

MERRY'S SEXUAL SEDUCTION IN LAURA LONDON'S *THE WINDFLOWER*

Tangkas Priambodo

English Literature

Faculty of Language and Arts

State University of Surabaya

tangkaspriambodo@gmail.com

Dr. Ali Mustofa, M.Pd.

English Language and Literature Department

Faculty of Language and Arts

State University of Surabaya

ali_mustofa2005@yahoo.co.uk

Mamik Tri Wedawati, S.S., M.Pd.

English Language and Literature Department

Faculty of Language and Arts

State University of Surabaya

Abstrak

Romansa cinta merupakan suatu hal yang memegang peranan penting dalam novel ini. Disini karakter memegang peranan penting untuk menentukan alur cerita. Karena ini sangat penting, maka studi ini akan mengobservasi lebih banyak lagi tentang romansa cinta yang ada di novel ini. Dalam novel karangan Laura London, *The Windflower*, Merry menjadi tokoh utama, yang digambarkan memiliki hubungan yang cukup rumit dengan Devon Crandall. Studi ini akan menunjukkannya. Disamping itu, studi ini juga akan menunjukkan efek yang ditimbulkan dari kisah cinta antara Merry dengan Devon. Untuk mendapatkan hasilnya, studi ini menggunakan 3 metode: yaitu data; kumpulan teori, dan prosedur analisis. Data mutlak didapatkan dari novel. Untuk penggunaan teori, tesis ini menggunakan teori tentang godaan seksual serta teori tentang gender dari Sigmund Freud dan Judith Butler. Dua teori ini mempunyai tujuan yang sama, yaitu untuk menunjukkan bagaimana cerita ini membentuk romansa – romansa cinta melalui sudut pandang karakter Merry. Teori tentang sex dan gender berhubungan dengan alat kelamin dan gender melalui pengalaman dari karakter utamanya, dan teori tentang godaan seksual yang dijelaskan melalui esensi romantismenya. Setelah menggunakan teori ini, hasil yang dapat diperoleh adalah proses pembentukan godaan seksual melalui karakter Merry. Melalui hasil tersebut, studi ini mampu menunjukkan efek dari godaan secara seksual yang terjadi pada Merry melalui percakapan dan narasi yang ada di dalam cerita.

Kata Kunci: sex, godaan, gender.

Abstract

A romance in this novel is something which is so important. A character which becomes it is able to decide how the story goes. Because this is important, this study wants to observe more about the romance in the story. In Laura London *The Windflower*, Merry has become the main character which has complicated relationship to Devon Crandall. This study wants to show it. Besides that, this study also wants to show the effects of romance story between Merry and Devon. To obtain the results of those purposes, this study uses three methods: data, theoretical approach, and procedure of analysis. Data absolutely comes from the novel. For theoretical approach, this study uses theory of seduction and theory of sex and gender which are brought by Sigmund Freud and Judith Butler. Those two theories have the same purpose, to show how the story creates a romance stories trough Merry. Theory of sex and gender comes with terms: sexual genitalia

and gender which are experienced by the main character and theory of seduction which are experienced by the romantic essence. After using those theories, the results will be the process of creating a sexual seduction through Merry. From that result, this study is able to show the effect of seduction in Merry using conversations and narrations in the story.

Keywords: sex, seduction, gender.

INTRODUCTION

Sexual seduction has been practiced for such a long time. Sexual seduction is a social principle that involves the process of purposely tempting a person into a particular act. The way of doing it comes in varied forms. It can be done jokingly or seriously, but one thing is for sure: it usually refers to the use of a person's sexual behavior. And most of the time, sexual seduction is utilized to make a person do something that he is likely to regret in the future.

Sigmund Freud developed the theory of seduction in the years 1895-1897, and then he abandoned it. The theory accounted for the genesis of the psychopathological unconscious on the basis of a complex mechanism that brought two moments into play: a scene in which a child is seduced by an adult, and the "deferred" reactivation of this scene at later time

Freud's original seduction theory was strictly confined to the realm of the psychoneuroses. It is even tempting to think that Freud posited the existence of the unconscious in neurotics alone, and that he nourished the hope that cure might come to mean the elimination of the unconscious(<http://www.enotes.com/general-theory-seduction-reference/general-theory-seduction>).

The Windflower is an historical romance set in 1813. The story starts out stateside in Virginia where our young heroine, Merry Patricia Welding lives with her Aunt who serves as her guardian since her mother passed away and her father and brother are both too preoccupied with their military efforts for the American cause against Britain during the War of 1812 to properly see after Merry.

The Windflower was a revelation to me - a many-layered, multi-textured leap forward that set a new standard of excellence for the genre. As evidenced in their other books, Sharon and Tom Curtis have a remarkable talent for taking an ordinary young woman and putting her into extraordinary circumstances that captivate the reader. Arguably, this is their master work.

Imagine that if you are women who live in your national enemy lands, and then you've got kidnap by a pirate. Start an unexpected journey, alone, and face the world with the different point of view. That is sometimes happened to the people who live in the pirates' era. The United States, enraged by the Great Britain's attitude, and

determined to seize aboriginal land that was impeding their western expansion, declared war on Great Britain and attacked its colony, Canada.

At the turn of the 19th century, Europe became a vast battlefield with the eruption of the Napoleonic wars. These events had a direct impact on British North America and on the United States, which had recently become independent after the American Revolution. Both latter parties were victims of measures imposed by France and Great Britain to win the war, including a blockade to prevent American trade.

Anxious were both governments to reach an agreement that no mention was made of the problems that had originally caused friction between the two nations. The matter of British seamen searching American vessels was ignored, and Indian claims to land in the America west were never discussed. In terms of men, money and materials, the cost of tragic struggle cannot be calculated with any degree of accuracy. Official reports suggest British losses were 8,600 killed, wounded or missing, while the Americans suffered a total of about 11,300 militia units were neither complete nor accurate. Deaths from disease among the regulars, militia and Indians also would add substantially to the totals.

In Upper Canada, where the hand of war of had struck most heavily, a bitter distrust of the United States persisted among the inhabitants for many years. This unfortunate legacy of suspicion proved a serious handicap in development of goodwill between the two peoples. Oddly enough, the war of 1812 bought some lasting benefits to British North America; there was a new sense of pride among the people, a pride in having defended their lands with courage and skill. There was, too a better understanding between French speaking and English speaking Canadians, for each race had fought a common foe.

Certain practical advantages resulted from the conflict. Large sums of British money spent in the British provinces of war supplies brought a degree of prosperity previously unknown. In Nova Scotia, additional funds had been gained from the sale to Britain of captured American ships supplies with the blockade states of New England. In Lower Canada (Quebec), such town as Quebec City and Montreal had become propoerous centre of trade and transportation. In Upper Canada (Ontario),

the flow of British funds affected the economy of the province from one end to the other. York recovered rapidly from its misfortunes, and Kingston thrived on the work provided by its busy shipyards. Farmers located near military centres had no trouble in selling their produce at high prices.

It was not realized at the time but the conflict with the United States was the first step toward the ultimate union of the provinces of British North America. The war had, in effect, forced the provinces to co-operate with one another in the urgent matter of defence. As the Canadian historian, Arthur Lower says: "It therefore does not seem too far out to say that the War of 1812 is one of the massive foundation stones of Modern Canada."

In this era at 1812, pirates still exist. An ancient pirates, considered one of the oldest professions, piracy began soon after people first used water to carry goods from one place to another. Pirates required a ship to practice their trade. They *elected* their officers and certain pirates had a greater value than others because of their skills.

Pirates did not live or work in vacuum. They required others to fence the stolen booty or to prey upon. The outrages they committed stirred merchants, ministers and governments to see that justice was done. The pirates also visited safe havens where women and spirits awaited them. Informants shared their knowledge. Governors authorized hunting expeditions. Hunters tracked down their quarry. Victims testified at trials. Once caught, most pirates met a similar fate. Victims testified at trials. Once caught, most pirates met a similar fate, dancing the "hempen jig".

Pirates were notorious for their lawlessness and brutality. Yet they adhered to the ideals of the French Revolution – liberty, equality, and brotherhood – a century before that country's monarchy fell. Their Articles of Agreement set them apart from other naval and governmental institutions of the time because they incorporated principles of democracy.

"What did pirates wear?" It seems like a straightforward question, but it's not. Clothes change as time passes. What's in fashion one day may be out of fashion the next. The further back in time one looks, the more stringent the rules regarding clothes become. The basic outfit worn by all mariners didn't change much over the centuries when wooden ships with blowing sails ventured farther and farther from their homelands. Pirates' clothes, like the rogues themselves, broke societal boundaries and deviated from the norm.

Nowadays, most people would say pirates were irreligious and, to a degree, this is true. To classify all pirates as such, however, religion played a key role in acts of piracy, and pirates who blasphemed "found"

religion before they died. It opens with a continuation of accounts from the later years of the seventeenth century, followed by those concerning the Golden Age of Piracy, and ends with a look at Asian pirates and their religious practices.

In this novel, romance was being a main problem. There are many values about love which is made by the two British people. Those love values made several sexual seductions. Seduction theory emphasizes the causative impact of nurture: the shaping of the mind by experience. This theory held that hysteria and obsession neurosis are caused by repressed memories of infantile sexual abuse.

RESEARCH METHOD

This study uses a novel entitled *The Windflower* written by Sharon and Tom Curtis (under the name of Laura London), publisher Dell Publishing Co. Inc, New York, 1984, as data source in this study. The data are from direct and indirect speech of the characters, dialogues, and epilogues which represent aspects of sexual seduction in this novel.

It does not use statistical method. It is not served in numbering or table. Data is derived by close reading meticulously and analyzing literary elements both intrinsic and extrinsic. The references are taken from library and internet to support the theory.

The data in the thesis will be classified according to problem statement. So the discussion will not broadly talk about unimportant things. It will ease to analyze and observe the story. The next step is relating the data with the acceptable theory and concept of Sexual Seduction Process by Sigmund Freud and the Theory of Sex and Gender by Judith Butler. This thesis also uses the theory of sexual difference by Jacques Lacan. This problem of statement will be deeply analyzed by concept of sexual seduction process and sex and gender theory.

THEORY OF SEX

The difference between plant and animal life lies in the fact that the plant is concerned chiefly with storing energy, and the animal with consuming it. The plant by a very slow process converts lifeless into living matter, expending little energy and living as a profit. Expressed in biological formula, the habit of the plant is predominantly anabolic, that of the animal predominantly catabolic.

Actually, Butler's assertion that bodies are discursively constructed comes as no surprise. Butler said that she rejects the distinction between sex and gender, and even she asserts that sex is gender. Butler said that 'as a locus of cultural interpretations, the body is a material reality which has already been located and defined with a social context. The body is also a situation of having to take up and interpret that set of received

interpretations “existing” one’s body becomes a personal way of having to take up and interpret that set of received gender norms (Salih:74). “To exist” one’s body is not quite as the same as ‘to be it’, since the former implies that we have a degree of agency and choice when it comes to the matter of matter. Throughout her analysis, Butler is careful to emphasize that sexuality and sex do not precede ‘race’, although we will see that her own focus sometimes appears to endorse such a privileging by failing to integrate the matter of ‘race’ into her analysis of subject – formation (Salih:76).

By explaining the meaning of ‘sex’, Butler is not referring to ‘sexual intercourse’, but to one sexed identity. To talk in terms of the ‘allocation’ of sex is already to assume that it is not ‘natural’ or given, and in her brief description of the ‘sexing’ which take place at the scene of birth, Butler relies on the notion of interpellation. Butler argues that consider the medical interpellation with (the recent emergence of the sonogram notwithstanding) shifts an infant from an ‘it’ to a ‘she’ or a ‘he’, and that naming the girl is ‘girded’, brought into the domain of language and kinship through the interpellation of gender. But that ‘girding’ of the girl does not end there; on the contrary, that founding interpellation is reiterated by various authorities and throughout the various intervals of time to reinforces or contest this naturalized effect. The naming is at once the setting of a boundary, and also the repeated of inculcation of a form (Butler:7-8).

A definition of the verb ‘to interpellate’ will tell you that it is the action of appealing to someone, a summons, citation, or interruption, but Butler uses ‘interpellation’ in a specifically theoretical sense to describe how subject positions are conferred and assumed through the action of ‘hailing’. The existence of ideology and the hailing or interpellations of individuals as subjects are one and the same thing (Salih: 78).

To theorize sex in terms of interpellation as Butler does is to imply that one’s body parts (particularly penis and vagina) are not simply and naturally ‘there’ from birth onwards, but that one’s sex is per formatively constituted when one’s body is categorized as either ‘male’ or a ‘female’. Butler argues that interpellation is not a ‘simple per formative’, in other words, it does not always effectively enact what it names, and it is possible for the subject to respond the law in ways that determine it. Indeed, the law itself provides the condition for its own subversion (Butler:122).

Butler said that if one ‘hailed’ into sex rather than simply born a ‘woman’, then it must be possible to take up one’s sex in ways which undermine *heterosexual hegemony*, where hegemony refers to the power structures within which subjects are constituted through ideological, rather than physical, coercion. Butler also said that a girl

is not born a girl, but she is ‘girded’, at or before birth on the basis of whether she possesses a penis or a vagina. This is an arbitrary distinction, and Butler will argue that sexed body parts are *invested* with significance, so it would follow that infants could just as well be differentiated from each other on the basis of other parts – the size of their ear lobes, the color of their eyes, the flexibility of their tongue. Far from the being natural, the perception and the description of the body is an interpellative per formative statement, and the language that seems merely describes the body actually constitutes it. Again, Butler is not refusing the ‘existence’ of matter, but she insists that matter can have no status outside a discourse that is always constitutive, always interpellative, always per formative (Salih:80).

As Butler said, in other words of coherence and the continuity of “the person” are not logical or analytic features of personhood, but rather, socially instituted and maintained norms of intelligibility. In as much, “identity” is assured through the stabilizing of concepts of sex, gender and sexuality, the very notion of “the person” is called into question by the cultural emergence of those “incoherent” or “discontinuous” gendered beings who appear to be persons but who fail to conform to the gendered norms of cultural intelligibility by which persons are defined. “Intelligible” genders are those which in some sense institute and maintain relations of coherence and continuity among sex, gender, sexual practice and desire. In other words the specters of discontinuity and in coherence, themselves thinkable only in relation to existing norms of continuity and coherence, are constantly prohibited and produced by the very laws that seek to establish causal or expressive lines of connection among biological sex, culturally constituted genders, and the “expression” or “effect” of both in the manifestation of sexual desire through sexual practice.

The notion that there might be a “truth” of sex is produced precisely through the regulatory practices that generate coherent identities through the matrix of coherent gender norms. The heterosexualization of desires requires and institutes the production of discrete and asymmetrical oppositions between “feminine” and “masculine”, where these are understood as expressive attributes of “male” and “female”. The cultural matrix through which gender identity has become intelligible requires that certain kinds of “identities” cannot “exist”, that is, those in which gender does not follow from sex and those in which practices of desires does not “follow” from either sex or gender. “Follow” in this context is a political relation of entailment instituted by the cultural laws that establish and regulate the shape and meaning of sexuality. Indeed precisely because certain kinds of “gender identities” fail to conform to those norms of

cultural intelligibility, they appear only as development failures or logical impossibilities from within that domain. Their persistence and proliferation, however, provide critical opportunities to expose the limits and regulatory aims that domain of intelligibility and, hence, to open up within the very terms of that matrix of intelligibility rival and subversive matrices of gender disorder.

Central of each of these views, however, is the notion that sex appears within hegemonic language as *substances*, as, metaphysically speaking, a self – identical being. This appearance is achieved through a performative twist of language and / or discourse that conceals the fact “being” that a sex is fundamentally impossible.

SEXUAL SEDUCTION

Sexual seduction has been practiced for such a long time. Sexual seduction is a social principle that involves the process of purposely tempting a person into a particular act. The way of doing it comes in varied forms. It can be done jokingly or seriously, but one thing's for sure: it usually refers to the use of a person's sexual behavior. And most of the time, sexual seduction is utilized to make a person do something that he is likely to regret in the future.

Sigmund Freud almost changed the world with some of his work and the treatment of victims. Most people do not know that Freud actually believed those who came to him and told him about their sexual abuse as children. He listened intently. He was beginning to give voice to the women who had been sexually abused as children and bring to light the problems of child abuse.

Freud later said that these women were dealing with “something else.” It mattered not if he said it was a projection, penis envy or sublimated sexual desires through the Oedipus Complexs. He stopped believing and became silent. Initially Freud called the neurotic problems associated with childhood abuse The Seduction Theory.

GENDER

What Butler means is that gender is an act or sequence of acts that is always and inevitably occurring, since it is impossible to exist as a social agent outside the terms of gender. The very subject of women is no longer understood in stable or abiding items. There is a great deal material that not only questions the viability of “the subject” as the ultimate candidate for representation, or, indeed, liberation, but there is very little agreement after all on what is that constitutes, or ought to constitute, the category of women. The domains of political and linguistics “representation” set out in advance the criterion by which subject themselves are formed, with

the result that representation is extended only what can be acknowledge as a subject.

Butler suggests that the presumed universality and unity of the subject of feminism is effectively undermined by the constraints of premature insistence on a stable subject of feminism, understood as a seamless category of women, inevitably generates multiple refusals to accept the category. These domains of exclusion reveal the coercive and regulatory consequences of that construction, even when the construction has been elaborated for emancipatory purposes.

Although the unproblematic unity of “women” is often invoked to construct a solidarity or identity, a split is introduced in the feminist subjects by distinction between sex and gender. Originally intended to dispute the biology is destiny formulation, the distinction between sex and gender serves the argument that whatever biological intractability sex appears to have, gender is culturally constructed: hence, gender is neither the causal result of sex nor as seemingly fixed as sex.

If gender is the cultural meanings that the sexed body assumes, then a gender cannot be said to follow from a sex in any one way. Taken to its logical limit, the sex / gender distinction suggests a radical continuity between sexed bodies and culturally constructed genders. Assuming for the moment the stability of binary sex, it does not follow that the construction of “men” will accrue exclusively to the bodies of males or that “women” will interpret only female bodies. Further, even if the sex appears to be unproblematically binary in their morphology and constitution, there is no reason to assume that genders ought also remains as two. The presumption of a binary gender system implicitly retains the belief in a mimetic relation of gender to sex whereby gender mirrors sex or is otherwise restricted by it. When the constructed status of gender is theorized as radically independent of sex, gender itself becomes a free – floating artifice, with the consequence that *man* and *masculine* might just as easily signify a female body as a male one, and *women* and *feminine* a male body as easily as a female one.

This radical splitting of the gendered subjects poses yet another set of problems. If the immutable character of sex is constructed, perhaps the construct called “sex” is as culturally constructed as a gender; indeed, perhaps it was always already a gender, with the consequence that the distinction between sex and gender turns out to be no distinction at all.

It would make no sense, to define gender as the cultural interpretation of sex, if sex itself is a gendered category. Gender ought not to be conceived merely as the cultural inscription of meaning on a pre-given sex; gender

must also designate the very apparatus of production whereby the sexes themselves are established. As a result, gender is not to culture as sex is to nature; gender is also the discursive / cultural means by which “sexed nature” or a “natural sex” is produced and established as “prediscursive,” prior to culture, a politically neutral surface *on which* culture acts. This production of sex as the prediscursive ought to be understood as the effect of the apparatus cultural construction designated by gender.

When feminist theorists claim that gender is the cultural interpretation of sex or that gender is culturally constructed, what is the manner or mechanism of this construction? On some accounts the notion that gender is constructed suggests certain determinism of gender meanings inscribed on anatomically differentiated bodies, where those bodies are understood in terms such a law or set of laws, when it seems that gender is as determined and fixed as it was under the biology – is – destiny formulation. In such a case, not biology, but culture, becomes destiny.

On the other hand, Simone Beauvoir suggests that “one is not born a woman, but rather becomes one.” For Beauvoir, gender is “constructed,” but implied in her formulation is an agent, a *cogito*, who somehow takes on or appropriate that gender and could, in principle, take on some other gender. Beauvoir is clear that one “becomes” a woman, but always under a cultural compulsion to become one. And clearly, the compulsion does not come from “sex”. There is nothing in her account that guarantees that the “one” who become women is necessarily female. If “the body is a situation,” as she claims, there is no recourse to body that has not always already been interpreted by cultural meanings; hence, sex could not qualify as prediscursive anatomical facticity. Indeed, sex, by definition, will be shown to have been gender all along.

The controversy over the meaning of *construction* appears to founder and the conventional philosophical polarity between free will and determinism. As a consequence, one might reasonably suspect that some common linguistic restriction on thought both forms and limits the terms of the debate. Within those terms, “the body” appears as a passive medium on which cultural meanings are inscribed or as the instrument through which an appropriative and interpretive will determines a cultural meaning for itself. In either case, the body is figured as a mere *instrument* or *medium* for which a set of cultural meanings are only externally related. But “the body” it itself a construction, as are the myriad “bodies” that constitute the domain of gendered subjects. Bodies cannot be said to have a signifiable existence prior the mark of their gender.

Whether gender or sex is fixed or free is a function of a discourse which, it will be suggested, seeks to set certain limits to analysis or to safeguard certain tenets of humanism as presuppositional to any analysis of gender. The locus of intractability, whether in “sex” or “gender” or in the very meaning of “construction,” provides a clue to what cultural possibilities can and cannot become mobilized through any further analysis. The limits of the discursive analysis of gender presuppose and preempt the possibilities of imaginable and realizable gender configurations within culture. This is not to say that any and all gendered possibilities are open, but that the boundaries of analysis suggest the limits of a discursively conditioned experience. These limits are always set within the terms of a hegemonic cultural discourse predicated on binary structures that appear as the language of universal rationality. Constraint is thus built into what the language constitutes as the imaginable domain of gender.

Although social scientists refer to gender as a “factor” or a “dimension” of an analysis, it is also applied to embodied persons as “a mark” of biological, linguistic, and / or cultural difference. In this latter case, gender can be understood as a signification that an (already) sexually differentiated body assumes, but even then that the signification exists only *in relation* to another, opposing signification. Some feminists’ theories claim that gender is “a relation”, indeed, a set of relations, and not an individual attribute. Others, following Beauvoir, would argue that only the feminine gender are conflated, thereby defining women in terms of their sex and extolling men as the bearers of a body – transcendent universal personhood.

Women are the “sex” which is not “one”. In this sense, women are the sex which is not “one”, but multiple. For Beauvoir, women are the negative of men, the lack against which masculine identity differentiates itself. Other, but the falsity of the signification points out the entire structure of representation as inadequate. The sex which is not the one, then, provides a point of departure for a criticism of the hegemonic and of the metaphysics of substances that structure the very notion of the subject.

What is the metaphysics of substances, and how does it inform thinking about the categories of sex? In first instance, humanist conception of the subject to assume a substantive person who is the bearer of various essentials and non essentials attribute. A humanist feminist position might understand gender as an *attribute* of a person who is characterized essentially as a pre - gendered substance or “core” called the person, denoting a universal capacity for reason, moral deliberation and language. The universal conception of the person, however, is displaced as a point

of departure for a social theory of gender by those historical and anthropological positions that understand gender as a relation among socially constituted subject in specifiable context.

SEXUAL SEDUCTION PROCESS

At this chapter, the writer will be discuss about the analyze of the novel through the theory. In this case, the writer will be analyze about the sexual seduction process and the sexual seduction impact. This chapter presents board analysis as the answer of problem statements as reflected in this chapter. The theory of sex and gender will be appropriate to reveal the sexual seduction of Merry's character in Laura London's *The Windflower*. This chapter will be started in analyzing the depicted of Merry's sexual seduction. The purpose of this representation is to explain about the significance of the sexual seduction. The sexual seduction can happen when we have do a conversation or by a touch. The purpose of this representation is to explain how the sexual seduction do and when.

The sexual seduction is assigning by marked feelings of mutual interest between a man and women. Sexual seduction is a social principle that involves the process of purposely tempting a person into a particular act. The way of doing it comes in varied forms. It can be done jokingly or seriously, but one thing's for sure: it usually refers to the use of a person's sexual behavior. And most of the time, sexual seduction is utilized to make a person do something that he is likely to regret in the future.

This novel can show the portrayal of women as sexual genitalia, not as a sexual intercourse. Merry's depiction was assuming that thing. As a sexual genitalia, Merry's described by its manner, by using blossoms.

The process of 'girling' is also shown in this novel. The 'girling' process also happened at Merry daily activities. She drawing sketch, made an apple tea and helps his aunt to crochet wool. The habitual that usually do by a woman, when the man was working in the farm and the woman was at home.

To talk in terms of the allocation of 'sex', Butler argues that consider of the medical interpellation with shifts an infant from an 'it' to be 'he' or 'she', and that naming the girl is 'girling', brought into the domain of language and kinship through the interpellation of gender. The meaning of 'to interpellate' will tell that it is the action of appealing someone.

As a Butler said, the medical interpellation with (the recent emergence of the sonogram notwithstanding) shifts an infant from an 'it' to a 'she' or a 'he', and that naming the girl is 'girling', brought into the domain of language and kinship through the interpellation of gender. But that

'girling' of the girl does not end there; on the contrary, that founding interpellation is reiterated by various authorities and throughout the various intervals of time to reinforces or contest this naturalized effect. The naming is at once the setting of a boundary, and also the repeated of inculcation of a form (Butler:7-8).

This chapter also explains about the first stages in Gender theories, women as a subject of feminism. For feminist theory, the development of a language that fully adequately represents women has seemed necessary to foster the political visibility of women. This has seemed obviously important considering the pervasive cultural condition in which women's lives were either misrepresented or no represented at all.

As a Butler said, Butler suggests that the presumed universality and unity of the subject of feminism is effectively undermined by the constraints of premature insistance on a stable subject of feminism, understood as a saemless category of women, inevitably generates multiple refusals to accept the cattegory. These domains of exclusion reveal the coercive and regulatory consequences of that construction, even when the construction has been elaborated for emancipatory purposes. (Butler, 1993, hal. 1)

Merry was constructed by her gender to being a subject of feminism. By her manner and her dress, Merry formed naturally to be a *lady*. It is due to what Butler said. Merry ways of speech represents women who had political visibility and had a development language.

The depiction of Merry character as a subject of feminism is also show when she got married. She got served, treated and dressed like a *lady*. She bound with any regulation of how to act like a *lady*. It happens because Merry born and live in the society of English Royal Empire. It is due to what Butler said that for feminist theory the development of a language that fully adequately represents women has seemed necessary to foster the political visibility of women. This has seemed obviously important considering the pervasive cultural condition in which women's lives were either misrepresented or no represented at all.

As the identity of the girl, in this case Merry got an emphasis of sexually. Merry got threatened by Devon, the person who's that seemed give a little force to Merry. This is fairness in sex, because men often feel more powerful than the women. It is depicted when his arm tightened her to his body, drifted slightly over her cheekbone, and then moved to her lips and, with a gentle pressure and urged them open.

SEXUAL SEDUCTION IMPACTS

This chapter will analyze about the impact of the sexual seduction impacts. In this case is between Merry and Devon. As we knew before, Devon was being the main character who doing the seduction to attract Merry. What Devon do made Merry has no power to refuse this desire.

From these evaluating resources, there are an "identity" of the person which shown up in this part. The notion of "the person" here was received analytic elaboration on the assumption that whatever social context the person is in remains somehow externally related to the definitional structure of person – hood, be that consciousness, the capacity for language, or moral deliberation. The identity here is to stabilizing the concepts of sex, gender and sexuality, the very notion of "the person" is called into question by the cultural emergence of those "incoherent" or "discontinuous" gendered beings who appear to be persons.

This chapter explains about the sexual seduction theory. In this case is the impact of the sexual seduction. As Freud said that sexual seduction is a social principle that involves the process of purposely tempting a person into a particular act. The way of doing it comes in varied forms. It can be done jokingly or seriously, but one thing's for sure: it usually refers to the use of a person's sexual behavior. And most of the time, sexual seduction is utilized to make a person do something that he is likely to regret in the future.

This chapter also explains about the second stages in Gender theories, the compulsory order of sex / gender / desire. This is the theory about gender: the circular ruins of contemporary debate. When we talk about gender, we cannot argue that sometimes gender given the same meaning with sex. Gender is constructed suggests certain determinism of gender meanings inscribed on anatomically differentiated bodies, where those bodies are understood in terms such a law or set of laws, when it seems that gender is as determined and fixed as it was under the biology – is – destiny formulation. In such a case, not biology, but culture, becomes destiny.

And the last this chapter also explains about the third stages in Gender theories, gender: the circular ruins of contemporary debate. In this case, a humanist feminist position might understand gender as an *attribute* of a person who is characterized essentially as a pre - gendered substance or "core" called the person, denoting a universal capacity for reason, moral deliberation and language. The universal conception of the person, however, is displaced as a point of departure for a social theory of gender by those historical and anthropological

positions that understand gender as a relation among socially constituted subject in specifiable context.

CONCLUSION

Merry is a recreational artist, and is quite good at it, too. One of her greatest talents is her ability to draw accurate sketches of people she simply sees in the streets. Capitalizing on this, Merry's brother takes her to a local tavern at which he wants her to take careful note of some British pirates who are expected to show up there so that she can draw sketches in order to create wanted posters of them. Well, plans don't go exactly as planned and Merry makes a narrow escape from the tavern, but not before the pirate Devon Crandall corners Merry in order to extract details about her suspicious behavior and ends up stealing extremely passionate kisses with her. It is so passionate and mysterious, because both Devon and Merry are strongly affected by a few simple kisses.

Heroine Merry Wilding lives a quiet life in her small Virginia community with a maiden aunt whose devotion to all things British has left them nearly ostracized. But Mary is soon wrenched from her pallid existence and thrust into a full-blown adventure when she runs afoul of Devon, a gorgeous Englishman who thinks she's assorting with his enemy. Tossed into his cabin aboard a pirate ship, Merry struggles to preserve her virtue - and her very life.

Several weeks pass after this incident and Merry's aunt decides it is time to take her to England for a holiday, and with hopes of possibly meeting some suitable man for marriage. Well, plans don't go exactly as planned *again*, and shortly after boarding her ship bound for England, Merry gets inadvertently kidnapped and delivered to *The Black Joke*, the pirate ship of Captain Rand Morgan and his disciple, Devon Crandall. Merry spends most of the remainder of the book as a prisoner on *The Black Joke* pirate ship, keeping out of harm's way and inevitably lands a special place in the hearts of the crew--especially one such pirate named Devon Crandall who falls deeply for the beautiful, naive maiden, and she for him. Of course she tries desperately to not fall for him because he's a brute and an ass. And of course he tries desperately to resist falling for her because he thinks she's the lover of his worst enemy. Of course she refuses to denounce any false accusations about what she was doing in the tavern that night in order to protect her brother and his American idealist role in the war. Plus Devon isn't actually forthright with why he needs to know, either, so their game of cat and mouse ensues.

REFERENCES

Butler, J. (1993). *Bodies That Matter*. New York: Routledge New York & London.

Nicholson, L. J. (1990). *Gender Trouble: Judith Butler*. 29 West 35 Street New York, NY 10001: Routledge.

Salih, S. (2002). *Judith Butler*. 11 New Fetter Lane, London EC4P 4EE: Routledge Critical Thinkers.

Thomas, W. I. (1913). *Sex and Society*. Chicago, Illinois: Fourth Impression.

Darma, Budi. 2004. *Pengantar Teori Sastra*. Jakarta: Pusat Bahasa.

Thornham, Sue. 2000. *Feminist Theory and Cultural Studies: Stories of Unsettled Relations*. London, Arnold

Saptari, Ratna. 1997. *Perempuan, Kerja, dan Perubahan Sosial*. Jakarta: Pustaka Utama Grafiti.

Minderop, Albertine. 2010. *Psikologi Sastra: Karya Sastra, Metode, Teori dan Contoh Kasus*. Yayasan Pustaka Obor Indonesia.

Nurhayati, Eti. 2012. *Psikologi Perempuan Dalam Berbagai Perspektif*. Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar.

London, Laura. 1984. *The Windflower*. Labuan, Malaysia: Big Apple Agency, Inc.

Sarlito, Mas. 2002. *Teori – Teori Psikologi Sosial*. Jakarta: PT. Raja Grafindo Persada.

Wellek, Rene & Austin Warren. 1949. *Theory of Literature*. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company.

