a prototype for womanhood as defined in a patriarchy: weak, emotional, submissive, and inferior. She surrenders to an imposed designation of her center, her "home." She is reduced to her "proper" place.

A topoanalytical discussion of "The Chrysanthemums" clearly reminds us of the human propensity for dichotomization. Within gender studies, this activates serious debate between those who see this tendency as a consequence of a combination of patriarchal dualism and competitiveness versus womanly networking, and those who do not. Leaving aside the issue of whether this is "nature" or "nurture," of greater importance at the moment is simply the fact that western societies, at least, manifest a strong preference for ordering their world in this fashion. Not only do we classify and categorize in our attempts to understand the universe and our place within it, but we also tend to polarize. In "The Chrysanthemums," the perspective of spatial organization leads us to contrast interior space with exterior space in significant ways, stemming from the fundamental juxtaposition of "One" and "Other." In a patriarchy, men are the center, women the margin. On the surface, men are in charge of public space, women of private space (although in reality the hegemonic group controls both, of course, by defining the sphere of each). Public space is unlimited, while private space is closely circumscribed. (In another sense, however—that of personal interior space—there are no limits to selfhood, even when public space imposes them.) The dichotomy can also be perceived in terms of public identity versus private identity. Which is our "real" identity: that

which we construct for ourselves, or that which is attributed to us? To what extent is the gendered nature of those identities inherent, to what extent learned?

In his contemplation of the significance of space, Bachelard has observed that "Immensity is within ourselves. It is attached to a sort of expansion of being that life curbs and caution arrests . . ." (184). To put it another way, human potential is in itself unlimited, but humans find ways to impose restrictions. In a patriarchy, as Epstein has observed, women seem to have opportunities to exert control only in the "spheres relinquished by men" (234). When "space" is transformed into "place" or "sphere," immensity is not a possibility; being is restricted rather than expanded. Space may be "natural," but social "nurturing" defines it, with every definition necessarily implying limitation. When gender considerations take priority over human nature, the existence of spheres is the consequence, with their concomitant divisions, prejudices, and negations. Biology is destiny only if it is construed as essence and the entire socio-historical context is ignored. As Simone de Beauvoir affirms, "Woman, like man, *is* her body; but her body is something other than herself" (29).

Bibliography

- Bachelard, Gaston. 1958. *The Poetics of Space*. Trans. Maria Jolas. Boston: Beacon, 1964.
- Beauvoir, Simone de. 1948. *The Second Sex*. Trans. and ed. H. M. Parshley. 1953. NY: Vintage/Random, 1981.
- Brownmiller, Susan. 1984. *Femininity*. NY: Linden.
- Epstein, Cynthia Fuchs. 1988. *Deceptive Distinctions: Sex, Gender, and the Social Order*. New Haven: Yale UP.
- Flynn, Elizabeth A. and Patrocínio P. Schweickart, eds. 1986. *Gender and Reading: Essays on Readers, Texts, and Contexts*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP.
- Janeway, Elizabeth. 1971. *Man's World, Woman's Place: A Study in Social Mythology*. NY: Morrow.
- Millett, Kate. 1970. *Sexual Politics*. NY: Doubleday.
- Steinbeck, John. 1938. "The Chrysanthemums." *Fiction 100*. 5th ed. Ed. James H. Pickering. NY: Macmillan, 1988. 1317-1324.
- Warhol, Robyn R., and Diane Price Herndl, eds. 1991. *Feminisms*. New Brunswick: Rutgers.
- Weinstein, Arnold. 1993. *Nobody's Home: Speech, Self, and Place in American Fiction from Hawthorne to DeLillo*. NY: Oxford.