

RESISTANCE TO SEXIST MEDICAL COMMUNITY WITH SEMIOTIC LANGUAGE IN AUGUSTINE (BIG HYSTERIA)

Burcu GÜNDOĞDU*

Abstract

Set in the late nineteenth-century, Anna Furse's play, Augustine (Big Hysteria) rewrites the real life woman, Augustine's story, who was accused of madness, to demonstrate how the phallogocentric medical community promotes gender-based treatment. In the play, the cast included neurologist Professor and governor of the Salpêtrière hospital, Jean- Martin Charcot and psychologist aspiring student Sigmund Freud exhibits intriguing case of Augustine to the all-male audience under the disguise of medical wisdom and discovery. Through her hysteric performance to all-male spectators, who are intentionally put into the role of voyeur, Augustine not only succeeds in acting out her rape scene and makes a critique of male-dominated society. In Furse's feminist revision, Furse also deals with how Augustine's semiotic language creates an alternative to the male-oriented language. Augustine's final critical response to the male-dominated society is achieved through her escape in male attire. This paper investigates how the mental hospital under the control of misogynist Charcot and male-oriented language system converts Augustine into a voiceless sexual object.

Key Words: Sexism, Medical Community, Woman, Furse, Augustine (Big Hysteria).

AUGUSTINE (BIG HYSTERIA)'DA GÖSTERGEBİLİMSSEL DİL İLE CİNSİYETÇİ TIP TOPLUMUNA BAŞKALDIRI

Özet

On-dokuzuncu yüzyılın sonlarında geçen, Anna Furse'in Augustine (Big Hysteria) adlı oyunu, delilikle suçlanmış Augustine'in hikayesini tekrar yazarak fallus merkezli tıp toplumunun cinsiyet ayrımı gözetilen tedaviyi desteklediğini göstermektedir. Oyunda, nöroloji profesörü Charcot ve psikolog Sigmund Freud'dan oluşan oyuncu kadrosu, tıbbi ilim ve keşif kisvesi altında Augustine'nin gizemli durumunu, tamamı erkeklerden oluşan seyirciye sergilemektedir. Kasıtlı bir şekilde rötgenci rolü verilen tamamı erkek seyircinin izlediği bu histeri performansı ile Augustine sadece tecavüz olayını canlandırmakla kalmayıp, aynı zamanda erkek egemen toplumu da eleştirmektedir. Feminist uyarlaması olan bu oyununda, Furse ayrıca Augustine'in göstergebilimsel dili ile erkek egemen dile karşı alternatif oluşturmasını konu almaktadır. Augustine'in erkek egemen topluma son eleştirisi ise hastaneden erkek kılığında kaçması ile verilmektedir. Bu makale, kadın düşmanı, Charcot'un yönettiği hastanenin ve erkek egemen dil sisteminin Augustine'i uydurma bir histeri hastalığı ile pasifleştirmesini ve sessiz bir cinsel obje haline dönüştürmesini incelemektedir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Cinsiyetçilik, Tıp Toplumu, Kadın, Furse, Augustine (Büyük Histeri).

Anna Furse's *Augustine (Big Hysteria)* is concerned with real life woman, Augustine, who is taken for a treatment after being diagnosed as a hysteric and manages to escape the Salpêtrière hospital in Paris by disguising herself in male attire. In Furse's feminist revision, it is shown that "The hysteric is someone who has a story, a *histoire*, and whose story is told by science. Hysteria is no longer a question of wondering womb; it is a question of wondering story and of whether that story belongs to the hysteric, the doctor, historian, or the critic" (Showalter, 1993: 335). This citation, in fact, reflects Augustine's story based on gender-biased medical case history that distorts the truth to its own end. In order to deconstruct "his story", Furse incorporates factual characters Augustine, Charcot and Freud, thereby revealing Augustine as a pretentious performer of hysteria, Charcot as a voyeuristic neurologist, and Freud, an oppressed aspiring student with a new theory of female hysteria. Particularly, Charcot elicits the central criticism due to his objection of not listening to her. Nevertheless, if we confine our attention only to Charcot's refusal of listening to Augustine, this would be an unreasonable argument. As far as science concerned, it is also necessary to take into account that it indisputably requires Charcot's strict accordance with scientific observation, and therefore; hysteric chattering might seem untrustworthy from a scientific point of view. However, it is not possible to find a logical reason for men of wisdom, both Charcot and Freud, who are respectively characterized as a visionary and listener, overlook Augustine's evocative bodily postures and its correspondence with her recurring symbolical words and dreams indirectly signifying her rape scene. As a reaction to sexist medical community and the male-governed language, Furse converts Augustine into an actress that employs pretentious hysterical performance.

In discussing *Augustine (Big Hysteria)*, it is essential to note that "[Furse] has taken historical liberties to create her own artistic effect (Goetz, 2006: 26). In other words, in her feminist revision, Furse draws on factual characters such as Freud, Charcot and Augustine, but all the other details come out of Furse's creative imagination.

Thus, she has made a criticism on the patriarchal medical community under the control of misogynist Charcot and inhumane exhibition of Augustine to the whole male spectators. Historically speaking, Charcot, the distinguished neurologist of the play, has been a controversial person since there is more than one interpretation with regard to his notion of hysteria. While Andrew Scull, notes that Charcot "departures from the conventional wisdom of his time had been his insistence that hysteria was not just a female disease." (2009: 124), on the other hand, it is also firmly stated that "women in his writings fell ill due to their vulnerable emotional nature, inability to control their feelings, while men got sick from working, drinking and fornicating too much" (qtd. in Showalter, 1993: 309). Furse's play serves to explore the above-mentioned second standpoint by creating a hospital setting with all-female inmates and all-male spectators. This highlights how the medical community governed by Charcot self-righteously propagates madness as a feminine illness. Charcot verifies his gender-based categorization of hysteria with these words:

The first thing you must learn about our hysterics is that they may have particularly lively minds, excited no doubt by reading cheap novels and romances! Then they come here and spend a lot of time lying on their backs- fiction affliction! [...] the disease is precipitated by some trauma no doubt and of course, we cannot ignore predisposition to hysteria, nor its hereditary basis, true. Madness breeds madness! And the past may shape the present! But we won't find answer in her chattering [...] not in her dreams! No, the answer lies IN THE BODY [...]. (Furse, 1997:34)

Reflecting on these views, it is obvious that Charcot belittles female experiences, attributing the development of female hysteria to their reading habits as well as other well-known causes such as hereditary and women's predisposition to hysteria because of their susceptible nature. But, being a man of wisdom, Charcot ignores a link between women's traumatic accounts of sexual, verbal

and psychological oppression and reactionary hysterical attacks on their oppressed existence in male dominated society. Then, a question arises: why does he need such a distortion of a real circumstance that exists openly in patriarchal society? In order to appreciate Charcot's mentality, it is necessary to indicate his contradiction in application of his method. As a method of diagnosing hysteria, Charcot states, "I am a visionary! Mine is a SCIENCE way of looking [...]" (Furse, 1997: 18). Then one easily poses a question that if that is so, why he overlooks Augustine's hysterical performance suggestive of her sexual abuse. Along with the above question, this question also defies any definite explanation, but eventually, the reader is drawn to infer that Charcot has an ingrained misogyny that could not be altered despite his power of scientific reasoning and his strict adherence to meticulous observation. To illustrate, Elaine Showalter states, "Although she had not yet begun to menstruate, Augustine had the appearance of a sexually mature woman. One does not have to search far for the traumatic experiences that had precipitated her hysterical attacks" (1993: 311). Her double-edged appearance serves as an outward manifestation of her traumatic experience and Charcot is not likely to evade the contrasting points in Augustine's appearance. Augustine's depiction is as follows: "A child woman. Part of her extremely advanced for her age and time, the other in suspended childhood" (Furse, 1997: 16). In addition, having the notion of hysterics as "veritable actresses" (qtd. in Furse, 1997: xv), it is fair to argue that Charcot's misogynistic perspective inhibits him from seeing the Augustine's theatrical performance of her rape. Under this point of view, it would be plausible to consider that Charcot, like some other "Victorian doctors saw hysteria as a disorder of female adolescence, caused both by the establishment of the menses and by the development of sexual feelings that could have no outlet or catharsis" (Showalter, 1993: 301).

Another reason why Charcot becomes the butt of Furse's criticism could be due to the fact that even though Charcot refuses the Hippocrates and Plato concept of Hysteria, he puts emphasis on the "the territory of

Hysterical body" (Furse, 1997: 18), and perceives Augustine as a fetish object.

Until more recently we doctors thought the womb to be a dancer, or an animal, crouching, leaping around the body and trying to strangle the hysteric by getting stuck in throat. So sneezing is prescribed for hysterical attacks, even labour pains...This of course is nonsense! The UTERUS IS NOT AN ACROBAT! [...] I am a visionary! Mine is a SCIENCE way of looking [...]. (Furse, 1997: 18)

Though Charcot entitles his method as scientific observation of the body, according to some critics, it is perverse to think "hysterical body as an art objects" (Showalter, 1993, p. 310). Therefore it is indicated that "[...] in more recent decades Charcot's hysterics were reread as victims, martyrs to the cruelties of patriarchal science" (Didi -Huberman and Hartz, 2005: 135), because "Charcot is ... using [Augustine's] body as a specimen, touching various parts, under breasts, etc as he speaks" (Furse, 1997: 29). Charcot's presses on "Hystero-genic points" (Furse, 1997: :30), which involve sexually intimate body parts and his making a spectacle out of Augustine's body open up the interpretation that Charcot appeals not only his male gaze but of the spectators during Augustine's hysterical seizures. In Charcot's hand, Augustine is moulded into stereotyped female images that serve to perpetuate stereotyped women roles. In one instance, "[Charcot] is 'moulding' her body...he folds her arms in prayer. AUGUSTINE' whole body becomes suffused with saintliness" (Furse, 1997: 27). In doing so, Charcot tries to turn her into a holy image as to impose the so called ideal feminine grace of chastity. In another instance, he likes her skin to "sorceresses" (Furse, 1997: 24), when Augustine does not give any reaction to his pricking her body with a pin. Here, Charcot wants to persuade the audience to the analogy between hysterical body and witch's body. He states, "Scratch a hysteric, find a witch" (Furse, 1997: 24). In addition, Charcot likens her to a demon because of her hysterical seizures with sexual aspects. "The demon has entered, the demon has left [...] all the obscenity she has uttered her in this

'lascivious choreography' (Furse, 1997: 42). However, Charcot can not think of another explicit reason, which Augustine insinuates through her symbolical words accompanied with declamatory body movements during her hysterical performance. For instance, Augustine states, "he forced my legs [...] I didn't know it was a beast that was going to bite me! I want to go out every night, because he wants to get in my bed when Madame is asleep..." (Furse, 1997: 41).

Apart from this, Charcot grouped Augustine's hysterical seizures into four phases, including epileptoid, clownish and delirious withdrawal. "Attitudes Passionelles" phase is of a great importance than the others since Augustine reacts against the sexual titles of that phase's photographs as follows: " 'Amorous Supplication!' 'Eroticism!' 'Ecstasy!' Who gave them these titles? How does he know? He doesn't understand anything [...] I think he's got a real nerve [...]" (Furse, 1997: 37). Augustine's anger stems from Charcot's way of recognizing her hysterical performance as a manifestation of her frustrated sexual desires and erotic misbehaviors. At that point, one could argue that Charcot relinquishes his objectivity because his patriarchal identity governs his mind's eye.

Furse reinforces the foregoing point when Charcot expresses his idea of ethical hunting which openly indicates his objectification of the women as sexual entity and criticizes it as an act of perversity. The idea that Charcot as a sexual perverse is not solely attributed to his sexual objectification of the women since that would be a judgmental argument, but the point is strengthened through the fact that he is a zoophile, which Charcot puts forward as follows:

What can be more barbaric than hunting? It is man's festival of murder! The only huntress I can accept is Diana! Naked, her bow in her hand, arrows in her quiver, running through the forest barefoot, caring not a jot, neither for her outfit nor the danger. No, one thing I can't stand in the country today is the sight of these velvet-clad lady-huntress of ours, pistol in hand, ready to shoot the nearest pigeon. (Furse, 1997: 46)

Upon this, a male audience exclaims in ironical undertone pointing at Charcot's boundary oppositional mindset with regard to female. "Diana's nudity may have something to do with the exception you make for! (Furse, 1997: 46), which in return acknowledged by Charcot with the following statement: "[Diana's] Nature herself, the personification of its forces, a symbol" (Furse, 1997: 46). Nature is commonly attributed to women due to their productive quality, but by implication, nature is also linked with uncontrollable desires. Above all, Charcot's emphasize on the Dianna's nudity highlights his objectification of woman as sexual beings without personality. This is also made evident through Charcot's not knowing Augustine's identity until Freud tells Augustine's position in his public lectures. Only then Charcot recognizes Augustine, but as a fetish object, "young pearl" (Furse, 1997: 33).

Furse also draws parallel between Professor (Charcot) and Augustine's rapist, Carnot through their identical names so as to pinpoint their shared sexual abuse. Christopher G. Goetz states,

[...]to insert a sexual and abusive trait into Charcot's character, the author purposefully ascribes the name Carnot to Augustine's childhood guardian and molester, forcing a phonetic connection to Charcot himself. (Furse, 1997: 28)

In Furse's theatre, the most poignant scene is when Augustine's rapist is among the audience without any concern to be given away since he is very well aware of the fact that Augustine's words would fall into deaf ears. Augustine reacts to Carnot, (rapist) with these words:

At that scene, it is also made evident that Augustine's sexual harassment is not just through Carnot but also through Charcot (professor), and the all- male audience's gazes on her body.

I hate you! I see your eyes are shining like Augustine puts it forward as follows: "I hate you! I see your eyes are shining like topazes [...] I don't want any doctors' fingers! [...] I don't want performances [...] I don't want any doctors' fingers!

[...] I don't want performances! (Furse, 1997: 36)

As for Freud, in spite of that fact he has an enthusiasm to approach hysteria in a new light in terms his attention to Augustine's recurring dreams and her speech, it is discernible that he is driven by self-interest and ambition. Young Freud with aspirations considers that if he could clear up his point, it would be a new discovery and that would bring him recognition in the science world. "Her professor, you know you were talking of the adventure, the courage to see the new? Well...er...I've been thinking. Couldn't it be an antic disposition ... an outward performance ... of some deeper story trying to be told?" (Furse, 1997: 30). With these words, in fact, Freud tries to say that Augustine's body movements are of a great importance to learn her traumatic experience. In a way, her hysterical performance is "[...] a theatre for forgotten scenes" (Furse, 1997: 31). According to Freud, "in Hysteria, the psychic embodied in a traumatic sexual memory which has been repressed is displaced unto a somatic site; that is, a hysteric converts repressed sexual impulses into physical symptoms" (Dane, 1994: 232). Freud inquires about Augustine's dreams. Even though Augustine explicitly voices (Carnot), rapist's calling her "a filthy whore" (Furse, 1997: 45), and his desire to kill her if she tells on him, Freud ignores. Freud argues in favour of "... listening to the meaning" (Furse, 1997: 44), rather than "listen with eyes" (Furse, 1997: 44), but contradicting himself, have no confidence on what Augustine tells at the same time. Rather than this idea, perhaps, it would be fair to consider that Freud perceives the truth, but he also chooses to disbelieve her story due to his patriarchal mentality. In the light of this argument, Irigiray states that "Plato and Freud define woman: as irrational and invisible, as imperfect (castrated) man" (Jones, 1981: 250). Therefore, Freud also identifies woman as a weaker (secondary) sex. Apart from this fact, Freud names Augustine as "sphinx with a riddle" (Furse, 1997: 34), which shows his attitude toward his patient. Obviously, it is not his desire to identify with Augustine's suffering or listening to her, his sole aim is to discover the disease's reasons for his own reputation. Another thing that Furse criticizes

could be Freud's oppression under patriarchal science world because he is reproached by Charcot having "a keen ear" (Furse, 1997: 34). The hierarchical order in medical community, though not Furse's primary concern here, yet it still can be considered as one of her implicit criticism.

The play is not merely concerned with Charcot's misogyny and Freud's ambition for recognition, but the playwright seeks to dispute another issue concerning oppression of women. As the playwright states in the introduction part: "In many ways this play is about language. Who owns it? Who suppresses it? Who re-invents it? [...]" (Furse, 1997:13). As Furse states, silence is forced upon women since language is imbued with oppositions reinforcing the binary view of gender. Saussure puts it as follows: "male and female, for example, mainly have meaning in relation to each other: each designates the absence of the characteristics included in the other [...]" (Barry, 1995: 42). The male-oriented language, therefore, is unlikely to articulate precise female experience. Correspondingly, Simone De Beauvoir also proclaims in her preface to *The Second Sex*, "[Woman] is defined and differentiated with reference to man and not he with reference to her, she is incidental, the inessential as opposed to the essential. He is the subject; he is the Absolute-she is the other" (1976: xvi). Due to being the "other" in all-male medical hospital with male-governed language, Augustine is rendered voiceless.

Augustine embodies the repressed woman, now lifted by the playwright from her historically emblematic and voiceless role at the Salpêtrière to a modern liberation on stage that allows her to express herself as a person, specifically a woman, and not as a disease or archetype of diagnosis. (Goetz, 2006: 27)

However, as an attempt to overturn patriarchal oppression of female language, Augustine articulates her sexual exploitation through suggestive bodily gestures. **Hélène** Cixous proclaims that "Write yourself: your body must take itself heard. Then the huge sources of the unconscious will burst. Finally the inexhaustible feminine imaginary is going to

be deployed" (qtd. in Dane, 1994: 242). Cixous states that the symbolic imprisonment might end only when woman writes through her body. Augustine, for instance, "plays out the aggressor [...] one hand moves towards her body, the other pulling it away [...]" (Furse, 1997: 40). She also verbalizes the rape scene with the following words: "You're so heavy! You're hurting me! Put that snake back in your trousers! [...] get your rat out of my botto[...]" (Furse, 1997: 40). She does not explain rape with straightforward language, but her language is imbued with symbolic animal imagery that stands for phallus. Hélène Cixous defines her own concept of semiotic language with these words:

Her writing can only keep going, without ever inscribing or discerning con-tours.... She lets the other language speak-the language of 1,000 tongues which knows neither enclosure nor death.... Her language does not contain, it carries; it does not hold back, it makes possible (Jones, 1981: 252).

Augustine's body language exemplifies Cixous's semiotic language on the basis of its being uncontainable unlike the symbolic language, which is governed by societal conventions. Kristeva is also an important to appreciate Augustine's semiotic language. Kristeva divides language into two categories: the symbolic and the semiotic language.

While the symbolic is predicated upon the rejection of the mother, the refusal of the mother as an object of sexual love, the semiotic, through rhythm, assonance, intonations, sound play and repetition, re-presents or recovers the maternal body in poetic speech (Butler, 1989:107).

Having discussed the semiotic language as a maternal language rather than a paternal, then Kristeva argues that the hysterics employ the semiotic language to overturn the male-oriented form of language, which they are forced to imitate.

Women, for Kristeva, also speak and write as «hysterics,» as out-siders to male-dominated discourse, for two reasons: the predominance in them of

drives related to anality and childbirth, and their marginal position vis a vis masculine culture. Their semiotic style is likely to involve repetitive, spasmodic separations from the dominating discourse, which, more often, they are forced to imitate. (Jones, 1981: 249)

Her semiotic speech is more in the form of childish descriptive speech rather than concise comprehensible symbolic language: "Oh there is something pulling my fingers, pulling my tongue, there's something in my throatMAMAN!!!!!!!!!" (Furse, 1997: 17). It is therefore fair to argue that Augustine's feeling of having something on the throat and her tongue pulled back might refer to the symbolic language that blocks her speech. It is noted that "Hysteria: nervous disorder that manifests itself in the form of a fit and is characterized by convulsions, by a sensation of a ball rising from the womb to into the throat, and by suffocation" (Showalter, 1993: 13). It could then be argued that female suffocation has a subtle relationship with the symbolic imprisonment since both are the results of hysteria. Therefore, hysteria could be deemed as "a syndrome of physical and linguistic protest against the social and symbolic laws of the father" (qtd. in Showalter, 1993: 288).

Similarly, Luce Irigaray maintains that woman is constructed "as an object: of representation, of discourse, of desire" (Dane, 1994: 234). To put it more clearly, they are degenerated into hysteria through three-dimensional subjugation through ill-representation, the symbolic language and sexual objectification through the male gaze. Therefore, hysterics mimic the patriarchal language through their body to destabilize the given male-oriented language that transmits patriarchal values rather than fusion of both gender's values.

Hysteria: *it speaks* in the mode of a paralyzed gestural faculty, of an impossible and also a forbidden speech . . . It speaks as *symptoms* of an "it can't speak to or about itself" [...] both mutism and mimicry are then left to hysteria. Hysteria is silent and at the same time it mimes. And-how could it be otherwise-miming/ reproducing a language that is not its own, masculine language, it

caricatures and deforms that language: it "lies," it "deceives," as women have always been reputed to do. (Furse, 1997: 136-37)

Concerning the child voice accompanied by the invisible violinist, it is reasonable to argue that the music in the play stands for Kristeva's idea of the semiotic language because of having a poetic flow of language rather than ordered speech. The song is as follows: "oh, my pretty Augustine, everything is cracked/ Eyes are cracked, head is cracked/ hand is cracked, heart is cracked [...]" (Furse, 1997: 17). After German child's song is heard, Augustine reacts in the following manner. "The sounds of the actress causing this begin to scream out, throttled gasps to yells and finally to speech" (Furse, 1997: 7). Therefore, it is fair to suppose that the child voice along with the invisible violinist might stand for Augustine's alter egos.

Apart from the foregoing discussion on male-oriented repressive mode of language, before closure, it is important to have an insight into another disputable aspect in the play. Upon reading *Augustine (Big Hysteria)*, one immediately question whether it is a real case of hysteria or a subversive mimicry. One thing, the reader can be sure, being aware of oppressive ideology, Augustine mimics the ascribed hysteric role to challenge patriarchal ideology. This is verified with the following quote:

She is playing the eager accomplice. It is as if she is to play the role of 'lovely assistant' to a great magician. She awaits her cues. We must understand from this behavior in this scene that time has passed and she has become accustomed to these performances. (Furse, 1997: 23)

As Furse claims in the introduction, Augustine's colour blindness could also be considered as an example to Augustine's mimicry:

Augustine doesn't lose her sense of colour because she is *mad* but because she is merely embodying that which others (her medical voyeurs) condemn her to. She is "writing her body" with characteristics theatrically. Her body

is saying: I am a photograph. But I am also a camera and I see you out there in black and white. (Furse, 1997: 5)

Augustine's mimicry is made discernible because colour blindness is largely developed as a result of genetic factors.

In the last scene, Augustine runs away from the hospital disguised in manly attires in order to ridicule male authority. Augustine and Charcot engage in a conversation in which Augustine tells that she sees god, Jesus, Marry virgin, embodiment of virtue and virginity is "taking to Magdalene AND she is laughing!!!" (Furse, 1997: 49). Two religious female figures with their distinct place in societal norms, one is honorable, the other is redeemed woman by Jesus Christ are given in reconciliation. This perhaps gives Augustine innate strength to defy patriarchal system that burdens women with categorizations. After this, Augustine shows up on the stage disguised in male attires, which gives critical message on the gender-based discrimination in medical community.

Augustine burst on stage, bringing warm, rich colored lighting with her, as though the stage had switched from black and white to technicolor. Dressed in a mixture of CHARCOT and FREUD's clothes [...] FREUD and Charcot are sitting on chairs. They are both in shirt sleeves and long johns. Defrocked, they look vulnerable, like babies. They stare out like statues. (Furse, 1997: 49)

As was stated above, Augustine usurps their authority by wearing their clothes and renders them impassive. By disguising in male attire, she also seeks to be invulnerable in patriarchal world. This point is verified by the following quote: "One cannot help rejoicing at Augustine's escape, and her male disguise seems like a coded statement about hysteria and gender; despite Charcot's insistence on the equality of male and female hysteria, men had an easier time getting out of Salpêtrière" (Showalter, 1993: 312). Therefore, in the light of Cixous argument in *the Laugh of the Medusa* states, the biting satire of Furse's play is: "There's no room for her if she's not a he. If she's a her-she, it's in order to smash everything,

to shatter the framework of institutions, to blow up the law, to break up the "truth" with laughter" (1976: 888). Only with fluctuation between man and woman, Augustine can live up to her own conventions and criticize patriarchal society at the same time.

In the light of the foregoing views, it is reasonable to infer that Furse takes aim at the patriarchal science and its governor, Charcot, who follows a gender-based policy not solely in ascribing hysteric role to Augustine, but also treating her as a sexual object. Furse also explores that though Freud is silenced by hegemonic governor, it is Freud's choice

to not to identify with Augustine and comes up with a solution. In addition, Furse criticizes the symbolic language that renders woman voiceless. However, creating an alternative linguistic order, Augustine is redeemed from her silenced and pacified 19th century woman role by expressing her views through her declamatory body movements, and the music's maternal effect, which in return serves as a bridge to cross over into the semiotic order. Lastly, Augustine's escape from the patriarchal medical community disguised in Charcot and Freud's clothes work as a way to feminist revenge on oppressive patriarchal system through seizing their male authority.

REFERENCES

- Barry, P. (1995). **Beginning Theory: An Introduction to Literary and Cultural Theory**. New York: Manchester University Press.
- Butler, J. (1989). "The Body Politics of Julia Kristeva". Hypotia. **French Feminist Philosophy**, 3/3,104- 18.
- Cixous, H. (1976). "The Laugh of the Medusa". Trans. Keith Cohen and Paula Cohen, **Signs**, 1/4, 875- 93.
- De Beauvoir, S. (1976). "*The Second Sex*". Ed. and Trans. **H.M.Parshley**. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.
- Didi-Huberman, G. and Hartz. A., (2005). "Invention of Hysteria: Charcot and the Photographic Iconography of the Salpêtrière." Rev. Katherine Gantz. **South Central Review**, 22/2, 134-36.
- Furse, A. (1997). **Augustine (Big Hysteria)**. Amsterdam: Hardwood Academic Publishers.
- Dane, G. (1994). "Hysteria as Feminist Protest: Dora, Cixous, Acker". **Women's Studies**, 23/3, 231-55.
- Showalter, E. (1993). "Hysteria, Feminism and Gender". Gilman, S.,et al.(Eds). **Hysteria Beyond Freud**. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Goetz, Christopher G. (2006). "Charcot in Contemporary Literature". **Journal of the History of the Neurosciences**, 15/1, 23-20.
- Irigaray, L. (1985). **This Sex Which Is Not One** . Catherine Porter and Carolyn Burke (Trans). New York: Cornell University Press.
- Jones, Anna R. (1981). "Writing the Body: Toward an Understanding of "L'écriture Feminine". **Feminist Studies** 7/2, 247-63.
- Scull, A. (2009). **Hysteria: The Biography**. New York: Oxford University Press.