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Virginia Woolf (1882-1941) is not only a great modernist writer, but also the founder of western feminist literary criticism. Though not the first to protest against the sexual prejudice and social and cultural exclusion women have suffered in the patriarchal west, she is certainly the first to set out to establish a new specific field of literary studies: feminism. As "the alpha and omega of feminist criticism, its origin and its 'goal'," [1] her decisive role in the development of western feminism can never be overestimated.

All of Woolf's fictional works bear perfect manifestation of her critical views about history, society, culture, literature and art, but most of her literary theories are contained in her non-fictions. Her canonical [2] _A Room of One's Own_ (1829) [3] is widely considered "the first modern text of feminist criticism, the model in both theory and practice of a specific socialist feminist criticism." [4] It is the inspirational...
source for the fundamental queries of a female literary tradition and the historicized, politicized and gendered 2nd-wave Women's Movement in the last century, and is also much appreciated in the present post-modernist or post-feminist time.

The paper here intends to re-read ROO for a revision of Woolf's critique of the patriarchal culture, her proposal of (re)construction of a female literary history and establishment of a specific and distinctively female literature, and her advocacy of the aesthetic of androgyny.

1. A Female Literary Tradition

Little doubt, Woolf's feminist literary theory is built upon an angry protest and denunciation of the patriarchal social and cultural system. In ROO, the outcome of her two lectures in Cambridge on the topic of "Women and Fiction," she points out that western history so far has been the history of the patriarchy, a history written by men about men and for men, in which women have played no part except as helpless dependents, or "looking-glasses possessing the magic and delicious power of reflecting the figure of man at twice its natural size". As daughter, wife or mother, they have no equal rights and no economic independence, and their right to personal property came to them only recently. No matter how gifted and capable they may be, they are denied the classic education their brothers enjoy; they have no chance to go out of home to participate in the wider social life, let alone develop a professional career. For centuries they have been confined to the very limited sphere of domestic life, to be trained after the traditional model of femininity, i.e. "Angel in the House," and to bury themselves in the endless trivial housework, with no money, no rest, no private space, and no chance for self-realization. If any of them wishes to step beyond the set role, she is considered insane, monstrous, to be suppressed and cursed by men and shunned by her own sex.

To illustrate her point, Woolf makes up a story of Judith Shakespeare, supposedly the sister to the great Elizabethan playwright. Judith is as intelligent as her brother, also full of adventurous spirit and rich imagination, but she is not sent to school, as her brother is, to learn grammar and logic. The best she can do is to steal a few looks at her brother's books between her patching work and cooking. Sometimes she would scribble down a few lines and then hide them away. When her brother goes to London and becomes a great dramatist, she is to be engaged to a neighboring wool merchant's son. Beaten up by her father because she rejects the arranged marriage, she decides to run away to London and make an acting career as
her brother has done before. But everybody laughs at her dream. Moreover, she is
impregnated by the theatre agent. Finally she dies and is buried at crossing roads.
Obviously, the story is a miniature of the pathetic life of women, esp. women of
talent and ambition, in the old days.

Besides the patriarchal sexual prejudice and repression, Woolf also relates
women’s absence from the British literary history to the fact that western culture
and literature have always been controlled and judged by the single masculine or
patriarchal standard, which otherizes women as the weaker and inferior sex, and
denies them of the intelligence and creativity required for literary composition. She
refutes Arnold Bennett’s claim that “no amount of education and liberty of action
will sensibly alter the fact that women are inferior to men in intellectual power”[7]
and illustrates her point with historical facts and specific cases to prove that women
in the past could not leave a record in history because they didn’t have the condition
(time and space) to write and were not allowed to, and their works didn’t receive
fair judgment from the male critics. During the Renaissance time, she argues, the
few upper-class ladies who dared to join the poetic choir were either petted for mere
private amusement, or ostracized as maniac. As for women writers of popular
fiction in the 18th century, they were slighted and ignored because they were
supposedly off the main realist trend. And in the 19th century, such famous women
writers as Jane Austen, the Brontë sisters and George Eliot, despite their obvious
talent for narration, still had the problem of making literary writing an honorable
career, and for fair judgment they were forced to hide their sexual identity behind a
male name.

So, to conclude her critique of the patriarchal confinement and repression of
women and women’s literature, Woolf makes the most famous statement: “[A] woman
must have money and a room of her own if she is to write fiction,” and “that
it is necessary to have five hundred a year and a room with a lock on the door if you
are to write fiction or poetry.”[8]

The proposed requirement or standard is accused of being too exclusive and
middle-class in ideology by the contemporary American feminist theorist and
scholar Elaine Showalter[9]. The charge is justified in a way, for the suggested
prerequisite for writing seems to deny the writings of the working women who have
been able to snatch a minute or two from their daily drudge in and outside the house
and scribble down a few lines or a paragraph in their diaries or notebooks. And yet,
the exclusiveness of the middle-class ideology found in Woolf’s theory is not
without its reasons. Firstly, the writing experience Woolf has gathered from her research into the past records shows that almost all the women writers by then have been educated—whether through self-study or tutorship at home, or by attending public schools—and of middle-class or upper middle-class. Secondly, the emphasis of economic independence, in the form of a room of one’s own, is indeed most fundamental to literary creation. To borrow a Marxist economic-historic concept, economy is the basis for the superstructure of ideology. "Intellectual freedom depends upon material things. Poetry depends upon intellectual freedom." Here is a reason why Woolf is said to have restrained herself from participating in the feminist activist events of the time. To her, the suffrage, important as it is, comes not as urgent as property ownership and the right to heritage. Women who live in rooms that belong to men have no independence and freedom to stand them up as equal and dignified beings. And the income of 500 pound a year is not an exact figure to distinguish people in terms of social status, but a symbol of independence and freedom. And finally, the room itself means not only a space; it is a metaphorical reference to a state of complete independence and freedom, where a woman can return to her real self, where she can feel, think and act as she likes without considering her own position and sex. Only in such a state of absolute independence and freedom can one create really great literature, Woolf believes. So, the statement is not the social discrimination of a privileged middle-class lady, but the social and sexual politics of a cool-minded and rational materialist, as well as the idealized aesthetic of a literary elite.

After an angry run-over of the hardships, fears, inhibitions and struggles previous British women writers have experienced, Woolf says, "It would be ambitious beyond my daring, I thought, looking about the shelves for books that were not there, to suggest to the students of those famous colleges that they should re-write history." Hence, for the first time in the feminist literary history, the sacred mission for Women’s Movement is set down: to restore the roles women have played in history, to (re)construct a literary history of women and discover a female literary tradition. She calls the audience’s attention to the importance of the tradition of women’s literature, claiming, "[W]e think back through our mothers if we are women," and "Women’s writing continues each other." Not only the designer of the great campaign, Woolf herself is also the first female literary historian and critic. She frequents the libraries of the State and famous universities in search of the record of previous women’s writing. To her
disappointment, information is nearly naught about women writers before the 17th century. Probably due to the limited source of her research then, Woolf somehow makes a mistake about the Renaissance women’s writing, and her mistake has to wait until a few decades after her death when modern feminist critics and scholars carry on the mission of (re)constructing a women’s literary history. They not only fill up the blank pages she leaves about the earlier periods, but also rescue from the 18th-century records and onwards hundreds of popular women writers out of obscurity and anonymity. Quite a lot of anthologies on women’s literature in English have been published, and they get thicker with each revision as more writings in different genres by women are unearthed from the forgotten corners of history: diaries or journals, letters, pamphlets, essays, poetry, and fiction, esp. sentimental and gothic novels. Of the many anthologies published in the 20th century, The Norton Anthology of Women’s Literature (W.W. Norton and Company, 1996) edited by Sandra M. Gilbert and Susan Gubar, The Longman Anthology of Women’s Literature (Longman, 2000) edited by Mary K. DeShazer, The Prentice Hall Anthology of Women’s Literature (Pearson Education, 1999) edited by Deborah H. Holdstein, and Women’s Worlds: The McGraw-Hill Anthology of Women’s Writing in English Across the Globe (McGraw-Hill Higher Education, 2007) edited by Robyn Warhol-Down, Diane Price Herudl, are among the best known and most read texts and references to feminist scholars and students.

The increasing findings and discoveries in women’s literary history bring to people’s mind a totally different picture of the past publishing business and readership. And reading today’s tremendous “archeological” findings of female writing, we can’t help thinking of Woolf. So, it is no exaggeration to say, western women’s literary history owes its existence to her.

II. A Literature of Their Own

In her analysis of the causes of women’s exclusion from the historical record, the hardships and fears of women writers, and the difficulties of historical (re)construction, Woolf reveals the patriarchal sexual prejudice and repression as primary and fundamental. She suggests, that to be able to write, women must, first of all, kill the “Angel in the House,” i.e. break away both in ideology and actual life from the conventional confinement and self-renunciation patriarchy has forced upon them. Or, as she claims in “Professions for Women”, “Had I not killed her, she
would have killed me. She would have plucked the heart out of my writing! If I had not killed her — Angel in the House —, she would have killed me.”[16]

The other cause or difficulty confronting women writers is that they don’t have a ready literary tradition or standard to follow. On one hand, as most of the women writers of the past have been written “out” of record, there is no written history women can claim for themselves. So, they must (re)construct one by unearthing the buried, ignored and forgotten historical ruins. On the other hand, women don’t have a specific and independent literary criterion for the judgment of their literature, and they are seldom entitled to judge.[17] That’s why they have often been belittled by male critics and excluded from the literary canon. Such repression of the patriarchal cultural hegemony, in Woolf’s opinion, is the biggest obstacle to women’s literature, for in the literary arena it has been men who have the say or discourse, and their value system decides everything.

In her letter to New Statesmen on October the 16th, 1920, Woolf refutes Desmond MacCarthy’s defence of Arnold Bennet’s remark about women’s intellectual and creative inferiority, concluding her argument in the following statements:

But it is not education only that is needed. It is that women should have liberty of experience; that they should differ from men without fear and express their difference openly (for I do not agree with Affable Hawk that men and women are alike); that all activity of the mind should be encouraged that there will always be in existence a nucleus of women who think, invent, imagine and create as freely as men do, and with as little fear of ridicule and condescension. [18]

In ROO, she reiterates her idea of sexual differences in a more affirmative tone: “...it is obvious that the values of women differ very often from the values which have been made by the other sex,”[19] because “the nerves that feed the brain would seem to differ in men and women, and if you are going to make them work their best and hardest, you must find out what treatment suits them.”[20] She feels strongly that “both in life and in art the values of a woman are not the values of a man.”[21]

And speaking of women’s creativity and its exclusion from history, she protests with an angry eloquence:

For women have sat indoors all these millions of years, so that by this time the very walls are permeated by their creative force, which has, indeed, so overcharged the capacity of
bricks and mortar that it must needs harness itself to pens and brushes and business and politics. But this creative power differs greatly from the creative power of men. And one must conclude that it would be a thousand pities if it were hindered or wasted, for it was won by centuries of the most drastic discipline, and there is nothing to take its place. It would be a thousand pities if women wrote like men, or lived like men, or looked like men, for if two sexes are quite inadequate, considering the vastness and variety of the world, how should we manage with one only? Ought not education to bring out and fortify the differences rather than the similarities? For we have too much likeness as it is, and if an explorer should come back and bring word of other sexes looking through the branches of other trees at other skies, nothing would be of greater service to humanity. [22]

Here, by defending women's distinctive experience, imagination and productivity, by emphasizing the differences between the two sexes, Woolf makes a declaration of independence of women's literature from the patriarchal tradition and launches the campaign for a women's literature.

Meantime, Woolf makes a point to expose the sexual prejudice of the patriarchal critical authority, which has either ignored or undervalued women writers simply because they are women and not professional enough. For instance, the male critics have found fault with Jane Austen's work for its narrative obsession with the daily trivial rather than the great social and historical events like the war. They just don't think women are capable of serious literary creation. So, Woolf tells her audience that if they are to write as independent and equal beings, they must accept the sexual difference and realize that they have a value system and life pattern different from men's, and that their very existence depends on their difference from, rather than similarity with, men. In other words, to achieve equality and independence, women must create a literature of their own. Instead of following the male literary tradition and critical criterion, they should lay down their own critical standard and establish their own literary tradition on the basis of the writings of their "mothers". Like Mary Carmichael [23], they should cast aside the male tradition and defy the conventional rules; they should express their true self by writing about what is closest to their interest, i.e. their own experiences, where a small dialogue or ball scene is often more important than the war. And since literary discourse, such as genre, structure and language, is man-made, women should create a style or genre that is distinctively female and choose words proper for their emotional needs and literary or ideological purpose. In her opinion, women's literature should be unconventional, typical of and distinctive with women's characteristics and
experiences, rich in imagination, vivid in image, true to life, and at the same time contradictory, complicated and pluralistic in perspectives.

Woolf herself has brought the idea to her own literary creation, where she experiments with different techniques and various literary genres or forms of narration in order to present the trivial ordinariness and the complicated emotional and psychological experiences of women. Her fictions are all intended to demonstrate a competence or perfection pertaining only to women. What she has managed to achieve in fictional experiments is of great significance to both feminism and modern or post-modern literature. As Pamela Caughie says in *Virginia Woolf and Postmodernism: Literature in Quest and Question of Itself*: "Woolf raised many of the feminist and poststructuralist critical issues that have subsequently emerged as such. Her formal experiments resulted in what many have come to call a postmodern narrative practice, as well as in a feminist textual politics."[24] And Woolf’s proposal of a literature of women’s own has later been enthusiastically responded to by the 2nd-wave feminist writers and echoed in such famous postmodern French feminist theories as Kristeva’s semiotic abject and histories and Hélène Cixous’s concept of “écriture feminine”. And even her *ROO* is regarded as a model of deconstructive defiance against the traditional objective and rational argument.

**III. The Aesthetic of Androgyny**

Woolf is, as discussed above, a firm believer in the continuity of a female literary tradition and the necessity of a sexed creativity. Yet her ultimate goal is not to set up something to counteract or replace the powerful patriarchal literature, but to transcend “the tyranny of sex.”[25] In *ROO*, she makes clear and public her own aesthetic standpoint.

Defining the androgynous nature of the perfect human mind as two opposite and sexed presiding powers working in harmony, Woolf describes the relation in the following simple statements:

[1]In the man’s brain the man predominates over the woman, and in the woman’s brain the woman predominates over the man. The normal and comfortable state of being is that when the two live in harmony together, spiritually co-operating. If one is a man, still the woman part of his brain must have effect; and a woman also must have intercourse with the man in her.[26]
What she describes as a androgynous mind is a state of mind, a “moment of being”, where the two sides of masculinity and femininity come together into “a natural fusion” and enter a state of balanced wholeness and complete freedom. In Woolf’s opinion, it is only in such a state of mind, only when the artist is free from or goes beyond all the confinements, political, economic, social, cultural as well as sexual, and is entirely at ease with the unconscious real self, can great art be produced. She denies a purely masculine or feminine mind of true value and longevity, and speaks highly of androgyny, saying “that the androgynous mind is less distinguishing than the single-sexed mind; that the androgynous mind is resonant and porous; that it transmits emotion without impediment; that it is naturally creative, incandescent and undivided.”

She warns her audience against sexed thinking and reasoning:

[It] is fatal for anyone who writes to think of their sex. It is fatal to be a man or woman pure and simple; one must be woman-manly or man-womanly. It is fatal for a woman to lay the least stress on any grievance; to plead even with justice any cause; in any way to speak consciously as a woman, ... Some collaboration has to take place in the mind between the woman and the man before the art of creation can be accomplished. Some marriage of opposites has to be consummated. The whole of the mind must lie wide open if we are to get the sense that the writer is communicating his experience with perfect fullness. There must be freedom and there must be peace. ... for anything written with that conscious bias is doomed to death.

To better convince the audience, Woolf enlists Samuel Coleridge as authoritative support and refers to Shakespeare, as well as a few others, as an example of androgynous mind, truly great mind, which “is fully fertilized and uses all its faculties when fusion of the two sides takes place.” And she relates to the personal experience of perfect collaboration of the mind as she watches a man and a woman coming together and getting into a taxi.

The core of Woolf’s androgynous aesthetic is, of course, sexual transcendence. While allowing sexual differences — biologically and socially or culturally — its inevitability in real life, she is opposed to the simplistic emphasis of sexual differences and exclusiveness, or single-sexedness, and is skeptical of all sexual branding. On several occasions, she questions the patriarchal sexual and cultural connotations of the word “womanhood”, a key concept for feminist studies which is
to be fully expounded and defined twenty years later by the French feminist philosopher Simone de Beauvois in *The Second Sex* (1949). Neither does she approve of the concept of sexual duality or binary structure upon which traditional western philosophy is built. In her lectures, she ridicules the absurd dual structure of the western phallocentrism, saying, “All this pitting of sex against sex, of quality against quality; all this claiming of superiority and imputing of inferiority belongs to the private-school stage of human existence.” The real world, she believes, is far more sophisticated than the simplistic duality of man vs. woman, or male vs. female. In her own fiction, she undermines and subverts the conventional concept of sex, and makes sexual difference a question, as in *Orlando*, portrays the complicated, uncertain nature of sexual identity, as in *Mrs. Dalloway* and *Night and Day*, and explores the difficulty as well as the possibility of the ideal of androgynous being, as in *To the Lighthouse*. Her androgynous mind allows her to look at the sexual problems with a more objective profundity and keener insight, and her ever-changing, ambiguous and pluralistic perspective enables her to transcend not only her sex, but also her time.

Nevertheless, androgyny, ideal as it is, is not an easy state of mind to achieve, especially in Woolf’s time when women were still struggling for the basic rights to vote, to occupation and to higher education. If some of us find Elaine Showalter’s critical remark about Woolf’s androgyny a bit too pointblank and harsh, Woolf’s own words confirm its truth. She confesses the difficulty to her audience, saying, “And if it be true that it is one of the tokens of the fully developed mind that it does not think specially or separately of sex, how much harder it is to attain that condition now than ever before.” The confession brings to our mind the conflict between Woolf’s ideal of perfect art and the conventional approach the male critics expect her to take; it sharpens our awareness of the agonies and anxieties she has to constantly live and struggle with before her suicidal walk to River Ouse.

Fortunately, the value of androgynous aesthetic Woolf proposes stays. Though some traditional or radical feminists may have been disconcerted or displeased by the seeming self-contradiction between her feminist aesthetic and androgynous aesthetic, between her loyalty to and deviation from Women’s Movement, Woolf’s sex-transcendent aesthetic of androgyny is applauded as deconstructive by contemporary critics like Toril Mois and Rachel Bowlby, and her concerns for sexual or gender identity, as well as homosexual relations are now continued by post-feminist cultural studies.
Conclusion
The role Virginia Woolf has played in the development of the western feminist literary criticism is irreplaceable, and the contribution she has made to women's emancipation and to the humanistic ideal of basic rights, dignity, democracy and equality is eternal.

Now, almost 70 years since her death, her works—fiction or non-fiction—are still in great demand in bookshops and university classrooms throughout the world. Today, many post-feminist scholars and critics in the west find themselves standing closer to Virginia Woolf than to their immediate 2nd-wave predecessors in central concerns and critical views. Even though there won't be another revival\(^3\) of Woolfian studies, her name and position in the history of the western feminist literary criticism will never change. She will continue to be the subject of study. As Toril Moi suggests in her _Sexual/Textual Politics_ (1985), feminist criticism should "do both justice and homage to its great mother and sister: this, surely, should be our goal."\(^3\) To achieve the goal, we should at least "pay her the compliment of a searching regard, a careful analysis"\(^3\) by a re-reading of her works now and again.
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