

Representing Men's and Women's Speech: A Linguistic Analysis of Nick Joaquin's "The Summer Solstice"¹

Aileen O. Salonga

Without a moment's hesitation, he sprawled down flat, and, working his arms and legs, gaspingly clawed his way across the floor, like a great agonized lizard, the woman steadily backing away as he approached, her eyes watching him avidly, her nostrils dilating, till behind her loomed the open window, the huge glittering moon, the rapid flashes of lightning. She stopped, panting, and leaned against the sill. He lay exhausted at her feet, his face flat on the floor.

She raised her skirts and contemptuously thrust out a naked foot. He lifted his dripping face and touched his bruised lips to her toes; lifted his hands and grasped the white foot and kissed it savagely—kissed the step, the sole, the frail ankle—while she bit her lips and clutched in pain at the window-sill; her body distended and wracked by horrible shivers, her head flung back and her loose hair streaming out the window—streaming fluid and black in the white night where the huge moon glowed like a sun and the dry air flamed into lightning and the pure heat burned with the immense intense fever of noon. (Joaquin, "The Summer's Solstice" 38)

Introduction

The passage above comprises the last two paragraphs of "The Summer Solstice," a popular and rather controversial short story in the Philippines written by Philippine National Artist for Literature Nick Joaquin. The short story's popularity relies on a number of things: 1) it is one of the most anthologized of Joaquin's works; 2) it seems to be one of Joaquin's personal favorites, since he also wrote "Tatarin: A Witches' Sabbath in Three Acts," which is a drama version of the short story;² and 3) its drama version was turned into a popular movie some years back, making the story familiar even among non-literary Filipinos. The short story is also controversial, primarily because of the conflicting interpretations that generations of Filipino critics have ascribed to it. One point of contention among these critics is the story's ending—whether it signifies the triumph of the pagan, the primitive, and the woman, on the one hand, over Christianity, civilization, and the man, on the other, or vice versa.³ The story's ending is, of course, only one part of the story; there is much in "The Summer Solstice" that needs to be examined and analyzed. Moreover, approaches other than those usually utilized in literary criticism can be used in examining and analyzing the short story, which may then yield significant insights not only into the story itself but previous interpretations of the story as well.

This paper then is an attempt at doing something new to the story. While the story's ending and existing body of criticism remain crucial to my analysis, I endeavor to look at an aspect of the story that has not been explored and use an approach that has not been employed in previous interpretations. Specifically, I intend to do a linguistic analysis, focusing on the speech representation of the characters in the story.⁴ This is not to suggest that linguistic criticism is better than literary criticism; this is only to show that there are other possibilities of analysis, which may enrich, supplement, affirm, contest, or make more profound existing interpretations that have been arrived at through literary criticism. I also believe that particular

attention given to the workings of language in literary texts allows for a deeper appreciation of both language and literature.

In this paper then, I aim to show that a linguistic analysis of the story's speech representation of its characters reveals stereotypical notions of masculinity and femininity that highlight and naturalize gender differences and the hierarchical relationship between them. Since I am concerned with this linguistic feature, it follows that I deal mainly with parts of the story in which characters engage in dialogues. I establish the context of the dialogues that I analyze, however, to provide additional basis for my interpretation. Overall, this analysis keys into contemporary feminist readings of the story, which maintain that, despite Don Paeng crawling on the floor and kissing Doña Lupeng's feet, "The Summer Solstice" remains an anti-women, and therefore anti-feminist, text.

The longest day of the year

"The Summer Solstice" opens with Doña Lupeng waking up to an intense feeling of heat and complaining about a headache. Her children excitedly surround her and ask her to hurry; it is St. John's Day, and they are excited to go to their grandfather's house. Doña Lupeng goes to the kitchen and finds her children's nurse preparing breakfast instead of their cook, Amada. She goes out, hears a scream, which she knows belongs to Amada, and finds Entoy, their driver and Amada's husband, preparing the carriage. She asks Entoy if he has been beating Amada again. Entoy says he has not touched her. Doña Lupeng then proceeds to the servant's quarters and finds Amada spread out half-naked across the bed. She finds out from Entoy that Amada has been to the Tadtarin rites⁵ and now believes that she is the Tadtarin herself. She scolds Entoy for letting Amada go, but Entoy says that he has no choice, for "[t]he Spirit is in her. She is the Tadtarin. She must do as she pleases. Otherwise, the grain would not grow, the trees would bear no fruit, the rivers would give no fish, and the animals would die" (25).

The next scene opens with Doña Lupeng asking Don Paeng, her husband, how Amada and Entoy can still believe in such things. Don Paeng does not say anything, but looks at her to suggest that they should not talk about such things in the presence of the children. Before she can respond to Don Paeng's pointed look, the carriage stops to make way for the St. John procession. They then watch hordes of young men in wet clothes walking proud and tall with their statue of St. John, which is characterized as "a fine, blonde, heroic St. John: very male, very arrogant: the Lord of Summer indeed: the Lord of Light and Heat—erect and goldly virile above the prone and female earth" (26). Annoyed with this display of manly arrogance, Doña Lupeng thinks to herself that these men enjoy the false illusion that they are in control. She tells herself that it is women who make possible this illusion of men: "Women had built it up: this poise of the male. Ah, and women could destroy it, too" (27). Deep in her thoughts, she does not realize that the procession has passed, until her husband tells her so and mocks her, for she is still standing up and looking at the now empty street. The children laugh, and Doña Lupeng feels herself reddening and becoming ashamed of her thoughts.

At the children's grandfather's house, Doña Lupeng meets Guido, Don Paeng's cousin, who has just arrived from Europe. She finds out that Guido has joined not only the St. John procession, but also the Tadtarin rites. To her expression of surprise, Guido answers: "But I *adore* these old fiestas of ours! They are so *romantic!*" (28, italics in the original). He then tells her of the beauty and magic of the Tadtarin, the supremacy of women in the ancient times, and the mystical power of women, which underlies, and can therefore destroy, the power of men. He tells her, too, that women should be glorified and adored. While Guido's pronouncements are similar to the thoughts she had in the carriage, she feels embarrassed nonetheless and tells

Guido to stop talking about such nonsense. She suddenly says that she needs to look for her children and hurriedly stands up. Before she can go away, however, Guido lifts her skirt and kisses her feet. Horrified, she flees.

On their way home, Don Paeng and Doña Lupeng find themselves alone in the carriage since the children are spending the night at their grandfather's. Don Paeng comments on how Guido had followed Doña Lupeng like a "whipped dog" the whole afternoon. Annoyed by this comment, Doña Lupeng tells her husband that, besides following her around, Guido also kissed her feet. Don Paeng, disgusted by the thought, says that a woman should not be adored, but loved and respected. Doña Lupeng tells him that, perhaps, women "do not want to be loved and respected—but to be adored" (31). When he asks her if Guido has converted her, she tells him that she has a terrible headache and does not want to talk about it anymore. However, Doña Lupeng does not rest when they reach home. Instead, she asks her husband if they can see the Tadtarin. Don Paeng disagrees, but Doña Lupeng is insistent and says that if he does not go, she still will. Don Paeng then agrees to accompany her.

When they reach the plaza, Don Paeng and Doña Lupeng see "prancing, screaming, writhing women" who are making a keen animal sound. They carry with them their own St. John statue: "a crude, primitive, grotesque image, its big-eyed head too big for its puny naked torso, bobbing and swaying above the hysterical female horde and looking at once so comical and pathetic" (33). This time, it is Don Paeng who gets outraged, feeling as if the statue were a personal insult to him. When he turns to ask Doña Lupeng to go, he sees her rather transformed as she watches the parade with greedy eyes, an open mouth, and sweat shining on her face. Terrified, he asks her to go. Doña Lupeng, however, seems to have lost herself in the ceremonies. She runs, joins the other women, starts dancing, and laughs. Don Paeng follows her into the crowd, but when the women realize that he is male, they hit his face, scratch his skin, and push him down.⁶ Bloodied and bruised, he finally extricates himself from the crowd. He returns to the carriage and tells Entoy to go and get Doña Lupeng. When Don Paeng and Doña Lupeng are back in the house, Doña Lupeng makes Don Paeng say that he adores her; she makes him kiss her feet. Don Paeng resists, but as the epigraph shows, he submits in the end.

Various takes and changing significations

Early criticism of "The Summer Solstice" has focused on its lush and vivid description—generally considered as Joaquin's style—of Philippine cultural life in the midst of transition from a predominantly Hispanic country to an American one. While some critics praise this style and see it as setting the right mood for the mystical past that Joaquin depicts in the story (Locsin 1963; Bernad in Garcia-Groyon 1972), there are those who find it excessive, as it is said to detract from the story's narrative logic and formal elements and create a melodrama that "no sane reader can accept" (Furay 1972; Tiempo 1995, 21). Another focus in early critical works of "The Summer Solstice" is the interesting fusion of pagan rituals and Christian practices, superstition and religion, and the old and new, which is generally believed to be the result of the country's historical past. It has to be noted, however, that the fusion of these cultural forces is not smooth, coherent, or stable (Manalo in Pablo 1972; Arambulo, 1986; Francia 1993). In a way, it is perhaps wrong to call this mixture a fusion; fission seems to be the more accurate term, since it is characterized by struggle and discontent with one set of elements seemingly always trying to overpower another.⁷

Related to these contradictions is Joaquin's portrayal of the Philippines' pre-Spanish past as rich and luscious, and, at the same time, savage and terrifying, which has led some critics to theorize on his nostalgia for the country's pre-colonial past, and yet, his inability to embrace

this past completely. Since he also depicts the Philippines' Spanish past in highly romantic terms, these same critics contend that Joaquin is actually nostalgic of the country's colonial, not pre-colonial, past. Similarly, he does not seem able to accept this colonial past completely (Casper 1962, 1966; Pablo 1972; Lacaba 1972). As a consequence of this nostalgia and ambivalence, one critic contends that "The Summer Solstice"—and other Joaquin stories, for that matter—is essentially a search for the Philippines' national and cultural identity (Lacaba 1972).

A more contemporary take on the short story is a structuralist reading: indeed, certain binary oppositions—sun and moon, day and night, Christianity and paganism, faith and superstition, the 'macho' St. John and the emasculated one, reason and emotion, rich and poor, colonizer and colonized, and man and woman—are so apparent in the text that they can be neatly mapped out and explained in terms of the One and the Other. What is interesting in this analysis, however, is its contention of a reversal of expectations in the course of the story—that is, instead of the One conquering the Other, which is often the case in structuralist renderings, it is the Other which conquers the One. This conclusion is drawn from the fact that, when the story ends, it is Don Paeng who crawls on the floor and kisses Doña Lupeng's feet, overturning the story's beginning, in which Don Paeng seems to have the upper hand. This is said to signal the triumph of Doña Lupeng and all the images that are associated with her, and consequently, Don Paeng's defeat as well as those elements that are aligned with him.⁸

Early criticism, without necessarily invoking feminist terms, has generally interpreted this reversal of roles as a triumph for women. The first reason for this interpretation is the obvious submission of Don Paeng to Doña Lupeng at the end of the story. The second reason is more implicit: the recognition of the woman's ancient power as "the source of life, maker and therefore ruler of men" (Locsin 1963, ix; Casper 1966; Francia 1993).⁹ However, this pro-woman, feminist interpretation is contested by contemporary feminist readings (Mendez Ventura 1992, 1994; Kintanar 1992). Mendez Ventura (1992), for instance, calls the feminist streak in the story "pseudo-feminism" in that it does not afford women any real, long-term power, but a mysterious, illusory one, which they acquire only during the summer solstice, the longest day of the year, which, ironically, happens only once a year. What this suggests is that, the next day, when the Tadtarin madness is over, Don Paeng resumes his position of power, and Entoy beats Amada again. Mendez Ventura (1992) also points to how the imagery associated with Doña Lupeng and Amada creates "the man-made concept of woman as a demonic mystery to be feared" (153). Through the alignment of the woman with the image of the moon and the earth, the Tadtarin, and wild, frenzied, hysterical passion, she is assigned a primordial power that strikes fear in the heart of any man. If one really comes to think of it, however, this primordial power has no value in a society that prizes logic, reason, and restraint.¹⁰

I proceed from the assumptions of these contemporary feminist readings. I believe that the power assigned to Doña Lupeng and Amada is not real. It is, at best, a token gesture. I also do not think that the depiction of women deriving their power from some dark, primeval source advances the case of feminism; rather, it throws it backwards by shrouding it in some kind of unexplainable, and therefore unknowable, mystery. I argue, however, that these are done not only through the story's reversal of binaries, its representation of women in a dark, mysterious light, or its imagery, but also through the manipulation of certain linguistic features, specifically, speech representation, which reveals, highlights, and naturalizes stereotypical and asymmetrical notions of masculinity and femininity.

Representations of men's and women's speech¹¹

Speech representation can be broadly categorized between Direct Speech (DS) and Indirect Speech (IS). “Ana visited me yesterday,” Kathy said” is an example of DS, while “Kathy said that Ana visited her yesterday” is an example of IS. Besides a difference in form—that is, only the DS example has inverted commas and only the IS example has a subordinated reported clause to the reporting clause—there is also a difference in function and effect. For instance, in the DS example, what the person actually said is given without any mediation from the speaker. The listener is thus given both the exact words and the original proposition of the utterance. In the IS example, a certain degree of speaker mediation is already present such that, while the original propositional content of the utterance is given, it is possible that the actual utterance has already been paraphrased by the speaker (e.g., the actual utterance could have been “Ana came over the other day;” in this case, “Ana visited me yesterday” is a paraphrase). What this means is that DS “claims to represent accurately the propositional content *and* the words originally used to utter the content,” while IS “claims only to represent the original propositional content, using instead the words of the person reporting the speech” (Short 1996, 289, italics in the original). Applied in fiction, this suggests that the words of DS are the characters’ actual words, while the words of IS are those of the narrator.

It has to be noted that there are other categories of speech representation besides DS and IS. The table that follows summarizes these categories of speech representation and gives examples to illustrate how they differ from each other in terms of form:

Category	Example
Narrative Report of Action (NRA)	Ana visited Kathy yesterday.
Narrative Report of Speech Act (NRSA)	Ana said something about visiting Kathy.
Indirect Speech (IS)	Kathy said that Ana visited her yesterday.
Free Indirect Speech (FIS)	Ana visited me yesterday, Kathy said.
Direct Speech (DS)	“Ana visited me yesterday,” Kathy said.
Free Direct Speech (FDS)	“Ana visited me yesterday.”

As far as function and effect are concerned, what is significant in these categories is their gradation in terms of narrator control over the narrative—that is, from NRA, which shows that the narrator has the most control over the narrative, to FDS, which shows that the narrator has the least control over the narrative. Additionally, the use of any of these forms suggests the narrator’s interference into and attitude about what the characters say and how they say it. Moreover, a dominance of a particular form may highlight the narrator’s attempt at either objectivity or subjectivity. For instance, if a character’s speech is represented in the form of an FDS, the narrator may be letting the readers imagine on their own the character’s way of saying things and decide for themselves what kind of person this character is. The narrator’s objectivity is also highlighted here, since the narrator is reporting verbatim what the character has said. On the other hand, if the IS form is used to represent a character’s speech, it may be that the narrator is telling the readers that they should not necessarily believe in the accuracy of what the character is saying, since the narrator may have already paraphrased the character’s utterances. Since it is possible that what is reported is already the narrator’s interpretation of the character’s utterance, this renders the narrator as rather subjective.

In “The Summer Solstice,” speech is generally represented in the FDS form.¹² While there are occasions when the DS form is used in the exchanges between characters (e.g., in a

series of FDS in the exchange between Doña Lupeng and Guido, one utterance of Doña Lupeng is in DS: “‘And that was romantic too?’ asked Doña Lupeng”), the FDS remains dominant. This dominance is illustrated in the following exchange between Doña Lupeng and Entoy:

‘Tell me, Entoy: has she been to the Tadtarin?’
 ‘Yes, señora. Last night.’
 ‘But I forbade her to go! And I forbade you to let her go!’
 ‘I could do nothing.’
 ‘Why, you beat her at the least pretext!’
 ‘But now I do not dare touch her.’
 ‘Oh, and why not?’
 ‘It is the day of St. John: the spirit is in her.’
 ‘But, man—’
 ‘It is true, señora. The spirit is in her. She is the Tadtarin. She must do as she pleases. Otherwise, the grain would not grow, the trees would bear no fruit, the rivers would give no fish, and the animals would die.’ (24-25)

Other exchanges (e.g., between Doña Lupeng and the children, Doña Lupeng and Don Paeng on the carriage, Doña Lupeng and Guido, Don Paeng and Entoy) basically have the same predominance of the FDS form. Overall, the dominant use of FDS and occasional use of DS set up the narrator as objective and reliable, since the narrator seems to be only reporting what is said in exactly how it is said. This objectivity, however, does not stand if one begins to look more carefully into which part of the story the occasional use of DS actually increases. Interestingly, DS becomes the dominant form in the exchange between Doña Lupeng and Don Paeng just before the story’s resolution: they have just gone back from the Tadtarin rites. Don Paeng tells Doña Lupeng that he will whip her, because she behaved like a lewd woman. Doña Lupeng tells him that he wants to whip her only because the women in the Tadtarin whipped him. This dialogue actually starts out in FDS; it however develops in DS. The extract covers the dialogue’s DS representation:

Her eyes were upon him and the shameful fear that had unmanned him in the dark chapel possessed him again. His legs had turned to water; it was a monstrous agony to remain standing. But she was waiting for him to speak, forcing him to speak.
 ‘No, I cannot whip you!’ he confessed miserably.
 ‘Then say it! Say it!’ she cried, pounding her clenched fists together. ‘Why suffer and suffer? And in the end you would only submit.’
 But he still shrugged stubbornly. ‘Is it not enough that you have me helpless? It is not enough that I feel what you want me to feel?’
 But she shook her head furiously. ‘Until you have said it to me there can be no peace between us.’
 He was exhausted at last: he sank heavily to his knees, breathing hard and streaming with sweat, his fine body curiously diminished now in its ravaged apparel.
 ‘I adore you, Lupe,’ he said tonelessly.
 She strained forward avidly. ‘*What?* What did you say?’ she screamed.
 And he, in his dead voice: ‘That I adore you. That I worship you. That the air you breathe and the ground you tread is holy to me. That I am your dog, your slave...’
 But it was still not enough. Her fists were still clenched, and she cried: ‘*Then come, crawl on the floor, and kiss my feet!*’ (37-38)

This sudden shift from FDS to a *series*¹³of DS is quite interesting: why use the DS form now when the story has moved along substantially with the FDS form? Why the narrator’s sudden attempt at controlling the narrative when the story is now about to end? Why this shift? It may be argued that there is actually no shift—that is, though there is a shift in form, there is no shift in meaning—since DS and FDS are not very much different from each other anyway. If

one considers the range of forms for speech representation, DS and FDS are actually the last two in terms of the narrator's control over the narrative. Granted that FDS allows the least control for the narrator, DS, because it reports in exactly the same way what has been uttered, may be said to function in the same way that FDS does. I argue, however, that DS and FDS function in very different ways, because, while FDS does not make use of a reporting verb (e.g., "I adore you"), DS does (e.g., "I adore you," Don Paeng intoned). That the DS form makes use of a reporting verb means that, while what has been uttered is reported in exactly the same terms, the readers' perception of how it has been uttered may be conditioned by the reporting verb and the adverb that is used to describe the reporting verb. This is how the narrator becomes in control of the narrative, and this is what accounts for the change in meaning.

Going back to one of the questions I posed earlier, why would the narrator want to control the narrative at this point? I believe that it is to show that, while Don Paeng is in the process of submitting to Doña Lupeng, the manner by which he is doing it does not signify acquiescence. In fact, the reporting verbs used and the adverbs that describe these reporting verbs ("confessed miserably," "said tonelessly," and "he, in his dead voice") show that even when he agrees to what Doña Lupeng wants, he also resists it. His submission then in the end is not a real submission. Moreover, the use of these verbs and the adverbs that modify them imply that, despite the craziness of the situation, Don Paeng remains quiet, calm, and rational. It is an altogether different story when the reporting verbs of Doña Lupeng's utterances are considered. The reporting verbs "cried" (which is actually used twice) and "screamed" emphasize the high emotional state she is in, which is perhaps the reason for why she does not see that her husband is not really submitting to her. These reporting verbs, being highly charged with emotion, also work to show that Doña Lupeng is loud, hysterical, and unreasonable.

If these observations may seem rather hasty, given that I examine only one particular exchange, it is perhaps significant to point out that in the few uses of the DS form in those exchanges that are predominantly FDS, the reporting verbs assigned to Don Paeng and Doña Lupeng are consistent with the ones used in this last exchange—that is, neutral reporting verbs are assigned to Don Paeng's utterances, while highly-charged ones are assigned to Doña Lupeng's. For instance, Don Paeng "says", "asks", "pronounces", "demands,"¹⁴ while Doña Lupeng "groans", "shouts", "cries", "wonders", "screams", and "shrieks."¹⁵ What this means is that, in the end, the narrator seems to have felt the need to set the record straight: Don Paeng, though he crawls on the floor and kisses Doña Lupeng's feet, is not really submitting to Doña Lupeng since he remains calm, quiet, and reasonable; Doña Lupeng cannot see this, however, because she is overcome by her emotions and deafened by the sound of her own cries. Overall, speech representation in this short story works in affirming and highlighting the masculine stereotype of cool logic and restraint, and consequently, the feminine stereotype of excess and unbridled emotion. Because these gender stereotypes are situated within an overall imagery of masculine and feminine binaries, and judgment is made on which set of binaries are (and should be) prized, encouraged, and rewarded, these stereotypes and the hierarchy between them are therefore naturalized.

Conclusion

The contemporary feminist readings of "The Summer Solstice" can definitely stand on their own. I believe, however, that by paying more careful attention to the language of the short story, the insights, observations, and assumptions of these feminist readings acquire a more profound, concrete, and material significance. As this paper has shown, an analysis of even only one linguistic feature can tell a lot about a text's positioning on an issue such as gender. This is because, ultimately, what linguistic criticism does is that it makes explicit usually hidden

meanings, assumptions, and significations within literary texts, which literary criticism may sometimes take for granted.

Notes

- ¹ This paper was originally written for EL 5221: The Linguistic Analysis of Literature, a postgraduate module offered by the Department of English Language and Literature of the National University of Singapore and taught by A/P Ismael Talib. EL 5221 is an interface module as it makes use of methods and tools in linguistics and discourse analysis to interpret and make sense of literary works. A more detailed description of the current module may be viewed at <http://courses.nus.edu.sg/course/ellibst/5221/>. It has to be noted that there are some differences in terms of the specific topics covered between the current syllabus and the syllabus that our class followed (Semester 2, AY 2004–2005). However, the general description, and aims and objectives are the same.
- ² The drama version is basically like the short story version except for some additional scenes and characters, and the change in the story's time setting—that is, from the turn of the century to the 1920s. According to Sylvia Mendez Ventura (1992), this change in time setting is probably to create “a more modern prefiguration of the women's liberation movement” (150). What Ventura's comment suggests is a feminist reading of the text, which is not present in early criticism of the work. In fact, this feminist angle was articulated only in the mid-1990s.
- ³ This is why I decided to use the story's ending as epigraph. I want to foreground the tensions within the text's critical tradition as early as the introduction.
- ⁴ A few academic reasons govern my choice of this linguistic feature. For one, it has been discussed in class, which allows me a certain degree of familiarity with how it may be used in analysis. For another, it is a feature of the story that is yet to be explored, since previous interpretations of the work that can be characterized as having some kind of linguistic dimension focus mainly on the narrative elements of the story, its imagery and symbolism, and the description assigned to the characters. I have to admit, however, that my choice of this feature has to do primarily with salience—that is, it is the feature that stands out in my own reading of the text. In fact, as I shall argue later, an analysis of the characters' speech representation shows a consistent depiction of masculinity and femininity that tends to affirm, highlight, and naturalize gender stereotypes and asymmetries.
- ⁵ The Tadtarin is a three-day pagan celebration, the last day of which coincides with St. John's Day, which is a Catholic feast.
- ⁶ Men can participate in the Tadtarin only if they wear a piece of women's clothing, which is what Guido did, so he was able to participate in it.
- ⁷ I think the Bakhtinian notion of heteroglossia will also work well as a framework for this kind of analysis. However, I have yet to see an analysis that makes use of this framework.

- ⁸ This structuralist analysis was a product of a class exercise I had in CL 122, an undergraduate module on contemporary literary theory and criticism offered by the Department of English and Comparative Literature of the University of the Philippines in Diliman and taught by A/P Judy Ick at the time I took it many years ago.
- ⁹ It is perhaps interesting to point out that it is mostly the male literary critics who see “The Summer Solstice” as a pro-woman, feminist text. The female ones, on the other hand, read it as anti-women and anti-feminist.
- ¹⁰ I have focused on Mendez Ventura’s 1992 article, because this work directly addresses the issue of feminism in “The Summer Solstice.” The other Mendez Ventura article (1994) and the Kintanar article (1992) mention “The Summer Solstice” either in passing or in relation to a point they are making about the main Joaquin text that they are examining. Both critics nevertheless agree that the primordial woman image in “The Summer Solstice” and other works of Joaquin, while seemingly powerful, is devoid of power. She is also sexualized, demonized, and made to behave in ways that tempt men and destabilize order.
- ¹¹ My definition of the various categories of speech representation and some of their possible interpretive value are drawn from Leech and Short (1981), Short (1996), and Dr. Talib’s handout and lecture on speech and thought representation. The examples, however, are mine; should there be inaccurate examples, I take full responsibility for them.
- ¹² There is also a dominance of NRA forms in the expository parts of the narrative. Since I am concerned with speech representation, I do not consider these NRA forms in my interpretation.
- ¹³ I put ‘series’ in italics to emphasize the fact that this is the first time that a series of DS has been used in the story. As I have pointed out earlier, DS representation is generally used only once or twice in a series of FDS.
- ¹⁴ In fact, in some cases, he doesn’t even say anything; he just looks at Doña Lupeng in a significant way.
- ¹⁵ In fact, “crying” seems to be the form that her utterances usually take, because it is the verb that is often used to report her utterances.

Works Cited

- Arambulo, Thelma E. 1986. “Critical essay on ‘The Summer Solstice.’” *The Prism of Literature*. Eds. Thelma E. Arambulo and Yolanda V. Tomeldan. 261-265. Quezon City: National Bookstore.
- Casper, Leonard. 1962. Introduction. *Modern Philippine Short Stories*, Ed. Leonard Casper, xi-xxv, 21-22. New Mexico: U of New Mexico P.
- _____. 1966. *New Writing From the Philippines: A Critique and An Anthology*. New York: Syracuse UP.

- Francia, Luis H. 1993. Introduction. *Brown River, White Ocean: An Anthology of Twentieth-Century Philippine Literature in English*, Ed. Luis H. Francia. ix-xix. New Jersey: Rutgers UP.
- Furay, H.B. 1972. "The Power and Greatness of Nick Joaquin." *Philippine Fiction: Essays from Philippine Studies 1953-1972*. Ed. Joseph A. Galdon. 1-11. Quezon City: Ateneo de Manila UP.
- Garcia-Groyon, Regina. 1972. "Joaquin's Connie Escobar: Fall and Rise." *Philippine Fiction: Essays from Philippine Studies 1953-1972*. Ed. Joseph A. Galdon. 25-44. Quezon City: Ateneo de Manila UP.
- Joaquin, Nick. 1962. "The Summer Solstice." *Modern Philippine Short Stories*. Ed. Leonard Casper. 23-37. New Mexico: U of New Mexico P.
- Kintanar, Thelma. 1992. "From Formalism to Feminism." *Women Reading...Feminist Perspectives on Philippine Literary Texts*. Ed. Thelma B. Kintanar. 131-145. Quezon City: U of the Philippines P and University Center for Women's Studies.
- Lacaba, Emmanuel A.F. 1972. "Winter After Summer Solstice: The Later Joaquin." *Philippine Fiction: Essays from Philippine Studies 1953-1972*. Ed. Joseph A. Galdon. 45-56. Quezon City: Ateneo de Manila UP.
- Leech, Geoffrey and Mick Short. 1981. *Style in Fiction: A Linguistic Introduction to English Fictional Prose*. London and New York: Longman.
- Locsin, Teodoro. 1963. Introduction. *Prose and Poems, Nick Joaquin*, i-xii. Manila: Alberto S. Florentino Press.
- Mendez-Ventura, Sylvia. 1992. "Sexism and the Mythification of Woman: A Feminist Reading of Nick Joaquin's 'The Summer Solstice' and Alfred Yuson's 'The Hill of Samuel.'" *Women Reading...Feminist Perspectives on Philippine Literary Texts*. Ed. Thelma B. Kintanar, 146-162. Quezon City: U of the Philippines P and University Center for Women's Studies.
- _____. 1994. *Feminist readings of Philippine Fiction: Critique and Anthology*. Quezon City: U of the Philippines P.
- Pablo, Lourdes Busuego. 1972. "The Spanish Tradition in Nick Joaquin." *Philippine Fiction: Essays from Philippine Studies 1953-1972*. Ed. Joseph A. Galdon. 57-73. Quezon City: Ateneo de Manila UP.
- Short, Mick. 1996. *Exploring the Language of Poems, Plays and Prose*. London and New York: Addison Wesley Longman.
- Talib, Ismail S. [unknown]. "Speech and thought presentation." [unknown], 195-206. [unknown].
- Tiempo, Edilberto. 1995. *Literary Criticism in the Philippines and Other Essays*. Manila: De La Salle UP.