

City University of New York (CUNY)

CUNY Academic Works

All Dissertations, Theses, and Capstone
Projects

Dissertations, Theses, and Capstone Projects

9-2020

Describing the Dress of Women: Author's Notes on the Development of Gender

Cassandra B. Tan

The Graduate Center, City University of New York

[How does access to this work benefit you? Let us know!](#)

More information about this work at: https://academicworks.cuny.edu/gc_etds/3959

Discover additional works at: <https://academicworks.cuny.edu>

This work is made publicly available by the City University of New York (CUNY).
Contact: AcademicWorks@cuny.edu

DESCRIBING THE DRESS OF WOMEN: AUTHOR'S NOTES ON THE DEVELOPMENT OF
GENDER
BY CASSANDRA TAN

A master's thesis submitted to the Graduate Faculty in Liberal Studies in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts, The City University of New York
2020

Describing The Dress of Women: Author's Notes On The Development of Gender

By

Cassandra Tan

This manuscript has been read and accepted for the Graduate Faculty in Liberal Studies in satisfaction of the thesis requirement for the degree in Master of Arts.

Dr. David Humphries

Thesis Advisor

Dr. Elizabeth Macaulay-Lewis

Executive Officer

THE CITY UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK

ABSTRACT

Describing The Dress of Women: Author's Notes On The Development of Gender

By

Cassandra Tan

Advisor: Dr. David Humphries

This thesis is an examination of how authors of the late Victorian and early Twentieth Century describe the embodied and mental effects of the nature of women's clothing through works of fiction and nonfiction. Through this analysis, I argue that clothing serves as a mechanism to oppress women by eliminating concrete and philosophical access to wealth and necessities as well as by instigating acts of violence upon a developing body through stricture and hygiene. I examine the ways that feminine dress, from youth through adulthood, shapes the way women view themselves, and in turn has a reciprocal effect on how they view their place in the world. I work primarily through the writing of Charlotte Perkins Gilman, but use George Eliot and Virginia Woolf to give contextual contrast to my arguments. In addition, I employ a variety of methods of literary theory, drawing primarily from a cultural materialist and Marxist perspective of embodiment and means, but also diving into esoteric views of literary narratives, fashion theory, and the history of fashion. I conclude that the patriarchal imposition placed upon women's garments is emblematic of the historical, patriarchal oppression.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First of all, a big “no thank you” goes to the Coronavirus, for truly delaying the completion of my thesis. But a big thank you for saving me money on my regalia. My thesis would not have been able to be completed without the guidance and help of fellow Northeast Ohioan Professor David Humphries who took me on without ever having met me, and really stepped in and helped me turn a million ideas into one cohesive thesis. I also owe Elizabeth Macaulay-Lewis and Kathy Koutsis for helping me when I thought all was lost at the beginning of the semester, and also for their guidance throughout my academic career at The Graduate Center. I would be remiss if I did not mention the guidance of Professor Blanche Cook, who has been an inspiration to me at The Graduate Center, a friend, and mentor. I want to thank Professor Elizabeth Wissinger for introducing me to fashion theory, and how it can be applied in more areas than just lace and dresses. And I want to thank Professor Jean O’Malley for inspiring me to explore developmental gendered embodiment, and for giving me the courage to look to myself for expertise in the area.

Also, thank you to my husband and kids who ate a lot of takeout as I wrote this, and my husband who bought me a Nespresso machine just for the occasion.

Table of Contents

ABSTRACT	IV
INTRODUCTION: DESCRIBING THE DRESS OF WOMEN: AUTHOR'S NOTES ON THE DEVELOPMENT OF GENDER	1
POTENTIAL PROBLEMS:	6
THE SHAPING OF GILMAN:	8
DRESS AND GILMAN:	12
LINGUISTIC CHOICE AND ITS IMPLICATIONS	18
POCKETS AND THEIR IMPORTANCE	22
ADVERTISEMENTS AS NARRATIVE	33
ELIOT'S <i>MIDDLEMARCH</i>	37
POCKETS FULL OF VIOLENCE IN WOOLF'S <i>DALLOWAY</i>	44
WHAT HAPPENS WHEN A FIXATION BECOMES A POINT OF PROCESS FOR AN AUTHOR	47
CONCLUSION	49

Introduction: Describing the Dress of Women: Author's Notes On The Development of Gender

If “The clothes make the man,” do they not also make the woman? When it comes to the development of gender, the ways in which the body is adorned has significant impact on the person within that adornment. Gender scholars grapple with how to best examine the ways into which a person accesses their gender and how external stimuli might have an effect on the developmental gendered embodiment and adult self-identity. It is my assertion that we can learn a great deal about the situational historical development of gendered embodiment through the examination of works of varied historical writings, provided that scholars have access to a broad catalogue of both fictional and non-fictional work of each author whose works are being examined. This type of historical analysis could prove crucial to how we understand the course of the progress of gender embodiment so that we may better understand how our collective memory is affecting how gender is performed in the present, as well as how it may be performed in the future.

As I am primarily concerned with the affective nature of clothing and adornment on the development of female bodies, my research opens up an area of exploration that could have a transitive property in the development of male, transgendered or nonbinary persons. I will accomplish this through the examination of three authors who have vast, searchable libraries of published work from which to draw. I will be employing the use of data searches, psychological study, fashion theory, and as well as gender and literary theory to examine the nature of garments and how they affect the development of female

(nonmale¹) or assigned female at birth (AFAB) bodies. To my purposes, I have chosen to focus primarily on the works of Charlotte Perkins Gilman, but I am also bringing in two additional sources in George Eliot and Virginia Woolf to further illustrate one specific point of interest in the notion of how the constraints of women's clothing are subconsciously associated with an innate expression of female value, and how aspects of gendered embodiment and self-identity become inextricably linked to both the actual and the metaphorical implications of feminine dress. I chose these three authors because they are emblematic of three pieces of an era.

How our bodies react to stimuli and how they feel in space influences how our mind processes thought, feeling, and cognition. This idea of embodied cognition is a relatively new field of psychology and psychological neuroscience, first gaining real ground in 2005, when social psychologist Paula Niedenthal and her cohort began exposing the problems inherent in the idea that the body and the brain are developmentally different from one another, and that amodal architectures -- those perceptions built without exterior modalities -- are not the only ways in which the body and brain develop. For years, it was thought that the "software" or the brain of the person was independent and apart from the "hardware" or the body of the person. Niedenthal et al. were the first cognitive psychologists, but not the first theorists (Judith Butler has been saying things to this effect for decades) to posit that exterior influences are capable of affecting interior spaces to the point where the emotion that develops from that can override education, practicality, and

¹ "Nonmale" is a term used within the gender activist community that comprises everyone who does not specifically identify as male or a man. It is typically used in conjunction with the term "femme" or "woman," but both femme and woman are also nonmales. However, the distinction is important.

base cognition. For example, if a child is raised to always speak softly, and reprimanded when they shout or speak up, it would be understandable if they developed a shy or unassuming personality. If they are encouraged to speak their mind, and given the opportunity to do so, they might become a more confident person. The researchers put to scientific record what Gilman expressed at the turn of the century when she writes in *The Home, Its Work, and Its Influence*, that,

The modifying influences of social environment have deeper and surer effect on the human race than any others, and that effect is strongest on the young. Therefore, we attach great importance to what we call the "bringing up" of children, and we are right. The education of the little child, through the influences of its early environment, is the most important process of human life (1510).

The lack of stringent adherence to the way the brain made allowances for how the body was structured even in Eliot's Victorian Era made these her authors interesting to me.

Woolf takes the idea a step beyond even Gilman and uses the subliminal to expose reactions and embodied notions of fear and recognition. These authors show the evolution of an idea that developed over a century, and now that there is definite language for it, and science surrounding it, the evaluation can become so much more dynamic. How did the female mind become the way it is inside of the female body, and what exterior influences and mental nudging was at play?

The primary reason I chose to study each of these authors is individual to that woman. I look at George Eliot (née, Mary Ann Evans), who was a late Victorian author who took up a male nom de plume to publish her work, and yet who managed to subvert the patriarchal systems of gender compliance by writing texts that showed the corruption of

English society in a way that angered men and women equally. Gilman was a firebrand and social intellectual active during the American women's suffrage movement. She was a victim of medical malpractice and spoke of the inequities of care in female health and development years before Atwood would write *Handmaid's Tale*. Woolf (nee Adeline Virginia Stephen), was the bohemian author of deep introspective work -- and clearly influenced by both Eliot and Gilman. These three women were of similar educational backgrounds and were also of the same race and class. But where Eliot and Gilman were constrained by the popularity of certain forms of literature of their times, Woolf was born into a period where experiment was more common, and therefore considered readable by the masses.

On top of that, all three of these women also all have the additional similarity of publishing or editing literary journals or magazines. Eliot was the editor of *The Westminster Review* (Gray 212), Gilman of *Forerunner*, and Woolf of *Hogarth Press* and *The Bloomsbury Review* (Heyes). The three women obviously desired some level of influence over their readers that mere fiction would not provide. While Gilman's paper was a one woman show, the others had editorial authority over a variety of writers, as well as the ability to publish their own opinions and set the framework and point of view for their publications. These three authors spent a large portion of their writings decrying the misfortunes society held for them for being born a woman. All lived fairly radical, unorthodox lives in times when this was not celebrated. All three women would write about how they felt that they were different (and indeed this is true) from most of the women of the time -- but even in their most fantastical fiction, the bearings of their sex, and the aspects of their gender, in the way that it was performed in their era, become entwined

in the narrative. A striking thread that these three women share in their creations and carry throughout their works is that they are seemingly preoccupied with wardrobe. Though they all eschew the frippery that was prevalent in women's lives as gauche and romantic, they take great care in describing how clothing affects the body, how it is used to present themselves to others, and how there are real, problematic differences between the dress of women and that of men.

With Gilman, it is impossible to believe that the obsession with clothing and the way women dress is anything other than absolutely purposeful, and I will explain more on that later. With Woolf and Eliot, it seems to happen without conscious thought, an echo in their lives that makes its way into their work, because, as Gilman says in *Women and Economics*, "In spite of the power of the individual will to struggle against conditions, to resist them for a while, and sometimes to overcome them, it remains true that the human creature is affected by his environment" (Collected Works 1793). This is because clothing is a part of what May Ling Halim and Diane Ruble (2010) refer to as implicit centrality, or, "the extent to which a given identity is chronically accessible in an individual's everyday, normative experiences as they relate to the self" (497). It is the part of gender development that happens because of the way the world forces them into categorized boxes. It is uncontrollable and external, unlike explicit centrality, which is the way the person sees themselves as they develop. One cannot form without the other, and this inextricable linkage causes slipperiness in the development of gender that provides clothing an outsized level of influence. As Judith Butler says in *Bodies That Matter*,

To claim that the materiality of sex is constructed through a ritualized repetition of norms is hardly a self-evident claim. Indeed, our customary notions of 'construction'

seem to get in the way of understanding such a claim. For surely bodies live and die; eat and sleep; feel pain, pleasure; endure illness and violence; and these "facts," one might skeptically proclaim, cannot be dismissed as mere construction (ix).

Potential Problems:

I am aware that there are, of course, inherent problems in proposing research that relies on these three women and their writings being used as material culture to interpret developmental gendered embodiment and how clothing has defined this. The three authors I chose all represent the upper social and educational strata. All three women are white, are privileged in relation to other women of their era (or became so through marriage), and highly learned. Woolf herself once noted that her position of privilege was afforded to few women, and noted that women writers were hamstrung by their station, and that even Eliot, "the emancipated woman," could not live as her contemporaries, instead living smaller, more private lives that led to a lack of exposure to the world that often makes great art (Kronenberger). This difference in lifestyles and upbringings makes for a static understanding of their cultural identity, and delimits the scope of the paper to a fairly privileged position. However, I would argue that because their work became so much a part of the historical record, influencing the society in which it was wrought as well as influencing global culture, that it has merit, and offers up a rubric for how one might open a more intersectional analysis, or cross-cultural analysis of the same. As cultural theorist Brad Evans writes, it is possible "...to pick up anthropological models, especially the concept of culture as a system of signification, while not only remaining politically unscathed but actually pushing forward what many understood to be a radical theoretical

agenda” (434). This research could be applied to varying levels of cultural criticism between races and classes, a key hallmark of broad gender scholarship.

This manner of examining how dress affects embodied development is also problematic in that it is inherently situating itself firmly in a gender binary where fluidity is difficult to manage. I believe that while this binary in practice is utterly false and harmful, it was for some time the only widely-accepted idea about gender and sexuality. (And in many arenas and areas this is still sadly true.) I am working within the framework of the Foucauldian “regulatory ideal.” But, that being said, this exploration of how female (nonmale) bodies develop inside of the problems of this binary could help serve communities outside of that binary. If we know how to look at language to learn how the psychosocial link between linguistics and embodiment can actuate the use of metaphor and style across varying genre of literature, then we can use that same method to turn a critical eye to the trans and nonbinary experience. In the way that female identifying authors write about clothing and the manipulations of men as viewed through that clothing, so may we also view how the violence inherent in the binary are affecting other gendered or agendered people by experiencing their authorship, understanding that this requires publishing to accept and celebrate other gendered and agendered authors as the champions of their own experiences, as opposed to what has happened in the past with these authors (Siegel).

For the purposes of this thesis, I am agreeing with the assertion that there is a certain level of exteriority in what shapes a person’s gender and sense of self, and that exteriority and embodiment is apparent in the writings of authors, particularly that in the works of female authors who are forced to contend with the dual oppression of denied

independence as well as forced standards brought about by the male gaze and the objectification of women's bodies.

The Shaping of Gilman:

"Descriptions aren't any good when it comes to women, and I never was good at descriptions anyhow," or so says the narrator of Charlotte Perkins Gilman's novel, *Herland* (11). However, throughout the entirety of Gilman's oeuvre of works -- women, and specifically the manner in which they clothe themselves, are described over and over again, often in great detail. The level of nuance given to fashion in her writings is a logical authorial position that stems from her work as a reformer. Through these descriptions, Gilman works to equip women with the language required to undermine the oppressive nature of the women's fashion of the epoch, and she uses her talent as a writer to effect change during a period of social upheaval when "modern notions of womanhood were deeply rooted in and debated through images and representations" (Rabinovitch-Fox 15).

Gilman (1860-1935), was born in Hartford, Connecticut to an astonishing literary and activist lineage which included the famous author, Harriot Beecher Stowe — her aunt. Raised by a single mother after her father deserted the family, Gilman was shaped in her early life by the poverty of her situation, but also by her aunts with whom she spent a great deal of time, and who aided in her education. During her first marriage, Gilman would suffer a severe bout of postpartum depression for which she was prescribed the famous "rest cure" by her doctor S. Weir Mitchell. The "rest cure" was such that the patient would be confined from society, cut off and isolated from loved ones as much as possible. They would be fed a diet rich in milk fat, force fed if necessary, and cared for entirely by nurses. They were not allowed to write, to sew, or take care of themselves in any way. Used as a

treatment for everything from neurasthenia to anorexia, it was primarily a treatment for women. This infantilizing treatment, though considered revolutionary at the time, was often worse than the disease it was trying to treat (Stiles). The diseases treated by the so-called rest cure were frequently related to pregnancy and miscarriage, and Mitchell never considered the pregnancy, miscarriage, or loss of children as a potential root cause of the disease, but instead the physical differences in women as well as the draining qualities of childbirth the actual problem. He often referred to these cases in his literature as “hysteria,” and hysterical women were not to be trusted with their own care, or even to honestly relay their emotions or physical aptitude. He determined that prolonged absences from everyday life was the only treatment, a theory later heartily rebuffed by physicians and psychologists who would determine that it was a treatment that was not only inherently misogynistic, but also strongly denied women their own agency and ability for recourse (Bassuk).

Following her period of forced rest with the lack of agency given to her, Gilman would write her most famous work, and perhaps the one by which all of her other works are judged, the semi-autobiographical story, “The Yellow Wallpaper.” She gives the readers a deeper glimpse of the horror of the cure in the preface to the short story, writing that after it was prescribed that she “went home and obeyed those directions for some three months, and came so near the borderline of utter mental ruin that I could see over” (30). However, as she emerged from her illness, taking less benefit from her rest cure than she did her confessional prose, she found herself once again, noting in the preface that she “cast the noted specialist's advice to the winds and went to work again -- work, the normal life of every human being; work, in which is joy and growth and service, without which one is a

pauper and a parasite -ultimately recovering some measure of power" (31). This particular turn of phrase begins to shape for her readers how she views those without means or occupation -- namely, women. She says that work is the thing of every human being, and to a point that's true be it domestic or outside of the house. But at the turn of the century, American women of means did not do much in the way of either, herself during her rest included. She notes that these women are "paupers" and "parasites." It is graphic language to describe the women who ultimately would be the ones reading her work.

After beginning to write again, Gilman made the audacious choice to divorce her husband, a radical idea in the period. In reading "Wallpaper" it is possible to intuit the building resentment Gilman had towards her husband as he was able to live normally and healthfully,² as he had her spirited away in an attempt to fix a part of her that he viewed as broken. This idea of men viewing women as either broken or less-than became a theme of her work in the intervening years between "Wallpaper" and her final publications.

The husband in "The Yellow Wallpaper" becomes a rubric for the men in the rest of her work. They are upright and studious, but also completely oblivious to anything not in their immediate vicinity. They cannot accept that women might have their autonomy or even their own mind. The way Gilman writes of the institution of marriage in general, and her quickness to absolve her own gives the reader clues as to her mindset regarding what marriage does to a woman.

² It should be noted that in the same preface, Gilman note that Mitchell changed his practices of the rest cure after reading "The Yellow Wallpaper," though there is no evidence of this in his own notes. While it remains a historical bit of hearsay, it is what Gilman asserted until her death.

Radical ideas were not uncommon to Gilman who would write books and essays on all manner of topics ranging from the political economy of women, to the problematic nature of motherhood -- all of which were answered with equal parts scorn and adulation by her peers. However, in both her fiction and her nonfiction, she was almost obsessive in the development of girls into women, and how the aesthetics of femininity shape who and what women become. She frequently bemoans the fact that women of her era were designed to be objects of appreciation that curate and coordinate their environment to be suited similarly. She writes of this problem in *The Home, Its Work, and Its Influence* saying that “[s]he may devote as much time to the adornment of the table as she wishes...She may also devote herself to the parlour and its adornment; but most naturally of all to the adornment of her own young body—all these are proper functions of the home” (1530). This theory of girls becoming women through ideas and acts propelled upon them by men would fuel Gilman’s career. While it is nowhere near a unique point of view, few authors of her time were so devoted to the idea. As Butler writes in *Performative Acts and Gender Constitution* (1988) ..to be a woman is to have become a woman, to compel the body to conform to an historical idea of ‘woman,’ to induce the body to become a cultural sign, to materialise oneself in obedience to an historically delimited possibility, and to do this as a sustained and repeated corporeal project” (522). To be historically delimited in possibility - as Butler writes -- by being forced to attend to the fripperies of home and self-beautification, is the quandary set forth by Gilman as it applies to the culture she represents. The construction of woman is a narrow focus of what is thrust upon them by the acts of societal expectation. Butler asks in *Bodies*, “If the subject is constructed, then who is constructing the subject” (15), and “If everything is discourse, what about the body”

(15)? Gilman has at least part of the answer to these questions, at least as they related to the struggles and construction of the female gender of her time. The subject -- women -- were constructed at least in part by the dominating influence of masculine, androcentric culture, and the discourse relates to the body in that the way that women were interacted with and upon made the diminution of ability and agency the currency required to be a woman of the society. It acted upon her body in sometimes oblique, sometimes overt ways, but she was never permitted to be a part of the discourse if she was dissenting from that cultural conviction. It was the moral relativism engaged by men (specifically white men) of the time that allowed them to denigrate whole populations of people.

Dress and Gilman:

Gilman's breadth of work, which spans the gamut from pleasure reading and informative articles, works particularly well as an example of gender theory because of its scope, but also because, as fashion and gender theorist Melyssa Wrisley writes "[s]he embodied the contradictions and struggles of women trying to negotiate the perceived chasm between feminist convictions and cultural expectations" (1). This inner negotiation is evident in a great deal of her writing and as exemplified here in her work *The Dress of Women*, which was Gilman's introduction to the sociological implications of women's clothing, and how it is a driving factor in how women act, how women are perceived, and how they are oriented in society. The work was originally printed in *Forerunner*. She writes,

It is not in the nature of girl children to sit quiet and keep their clothes clean. They would keep on romping and playing as boys do; they do so keep on in the cases where they are allowed; but very early comes the parental mandate on one side and

the boy's scornful repudiation on the other; after which he continues enjoying the exercises which give full free muscular development, while she begins to 'sit still'(Forerunner v.6 1915).

In this excerpt, Gilman is writing about the social grooming process that girls go through in an effort to condition them to the expected behaviors of their sex. Later in the essay Gilman chooses to use exclamatory words like "crippled" and calls the design of the hobble skirt and its ilk "perverted," saying that "Whenever we have been forced to admit the injurious limitations of women's clothes we have met the charge by alleging it to be a necessity, or as something inherent in the nature of women, and also by our perverted ideas of beauty and decorum" (103).

Indeed, the name of the hobble skirt is derived from the manner in which it caused women to walk. This article of dress consisted of a long column of a skirt, typically stitched tightly down the rear of the dress in a single seam, where it opened for a slight pleat at the back of the knee (Blanco 176). They were as Gilman represented, a dangerous, crippling, and sometimes deadly³ interference in the lives of Edwardian age women, meant to force them into dainty, small steps that would be viewed by men as feminine and comely. The hobble skirt had the added problem of rendering a woman's hand useless, as the women

³ From *The New York Times* 1 September, 1911: "Troy, NY A narrow hobble skirt which she was wearing this afternoon, was responsible for the death of Miss Ida Goyette, 18 years old, a resident of Cohoes. While Miss Goyette was crossing a bridge over the Erie Canal, and trying to step over the lock gate, the skirt caused her to stumble and she plunged over the low railing. She fell into the water below, and before she could be rescued, she drowned. Her body was recovered to-nite."

<https://www.nytimes.com/1911/09/01/archives/hobble-skirt-caused-her-death.html>

who wore them were often forced to carry a parasol with them to use to steady their gait, or they were reliant upon the help of a man to keep them steady through their walk. Gilman would likely have been forced at some point to wear one of these skirts, likely during the time of her rest cure, so it seems to be obvious why this would make its way into her dialogue about how women are forced to manipulate their bodies into perverted fashions that keep them unwell but feminine. Her word choice surrounding the garb is absolutely intentional.

Gilman was a master of the language. Each of the words she uses in her works are deliberate and weighty. Lou Ann Matossian writes of Gilman that she “saw in language, as in many other forms of social behavior, the collective self-expression of an evolving species. As human civilization progressed, language would follow, recording new concepts and discarding old prejudices” (1). There are a few instances in her works, where one word stands out as a signal point to the meaning of the narrative. When one considers Gilman’s word choice in relation to fashion, the word “perverted” stands out because of its potential definitions. As per the *Oxford English Dictionary*, the word “perverted” during the time of Gilman could either mean “[t]urn aside from a correct state, course, or aim,” or in its transitive form to mean “[t]o interfere with or distort (a correct order or process); to impede, thwart” (OED). It’s not a word she used frequently in her published works. In fact, I ran a word search through her collected works to determine the frequency of her usage of this word so that I may compare its use in different contexts and was surprised by the results. I discovered that she used it utterly rarely -- in fact, only nine times in her published pieces does any variation of the word “perverted,” or its root word “pervert,” appear. The use of the word pervert/perversion/perverted so sparingly and pointedly

strikes me as notable because of how it has been used historically -- specifically by Gilman's contemporary Carl Jung -- to describe a type of sexual unnaturalness that is based on a culture of intimate dominance and violence (Ross, 2013). Gilman, more often than not, chose to repeat words and patterns throughout her work. This might be due in part to her persuasive technique, but it also could be used to help the women who read her work more readily understand the concepts presented. While her theories and rationale are complex and reasoned to the point of unblinking understanding, she is not one for a great deal of extraneous dialogue, and therefore she is known for using a smaller variety of words. To find this word used so sparingly is telling. There must be little of which she views with such distinct disgust and of which she is so compelled to persuade readers to shift their ideas to better align with what she sees should be the ideal.

That doesn't mean that Gilman is some sort of linguistic dictator. When Gilman uses the word to describe the clothing of women in her works of nonfiction, the point of the word is up for interpretation by the readers. Gilman just provides enough of a directional hint in the form of facts and recollection that the point is easier to find. As in the case of *The Dress of Women*, she says that the hobble skirt has come to be fashion due to humanity's "perverted" ideas of dress and decorum (103). If we consider the use of "pervert" as a piece of the entire argument of the work, it could be read as the means by which the male inclinations toward a woman's feminine form, and the women's reticence to challenge those notions, have altered or thwarted the natural order of the body and its strengths. Gilman is aware that there is a level of complicity happening on the part of the woman that they continue to wear these body-altering garments that are meant to lure the gaze of the men, even if they pervert the structure of the women's bodies.

She argues that if society did not put these impediments on the girls of the species, they would naturally be as inclined toward activity and motion as their male counterparts, and would thrive in similar actions of physicality. However, because of the stress and strain of constrictive and purposefully prim and pure clothing that requires a level of fastidiousness unnatural to children, girls' bodies are not able to mature at the same rate or in the same fashion as boys' bodies are allowed. She notes this developmental stumbling block for girls in *The Dress of Women*, saying,

The vigorous girl may be a good walker; she may dance long and well, thus proving the possession of good muscles and of endurance, but she lacks that full coordination of all the muscles which the untrammelled boy develops. She grows stiff sooner, ages earlier, falls more readily, is more liable to strain and sprain because of being less able to promptly recover herself from falling (103).

Gilman argues that the effects of the weight of these garments are not merely mental, and not merely physiological, but that each has a reciprocal effect upon the other. She says that the standards of beauty that existed to change the very ways in which a woman moves alters the way young girls and women view themselves, and when these obstructions are lifted in the privacy of their own home, it is a depressing revelation, knowing that they will once again be forced to confine their bodies into the unnatural heaviness of their gendered, "perverted" dress. Once the weight becomes codified in the embodied sense of self that these girls are constructing then the comfort that they are experiencing in those scant hours becomes as much of a developmental albatross as it is a bodily relief. When you are aware of what you are being denied, the pain of being denied is so much keener for that experience. There is a moment between what the girl or woman poses to others, and the

one she finds herself in her private spaces that puts her position in relation to others in stark relief. Without the constraints of society, she is free in herself and in her body to move and be.

Scholars can and should examine word choice across genres of Gilman's works and attempt to form connections between them. While some may argue that this discourse of semantic prosody is nothing more than the equivalent of a literary fortune telling, others like myself or John Morley would argue that repetition, repeated signifiers and lexical maneuverings are crucial in understanding the entirety of a work in any academic setting under the heading of a close reading (146). It is therefore not a leap to consider that when Gilman uses the word "pervert," she is echoing her own thoughts and examinations and giving detail to the word by consociating it with patriarchal suppression and the subversion of the feminine and maternal into a subjugation that begins in the nursery. Regarding her use of "perverted" in *The Dress of Women*, the word, and practice associated with its use now has more gravity. It makes sense that she would write of it only after explaining the ways in which boys are given free reign to do what it is that comes naturally to them as related to their biology, whereas girls are dressed in clothing that constantly reminds them that they must stay clean, they must not move as their brothers do, and that they are expected to maintain a level of perceived femininity at all times, lest they call into question their own credibility as a future representative of the arch subjugated maternal. It is in this that we can extrapolate that Gilman was using dress, and the perversion of it, to describe how boys and girls are groomed from birth to dominate or obey through the use of freedoms and biological development.

Linguistic Choice And Its Implications

Literary scholars know that word choice is both implicit and explicit, but that there is a type of deliberate function to most of the words developed authors choose. Virginia Wise-Beringer writes that “[t]he construct of writing as design views linguistic choice as a discriminating selection process from a repertoire of possibilities, creating shades of meaning that align the unfolding of the writer’s design intentions” (249). She says that understanding how writers use this precise linguistic control allows scholars to intuit a metalinguistic understanding of the structures, meanings, and intention of the author through word choice and text. Because of the overtness of the use of the word “pervert,” and how it is manipulated through persuasive dialogue, we can ascertain that she was assigning a multitude of meanings to the word, giving it depth as both an alteration and an aberration of what she considers natural.

Marcel Mauss would describe this perversion and development of learned animation through instruction and dress as a “technique of the body,” and explain that such techniques are used all over the world, and that they specifically deal in the binaries of gender (230). For a contemporary reference consider how we clothe our athletes. Girls who play volleyball are given shorter shorts to wear on the court. In tennis, skirts with nothing more than underwear beneath them serve as a uniform. The clothing is as much a constraint on their body, and overt sexualization as they are the function of their sport. Yes, a cheerleader in a skirt has more fluidity in her movement thanks to the apparatus placed upon her. But why must tennis players also be made to endure such an alteration of their movements? Why is it that women in volleyball must be as concerned with their ability to

keep their uniform in place as where the ball is headed? Why must some of the most powerful of athletes be denied the same comfort?

A more Jungian interpretation of the language Gilman uses in regards to perversion would infer that this early manipulation of the female form through clothing that is so different from that of men is not simply or innocently allowing girls to align with gender binaries -- and lives outside of his notions of the archetypes of anima and animus -- serving to groom girls to be the objects of male fascination (231) denying them both of the contrasexuality innate to their psyches. If you expressly forbid the body from experiencing any freedom from gendered recognition, it could have a profound impact on the ability of the mind to imagine such freedoms. Keeping cheerleaders and tennis players in skirts, and girls in all white clothing that cannot be sullied is purely for the male gaze, for their attraction, which is how the value of women is determined, and Gilman was completely aware of that.

Eventually, this inextricable link between bodily awareness and mental congruity will blur as the subject enters adulthood. The language Gilman uses in her fiction to describe the dress of adult women informs not only the characters but also the situation in respect to the deeper meaning of the work. For instance, in "The Yellow Wallpaper" (1892), the reader never learns what it is that the protagonist is wearing, only if she is able to dress herself or not. This is deliberate. We know this because she notes the clothing of those around her. For instance, she describes her husband's stiff collar, and the way that the yellow of the wallpaper sticks to everything in "smooches" (21), yet no mention is given to what article of clothing that she is wearing which is being damaged by the paper. We only know that the stain is invasive, and it is only she who seems to notice. Gilman's distinct lack

of description of the protagonist's attire clues the reader in on the fact that she believes that adornment is irrelevant in the face of progressing, debilitating mental illness. Given Gilman's proclivity for remarking on the nature of women's clothing, particularly the differences between what women wear at home versus what they wear when they are outside of it, as she describes in *The Dress of Women*, the utter absence of such description underscores the superfluous nature of fashion in the rigors of a woman's life. Her clothing is marked by the depression and delusions that followed her, much in the way that the clothing and what it represented was a cause of her delusion. The dirtied clothing was as much a prison as the attic with the yellow wallpaper that she was forced to retire within.

In other works of Gilman's fiction, wherein the situation of the women is not so dire, Gilman uses detailed descriptions of fashion to develop character and inform readers of their position in society relative to the adornment they choose for themselves, as well as their attitudes towards the dress of others. In her novel, *The Crux* (1911), a tale about women moving to the "Wild West" to open a boarding house for men to potentially meet suitors who might make decent spouses, Gilman spends a significant allotment of the pages intricately explaining what it is that each of the women are wearing, down to the color of the fabric, and the sound that their jewelry makes as they sit down. She makes specific use of flowery, aureate language when describing the nature of the clothing of those of whom society would deem ardently feminine women. For example, she writes of Mrs. Cloud, a woman of high moral standing, that she is "Clothed in soft, clinging fabrics, always with a misty, veiled effect to them, wearing pale amber, large, dull stones of uncertain shapes, and slender chains that glittered here and there among her scarves and laces..."(21). On the other hand, she dresses women who have chosen a different path for

their life, one that is not celebrated by men, and by extension, society, in officious, masculine attire, described in similarly masculine, clipped language. She describes the female Dr. Bellair as someone who "...wore rather short, tailored skirts of first-class material; natty, starched blouses--silk ones for 'dress,' and perfectly fitting light coats. Their color and texture might vary with the season, but their pockets, never" (43). In comparing these two descriptions, it is clear which clothing is more desirable. The moral woman wore dull clothing that occasionally glittered, with diaphanous plumes of femininity sewn into its construction that may have looked inviting and soft, but in reality would only weigh the women down and prevent free movement. The doctor, for all her masculine presentation, wore top-shelf everything, all of it fitting appropriately and working with her for the occupation she carried out. This is the tension between the explicit and implicit centrality of gender construction. Both women are dressed in a way that is acceptable and suitable to their genders, but it is only the doctor, for whom Gilman writes about in positive and honest terms (nothing is misty or veiled, instead it is straight-forward) who is given narrative authority that is consistent with Gilman's own sense of her gender.

Dr. Bellair is not the hero of the story, which is surprising given the high praise allotted to her occupation, education, and choice of garment. Oddly, the protagonist of the story is a feminist antihero, Vivian who shows readers that going against what society deems as respectable can have dire consequences, often leaving the women alone and forced to live their lives in solitude. In *The Crux*, Gilman writes an allegory that describes how climbing after the feminine ideal as opposed to a genuine pursuit of self-interest leads to a poisoning of the intrinsic nature of women. In this story, the women who travel West, seeking to further their social standing by appealing to men in the typical fashion, are left

with unenviable outcomes that preclude them from being able to continue the trajectory of the assumed female ideal, and instead relegate them to a life of vassalage under the men in their environment without even the ability to achieve the ultimate prize in womanly life -- motherhood. In *The Crux*, Vivian, a character who early in the story proclaims that she wants “six children” (35) but who dresses in all brown, and reads “doctor’s book” (266), “books on pedagogy” (266), and has dreams of university and becoming a doctor falls in love with a man who boards with her, only to find out that he has syphilis, rendering him unfit to father children with our anti-hero Vivian. This combination of unfit female attitudes and dress with a “substandard” male specimen exemplifies the opinions of the era, even tripping into what Maureen Egan points to as notes of social Darwinism and a compliment of the theory of eugenics popular in the era in which she is writing this (110).

That being noted, from an historical analysis of the description of clothing and language used, Gilman’s espousal of alternative dress for women as a superior means of self-expression and occupation, offers an insightful commentary via her descriptive assemblage of attire that is present throughout several of her works. Women’s clothing is soft, cloud like, tinkling. Masculine, unwanted clothing is practical, but natty and freeing. The clothing women should desire is not that which makes pretty sounds or hides a woman’s true figure through boundless yards of taffeta, but instead something that is serviceable and well-made that provides comfort and practicality is what is best. This idea is perhaps nowhere more apparent than in her remarks on the doctor’s pockets.

Pockets And Their Importance

In *The Crux*, Gilman introduces what would become a recurring theme in her fiction in regards to her description of womenswear as opposed to menswear -- the pocket. As I

mentioned earlier, the “masculine” Dr. Bellair was never without pockets. She reaches into them with some frequency, Gilman making a note of the occasion every time. Gilman notes this explicitly in her description of the spinster doctor because she uses the concept of a pocket as much as a figure of mythology as she does its literal definition. It is her magic bottomless carpet bag, a practical representative of the entrance to another plane, her pinnacle of equality. Pockets are to her, the ultimate in convenience and also oppression. Women in her stories who are depicted in traditional feminine roles are burdened by the things they carried, and by the things they cannot. They are either forced to bring along with them a pouch or bag, or they are allowed nothing. There is no access to things without the weight of something else. Bridget Bennett, in “Pockets of Resistance: Some Notes Towards an Exploration of Gender and Genre Boundaries in *Herland*,” examines the way Gilman obsesses over pockets, assessing how it is that Gilman argues that one small item of clothing can serve as a greater representation of a vexing reality in women’s lives. Bennett writes that Gilman “was a keen upholder of the possibilities offered by pockets, which she saw as gendered spaces” (38). She notes that for Gilman,

The difficulty of finding established and appropriate writing models (as well as pockets) and the boundaries of convention which her female protagonists can encounter as they try to express themselves are persistent themes in her writing: she wanted to communicate to other women and adopted numerous techniques (lectures, journalism, essays and fiction) in order best to do it (40).

For example, while Gilman was a pioneer in mythical Utopian unreality, her ability to weave a fantasy into a discourse on gender is perhaps her greatest feat, as you can see as her search for pockets continues in Gilman’s short story “If I Were a Man” (1914). The

narrative is a brief science fiction story depicting a woman who falls into the body of a her husband for the duration (at least) of a train ride. Through this unreal body swapping, readers are given insight into the prominence of pockets in Gilman's estimation. In the story, the protagonist, searching for her train ticket, realizes that it is not where it should be. Upon noting her change of dress, from the lack of feathered hat to the bottom of her feet, she knows the ticket is not where it would be if she was in her feminine form. She is positively giddy when she understands that the ticket would be in her pocket, delighting over the prospect of obtaining pockets, and thereby a new level of convenience, saying "[t]hese pockets came as a revelation. Of course she had known they were there, had counted them, made fun of them, mended them, even envied them; but she never had dreamed of how it felt to have pockets" (1914/1987). Gilman begs the reader to question why it is that for a woman to have pockets would be such a revelation to warrant this unbridled appreciation of something so ordinary. The use of science fiction brings the debate into an interesting discourse, because in order for a woman to truly intuit convenience and autonomy, she must first abandon the truth of her gender and become a man. It is only then that she can even dream of what it would be like to be equipped with such practicalities.

Looking at the history of women's dress, and indeed this continues to this day, it is understandable that Gilman would be consumed with the idea of pockets. Women of the late Victorian era and the early twentieth century did not have such luxury in their garb, and functional purses were not yet popular (Johnson 44). (And again, the majority of clothing for women and girls still lack functional pockets. Girls frequently wear pocketless leggings, and the pockets in many women's jeans are purely for show.) Pockets are an

emblem for Gilman of all of the ways in which women's ability to govern their own existence has been dictated and hampered by the men of the era who were not so burdened with forced submission. They are the heraldry that comes with the masculine sex.

Christopher Matthews writes in his work, *Form and Deformity: The Trouble with Victorian Pockets*, that during the long nineteenth century, all men, from the upper class and aristocracy to the poorest member of the proletariat, wore pants and waistcoats or jackets complete with fully-functioning pockets. The only women who were afforded this luxury were women who made their own livelihoods, often without the benefit of a male partner. The clothing of middle class women like Gilman, and women of higher stations lacked pockets, for the most part, though some clothing was designed with miniature pockets to keep only a handkerchief or a round of solid perfume. Because men controlled the money of the household, they were allowed the luxury and given the necessity of pockets. Matthews writes that this reflects the "...tenacious cultural logic by which men's and women's pockets were imagined to correspond to sexual differences and to index access, or lack thereof, to public mobility and financial agency" (11). This is obviously not accounting for worker women, who by the nature of their occupations were fitted with both dresses and aprons complete with pockets for holding the tools that were essential to their occupations.

Gilman's ideations surrounding the pocket became what reads like an obsession in her writing. In what is often considered to be her most virulent rebuke of domestic life and all its disenchantments, *The Home, Its Work, and Its Influence* (1903), Gilman writes that women have been forced to comply with a societal contract in which they had no hand in its design. She says that "[t]here is less stealing, the goods being more in common, only

sometimes a sly rifling of pockets by the unpaid wife.” She continues by explaining that these pockets are there so that the man can pay the women he is forced to pay -- like housekeepers -- or perhaps to even permit his wife an allowance, and that this control over the pockets begins in childhood, when boys are valued for their labor, and women are not, bringing back Gilman’s argument that the social perversion of women, and their control over their own autonomy, begins in infancy. Women are viewed as nothing more than thieves or dependents, instead of the autonomous people that they are.

The metaphor of the pocket becomes such a crucial idea in her work, that when she writes her 1915 Utopian epic, *Herland*, pockets, and what they mean to the people who have them, becomes almost as central to the theme as the act of parthenogenesis that allows for the women of the island to self-reproduce. Women are the only inhabitants of the island and because of the fact that there are no men on the island they are an equal society and view the men as such when they arrive. The clothing that they wear is utilitarian, but beautiful, and everyone in that feminine paradise has pockets. One of only two male characters in the novel, Vandyck Jennings describes these in an almost avuncular tone, saying “I see that I have not remarked that these women had pockets in surprising number and variety. They were in all their garments, and the middle one in particular was shingled with them” (30).

Gilman understands that the manner in which women intuit their station is not merely relegated to such external influences, but the political acts upon the body, similarly to what Butler is arguing in *Gender Trouble* (1990). These acts assist in determining how a person’s gender is understood. In the text, Butler raises the idea of the vitalistic biologies, or, the understanding that the ontological self is not independent of chemical or physical

forces. This idea is interesting in regards to pockets, because it is not the weight of that physical force that is determining the development of the body and self, but instead, it is developing in the absence of it, with knowledge of its existence. Butler argues that individuals are as frequently identified with what they do not have, as they are by what they do, and this becomes a dynamic influence in the function of their performance, because they intuit what they do not have. Women who are developing their internal constructions without access to their finances or property through the use of a pocket, knowing and understanding that men have this access, begin to internalize and rationalize that they are somehow less responsible with such matters, and therefore less deserving.

As I mentioned earlier, in Gilman's essays she argues that from an early age girls and women begin losing something that is essential to men through what they are forced to wear. This is true whether it be through the nature of restrictive skirts and corsets that prevent the full range of motion for a growing body, impeding its maturity -- or the effects this dress has upon the psychological development of girls -- such as in the case of the pocket. "She cannot measure her wealth by touch, cannot feel her means and study an object of charity or desire simultaneously" (Matthews 565). This inability to access even the appearance of independence through the lack of something so fundamentally material is critical in how I engage with the notion of how men administer feminine oppression through the intercorporeal relationship between pockets, women, and their subsequent evolutions.

The descriptions of pockets in literature is critical to my research because scholars in the field have examined everything from the historical timeline of the pocket to the significance of the dearth of pockets through a feminist lens, determining that their

availability is certainly based in the subjugation of women and serves to limit their ability to remain unexamined in their own fortune. However, with the exception of Bennett, the situational relation of pockets in writing is mostly overlooked, and even in Bennett's work, it is given no cross-examination with the texts of other, comparable authors. Using historical analysis and juxtaposing that with contemporary recollections and entertainment allows us a deeper insight into how such things might be affecting the subconscious mind and shifting personal awareness during the development of an embodied person.

To this, in the work "Hands Deep in History: Pockets in Men and Women's Dress in Western Europe," Rebecca Unsworth provides a historical timeline as to the invention and adaptation of pockets in men's and women's clothing between the fifteenth and seventeenth centuries (2017). Unsworth reckons a path through history that sees the long road between sumptuous Elizabethan holding places that lie in the secret places of women's clothing, and the very external, very exposed pocketbooks of later eras. It is her assertion that while pockets in women's clothing followed fashionable practice and the lines of elegant dress, that these lines might serve to separate the sexes by wealth and access. It is therefore not so overweening to assume that -- however consciously or unconsciously -- fashionable (male) designers and tailors of that era might have chosen silhouettes that prevented a woman's ability to carry articles close to her person that could conceal any financial independence. Because of this move toward sleek, pocketless dresses, women were forced to adapt their behaviors, and needed to learn how to maneuver themselves in a world where their valuables, and indeed, their value would forever be

detached from themselves. Instead worth is an object placed with them or upon them, with the ability to be judged by onlookers as it is when on display.

The socio-linguistical implications, and more broadly, the sociological connotations of pocket as both object and idea as used by Gilman works much in the same way as her use of the word perverted. Her attention to the concept of pockets stems from the cultural degradation of the essential autonomy of women. When Gilman manipulates the usage of the object as a descriptor of character, scholars gain better inferences as to what this complex, embedded coding of the language means to Gilman and other writers like her. Gilman's female characters never rush to seek their own riches, or to fill their own pockets with worth as she does when speaking of men like the adventurers in *Herland*. Instead, it is the opportunity for the independence which the pockets represent that excites Gilman. The female characters in her Utopia are not forced to carry a bag with them, nor are they hampered with the need to request their coin from their husbands or fathers. They are merely equipped with the same space of possibility and potential that men possess without limitation.

Gilman also understands that masculine clothing has a proscribed physicality to it that lends authority to those who are permitted to don such clothing. In "If I Were A Man," she writes about how the main character Mollie's body sat differently in the seat, her head, unencumbered by the frippery of the fashionable hats of women, was straight and tall, her feet were flat upon the floor, giving her extra balance and strength, and with her hand in her pocket, she was given a secret, and additional masculine potential. In *Herland*, Gilman's narrator speaks of the pockets on the jackets of the women on the islands as "lacking for nothing," and "convenient for the hand" (103). The women of the island were standing as

men, with the ability to be straight-backed and confident in their stance. Thanks to the research of Daniel J. Gurney, in his work “Dressing up Posture: The Interactive Effects of Posture and Clothing on Competency Judgements,” we know that the effects of clothing and posture are interrelated to the point where the perception of self is apparent and affects the perception of others. When a person is wearing what they understand as clothing that signifies power and authority, their body and posture shifts to comply with that information, and others perceive them to have an innate authority and place them in a position of dominance. Because women have largely been viewed as the lesser sex throughout history, it is reasonable that Gilman would not clothe her powerful women in the same way that women of her era were garbed. Instead, she placed them in clothing both beautiful and utilitarian, maximizing all of the best qualities of the characters.

The masculine gendered representation Gilman employs when her utopian characters strike a pose is of unique interest, because the women of the island have no recollection of men, yet they position their bodies in a way that could be recognized as a male air. This can be read as an ahistorical representation of the sexes, or it could also be representative of Gilman’s own areas of unexamined gendered bias. I say this because as Wil Fisher notes in *Materializing Gender in Early Modern English Literature and Culture* (2010), pockets are critical not merely in their performance of gender, but also in its construction. For example, he discusses at length how depictions and descriptions of pockets in men’s clothing of the era are vastly disparate from the women, and how the effective sexuality of men’s clothing in the Early Modern era is caught up in the construction of the clothing. He notes that with its preponderance of tights and codpieces, men were perpetually in a state of showing their “maleness” through the use of external

devices and wardrobe. They were attached to a type of “prosthetic maleness,” and the addition of pockets allowed for men to have a place in which to thrust their hands, mimicking sexually aggressive gestures, jutting forward their hips and codpieces, in a strange display of prowess and value. The interaction of men and their pockets becomes an extension of their masculinity, and through which how men and women understand the relationship between maleness, sexuality, dominance, and pockets. When Gilman has the women of *Herland* strike such a pose, outside of the world where codpieces evolved into pant pockets, it positions her as a passive perpetuator of a history of the sexually aggressive male stratagem.

It could be that Gilman, in choosing for her utopic female characters to mirror a modern man’s pose, is simply a passive device designed to serve to lend the weight of maleness. However, it can also be read as a subversive reaction to a society that places a sexual, subliminal message of a man’s posture and links it to the ability for men to provide for their women while at the same time forcing the women they lure with their jutting poses to abandon their independence in want of finding a suitable partner. The way in which Gilman luxuriates in the commanding quality of the typical embodied male, assigning it to an embodied female, suggests to the reader that the only true difference between the sexes is in who is the subject of interpretation. It provides the men who venture onto the island the ability to appraise the women differently from how they appraise women in their homelands. After all, they knew before they arrived that these women had never experienced men, so they are forced to wonder what their own women would be like if they did not have the mediating, diminishing influence of the masculine sex thrust upon their developing identities.

Readers see this unraveling of masculinity through the voice of the male narrator of *Herland* who arrived on the island with a group of companions who took the journey on a bit of a lark. The narrator, Vandyck "Van" Jennings, is a sociology student drawn to the interesting island by his own curiosity, and who recounts his time there in *Herland*. Scholar Anne Cranny-Francis writes that Gilman's use of a male voice "...was a conservative choice positioning readers to accept the authority of her text, but on the other hand, as she [Gilman] repeatedly deconstructs the objectivity and rationality of that voice, becomes a critique of assumptions of masculine authority" (172). The narrator becomes increasingly irrational throughout the text, and at the same time, more open and aware of the possibilities and potential of the women of the island. He comments on their intelligence, their wit, their economics and their politics with a sustained level of surprise, and describes his own abject shame that he never thought women would be capable of such civility -- as good as, or surpassing that of a man.

While Gilman writes about pockets across a wide variety of mediums, she most famously uses the genre of science fiction to examine the gender construct through clothing outside of the socio-temporal reality in which she found herself, as in "If I Were A Man," and *Herland*. The ability for her female characters to experience an agendered or male body permitted Gilman to move out of the realm of what was rightly possible, and into a sublime unreality which allows readers to consider the problem of gendered dress under a more detached set of circumstances than that which normative literary fiction and essays would otherwise be able to accomplish. As Veronica Hollinger writes in her work examining the queer reading of historical science fiction works, science fiction is "ideally suited, as a narrative mode, to the construction of imaginative challenges to the smoothly oiled

technologies of heteronormativity, especially when/as these almost invisible technologies are pressed into the service of a coercive regime of compulsory heterosexuality” (24).

Gilman intuits this quality of the genre, and uses the resource to complicate a subject which she found vexing and problematic, and mechanize it to further her own particular point of view.

Advertisements As Narrative

In the early years of her periodical, *Forerunner*, a paper she began as a means of publishing her progressive work that would otherwise likely go unpublished, Gilman featured advertisements for goods, and would include a personal testimonial for the majority of these advertisements. In the first issue of the magazine, Gilman wrote that “We have long heard that ‘A pleased customer is the best advertiser’.” *The Forerunner* offers to its advertisers and readers the benefit of this authority. In its advertising department, under the above heading, will be described articles personally known and used” (32). Because Gilman was not only the author, but also the marketing arm and publisher of *Forerunner*, her testimonials were assured to be her own, though her call for advertisements might have you believe otherwise. When she notes further in the same call that “So far as individual experience and approval carry weight, and clear truthful description command attention...If advertisers prefer to use their own statements *The Forerunner* will publish them if it believes them to be true” (32). This means that she is only going to advertise what she likes, and will only use the words of the maker if she agrees. In this she has total control.

In her testimonies, Gilman’s authorial point of view does not move from the magazine, or from her fiction. In one of these ads, Gilman writes a few scant, but revealing

sentences about Moore's fountain pens (31). The ad itself is a stock standard illustration of the fountain pen, placed at an angle, with the details surrounding it. However, Gilman's addendum to the advertisement reads like a poem, or a reflection on the broader problems of the nature of womanhood. Gilman is selling these pens, and at the same time forcing readers and potential customers to confront the unfairness of being a woman, and having no pockets. She writes:

It is all very well for men, with vest pockets, to carry a sort of leather socket, or a metal clip that holds the pen to that pocket safely--so long as the man is vertical. But women haven't vest pockets--and do not remain continuously erect. A woman stoops over to look in the oven--to pick up her thimble--to take the baby off the floor--and if she carries a fountain pen, it stoops over too and spills its ink. If the woman carries it about in a little black bag, it is horizontal, and the ink ebbs slowly from the pen into the cap, afterwards swiftly to her fingers. With Moore's you pull the pen into the handle, and then the cap screws on. That's all. The ink can not get out(Forerunner 1.1 1909)

This personal testimonial of the fountain pens brings the narrative scope of the concept of pockets into the expectations of the safety of femininity as perceived by women. Men are able to carry protection from everyday life in their pockets, and they are not forced to stoop or submit themselves to the types of labor women are made to do. Their ink never spills. Women are given no such protections, and they oft find themselves in situations where the lack of protection dirties their person, sullies their hands. What makes Moore's pen so novel is that it is a protection for women, a little representation of autonomy, as Gilman states, the problems -- the ink -- "cannot get out." This line about fountain pens can be read

as a precursor to a very similar line in “If I Were A Man,” when she writes “Behind her newspaper she let her consciousness, that odd mingled consciousness, rove from pocket to pocket, realizing the armored assurance of having all those things at hand, instantly get-at-able, ready to meet emergencies...the firmly held fountain pen, safe unless she stood on her head” (4).

The inspiration for the pocket full of pens that would not leak was set five years before the story was written, giving scholars the ability to roadmap her fascination, and witness its evolution. Throughout the breadth of her work, there is no abeyance in her need to explain the dire situation that befalls a person without the freedom of pockets, which is echoed in the authorship of a great many female authors in the same era, making it particularly relevant for discussions related to embodiment.

Pockets and fashion might not at first blush appear to be a relevant point of fixation in literary scholarship in regards to embodiment, but it is an utterly timely device. Whether authors are writing utopian fiction or penning essays about women’s rights, there in the background are easily placeable temporal materials whose descriptions carry more weight than we might estimate. Elizabeth M. Sheehan in her work *Modernism a La Mode* (2018) writes that “[f]ashion functions in texts as a mode of perception, a target of critique, and a means of touching and connecting bodies and objects across time and space” (11). Gilman is certainly managing all of these things across her work, be it through her persuasive arguments regarding the gender dysfunction thrust upon girls from the nursery, her conspicuous advertisements for ink pens, or the elaborate and myriad descriptions of pockets in her fiction. Because scholars have access to all potential forms of literature from Gilman, from advertisements, to letters, to essays, to her fictional canon, we can build a

substantial framework to further the development of early twentieth century feminist fashion theory to include both the personal and objective rationale of the period, which is difficult to obtain through authors with a more limited body of work. While Gilman is only one author, her prolific career bordered on the maniacal speed of Hamilton or Dickens in its intensity, with a broader scope and tighter point of view. Through the examination of her descriptions, we can evaluate the analysis of a field of other authors who might not have written as much as Gilman.

Using my extensive research into Gilman (not to mention the thousands of pages of reading) I decided to conduct a small experiment with a few other authors who are often linked to Gilman through popular feminist frameworks and are often viewed as her predecessor and successor -- George Eliot and Virginia Woolf. I considered a great deal of other authors from Kate Chopin to Willa Cather and Flannery O'Connor. It was by virtue of the similar lifestyles of Eliot, Gilman, and Woolf that I chose them. They all shared a love of correspondence, and their own way of grappling with their gender and sex. I wanted to see if they, too, had made mention of pockets. I knew from having read their work with some frequency, that how women and men are dressed was a point of note for both authors, but having never previously read as a means for subtextual analysis, I was not sure if pockets held any fascination for them. Therefore, I took books that I was familiar with from both authors, and began my search to see if my theories of this capacious sartorial element would hold true with other women of the time. I was not disappointed. While *A Room of One's Own* is alarmingly absent of the notion, Woolf's other works, as well as her personal correspondence is saturated with pockets. As for Eliot, she is nearly as focused in her attention to pockets as Gilman. I will be attending to Eliot first, as she was born forty-one

years before Gilman, and then Woolf, born twenty-two years after Gilman. In comparing Woolf and Eliot with Gilman, it becomes apparent that this idea of embodied development is a lasting one, and by examining how one article might be represented in text through time, we can better interpret motivation. Just as we read Marlow through a Shakespearean lens, so can we read Eliot and Woolf through the perspective of Gilman's authorial stance. This small detail is played to large effect over and over again -- far from it.

Eliot's *Middlemarch*

It was not only radical feminist authors of the late nineteenth and early twentieth century who were preoccupied with the concept of pockets. Pockets are so codified as an important article that it is difficult to find literature written by any gender where one does not encounter them. Their practicality and importance are just as present in fiction as they are in real life, which is a part of what makes them such an astonishing area of inquiry. One of the more revealing works of the nineteenth century, *Middlemarch* (1872) written by George Eliot, provides a complex series of oblique, if not unintentional textual references to pockets. In several instances throughout the novel, pockets are related to agency, value, meaning and development of gender. Men speak of pockets in terms of wealth, but also in how they are presented and important in their dealings with women. And, as it was with Gilman, it is in how the men stand, as when Mr. Rigg Featherstone is described "with his legs considerably apart and his hands in his trouser-pockets" (555).

Eliot's interest in clothing is representative of Victorian authorship on the whole. A data analysis completed in 2013 found that female authors were twice as likely to write about women's clothing than male authors, and that the inverse was also true, with male authors writing about men's clothing approximately twice as much as female authors

(Jockers and Mimno). When you consider that Eliot speaks about pockets almost as much as she discusses the dress of women, it becomes significant on not just a literary and theoretical note, but also quantitatively. In all of her work, she comes across as almost enraptured by dress, and like Gilman, dresses her proper ladies in over-the-top feminine clothing, while giving her more staid wardrobes to those without means or to those whose characters are not as connected to the manner in which they dress. Her men are simply dressed, but like Gilman, a great many of them spend an inordinate amount of page time reaching into and retrieving something from their confines.

In one of the fifty-four mentions⁴ of pockets in the novel, auctioneer, Mr. Trumbull is selling his wares to a gathered group. One of the items up for auction has a specific joint use -- it can be a decoration for the table, or it can be carried in the pocket. It's a heart shaped box full of bawdy riddles that "...promote innocent mirth, and I may say virtue...hinders profane language, and attaches a man to the society of refined females" (499). Eliot, through Trumbull, writes that if "carried in the pocket it might make an individual welcome in any society" (499). Eliot writes that this item, carried by men in their pocket, bestows upon them a singular benefit of assisting those men to be read as funny and worthy of refined women, making them at home in any situation. It is a heart-shaped key to a society in which they might otherwise not be accepted. Trumbull goes on to read one of the riddles that further intimates the subliminal bond between pockets and gender.

⁴ I ran a search for the word through my e-reader program (Scribd), and then cross-referenced it with an additional e-reader program (Kindle) for accuracy. I then ran both of the programs through an additional analysis through a program I built that checks for both words and related phrasing through multiple fonts, spellings, and potential sources of errors.

“How must you spell honey to make it catch lady-birds? Answer—money.’ You hear?— lady-birds—honey money. This is an amusement to sharpen the intellect; it has a sting—it has what we call satire, and wit without indecency” (499). This collection of riddles, in a heart-shaped box, meant to be carried in the pocket, in a space away from women -- to win over the hearts of women -- contains a riddle about the grasping, greedy nature of the one it intends to collect.

It is in this section that it becomes clear that Eliot believes about pockets the same thing that Gilman does -- that they are disallowed from women to keep them both without ready coin, but also without the intelligent compensation of pocketable knowledge. In *Herland*, the women of the island always carry a journal (662) with them that allows for their immediate preservation of knowledge. This put them on equal footing with the male invaders of the island, who came replete with “pocket encyclopedias” (696), which they used to educate the women of the island who were isolated for some two thousand years. The men who traveled to the island were young, unwed, and somewhat shabby -- certainly not what would have been judged as the highest rung of classes, yet, they are afforded the capacity for intelligent speech and fiscal independence in their wardrobe. On the island, (which is aggressively socialist) the women -- all learned and equal -- are not denied this as they would be if they were integrated into the society of the world.

The women of *Middlemarch*, like those women of Gilman’s other works, have no pockets in their clothing, and men of lesser status, like that of the vicar, are spoken of in relation to his having empty pockets. However, the other, more wealthy and powerful men in the novel use feminine descriptive language for the vicar, further showing how internalized the embodied nature of pockets really is. When the doctors are discussing the

Vicar's salary begin to converse about his holdings, they say, "But why take it from the Vicar? He has none too much—has to insure his life, besides keeping house, and doing a vicar's charities. Put forty pounds in his pocket and you'll do no harm. He's a good fellow, is Farebrother, with as little of the parson about him as will serve to carry orders" (281).

In this excerpt, the doctors refer to the vicar's lack of wealth, and how he only has his housekeeping and charities to keep him company – both of which were considered to be (and largely still are) the arena of women. By noting that if you put "forty pounds in his pocket,"(281) that it will "do no harm" (unlike if you do the same for women) they are implying he is only about to serve and carry orders. This removal of his agency allows the doctors and resident alpha males to deem him a suitable repository of their good will and permits that male to be given money much in the same way they may provide their wives an allowance. They reckon that the feminine vicar is just male enough to be given money, but woman enough to not do much with it. He has pockets, but they are useless, designed to remain empty. They suggest this by saying that he is pliant and will take orders and serve them, much in the same way that their wives serve them. This paradox proves to be a problem for the vicar in the long run, as the effect of Farebrother's perceived femininity causes the doctors to argue that he is not strong enough to lead the weakened souls of even the ill and infirmed, and is therefore passed over in favor of Mr. Tyke. Tyke is a clergyman who is not only observed by the doctors to be a strong, evangelical preacher, but is unconsciously afforded the prefix of "Mister," which is telling in its own right. Farebrother is only "Farebrother" or "the Vicar," further stripping him of agency, independence, and masculinity.

I chose *Middlemarch* as a counterpoint to Gilman because Eliot was generally considered to be fairly conservative, but had a strong belief in “the necessity to reform” (Szirotny 22) -- in contrast to Gilman -- an outspoken, radical feminist. For Eliot to be so infatuated with this accessory points to strong inherent and unconscious understanding of how they affect women, in spite of all of Eliot’s effort to appear as undaunted by the feminist effort as she desired to be perceived. Examining the way that Eliot describes how women and men were contrasted in the practicality of their clothes also shows that women noted the differences and how they influenced the lives of women decades before Gilman would ever bemoan their absence.

Eliot went to such pains to construct her image as someone who is not beholden to the whims of womanhood that modern feminist scholars have difficulty accounting for a number of her narrative choices. Gilbert and Gubar in their work, *The Madwoman in The Attic* (1979) take aim at Eliot for her reduction of the female interior as unimportant, and also with the fact that she only revealed herself as a woman when it became expedient to do so, going so far as to amend an earlier publication – the novella “The Lifted Veil”-- to explain why she had penned such a fussy, paranormal story that stands in such contrast to her works that explain English society, by writing a little prefix to it:

Give me no light, great Heaven, but such as turns

To energy of human fellowship;

No powers beyond the growing heritage

That makes completer manhood (446).

Gilbert and Gubar note that “[n]ot only does this plea for the redemptive imagination comment directly upon a story about alienation from human fellowship and

incomplete manhood, it also immediately signals that this tale will focus on Eliot's anxiety about the light and power she knows to be hers, although she is just a man in name" (443). As an author, Eliot is conscious of the fact that her work was long viewed with the assumption that the authorial provenance was to that of a man, when it was made known that it was to a woman, she believed that she needed to provide a circumspect addendum to texts which might not fit that assumption.

Considering this precarious balance of manliness and femininity, her repeated mention of pockets, pocketing, and pockets full of objects and ideas in her work begins to feel more as a subject to the author instead of the casual descriptions of a clothed body. Her caution when presenting her gothic fantasy, "The Lifted Veil," versus the forthrightness with which she publishes her later novels feels to those studying Eliot that she wished for her sex to be separate from work, yet the bias she is unconscious to has carved her presentation and her work for her as both elite and subjugated.

Also, the thread of her own feelings about female dress reveals themselves as potentially purposeful precisely because of how she speaks about pockets in *Middlemarch*. They come up in the text often enough that a casual reader might pick up on it. While writing about a specific point of a garment might seem commonplace, Eliot takes time in her novels to discuss dress and dressing at some length, (not difficult given the length of Victorian novels) and with a great deal of weight. A person's taste in dress, and how they are attired is referenced throughout her novels as a means to define a person, their status, and their mental state. To go into such depth in relation to one tiny part of a garment, so frequently, would suggest that if it is not meant specifically to be thematic; it is rendered

deeply enough in her subconscious to be important to the overall tone and language of the characters.

Eliot doesn't only make reference to pockets as a way of defining the differences between the men and the women and their financial station in the story. She also uses the idea of the pocket to imply the emotional possibility of having that space where anything can be held. Much like Dr. Bellair's pockets in *The Crux*, pockets are not merely fabric and thread, but a holding place of potential. A stark example of this comes later in the *Middlemarch* when Caleb Garth arrives to visit his daughter, Mary, to ask for money. He is an idealist, and worries for his daughter. Specifically, he is concerned that her suitor, Fred will take advantage of her in the way he views that Caleb has taken advantage of the good graces of his wife. Mary soothes his ego, and begs him not to worry over her relationship with Fred as she gives over her savings of "four and twenty pounds" (350). As Caleb is leaving, she says to him, "Take pocketfuls of love to all of those at home," even though she has just filled his pockets with all of her personal life savings. Eliot was quite cognizant of how they would be understood by the reader: Mary Garth's pockets were now empty, so she gave all else she could with her love, and Caleb Garth's pockets would not be full of money for long, as he was using the pounds provided to pay a bill he could not afford. However, Mary insists that he maintain the metaphor of having his pockets full of something which she thought valuable above even her wages. Mary understands that a man without anything in his pockets is a diminished creature. She is attempting to shore up both her father's confidence and her own construction of him through making these metaphorical gifts to him.

Gilman used the idea and actuality of pockets in a much more straightforward manner than Eliot, but Eliot, in her attempt to write if not in an overtly “masculine” style, but in one that leaves no reader questioning the *nom de plume*, attaches to the convention and attitude about pockets more a different sort of *bona fides*. Gilman hid nothing of her political associations or gender. Instead, she leaned as far into them as one could potentially lean, so it doesn’t surprise anyone that she would argue for similar comfortable practicality in women’s dress as in men’s. Eliot wanted just the opposite, and in choosing to guise herself as a male writer, it is therefore somewhat more striking how the idea of the freedom and meaning of the pocket would seep into her fiction like groundwater after a storm.

Pockets Full of Violence In Woolf’s *Dalloway*

As I mentioned, Gilman and Eliot are not the only authors to be fixated on pockets, and the vast potential for metaphor that they bring with them, along with what it means for women. Years after Gilman would postulate on the virtues of pocket encyclopedias, and decades after Eliot sent Caleb Garth away with pocketfuls of love, Virginia Woolf would wax poetic about these pieces in her 1935 classic, *Mrs Dalloway*. The link between the three is obvious after close reading their work. The style of writing that positions the female experience in a place of wealth and high society, crippled somewhat by the misfortunes of being born without independence, written in the dry, subtly humorous tone preferred of the time, is apparent in all three authors’ works.

Woolf’s Dalloway, a story about a woman who is grappling with being seen as someone other than Mrs. Richard Dalloway, holding fiercely to some semblance of autonomy and independence, has herself a small pocket, and she uses it to go shopping.

After all – “Mrs. Dalloway said she would buy the flowers herself” (1). The unfortunate reality is that she is never allowed more than a few shillings to fill that pocket, managing to only eke out a small portion of the autonomy she so desires. This sense of having only in her pocket what a husband can provide for her, repeats itself several years later in her personal journal where she writes that after receiving royalties for *Orlando*, that she has “an agreeable luxurious sense of coins in my pocket beyond my weekly thirteen which was always running out” (175). Dalloway’s sense of “otherness” in her station and the assertion that she would do for herself is eerily similar to when Woolf says that “I have been spending money. The spending muscle does not work naturally yet” (175). There is a hesitance to control the finances for both Dalloway and Woolf, and the similarities cannot be cast aside. Woolf’s hesitance with finances is reflected in Dalloway’s.

Mrs. Dalloway observes her former suitor and antagonist, Peter Walsh, and that he is forever pulling a pocket knife out of his own pocket. It becomes such a point of reference for his character, that one cannot imagine him without it. He pulls it out to clean his nails, to kill time, to cut apples and simply to idly flick back and forth. Mrs. Dalloway denied him as a potential husband, but here he is, just back from traveling to India, having her questioning her choices, and allowed not only money and a handkerchief in his pocket, but also a weapon, a utensil, and a distraction. “He had his knife out. That’s so like him, she thought” (45).

When Woolf combines the autonomy of pockets with a weapon and tool that is frequently used throughout the book, it raises the patriarchal implications of power over women – and by extension that man’s pockets to the level of potential violence. While much has been said about Woolf’s penchant for playing with gender representation as a means of

conveying underlying violence, it is, I would argue, as much about a woman's sense of imprisoned embodiment that she so deftly portrays in her work. Kylie Valentine notes that "Woolf was sensitive to the political importance of discourse and embodiment" (115), and it is well-represented throughout her library of works. Dalloway is not a desperate character, but the inexact way in which she describes her own actions, versus how she describes those of Peter Walsh implies a sense of awareness that she is in an unequal dynamic exacerbated by her own inability to reach into something on herself to protect herself from either harm or utility or boredom. Her use of pockets conveys the precariousness of women's safety to the reader, as well as an intuited sense of powerlessness on the part of the author that was prevalent of the era -- and not yet entirely changed.

The way Clarissa Dalloway intuits that Peter Walsh's constant retrieval of his pocket knife as implying the possibility of violence takes my idea that this is an embodied cognition of emotion that much further. Psychologist Jocelyn Hollander conducted an experiment that worked on the theory that being a woman means having a body that fears violence and recognizes subtle behavioral changes in people of the opposite sex (83). She found that from girlhood, girls and nonmen have a well-honed sense for violence, and to whom that potential violence is directed. She found that this is because, both through conversations, lived experience, and the relaying of facts through books and media, that girls learn and that their bodies *feel* when violence is present. While Dalloway never outright suggested that the violence was directed toward her, she understood that Peter Walsh was a man who would be able to commit violent acts upon a body, and that his obsession with his pocket knife, with its large blade, was in itself a threat. This is not only

significant from the part of Clarissa Dalloway and for how Woolf interpreted and relayed the sense of a violent trigger, but also because in writing it, Woolf is situating the hidden knife and a man's pockets as a carrier of potential harm to women beyond that of neglect, invoking that female hindbrain bodily reaction, perpetuating the response.

With Eliot, we see a progenitor of this sense of embodied writing and development, and how her capitulation to write as a man, belies what she knows and has lived as a woman. This experiential influence in the deeper meanings of texts however subconscious it is reads like the grandmother of Gilman and Woolf. Gilman reads like the persuasive radical that she was, shouting of her problems, and the problems of women into the work that she produced. Woolf brings up the tail of that line of feminist inquiry, pushing back on Eliot's notions of sexist males as bad but not deadly, by adding the indications of violence that women see and endure every day. Her work is subtle like Eliot, but as condemning as Gilman's.

What Happens When A Fixation Becomes A Point Of Process For An Author

Perhaps it is the blatant fixation upon one item that makes Gilman so intriguing compared to Woolf, Eliot, and most other female writers of the Victorian and modernist periods. She was so vocal in her opposition to the impracticality of gendered dress that she would include the accessory so heavily as to almost grant the item character in its own right, as she did in "If I Were A Man" (1914). Unlike other authors who seem to be more subconsciously plagued by pockets in clothing or the lack thereof, with Gilman it is extreme and unabashed in its "in your face" nature, and makes its presence known in every arena she enters. Bennett writes that "[j] as Gilman's interest in pockets articulates her challenge to the boundaries of dress codes, so her diverse writing interventions in the world and her

appropriation of many forms of writing, such as the romance, the quest narrative, the myth” (40). Gilman never strays from the course when she sets her mind on something, and like Dickens with the cause of poverty and debt or Ocean Vuong and the plight of the immigrant, she begins to chip away at one issue through the use of pointed metaphor and direct speech across a series of styles. While Dickens had the newspaper and his books, and Vuong has poetry, academic papers, and novels, Gilman carved out her own publication to have the ability to be imbibed in many forms and fashions to convince her readers of the importance of topics. Yes, Eliot and Woolf also did this to a point, with their own publishing houses and in their own personal correspondence, but no one hammered one singular point home more than Gilman.

She uses these different styles of writing to bring forward many feminist points of view, showing that when you distill your field of interest down to only one problem, that breadth of range permits scholars to better examine how the author is embodied in that particular vexation. Gilman reacts to the world from inside of the freedom she’s given herself as a woman that she took from not only men in general, but certainly from the ties of motherhood and her first husband, and she charges forth in an attempt to dismantle the paradigm that holds girls and women from their own personal achievements. In choosing to focus on development and dress, she implicates through her fiction and her scholarship that in order to fully realize one’s self that girls need to be free to live in an unencumbered state from both the restriction of their garments and from the lack of access to their own interior spaces. We can reckon that Gilman places such a strong emphasis on the ideals of feminine freedom of development and the implications of the influence of the exteriority of such by comparing her writings of it with other authors who face similar problems. When

we examine how it is that this embodied cognition shapes the way other women of similar station see themselves and how that influences how they write women, we can begin to explore how very common and not unique it is, therefore giving us as scholars of literature and of gender a pathway to find other potential linking agents that might help us define what the things are that have had outsized influence on our development, even if they seem so inconsequential as pockets.

Conclusion

The literature for Gilman is only the surface. Once scholars begin to extract from her literature, the narrative scope of her material descriptions, they are able to construct an entire evolution of her feminist pathos through one object, in what is ultimately a fascinating study -- one that thrives apart from the author who wrote it. Raoul Moati argues that Searle would assert that the author becomes detached from the words they write or speak from the moment they are completed, and that this detachment from the author has broad implications for how it should be read and how it should be interpreted, allowing for the mode of reading to be transferred to other authors. He says that “[t]he author of writing is systematically absent regardless of whether he is alive or dead. For even alive, the author will not be able to reassume authorship of the sum of linguistic acts that his text contains, especially if it is an extended text such as a book” (173). This would imply that because of the permanence of the words in place, reader are therefore given free reign, or even encouraged by the absence of the author to dwell inside the signatories present within to extrapolate consequences for their own work, while also understanding that literature has life outside of the text and time from when it was put onto paper. If scholars can begin examining how gendered embodied development makes its way into language through the

evaluation of the works of the past, we can move forward to examine in what other ways developmental embodiment is present in other works.

In this thesis I have attempted to explain how the embodied experience of becoming a woman has been and continues to be inextricably linked to the way in which women are adorned and presented to the world. From hobble skirts and white clothing, to the dearth of pockets, clothing has affected women throughout time. Through the use of the close readings of the metaphors in literature as well as the opinions of a variety of historians and scholars, it is my contention that it would be hard to argue at this point in our philosophical epoch that pockets and other inhibitory articles of the dress of women are anything but a gendered representation of the archpatriarchal prerogative. I believe that it would behoove the record if more scholars put forth the effort to examine an even greater array of the written and physical history of what might be affecting the developing bodies of women and nonmen to expand upon their own work, and deepen their understanding of the historical and metaphorical record.

Works Cited

Bassuk, Ellen L. "The Rest Cure: Repetition or Resolution of Victorian Women's Conflicts?"

Poetics Today, vol. 6, no. 1/2, 1985, pp. 245–257. JSTOR,

www.jstor.org/stable/1772132. Accessed 18 July 2020.

Berninger, Virginia Wise. *Past, Present, and Future Contributions of Cognitive Writing*

Research to Cognitive Psychology. Psychology Press, 2012.

Blanco, José F. et al. *Clothing and Fashion: American Fashion from Head to Toe*. ABC-CLIO,

an Imprint of ABC-CLIO, LLC, 2016.

Bourdieu, Pierre. "Social Space and Symbolic Power." *Sociological Theory*, vol. 7, no. 1, 1989,

pp. 14–25. JSTOR, www.jstor.org/stable/202060.

Bennett, Bridget. "Pockets of Resistance: Some Notes Towards an Exploration of Gender

and Genre Boundaries in Herland." *A Very Different Story: Studies on the Fiction of*

Charlotte Perkins Gilman, edited by Val Gough and Jill Rudd, Liverpool University

Press, 1998, pp. 38–53.

Butler, Judith. *Gender Trouble*. Routledge, 2006

---"Performative Acts and Gender Constitution: An Essay in Phenomenology and

Feminist Theory." *Theatre Journal*, vol. 40, no. 4, 1988, p. 519.,

doi:10.2307/3207893.

--- *Bodies That Matter*. Taylor And Francis, 2015.

Cranny-Francis, Anne. "Spinster of Dreams, Weaver of Realities." *A Very Different Story:*

Studies on the Fiction of Charlotte Perkins Gilman, edited by Val Gough and Jill Rudd,

1st ed., vol. 14, Liverpool University Press, 1998, pp. 161–178. JSTOR,

www.jstor.org/stable/j.ctt5vjgjp.17.

- de Lemus, Soledad, et al. "The Power of a Smile to Move You: Complementary Submissiveness in Women's Posture as a Function of Gender Salience and Facial Expression." *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, vol. 38, no. 11, Nov. 2012, pp. 1480–1494, doi:10.1177/0146167212454178.
- Egan, Maureen L. "Evolutionary Theory in the Social Philosophy of Charlotte Perkins Gilman." *Hypatia*, vol. 4, no. 1, 1989, pp. 102–119. JSTOR, www.jstor.org/stable/3809937. Accessed 1 Mar. 2020.
- Evans, Brad. "Introduction: Rethinking the Disciplinary Confluence of Anthropology and Literary Studies." *Criticism*, vol. 49, no. 4, 2007, pp. 429–445. JSTOR, www.jstor.org/stable/23128720. Accessed 23 Feb. 2020.
- Fisher, Will. *Materializing Gender in Early Modern English Literature and Culture*. Cambridge University Press, 2010.
- Gilman, Charlotte Perkins. "If I Were A Man" 1914. Pearson Prehall, http://wps.prenhall.com/wps/media/objects/107/110026/ch18_a2_d2.pdf.
---Crux. Project Gutenberg.
---*The Forerunner*. New York: Charlton Co., 1909. HathiTrust, University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign <https://hdl.handle.net/2027/uiug.30112003646616>
---"Forerunner. V.6 1915." HathiTrust, University of Michigan, hdl.handle.net/2027/mdp.39015029837609?urlappend=;seq.
---*Herland and Selected Stories*. Signet Classics, 2014.
---"Personal Letters." Radcliffe Library, Harvard University, schlesinger.radcliffe.harvard.edu/onlinecollections/gilman/.

---*The Charlotte Perkins Gilman Reader: The Yellow Wallpaper & Other Fiction*.
Women's Press, 1987.

The Collected Works of Charlotte Perkins Gilman. Benediction Books, 2015.

---*The Home, Its Work, and Its Influence*. Project Gutenberg, 2013.

<https://www.gutenberg.org/files/44481/44481-h/44481-h.htm>

---"The Dress of Women." *The Forerunner*, v.1, v.6 , no. 1909, April 1909 and 1915,
June 1915, pp. 103–105. hdl.handle.net/2027/mdp.39015029837609.

---*The Man-Made World or Our Androcentric Culture*. Project Gutenberg, 2013.

<http://www.gutenberg.org/files/3015/3015-h/3015-h.htm>

Gray, Beryl. "George Eliot and the 'Westminster Review.'" *Victorian Periodicals Review*, vol.
33, no. 3, 2000, pp. 212–224. JSTOR, www.jstor.org/stable/20083746. Accessed 10
Mar. 2020.

Gurney, Daniel J., et al. "Dressing up Posture: The Interactive Effects of Posture and Clothing
on Competency Judgements." *British Journal of Psychology*, vol. 108, no. 2, May 2017,
pp. 436–51, doi:10.1111/bjop.12209.

Halim, May Ling, and Diane Ruble. "Gender Identity and Stereotyping in Early and Middle
Childhood." *Handbook of Gender Research in Psychology: Volume 1: Gender Research
in General and Experimental Psychology*, Springer New York, 2010, pp. 495–525,
doi:10.1007/978-1-4419-1465-1_24.

Heyes, Duncan. "The Hogarth Press." *The British Library*, The British Library, 18 Apr. 2016,
www.bl.uk/20th-century-literature/articles/the-hogarth-press.

“Hobble Skirt Caused Her Death.” *The New York Times*, 1 Sept. 1911, p. 1. New York Times, <https://www.nytimes.com/1911/09/01/archives/hobble-skirt-caused-her-death.html>.

Hollander, Jocelyn A. “Vulnerability and Dangerousness: The Construction of Gender through Conversation about Violence.” *Gender and Society*, vol. 15, no. 1, 2001, pp. 83–109. JSTOR, www.jstor.org/stable/3081831. Accessed 17 July 2020.

Hollinger, Veronica. “(Re)Reading Queerly: Science Fiction, Feminism, and the Defamiliarization of Gender.” *Science Fiction Studies*, vol. 26, no. 1, 1999, pp. 23–40. JSTOR, www.jstor.org/stable/4240749.

Jockers, Matthew L., and David Mimno. “Significant Themes in 19th-Century Literature.” *Poetics*, vol. 41, no. 6, 2013, pp. 750–69, doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.poetic.2013.08.005>.

Johnson, Anna. *Handbags: The Power of The Purse*. Workman, 2002.

Jung, C. G. *Psychology of The Unconscious*. General Books LLC, 2012.

Kronenberger, Louis. “Virginia Woolf Discusses Women and Fiction.” *The New York Times*, 10 Nov. 1929, movies2.nytimes.com/books/00/12/17/specials/woolf-room.html.

Leary, Andrea M. “Charlotte Perkins Gilman as a Master of Audience: Newspaper Reviewers Expose a Radical Lecturer.” *Resources for American Literary Study*, vol. 30, 2005, pp. 216–235. JSTOR, www.jstor.org/stable/26366994.

- Luczak E.B., "Eugenic Strands in the Gynaecocentric Criticism of Charlotte Perkins Gilman."
 In: *Breeding and Eugenics in the American Literary Imagination. Palgrave Studies in Literature, Science and Medicine* pp. 101-116. Palgrave Macmillan 2015
- Johnson, Anna. *Handbags: the Power of the Purse*. Workman, 2002.
- Matossian, Lou A. "A Woman-made Language: Charlotte Perkins Gilman and Herland: WL WL." *Women and Language*, vol. 10, no. 2, 1987, pp. 16. ProQuest, <http://ezproxy.gc.cuny.edu/login?url=https://search-proquest-com.ezproxy.gc.cuny.edu/docview/198804412?accountid=7287>.
- Matthews, Christopher Todd. "Form and Deformity: The Trouble with Victorian Pockets." *Victorian Studies*, vol. 52, no. 4, 2010, pp. 561–590. *JSTOR*, www.jstor.org/stable/10.2979/vic.2010.52.4.561. Accessed 14 July 2020.
- Mauss, Marcel, et al. *Techniques, Technology, and Civilisation*. Durkheim Press/Berghahn Books, 2006.
 --- *Sociologie et Anthropologie* (with introduction by Claude Levi-Strauss), Fourth edition, Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1968. pp. 364-386.
- Merleau-Ponty, Maurice, and Richard Calverton. MacCleary. *Signs*. Northwestern University Press, 1964.
- Moati, Raoul. Derrida. *Searle: Deconstruction and Ordinary Language*. Columbia University Press, 2014.
- Morley, John, and Alan Partington. "A Few Frequently Asked Questions about Semantic — or Evaluative — Prosody." *International Journal of Corpus Linguistics*, vol. 14, no. 2, John Benjamins, 2009, pp. 139–58, doi: <https://doi.org/10.1075/ijcl.14.2.01mor>.

Muehling, Darrel D. and Pascal, Vincent J "An Empirical Investigation of the Differential Effects of Personal, Historical, and Non-Nostalgic Advertising on Consumer Responses", *Journal of Advertising*, 40:2, 107-122, 2011. DOI: 10.2753/JOA0091-3367400208

Niedenthal, Paula M., et al. "Embodiment in Attitudes, Social Perception, and Emotion." *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, vol. 9, no. 3, 2005, pp. 184–211., doi:10.1207/s15327957pspr0903_1.

"pervert, v." OED Online, Oxford University Press, March 2019, www.oed.com/view/Entry/141685. Accessed 8 May 2019.

Parkins, Ilya "Building A Feminist Theory of Fashion," *Australian Feminist Studies*, 23:58, 501-515, 2008 DOI: 10.1080/08164640802446565

Rabinovitch-Fox, Einav. "[Re]Fashioning the New Woman: Women's Dress, the Oriental Style, and the Construction of American Feminist Imagery in the 1910s." *Journal of Women's History*, vol. 27 no. 2, 2015, pp. 14-36. Project MUSE, doi:10.1353/jowh.2015.0024

Ross, Fiona. *Perversion: A Jungian Approach*. First edition, Karnac, 2013.

Sampson, Ellen. "The Cleaved Garment: The Maker, The Wearer and the 'Me and Not Me' of Fashion Practice." *Fashion Theory*, vol. 22, no. 3, Mar. 2017, pp. 341–360., doi:10.1080/1362704x.2017.1366187.

Seitler, Dana. "Unnatural Selection: Mothers, Eugenic Feminism, and Charlotte Perkins Gilman's Regeneration Narratives." *American Quarterly*, vol. 55, no. 1, 2003, pp. 61–88. JSTOR, www.jstor.org/stable/30041957.

- Siegel, DP. "Transgender Experiences and Transphobia in Higher Education." *Sociology Compass*. 2019; 13:e12734. <https://doi.org/10.1111/soc4.12734>
- Smith-Rosenberg, Carroll, and Charles Rosenberg. "The Female Animal: Medical and Biological Views of Woman and Her Role in Nineteenth-Century America." *The Journal of American History*, vol. 60, no. 2, 1973, pp. 332–356. JSTOR, www.jstor.org/stable/2936779. (Footnote)
- Stiles, Anne. (2012, January). "Go Rest, Young Man." *Monitor on Psychology*, volume 33, number 1, online. 1. <http://www.apa.org/monitor/2012/01/go-rest>
- Szirotny, June Skye. *George Eliots Feminism: The Right to Rebellion*. Palgrave Macmillan, 2015.
- Unsworth, Rebecca. "Hands Deep in History: Pockets in Men and Womens Dress in Western Europe, c. 1480–1630." *Costume*, vol. 51, no. 2, 2017, pp. 148–170., doi:10.3366/cost.2017.0022.
- Valentine, K. *Psychoanalysis, Psychiatry and Modernist Literature*. Palgrave Macmillan, 2014.
- Woolf, Virginia. *Virginia Woolf: A Writer's Diary*. Mariner Books, 2003.
- Mrs Dalloway* Penguin Books, 2008
- Wrisley, Melyssa. *Fashioning a New Femininity: Charlotte Perkins Gilman and Discourses of Dress, Gender and Sexuality, 1875–1930*, State University of New York at Binghamton, 2008. ProQuest, <http://ezproxy.gc.cuny.edu/login?url=https://search-proquest-com.ezproxy.gc.cuny.edu/docview/250189755?accountid=7287>.

