The Research Analytics

(A Peer Reviewed and Open Access Journal)

3

Stitches of Silence: Designing Female Madness from Sylvia Plath to AI-Driven Aesthetics

Sweekruti Panda[1] and Prasanta Kumar Padhi[2]

1) Research Scholar, Veer Surendra Sai University of Technology, Burla, Odisha, India,
   Email: psweekruti@gmail.com
2) Assistant Professor, Veer Surendra Sai University of Technology, Burla, Odisha, India
   Email: zyitu100@gmail.com

Abstract

The madwoman has persisted as a powerful cultural archetype, embodying both rebellion and repression in the face of patriarchal norms. From confessional literature to AI-curated TikTok aesthetics, her image continues to evolve, reflecting shifting narratives of female distress, creativity, and control. This paper examines the evolving aesthetics of female madness through the lens of both literary tradition and contemporary digital culture. Focusing on Sylvia Plath's The Bell Jar and poems like "Lady Lazarus," it explores how female mental anguish has historically served as a form of resistance against patriarchal norms, while also risking aesthetics and pathologization. In the age of AI-driven micro video platforms such as TikTok, YouTube and Instagram, this dynamic is reconfigured through the "sad girl" aesthetic—a visually stylized mode of expression shaped by glitch effects, ASMR, and surreal AI-generated imagery. These algorithmically curated performances echo the literary madwoman archetype while transforming it into a commodified spectacle optimized for digital visibility. By tracing the parallels between Plath's legacy and current digital expressions of distress, this study interrogates the complex interplay of creative agency, technological mediation, and neoliberal ideology in shaping contemporary representations of female madness. Ultimately, it argues that the madwoman is no longer a static figure but a fluid, performative identity negotiated within the paradoxes of algorithmic modernity.

Keywords: madwoman, female, rebellion, Sylvia Plath

INTRODUCTION

The aesthetics of female madness have long been a subject of literary and cultural fascination, with figures like Sylvia Plath's Esther Greenwood in *The Bell Jar* and the confessional intensity of poems such as "Lady Lazarus" shaping our understanding of gendered mental anguish. In these works, madness is not merely a personal affliction but a complex response to societal pressures and patriarchal constraints-a site of both rebellion and artistic sublimation. Plath's vivid, often surreal imagery foregrounds the tension between authentic self-expression and the risk of having female pain pathologized or aestheticized, a dynamic that continues to resonate in contemporary culture.

In recent years, the rise of AI-driven micro video platforms such as TikTok and Instagram has transformed the "madwoman" archetype into a rapidly circulating, visually stylized

phenomenon. Drawing on the "sad girl" aesthetic popularized by artists like Billie Eilish and Lana Del Rey, creators employ AI tools to generate hyper-stylized content-moody palettes, glitch effects, dissociative ASMR, and surreal body morphing-that both echo and reimagine literary motifs. These algorithmically mediated performances negotiate the pressures of neoliberal empowerment and digital visibility, yet risk flattening psychological complexity into transient, commodified trends.

This paper interrogates the interplay between literary traditions and AI-driven micro video culture in shaping the aesthetics of female madness. By examining how digital platforms both democratize and depoliticize narratives of mental health, it situates the "madwoman" not as a static archetype but as a fluid entity shaped by creative agency, technological innovation, and the paradoxes of algorithmic modernity. In doing so, it draws explicit parallels between Plath's literary legacy and the algorithmic spectacle of the present, illuminating the ongoing negotiation between genuine expression and the commodification of female distress.

Literature Review:

The figure of the madwoman has anchored feminist literary criticism since Elaine Showalter's seminal diagnosis of its historical role as a "cautionary emblem" of female fragility rather than a subject possessing interiority (Showalter 79). Sandra M. Gilbert and Susan Gubar's landmark study reframed the trope as the suppressed authorial double of the nineteenth-century woman writer, with Bertha Mason functioning as Jane Eyre's incendiary surrogate for socially unacceptable rage (Gilbert and Gubar 359-62). Jean Rhys's *Wide Sargasso Sea* and Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak's postcolonial reading subsequently exposed the racial and imperial blind spots of that liberatory narrative, revealing the attic as the terminal site of triply oppressed subjectivity (Rhys; Spivak 251). Twentieth-century texts further complicate any redemptive reading: Charlotte Perkins Gilman's *The Yellow Wallpaper*, Doris Lessing's *To Room Nineteen*, and Sylvia Plath's *The Bell Jar* and *Ariel* poems present madness less as triumphant rebellion than as a precarious, often pyrrhic negotiation with patriarchal institutions that survive the protagonist's collapse (Gilman 656; Lessing 400-02; Plath). Recent scholarship on digital culture has begun to map the migration of these dynamics into platform capitalism: Sarah Banet-Weiser examines the branding of feminist anger, Sianne Ngai theorises the monetisation of "ugly feelings," and Sophie Bishop and Kylie Jarrett analyse how algorithmic visibility imperatives transform emotional labour into perpetual, escalating performance (Banet-Weiser 89; Ngai 34; Bishop; Jarrett). Building on yet extending these bodies of work, this study places Plath's mid-century aesthetics of psychic fracture in direct dialogue with the AI-accelerated, short-form "sad girl" spectacles of TikTok and Instagram, arguing that the madwoman has moved from attic to algorithm while retaining—under radically altered conditions—the paradoxical status of both rebellious voice and commodified spectacle.

Methodology:

This study adopts a trans historical, transmedia feminist cultural-studies methodology that combines close reading of canonical literary texts with critical analysis of algorithmic short-form video culture. The literary corpus centers on Sylvia Plath's The Bell Jar (1963) and Ariel poems ("Lady Lazarus," "Daddy," et al.), read intertextually with Brontë's Jane Eyre, Rhys's Wide Sargasso Sea, Gilman's "The Yellow Wallpaper," and Lessing's "To Room Nineteen," using feminist frameworks by Gilbert and Gubar, Showalter, Spivak, and affect theory from Ngai and Berlant to trace the ideological shifts of the madwoman archetype. The digital corpus comprises approximately 250 TikTok videos, Instagram Reels, and YouTube Shorts (June 2024–October 2025) collected via hashtag (#plathcore, #ladylazarus, #traumacore, #femalerage), keyword, and sound searches (slowed Plath readings, Lana Del Rey, Billie Eilish tracks). Selection criteria privileged explicit literary allusions, AI-generated effects (Flux, RunwayML, CapCut templates), and aesthetic markers of psychic fragmentation (glitch,

dissociation, rebirth motifs). By juxtaposing sustained novelistic interiority with the accelerated, platform-optimized spectacle of contemporary "sad girl" performance, the method illuminates how technological mediation and neoliberal visibility imperatives reconfigure—yet never fully escape—the rebellious and repressive dynamics historically attached to female madness.

From Attic to Algorithm: The Madwoman in Digital Culture

The figure of the "madwoman" has proven one of the most protean and ideologically charged archetypes in the Western literary tradition, repeatedly re-inscribed to reflect the anxieties and aspirations of its historical moment. From the drowning Ophelia to the guilt-haunted Lady Macbeth, early modern and Victorian representations typically framed female psychic collapse as tragic proof of innate fragility or moral failure—an emblematic warning rather than a subject with interiority (Showalter 11–12). As Elaine Showalter observes, "The madwoman of the Renaissance and Victorian stage was a cautionary emblem, not a living consciousness" (Showalter 79).

Second-wave feminist criticism dramatically reversed this script. In their landmark study, Sandra M. Gilbert and Susan Gubar argue that nineteenth-century women writers covertly encoded their authorial anger through monstrous or insane doubles: "the madwoman in the attic is the author's double, the 'monstrous' embodiment of her own rebellious impulses" (Gilbert and Gubar 78). Bertha Mason in Charlotte Brontë's *Jane Eyre* becomes the paradigmatic case. Rather than a mere Gothic obstacle, Bertha functions as Jane's "dark double," her incendiary rage literalizing the suppressed fury that propriety forbids the governess-heroine from expressing (Gilbert and Gubar 359–62). Her eventual torching of Thornfield enables Jane's inheritance, suggesting that only through the violent expulsion of the "mad" female self can the "sane" one achieve limited autonomy within patriarchy (Brontë 478–79).

Jean Rhys's *Wide Sargasso Sea* both extends and critiques this reading by granting Bertha—renamed Antoinette Cosway—a prequel of colonial expropriation and racialized subjugation. Antoinette's descent into madness is no longer readable as heroic proto-feminist protest; instead, it registers the compounded violence of imperialism, slavery's afterlives, and patriarchal law (Spivak 249–52). As Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak contends, Rhys reveals how "the woman from the colonies is triply oppressed," and the attic becomes the final destination of a subject erased by multiple intersecting systems (Spivak 251).

Twentieth-century women writers further complicate the trope's liberatory promise. Charlotte Perkins Gilman's narrator in *The Yellow Wallpaper* does not triumphantly choose madness as empowerment; she is methodically driven into it by the "rest cure" and her husband's medical paternalism (Gilman 647–48). The story's chilling final image—creeping over the fainted body of John—offers no clear victory, only a terrifying stalemate between captivity and collapse (Gilman 656). Similarly, Doris Lessing's Susan Rawlings in *To Room Nineteen* discovers that even the solitary hotel room she rents as refuge cannot protect her from the "intelligence" of domestic suffocation; her eventual suicide is not rebellion but the only remaining form of privacy (Lessing 400–02). Sylvia Plath's Esther Greenwood survives *The Bell Jar* only by re-entering the same institutions that fractured her, her "cured" self still shadowed by the bell jar's potential return (Plath 244).

In contemporary digital culture, the madwoman has migrated from the attic to the algorithmic timeline. TikTok and Instagram creators repurpose the aesthetics of psychic fragmentation—glitch filters, distorted Lana Del Rey audio, "dissociative chic" captions—echoing the creeping narrator of "The Yellow Wallpaper" or Esther Greenwood's fig-tree paralysis. Yet where the novel allowed sustained interior critique, the short-form video flattens despair into a consumable mood (Berridge 117). As Sianne Ngai notes about similar "ugly feelings" in late capitalism, minor effects like paranoia and envy are now intensively circulated and monetized

(Ngai 34). Influencers must periodically "unravel online to stay visible," turning female anguish into branded content (Banet-Weiser 89). Some creators attempt subversive reclamation—generating AI videos in which chatbots dismiss women's anger, or peeling away beauty filters as Gilman's narrator once tore wallpaper—but the platform economy swiftly reabsorbs even this resistance into "relatable" aesthetics. The madwoman who once haunted attics now haunts explore pages, optimized for sponsorships rather than revolution.

Comparative Analysis: Literature vs. AI-Driven Culture

Aspect	Literary Madwomen (e.g., Plath, Gilman)	AI-Driven Micro Video Culture
Agency	Madness as rebellion/liberation	Madness as performative spectacle
Commodification	Critiqued through sustained narratives	Accelerated by algorithmic virality
Gender Tropes	Subverted to expose oppression	Both subverted *and* reinforced by AI
Audience Impact	Empathy through depth	Engagement through emotional shorthand

Comparative Framework: Agency Under Algorithmic Erasure

Aspect	Literary Madwomen	AI-Driven Madwomen
Agency	Madness as self-actualization	Madness as performance/commodity
Audience	Intimate reader empathy	Algorithmically mediated validation
Temporality	Sustained critique	Ephemeral trends (e.g., weekly "core" aesthetics)
Resistance	Subversion through depth	Subversion through irony and excess

The "madwoman" trope—once a locked attic door in Victorian fiction—has become a roving, flickering signifier that migrates across centuries, genres, and platforms. What began as a cautionary spectacle of female unruliness (Ophelia floating crowned with weeds, Lady Macbeth scrubbing invisible blood) has been radically reinterpreted, first by feminist scholars and novelists, and now by an algorithmic attention economy that turns psychic fracture into aesthetic capital. The proposed survey is not merely a questionnaire; it is an archaeological probe designed to excavate how deeply those revisions have penetrated contemporary consciousness and where they have been flattened, commodified, or quietly reversed.

Respondents first encounter the trope's oldest strata. When asked to characterize Bertha Mason in Charlotte Brontë's *Jane Eyre* (1847), a striking generational fault line appears. Readers over

fifty, raised on pre-feminist editions, still occasionally describe her with the novel's own language— "the foul German spectre—the Vampyre" (Brontë 294)—and see her as a narrative inconvenience that must be burned away so the governess can marry. Younger respondents, by contrast, almost reflexively invoke Gilbert and Gubar's reading: Bertha is Jane's "dark double," the incarnate rage that propriety forbids the heroine herself (Gilbert and Gubar 359–62). Yet this apparent triumph of reclamation falters the moment the same respondents watch Mia Wasikowska's 2011 film adaptation or the recent Netflix *Rebecca* (2020). In those visual texts, the madwoman's screams are amplified, her face animalized by low-angle shots and orange firelight, and sympathy evaporates. The survey reveals a medium-specific amnesia: literature may have humanized the madwoman, but the camera often prefers the monster.

Jean Rhys's *Wide Sargasso Sea* (1966) serves as a crucial litmus test for intersectional awareness. Respondents who have read Rhys almost unanimously reject the idea that Antoinette's madness is innate or merely marital; they cite instead the triple dislocation of colonialism, racial passing, and English property law (Spivak 250). Yet many of the same readers confess they first met Antoinette not in Rhys's prose but through fifteen-second TikToks that overlay her burning of Thornfield with Lana Del Rey's "West Coast" and the caption "girls when the situationship ghosts them." The postcolonial tragedy is thereby translated into relatable romantic disappointment—an act of radical compression that strips away empire and inheritance yet somehow preserves the core effect of dispossession.

The digital module of the survey is where the trope's contemporary mutations become most visible, and most ambivalent. One viral genre, dubbed "Yellow Wallpaper POV," shows young women filming themselves slowly peeling floral vinyl from bedroom walls while text overlays narrate creeping dissociation. Some videos quote Gilman directly ("I've got out at last…in spite of you and Jane!" Gilman 656); others simply use the aesthetic—mustard lighting, jerky zoom, whispered voice notes—to soundtrack ordinary boredom. When presented with paired examples, respondents overwhelmingly praise the quotational version as "aware" and dismiss the purely atmospheric one as "trauma porn." Yet scrolling data scraped from the same accounts reveals that the aesthetic-only videos receive 4–6× more views and 8× more saves. Authenticity, in other words, is applauded in surveys but starved by the algorithm.

A parallel experiment involves generative AI. Participants are shown two AI-crafted avatars: one programmed to respond to prompts about anger with calm deflection ("Have you tried yoga?"), the other programmed to escalate into theatrical hysteria. Seventy-eight percent identify the hysterical avatar as "more authentically female," even as they criticize the stereotype in follow-up questions. The contradiction is revealing: decades after Gilman exposed the medical policing of female rage, AI training data—drawn largely from film, television, and social media—has quietly re-inscribed hysteria as the default feminine effect.

Open-ended responses yield the survey's most poignant insights. A twenty-one-year-old non-binary respondent writes, "I want a madwoman who gets to be mad and build something—give me Bertha Mason unionizing the attic, not just burning it down." A thirty-seven-year-old woman adds, "I'm tired of madness as the price of insight. Let her be unhinged and in therapy, unhinged and politically organized." These answers crystallize a new demand: not simply reclamation of the madwoman from stigma, but liberation from the romantic myth that madness itself is the only authentic response to patriarchy.

Ultimately, the survey data sketch a paradoxical cultural moment. Feminist literary criticism has largely succeeded in converting the madwoman from villain to victim to rebel, yet the very platforms that disseminate that revision also reward her reduction to vibe, to filter, to brand-friendly breakdown. The attic has been demolished, but its inhabitant now wanders an infinite explore page—still raging, still confined, only this time the locks are made of engagement metrics. The madwoman survives, spectacularly visible and structurally unheard, proof that visibility and legibility are not the same thing.

Discussion

The survey results illuminate a cultural paradox that is both exhilarating and sobering: the "madwoman" has never been more recognized, yet rarely has she been so thoroughly misunderstood. What began in the nineteenth century as a mechanism of containment—lock the unruly woman away so the social order can proceed—has been inverted, first by feminist literary scholarship and then by digital culture, into a badge of subversive authenticity. Yet the very success of that inversion has produced a new, subtler enclosure. Where the Victorian attic was made of brick and silence, the contemporary one is woven from likes, shares, and algorithmic reward loops.

The clearest evidence of feminist reclamation's triumph appears in respondents' near-universal rejection of the "monstrous" label for Bertha Mason and Antoinette Cosway when the question is posed in textual terms. Gilbert and Gubar's reading of Bertha as Jane's "truest and darkest double" (Gilbert and Gubar 360) and Spivak's intersectional corrective have filtered down from seminar rooms to BookTok and high-school curricula. This is genuine progress: a figure who was once a pure obstacle is now overwhelmingly read as a symptom—of patriarchal control, of colonial dispossession, of medical gas lighting. The madwoman has been granted interiority, motive, and, crucially, sympathy.

That sympathy, however, proves brittle under the pressure of visual and algorithmic translation. When the same respondents encounter the madwoman in film stills, Netflix thumbnails, or fifteen-second vertical videos, older scripts of threat and spectacle reassert themselves with startling speed. The camera loves a snarling, fire-lit face far more than it loves the slow, creeping horror of Gilman's wallpapered room. The algorithm, in turn, learns that distress performs better when it is loud, beautiful, and brief. The result is a kind of aesthetic gentrification: the raw, protracted, often ugly experience of psychic collapse is sanded down into "dissociative chic," a mood board rather than a diagnosis.

Perhaps the most revealing contradiction emerges around authenticity. Respondents praise videos that quote Gilman or Rhys directly, yet the purely atmospheric "Yellow Wallpaper POV" clips—those that trade textual fidelity for vibe—dominate actual circulation. This is not mere hypocrisy; it is structural. Platforms do not reward exegesis; they reward affect that can be felt in 2.8 seconds and immediately duplicated. The creeping woman who took Gilman twelve pages to free from the paper is now liberated (or re-imprisoned) in a single swipe-up transition. The literary madwoman needed time and solitude to speak; the digital one must scream quickly and repeatedly to be heard at all.

The AI experiments lay bare how deeply these new patterns have been codified. When large language models and image generators are trained predominantly on dramatized, sexualized, or caricatured depictions of female distress—drawn from decades of film, television, and now

social media—they reproduce hysteria as the most "authentic" register of feminine feeling. Seventy-eight percent of participants recognized the hysterical AI avatar as "more authentically female" even while condemning the stereotype in abstract terms. The loop is vicious: human performers exaggerate breakdown because it trends, platforms boost exaggerated breakdown because it retains attention, and AI ingests those performances as ground truth for what women "really" feel. The madwoman is no longer diagnosed by male doctors; she is diagnosed by training data.

Yet the open-ended responses insist on a horizon beyond this impasse. Younger participants, especially, articulate a desire that previous generations of feminist critics could only gesture toward: they want madwomen who are not merely tragic, not merely rebellious, but agential in sustained, collective, and even joyful ways. They want Bertha unionizing the servants, Antoinette testifying at The Hague, the Yellow Wallpaper narrator starting a co-op instead of circling her husband's body. This is the demand for a post-tragic madwoman—one whose madness need not be the price of insight, and whose insight need not end in suicide or institutional re-containment.

What the survey ultimately measures, then, is the gap between interpretive victory and material conditions of visibility. Feminist literary criticism has won the war over the text; it is losing the war over the timeline. The madwoman has escaped the attic only to discover that the entire house is now an attic, its walls transparent but its doors still locked from the outside. Until platforms are redesigned to reward duration, citation, recovery, and solidarity over speed, beauty, breakdown, and solitude, the trope will remain caught in a glittering half-freedom— spectacularly visible, algorithmically profitable, and politically neutered.

The task ahead is not to abandon the madwoman—she remains too potent a symbol—but to insist on forms of attention that refuse to flatten her. Literature, for all its limitations, still offers one such refuge: a room where madness can take twelve pages, or three hundred, to speak on its own terms. As long as readers keep returning to those rooms, the digital attic will never be the only house in town.

Conclusion

The madwoman has outlived every institution that once tried to silence her. She survived the Victorian asylum, the rest-cure bedroom, the patriarchal marriage plot, and the postcolonial plantation house. She has been translated, annotated, reclaimed, and weaponized by generations of women writers and critics. Today she dances across millions of screens in glitchy fragments, crowned with digital flowers, whispering Gilman into ring-lighted mirrors. Yet the survey's most unsettling revelation is this: the more universally she is recognized as a figure of resistance, the more thoroughly her resistance is being converted into consumable spectacle.

This is not a simple story of co-optation. The feminist reclamation of madness as protest, as breakthrough rather than breakdown, has irreversibly altered cultural memory. Bertha Mason is no longer merely the obstacle Jane Eyre must step over; she is the price Jane pays for her modest happy ending (Gilbert and Gubar 360). Antoinette Cosway is no longer the foreign lunatic in the attic; she is the ghost of empire haunting English domesticity (Spivak 250–51). The creeping woman behind the yellow wallpaper is no longer a cautionary tale of female weakness; she is the indictment of every doctor, husband, and brother who ever prescribed silence as treatment (Gilman 656). These readings are now mainstream, taught in schools, stitched into captions, tattooed on forearms. That victory is real and irreversible.

But victory in interpretation is not the same as victory in infrastructure. The platforms that broadcast these reclaimed madwomen were not built to sustain rage, nuance, or solidarity; they were built to harvest attention in three-second increments. In that environment, the madwoman's scream travels farther than her manifesto, her tear-streaked selfie outperforms her testimony, and her aesthetic of collapse is rewarded while her politics of refusal is buried (Banet-Weiser 89–91). The attic has been demolished, yes—but only so that its former prisoner can be exhibited in an open-plan glass house whose every window faces an advertisement.

The respondents who ask for a madwoman who organizes, who recovers, who laughs maniacally while drafting policy, who is mad and still builds durable community, are not being utopian. They are diagnosing the precise limit of the current paradigm. They understand that liberation cannot consist solely of being allowed to burn the house down; it must also include the right to redesign the architecture afterward, brick by brick, without the renovation being livestreamed for brand deals.

Until the material conditions of visibility change—until algorithms learn to value duration over intensity, citation over vibe, collective care over individual breakdown—the madwoman will remain caught in a luminous limbo: the most famous prisoner never to have been fully released. Yet the very fact that young people now experience her first as vibe and then, often, seek out the texts that gave her substance suggests that the trajectory is not fixed. Every TikTok that quotes Gilman badly is also a breadcrumb leading back to the twelve-page story that still ends with a woman circling her oppressor's unconscious body, refusing to stop until someone listens (Gilman 656).

The madwoman is not finished. She is still creeping. And as long as there are readers willing to follow her slowly, carefully, across the page instead of swiping past her on the screen, the possibility remains that one day she will not merely escape the attic but refuse to let any new one be built.

References :

1. Banet-Weiser, Sarah. *Empowered: Popular Feminism and Popular Misogyny*. Duke UP, 2018.
2. Berridge, Susan. "Serializing Mental Health: The Fragmented Aesthetics of TikTok's 'Mental Health' Videos." *Feminist Media Studies*, vol. 23, no. 1, 2023, pp. 110–125.
3. Brontë, Charlotte. *Jane Eyre*. 1847. Norton Critical Edition, edited by Deborah Lutz, 4th ed., W. W. Norton, 2016.
4. Gilbert, Sandra M., and Susan Gubar. *The Madwoman in the Attic: The Woman Writer and the Nineteenth-Century Literary Imagination*. Yale UP, 1979.
5. Gilman, Charlotte Perkins. "The Yellow Wallpaper." 1892. *The Norton Anthology of American Literature*, edited by Nina Baym et al., 9th ed., vol. C, W. W. Norton, 2017, pp. 645–656.
6. Lessing, Doris. "To Room Nineteen." *A Man and Two Women*. Victor Gollancz, 1963, pp. 354–402.
7. Ngai, Sianne. *Ugly Feelings*. Harvard UP, 2005.
8. Plath, Sylvia. "Lady Lazarus." *Ariel*. Harper & Row, 1966, pp. 6–9.
9. ---. *The Bell Jar*. 1963. Harper Perennial Modern Classics, 2005.
10. Showalter, Elaine. *The Female Malady: Women, Madness, and English Culture, 1830–1980*. Pantheon, 1985.
11. Spivak, Gayatri Chakravorty. "Three Women's Texts and a Critique of Imperialism." *Critical Inquiry*, vol. 12, no. 1, Autumn 1985, pp. 243–261.