

T.C

ATILIM UNIVERSITY

GRADUATE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES

DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE

ENGLISH CULTURE AND LITERATURE MASTER'S PROGRAMME

**THE PLACE OF WOMEN IN THEIR RELATIONSHIPS IN AGATHA
CHRISTIE'S TAKEN AT THE FLOOD AND DEATH ON THE NILE IN THE
LIGHT OF SIMONE DE BEAUVOIR'S THE SECOND SEX**

Master's Thesis

Pelin Duygu Aksu

Ankara 2020

T.C.
ATILIM UNIVERSITY
GRADUATE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES
DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE
ENGLISH CULTURE AND LITERATURE MASTER'S PROGRAMME

**THE PLACE OF WOMEN IN THEIR RELATIONSHIPS IN AGATHA
CHRISTIE'S TAKEN AT THE FLOOD AND DEATH ON THE NILE IN THE
LIGHT OF SIMONE DE BEAUVOIR'S THE SECOND SEX**

Master's Thesis

Pelin Duygu Aksu

Supervisor

Assist. Prof. Dr. Gökşen Aras

Ankara 2020

ACCEPTANCE AND APPROVAL

This is to certify that this thesis titled “The Place of Women in Their Relationships in Agatha Christie’s Taken at the Flood and Death on the Nile in the Light of Simone de Beauvoir’s The Second Sex” and prepared by Pelin Duygu AKSU meets with the committee’s approval unanimously as Master’s Thesis in the field of English Culture and Literature following the successful defense of the thesis conducted in 04.06.2020.



Prof. Dr. Dilaver TENGİLİMOĞLU (Director)

Asst. Prof. Dr. Gökşen ARAS (Supervisor)

Asst. Prof. Dr. Kuğu TEKİN (Jury Member)

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Dürrin ALPAKIN MARTINEZ CARO (Jury Member)

ETHICS DECLARATION

I hereby declare that;

- I prepared this thesis in accordance with Atılım University Graduate School of Social Sciences thesis Writing Directive,
- I prepared this thesis within the framework of academic and ethics rules,
- I presented all information, documents, evaluations and findings in accordance with scientific ethical and moral principles,
- I cited all sources to which I made reference in my thesis,
- The work of art in this thesis is original,

I hereby acknowledge all possible loss of rights in case of a contrary circumstance in case of any circumstance contradicting with my declaration.

04.06.2020

Pelin Duygu Aksu

ÖZ

Aksu, Pelin Duygu. Agatha Christie'nin *Taken at the Flood* ve *Death on the Nile* Adlı Romanlarındaki Kadın Karakterlerin, Simone de Beauvoir'ın *The Second Sex* Eseri Işığında, İlişkilerindeki Konumlarının İncelenmesi, Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Ankara, 2020.

Bu tezin amacı, Agatha Christie'nin *Taken at the Flood* ve *Death on the Nile* başlıklı romanlarındaki kadın karakterlerin ilişkileri içindeki konumlarının araştırılmasıdır. Referans olarak Simone de Beauvoir'ın *The Second Sex* (*İkinci Cinsiyet*) kitabındaki the “One” ve the “Other” (asıl ve öteki) konseptleri kullanılmıştır ve kadınların ilişkileri içinde erkek partnerleri tarafından ötekileştirilip ötekileştirilmediği analiz edilmiştir. Buna ek olarak kadın karakterler birbirleriyle de karşılaştırılmıştır ve ötekileşen ve ilişkilerinde pasif rolde olan kadınların, ilişkilerinde ikincil rolde olmayan diğer kadın karakterlerden neden farklı olabilecekleri, Marxist feminist bakış açısıyla incelenmiştir.

Ayrıca, tezde feminizmin ve detektif romanın tarihsel gelişimi ve değişimine de değinilmiştir. Bunun amacı, romanların yazıldığı dönemdeki feminizm hareketi ve roman türü olarak altın çağını (golden age) yaşayan detektif romanının, tezde incelenen romanların yazıldığı zamanın şartlarıyla değerlendirmektir. Christie'nin edebiyat kariyeri ise, gelişmekte olan türün öncülerinden biri olduğu için ve otobiyografisinden edinilen bilgilerin yazarın kariyerinin ve yarattığı karakterlere etkisinin gözlenebilmesi amacıyla eklenmiştir.

Sonuç olarak, Christie'nin birbirine yakın tarihlerde yayımlanan bu iki romanında, biri hariç tüm kadın karakterler, ilişkilerinde de ötekileştirilmemiştir; aksine tüm karar mekanizmalarının bu kadınların elinde olduğu bilgisine ulaşılmıştır. Ötekileştirilen tek karakterin (Rosaleen Cloade) olduğu, ve ekonomik sınıfa bağlı olarak erkek partneri tarafından ezilmeye mahkum olduğu sonucuna varılmıştır.

Anahtar kelimeler: Feminizm, Kadın, Agatha Christie, Öteki, İlişki

ABSTRACT

Aksu, Pelin Duygu, *The Place of Women in Their Relationships in Agatha Christie's *Taken at the Flood and Death on the Nile* in the Light of Simone de Beauvoir's *The Second Sex**, MA Thesis, Ankara, 2020.

The aim of this thesis is to explore the position of women in their relationships with their male partners in Agatha Christie's *Taken at the Flood and Death on the Nile* referring to the "One" and the "Other" concepts through Simone de Beauvoir's *The Second Sex*, and it specifically focuses on whether female characters in these two books are the "One" or the "Other" in their relationships, and the reason why they are dominated or not dominated by a man is discussed. In addition, female characters are compared with each other to find the differences between one another, which will help explain why one is subordinated while the other has an active role in her relationship. In addition, the differences the women characters have been analysed, and discussed referring to the Marxist Feminist perspective.

Also, the history of feminism and crime fiction is added to analyse the novels regarding the changes and improvements in the genre, and feminist movement. In addition, the literary career of Christie provides how the genre was changing then since she was one of the pioneers who developed the genre during its golden age. It is thought that her autobiography may provide a guide to her literary style and her characterization of both women and men in her books.

It is concluded that all the woman characters, except for one of them, Rosaleen Cloade, in the novels have an active role in their relationships. It is found that they are not only dominant, but also active participators in their partnership, and the reason why Rosaleen Cloade is doomed to be othered is the class she belongs to.

Keywords: Feminism, Agatha Christie, Woman, Otherness, Relationship.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

I would like to express my gratitude to my supervisor Assist. Prof. Dr. Gökşen Aras for her valuable contributions and never-ending patience. It has been an honour for me to have a supervisor like her.

I would also like to thank Prof. Dr. Belgin Elbir, Assist. Prof. Dr. Kuğu Tekin and Assist. Prof. Dr. Sibel İzmir for broadening my horizon during my master's journey.

I would like to thank Assoc. Prof. Dr. Dürrin Alpakin Martinez Caro and Assist. Prof. Dr. Kuğu Tekin for attending my defense despite these difficult covid-19 days.

I would like to thank my mother for raising me as an independent woman and always believing in me.

I also thank Kübra Gül for being my best friend for more than fifteen years, and calling me all of a sudden and making me realize that true friendship knows no distance.

I would like to thank Seda Can for bearing me for more than ten years and supporting me whenever I need. She is full of miracles.

I also would like to thank Esra Ordu and Ş. Eda Marangoz for enlightening me with their intellect. Talking with them opens new doors to me.

I thank Gökhan Yıldız for his help and, more importantly, I thank him for being my friend.

Lastly, I would like to thank Selin N. Aksu and Barış Semercioğlu for always being with me, encouraging me and making me the luckiest person on Earth. I cannot imagine a life without them. They are my favorite human beings.

To Mualla, Moncher, and Pamir Sezar

CONTENT

ÖZ.....	i
ABSTRACT.....	ii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	iii
CONTENTS.....	iv
INTRODUCTION.....	1

CHAPTER ONE

1.1.HISTORY OF CRIME FICTION.....	5
1.2.AGATHA CHRISTIE’S LITERARY CARE.....	14

CHAPTER TWO

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

2.1.HISTORY OF FEMINISM.....	21
2.2.SIMONE DE BEAUVOIR’S <i>THE SECOND SEX</i>.....	29

CHAPTER THREE

AGATHA CHRISTIE’S WOMEN.....	37
-------------------------------------	-----------

CONCLUSION.....	79
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	85
CV.....	91

INTRODUCTION

This thesis aims to explore the condition of women with reference to Agatha Christie's *Death on the Nile* and *Taken at the Flood* in the light of Simone de Beauvoir's *The Second Sex*. The study focuses on such concepts as "One" or the "Other" as Beauvoir states in her book. According to Beauvoir, woman has always been accepted as the "Other" while man has been the "One" since he has always been the one who dominates and shapes the world. This power of changing the world according to his own wishes has allowed him to be the ruler of his family, as well. Now, everything seems to be turning round himself. Therefore, this thesis aims to find whether the women characters in the chosen books are oppressed by their male partners, or they have an equal place in their relationships. Furthermore, the reasons of their oppression or why they are not placed as a second sex will be analysed because it has been thought why they have different roles as women needs to be questioned to highlight how and why they have differences.

Unfortunately, woman has experienced this situation for a very long time. She has been subordinated for centuries. Even in holy books, man is represented as a more important creature than woman is. There are a lot of reasons of woman's subordination. To illustrate, in the book of Genesis, it was stated that the man was created in His image, then God created woman to magnify the man and make man's existence stronger along with her companionship. Moreover, their biology has been thought something that prevents her from being accepted as equal to man. Since woman has their periods, bears children, and she is not as powerful as man is, she has been regarded as the "Other". In addition to her biology, others have claimed religion for her oppression. It has been suggested that God created man before woman because man is more valuable. On the other hand, it has been claimed that man was a draft, so God created woman after man to have a better version of a human being. On the other hand, in 1589, Jane Anger claimed in her book *Her Protection For Women* that woman was created after man because she is more superior, and God needed a draft before creating her. Moreover, even scientists have asserted that because of the way woman is created, they lack a lot of things and they cannot be as equal as men. Nonetheless, none of these assertions has not been

proved, and it is said that they are all made up to make woman subverted (qtd. in Hudson, 1).

However, the awareness of women's situation started to rise during the sixteenth and seventeenth century. There were texts defending women's rights. In the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, there were both women and men dealing with women issues. They wanted to show difficulties women had, how women were capable as much as men were, and women could have the capacity of a man. For instance, Mary Wollstonecraft wrote *A Vindication of the Rights of Woman* in 1792. She suggested women and men could be equals. Differences between them stem from the fact that women did not get the same education with men. Also, she claimed that women should not try to please men with their appearance; instead, they should be preoccupied with their education rather than wasting their time by reading low-quality books, or dealing with fortune telling.

Toward the twentieth century, the feminist movement rose dreadfully. The movement called the first-wave feminism appeared in 1920s. The pioneers of the movement made people realise that the education women got and the position they had at home and at work were not fair as men had higher positions; they even got more salaries than women had. They also focused on the way history had been introducing women, and showed how women had been introduced falsely throughout the history. The second-wave feminism, on the other hand, looked for women's social and legal rights in 1960s, and those times were when the feminist movement peaked. After 1960s, the number of women and the number of women academics rose. Moreover, women started to be a subject discussed in social sciences.

Unfortunately, even today the same topics are being discussed. Still, the number of male students is more, and men have more quality education than women. Also, more women work in fields requiring caring such as nursing than men do (Ruether qtd. in Mellor, 303).

Born in 1890, and died in 1976, Agatha Christie wrote approximately two hundred books in her literary career. As she states in her autobiography, she had no intention to write any books, or to be an author until she got sick and tired because of her illness. She was so bored that she started to write. She had written poems and won prizes, but she actually did not have an aim to do it professionally. On the day

she got bored, she may have enjoyed writing since she started to send her works to editors, but they were rejected one by one. She did not give up, and while she was working, creating a detective came to her mind, and she wrote a detective story, which started her unexpected literary career. Then, she created a woman detective, Miss. Marple.

The way Christie represents her women characters has been discussed because it is thought that Christie was not a feminist and this can be understood from the way she reflects women in her books. It is said that her women characters are evil and they do not speak properly while men are “professional, and active” (Peter and Krouse, 144-150). However, considering what she says in her autobiography, it is seen that she has comments on women’s situation and how their position has gone “for the worse” (268). Also, she states that her mother was a creative and powerful woman, while her father was a simple lazy man.

When Christie’s women characters are taken into consideration, blaming her as an anti-feminist may not be true because some of her women characters are represented as superior to male characters. Therefore, in this study, the place of women characters in their relationships is explored to see whether they are oppressed or they are equal to their partners. For this reason, the books in the study have been chosen according to their publication dates regarding the movements and changes of movements, systems and life styles. Another reason is that the place of women in these particular books changes according to their economic situation and their family background. Therefore, the reason why they have a different position in their relationship has been grounded on what Beauvoir states in *The Second Sex*. Also, these reasons have been supported by Lacanian and Marxist perspectives. In addition, their motives for crime have been analysed as they differ according to their sex, financial situation and social background.

The aim of this study is to explore the places of women in their relationship with their male partners in Agatha Christie’s *Taken at the Flood* and *Death on the Nile* referencing to *The Second Sex*. In the first chapter, the history of crime fiction and Agatha Christie’s literary career have been discussed. In the second chapter, the history of feminist movements and Beauvoir’s *The Second Sex* have been introduced to see the way feminist movements have progressed. In the third chapter, a

comparison of *Death on the Nile* and *Taken at the Flood* has been made in terms of their male and female characters, and how women characters were treated by their male partners in their relationships. It has been found that the female characters, except for one of them, in both books are not dominated in their relationships, on the contrary, they are the decision makers and dominators. The reason why the female character is oppressed linked to the Marxist feminist perspective. It is for the fact that she belongs to a lower class, she does not have the chance to survive in the world run by capitalism as the other women belong to higher classes.



CHAPTER ONE

1.1 History of Crime Fiction

Crime fiction or detective novels have been attracting readers for a very long time. The same stories of famous detectives such as Sherlock Holmes, Hercule Poirot or Miss Marple have been adapted to movies, TV series for several times, or, they have managed to be read by people from different age groups or in different parts of the world all the time. It can even be said that the genre has not lost its popularity yet. The reason why crime stories that were written in the eighteenth or nineteenth century have been able to attract people, as John Scaggs states, is the “question mark” because it “encourages the reader to imitate the detective, and to trace the causative steps from effects back to causes, and in so doing to attempt to answer the question at the heart of mystery and detection” (35). Similarly, George Grella states that

most readers and writers of detective fiction claim that the central puzzle provides the form's chief appeal. Every reasoning man, they say, enjoys matching his intellect against the detective's, and will quite happily suspend his disbelief in order to play the game of wits. (31)

For this reason, it can be said that the genre is popular because it gives readers the pleasure of following the detective(s) in the story and trying to find the one who has killed the victim, and why s/he has done it. Also, Grella shows that the detective story and other genres have similarities as follows

Once the comic nature of the detective story is revealed, then all of its most important characteristics betray a comic function. The central puzzle provides the usual complication, which the detective hero must remove; and its difficulty insures a typically comic engagement of the intellect. The whodunit's plot, full of deceptions, red herrings, clues real and fabricated, parallels the usually intricate plots of comedy, which often depend upon mistaken motives, confusion, and dissembling; it also supports the familiar romantic subplot. (33)

The beginning of the genre is generally said to date back to the nineteenth century, but it actually has a longer history. Although the American writer Edgar Allan Poe is accepted as the founder of the genre, there is no doubt that there are earlier works that have crime and mystery. To illustrate, in some of the stories from the Old Testament, the book of Daniel, or Herodotus, or *Oedipus the King*, Seneca's

tragedies, elements of crime fiction can be detected (Scaggs, 8-11). However, the British author of mystery and critic, Julian Symons claims that they may have the elements of crime fiction because they may puzzle the reader, but they should not be categorised as an example of crime fiction since they do not have the stories of detectives. He also says that these stories focus on the punishment of the bad, not the detection (qtd. in Scaggs, 8). Therefore, it can be said that even though some books or stories were not written in the form of a detective fiction, they do have the mysterious air that a detective novel or story has. It is known that the crime stories became popular towards the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, and the structure of the detective fiction is accepted to be created by Poe in 1841, which was followed by Arthur Conan Doyle in English literature in the following years. However, it is true that even works of Shakespeare make readers curious about the deaths, killers and resolutions. *Macbeth*, for example, has the murder, the mystery thrill and a case to be solved, almost all of which can be found in a detective story or a novel.

Although works created in earlier centuries have the sense of a mystery, they are not structured as a work of detection. The detective stories themselves, actually, appeared as a result of what was being experienced in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. In these centuries, with the rise of population in the cities because of the Industrial Revolution, the number of criminals increased enormously. More people than needed moved to big cities like London, and they could not find jobs, or they could not earn enough money to survive in a big city. All of these made crime rates increase greatly. Therefore, it was inevitable for London to build prisons for the criminals multiplying day by day (Scaggs, 17). In 1773, a collection of stories of criminals in the Newgate Prison was published. In these stories, how the criminals were caught, their adventures, punishments are told, and these managed to attract readers. They were curious about what a criminal faces during his journey in the prison after being caught and what she or he experienced in the prison (Scaggs, 13-14). According to Stephen Knight, on the other hand, this collection was published to “maintain the social order” in the city since the number of criminals were increasing, it was thought that making people witness what happened to criminals would be a good way to provide security. However, these stories also do not have a detective finding a criminal or a police officer dealing with crime and punishment as criminals were

caught by “pure chance” (10-13). Although it caused controversies among them because of its reflection of the social, literary and cultural changes of the Victorian Period, this collection was very popular among readers. It inspired and encouraged other authors to write their own crime stories (Bell, 18-19).

The Newgate Prison might have inspired people to publish the *Newgate Calendar*, but it also gave inspiration to important authors of the age such as Daniel Defoe. In *Moll Flanders*, published in 1722 and accepted as one of the first novels in English literature, readers witness the adventures of a woman called Moll Flanders. They see how she tries to survive by stealing, deceiving, cheating and committing to kill even a small boy. On the other hand, Defoe is not the only one who dealt with crime stories in the eighteenth century. Apart from Defoe, other earliest novelists such as Samuel Johnson, Henry Fielding and Horace Walpole are among the authors who dealt with crime stories (Bell, 7-8). For this reason, it would not be wrong to deduce that there was not a genre called crime fiction or detective fiction, but crimes and criminals had been attractive for a very long time until the publication of the first true detective stories.

With the rising popularity of *the Newgate Calendar*, appearance of crime stories increased, as well. Another example is William Godwin's *Caleb Williams*, which was published in 1794. *Caleb Williams* becomes the secretary of the aristocratic Falkland, who is humiliated by a squire, Tyrrel in public. Then, he kills Tyrrel because he has felt that he has lost his personal honor. Caleb, however, understands that it is Falkland who has killed Tyrrel, but he is unable to realize it. The murderer is not revealed as soon as Tyrrel is killed, but towards the end of the book. This book is one of the first examples of “investigation and deductive reasoning” (Scaggs, 14). So it can be said that what makes a detective story different from the earlier crime stories or mysteries is the element of making observation and deduction. However, why *Caleb Williams* is not accepted as a true detective story is explained as follows:

It is this ultimate rejection of the possibility of restoring the social order through the one-to-one conflicts between men that is structurally fundamental to much detective fiction. This makes Godwin's novel a problematic example of the form, despite his technique of working backwards to bring the narrative to its climax – a technique that crime

fiction was later to adopt as its own. (Knight qtd. in Scaggs, 15)

On the other hand, similarities between gothic stories which became popular in the eighteenth century, and crime stories have been found since

Knowledge of [a] secret, in both genres, is the key to understanding the seemingly irrational and inexplicable events in the present, and it is this drive to make the unintelligible intelligible which characterizes both Gothic romance and crime fiction. Characters protect themselves in the present by covering up their secrets in the past, and it is significant that in the Gothic novel, as in the crime story. (Scaggs, 16)

Another example is *Mémoires*, which was written by Eugène François Vidocq and published in 1828. Vidocq was actually a criminal, but later on he became the first chief of the police force of Paris. His life story became very popular and it inspired writers such as Edgar Allan Poe and Victor Hugo (Scaggs, 17). Or, Charles Dickens's *Oliver Twist* (1838) or *Martin Chuzzlewit* (1844) are other examples of stories having criminals, crimes and struggles, but again, they do not have a detective or the "nature of the detective story" (Horsley, 21). On the other hand, it is known that Dickens wrote "Detective Anecdotes", in which he reported activities of real detectives in London in 1850 (Kayman, 42).

When everything is taken into consideration, it is understood that the emergence of prisons or police offices was the result of the problems of the security in big cities, which resulted in establishing an organized police force (Scaggs (17-18).

In 1887, Arthur Conan Doyle published the first Sherlock Holmes book, *A study in Scarlet*. Then, in 1890, *The Sign of Four* was published, but they did not become popular until the stories of Holmes were published in in 1891 (Horsley, 20). Martin A. Kayman explains Doyle's success as follows:

Doyle's success in presenting fiction as fact is apparent both in the remarkable status of Sherlock Holmes himself in the popular imagination and the extent to which Holmes's London has established itself as a stereotypical vision of Victorian London. (42)

On the other hand, Martin Priestman claims that the reason why detective stories became so popular is that the magazine culture of the time made the genre

appear (qtd. in Kayman, 43). Also, it is known that because of the improvements in railways and communication, people started to reach books or magazines more and more each day, and they started to be interested in stories of mystery. However, when the stories of Sherlock Holmes are considered, Priestman changes his ideas of those serial productions of crime stories. He states that

In contrast to the serial publication of long novels, here each tale is self-contained, the detective's solution providing full narrative satisfaction, but so managed as to stimulate an appetite for another, similar story – so much so that, notoriously, popular demand and apparently irresistible commercial pressures made it impossible for Doyle to kill Holmes off as he wished in 1893. (qtd. in Kayman, 43)

It is said that Arthur Conan Doyle was inspired by a former teacher working at Edinburgh Infirmary, Joseph Bell. Bell was the one who could give “diagnostic deductions”. Then, Doyle created a “consulting detective” by adding some features of Edgar Allan Poe and Eugène François Vidocq in his character Sherlock Holmes. Also, he combined Sherlock Holmes's genius with Dr. Watson, who is “loyal, honest, admiring, but less than brilliant narrator” (Scaggs, 24-25). Scaggs claims for the stories of Sherlock Holmes that “The ideology is clear. Crime will always be punished, either by the law or by divine providence. The only exceptions to this rule are the sins of the aristocracy, whom Holmes either cannot, or will not, bring to justice” (25).

The time that the detective fiction became the most popular is the inter-war years. According to Lee Horsley, in these years, the stories taking place in big cities like London shifted to “country houses” because people had a more restricted life. In other words, stories took place in “exclusive settings” (37). She states that

the enclosed community itself was the source of tensions, deceptions, betrayals, and death- this being the period during which murder came to be an essential part of the detective story. In contrast to the early Holmes stories, they focus on fraud and crimes against property. (37)

Also, at the beginning there were more stories than novels, but it changed at the “golden age” of the genre in English Literature. It is said that the golden age of the detective genre started in 1920 when the writers such as Agatha Christie, Dorothy

S. Layers, Marjorie Allingham, Josephine Tey and Ngaio Marsh appeared. On the other hand, John Scaggs claims that the golden age actually started when Agatha Christie wrote *The Mysterious Affair at Styles* in 1920 (26). There were of course, male detective storywriters and what is thought about the golden age of the genre is that detectives are “feminized” because of their passivity, politeness, domesticity and the traditional things linked to femininity (Horsley, 38). The golden age ended when the Second World War started. It was also the time when the first woman detective was created. The first woman detective, Miss Marple, was created by Agatha Christie in 1930s (Scaggs, 26).

In 1928, The Detection Club was formed by British mystery and detective storywriters. The club members set ten rules for the genre and they took an oath to follow them. According to the rules, the criminal has to be introduced at the beginning, and the detective must not commit the crime himself. Or, the detective should not make things clear immediately and he should not encourage the reader to find the criminal in a very short time. Supernatural things or the use of twins should be avoided. Also, there should not be more than a hidden room. And, interestingly, one of the rules says that the stupid friend of the detective, Dr. Watson, should not hide what he thinks of (Scaggs, 37). However, it is obvious that even though these rules were set strictly at the beginning, they lost their importance in time.

When the detective story is analyzed in the following years, it can be said that new crime fiction writers of the post-Second World War followed the authors who were the pioneers of the Golden Age from 1940s to 1970s (Priest, 174). However, crime fiction started to have changes towards 1970s because there was a decline in the market. Also, authors’ concerns were different. They were concerned with the conditions of the contemporary society on the contrary to the authors of the Golden Age, who dealt with the upper-middle class in their stories (Horsley, 53). Moreover, with the improvements in the police forces in Britain, detectives were replaced with the police forces. The process of detection has been identified as “police procedural”. According to Peter Messent, this development has brought realism in the genre (qtd. in Scaggs, 31). Also, police officers have started to be taken seriously (Priest, 174). Police forces have been seen in the books instead of “heroic

detectives” (Horsley, 54). Setting is one of the components that have changed. Country houses and locked-room mysteries may be still available in contemporary crime fiction, but authors no longer prefer to have country-house setting in their novels or stories because they do not think “this certain stereotypical view of a Britain does not exist” (Scaggs, 53). Urban areas and metropolitans have been preferred. Thus, characters also have changed. They are the people who live in big cities. Also, “with the emergence of psychopathic characters, criminality has become less rational and alarming” (Horsley, 58-59).

To refer once more to the historical development of detective fiction, it is obvious that the structure of the genre was actually formed by Edgar Allan Poe. The crime is committed in a social community disturbing the order that specific community has in it, and the punishment is not always mentioned in the story. According to Scaggs, the aim of the detective fiction is to provide “instant morality” because the order has been disturbed and it has to be resettled after the person responsible for it has been punished, and this order is brought back by the detective. On the other hand, George Grella resembles detective stories Greek tragedies, as there is mystery and someone causing unfortunate things.

In the Golden Age detective stories, also, it is seen that the punishment is given according to the laws and systems. In addition, most of the criminals in the golden age of the genre are professional criminals, and they commit crimes because of their ideologies. However, they form the society in which they live, which also makes it difficult to find the criminal. It is said that the narrator goes forward until the conclusion, but the detective goes back to reveal what actually has happened to make things clear (Scaggs, 44-47).

This method can also be seen in most of Agatha Christie’s books. The detective, Hercule Poirot, generally tells his audience what actually happens. For example, in *Murder on the Orient Express*, almost nothing is revealed until the end of the story. Readers guess who killed the man, and they try to find the criminals along with the narrator. In the end, the genius detective finds out who kills the victim, when he is killed, and where he is killed, maybe the most importantly, why he is killed. On the other hand, some of her books such as *Taken at the Flood* start

with a flashback without giving too many details. However, Christie organizes this story so brilliantly that it becomes difficult to combine the characters and the events, so, once again; the mystery is not solved until the detective reveals what has happened by moving backwards. In addition, it is said that generally the detectives of the golden age are not much “respectable” and the resolution is romantic. This can also be seen in Christie’s books. To illustrate, in *Death on the Nile*, Jacqueline Bellefort kills Linnet Doyle since she is the reason why Bellefort and her boyfriend separate. Therefore, Jacqueline kills Linnet to take her revenge. On the other hand, it is a fact that Bellefort is not the only one who is to be blamed. Simon Doyle, as well, is a criminal, but his motive is not revenge, but money. For this reason, Christie, whose literary career is discussed in the following part, does not base her stories on simple and predictable events. It can be said that she has her own style and genius while creating characters and stories.

As for the characters, it is seen that they belong to the upper class or upper-middle classes. Stories take place in isolated places where these people live in. It is also said that it is as if “the Great War never happened” since these people continue their lives, and it seems that nothing bothers them in their isolated places, even the war itself. However, these rich people always have something to hide, which makes them suspects in the story (Scaggs, 48). For instance, in *Taken at the Flood*, almost all of the characters seem to have a secret, so it becomes possible to suspect them, but this makes the reader have a difficulty in finding the real criminal. Christie has a very different story setting in the book, which puzzles the reader as they read through the story. Moreover, she does not only create characters that readers would think s/he is the one who has done everything, but also her minor characters have so much to hide that it becomes almost impossible to solve the case. On the other hand, she makes great use of isolated places. She does not have a country house all the time, she prefers different isolated places such as a ship as in *Death on the Nile*.

As for the setting, a rural area is chosen. For the reason of choosing pastoral settings, Priestman suggests a link to England’s golden ages in earlier times such as Renaissance. Therefore, he claims, the aim is to “return” and “restore” because there was an order that is “superior to the present world” (qtd. in Scaggs, 50). In addition,

this specific setting in the Golden Age has another importance because of its style. He asserts that this setting has “important stylistic effects, such as the characteristic irony in the incongruity of murder in a pastoral setting” (50). It may be because of the fact that one hopes to find a peaceful atmosphere in a pastoral scene where every living creature lives at ease, however, in crime fiction stories, this understanding does not seem to have a place because these peaceful places are the source of violent crimes. For example, in *The Mysterious Affair in Styles*, which is the first book of Agatha Christie, the story takes place in a country house, and the suspect is in that particular house. The house the murder is committed used to be the house the detective had when he had a health problem when he was young. Now, it has become a place where the landlady of the house is killed by her younger husband with the companionship of one of her beloved friends.

Also, according to Scaggs, these kinds of closed settings have made different sub-genres such as locked-room or country-house appear. By using these settings, authors make sure that the number of the suspects and the space in which the criminal is looked for in the book stays limited. Also, the chance to see new characters is reduced (52). Therefore, the limited area does not allow readers to have a great number of possibilities, but keep their options limited, which make it easy to find the person they have been passionate to find easier to some extent. Also, it is said that locked-room and country-house setting do not belong to only the Golden Age of the genre; they are still used in contemporary crime fiction stories or novels (Scaggs, 54). Locked-room and country-house setting are found in Gothic works as well.

Finally, it can be understood that people’s fondness of mysterious stories does not start with the first crime fiction story written by Edgar Allan Poe, but it has a very long history. Greek tragedies, holy books, stories from Newgate Prison and many more have attracted people, and the development of technologies in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries gave people more opportunities to reach magazines or newspapers in which they could find interesting stories. Also, the increasing number of crimes in big cities resulting from the Industrial Revolution gave way to appearing crime stories at that time. When these kinds of stories were

welcomed by a lot of people, and became so popular, it was inevitable for some authors to start to write crime stories even if there was not a genre called crime fiction or detective stories. Or, the structures of those stories were different from the structures of Poe' or Doyle's.

On the other hand, it is known that there was not an organized security system at the time, and there was not an efficient police force. Therefore, the idea of having a talented detective appeared to be crucial. Even in some detective stories, the detective makes fun of the police force. However, when the organization of the security was bettered, that understanding changed.

Overall, even though it is said that the genre is accepted to be created in the nineteenth century, the popularity of crime stories dates back to very early times. People have been still enjoying reading *Oedipus the King* or *Hamlet*, or the same people still enjoy reading Arthur Conan Doyle, Agatha Christie or Dorothy L. Sayers although twenty first century has also many other crime and detective novels. Moreover, even their movie or TV series adaptations shot in different times by different people have been high in demand all around the world.

1.2 Agatha Christie's Literary Career

Born in Torquay, England in 1890, Agatha Mary Clarissa Miller was a very happy child as she states in her autobiography. Her family had a lot of opportunities such as having a house with a garden and servants. She also had parents loving each other very much. She never complains about them in her book, but mentions how much she liked living with them, and how much she suffered after their death. She describes her American father as an "agreeable man" who is quite simple, but humorous while she says that her mother was different than her father since she was a forceful and melancholic", but a "devoted" woman (19-20). Also, she says that her mother was a creative woman who did not see the world as it is, and she believed that education for girls is very important (29-38).

As mentioned above, Christie had a very happy childhood. She remembers her childhood as a "lovely, safe, but exciting" one. She says that she liked spending

time in their garden, and she enjoyed being with their neighbors (33). Also, it is stated that she learnt reading when she was five, but her mother did not become happy with it. However, she did not listen to her mother and she spent her time by reading to her father. She says that what she enjoyed more was figures since she liked dealing with problems (38-39). Therefore, it can be said that her dealing with problems could be a foreshadowing to her literary career.

Although she was born to an upper-middle family, it can be understood from the way she writes in her autobiography that she was raised as a modest young woman. She always praises her family's servants and appreciates their hard work. She even tells a story how her mother gave a lesson to a boy who humiliated a servant in their house consciously or unconsciously by saying that servants should be treated kindly all the time (61). Her depictions and memories about them are seen very vividly. Also, it can be inferred from her childhood and adulthood memories that she had good terms with people without considering their races or classes.

It is obvious that Christie loved reading throughout her life, but enjoyed the dark ones more as she states; "All these gloomy books I read with great satisfaction" (78). Although she became the most famous person of the family, and wrote many books appreciated all around the world, she thought she had a modest brain, but her sister was the "brain of the family". On the other hand, she says for brother that he was interested in literature, but "intellectually backward" (92). She also tells how much difficulty she had while learning French, and she describes herself as "bone-headed" (146).

It may be said that what an author has gone through is important because it gives a lot to deduce from her/his characters. Therefore, it can be said that Christie must have been inspired by her family and servants a lot. For example, she describes Simon Doyle in *Death on the Nile* as a simple man while his girlfriend is described as a woman having brains. Likewise, her father is depicted as a simple and lazy man while her mother is a powerful woman. Moreover, since she was raised in a family giving a lot of importance to servants, it is clearly seen that she did not create servants as side characters having no importance, but gave important roles. To illustrate, one of the murderers in *Murder on the Orient Express* is a servant girl, or

one of the main characters of *Taken at the Flood* is a servant girl trying to steal money. Or, she was engaged to someone else when she first met Archie Christie, who wanted her to leave her fiancé, and who would also be her first husband, which may remind us the relationship between Linnet Ridgeway, Simon Doyle and Jacqueline Bellefort in *Death on the Nile*.

For her literary career, it can be said that it started early. She started to write poems when she was a child and she won prizes for some of her poems (320)). Also, she began writing a story because of boredom on a sick day (326). She wrote stories with her pen name but they were not liked by editors, which became a thing she got used to (332). However, she did not give up on writing. While working in a dispensary, she thought of writing a detective story (431). Then she started to look for what kind of a detective she should create. Her way of searching for a detective is stated in her autobiography by her own words as follows:

I reviewed such detectives as I had met and admired in books. There was Sherlock Holmes, the one and only—I should never be able to emulate him. There was Arsene Lupin— was he a criminal or a detective? Anyway, not my kind. There was the young journalist Rouletabille in *The Mystery of the Yellow Room*—that was the sort of person whom I would like to invent: someone who hadn't been used before. Who could I have? A schoolboy? Rather difficult. A scientist? What did I know of scientists? Then I remembered our Belgian refugees. (435)

Therefore, it is seen clearly that she created her famous detective inspired by what had been going on around her as she might have created others inspired by the people around herself. In the process of creating Poirot, it is obvious that she thought a lot of details, and criticized herself to create a good one as understood from what she said to herself as follows:

Why not make my detective a Belgian? I thought. There were all types of refugees. How about a refugee police officer? A retired police officer. Not too young a one. What a mistake I made there. The result is that my fictional detective must really be well over a hundred by now. 435)

What is interesting about her autobiography is that she gives a lot of details about her life, parents, experiences, and, of course, her first famous detective Poirot. She expresses how she became happy when she could find a name for him after

creating his personality as a “tidy little man” (436). She tells how she created Hercule Poirot as stated below:

How about calling my little man Hercules? He would be a small man—Hercules: a good name. His last name was more difficult. I don’t know why I settled on the name Poirot, whether it just came into my head or whether I saw it in some newspaper or written on something—anyway it came. It went well not with Hercules but Hercule—Hercule Poirot. That was all right—settled, thank goodness. (436)

One day, unexpectedly, she received a letter about *The Mysterious Affair at Styles*. She says that the day that letter came was the first day of her “long career” (471). Since her Belgian detective became so famous, she kept writing about him (479). Poirot is not the only detective she created, a woman detective also started to appear in her books. However, she states that among her books, *Crooked House*, *Moving Finger* and *Ordeal by Innocence* are her favorite books. On the other hand, she criticizes her book, *The Mystery of the Blue Train* as follows:

However, I have come near it, I think, in *The Mystery of the Blue Train*. Each time I read it again, I think it commonplace, full of clichés, with an uninteresting plot. Many people, I am sorry to say, like it. Authors are always said to be no judge of their own books. (891)

As is known, Agatha Christie was a Golden Age detective storyteller, but she kept writing until she dies. Her last book was written in 1975. So, it is obvious that in her long lifetime she witnessed a lot of things, most importantly, wars, and she could observe how the world changed, which might have affected her style of writing and the way she presented her characters.

Christie’s works are accepted as “original in the sense that it is a puzzle story”, and she is defined as the originator of a pattern of an extraordinary resilience” (Priestman qtd. in Knight, 81). As Lee Horsley states, she deals with “symptomatic instability”. She writes about families having troubles in itself, people with other identities, or people mentally disturbed. Also, she reflects the society “preying on itself”. Horsley also adds:

Christie portrays a society of strangers in which all social exchange is theatrical and she structures her narratives to reveal sources of menace that seem inextricably bound up with the traditional social hierarchies she

represents. In this reading, “containment” of crime is double-edged: it allows reassuring closure but also implies that the class represented is preying on itself, and that it contains the seeds of its own destruction. (40)

Therefore, it is understood that the class Christie represents in her books is shown with its isolation and regulation but at the same time people belonging to that class and living in that particular isolated area try to destroy each other. In this respect, Christie’s first book, *The Mysterious Affair at Styles*, may be given as an example. The story of the book takes place in a country house. The landlady is killed by her own husband, who is much younger than her. However, the husband is not the only one committing the murder, but his lover, who is also one of victim’s closest friends. As understood from this book, people living together deal with each other and, as Horsley states above, destroy each other.

When the motives of the characters are regarded, it is said that it changes in her books. According to Priestman, motives in general are “money, fear of exposure, and sexual jealousy (qtd. in Knight). These may be the central motives, but there are some cases in which the detective Poirot finds no motives. To illustrate, in *Taken of Flood*, one of the reasons why Poirot has difficulty in solving the case is the lack of motive. Also, revenge can be the motive in some of her books such as *Murder on the Orient Express* or *Death on the Nile*.

As for the techniques she used, as Stephen Knight states that in her first novel, she used techniques which “rejected romantic male heroism as a protecting force”. However, she developed the “archetypal featured of the clue-puzzle”. Her first detective is Belgian Hercule Poirot. He is a “fussy, unheroic figure. His physical vanity is foolish but his brain works well”. In 1930, she created her first female detective, Miss. Marple, coming from a respected family, in *Murder At The Vicarage*. Like Poirot she has a strong power of observation, and she reflects them perfectly (81- 108). The titles of Christie’s books give information about the incident or the setting (e.g. *Murder on the Orient Express*, *Death on the Nile*). Murderers are not strangers. They are from the upper-middle class, and they can be anyone within the family. Also, the murderer is generally the least suspected and most trusted character in the story (Scaggs 46-48). Her victims have a property and the death of

the victim disturbs the “social unit of the family.” That’s why the enemy is found in the family because “property-owning is the personalized wish and self-knowledge of the bourgeois man and woman.” Also, her characters are deceived easily and they do not have strong moral codes. The deceived and betrayed character feels an urge to take his/her revenge, and commits murder (115-128).

Christie uses isolated and semi-rural villages for setting, which makes setting and characters limited. People cannot leave or anyone new cannot join them (Scaggs, 46-48). For instance, in *Murder On The Orient Express*, a man is killed in a compartment and, luckily, the train breaks down, which limits the place and the characters. They are in an isolated place, and the people in that compartment are known by the detective, which would make his investigation easier.

Readers of Agatha Christie are involved in the process of detection. They interpret, and make deductions together with the detective. However, Christie misleads her readers. She does not give a lot of details about the characters. She just gives brief summaries about them. Moreover, they all have a motive to be murderer. Therefore, a book has a lot of suspects (Horsley, 44-45). For instance, in *Death On The Nile*, each passenger in the boat, except for Poirot, has a reason to kill the victim. She may have been killed by her lawyer, who wants to steal money from her, or the woman, who has become poor because of the victim’s father, or the old woman, who is obsessed with expensive jewelry which the victim wears.

Christie’s novels end “not with a final solution of the problem, but with the final union of two lovers.” As in *Death On The Nile*, murder of the victim is planned by two lovers. The male character deceives the victim and they get married. The plan is to get her money. However, they get caught by detective Poirot. In the end, they kill themselves and they get united dying together, which makes the resolution of the mystery a romantic one (Scaggs, 48).

In conclusion, born in the Victorian Age and died in 1976, Agatha Christie, witnessed different ages in her lifetime. Along with witnessing changes, a lot of loss and grieves during wars, she worked at hospitals as a nurse. Moreover, she could write so many great books which have still been attracting people, and there have

been several adaptations of her books, and play, *Mousetrap* throughout the world. As understood from her autobiography, she had a very happy childhood, and she was very happy with her family. She states that she loved her parents because they are her mother and father, but they are very loving (22). Also, it is obvious that she is aware of the fact that their economic situation enabled her to be engaged in writing. However, it is obvious that the opportunities she had in her life did not make her a snob, but a productive woman, who still makes people enjoy reading detective fiction. Although she does not define herself as an ambitious woman, she could write approximately two hundred books, which may actually prove her passion in writing.



CHAPTER TWO

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

2.1 History of Feminism

Having equal rights for women is one of the issues that are still being fought for. Even in the twenty first century, women do not have the same right with men. They are not only discriminated in their family, but also they have difficulties at work. Furthermore, they are criticized by their look, race, the way they dress, or their partners. It is as if women come to the world to be judged by the society they are born to. However, it cannot be denied that today's women can be a bit luckier because the number of feminist women and men has been increasing, and more and more people have been more aware of the fact that there is no reason why women do not have equal rights with men.

The first feminist movement began in the eighteenth and nineteenth century (David, 32). However, the first steps of these movements actually date back to Renaissance. Before and during the Renaissance, it was thought, "women were guilty of licentiousness, disloyalty, disobedience, gluttony, pride, vanity, greed, quarrelsomeness, vindictiveness, and talkativeness" In addition, in the book of Genesis, it was stated that

God created the man in his image: in the image of God created him: He created them men and women. The man was a "perfect creation". In a gesture of compassion, to complement man's solitary, existence, God made creatures and brought them to the man for naming, signifying man's hegemony over them and over the natural world. The serpent's tempting of the woman resulted in her sins of disobedience and pride, followed by those of the man. (1:27)

Therefore, women were seen as the "chief distraction" to men as they were believed to be seductive. Also, it was claimed that Adam was created from dust "in the image of God", but Eve's creation had a more complex explanation. People were trying to find an answer to whether she was a companion to Adam, or she was created for solely "biological reasons". For this reason, the book of Genesis was studied to have "a purer text" of the book (Harvey, 36-39).

Genesis was not the only source that ignored women and her capabilities. History also mentioned men's victories whereas it tended to mention women's

manipulations although women did take action and have achievements (Zinsser 2-3). Also, it was man who created history and women were not reflected realistically, and they were searched as mothers, daughters and widowers in the man-created history (Lerner qtd. in Zinsser, 7-8).

Writing *The Book of the City Ladies* in 1405, Christine de Pizan is accepted as the first feminist historian. She rejected the subordination of women in all aspects, their dependence and inferiority (Zinsser, 2-3). In her book, Pizan creates a city and the residents of the city are famous women. It is a city that women are valued. Pizan also focuses on how important education for women is in her book written in the fifteenth century.

Further studies were done following the fifteenth century. Jane Anger, for instance, wrote *Her Protection for Women* in 1589. She stated in her book that contrary to the common belief that “misogyny was a new concept”, actually women had been experiencing it since pagan and early Christian times. Furthermore, women’s weakness presented in Genesis should be questioned. She even claimed that “at the very inception of the human story, irrefutable proofs of woman’s superiority to man were established since God used finer substances to create woman” (Anger).

In 1617 Ester Sowernam wrote *Ester Hath Hang’d Haman: Or and Answer to a Lewd Pamphlet Entitled “The Arraignment of Women”*. She wanted to show that women and men were equal creatures designed by their creator. Rachel Speght wrote *A Mouzell for Melastomus: The Cynicall Bayter of, and Foul Mouthed Barker Against EVAHS SEX* in the same year. She believed that women were “excellent work of God’s hands” and they were created or “built” to show that “men were imperfect buildings afore women were made; and, bringing them unto Adam, united and married them together.” Thus, she wanted to “blur the differences between women as superior and women as equal to man”, and focused on the “equality and mutuality” among women and men. Speght also asserted that women were created as helpers and companion to men, but this should not mean that all the domestic responsibilities should belong to women. They should share “cares, grieves, and calamities” (Speght).

In the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, there were also women and men

who published sketches to attract attention of women. Especially in the nineteenth century, these sketches had great popularity among women (Zinsser, 5). Especially in the nineteenth century, feminists focused on discriminations that prevented women from having the equal rights in education because they could not get the same education with men (David, 37). To illustrate, Harriet Taylor commented on the system which did not let a married woman have the property inherited from their fathers since she believed that the property should belong to women, not their husbands (74). Mary Wollstonecraft wrote *A Vindication of the Rights of Woman* in 1792. She stated that women and men could not be equals due to their different standards of their education.

However, after women's struggling to be accepted to universities and to some colleges such as Oxford and Cambridge in the nineteenth century, in the twentieth century, Henry Maudsley came up with an argument claiming that women could not be men's equals because they menstruated, which caused a lot of trouble for women at that time. Until the World War II, the majority of the students in Cambridge were men (David, 37).

On the other hand, along with developments in the nineteenth-century, social and economic structures changed, especially in England. People were experiencing mobility of classes since England was becoming the world power of the age. People were also moving from rural areas to urban centres because of the need for labor. This also affected relationships between men and women because women started to take place in labor leaving their domestic roles in the patriarchy. So, the control of men over women was disturbed. Until the nineteenth century, man had been always the "breadwinners". They had been used to working in dangerous and dirty places such as mines while women had been dealing with domestic issues such as cleaning and cooking. As soon as women had occupied men's space, they were abolished from places that had belonged to men. This was followed by women's abolishment from social life and politics, both of which were being occupied by men since women could not have any room in such spaces which were to be shared by only men. Therefore, women had difficulties in finding paid jobs. They could work as cleaners or baby sitters (McDowell, 191-193). As a result, the number of women workers increased but they could not find a place for themselves in

patriarchal societies. What was worse was that their domestic work increased at that era due to the “transformation from domestic to factory production” (McDowell 194-196). Moreover, industrialization and urbanization caused women to lose their independence. With the emergence of urbanization, they had to leave their agricultural work, which resulted in division of labor at work and home. On the other hand, women from high classes only looked after their children, which resulted in the increase of the birth rate (Freidan qtd. in Mellor, 300).

Furthermore, John Stuart Mill dealt with women issues in the Victorian Age. In his essay *The Subjection of Women*, he supported that women should have the same legal rights with men. He stated that man was accepted as masters, and they wanted women’s “obedience, sentiments and oppression”, and he suggested that women speak up and deal with literature to reflect their problems, and they should create characters respecting women and speaking up about their issues.

As a result, although there were feminist movements in the Victorian Era, feminist ideas were not included in academia (David, 32). In addition, women had serious limitations, and they were asked to be domestic, while they were “highly sexualized” (Mellor 302). They did not have as many opportunities as men always had because of the “collective identity” created by the society and “traditional histories”. Even though some women wanted to achieve something for their subordination, they were not taken seriously (Zinsser, 4).

In the twentieth century, social and political changes such as the right for vote, education and birth control appeared. Along with these changes, there were fierce feminist campaigns and protests. Women were able to get education at schools, but they were not treated as equals to men at schools. They still did not have the same opportunities with male students. Some places were also single-sex. To justify differences between women and men, authorities used “separate but equal” statement. Women started to have some qualifications, but they were encouraged to be only teachers, nurses or social workers. They did not have to go to universities for these vocations, but to specialist schools. Therefore, they did not have university degrees. Teaching older children and young adults was a profession requiring an undergraduate degree, so there were more men than women in academic positions (David 35-36).

Feminists who fought against these inequalities between the late nineteenth century and the early twentieth century are called first-wave feminists (David 33). In 1930s, there were different approaches. In addition, Mary Ritter Beard paid great attention to “duality of women’s position in society”, she also claimed “women have been active and the center of history”. On the other hand, Simone de Beauvoir believed in “the concept of women as a group ‘dogma’ (qtd. in Zinsser, 6). In her Book, *The Second Sex*, Beauvoir focused on women’s situation and subordination from the beginning of history. She was concerned with women and their problems. Her ideas became popular after 1960s first in France and then they spread worldwide.

Between 1940s and 60s there were also a great deal of feminist ideas since it was a time of great changes for women and their status in the society. Especially 1960s was a time when people fought for women, social and civil rights. Until that time patriarchal system was not analyzed in terms of feminist perspective, and there were not any studies on sexism. Also, women issues were not in the agenda, and the number of women students was far less than the number of men.

However, with the emergence of the second-wave feminists in 1960s, such issues as women as daughters, sisters, wives and mothers, and their situation in family life, education and work were dealt with. Consequently, their situation began to change. There were co-educational practices in Cambridge and Oxford, which moved the relationship between men and women, which had been private and limited to family, to public (David, 29-39). Also, the second-wave feminists noticed that history did not give much space to women since women had been “put aside and disregarded”. Therefore, they started to look for women in history. For example, history of women’s “biographical, social, political, labor and ideological” was discussed, and it was compared to “masculine standards”. Also, women were represented as wives of important heroes, not as decision takers or rulers (Matthews, 147). Therefore, a lot of articles and essays were written, surveys were conducted, and a lot of people were inspired to do more research because history focused only on “heterosexual male elite” (Zinsser, 5-8).

Other issues feminists dealt in 1960s and 80s were the position of women at work, their rights, how the labor was divided among women and men between 1960s

and 1970s, and they also questioned the origin of differences. There were important changes worldwide. First of all, it was a post-war period. Economy and social structures of countries were changing. Problems were solved by governments in “peaceful” ways. Some institutions were growing wider and they had their economic needs which required training for teaching and technology. Thus, more women started to take place in universities, but the number of men in universities was much more than the number of women. Also, most of the women were in humanities, not in science. To encourage people to go to universities, Robbins Report was declared in 1963. The report also focused on the importance of the quality of women’s education:

In particular, where women are concerned, the effect might well be either that British parents would be strengthened in their age- long disinclination to consider their daughters to be as deserving of higher education as their sons, or that the eligibility for marriage of the more educated would be diminished by the addition to their charms of what would be in effect a negative dowry. (Robbins qtd. in David, 38-45)

Also, in 1970s, the number of women who started to do jobs only man could do increased, and whereas some were welcomed, some others were lucky enough to be tolerated by men (Epstein, 12). Also, the number of women academics increased and they gained a lot of importance. They questioned “long-lived patriarchal institutions” and examined traditions in economy, politics and religion. Furthermore, they dealt with the language used for women, texts on women and binary oppositions towards women. Some important theorists like Lacan, Derrida and Foucault were analysed in detail (Zinsser, 10-19). In addition, Kate Millet’s *Sexual Politics* was published in 1970. She suggested that relationships between sexes and politics depended on the definition of politics. If politics deals with power-structured relationships and arrangements, one group’s domination will be over the other. Therefore, men’s domination over women was inevitable. Moreover, she denied that the anatomy of sexes created differences between them, and she focused on the difference between the concept of gender and sex.

Even in the twentieth century, women are accepted as subordinates to men throughout the world. Gender discrimination affects women’s reproduction and their

economic situation, and, thus, they are not as autonomous as men are, they are not appreciated as much as men, their right of decision making is limited, all of which prevent women from feeling secure. What is more, this situation is enforced by social, cultural and psychological structures in society, which is the main reason of injustice, struggle and discomfort. It is also known that women's boundaries have been built by "cultural entrepreneurs who translate the concepts into practice- rulers behind the closed doors of palaces and executive offices, judges in courtrooms; priests, rabbis and mullahs,; leaders and members of unions and clubs, and teachers, parents, and the people in the street". Even in the twenty- first century, how women behave or dress or even how much space they occupy in public is in the control of men. They do not have the full control over their bodies. To illustrate, abortion has been a very controversial issue. Women, unfortunately, cannot decide on this situation by themselves. It is stated that gender discrimination is not based on biology; it is social and cultural structures that create all the so-called differences (Epstein, 1-4).

Today, women have certain roles assigned to them by society, and if a woman does not play her parts in the society, tries to be free, or is considered to have a sexual intercourse with a man, she is killed in some societies. For instance, *New York Times* has reported in Turkey that women are killed for having male partners, or they are forced to commit suicide (Bilefsky qtd. in Epstein, 14). Or, in Africa some parts of women's genitals are cut to prevent them from sexual pleasure. In addition, there is a dress code for women in some countries. Women are asked to hide some parts of their bodies. Even in some countries, the whole body is covered up. The reason may be that women's body is treated as if it is something to be hidden. For example, Sandra T. Mohanty states that

A large number of different, fragmented examples from a variety of countries apparently add up to a universal fact. For instance, Muslim woman in Saudi Arabia, Iran, Pakistan, India and Egypt all wear some sort of veil. Hence, this indicates that the sexual control of women is a universal fact in those countries in which women are veiled. (376)

The way they dress is a sign of their honor. It is asserted that some clothes have been designed to limit women's mobility. For example, women used to wear

long skirts. The situation may be changing, and women may be wearing jeans or T-shirts, but it is undeniable that “more sexually evocative” clothes have been produced by fashion industry for women rather than men (Epstein, 14-15).

This may be linked to the idea that women might be expected to be feminine in patriarchal societies. Producing certain types of clothes which make women look feminine means that industries in patriarchal societies aim to create a standard in which women become just one type like a uniform. The underlying idea may be that since women are females, they should naturally look feminine. However, Toril Moi focuses on the difference between being female and feminine. She states that being female is a biological feature, so it is women’s “nature” whereas being feminine is women’s “nurture” (122). She also refers to Simone de Beauvoir, who suggests that “Femininity is a cultural construct: one is not born a woman, but becomes a woman (qtd. in Moi, 122). In addition, Hèlené Cixous states that being a woman should not be considered as “a female sexuality” since women are different from each other and their “imagination is inexhaustible, like music, painting, writing” (876). Therefore, it is understood that being a woman cannot be related to being feminine since they are different concepts.

Another area where women are restricted is their free time. In many countries women get up earlier than men, prepare food, and they do not have the privilege of having their meal with a companionship of a man. They are always busy with these domestic issues. Also, what they do in their free time, how they spend it, or with whom they spend their free time are controlled by men. Men always know when and where women go, with whom they go, and when they go back home. On the other hand, men have more space than women do. It is not wrong for a man to appear in public. They are seen more often than women are. On the other hand, women do not have enough time for themselves; they just have always had an “attempt” of having free time (Epstein, 14-15).

In conclusion, earning less, being unimportant and quiet, women are still abused especially when sexism takes place along with racism and patriarchy (Mies qtd. in Mellor, 298). In societies in which people lived in tribes, women used to have so much importance because they played a vital role in the economy of their house. They were the “food gatherers” and they were claimed to be as those improving

gardening. On the other hand, men were hunting and fighting. So, it is argued that “male dominance grew out of the colonizing of social space (Mellor, 299). Therefore, it is clear that the subordination of women dates back to the time when private properties, and master and slave relationships appeared. As Engels states, “the worldwide defeat of the female sex” dates back to the time when the private property appeared (67). In their properties, women stayed home and they were busy with domestic works. In the work divided among men and women, men went hunting, and women dealt with their house, which caused women’s work to be abused by men. Moreover, what women did was not paid; therefore, it did not have as much as value of men’s. Unfortunately, this situation has not changed since private properties have appeared.

2.2 Simone de Beauvoir’s *The Second Sex*

In her book, *The Second Sex*, Simone de Beauvoir portrays woman’s subordination, and she focuses on the origin of her subordination. She gives details of how the status of woman has changed or has not changed. Beauvoir not only shows the reasons of discrimination between women and men, but also analyses the relationship between women and men throughout history.

The first part of the book focuses on the biology of men and women. Their biological differences have been used to prove their differences, but Beauvoir does not agree with what has been said. She says that men have tried to justify women’s inequality by referring to her biology. They have tried to prove the differences between men and women by stating that men produce sperms and women produce eggs. However, they have failed to see that these two can be produced by the same individual. The source of the discrimination used to be based on myths and it did not have scientific proof. Also, differentiating women from men is not easy. A crystal clear distinction cannot be made just because there are two types (male and female). In addition, the existence of differences cannot confirm the existence of passivity and activity. To illustrate, women cannot be regarded as passive because it is actually sperm that develops the embryo. However, it is also known that egg is also an active organism (1-27). She adds women and men are different from each other in terms of their height, weight and the shape of their skeleton. Even the connection of their

tissues or amount of hemoglobin or hormones is different, but this does not support the passivity of women. As a result, nobody can deny these differences but it is obvious that they are not important or biological differences do not have any basis to prove women's subordination.

Then, Beauvoir mentions the history of men and women, and their relationship. In pre-historic times, women and men were equal. Men were going hunting and fishing whereas women had domestic duties such as dealing with the land or pottery. As a result, they had an important role in economy. However, with the appearance of copper, tin, iron and bronze, men began to have a bigger role because dealing with those new discoveries required "intensive labor" which women could not meet. They also caused private properties to appear, which resulted in not only master and slave relations, but also women's enslavement by men in patriarchal families. What men created was more valuable than women's domestic work because men could realize that they were the discoverer, producer, creator and dominator. They felt they were more powerful than the nature itself and, therefore, they believed they could achieve everything by themselves (60-63).

However, when Agatha Christie's *Taken at the Flood* and *Death on the Nile* are analysed with this respect, it is seen that most of the women in these books are not represented as women who deal with house cleaning, or taking care of their children. Actually, they are busy with making plans to take revenge or save their families from bankrupt while men do not seem to have the intelligence to organize all the work the women handle. Interestingly, most of the men in both books are quite passive, and they lack the practicality and courage the women have. There is just one book and man who lead their lives to patriarchal ways.

On the other hand, appearance of private properties was not the only reason of women's subordination (Beauvoir, 63). At this point Beauvoir refers to Engels. Engels states that women did not have enough muscular strength, which enabled them to produce tools from bronze or iron. In addition, they had limited capacity while men could actively participate in labour production, which caused the catastrophe of women and helped men's enlargement. Relationship between men and women was not based on friendship, but it evolved into a master-slave relationship (64). Hegel highlights the fact that the master and slave relationship is quite different

than the relationship between men and women. A slave is conquered and there is a risky situation. However, women do not risk her life for men. There is not a battle between them since women accepted man as the one who shaped the future and they had their own values, but women failed in having their own values as men did for themselves (73). Therefore, division of labor because of the difference between sexes was the main reason of women's oppression. Moreover, it was asserted that the capacity of women decreased when they had their period, became pregnant and had children. Therefore, men had to do all the necessary work when women were passive during their pregnancy and the times when they have their period. Men had to produce, hunt or fight alone. Women were behind men and they were put in the second place (70). Nonetheless, women lost their values when men started to practise slavery because they no longer needed women in labor, which resulted in women's losing their role in economy in their community. The more men got stronger, the weaker women became (88).

As men got used to the agricultural life they could reflect himself with the way they shaped the world and they focused on himself and the world they lived in. They settled on their particular place that they owned. Since men were the creators and owners of everything, women had nothing for themselves. Therefore, women could not exist as separate individuals. Also, their children belonged to their fathers. Fathers were responsible for their livings and deaths. While male babies had right to live, girls were commonly killed. Fathers were the authority of young girls. When women married, the authority switched hands: husbands became their new authorities (Beauvoir, 74- 93).

From the Middle Age to the eighteenth century, woman was an honorable creature in the early times of Christianity as long as she was a member of the Church. However, she was not in the first place in the worshipping ceremonies. In the marriages in those times, husbands and wives had to be faithful to each other, but the husband had the ultimate authority over the wife (109). This situation did not change for a very long time. However, in the seventeenth century women enjoyed arts and letters. In addition, the salon culture was widespread among high level of classes. In the eighteenth century, in the rising middle class, husbands gave importance to morality of their wives while the upper-middle class women of the age

were living a life full of vanities. Also, there were women who read philosophy and dealt with physics and chemistry. Although women of higher classes had more privileges, they were not pleased with their situation. In the late nineteenth century, they stated they needed to have “a room of their own” (119-120). Finally, equals rights of men and women were proclaimed in the Socialist Congress in 1879 although they did not have any feminist intention, and women’s voting was suggested for the first time in 1901 (138).

Another point Beauvoir focuses on is woman in history. She is aware that women have been unable to have a word in their history of creation because they have always been guarded by men. Even though it can be said that women belonging to a higher economic class could enjoyed their freedom, it was not a freedom that had been endowed to men. What was worse is that working class women had a much worse situation. They were in a complete slavery. Therefore, women were unable to act against their situation (145). Beauvoir states, “It is not the inferiority of women that has caused their historical insignificance, it is their historical insignificance that has doomed them to inferiority” (148).

She also makes a comparison between men and women, and how they are treated differently in their families and society. Boys and girls give different reactions to their separation from their mothers. They do not need to be fed by their mothers’ milk anymore and they need to step forward to become an individual. As for girls, they are around their mother and father. They are allowed to sit on their fathers’ knees. They are forced to wear beautiful dresses or skirts, and they are allowed to cry and be capricious while boys do not have the right to cry because “a man does not cry” and they should not look for kisses anymore. In addition, being persuaded “more is demanded by boys because they are superior” they are imposed that they need to be away from women to be a man (304-305).

In addition, elder girls have the model motherly figure. They help their mothers on housework. Unfortunately, they are not aware of how these things will affect their through their maturation. They become “little women” even when they are children. They feel pleased when they look after her younger siblings. They do this proudly. Since their mothers are always home, they are always aware of what is going on around them. Brothers do not involve as their sisters do. However, they are

curious of what is going on in their fathers' lives. It is not like mothers' situation because fathers are not home all the time. They have their own lives which their wives cannot intrude. Even in their childhood, girls listen to stories such as "Cinderella" or "Rapunzel" in which the male character has to leave or save the girl. It is as if they have to wait someone to be saved and this idea is imposed on girls from their childhoods. However, as they get older, they realize that there is a whole wide world outside. They used to think that their homes are the world itself and their mothers are the dominator, but they come to a realization that it is not the case. They understand that the world outside belongs to men. Men are the dominators of the world (321-346).

On the other hand, during their maturity, boys stay active, but young girls are still passive. They want to be safe and they look for a man to fulfill their dreams. They seek the same security in their fathers' arms in another man/her husband (367-368). Another point is that, in social life, men are the one who produce and join communities. They have social bonds and they have an active lifestyle. On the other hand, women are not seen outside as an active participant as much as men do. They just meet their female peers and do not appear outside much. In addition, women are expected to be erotic objects and wear clothes that attract their husbands like a "prey" while such things are not demanded by their husband (588-590).

Again, Christie's women and men in *Taken at the Flood* and *Death on the Nile* differ from what Beauvoir states above. Except for Rosaleen Cloade, no other women need protection from anybody. They are capable enough to live their lives without needing a man. To illustrate, Lynn Marchmont in *Taken at the Flood*, is a woman who goes to the battle field during the war while her fiancé prefers to stay in the village and keep living in peace unlike his fiancée. Or, Jacqueline Bellefort in *Death on the Nile* makes a very good plan by herself that the detective appreciates the way the plan made since it takes a lot of time and energy to solve it. These women prove that women can be as active and intelligent as men without needing to be an erotic object.

According to Beauvoir, as women get older, women tend to give up their battle. When their older husbands die, they start to enjoy their lives, which gives them a way to take their revenge. However, men are more "disturbed" than women

when they lose their wives because they “gain” more from marriages than women do (662).

To sum up, according to Simone de Beauvoir, women have become the “Other” whereas men have always been the “One” throughout history. Men have all the advantages: They have been active participants in life; they have had the power to shape the world as they wish, they have been lucky to have prestigious jobs, and earn more than women. Women have always had a guardian in their lives. This guardian is first their father or brother, then their husband takes it over. Whenever they want to express themselves, they are hindered, because it is thought that they do not have the right to do so. As a result, they become “alienated” and, then, they are enslaved in a world they are controlled by others. (28).

The husband does not want to help his wife with housework because he does not want to “lower” himself. Also, women are not allowed to initiate a sexual intercourse because it is man’s duty and an honored woman does not do such thing. Actually, they are expected to be capricious, frivolous, informant and sorrowful. These are what make a woman attractive. Having a woman having with these characteristics, a man feels himself secure. In addition, these are the characteristics that men do not choose for themselves (205).

On the other hand, when women in Christie’s books, *Taken at the Flood* and *Death on the Nile* are regarded, it is seen clearly that women are not othered by their partners. On the contrary, most of them have very important places in their relationships, and they cannot be underestimated for their intelligence. To illustrate, Jacqueline Bellefort makes a perfect plan to murder her friend, Linnet Doyle understands business, or Frances Cloade sacrifices her relative to save their money from her brother-in-law’s wife.

When what Beauvoir states in her book *The Second Sex* is taken into consideration, it is clearly seen that women have always been victimized, oppressed and suppressed by men. They are subordinators and they are not seen as important as men both in their family and in society. Although most of the female characters in *Taken at the Flood* and *Death on the Nile* are portrayed as strong and self-sufficient women, as stated before, there is just one woman who is victimized and oppressed by her partner, David Hunter. As Beauvoir states, it seems that she has served people all

her life, searched for a man for protection instead of trying to do it by herself. In addition, she is reflected as a woman who obeys her partner, who scares her every time she does something he does not approve of. Therefore, it is obvious that the impression Rosaleen Clade gives the reader is parallel to the woman who is underestimated by her male partner, also, oppressed and abused by him. Yet, Simone de Beauvoir criticizes not only men, but also women. She blames women for choosing to be passive and subordinated by men throughout history. She also asserts that women do not have the ability to unite against their unfortunate situation and they have been struggling to exist in the patriarchal society without forming a sisterhood (xxi-xxii).





CHAPTER THREE

AGATHA CHRISTIE'S WOMEN

As is known, Agatha Christie wrote approximately two hundred novels or plays in her lifetime, which presented a great variety of women and men appear. Some come from very prestigious families whereas some belong to the lower classes of the society. Also, there are a lot of strong women and men as well as weak ones. Therefore, whether Christie is a feminist or an anti-feminist has been an issue dealt with critics due to the way these characters are represented in her works, but it is known that representation of all of these characters does not have a certain pattern. Therefore, there are several approaches about her feminist or anti-feminist attitudes. To illustrate, Margot Peters and Agate Nesaule Krouse find sexism in Agatha Christie novels, which they find inconvenient for a woman writer (144). They also depict Christie's women characters as follows:

Her women are garrulous, talking inconsequentially and at length about irrelevancies. If young, they are often stupid, blonde, red-finger nailed gold diggers without a thought in their heads except men and money. Her servant girls are even more stupid, with slack mouths, "boiled gooseberry eyes," and a vocabulary limited to "Yesm" and "Nom" unless, of course, they're being garrulous. (150)

They also draw attention to the contrast between the image of women and men in Christie's books:

The men are by and large presented as professional, active, and rational. The women are portrayed, on the other hand as social aberrants-exotics, witches, sea nymphs, woodsprites; as unattractive-snoopy, whining, foreign; or as mentally confused – "an imaginative if untidy mind". (150-151)

There are, of course, some women whom Peter and Krouse find "competent", but, according to Knepper, they are "portrayed as either deadly or destructive" (151).

On the other hand, accepting Christie's sexist attitudes, Mary S. Knepper states that Christie actually has respect towards her women characters, and she sympathises with them. Knepper also claims that Christie's women may be reflecting "her prejudice against women" (389-390).

When aforementioned criticism concerning feminism or anti-feminism in Agatha Christie's characters is taken into consideration, it is obviously seen that characterization of women shows differences in the books selected for this thesis. For example, the servant girl in *Taken at the Flood* may be similar to the ones Peters and Krouse mention but there are some nuances in their general interpretation of the servant girls in Christie's books. Also, it is true that there are some women who are not smart at all, but it does not mean that not all women characters are thoughtless and ignorant and looking for money under the control of a man. To illustrate, one of the main women characters in Christie's last book, *Curtain*, is represented as a strong, brave, independent and intelligent woman who has fierce discussions on freedom with her father. Therefore, the analysis of the couples of these two books from a feminist perspective by referring to Simone de Beauvoir's *The Second Sex* will show that Agatha Christie has various kinds of women and men characters in her books, and she *did* create very courageous and smart women throughout her career. Therefore, analyzing women and men in *Taken at the Flood* (also known as *There is A Tide*) and *Death on The Nile* will help display how various unconventional women and men characters have been created.

Written in 1948, *Taken at the Flood* is a crime story with several victims and criminals. It is not like an ordinary crime story because, as Hercule Poirot states, the case in the book is "wrong way round" (Christie, 188).

Similar to *Death on the Nile*, the motive for the murder(s) is money. However, interestingly, nobody kills anyone for his or her money. Gordon Cloade, the rich character of the book, dies in a blast leaving no wills behind him. His family becomes quite restless after his death because they have been depending on him for their living. The actual reason of this unrest is that Gordon Cloade leaves a widower behind him. Now all the money belongs to Rosaleen Cloade, who is much younger than Mr. Cloade.

Being hopeless about their current situation, the Cloade family tries to find a way to have their portion from Gordon Cloade. They are determined to have their right because, otherwise, they cannot survive due to the economic situation of the

country resulting from World War II. Therefore, they make a plan to get rid of Rosaleen, but they do not know Rosaleen has a brother with her.

When the family meet Rosaleen, they realize that she is not as they have expected. They have expected her as an assertive young rich woman, but she appears as a lovely woman who married Gordon for his money. They think she does not know how to wear expensive clothes (37). Also, from her appearance they feel that she is “an uneducated woman.” This means she must be someone who can be easily tricked. So, the family members start to borrow money from her, and Rosaleen cannot reject them and gives the money they need. However, with her brother, David Hunter’s interference, they stop asking money from her.

Meanwhile, Gordon Cloade’s niece, Lynn Marchmont falls in love with David Hunter because she finds him courageous and dangerous. She is impressed by this dangerous man because he is not like her fiancée, Rowley Cloade, who is a farmer and has a quiet life in the village they live together. Also, the rest of the family understands that it is not Rosaleen, whom they should be afraid of, but her brother because he is the one who makes all the decisions and dominates Rosaleen and the money they have been expecting to have. As a result, they make plans regarding David and his sister Rosaleen.

Another point the Cloade family takes into consideration is that Rosaleen was married before she married Gordon Cloade, and her former husband is believed to have died, but nobody is sure about it. Therefore, the family thinks that they can benefit from this fact and prevent Rosaleen from taking the money Gordon has left because if her husband is still alive, that means she is not officially divorced, and she does not have any right to have the money. And suddenly Rosaleen and David receive a letter from a man named Enoch Arden saying Rosaleen’s husband, Robert Underhay, is not dead. David understands that the man, called Enoch Arden, is blackmailing them. However, this man is killed accidentally, and nobody knows who the man really is, or whether he is Rosaleen’s former husband, or whether he is someone who tries to blackmail them. Therefore, Rosaleen is asked to identify the body. Although she claims that he is a man she has never met, Major Porter confirms that he is Rosaleen’s former husband, Robert.

The detective Poirot is unable to solve this case because things do not go on as expected. Although all of the characters in the book have a motive to kill someone, and when the victims are considered, it becomes difficult for Poirot to find the true criminal because suspects prove that they have not done anything although they are highly supposed to do so. In the end, Hercule Poirot finds the truth: Rosaleen and David Hunter are not sister and brother. Rosaleen is actually the maid of the house Gordon Cloade had. Since the Cloade family does not meet her when she gets married to Gordon, David Hunter wants to benefit from it and makes a plan to have Gordon's inheritance. Later, it is revealed that the real Rosaleen died in a blast, too.

However, David's plan does not proceed as he expects because he cannot foresee that the real Cloade family is waiting to get their proportion from Gordon's will. They have been making plans helplessly and hopelessly, and they are ready to do everything not to give up. In addition to Cloades, Rosaleen gives up her deal with Hunter. These are all unexpected situations for David, which results in his killing Rosaleen in the end. On the other hand, the Cloades also fail in their plans. They are the ones who have come up with the idea of Enoch Arden's giving news about Rosaleen's dead husband. However, this plan is also doomed to fail because of the unexpected murder of Enoch Arden, who is actually Mrs. Cloade's cousin.

Similarly, published in 1938, *Death on the Nile* is a crime story in which the motive of the murderer is money. Nevertheless, the story takes place on the River Nile.

Linnet Ridgeway is a beautiful, young and a smart woman, who has inherited a lot from her father. Her father's loss does not affect her finance because she is capable of conducting her father's business. Her close and unfortunate friend, Jacqueline de Bellefort, visits Linnet with her fiancée and it is the day when Linnet Ridgeway makes a horrible decision for her life. She falls in love with Jacqueline's lover, and then marries him. Determined to take her revenge, Jacqueline follows them to Egypt on their honeymoon.

On the other hand, having heard of the news about Linnet, people who have business deals with Linnet start to get worried because they think Linnet will not be able to deal with business after her marriage anymore, and they feel they need to do

something for their own benefits. Therefore, they also follow Linnet and her new husband, Simon Doyle, to Egypt. However, among people following Linnet and Simon, are there others who have had bad experiences with the Ridgeway family. A woman's father, for example, loses her fortune because of Linnet's father. Again, Christie gives readers a story full of characters having at least one motive to kill someone.

Unaware of everything going on around them, the couple has a lot fun until they see Bellefort in Egypt. She threatens them and swears to kill them both for what they have done to her. Meanwhile, the detective, Hercule Poirot, talks to the couple, tries to prevent Jacqueline from her revenge, and observes others as he always does because he is smart enough to understand that something is about to happen. Linnet Ridgeway's murder does not shock people because there has been a woman after her who has been waiting for taking her revenge and longing for getting her lover back. Even though Jacqueline de Bellefort is supposed to be the only suspect of the story, it cannot be proved. So, again, a difficult case is waiting for Monsieur Hercule Poirot to be solved.

Similar to the case in *Taken at the Flood*, this one also excites Poirot because everyone expects Jacqueline to be the murderer, but she is seen somewhere else when the murder is committed. For this reason, Poirot starts to revise his observations and tries to find the murderer, but he is unable to fill the gaps until he finds out that this murder has been planned together by Simone Doyle and Jacqueline de Bellefort. It is revealed that they have not actually ended their relationship, and they have been planning to kill Linnet for her money, and to escape afterwards. However, their plan is also doomed to fail as in *Taken at the Flood* because Hercule Poirot is on the ship with them. When everything is revealed, Jacqueline de Bellefort first shoots Simon in the head, and then herself.

The first main couple is Rosaleen Cloade and David Hunter in *Taken at the Flood*. They play the role of a sister and brother to get the money left by rich and famous Gordon Cloade. These two characters are actually poor and miserable and the only way for them to steal the money is to make collaboration. However, in this collaboration, both participants have an important role, but making decisions belongs to only David Hunter. He has all the responsibilities such as being the head of the

plan, making decisions, changing them, and managing critical conditions as well as being the protector of his partner.

On the other hand, the only thing Rosaleen is expected to do is obeying the rules set by her partner. Therefore, their relationship can be likened to that of a master and a slave, not to a partnership where both of the partners are equal to each other as Beauvoir states “[...] the basic trait of woman: she is the Other in a totality of which the two components are necessary to one another”(xxiii). Although Rosaleen and David are necessary to each other in their plan, David is the One, which inevitably makes Rosaleen the Other. He even manipulates her thoughts about people for his own interest claiming he is there to “look after” her (55).

In addition, it is necessary to look at their relationship in a deeper level. Especially Rosaleen’s attitudes, reactions, decisions, and impressions of others on her have great importance as much as David’s treatment.

To begin with, Christie represents Rosaleen as a weak and vague character who hates hating people (44). She does not have anything to say most of the time. She is a character who depends on her fortune telling cards rather than observing what has been going on around her because she does not have enough intelligence to make deductions from what others say or how they behave. The reason may be that she may be deprived of education when she was a little girl as most of the families do not give enough importance to their daughter’s education (Beauvoir, 154). Also, coming from a poor family and working as a servant, Rosaleen may not have had a chance to get proper education. There is just one moment when she wants to do something alone, but it ends up with her murder.

As mentioned above, Rosaleen and David are working together on their plan, and they depend on each other. They do not have a romantic relationship, which might have created other dimensions if they had one. Even though Rosaleen is necessary for him, and she is his only option for a better life, he always humiliates her:

“Rosaleen's rather stupid. She's scared. She always has been rather scared. She drifts into things and then doesn't know what it's all about. Shall I tell you about Rosaleen?”

If you like," said Lynn politely.

“I do like. She started by being stage-struck and drifted on to the stage. She

wasn't any good, of course. She got into a third-rate touring company that was going out to South Africa. She liked the sound of South Africa. The company got stranded in Cape Town. Then she drifted into marriage with a government official from Nigeria. She didn't like Nigeria - and I don't think she liked her husband much. (41)

As well as humiliating his sister, he also tries to show that Rosaleen lives carelessly, which may also indicate that she lives her life without using her logic, and she does not plan her life, she lives a life however she feels like. She marries her first husband, starts to live with him in Nigeria. Then, she does not like the idea of living there and changes her mind. While she returns, she meets someone on the ship and she suddenly marries. In addition, David comments on her husbands in a negative way, as if she does not deserve to live a proper life with her husband (s):

If he'd been a hearty sort of fellow who drank and beat her, it would have been all right. But he was rather an intellectual man who kept a large library in the wilds and who liked to talk metaphysics. So she drifted back to Cape Town again. The fellow behaved very well and gave her an adequate allowance. He might have given her a divorce, but again he might not for he was a Catholic, but anyway he rather fortunately died of fever, and Rosaleen got a small pension. Then the war started and she drifted on to a boat for South America. She didn't like South America very much, so she drifted on to another boat and there she met Gordon Cloade and told him all about her sad life. So they got married in New York and lived happily for a fortnight". (41)

As is understood, David does not take her seriously and humiliates her in front of other people while he is proud himself about going to war and fighting for England despite being an Irish. He proudly says:

When the war broke out I saw no reason why I should fight for England. I'm Irish. But like all the Irish, I like fighting. The Commandos had an irresistible fascination for me. I had some fun but unfortunately I got knocked out with a bad leg wound. (42)

Here David wants to show how courageous and dangerous he can be, and how much he suits in the role assigned to men as an active and fearless man. This way he threatens the Cloade family members in case of a situation in which they can fight against this couple.

In addition, it is clear that he underestimates her. He does not accept her as his partner in crime, but an ornament helping him get what he wants. To him,

Rosaleen is someone who accepts what she gets and enjoys what she has from their plan such as expensive clothes or jewels. He probably thinks they are what women long for in their life, and Rosaleen should be aware of her advantageous situation and leave everything to David, and she seems to do so:

Come now, my lovely sister Rosaleen, aren't you enjoying all this? A big house, servants- jewellery? Isn't it a dream come true? Isn't it? Glory be to God, sometimes I think I'll wake up and find it is a dream.”

She laughed with him, and watching her narrowly, he was satisfied. He knew how to deal with his Rosaleen. It was inconvenient, he thought, that she should have a conscience, but there it was.

“It's quite true, David, it is like a dream - or like something on the Pictures. I do enjoy it all. I do really. (50)

The main reason why he tries to show himself as a threatening man is that “gender reality is created through sustained social performances” (Butler, 503). He tries to show his masculinity, which will make him a man everybody will be afraid of. However, it is revealed that when he visits Enoch Arden, who blackmails David and Rosaleen, he wears women clothes and puts a lipstick. Although he tries to represent himself as a tough man, he prefers to change his appearance to deceive people. Also, he does not feel ashamed of it; indeed, he enjoys what he has done. He says, “I think a good deal of myself as a female impersonator. Lord, you should have seen that old gorgon’s face!” (186). Therefore, it can be said that it is strange that a man like David Hunter, who is a former soldier risking his life for England as an Irish man, also, the head of the plan and the tough guy, wears woman’s clothes and pretends to be a woman, and enjoys it. This may suggest that there is a discrepancy between how he represents himself and what he has inside, which proves what Judith Butler suggests for gender attributes. She states that “if gender attributes, however, are not expressive but performative, then these attributes effectively constitute the identity they are said to express or reveal. This distinction between expression and performativeness is crucial” (503). For this reason, it can be inferred that what David is actually doing is performing because according to Butler,

gender reality is created through sustained social performances, which means that the very notions of an essential sex and a true abiding masculinity and femininity are also constituted as part of the strategy that

conceals gender's performative possibilities for proliferating gender configurations outside the restricting frames of masculinist dominations and compulsory heterosexuality. (503)

For this reason, it may be true that David is pretending to be a macho, but deep inside it is not a problem for him to dress like a woman and wear lipstick on.

Another issue Beauvoir focuses on is how the "quarrel" between man and woman started. She thinks it appeared because of man's arrogance, which has made people try to understand whether woman is "superior, inferior or equal to man". (xxxii). In the collaboration between David and Rosaleen, it is obvious that there is no equality between them as David has all the power. It is not something surprising because it is known that throughout history man has believed he can achieve anything by himself without needing women after realizing he is the only discoverer, producer, creator and dominator of the world (Beauvoir, 63). Believing and trusting in himself man has left nothing to woman, which has resulted in making woman unable to exist as a separate individual (Beauvoir, 93). Furthermore, Beauvoir suggests "What we need is an angel- neither man or woman- but where shall we find one? Still, the angel would be poorly qualified to speak, for an angel is ignorant of all the basic facts involved in the problem" (xxxii). Therefore, it can be said the angel of the couple is Rosaleen since she has all the poor qualities of an angel: she does not speak, she does not have an active participation, and she is not a woman of action. On the contrary, she does what she is asked to because

As the other she is other than herself, other than what is expected of her. Being all, she is never quite this what she should be; she is everlasting deception, the very deception of that existence which never successfully attained nor fully reconciled with the totality of existence. (Beauvoir, 223)

Therefore, it can be said that Rosaleen is unable to exist as herself. Whenever she tries to decide on something by herself, she has to face David. For instance, when the Cloade family asks for money, she wants to lend them, but David solves this problem by suggesting they actually want to kill her and get her money. What is worse is that when she regrets for what she has done so far, and tells the truth in the end, David kills her. He does not try to come to an agreement with her, and he solves the problem with his own way as a man. Therefore, Rosaleen's situation as a passive

and oppressed woman can be explained with what Mary Wollstonecraft states in *A Vindication of the Rights of Woman*:

Women are told from their infancy, and taught by the example of their mothers, that a little knowledge of human weakness, justly termed cunning, softness of temper, outward obedience, and a scrupulous attention to puerile kind of propriety, will obtain for them the protection of man; and should they be beautiful, everything else is needless, for, at, least, twenty years of their lives. (65)

What is to be deduced is that Rosaleen must have been raised as an ignorant woman. She does not have a role model in her life who would teach her how to survive as a woman in the world. What is more, she must have been taught to obey a man all her life, and, therefore, she has lacked self-confidence, and she has needed a man to help who will be a protection for her throughout her life.

As revealed at the end of the book, the woman called Rosaleen Cloade is not the real Rosaleen Cloade, but the servant girl working in Gordon Cloade's house. Therefore, her vocation as a servant and her role as a servant can show parallelism. To illustrate, she serves people in Gordon Cloade's house, and then she becomes a servant to David in their plan. Also, it is known that Simone de Beauvoir says, "[...] as the young girl attains adulthood, her apprenticeship is not yet over" (413). So, it is clear that Rosaleen is doomed to be apprentice as a woman until she dies.

As mentioned at the beginning of this chapter, what other characters think about Rosaleen has great importance because they do not know her, and they are prejudiced about her. For this reason, their impressions of her will prove what has been said about her so far.

Even though the family members are in a hopeless situation after Gordon Cloade's death since he is the only one who has taken care of them, they try to find a way to get rid of this situation in their own way. Also, although they have their own businesses or they have prestigious jobs, they are not able to live on by themselves, so they have trusted Gordon to survive and they do not know what to do, but expect to get their proportions from the money left by him. Even this miserable family has a negative impression about Rosaleen as they might have thought that they would see a strong and attractive woman who lives in her husband's wealth and enjoys it to the

utmost, which means a real lady, but what they see is an “uneducated woman” (33). Moreover, they soon realize that she is not a lady:

Oh, she's not a lady, if that's what you mean. She's got lovely eyes, and a very good complexion - and I suppose old Gordon fell for that, with her extraordinary air of being quite unsophisticated. I don't think it's put on - though of course you never know. She just stands around looking dumb and letting David run her. (34)

Likewise, Gordon Cloade’s sister, Adela Marchmont, wonders what impressed his brother because she thinks Rosaleen is not an attractive woman. She thinks as follows:

Was that, Adela wondered, her charm? Was that what had attracted that hard-headed shrewd business man, Gordon Cloade, and blinded him to her stupidity and her lack of breeding? After all, it couldn't only be looks. Plenty of good-looking women had angled unsuccessfully to attract him. But childishness, to a man of sixty-two, might be an attraction. Was it, could it be, real - or was it a pose - a pose that had paid and so had become second nature? (47)

And, when she visits Rosaleen for asking for money, she understands that she is actually a “surely strangely simple woman”. Therefore, it is clear that Rosaleen gives the impression of an immature childish person. It is difficult to understand what attracted an old rich businessman, so her immaturity and purity make Adela think that there may be another personality Rosaleen has in order to attract men.

Similar to her mother, Adela, Lynn Marchmont, who has just come back from battlefield, is aware that Rosaleen does not have a taste in luxury, so she does not seem beautiful even in expensive ornaments. She is jealous of Rosaleen, but at the same time, she thinks she seems harmless:

Yes, she was lovely, this girl who had married old Gordon Cloade for his money. And it was true what Rowley had said, that she had an air of innocence. Black hair, set in loose waves, Irish blue eyes put in with the smutty finger-half-parted lips. The rest of her was predominantly expensive. Dress, jewels, manicured hands, fur cape. Quite a good figure, but she didn't, really, know how to wear expensive clothes. Didn't wear them as Lynn Marchmont could have worn them, given half a chance! (But you never will have a chance, said a voice in her brain.) (37)

However, things change when there is a possibility that Rosaleen's ex-husband is not dead. Mrs. Marchmont does not have the same feelings towards Rosaleen whereas Lynn wants to continue to believe in her innocence:

“That type of young woman - the adventuress type (of course poor Gordon was completely taken in) they've usually got a - well, a young man of their own in the background. Suppose she says to Gordon she's got a brother - wires to him in Canada or wherever he was. This man turns up. How is Gordon to know whether he's her brother or not? Poor Gordon, absolutely infatuated no doubt, and believing everything she said. And so her “brother” comes with them to England - poor Gordon quite unsuspecting.”

Lynn said fiercely:

“I don't believe it. I don't believe it!”

Mrs. Marchmont raised her eyebrows.

“Really, my dear-”

“He's not like that. And she - she isn't either. She's a fool perhaps, but she's sweet - yes, she's really sweet. It's just people's foul minds. I don't believe it, I tell you.” (58)

This conversation also shows that the mother and daughter are aware of the fact that Rosaleen is not a bad character, but the condition around her makes her so. On the other hand, Lynn does not want to believe that David and herself have some plans which will affect the family badly in the end because she has feelings for David, which will be discussed later in this chapter.

Towards the end of the book, Rosaleen wants to give up on their plan because she does not feel secure and she realizes that she is doing a bad thing. Also, she freaks out in dangerous situations such as the appearance of Enoch Arden, his blackmailing them, the Cloade family's attitudes, and David's going to prison. Feeling lonely, losing her protection and having no ideas to save herself, she becomes hopeless. She thinks that she has become a sinner. She confesses what she has been feeling to Mr. Poirot: “I'm frightened. David said I'd be safe as long as he was there to look after me. But now they've taken him away - I'm afraid. He said - they all wanted me dead. That's a dreadful thing to say. But perhaps it's true” (131). This confession proves that she is hopeless without her partner and she does not have a back-up plan since it is known that women have always been under men's protection. Her protection is first her father and brother, then it is taken over by her husband (Beauvoir, 80-81). David may not be her husband, but it is obvious that she

has looked for a roof where she can feel secure like other women who want to be safe and look for a man to fulfill their dreams (Beauvoir, 367-368). However, David is incapable of being a safe place for Rosaleen. She feels so helpless that it can be understood from her letter which shows her situation: "I don't know what to do... I can't go on... I've been so wicked. I must tell someone and get peace... I didn't mean to be so wicked to begin with. I didn't know all that was going to come of it. I must write down-" (170).

The letter may be the only action Rosaleen has ever taken by herself, but she cannot finish it because her partner kills her. She has been always the Other, and she does not want to change it. In this respect, Beauvoir refers to Hegel who states that a woman does not risk her life for men. There is not a battle between them. Men have their own values, but women have failed in having their own values as men have done for themselves, but, at the same time, women want to be recognized as equal to men (qtd. in Beauvoir, 73). When all these things are regarded, it is seen quite clearly that Rosaleen is what Beauvoir depicts in *The Second Sex*: She *does* risk her life, she *does* let a man shape the whole plan, and she *does* fail in having her own values. The worst may be that her life is taken by the man with whom she hoped to find a way to escape from her poor life. Also, writing is accepted as a chance for a woman to "recreate the world" (Jones, 252). This way, Rosaleen may have wanted to change the situation she has been in, and, most probably, she has wanted to get rid of her fake brother, David since she has felt guilty for what she has been doing. However, as she is controlled by a man in the world she wants to create again, she fails.

Finally, it can be said for Rosaleen's end that all these things happened to her because of her passivity. This is because she has accepted to live in the gender role assigned to her by the culture she lives in (Young, 46). It is also known that a woman is not represented and she is not allowed to express herself in that culture (Postl, 147). Even though she works and earns money by herself, she never feels independent. However, as Selma James suggests in her article, "A Woman's Place", a working woman has more independence and freedom, and her life is quite different than a woman's life in the past, Rosaleen fails to be a confident woman (187). She has been passive from the beginning of the novel and she does not take an action except for writing a letter to confess their plan. However, before blaming her for not

being a powerful and strong woman, it is important to know that a woman is afraid of her future and not pleased with her present situation because she has been used to being a passive child. She is not prepared or she has not been helped to prepare herself for the future because all the things have been invested to her brother or she has been given nothing. She has doubts to be a woman. She is troubled because “she has already left her past behind, but she has not entered upon a new life. She is busy, but he does nothing; because she does nothing she has nothing, she is nothing” (Beauvoir, 399). Therefore, there is no doubt that Rosaleen is one of these women.

The second couple of the novel is Lynn Marchmont and Rowley Cloade. They have been engaged for years and they are supposed to marry when Lynn comes back to the village after her service in the British army. As a woman who has the courage to be in the battlefield, Lynn is portrayed as a different woman than Rosaleen Cloade. However, even though she has worked as a soldier and she is reflected as a brave woman, she still depends on her uncle Gordon Cloade for her living. She does not know what will happen to her family if Rosaleen and her brother take over all the money Gordon leaves after his death because he does not bring a will to his family.

On returning home, Lynn Marchmont realizes that she has changed so much. She feels she is not the same woman anymore. She starts to think of what she has been through. She thinks she used to know what she wanted or did not want, but now she has no aim and she is “drifting along” (80). It is as if she has lost all her aims to live in this world. She has seen the danger, experienced it, and does not wish to live in a small village without money, she is left with nothing, but her problems:

Yes, that was just what it was! Drifting along! An aimless, formless method of living. Ever since she had come out of the Service. A wave of nostalgia swept over her for those war days. Days when duties were clearly defined, when life was planned and orderly - when the weight of individual decisions had been lifted from her. But even as she formulated the idea, she was horrified at herself. Was that really and truly what people were secretly feeling elsewhere? Was that what, ultimately, war did to you? It was not the physical dangers - the mines at sea, the bombs from the air, the crisp ping of a rifle bullet as you drove over a desert track. No, it was the spiritual danger of learning how much easier life was if you ceased to think... She, Lynn Marchmont, was no longer the clearheaded resolute intelligent girl who had joined up. Her intelligence had been specialised, directed in well-defined

channels. Now mistress of herself and her life once more, she was appalled at the disinclination of her mind to seize and grapple with her own personal problems. (80)

Also, she starts to question her relationship with her fiancé, Rowley Cloade, because she thinks he is a weak man who has not experienced anything manly. Therefore, she is not sure whether to marry him after going through a lot of things in the war. The problem for her is that she has changed but Rowley stays the same (81). She wants to marry someone like David Hunter. She actually starts to have an affair with him. She likes David when she sees him for the first time. David impresses her with his determined and powerful manly behaviors because he is a fearless man unlike Rowley, who has not left the village in his life. Also, David Hunter shows off his courage to fight for England as an Irish man. On the other hand, Rowley is quite the opposite. He chooses not to fight and stay in the village to have a safe and sound life. Also, David is one of those who is allowed to fight for and against something and explore the world outside where women are pacified, but Rowley does not have an active life which can impress Lynn or any other women who are looking for a fearless, dangerous and courageous man. Moreover, similarly, Lynn is one of those who try to explore the world and have different experiences, so it is not surprising that she is impressed by David. The conversation between Poirot and Lynn proves her urge to get away:

“You wanted to get away. You wanted to go abroad, to see life. You wanted, perhaps, to get away from Rowley Cloade... And now you are restless, you still want - to get away! Oh, no, Mademoiselle, people do not change!”

“When I was out East, I longed for home,” Lynn cried defensively.

“Yes, yes, where you are not, there you will want to be! That will always be so, perhaps, with you. You make a picture to yourself, you see, a picture of Lynn Marchmont coming home... But the picture does not come true, because the Lynn Marchmont whom you imagine is not the real Lynn Marchmont. She is the Lynn Marchmont you would like, to be.”

Lynn asked bitterly:

“So, according to you, I shall never be satisfied anywhere?”

“I do not say that. But I do say that, when you went away, you were dissatisfied with your engagement, and that now you have come back, you are still dissatisfied with your engagement.”

Lynn broke off a leaf and chewed it meditatively.

“You're rather a devil at knowing things, aren't you, M. Poirot?” (165)

Realizing Lynn's interest in himself, David starts to abuse it. He promises her to get married and he makes Lynn leave Rowley Cloade, and Lynn explains Rowley why she does not want to be with him anymore. She says she has fallen in love with David Hunter because he is dominant, and impressive (191). However, the strange thing is that when she learns that David Hunter does not have an intention to marry her and he has lied to her, and Rowley has killed Enoch Arden even by mistake, she changes her mind about Rowley. Moreover, when Rowley holds her throat and says she belongs to him, she starts to fall in love with him again:

I fell in love with David because he was dangerous and attractive - and, to be honest, because he knows women much too well. But none of that was real. When you caught hold of me by the throat and said if I wasn't for you, no one should have me- well - I knew then that I was your woman! Unfortunately it seemed that I was going to know it - just too late... Luckily Hercule Poirot walked in and saved the situation. And I am your woman, Rowley! (191)

Another couple to be analysed in the novel is Gordon Cloade's brother Jeremy and his wife Frances Cloade. Jeremy works as a lawyer, but their economic situation is not good. The war has been affecting them very badly and they are in debt so they depend on Gordo Cloade financially. Frances tries to find solutions for this. Her family used to be very rich, but has lost all their money. Therefore, Frances is used to hard times and she is ready to fight for getting their proportion from Gordon Cloade's money because she has got experienced in her family to deceive people for money. For this reason, unlike her husband, she is courageous and ready to take an action to save her family from this situation. She is also aware of her family's situation and she does not deny anything about her family:

I don't want that to happen. I'll fight like anything to stop it, but don't credit me with moral indignation. We're not a moral family, remember. Father, in spite of his attractiveness, was a bit of a crook. And there was Charles - my cousin. They hushed it up and he wasn't prosecuted, and they hustled him off to the Colonies. And there was my cousin Gerald- he forged a cheque at Oxford. But he went to fight and got a posthumous V.C. for complete is people are like that - not quite bad or quite good. I don't suppose I'm particularly straight myself - I have been because there hasn't been any temptation to be otherwise. But what I have got is plenty of courage and - (she smiled at him) I'm loyal! (31)

Ready to even rob a bank to survive, she always motivates her husband not to give up (32). However, her husband is reflected as a passive person in contrast to his wife. He is so passive that he is called “a dry stick” among the family members (25). In the end, when everything is resolved except for finding who Enoch Arden really is, she confesses everything. Enoch Arden is actually her cousin, Charles, and she had to do everything for her family:

Yes, the story has got to be told. We were desperate for money - that's of trouble. Disgrace, perhaps imprisonment lay ahead of him- still lies ahead of him for that matter. Now understand this, M. Poirot, the plan I made and carried out was my plan; my husband had nothing to do with it. It wasn't his sort of plan in any case - it would have been far too risky. But I've never minded taking risks. And I've always been, I suppose, rather unscrupulous. (154-155)

As is understood from the way she acts in the novel and the way she talks with her husband, her relationship with her husband is different from the relationship between Rosaleen and David Hunter. She is not the Other, or her husband is not the dominator of the family. It seems that she is the one who decides on what to do and what not to do. She is also represented as “a loyal wife and a careful mother” in the novel. (24) As a result, while Frances is powerful, brave, smart and practical, her husband, Jeremy, is quite passive, vague and ignorant, which make them an unusual couple.

The last couple of *Taken at the Flood* is Gordon's another brother Lionel and his wife Kathy Cloade. The aunt Kathy is found “ridiculous” by the family members although they like her (36). Poirot thinks, “she is quite harmless” (105). Through the end of the novel, it is understood that she is the one who visits the detective to find Rosaleen's former husband, Robert Underhay. When Poirot reveals it, the family members get surprised because they think that the one Mrs. Cloade Poirot mentions must be Frances Cloade, not Kathy. It is not because she is a woman, but she is not someone respected and found smart in the family. The reason of this may be that she is interested in spiritual things and she seems to be away from the reality. However, she is the one who asks a detective to find the man, who would help them get Gordon's money. On the other hand, Lionel Cloade, who is a doctor, is quite similar

to the other Cloade men in terms of the relationships they have with their partners, and being a passive man.

At the end of the novel, detective Poirot reveals everything. He says there is not someone called Rosaleen Cloade because she died in the blast, and the woman they call Rosaleen is actually Eileen Corrigan, who is an Irish servant working for Gordon Cloade. When the couples of the book are compared, the men of Cloade family are different from what Simone de Beauvoir says in her book *The Second Sex*. That is, women have not become servants to their husbands. They are not oppressed by their husbands, or their husbands dominate them. There is not an atmosphere that gives the impression that women are abused, weak, or less smart than their husbands. They are not in a relationship in which “one consists of persons with a will and a substantive existence, the other of humble companions to these persons, attached, each of them to one, for the purpose of bringing up *his* children, and making *his* home pleasant to him” (Taylor, 77). On the contrary, husbands trust their wives, and also respect them. There is not a man who tries to be the One in the family. Although these women are represented as good wives and mothers in the book, they are not doomed to be busy with their domestic work. Also, their husbands depend on their wives to get over their unfortunate situations even though they have a profession that may save them from hard times. On the other hand, in her relationship with David Hunter, Rosaleen is always the passive one. Abusing, oppressing and subordinating her, David kills her in the end to prevent her from revealing their secret.

Finally, when the couples of the book are compared to one another, it is seen clearly that the couples of the Cloade family and the companionship of Rosaleen and David are quite different. On the one hand, the Cloade women are active, practical, smart and brave unlike Rosaleen unlike their partners who are quite passive, quiet and sometimes ignorant. They are aware of the situation they have been in, but unable to act, but their wives do not want to leave anything to chance. They plan and act accordingly even though they fail in the end. On the other hand, in her relationship with David, Rosaleen is oppressed and she depends on David all the time. They are the representations of a patriarchal society in which the aggression is associated with man and passivity is linked to women (Millet, 32).

However, although the Cloade women are represented as the head of their

families, so they do not seem to have a patriarchal family structure, they all depend on Gordon Cloade's money. Here, it is important to remember that in a patriarchal society "father is the head of the family" (Millet, 33). In the nuclear family, the head of Cloade families is a woman, but the whole family needs Gordon Cloade's help. He is not their father, but he has the role of a father. For this reason, the Cloade family has some features of a patriarchal family even though female heads are not preferred in most of the societies (Millet, 33).

The second novel to be studied in this thesis is *Death on the Nile*. As understood from the title, the story takes place on the river Nile. All the characters in the novel are on holiday in Egypt and they are all related to the victim, Linnet Doyle. However, whether Linnet is a real victim or not is questionable because of the things she has done to her so called best friend, Jacqueline Bellefort. Also, her relationship with her husband has great importance because they are different from ordinary couples. Actually, they are not the only couple of the novel. As known, Simon and Jacqueline are expected to marry, but Linnet Ridgeway impresses Simon and she marries him. Towards the end of the novel it is understood that Jacqueline and Simon's relationship does not end, and they make a plan together to get Linnet's fortune. Therefore, the relationship of Linnet and Simon will be analyzed, but also Jacqueline and Simon's relationship will be discussed to find out whether they have a traditional one.

The first couple is Linnet Ridgeway and Simon Doyle. Linnet is a woman who comes from a very rich family. Not only her father, but also her mother comes from well-known families. Unfortunately, she loses her father and she inherits all the money. As well as being a very beautiful young woman admired by everybody around her, she has a business mind unlike her husband, which makes people jealous. They say, "Money and looks— it's too much! If a girl's as rich as that she's no right to be a good-looker as well. And she is a good looker... Got everything, that girl has. Doesn't seem fair. . ." (6). Everybody praises her for being beautiful, having a fortune at twenty-one, and also being intelligent (7). Moreover, she is called "Linnet Ridgeway, the Girl Who Has Everything (18). Even her marriage appears on newspapers because people are curious whom she marries so suddenly. However, people cannot find what they have expected from this marriage news because she

marries a poor man although she is supposed to marry someone with a title. She does not want to marry Lord Windlesham because she does not want to leave her home and become a mistress of another house that is not hers. She wants to rule her own house and she wants to be taken seriously. She knows that it will not happen because Lord's family has lived in Charltonbury since the time of Elizabeth, and it is obvious that Linnet's house is modest compared to Lord's, but it cannot be compared to Lord's. Therefore, she does not want to lose her status at home. She thinks:

Charltonbury— yes, that was it— she had resented the mention of Charltonbury. But why? Charltonbury was modestly famous. Windlesham's ancestors had held it since the time of Elizabeth. To be mistress of Charltonbury was a position unsurpassed in society. Windlesham was one of the most desirable peers in England. Naturally he couldn't take Wode seriously. ... It was not in any way to be compared with Charltonbury. Ah, but Wode was hers! She had seen it, acquired it, rebuilt and re-dressed it, lavished money on it. It was her own possession— her kingdom. (19)

The quotation explains why she has chosen a man like Simon as her husband. Even her beloved girlfriend Jacqueline defines him as "simple". She says openly, "He's so childishly simple. He'd have no kind of subtlety about it— and he's got no imagination (247). Also, Christie depicts him as "a type of men who find it difficult to put through into words and have trouble in expressing themselves clearly" (58). Therefore, it can be understood from the way Linnet lives and makes decisions that she is not a "woman who seeks protection in a man's arm" (Beauvoir, 368). Indeed, she is independent and she does not want to be protected by another man because she believes in herself. Also, her role in her family is not known clearly, but she chooses someone who cannot dominate her after getting married in contrast to women Beauvoir depicts in her book, *The Second Sex*. She says marriage is the "destiny" of women and it is what is expected from women by the society. However, the perception of marriage of men and women is quite different. Being independent and social, man needs a woman who will make the necessary organization in the man's life. She does not have the control of her life. Having been raised as a domestic creature woman fulfills her roles as a wife in her domain. Also, having been dominated by her brother and father woman is now dominated by her husband (475-476). However, Linnet Ridgeway is not one of them. She even forgets her surname

changed after she married (99). This is not because she must be someone who is so careless, but she must be having difficulty in accepting to use another man's. It is known that "woman is defined and differentiated with reference to man and not his reference to her; she is the incidental, the inessential as opposed to the essential. He is the Subject, he is the Absolute- She is the Other" (Beauvoir, xix). However, it is clear that Linnet is not this sort of woman. She does not accept to be the Other, and she does not serve her husband as expected from wives (Beauvoir, 476).

One of the reasons why Linnet has such power over her husband is that, as stated at the beginning of the chapter of the thesis, she comes from a well-known family whose pictures appear in newspapers. Also, it is known that because of the class she comes from, it is quite likely that she has more advantages as a woman who belongs to a privileged family than a woman coming from lower classes (Mill, 81). Regarding the class Simon comes from, it is not surprising that Linnet is not reflected as an oppressed and a servant-like wife to Simon.

Also, Selma James states that

a lot of women work before they get married and find that they are able to take care of themselves. They are very independent as compared to single girls twenty years ago. They want to get married but they say their marriages will be different. They say they will not let themselves be the household drudges their mothers were. (187)

Therefore, when Linnet's decisions on her marriage are taken into consideration, it can be said that she is the independent woman James claims in her article "A Woman's Place". Even though there is not detailed information about her mother's past in the novel, it is obvious that Linnet does not want to be a woman who is busy with housework all the time. She wants to continue to be a woman admired for both her beauty and intelligence. James also states that women do not want to give up on their freedom once they get married underlining that women have never had the freedom men have had (188). For this reason, Linnet does not marry the Lord because it would mean that she will have to leave her home and she will be like a guest of her new home rather than being the landlady because the Lord comes from a very old family, therefore, they would not let her be one of the owners of the house, which makes Linnet think that she will not be happy if she ever lives in that house and in the status that will be given to her because she wants to be the only ruler of her own house. To explain this, it is important to know that when people fall

in love, they learn the truth(s) about themselves (Miller qtd. in Demandante 109). Whether Linnet is after a truth about herself is questionable, but from her understanding of the concept of love, it can be inferred that the way she loves Simon shows that she has been looking for someone she can easily have, and what is advantageous for Linnet is that Simon is a man who needs money and he can be easily dominated. He is not a powerful man because he does not have any money or anyone who can support him financially, so he cannot claim much from a woman like Linnet Ridgeway. For this reason, it is obvious that Linnet has chosen Simon as her husband to satisfy her ego. It is not known whether she is aware of it, but it is highly possible that what she has seen in Simon is that she can satisfy herself by getting married to a man who will be in a lower status in society than she is. As a result, what Renata Salecl explains about love is parallel to what Lacan says about love in the following paragraph:

What is at work in falling in love is the recognition of the narcissistic image that forms from the substance of the ideal ego. When we fall in love, we position the person who is the object of our love in the place of the ideal ego. We love this person because of the perfection we have striven to reach for our own ego. However, it is not only that the subject loves in the other the image he or she would like to inhabit him or herself. (13)

When considering what Linnet says or thinks about herself, and what the narrator tells about her, it is seen clearly that the only reason why Linnet marries a man like Simon must be that she does not want to give up her dominance, and Simon is a very easy pray for her. However, she misses that she is not the only one who is privileged to have plans on others, there are people who want to hurt her to take their revenge.

Another important point about Linnet is that she is used to the attention she always gets from others, which probably explains her decision to marry Simon Doyle. She is described as follows:

Linnet Doyle was looking as perfectly turned out as if she were stepping famous actress. She was used to being looked at, to being admired, to being the centre of the stage wherever she went. She was aware of the keen glances bent upon her—and at the same time almost unaware of them; such tributes were part of her life. She came ashore playing a role, even though

she played it unconsciously. (36)

Therefore, it can be inferred that she is looking for attention from others and she wants to be in the center. Therefore, she has refused to marry the Lord because he would have all the attention because of his status. As a result, marrying a man from a lower class would satisfy her ego. However, their relationship does not depend on a power relationship because it is known that Linnet falls in love with Simon at first sight:

Linnet saw a tall, broad-shouldered young man, with very dark blue eyes, crisply curling brown hair, a square chin and a boyish, appealingly simple smile...She stretched out a hand. The hand that clasped hers was firm and warm...She liked the way he looked at her, the naive genuine admiration. (20)

She also thinks that Jacqueline is so “lucky” to have a man like Simon Doyle (20). For this reason, even though she has everything she wants and she is respected by everyone, she cheats her friend Jacqueline, and marries her boyfriend Simon. Rather than feeling ashamed of this fact, she tries to justify herself:

“I see perfectly what you are driving at, Monsieur Poirot! You think, to put it vulgarly, that I stole my friend’s young man. Looking at the matter sentimentally -which is, I suppose, the way people of your generation cannot help looking at things— that is possibly true. But the truth is different. I don’t deny that Jackie was passionately in love with Simon, but I don’t think you take into account that he may not have been equally devoted to her. He was very fond of her, but I think that even before he met me he was beginning to feel that he had made a mistake (28).

The reason why she rejects the Lord may be that she does not want to be ruled by anyone else and to live in a big house which she will not be able to dominate as she wishes. However, why she has chosen Simon as her husband may be explained with what Lacan says about love:

[...]love is regarded as an imaginary passion, an obstacle to analysis because it is based on the idea of loving an “other” whose image is taken from oneself. It is not really the other that one loves; rather, it is the self in the other. (Lacan qtd. in Demandante, 105-106)

Therefore, it can be said that Linnet falls in love with what she has seen in

Simon, not because of his distinguished personality. Moreover, it is highly possible that Linnet sees her own self as a cheater. For this reason, it is understood that her love derives from her narcissistic personality because it is linked to “a narcissistic relation to the subject” (Demandante, 106). According to Lacan, “love is an illusion of oneness with the beloved and this illusion is carried over in the process of analysis, hindering its success (Lacan qtd. in Demandante, 106). Especially when Linnet’s justification is considered, she must think she is the one who deserves Simon. Therefore, she falsely believes that Simon is in love with her, not with Jacqueline, which is quite the opposite since as Lacan suggests, “this illusion is a reflection of reality, that love is nothing but a misplaced emotion, an emotion brought about by the imaginary ego” (qtd. in Demandante, 106). Additionally, Lacan states that

[...] idea of love as narcissistic, wherein the subject loves the other because the subject is able to identify himself or identify with the other. In the realm of the imaginary, love springs from a subject’s identification of an ideal ego, which he finds in the image of the other. This ideal ego sums up what the subject desires to achieve, particularly the experience of wholeness. (qtd. in Demandante, 108)

Similarly, Freud states that there is a relationship between people’s narcissism and their separation from their parents. They are expected to fall in love after this separation, and they need to fill the love of their parents with the loved one, but it is not the only reason. Furthermore, the reason of why they fall in love is that they see their self in an idealized form in the other self (164).

As a result, it can be said that Linnet’s egoistic and narcissist personality makes her believe that she must be the one who has to be with Simon no matter how poor or unqualified he is. Also, what she says to Poirot about the love she believes she has with Simon proves that she has false illusions:

Look at it clearly, Monsieur Poirot, Simon discovers that it is I he loves, not Jackie. What is he to do? Be heroically noble and marry a woman he does “I do not care for— and thereby probably ruin three lives— for it is doubtful whether he could make Jackie happy under those circumstances? If he were actually married to her when he met me I agree that it might be his duty to

stick to her— though I'm not really sure of that. If one person is unhappy the other suffers too. But an engagement is not really binding. If a mistake has been made, then surely it is better to face the fact before it is too late. I admit that it was very hard on Jackie, and I'm terribly sorry about it— but there it is. It was inevitable". (49-50)

Here it is seen that an intelligent woman like Linnet makes herself believe that Simon does not love Jacqueline, and their relationship is doomed to finish one day. She does not even feel guilty for what she has done to her best friend. Indeed, she humiliates her origin (52). All of these reflect Linnet as an egoist woman. As mentioned above, her egoist personality causes her to perceive her life and love in her own way. She thinks she has the right to have whatever she wants.

On the other hand, Simon Doyle, as mentioned above is quite a passive man unlike his partners Linnet and Jacqueline. He does not have the dominance, or he does not have a wish for that. He does not even try to be the head of the family or have an important role in his both relationships. He is not one of those "whose power has reached the stage which the power of kings had arrived at when opinion did not yet question the rightfulness of arbitrary power, but in theory, and to a certain extent in practice, condemned the selfish to use it" (Taylor, 77). Neither he tries to be the "judge, magistrate, or ruler" in his marriage, nor has he self-will as opposed to what Harriet Taylor states for a married man (78). Therefore, it can be said that Simon is not a kind of a husband who enjoys his unquestionable power over his wife. However, it is important that his wife would not allow such a thing to happen in their marriage because it is known that Simon's passive and weak character is one of the reasons why she has chosen him as her husband.

Even Jacqueline, who loves him so much and sacrifices herself for him, introduces him as a vague man:

"His name's Simon Doyle. He's big and square and in-credibly simple and boyish and utterly adorable! He's poor —got no money. He's what you call people come from Devonshire. He loves country and country things". (12)

Unlike the common belief in men as a dominator and creator of the world, Jacqueline tells, "He really is a pet." (13). Likewise, his wife, Linnet, says she needs to "educate him" (76). It is because he is quite ignorant about the historical beauties around him. He does not enjoy these places he visits with his wife. He also makes

absurd comments on historical figures, which makes Linnet embarrassed (94). Actually, he is aware of himself with this respect. He knows who he really is. He says to Poirot:

You know, I'm not much of a fellow for temples and sight-seeing and all that, but a place like this sort of gets you, if you know what I mean. Those old Pharaohs must have been wonderful fellows." (91)

In addition, he is not business minded like his wife. He does not read papers before signing. Even her lawyer gets surprised when Linnet reads the document thoroughly. This also shows how well she suits to be a businesswoman.

"My dear girl, you're not going to read the whole lot through, are you? You'll be at it till lunch time and longer."

"I always read everything through," said Linnet. "Father taught me to do that. He said there might be some clerical error." Pennington laughed rather harshly. "You're a grand woman of business, Linnet." (85)

Therefore, it can be said that Linnet is exactly what John Stuart Mill asserts about women as follows:

Women in general would be brought up equally capable of understanding business, public affairs, and the higher matters of speculations, with men in the same class of society; and select few of the one as well as the other sex who were qualified not only to comprehend what is done or thought by others, but to think or do something considerable themselves, would meet the same facilities for improving and training their capacities in the one sex in the other. (85)

Mill defends the idea that woman should get intellectual education (85). It is because they can have a place in society only this way, and they would save themselves from being a servant like Rosaleen. Therefore, it is quite natural for Linnet to be a woman admired by everyone around her that much and recognized like a star.

In contrast to his wife, Simon Doyle is so ignorant about business. He knows what to do, but he does not care about business papers at all. He tells that his wife is very careful about business deals in contrast to himself. This can be understood clearly from the conversation with their lawyer:

“She’s much more conscientious than I’d be,” said Simon, laughing. “I’ve never read a legal document in my life. I sign where they tell me to sign on the dotted line— and that’s that.”

“That’s frightfully slipshod,” said Linnet disapprovingly. (84)

He is also aware of his ignorance. He tells that it is because he trusts, but most probably, he has never had to sign a paper similar to the one Linnet has signed. Also, it is known that he has not got proper education like his wife has. He is a simple man living his life carelessly under his wife’s roof. Moreover, he does not have pride man is expected to have. He admits he does not understand business, and he does not have such worries rich people generally have as he states as follows:

“I’ve no business head,” declared Simon cheerfully. “Never had. A fellow tells me to sign— I sign. It’s much the simplest way.” Andrew Pennington was looking at him thoughtfully. He said drily, stroking his upper lip, “A little risky sometimes, Doyle?”

“Nonsense,” replied Simon. “I’m not one of those people who believe the whole world is out to do one down, I’m a trusting kind of fellow— and it pays, you know. I’ve hardly ever been let down.” (84-85)

All in all, when Linnet and Simon’s marriage is analysed, it is seen that their marriage does not depend on a marriage in which women are passive, look for security, and men “take” women as women take men’s name (Beauvoir, 479). On the contrary, it is as if Simon is the one who looks for security because he has lost his job, and Linnet takes Simon and supports him even though she has to have his surname. However, as mentioned above she forgets that she has changed her surname, which shows how she is used to being an independent woman. Also, it is crystal clear that she is not passive both in her marriage and relationships with others. She is not the kind of a wife who stays home and is busy with domestic issues (Beauvoir, 589). She does not want to have a higher rank in the society, so she does not try to show off because she already has prestige in society thanks to her father and mother. It seems that the only thing she longs for is to find a man whom she can dominate and has a good time with without being pacified, and Simon is fitted into this wish so easily.

When the relationship between Jacqueline Bellefort and Simon Doyle is analysed, it is seen that, again, a man is not the head of the relationship. Also, as known, they have a plan to kill Linnet, but the brain of the plan is Jacqueline; Simon

is drawn as an apprentice to his master, Jacqueline. Her intelligence also takes the attention of Monsieur Poirot. He becomes aware that she is so smart and she is capable of doing everything.

To understand Bellefort better, it is important to know her background. She is in a convent with Linnet in Paris, but when her father goes bankrupt, the family loses all their money (8). Therefore, Linnet, who has not heard of her for two years wants to help her old friend. When the maid of the house implies that Jacqueline wants money from Linnet and tries to abuse their friendship when she calls her, Linnet defends her friend by saying she is not a beggar, and she is a woman who can survive by herself. She also emphasizes how fearless she has been:

“What’s she in such a hurry to see you for? I’ll bet she wants something! You just wait and see.”

“She sounded excited about something,” admitted Linnet. “Jackie always someone!”

“Darling, how thrilling!”

“A boy who was teasing a dog. Jackie tried to get him to stop. He wouldn’t. She pulled him and shook him but he was much stronger than she was, and at last she whipped out a penknife and plunged it right into him.” (9)

Here, the way Christie represents Jacqueline shows that Jacqueline does not fit into the general belief of feminine young women as Beauvoir states:

To be feminine is to appear weak, futile, docile. The young girl is supposed not only to deck herself out, to make herself ready, but also to repress her spontaneity and replace it with the studied grace and charm taught her by her elders. Any self-assertion will diminish her femininity and her attractiveness. (376)

Therefore, it is true that Jacqueline is not the Other of her relationship although she sacrifices herself for her love in the end. Indeed, she finds Simon quite simple and she asserts that he has been deceived by Linnet; otherwise he would not have left her (55). On the other hand, she is aware that Simon does not marry Linnet for money, but something else she pretends she does not know. The conversation she has with Poirot shows what she actually thinks about Simon Doyle:

“And he allowed himself to be— bought?” Jacqueline shook her dark head slowly.

“No, it’s not quite like that. If it were, I shouldn’t be here now... You’re suggesting that Simon isn’t worth caring for...If he’d married Linnet for her money, that would be true. But he didn’t marry her for her money. It’s more complicated than that. There’s such a thing as: glamour, Monsieur Poirot. And money helps that. Linnet had an atmosphere, you see. She was the queen of a kingdom— the young princess— luxurious to her fingertips. It was like a stage setting. She had the world at her feet one of the richest and most sought after peers in England wanting to marry her.” (55)

This conversation shows that Simon marries Linnet just because she wanted him to, not because he falls in love with her at first sight (55). Therefore, it can be said that Simon has a very weak personality that he does not seem to care what happens in his life, and it is as if he can be drifted away easily in any way.

It is also possible to see Jacqueline as a confident person. Although Linnet trusts her money and prestige in society, her situation does not make Jacqueline feel inferior. She is reflected as a woman who can enjoy herself (54). Even though Poirot tries to prevent her to kill Linnet, she does not care at all, and smokes her cigarette smiling (44).

The best example of her confidence is, of course, her murder plan. She is determined to kill Linnet for stealing her boyfriend and she does not hide that she wants to kill her. Her true feelings read as follows:

The best example of her confident is, of course, her murder plan. She is determined to kill Linnet for stealing her boyfriend and she does not hide that she wants to kill her. She says, “Oh, it’s too late now— too late for warning... You were right. I ought not to have come. Not on this journey. What did you call it? A journey of the soul? I can’t go back; I’ve got to go on. And I’m going on. They shan’t be happy together; they shan’t. (100)

She also threatens Simon as well claiming that he is her man and he cannot be with someone else by saying she will shoot him like a dog (100). This is surely not a real threat because the real person she plans to kill is Linnet Doyle, but it is a good way of showing how serious she is.

When Linnet Doyle is killed, everyone suspects Jacqueline of murder because she has been threatening Linnet and Simon during their vacation. However, it is proved that Jacqueline is not the murderer because she is in another crisis. Actually, they have a plan with Simon that she pretends to shoot Simon, and, meanwhile, they will kill Linnet when everybody is in a hurry and shock. Their plan

proceeds very well, but suddenly Jacqueline starts to feel very bad about what she has done and what has happened to Linnet Doyle, and Simon defends her and tries to protect her claiming that she is not a sort of woman who can kill someone (131). Also, he blames himself for what Jacqueline has gone through so far (124). Meanwhile, it is understood that someone has seen what has happened to Linnet, but the couple takes care of the witness: they kill her.

In the end, the detective reveals everything after a detailed investigation. Jacqueline and Simon Doyle kill Linnet and the witness who sees everything from the beginning because they are still together. She has killed her because she has been longing for taking her revenge. She proudly says,

“What I’m going to say now is quite true, Monsieur Poirot. Even though Linnet is dead, it doesn’t alter the truth. That’s why I’m not really sorry about her, even now. She went all out to get Simon away from me. That’s the absolute truth! I don’t think she even hesitated for more than about a minute, I was her friend, but she didn’t care. She just went baldheaded for Simon...” (246)

And what she says about Simon shows that Simon is just a part of her plan, and he seems to enjoy the wealth that Linnet has inherited from her parents. His only motive is the money Linnet has. However, there is no doubt that he has never given a sign that he has married Linnet for her money because she has been so sure that what they have is true love. However, Jacqueline shows the real face of Simon Doyle without any hesitation:

And Simon didn’t care a damn about her! I talked lot to you about glamour, but of course that wasn’t true. He didn’t want Linnet. He thought her good-looking but terribly bossy, and he hated bossy women! The whole thing embarrassed him frightfully. But he did like the thought of her money. Of course I saw that . . . and at last I suggested him that it might be a good thing if he— got rid of me and married Linnet. But he scouted the idea. He said, money or no money, it would be hell to be married to her. He said his idea of having money was to have it himself— not to have a rich wife holding the purse string: ‘I’d be a kind of damned Prince Consort,’ he said to me. He said, too, that he didn’t want anyone but me...” (246)

Even though, throughout the book, Simon is reflected as a passive and weak character who is directed by either Linnet or Jacqueline, this quotation shows that he

also has patriarchal attitudes such as finding Linnet too bossy.

For the way the murder has been planned and committed, Poirot is aware of the fact that the “brain of the murder” is Jacqueline herself. He finds her intelligence “cool, resourceful and planning” (241).

After being caught by Poirot, there is no other way for them to escape. Knowing this, Jacqueline says,

“Don’t mind so much for me, Monsieur Poirot. After all, I’ve lived hard always, you know. If we’d won out, I’d have been very happy and enjoyed things and probably should never have regretted anything. As it is— well, one goes through with it” (248)

Also, she says she was “like a flash” and she felt excited during the process, which shows her practical and advantageous personality (248). Before killing first Simon, and herself, she says it is a “fool’s game” and she has lost (251). Furthermore, she smiles at Poirot just before shooting herself, which also shows her confidence.

In addition to the relationships of partners, the relationship between Linnet and Jacqueline is important in terms of not having a unity among women. Beauvoir says “women’s mutual understanding comes from the fact that they identify themselves with each other; but for the same reason, they are against the others” (606). On the other hand, Selma James suggests that women have the same problems and they have the same troubles in their lives so they are supposed to understand one another and help each other (191). However, it is not the case for Linnet and Jacqueline. There is no unity between Jacqueline and Linnet. What is worse is that Linnet wants to help her at first, but she changes her mind when she sees Simon Doyle. She cheats her friend, and, most probably, she does the worst to her friend, who is in a difficult situation. As for the unity among women, Jacqueline says, “We girls must be stick together.” (108). Although whether she really means it is not known for sure, Jacqueline is someone who has suffered from it, and she wants to take her revenge in a cruel way. She does not regret it, and she kills herself without hesitating. The reason why these two friends do not have a unity and neither have an understanding to one other may be that they do not put themselves into each other’s place.

It has been stated by Chandra T. Mohanty that women come together because of the “sameness of their oppression” (374). However, these two women do not share anything in common except for Simon Doyle. One has been in a bad situation because of her father’s bankruptcy and the other enjoys her life and has the freedom to do whatever she wishes for. As a result, they are unable to understand each other and they cannot sympathize with one another. However, it should not be forgotten that Beauvoir questions whether a man is the cause of the abjection between women. She thinks that the intense love and hate women have for each other drives from the relationship between their mothers, which makes their relationships with other women difficult (qtd. in Direk, 25). This may explain why Linnet and Jacqueline have separated from each other after sharing a period of their life together, but there are not any details about the relationship with their families.

In conclusion, when these women characters are compared to each other in terms of the impression they give others, their cooperation with partners, the way they act as dangerous things happen, and how the things end, they have a lot of differences.

First of all, as mentioned before, Rosaleen, who is a servant girl, takes the place of another woman, who is very rich. People find her childish and they think she seems to be uneducated as a woman, married to Gordon Cloade. They see that she is a harmless person and she is not as evil as they think before they meet her. Also, they are aware that her brother, David Hunter, dominates her, and she does what he asks from her. On the other hand, Linnet and Jacqueline are very much different from Rosaleen. When Poirot sees Jacqueline, he understands that she is an intelligent woman and has the potential to kill Linnet and Simon. Similarly, Linnet is admired by everyone for both her beauty and her intelligence. Everyone on the ship is aware of the fact that they are intelligent and strong women. However, Rosaleen does not have the same chance. Her economic situation may be the reason, but Jacqueline is also almost as poor as Rosaleen. Therefore, it can be said that her passivity causes what has happened to her in the end because Jacqueline is a risk taker and she takes actions unlike Rosaleen.

When women’s cooperation with their partners is compared, Rosaleen, and Linnet and Jacqueline show differences. Rosaleen depends on a man and she does

not feel secure without a man helping and protecting her. As Beauvoir depicts, she is a kind of a woman who accepts a man's values and lives accordingly (144). She feels nervous when David is put into prison. She is "the angel in the house" as Virginia Woolf states in her essay "Professions for Women". She is ready to serve, and she has no time to think critically by herself because she has to obey her partner all the time. She can think in a church, but the only thing she can do is to pity herself. Unlike her, Linnet and Jacqueline are independent and smart women. They do not need a man to survive because they are capable of living alone. Linnet's situation would be different if she were not rich, but it can be said that she would still be a smart woman who can handle her life without needing a man beside herself. So, they are not the angels of their partners. They have enough time for dealing with their own business and making plans on their own. Furthermore, both women are aware of Simon's character and they are sure Simon will do whatever they want him to. While Rosaleen is the Other, Linnet and Jacqueline are the Subjects of their relationships. Therefore, since Rosaleen does not kill the angel in herself, the angel makes her get killed by the one whom she obeys. However, it is clear that Linnet and Jacqueline are not the angels in their houses or their partners. They are quite strong women unlike Rosaleen. They are independent and they do not seem to have a wish to be the angel since their personalities would not let them be so.

As things proceed in the novels, characters react differently. Rosaleen freaks out and she tries to give up her plan with David. She thinks she has lost her innocence and she feels guilty. On the other hand, Linnet marries Simon and she does not feel guilty of it, but when Jacqueline threatens her, she starts to feel frightened because she knows what Jacqueline is capable of. However, Jacqueline is the only character who can achieve to stay calm, and get what she wants. She fights for it and even though she fails in the end, she accepts it without feeling guilty. Here, the mental power the women characters have in both novels can have importance when their reactions are regarded. As can be seen clearly, Linnet Doyle and Jacqueline Bellefort are the ones who are represented as strong-minded women while Rosaleen is reflected as a much weaker woman. Therefore, it is inevitable that these women, Linnet and Jacqueline, have dominance over their partner, Simon. However, the great advantage is taken when both partners are "strong minded" as Harriet

Taylor claims (78). She says,

The mental companionship that is improving is communion between active minds, not mere contact between active and passive. This inestimable advantage is even now enjoyed, when a strong-minded man and a strong-minded woman are, by rare chance, united. (78)

For this reason, it can be deduced that none of the couples in both books is in a relationship in which both partners have powerful minds. One of the sides is always weaker or less intelligent. Therefore, it can be said that their plans fail in the end since they do not perform equally.

Another reason why all these women characters have differences in terms of their place in their relationships may be their classes. As Kate Millet states, the higher class a woman belongs to, the more advantages she has in her relationship with a man (36). As known, Linnet's both mother and father come from very rich families and they belong to the higher class of society. Similarly, Frances Cloade and Jacqueline Bellefort's families used to be very rich. Therefore, they are represented as powerful women. On the other hand, Kathy Cloade is an Irish woman and she does not seem to have an important role among the family members. Indeed, they get surprised when they learn that she has a visit to Poirot to find Rosaleen's first husband. For this reason, Kathy and Lionel Cloade's situation is different from the other women coming from rich families. She is reflected as an underestimated Irish woman, but she has an important place both in her nuclear family and in the whole Cloade family. When Rosaleen and David's relationship is analysed, Rosaleen is different from the rest of the women characters because she has a much weaker role than them. However, Kate Millet states that a man has less authority when the woman contributes to the relationship (36). There may not be a family relationship or a romantic relationship between them, but they have an aim, which brings them together. Therefore, Rosaleen's situation is open to discussions because, according to Millet, economic dependence of a woman on a man makes her a slave to her husband (38). However, Rosaleen is a woman earning money, and she has an important part of her collaboration with David. It may be the way she is raised by her family, or it may be that she does not have an understanding that she is supposed to participate as much as David does because it is not only his plan, but she has a very important role

in it, or she has adopted her role as a helper since she has been working as a maid in Gordon Cloade's house.

In this respect, the Marxist feminist criticism may be helpful to understand why these women have a huge difference because Marxism helps to see that there is a connection between the woman's oppression and its reflections in literary works consciously or unconsciously (Humm, 117). Michèle Barret, for example, explains the possible consequences of the class difference in her book *Women's Oppression Today*. She states, "the character of woman's oppression differs greatly between the classes of capitalism" (180). A woman coming from a higher class has more independence when compared to a woman from a lower class (Barret, 180). In addition, it is said that women generally take place in work fields requiring care, help or support (Barret, 181). When Rosaleen and Linnet are compared, it can be said that their class difference reflects this difference in a very clear way. Rosaleen works as a servant. Her job is to serve people and take care of Gordon Cloade's house. On the other hand, Linnet Ridgway, a member of a high-class family, deals with business papers and she has servants in her house. Moreover, it is stated that women's conditions at work are worse, and they earn less than men do (Barret, 185). It is true that David is the one who tries to take greater advantages from the plan. He makes Rosaleen afraid of the Cloade family, and he decides what to do and what not to do. He even kills her when she is about to reveal the plan. However, Linnet and Jacqueline have different roles in their relationships because of the background they come from. When all considered, the role of patriarchy is seen obviously because it has a relationship with capitalism. It is said, "capitalism uses patriarchy and patriarchy is defined by the needs of capital" (Eisenstein qtd. in Barret, 16). Therefore, it is understood that since Rosaleen and David are not in the same class with Linnet and Jacqueline, Rosaleen is the one who is doomed to be oppressed whereas Linnet and Jacqueline have the chance to live an independent life thanks to their background. Also, since Simon is a poor and jobless man, he does not have a right to make decisions or rule the women in his life because of these women's status in the society they belong to.

In the end, death is waiting for all these women. However, not all of them die because someone kills her. Jacqueline, for instance, kills herself when she is caught.

She kills Simon first because she knows that not only he cannot survive alone in a prison but also he does not have the courage to kill himself. As for Linnet and Rosaleen, they are murdered by their partners. Linnet is killed because of revenge and her money, but Rosaleen is killed when she is about to reveal everything for her own salvation. David, who accepts what he has done and does not feel guilty, is the only character staying alive even though he is put into prison.

As for their motives to commit a crime, it is seen that David and Rosaleen are after money, while Jacqueline kills Linnet to take her revenge. On the other hand, the reason why Simon agrees with Jacqueline is to help his lover, Jacqueline, and enjoy the wealth Linnet has. There are several ideas about the reason why people commit crimes. According to natural law, it is not a criminal act. Indeed, a person is free to do everything for his/her survival (Maximillian, 200). When David and Rosaleen's motive is considered in this respect, they try to steal Gordon Cloade's money because they have to. Also, it is known that it is the time of World War II and they have nothing to survive. Rosaleen has lost her job, and David has come back from the war. Although they feel they have to commit crime only to survive, it does not make them guilty before laws.

On the other hand, it has been found that people commit crimes because of their ego and perversion. Also, according to Martin Wolfgang, most of the criminals have low intelligence and they act without thinking the result. Reasons for a murder derive from "desire for gain, revenge, robbery, elimination, jealousy, the lust of killing and conviction". Social background and culture also affect people's tendency to commit a crime (185-186). Again, when Rosaleen and David are considered, it is obvious that they do not have a good plan. It seems that they have only planned to steal Gordon Cloade's money by pretending they are Gordon's wife and brother-in-law, but they lack details and they do not have any plans in the case of any crisis, which proves that they do not have enough intelligence to proceed as Wolfgang states. It is understood clearly that they have planned everything so carelessly that they do not have any idea of whom they will have to deal with when they go to Gordon Cloade's village. The reason why Poirot has difficulty in finding the criminal(s) is that the plan Rosaleen and David have made lacks a smart design. Also, David tries to handle everything on his own without asking anything to

Rosaleen, which may have made things more difficult. Moreover, some other unexpected people and incidents have happened, therefore, it has become a difficult case to solve. However, this situation cannot prevent them from getting caught. When the way Jacqueline has made her plan to kill Linnet is considered, it is seen clearly that everything has been planned carefully. She has thought of all the details. Therefore, Poirot says that the murder has been planned and organized very neatly, which reflects Jacqueline's capacity as a smart woman. Even though it is said that most criminals have lower intelligence as mentioned above, Jacqueline is an exception in this situation. It is also possible that she has done everything alone because Simon is not reflected as a man capable of planning a murder throughout the book. Jacqueline's aim, on the other hand, is different than Rosaleen and David's; she kills Linnet to take her revenge. Also, as stated above, selfishness is one of the reasons of committing crime. Jacqueline may have wanted to take her revenge, but she may have done it because of her ego since her close friend has cheated on her by stealing her fiancé. It may be a good idea to get her money, but it seems that she does not focus on the money Linnet has. However, it can be said that Simon must like the idea to kill his wife for money since he does not feel anything for her as Jacqueline says.

In addition, poor conditions such as limited education or money lead people to commit crimes. According to Marxist perspective, people from lower classes and people who do not have a job can commit a crime easily because they do not think that laws will help them to reach their goals (Özdemir and Özkan, 355). Actually, this is what summarizes the motives in *Taken at the Flood*. Regarding the situations of both Rosaleen and David, and the Cloade family, it is detected that all they need is Gordon's money. However, the Cloade family's plans are not as deadly as David's. It is known that David does not plan to kill someone, but when he feels to do so, he kills his partner without hesitating. On the other hand, the Cloades have more intelligent plans, which would not hurt anyone, but, unfortunately, it has caused someone's death. Therefore, it is seen that if a person belongs to a lower class, it is more likely to commit a crime. That is to say, David and Rosaleen belong to a lower class, so it is natural that they have more tendency to commit crime. It is also important that Rosaleen and David try to steal the money the Cloade family is

supposed to have legally, which can be referred to the Marxist perspective on committing crime.

Moreover, according to the feminist perspective, it is stated that men commit more crimes than women do because women care others more than men do, which decreases the crime rates among women (Özdemir and Özkan, 356). Men generally commit crimes in the name of protecting “their names, honor of their mother, virtue of womanhood and their masculinity” (Wolfgang, 188). When this statement is taken into consideration, it can be said that the feminist perspective mentioned above does not reflect the characters analysed in *Taken at the Flood* and *Death on the Nile* except for Rosaleen since the plans have been made by women characters in both books. For instance, it is Kathy Cloade, who visits Poirot to ask him to find Rosaleen’s first husband so as to prevent her from inheriting Gordon’s wealth. Or, again, it is Frances Cloade, who has asked her cousin to be Enoch Arden and blackmail Rosaleen and David to give up on Gordon’s money. However, what is interesting is that the reason why these women arrange these things may be that they want to protect their names and honor as rich people, more importantly, they try to help their husbands in a difficult situation after their brother’s death, which reflects the idea that women care others as stated above. What is more, when Rowley kills Enoch Arden by mistake, he feels proud because he has done something manly, which would impress Lynn Marchmont. However, at the same time, he feels very bad because he is not a person who would kill someone. Therefore, it can be said that even though Rowley Cloade does not have a single motive to kill Enoch Arden such as protecting his honor or name, or virtue of someone, it seems he feels a little stronger because what he has done is something which will boast his masculinity.

In *Death on the Nile*, on the other hand, when the criminals are analysed, as opposed to what has been commented on murder in the light of Simone de Beauvoir’s the One and the Other concepts, the criminal is a woman who kills another woman. She aims to take her revenge because the victim has stolen her fiancé. Therefore, it can be said that the criminal wants to protect her name and honor. Also, throughout the book, she says that she will kill Linnet for sure. Nevertheless, Linnet is not the only one who gets killed in the book. Jacqueline kills the woman who sees the murder. For this reason, it is obvious that, in this book, it is

not a man who is in charge of everything, but a woman. A woman makes plans, and she is the one who organizes each and every step they are to follow. The man, Simon, only obeys and tries to protect his partner when the murder is committed. So, it seems that he has the role of a woman in this case when the feminist perspective on crime is considered.

As a result, it is a fact that Agatha Christie created a lot of different female characters in her books. Some show her feminist attitudes whereas others are doomed to be oppressed by a man. Not only these two books analyzed in this study, but also her other books have a variety of women and men who are reflected in a feminist attitude. For example, in *Murder on the Orient Express*, in which the murder is committed by a group of people in the platform of the Orient Express, it is a woman who takes the whole responsibility of the murder suggesting that there is someone to be blamed and put in the jail, she is the one to be blamed. Also, in her last book, *Curtain* (1975), there are several scenes where a daughter wants to make her own decisions on her own without asking for permission from her father. She is represented as a fierce feminist, as well. However, it is also obvious that there are characters that are anti-feminist. David Hunter, for instance, is one of them. In *Death on the Nile*, there are characters who are not happy with women's talking about their rights or their comments on free women. However, there are also male characters such as Simon Doyle, who is like a servant of his wife and girlfriend. Or, Poirot appears as a man making compliments on women characters' intelligence.

For this reason, blaming Agatha Christie as an anti-feminist writer may not be right when all these things are considered. Moreover, it is important to consider the period the writer lived. According to Gilbert and Gubar, it is not easy to write as a woman in a patriarchal society, which makes woman writers have their own strategies to survive (48). Also, a woman author reflects the discrepancy between what she is and what she really wants to be through her characters (Gilbert and Gubar, 78). Considering the time Christie lived, therefore, it is highly normal that she created women becoming like a servant to men. On the other hand, she is also criticised to have created evil women by Margot Peters and Agate Nesaule Krouse. However, her creating women gossiping or behaving like servants should not make her an anti-feminist because there are also women not oppressed by men, they

choose to live as they wish or they tend to dominate a man. Also, it should not be forgotten that they try to survive in a patriarchal world, which may cause them to be double evil. Or, as Elaine Showalter states, women do not have the same status as men do in society, and, therefore, characters created by women authors may reflect what these authors have been experiencing in their life styles (11). Regarding that Christie was born into an upper-middle class family, she had the chance to visit a lot of different places, her family's marriage was a happy one as she states in her autobiography. It is not surprising that she could create different types of characters because it is understood that she did not have a difficult childhood economically and emotionally. Also, she must have a chance to have a room of her own because of her father's economic situation. As Woolf suggests in *A Room of One's Own*, a woman is supposed to have her own time and space so that she can produce, and it is highly possible that she could have her own free time to produce more than one hundred literary works.

When her economic situation is taken into account, it can be deduced that women characters she created may be the reflections of her life. It is seen that weaker characters are not reflected as good people even though they have good intentions sometimes. To illustrate, towards the end of *Taken at the Flood* that Rosaleen is represented as a sympathetic, helpful and vulnerable widow, but it is understood that she is not the real wife of Gordon Cloade, and she is a woman trying to steal money by replacing Gordon's dead wife. What is more, she is always weak and she does not make any attempt to get rid of David, or she does not take any action staying as a subordinate to him. On the other hand, Jacqueline Bellefort in *Death on the Nile* is appreciated by the detective Poirot, known as one of the smartest detectives, because of her capability to make such a plan. Her bad side as a murderer is not emphasized as much as the way she has planned Linnet's murder. Moreover, the detective understands that she is very intelligent as soon as they meet in the ship. Or, Linnet Ridgeway is always mentioned as an elegant rich woman. There are a few scenes where she is criticized as a cheater by other characters. As a result, what is deduced from them is that Agatha Christie was able to create different incidents and characters that are very rich for analyses from with feminist, Marxist and Lacanian perspectives.

In conclusion, when the publication dates of *Taken at the Flood* (1948) and *Death on the Nile* (1938) are considered, it can be said that those were the times when the feminist movements did not rise fully. It is known that it is after 1960s when the most forceful movements for feminism began. Nevertheless, it may also be surprising that Agatha Christie was able to create such powerful women and weak men in her books in 1930s and 1940. Therefore, it can be said, without any doubt, that she has her feminist attitudes, and she reflects them successfully in her characters such as Linnet Ridgeway and Jacqueline Bellefort in *Death on the Nile*, or Lynn Marchmont and Frances Cloade in *Taken at the Flood*.





CONCLUSION

In *The Second Sex*, Beauvoir shows how women have been suppressed by men throughout history. Also, she focuses on how the class differences have an effect on the position of women in the society. If women are dependent on men economically, they are doomed to be oppressed, and to have a position like a slave serving to his/her master. They are born and they are protected in their fathers' arms until they are given to another man to be protected. Also, it is said that she is controlled all the time and what she does or she will do is determined by a man. This man is first her father, then her husband takes over the control.

On the other hand, if she belongs to a higher class, or if she has a job and contributes to the family, she may have more freedom than a woman treated like a slave, and the possibility of her being oppressed by a man decreases. Michèle Barret, for example, explains the possible consequences of the class difference in her book *Women's Oppression Today*. She states that oppression of woman highly depends on the class in which she is born. A woman belonging to a lower class is more likely to depend on a man when compared to a woman from a higher class (Barret, 180).

In this respect, it can be said that women characters analyzed in *Death on the Nile* and *Taken at Flood* fit into what has been said about women's situation through history. In *Taken at the Flood*, for example, how the class difference affects women's place is detected. It is actually seen in the relationship between Rosaleen's relationship between David Hunter and Linnet's with Simon Doyle. Rosaleen, who introduces herself as Gordon Cloade's wife, is actually Gordon's servant and she obeys what he commands. Their relationship is based on a relationship a servant and a master would have. Also, as Beauvoir states, a woman is taught to be an angel, and she is used to serve a man. Moreover, she does not have chance to learn to protect herself, and she always waits for a man to protect her. To Rosaleen, it is supposed to be David Hunter, who protects her, but unfortunately, he abuses her taking the advantage of weaknesses.

When the other couples of Gordon family have been considered, it can be said that women in the Gordon family have the control all the time. They make plans which they hope to get rid of the fear of being poor after Gordon Cloade's death. Men, however, are quite passive, and they do not seem to have any contribution to

the plans made to save the family. In addition, Lynn, coming from her service in the British army, wants to leave her fiancé because she wants to be with David Hunter, who is more of a man than Rowley.

On the other hand, in *Death on the Nile*, a businesswoman dealing with papers and having connections with lawyers or businessmen, Linnet Doyle, is represented as the master of Simon Doyle, defined as simple by both women he has relationship with. The reason of his passiveness may be based on his economic situation because at the beginning he is represented as Jacqueline Bellefort's fiancé looking for a job. For this reason, it is obvious that Linnet Doyle has the dominance over her husband, Simon Doyle because she is much richer than Simon and she has a respectable position in the society thanks to her mother and father, both of whom come from very respectable families.

However, it is known that it is Jacqueline who forces Simon to marry Linnet since they are both poor and Linnet is the best option which may make them survive without suffering a lot. Therefore, Simon agrees to marry Linnet because of her money, but he tries to hide his aim very carefully. He does it very skillfully that a woman like Linnet does not hesitate at all. She is so sure that it is not Jacqueline, but herself whom Simon falls in love with. Moreover, she believes that Simon and Jacqueline would have broken up if she had not stolen her friend's fiancé although Simon marries her for her money. Her imaginary love, on the other hand, is linked to "a narcissistic relation to the subject" (Demandante, 106). According to Lacan, love is an illusion in which one thinks s/he becomes one with the beloved one (Lacan qtd. in Demandante, 106). Therefore, she finds herself right on this subject, and with the power of her economic situation, she achieves to get what she wishes.

When Linnet and Simon's relationship is analysed, it is found that Simon is not represented as a man who abuses her partner or suppresses her. However, it is Jacqueline, who has all the control, or makes all the murder plan. Moreover, other characters on the ship understand that she is an intelligent woman, and even the detective has difficulty to find how the murder has been committed and he confesses that it is a murder planned carefully by a person having brains. The reason of Jacqueline's dominance over Simon may be based on her background. She may have

financial problems, but, originally, she comes from a rich family just like Linnet Doyle, but her father goes bankrupt.

Overall, except for Rosaleen, rest of the woman characters is represented as powerful and determined women. As well as being powerful, they are determined. Moreover, they are courageous enough to kill someone. They do not hesitate to sacrifice themselves for the people they love. The reason why Rosaleen is a passive woman may be her background since she comes from the lower class unlike other women characters in the two novels studied. As is known, if a woman comes from a lower class, it is more likely for her to be oppressed. Although she used to have a job, and she used to earn money by herself, after losing her job, she must feel insecure, and she must look someone to protect her. Unfortunately, she finds a man like David Hunter, who kills her in the end.

Unlike Rosaleen, the others come from higher classes, which makes them more confident compared to Rosaleen. What is more is that their male partners do not attempt to do anything, but obey these women. When compared to Simon Doyle, Cloade men are educated, but, surprisingly, they all depend on their brother Gordon Cloade. Simon Doyle or Rowley Cloade, on the other hand, are not represented as strong as their partners although they come from different classes. In this respect, it can be said that Christie's creating a woman like Rosaleen, who is passive, weak and unable to make decisions by herself should not make her an anti-feminist because she has women like Linnet, Jacqueline, Kathy, Frances, who are practical, intelligent and ready to act.

When the women characters' positions in their relationships are taken into consideration, it is seen obviously that they do not accept the role assigned to them by society. They are strong and they reject what the society demands from a woman. Also, they understand business, and they do not need a man's protection to survive because they have the capacity to survive by themselves. However, when Rosaleen's situation is regarded, it is seen that she is not like the rest of the women characters. The reason of this is that she does not have the capability to survive by herself.

Another difference Rosaleen has is that she does not have a financial security. She has a job, but she loses it afterwards, which pushes her to risk her life for the sake of stealing her husband's money. Therefore, what makes the other women

characters of this thesis different is that all of them but Rosaleen come from rich families. Even though Jacqueline does not have money, she is not treated like a servant thanks to her background. On the other hand, Rosaleen, a former servant, has never had the chance the other women have had in their lives, and it can be deduced that she has had a life of a servant's. Moreover, she seems to lead a life according to social norms since she always obeys what David Hunter commands.

For this reason, when these women are compared to each other in terms of the position in their relationship, their reactions in the case of a crisis, their determination, the way they act, it is seen that their economic situation has a very important effect on all of these. The richer women have much more power over their partners. In addition, in a relationship between two poor people, it is seen that man is the one who has the ultimate power. Therefore, it may be deduced that the position of women changes according to the wealth they have, and the class they belong to, or they once belonged to.

As for Linnet, it can be said that she is represented as a woman admired by people around her, and she is accustomed to this admiration. As well as being a beautiful woman, she is capable of understanding business, and she deals with it herself after her father's death. Moreover, she marries Jacqueline's fiancé, Simon claiming that she is the one Simon loves. This may be explained by what Lacan says about love. According to Lacan, love is actually the imagination of people, and people asserting that they are in love actually strive to satisfy their ego by seeing their reflection in other people, and this shows their narcissistic tendencies (13). For his reason, it can be said that Linnet is a woman who is trying to satisfy her ego and that's why she does not marry the Lord, but Simon Doyle.

It is obvious that all these female characters, Linnet, Jacqueline, Rosaleen and the Clodes, are different from each other in terms of their class and financial status. It is stated that a woman's dependence is derived from her economic independence (Barret, 180). This is actually what makes Rosaleen a dependent woman is her financial situation, which makes her have a lot of difficulties in the capitalist world. Therefore, it is seen in both books that the more independent women are, the less they are suppressed by their partners. The reason why they have freedom and nobody can dominate them is that they do not need anyone because they can lead their lives

by themselves, but it is important that it is thanks to their backgrounds, not that they try hard to have an important position in the society.

In other words, it can be said that what does not make a woman the Other is her economic independence. It is clearly seen that characters from high classes such as the Frances and Kathy Cloade, Linnet Ridgeway, or Jacqueline Bellefort are represented as the One in their relationships. Their partners do not dominate them, or they do not have any attempt to do so. However, it seen in Rosaleen and David's relationship that Rosaleen, who is a servant girl, is abused, suppressed, and killed in the end by her partner. It is obvious that David is the One, and Rosaleen is the Other, who does not have any right in this oppressive relationship.





BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Anger, Jane. *Her Protection for Women*. Printed by Richard Jones, and Thomas Orwin, 1589, Digital Library Upenn, <https://digital.library.upenn.edu/women/anger/protection/protection/html>.
- Barret, Michele. *Women's Oppression Today*. The Thetford Press Ltd., 1986.
- Beauvoir, Simone. *The Second Sex*. Vintage Book, 2010.
- Bell, Ian. "Eighteenth-Century Crime Writing". *The Cambridge Companion To Crime Fiction*, edited by Martin Priestman, Cambridge University Press, 2003, pp. 7-18.
- Bunson, Matthew. *The Complete Christie: An Agatha Christie Encyclopedia*. New York: Pocket Books, 2000.
- Buttler, Judith. "Feminism and the Subversion of Women". *Feminist Theory: A Reader*. ed. Bartkowski & Kolmar. McGraw-Hill, 2005. pp-496-.504
- Christie, Agatha, *An Autobiography*, Kindle ed. Harper Collins, 2012.
- Christie, Agatha. *Curtain*. Dodd, Mead & Company, 1975.
- Christie, Agatha. *Death on the Nile*. William Collins Sons & Co., 1989.
- Christie, Agatha. *Murder on the Orient Express*. Harper Collins, 2011.
- Christie, Agatha. *Taken at the Flood*. Collins, 1948.
- Christie, Agatha. *The Mysterious Affair at Styles*. Bantam Books, 1975.

- Cixous, Hélène, et al. "The Laugh of the Medusa." *Signs*, vol. 1, no. 4, 1976, pp. 875–893. *JSTOR*, www.jstor.org/stable/3173239. Accessed 1 May 2020.
- Curran, John. *Agatha Christie's Secret Notebooks: Fifty Years of Mysteries in the Making*. London: HarperCollins Publishers, 2009. 111.
- David, Miriam E. "Changing Feminism." *Reclaiming Feminism: Challenging Everyday Misogyny*, 1st ed., Bristol University Press, 2016, pp. 27–52. *JSTOR*, www.jstor.org/stable/j.ctt1t89279.7. Accessed 23 Apr. 2020.
- Defoe, Daniel. *Moll Flanders*. Dejavu Publishing, 2012.
- Demandante, Darlene. "Lacanian Perspectives on Love". *Kritike*. vol., 8. no.1, June 2014. pp. 102-118.
- Direk, Zeynep. "Simone de Beauvoir: Abjeksiyon ve Eros Etiği". *Cogito*, Ocak 2019, pp. 11-38.
- Engels, Frederich. *Origin of the Family, Private Property, and the State*. Resistance Books, 2004.
- Epstein, Cynthia Fuchs. "Great Divides: The Cultural, Cognitive, and Social Bases of the Global Subordination of Women." *American Sociological Review*, vol. 72, no. 1, 2007, pp. 1–22. *JSTOR*, www.jstor.org/stable/25472445. Accessed 23 Apr. 2020.
- Freud, Sigmund. *Sexuality and the Psychology of Love*. Touchstone, 1997.
- Godwin, William. *Caleb Williams*. Oxford University Press, 2009.
- Grella, George. "Murder and Manners: The Formal Detective Novel." *NOVEL: A Forum on Fiction*, vol. 4, no. 1, 1970, pp. 30–

48. *JSTOR*, www.jstor.org/stable/1345250. Accessed 23 Apr. 2020.

Hark, Ina Rae. "Impossible Murderers: Agatha Christie and the Community of Readers." *Theory and Practice of Classic Detective Fiction*. Ed. Jerome H. Delamater and Ruth Prigozy. Connecticut, London: Greenwood Press, 1997. pp. 111-118.

Harvey, Richard. "Early English Feminism and the Creation Myth." *The Historian*, vol. 54, no. 1, 1991, pp. 35–48. *JSTOR*, www.jstor.org/stable/24447931. Accessed 23 Apr. 2020.

Horsley, Lee. *Twentieth-Century Crime Fiction*. Oxford University Press, 2005.

Humm, Maggie. *Feminist Edebiyat Eleştirisi*, translated by Gönül Bakay. Say Yayınları, 2002.

Gilbert, Sandra & Gubar, Susan. *Mad Woman in the Attic*. Yale University Press, 2000.

Hudson, Judith. "Jane Anger". *English Renaissance Literature.*, vol. 1, eds. Sullivan & Steward. Blackwell Publishing, 2012.

James, Selma. "A Woman's Place". *Feminist Theory: A Reader*. ed. Bartkowski & Kolmar. McGraw-Hill, 2005. pp-187-194.

Jones, Ann Rosalind. "Writing the Body: Toward an Understanding of 'L'écriture Feminine.'" *Feminist Studies*, vol. 7, no. 2, 1981, pp. 247–263. *JSTOR*, www.jstor.org/stable/3177523. Accessed 23 Apr. 2020.

Kayman, Martin A. "Short Story From Poe to Chesterton". *The Cambridge Companion To Crime Fiction*, edited by Martin Priestman, Cambridge University Press, 2003, pp. 41-58.

Knepper, Marty S., "Agatha Christie—Feminist,". *Armchair Detective*, Vol. 16, No. 4,

Winter, 1983. pp-398-406.

Knight, Stephen. *Form and Ideology in Crime Fiction*. The Macmillan Press Ltd, 1980.

Marcus, Laura. "Detection and Literary Fiction." *The Cambridge Companion to Crime Fiction*. Ed. Martin Priestman. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2003. 245 -267.

Matthews, Jill. "Feminist History." *Labour History*, no. 50, 1986, pp. 147–153. *JSTOR*, www.jstor.org/stable/27508788. Accessed 23 Apr. 2020.

McDowell, Linda, and Doreen Massey. "A Woman's Place?" *Geography Matters!: A Reader*, edited by Doreen Massey and John Allen, by James Anderson et al., Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1984, pp. 191-211.

Mellor, Mary. "New Women, New World, Setting the Agenda" *Organization & Environment*, vol. 10, no. 3, 1997, pp. 296–308. *JSTOR*, www.jstor.org/stable/26161525. Accessed 23 Apr. 2020.

Merrill, Robert. "Christie's Narrative Games." *Theory and Practice of Classic Detective Fiction*. Ed. Jerome H. Delamater and Ruth Prigozy. Greenwood Press, 1997. pp. 87-101.

Millet, Kate. *Sexual Politics*. University of Illinois Press, 2000.

Mill, John Stuart. From *The Subjection of Women*. *The Norton Anthology of English Literature*. 6th ed. vol. 2. Eds. Stephen Greenblatt, et. al. Norton, 1993. pp. 1012-1022.

Mohanty, Chandra. "Under Western Eyes: Feminist Scholarship and Colonial

Discourses". *Feminist Theory: A Reader*. ed. Bartkowski & Kolmar. McGraw-Hill, 2005. pp-372-379.

Moi, Toril. "Feminist, Female, Feminine". *The Feminist Reader: The Essays in the Gender and the Politics of Literary Criticism*, edited by Cathrine Belsey and Jane Moore, Blackwell Publishers Inc., 1989, pp. 117-132.

Novak, Maximillian. "Conscious Irony in Moll Flanders: Facts and Problems." *College English*, vol. 26, no. 3, 1964, pp. 198–204. *JSTOR*, www.jstor.org/stable/373590. Accessed 23 Apr. 2020.

Özdemir, Fatih & Özkan, Bengi. "The Nature of Crime: Different Approaches toward the Causes of the Criminal Act". *Nesne Psikoloji Dergisi*, vol. 5, no. 11, 2017, pp. 345-361.

Peters, Margot, and Agate Nesaule Krouse. "Women and Crime: Sexism in Allingham, Sayers, and Christie." *Southwest Review*, vol. 59, no. 2, 1974, pp. 144–152. *JSTOR*, www.jstor.org/stable/43468591. Accessed 15 Mar. 2020.

Priestman, Martin. "Post-war British Crime Fiction". *The Cambridge Companion To Crime Fiction*, edited by Martin Priestman, Cambridge University Press, 2003, pp. 173-189.

Postl, Gertrude. Tekrar Etme, Alıntılama, Altüst Etme : Irigaray'ın Taklit Kavramının Politikası. *Cogito*, Ocak 2019, pp. 146-158

Scaggs, John. *Crime Fiction*. Rutledge, 2005.

Showalter, Elaine. *A Literature of Their Own*. Princeton University Press, 1977.

Speght, Rachel. *A Mouzell for Melastomus: The Cynicall Bayter of, and Foul Mouthed Barker Against Evahs Sex*. Printed by Nicholas Okes and Thomas

Archer, 1617. UoragonEdu. <https://pages.uoregon.edu/dluebke/WesternCi v102/SpeghtMouzell1617.htm>

Swaminathan, Padmini. "State and Subordination of Women." *Economic and Political Weekly*, vol. 22, no. 44, 1987, pp. WS34–WS39. *JSTOR*, www.jstor.org/stable/4377660. Accessed 23 Apr. 2020.

Taylor, Harriet. "Enfranchisement of Women". *Feminist Theory: A Reader*. ed. Bartkowski & Kolmar. McGraw-Hill, 2005. pp-74-79.

Wolfgang, Martin. "A General Perspective of Criminal Homicide". *Patterns in Criminal Homicide*, University of Pennsylvania Press, Philadelphia, 1958, pp. 20-28. *JSTOR*, www.jstor.org/stable/j.ctv4s7hx0.6. Accessed 23 Apr. 2020

Wollstonecraft, Mary. *The Vindication of the Rights of Women*. *The Norton Anthology of English Literature*. 6th ed. vol. 2. Eds. Stephen Greenblatt, et. al. Norton, 1993. pp. 101-126.

Woolf, Virginia. *A Room of One's Own*. Mariner Books, 2009

Woolf, Virginia. "Professions for Women". *The Death of the Moth, and Other Essays*. Harcourt Brace and Company, 1970.

Young, Iris Marion. "Yaşanan Bedene Karşı Toplumsal Cinsiyet: Toplumsal Yapı ve Öznellik Üzerine Düşünce". *Cogito*, Ocak 2019, pp. 39-56.

Zinsser, Judith P. "Women's History/Feminist History." *The SAGE Handbook of Historical Theory*. Partner, Nancy, editor, and Sarah Foot, editor 55 City Road: SAGE Publications, Ltd, 2013, pp. 238-265. *SAGE Research Methods*. Web. 23 Apr. 2020, doi: 0.4135/9781446247563.

%3

BENZERLIK ENDEKSI

%1

İNTERNET
KAYNAKLARI

%1

YAYINLAR

%2

ÖĞRENCİ ÖDEVLERİ

BIRINCIL KAYNAKLAR

1

Submitted to University of Warwick

Öğrenci Ödevi

<%1

2

www.kritike.org

İnternet Kaynağı

<%1

3

Richard Harvey. "Early English Feminism and the Creation Myth", The Historian, 2020

Yayın

<%1

4

www.stiba-malang.com

İnternet Kaynağı

<%1

5

Stephen Knight. "Chapter 5 '... done from within'— Agatha Christie's World", Springer Science and Business Media LLC, 1980

Yayın

<%1

6

Submitted to Mascoutah High School

Öğrenci Ödevi

<%1

7

Submitted to Amity University

Öğrenci Ödevi

<%1

8

wesley.nnu.edu

9 Submitted to Agoura High School
Öđrenci Ödevi

<% 1

10 www.bartleby.com
İnternet Kaynađı

<% 1

11 anhducblogs.blogspot.com
İnternet Kaynađı

<% 1

12 www.mdpi.com
İnternet Kaynađı

<% 1

13 foundreview.com
İnternet Kaynađı

<% 1

14 Submitted to University of Chichester
Öđrenci Ödevi

<% 1

15 Submitted to Upper Dublin High School
Öđrenci Ödevi

<% 1

16 www.crcpress.com
İnternet Kaynađı

<% 1

17 Submitted to Boiling Springs High School
Öđrenci Ödevi

<% 1

18 Submitted to Yeditepe University
Öđrenci Ödevi

<% 1

19 www.bored.com
İnternet Kaynađı

<% 1

20 walkerramblings.blogspot.com <% 1
İnternet Kaynağı

21 www.aijcrnet.com <% 1
İnternet Kaynağı

22 Submitted to Archbishop Spalding High School <% 1
Öğrenci Ödevi

23 Submitted to Santa Rosa Junior College <% 1
Öğrenci Ödevi

24 Submitted to Clayton College & State University <% 1
Öğrenci Ödevi

25 Submitted to Middlesex University <% 1
Öğrenci Ödevi

26 Submitted to University of California, Los Angeles <% 1
Öğrenci Ödevi

27 Submitted to Adamson University <% 1
Öğrenci Ödevi

28 Submitted to University of Leicester <% 1
Öğrenci Ödevi

29 cornerstone.lib.mnsu.edu <% 1
İnternet Kaynağı

30 Submitted to Loughborough University <% 1
Öğrenci Ödevi

31

M. Mellor. "New Woman, New Earth--Setting the Agenda", Organization & Environment, 09/01/1997

Yayın

<% 1

32

library.binus.ac.id

İnternet Kaynağı

<% 1

33

Submitted to West University Of Timisoara

Öğrenci Ödevi

<% 1

34

Submitted to 36315

Öğrenci Ödevi

<% 1

35

Submitted to Roanoke College

Öğrenci Ödevi

<% 1

36

suward.com

İnternet Kaynağı

<% 1

37

Submitted to City Colleges of Chicago

Öğrenci Ödevi

<% 1

38

Submitted to Royal Holloway and Bedford New College

Öğrenci Ödevi

<% 1

39

studymore.org.uk

İnternet Kaynağı

<% 1

40

"Visions of Women", Springer Science and Business Media LLC, 1983

Yayın

<% 1

41

[Submitted to Bath Spa University College](#)

Öğrenci Ödevi

<% 1

42

[etd.lib.metu.edu.tr](#)

İnternet Kaynağı

<% 1

43

[detective.gumer.info](#)

İnternet Kaynağı

<% 1

44

[Submitted to Parkland High School](#)

Öğrenci Ödevi

<% 1

45

[Submitted to Harpeth Hall High School](#)

Öğrenci Ödevi

<% 1

46

[eclecticbookgatherer.blogspot.com](#)

İnternet Kaynağı

<% 1

47

[Submitted to Oak Ridge High School](#)

Öğrenci Ödevi

<% 1

48

[sociologicalfragments.files.wordpress.com](#)

İnternet Kaynağı

<% 1

49

[Submitted to University of Westminster](#)

Öğrenci Ödevi

<% 1

50

[Submitted to Southampton Solent University](#)

Öğrenci Ödevi

<% 1

51

[Submitted to Hong Kong Baptist University](#)

Öğrenci Ödevi

<% 1

52

[Submitted to Utah Education Network](#)

Öğrenci Ödevi

<% 1

53

Submitted to Pacific University

Öğrenci Ödevi

<% 1

54

classicmystery.blog

İnternet Kaynağı

<% 1

55

Submitted to North West University

Öğrenci Ödevi

<% 1

56

Submitted to CSU, Long Beach

Öğrenci Ödevi

<% 1

Alıntılarını çıkart

üzerinde

Eşleşmeleri çıkar

Kapat

Bibliyografyayı Çıkart

Kapat

Curriculum Vitae

Adı ve Soyadı: Pelin Duygu Aksu

Doğum Yeri ve Tarihi: Ordu, 1991

Education

Undergraduate	English Language Teaching	Middle East Technical University	2013
Graduate	English Culture and Literature	Atilim University	2020

Experience

Atilim University	Instructor	2017-...
TED University	Instructor	2016-2017
Türk Hava Kurumu University	Instructor	2014-2016

Yabancı Diller: English

E-posta: pelindaksu@gmail.com

pelin.aksu@atilim.edu.tr

Telefon:

Tarih: