Women’s writing is often related to female body. It is considered aestheticized female body. In the tradition of Zeherzade it is a surrogate female body that saves not only the narrator but also her race of females from death and male cruelty. Women’s writing is also an oppositional practice that deconstructs the patriarchal discourses which stereotype and misrepresent female sexuality. Since women are constrained by the lack of a female centred language, they cannot truthfully represent the collectivity of female experience. In this context, Cixous remarks:

It is impossible to define a feminine practice of writing, and this is an impossibility that will remain, for this practice can never be theorized, enclosed, coded- which doesn’t mean that it doesn’t exist. But it will always surpass the discourse that regulates the phallocentric system; it does and will take place in areas other than those subordinated to philosophico-theoretical domination. It will be conceived of only by subjects who are breakers of automatism, by peripheral figures that no authority can ever subjugate. (Evans 119)

Since men are the custodians of linguistic codes, the feminine practice of writing is difficult to be theorized. But it exists in spaces where there is no
phallocentric control of ideas. It is an expression of female subjects in which women acquire the position of subjects through articulation of their native strength.

According to Cixous, it is impossible to define a feminine practice of writing. French post-structuralist feminists including Luce Irigaray, Helene Cixous and Julia Kristeva have redefined feminist literature as born out of women’s body and body fluids. They compare reading to a pleasurable act or *jouissance*. It is similar to the visual pleasure obtained by viewing the female body. It is based on the female imaginary, which is the pleasure of giving. Cixous concentrates on the erotics of writing derived from a feminine unconscious and shaped by female body drives:

Write yourself. Your body must be heard. Only then will the immense resources of the unconscious spring forth … To write. An act which will not only realize the decensored relation of woman to her sexuality, to her womanly being, giving her access to her native strength; it will give her back her goods, her pleasures, her organs, her immense bodily territories which have been kept under seal… . (Evans 116)

Cixous means that women’s writing is an expression of the female unconscious unrestricted by the anatomy of female sexuality. It is an expression of the joy and pleasure a woman derives from her innate strength—the unhindered expression of her sexuality. This kind of writing evolves from
woman’s right of her body and its functions not conditioned by any ideology and surveillance.

Cixous prescribes a kind of writing for women based on *jouissance* which she calls *écriture féminine*. *Écriture féminine* is a radical, disruptive mode of feminine writing that is opposed to the patriarchal discourse with its rigid grammar, boundaries and categories. It is a psycho-poetics developed by Cixous from the works of Lacan but against the patriarchal values and practices. It is linked to the realm of imaginary which gives voice to the unconscious, the body, the nonsubjective and polymorphous drives. Cixous follows *écriture féminine* in her own writing and she asks women writers to adopt such a style. She rejects Freud’s and Lacan’s concept of woman as lack, and asserts the value of female body as a positive force, plentitude and also as a source which is capable of multiple physical capacities like gestation, birth and lactation. Her writings are rich in maternal metaphors. She calls compositions as child birth and ink as milk.

Jelinek through her novels develops a feminine mode of writing which breaks laws of language that is created by phallagocentric thinking. Phallagocentric thinking excludes woman as “the Other” and Jelinek gives voice to this “Other” in her novels by making her women characters follow typical traditional roles. Her parodic word plays and sarcastic comments in her novels produce the stylistic effect of *écriture féminine*. She deconstructs phallocentrism and critique it in a strong and powerful language.
Jelinek does not follow linear forms of narration in her novels. She rejects everything finite, definite and structured. There is no proper beginning or a satisfactory end to her novels. Her novels are noted for abrupt beginnings and lack of clear endings. Her novels cut directly into action without any introductory details. The novel *Greed* does not contain a linear form of narration. There is no unity or coherence in the novel. We can consider it as a prose poetry or dramatic monologue. This novel is full of fragmented narration. The unnamed narrator in the novel speaks in one voice from multiple minds. Sometimes the narrator takes a single subject position “I”, sometimes “We” is present and sometimes it is the interior monologues of the character. In the novel the narrative voice oscillates between the individual “I” and the communal “we” and often splits into the Double and the Other that manifest in the form of interior monologues. Even though there are various speaking subjects in *Greed*, they all follow a homogeneous tone in their narration and that is sardonic. The narrative voice comments about various things in the novel. It varies from current events, pollution, town gossip, television, snow filled mountains, tourism, sports, old people’s homes, fashion, Nazi past, traffic, old age, fascistic present and so on. The narrative voice, without any intention on the progress of the story, rants about all these things in a fragmented form. Only few of the pages in *Greed* advance the plot. Long slabs of unparagraphed text are presented in the novel. Even in those paragraphs only two or three sentences convey what happens next.
Jelinek successfully carries out the free form in her novel with nihilistic digressions, repetitive and controlled sentences and commentaries.

The novel *Lust* begins with the following sentence: “CURTAINS VEIL THE WOMAN in her house from the rest” (7). This sentence reveals the condition of the woman in that household. Gerti’s condition is that of a slave in her house and to the outside world she is the director’s wife, an upper class woman who enjoys luxurious things in her life. *The Piano Teacher* opens with Erika and her mother’s fight over her shopping habit. *Wonderful Wonderful Times* opens with an assault on a solitary man by four youngsters in the Vienna municipal park. Thus, it gives an introduction towards the fascist attitude of post war Austria.

The complex endings do not provide any ideas about the future of characters. In *The Piano Teacher*, we have no idea about what will happen to Erika after such a traumatic experience and an attempt at self-extinction. The author only comments that Erika is heading towards her home. The last sentence of *Lust* is also a complex one: “But now rest a while!” (*Lust* 207). Whether it is intended for the dead son, or for the tired Gerti or towards the readers is uncertain. The same is the situation of *Wonderful, Wonderful Times*. The concluding sentence is: “Now you know everything, I am at your disposal” (*Wonderful, Wonderful Times* 253). It serves two purposes. If it is taken as the comment by Rainer, after his confession of patricide, matricide and sororicide, then he is asking the officer to take necessary steps because he
is at his disposal. It can also be read as a comment by the author that now the work has come to an end and the readers are aware of the content and the future or fate of the author is at their disposal. The author comments that she is ready to accept their criticisms. The novel *Greed* ends with one of the characters committing suicide. The last sentence in the novel is: “It was an accident” (*Greed* 340). It hints that nobody is going to investigate the situations which led to the suicide of Gerti. It also suggests that the cruelties of Kurt Janisch will go on because nobody has got any evidence against him to catch him red-handed. The author hints that the exploitation against women will continue because it is a patriarchal society. Thus, the last sentence gives an open ending to the novel. The author finishes her novel *Women As Lovers* with Paula working in the Brassiere Company. She wishes: “good bye and safe journey, paula” (*Women As Lovers* 192). Such an ending deconstructs the traditional mode of storytelling. The author and the readers leave Paula in her inescapable situation, which is a direct result of her belonging to the weaker sex, and wish a good life for her.

The novel *Women As Lovers* follows a traditional kind of story telling. It is divided into thirty four mini chapters. The novel begins with a foreword and ends with an epilogue. The story starts and ends in a brassiere company. *Women As Lovers* depicts lives of two young women Paula and Brigitte and their struggle to find out future husbands. In the foreword, the author comments like this: “if someone has a fate, then it’s a man, if someone gets a
fate, then it’s a woman” (3). This sentence conveys the essence of the following incidents in the novel. In the epilogue the author concludes how the two main characters Brigitte and Paula get their fates. The two stories form a dialectic. The lives of Paula and Brigitte are depicted in a series of contrasts and comparisons. The narrative is differentiated with titles, which stand for what happen in the chapters: for example, “beginning”(5), “the example of paula” (12), “what is it, that shines so bright?” (20) and so on. The Brassiere Company is an important place in the lives of both Paula and Brigitte. One wants to escape from it and the other goes into it by circumstances: “paula has already experienced her fate somewhere else. here it is over. brigitte began her fate here. brigitte has got away” (Women As Lovers 192).

Repetition is a literary technique adopted by Jelinek to describe the inescapable situation of her characters. Jelinek uses same sentences for the beginning part of foreword and epilogue in Women As Lovers. It begins with “do you know this BEAUTIFUL land with its valleys and hills? ... the factory looks as if it were part of this beautiful landscape... and good people go in and out of it” (Women As Lovers 1, 90). It suggests the limited space of Paula and Brigitte. Jelinek purposefully repeats incidents and things in her novels. She thus succeeds in disrupting a male centred language, because through repetition, the invisible elements become visible. For example in Lust, she purposefully repeats the brutal sexual assaults of the husband on the wife.
Through a playful repetition of the details of copulation, which is part of written pornography, she engages in showing the power relation between husband and wife. Again, in *Women As Lovers*, she repeats sentences, situations and dialogues of characters. Through this, she shows the pathetic condition of womanhood. For example, Brigitte proclaims her love at numerous times, even making the reader irritated over the repetition. But the author shows the bound condition of Brigitte, her inescapable situation. The stories of two young women are depicted separately in all the chapters except in one which is “The WEDDING”. In this particular chapter, Jelinek uses same phrases to describe both the couples:

brigitte has at last found a real complement to her life: a partner for richer or poorer.

paula has at last found a real complement to her life: a partner for richer or poorer.

many relatives have come to heinz and brigitte’s wedding.

many relatives have come to erich and paula’s wedding.

the wedding of heinz and brigitte is very moving and solemn.

the wedding of erich and paula is very moving and solemn.

brigitte is very happy.

paula is very happy.
brigitte has made it.

paula has made it. (*Women As Lovers* 166)

By repeating the same phrases Jelinek draws our attention towards the commonality of marriage experience. She subverts the marriage mystique by portraying it as a common experience of two young women, who are caught up in situations. By repeating the same things, Jelinek hints towards the inescapable situation of women in society. Apart from celibacy, the only option for woman in a society is marriage. Brigitte is presented as a pragmatic one where as Paula a romantic one. Even though both of them try different paths to get their fates, their destiny is the same- marriage. The author cleverly portrays the paths covered by Paula and Brigitte and sometimes presents them in contrast to each other to signify the point that the same submissive, inessential, the Other kind of role is awaiting them. Repetitions get the look of a chanting in *Women As Lovers* and thus Jelinek moves into the realm of a mystic. According to Irigaray, a mystic’s position is not much questioned in Western discourse because mysticism is related primarily with complete submission of the self. A mystic can experience ecstatic vision which moves beyond the specular rationality of patriarchal logic. In her novels, Jelinek rises up to the level of a mystic who by complete submission of herself moves beyond the patriarchal logic.
Irigaray argues that women writers do not try to be equal to that of male writers. They have to adopt a different method:

That they do not claim to be rivaling men in constructing a logic of the feminine that would still take onto-theo-logic as its model, but that they are rather attempting to wrest this question away from the economy of the logic. They should not put it, them, in the form “What is Woman” but rather, repeating/interpreting the way in which, within discourse, the feminine finds itself defined as lack, deficiency, or as limitation and negative image of the subject, they should signify that with respect to this logic a descriptive excess is possible on the feminine side. (78)

Thus, by repetition Jelinek shows that woman has a limited space in society. She is depicted as lack or negative one. Another example of repetition highlights the domesticity of women: “and make sure you don’t disturb dada’s afternoon nap, which he needs with his bad asthma ... and make sure for my sake that you don’t disturb dada’s afternoon nap, because he was on the railways ... and just make sure for my sake that you don’t disturb dada’s afternoon nap, which he needs for his bad bronchial asthma, because he was on the railways ...” (Women As Lovers 45). Irigaray in her works adopts a slippery kind of writing. She foregrounds different modes of feminine writing like puns, word plays, fragmentation, syntactic experiments and new
arrangements. She argues that such a feminine writing breaks the stranglehold of masculine rigidified and rule bound language. For Irigary, feminine reading and writing must favour the images and metaphors of fluidity, dynamism, polysemy and plurality rather than that of unity, monologism, stability and fixity. Jelinek also follows such forms in her novels. She employs elements of multimodalities like variety of typographies to represent the situation of characters or their prominence in society.

Hermann, the dictator husband of Gerti in *Lust*, is given the title “Direktor” throughout the novel. Jelinek has used such an adjective purposefully to suggest his powerful role in that household. He is also the Direktor of a paper mill company. The employees consider him as the supreme one: “This Man dispenses truth as readily as he breathes out air. That is how much his rule is taken for granted” (*Lust* 7). His wife is like a slave to him, who moves only according to his directions. She has to be always ready to perform the sexual drama between them. In that drama, she has no role at all. He directs all the actions. All the actions are being carried out only for his own pleasure: “The Direktor has put everything on computer. He writes the programmes himself by way of a hobby” (*Lust* 14). Hermann is a greedy person whose only aim is to satiate his lust. He has no regard for his wife.

Most of the time, the author introduces Hermann as either the Direktor or the Man. Both the words are used in the novel with its starting letters in
the capital form. The word woman starting with small letter “w” is used when Gerti’s character appears in the novel. Both the words ‘the Man’ and ‘the woman’ are used in such a way to show the power relation between them. According to Cixous, women are differentiated from men both sexually and linguistically. She objects to masculine writing and thinking because it is based on binary oppositions. Binary logic is a crucial characteristic of western patriarchal thought. In the essay “Sorties”, Cixous list some of these dichotomous pairs:

Activity / Passivity

Sun / Moon

Culture / Nature

Day/ Night …

Thought has always worked through opposition,

Speaking / Writing

Parole / Ecriture

High / Low. (Rivkin and Ryan 578)

Binary logic structures reality into a series of either / or oppositions. In these oppositions one term is always privileged over the other. Man is always associated with all that is active, cultural, high and positive, whereas women
is associated with all that is passive, natural, low and negative. Such a view has integrated into our thoughts and expressions. It helps in the relegation of feminine to the role of “the Other” or the negative. Her analysis shows how the biological opposition male/female is used to construct a series of negative feminine qualities. In *Lust* Hermann enjoys all the benefits of being a male member - he is aggressive and active, whereas the woman is an epitome of docility. It is the Man who speaks most of the times. He carries out most of the action. The woman has no role at all. Jelinek hints at the comment of De Beauvoir that she is an inessential one compared to the “the Man”. Whenever the sexual act between the husband and wife is portrayed, Jelinek uses the words ‘the Man’ and ‘the woman’. Thus the author successfully shows the biased attitude of language which gives importance to the male sex.

In the essay, “This sex which is not one,” Irigaray shows how women writers escape the patriarchal logic through language:

> Hers are contradictory words, somewhat mad from the standpoint of reason, inaudible for whoever listens to them with ready-made grids, with a fully elaborated code in hand. For in what she says, too, at least when she dares, woman is constantly touching herself. She steps ever so slightly aside from herself with a murmur, an exclamation, a whisper, a sentence left unfinished... When she returns, it is to set off again from elsewhere. From another point of pleasure, or of pain. One
would have to listen with another ear, as if hearing an “other meaning” always in the process of weaving itself, of embracing itself with words, but also of getting rid of words in order not to become fixed, congealed in them. For if “she” says something, it is not, it is already no longer, identical with what she means. What she says is never identical with anything, moreover; rather, it is contiguous. It touches (upon). and when it strays too far from that proximity, she breaks off and starts over at “zero”: her body-sex.

It is useless, then, to trap women in the exact definition of what they mean, to make them repeat (themselves) so that it will be clear; they are already elsewhere in that discursive machinery where you expected to surprise them. They have returned within themselves. Which must not be understood in the same way as within yourself. They do not have the interiority that you have, the one you perhaps suppose they have. Within themselves means within the intimacy of that silent, multiple, diffuse touch. And if you ask them insistently what they are thinking about, they can only reply: Nothing. Everything. (28-29)

Jelinek subverts the syntactical structure in her novels. In Wonderful Times, we can see the following sentence: “Stifter benevolently
hammers away like a woodpecker at his theme of the sheen of radiant air and wonderful April clouds shot through with occasional rays of sun and the beautiful green strips of winter seed pricking up, he’d have been better getting his prick up somewhere else, says Rainer, casting Sophie a sidelong glance as he snarls and snorts. (Wonderful Wonderful Times 52). In Cixous’s opinion, by breaking the syntax, Jelinek is breaking a tiny little thread, which acts as a surrogate umbilical cord for men. Thus, Jelinek moves away from creating a phallus in her works.

Like the Direktor in Lust, the mother character in The Piano Teacher, is written throughout the novel as “Mother”, starting with a capital letter. It signifies the supreme power of mother in that household and her control over her daughter: “... she (Mother) also keeps twisting her daughters vertebrae, unconcerned about the child’s mood, worrying solely about her own influence on this stubborn easily deformable, living instrument” (The Piano Teacher 35-36). It was mother, who insisted that Erika should be a piano concertist. But Erika could not fulfil her dream because the excessive control took a negative turn in her character.

The author uses both the capital and small lettered third person pronouns to portray the character of Erika. During her adolescent years, mother tried everything to control the individuality of her daughter. The author uses capital letters during such events to signify the encroachment of mother on the character development of child: “They cut off HER life in
thick slices and the neighbors are already snipping away at HER character” (The Piano Teacher 34). Erika was forced to suppress her sexuality by her mother. Her time was completely devoted to piano learning. The suppression of sexuality under the control of mother developed negative character traits in Erika. She became passive, masochist, sadist and narcissist. Her character becomes an active one or takes a subjective position during masochist and sadist activities. The capital lettered words SHE and HER are used when her sadist activities in the tram are described: “SHE furiously kicks a hard bone which belongs to a man” (17); “SHE kicks the right heel of an old woman” (21); and “Now some woman asks HER for directions but SHE doesn’t answer. SHE doesn’t reply although SHE does know the way” (The Piano Teacher 22). The capital lettered words also appear when she hurts herself with a blade: “The blade is destined for HER flesh... SHE sits down in front of the magnifying side of a shaving mirror, spreading her legs, she makes a cut, magnifying the aperture that is the doorway into her body” (The Piano Teacher 86). By using both these third person pronouns, the author hints at the complex personality of Erika.

In Wonderful Wonderful Times, the capital lettered word ‘Mother’ is used in utter contrast with the powerful mother in The Piano Teacher. Here mothers are submissive ones who have no control even over their children. Here it is capitalized to denote the powerlessness of women characters who have become more chained because of their motherhood and get no love and
recognition from their children: “Mother… tries to teach her children the principles of humanity … Still Mother soon has to abandon the attempt because the children are out to be inhuman and do everything they can to look the part as well” (Wonderful Wonderful Times 32).

Jelinek’s sometimes uses only a letter to signify the characters: “b. lets heinz go on believing in the natural force of nature. b. groans dreadfully and heartbreakingly. Cause: his natural force” (Women As Lovers 64). The author has narrowed down Brigitte into a mere ‘b’ to express her complete submission of the self to acquire a future. Brigitte, because of her sex, is trapped in a helpless situation. She does not want to enjoy any pleasure. She has let herself completely for Heinz because only through him, her life will be secure: “heinz does not know why b. thinks it’s funny when he sinks down on her like an eclipse or other natural catastrophe” (Women As Lovers 64).

In Women As Lovers Jelinek deviates from the standard rule of using capital letters for the first letter of names. The names of characters – paula, brigitte, heinz, erich and susi are given in such a way that small letters are used for the first letter. Throughout the novel, the author follows such a pattern. She gives no importance to particular characters. They just represent masses of people, who have a similar fate. Paula and Brigitte are representatives of the female world, who are caught up in the webs of domesticity because of their sex. Heinz and Erich are representatives of the male world who enjoy more power because they belong to the privileged sex.
Jelinek does not follow patriarchal standards of logic in *Women As Lovers*. All the sentences in the novel begin with small letters. It is a way of revolting against the patriarchal standardization. She capitalises some words here and there in the novel to convey the gravity of the situation. For example, Erich realizes his manliness or the power related to him through male sex by jeopardizing the life of Paula:

> erich grasps that all of a sudden his decisions and actions have become important for another person. that someone is DEPENDENT on him. that someone is at his MERCY in a way. that produces a nice new feeling. (*Women As Lovers* 125)

Jelinek’s linguistic style throws light on the power relation inherent in society. Erich enjoys all the benefits of being a member of the male sex. Even though he is a fool, who knows only wood cutting and drinking, he has authority over Paula. The capitalised words altogether reveal the submissive state of women. The following sentence depicts the incompatibility between man and woman: “The Opposite Sex always wants the exact opposite” (*The Piano Teacher* 143).

The feminine language which Jelinek employs in *Women As Lovers* goes like this: “so over the years a natural cycle has come into being: birth and starting work and getting married and leaving again and getting the daughter, who is housewife or sales assistant, usually housewife, daughter
starts work, mother kicks the bucket, daughter is married, leaves, jumps down from the running board, herself gets the next daughter…” (*Women As Lovers* 12-13). The patriarchal logic would be unable to discern the coherence of any meaning out of the above lines. Jelinek leaves blind spots in between these words and those blind spots throw light on the marginalized, submissive state of women, whose only destiny is domesticity.

Jelinek plays with language in a beautiful way. The following sentences reveal it:

Paula’s expecting a child.

Paula’s expecting a child!. (*Women As Lovers* 115)

With an exclamatory mark, the author is able to change the whole ambience of the situation. The first one stands it as a natural thing, whereas the second one throws light on the various factors such as women’s position in society, illegitimacy and double standard of society.

The feminine language is a great subversive force. In this context Irigaray remarks: “Its [Feminine language] function would thus be to cast phallocentrism, phallocratism, loose from its moorings in order to return the masculine to its own language. Leaving open the possibility of a different language. Which means that the masculine would no longer be everything. That it could no longer, all by itself define, circumvene, circumscribe, the properties of anything and everything” (80). Such a situation takes place in
*Lust*, when the author feels the lack of words to explain a particular situation in *Lust*:

The child knows everything. He is white and his face is brown from the sun. In the evening he will be bathed. He will have prayed. He will have done his work. And he will cling to the woman, graze upon her, bite her nipples to punish her for allowing father to explore tunnels and piping. Are you listening? This is language itself, wanting to get a word in. *(Lust 25)*

Jelinek comments that the existing language is not enough to carry out the demeaning situation of women in society. She also hints at why she is following a fragmented narration in her novel: the linear form of narration in a male centred language is not helpful in voicing the atrocities against woman. The atrocities against women are silenced in the phallagocentric world. That is why Gerti blubbers when she is cruelly beaten and tortured by Kurt Janisch:

So here, on the cold stairs, a former foreign correspondence clerk and business translator and part-time pianist from the formerly big bad wild city, holds her head in her hands and blubbers. She knows, in how many languages one can plead and in what tones, she knows many of them, but she should also know, that tones are no use, if there’s someone who doesn’t
want to hear and feel or has no receiver for them, not even in a
dental filling with detector capabilities. This woman simply
cannot be understood. That’s the way it is. It’s all no use.

(Greed 87)

In the following lines, Jelinek brilliantly portrays the pitiable situation of
Gerti in *Greed*. Her pathetic situation leads her into a schizophrenic split and
her tone is a perfect example of the sardonic:

No one, I hope. No one must see me like this, naked, bleeding
and my clothes all mucky. I hope it’s not a colleague of his,
from the same station, who’s come without being called.
Screams outside? That’s right, it’s me who’s screaming, what,
it’s supposed to be me? That doesn’t sound good. It sounds
like someone who wanted to cut him short and instead,
presumably in a rage, but why? Was thrown out onto the stairs,
where it’s cold. (Greed 84)

In *Wonderful Wonderful Times*, Jelinek shows how the importance given to
phallus affects the growth of twins who belongs to the different sexes. The
fascist attitude of Otto Witkowski creates negative character development in
the children. The authority of the father, who is also the more vocal one in the
family, makes Rainer a talkative one and Anna with speech problems. She
continues to be silent for months and at those times Rainer becomes her voice.
Their mother, Margarethe, has no role in the family. She is completely under
the control of the husband. Anna learns to be a silent one like her mother. When she gets involved in a relationship she also follows the same power equation which her mother and father share. Anna breaks out of her silence to praise manly qualities in Hans. Thus, like her mother, she searches for protection from her aggressor. Otto Witkowski fears Rainer badly because he has set himself a bad example for him. He sexually abuses his wife and maltreats his children. Even as a Nazi employee, he has killed innocent people and treated them cruelly. Rainer develops his rivalry towards his father and towards the end he commits matricide, sororicide and patricide. The fascist attitude which the father shows inside the family reflects in the activity of Rainer because deep inside his heart he wants to emulate his father. The quest for power and authority is visible in the action of Rainer.

Jelinek portrays how women are silenced in a patriarchal society in *Wonderful Wonderful Times*. The violence against women in the novel gets a parallel in the Nazi violence against innocent Jews. The Nazi past of Austria is purposefully silenced by the society. Jelinek presents two periods in *Wonderful Wonderful Times*. They are the pre-and post-war periods. Through the elder characters, we get a picture of the Nazi atrocities, anti-Semitism, Holocaust and the communist uprising. The new generation of the postwar period is presented as anarchists who have no regard for any kinds of authority or work and they unknowingly represent the fascist traces of their parental generation. Jelinek states that no matter whether it is the prewar or
postwar period, the atrocities against women are the same. Jelinek argues that like the purposeful oblivion of the Nazi past, the atrocities against women are silenced ones in the Austrian society. So she gives a parallel reading of the fascist attitude during the Nazi era and the fascist attitude of men against women in the postwar era. Jelinek indirectly points out that even communism have failed to bring a change in gender inequality.

A polymorphous play of meanings is presented in Jelinek’s novels. For Cixous, phallagocentric writing, which is her term for masculine writing, is ultimately boring because it has only one signifier, the phallus. Such a view is expressed by Jelinek in Lust: “Language draws itself up erect before her like her husband’s penis, you rattle the chain and whoosh off you go downhill” (131). For Cixous, female sexuality exists in multitudes and the signifiers associated with it are numberless. Thus feminine writing is open, varied and multiple, full of pleasures and full of possibilities. Such a writing creates a subversive text. A systematic derangement of language takes place in Jelinek’s novels. The title of the novel Greed gets multiple meanings throughout the novel: greed of men for property through the character of Kurt Janisch, greed of banks, greed of phone companies, greed of churches and greed of women for love and care. Jelinek, through her unique writing style, makes fun of the greed of the audience for a coherent and linear form of narration and the writers’ greed for recognition in the literary world for their particular way of storytelling. She does not satiate the audience’s greed for a
linear form of narration in *Greed. Wonderful Wonderful Times* ends with the sentence, “Now you know everything – I am at your disposal” (*Wonderful Wonderful Times* 253). Rainer agrees to the authorities that the murders are committed by him. This sentence also has the feature of a pun because it can be taken as a sentence uttered by the author towards the end of her work. She comments that now the future of her work is at (your) the readers’ hands.

Jelinek’s novels are full of symbols and images. She often compares her women characters to food items which are there to satiate the sexual appetite of males. In *Greed*, Kurt comments: “She’s (Gabi’s) so juicy, one would like to eat her right out of the wrapper” (106). On another occasion, Gerti’s inner thoughts are given like this: “The woman now wants him to fall upon her, to tear down and/or shove up her clothes, as so often and with a good appetite sink his teeth into her cunt as into well- filled sandwich…” (*Greed* 243). Kurt puts the dead body of Gabi which is wrapped in a plastic cover into the lake. Jelinek compares lake into an animal which devours the body of this young girl: “Then the water can chew at the package for a bit or a bit longer, and see whether it likes the taste. It can open its jaws to draw breath at the same time spitting out the human roll with the plastic cover, then snap at it again, or it can also keep the meat roll of course” (*Greed* 117).

Hermann’s lust is showed poignantly in *Lust*. Jelinek is successful in portraying the materiality of his unsatisfying sexual hunger. She has made use of perfect metaphors to portray his lust: “The man, compact, loaded fresh
from the factory. Waiting to unload. He’s been fermenting in his bottle and he wants to uncork the fizz” (Lust 40). Jelinek makes fun of the idea of phallic pen and paternity theory of art: “He is leafing abstractedly through his pocket dictionary… Already his word has arrived there and will be taken to heart. He opens wide his wife’s genitals to see if his signature there is legible” (Lust 28-29).

Jelinek narrates Lust in a seemingly unemotional and objective way. This is interrupted with the usage of “I” or “We” which makes the readers accomplices of the situation. This “I” or “We” makes sarcastic comments about the situation. It can be either the narrator or the realisation of one of the characters’ voice. The important aspect in the novel is that no character is given a particular voice in the novel. Everything is reported by a third person in a completely unemotional and objective way. The interventions in the novel such as: “I’ve grasped … it. And you … feel warm” (Lust 166) and “We’ll be in touch taste hearing sight and smell” (Lust 182) are left us with no clue about the voice behind these “I” or “We”. Jelinek has followed an ambivalent form of writing in Lust. She has made use of a wide number of allusions, quotes and proverbs in her novels.

The author interferes in Lust at some points. Sometimes she explains the situations to us in a mocking way. For Example: “When the Man sobers up he is obliging towards the woman and good-natured, of course he’ll buy her whatever she wants, he bought everything you see here in full colour,
ladies and gentleman. So dry your cheeks! There, now” (*Lust* 36-37). At other times, she asks sorry from the readers like this: “My thanks for listening to these insults” (*Lust* 119). Later she takes the position of readers and third person pronoun appears: “If we all keep together and keep everything we’ve got together, our premonitions may come true. We are unnecessary” (*Lust* 119). She tells the readers frankly that any preconceived notion about her novel is unnecessary because it does not follow any traditional kind of storytelling.

The authorial voice is also present in *Women As Lovers*. She comments: “our story, which will soon be over, begins in the urban island of peace” (*Women As Lovers* 3). Even though she follows a traditional storytelling formula in *Women As Lovers*, such a comment takes out the traditional form from it. The faceless voice makes comments about the direction of the plot: “soon we shall describe a beautiful wedding, so that the plot doesn’t get too disagreeable. one must not describe only negative and ugly things” (*Women As Lovers* 159). We are left clueless about the face behind the voice because it can either be a group of readers along with the author or the author herself.

In *Greed*, sometimes the authorial voice speaks: “I always find it embarassing, to name names, don’t you think so too? It sounds so silly, but how else should one speak to people?” (*Greed* 52). She makes a clear cut difference between men and women that men are beasts who are ruled by
their penises whereas women are pretty damned stupids who have no self respect and make themselves prey for the beasts. Jelinek calls herself the “Sweet mistress of language” (Greed 177). The unnamed narrator in Greed constantly appears in the novel to address the readers about her mode of writing. She warns the readers of boredom and requests not to blame her for it. Jelinek repeats the same ideas in her novels. The author hilariously presents such a situation in Greed: “Please permit me to say the following once again, because it is important to me and because I can’t now find the passage where I said it once before…” (Greed 276).

Jelinek compares her writing to the process of cracking a nut with a sledge-hammer: “Writing, that’s taking a sledge hammer to crack a nut” (Greed 185). The narrative voice warns the readers about the greed of people, establishments, governments and so on. The narrator herself acknowledges the fact such commentaries have taken away the artistic quality of her work: “Finally, I’ve attached a number of signal lamps, reflectors and coloured adhesive strips to my poetic art, so that if all else fails you’ll hear all the bells ringing at once, until you’re almost deaf. It’ll turn into a wonderful chorus, once I’ve given the cue. And with the words meat or flesh I’ve provided an additional hint, superfluous of course, I didn’t need to say it at all (at least when a heavy object is dropped into the water, then it’s not hard to know who or what is meant) and now it’s all no longer art, a pity, really”
(Greed 120). The novelist probably points to the degrading influence of the reviews on the readers.

In *Speculum of the Other Woman*, Luce Irigaray argues that patriarchal discourse situates women outside representation. She is always the absence, negativity, the Dark Continent or a lesser man. The feminine is misrepresented in a patriarchal culture and is represented only as a man’s specular Other. According to her, she is always the negative required by the male subject’s specularization. Speculum is a concave mirror used for the vaginal inspection of woman. A speculum can do its purpose only because of its own concave shape. Only by imitating a particular shape, the speculum can objectify things. Irigary comments that specularization takes place in Western philosophical discourse. They are disguised as reflections on the general condition of Man’s being, but in reality the philosophers’ self-reflexivity is reflected in their contemplation. Thus Western philosophical discourse represents femininity as negative of its own reflection. According to her, a woman writer is in a troublesome state when she tries for self-representation in her works. Toril Moi appropriately explains Irigaray’s argument:

Caught in the specular logic of patriarchy woman can choose either to remain silent, producing incomprehensible babble (any utterance that falls outside the logic of the same will by definition be incomprehensible to the male master discourse),
or to enact the specular representation of herself as a lesser male. The latter option, the woman as mimic, is according to Irigaray, a form of hysteria. The hysteria mimes her own sexuality in a masculine mode, since this is the only way in which she can rescue something of her own desire. The hysteric’s dramatization of herself is thus a result of her exclusion from patriarchal discourse. (135)

Irigaray herself has followed mimeticism in *Speculum of the Other Woman*. She has imitated the male discourse but in reality she tries to disrupt the patriarchal logic. In this regard, Toril Moi observes:

Irigaray’s mimicry in *Speculum* becomes a conscious acting out of the hysteric (mimetic) position allocated to all women under patriarchy … Hers is a theatrical staging of the mime: miming the miming imposed on women, Irigaray’s subtle specular move (her mimicry mirrors that of all women) intends to undo the effects of phallocentric discourse simply by overdoing them. Hers is a fundamentally paradoxical strategy that reflects that of the mystics: If the mystic’s object surrender becomes the movement of her liberation, Irigaray’s undermining of patriarchy through the over miming of its discourses may be the one way out of the straightjacket of phallocentrism. (140)
Moi means that a woman writer can undermine a patriarchal discourse or subvert it through a mimicry or parody of the discourse.

Mimicry or mimetisme is an interim strategy in which women writers deliberately assume the feminine style and posture assigned to them within the discourse in order to uncover the mechanisms by which it exploits women. Jelinek’s writing is also a miming of the male discourse. She adopts ‘mimetisme’ in Irigaray’s words. Through this Jelinek succeeds in disrupting the patriarchal logic. She has left blank spaces between the signs and lines of her own mimicry. Her novels mean the opposite of what they really mean. The blank spaces and the expressions left by her undergo deconstruction and create a new language. This is a new language which represents woman, not the incomprehensible chatter in the male point of view. Irigaray also explains the significance of mimesis for women writers: “To play with mimesis is thus, for a woman, to try to recover the place of her exploitation by discourse, without allowing herself to be simply reduced to it. It means to resubmit herself- in as much as she is on the side of the “perceptible”, of “matter”- to ideas, in particular to ideas about herself, that are elaborated in/by a masculine logic, but so as to make ‘visible’, by an effect of playful repetition, what was supposed to remain invisible- the cover-up of a possible operation of the feminine in language” (76). Irigaray points out that a playful repetition of the discourse can make visible the female identity submerged in the patriarchal discourse,
In *Lust*, by constructing the image of a pornographic text, Jelinek deconstructs the brutal sexual politics inherent in heterosexuality. She presents the husband/wife relationship in such a way as to unravel the power politics inherent in marriage. Jelinek carries out an exorcism of pornography through her mimicry method. She repeats the obscene sexual acts in such a way as to arouse disgust rather than sensuality in the readers. In *Lust* she also mimicries Freud. Freud was adamant in asserting the rule that heterosexuality is the only acceptable form of sexuality. In the novel, the husband is interested in only anal and oral sexes which are considered perversions by Freud.

Jelinek mimicries the romantic mime in most of her novels. In romantic novels, the heroes appear as epitomes of masculinity. In *Women As Lovers*, Erich appears as “... the white cigarette in the brown face, above it the jet black hair and eyes, an exotic figure like a panther, a little like a panther” (*Women As Lovers* 46). Even though he is presented as a super human with elegant features, he is interested only in drinking and racing. He dreams of a bike which he does not have. In reality, he is a real fool who has no heroic qualities. By miming the patriarchal standards, Jelinek disrupts the stereotyped images. Another example is that of the romantic Paula. She has great concepts about her love. She always relates love with sensuality.
But after her first sexual experience with Erich, her dreams shatter:

Paula was very much looking forward to love, which she doesn’t get however. Long after Erich has gone again Paula is still looking for love between the posts, in the battered manger, in the hay and in the dung channel. But Paula’s snatch hurts, that’s all. And Erich climbs up the mountain – trala! (Women As Lovers 109)

Jelinek makes a travesty of the romantic love and vaginal orgasm in the above situation. Her mocking sound reveals the fact that feminine sexuality is a misrepresented one. Women find it difficult to fit into the patriarchal standard of normal feminine sexuality. Characters like Paula are masochists because by hurting themselves they adhere to the patriarchal rules. Through her mimesis, she is able to throw light on the fact that romantic love is not based on equality. A hunter and prey equation is present in love and marriage.

Irigaray’s theories are also helpful in analysing the complexities in the nature of Erika in The Piano Teacher. Erika was brought up in a strict condition by her phallic mother. She was given little space to express her own individuality. Most of her time was devoted to Piano practicing. Jelinek uses Irigaray’s technique of mimesis to point out the negative impact of Freud’s theories on female sexuality. In the essay “Femininity”, Freud talks in
detail about penis envy in girls: “The castration complex of girls is also started by the sight of the genitals of the other sex. They at once notice the difference and, it must be admitted, its significance too. They feel seriously wronged, often declare that they want to have something like it too, and fall a victim to ‘envy for the penis’, which will leave incredible traces on their development and the formation of their character and which will not be surmounted in even the most favourable cases without a severe expenditure of psychical energy” (Minsky 226). The concept of penis envy leads to the definition of woman as lack or homme manqué.

*The Piano Teacher* presents an incident in the life of Erika when she gets a closer look at male sexual organ. She has no clue about the ‘aura’ around the males because of their penis. She considers her suppressive upbringing as a normal one until then. But her assumptions change with the coming of a male cousin in her house: “Suddenly life has entered the house, for a man always brings life into a house. Smiling indulgently but proudly, the women of the house gaze at the young man, who has to let off steam” (*The Piano Teacher* 38). Erika understands the changed climate in her own house with the coming of her cousin. Her mother is more liberatory towards him: “Mother stands on the steps of the porch, laughing. She laughs and holds a plate of cookies in her hand. Mother says you’re only young once, but no one can hear her amid all the screeching” (*The Piano Teacher* 40). All the while Erika was closed inside her room, practicing her Piano lesson:
“SHE practices on her piano, ignoring the salvos of laugher that shoot up in fits and starts” (*The Piano Teacher* 40). She realizes her mother’s biased attitude towards the different sexes. Later when Erika and her cousin get some private space without anyone’s indulgences, she sees his male sexual organ. The sight of that organ caused “a landslide” inside Erika (*The Piano Teacher* 43). She is unable to hold her curiosity: “She peers and peers”. Her cousin notices the landslide effect of his organ in her. During that night Erika carries out her first masochistic action of cutting her own body with a razor blade and later her vagina (*The Piano Teacher* 86).

For a follower of Freud’s psychoanalytic theories, it is an expression based on penis envy. But Jelinek’s novel presents elements which deconstruct the idea of penis envy. Erika realizes that it is the thing which gives power to him inside the household. Her envy is based not on the organ but on the power related to it. She makes four wounds within her own body with a razor blade:

Four slits, oozing nonstop. On the floor and on the bedding, the four tiny brooks unite into a raging torrent. “Just keep following my tears, and the brooke will take you in”. A small puddle forms. And the blood keeps running. On and on. It runs and runs and runs and runs. (*The Piano Teacher* 44)

Erika’s mother had done everything to curb her sexuality. Her mother has tried to chain her up with various strategies like tears, threats, scolds and so
The suppression of her individuality and sexuality in the hands of a masochist mother often makes her carry out masochist actions on herself. Freud considered masochism as a truly feminine condition in a patriarchy. Through her specularization technique, Irigaray carries out a clear cut attack on Freud. She argues that Freud was explicating his own views of feminine sexuality through his psychoanalytical theories:

He [Freud] does not invent female sexuality nor male sexuality either for that matter. As a “man of science”, he merely accounts for them. The problem is that he fails to investigate the historical factors governing the data with which he is dealing. And, for example, that he takes female sexuality as he sees it and accepts it as a norm. That he interprets women’s sufferings, their symptoms, their dissatisfactions, in terms of their individual histories, without questioning the relationship of their individual histories, without questioning the relationship of their “pathology” to a certain state of society, of culture. As a result, he generally ends up resubmitting women to the dominant discourse of the father, to the law of father, while silencing their demands. (70)

As Irigaray has pointed out, Freud never noticed the conditions which caused such characteristics. Freud’s theory subordinates women to the patriarchal discourse, the phallus, the law of the father.
When Erika is alone in her house, and that too is a rare phenomenon, she experiments with her body. She cuts her own body: “Her hobby is cutting her own body” (*The Piano Teacher* 86). It is her way of showing revenge on her mother because she has got no other outlet to take out her frustration. When Erika turns an adult and an earning member, she saves time and money from the eagle eyes of her mother to watch porn movies and peep shows. There she gets the idea that female sexuality is passive and is a product of vaginal penetration. Jelinek mimics the notions of Freud in her novel. She presents Erika as a complete failure in all her sexual relationships. For Freud, the castration complex leads women to three directions: “The discovery that she is castrated is a turning point in a girl’s growth. Three possible lines of development start from it: one leads to sexual inhibition or to neurosis, the second to change of character in the sense of a masculinity complex, the third finally to normal femininity” (Minsky 226-27). Such norms on femininity, as a result of Freud’s biased discoveries, lead to the negative character development of Erika. She is unaware of her own sexuality. Irigaray also comments on such a situation in *This Sex Which Is Not One*:

Women in this sexual imaginary, is only a more or less obliging prop for the enactment of man’s fantasies. That she may find pleasure there in that role, by proxy, is possible, even certain. But such pleasure is above all a masochistic prostitution of her
body to a desire that is not her own, and it leaves her in a
familiar state of dependency upon man. Not knowing what she
wants, ready for anything, even asking for more, so long as he
will ‘take’ her as his ‘object’ when he seeks his own pleasure.
Thus she will not say what she herself wants; moreover, she
does not know, or no longer knows, what she wants. (25)

Such a situation happens in Erika’s life. She does not know what to expect
from a relationship. She has faked orgasm in most of her relationships. But
her enactment of sexual pleasure does not satisfy her partners. They all leave
her very soon.

Jelinek beautifully portrays the submissiveness of Erika to her
mother: “…a well-nourished fish in her mother’s amniotic fluid” (The Piano
Teacher 56). Her mother’s clutches have gripped her so tight that she is
unable to free herself from it: “SHE is swathed in her daily duties like an
Egyptian mummy…” (The Piano Teacher 81). Her adherence to phallic
mother is repeated in her relationship with Klemmer. When she falls in love
with her student, she submits herself to him with masochistic devotion. Her
letter full of sadomasochist traits is an example of it. She, misdirected by the
sexism in pornographic materials, believes that those are the ways which give
pleasure to a woman. So she asks him to enact such actions on her. The
foolish Erika believes that by directing the actions through the letter, she is
going the lead role in the sexual encounter between her and Klemmer.
But in reality, she is a victim of the working of patriarchal web, which considers women as passive and submissive. Erika is unable to voice her own needs. It is evident from the letter that she writes to Klemmer. Unfortunately that letter contains the language of male fantasies. Thus she passes her masochistic devotion from her mother to Klemmer in the novel.

Jelinek has created the character of Erika as a specular Other of Freud. She has presented the traditional notions of femininity in an extreme level in Erika. Thus, she cleverly makes a mimicry of such patriarchal notions of femininity. She distorts feminine specularization through Erika. Erika wants to break out of the clutches of her mother, but she is unable to do so because she is moulded into such a power structure. Erika once tries to rape her mother who has tried to irritate her with questions and attack her for a late arrival. The sight of mother’s pubic hair makes her aware of the similarity between them as women.

It is possible to find a parallel in the titles of Jelinek’s *Women As Lovers* and D.H Lawrence’s *Women In Love*. More than the title, the stories of the novels are also similar. Lawrence’s novel is a story of two young sisters Ursula and Gudrun. Jelinek’s novel is about two young women who have no relation among them. Ursula is presented as an incomplete creature and Birkin has the responsibility of giving a new birth to her. Jelinek creates mimicry of such a situation in *Women As Lovers*. She represents both Paula and Brigitte as incomplete ones who are in search of their redeemers. She presents their
situation in such a way that marriage is the only available option for them. Lawrence eulogizes the necessity of marriage in the novel and Millett criticizes his attitude in *Sexual Politics*:

> What is particularly surprising about all this is how very much Lawrentian marriage resembles a plunge into another sleep, even a death… We are told over and over that the marriage is to bring her a new life, yet nothing materializes, and she becomes more and more her husband’s creature … sexually, she comes to be the epitome of passivity: “she wanted to summit, she wanted to know, what would he do to her? …She could not be herself …she abandoned herself to him”. Hereafter, marriage represents not only the taming of the woman but her extinction. (264-65)

Jelinek through her mimicry technique criticizes the patriarchal hegemony in marriage. She presents marriage as the only available option for women in the novel. After marriage they are entrapped in the cobwebs of domesticity. Jelinek presents the helpless situation of Brigitte: “but brigitte… knows that there is no going up in the world for her, there is only heinz or something worse than heinz or sewing brassieres until the end of her life… heinz must become brigitte’s story, he must make her a life of her own, then he must make her a child, whose future in turn will be moulded by heinz and his job” (*Women As Lovers* 6-7). In order to build a safe future she submits completely to him. She offers her body to him, irrespective of her own desires. Jelinek’s
male characters are like the male protagonists of D H Lawrence. Lawrentian males are always interested in subordinating women. He never presents the successful life of a modern woman. Modern women in his novels are doomed for extinction. In this regard, Millett comments:

It [Women in Love] resumes the campaign against the modern woman, represented here by Hermione and Gudrun … The … two women are not only damned but the enemy. The portrait of Hermione is probably the most savage personal attack Lawrence ever wrote. She is the new woman as the intellectual, a creature to whom both Birkin and the narrator react with almost hysterical hatred, bombarding her with this sort of description: “Macabre, something repulsive”, “a terrible void, a lack, a deficiency of being within”. (263)

Jelinek does not portray any modern woman in her novels. Susi, Brigitte’s rival is presented as an educated one who has big dreams in her life, but she turns out to be somebody preparing for a good housewife position: “susi too will accept the fate of a woman as brigitte has accepted it. brigitte, smart girl recognized the fate of a woman even before susi” (Women As Lovers 174-75).

Jelinek subverts the logic of Lawrence- women are to be subordinated by men in Women As Lovers. For Jelinek, the patriarchal hegemony curtails the freedom of women and leads to male domination in the world. Women are mere puppets in the hands of men because of patriarchal hegemony.
Women are under this cruel subordination for centuries. Jelinek portrays the sexual politics inherent in sexual relationships through her mimicry. She subverts the reality, appropriating the techniques of the patriarchal logic. She beautifully portrays the inescapable and repetitive condition of women in society. Marriage takes away the complete identity of women. Brigitte, trying to have an identity through Heinz, and Paula, running after Erich to grant her an identity are examples of women’s inferior status in a society. Jelinek presents such situations satirically and conveys the message clearly to the readers.

For Jelinek, marriage is equal to death: “… the death throes of their wives often last for years and years, and often so long that they can even be present at their daughters’ death throes. The women begin to hate their daughters and want to have them die as quickly as possible just as they once died, so: so they must get a man” (Women As Lovers 13-14). The marital vow and ceremony are mostly carried out as linguistic expressions. They indicate how the relationship between couples are viewed or imagined by the society. The author shows the power politics in marriage through her language: “Man and wife are one flesh” (Lust 116). The Christian marriage which is based on such a faith accepts the masculine characteristics related to the word “Man”. This faith perpetuates sexual discrimination as it gives importance to the essence of man, which is considered active and arrogant by the patriarchal society. A woman’s identity is of ‘wife’s’ where she has no individuality,
but to carry out the submissive role the society demands. Such a situation is depicted by Jelinek in her novel *Lust*: “No, the Direktor won’t allow this woman simply to tumble out of his nest. What does she think she’s doing, obeying her own senses, not him? Man and wife are one flesh” (*Lust* 115-16). Again the concept “one flesh” is problematic because it gives religious sanctity to the lust of the husband. Irrespective of the resistances from Gerti, most often Hermann forces her for copulation. The sexual discrimination in the marital vow is voiced by Jelinek in the novel: “... the Man, that irreconcilable enemy of her sex” (*Lust* 65). The author alludes to the concept of transubstantiation in *Lust*. She suggests that they have undergone transubstantiation through marriage: “In their transubstantiation he has had her body rebuilt to his specifications. It is a vessel designed for copious giving” (*Lust* 48). Her body is only for the use of the husband.

As in Lawrence’s *Women In Love*, Jelinek also employs a triangular situation. In *Women in Love*, it is between Birkin, his wife and Gerald. Here, the male Birkin is at the centre. He longs for love of Gerald, another male. He has no concern for his wife Ursula. She is presented as an inessential one who has no right or power over the husband. Millett presents her predicament:

At the end of the book, Birkin is an faintly ridiculous figure, complaining to his wife of how his lover has slighted him. “You’ve got me”, she naively reminds him. “Aren’t I enough
for you?” his model wife asks him, declaring that he is surely enough for her. “No” he said, “You are enough for me as far as a woman is concerned. But I wanted a man friend … .”

The triangular situation in *Women As Lovers* is between Heinz, Brigitte and Susi. Brigitte sees her future in Heinz and offers her body to him. She calculates that a child in her womb through Heinz will fix her future. Heinz is only interested in the physical availability of Brigitte’s body. He has no emotional attachment towards her. He is also interested in Susi whom he has met at an open air swimming pool. Irrespective of the sexual relationship between him and Brigitte, he thinks of Susi as an eligible one for him. He invites her home: “heinz believes, that he and a thoroughbred women like Susi would make the ideal union” (*Women As Lovers* 100). But Susi is not interested in him. She needs a thoroughbred husband, which Heinz is not. Brigitte, even after knowing Heinz’s inclination, continues the race for her future. She is presented as a helpless woman who has no escape from the rules of the patriarchal society where marriage is the only option for her. For this, she has to compromise her individuality and it is a slow death for her. She succeeds in her plan when she becomes pregnant. Heinz marries her for the child. Thus she becomes a typical housewife, who lives according to the whims of the husband.

Intertextuality is a term coined by the French post-structuralist Julia Kristeva. According to her, language is a complex signifying process rather
than a monolithic system. It denotes the interdependence of literary texts. It signifies the multiple ways in which one literary text is made up of other texts, by means of its open or covert citations and allusions, its repetitions and transformations of the formal and substantive features of earlier texts and its participation in the common stock of linguistic and literary conventions and procedures. According to Leon S. Roudiex, “…it has nothing to do with matters of influence by one writer upon another, or with the sources of literary work; it does, on the other hand, involve the components of a textual system such as the novel, for instance. It is defined in *La Revolution du Language Poetique* as the transposition of one or more systems of signs into another, accompanied by a new articulation of the enunciative and denotative position. Any signifying practice is a field (in the sense of space traversed by lines of force) in which various signifying systems undergo such a transposition” (*Desire in Language* 15). Kristeva argues that more than isolated sentences, it is important to study the ideological, cultural and psychoanalytical articulations within the particular text and its relation with society, with the creative psyche and also with other texts.

Jelinek’s novels are full of intertextual elements. In *Wonderful Wonderful Times*, Jelinek provides information about the Nazi cruelties and victimisation of Jews. She depicts the war ridden condition of innocents including women in Treblinka and Auschwitz. Through Hans’s mother she gives ideas about communism. She cites from other texts also: “Mother
opens a book and reads in a dispassionate tone: On Friday 6.10. 1950 the schilling was devalued...” (Wonderful Wonderful Times 133). Allusions to Bible are also present at many instances in the novel. Throughout the novel, Rainer is engaged in reading Albert Camus’s The Outsider. The interesting thing is that Rainer ends up in jail like the hero in The Outsider: “In Camus’s The Outsider, which he is currently reading together with Sophie and with her alone, the hero ends up in prison too. Under sentence of death, he hears soft sounds outside, sounds originating in nature, and becomes sensitive to nuances” (Wonderful Wonderful Times 187). The author does not give any clue about the punishment for Rainer which he gets for patricide, matricide and sorroricide. We can take the fate of hero in Camus’s novel as a hint towards Rainer’s future. Rainer’s comments on expressionism are given in Wonderful Wonderful Times. He sometimes composes meaningless poems and shows them to Sophie.

Allusions to fairy tales are also present in Wonderful Wonderful Times. During school living party, Anna leaves without making any notice: “She doesn’t even leave the tiny dent of a metal stiletto heel in the parquet flooring” (Wonderful Wonderful Times 245). The author alludes to the Cinderella story. The narrator also hints that there is no prince to wait for her, because Hans is after Sophie. Allusions to fairy tales and the Bible are also present in Greed. Gabi, the fifteen year lover of Kurt, is compared to Snow white in the novel. She is asleep like Snow white in the polluted lake:
“This snow white died gently from the throttling of the glomus caroticum, an itself agreeable ganglion. The vagus, the tenth carnial nerve, is immediately paralysed and one dies a reflex death on the spot... No poisoned comb, no poisoned apple, until no more breath came from the child’s mouth” (Greed 294). So no further attempts to kill this girl are necessary. Gerti is also compared to Christ at one occasion: “…and she (Gerti) doesn’t even have a veronica to wipe her eyes” (Greed 116). Jesus Christ’s face was wiped by Veronica on his way to crucifixion. Here nobody is there to wipe the tears of lonely and aged Gerti. In Lust, the wife must clean the husband after the coitus. The author shows it in sharp contrast to the act of Mary Magdalene who cleaned Jesus with fragrant oil and dried him with her hair: “…she must groom him and lick him clean and dry him off with her hair. Jesus came first, so to speak, in this. He was wiped dry by a woman” (Lust 34-35). Gerti’s action is a forced one, which is in utter contrast with the willful action of Magdalene.

Unlike Irigaray and Cixous, Kristeva does not have a theory of femininity. For Kristeva, femininity is something which is marginalized by the patriarchal symbolic order. Toril Moi views that Irigaray and Cixous are trying to essentialize femininity by defining it as lack, negativity, absence of meaning, irrationality, chaos, darkness and most importantly as a non-being. Kristeva gives importance to the position rather than essence because marginality is something related to position. Kristeva displaces Lacan’s
distinction between the imaginary and the symbolic order into a distinction between the semiotic and symbolic. Kristeva posits two types of signifying processes to be used for analysis within any production of meaning: a semiotic one and a symbolic one. The semiotic process relates to the *Chora*, a term meaning receptacle, which she has borrowed from Plato. She points out that semiotic Chora is pre-oedipal and linked to the mother, which is equal to the imaginary order of Lacan. The symbolic is limited by the Law of the father. In this context, Kristeva explains the semiotic:

We shall call this disposition semiotic (Le semiotique), meaning, according to the etymology of the Greek semeion, a distinctive mark, trace, index, the premonitory sign, the proof, engraved mark, imprint-in short, a distinctiveness admitting of an uncertain and indeterminate articulation because it does not yet refer (for young children) or no longer refers (in psychotic discourse) to a signified object for a thetic consciousness (this side of, or through, both object and consciousness). Plato’s Timeus speaks of a Chora, receptacle, unnamable, improbable, hybrid, anterior to naming, to the One, to the father, and consequently, maternally connoted to such an extent that it merits “not even the rank of syllable”. One can describe more precisely than did philosophical intuition the particularities of this signifying disposition that I have just named semiotic-
a term which quite clearly designates that we are dealing with a disposition that is definitely heterogeneous to meaning but always in sight of it or in either a negative or surplus relationship to it. (133)

She argues that once the subject enters the symbolic order, the chora will be repressed by the Law of the father. These repressions appear in the symbolic language in the form of contradictions, meaninglessness, silences and absences. Thus, Chora constitutes a heterogeneous disruptive dimension of language which is never understood in a traditional linguistic theory. The novel *Wonderful Wonderful Times* is full of silences and gaps. Thus, it practices ecriture feminine. The text contains numerous narratives and typographical gaps which suggest the silencing of women. Jelinek appropriately presents the silenced position of Anna: “... (Anna)” (*Wonderful Wonderful Times* 208). It suggests the lack of voice of Anna and her lack of recognition among friends.

Jelinek presents contradictory collages in *Women As Lovers*. She distorts patriarchal hegemony through contradictory collages. She reveals fissures in phallagocentrism. She adopts the methods of travesty and her mocking sound gives expression to the marginalised and silenced women. She presents the lives of Paula and Brigitte in the form of a contradictory collage. Both their lives are presented one after another and the contradictory elements reveal the inescapable condition of women. The one time
intercourse of Paula makes her pregnant and a caste out from society whereas Brigitte adopts all the methods to become pregnant. Paula begs after Erich to legalise her motherhood. Whereas Brigitte’s pregnancy secures her future with Heinz. Apart from incidents, sentences also reveal a contradictory quality. For example, Jelinek portrays the equation between Susi and Brigitte: “the difference between susi and brigette/ what susi and brigitte possibly have in common” (Women As Lovers 95). Jelinek also makes a contradictory collage out of paula and erich’s lives. She presents the scorns and threats that paula receives because of her illegitimate pregnancy along with the grand impregnator title which erich enjoys because of his male sex.

Julia Kristeva believes that there is much opposition between masculine and feminine writings. This difference operates at the levels of thematic selection, stylistic unity and plot construction. Phallocentric writing is noted for its linear narration which ends with a definite conclusion. Female writing does not follow a linear narration and ends on a diffused note. Certain symbols, metaphors, images, styles or tones may recur in female writing. Male writing is based on reasons, logic, linearity and chronology while female writing is based on associative, anti-logical, non-chronological and non-linear forms.

For Cixous, writing is an act of resistance in this phallocentric universe. Women have to break free from the Symbolic order and produce
texts that challenge the Law-of-the Father. She observes in “The Laugh of the Medusa”:

I shall speak about women’s writing; about what it will do. Woman must write herself: must write about women and bring women to writing, from which they have been driven away as violating as from their bodies ... Women must put herself into the text- as into the world and into history- by her own movement ... Her libido is cosmic, just as her unconscious is worldwide … She lets the other language speak- the language of 1000 tongues which knows neither enclosure nor death. (Evans 112-24)

Of all Jelinek’s characters, only Gerti in Lust shows a strong resistance to patriarchy. Gerti breaks from the divine composure of a well adjusted normal woman as per the patriarchal standard to that of a monster when she kills her own son. The unconventional act of Gerti is the result of her resistance towards the continuation of patriarchal hegemony. The boy, who has internalised the arrogant and assertive nature of his father, has turned into a complete replica of Hermann. Gerti is afraid of such a situation and she commits the murder. Jelinek’s strong characterisation of Gerti towards the end of the novel distorts the maternal mystique. Gerti transforms herself from an extremely submissive one to an extremely powerful one when she commits such an action. She moves beyond the binary logic of patriarchy that women
are passive and emotional. Thus, Jelinek is able to shock and awaken women from the patriarchal cocoon with her satirical laughter. Cixous has commented about such a powerful writing in “The Laugh of the Medusa”:

A feminine text cannot fail to be more than subversive. It is volcanic; as it is written it brings about an upheaval of the old property crust, carrier of masculine investments; there’s no other way. There’s no room for her if she’s not a he. If she’s a her-she, it’s in order to smash everything, to shatter the frame work of institutions, to blow up the law, to break up the “truth” with laughter. (Evans 123)

Cixous argues that the true texts of women scare the readers. They [texts] strive in the direction of difference, struggle to undermine the dominant phallogocentric logic, split open the closure of the binary opposition and revel in the pleasures of open-ended textuality.

Cixous tries to take out the écriture feminine from binary logic of the patriarchy. She opts bisexuality in the writers and argues that women are bisexual. She argues that male writers are narrowed down into a phallic monosexuality. They are unable to see anything beyond the primary of phallus. In this regard, Cixous comments in “Sorties”: “In her becoming-women she has not erased the bisexuality latent in the girl as in the boy. Femininity and bisexuality go together in a combination that varies according to the individual, spreading the intensity of its force differently and
(depending on the moments of their history) privileging one component or another. It is much harder for man to let the other come through him” (Rivkin and Ryan 583). Such a bisexual outlook is present in Jelinek’s writings. She subverts the patriarchal binary schemes through her sarcastic comments. She takes multiple positions in her novels. Thus, her work deviates between the divisions- feminine one and masculine one. In Cixous terms, such a peopling disturbs the relationship to reality.

Women writers have only a marginalized space in a phallagocentric world. They are marginalized ones in the world of creation. Women writers try their best to regain their voice which is lost in the flood of masculine-oriented writing. They have to discard patriarchal logic in their writings by following strategies such as parody, mimetisme, intertextual elements, repetitive and cumulative sentences, nonchronological order, breaking of syntactic structures, playing with semantics, subversion, silences, gaps and so on. Such a form of writing which gets the disguise of a formless writing is incomprehensible to the patriarchal world. The feminine writing, which is a result of feminine body and its jouissance, subverts the patriarchal logic and order. Such a kind of writing is present in Jelinek’s fiction. Cixous has commented: “When the repressed of their culture and their society returns, it’s an explosive, utterly destructive, staggering return, with a force never yet unleashed and equal to the most forbidding of suppressions” (Evans 122). Such a volcanic eruption is present in Jelinek’s novels. Jelinek tries to free the
women who are ended up in familial – conjugal enterprise of domestication. She gives voice to the castrated ones. The sarcasm of Jelinek towards women for their lack of self-respect is heard everywhere. No woman character raises her voice against the patriarchal hegemony. But Jelinek’s unique style of writing raises voice against the subordinate position of women.