



ANQ: A Quarterly Journal of Short Articles, Notes and Reviews

ISSN: (Print) (Online) Journal homepage: <https://www.tandfonline.com/loi/vanq20>

“Imaginative Power” in “The Yellow Wallpaper”

Selina Jamil

To cite this article: Selina Jamil (2021): “Imaginative Power” in “The Yellow Wallpaper”, ANQ: A Quarterly Journal of Short Articles, Notes and Reviews, DOI: [10.1080/0895769X.2021.1895707](https://doi.org/10.1080/0895769X.2021.1895707)

To link to this article: <https://doi.org/10.1080/0895769X.2021.1895707>



Published online: 23 Mar 2021.



Submit your article to this journal [↗](#)



Article views: 2469



View related articles [↗](#)



View Crossmark data [↗](#)



“Imaginative Power” in “The Yellow Wallpaper”

Selina Jamil

From the beginning of “The Yellow Wallpaper,” Charlotte Perkins Gilman focuses on the narrator’s internal conflict, for, although she is a somewhat unconventional wife who “disagree[s]” with her husband’s ideas and believes that “congenial work, with excitement and change, would do [her] good,” in her world of patriarchal conventions she takes “pains to control” herself (1185) as she tries to be the obedient wife of the physician, who, having diagnosed her condition as “temporary nervous depression,” “absolutely” forbids her to “work” (1184): “I get unreasonably angry with John sometimes. I’m sure I never used to be so sensitive. I think it is due to this nervous condition” (1185). So pronounced is this internal conflict that even though her journal entries are on “dead paper” that is not intended for another “living soul,” she periodically addresses “you” (1184, 1187, 1188, 1189, 1191, 1195). Gilman develops this internal division through images of moon and sun – “[t]he moon shines in all around just as the sun does” – to illustrate the flow and ebb of the narrator’s ability to perceive her own condition and her relationship with her segmented and stratified environment (1190). The flow occurs in symbolic moonlight when she develops self-expression in her journal entries with her “imaginative power” (1186), which John belittles as “silly fancies” (1189), while the ebb occurs in symbolic sunlight when she submits to his prescription of rationality, which produces the meaninglessness of self-suppression. Nonetheless, as Gilman builds the tension of the internal conflict in the last scene, the narrator experiences a Deleuzoguattarian “line of flight,” as she deterritorializes herself absolutely from the diseased world of patriarchal hegemony with the “power” of her creative imagination.

Clearly, moonlight, which spurs the narrator’s longing to create meaning, symbolizes her faculty of imagination. It incites and stimulates her into a quest for meaning: “By moonlight – the moon shines in all night when there is a moon – I wouldn’t know it was the same paper” (1191). Because in moonlight objects cannot be perceived clearly, the interpreter, in whom uncertainty awakens emotions such as curiosity, fascination or anxiety, turns to imagination in an earnest effort to interpret what appears shadowy, obscure, or ungraspable: “I kept still and watched the moonlight on the undulating wallpaper till I felt creepy” (1190). Such is its impact that the imaginative narrator, who yearns for “romantic felicity” (1184), feels “something strange,” on a “moonlight evening” (1185) at the beginning of her sojourn with John in the unfamiliar aristocratic environment of a “colonial mansion, a hereditary estate” that is not the legacy of middle-class persons like them (“mere ordinary people”) in postcolonial America (1184). With her “romantic felicity” that shows the connection between imagination, instinct, and emotions she interprets this ungraspable phenomenon as a ghostly presence from the “colonial” past in the seclusion of “the top of the house” (1186), where “ravages” demonstrate the “wars” that individuals like herself have fought silently from earlier times (1187). As Gilman uses dramatic irony in the narrator’s words, “my ghostliness,” the latter, whose “romantic” sensibility finds expression in imaginative vitality, gives intuitive expression to her own emotional condition as she unwittingly associates her shadowy self (“my”) with women in her segmented and stratified environment, where like apparitions, they are generally dismissed as insubstantial (1185). As Gilman suggests through the shadowy woman who associates herself with “ghostliness,” and who as a subaltern identifies herself as “mere ordinary” and turns to “dead paper” as a reader and writer in the suppressive environment of a hegemonic patriarch who brings her to a colonial mansion where, being doubly in shadow, she subsequently learns to say “not another word” (1191), “[w]hen we come to the [...] question of the consciousness of the subaltern, the notion of what the work *cannot* say becomes

important" (Spivak 82). And as Gilman also suggests to her readers, what the narrator's and Gilman's own work cannot say, needs to be contemplated with the fluid faculty of imagination.

Although John associates imagination with "illusions," the impression that he successfully suppresses the narrator's imagination (Shumaker 598), or that her creative imagination "has been arrested and sublimated by socially sanctioned behavior" (Knight 297) soon dissipates. For, although "John has cautioned [her] not to give way to fancy in the least" (1186), as her journal reveals, despite the "disruptions [that] put her at the mercy of those who wish to suppress her writing" or that "illustrate [her] mood fluctuations" (Dock 55), she soon learns to visualize the disorder and disjunction of her conflicted, segmented, and stratified world with her imagination: "Up and down and sideways they crawl, and those absurd, unblinking eyes are everywhere. There is one place where two breadths didn't match and the eyes go all up and down the line, one a little higher than the other" (1187). Such are the "unblinking eyes" of her own suppressed consciousness that, despite analytical fragility, she learns to give imaginative expression to her intuitive sense of hierarchical divisions between "up and down" or the "higher" and lower of binary opposites. Clearly, as she continues to focus on the wallpaper, the "power" of her imagination enables her to see "dim shapes get[ting] clearer every day" (1189). Thus, she gradually moves on to imaginatively reading her internal conflict on the wallpaper as the "front design" of domination (1188) and the "sub pattern" of resistance (1187), which becomes a "formless [...] figure that seems to skulk behind the silly and conspicuous front design" (1188) and subsequently turns into a "faint figure" who "shake[s] the pattern" just as if she want[s] to get out" (1190).

As Gilman explores patriarchal hegemony, however, she links it with the faculty of rationality whose limitations the hegemon is oblivious of. Clearly, the faculty of rationality that "spoils" the narrator's sense of perceptual excitement and dampens her "romantic felicity" as she considers the "legal trouble" of the rented mansion (1185) is that "good sense" (1186) which John, who instructs her to "check" her "imaginative power," and to "have perfect rest" (1185) for her postpartum "nervous-[ness]," suppressively insists on (1186). He belongs in an environment where "male physicians' assertions of the detrimental effects of education on women" dominate (Tsang 138), and where an "increasing stress on the dominance of the female reproductive system" produces the belief that reproductive activity "could lead to female insanity" (Digby 193, 204). Unsurprisingly, such is John's notion of his wife's weakness that he doubts she has the "strength" to "exercise" (1185). "If women's weak minds were weakened further by physical movement, then women ought to be confined to rest, so said logic" (Hardes 185). A physician, whose rationalist mind has "no patience with faith" and who cultivates "an intense horror of superstition," completely oblivious of the limitations of human knowledge, he "scoffs openly" at anything that does not have a physical and rational explanation; but through his suppressive attitude Gilman underscores the limitations of the rational faculty (1184): "he knows there is no *reason* to suffer, and that satisfies him" (1186). Hence, oblivious to inexplicable phenomena, the suppressive John truncates and dismisses his wife's emotion with the obdurate inattentiveness of insensitivity: "he said what I felt was a *draught*, and shut the window" (1185). Utterly unwilling to explore the psychological world of emotions, the undiscerning John, who celebrates the calmness of rationality, coldly analyses her postpartum anxieties as a "a slight hysterical tendency" (1184). As a member of the patriarchal culture where "[r]ationality, restraint, and judiciousness were valuable but rare qualities, which propertied, white men were most likely to possess and keep" (Evans 830), John instructs her to practice "proper self-control" (1185) with the arrogant "stern[ness]" of "reproach[]" (1191). Clearly, his attitude of binary opposition between rationality and emotions, as between rationality and imagination, aggravates the narrator's internal conflict, just as it makes him blind to the constructive exchange between the faculties of emotions and imagination: "he said that [...] nothing was worse for a nervous patient than to give way to [...] fancies" (1186). Indeed, as he practices the "heavy opposition" of hegemonic masculinity, the physician, who is "practical in the extreme" reveals the attenuated work of rationality (1184). Unsurprisingly, such a turn only shows the perceptual obstacle of contradiction that Gilman ironically associates with the limited efficacy of rationality; for, although John "does not believe" that his wife is sick, he illogically forbids her to "work" (1184). On the one hand, he tells her that she is unable to visit Cousin Henry and

Julia and unable “to stand it” afterward (1189), but, on the other hand, he tells her that she “really” is “better” (1190). Indeed, patriarchal hegemony is the disease that readily manifests itself in the cold and clearly vulnerable faculty of rationality. Understandably, the narrator imaginatively interprets patriarchal hegemony as “flamboyant patterns” that plunge into “unheard of contradictions” with “a sickly sulphur tint” on the wallpaper (1185).

Thus, Gilman develops the symbolism of sunlight, which reveals the “sickly sulphur tint,” to depict the incoherence that generates from the association between the weak faculty of rationality and patriarchal domination. As Gilman depicts symbolic sunlight, the bright light that symbolizes rationality because it enables clear visual sensation, ironically, fails to signify the vigor of clarity of perception and a natural agent of purification and healing. While in moonlight the “sulphur”-like yellow is not visible on the wallpaper, in sunlight it is frustratingly atrocious: “The color is repellant, almost revolting; a smouldering unclean yellow, strangely faded by the slow-turning sunlight” (1185). Unsurprisingly, as the “rational, practical” John, “a man of daylight” (Horowitz 181), “laughs” at and belittles the narrator with the pattern of patriarchal hegemony (1184, 1186), so does the sun: “the sun came and that awful pattern began to laugh at me” (1192). Observing that “[w]hen the sun shoots in through the east window [...] it changes so quickly that [she] never can quite believe it,” the narrator finds it frustratingly befuddling (1191): “In the daytime it is tiresome and perplexing” (1192). For the sunlight only highlights “the strangest yellow” (1192). So suggestive of proliferative disease is the “sickly” yellow wallpaper in daylight, “always” revealing “new shoots on the fungus, and new shades of yellow all over it” (1192), that it produces an impression of “delirium tremens” (1188). Determined to “follow the pointless pattern to some sort of conclusion,” the narrator tries to apply “the principle of design” (1188). The rules of logic, however, are impotent, for, the “laws of radiation, or alternation, or repetition, or symmetry” lead only to “isolated columns of fatuity” (1188). Indeed, when she “can almost fancy radiation,” as “the low sun shines directly” upon the wallpaper (1189), she finds the diffusion of hegemonic incoherence: “the interminable grotesques seem to form around a common centre and rush off in headlong plunges of equal distraction” (1189). As Gilman links patriarchal incoherence with the limitations of rationality, this “common centre” of patriarchal hegemony that insists on “a centered or segmented higher unity” (Deleuze and Guattari 16), produces the “distraction” that becomes obvious in sunlight: “On a pattern like this, by daylight, there is a lack of sequence, a defiance of law [...] It slaps you in the face, knocks you down and tramples upon you. It is like a bad dream” (1191). Thus the ghostly “woman” who makes the “dim sub-pattern” is so “subdued, quiet” by “daylight” (1191) that she submits to the pattern of self-suppression” and “creep[s] by daylight” (1193).

Such is the debilitating frustration of “confusion” (1189) which the aggressive pattern of patriarchy evokes in daylight that “sprawling outlines run off in great slanting waves of optic horror” (1188) on the “aesthetically disorganized” wallpaper (Edelstein 76). A part of this “optic horror” of the “front design” manifests itself in the incoherence of “a kind of ‘debased Romanesque’” (1188). As this “optic horror” persists, subsequently the “outside pattern” is also as confusing as “a florid Arabesque” (1191). In equating Romanesque with Arabesque, the narrator reveals that her frustration is not so much with Arabesque, which after all “was widely accepted and appreciated in Western art” (Roth par. 8), as with “florid” Arabesque, which is associated with “debased” Romanesque. If Arabesque becomes “an aesthetic of unreadability” (Roth par. 20), it is particularly so for the narrator, when it is “florid”. The only way to transcend the “optic horror” of meaninglessness in the wallpaper that cannot be read with logic, then, is to turn to the creative imagination in an effort to construct meaning: “If you can imagine [...]” (1191). Thus, one “night,” as she “watche[s] the moonlight,” she attempts to work at making meaning with John (1190): “I thought it was a good time to talk” (1190).

Clearly, moonlight, wherein the debilitating yellow is no longer distinguishable, consistently suggests a flow in the narrator’s ability to confront and articulate her internal conflict imaginatively. As the moon’s gravitational force is stronger than the sun’s, in the symbolic moonlight that touches the “barred” windows of the secluded room, the narrator develops coherence (1185): “At night in any kind of light, in twilight, candlelight, lamplight, and worst of all by moonlight, it [the wallpaper] becomes

bars! The outside pattern I mean, and the woman behind it is as plain as can be” (1191). And as she continues to watch her own symbolic shadow on the wallpaper in the symbolic moonlight that “creeps [...] slowly” and stirs up her emotions furtively (1190), images of the “broken neck and bulbous eyes” of the helplessness of segmentation and stratification in her secluded room (1187), and of the “woman stooping down and creeping” in submissiveness, frequently give way to the image of a woman who “is all the time trying to climb through” (1193). Increasingly, the light of the moon is the energy that enables the narrator to imaginatively express her protest:

As soon as it was moonlight and that poor thing began to crawl and shake the pattern, I got up and ran to help her.

I pulled and she shook, I shook and she pulled. (1194)

So resolute and vigorous is this woman that “her crawling shakes [the wallpaper] all over” (1193). Clearly, the so-called “silly fancies” enable the movement from the meaninglessness of the “top pattern” (1194) to the “exciting” (1192) “under” pattern of defiance (1194), or from disintegration to resilience, and thus from self-suppression to self-expression, not simply in one individual woman, whose “imaginative power” of “story-making” (1186) helps her to grapple with the confining “space that prohibits, rather than enables, literary production” (Edelstein 81), but also in “a great many women” (1193) whose “indistinct and yet rapid, barely perceptible but inexorable” movement is “not unlike the progress of nineteenth-century literary women out of the texts defined by patriarchal poetics into the open spaces of their own authority” (Gilbert and Gubar 115).

Indeed, in the last scene, where her internal conflict culminates, the narrator’s imagination creates such a surge of “power” in the “moonlight” (1194) that her complete loss of rationality coincides with a Deleuzoguattarian “line of flight”. In this tumultuous efflux of her internal conflict that culminates in the utter loss of rationality, on the one hand she runs to the wallpaper to “help” the ghostly woman (1194), but on the other hand, she wishes to “tie her” with a rope (1195). Confronting her segmented and stratified world, which she imaginatively reads as a “broken” neck and “strangled heads” on the wallpaper (1195), she locks herself in, and ties herself with the rope with which she means to “tie” the “woman [if] she does get out” (1195), and in doing so, she, as Deleuze and Guattari would say, in “the infinity of a line of flight” (277) that “no longer tolerates segments” (197), “dismantle[s]” herself “in order finally to be alone and meet the true double at the other end of the line” (197), “the Double approaching from the other side” (202). Although rationally she fails to perceive the disease of self-suppression that the patriarchal prison generates not just in her but in “a great many women,” she continues to perceive it imaginatively: “I am securely fastened now by my well-hidden rope” (1195). With her “imaginative power,” however, she also expresses her defiance of patriarchal hegemony in the vague light of the moon, as she invents absolute “deterritorialization and destratification,” for “[n]obody can do anything for or against [...] her] any longer” (Deleuze and Guattari 1, 199). If this “troubling final scene is the culmination of a tension [...] between a trapped but energetic physicality at odds with a frenzied consciousness attempting to narrate its experience” (Blackie 70), it is also the culmination of her internal conflict that generates such a surge of her imaginative “power” that she creates the “line of flight” that nullifies John’s control and demonstrates that insanity does not obstruct her becoming but shows how she now “knows [...] to be nobody, to no longer be anybody” (Deleuze and Guattari 197).

Hence, at this point, when she is released from her past identity, John is forced to hear the voice of a woman who chooses to creep in her struggle against voicelessness. She directs him to the room’s key that she knows is “under a plantain leaf” not so much with visual perception (for she is on the top floor in a room with barred windows) as with her imagination (1196). If the key under the plantain leaf is “the key to understanding Anglo-American women’s relationship to the democratic nation and modernity” (Lockwood 107), it is also the key to understanding that the faculty of imagination, which John “caution[s]” against as something that needs to be “check[ed]” and dismissed, is like a spontaneous broadleaf plantain that may be checked and dismissed as a bothersome weed but that is

indeed a hardy and useful herb. Although Gilman writes a “terrifying” story (“[Why I wrote ‘The Yellow Wallpaper’](#)” 1204) that suggests that the narrator is “ultimately destroyed while absorbed in a mesmerizing text” ([Hochman](#) 89), or that she “attempts and fails at becoming the ‘wise’ manager of her own madness” ([Hume](#) 18), an insistence on the “self-destructive[ness]” of the madness ([Hume](#) 8) in a patriarchally hegemonized woman who belongs in the “mere ordinary” group of post-colonial American society, but who perceives that crawling can be used for shaking, hazards a disregard for [Spivak’s](#) warning that “the subaltern as female cannot be heard or read” (104), through a disregard for the voice that John finally hears as she speaks “several times, very gently and slowly” (1196).

Borrowing from [Foucault](#), as power is “above all a relation of force” (89), both John and she “are always in the position of simultaneously undergoing and exercising [...] power” (98). Indeed, if Gilman suggests that the narrator crawls around “like a child [...] bound by an umbilical cord” ([Haney-Peritz](#) 120), she also suggests that, “acting like a feline, the narrator has decided to have an interaction with John, her live ‘prey,’ on her own terms” ([Golden](#) 28). Clearly, in her absolute deterritorialization, as she “creep[s]” defiantly (1196), she does not, to borrow from [Deleuze and Guattari](#), “imitate or identify with something or someone” (272), but enters “becomings-animal” (200). As this imaginative rejection of the human world of patriarchy indicates, the narrator’s complete loss of rationality corresponds with the surge of imagination, which demonstrates not simply how she rejects the hegemonic John but, “devoid of the identity that her husband (and his patriarchy) had inscribed on her” ([Bak](#) par. 21), also the perplexed “Jane” that she has been as John’s shadow, like Jennie, or that is squeezed between a John and a Jennie (1196). Deterritorializing herself absolutely in her insanity, as she keeps “on creeping” (1196), she, who “knows exactly what is at stake: her potential (indeed probable) re-confinement” ([Roethlisberger](#) 161), creates a bizarre, unprecedented and hence curiously original expression of freedom as, to borrow from [Deleuze and Guattari](#), “[a] clandestine passenger on a motionless voyage” (199): “I’ve got out at last [...] so you can’t put me back,” she announces to John whose shock at what he fails to grasp is so acute that he faints while she continues to “creep over” his body repeatedly (1196). Clearly, as she demonstrates through the presence of mind with which she later records the unsettling scene in her journal, her writing is “a becoming” that produces “a becoming-woman as atoms of womanhood capable of crossing and impregnating an entire social field, and of contaminating men, of sweeping them up in that becoming” ([Deleuze and Guattari](#) 240, 276).

Indeed, such is the effect of this ungraspable condition of the narrator’s “becomings-imperceptible” ([Deleuze and Guattari](#) 200) on the uncomprehending John, whose rationality fails as the faculty of perception, that he unambiguously and unequivocally loses consciousness. As Gilman repeatedly underscores the weakness of the rational faculty not simply through the narrator but also through John, who, in his segmented and stratified world of hegemonic masculinity, ironically “assum[es] the traditional role of frail female” ([Davison](#) 66), his loss of consciousness signifies an utter loss of comprehension. While the narrator, who is cognizant of her own and John’s actions in the last scene, can still rely on the mental faculty of imagination after losing that of rationality, he who instructs his wife to suppress her “imaginative power,” has no other mental faculty to rely on when the weak faculty of rationality dissipates (1186). Thus Gilman highlights John’s loss of consciousness: “Now why should that man have fainted?” (1196). For, unlike the narrator, who continues to read with the imagination that accentuates her consciousness, and whose madness does not prevent her “line of flight,” John experiences a complete loss of comprehension at the sight of her complete loss of rationality, demonstrating the irony of his own impotent rationality. While the absence of rationality in the narrator does not disable her perceptual abilities, the solitary presence of rationality in John disables his perceptual abilities.

As Gilman illustrates the narrator’s imaginative consciousness through her “line of flight,” then, she invests her action in the last scene with the ambiguity wherein, as “it is no longer possible for anything to stand for anything” ([Deleuze and Guattari](#) 198), the reader focuses on it with the fluidity of imagination. For, if this scene that demonstrates the culmination of the narrator’s internal conflict, suggests that she is “creeping” after having bound herself with her rope, it simultaneously suggests that

the rope around her could be choking her as though she, who does not speak loudly but “gently” (1196), is in the act of strangling herself. Whether the shadowy woman, who has been denied substance as her voice has been unheard, and who is prevented from “jump[ing] out the window” only because the “bars are too strong even to try” (1195), and for whom the wallpaper’s pattern is full of “lame uncertain curves” that “suddenly commit suicide” (1185), is, in the last scene, in a most curious manner constricting her own neck with the ominous rope and, swaying repeatedly over John’s prostrate figure, or whether she, in a most curious manner, is creeping over it and around the room after having tied herself up, through ambiguity Gilman suggests that, suspended in-between the act of choking that suggests a metaphorical disembodiment or a becoming-ghost and the act of surmounting a physical obstacle that suggests an emergence from a literal embodiment of a shadow, she has transcended her conventional world with the “synthetic and magical power” of imagination that “dissolves, diffuses, dissipates” (Coleridge 157, 151) to associate insanity with a “line of flight”. Indeed, she, who engages with the wallpaper whose “meaning cannot be fixed” (Treichler 75), is in the state where, borrowing from Deleuze and Guattari, as she “enter[s] into composition” (274) with the wallpaper, she deterritorializes herself so completely with her imagination that she “never ceas[es] to become” (277).

In the tension of the internal conflict that Gilman depicts in much of the text through symbolic moonlight and sunlight, and that culminates in the last scene, then, she reveals that as “[b]ecoming produces nothing other than itself” (Deleuze and Guattari 238), the narrator’s “line of flight” has neither beginning nor end, departure nor arrival” (293). With her imagination she creates her “line of flight” that is “forever in the process of being drawn, toward a new acceptance, the opposite of renunciation or resignation” (Deleuze and Guattari 207). That is, a text where “no coherent or final reading is possible or desirable” (Lanser 424), “instills the sense that there is *therapeutic potential* in interpretation itself” (Thrailkill 552), for Gilman opens her readers to the fluid energy of imagination. Hence, as she focuses on the undecidability of the “vital space between representation and reality, language and being” (Finn 113), the story ends with the in-betweenness of the narrator’s “line of flight,” for she, who has absolutely deterritorialized herself in the flux of identity, is now in the Deleuzoguattarian “process of drawing her territories” which are “out of grasp” (199). As the “space between representation and reality, text and context, expression and experience, language and being is the necessary and indispensable space of judgement and critique, creativity and value, resistance and change” (Finn 113), that space needs to be contemplated with the fluidity of imagination.

Disclosure statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the author.

Works cited

- Bak, John S. “Escaping the Jaundiced Eye: Foucauldian Panopticism in Charlotte Perkins Gilman’s ‘The Yellow Wallpaper.’” *Studies in Short Fiction*, vol. 31, no. 1, 1994, pp. 39+. Gale Academic OneFile, https://link-gale-com.ezproxy.pgcc.edu/apps/doc/A15356232/AONE?u=pgcc_main&sid=AONE&xid=503dbc3b. Accessed 13 Jul. 2020.
- Blackie, Michael. “Reading the Rest Cure.” *The Arizona Quarterly*, vol. 60, no. 2, summer 2004, pp. 57–85, <http://search-proquest-com.ezproxy.pgcc.edu/docview/199334313/fulltextPDF/19A79E58B924BD1PQ/1?accountid=13315>.
- Coleridge, Samuel Taylor. *Biographia Literaria*. Book Jungle, 2007.
- Davison, Carol Margaret. “Haunted House/Haunted Heroine: Female Gothic Closets in ‘The Yellow Wallpaper.’” *Women’s Studies*, vol. 33, no. 1, 2004, pp. 47–75. doi:10.1080/00497870490267197.
- Deleuze, Gilles, and Felix Guattari. *A Thousand Plateaus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia*. Translation and foreword by Brian Massumi, U of Minnesota P, 1987.
- Digby, Anne. “Women’s Biological StraitJacket.” *Sexuality an Subordination: Interdisciplinary Studies of Gender in the Nineteenth Century*, edited by Susan Mendus and Jane Rendall, Routledge, 1989, pp. 191–220. eBook web.a.ebscohost.com.
- Dock, Julie Bates. “‘Bur One Expects That’: Charlotte Perkins Gilman’s ‘The Yellow Wallpaper’ and the Shifting Light of Scholarship.” *Twentieth-Century Literary Criticism*, vol. 117, 2002, pp. 52–65.

- Edelstein, Sari. "Charlotte Perkins Gilman and the Yellow Newspaper." *Legacy*, vol. 24, no. 1, 2007, pp. 72–92. doi:10.1353/leg.2007.0004.
- Evans, Catherine. "Wondrous Depths: Judging the Mind in Nineteenth-Century America." *Law & Social Inquiry*, vol. 44, no. 3, Aug 2019, pp. 828–49. *ProQuest*, doi:10.1017/lsi.2018.19.
- Finn, Geraldine. "The Politics of Spirituality: The Spirituality of Politics." *Shadow of Spirit: Postmodernism and Religion*, edited by Philippa Berry and Andrew Wernick, Routledge, 1992, pp. 111–20.
- Foucault, Michel. *Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings 1972-1977*. Edited by Colin Gordon, translated by Colin Gordon, Leo Marshall, John Mepham, Kate Soper, Pantheon Books, 1980.
- Gilman, Charlotte Perkins. "The Yellow Wallpaper." *The Heath Anthology*, edited by Paul Lauter, Vol. C, 7th ed., Wadsworth Cengage Learning, 2014, pp. 1184–96.
- . "Why I Wrote 'The Yellow Wallpaper'." *The Heath Anthology*, pp. 1203–04.
- Golden, Catherine J. "Marking Her Territory: Feline Behavior in 'The Yellow Wall-Paper'." *American Literary Realism*, vol. 40, no. 1, 2007, pp. 16+. *Gale Academic OneFile*, pgcc.edu/apps/doc/A168055009/AONE?u=pgcc_main&sid=AONE&xid=2b1ee0f6. Accessed 8 Aug. 2020.
- Gubar, Sandra M., and Susan Gilbert. *The Madwoman in the Attic: The Woman Writer and the Nineteenth-Century Literary Imagination*. 2nd ed., Yale UP, 1979. First published as a Yale Nota Bene book in 2000, <https://pdfget.com/pdf-epub-the-madwoman-in-the-attic-the-woman-writer-and-the-nineteenth-century-literary-imagination-download/>.
- Hardes, Jennifer Jane. "Women, 'Madness' and Exercise." *Medical Humanities*, vol. 44, no. 3, Sep. 2018, pp. 181–92. *ProQuest*, doi:10.1136/medhum-2017-011379.
- Hochman, Barbara. "The Reading Habit and 'The Yellow Wallpaper'." *American Literature*, vol. 74, no. 1, 2002, pp. 89–110. <http://read.dukeupress.edu/american-literature/article-pdf/74/1/89/390062/04.pdf>.
- Horowitz, Helen Lefkowitz. *Wild Unrest: Charlotte Perkins Gilman and the Making of 'The Yellow Wall-Paper'*. Oxford UP, 2010. eBook web.a.ebscohost.com.
- Hume, Beverly A. "Managing Madness in Gilman's 'The Yellow Wall-Paper'." *Studies in American Fiction*, vol. 30, no. 1, spring 2002, pp. 3–20. https://link-gale-com.ezproxy.pgcc.edu/apps/doc/H1420101196/litR?u=pgcc_main&sid=litR&id=d58b4471. Accessed 8 Aug. 2020..
- Knight, Denise. "The Reincarnation of Jane: 'Through This' – Gilman's Companion to 'the Yellow Wall-paper'." *Women's Studies: An Interdisciplinary Journal*, vol. 30, no. 3/4, 1992, pp. 287–302. doi:10.1080/00497878.1992.9978914.
- Lanser, Susan S. "Feminist Criticism, 'The Yellow Wallpaper,' and the Politics of Color in America." *Feminist Studies*, vol. 15, no. 3, 1989, pp. 425–32. doi:10.2307/3177938.
- Lockwood, J. Samaine. "Charlotte Perkins Gilman's Colonial Revival." *Legacy: A Journal of American Women Writers*, vol. 29, no. 1, 2012, p. 86+. *Gale General OneFile*, https://link-gale-com.ezproxy.pgcc.edu/apps/doc/A295060513/ITOF?u=pgcc_main&sid=ITOF&xid=891064. Accessed 3 Aug. 2020.
- Roethlis, Christopher. "A Healthy Play of Mind: Art and the Brain in Gilman's 'The Yellow Wallpaper'." *American Literary Realism*, vol. 52, no. 2, winter 2020, pp. 147–66. <https://muse.jhu.edu/article/745270>.
- Roth, Marty. "Gilman's Arabesque Wallpaper." *Mosaic: A Journal for the Interdisciplinary Study of Literature*, vol. 34, no. 4, 2001, pp. 145+. *Gale Academic OneFile*, https://link-gale-com.ezproxy.pgcc.edu/apps/doc/A81223363/AONE?u=pgcc_main&sid=AONE&xid=3edbcfe0. Accessed 12 Aug. 2020.
- Shumaker, Conrad. "'Too Terribly Good to Be Printed': Charlotte Gilman's 'The Yellow Wallpaper'." *American Literature*, vol. 57, no. 4, Dec. 1985, pp. 588–99. <http://www.jstor.com/stable/2926354>.
- Spivak, Gayatri Chakravorty. "Can the Subaltern Speak?" *Colonized Discourse and Post-Colonial Theory*, edited by Patrick Williams and Laura Chrisman, Columbia UP, 1994, pp. 66–111.
- Thrallkill, Jane F. "Doctoring 'The Yellow Wallpaper'." *ELH*, vol. 69, no. 2, Summer 2002, pp. 525–66. <http://www.jstor.com/stable/30032030>.
- Treichler, Paula A. "Escaping the Sentence: Diagnosis and Discourse in 'The Yellow Wallpaper'." *Tulsa Studies in Women's Literature*, vol. 3, no. 1/2, 1984, pp. 61–77. *JSTOR*, doi:10.2307/463825.
- Tsang, Tiffany Lee. "'A Fair Chance for the Girls': Discourse on Women's Health and Higher Education in Late Nineteenth Century America." *American Educational History Journal*, vol. 42, no. ½, 2015, pp. 137–50. *ProQuest*, <https://ezproxy.pgcc.edu/login?url=https://www-proquest-com.ezproxy.pgcc.edu/docview/1716404939?accountid=13315>.