

1. Narrative as Soft Violence in Margaret Drabble's *The Pure Gold Baby*

Bushra Juhi Jani

Research Student

School of English

The University of Sheffield

United Kingdom

ORCID iD <http://orcid.org/0000-0001-6329-3603>

E-Mail: bushrajuhi@yahoo.com

Abstract

*This article deals with Pierre Bourdieu's concept of "symbolic" or "soft" violence in Margaret Drabble's latest novel, *The Pure Gold Baby* (2013). The novel is about a young anthropologist student, who becomes pregnant whilst in a relationship with her married professor. Her promising academic career and dreams of being a field anthropologist and of returning to Africa are put to one side and she becomes a desk-bound anthropologist in north London while caring for her daughter, the "pure gold baby" of the title, who suffers from serious developmental problems. The article reflects the importance of the ambiguity of narration in the novel in which soft violence is practiced by the author, the narrator, the protagonist, the educational and religious institutions, as well as through the class structure. It shows a complex and interrelated thematic and theoretical strands, discussing the novelist as anthropologist, narration as controlling authorial act, the shift from victimhood to perpetration of violence in the exploration of gender, education and sexuality. It explores the soft violence of racism and colonial exploitation and domination.*

Keywords

*Margaret Drabble; *The Pure Gold Baby*; Pierre Bourdieu; soft Violence; anthropology; disability; education; domination; IQ racism; colonialism; neo-Colonialism; missionaries.*

Narrative as Soft Violence in Margaret Drabble's *The Pure Gold Baby*

In this article, I will discuss the concept of “soft” violence in Margaret Drabble’s latest novel, *The Pure Gold Baby* (2013). I found the theory of symbolic violence, by the French sociologist, anthropologist and philosopher, Pierre Bourdieu, to be a very suitable framework to apply to the novel. *The Pure Gold Baby* is about a young anthropology student, Jessica Speight, whose promising academic career and dreams of living in Africa are curtailed because of an affair with her married professor which turns her into a single mother. Jess becomes, as we are told in the novel, “an armchair, study-bound, library-dependent anthropologist” while caring for her daughter, Anna, the “pure gold baby” of the title, who suffers from serious developmental problems.¹ The title, Drabble (2013) says, “**haunted me very strongly long ago**. It’s a phrase from a Sylvia Plath poem, “Lady Lazarus” (Drabble, 2013a). Gold is precious, but, as Langan (2013) states, “a heavy carry,” therefore Anna “**would be what she would be – a millstone, an everlasting burden, a pure gold baby, a precious cargo to carry all the slow way through life**” (TPGB, pp. 19-20). **The “gold baby” is an ambivalent image in this novel since Anna is good as gold because she is not a normal child.** Perhaps, Anna is “pure” in the sense of being non-sexual, never growing up. “She has no sexual interests, no libido,” as we are told in the novel (TPGB, p. 138). The title is interestingly ambiguous grammatically, as it allows many meanings: “*pure gold baby*” means “special” and “exceptional,” but also a source of wealth; “*pure gold baby*” emphasises Anna’s non-contamination by violence, worldliness or perhaps males; while “*pure*” plus “*gold baby*” may reflect Jess herself, with her “golden” prospects and “idealistic” and purist views about humanity, which she practises in relation to Anna.

In *The Pure Gold Baby*, Drabble reflects on the time when she first started writing novels in the early 1960s, which is when the events in this novel begin, to which she “look[s] back with great nostalgia” (Drabble, 2013a). Eleanor, the “Drabble-aged narrator,” is a lawyer and Jess’s lifelong friend from those early motherhood days (Donaldson, 2013). In fact, it is a reflection on Drabble’s generation as a whole and social change through time, therefore, Eleanor, also referred to as Nellie, narrates the story using the collective “we”: “we worried for her, we, her friends, her generation, her fellow-mothers” (TPGB, p. 6). The concept of a female-centred community seems strong here. Drabble has expanded her focus from the concerns of one or a group of women to a whole community.

The novel is full of facts about mental health institutions, missionaries, writers, artists, philosophers and so on. It is also full of social observations about a changing world. After writing the

¹Margaret Drabble (2013c). *The Pure Gold Baby*. Edinburgh, England: Canongate. P. 7.

All subsequent references to the novel will be in the main body of the text as an abbreviation of the novel (TPGB) followed by a page number.

novel, Drabble stated, “I no longer feel the need to turn everything I see into words” (Stokes, 2013). However, as Elizabeth Day (2013) states, “Drabble's observational intent is made even more explicit by the fact that her protagonist, Jess, is an anthropologist.” Drabble thinks that “many novelists are in part anthropologists” (Stokes, 2013). She herself has always been interested in anthropology:

I have always been intrigued by social change, by the rise and fall of neighbourhoods, by the evolution of place as well as of people. I walk around observing, making notes, eavesdropping. I love public transport. You learn a great deal about social groupings and behaviour on the buses, tubes and trains (Stokes, 2013).

Anthropological writings are close to fiction because they are “themselves interpretations” or “fictions, in the sense that they are ‘something made’, ‘something fashioned’” (Geertz, 1973).

Drabble shows Jess sharing her specialised knowledge of anthropology with other women. Eleanor observes that, “I learnt a lot of second-hand anthropology from Jess. She aired her ideas on me” (TPGB, p. 30). Eleanor also says, “I’ve learnt new ways of looking from Jess. She continues to find ways of employing her sociological and anthropological expertise” (TPGB, p. 41). Anthropology, here, means the art of observing, exploring and analysing others, which is what the readers are invited to do as well. I will discuss, in this article, how Eleanor views/narrates Jess anthropologically. I will also discuss the connection between anthropology and violence. In fact, anthropology is a kind of violence, a kind of interpretive violence when people’s lives, behaviours and intimate practices are being explored and analysed. Anthropologists themselves are seen as possessing a dual role “as preservers and destroyers of culture,” because of their meddling with other people’s affairs and because of the violence surrounded most of their anthropological research (Kirksey, 2002). As many historians of anthropology have highlighted, “anthropology as a discipline and a point of view has its origins in European imperialism and colonialism” (Reed-Danahay, 2005, p. 157). Indeed, imperialism and colonialism are themselves among the themes of the novel. Jess’s anthropological interests centre on Africa, its colonial history and even Dr David Livingstone and his African sojourns. Anthropology, in *The Pure Gold Baby*, is regarded as :

full of strange spirit stories, about shamans and witchcraft and night ridings and animal shape-shiftings, stories which hover between myth and fairytale and religion and tribal memories of historical events between belief and denial (TPGB, p. 253)

This raises the question of whether the novel itself is not about such shamans and shape-shiftings, whether Anna is represented within it as a “strange spirit,” and to what extent the story might itself be described as “hover[ing] between belief and denial.” Drawing attention to the text itself as an



anthropological document, all these questions make us wonder whether the narrator is reliable or not and why she is there in the first place.

Because of the “psychological” and “meditative” nature of the novel, it lacks physical violence (Wolitzer, 2013). Nevertheless, in terms of non-physical violence, there is much to be discussed. Bourdieu’s theory of symbolic violence provides a particularly useful angle from which to explore these issues. In fact, this study will examine the novel in terms of Bourdieu’s theory and examine this theory itself in terms of the novel. I will discuss Bourdieu as well as other theorists for whom “symbolic” or “soft” violence is significant, such as Michel Foucault, Antonio Gramsci and Slavoj Zizek.

Besides belonging to the same era of the events in the novel, Bourdieu made it his profession to be “a sociocultural observer, and undertook ethnographic research in his own natal region, among people he knew, even having his own mother serve as an informant,” as Deborah Reed-Danahay (2005) states (p. 157). Anthropology in this novel is one kind of Bourdieu’s soft violence, as the present article will explore. Bourdieu’s soft violence theory is, interestingly, applicable to many aspects of the novel. I will try to explain Bourdieu’s theory of soft violence and its relevance to the novel from an anthropological point of view by showing how Jess is both victim and perpetrator of soft violence. Anthropologically speaking, the narrator remains a perpetrator of soft violence all the way through to the end of the novel, a point I will consider in more depth in the section about Drabble’s style. Because of the anthropological nature of the novel, the themes of racism and colonialism will also be discussed with regard to the concept of domination, which is an essential element of soft violence.

Soft Violence

To begin with, the concept of soft violence was first introduced by Bourdieu in his studies of the relationship of culture to power. Bourdieu’s sociological thought contains a philosophical anthropology, which “attempts to define and understand what it means to be human” (Peters, 2011; Dutton). His image of the human condition depicts a quest for meaning, which is also a quest for power. His philosophical anthropology studies how power is unequally distributed (Lizardo, 2010). Essentially, I will argue that Bourdieu belongs to a line of anthropological thinking that is best described in relation to the concept of soft violence. Bourdieu refers to the concept as “symbolic” violence, yet he also uses “soft” or “gentle” in his definitions of symbolic violence, interchangeably.

I prefer to use “soft” rather than “symbolic” because I will be talking about soft power in my analysis of the novel and its connection to violence. According to Bourdieu (1991), “soft” violence is a form of social control that fosters the reproduction and legitimation of unequal social relations (p. 24). Bourdieu’s soft violence is “censored, euphemized, that is, misrecognizable” or masked (Bourdieu, 1990, p. 126). Rather than tackling physical coercion, Bourdieu addresses the “softer” violence, which for him, is a “more subtle means of exercising power,” as he puts it in his book *Language and Symbolic Power* (1991, p. 24). However, Bourdieu (2001) complains that people



sometimes naively assume that, “to emphasize symbolic violence is to minimize the role of physical violence” (, p. 34). This is obviously, as Bourdieu pointed out, a mistaken belief. He believes that “soft” violence has as many “real” and “actual” effects although not necessarily bodily ones. Soft violence sometimes takes “the form of a more effective and in this sense more brutal, means of oppression” (Bourdieu & Eagleton, 1992, p. 115). Bourdieu (1996b) thinks that those who undergo soft violence are complicit in it as they deny themselves the possibility of evading it once they become aware of it or “they deprive themselves of the possibility of a freedom founded on the awakening of consciousness” (p. 4). Thus, it is not “symbolic” violence, in my view. I will return to this point later when I discuss Jess and her relationships with other characters.

Soft violence does not result from physical force but from forms of symbolic domination and classification caused by contemporary social hierarchies and social inequality in advanced capitalist societies, “in which the violence has become soft, invisible” (Bourdieu & Eagleton, 1992, p. 115). It is worth mentioning that in his discussion of domination, Michel Foucault (1998) remarks that “humanity installs each of its violences in a system of rules and thus proceeds from domination to domination” (p. 378).

Because it is a misrecognized or unperceived form of everyday violence that takes place “below the level of the consciousness,” soft violence can be analysed according to Freud’s psychoanalysis of the underlying influences of the unconscious (Bourdieu, 2001, p. 42). Bourdieu argues that the systems of categorization and domination are seen as natural and legitimate by both the dominant and the dominated (Schubert, 2008, p. 183). He asserts that the structures of relations of domination are the constant work of reproduction of unequal social relations that involve institutions such as “families, the church, the educational system, the state” (Bourdieu, 2001, p. 34).

Identifying the dominant social institutions or structures has an echo of Gramsci’s theory of hegemony; nevertheless, by attributing violence to these institutions, hegemony becomes more objective or “systemic,” in a way similar to the theory of invisible objective violence by Slavoj Zizek, who mentions hegemony in his essay “Class Struggle or Postmodernism? Yes, please!” (Moi, 1991, p. 1019; Zizek, 2008, p. 2; Zizek, 2000, p. 97). In his book *Violence* (2008), Zizek argues that subjective violence, which is “performed by a clearly identified agent,” is the result of objective violence, which “is the often catastrophic consequences of the smooth functioning of our economic and political systems” (pp. 1, 2). Zizek also refers to soft or “symbolic” violence, but only as embodied in language and its forms (pp. 1-4). It seems that Zizek has built upon Bourdieu’s work. In a recent article about language and violence, Zizek (2014) mentions Bourdieu in regard to his theories concerning language: “There are many violent features of language rendered thematic by philosophers and sociologists from Bourdieu to Heidegger.”



In many of his books, especially *Language and Symbolic Violence* (1991), Bourdieu shows how everyday linguistic exchanges can express relations of power and how language can be used as an instrument of coercion and constraint, as a tool of intimidation and abuse, condescension and contempt. As language can function as “an instrument of power and action,” thus, language is a form of domination and a mechanism of soft violence (Bourdieu & Eagleton, 1992, p. 111).

In *The Pure Gold Baby*, soft violence can be traced in many aspects, although Drabble said that she was not aware of Bourdieu’s theory when she wrote the novel.² I will discuss these modes of soft violence in the novel represented by the domination of the education system, the church, and other institutions, as well as gender and racial domination.

First of all, I will examine the soft violence of the educational system and its domination. I will also talk about the professorial status and its power, as represented in the novel by the Professor, who taught Jess in the School of Oriental and African Studies or SOAS.

Soft Violence and Education

Education in Drabble’s novels is very important and empowering to her female protagonists, who are enabled through it to have equal opportunities with men. Many of her novels, especially *The Radiant Way*, which is mentioned in *The Pure Gold Baby*, along with *The Millstone*, focus on the role of highly educated women in society, and on their careers. In his review of *The Pure Gold Baby*, Allan Massie (2013) states, “back in the 1960s and 1970s, Margaret Drabble was the voice of a university-educated generation of young women.” Drabble has achieved distinction in presenting educated women, especially when compared with previous novelists like Jane Austen and Virginia Woolf, as Lidan Lin (2005) argues:

Drabble emphasizes these changes by contrasting Jane Austen’s provincial and domestic heroines with her own mobile and Cambridge-educated new women, a contrast strategically maneuvered to bring the force of history to bear on the new social conditions surrounding post-war British women. One important change is the availability to women of equal opportunity for higher education and scholarships, a reality simply unimaginable for Austen and merely a dream for Virginia Woolf (p. 10).

² Margaret Drabble said in an e-mail, on 23 Jan. 2014, that she was not aware of Bourdieu’s symbolic violence theories when she wrote the novel.



Drabble is also considered as a campus novelist, writing novels set in a university environment (McClellan, 2012). The protagonists of her novels, especially the earliest ones, are either newly graduated from Cambridge or Oxford, like Sarah in *A Summer Birdcage* (1964), who is just down from Oxford, or still students, like Rosamund Stacey, in *The Millstone* (1966), who is “an aspiring academic” (Drabble, 2011). Clara Maugham, in *Jerusalem the Golden* (1967), is in her final year at university in London and Jess is a professional academic in *The Pure Gold Baby*.

Like Drabble, Bourdieu believes that education is empowering but in a rather negative sense. His philosophical anthropology views the huge growth of the education and cultural markets in advanced societies as producing more elusive cultural mechanisms of domination than was the case previously. Bourdieu addresses this change in types of domination in his soft violence theory. In his book, *The State Nobility*(1996b), Bourdieu argues that “no one can deny that the school plays a crucial role in distribution of knowledge and know-how,” but it also contributes “to the distribution of power and privilege” (p. 118). Bourdieu (1996a) calls the educational system “an institutionalized classifier” that reproduces “the hierarchies of the social world” (p. 387).

Education is also responsible for the construction of the *habitus* of every individual. This view is supported by Bourdieu in his book, *Distinction* (1996a), in which he defines habitus as a set of dispositions that “tends to generate practices and perceptions” (p. 6). Through the construction of habitus, the school imposes lasting dispositions “or trained capacities and structured propensities to think, feel and act in determinant ways, which then guide them” (Navarro, p. 16).

In *The Pure Gold Baby*, schools and universities are shown as producing the hierarchies of the social world. We are told that, “big men of the future,” who “were now in the process of re-writing history” are “products of SOAS and the LSE and the Inner Temple” (TPGB, p. 9). In these schools and organizations, there are also “all the lesser people” (p. 9):

The witty Indian students, the tall aspiring South African boys who had graduated from Rhodes or Cape Town, the Guyanese intellectuals, the Burmese mystics, the vegans from Mauritius, the twins from Jakarta, the would-be white middle-class dervish from Southport ... (p. 9)

These groups of people from underdeveloped countries come to these universities to gain power that will make them dominant in their counties. The novel supports Bourdieu’s argument that education is overcome by soft violence due to its umpiring structures which decide the allocation of status and power, cementing social inequality further, rather than exterminating it (Tabb, pp. 5-6).



Some writers challenge Bourdieu by questioning his work in relation to women, their status and education. Women have penetrated the male academic citadel for several decades, and have managed to do this because they are fully aware of their status and are constantly trying to overcome it, whilst the education has changed too, giving females more chance of competing for high ranking jobs and careers: women now compete with men in the labour market and in having professional qualifications; there are more women professors in academia than ever before. In her book, *Formations of Class and Gender* (1997), Beverley Skeggs states: "Education was the means by which [women] could convert their caring capital into an economic resource in the labour market" (p. 82). Although it is a positive thing for women to accede to the "privileged" world of men, Bourdieu's philosophical-anthropological views are more concerned with males and their quest for power.

In *The Pure Gold Baby*, titles and posts are obtained by females as well as males, which challenges Bourdieu's ideas. Interestingly, as far as the novel is concerned, what Bourdieu theorised about men can be applied to women as well. For example, the university enables Sylvie, one of the characters on the fringe of Jess's and Eleanor's social network in North London, to be a doctor specializing in bladder disorders. Sylvie becomes a baroness and a Member of Parliament (TPGB, pp. 258, 155). The post is granted to her due to her education, academic medical title and her activities. Bourdieu (1996b) shows that academic titles, like noble titles, are "privileges" (p. 374).

Sylvie's academic title becomes, as Bourdieu (1996b) indicates, "a privilege symbolically instituted and guaranteed by the state" (p. 377). The university has become as dominant as the state because the educational system is seen "as the principal (indeed, the only) means of access to administrative positions" in any progressive state (Bourdieu, 1991, p. 49). Becoming a baroness, Sylvie, "the public woman" (TPGB, p. 176) gains a "title-nobility," which is as respected and revered as the "blood-nobility," as termed by Bourdieu (1996b, p. 373).

Jess was educated "in what she believed to be a noble tradition," as Eleanor states (TPGB, p.12). What prompts Eleanor to describe Jess's education as noble is the notion, as described by Bourdieu (1996b), that the new academic "elite" are thought of as a nobility in the newly established category of democratic understanding, in which scientific knowledge also accomplishes a magical or religious act (p. 374). What I want to emphasize here is that, in relation to the plot, the university in the novel is surrounded by a kind of sacred halo, as a mystical place (p. 374). It is described in the novel as a "mysterious cradle" (TPGB, p. 102). SOAS is presented as both magical and bewitching:

SOAS! How magical those initials had been to [Jess] as a seventeen-year-old when first she heard them, and how thrilling and bewitching they were to remain to her, even into her late middle age! (p. 8)

Jess remains bewitched by her university, even in older age, because it is the university domination that remains with her throughout her life, as do academic titles. Jess's spontaneity and unconsciousness of the domination of her university shows total 'submission' to this system, which is what Bourdieu (1996b) describes as "voluntary servitude" (p. 4).

Bourdieu illustrates the idea that people are unconsciously complicit in the act of being dominated, which is what Jess is doing. Bourdieu has noticed that the students are taught and socialized by the school in a certain manner. Only certain subjects are taught and certain forms of judgements are imposed and later become part of one's habitus. In *Reproduction in Education, Society and Culture* (1977), Bourdieu has shown that "all pedagogic action is, objectively, symbolic violence" (p. 5). Jess is taught certain ideas and attitudes at SOAS, which do not necessarily reflect her views. She is taught to distrust "missionaries on principle" (TPGB, p. 37). Jess's judgement on Dr David Livingstone, for example, is not hers but imposed by her school: "She disapproved of Livingstone as a proto-imperial trader with a gun, as she had been taught to do at SOAS" (p. 37). These unrecognized imposed attitudes remain with Jess all her life, as habitus, which shows the power of the pedagogical system, its domination and its ability to reproduce opinions and judgments and maintain them from generation to generation. It also shows academics' and students' "blind adherence" and "accept[ing] without opposition" of the "traditional language of ideas" of the system (Bourdieu *et al*, 1994, pp. 20, 4). Obviously, Jess did not question the ideas transmitted through language in her university, but she accepts them with "resigned indifference," as Bourdieu puts it (Bourdieu *et al*, 1994, p. 4). It is the soft violence of the pedagogical system that Jess fails to recognize.

The Professor and Bob

One of the main characters in *The Pure Gold Baby* is the Professor. It is revealing that he is always referred to only by his title. His teaching profession puts him "within the dominant class," as he says in his book, *Distinction* (1996a, p. 600). In this novel, Eleanor refers to the Professor as "the dominating Professor" (TPGB, p.116). Furthermore, his wife is a professor, too, which challenges Bourdieu's theory, as I will discuss later. In Bourdieu's view, the professor's social value or "prestige" stems from the cultural capital "that is dominant in the structure of their assets," as Bourdieu (1996a) maintains (p. 102). Cultural capital, as Bourdieu (1986) points out, refers to "a specific cultural competence" including inherited knowledge, views, and skills that confer "power" and "social status" (pp. 244-6). Moreover, the professors are highly respected by their students. Bourdieu *et al*. (1994) shows that "consciously or unconsciously, the great majority of students (especially in the humanities) cast the professor in the role of 'master of wisdom,' or guru, dispenser of rules of life" (p. 7). Bourdieu *et al*. (1994) found that female students are different from male students in the way they interact with their professors, or in their submission to them, because of their "desire for personal contact and for domination by the master" (p. 107, 110). Bourdieu (2001) thinks that women want to be dominated:

'Women are their own worst enemies' or even that they love their own domination, that they 'enjoy' the treatment inflicted on them, in a kind of masochism inherent in their nature (p. 40).

As a woman, I find this theory rather retrograde. Bourdieu seems to be a gender essentialist and his ideas are reductively/stereotypically Freudian, emphasising the male-female differences and distinct gender roles. Bourdieu (2001) mentions more desired aspects in men, besides age, that women seem to look for, such as height, which can be "justified as indices of maturity and guarantees of security" (p. 36). However, Bourdieu's analysis "evoked strong criticisms from feminist scholars who argued that it presents an ahistorical, androcentric worldview," as Holly Thorpe (2009) states. According to Julie McLeod (2005), Bourdieu's "insights into gender reproduce standard binaries of masculine domination and female subordination as if these structures are unitary, coherent and unchanged by and in contemporary social life" (p. 19). Despite such criticisms, some feminist scholars, including McLeod, Moi and Skeggs, have recognized the potential in Bourdieu's social theory for deepening and developing "feminist theorizing and set about deploying, rethinking and critically developing his conceptual schema" (Thorpe, 2009). But is *The Pure Gold Baby* doing this? Does the novel offer a feminist inversion of the stereotypical Freudian/Western traditional view of gender, or does it offer a multi-layer critique of structures of power, or both?

As far as the novel is concerned, Drabble's protagonist is, to a certain degree, masochistic, which is a "'normal' femininity," according to Freud, whose assertions also tend in this direction (Irigaray, 1985, p. 45). She is attracted to the Professor's "domination" and "superiority" (Bourdieu, 1991, p. 86), which makes it easy for him to "seduce" (TPGB, p. 232) and exploit her.

For Bourdieu (1998), such "soft relations of exploitation only work if they are soft" (p. 111). He blames those who suffer from exploitation as being compliant and collaborating "in their own exploitation through affection or admiration" (p. 111). It is Jess who submits to the Professor's domination. Eleanor says that Jess eventually discloses how she "used to spend her Thursday afternoons with Anna's father in a small cheap hotel in Bloomsbury, making love" (TPGB, p. 21). In accepting this plan, Jess helps the Professor to exercise soft power over her, turning a blind eye to the warnings of others about the real intentions of the Professor to exploit her. Her sponsor and supervisor at SOAS, *Guy Brighouse*, who knows the Professor quite well, "had warned her off the Professor and his habits, but she had taken no heed," (TPGB, p. 223) because she is captivated by what Bourdieu (2001) terms the "hypnotic power" (p. 42) of the Professor. Jess fails to recognize the Professor's domination because such soft domination, as Bourdieu (1992) argues, "is something you absorb like air, something you don't feel pressured by; it is everywhere and nowhere, and to escape



from that is very difficult” (p. 116). The Professor’s domination is concealed “beneath the veil of an enchanted relation,” to use Bourdieu’s terms (Bourdieu, 1991, p. 24). The domination/submission relations are changed into “affective relations” and the power is changed into “charisma or charm,” evoking “affective enchantment” (Bourdieu, 1998, p. 102). Accordingly, Jess is charmed and enchanted by the Professor, whose domination has turned into “charisma” that has produced affection. Eleanor is astonished that Jess did not “resent the structure of her relationship” (TPGB, p. 21) with the Professor and how she accepted it. It seems as if Eleanor sees through the mask of soft violence as she recounts events she has a second-hand knowledge of. Even when relating events with first-hand knowledge, she gives an excuse for not warning Jess: “But who were we to warn her? We were all busy making new mistakes, or learning how to live with our old ones” (TPGB, p. 50). Eleanor narrates:

[Jess] accepted it, just as she had accepted the advances of her 44-year-old lover when he had propositioned her in a corridor, and led her into his study, and locked the door, and laid her upon the institutional professorial Turkey carpet (p. 21).

Eleanor reiterates that Jess, “not only accepted [these rendezvous], she welcomed them. She found him very attractive. [...] Love excused and gave permission to adulterous sex” (TPGB, pp. 21-22). Bourdieu (1996a) sees soft violence as unconscious acceptance of social differences and hierarchies because “the social order is progressively inscribed in people’s minds” (p. 471). Eleanor, in an ironic way, shows how Jess succumbs to the temptations of the Professor when she accompanies him to his study and how, when laying her on “the *institutional professorial Turkey carpet*” (my italics) there is a reference to the educational institution and professorial posts as symbols of power and domination, while the Turkey carpet stands for exploitation and inequality. In Turkey, it is well known that women are the creators of Turkish carpets, but “they still encounter gender inequalities with respect to control over their own labor power and household expenditures” (Ornelas). Jess, like these Turkish women, is being exploited.

Being “in her early twenties” (TPGB, p. 44) and having an affair with a middle-aged man tells us much about Jess as a woman. According to Bourdieu (2001), “women generally agree with men (who, for their part, prefer younger women) when they accept the external signs of a dominated position” (p. 36). Jess’s response to the Professor’s advances shows her willingness to be dominated by a man older than herself. Later, Jess gets married to American-born Bob Bartlett, who is a freelance anthropologist and professional photographer. Bob is “more her own age” (TPGB, p. 47), therefore, Eleanor tells us, Jess “engaged in a cool mature friendly equally balanced sexual partnership with Bob Bartlett” (p. 116). But soon Jess discovers that her conception of Bob “had been mistaken” (p. 116). Jess takes Bob very lightly, probably because he is not older than her, finding in Bob an opportunity that she does not want to miss, but does not want to keep either. Eleanor says:



To outsiders, Jess's arrangements for [...] Bob seemed to be working adequately, but it was also clear that this marriage was not destined or even very seriously intended to last [...] It was only a matter of time (p. 87).

Eleanor tells us that "Jess never took the name Bartlett and often forgot it was legally hers" (TPGB, p. 99) - interestingly, Drabble also never uses the surname of her ex- or her current husband when she publishes her novels. Jess treats Bob like a pet because he is not dominant, like the Professor. We are told that Bob is a "more manageable, more entertaining species" (p. 50). Then a comparison is made between the two:

The Professor was a wedge, a prow, a beak. Austere, determined, rock hard and unrelenting. Bob, as his name happily suggests, was a rounder chap, with animal spirits and a good deal of energy (pp. 50-51).

In this quotation, some of the words like 'wedge', 'beak', 'austere', 'determined' can be found in Virginia Woolf's *To the Lighthouse*. Drabble, who wrote an introduction to the 1992 edition of the novel, thinks that this novel "is one of the truly great novels. There's not a word over, or missing" (Yagoda, 2004, p. 111). Mr. Ramsay in Woolf's novel is selfish and domineering, like the Professor, who is described as "egocentric" (TPGB, p. 22). Woolf's use of language, as Elizabeth Hirt(2013) observes, "gives the reader a sense of the disconnectedness that her characters are experiencing" (p. 63). Similarly, Drabble wants to convey the message of disconnectedness between Jess and the Professor by using some of Woolf's vocabulary. In fact, Jess "wished to disconnect [the Professor] from the story, and she appeared to succeed in doing so" (TPGB, p. 26).

There is also a huge gap between the Professor and Bob. Eleanor tells us that "Jess had the upper hand in the relationship [with Bob]. She had the house, she had the confidence, she had a network of her friends around her" (TPGB, pp. 87-88). This sends us back to Bourdieu and his theory of sexual labour and men's upper-handedness. Bourdieu's masculine domination theory highlights the idea that women respect men who, unlike Bob, are above them or dominating them, like those in the position of the Professor. According to Bourdieu (2001), "the man should occupy the dominant position within the couple" because women "can only want and love a man whose dignity is clearly affirmed and attested in and by the fact that he is visibly 'above' them" (p. 36).

Jess views her affair with the Professor as "glamorously adult and pleasantly secretive" (TPGB, pp. 50-51). However, we never know the Professor's height, only that she views Bob as a little man. For Jess, "Bob appeared like a tiny figurine in her memory, very small and boyish" (p. 116), therefore signifying that she does not think highly of him. In fact, "none of Jess's plans featured Bob in

any starring role” (p. 115). Later, Jess rejects Bob for the sake of the Sudanese expatriate, Zain, who, when Jess compares him to Bob, “loomed large and present and overpowering” (p. 116). But even Zain is not the dominant man Jess desires because Eleanor tells us that “Zain’s days in Jess’s calendar, it was easy to tell, were numbered” (p. 126). She never meets any man that can satisfy her like the Professor. Jess, Eleanor says, “had been sexually obsessed by the *dominating* Professor” (p. 116) (my italics). The whole issue is based on domination.

Style

As a narrator, Eleanor sometimes reports Jess’s words and sometimes gives her own views or feelings. This narrative viewpoint reveals much about Jess and her relationship with the narrator and the other women. Eleanor says that Jess “had thought herself ‘madly in love’” (TPGB, p. 116) with the Professor. The phrase “thought herself,” though repeated many times in the narration, suggests that Jess was deluded, as does “madly” here. It seems that Jess was told to think this way. Her friends, including Eleanor, herself, confirm this for her. The same seems true of confessional remarks by Jess: “but I suppose I do now. I thought I knew what I was doing, but I didn’t” (p. 228). We see again that there is much equivocation here, when she says “I suppose I do now.” Again Jess submits to her friends’ world view. It is a kind of habitus imposed on Jess by her friends. Instead of family domination, Drabble seems to show how friends can practise domination, which Bourdieu obviously omitted from his theory. In fact, this raises questions about the mediating of the narrator. Eleanor controls Jess’s story, knowing even intimate details about it, but Jess is not accessible. We can never know whether what Eleanor is telling us is true or not, so she remains ambiguous to us. They seem to be “behind a curtain of unknowing, a cloud of unknowing” (p. 268). If we go back to Eleanor’s comments about Jess’s uncertain remarks about her ex-lover, we see that :

She found him very attractive. Well, perhaps that is an understatement. She thought herself ‘madly in love’ with him, though in later years she came to see that this phrase (which she employed only in the schoolgirl privacy of her student mind) was merely a gloss on her finding him ‘very attractive’ (pp. 21-22).

Was Jess really madly in love with him or not? We see that generating such questions is typically part of Eleanor’s subtle style and her way of “making narrative itself problematic” (Rose, 1988, p. 87). Furthermore, Eleanor seems here to be a Drabble-like figure. We are left with many questions concerning the function of the narrator as well as the questions raised by the narration. It is because Drabble thinks that “writers are there not necessarily to give the answers but to ask questions about the way we perceive the world and about what we’re told” (Peyre, 2011, p. 125). Drabble also thinks that “writers are very useful about giving a sense of reality that isn’t the reality of the textbook or the newspaper or the historian” (Peyre, 2011, p. 125). It is, instead, the “daily reality.” What Drabble wants to convey here is that “writing isn’t about writing; it’s about the other thing, which is called



life,” as she told her interviewer, John Hannay (1985, p. 130). She believes in “the possibility of accurately representing ‘reality’ in imitative art in her novels” (Bromberg, 1990, p. 5). Therefore, the fact that key areas remain vague can be seen to represent Drabble’s sense that this is what life and living is like.

Eleanor is apparently the mouthpiece of the author or “the stand-in for Drabble” (Goudie, 2013). When driving Jess and two other characters home from a fundraiser in her new Honda car, Eleanor says: “Sylvie, Jess and Raoul are my passengers, my puppets, I can take them wherever I wish” (TPGB, p. 192). Interestingly, Drabble also drives “a Honda Accord, which I love,” as she told her interviewer, Samuel Muston (2010). One of the reviewers comments on Eleanor driving Jess and the other characters, saying, “as Jessica has never learned to drive, Eleanor willingly ferries her about, feeding the narrative” (Leach, 2013). Besides feeding the narrative, Drabble, as represented by Eleanor, shows us that she is there, “still retaining a hint of authorial authority” (Duran, 2007, p. 23). Generally, Drabble considers that her third-person narrators are very close to herself: “they are me; they are not unreliable” (Leeming, 2006, p. 15). But Eleanor is an unreliable narrator. She says:

I haven’t invented much. I’ve speculated, here and there, I’ve made up bits of dialogue, but you can tell when I’ve been doing that, because it shows. I’ve known Jess a long time, and I’ve known Anna all her life, but there will be things I have got wrong, things I have misinterpreted (TPGB, p. 253).

The narrator seems disingenuous for “mak[ing] up what she doesn’t know,” as Lisa Hill (2013) comments. Eleanor avoids talking about her own life while observing and investigating the life of Jess and her daughter: “this story isn’t about my children; I haven’t the right to tell their stories” (TPGB, p. 29). However, how much Eleanor has invented also remains uncertain. Eleanor says:

When we look back, we simplify, we forget the sloughs and doubts and backward motions, and see only the shining curve of the story we told ourselves in order to keep ourselves alive and hopeful, that bright curve that led us on to the future (p. 19).

Eleanor thus presents herself as telling the story for the purpose of amusing herself and remaining alive and hopeful, now that she is a widow and her children are living independently. She also includes the reader by using the pronoun “we”: “We are all adept at rewriting the past, at reinventing it” (TPGB, p. 33). She also says, “we watched, we waited, I would like to think without too much malice or *Schadenfreude*, although of course none of us are malice-free” (p. 87). Again, the “we” here includes the reader, who is invited to watch and gaze like Eleanor. In this way, Eleanor and we,



the readers, are not malice-free. We are doing something malicious or perhaps violent, a soft kind of violence. It is Drabble's anthropological approach that makes the narrator act in a sinister way, observing and speculating. Eleanor says, "we were all, in our ways, bad – motivated by ambition, or rivalry, or envy, or lust, or spite, or sloth, and observing the seeds of these passions" (p. 84). This raises questions about the sinister element of the narrator, who wants to include the reader in having these negative qualities. Was Eleanor driven by rivalry or envy or lust to write Jess's story? She describes Jess in a way that shows an infatuation with her:

Jess, was, and is, an attractive woman, with a hypnotic intensity of attention that tends to mesmerise an interlocutor. She concentrates on others in a manner that sucks out the soul. It would be fair to say that we were all rather in awe of her. Not a great beauty in any classical style, but noticeable, memorable, one might even say seductive [...] When she is talking to you, she transfixes you (TPGB, p. 34).

Eleanor also invites the reader to feel what it would be like to talk to a woman like Jess. It is clear to the reader that she is attracted by Jess's beauty, though it is not clear at any stage whether Eleanor herself is aware of her lesbian inclinations. She may already be well aware of it, but she chooses to keep it to herself. All these things make Eleanor a sinister narrator, similar in a way, to Barbara Covett, the narrator of Zoë Heller's novel, *Notes on a Scandal* (Stead, 2003). Both women are old and lonely. Barbara describes herself as "a dried-up old lady with no husband, very few friends, no children" (Heller, 2003). Eleanor has children and grandchildren, but she feels empty: "I don't know why life seems emptier when one is older, even when it is full. It thins out, like the hair of one's head" (TPGB, p. 246). Both narrators are attracted to a younger female friend: Jess is not as young as Sheba, the 42-year-old high school teacher in Heller's novel, but she is at least a decade younger than Eleanor, who "had her bus pass for years now" (TPGB, p. 167). Both are unreliable and manipulating narrators.

The Pure Gold Baby is written in the past and present tense as the narrative goes back and forth. Drabble experiments much with rhetorical questions, tense, direct address and so on. There is a deliberate conversational relationship with the reader, which shows Drabble's kinship with the novelists of the past, like Charles Dickens and George Eliot (Bernard, 2014). As Glenda Leeming (2006) states, addressing the reader "may contribute to the impression that the narrator, or through the narrator the author, is a communicative presence" (p.14). About her style, Drabble (2013a) wrote:

In our head we switch tenses all the time. I like watching things on hand-held camera and I think I write a bit like that – I zoom in and out and go backwards and forwards, because that's how my brain works. It makes some people queasy, changing perspectives from 'I' to 'we'...

Eleanor zooms in and out, but she does not tell us much about her characters. By creating Eleanor, Drabble, as Ellen Cronan Rose(1988) believes, is “messaging up” her novel “with the untold” (p. 92). Drabble said that she does not “feel superior” and cannot dominate her characters, but, surely, she lets her narrator dominate her readers by using a vague language as an instrument of domination (Creighton, 1982, pp. 20-21). We are bewildered by her elusive language, but we cannot do anything about it. We cannot challenge Drabble or her narrator, we just submit to them, which makes us undergo their soft violence against us. It strikes me that Drabble knows “who the readers are or I know who some of them are,” as she told her interviewer, Claudine Peyre (2011, p.119-20). She knows then how to manipulate them.

The Dominating Jess

As the novel progresses, we notice how Jess’s role in the novel changes. She seems to switch positions from being a victim of soft violence to being a perpetrator of it. She becomes possessive and dominating, like the Professor. It is somewhat surprising that the Professor, as we are told later, is only ever a doctor, which is what Jess herself has become, a Doctor of Anthropology. Eleanor says that Jess has “given him that title, in her dialogue with herself and eventually with us, as a joke. He’d been DrLindahl, not the Professor. He’d never become Professor Lindahl” (TPGB, p. 234). After graduation, Jess starts “teaching an extramural class or two” (p. 7). Moreover, Jess has “become rich” (p. 231). Her own house is worth £800,000 (p. 231). She has bought it with the money the Professor gave her for an abortion, but Jess refused to abort her child and kept the money.

He paid me off with £1,325. That was a lot of money in those days, I was going to invest it for Anna. [...] I did invest it at first, but then I thought it was more sensible to use it as a deposit to buy this house, so I did. I had some from my father too, but it was his money that made me think of it, that made it possible (p. 230).

The fact that Jess is financially supported by these two men, her ex-lover and her father, reminds us of the nineteenth-century novel, which often depicts a world in which the roles of men and women are fixed: men offer financial support to women while women were to sit at home and raise their children (Sönmez, 2012, p. 295). Jess does not leave Britain to be an adventurer anthropologist as she aspired to do, but stays in her home country to raise her daughter. In spite of not achieving her dreams, Jess manages to achieve the betterment of her position. Her education and degree enable her to do that. The school days grant Jess gold, represented by Anna, the pure gold baby, for the sake of whom the Professor gave Jess money. The gold, the money and the house are emblems of cultural and economic capital that are converted into educational credentials. Jess gained higher educational credentials, which are a major mechanism of social reproduction in advanced capitalist societies



(Sullivan, 2002, p. 144). They all refer to what Bourdieu (1996b) calls “the magic of the academic title” which gives “a lifelong guarantee of competence,” and “dignity” that does not age (p. 118). In short, the profit or advantage from that title puts Jess within the dominant class. Therefore Eleanor says, “you need not feel too sorry for Jess. Some sorrow is appropriate, but she was not, as I hope I have made clear, an object of pity” (TPGB, p. 34). Jess is enlightened and empowered by her education. She is not only equal to men, she finds herself stronger than them. Jess manages to liberate herself from the tangles of the Professor, especially when she bought the house:

So Jess moved on, liberating herself from the irresponsible, emotionally arrested, possibly mythical, possibly mythologised Professor, and when she was well settled into her life with Anna in her own new home in Kinderley Road (p. 47).

Jess becomes rich and equal to upper-class Sylvie, who invites her to a fundraising party.

Jess’s affair with Zain, as predicted by Eleanor, comes to an end. She dismisses him and he “disappeared, without protest, as Bob before him had disappeared” (TPGB, p. 128). Jess, “bold, brave, independent, proud, self-sufficient” (p. 229), has become more powerful than the Professor. She dismisses the lovers she is no longer interested in, “heav[ing] Bob out of the brightly cushioned nest” (p. 114) because “the Bob-need in her had died” (p.115) when she has Zain, “the dark card” (p. 113), and “eject(ing) Zain” (p. 120) for Anna to come home from the school for children with special needs, which seems an excuse to get rid of Zain because she “wasn’t wholly proud of” (p. 116) her affair with him. She makes them disappear from her life rather than she disappearing from theirs, like the Professor. Bob and Zain become the victims of Jess’s soft violence.

Jess becoming the perpetrator of soft violence completely contradicts Bourdieu’s gender essentialist theory. Clearly, there are limitations to this theory. The novel is highly sophisticated and non-conventional in dealing with its female protagonist. Drabble seems to challenge the basis of Bourdieu’s theory simply by reversing it, which succeeds to a degree. Bourdieu’s theory is hence only partially successful when applied to the novel. Drabble’s narrative is sufficiently flexible and subtle that it challenges the gender asymmetry of power that Bourdieu is suggesting. This challenge to Bourdieu’s ideas works through Drabble’s depiction of woman and how she can be in a superior position and have autonomy. Bourdieu is stereotyping the view that everybody is complicit in reproducing these values. He talks about a fixed polarity that does not change, such as the pairings male-female, master-servant, lecturer-student, but women can be lecturers (and masterful) too! Obviously, women writers like Drabble resist a male model of history, often challenging sexism and gender inequality.

Jess also dominates her daughter, who undergoes Jess's soft violence. Anna is an obstacle to Jess's progress to her degree, "a millstone" (p. 19). Drabble here invokes her third novel, *The Millstone*, which is also set in London during the 1960s and also about a young woman who becomes a single mother with an unplanned child that changes her life. In *The Millstone*, as in many of Drabble's novels, motherhood is an important issue because, as Ann Rayson observes, "having children is a stabilizing force, a means of grounding one in reality, a positive aspect of female sexuality and self-identity" (Rayson, 1978, p. 43). Drabble is considered by some critics, like Elaine Showalter (1978), to be "the novelist of maternity, as Charlotte Brontë was the novelist of the schoolroom" (p. 305). But in *The Pure Gold Baby*, motherhood is not a positive aspect of Jess's self-identity. This shows a great split in Drabble's notion of motherhood. Jess is too possessive toward Anna. Eleanor says that "the word 'over-protected' sneaks into Jess's mind, unbidden. Maybe it is, after all, through selfishness that she has kept Anna at home. Through selfishness, through pride" (TPGB, p. 162). Although we don't trust Eleanor for telling us what is going on in Jess's mind, we can go along with what Eleanor says about her speculation. Eleanor blames Jess, saying she "had made Anna dependent. She had been wrong to make her so dependent" (p. 202). Eleanor said that some tried to warn Jess, but she did not listen, calling her "obsessive Jess" (p. 163). For Anna, there is a lifelong soft violence at the hands of her mother because she can never be aware of it, while the others, including Jess herself, may at some point in their lives become conscious of the soft violence they have undergone. Bourdieu (2001) has observed that "[soft] violence can be overcome with the weapons of consciousness and will alone" (p. 39). According to this, for Jess to overcome the Professor's soft violence, she has to be conscious of that violence, which has gone deep in her practices and perceptions. Decades after the disappearance of the Professor, Jess comes to acknowledge that she was not conscious of what the Professor was doing to her:

'He took advantage of me', said Jess, smiling wryly as she clasped her 'Present from Southend' mug. 'I didn't think that at the time, but I suppose I do now. I thought I knew what I was doing, but I didn't' (TPGB, p. 228).

Not only does Jess realize the soft violence she underwent in her early youth, but she also recognises the true essence of the Professor: "Looking after Anna had enabled her to see the Professor as an undeveloped and childish person" (TPGB, pp. 44-45). The phrase "*undeveloped and childish person*" (my italics) is interesting here. Jess starts to find a strong connection between the Professor and his daughter because Jess is now able to make the classification. It is the Professor who is dull this time:

The Professor as father and, we may assume, as lover proved disposable, as his emotional and intellectual limitations became more and more obvious to Jess, and off he went, unregretted (p. 44).



Jess begins “to feel shamed by the shabbiness of their hole-in-the corner relationship, their cheap Thursday-afternoon hotel” (TPGB. p. 229). However, she moves on to realize her potential.

IQ Racism

The novel addresses what Bourdieu calls “the racism of intelligence” or “IQ racism, which he discusses in *Sociology in Question*(1993, p. 177). I will deal with IQ racism in the novel as a form of soft violence because it is based on domination and class difference. Actually, the term racial intelligence is mentioned in the novel, but without referring to Bourdieu. The German psychologist, Hans Eysenck, is mentioned instead. Eleanor says, “those were the days of Hans Eysenck and fierce debates about racial intelligence and heritability” (TPGB, p. 119). Bourdieu (1993) says that the racism of intelligence is used by the members of the dominant class as a means to produce a kind of “theodicy of their own privilege” and to justify the social order that they dominate (p. 177). Bourdieu argues that IQ “causes the dominant class to feel justified in being dominant: they feel themselves to be *essentially* superior” (p. 177). This kind of domination, as Bourdieu maintains, is linked to educational qualifications because it is partly based on possession of “titles,” which are “presumed to be guarantees of intelligence,” and guarantees “for access to positions of economic power” (p. 177).

This kind of soft violence is also “*misrecognizable*”because, what Bourdieu (1993) calls, “the new racists” use “euphemization,” which is “obviously the apparentscientificization of language,” and scientific discourse to justify IQ racism (pp. 178, 190). Accordingly, the dominant class uses highly euphemized language to address the issue of IQ racism, “by slipping it through unnoticed,” such as, when they talk about genetics or ecology or when they favour eugenics (p. 178).

In the novel, the issue of the IQ is highly stressed because it falls at the centre of the novel. Anna lacks intelligence. She has “learning difficulties” (TPGB, p. 146) and “could not remember the letters of her name” (p. 60).Her mind does not develop and remains the same all her life. We are told that for Anna, “the concept of progress was in perpetual abeyance” (p. 130). That makes her different from others. Her mother segregates her daughter from the world. She “kept Anna at home” (p. 162). In fact, Jess is accused of making Anna an excuse to withdraw to her IQ world and “to the life of the mind, to the idle life of the busy mind. The magpie mind” (p. 202), rather than fulfilling her dreams of visiting and exploring Africa.

Jess’ thesis in SOAS was concerned, we are told, “tangentially, with the variability of the concept of IQ with reference to ‘the savage mind” (TPGB, pp. 35-36). It seems that Jess has found in Anna some of what she saw in Africa, namely the simple lobster-claw children that she observed on the Lake Bangweulu in Zambia when she visited the place as a young doctoral anthropologist. The disability of these children is called SHSF: “‘Split Hand Split Foot’ or ectrodactyly [which] is a rare

congenital disorder involving the absence of one or more of the central digits of the hand or foot” (Drabble, 2013a). The African children are referred to in the novel as “simple” (TPGB, p. 3), “simple-minded” (p. 81), “simple savage” (p. 173) and “the most ‘primitive’” (p. 273). These words are referred to as abusive and have dropped from use, although they are used frequently in the novel. However, the novel draws a connection between the so-called simple-minded Africans and Anna concerning IQ racism and pain linkage. One of the characteristics of Anna, as Eleanor mentions, is given as:

An ability to suffer minor physical pain without making a fuss: little injuries such as bruises and scratches which made our children yell for attention she would endure with minimum noise or complaint (p. 83).

Anna’s endurance of pain is correlated to her feeble-minded condition, which is similar to that of the “Negro.” Again, the word Negro is considered now as derogatory. Eleanor says:

Jess once read out to me a phrase from an early anthropological textbook on the Negro, [...]: *The nervous system of the Negro is not very sensitive, and the appreciation of pain is dull.* She had also discovered research that indicated that sensitivity to pain showed a positive correlation to intelligence (TPGB, p. 84).

Similar racist remarks are echoed when Dr Livingstone’s views on “slave spirit” are mentioned:

Livingstone had unfortunately recorded that the ‘slave spirit’ in [...] went deepest in ‘those who have the darkest skins’. That remark has not been good for his posthumous reputation. He has been retrospectively cast as a racist, which Jess considers may or may not be fair (TPGB, p. 152).

Eleanor is not sure about Jess’s stance towards Livingstone’s racial remarks. Jess “*may or may not*” find them racist, suggesting that the novel or rather, its representation of Jess does not exclude racial discrimination and prejudices. These issues are illustrated when Zain appears in the novel, showing people’s racialized/racist tendencies at that time. Zain is described in the novel as “a very gifted man. He wrote an important book on Sub-Saharan economics which has come to be cited as a classic” (TPGB, p.128). People at that time, probably in the 1970s, as Eleanor indicates, were influenced by the ideas of Eysenck. She says, “In those distant days, we still spoke quaintly of the ‘colour bar’ of



‘crossing the colour bar’” (p. 119). Although Eleanor praises Zain as a “living proof that the Sudanese IQ was in no way inferior to the Caucasian IQ” (p. 119), still she highlights that “most people still secretly believed that blacks were mentally inferior to whites, but it was becoming more difficult to say so openly” (p. 119).

The connection between Anna and the lake children is made several times: “lobster claws and the pure gold baby that was Anna: the mysteries of diagnosis turned in Jess’s mind” (TPGB, p. 177); “They were her introduction to maternity” (p. 3); “They were proleptic, but they were also prophetic” (p. 3). This last phrase seems to link narrative structure to a personal trait (foresight). The word “proleptic,” is frequently used in the novel, starting from its first sentence: “proleptic tenderness.” It is always associated with the deformed African children. It seems that these children anticipated the birth of Anna, who has a mental rather than physical disability. Anna’s “IQ and good nature were immeasurable, and would not feature meaningfully on any chart or graph” (p. 120). This connection between the IQ of Anna and the African children or “enfant sauvage” (p. 36) is established in terms of innocence: “Anna didn’t know how to be bad” (p. 84).

Eleanor seems to suggest that the higher IQ you have, the more you lack innocence and vice versa. Anna and the African children are considered innocent because of their low IQs. Eleanor thinks that such people are becoming a rarity, probably, because of the world’s advancement and development:

An innocence, with children such as Anna, would be gone from the world. A possibility of another way of being human would be lost, with all that it signifies. They are God’s children, les enfant du bon Dieu (TPGB, p. 44).

There are similarities here to Blake’s concepts of innocence and experience and how children are in a state of protected innocence. Anna and the children of the lake signify innocence, which is contrasted to experience. These children are so close to God, like Adam and Eve before they ate from the tree of knowledge. In fact, Adam’s and Eve’s “Original Sin” (TPGB, p. 165) of Milton’s “Paradise” and “Fall,” is mentioned in the novel when referring to Sylvie’s son, Joshua, who is jailed for criminal acts. Joshua was an innocent child but grew up and “turned crook” (p. 165):

It was hard to blame Josh, whom we had known when he was very little, when he was so very little, when he was in a state of grace, before he went to be bad. We had known him as a baby in a pushchair, as an angel in a nativity play, as a child gazing rapt at modest indoor fireworks at Christmas. There had been no harm in him then, no sign of Original Sin (p. 165).



The idea here is that “grace” and innocence is found in children when their IQ is not fully developed, but when the children become mature and gain knowledge, they lose innocence and become harmful. Drabble herself is “**very interested in the idea of innocence**,”and puts a lot of emphasis on it (Drabble, 2013a).Her novel shows that it is necessary to lose innocence to survive: “It’s hard to survive without aggression” (TPGB, p. 84). These ideas of innocence, knowledge and aggression are all linked to Jess’ past. When Jess was young, she was innocent, like the children of the lake and like Anna. We are told that Jess loved all the students who were studying with her in SOAS:

She was in love with all those peoples.
 We lived in an innocent world.
 What did we mean by ‘innocence’, you may ask? (p. 9)

Jess, from time to time, dreams of the children of the lake. She calls these dreams, “Jungian dreams of the collective unconsciousness, the dreams which had given birth to Anna” (TPGB, p. 148). Jungian dreams here show the split in Jess’s psyche. There is a duality and unbalance between innocence and knowledge. Anna is the solution and the correction to Jess’s imbalanced psyche. Anna represents innocence, which Jess puts under her control, as if Jess confines her own innocence by keeping Anna at home. Jess does not want to repeat the mistakes of her past, therefore she hides her innocence the way she hides Anna. Jess is keen on dominating Anna in order for her to survive in the jungles of life. What Jess is doing is really equivalent to IQ racism against Anna’s innocence.

Racial prejudice against African children is also shown when the novel talks about a cluster of children with lobster-claw hands in Scotland who are “considered of average or even above-average intelligence” (TPGB, p. 177). Although the deformities of both the African, and Scottish children are blamed on “genes”(p. 177)and both are seen to be oblivious of their deviance from the norm, only the African children are dismissed as simple-minded. It seems that the novel adopts the views of Eysenck (1982), who had argued that IQ was mostly biological, saying, “something like 80% of the variance on the traditional IQ measures is accounted for by genetic causes, 20% by environmental causes” (p. 256). However, Bourdieu (1993) does not blame genes for the IQ but accuses psychologists of using euphemized scientific language “by talking about genetics or ecology” (p.178). Bourdieu believes that “one should purely and simply refuse to accept the problem of the biological or social foundations of intelligence, in which psychologists have allowed themselves to be trapped” (p. 178). He suggests that “it is the language of ‘leaders’ who feel themselves to be legitimized by ‘intelligence’ and who dominate a society founded on discrimination based on ‘intelligence’” (p. 178). In the novel, the language of the leader, Bourdieu mentions, is the language of the white people, whose superiority is emphasised while black people are presented as inferior to “the Caucasian IQ” (TPGB, p. 119). In the novel, this white supremacy is emphasized by the laws of a European country against weak IQ or dyslexia: “Sweden, as Jess did not then know, as not many



people in Britain then knew, practised compulsory sterilisation of those with learning difficulties until 1975” (p. 45). Eleanor remarks that such procedures seem “a long-lasting anomaly in what is rightly held to be tolerant, liberal egalitarian society” (p. 45). Sweden is a progressive country but practised IQ racism for a long time to ensure its domination and power. Moreover, the Professor, who is Swedish, upholds his country’s procedures. When he went off with his professor wife to make a study of child rearing and infanticide in agrarian communities in a remote border community in China, they “were prepared to consider infanticide as an appropriate response to many family problems” (p. 45), probably, meaning IQ, besides population size problems.

Following Bourdieu’s theory of soft violence, which is based on institutional and class domination, we can see that the novel stresses the racism of intelligence, but it does not condemn it.

Colonialism and Neo-Colonialism

The racial discrimination in the novel is closely linked to colonialism. *The Pure Gold Baby* is not about colonialism, but includes thoughts on Africa when it was colonized by the Europeans. However, the main character, Jess, does not view Africa as *The Heart of Darkness*, but a place out of which ‘all life’ came: “From that great lake all life forms had arisen, there they had all been engendered” (TPGB, p. 148). *The Pure Gold Baby* seems like a feminist reworking of *The Heart of Darkness*, in which the narrator is male too, whilst in Drabble, it is a female, thus reinforcing the sense that we are looking at women’s engagement with these issues through women in this novel, in a deliberate inversion of Conrad’s approach. Conrad’s novella is echoed at the beginning and at the end of the novel.

Although Drabble’s novel is not an homage to Conrad, it does affirm Conrad’s horror at the Western colonialist adventure in Africa, providing even more evidence and an updated historical perspective to persuade readers of the devastating and long-lasting effects of that colonialism. *The Pure Gold Baby* stresses the domination and soft violence of the agents of colonialism and neo-colonialism in missionary work and explorers who reinforced colonialism. It also mentions political changes during the passage of time in which missionaries are replaced by Non-Governmental Organizations of neo-colonialism.

Bourdieu’s notion of soft violence is also associated with colonialism, although he is accused of “perilously overlooking colonialism” (Go, 2013, p. 50; Said, 1989, p. 223). However, in his early work, such as *Algerians*, Bourdieu theorizes colonialism as a ‘racialized system of oppression based on violence’ (Go, p. 68), or soft violence, because, according to him, colonialism is “the exercise of the power” (Bourdieu, 1962, p. 120) by the dominant society on the dominated society. He views colonial society as a sort of “a caste system” (p. 132) of relationships between the superior and the inferior (p. 133). Bourdieu highlights how this caste system is to produce persons whom the colonists scornfully

call “natives” (p. 134), who are considered by the colonists as “the stranger[s]” (p. 131). As I said earlier, Bourdieu blames the victims for being dominated. This time, he blames the natives for being passive and letting their colonizers dominate them. In Bourdieu’s opinion, “the colonial system can function properly only if the dominated society is willing to assume the very negative nature” (p. 134), therefore, the gap separating the natives from the dominant society “steadily becomes wider, as much in the social and psychological as in the economic domain” (p. 134).

The natives’ negativity, or colonial assumptions about this, which allows the colonists to function on their land, is clearly stressed in the novel. In a social gathering, Jess talks about a tribe in Zambia’s Bangweulu Lake, describing them as “being very simple people,” of “pygmy hunter-gatherers and fisher folk,” who “wouldn’t like the new industrial prosperity of the copper mines” (TPGB, p. 81). Eleanor, the narrator, thinks that “could have been a politically reactionary aside, in support of colonial oppression” (p. 81). These same people, we are told, were forced to work in the mines:

She had learnt that the people of the big lake went mad when sent to work in the copper mines, and would not eat of the flesh of the amphibious land-dwelling fish called nkomo, because if you ate of this mad non-fish it would drive you mad (p. 36).

The colonizers do not understand the taboos of the natives and the natives are not willing to change. The natives refuse to eat taboo food as they refuse to accept industry. By refusing to change, the natives remain under the domination of the colonizers.

The novel stresses the colonial, racial and sexual exploitation of the natives. When Jess was a little girl, her father brought a booklet called *The People of ManyLands* of hand-coloured drawings of native peoples. He acquired the booklet during his travels with the RAF in the Second World War, in a bazaar in North Africa. The booklet was not on display, but Jess came upon it:

[Jess] found them very interesting partly because of the nudity on display, so rare in those days – here were bare-breasted Africans [...] bosoms that descended like leathery sacks or wineskins below the waist, and little conical breasts that pointed cheerfully upwards (TPGB, p.10).

In her essay “Beyond the Black Venus,” Sandra Ponzanesi (2005a) gives the history of what she labels the “hegemonic graphic representations” which “still connote ‘visualizations’ of the black female body in contemporary culture” (p. 165):



The representation of the racial sexual other was first seen in orientalist paintings, and reached its apogee in the colonial era. Racial diversity, invented at the height of European empire to create a cultural divide between colonizers and colonized, was also forcefully implemented through rigorous social-scientific scholarship (p. 165).

These sexual representations are “cultural technologies of domination” as Ponzanesi (2005a) puts it, in which “the black body became an icon for sexuality in general and how sexuality became a metaphor for domination” (p. 165). In *Carnal Knowledge and Imperial Power*, Ann Laura Stoler(2002) also argues that sexuality “serves as a loaded metaphor for domination,” and discusses how “sexual images illustrate the iconography of rule” (p. 44).

Eleanor compares Jess’s father’s booklet with the famous exhibition called the Family of Men in the 1950s because both “featured and documented the many peoples of the world” (TPGB, p. 117). By talking about the limitations of the exhibition, Eleanor indirectly condemns the booklet:

I was disappointed but not surprised to read recently an account of its alleged limitations – it has been deconstructed as racist and sexist, and images that had seemed beautiful and universal to me (as the pictures in Jess’s father’s book had appeared to Jess) were condemned as condescending and exploitative (p. 117).

The novel also condemns the “condescension and racial prejudice” (TPGB, p. 36) and the insanitary living conditions in the African colonies: “The laziness, the dirtiness, the unhealthiness! The smallpox, the jiggers, the worms, the ticks, the syphilis, the scurvy, the leprosy!”(p. 36), while talking about explorers and big-game hunters and native commissioners. Here, we find echoes of *Heart of Darkness*, showing us that colonizers and their agents are very often corrupt, and revealing an image of Africa that is very dangerous and neglected. Frantz Fanon (2001), the Martinique-born Afro-French writer, thinks that colonizers deliberately neglect their colonies because colonialism contents itself with bringing to light the natural resources, which it extracts, and exports to meet the needs of the mother country's industries, thereby allowing certain sectors of the colony to become relatively rich. But the rest of the colony follows its path of underdevelopment and poverty, or at all events sinks into it more deeply (p. 1583).

Colonizers exploit the natural resources of the colonized country while ignoring the rest of it. Even in postcolonial times, it is neglected because, as Fanon argues, members of the African bourgeoisie are merely decadent imitators of their Western masters (p. 1577). Fanon accidentally echoes Bourdieu, putting the blame on the dominant class structure. According to Fanon, “social, economic and



political oppression in the third world was ultimately more a matter of class” (p. 1576). However, “in his conviction that colonialism would be ended only through violent anticolonial struggle” (p. 1576), Fanon moves away from Bourdieu’s theory of soft violence.

A great part of *The Pure Gold Baby* deals with missionaries, including David Livingstone, Mungo Park, Mary Slessor and others. Although these missionaries enact the soft power of the Church, as indicated by the American political scientist Joseph Nye in *Soft Power*(2004), they function as the soft power of the colonizers as well. “Because of attraction, not coercion” (p. 94), these missionaries can create soft power by attracting masses of people to be their followers. By following missionaries and converting to the religion of the colonizers, these masses will unconsciously support colonialism. In a review of the novel, literary editor Rosemary Goring (2013) describes these missionaries as “intrepid Scots” who “represent the extremes of colonial attitudes towards the African continent,” adding that such inclusion of this particular strand shows that Drabble is “as concerned to chart modern political and social progression, and the errors of our forebears,”as to focus on her fictional characters.

In his book *Language and Symbolic Power*, Bourdieu (1991) describes the priests as “oblates” (p. 195) of the churches that appoint them and give them power. Bourdieu believes that the priests are nothing without the power granted to them by the church:

The institution gives everything, starting with power over the institution, to those who have given everything to the institution, but this is because they were nothing outside the institution or without the institution (p. 195).

Similarly, Drabble indicates that these missionaries were nothing outside the church:

Most missionaries went forth from oppressed lives, from lives without prospects, to better themselves [...] they were mill workers, Presbyterians, Congregationalists, the children of drunkards (TPGB, p. 175).

Drabble suggests that David Livingstone and Mary Slessor are examples of those who lived “oppressed lives,” showing that when they went to Africa, they did not leave “a life of comfort” because they were raised in poverty and had to work in their childhoods (“David Livingstone’s

Life”;Benge, 2002). However, as adults, the Church gave them authority and power that enabled them to dominate others.

The novel shows the imperial practices of imposing powerful culture and religion on the natives or what Bhabha(1994) calls, “the colonialist project of English civility” (p. 108) in which the Bible is not merely a religious book, but “the English book” (p. 108), “bearing both the standard of the cross and the standard of empire” (p. 92). Livingstone tries to introduce the Bible to the natives, who were impressed by its stories, but did not understand it because of the “hybrid gap” (p. 58) between them as colonial subjects and their colonizers:

The Africans whom Livingstone encountered were not converted, but they enjoyed watching magic lantern shows of Bible stories. Moses in the bulrushes reminded them of the shores of Bangweulu, and they liked the baby in the manger with the ox and the ass. They did not care at all for the crucifix. They expressed the view that crucifixion was cruel, and not even the cruel Moors went in for it. Livingstone was not sure that they fully understood that crucifixion was not being recommended by the Gospels (TPGB, pp. 86-87).

According to Bhabha’s “colonial hybridity,” technological advances and “the creation of a print technology [are] calculated to produce a visual effect” (p. 118), so that the natives may “lessen their dependence on their own religious and cultural traditions” (p. 118). By using the magic lantern shows, Livingstone was part of what the American anthropologist Nicholas Dirks has labelled “the cultural technologies of domination” (Ponzanesi, 200b, p. 166), or the soft power of colonialism because of his role in a “combination of religious teaching, massive involvement in colonial education, and relative autonomy from the practice of colonial control”, which gave him, as a missionary, “a special position at the juncture of colonial technologies of domination and self-control” (Pels, 1997, p. 172). In spite of his “perseverance” (TPGB, p. 87), Livingstone finds that “teaching the heathen was not an easy task” (p. 87). Therefore, Drabble describes him as an “unpersuasive and unsuccessful missionary” (p. 86), suggesting what Bhabha(1994) terms “the paranoia” and blindness of power (p. 100).

Drabble’s narrator declares that missionary work comes to an end, but the “missionary motive dies hard” (TPGB, p. 156). Eleanor, who works for a worldwide charity organization, thinks that the “missionary work has been taken over by NGOs, most of them secular” (p. 149), which is viewed by some as “a form of neo-colonialism” (p. 167). Like the missionary, “nongovernmental groups develop soft power of their own” that “may reinforce,” according to Nye (2004), “official foreign policy goals,” or neo-colonialist ambitions (p. 17). Therefore, Eleanor sees their “impact on

the client populations” as “negligible. And maybe, yes, I agree, maybe even malign” (TPGB, p. 167). Like Eleanor, many people do not trust the NGOs, as Nye (2004) indicates. Some call them “the world’s other superpower” because some of them possess soft and hard power and are as strong as governments (pp. 94, 90). The novel shows one of the techniques used by NGOs to get funded from the rich. Eleanor and Jess attend a fundraising at Wibletts: “we stand there begging for alms, begging for money from the rich, although some of us who do this are rich enough ourselves, but we have nothing better to do than beg” (TPGB, p. 166). However, they start to hate this process because most of the rich people are giving the money to show off and some of their free gifts do not help ending poverty:

Jess and I agree that we have come to hate fund-raising professionals and fund-raising techniques. They are disgraceful and distasteful. The cold-calling, the faked handwriting on appeal letters, the celebrity endorsements, the celebrity auctions, the television bonanzas, the vanity of pop stars, the ridiculous little free gifts designed to induce guilt and misery. The biros, the free Christmas cards, the stick-on personalised address labels, the small unwanted devalued devaluing coins (p. 167).

Like the missionary workers in the novel who died on foreign lands, some of Eleanor’s volunteers “have come to bad ends and died on the job” (TPGB, p. 149), therefore, she says:

Sometimes I think we should leave other countries to perish. My optimism has perished. When I hear rock stars and pop stars allegedly raising funds for Africa, I want to scream and tear my hair and weep (p. 149).

Eleanor is obviously concerned about the volunteers’ lives, but she is also expressing beliefs held by colonialists and missionary workers, who maintain that, without their help, power and domination, the “Third World” countries would perish. It is probably because “there are missionaries in [her] ancestry a long way back” (p. 149). Jess thinks that Eleanor’s lineage “affected [her] motivation” (p. 149) though she, herself, does not think so.

Although the novel does not explicitly condemn racism as a kind of soft violence, it surely shows a post-colonial indignation about all kinds of colonial exploitation and domination.

Conclusion

As a conclusion, I find Bourdieu's theory of soft violence to be relevant to the novel because of the lack of physical violence in the novel. However, there are certain limitations in applying this theory to sophisticated prose fiction like *The Pure Gold Baby* as far as gender is concerned. In spite of these limitations, soft violence is shown to be practised in the novel by the author, the narrator, the protagonist, the educational and religious institutions, as well as through the class structure. It seems that one cannot escape being a victim of soft violence through family or friends or institutions and so on. This kind of violence is not easily perceived. It takes Jess a while to realise that she was a victim of some sort of violence. Jess herself, becomes the perpetrator of soft violence, though unconsciously. In spite of that, she remains a victim of the soft violence of the narrator's anthropological gaze and the author's anthropological approach. In fact, we are invited by the narrator and the author to be part of that gaze, but we also fall victims to both of them because we are left with no choice but to accept what they want us to believe. Although we cast doubt on what they are telling us about the protagonist and the other characters, we cannot argue with them: "They couldn't argue with me. I had the wheels" (TPGB, p. 269), Drabble's narrator says. They take us on a journey that starts in Africa near the Anna-like non-violent low IQ children by the shining lake. Then we are taken to North London to see the changes in people and places over the decades. Then we are taken back into Africa where we are told to see a different Africa from that of Conrad's *Heart of Darkness*, though we visit the burial place of the heart of Dr Livingstone, a reminder of Africa that was dark and violent for both the colonizers and the natives. We are taken in the novel to a place "where all seems fore-ordained and fore-suffered, and yet all is unfinished and unknown" (p. 63). It is an anthropological journey that sees reality as multi-layered and multi-mediated, imitating the complex relationship with actuality we have in reality. But is the novel itself a liberal form of Conradian fear of the African Other? Drabble's ambiguities and complexities seem to capture a historical moment of indecision over power, identity and human nature. *The Pure Gold Baby* could be said to be perpetuating as well as critiquing the mechanisms of soft violence. It is an invitation by Drabble to consider questions about social political and gender dynamics.

REFERENCES

1. BENGE, JANET (2002). MARY SLESSOR. SEATTLE, WASHINGTON: YWAM PUBLISHING.
2. BHABHA, HOMI K. (1994). THE LOCATION OF CULTURE. LONDON, ENGLAND: ROUTLEDGE.
3. BERNARD, APRIL (2014 FEBRUARY 6). MARGARET DRABBLE: IN DEFIANCE OF TIME. THE NEW YORK REVIEW OF BOOKS. RETRIEVED FROM [HTTP://WWW.NYBOOKS.COM/ARTICLES/ARCHIVES/2014/FEB/06/MARGARET-DRABBLE-DEFIANCE-TIME/](http://www.nybooks.com/articles/archives/2014/feb/06/margaret-drabble-defiance-time/)
4. BOOK REVIEW. (2013, NOVEMBER 10). THE PURE GOLD BABY, BY MARGARET DRABBLE. THE INDEPENDENT. RETRIEVED FROM [HTTP://WWW.INDEPENDENT.CO.UK/ARTS-ENTERTAINMENT/BOOKS/REVIEWS/BOOK-REVIEW-THE-PURE-GOLD-BABY-BY-MARGARET-DRABBLE-8929655.HTML](http://www.independent.co.uk/arts-entertainment/books/reviews/book-review-the-pure-gold-baby-by-margaret-drabble-8929655.html)
5. BOURDIEU, PIERRE, PASSERON, JEAN-CLAUDE & MARTIN, MONIQUE DE SAINT (1994). ACADEMIC DISCOURSE: LINGUISTIC MISUNDERSTANDING AND PROFESSIONAL POWER (RICHARD TEESE, TRANS.). CAMBRIDGE: POLITY PRESS.
6. BOURDIEU, PIERRE (1996A). DISTINCTION: A SOCIAL CRITIQUE OF THE JUDGEMENT OF TASTE (RICHARD NICE, TRANS.). HARVARD: HARVARD UNIVERSITY PRESS.
7.& EAGLETON, TERRY (1992). DOXA AND COMMON LIFE. NEW LEFT REVIEW. 191, 111-121. RETRIEVED FROM [HTTP://NEWLEFTREVIEW.ORG/1/191/TERRY-EAGLETON-PIERRE-BOURDIEU-DOXA-AND-COMMON-LIFE](http://newleftreview.org/1/191/TERRY-EAGLETON-PIERRE-BOURDIEU-DOXA-AND-COMMON-LIFE)
8. (1991). LANGUAGE AND SYMBOLIC POWER (GINO RAYMOND AND MATTHEW ADAMSON, TRANS.). OXFORD: POLITY PRESS.
9. (2001). MASCULINE DOMINATION (RICHARD NICE, TRANS.). STANFORD, CALIFORNIA: STANFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS.
10. (1998). PRACTICAL REASON: ON THE THEORY OF ACTION. STANFORD, CALIFORNIA: STANFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS.
11.& JEAN-CLAUDE PASSERON (1977, REP. 1990). REPRODUCTION IN EDUCATION, SOCIETY AND CULTURE (RICHARD NICE, TRANS.). LONDON, ENGLAND: SAGE.
12. (1993). SOCIOLOGY IN QUESTION (RICHARD NICE, TRANS.). LONDON ENGLAND: SAGE.
13. (1962). THE ALGERIANS (ALAN C. M. ROSS, TRANS.). TORONTO: BEACON PRESS.
14. (1986). THE FORMS OF CAPITAL. IN JOHN G. RICHARDSON (ED.), HANDBOOK OF THEORY AND RESEARCH FOR THE SOCIOLOGY OF EDUCATION (PP. 241-258). NEW YORK, NY: GREENWOOD PRESS.
15. (1990). THE LOGIC OF PRACTICE (RICHARD NICE, TRANS.). CAMBRIDGE: POLITY PRESS.
16. (1996B). THE STATE NOBILITY: ELITE SCHOOLS IN THE FIELD OF POWER (LAURETTA C. CLOUGH, TRANS.). OXFORD: POLITY PRESS.
17. BROMBERG, PAMELA S. (1990, AUTUMN). MARGARET DRABBLE'S THE RADIANT WAY: FEMINIST METAFICTION. NOVEL: A FORUM ON FICTION. 24 (1), 5-25. RETRIEVED FROM [HTTP://WWW.JSTOR.ORG/STABLE/1345722](http://www.jstor.org/stable/1345722)
18. CREIGHTON, JOANNE V. (1982). AN INTERVIEW WITH MARGARET DRABBLE. IN DOREY SCHMIDT (ED.), MARGARET DRABBLE: GOLDEN REALMS (PP. 18-32). EDINBURG, TX: PAN AMERICAN UNIV.
19. DAVID LIVINGSTONE'S LIFE. LIVINGSTONE ONLINE. RETRIEVED FROM [HTTP://WWW.LIVINGSTONEONLINE.UCL.AC.UK/BIOG/DL/BIO.HTML](http://www.livingstoneonline.ucl.ac.uk/biog/dl/bio.html)
20. DAY, ELIZABETH (2013, NOVEMBER 16). THE PURE GOLD BABY BY MARGARET DRABBLE. THE OBSERVER. RETRIEVED FROM [HTTP://WWW.THEGUARDIAN.COM/BOOKS/2013/NOV/16/PURE-GOLD-BABY-MARGARET-DRABBLE-REVIEW](http://www.theguardian.com/books/2013/nov/16/pure-gold-baby-margaret-drabble-review).



21. DONALDSON, EMILY (2014, JANUARY 01). THE PURE GOLD BABY BY MARGARET DRABBLE. RETRIEVED FROM [HTTP://WWW.THESTAR.COM/ENTERTAINMENT/BOOKS/2014/01/01/THE_PURE_GOLD_BABY_BY_MARGARET_D
RABBLE_REVIEW.HTML](http://www.thestar.com/entertainment/books/2014/01/01/the_pure_gold_baby_by_margaret_drabble_review.html)
22. DRABBLE, MARGARET (2013A, NOVEMBER 4). IN OUR HEAD WE SWITCH TENSES ALL THE TIME. METRO. RETRIEVED FROM [HTTP://METRO.CO.UK/2013/11/04/MARGARET-DRABBLE-IN-OUR-HEAD-WE-SWITCH-
TENSES-ALL-THE-TIME-4170280/](http://metro.co.uk/2013/11/04/margaret-drabble-in-our-head-we-switch-tenses-all-the-time-4170280/)
23.(2013B, NOVEMBER 7). MARGARET DRABBLE INTRODUCES HER NEW NOVEL, THE PURE GOLD BABY [VIDEO FILE]. RETRIEVED FROM [HTTPS://WWW.YOUTUBE.COM/WATCH?V=EX3CJEVjO58](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=EX3cJEVjO58).
24. (2011, MARCH 19). THE MILLSTONE. THE GUARDIAN. RETRIEVED FROM [HTTP://WWW.THEGUARDIAN.COM/BOOKS/2011/MAR/19/BOOK-CLUB-MARGARET-DRABBLE-MILLSTONE](http://www.theguardian.com/books/2011/mar/19/book-club-margaret-drabble-millstone)
25. (2013c). THE PURE GOLD BABY. EDINBURGH, ENGLAND: CANONGATE.
26. DURAN, JANE (2007). WOMEN, PHILOSOPHY AND LITERATURE. ALDERSHOT: ASHGATE PUBLISHING COMPANY.
27. DUTTON, EDWARD. THE PHILOSOPHY OF ANTHROPOLOGY. INTERNET ENCYCLOPAEDIA OF PHILOSOPHY IEP. RETRIEVED FROM [HTTP://WWW.IEP.UTM.EDU/ANTHROPO/](http://www.iep.utm.edu/anthropo/)
28. EYSENCK, H. J. (1982). EPILOGUE: IS INTELLIGENCE?. IN H. J. EYSENCK (ED.), A MODEL FOR INTELLIGENCE (PP. 255-259). NEW YORK, NY: SPRINGER BERLIN HEIDELBERG.
29. FANON, FRANTZ (2001). THE WRETCHED OF THE EARTH. IN VINCENT B. LEITCH (ED.) THE NORTON ANTHOLOGY OF THEORY AND CRITICISM (PP. 1578-1587). NEW YORK, NY: W. W. NORTON & COMPANY.
30. FOUCAULT, MICHEL (1998). AESTHETICS, METHOD, AND EPISTEMOLOGY: ESSENTIAL WORKS 1954-1984 VOL. 2 (ROBERT HURLEY AND OTHERS, TRANS.). NEW YORK, NY: THE NEW PRESS.
31. GEERTZ, CLIFFORD (1973). THE INTERPRETATION OF CULTURES: SELECTED ESSAYS. NEW YORK, NY: BASIC BOOKS.
32. GO, JULIAN (2013). DECOLONIZING BOURDIEU: COLONIAL AND POSTCOLONIAL THEORY IN PIERRE BOURDIEU'S EARLY WORK, SOCIOLOGICAL THEORY. AMERICAN SOCIOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION, 31 (1), 49 -74. RETRIEVED FROM [HTTP://WWW.ACADEMIA.EDU/2075351/DECOLONIZING_BOURDIEU_COLONIAL_AND_POSTCOLONIAL_THEORY_I
N_PIERRE_BOURDIEU'S_EARLY_WORK](http://www.academia.edu/2075351/DECOLONIZING_BOURDIEU_COLONIAL_AND_POSTCOLONIAL_THEORY_I
N_PIERRE_BOURDIEU'S_EARLY_WORK)
33. GORING, ROSEMARY (2013, NOVEMBER 24). MARGARET DRABBLE: THE PURE GOLD BABY. HERALDSCOTLAND. RETRIEVED FROM [HTTP://WWW.HERALDSCOTLAND.COM/BOOKS-
POETRY/REVIEWS/MARGARET-DRABBLE-THE-PURE-GOLD-BABY-CANONGATE.22735547](http://www.heraldscotland.com/books-poetry/reviews/margaret-drabble-the-pure-gold-baby-canongate.22735547)
34. GOUDIE, JEFFREY ANN (2013, NOVEMBER 03). THE PURE GOLD BABY GOES DEEP AND WIDE. MISSOULIAN.COM. RETRIEVED FROM [HTTP://MISSOULIAN.COM/ENTERTAINMENT/BOOKS-AND-LITERATURE/THE-PURE-GOLD-BABY-
GOES-DEEP-AND-WIDE/ARTICLE_E8D4FA58-431C-11E3-B1D9-0019BB2963F4.HTML](http://missoulian.com/entertainment/books-and-literature/the-pure-gold-baby-goes-deep-and-wide/article_e8d4fa58-431c-11e3-b1d9-0019bb2963f4.html)
35. HANNAY, JOHN (1985, JUNE 20 AND 25). MARGARET DRABBLE: AN INTERVIEW. TWENTIETH CENTURY LITERATURE. 33 (2), 129-149. RETRIEVED FROM [HTTP://WWW.JSTOR.ORG/STABLE/441312](http://www.jstor.org/stable/441312)
36. HELLER, ZOË (2003). NOTES ON A SCANDAL. LONDON, ENGLAND: PENGUIN.
37. HILL, LISA (2013, DECEMBER 8). THE PURE GOLD BABY BY MARGARET DRABBLE. ANZ LITLOVERS_LITBLOG. RETRIEVED FROM [HTTP://ANZLITLOVERS.COM/2013/12/08/THE-PURE-GOLD-BABY-BY-MARGARET-DRABBLE/](http://anzlitlovers.com/2013/12/08/the-pure-gold-baby-by-margaret-drabble/)
38. HIRT, ELIZABETH (2013). LANGUAGE IN THE SILENT SPACE: VIRGINIA WOOLF'S 'TO THE LIGHTHOUSE'. THE OSWALD REVIEW. 7 (1), ARTICLE 5, 61-71. RETRIEVED FROM [HTTP://SCHOLARCOMMONS.SC.EDU/TOR/VOL7/ISS1/5](http://scholarcommons.sc.edu/tor/vol7/iss1/5)
39. IRIGARAY, LUCE (1985). THIS SEX WHICH IS NOT ONE (CATHERINE PORTER WITH CAROLYN BURKE, TRANS.). NEW YORK, NY: CORNELL UNIVERSITY PRESS.

40. KIRKSEY, EBEN (FALL 2002). ANTHROPOLOGY AND COLONIAL VIOLENCE IN WEST PAPUA.MELANESIA: THE FUTURE OF TRADITION.26 (3). RETRIEVED FROM [HTTP://WWW.CULTURALSURVIVAL.ORG/OURPUBLICATIONS/CSQ/ARTICLE/ANTHROPOLOGY-AND-COLONIAL-VIOLENCE-WEST-PAPUA](http://www.culturalsurvival.org/ourpublications/csq/article/anthropology-and-colonial-violence-west-papua)
41. LANGAN, MICHAEL D. (2013, NOVEMBER 3). DRABBLE'S PURE GOLD BABY ADDRESSES MOTHERHOOD WITH COMPLICATIONS.NEWS BOOK REVIEWER. RETRIEVED FROM [HTTP://WWW.BUFFALONEWS.COM/LIFE-ARTS/BOOK-REVIEWS/DRABBLES-PURE-GOLD-BABY-ADDRESSES-MOTHERHOOD-WITH-COMPLICATIONS-20131101](http://www.buffalonews.com/life-arts/book-reviews/drabbles-pure-gold-baby-addresses-motherhood-with-complications-20131101)
42. LEACH, DIANE (2013, NOVEMBER 12).THE PURE GOLD BABY: TELLS OF THE CHILDREN WHO SMILE AT EVERYONE AND EVERYTHING.POPMATTERS. RETRIEVED FROM [HTTP://WWW.POPMATTERS.COM/REVIEW/176199-THE-PURE-GOLD-BABY-BY-MARGARET-DRABBLE/](http://www.popmatters.com/review/176199-the-pure-gold-baby-by-margaret-drabble/)
43. LEEMING, GLENDA (2006).MARGARET DRABBLE.TAVISTOCK: NORTHCOTE. BRITISH COUNCIL.
44. LIN, LIDAN (2005). SPATIAL NARRATIVE AND POSTFEMINIST FICTION: MARGARET DRABBLE'S THE RADIANT WAY. ENGLISH STUDIES.86 (1), 51-70. RETRIEVED FROM [HTTP://OPUS.IPFW.EDU/ENGLISH_FACPUBS/250](http://opus.ipfw.edu/english_facpubs/250)
45. LIZARDO, OMAR (2010). PIERRE BOURDIEU AS A POST-CULTURAL THEORIST', CULTURAL SOCIOLOGY, 5(1), 1-22. RETRIEVED FROM [HTTPS://WWW3.ND.EDU/~OLIZARDO/PAPERS/CS-BOURDIEU.PDF](https://www3.nd.edu/~olizardo/papers/cs-bourdieu.pdf)
46. MASSIE, ALLAN (2013, NOVEMBER 9). BOOK REVIEW:THE PURE GOLD BABY BY MARGARET DRABBLE.THE SCOTSMAN.RETRIEVED FROM [HTTP://WWW.SCOTSMAN.COM/LIFESTYLE/BOOKS/BOOK-REVIEW-THE-PURE-GOLD-BABY-BY-MARGARET-DRABBLE-1-3181709](http://www.scotsman.com/lifestyle/books/book-review-the-pure-gold-baby-by-margaret-drabble-1-3181709).
47. MCCLELLAN, ANN K. (2012).HOW BRITISH WOMEN WRITERS TRANSFORMED THE CAMPUS NOVEL: VIRGINIA WOOLF, DOROTHY L. SAYERS, MARGARET DRABBLE, ANITA BROOKNER, JEANNETTE WINTERSON. NEW YORK, NY: EDWIN MELLE PRESS.
48. MCLEOD, JULIE (2005, MARCH 30). FEMINISTS REREADING BOURDIEU: OLD DEBATES AND NEW QUESTIONS ABOUT GENDER HABITUS AND GENDER CHANGE', THEORY AND RESEARCH IN EDUCATION.RETRIEVED FROM [HTTP://WWW.SAGEPUBLICATIONS.COM](http://www.sagepublications.com)
49. MOI, TORIL (1991 AUTUMN).APPROPRIATING BOURDIEU: FEMINIST THEORY AND PIERRE BOURDIEU'S SOCIOLOGY OF CULTURE.NEW LITERARY HISTORY.22 (4), 1017-1049. RETRIEVED FROM [HTTP://WWW.TORILMOI.COM/WP-CONTENT/UPLOADS/2009/09/APPROPRIATING_BOURDIEU_Moi1.PDF](http://www.torilmoi.com/wp-content/uploads/2009/09/Approprating_Bourdieu_Moi1.pdf)
50. MUSTON, SAMUEL (2010, SEPTEMBER 18). MY SECRET LIFE: MARGARET DRABBLE, AUTHOR, 71. THE INDEPENDENT. RETRIEVED FROM [HTTP://WWW.INDEPENDENT.CO.UK/NEWS/PEOPLE/PROFILES/MY-SECRET-LIFE-MARGARET-DRABBLE-AUTHOR-71-2080156.HTML](http://www.independent.co.uk/news/people/profiles/my-secret-life-margaret-drabble-author-71-2080156.html)
51. NAVARRO, ZANDER (2006). IN SEARCH OF CULTURAL INTERPRETATION OF POWER.IDS BULLETIN37(6), 11-22.DOI: 10.1111/j.1759-5436.2006.tb00319.x
52. NYE, JR., JOSEPH S. (2004).SOFT POWER: MEANS TO SUCCESS IN WORLD POLITICS. NEW YORK, NY: PUBLIC AFFAIRS.
53. ORNELAS, MARIANA. WOMEN AND CARPET WEAVING IN TURKEY.TURKISH CULTURE PORTAL. RETRIEVED FROM [HTTP://WWW.TURKISHCULTURE.ORG/TAPESTRY/ANATOLIAN-CARPETS/CARPET-WEAVING-TRADITION-600.HTM](http://www.turkishculture.org/tapestry/anatolian-carpets/carpets-weaving-tradition-600.htm)
54. PELS, PETER (1997, OCTOBER). THE ANTHROPOLOGY OF COLONIALISM: CULTURE, HISTORY, AND THE EMERGENCE OF WESTERN GOVERNMENTALITY.ANNUAL REVIEW OF ANTHROPOLOGY.26, 163-113.DOI: 10.1146/annurev.anthro.26.1.163.
55. PETERS, GABRIEL (2011).THE SOCIAL AS HEAVEN AND HELL: PIERRE BOURDIEU'S PHILOSOPHICAL ANTHROPOLOGY.JOURNAL FOR THE THEORY OF SOCIAL BEHAVIOUR42 (1), 0021-8308. RETRIEVED FROM



[HTTP://WWW.ACADEMIA.EDU/365090/THE_SOCIAL_AS_HEAVEN_AND_HELL_PIERRE_BOURDIEU_PHILOSOPHICAL_ANTHROPOLOGY](http://www.academia.edu/365090/The_Social_as_Heaven_and_Hell_Pierre_Bourdieu_Philosophical_Anthropology)

56. PEYRE, CLAUDINE (2011). THREE INTERVIEWS WITH MARGARET DRABBLE. *CERCLES* 21, 112-130. RETRIEVED FROM [HTTP://WWW.CERCLES.COM/N21/PEYRE.PDF](http://www.cercles.com/n21/peyre.pdf)
57. PONZANESI, SANDRA (2005A). BEYOND THE BLACK VENUS: COLONIAL SEXUAL POLITICS AND CONTEMPORARY VISUAL PRACTICES. IN JACQUELINE ANDALL AND DEREK DUNCAN (EDS.), *ITALIAN COLONIALISM: LEGACIES AND MEMORIES* (PP.165-189). OXFORD: PETER LANG PRESS.
58.(2005B). OUTLANDISH CINEMA. SCREENING THE OTHER IN ITALY. IN SANDRA PONZANESI AND DANIELA MEROLLA (EDS.), *MIGRANT CARTOGRAPHIES: NEW CULTURAL AND LITERARY SPACES IN POSTCOLONIAL EUROPE* (PP. 267-280). LANHAM, MD.: LEXINGTON BOOKS.
59. RAYSON, ANN (1978, SUMMAR). MOTHERHOOD IN THE NOVELS OF MARGARET DRABBLE', *FRONTIERS: A JOURNAL OF WOMEN STUDIES*, 3 (2), 43-46. MOTHERS AND DAUGHTERS. RETRIEVED FROM [HTTP://WWW.JSTOR.ORG/STABLE/3346399](http://www.jstor.org/stable/3346399)
60. REED-DANAHAY, DEBORAH (2005). LOCATING BOURDIEU. INDIANA UNIVERSITY PRESS.
61. ROSE, ELLEN CRONAN (SPRING, 1988). THE SEXUAL POLITICS OF NARRATION: MARGARET DRABBLE'S FEMINIST FICTION. *STUDIES IN THE NOVEL*. 20 (1), 86-99. RETRIEVED FROM [HTTP://WWW.JSTOR.ORG/STABLE/29532546](http://www.jstor.org/stable/29532546)
62. SAID, EDWARD (WINTER, 1989). REPRESENTING THE COLONIZED: ANTHROPOLOGY'S INTERLOCUTORS. *CRITICAL INQUIRY*. 15:2, 205-225. RETRIEVED FROM [HTTP://WWW.JSTOR.ORG/STABLE/1343582](http://www.jstor.org/stable/1343582)
63. SCHUBERT, J. DANIEL (2008). SUFFERING/SYMBOLIC VIOLENCE. IN MICHAEL GRENFELL (ED.), *PIERRE BOURDIEU: KEY CONCEPTS* (PP. 183-198). STOCKSFIELD, UK: ACUMEN.
64. SHOWALTER, ELAINE (1978). *A LITERATURE OF THEIR OWN: BRITISH NOVELISTS FROM BRONTE TO LESSING*. LONDON, ENGLAND: VIRAGO.
65. SKEGGS, BEVERLEY (1997). *FORMATIONS OF CLASS AND GENDER*. LONDON, ENGLAND: SAGE PUBLICATIONS.
66. SÖNMEZ, YAĞMUR (NOV. 2012). THE "MORALLY IDEAL WOMAN" IN MIDDLEMARCH. *ACADEMIA.EDU. ÇANKAYA UNIVERSITY JOURNAL OF HUMANITIES AND SOCIAL SCIENCES*. 9(2), 295-309. RETRIEVED FROM [HTTP://WWW.ACADEMIA.EDU/1372693/THE_MORALLY_IDEAL_WOMAN_IN_MIDDLEMARCH](http://www.academia.edu/1372693/The_Morally_Ideal_Woman_in_Middlemarch)
67. STEAD, MARGARET (2003, JUNE 1). SEE ME AFTER CLASS: BLACK COMEDY AND TRAGEDY MINGLE IN ZOË HELLER'S TALE. *THE GUARDIAN. THE OBSERVER*. RETRIEVED FROM [HTTP://WWW.THEGUARDIAN.COM/BOOKS/2003/JUN/01/FICTION.FEATURES3](http://www.theguardian.com/books/2003/jun/01/fiction.features3)
68. STOKES, EMILY (2013, OCTOBER 7). SIX QUESTIONS: THE PURE GOLD BABY', THE STREAM. RETRIEVED FROM [HTTP://HARPERS.ORG/BLOG/2013/10/THE-PURE-GOLD-BABY/](http://harpers.org/blog/2013/10/the-pure-gold-baby/)
69. STOLER, ANN LAURA (2002). *CARNAL KNOWLEDGE AND IMPERIAL POWER: RACE AND THE INTIMATE IN COLONIAL RULE*. UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA PRESS.
70. SULLIVAN, ALICE (2002). BOURDIEU AND EDUCATION: HOW USEFUL IS BOURDIEU'S THEORY FOR RESEARCHERS?. *THE NETHERLANDS' JOURNAL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES*. 38 (2), 144-166. RETRIEVED FROM [HTTP://WWW.CLS.IOE.AC.UK/LIBRARY-MEDIA%5CDOCUMENTS%5CBOURDIEU%20NETHERLANDSJOURNAL.PDF](http://www.cls.ioe.ac.uk/library-media%5Cdocuments%5CBourdieu%20NetherlandsJournal.pdf)
71. TABB, EMILY. OUTLINE AND ASSESS BOURDIEU'S EXPLANATION OF SOCIAL INEQUALITY. RETRIEVED FROM [HTTP://WWW.ESSEX.AC.UK/SOCIOLOGY/DOCUMENTS/PDF/UG_JOURNAL/VOL6/2011SC301_EMILYTABB.PDF](http://www.essex.ac.uk/sociology/documents/pdf/ug_journal/vol6/2011sc301_emilytabb.pdf)
72. THORPE, HOLLY (2009). BOURDIEU, FEMINISM AND FEMALE PHYSICAL CULTURE: GENDER REFLEXIVITY AND THE HABITUS-FIELD COMPLEX. *SOCIOLOGY OF SPORT JOURNAL*. 26, 491-516. RETRIEVED FROM



HTTP://RESEARCHCOMMONS.WAIKATO.AC.NZ/BITSTREAM/HANDLE/10289/3681/BOURDIEU,%20FEMINISM.PDF?SEQUENCE=1

73. WOLITZER, MEG (2013, OCTOBER 02).MARGARET DRABBLE SPINS A MOTHER-DAUGHTER YARN INTO “GOLD”.NPR BOOKS. RETRIEVED FROM HTTP://WWW.NPR.ORG/2013/10/20/225461025/MARGARET-DRABBLE-SPINS-A-MOTHER-DAUGHTER-YARN-INTO-GOLD

74. YAGODA, BEN (2004).THE SOUND ON THE PAGE: GREAT WRITERS TALK ABOUT STYLE AND VOICE IN WRITING. NEW YORK, NY: HARPERCOLLINS PUBLISHER.

75. ZIZEK, SLAVOJ (2000). CLASS STRUGGLE OR POSTMODERNISM? YES, PLEASE! IN CONTINGENCY, HEGEMONY, UNIVERSALITY CONTEMPORARY DIALOGUES ON THE LEFT BY JUDITH BUTLER, ERNESTO LACLAU AND SLAVOJZIZEK,(PP. 90-135). LONDON, ENGLAND: VERSTO.

76. (2014, MARCH 3). THE POETIC TORTURE-HOUSE OF LANGUAGE: HOW POETRY RELATES TO ETHNIC CLEANSING.POETRY MAGAZINE. RETRIEVED FROM HTTP://WWW.POETRYFOUNDATION.ORG/POETRYMAGAZINE/ARTICLE/247352

77.(2008).VIOLENCE: SIX SIDEWAYS REFLECTIONS.NEW YORK, NY: PICADOR.

CITE THIS ARTICLE:

Citation Format APA

Jani, B. (2015). Narrative as Soft Violence in Margaret Drabble’s *The Pure Gold Baby*. *SOCRATES*, 3(1), 1-34. Retrieved from <http://www.socratesjournal.com/index.php/socrates/article/view/123>

For More Citation formats please visit:

<http://www.socratesjournal.com/index.php/socrates/rt/captureCite/123/0>

