XPLORE PUBLICATIONS

Chapter 5

Gendered Thrownness and the Unequal Disclosure of Possibility: Heidegger and Jaya in Shashi Deshpande's That Long Silence

Abhimanyu Godara (*department of english and foreign languages ,guru jambheshwar university of science and technology*) **Dr. Mandeep Kaur** (*department of english and foreign languages ,guru jambheshwar university of science and technology*)

In: *Women, words and world : Gender Studies in English Literary discourse*. edited by Dr. C. Chamundeshwari , Associate Professor , Department of Languages / English School of Arts, Humanities and Social Sciences REVA University, Bengaluru, India. ISBN 978-81-992603-3-7.

Abstract

This article reads Shashi Deshpande's That Long Silence through Martin Heidegger's account of thrownness, everydayness, das Man, anxiety, possibility, and authenticity, supplemented by feminist phenomenology. It proposes gendered thrownness as an analytical term, distinct from Heidegger's own vocabulary, naming the historically specific conditions through which universal thrownness is lived. The article argues that gendered thrownness operates most powerfully at the level of social intelligibility: before Jaya can choose a possibility, that possibility must first become recognizable to her as something she could want. Reading Jaya's boredom, her instruction into gendered role, her marital crisis, her abandoned writing, and her closing reflections against verified passages from Heidegger and from feminist theorists, the article argues that her movement at the novel's end constitutes a partial, textually uncertain shift in her relation to possibility rather than emancipation, and that this distinction between authenticity and emancipation is necessary to keep the concept philosophically honest.

Keywords: thrownness, das Man, authenticity, feminist phenomenology, gendered thrownness, possibility

Introduction

Readers of Shashi Deshpande's That Long Silence have mostly approached Jaya through the vocabulary of gender, patriarchy, and silence: as a case study in what a middle-class Indian marriage does to a woman's inner life. That vocabulary captures something real, but it tends to treat Jaya's condition as a social fact to be reported rather than a structure of existence to be examined. This article asks what her experience shows about the structure of existence itself, using the terms Martin Heidegger developed in Being and Time: thrownness, everydayness, das Man, possibility, anxiety, and authenticity.

The difficulty is immediate. Heidegger's Dasein is meant to be ontologically neutral. Before it is male or female, before it belongs to any social category, Dasein simply exists, thrown into

a world it did not choose and oriented toward possibilities it did not invent. On the other hand ,Jaya's world, is saturated with gender from the outset: she is a wife, a mother, a daughter, and a writer, and her speech, her anger, and even her desire are already regulated by expectations she did not set. This article argues that Heidegger's categories remain useful for describing Jaya's existence, but only once they are supplemented by an account of how thrownness, everydayness, and possibility are distributed unevenly along the lines of gender.

The term proposed for that supplement is gendered thrownness. It does not replace Heidegger's ontological concept, and it is not Heidegger's own term; it names the historically specific conditions through which universal thrownness is lived, conditions in which gendered structures shape which possibilities are recognizable, accessible, or costly for a given subject. Three questions organize the argument that follows. First, how does Jaya's experience reveal the ways universal thrownness is lived through socially gendered structures of possibility? Second, what does it mean that Jaya cannot, for most of the novel, answer the question of what she wants, and what does her eventual movement toward self-reflection show about the relationship between Heideggerian authenticity and feminist emancipation? Third, what precisely does gendered thrownness add to existing feminist phenomenological concepts, such as situatedness, embodiment, and orientation, that already describe social constraint on freedom?

The method is phenomenological close reading: treating recurring narrative structures in the novel, mood, repetition, gendered instruction, silence, and possibility, as textual manifestations through which existential structures become narratively perceptible. Five moments in the novel are read closely because each marks, on independent grounds, a distinct stage in Jaya's relation to possibility: the boredom that precedes the narrated present, the gendered instruction she receives in Mohan's family, the collapse of domestic routine that follows Mohan's professional disgrace, her abandonment and later confrontation of her writing, and her closing reflections on choice. Each moment is read against a verified primary passage from Heidegger and against feminist phenomenological work that specifies what his categories look like once gender is taken seriously; each theorist is assigned one specific analytical task rather than invoked as general support.

The argument can be stated in advance. Jaya is universally thrown as Dasein, but she experiences that thrownness through a historically gendered world. That world does not simply forbid or permit particular acts; it shapes which possibilities are intelligible enough to be wanted in the first place. Her boredom, and the marital crisis that follows it, disrupt her everyday absorption in inherited possibilities and expose the question of what she actually wants, a question she initially cannot answer. By the novel's end she recognizes alternatives she had not previously been able to formulate, but she does not leave the social world that produced her, and the novel does not resolve what she will do next. Gendered thrownness names the resulting tension between the universality of Heideggerian thrownness and the unequal social conditions under which it is lived, operating most powerfully before choice, at the level of what can be recognized as wantable at all.

Existing scholarship and theoretical context

Existing criticism of That Long Silence is extensive and organized around three overlapping approaches. The largest is a feminist-sociological reading that treats the novel as a document of patriarchal constraint: Jaya's silence, her deferral to Mohan, and her abandoned writing are read as evidence of what patriarchy costs educated middle-class women, with the ending read as a qualified movement toward self-assertion (Yadav and Rohitashwani 169–177). A second, narratological approach attends to how Deshpande's first-person, retrospective, associative narration itself performs the recovery of a silenced voice; Maninder Kapoor and Seema Singh read the novel's fragmented, flashback-driven structure as formally enacting the split between Jaya's public and private selves (63–92). A third, represented by Jasbir Jain's monograph-length study, resists reading the fiction only through what Jain calls the woman question, treating Jaya's self-formation as

a broader problem of identity and social space, closer in spirit to this article's interest in existence than in victimhood.

A smaller strand of criticism comes closer to the phenomenological interest this article pursues, without developing it in Heideggerian terms. Kamalakar Bhat's reading of the novel's attention to routine and domestic detail argues that this is not incidental description but the means by which the novel discloses how national and patriarchal structures become naturalized in ordinary experience. Bhat's account comes close to describing what Heidegger would call everydayness, the way a structure becomes invisible by becoming habitual, but it moves toward questions of nation, class, and narrative voice rather than toward the structure of possibility itself, and it does not ask what it means, in Heidegger's specific sense, for a possibility to become unavailable to a subject before she can even want it. Sarla Palkar's earlier reading of the novel's silences as a spectrum of survival strategies performs a related service for the material this article takes up later, cataloguing what silence does across several women without asking what makes Jaya's own silence phenomenologically different from theirs.

None of this existing scholarship asks the specific question this article asks: not simply how patriarchy constrains Jaya's choices, but how it governs the prior intelligibility of what she is able to want. This article identifies that question as a comparatively underdeveloped one in the existing literature, rather than claiming it has never been raised in any form.

On the philosophical side, the relevant literature is the smaller body of feminist engagement with Heidegger directly. Charlotte Knowles argues that Heidegger's account of das Man, though gender-neutral on its face, is structurally compatible with a feminist account of how gendered norms become anonymous and self-perpetuating, since the 'they' is defined precisely by its facelessness rather than by any particular social content (Knowles 103–124). Lauren Freeman argues for reading Heideggerian selfhood as inherently relational rather than atomistic, on the grounds that Dasein's Being-with is as fundamental to it as its individual mineness, which blunts the common objection that Dasein is too solitary a figure to be useful to feminist theory (Freeman 361–383). The essays collected in Nancy Holland and Patricia Huntington's Feminist Interpretations of Martin Heidegger extend this project across a wider range of Heidegger's texts, several arguing that Heidegger's studied silence on sexual difference leaves his ontology open to, rather than closed against, feminist elaboration. What this philosophical literature does not do, because it is not its task, is test these claims against a sustained literary case. This article's contribution sits at the intersection the two literatures leave open: a use of Heidegger's structure of thrownness, worked out through Knowles's and Freeman's accounts of its compatibility with feminist critique, to ask a question Deshpande scholarship has approached only indirectly — not what Jaya suffers, but what she is, for most of the novel, unable to want.

Situating the argument this way also clarifies what gendered thrownness adds to concepts already established in feminist phenomenology, such as situatedness, embodiment, or orientation. Those concepts, developed further below with direct textual evidence, describe how a subject's freedom is exercised from within unchosen conditions. Gendered thrownness names something prior to that: not simply that Jaya's exercise of her possibilities is constrained, but that certain possibilities do not register for her as possibilities at all until a specific narrative disruption makes them visible.

Heidegger: thrownness, everydayness, and possibility

Heidegger's account begins with Dasein rather than with a pre-social, already-formed individual. Dasein is "ontically distinguished by the fact that, in its very Being, that Being is an issue for it" (32). Dasein, in other words, is not a fixed thing but a relation to its own existence; it does not simply occur, the way a stone or a tool occurs, but is always already interpreting and taking a stand on what it is. This matters immediately for Jaya, because it means her identity is not a

possession she carries but something continually at stake for her — which is exactly the condition the novel dramatizes when the marital crisis makes her ask, in effect, what her own being as a wife has actually amounted to.

Being-in-the-world names the fact that Dasein cannot be separated from the meaningful world it inhabits. Heidegger writes that Dasein "comports itself understandingly towards" its own Being and that, formally, 'Dasein exists' rather than merely occurring (Heidegger 78). The world is not an object standing apart from the subject but the network of practices, relationships, and possibilities within which Dasein already finds itself. Jaya's marriage and family are not external facts that happen to affect her from outside; they are part of the language in which she already understands herself. This is why Beauvoir's account of woman as situated, discussed below, attaches so easily to Heidegger's structure: both refuse the idea of a subject who first exists neutrally and only afterward acquires a social world.

Heidegger calls Dasein's basic condition Geworfenheit, thrownness: "we call it the 'thrownness' of this entity into its 'there' " (174), meaning that Dasein finds itself already delivered over to a factical situation it did not choose a family, a historical period, a language, a body. Facticity, on Heidegger's account, "never becomes something that we can come across by beholding it" (174); it is not a fact Dasein can step back and inspect from outside, because it is the very ground from which Dasein does any inspecting at all. Jaya's account of her marriage bears this out precisely: she does not first exist as a neutral self and then encounter Mohan's family's expectations as external data. She is already living inside those expectations by the time she is capable of noticing them as expectations, which is what makes her later recognition of them feel less like new information than like waking up inside a room she did not know she had entered.

But thrownness is not determinism, because Dasein also projects possibilities from within its factical situation. Heidegger's account of possibility resists a common simplification: "In each case Dasein is its possibility", and it " 'has' this possibility, but not just as a property ... as something present-at-hand would" (68). Dasein does not possess its possibilities the way an object possesses attributes; it is its possibilities, in the sense that what it will be next is always still open, still to be taken up. This is the concept that this article needs to keep separate from ordinary choice. Heideggerian possibility is not one option selected from a menu of alternatives; it is a way of Being toward which Dasein projects itself, prior to and more fundamental than any discrete act of choosing. When Jaya later reflects that her life holds "so many crossroads, so many choices" (Deshpande 173), that language of choice should not be read as a direct translation of this more fundamental Heideggerian possibility. Her recognition of crossroads is evidence of a changed relation to possibility, not proof that she has simply started choosing where she once did not; this distinction is returned to directly in the discussion of the novel's ending.

The concept of everydayness clarifies how this projection usually works. Das Man, 'the they,' is Heidegger's name for the anonymous norms through which everyday behavior becomes intelligible. Heidegger's own formulation is stark: "Everyone is the other, and no one is himself" (165"Thus the 'they' maintains itself factically in the averageness of that which belongs to it.This care of averageness reveals in turn an essential tendency of Dasein which we call the 'levelling down' [Einebnung] of all possibilities of Being". Das Man is not a specific institution or person; its power lies precisely in its anonymity, in the fact that no one in particular can be pointed to as its author. For Jaya, the normalcy of everyday life carries a distinctly gendered content, though das Man should not simply be equated with patriarchy. Patriarchal expectation is better described as one historically specific form the anonymous norms of 'the they' can take: what Heidegger describes as facelessness is, in Jaya's world, filled with the specific content of wifehood and motherhood, without ceasing to operate the way Heidegger says all averageness operates by levelling, by making the exceptional pass unnoticed, by never needing a named enforcer.

Anxiety and boredom must be kept distinct. For Heidegger, anxiety is the mood in which the familiar intelligibility of the everyday world collapses: "Anxiety individualizes Dasein for

its ownmost Being-in-the-world, which as something that understands, projects itself essentially upon possibilities" (232). Anxiety has no definite object; it is not fear of something in particular but a disclosure of Being-in-the-world as such, stripped of the 'they''s tranquillizing familiarity. Boredom, developed in the next section, is not identical to anxiety in this technical sense, but it performs an adjacent function: it is the mood in which repetition becomes perceptible as repetition, preparing the ground on which a later disruption can register as a genuine crisis rather than an isolated event.

Authenticity, on this account, is not the discovery of some hidden inner self, nor is it a wholesale rejection of the social world. What Heidegger says about its most developed form, resoluteness, is explicit on this point: "Resoluteness, as authentic Being-one's-Self, does not detach Dasein from its world, nor does it isolate it so that it becomes a free-floating 'I' " (344). Resoluteness, in other words, changes Dasein's relation to the same people, roles, and world it already inhabits; it is not an exit from that world. This is the passage this article returns to when assessing whether Jaya's ending can be called resolute in Heidegger's sense.

Gendered thrownness: Jaya's social world

While Jaya is not thrown into abstract conditions, but rather a specific world where her family's had already provided a concrete meaning of gender, it is the most obvious indicator of Das Man in Heidegger's sense that has been produced. The clearest sign of this is not that Jaya was taught how a woman should act, but that she, slowly and with repetition, tells herself. Her account of her first visits to Mohan's family describes a process rather than a lesson: she learns, says, "all the things I could and couldn't do, all the things that were womanly and unwomanly" (Deshpande 78), watching women that she describes as "sharply defined" in the roles they play and "so definite about their roles" to the point that she found the pattern itself entrancing (78). The crucial move comes next, and the fact that having watched these women, Jaya does not just comply with an external rule shows that she has decided to, in her own words, "pattern myself after them" (79). That sentence is the turn that this article needs in order to reach a change from social expectation to das Man in Heidegger's specific sense: the norm stops being imposed by a particular person and is elected, then repeated and eventually felt as a tendency of her own. By the time she explains her position to Kamat years later, with the simple sentence "I'm a wife and mother first" (135), the norm no longer needs an enforcer. It has become, in the terms defined by Heidegger, simply 'what one does' which is precisely the levelling process his account of the 'they' describes.

This structure strengthens around the institution of marriage. Vanitamami's advice, "a husband is like a sheltering tree" (33) is often read as a picture of coercion: protection is offered to people in return for dependency. While that interpretation is not entirely wrong, it underestimates what makes the metaphor effective. Jaya is not simply told to depend on Mohan despite her own sense of things; she is offered a world where dependency is presented as a meaningful and safe and intelligible way to inhabit womanhood, and one that promises shelter rather than humiliation. The problem the novel dramatizes is not that women are ordered to depend on men, but that those dependencies are made possible as a coherent and even comforting form of selfhood, and the reason the metaphor survived exposure to Jaya's skepticism for so many years before it began to fail her is because of this. This is what gendered thrownness captures that a cruder account of coercion can't: a possibility can be lived as freely chosen and still be one whose intelligibility had been manufactured in advance.

Thrownness is the concept that makes this pattern analytically visible. Jaya's thrownness is universal in Heidegger's sense: she had no say in the circumstances of her birth. But the content of her thrownness matters, as social structures make certain ways of living familiar while others are hard even to imagine. Gendered thrownness should not be conflated with social determinism. Jaya reads, writes, argues, resents, remembers and judges; not every one of her acts is simply pa-

triarchy's doing. The gendered structure works less like a cause and more like a setting, lending certain kinds of speech an air of sense and others an air of excess, marking certain forms of ambition as reasonable and others as barely conceivable. Thrownness stays philosophically universal in form but is historically unequal in its lived content, and this gap is precisely what a feminist reading of Heidegger needs to keep open rather than resolve.

Boredom, disruption, and the opening of possibility

Before the marital crisis that structures the novel's present, Deshpande gives Jaya a memory that explains how she arrives at that crisis already able to recognize it as one. Reflecting on her earlier life in Churchgate, she admits that she had often found family life unbearable, and that the worst part of it had not been any single event but its repetition:

> The illusion of happiness — yes, I had to let it go. Perhaps the truth is that I was not then remote enough from the scene I was fantasising about to sustain the illusion. Perhaps — who knows? — after some years time may play a disappearing trick with the ugliness and the bickering, leaving only an idyllic picture behind. But then, at that moment, I had to admit the truth to myself — that I had often found family life unendurable. Worse than anything else had been the boredom of the unchanging pattern, the unending monotony. I remember now how often I had sighed for a catastrophe, a disaster, no, not a personal one, but anything to shake us out of our dull grooves.(10)

This passage deserves more theoretical weight than a single mood-word can carry. Boredom, on the reading proposed here, is not simply dissatisfaction with domestic life; it is the mode in which the taken-for-granted structure of everyday existence becomes perceptible as structure. Everydayness, for Heidegger, ordinarily conceals itself: das Man works precisely because its demands do not present themselves as demands. Boredom interrupts that concealment from the inside, without yet offering anything to replace it. Jaya's own account continues in exactly this register: nothing else, she says, had seemed possible "for people like us" (10). The line matters because it shows boredom doing its work before any external crisis arrives; the horizon of her possible life has already narrowed to a single, unquestioned shape, and she can name that narrowing only as tedium, not yet as a structure that could be otherwise.

Jaya's boredom is not yet anxiety in Heidegger's technical sense, and the difference should not be blurred: it does not expose her directly to her own finite possibilities the way the passage on page 232 describes, and it resolves, for years, back into the same unchanging pattern rather than into a genuine confrontation with nothing to hold onto. What boredom does is prepare the disruption that follows so that it can register as a crisis rather than a passing bad patch. When Mohan's professional disgrace forces the couple out of their ordinary domestic setting, the routines that had organized Jaya's sense of who she was, the shopping, the cooking, the arranging of the house, fall away all at once, and what is left, in her words, is that "my own career as a wife was in jeopardy" (27). This is closer to anxiety proper: the familiar intelligibility of her everyday world genuinely collapses, and what she reports is not simple distress but "a curious sense of freedom" (27), the specific mixture of dread and openness Heidegger's account of anxiety individualizing Dasein for its own Being-in-the-world would predict. Boredom, on this account, does not cause the later anxiety; it is what allows Jaya to recognize the collapse of her routine as meaningful rather than merely inconvenient, because she had already, without yet having the concept for it, felt the routine as a structure rather than simply as her life.

The same crisis makes das Man visible as an active force rather than an abstraction. Faced with an image of herself as "nervous, incompetent, needing male help and support" (72), Jaya asks, "how did I get this way?" (72). The question does not free her from the pattern it names, but it does make visible a structure that had been operating invisibly. This is the moment at which

everydayness stops absorbing Jaya without remainder and starts to become an object for her own reflection — the beginning of the movement toward what Heidegger calls resoluteness, though whether Jaya's later movement earns that specific description is a question this article defers until the section on the novel's ending, where the criterion established above (that resoluteness does not detach Dasein from its world) can be applied directly to the textual evidence.

Jaya and Suhasini: the internalization of gendered possibility

The clearest example of this internalization appears in Jaya's account of her two names. "I was Jaya. But I had been Suhasini as well" (20), she recalls, describing Suhasini as "soft, smiling, placid, motherly" (20). The temptation is to read Suhasini as a mask over a more authentic Jaya underneath. The novel resists that reading. Suhasini should not be treated as a disguise concealing a supposedly real Jaya; she is a socially intelligible way of being a woman, and softness, placidity, and accommodation are qualities Jaya's world rewards. Jaya has not simply been performing a false self. She has been living out one of the possibilities her world made available and encouraged, within the limits patriarchy set on what a woman could be.

This account risks making Suhasini sound like nothing but a constraint, a possibility patriarchy simply imposed. The novel is more careful than that, and the reading should be too. Suhasini did not only cost Jaya something; she also gave her something. To be "soft, smiling, placid, motherly" was not only to be diminished but to be legible, competent, and secure within a relational world that recognized and rewarded exactly that performance. Jaya's own description of the identity she later retreats into, a "hole" she can crawl into and feel safe and comfortable in (135), makes the same point from the other direction: the socially available role is not simply a cage. It is also a shelter, and its power over Jaya lies precisely in being both at once.

Mohan's later grief confirms how relational this identity was. When he mourns that "Suhasini was dead" (111), the loss he registers is not only Jaya's transformation but his own loss of the relational identity his marriage had depended on. Suhasini existed between two people, not inside one; her disappearance changes the structure of the relationship itself. This is precisely the point at which Freeman's argument becomes analytically necessary rather than merely supportive: if Dasein's selfhood is inherently relational, Being-with rather than a solitary interior, then Suhasini's dependence on Mohan's recognition of her is not a departure from authentic selfhood but consistent with what selfhood always is on Heidegger's own terms, once selfhood is read the way Freeman reads it. Philosophically, the question is therefore not which name is the real Jaya. Both names come from the world into which Jaya was thrown, so the more useful question is whether she can learn to treat these identities as available possibilities rather than as claims about a fixed essence.

Silence, writing, and the cost of possibility

Silence carries no single meaning in That Long Silence. Reflecting on a story Mohan tells her about his own mother's suffering, Jaya concludes that the woman's silence had been "the only weapon. Silence and surrender" (38). Vimala, Mohan's sister, dies with "her silence intact" (40), her reasons for concealing her illness never explained. Rahul's inability to say what he wants is eventually what "catapulted" him "into open revolt" (49). Sarla Palkar's reading of the novel's silences as a spectrum running from protection to resistance to punishment already establishes this multiplicity at the level of theme. What existing readings of the novel's silence have not asked is the question that matters here: not what silence does across these different women, but what is structurally different about Jaya's own silence, the one the novel's title names.

The answer is that Jaya's silence, unlike Kusum's, Vimala's, or Rahul's, is not initially experienced as silence at all. For most of the novel it functions as unexamined absorption, something closer to Heideggerian everydayness than to a deliberate withholding of speech. Jaya does not, for most of her marriage, feel herself to be silent; she feels herself to be behaving normally. Silence

becomes visible to her as silence, as one live option among others rather than simply the shape of her days, only once the marital crisis has already disrupted her everyday absorption elsewhere.

Jaya's abandonment of her own writing shows this shift most clearly. After Mohan reacts with hurt rather than anger to a story she has published, asking her how she "could have done it" (Deshpande 131), Jaya stops writing, not because he forbids it, but because his hurt is harder to argue with than his anger would have been. Years later, confronting a file of rejected manuscripts, she admits to herself that Mohan was never really the reason she stopped:

> And then it was all done and with the returning silence the truth came to me. I hadn't stopped writing because of Mohan; I could not possibly make Mohan the scapegoat for my failures, for I had written even after that confrontation with him — stories that had been rejected, stories that had come back to me, stories that I had hidden here in this house.(132)

Kamat tells her plainly that her writing lacks the anger she clearly feels, and that the excuse she gives him, "I'm a wife and mother first" (135), is exactly what is keeping her from writing honestly. Her eventual decision that she "will have to erase the silence" between herself and Mohan (174) is not the discovery of some pure voice she had been suppressing all along; that reading would undercut this article's own argument that authenticity is not the recovery of an essential self. It marks the point at which silence, for the first time, becomes visible to Jaya as a choice rather than an unquestioned condition — the same movement from absorbed everydayness to a more explicit relation to possibility traced since the discussion of boredom.

Authenticity without emancipation

By the novel's close, Jaya arrives at an image of her marriage that replaces her earlier one of two bullocks yoked together: she begins to see, instead, "so many crossroads, so many choices" (173). The final line of the novel, "life has always to be made possible" (175), extends this image of possibility toward something close to Heidegger's account of Dasein's constant projection toward what it might yet become. As the earlier distinction between possibility and choice established, this language of crossroads is evidence of a changed relation to possibility, not proof that Jaya has simply exercised a choice she previously lacked.

Whether that changed relation amounts to Heideggerian resoluteness can now be tested against the criterion set out earlier: resoluteness "does not detach Dasein from its world, nor does it isolate it so that it becomes a free-floating 'I' " (Heidegger 344). On that criterion, Jaya's ending is a stronger candidate for resoluteness than for any reading built on departure or rupture. She does not leave Mohan. She does not renounce the roles of wife and mother. What she does is refuse to keep automatically supplying "the answer I know he wants" (174), and commit herself instead to speech she had previously withheld. If resoluteness names anything in this novel, it names that refusal together with that commitment, not any change in her external circumstances. But the criterion cuts both ways: resoluteness, on Heidegger's own account, is a fully realized mode of authentic disclosedness, and the novel does not show enough of what follows Jaya's decision to say with confidence that she has reached it rather than merely turned toward it.

A before-and-after comparison makes the shift concrete rather than asserted. Before the crisis, Jaya explains herself to Kamat saying "I would pattern myself after them" (79); she cannot answer what she wants even hypothetically when asked (Deshpande 28); she offers "I'm a wife and mother first" (135) as a sufficient account of her own limits; and she manages Mohan by supplying the answer he wants in advance. After the crisis, she recognizes "so many crossroads, so many choices" (174) where she had once seen a single determined path; she commits to eradicating the silence between herself and Mohan, rather than managing to continue it; and she withholds the automatic answer she knows he wants, even though the narrative does not show her replacing it by

another. This last detail is important. The novel gives strong evidence of Jaya's changed relation to her own possibilities and very little evidence of what she will now do with that changed relation. This gap is not a weakness in this reading, it is the novel's own reticence and the argument should preserve it rather than resolving it on the novel's behalf. The ending permits a Heideggerian reading as movement toward a more explicit relation to possibility, but it does not supply enough to equate that movement with completed authenticity, much less with emancipation.

Authenticity, in Heidegger's sense, does not guarantee outcomes that would be socially desirable by any independent standard, and recognizing a possibility is not the same as having the social conditions needed to live inside it. Jaya's new awareness does not on its own afford her economic independence, a different distribution of household labor, or an escape from the expectations that had structured her life. Her awareness of possibility has expanded; the material and social conditions of her life have not undergone a matching change. Authenticity names the first fact; feminist critique names the second. The two are complementary descriptions of the same ending, as well as competing verdicts on it. This distinction, having been established here with textual evidence, does not need to be re-argued in what follows.

Toward a feminist reconception of authenticity

The problem in the conventional application of Heidegger to Jaya is not that his categories fail to describe her. They describe real features of her existence, because Dasein is Being-in-the-world, thrown, everyday, and oriented towards possibility regardless of gender. The problem is that these ontological categories need further specification once applied to a socially differentiated world, and that specification requires assigning each feminist theorist a precise task rather than treating them as a general chorus of agreement.

Beauvoir's most quoted claim, that “one is not born, but rather becomes, woman” (Beauvoir 295), is often read simply as a claim about gender construction. Its more precise philosophical use here is narrower: it establishes that woman's situation is produced rather than given, which supports the distinction this article has drawn between ontological possibility and possibility that is socially and materially available. Jaya's world does not simply describe womanhood to her; it manufactures her as a particular kind of woman through the pattern of instruction traced in the section above, which is exactly the becoming Beauvoir's claim names.

Young's analysis of what she calls inhibited intentionality gives this becoming a bodily register. Young argues that a woman performing a task “projects the possibilities of that task — thus projects an ‘I can’ — but projects them merely as the possibilities of ‘someone,’ and not truly her possibilities” (Young 141). The qualification matters: the possibility is present, even nameable, but it is not fully hers to inhabit. This is a more embodied version of the same gap between intelligibility and availability that structures Jaya's situation. Gendered thrownness is not only discursive, a matter of what Jaya is told; it is also habitual, a matter of how she moves through her own kitchen and her own marriage without needing to be told anything at all, which is why the domestic detail the novel records at such length is not merely setting but evidence.

Ahmed's account of orientation supplies the third piece. She writes that “bodies take shape as they move through the world”, directing themselves toward some objects and possibilities and not others, and that “some spaces extend certain bodies and simply do not leave room for others” (Ahmed). Used narrowly, this explains why some possibilities feel like paths already laid out for Jaya (wifehood, motherhood, the sheltering tree) and others feel like they must be cut from nothing (writing, anger, the plain question of what she wants). This is the phenomenon behind Jaya's difficulty in answering what she wants: it is not that the possibility of wanting something for herself is forbidden outright, but that her world has not extended itself to make that possibility a familiar path. Ahmed does not herself develop anything like gendered thrownness; the term is this article's own, brought into dialogue with her account of orientation rather than derived from

it.

Freeman's relational reading of Heideggerian selfhood does the philosophical work, established above, of showing that Dasein's authenticity was never meant to describe an isolated individual, which is what makes Suhasini's existence between two people, rather than inside one, compatible with rather than opposed to Heideggerian authenticity. And Knowles's account of das Man and gender does the work of showing that anonymous normativity can carry gendered content without ceasing to be, in Heidegger's own sense, anonymous, the argument this article has relied on throughout to avoid simply equating das Man with patriarchy.

Read together, these five specific contributions support a claim stronger than the general observation that freedom is socially situated, which feminist phenomenology has already established without needing Heidegger's help. The claim this article adds is a three-level model of how gendered thrownness operates. At the first level sits ontological possibility: Dasein exists toward possibilities as such, prior to any social content, as Heidegger's account of Dasein-as-possibility establishes. At the second level sits social intelligibility: a possibility must be recognizable as a possible way of being before a subject can so much as want it, and this is the level at which Jaya's inability to answer what she wants (Deshpande 28) becomes theoretically significant rather than merely poignant, and where Young's and Ahmed's accounts do their most precise work. At the third level sits material and social availability: even a possibility that has become intelligible must be socially and economically livable before it can be sustained, the level Beauvoir's account of situation addresses most directly. Gendered thrownness operates most powerfully at the second level, the level existing feminist phenomenology has least explicitly theorized, because a constraint on what can be wanted is harder to see, and harder to resist, than a constraint on what can be chosen.

Conclusion

That Long Silence does not simply illustrate Heideggerian authenticity; it puts pressure on the concept by showing what happens when the subject under discussion has lived within a world already structured by gendered expectation. Jaya is thrown, absorbed in everyday meanings, shaped by das Man, and oriented toward possibility, but the content of these structures is not neutral. Her thrownness is lived specifically through marriage, motherhood, family duty, and, for most of the novel, a silence she does not yet recognize as a choice.

Gendered thrownness names the resulting tension: thrownness can remain universal at the ontological level while its concrete social content is radically unequal, and das Man can retain its Heideggerian meaning as anonymous normativity even where its lived content is patriarchal. The more specific claim developed here, using verified evidence from Heidegger's own text and from Beauvoir, Young, Ahmed, Freeman, and Knowles, is that this unevenness operates most powerfully before the level of choice, at the level of what a subject can recognize as wantable in the first place.

Jaya's movement at the novel's end is best understood as partial and, on the evidence the novel itself provides, genuinely uncertain in its outcome. She begins to see that the identities she has lived through are not exhaustive. She recognizes crossroads and choices where she had once seen a single determined path. She commits to a kind of speech she had previously withheld. But the novel closes before showing what she does with any of this, and this article has tried not to supply an ending the text withholds. Her changing relation to possibility is real without being identical to emancipation.

To close with the three questions this section can now answer directly: Heidegger helps us see the structure of thrownness, everydayness, and possibility as such. Feminist phenomenology helps us see the unequal social and embodied conditions through which possibilities become intelligible and available, a specification Heidegger's own text leaves underdeveloped. And Jaya's story adds what neither can supply alone: a temporal, affective demonstration of how a possibil-

ity moves from invisibility, to intelligibility, to recognition, to a still-unresolved question of choice. The article does not claim that Jaya becomes liberated. It argues, on the textual and theoretical evidence assembled here, that she begins to inhabit possibility differently.

Limitations

This article is a literary-philosophical interpretation and does not claim to describe the experience of Indian women generally. Gendered thrownness is an analytical term proposed here, not a term found in Heidegger's own text, and the three-level model of possibility is this article's synthesis of resources that do not themselves present it in this form. Jaya's ending has been read as deliberately ambiguous rather than resolved, in keeping with the textual evidence rather than against it. Finally, the article does not claim that Heidegger himself provides, or intended to provide, a feminist theory of gender; it claims only that his structure of thrownness survives, and is clarified by, being read alongside one.

Works Cited

Ahmed, Sara. Queer Phenomenology: Orientations, Objects, Others. Duke University Press, 2006.

Beauvoir, Simone de. The Second Sex. Translated by Constance Borde and Sheila Malovany-Chevallier, Vintage Books, 2011.

Bhat, Kamalakar. "Embedded Imagination and Otherness in Shashi Deshpande's That Long Silence." Intersections: Gender and Sexuality in Asia and the Pacific, no. 22, Oct. 2009.

Deshpande, Shashi. That Long Silence. Penguin Books India, 1989.

Freeman, Lauren. "Reconsidering Relational Autonomy: A Feminist Approach to Selfhood and the Other in the Thinking of Martin Heidegger." Inquiry, vol. 54, no. 4, 2011, pp. 361–383. DOI: 10.1080/0020174X.2011.592342.

Heidegger, Martin. Being and Time. Translated by John Macquarrie and Edward Robinson, Blackwell, 1962.

Holland, Nancy J., and Patricia Huntington, editors. Feminist Interpretations of Martin Heidegger. Pennsylvania State University Press, 2001.

Jain, Jasbir. Gendered Realities, Human Spaces: The Writing of Shashi Deshpande. Rawat Publications, 2003.

Kapoor, Maninder, and Seema Singh. "[After] That Long Silence: A Feminist Narratological Study of Shashi Deshpande." Journal of Postcolonial Cultures and Societies, vol. 3, no. 2, 2012, pp. 63–92.

Knowles, Charlotte. "Rethinking Being and Time as a Resource for Feminist Philosophy." Heidegger's Being and Time: A Critical Guide, edited by Aaron James Wendland and Tobias Keiling, Cambridge University Press, 2025, pp. 103–124. DOI: 10.1017/9781108865579.007.

Palkar, Sarla. "Breaking Silence: Shashi Deshpande's That Long Silence." Indian Women Novelists, edited by R. K. Dhawan, vol. 5, Prestige Books, 1991.

Yadav, Shalini, and Rohitashwani. "The Silent Struggle for Self-Discovery: Patriarchy and Feminine Identity in Shashi Deshpande's That Long Silence." Feminist Theology, vol. 34, no. 2, 2026, pp. 169–177.

Young, Iris Marion. On Female Body Experience: "Throwing Like a Girl" and Other Essays. Oxford University Press, 2005.