

Diana Nogueira Soares

**Charlotte Brontë and Virginia Woolf: Feminism and
Androgyny**

Dissertação realizada no âmbito do Mestrado em Estudos Anglo-Americanos: Literatura
e Cultura orientada pelo Professor Doutor Jorge Miguel Pereira Bastos da Silva

Faculdade de Letras da Universidade do Porto

Setembro de 2015

Charlotte Brontë and Virginia Woolf: Feminism and Androgyny

Diana Nogueira Soares

Dissertação realizada no âmbito do Mestrado em Estudos Anglo-Americanos: Literatura
e Cultura orientada pelo Professor Doutor Jorge Miguel Pereira Bastos da Silva

Membros do Júri

Professor Doutor Gualter Mendes Cunha
Faculdade de Letras - Universidade do Porto

Professor Doutor Jorge Bastos da Silva
Faculdade de Letras – Universidade do Porto

Professora Doutora Marinela Carvalho Freitas
Faculdade de Letras - Universidade do Porto

Classificação obtida: Valores

Table of Contents	
Agradecimientos	6
Resumo	7
Abstract	8
Introduction	9
Chapter One	23
Charlotte Brontë, the Self and the Double	
The double in literature	23
Charlotte Brontë	23
<i>The Professor</i>	26
The self and the double	27
<i>Jane Eyre</i>	30
The self and the double	31
<i>Shirley</i>	33
The self and the double	33
<i>Villette</i>	36
The self and the double	37
Chapter Two	
Virginia Woolf and Androgyny	
Virginia Woolf	41
Gender and Androgyny	43
<i>A Room of One's Own</i>	45
<i>Orlando</i>	54
Conclusion	62
Bibliography	67

Acknowledgements:

Esta dissertação representa o fim de um ciclo no meu percurso académico e como tal, não poderia deixar de agradecer a quem ajudou a pavimentar o meu caminho,

Ao Prof. Jorge Bastos da Silva, meu orientador;

À Prof. Ana Luísa Amaral, pela inspiração;

À Dta. Marinela Freitas, pelas palavras de apoio e de incentivo;

Aos meus pais, por estarem sempre do meu lado, e por demonstrarem orgulho no meu percurso;

À Catarina, pelo apoio, mental e emocional; por me ter ajudado com o tema para o segundo capítulo; “we are the granddaughters of the witches you didn’t burn.”; por tudo.

Ao Paulo, por estar lá, sempre lá;

Ao Pedro, porque uma tese sobre jardins dava sempre que falar enquanto escrevíamos a tese;

À Sílvia e a Lúcia, por serem das melhores pessoas que já conheci, e por me ajudarem com esta tese, mesmo sem sabendo que o fizeram;

Ao André, pelas palavras de incentivo;

Às minhas pessoas normais, pelo apoio emocional e por me terem conseguido tirar de casa;

À Sofie, minha irmã;

À Luna, pela companhia, carinhos e beijinhos durante as tardes bastante entediadas;

Um muito obrigada a todos e a todas.

Resumo

Esta dissertação irá debruçar-se sobre as autoras Charlotte Brontë e Virginia Woolf, com o objectivo de analisar o contributo de ambas para a causa feminista, assim como o desenvolvimento do ideal andrógono. Através da análise das obras *The Professor*, *Jane Eyre*, *Shirley*, e *Villette*, e *A Room of One's Own* e *Orlando*, respetivamente, tentarei mostrar a luta das mulheres, assim como a de outros humanos que divergem do sistema binário de género, contra o sistema patriarcal.

Palavras-chave: Brontë; Woolf; Feminismo; Androginia; Duplo;

Abstract

This thesis will analyse how Charlotte Brontë and Virginia Woolf contributed to the feminist cause, as well as the development of the androgynous ideal. With the analyses of their works, namely *The Professor*, *Jane Eyre*, *Shirley* and *Villette*, and *A Room of One's Own* and *Orlando*, respectively, I will try to give insight on how women fought against patriarchal restrains, and this fight was also shared by human beings that diverge, even just for a moment, from the socially accepted norms about gender.

Key-words: Brontë; Woolf; Feminism; Androgyny; Double;

Introduction

As said before, this thesis will revolve around Charlotte Brontë, her novels and the figure of the double – which will be developed in the first chapter; and the second chapter will be about Virginia Woolf and androgyny. The aim will be to connect both authors using Feminism, as well as feminist views as glue, and bring to light the struggles women had to undergo in their journey to emancipation. Even though this thesis will give insight on most of the claims for equality, it will primarily focus on women writers. This introduction will give the necessary background to understand both authors, and the times in which they lived – Victorianism and Early Twentieth Century; and the conclusion will try to sum up and answer the questions raised through the thesis, as well as also raise some questions about the future of humanity.

The Victorian Era formally begins in 1837 with the coronation of Queen Victoria and ends in 1901 with her death. The early Victorian years are marked with the developments in economics, social life, religion and the government. The major governmental reformations can be seen in the Reform Acts of 1832, which introduced changes in the electoral system in order to increase seats in the House of Commons, in order to englobe the large cities that had emerged during the Industrial Revolution; being followed by the Reform Act of 1867, which doubled the number of adult males that could vote; and the Reform Act of 1884 that targeted the rural areas, so they could have the same right to vote as the urban areas.

The Industrial Revolution was the major event during the Victorian period; even though it started a few years earlier, it outlined the Victorian period both culturally and historically. It represented the transition of hand producing to machinery, the improvements in the efficiency of water power, the increase in the use of steam power, and also permitted the introduction of new processes for chemical manufacture and iron production; coal was the most important material for this revolution. The biggest industry was the textile industry for it had the larger numbers of employment, value of output and capital, which was invested in the machines.

Socially speaking, the Industrial Revolution gave benefit and triumph to a middle class of industrialists and businessmen; mills and factories represented an increase in opportunities for employment. However, ordinary men who had their own property and land with mills and factories did not hire as much as they would before the

Revolution due to the machines. The acquisition of power and wealth by the mill owners was deeply individualistic; leaving the owners fully at risk for their personal fortunes was tied up with the fortune of the mill.

This fear of the crowd or mob does much explain the intense government repression in the early nineteenth century of what the age called ‘combination’, the organization of working men into what we would call unions. In working-class political culture principles of association, community, and mutuality were (...) valued as means of asserting political and economic power. (...) but to the owners and the government the association of working men into unions with strong leadership posed a clear and present danger to the dominant power structure. This fear of workers’ becoming organized is registered in the bourgeois industrial novels’ representation of union organizers and all leaders of the working class as deceptive, bloodthirsty villains: witness *Hard Times*, *Shirley* and *Sybil*. (Tucker, 1999: 251)

Although the Industrial Revolution led to an increase in the population, the chances of surviving in childhood did not improve; with limited opportunity for education, children were expected to work. Children worked in bad conditions, receiving lower wages than the adults, and started working as young as the age of four. Many of these children developed lung cancer and other diseases, not reaching the age of twenty-five. Most of the children working in factories were orphans. In the years of 1833 and 1844, the first general laws against child labour, known as Factory Acts, were passed: children under the age of nine were prohibited to work, they also could not work at night, and the work day of a child under eighteen was limited to twelve hours.

The Novel

The printing industry expanded massively due to the application of the steam power machinery. Consequently, the number of newspapers and book publishing increased immensely. The Victorian writers were “influenced by English Romanticism, developments in modern art, and the changing intellectual milieu that questioned the possibilities of universal values or objective truth (...) [they] erased the boundaries between art and life” (Swarz, 1995: 8). The novel readers were invited to a private world in which the fictional characters seemed to act and behave like the readers themselves. The novel also offered an encounter with new worlds – like the travel novel.

The criticism the novel received revolved around the moral dimensions of the novel itself, as well as its relation to history and the nature of realism. Critics wondered if the novel should teach moral lessons, educate, “or aim for a narrative singularity that would provide aesthetic correlation for the domestic realism that ruled the form for most of the period. By the end of the nineteenth-century, novel reading itself was sometimes associated with (...) sexual repression, stultifying middle-class family life, and cramped vistas for women’s live”(David, 2012: 2).

Readers would enter the fictional world as a means to forget about reality, and would also identify themselves with that same world. Although it was fictional, the nature, the description of family affairs, as well as the individual self of the main characters were based on the reality which was familiar to the writers; hence the reader was able to see how real, and at the same time how fictional, the novel was.

The English Courtship novel, with its strong appeal for female writers and readers, reflects the tension between traditional definition of womanhood in terms of marriage market, and women’s demand for moral independence and self-respect. (Parrinder, 2006: 184)

Thus novels with independent female heroines were so appealing, and this gave the female authors the unwanted responsibility of giving their female readers the freedom which they were craving. When writing *Jane Eyre* and making Jane an equal to Mr. Rochester, Charlotte Brontë demonstrated that one can be strong, one can be independent and at the same time, one can have a love interest. A character like Shirley, - from *Shirley* - for instances, was wealthy and independent, and contrary to what the costume was, women having to marry men for their wealth, men wanted, and had the necessity, to marry Shirley for her wealth so they could have a good life.

Women and Marriage in late eighteenth and nineteenth centuries.

The wife was part of the furniture of home, of the resting place to which the man returned from business or pleasure. His occupations were, as they still are, among men; his pleasures and excitements also were, for most part, among men – among his equals. He was a patriarch and a despot within four walls, and irresponsible power had its effect, greater or less according to his disposition, in rendering him domineering, exacting, self-worshipping, when not capriciously or brutally tyrannical. (Rossi, 1970: 109)

In 1839 Sarah Ellis published *The Woman of England: Their Social Duties and Domestic Habits*, where Ellis “defines what is known as the ‘domestic ideology’, a

widely accepted conservative theory of social roles and ‘separate spheres’ of activity for Victorian middle-class men and women” (Tucker, 1999: 30). According to this social hierarchy, men would have governmental services, the business world as well as the industrial, the power to acquire property and improve the social and material condition of their families, whereas, women “are understood to be ‘clothed in moral beauty’” (Tucker, 1999: 30), were incarcerated inside the house, and had to live a life of selflessness; their goal in life was marriage, to bear and raise children.

“The Angel in the House” a poem written by Coventry Patmore, published in 1854, describes the perfect house wife to be passive and powerless, meek, charming, graceful, sympathetic, self-sacrificing, pious and pure. “Man must be pleased; but him to please/Is woman's pleasure (...) At any time, she's still his wife,/Dearly devoted to his arms;/She loves with love that cannot tire” (Patmore, 2012: 68).

“The Angel in the House” is supposed to bring “more than moral purity to the home that she at once creates and sanctifies for which her mate consequently regards her with a sentimental, essentially religious reverence” (Christ, 2013: 148). In the poem, Patmore defines the core of a woman with traditional feminine values of love, intuition, beauty and virtue, for these values result from the women’s lack of desire to act; or because society does not allow them to perform any acts.

Both Sarah Ellis and Coventry Patmore provide in their works an image of shallow women, deprived of legal, economic and political rights. Both authors helped to develop the principle of the separate spheres, being the women’s sphere subordinate to that of the men, since men were the ones with the power, but also because women ceased to exist after marriage; “the absorption of the wife’s identity into her husband’s subsequent to marriage”(Tucker, 1999: 38).

Before the nineteenth century, marriages were arranged by convenience; either for reasons of money, social status, or to give a better reputation to the bride’s family (Tucker, 1999: 89), thus women were subjected to the domination of men – either by their father, brother or husband. It was generally believed that their dependence was for their own good for they were economically and physically the weaker sex. In the eighteenth century, women had “four cardinal functions”: the first was to obey their husbands, second, to produce heirs, third to take care of the household, meaning, to provide “food, drink and comfort; commanding domestic servants (...) and arranging

entertainment”; and her forth duty was to be behave “ladylike”(Porter, 1991: 23). Sir William Blackstone in *Commentaries on the Laws of England*, published from 1765 until 1769, describes the law of marriage and the subsequent absorption of the woman/wife was “for her protection and benefit, so great a favourite is the female sex in the laws of England.”

By marriage the husband and wife are one person in law; that is, the very being, or legal existence of a woman is suspended during marriage, or at least incorporated and consolidated into that of the husband, under whose wing, protection and cover she performs everything. (Blackstone, 1765: 442)

Nevertheless, with the passing of time marriages were changing and the woman could now choose who she wanted to marry. In 1870, the bill Married Women’s Property Act was passed, however only accepted in 1882, giving wives the same right of property as their husbands, either acquired before, during or after the marriage. Nonetheless, this legislation failed from acknowledging women to have an equal identity in marriage by the law. “Women could only be freed from their slavery by making marriage a civil contract, dissoluble like any other contract”(Perkin, 1989: 212).

In *The Professor* with Frances, Charlotte Brontë explores the female character that rebels against society norms within limited boundaries for she can only get jobs designed for women, and at the same time gives the twitch of a strong female character who wants to live an independent and equal life with her husband, almost giving the basics for the creation of Jane Eyre.

Monsieur, if a wife’s nature loathes that of the man she is wedded to, marriage must be slavery. Against slavery all right thinkers revolt, and though torture be the price of resistance, torture must be dared: though the only road to freedom lie through the gates of death, those gates must be passed; for freedom is indispensable. Then, monsieur, I would resist as far as my strength permitted; when that strength failed I should be sure of a refuge. Death would certainly screen me both from bad laws and their consequences. (Brontë, 1989: 279)

This idea of marriage as a new form of master and slave, husband and wife namely, is later developed by John Stuart Mill on his critical essay *The Subjection of Women*, published in 1869. John Stuart Mill criticizes the principle that the “social relations between two sexes – the legal subordination of one sex to the other – is wrong in itself (...) and that it out to be replaced by a principle of perfect equality, admitting no power or privileged on the one side, nor disability on the other” (Mill, 1997: 1).

Mill goes deeper on the duality of master/slave, husband/wife, saying that

The masters of women wanted more than simple obedience, and they turned the whole force of education to effect[sic] their purpose. All women are brought up from the earliest years in the belief that their ideal of character is that the opposite to that of men; not self-will, and government by self-control, but submission, and yielding to the control of others. All the moralities tell them that it is the duty of women, and all the current sentimentalities that it is their nature, to live for other; to make complete abnegation of themselves, and to have no life but in their affections. And by their affections are meant the only ones they are allowed to have – those to the men with whom they are connected, or to the children who constitute an additional and indefeasible tie between them and a man. (Mill, 1997: 14, 15)

With this in mind and the additional image of “The Angel in the House”, it is only natural that Frances prefers to encounter death by defiance of the social norms than to live like a slave, a prisoner not only to what is socially accepted and dictated but also not to live under the role of a master or a tyrant; for she is head strong with a strong personality and is determined to live her dream to move to England, with or without William Crimsworth.

In *Jane Eyre*, Charlotte Brontë struggles to solve the inequality of the social class between Jane and Mr. Rochester, for in spirit they are the same, by changing the social relations between them, “Jane inherits a fortune that gives her economic autonomy; Rochester, maimed in a fire that destroys his country house, thus loses his physical and psychological advantages. Brontë has shaped social circumstances so as to reshape the marriage relation in a new form, albeit a form that does not solve all the problems the novel rises. But the ideal aim at is one in which husband and wife each are able to move out together, to develop into fully mature and independent adults” (Tucker, 1999: 91). Mr. Rochester’s marriage with Bertha Mason for the sole purpose of financial benefits ends in a failure not only because Bertha was mad, but also because they were not equal in spirit.

What later Virginia Woolf would claim, that female subjugation is primarily due to their economic dependence (Marcus, 1997: 42), was already being done, in a way by Brontë by giving Jane an inheritance. When Jane receives her uncle’s money, she finally believes that her and Mr. Rochester are equals and can get married.

Madness in the Nineteenth-Century

Madness – Feminist psychoanalysis help us understand that madness, or insanity, is defined by culture and not by biology. Phyllis Chesler, in her pioneering work *Women and Madness* (1972), argues that ‘madness’ is a label used for people whose behavior radically departs from what is socially prescribed. What we consider madness, she suggests, is either the acting out of the devalued female role or the total or partial rejection of one’s sex role stereotype. Women’s madness is an intense experience of female biological, sexual or cultural castration. Chesler argues that society expects women to have mental illness and that is part of the definition of what women are. (Humm, 1995: 156)

Marriage drove some women insane. In *Jane Eyre*, Charlotte Brontë does not explicitly write this; Mr. Rochester only discovered that Bertha Mason was mad after they were married. In her book, *The Madness of Women: Myth and Experience*, Jane Ussher explores the hysteria of eighteenth and nineteenth centuries until the “neurotic and mood disorder in the twentieth and twenty-first.” In the nineteenth-century, physicians would describe women as difficult, narcissistic and egocentric for not behaving according to the Victorian norm.

The affluent hysteric was characterised as an idle, self-indulgent and deceitful woman, ‘craving for sympathy’, who had an ‘unnatural’ desire for privacy and independence and was ‘personally and morally repulsive, idle, intractable, and manipulative.’ (...) In contrast, women suffering from the ‘nervous disorder’ of neurasthenia, which shared many of the symptoms of hysteria, were described as having a ‘refined and unselfish nature’ and as a being just the kind of woman one lives to meet’. (Usher, 2011: 9)

Jane Ussher writes about Bertha as a *Jane Eyre*’s *doppelgänger*, existing as a distorted mirror image of Jane’s repressed hunger, rebellion and rage, standing as an antithesis for chastity and sanity. The figure of the *doppelgänger* is used to describe an alter ego or a second self, appearing as a distinct and separate being that “exists in a dependent relation to the original” (Herdman, 1991: 14). However, there is another way to describe the double, which is the figure of the quasi-double, developed by Joseph Frank. Quasi-doubles appear in various forms, having an unambiguously independent existence, although being complementary opposites. Thus, Jane Ussher is wrong when saying that Bertha is Jane’s *doppelgänger* for she clearly acts the opposite of Jane, and sometimes even acting the way Jane wants to act.

The short-story written by Charlotte Perkins Gilman, *The Yellow Wallpaper*, published in 1892, gives a better account on how imprisonment affects the mind of women. The protagonist of this short-story is locked on a former nursery room, with yellow wallpaper, by her husband and brother, both doctors, who believe she is suffering from mental illness and hysteria after giving birth to her first child.

Since it was a former nursery room, the windows are barred increasing the sense of imprisonment. The narrator keeps a daily journal where she describes the yellow room. As the reader goes on through the journal entries, one is able to see how that imprisonment is affecting the narrator; she describes how the wallpaper appears to mutate, especially by the moonlight, and how the patterns and designs intrigue her until she starts to see a figure in the design, which resembles a woman. The narrator starts stripping the wallpaper apart in order to free this imaginary woman, who is the representation of herself. By the end of the story, the narrator locks herself inside the yellow room and when the husband tries to get in, he finds her passing backwards and forwards, touching the wallpaper, saying “I’ve got out at last.”

The subordination of women in marriage leads to madness. Women have to play the domestic, the angel in the house, passive role, while men play the active role. Men overlook the importance of self-expression, as Jane Eyre claims when she says that women need to be active as much their male counterparts, otherwise women will become mentally constrained, driving them insane. Women become forced to be completely passive, forbidden from exercising their minds, hiding their fears and anxieties as well as emotions for these same emotions were mistaken for hysteria.

The Figure of the Governess

The governess is considered a familiar figure to the Victorian families for it has been around since the Tudor’s era, however only becoming popular during the nineteenth-century. “As a competitor for work in an unregulated and increasingly overcrowded profession, the governess epitomised the toll capitalist market relations could exact from society’s less fortunate members” (Poovey, 1997: 168). The governess performed the role of mother and teacher to the middle-class children. She was a full time presence in the house, although not a servant, and would spent time with the lady of the house.

Even though it seems like a good job, the governesses would be kept out of the public sphere; their social life would decline for the job demanded much of their time. This would lead to isolation, loneliness and sometimes depression, and many of the governesses would end up living the rest of their lives in asylums. Nevertheless, the figure of the governess represented a rupture in, and of, the regular Victorian family system, and represents the beginning of the female monetary independence, because “for a woman without means, the only way out was marriage” (Peterson, 1970: 20).

The mid-nineteenth century saw the beginnings of a movement to broaden opportunities for employment of women. (...) But such change would not take place until the pressures of female militance, war, and the tensions inherent in the idea of woman as ornament, drove the middle classes to resign the leisured lady as a banner and bulwark of their gentility. (Peterson, 1970: 22, 23)

In *Jane Eyre*, Charlotte Brontë uses Jane to show that the figure of the governess is not on the level of the servant, for they show her respect, nor is a full member of the upper class, for they mock her. Standing between class lines, Jane tries to assert herself as a free woman aside from the social norms, struggling against confinement, injustice, and being subjugated, with her fierce integrity and quick intelligence.

Women as writers

Is a pen a metaphorical penis?

If the pen is a metaphorical penis, with what organ can females generate texts? (Gubar, 1979: 3)

Works published by women were merciless criticized, for the female authors were always seen as “women first, writers second. A female novelist could expect a variety of obstacles to her craft: scorn, satire, outrage, and, at worst, the risk of becoming an outcast in a society that expected her to behave in certain ways” (Sigurdardottir, 2013: 11). This patriarchal society made the male author a procreator of the text, a pen that is used as an instrument to create life, much like his penis. Even the word “author” suggests authority, command and the ability to speak one’s own voice, something which was denied to women.

In order to overcome this problem, women authors would write under pseudonyms, like the Brontë sisters – Currer Bell for Charlotte Brontë, Ellis Bell for

Emily Brontë and Acton Bell for Anne Brontë – or would choose androgynous names, like George Eliot, George Sand.

In the nineteenth century, guessing at the gender of an unknown author became part of the pleasure of reading. The first really important such debate concerned the true identity of Currer Bell, supposed author of *Jane Eyre*, first published in 1847. Brontë was not, however, alone among women novelists in inventing an unfeminine pseudonym. When Elizabeth Gaskell began publishing her first stories, a few months before the appearance of *Jane Eyre*, she did not so under the name Cotton Mather Mills. (Mullan, 2007: 76)

Writing under the anonymity of their sex, under a male pseudonym, would cause them to create a double of themselves and their writing – ““Believe me, my dear sir, “C. Brontë” must not here appear; what she feels or has felt is not the question—it is “Currer Bell” who was insulted—he must reply.””(Shorter, 1896: 352) – in order to be taken serious when writing about themes which were uncommon for their sex.

For some Victorians, it was bad enough having to read about bigamy, social climbing, grotesque physical violence and interracial marriage without the additional outrage of knowing that a woman’s delicate mind lay behind these scandalous subjects. (Eagleton, 2005: 126)

The novel was the primary, and also the most important, way for female cultural authority. In the turn of the century, things for women had not changed entirely. They were able to vote and study now, however, trying to make a living through writing was nearly impossible. Virginia Woolf in her famous extended essay *A Room of One’s Own* writes that if she had to choose between gaining money or gaining the right to vote, she would prefer the money, thus gaining the economic freedom that would free women from the subjugation to men, from men’s subjugation. In *A Room of One’s Own*, Woolf praises Aphra Bern, a poet from the Restoration period for being the first woman to earn her living as a writer

All women together out to let flowers fall upon the tomb of Aphra Behn, which is, most scandalously but rather appropriately, in Westminster Abbey, for it was she who earned them the right to speak their minds. It is she – shade and amorous as she was – who makes it no quite fantastic for me to say to you tonight: Earn five hundred a year by your wits. (Woolf, 2000: 66)

Aphra Behn had the necessity of making a living off her wits due to the death of her husband. This necessity gave courage to women to start writing. “Here, then, one had reached the early nineteenth century. And here, for the first time, I found several

shelves given up entirely to the works of women” (Woolf, 2000: 66). Virginia Woolf praises female writers like George Elliot, Jane Austen and Emily Brontë, Emily Davies and Florence Nightingale; however, when she writes about Charlotte Brontë it rarely is to say something good.

Virginia Woolf claims Charlotte Brontë writes with rage, foolishly and of herself instead of writing calmly, wisely and of her characters, that “she is at war with her lot”(Woolf, 2000: 70). In Woolf’s essay entitled *Jane Eyre and Wuthering Heights*, she goes as far to write that Charlotte Brontë “does not attempt to solve the problems of human life; she is even unaware that such problems exist; all her force, and it is the more tremendous for being constricted, goes into the assertion, ‘I love’, ‘I hate’, ‘I suffer’.” Nevertheless, the same can be said by Virginia Woolf and her anger management problems.

Elaine Showalter believes that Virginia Woolf in refusing to express her anger, it turned against herself. (1977: 262). Adrienne Rich (*On Lies, Secrets, and Silence: Selected Prose*, 1979) wrote that she recognized the tone Virginia Woolf used in writing *A Room of One’s Own*, it was “the tone of a woman almost in touch with her anger, who is determined not to appear angry, who is willing herself to be calm, detached, and even charming in a roomful of men where things have been said which are attacks on her very integrity”(Rich, 1979: 37).

Could anger be the fuel for female writers; or is it to women in general?

The Early Twentieth Century

The British twentieth century began with the ascension of Edward VII, son of Queen Victoria. London became the financial centre of the world, and Great Britain still was first in the world of the trading market, finances and shipping, also maintaining the nation’s strong bases in manufacturing and mining. The century began with revolutionary shifts in politics for common labourers and women, whom were excluded from wielding power in the past, and were now becoming increasingly involved in the world of politics. Economic wise it was an era with few depressions or recessions – when compared to previous years -, and prosperity was widely spread, at least among the aristocratic and middle classes.

The Edwardian period was marked with class tension – the class structure was the same as in the Victorian era, for money and status continued to be the primary differences between the rich and middle classes – who could afford luxury – and the poor, who scarcely had the resources for basic hygiene. Nevertheless, the old social order was paradoxically falling away, leading to an anxiety which reflected itself in politics. The Labour Party was founded on a basis of class identity and antagonism towards the bourgeoisie. William Gladstone, leader of the Liberal Party, was a major figure during this time, who took a grand stance against a selfish aristocracy. In the opposition, the Conservative Party and the Tories, launched a campaign where the noble upper class was praised, claiming that the poor were ungrateful and urging for a past when every Englishman knew his place.

The Edwardian Era did not last long. Edward VII died in 1910, raising to the throne his son; George V. King George V implemented a standard of conduct for the British royalty, which reflected the values and virtues of the middle-class instead of the upper-class lifestyles and vices. Even though he was a conservationist and traditionalist, who never fully approved or appreciated the changes that under way in British society, he used his power and influence as means to achieve neutrality and moderation, being the mediator rather than the final decision maker.

Women in the Twentieth-Century, the Beginning of the Struggle for Equal Rights

In 1897 the first women founded union, National Union of Women's Suffrage Societies (NUWSS), demanded the power to vote. This organisation was moderate; its members were called the suffragists, who wanted the right to vote for middle class property-owning women. They were led by Millicent Fawcett, and believed they could achieve their end using peaceful tactics – by signing petitions or using public manifestations. Fawcett was of the opinion that if the movement was seen to be intelligent, polite and acting according to the law, women would have proven themselves worthy and responsible enough to fully participate in politics. Although the leadership of the movement was exclusive to the middle class, soon the women realised they needed the support of the working class.

The establishment of a national suffrage movement was largely the work of Lydia Becker who travelled the countryside speaking at suffrage meetings and provided regular reports on all suffrage activity through the

Women's Suffrage Journal, which she began in 1870 and edited until her death in 1881.

Women's Suffrage Journal kept a continuous attack on the traditional laws pertaining to the property and legal rights of married women and on the 1870 Married Women's Property Act (...) It also dealt at length with the question of child custody. (Caine, 1997: 118, 119)

However, the non-violent policy did not do much for women and some suffragists did not like the passivity of the movement, so in 1903, Emmeline Pankhurst, a member of the Manchester suffragist group, left the Nation Union of Women's Suffragette Society (NUWSS) and founded another society, the Women's Social and Political Union (WSPU), with the help of her daughter Christabel. The Pankhurst recruited young working class women in order to draw attention to the cause. Their motto was *Deeds not Words*. The suffragettes continued with the NUWSS slogan "Vote For Women", using a tricolour banner – green, white and purple, symbolizing hope, purity and dignity; the banner soon became a common sight at manifestations through England.

In 1905 Christabel Pankhurst and Annie Kenney, a factory worker, interrupted a Liberal Party's meeting and were arrested. This event attracted a lot of unfavourable attention to the cause, and it was also a catalyst for other members of the movement to interrupt political meetings by chaining themselves outside the Parliament, to stage big marches and outdoor demonstrations, and resisting the police. In 1908, the WSPU began a campaign aiming to destroy the existing power structure by vandalising property, with the intent of getting maximum publicity. Some of their 'activities' consisted in pouring acid in mailboxes, breaking windows, defacing paintings at the National Gallery, destroying golf courses, and one suffragette went as far as vandalising the Prime Minister's car. The Suffragettes did not mind going to prison, for even there they could make a statement by going on a hunger strike. Prison guards were ordered to force them to eat, which caused public outcries for these practices, of forced feeding, were traditional used to feed lunatics in asylums.

Stories of women brutalized and assaulted, washed out of their cells with hoses, starving themselves into exhaustion and serious illness, held down by warders while doctors forced feeding tubes into their nostrils, all helped to create an image of the Suffragettes as victims and martyrs that brought many formerly apolitical women into the movement.(Zwerdling, 1986: 212, 213)

The government of approved the Cat and Mouse Act (Temporary Discharge for Ill-Health Act), as a response to the hunger strikes. This Act consisted in allowing the Suffragettes to go on a hunger strike and when they were very weak, they were released – if they did not die in prison – so there will be no embarrassment for the government. When they were released, the Suffragettes were too weak to take part of the violent demonstrations. However, when the women had regained their strength, they were taken back to prison, being re-arrested for trivial things, and the cycle recommenced – hunger strike, release, re-arrestment. For the government, this was a simple but effective weapon against the Suffragettes. However, this only made them more extreme. In 1913, suffragette Emily Davison gave her life trying to make a statement about wealth and power, when invading the Epsom Derby racetrack and standing in front of a racehorse.

In 1914 the Women's Social and Political Union ceased all manifestations, and the Suffragettes went to support in the World War I; Emmeline Pankhurst became an ardent militarist. The WSPU dissolved in 1917. A year later, recognizing the women's hard work during the War, the British government granted the vote, with the Representation of the People Act, to women over the age of thirty who owned property, later extending it to the age of twenty-one in 1928.¹

¹ In December 1918, Constance Markievicz, Countess Markievicz, was the first woman to be elected to the House of Commons, declining to accept her seat. In 1919, Nancy Astor, Viscountess Astor, was the first woman to take a seat as a Member of Parliament in the House of Commons. From 1929 to 1931, and from 1945 to 1970, Jennie Lee, Baroness Lee of Asheridge served as a Member of Parliament for the Labour Party. Another member of the Labour Party, Ellen Wilkinson served as Minister of Education from July 1945 until her death in February 1946.

Chapter One: Charlotte Brontë, the Self and the Double

The Double in Literature

The figure of the double, or the other self, has long been present in literary history; it functions as a device for articulating the experience of the division of self. The double is a means to give form to the tension between division and unity. “It stands for contradiction within unity. It stands for contradiction within unity, and for unity in spite of division, the likeness expressing the unity of the individual, the doubleness or complementary expressing division within the personality” (Herdman, 1991: 1, 2).

The term *Doppelgänger* was coined by Jean Paul Richter, a German Romantic writer. The figure of the *Doppelgänger* is of a second self, an alter ego which exists as a distinct and separate being in relation to the original character, or self. Another kind of double is the *Quasi-Double* coined by Joseph Frank. The *Quasi-Double*, contrary to the *Doppelgänger*, exists in an independent relation to the original character or self. They may also be complementary of the self, acting like an opposite; “characters whose unlikeness and contradiction reflect hostility and conflict, yet at the same time mutual dependence and interlocked destinies” (Herdman, 1991: 15).

Charlotte Brontë

“To you I am neither man nor woman—I come before you as an author only. It is the sole standard by which you have a right to judge me—the sole ground on which I accept your judgment.” (Eagleton, 2005: 347)

Charlotte Brontë, born April 21st 1816, Thornton, West Riding of Yorkshire, was the third daughter of Reverend Patrick Brontë and Maria Branwell. She was the only daughter of the five – Maria, Elizabeth, Emily, and Anne – to survive into adulthood, along with her brother Branwell. They moved to Haworth in 1820, when Rev. Patrick Brontë was appointed perpetual curate of St. Michael and All Angels Church, and their mother died the year after.

In August 1824, Reverend Brontë sent Maria, Elizabeth, Charlotte and Emily to the Clergy Daughter’s School at Cowan Bridge in Lancashire. It is believed that the Cowan Bridge School gave the basis for Lowood School in *Jane Eyre*. The school has

records of low food portions for growing girls, and a poor health record, as well as a great disease affecting the School.

The school's founder, William Carus Wilson, the Vicar of Turntall, had devised a harsh regime with the idea of instilling Christian resignation, reinforced by his constant reminders to the girls that they were objects of charity. In Charlotte's later view, low morale, semi-starvation, and physical neglect predisposed most of the pupils to infection. Maria and Elizabeth, perhaps weakened also by the after-effect of whooping cough, either fell prey to tuberculosis or the latent disease took hold. Many other pupils caught typhus and, in the spring of 1825, an uncontrollable epidemic swept the school. (Gordon, 2008: 23)

In Chapter X of *Jane Eyre*, Charlotte Brontë reconstructs the disease scenario previously described in the Cowan Bridge School,

When the typhus fever had fulfilled its mission of devastation at Lowood, it gradually disappeared from thence; but not till its virulence and the number of its victims had drawn public attention on the school. Inquiry was made into the origin of the scourge, and by degrees various facts came out which excited public indignation in a high degree. The unhealthy nature of the site; the quantity and quality of the children's food; the brackish, fetid water used in its preparation; the pupils' wretched clothing and accommodations – all these things were discovered; and the discovery produced a result mortifying to Mr Brocklehurst, but beneficial to the institution.

Maria, the eldest sister, gave the inspiration to the character Helen Burns. Maria, just like Helen, was repeatedly humiliated and punished by the school mistress Miss Andrews – the Miss Scatcherd in *Jane Eyre* – for being late, having dirty and untidy habits. Maria was removed from the school in February, Elizabeth in May, and Charlotte and Emily in June due to the poor conditions the School had; and also because Maria and Elizabeth got sick due to those same lacks of conditions. Both the elder sisters died at home, leaving Charlotte as the mother figure for both Emily and Anne. Along with their brother Branwell, they received lessons from the father again; and the girls learned to sew and other feminine domestic habits with her Aunt, Elizabeth Branwell, their mother's sister.

In the summer of 1826, Charlotte and Branwell invented the world of Angria, and in 1831, Emily and Anne created the world of Gondal. Both worlds were different, having only one thing in common – a strong female character as the main character. While in Angria, Charlotte's heroines were developed through a love interest in order to make sense of Branwell's wars, wars that gave a rough personality to the male

characters; in Gondal the main characters were headstrong women, ruled by Augusta Geraldine Almeda who was famous for ruining men. It was in Angria that the first male narrator, and male voice, emerged for Charlotte - "Charles Thunder" or "Charles Townshead", precursors to the later used "Currer Bell" (Gordon, 2008: 39).

Charlotte Brontë continued her education at the school Roe Head, in Mirfield, West Riding of Yorkshire, from 1831 to 1832. At Roe Head, she met her lifelong friends and correspondents, Ellen Nussey and Mary Taylor. Brontë later returned to Roe Head as a teacher from the year 1835 to 1838. In 1839, Charlotte Brontë began her career as a governess to the families in Yorkshire until 1841. Her experience as a governess is later told in *Jane Eyre* and in *Shirley*.

In 1842, Charlotte and Emily travel to Brussels to enrol at the boarding school run by Constantin Heger, and his wife Claire Heger. Their journey to the Pensionnant owned by the Heger's is later described in both *The Professor* and *Villette*, as Mme Heger is also cast on both novels, as Madame Reuter in *The Professor* and Madame Beck in *Villette*, as being "a caricature Catholic: sinister, devious, smooth – in this, deeply unEnglish – and unEnglish above all in her sly methods of surveillance in order to produce the school's model of robust obedience" (Gordon, 2008: 121). Charlotte Brontë fell in love with Professor Heger for his mind and not his physical appearance. She saw in him an opportunity to develop her brain and writing skills.

His passionate beliefs must have struck many a chord with Charlotte and Emily. Furthermore, he made no attempt to hide his admiration for the English girls, whose essays he would regularly read out to the rest of the class because they were immeasurably superior to the rest. It was exciting to have the admiration of M. Heger, who was so easily irritated by stupidity and was so frequently stern. Accounts by other pupils of their experiences of M. Heger all attest that in most particulars of looks and behaviour M. Paul Emanuel in *Villette* was an outstanding portrait of him: imperious, alarming, domineering, arbitrary, explosive, (...), his tigerish look. (Fraser, 1989: 168,169)

Both these experiences can be read in Chapter 18 of *The Professor*,

The public reading of one of her devoirs achieved the revelation of her talents to all and sundry;

And on Chapter XIV in *Villette*,

They were supplied in the person of a master – M. Paul Emanuel, professor of literature. (...) his name, with anecdotes of him, resounded

in one's ears from all sides. (...) She esteemed him hideously plain, and used to profess herself frightened almost into hysterics at the sound of his step or voice. A dark little man he certainly was; pungent and austere.

Charlotte Brontë later became an English tutor at the boarding school and left in 1844, returning to Haworth, where she started writing about her experience in Brussels, which later gave life to the novels *The Professor* and *Villette*. Brontë married Arthur Bell Nicholls, her father's curate, in the summer of 1854. She became pregnant soon after the wedding, but before giving birth, she died of pneumonia on March 31st 1855.

The Professor

The Professor is the first book written by Charlotte Brontë, 1846; however it was the last to be published, only in 1857. It is seen by most critics as a writer-to-be book, the first draft, the first painting of an artist, for it is generally adjudged as unpleasant and disquieting book; a book that does not have Charlotte Brontë's mature fictional "voice". It is also seen as an early draft for her last novel, *Villette*. It is a *Bildungsroman* novel for William Crimsworth, the main character.

The use of a male narrator in *The Professor* suggests that Charlotte Brontë might have been trying to disentangle herself from the story in order to give a more objectified narration. Charlotte Brontë approaches the theme of the disinherited female in a patriarchal society and "attempts (...) to resolve her anger and anxiety of its author both by examining her situation through sympathetic male eyes and by transforming her into a patriarchal male professor, an orphaned underling turned master" (Gubar, 1979: 317).

Under her male pseudonym, Currer Bell, Brontë puts the virtues of mastery, masculinity, and Englishness on the side of the narrator; the female writer seems to identify at once with teacher and student, man and woman, Englishman and foreigner. The hero of *The Professor*, in this reading, represents a strange alloy of the author and the object of her affections: collapsing desire with identification, Brontë seems to imagine that if she cannot have the master, then perhaps she can be him. (Cohen, 2003: 445)

Brief Summary:

The Professor narrates the story of the young orphan aristocrat William Crimsworth, who, refusing his uncle Charles proposal to become a clergyman, seeks his

older and richer brother, Edward for help. William is not happy with the job appointed to him by Edward, and with the help of Mr. Hunsden, goes to Belgium where he finds a new job, teaching English and Latin at an all-boys school. This school is run by Mr. Hunsden's friend M. Pelet. Next to M. Pelet's school there is another school, just for girls run by Mlle Reuter, in which William enrolls to teach as well. William falls in love with one of his students, who also happens to be a teacher at the school, Frances Henri. William and Frances fall in love, get married, and open a school together in Belgium before moving to England with their son.

The Self and Double in *The Professor*

In *The Professor*, William Crimsworth's personality has two counterparts, his brother Edward and Mr. Hunsden, "Like two contrasting parts of his personality, Hunsden and Edward struggle to dominate William" (Martin, 2013: 31). In the beginning of the novel William is young, without a defined personality, and plays a very androgynous role in the presence of both his brother and his friend. Edward Crimsworth is portrayed with a tyrannical vigour, with true male features and proportions.

I looked at him: I measured his robust frame and powerful proportions; I saw my own reflection in the mirror over the mantelpiece; I amused myself with comparing the two pictures. In fact I resembled him, though I was not so handsome; my features were less regular; I had a darker eye, and a broader brow – in form I as greatly inferior – thinner, slighter, not so tall. As an animal, Edward excelled me far; should he prove as paramount in mind as in person I must be a slave – for I must expect from him no lion-like generosity to one weaker than himself; his cold, avaricious eye, his stern, forbidding manner told me he would not spare. Had I then force of mind to cope with him? I did not know; I had never been tried. (Brontë, 1989: 49)

William has a woman like behaviour for he is reserved and passive; he even describes working for his brother like "I SERVED Edward". He calls his brother 'Master' and on the day of his 'Master' birthday, Edward did not present William to any of the young ladies at the party, much less presented him as his brother. William looked "weary, solitary, kept down like some desolate tutor or governess; he [Edward] was satisfied"(Brontë, 1989: 56).

Antipathy is the only word which can express the feeling Edward Crimsworth had for me – a feeling, in a great measure, involuntary, and

which was liable to be excited by every, the most trifling movement, look, or word of mine. (Brontë, 1989: 56)

And much like any female counterpart who is orphan and disinherited, William sees himself as powerless as a woman, “reacting with claustrophobic feelings of enclosure, burial, imprisonment and then a rebellious decision to escape” (Gubar, 1979: 320). And on his decision to escape, he receives help from Hunsden.

I owe him a sort of involuntary grudge, because he had more than once been the tacit witness of insults offered by Edward to me. I had the conviction that he could only regard me as a poor-spirited slave, wherefore I now went about to shun his presence and eschew his conversation. (Brontë, 1989: 58)

On the afternoon when Hunsden offers his help to William, he cannot help but to compare the two:

I had never observed him closely before; and, as my sight is very short, I had gathered only a vague, general idea of his appearance; I was surprised now, on examination, to perceive how small, and even feminine, were his lineaments; his tall figure, long and dark locks, his voice and general bearing, had impressed me with the notion of something powerful and massive; not at all: - my own features were cast in a harsher and squarer mould than his. (Brontë, 1989: 66)

Feeling like a woman, William perceives the men around him with being massive figures of masculinity when comparing to his own femininity and passiveness. However, this changes as soon as William starts to sense a feeling of freedom. It is in Brussels that William finally starts to understand that there is more to the female personality than he could imagine. By teaching in an only-girls boarding school he learns the ‘mystery’ of the female identity, finding and defining also his own mastery and personality, as the master of the school room.

Even though William’s yearnings for women are conventionally masculine, his judgments of women however, suggest that he is an unusual male – for he disgusts the stereotype of “the angel in the house”, wanting a woman with whom he can talk with and not just a portrait of the “doll-woman”. When William meets Frances it is when he finds out that there is more to the female character than what they tend to show. Having lived a life almost parallel to William – also orphan, moved to another country and a professor, Frances is almost like a chameleon, being a double herself. Although Frances continues to treat William as ‘Master’ after their marriage; she refuses to become

entirely dependent of his earnings. When William proposed to her, she said yes and also made a powerful statement, a considered to be a strong step towards female emancipation:

‘Well, monsieur, I wished merely to say, that I should like, of course to retain my employment of teaching. You will teach still, I suppose, monsieur?’

‘Oh yes! It is all I have to depend on.’

‘Bon! – I mean good. Thus we shall have both the same profession. I like that; and my efforts to get on will be as unrestrained as yours – will they not, monsieur?’

‘You are laying plans to be independent of me’, said I.

‘Yes, monsieur; I must be no incumbrance to you – no burden in any way’.

(...)

‘Think of my marrying you to be kept by you, monsieur! I could not do it; and how dull my days will be! You would be away teaching in close, noisy schoolrooms, from morning till evening, and I should be lingering at home, unemployed and solitary; I should get depressed and sullen, and you would soon tire of me.’

‘Frances, you could read and study – two things you like so well.’

‘Monsieur, I could not; I like a contemplative life, but I like an active life better; I must act in some way, and act with you.’ (Brontë, 1989: 249, 251)

As it can be read, Frances does not want to live a dependent life, a doll-woman, the angel in the house kind of life, so much so that when they open their own school, Frances is the school headmaster and also a professor. She leads an active life, confusing William to think that he has married two wives,

So different she was under different circumstances, I seemed to possess two wives. The faculties of her nature, already disclosed when I married her, remained fresh and fair; but other faculties shot up strong, branched out broad, and quite altered the external character of the plant. Firmness, activity, and enterprise covered the grave foliage. (Brontë, 1989: 273, 274)

By day, she was Madame Directress, always vigilant and solicitous, and in the evening “the lady-directress vanished before my eyes, and Frances Henri, my own little lace-mender, was magically restored to my arms” (Brontë, 1989: 276). It is because of

this behaviour that I claim that Frances is a double in herself. She plays the submissive pupil role when she is with William, without however losing the core of her being.

Jane Eyre

Jane Eyre, 1847, is seen by critics as the most feminist novel written by Charlotte Brontë. It is considered a female version of the *Bildungsroman* for the protagonist struggles to free herself from the childhood imprisonment towards an adult life of independence, as much as it is possible in a patriarchal society, where women must overcome oppression.

Charlotte Brontë tries to show that

Women feel just as men feel; they need to exercise for their faculties and a field for their efforts as much as their brothers do; they suffer from too rigid a restraint, too absolute a stagnation, precisely as men would suffer; and it is narrow-minded in their more privileged fellow-creatures to say that they ought to confine themselves to making pudding and knitting stockings, to play on the piano and the embroidering bags. It is thoughtless to condemn them, or laugh at them, if they seek to do more or learn more than costume has pronounced necessary for their sex. (Brontë, 2006: 129,130)

Brief Summary:

The novel begins with young Jane living with her aunt Mrs. Reed and her three children. Jane already demonstrates a fiery and head-strong personality since early age, which did not go well with her aunt. Mrs. Reed decides to send Jane to a charity school, Lowood, where Jane stays for eight years, six as a student and two as a teacher. Wanting more from life, Jane Eyre applies for a job as a governess at a place called Thornfield. There she meets her future husband to be, Mr. Rochester. Mr. Rochester and Jane fall in love and on the day of the wedding, Jane discovers that Mr. Rochester is already married to a woman named Bertha Manson.

Jane flees from Thornfield without destination, without money and a broken heart, and finds the Moor House, house to the Rivers family, later known to be Jane's cousins. Jane refusing to be a missionary wife to her cousin St. John Rivers, returns to Thornfield, only to find it in ashes, Mr. Rochester blind of one eye and injured on an arm living at Ferndean Moor. After a brief description of what happened at Thornfield

and how Mr. Rochester got that badly injured, Jane and Mr. Rochester get married and have a son.

The Self and Double in *Jane Eyre*

Jane Eyre exerts a powerful attraction on female readers partly because it combines unconscious fantasies centring on Bertha Mason – fantasies that appeal directly to the unconscious quirks of a woman brought up in this culture [patriarchal] – with political analysis directed by Jane at the reader's conscious mind. While Jane reasons out the causes and effects of women's domestic oppression, Bertha burns down the imprisoning house. (Wyatt, 1985: 200)

Bertha's physical presence or loud manifestations are associated with feelings of repressed anger, of rebellion; hunger and rage are side by side with Bertha's "low, slow, ha! ha!" and "eccentric murmurs". Jane's secure response to Mr. Rochester's apparently egalitarian sexual confidences is followed by Bertha's incineration of Mr. Rochester's bed. After discovering the existence of Bertha, Jane secretly desires that Thornfield ceased to exist – for it brought painful memories, and it also was the symbol of Mr. Rochester's mastery and Jane's own servitude – and this desire is acted out by Bertha when she burns down the house.

Nevertheless, Bertha not only serves to be the representation of Jane's repressed feelings, for they also behave alike. When Bertha is imprisoned in the attic, running "backwards and forwards", and the reader is recalled to Jane's acts when trying to appease her headache, by pacing "backwards and forwards" on the third floor. Bertha also helps the reader to recall the ten-year-old Jane, imprisoned in her uncle's death chamber, the red-room, howling and mad. Mrs. Reed remarks about Jane, that she talked to her aunt like something mad or fiend can be compared to Bertha's fiendish madness.

This combination of Jane's verbal protest with Bertha's vivid action is only one example of the way Brontë uses Bertha and Jane to lodge a powerful protest against women's oppression at all levels of her reader's psyche. Bertha (...) addresses the quirks of a female unconscious through the image of painful incarceration and fiery revenge. Jane appeals to the reader's intellect with a social analysis of how confinement in domestic structures damage women. While Bertha demonstrates, Jane articulates the causes of madness. (Wyatt, 1985: 207)

On the day previous to the wedding, Jane cannot fathom to bear the name of Mrs. Rochester; she claims that Mrs. Rochester does "not exist: she would not be born till to-morrow, (...) and I would wait to be assured she had come into the world alive

before I assigned to her all that property” (Brontë, 2006: 317). Either guessing the events that would occur the next day or not, Jane could not feel Mrs. Rochester because Mrs. Rochester already existed, as she discovers on the day of the wedding.

On that same night, Jane was gazing at the veil that Mr. Rochester had chosen for her, which she did not like. “I shut the closet to conceal the strange, wraith-like apparel it contained” (Brontë, 2006: 317), only to find on the next morning that her veil has been shred to pieces by Bertha during the night. Even unknowing of Bertha’s existence, Jane says to Mr. Rochester that “I continued also the wish to be with you, and experience a strange, regretful consciousness of some barrier dividing us” (Brontë, 2006: 324).

Given such ‘shadowings and foreshadowings’, it is only natural that Jane’s anger and fear about her marriage intensifies, and that she shows some resistance to the marriage, delaying getting dressed and ready to go, walking very slowly to the church, almost having to be dragged by Mr. Rochester.

On a figurative and psychological level it seems suspiciously clear that the spectre of Bertha is (...) another (...) avatar of Jane. What Bertha now does, for instance, is what Jane wants to do. Disliking the ‘vapoury veil’ of Jane Rochester, Jane Eyre secretly wants to tear the garments up. Bertha does it for her. Fearing the inexorable ‘bridal day’, Jane would like to put it off. Bertha does that for her too. Resenting the new mastery of Rochester, whom she sees as ‘dread but adored’ (...), she wishes to be his equal in size and strength, so that she can battle him in the contest of their marriage. Bertha, ‘a big woman, in stature almost equalling her husband’, has the necessary ‘virile force’ (chap. 26). Bertha, in other words, is Jane’s truest and darkest double: she is the angry aspect of the orphan child, the ferocious secret self Jane has been trying to repress ever since her days at Gateshead. (Gubar, 1979: 359, 360)

Jane Eyre greatly attracts the female audience that grew up living in the constraints of the middle-class. Jane Eyre is a young girl who defies authority with reason, trying to understand and simultaneously explain what happens when women are confined and domesticated, with Bertha being example of that confinement and domestication, acting not on reason but on impulse. Jane’s verbal defiance presents the reader with a noble image of a brave resistance fighter, while Bertha satisfies the female reader’s anger against the patriarchal society constraints (Wyatt, 1985: 200, 201, 207, 208).

Shirley

Shirley, published in 1849, is a regional novel as well as an industrial novel. Charlotte Brontë is “completely accurate in showing the close juxtaposition of the pastoral and the industrial in the Yorkshire of the early nineteenth-century. *Shirley* is a regional novel not only in its setting but in its characters. Most of these Yorkshire born and bred, and the fact that they were recognised as such by Charlotte Brontë’s Yorkshire readers is the best proof of their authenticity” (Duthie, 1986: 159, 160). Charlotte Brontë seeks to illustrate the link between sexual discrimination and mercantile capitalism, implying that the coercion of a patriarchal society affects and infects each individual member of that same society.

Brief Summary:

The novel revolves around two women, Caroline Helstone and Shirley Keeldar, and a manufacturer called Robert Moore, who has introduced labour-saving machinery in his mill. Caroline is in love with Robert, however, Robert intends to marry Shirley for her wealth. Shirley declines the marriage proposal, marrying Robert’s brother, who is also her tutor, Louis. Robert Moore’s mill is attacked by rioting peasants for Robert wanted to substitute the workers for machines, by cause of the rapid machinery progress and development as a result of the Industrial Revolution. Robert Moore and the workers reach a compromise that makes both parties happy: the employees would contract less, however giving higher wages. By the end of the novel, Caroline marries Robert and Shirley marries Louis.

The Self and Double in *Shirley*

Shirley Keeldar was no ugly heiress: she was agreeable to the eye. Her height and shape were not unlike Miss Helstone’s: perhaps in stature she might have the advantage by an inch or two; she was gracefully made, and her face, too, possessed a charm as well described by the word grace as any other. It was pale naturally, but intelligent, and of varied expression. She was not a blonde, like Caroline: clear and dark were the characteristics of her aspect as to colour: her face and brow were clear, her eyes of the darkest grey: no green lights in them – transparent, pure, neutral grey; and her hair of the darkest brown. (Brontë, 2006: 191, 192)

The physical appearance is not the only difference between Shirley and Caroline, who are the doubles in this novel. Caroline is an impoverished gentlewoman,

who has to consider working as a governess to earn a living, for she does not want to marry if not for love; and Shirley is an independent woman of property and money.

The reason was, Shirley's head ran on other things than money and position. She was glad to be independent as to property: by fits she was even elated to the notion of being lady of the manor, and having tenants and an estate (...) To admire the great, reverence the good, and be joyous with the genial, was very much the bent of Shirley's soul: she mused therefore on the means of following this bent far oftener than she pondered on her social superiority. (Brontë, 2006: 211)

Caroline is a lot more feminine than Shirley, who even thinks of presenting herself as "Shirley Keeldar, Esq., Lord of the Manor of Briarfield" (Brontë, 2006: 197). Contrary to Caroline, Shirley will not allow her pride and self-respect to be easily mastered before and after her marriage with Louis, even saying to Louis that even though she loves him, she wants to preserve her independent nature, that she cannot be tamed. "You name me leopardess: remember, the leopardess is tameless", said she" (Brontë, 2006: 586).

As brilliant as Caroline is colourless, as outgoing as Caroline is retiring, Shirley is not a dependent inmate or a passive suppliant, not a housekeeper or housewife. She is a wealthy heiress who owns her own house, the ancestral mansion usually allotted to the hero, complete with old latticed windows, a stone porch, and a shadowy gallery with carved stags' heads on its walls. (...) And she clearly enjoys her status as well as its ambiguous effect on her role in society[.] (Gubar, 1979: 381)

Shirley is Caroline's double for Shirley is a reflection of all Caroline's repressed desires, and Shirley's actions are the reflection of Caroline's impotency. Caroline's hate for the curates is gratified when Shirley expels them of her house after they attack Shirley's dog, Tatar. Caroline has the need to change her uncle, and Shirley does that for her, by bending him to her will. In the beginning of the novel Caroline wishes to be part of 'the men's business', and Shirley reads the newspaper and the letters of civic leaders, and helps Robert with the workers invasion. Caroline always wanted to help Robert with his money problems, and Shirley lends him money. Caroline knows that she has to repress her love and desires for Robert for she thinks he does not feel the same for her, plus her uncle would never approve their marriage, and Shirley swoons

Robert and he proposes to her. This proposal however is rejected by Shirley, projecting Caroline's desire to punish Robert for his deeds – marrying for money and not for love.

But I am poverty and incapacity; Shirley is wealth and power: she is beauty too, and love - I cannot deny it. This is no sordid suit: she loves him – not with inferior feelings: she loves, or will love, as he must feel proud to be loved. Not a valid objection can be made. Let them be married then: but afterwards I shall be nothing to him. (Brontë, 2006: 246)

As the novel develops, the roles invert. Caroline, discovering her long lost mother – Shirley's governess, starts to become more independent, recovering from a fever after acknowledging that she would have to forget about Robert. And Shirley succumbs to this love fever when she realises she is in love with Louis. Even though Shirley will continue to have her untamed status, she starts to resemble Caroline, when Caroline was love-sick for Robert:

Returned to the couch, she usually buried her face deep in the pillow, and drew the coverlets close round her, as if to shut out the world and sun, of which she was tired: more than once, as she thus lay, a slight convulsion shook the sick-bed, and a faint sob broke the silence round it. (Brontë, 2006: 397)

The next day – the day – the week – the fortnight after – this new and peculiar shadow lingered on the countenance, in the manner of Miss Keeldar. A strange quietude settled over her look, her movements, her very voice. The alteration was not so marked as to court or permit frequent questioning, yet it *was* there, and it would not pass away: it hung over her like a cloud which no breeze could stir or disperse. (Brontë, 2006: 464)

It is in this novel that Charlotte Brontë questions the most the idea of “The Angel in the House”, creating an androgynous character that neither fits the role of male or female. Shirley Keeldar breaks the separate public spheres for she has an ambiguous (male) name, though being a woman. Not only being revolutionary in this aspect, with *Shirley*, Charlotte Brontë questioned the patriarchal society which gives men's power over their women and over their workers.

Villette

Published in 1853,

Villette tests three kinds of women. It exposes the false femininity of high-society romance – Ginevra Fanshawe (...) She leans on Lucy as a dead weight emblematic of the burden of the feminine artifice.

Pauline Home is the domestic depend who accommodates to Victorian expectations. She has genuine feelings, but her distortion is such that a large part of what she feels will remain unknown (...).

Lucy Snowe is the woman to be. Rising from the shadows, she looks to the future.(Gordon, 2008: 301)

In *Villette*, Charlotte Brontë presents a repressed heroine outside society, a poor orphan who tries to emancipate herself in a patriarchal society. Unable to do so in England, Lucy Snowe travels to a foreign country. “Lack of marriage opportunities and work led surplus women to turn to emigration for searching an outlet” (Ma, 2013: 33). Charlotte Brontë analyses “the destructive effect of the buried life on women who can neither escape by retreating into the self (...) nor find a solution by dehumanizing the other into a spiritual object” (Gubar, 1979: 403).

On this novel, Lucy is the hero-antagonist and all the women she encounters are her double. She goes against what Victorian society has imposed to women and goes to a foreign country to explore her potential, to overcome the patriarchal British society. Lucy, much like Jane Eyre, is a rebel against society confinements.

Also like Jane Eyre, Lucy represents all women who must struggle toward an integrated, mature, and independent identity by coming to terms with their need for love, and their dread of being single, and so, like Jane, Lucy will confront the necessity of breaking through the debilitation roles available to the single women the Victorians termed ‘redundant’. (Gubar, 1979: 407)

Brief Summary:

The novel narrates the story of Lucy Snowe, the protagonist-narrator, on her journey from England to France. In France, Lucy Snowe starts her career as an English professor at Madame Beck’s school for girls, in a little town called Villette. At the school, Lucy falls in love with another professor, M. Paul, who also shares feelings for her. Lucy and M. Paul get closer and eventually fall in love. Madame Beck along with other characters try to keep them apart. They eventually manage to do it, forcing M. Paul’s departure to the West Indies to oversee a plantation. Nonetheless, he declares his

love for Lucy before his departure, and arranges for her to live independently as the headmistress of her own school, which he built for her. The novel ends with Lucy narrating all these adventures, while waiting for the return of M. Paul.

The Self and Double in *Villette*

Paulina acts on the impulses repressed by Lucy. Lucy is passive and calm and Paulina is passionate and intense.

It was low and long; a sort of ‘Why hast thou forsaken me?’ During an ensuing space of some minutes, I perceived she endured agony. She went through, in that brief interval of her infant life, emotions such as some never feel; it was in her constitution: she would have more of such instants if she lived. Nobody spoke. Mrs Bretton, being a mother, she a tear or two. Graham, who was writing, lifted up his eyes and gazed at her. I, Lucy Snowe, was calm (Brontë, 2004: 25).

Ginevra Fanshawe is a spoiled girl (“(...), who had to coquette between two suitors, and managed admirably: in fact she was in her element” (Brontë, 2004: 155)) - that explores the love that men feel for her without remorse in order to gain material goods.

Miss Fanshawe’s berth chanced to be next to mine; and, I am sorry to say, she tormented me with an unsparing selfishness during the whole time of our mutual distress. Nothing could exceed her impatience and fretfulness. (...) Many a time since have I noticed, in persons of Ginevra Fanshawe’s light, careless temperament, and fair, fragile style of beauty, an entire incapacity to endure: they seem to sour in adversity, like small-beer in thunder: the man who takes such a woman for his wife, ought to be prepared to guarantee her an existence all sunshine. Indignant at last with her teasing peevishness, I curtly requested her ‘to hold her tongue’. The rebuff did her good, and it was observable that she liked me no worse for it. (Brontë, 2004: 63)

Both Paulina and Ginevra possess a physical beauty that Lucy lacks, however, Lucy possesses the moral and intellectual superiority, even though she struggles to define herself against the repressive models of society; as it can be seen in this conversation between Lucy and Ginevra.

‘I would not be you for a kingdom.’

The remark was too naïve to rouse anger; I merely said:

‘Very good.’

‘And what would you give to be me?’ she inquired.

‘Not a bad sixpence – strange as it may sound,’ I replied. ‘You are but a poor creature.’

‘You don’t think so in your heart.’

‘No; for in my heart you have not the outline of a place: I only occasionally turn you over in my brain.’ (Brontë, 2004: 160)

Miss Marchmont, a woman whom Lucy works for before leaving England, has a self-imposed confinement and serves as a double to Lucy, for Lucy starts to resemble her mistress who waits for death as a release from pain. “Because Lucy prizes the morsel of affection she receives, she is almost content to subsist on an invalid’s diet, almost content to be Miss Marchmont”(Gubar, 1979: 405).

This resemblance can be seen on Chapter IV, page 42, where Brontë describes Lucy’s transformation, as well as Lucy’s adaptation to Miss Marchmont way of life and way of being,

Two hot, close rooms thus became my world; and a crippled old woman, my mistress, my friend, my all. Her service was my duty – her pain, my suffering – her relief, my hope – her anger, my punishment – her regard, my reward. I forgot that there were fields, woods, rivers, seas, an ever-changing sky outside the steam-dimmed lattice of this sick-chamber; I was almost content to forget it. All within me became narrowed to my lot. Tame and still by habit, disciplined by destiny, I demanded no walks in the fresh air; my appetite needed no more than the tiny messes served for the invalid. In addition she gave me the originality of her character to study: the steadiness of her virtues, I will add, the power of her passions, to admire, the truth of her feelings to trust. All these things she had, and for these things I clung to her.

Madame Beck is another of Lucy’s doubles. She is a symbol of repression, embodying the projection of Lucy’s commitment to self-control. Madame Beck is calm, self-contained and authoritative, alert to the dangerous passions that she has to control in order not to give the school a bad name. She spies on her employees and students and quickly understands that Lucy is also spying on her.

After all, Madame’s system was not bad – let me do her justice. Nothing could be better than all her arrangements for the physical well-being of her scholars. No minds were over-tasked; the lessons were well

distributed and made incomparably easy to the learner; there was a liberty of amusement, and a provision for exercise which kept the girls healthy; the food was abundant and good: neither pale nor puny faces were anywhere to be seen in the Rue Fossette.(Brontë, 2004: 81).

They both dress in grey, and are both attracted to Dr. John, however, neither are his choice for wife, for neither are his type. They are both capable of mastering themselves, repressing their desires towards Dr. John. “Brava! once more, Madame Beck. I saw you matched against an Apollyon of a predilection; you fought a good fight, and you overcame!” (Brontë, 2004: 116). In applauding Madame Beck, Lucy also applauds herself for her own commitment to self-repression and impulse towards self-surveillance.

Another double Lucy finds in Villette is the ghost of a nun. They are both under the monk’s surveillance and cannot escape the confinement of chastity. Like the nun before her, Lucy haunts the forbidden alley for she is beginning to revolt against the confinements of the school.

Nothing remained now but to take my freedom to my chamber, to carry it with me to me to my bed and see what I could make of it. (...) But I would not look; I had fixed my resolve, but I would not violate my nature. And then – something tore me so cruelly under my shawl, something so dug into my side, a vulture so strong in beak and talon, I must be alone to grapple with it. I think I never felt jealousy till now. (...) The love, born of beauty was not mine; I had nothing in common with it: I could not dare to meddle with it (Brontë, 2004: 516, 517).

My head reeled, for by the faint night-lamp, I saw stretched on my bed the old phantom – the NUN.

A cry at this moment might have ruined me. Be the spectacle what it might, I could afford neither consternation, scream nor swoon. Besides, I was not overcome. Warm from illuminations, and music, and thronging thousands, thoroughly lashed up by a new scourge, I defied spectra. In a moment, without exclamation, I had rushed on the haunted couch; nothing leaped out, or sprung, or stirred: all the movement was mine, so was all the life, the reality, the substance, the force; as my instinct felt. I tore her up – the incubus! I held her on high – the goblin! I shook her loose – the mystery! And down she fell – down all round me – down in shreds and fragments – and I trode upon her (Brontë, 2004: 519).

The nun is the projection of Lucy’s desire to submit in silence, to accept confinement, to dress in shadowy black, conceal herself and to desexualize herself, yet the nun’s life is also symbolic of the only socially acceptable life available for women, a life of service, self-abnegation and chastity. Despite having a number of doubles, Lucy

does not constrain to one or tries to define herself as one of them. This is a novel about a woman without identity trying to not only find herself in a cruel patriarchal society, but also to find herself within herself, i.e., trying to define an identity for herself without constraints.

In conclusion, the figure of the double in Charlotte Brontë's novels serves to demonstrate how the oppressive patriarchal society was affecting women. All the doubles Brontë uses are quasi-doubles, so in this way the author can demonstrate how two women, or more, behave or react to what was perceived to be the norm on women behaviour. In *The Professor*, Charlotte Brontë goes beyond the topic of oppression of women to demonstrate how the patriarchal society also affected men; even though not in the same ways that it did affect women, however it also affected their being, the freedom of living their lives without worrying if they were being too effeminate or not, to gentle or not, to sensitive or not.

Chapter Two: Virginia Woolf and Androgyny

Virginia Woolf, born January 25th 1882, in London, was the third child of Sir Leslie Stephen and Julia Stephen. Her father was an eminent literary figure, being the first editor of the *Dictionary of National Biography*. Sir Leslie Stephen was a notable historian, author, critic and mountaineer. Sir Stephen was friends with William Thackeray, and so his children were raised in an environment with abundance in Victorian literature and culture. Julia Stephen was one of the models for the Pre-Raphaelites, and her aunt was Julia Margaret Cameron, a British photographer who became known for her celebrity's portraits, as well as photographs with Arthurian and other heroic themes.

Virginia Woolf and her sister Vanessa were taught the Classics and English Literature at home, while their brothers Adrian and Thoby received a better education, being sent to Cambridge University. Woolf greatly resented this sexual division in her education, and viewed it as a form of degradation for women, in a patriarchal society. “[On studying Greek] It is a figure, for example, resurgent in *Three Guineas*, pointing up the educational privileges afforded her brothers and male peers, especially those now embarked on a life at Cambridge – Cambridge being, as we should know, the university to which Virginia Woolf did not go, an ambivalent matter for her, of both pride and grievance” (Sellers, 2010: 8). From an early age she was determined to be a writer and her sister aimed to be a painter. Adrian and Thoby made friends with Leonard Woolf, Clive Bell, Saxon Sydney-Turner, Lytton Strachey and Maynard Keynes – the nucleus of the Bloomsbury Group².

Virginia Woolf's most vivid childhood memories were from her family summer home, Talland House, which overlooked Porthminster Bay. “As a writer, Virginia Woolf took hold of the past, of ghostly voices speaking with increasing clarity, perhaps more real for her than the people who lived by her side.” (Gordon, 1984: 4); thus, Virginia Woolf's childhood memories can be read in her novel *To the Lighthouse* (1927); and the figure of her influenced the creation of Mrs. Ramsay of that same novel.

² The Bloomsbury Group was an influential group of intellectuals, writers, philosophers and artists. Their works and artwork influenced literature, aesthetics, criticism and economics, as well as developed modern attitudes towards feminism, pacifism and sexuality.

Her mother's sudden death in 1895 and the death of her half-sister Stella two years later, led to Woolf's first nervous breakdown. A second, and more severe, breakdown was in 1904 when her father died; it was her first suicide attempt and Virginia Woolf had to be institutionalized. In 1906, her closest brother Thoby died from a typhoid fever and was later re-invented, re-created as Jacob, in *Jacob's Room* (1922) and Percival in *The Waves* (1931). Since then, Virginia Woolf consulted at least twelve different doctors, consequently experiencing all types of medical treatment for the insane. Woolf later incorporated the language she heard into her character Septimus Smith in *Mrs. Dalloway* (1925). Despite all the hardships, Woolf was able to finish her studies in Greek, Latin, German and History at the Ladies' Department of King's College in London.

Virginia Woolf wrote greatly and extensively on the problem of women's access to the learned professions, such as academia, the church and medicine, as well as she also wrote about marriage equality. Her criticism reclaims the female writing tradition (*A Room of One's Own*) and gender deconstruction (*Orlando*). The literary criticism present in Woolf's essays show her dedication to women's lives and their writings, the reading through the body and the reading as a woman, the quest for female forebears, have become primal for the considerations on Woolf's work as an essayist, also giving importance to history and biography.

Though new readings of the novels have been placing great emphasis on communal memory, shared histories, group dynamics, struggles with tradition on women's lives, and though *A Room of One's Own* and (more problematically) *Three Guineas* have long been valued for their arguments against dictatorship, repression and conformity, the politics of her literary essays have not been so fully understood. Yet they are intensely interested in breaking down hierarchies, validating ordinary lives and encouraging readers to follow their own judgments. (Sellers, 2010: 94)

Virginia Woolf refused numerous marriage proposals, marrying Leonard Woolf at the age of thirty. Due to her mental condition, they were advised not to have children. In 1922, Virginia Woolf met Vita Sackville-West. Woolf's relationship with Vita is in the background of *Orlando* On March 28th, 1941; Virginia Woolf committed suicide by filling her pockets with stones and walking into the River Ouse.

"For Virginia Woolf, life and work were complementary"(Gordon, 1984: 8). All Virginia Woolf's life events are important to her development as a writer and also most

of her life events as well her life experiences give the basis for her literary works, and also her works as a critic. “As a writer, Virginia Woolf took hold of the past, of ghostly voices speaking with increasing clarity, perhaps more real for her than the people who lived by her side. When the voices of the dead urged her to impossible things they drove her mad but, controlled, they became the material of fiction”(Gordon, 1984: 4). The difference between the way in which Woolf was educated in comparison with her brothers, gives the motif of education discussed in *A Room of One’s Own*; the social difference between men and women which Woolf experience as a child and also as a grown woman, are the background for almost of her fiction.

Gender and Androgyny

Before one can begin the analysis of *A Room of One’s Own* and *Orlando*, one has to have some knowledge about gender and androgyny, since both themes are central for both literary works.

Gender - A culturally shaped group of attributes and behaviours given to the female or the male. (...) Polarity is essential to gender construction since each gender is constructed as the opposite of the other. (...) Traditional sex difference studies are designed to prove that these characteristics are not socially constructed but derive from biological differences. (Humm, 1995: 106, 107)

When talking about gender, one is referring to the differences between male and female in terms of “behavior, personality traits, identity, psychic configurations, roles, functions, rights (...) it also denotes norms applicable to every aspect of life – sartorial to gastronomical, sexual, linguistic and sanctioned conduct in everyday life. All these norms result in creating as a cultural ideal, a particular type of individual, recognized as a woman or a man”(Krishnaraj, 1996: 9).

The gender construction also takes as a basis the notions of femininity and masculinity as being two mutually distinctive and exclusive attributes to the female and male sex. The differentiations built with these attributes are not only made on psychological grounds as are also the way in which allocations of power, authority and resources, are shaped – meaning that men occupy positions of power, leadership, that require competence, and women occupy positions that require feminine behaviour; The

allocations in these positions are justified with the excuse of natural differences between the sexes.

A way to break this gendered norms and social hierarchies is to unify what is typically asserted to be male or female. The androgynous being is the one who consolidates the characteristics of both sexes and the basic human impulses – which are expressed by both sexes.

Androgyny - Greek word from andro (male) and gyn (female) which means a psychological and psychic mixture of traditional masculine and feminine virtues. It is to be distinguished from hermaphroditism, which means primarily a physical condition. (...) Virginia Woolf defined androgyny, in *A Room of One's Own* as a spectrum on which human beings could choose their places regardless of history or tradition. (Humm, 1995: 10, 11)

In a way, androgyny is a way to return to a psychological harmony, giving freedom to the mind without scrutiny of having to think only according to the male or female norms. Reaching an androgynous mind frame, or way of thought, is reaching an ideal and harmonious state.

In *A Room of One's Own* (...) Woolf offers an imaginary, idealized androgyny that enables writers to see beyond the limits of any gender perspective.

A Room of One's Own (...) repositions it [androgyny] within a romantic longing for transcending the particulars of time and place, and makes it into an abstract ideal to which writers can aspire. (Kaivola, 1999: 254,255)

In *A Room of One's Own*, Virginia Woolf alongside with discussing women rights to property, money, and same job and education opportunities, also explores the possibility of having an androgynous mind, and its benefits.

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. (Woolf, 2000: 103)

However, the notion that Woolf explores in *A Room of One's Own* is not based in the analysis of the male and the female frame of mind, but rather in the unification of both minds. “‘Man’, ‘woman’, ‘masculine’ and ‘feminine’ are all known quantities or qualities, with each pair forming a complementary whole” (Bowbly, 1997: 191).

The episode Mary Beton describes in Chapter Six, of the couple getting in the cab, gives the narrator a sense of satisfaction for “the sight of two people coming down the street and meeting at the corner seems to ease the mind of some strain” (Woolf, 2000: 95); it is an effortless decision for both man and woman, for they are in unison in their decision to enter the taxi. “Now that effort had ceased and that unity had been restored by seeing two people come together and get into a taxi-cab”(Woolf, 2000: 95).

Clearly the mind is always altering its focus and bringing the world into different perspectives. (...) But there may be some state of mind in which one could continue without effort because nothing is required to be held back. And this perhaps, I thought, coming in from the window, is one of them. For certainly when I saw the couple get into the taxi-cab the mind felt as if, after being divided, it had come together again in a natural fusion. The obvious reason would be that it is natural for the sexes to cooperate. One has a profound, if irrational, instinct in favour of the theory that the union of man and woman makes for the greatest satisfaction, the most complete happiness. (Woolf, 2000: 96)

As it can be observed, for Virginia Woolf the perfect state of mind, and the perfect mind is the one that unites the both so called masculine as well as feminine traits and frames of mind; that the normal state is the one where both can live in harmony,

Spiritually cooperating. If one is a man, still the woman part of the brain must have effect; and a woman also must have intercourse with the man in her. Coleridge perhaps meant this when he said that a great mind is androgynous. It is when this fusion takes place that the mind is fertilized and uses all its faculties. Perhaps a mind that is purely masculine cannot create, any more than a mind that is purely feminine. (Woolf, 2000: 97)

With *Orlando*, Virginia Woolf explores the theme of androgyny through sex change, exploring clothes ambivalence and the perfect union between two people that are depicted as ambivalent in behaviour and frame of mind, Orlando and Shelmerdine.

A Room of One's Own

Written in 1929, *A Room of One's Own* is an extended essay where Virginia Woolf debates about women's access to education, where she tries to go back to her mothers in order to build a history of women's writing. It is also in this small essay that Woolf reveals the aesthetics with which she tries to define the different forms women's writing might take, combining voice, style, sex and the body. *A Room of One's Own* is also an extensive consideration, and thought, on how under-represented women are in

the history of literature; a struggle to establish a feminine style of writing, in order to quiet the voices of men, constantly telling women that they cannot write, paint or perform any other type of art.

A Room of One's Own (...) has been most influential in the sphere of literary feminism. Woolf's construction of an independent female literary tradition, a separate story of women's literary development, has perhaps been the most significant model for feminist criticism this century, underlying the creation of presses dedicated solely to publishing women's writing and to the literary dimension of 'women's studies'. Woolf's assertion that 'we think back through our mothers if we are women' is, in the rhetorical contexts of *A Room of One's Own*, a more ambiguous claim than it would at first appear, but it has proved an immensely powerful model of literary matrilinearity none the less. Woolf also constructs a literary history around women's absence and exclusion (Marcus, 1997: 43, 44)

In the opening paragraph, Woolf's narrator explains that she has been invited to lecture about Women and Fiction; encountering already a few complications for there were no information about women writers, or literature written by women.

But at second sight the words seemed not so simple. The title women and fiction might mean, and you may have meant it to mean, women and what they are like; or it might mean women and what they write; or it might mean women and the fiction that is written about them; or it might mean that somehow all three are inextricably mixed together and you want me to consider them in that light. (Woolf, 2000: 5)

When it comes to women writing fiction, Virginia Woolf explains that there are two very important factors to have in mind: money and a room for herself – “a woman must have money and a room of her own if she is to write fiction” (Woolf, 2000: 6); the creative power lies in the peace of mind and spirit one finds when alone, in a place of one's own, where one feels comfortable enough to allow the creative power flow.

Woolf's narrator presents herself as “Mary Beton, Mary Seton, Mary Carmichael or by any name you please – it is not a matter of importance” (Woolf, 2000: 6,7) – on the contrary, it is a matter of great importance since this narrator does not have to hide her gender, or adopt a pseudonym – contrary to what was habit in the nineteenth century, as it was mentioned before in the Introduction and Chapter One, in the twentieth century the name of the author did not dictate the future of the book, hence women did not need to write under pseudonymous.

Mary Beton begins her investigation about Women and Fiction at Oxbridge College, where Beton reflects on the different educational experiences available to men and women, as well as on the material differences in their lives.

At the thought of all those women working year after year and finding it hard to get two thousand pounds together, and as much as they could do to get thirty thousand pounds, we burst out in scorn at the reprehensible poverty of our sex. (Woolf, 2000: 22)

It really is revolting when one looks back in time, and acknowledges what women had to go for just to have something for themselves without depending on a man; and if this was not bad enough, everything they owned, their husbands were entitled to have. For,

In the first place, to earn money was impossible for them, and in second, had it been possible, the law denied them the right to possess what money they earned. It is only for the last forty-eight years that Mrs. Seton has had a penny of her own. For all the centuries before that it would have been her husband's property (Woolf, 2000: 24)

And this leads one to question why. Why did the bureaucracy and the laws of the civilized world work on the basis of the slavery, that one sex is inferior to the other, that one sex is weaker in relation to the other on the basis of force, why do women have to content themselves with the little that their husbands give to them, why must the female sex depend on the male sex;

Why was one sex prosperous and the other so poor? What effect has poverty on fiction? What conditions are necessary for the creation of works of art? (Woolf, 2000: 27)

Unsatisfied with the answers, or the lack of them, Mary Beton goes to the British Library to see if she has any luck. At first, Beton discovers that there are a lot of books written about women, but none of them brings the "truth to my notebook" (Woolf, 2000: 28). Beton reaches the conclusion that England was under the rule of a patriarchy (Woolf, 2000: 25) and that "Women have served all these centuries as looking-glasses possessing the magic and delicious power of reflecting the figure of man at twice its natural size." (Woolf, 2000: 37); women are powerless as the reflection of men's power. Women, for men, were merely objects that served as reinforcing instruments for men's self-confidence; women were the mirrors in which men wanted to see their grandeur. Even though the narrator tries not to take this personally, Beton takes a stand against this sexist operational mode from a cultural viewpoint, invoking the fascist and

dictatorial political regimes, stating that both the mirror theory and these regimes had as a base, radical and extreme modes of thinking.

Whatever may be their use in civilized societies, mirrors are essential to all violent and heroic action. That is why Napoleon and Mussolini both insisted so emphatically upon the inferiority of women, for if they were not inferior, they would cease to enlarge. That serves to explain in part the necessity that women so often are to men. And it serves to explain how restless they are under her criticism; how impossible it is for her to say to them this book is bad, this picture is feeble, or whatever it may be, without giving far more pain and rousing far more anger than a man would do who gave the same criticism. For is she beings to tell the truth, the figure in the looking-glass shrinks; his fitness for life is diminished. (Woolf, 2000: 37)

In this passage, one is able to see the position which Virginia Woolf takes in regard to the relationship between men and women – the bystander; nevertheless Woolf’s fictional works, as well as her non-fictions, reveal the desire to do something about women’s restrained lives; to contribute to women liberation. One of the ways which Woolf uses to call to attention the difference between men and women, and how unequally women are treated, is when the narrator creates an imaginary twin for William Shakespeare. Judith Shakespeare is described to be as talented as her brother; however, her family and society did not recognized in her the same talents as her brother had, nor did they encourage her to pursue a career in play-writing. Judith’s talents are so underestimated and deemphasized that when she writes she is both ashamed and secretive about it. She is forced to marry at a fairly young age and when she begs her father not to do it, he beats her; she commits suicide short after. Judith Shakespeare is just an example given by Woolf to try and show that women were treated in such a different manner, that even having the unique talent to write like Shakespeare did meant nothing. (Woolf, 2000: 48, 49)

The major theme in *A Room of One’s Own* is undoubtedly money. Women need money to write, to have a room, to be educated; Woolf does not insist much on the theme of education, as it can be seen for instance in Charlotte Brontë, nevertheless, education has been a problem since the beginning.

Mary Wollstonecraft, who so greatly influenced the First Feminist Movement with her *A Vindication of the Rights of Woman* (1792), insisted that women were not inferior to men, only appeared so for their lack of education.

But what precisely were the rights of woman that Wollstonecraft sought to vindicate? There are two aspects to this question. First, she demanded a revolution of manners, based on a rethinking of conventional ideas about women's conduct and moral qualities in accordance with her belief that there was only one standard of human virtue and that it must be the same for men and women.

But alongside the discussion of moral questions, Wollstonecraft also argued for the institutional and legal change which followed from the recognition of women's moral autonomy: an education based on rational principles and which combined intellectual training with useful skills; an end to the sexual double standard; reform of marriage; and the admission of women to a range of fields of study and of paid employment which would allow them to be economically independent. (Caine, 1997: 27, 28)

Uneducated women have "the conduct and manners" that "evidently prove that their minds are not in a healthy state;" (Wollstonecraft, 1996: 6). A woman in a healthy state, both mental and physical, would see the patriarchal hierarchy as wrong, would not want to depend on men, nor have men dictate the "dos and don'ts" that they had to follow.

It offers a powerful critique of women's education and of the assumptions surrounding marriage and family life. But even more important is its complex discussion of sexual difference and its elaboration of the ways in which constructions of femininity, both at an ideological level and in terms of the conduct of everyday life, serve the interests of male sexual desire. (Caine, 1997: 23)

Mary Wollstonecraft even goes as far to 'attack' men in their demand to lower women's status in society, and as a being which is inferior to men – when it comes to strength (the basis in which both sexes were hierarchized).

In the government of the physical world it is observable that the female in point of strength is, in general, inferior to the male. This is the law of nature; and it does not appear to be suspended or abrogated in favour of woman. (...) But not content with this natural pre-eminence, men endeavour to sink us still lower, merely to render us alluring objects for a moment (Wollstonecraft, 1996: 7).

Thus the Angel in the House is being acknowledged already in the eighteenth-century; as well as the objectification of women for the pleasure and purposes of men – the looking glass, the object of desire, the fair inferior being which needs protection.

Women are told from their infancy, and taught by the example of their mothers, that a little knowledge of human weakness, justly termed cunning, softness of temper, outward obedience, and a scrupulous attention to a puerile kind of propriety, will obtain for them the protection

of men; and they should be beautiful, every thing else is needless, for, at least, twenty years of their lives. (Wollstonecraft, 1996: 18)

And due to this dependence and wrong teaching, women depended on men, were subdued to the task of taking care of the house and the children; to the most basic and sometimes performing tasks without the need of intellect or brain exercise. Nevertheless, even in this state, women were capable of learning a few things here and there, through hearing men talk and behaving in certain manners.

Led by their dependent situation and domestic employments more into society, what they learn is rather by snatches: and as learning is with them, in general, only a secondary thing, they do not pursue any one branch with that persevering ardour necessary to give vigour to the faculties, and clearness to the judgment. (Wollstonecraft, 1996: 22)

Since women were deprived to develop their brains, so did their sense of criticism and judgment suffer a down fall; the habit of wife-beating was considered 'normal', the stress that men underwent every day, was also used as an excuse for wife-beating. Wollstonecraft claims that by strengthening "the female mind by enlarging it, (...) there will be an end to blind obedience"; however, the state of blind obedience was necessary to keep women in a state of "slaves" or as "play-thing" (Wollstonecraft, 1996: 24). Mary Wollstonecraft's solution is simple: education of both the female and the male mind, and that they should be educated together, for in that way,

The constitution of boys would not be ruined by the early debaucheries, which now make men so selfish, or girls rendered weak and vain, by indolence, and frivolous pursuits. But, I presuppose, that such a degree of equality should be established between the sexes as would shut out gallantry and coquetry, yet allow friendship and love to temper the heart for the discharge of higher duties. (Wollstonecraft, 1996: 175)

If women are free, if they are properly educated, fairly educated the same way men are, if they are given the same opportunities that men receive, they too can become intelligent and virtuous. Educating men to become more sensitive to the status of women would also prevent wife-beating and other forms of female discrimination.

They will quickly become wise and virtuous, as men become more so; for the improvement must be mutual, or the injustice which one half of the human race are obliged to submit to, retorting on their oppressors, the virtue of men will be worm-eaten by the insect whom he keeps under his feet. (Wollstonecraft, 1996: 182)

And if men should worry about the behaviour of a learned woman, they do not have anything to fear for the learned woman still has morals, is modest and will continue doing her role in society; the difference will be that they will perform this same role in a more productive way. In other words, men did not have to fear, for women would still be submissive, but they would be learned.

There have been instances of women who, attaining knowledge, have not discarded modesty, nor have they always pedantically appeared to despise the ignorance which they laboured to disperse in their own minds. (Wollstonecraft, 1996: 182)

Unfortunately, the battle for education which began in the eighteenth century still lasted a long time. In the nineteenth century women gained access to education, yet when one compares the education that they received with the one which men received, one can see that women's education was still faulty; it was not in the same fields that men had access to. As it can be witnessed in Virginia Woolf's biography, this division in education still lasted until the twentieth century for Woolf was home schooled and her brothers went to Cambridge to receive a higher education.

The first campaign in which the issue of sexual difference, especially in terms of the intellectual differences between men and women, came to the fore was that over higher education. All mid-Victorian feminists agreed that educational deprivation was an essential feature of women's oppression, and one, as many of them would argue, bearing particularly harshly on middle-class women who were denied access to the schools and universities attended by their brothers. (Caine, 1997: 115, 116)

Hence, due to this lack of education, the search for women literary history, as Virginia Woolf does in *A Room of One's Own*, is an impossible mission, "what I find deplorable (...) is that nothing is known about women before the eighteenth century" (Woolf, 2000: 47).

Her (...) aim was to establish a woman's tradition, recognizable by its circumstances, subject-manner, and its distinct problems (the age-old confinement of women in the domestic sphere, the pressures of conformity to patriarchal ideas, and worst, the denial of private income and privacy). *A Room of One's Own* charted this vast territory with an air of innocent discovery which itself sharpens the case against induced ineffectiveness and ignorance that for so long clouded the counter-history of women. (Gordon, 1984: 182)

In this impossible quest, however, Beton did find Aphra Behn, who Woolf considered as biggest inspiration, as well as the biggest example, to follow if a woman

is to pursue a career in writing. Out of necessity “forced by the death of her husband” (Woolf, 2000: 64), along with some sacrifices, Aphra Behn “proved that money could be made by writing”.

Virginia Woolf states that in the eighteenth century, “hundreds of women” tried to making a living by the pen by “making translations or writing the innumerable bad novels (...) The extreme activity of mind which showed itself in the later eighteenth century among women – the talking, and the meeting, the writing of essays on Shakespeare, the translating of the classics – was founded on the solid fact that women could make money by writing” (Woolf, 2000: 65). It was due to Aphra Behn’s success that women started to believe in a life of independence and access to money, could be achieved by writing; even writing a simple review – mind you not a review of men’s work for they still were haunted by the Angel – already gave women some sense of power and control, and most importantly freedom, over their lives.

Nevertheless, the battle was far from being over, since the women in the nineteenth century were equally constrained; for they still were encourage not following the literary field or any other artist field. The nineteenth century is probably the century when the differences between male and female were most emphasized. With the Industrial Revolution and all its implications, men would go to work and women would be in charge of the house, doing their role as mothers, waiting for the husband to come home, and serve dinner. Women writers in the nineteenth century had to disguise their sex, writing under pseudonyms otherwise their works would not sell.

Even in the nineteenth century a woman was not encouraged to be an artist. On the contrary, she was snubbed, slapped, lectured, and exhorted. Her mind must have been strained and her vitality lowered by the need of opposing this, of disproving that. For here again we come within range of that very interesting and obscure masculine complex which has had so much influence upon the woman’s movement; that deep-seated desire, not so much that *she* shall be inferior as that *he* shall be superior (Woolf, 2000: 56)

Virginia Woolf, having had a Victorian environment in her upbringing (Zwerdling, 1987: 226) also felt this inferiority imposed by men on women – one can even start with her father and difference he made in educating his offspring –, as well as the influence of the Angel in the House in Woolf whenever she would write, either a review, and essay or a book.

Woolf's era of suffrage agitation, however, presented the woman writer not only with the usual conflict between the traditional female role and art but also with the perhaps more difficult choice between political and artistic rebellion. Either commitment had implications for the other; in either case the woman must sort out her attitudes toward the fact that she is a woman and that, as such, she has a world view different from that of the men who dominate both society and art. In either case she can limit her effectiveness by anger and bitterness, or she can transcend self-consciousness. (Marcus, 1983: 133)

So, in *Professions for Women*, Woolf endured one of the hardest battles, against her own self. In *Professions*, Woolf seeks to kill the Angel in the House that lurks inside her mind.

And when I came to write I encountered her with the very first words. The shadow of her wings fell on my page; I heard the rustling of her skirts in the room. Directly, that is to say, I took my pen in my hand to review that novel by a famous man, she slipped behind me and whispered: "My dear, you are a young woman. You are writing about a book that has been written by a man. Be sympathetic; be tender; flatter; deceive; use all the arts and wiles of our sex. Never let anybody guess that you have a mind of your own. Above all, be pure." (...) Thus, whenever I felt the shadow of her wing or the radiance of her halo upon my page, I took up the inkpot and flung it at her. She died hard. Her fictitious nature was of great assistance to her. It is far harder to kill a phantom than a reality. (Woolf, 1942: 130)

And thus Virginia Woolf is able to free herself of an Angel that clouded her mind, hence being able to see clearly that even though the women before her "wrote as women write (...) [that] all the thousand women who wrote novels [before her were able to ignore] the perpetual admonitions of the eternal pedagogue – write this, think that. They alone were deaf to that persistent voice, now grumbling, now patronizing, now domineering, now grieved, now shocked, now angry, now avuncular, that voice which cannot let women alone, but must be at them, like some too conscientious governess" (Woolf, 2000: 75); that they were also able to silence their own Angel, the nagging men that forced them to be a house doll, the perfect woman.

For women have sat indoors all these millions of years, so that by this time the vary 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. (Woolf, 2000: 87)

That even though some of them wrote like men did, they were able to write, to use their gift. They were able to contribute to the Women's Literary History; they were able to ensure that the future generations, when looking back to their mothers, do not have to go to the fathers due to the lack of material, that there is in fact a literary history worth to be studied, read and receive inspiration from.

Orlando

Woolf's theories of gender, sexuality, and desire do take into account the social reality of living as a woman in a society and how that reality forms one's mind or psyche – and, therefore, one's opportunities and talents. *Orlando* shows that only by living corporeally as both a man and a woman and being understood by one's society and one's intimates as one and then the other, can a person hope to obtain an androgynous mind. (Helt, 2010: 145)

With *Orlando*, Virginia Woolf continues her criticism on the patriarchal society as well as explores the androgynous mind; uses androgyny as a way to escape the binary limitation of gender, describing the self as theatrical – in a form of performance, role-playing with sexuality.

In the beginning of the novel, Orlando is presented as a “He – for there could be no doubt of his sex, though the fashion of the time [Renaissance] did something to disguise it” (Woolf, 2003: 5), and also from the beginning the idea of cross-gender is planted. From this point onwards, the reader already has an idea of what may come henceforth, and not be so surprised that when Princess Sasha, and the Archduchess Harriet are presented, that both of the characters also have an ambiguous gender.

When Princess Sasha is presented with “loose tunic and trousers (...) [which] seemed to disguise the sex” (Woolf, 2003: 17), the elements of cross-gender and performance are also present, however, Woolf used this moment to plant the idea that Orlando was curiously attracted to the personae Sasha was presenting, and not the sex.

a figure, which, whether boy's or woman's, for the loose tunic and trousers of the Russian fashion served to disguise the sex, was about the middle height, very slenderly fashioned, and dressed entirely in oyster-coloured velvet, trimmed with some unfamiliar greenish-coloured fur. But these details were extraordinary seductiveness which issued from the whole person. (Woolf, 2003: 17)

Only when Orlando came closer to her, does the reader know that he has always been a she. The first thought Orlando has is clearly a misogynist one, for to him, no woman could skate better than a man, thus, no woman could skate the way Sasha was skating.

When the boy, for alas, a boy must be – no woman could skate with such speed and vigour – swept almost on tiptoe past him, Orlando was ready to tear his hair with vexation that the person was of his own sex (Woolf, 2003: 17).

With Archduchess Harriet, Woolf is also breaking the gender pattern. Firstly presented as a woman, “the figure of a very tall lady in riding hood” (Woolf, 2003: 55), she breaks the pattern of femininity by showing “a knowledge of wines rare in a lady, and made some observations upon the firearms and the costumes of the sportsmen in her country” (Woolf, 2003: 56). Again, Orlando displaying the typical ‘man thought’ about women and their inferiority. Only when Orlando becomes a woman, does she fully understand that there are not so many differences between the sexes. Archduchess Harriet is later presented as Archduke, when Orlando becomes a woman.

The Archduchess (but she must in future be known as the Archduke) told his story – that he was a man and always had been one; that he had seen of portrait of Orlando and fallen hopelessly in love with him; that to compass his ends, he had dressed as a woman and lodge at the Baker’s shop; that he was desolated when he [Orlando] fled to Turkey. (Woolf, 2003: 88)

The gender performance and the notion of transvestism as well as the ideal of falling in love with someone due to their personality regardless of their sex, are characteristics which are also present in the Archduke’s character. Besides Orlando, the Archduke was the character which Virginia Woolf used to make the statement of breaking the female/male ideals and broke the boundaries, having both Orlando and the Archduke acting/performing with both sexes, deconstruction the feminine/masculine myths and typical behaviours associated to each sex.

Orlando had become a woman there is no denying it. But in every other respect, Orlando remained precisely as he had been. The change of sex, though it altered their future, did nothing whatever to alter their identity. (Woolf, 2003: 67)

With the romance between Orlando and Sasha going wrong, as well as his romance with Archduchess Harriet, and with Orlando falling into a sudden mood of melancholy, he falls asleep for a week, into a strange sleep, and wakes up a woman.

In *Orlando* the male principle turns out to be less different from the female than it is portentously claimed to be. The whimsical unsexed biographer of Orlando discovers him and her not much changed by the shifts in gender, though she [female Orlando] experiences the constraints imposed on her sex. He [male Orlando] is defined more by his class than his sex it turns out. (...) Orlando's male freedom is class freedom and so is Orlando's female freedom. (Roe, 1987: 446)

Woolf does not define identity or personality through sex. Even though Orlando changed sex, he/she did not change in terms of core, of being, the way of thinking – the only way to define Orlando is through the social class. Despite Sue Roe claiming in *Women Reading, Women's Writing*, 1987, that the male Orlando's freedom is the same as the female Orlando's it is not quite so, for when the female Orlando goes to the Law Courts to reclaim her house, Orlando discovers that she has law suits charged against her, "(1) that she was dead, and therefore could not hold any property whatsoever; (2) that she was a woman, which amounts to the same thing;" (Woolf, 2003: 82). Orlando thus had to wait for the court to acknowledge that she was in fact alive, and that she was the previous Duke Orlando; nevertheless, female Orlando had to get married in order to keep her property.

Orlando "was a man till the age of thirty; when to become a woman and has remained so ever since." (Woolf, 2003: 68) – recalling one to the famous sentence "One is not born a woman, but rather becomes a woman." by Simone de Beauvoir. (*The Second Sex*, 2010: 330).

She remembered how, as a young man, she had insisted that women must be obedient, chaste, scented, and exquisitely apparelled. 'Now I shall have to pay in my own person for those desires', she reflected; 'for women are not (judging by my own short experience of the sex) obedient, chaste, scented, and exquisitely apparelled by nature. They can only attain these graces, without which they may enjoy none of the delights of life, by the most tedious discipline. (Woolf, 2003: 76, 77)

At this point, Orlando is starting to realise that women are not as men perceive them, and that it is not easy to be a woman due to the fact that so many constraints and ideologies are imposed by society; "the category of women is a variable cultural accomplishment, a set of meanings that are taken on or taken up within a cultural field,

and that no one is born with a gender – a gender is always acquired”(Butler, 2006: 151). Orlando tried to reach a compromise in behaviour for she did not know to each sex she belonged to and did not know how to have, or was not capable of having, just one type of thinking, just one mind frame (male or female) – she had an androgynous mind, the unity and not the division.

And here it would seem from some ambiguity in her terms that she was censuring both sexes equally, as if she belonged to neither; and indeed, for the time being, she seemed to vacillate; she was man; she was woman; she knew the secrets, shared the weakness of each. It was a most bewildering and whirling state of mind to be in. (Woolf, 2003: 77)

Virginia Woolf used *Orlando* not only to defend a more humane view of human beings, as well as to call the attention of the reader to the construction of femininity and masculinity – a social construction that affected both sexes, for men could not be sensitive, and women could not be strong, powerful and independent, they had to depend on their husbands, fathers, brothers, but never could be on their own. When Orlando becomes a woman, she realises the faults and the wrongs of her previous sex, as well as her previous doings as a man, towards women. The episode with the prostitute, which will later be discussed, allows the reader to understand how deeply Orlando changed when it comes to thinking about women, and taking them into consideration.

Women, freed from martial ambition and the love of power can, she thinks, ‘more fully enjoy the most exalted raptures known to the human spirit’. The comic exaggeration tone here distances us from an emotion whose contingent and constructed natures made abundantly clear. Orlando begins to construct these responses not because she has become a woman in the biological sense, but because of the restricted opportunities offered to women under patriarchy. (Hanson, 1994: 98).

Woolf defends that one “must find our identity through the *constructed* categories of sex and gender”(Hanson, 1994: 109). Orlando knew from her experience as a man, “that men cry as frequently and as unreasonably as women”, what Orlando did not know, however, was that “should be shocked [or acted shocked] when men display emotion in their presence, and so, shocked she was” (Woolf, 2003: 88). Virginia Woolf also deconstructs the masculine myth, showing that women empower men, in this case, by making Orlando shocked when she sees Archduke crying, showing how fragile masculinity really is.

The theme of clothes is also an important one to be discussed, since both Virginia Woolf and Charlotte Brontë, use clothes to confuse characters or to give freedom to act or perform freely. Woolf uses clothes as a means to deceive and break stereotypes, Brontë, on the other hand, uses clothes and transvestism as a means to an end. In *Jane Eyre* when Mr. Rochester dressed as a female gipsy in order to discover the truth about Jane. And in *Villette*, when Lucy Snowe dresses herself as a man for a school play, and also when she discovers that the nun whom has been haunting her, is nothing more than a man with a costume.

As early as 1837, (...) Charlotte Brontë's Rochester dresses himself as a female gipsy not to degrade himself but to try to 'get at' the truth about Jane; in *Villette*, (...), Brontë's Lucy Snowe discovers ultimate truths about herself, first when she impersonates a man for the school play and, later, when she perceives that the nun who has haunted her is really no more than a costume worn by a transvestite male. Just as Rochester is trying to communicate with the 'savage thing' trapped in Jane, Lucy is trying to uncover that purely powerful element in herself and her life. (Gilbert, 1980: 413)

Contrary to Charlotte Brontë, Woolf's use of clothes is more intended to break the pattern of what is considered typical women's or men's clothes; she also uses the clothes to make the statement that gender can be a performance, and due to that, when comparing both pictures of Orlando as a male and Orlando as a female, there is such an abysmal difference of behaviour. Male Orlando has the typical pose associated to men, confident, staring the world straight ahead, always ready, while the female Orlando keeps her head down, only taking side glances of the world, with neither of the hands free – which does not happen with the male Orlando – waiting for something bad to happen, as she gazes with suspicion.

If we compare the picture of Orlando as a man with that of Orlando as a woman we shall see that though both are undoubtedly one and the same person, there are certain changes. The man has his hand free to seize the sword, the woman must use hers to keep the stains from slipping from her shoulders. The man looks the world full in the face, as if it were made for his uses and fashioned to his liking. The woman takes sidelong glance at it, full of subtlety, even of suspicion. Had they both worn the same clothes, it is possible that their outlook might have been the same. (Woolf, 2003: 92)

Virginia Woolf uses clothes as a means to confuse and play with Orlando's mind when presenting other characters; it was so with Sasha, the Archduke was dress like a woman in order to get Orlando's attention, and even Orlando herself was also depicted

as man or a woman with a change of clothes. “Clothes are but a symbol of something hid deep beneath.” Orlando herself decided to change and stop using men’s clothes and wearing women’s clothes instead. “It was a change in Orlando herself that dictated her choice of a woman’s dress and of a woman’s sex” (Woolf, 2003: 92).

If clothes ideally express the underlying sex, they may also be a secret, a cover, that conceals it, and the viewer has no means of telling which is which. The clothes offer an image which resembles that of a man or a woman; a woman’s clothes may either express a woman, or hide a man; a ‘woman’ may be only the temporary appearance or inclination of a ‘human being’ who vacillates from one identity to the other – and vice versa in both cases. (Bowbly, 1997: 47, 48)

After fastidiously having tea with Alexander Pope, Orlando decides to dress herself as a man again, and walk the streets of Leicester Square. Her encounter with Alexander Pope made her realise that women’s opinion on men’s art meant nothing, for they did not respect or valued, or even thought that women were able to do something more than just be pretty and do womanly things; that even though an intellectual could send to her his poems, essays, applaud her in her judgment, requests her criticism, none of this means that he respects her opinions, or admires her understanding of an art work (Woolf, 2003: 105).

Felling undervalued, Orlando dresses herself as a man and approached a prostitute named Nell. Nell behaved typically as women do next to a man, “the young woman looked up at him (for a man he was to her) appealing, hoping, trembling, fearing.” Orlando was able to capture these for she now had learned and understood, the ways women behaved around men, as also her previous experience as a man.

To feel her hanging lightly yet like a suppliant on her arm, roused in Orlando all the feelings which became a man. She looked, she felt, she talked like one. Yet, having been so lately a woman herself, she suspected that the girl’s timidity and her hesitating answers and the very fumbling with the key in the latch and the fold of her cloak and the drop of her wrist were all put on to gratify her masculinity. (Woolf, 2003: 106)

Orlando was not that far off from the truth, for when she revealed herself as a woman, Nell “burst (...) into a roar of laughter” (Woolf, 2003: 107), behaving and becoming more comfortable, loose and at ease in Orlando’s company. This change in behaviour by Nell is significant, for it demonstrates exactly the differences in behaviour of a woman when in the company of her sex and when in the company of the opposite sex. The effect that male Orlando has on Nell, to create fear, is completely the opposite

of the one she falls with female Orlando, when she becomes at ease. Women were supposed to fear men, especially the women who did not have any other way to survive besides being a prostitute.

Though she is a woman, she can choose to look like a man. This is like the first description of the relation between clothes and sex insofar as the clothes then make Orlando, to all intents and purposes, a man once more until she puts off her 'disguise.'

What Orlando adopts, then, is a strategy whereby as a woman she will have the best of both sexual worlds, posing at whim as one sex or the other, the difference being produced by a change of clothes. This 'vacillation' confounds the security of the structure in which the two sexes can be confidently distinguished, by reducing its determinants to a matter of outward appearances, simulating what may or may not be the true identity 'underneath'. (Bowbly, 1997: 49)

One can argue that Virginia Woolf achieved the perfect androgynous being when Woolf introduced Marmaduke Bonthrop Shelmerdine in *Orlando*. Shelmerdine and Orlando find love in each other, marry and have a child. Orlando and Shelmerdine form the perfect androgynous being.

'You're a woman, Shel!' she cried.

'You're a man, Orlando!' he cried. (Woolf, 2003: 124)

They have both the combinations of both female and male frame of mind; they both balance their actions in what it is perceived to be more 'masculine' or 'feminine'.

'Are you positive you aren't a man?' he would ask anxiously, and she would echo,

'Can it be possible you're not a woman?' and then they must put it to the proof without more ado. For each was so surprised at the quickness of the other's sympathy, and it was to each such a revelation that a woman could be as tolerant and free-spoken as a man, and a man as strange and subtle as a woman (...). (Woolf, 2003: 127)

With *Orlando* Woolf tried to make people aware that women and men are not so different after all, breaking gender stereotypes, showing that the female and the male frame of mind are not so different. Woolf also implicitly accused the typical masculinity and femininity that haunts the construction of a human being; if a woman, she has to behave in a certain way, if a man, in the complete opposite way. Virginia Woolf showed that gender is a performance – a simple change in clothes can cause confusion, a woman can pass as a man, a man can pass as a woman. With Orlando and Shelmerdine, Woolf

created the perfect androgynous being and achieved the androgynous mind she had already referred to in *A Room of One's Own*. Orlando did not change her frame of mind when she changed sex, and Shelmerdine already had a frame a mind and behaviour that are strange for a man. This question of odd non-gendered behaviour is also present in *The Professor*, Charlotte Brontë introduces William, the main character, as a man with a behaviour atypical from the man of his age – William only discovers himself and starts to define himself after he starts to teach in an all girl's school, when he gains some sort of economic independence, learning more about the female character, which allows him to construct his male personality by default. When Orlando changes sex, she knows what is like to behave like a man, however, she does not have a female personality; with time, Orlando starts to understand what it is like to be a woman, and chooses to dress in women's clothes. Orlando becomes a woman, not in the same sense that William becomes a man – for Orlando actually undergoes a change of sex, and William only learns by default what it is supposed to be the behaviour of a man.

In *A Room of One's Own*, Woolf successfully calls the attention for the talent women have for writing, for the arts; that a woman should be free and independent to have a job, money to get her by, and also a room where she can expand her creativity. By trying to construct a female literary history, Woolf demonstrates that women lived under the shadow of men for a long time, only in the sixteenth century was she able to find a woman with genius, who was able to make money by writing, who pioneered and inspired many generations of women that followed. Despite having to write under pseudonyms, women still endured the hardships imposed by men, and succeeded in writing, making money and a career; women were starting to vindicate their rights of property, education, however, Mary Beton still felt prejudice for being in a place where women were not allowed – discrimination and differentiation was still felt.

Conclusion

Charlotte Brontë and Virginia Woolf both, along with many other women writers, overcame the hardships of their time, the impositions that were made upon them, and were successful, giving to the world their geniuses through their writing. With different styles and different approaches, however, both had the same aim – to empower women. Charlotte Brontë created heroines with a rough background, most of them orphan, who had to work to make a living and achieve their dreams; heroines who were not afraid of hard work, who looked at patriarchy straight in the eyes and deconstructed it as much as they were capable. Virginia Woolf looked at patriarchy and, sometimes ironically, portrayed it in her works, calling the attention to how fragile masculinity was for it had to depend on a looking-glass mirror to feel empowered. Woolf demonstrated that men are only as powerful as women allow them to be. One interesting point common to both authors is the topic of education. In *Jane Eyre*, Brontë claims that women have the same necessity to work their faculties as their fellow men, and Woolf, in *A Room of One's Own*, exposes that women could not receive any type of education that was equal to men, i.e. study the same subjects, for men believed that women did not have the mental faculties to do so. Nevertheless, this call for education is not something new; Mary Wollstonecraft became famous with her *A Vindication of the Rights of Woman*, in which she wrote mostly about the right that women had to receive education, by not only claiming that right, as also to show how beneficial it was for both sexes and for society as well.

Even though Charlotte Brontë and Virginia Woolf are two different writers who used their gift in different ways, one revealed very subtly that one of the major problems women had was the lack of economic independence, while the other just simply wrote about it in the open. Brontë and Woolf both try to solve this same problem; Brontë gave economic independence to her female characters, not marrying them until they could stand on their own – for example, Frances in *The Professor* declines to marry William for he has a bigger salary and she does not want to depend on him ('How rich you are monsieur! And then she stirred uneasily in my arms. 'Three thousand francs!' she murmured, 'while I get only twelve hundred!' Brontë, 1989: 250). As it can be seen, already from her first novel, Charlotte Brontë tries to give equality through money to her heroines, making them no longer subjugated to the rule of men. One can argue, however, that only in *Jane Eyre*, can this statement be actually made,

since Jane inherits a fortune from her uncle and only then she feels ready to marry Rochester, for only now they are equals. When Virginia Woolf married Orlando and Shelmerdine, she did not need to make them equals for they already were, both in social status and in wealth. Contrary to Brontë, Woolf solves the problem from root by not creating characters that are orphan and have to battle their way to a successful life.

The theme of androgyny and ambiguity also circulates both authors. Brontë with William in *The Professor* creates an effeminate man, who behaves as women would behave in the presence of a male figure; and William is also a character who discovers and defines himself after having more contact with the female sex – by learning more about the female personality, he is able to learn more about his role as a man by default. In this William is the opposite to Orlando, who was born a man and then became a woman, however the process of learning how to behave according to their sex is almost the same. When Orlando is in the company of Nell, she is able to identify the typical women behaviour in the presence of a male for she too had to undergo the same experience. Unlike Orlando, however, William is born a man, and becomes a manly man. Orlando shares the same ambiguous name as Shirley, one of the protagonists of Brontë's third novel, *Shirley*. They both have ambiguous androgynous names, Shirley jokes about sending letters using "Esq. Lord" instead of lady, hence passing for a man, while Orlando actually dresses like a man. Another common point is that they both behave in masculine ways.

Charlotte Brontë did contribute and was important to the development of English literature and with *Jane Eyre*, Brontë inspired many young ladies to pursue a life of independence, of hard work, never forgetting that love also has important part in our lives, and that we should remain faithful to ourselves, even if that means to run away the night before the wedding. Virginia Woolf, one could argue was a bit more interventionist, making the clear statement that women, and England, were under the rule of patriarchy, that the only way women could free themselves was to be economic independent and to have a room of their own. Woolf deconstructed gender and the social standards associated to it, by creating characters that look at gender and see it as a performance. Woolf also appealed to unity of the minds – what she claims to be the perfect mind, a mind that has no sex, which can think without the boundaries imposed by society; two minds capable of achieving a common goal. The episode of the couple getting inside the taxi, which amazed the narrator of *A Room of One's Own* could be

analysed as a metaphor for something bigger, like equal rights. Woolf disregarded the vote, preferring the money. However, what Woolf did not see was that the vote was already a big step in women's emancipation history.

The feminist developments of the interwar period, only came to be recognised recently; many thought that after the First World War, the feminist activity and women's movement would eventually come to an end; however it continued into the 1920s, 1930s and beyond. The early feminists believed that the political and legal changes they sought could on themselves bring the moral and social transformations; nevertheless by 1918³ it was clear that this was not entirely the case. Thus, the next step feminists and suffragists took was towards a construction, a development, of a feminist programme which could englobe the diverse interests and needs of all women. The interwar period also brought to discussion the economic question – earn freedom by earning money.

During the War, many women were able, or forced, to find jobs for they could not go to war. Many of the men, who survived the war and returned, came home impotent and maimed. “For the first time, large numbers of men suffered from nervous diseases, especially hysteria – once seen as a specifically female problem.” (Caine, 1997: 180) Men, consciously or not, felt an antagonism towards women for they, the women, stayed at home safe, while they, the men, had to go to war; and also because women were used as the face of war propaganda. So the working class women were “exploited, heavily policed in order to ensure that they behaved properly” (Caine, 1997: 181), being more often than not patronized instead of praised and respected. This, along with other events, led to a strong anti-feminist reaction, with many organizations calling women to return to their domestic functions.

Post-war feminists were well aware that the power to vote was a very limited one, and were of little to no help in achieving economic freedom. In 1926, Eleanor Rathbone founded the National Union of Societies for Equal Citizenship (NUSEC), with the Union's primal aim the discussion of feminism and social welfare. The NUSEC created an agenda which consisted in six points: “equal suffrage; an equal moral standard; promotion of the candidature of women for Parliament; equal pay for

³ In 1918, with the Representation of the People Act, women with property over the age of thirty were allowed to vote. Despite being a positive change, it did not, however, englobe all women, hence socially and morally, there was not a notorious difference from previous years.

equal work and equality in industry and the professions; widow's pensions and equal guardianship; and active support for the League of Nations and of the practical application of the principle of equal opportunity." (Caine, 1997: 183,184)

Another union was formed by Lady Rhondda in 1921, the Six Point Group. The programme defended by this group "included: satisfactory legislation of child assault; satisfactory legislation for the unmarried mother and her child, an equal standard on sex morals; an equal guardianship of children." (Caine, 1997: 184) Differing from the NUSEC, the Six Point Group's preoccupations lay with the middle class and the professional women, and its commitment lay in equal pay for teachers and equal opportunities in the civil service, instead of an all-encompassing measure for equal pay and equal opportunities. While the Six Point Group extensively coped with the reformation of laws and how the court advanced on sexual assaults on children, the NUSEC became increasingly worried about the status and welfare of wives and mothers, focusing its energy on the questions of family and birth control pill. The birth control pill "was one of the welfare measures which feminism needed to support in order to improve a lot of the vast majority of women" (Caine, 1997: 185). The birth control pill was one of the first measures that gave women the power of choice of their bodies; women were reclaiming their bodies, their lives, the power of choice to themselves, after a long period living under the rules of men. Even though the birth control pill appeared a few years later, the discussion of the birth control pill already took place during this period, the 1920s, in feminist groups, by sex reformers and a great number of women associated with the Labour Party, especially Dora Russel, who was one of the leading figures in making the birth control pill an issue to be discussed.

During the war, as it was said before, many women started working – this was a central issue that still needed resolution. Despite "the visibility and the success of women in new trades and occupations during the war" and combining "with the first measure of their enfranchisement," it should have brought "a new attitude to the whole question of women's employment." (Caine, 1997: 192) However it did not, and the hope for change died. The demand for equality, involved opening to women the professions, trades and occupations once only allowed to men, and that the equal pay and acceptance of women's work equal to men, should not have an impact on their marital status.

Nowadays, we live under the illusion that we are equal. If so, why is that women still have to face difficulties in find a job because they can get pregnant? Why is it, that some women are rejected in some lines of work, typically attributed to men, when they have the same or better qualifications than their male counterparts? Why is it, that some women are underpaid for the same job? Why is it that women in Hollywood receive less than the male actors?

Even though after the struggle until the Second World War for equal pay and equal opportunities, during the Second World War, women were again called for their jobs in industries and factories, and still being payed less and receiving less instructions as men did. The feminist movements that followed in the 1960s and 1970s finally included women of all ethnicity, as well as the LGBT community. This community also grew in time to now standing as LGBTQIA – Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender, Queer, Intersex and Asexual. However, men also suffered and still suffer from living under the role of patriarchy. With the passing of time and the change of mentality, why is that the term “Feminism” did not evolve to “Humanism”, for it is the struggles of the humans, before one is their sex, gender, sexual orientation, one is born a human.

Notwithstanding the passing of time, and the changes in mentality, and the evolution of how one sees the world, is it possible to talk about Post-Feminism? Knowing that women and female children are being sold every minute into unwanted marriages, forced to have children when they are only children themselves, being raped, emotionally, psychologically and physically abuse; can one talk about Post-Feminism when women are still forced to wear clothes to cover their features so they can continue pure for their husbands, in the name of a religion made by men for men? There still is, and there still will be for a long time, discrimination towards women, and men, atrocities committed against the human race, for it still is hard to understand that eco is better than ego. Personally, I believe that the human race will go extinct before we reach the state of equality; but I am waiting to be proved wrong.

Bibliography

BEAUVOIR, Simone de, *The Second Sex*, Vintage Book Edition, New York, 2010.

BOWBLY, Rachel, *Feminist Destinations and Further Essays on Virginia Woolf*, University Press, Edinburgh, United Kingdom, 1997.

BRONTË, Charlotte, *The Professor*, Penguin Classics, 1989.

_____ (2004) *Villette*, Penguin Classics.

_____ (2006) *Jane Eyre*, Penguin Classics.

_____ (2006) *Shirley*, Penguin Classics.

BUTLER, Judith, *Gender Trouble*, Routledge Classics, New York, 2006.

CAINE, Barbara, *English Feminism, 1780-1980*, Oxford University Press, New York, 1997.

CHRIST, Carol, *Victorian Masculinity and the Angel in the House*, A Widening Sphere: Changing Roles of Victorian Women, ed. Martha Vinicius, Routledge Revivals, 2013.

COHEN, William A, *Material Inferiority in Charlotte Brontë's The Professor*, Nineteenth-Century Literature, vol. 57, no. 4, pp. 443-476, University of California Press, 2003, Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.1525/ncl.2003.57.4.443> p.445.

COYLE, Martin ed et all, *Encyclopedia of Literary Criticism*, Routledge, London, 1991.

DAVID, Deidre ed, *The Cambridge Companion to the Victorian Novel*, Cambridge University Press, 2nd ed, 2012.

DUTHIE, Enid L, *The Brontës and Nature*, Saint Martin's Press, New York, 1986.

EAGLETON, Terry, *The English Novel: An Introduction*, Oxford, United Kingdom, 2005.

FRASER, Rebecca, *Charlotte Brontë*, Methuen, London, 1989.

GILBERT, Sandra M. *Costumes of the Mind: Transvestism as Metaphor in Modern Literature*, *Critical Inquiry*, vol. 7, no. 2, pp. 391-417, The University of Chicago Press, 1980. Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1343134>

GILMAN, Charlotte Perkins, *The Yellow Wallpaper and Other Stories*, ed. and int. Robert Shurman, Oxford World's Classics, Oxford University Press, New York, 1998.

GORDON, Lyndall, *Virginia Woolf, A Writer's Life*, Oxford University Press, New York, 1984.

_____(2008) *Charlotte Brontë, A Passionate Life*, Virago Press, London.

_____(2008) *Charlotte Brontë: A Passionate Life*, Virago, London.

GUBAR, Susan & GILBERT, Sandra, *The Madwoman in the Attic: The woman writer and the nineteenth-century literary imagination*, Yale University Press, London, 1979.

HANSON, Clare, *Virginia Woolf*, Macmillan, London, 1994.

HELT, Brenda S, *Passionate Debates on "Odious Subjects": Bisexuality and Woolf's Opposition to Theories of Androgyny and Sexual Identity*, *Twentieth Century Literature*, vol. 56, no. 2, pp. 131-167, Hofstra University, 2010. Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/41062468>

HERDMAN, John, *The Double in Nineteenth-Century Fiction: The Shadow Life*, Saint Martin's Press, New York, 1991.

HUMM, Maggie, *The Dictionary of Feminist Theory*, Second Edition, Prentice Hall, Hertforshire, 1995.

KAIVOLA, Karen, *Revisiting Woolf's Representations of Androgyny: Gender, Race, Sexuality, and Nation*, *Tulsa Studies in Women's Literature*, vol. 18, no. 2, pp. 235-261, University of Tulsa, 1999. Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/464448>

KRISHNARAJ, Maithreyi, *Androgyny: An Alternative to Gender Polarity*, *Economic and Political Weekly*, vol. 31, no. 16/17, pp. WS9-WS14, *Economic and Political Weekly*, 1996. Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/4404054>

MA, Yujing, *Charlotte Brontë's Solution to the Excess Woman in Villette*, Waseda University, Japan, 2013.

https://dspace.wul.waseda.ac.jp/dspace/bitstream/2065/36971/1/BungakuKenkyukaKiyo2_57_Ma.pdf

MARCUS, Jane ed, *Virginia Woolf: A Feminist Slant* University of Nebraska Press 1983.

MARCUS, Laura, *Virginia Woolf*, Northcote House Publishers, United Kingdom, 1997.

MARTIN, Robert Bernard, *The Accents of Persuasion: Charlotte Brontë's Novels*, Fable and Fable, London, United Kingdom, 2013.

MCNEES, Eleanor ed, *Virginia Woolf: Critical Assessments*, vol. II, Helm Information, London, 1994.

MILL, John Stuart, *The Subjection of Women*, Dover Publications, New York, 1997.

MULLAN, John, *Anonymity, A Secret History of English Literature*, Faber & Faber, London, 2007.

PARRINDER, Patrick, *Nation & Novel: the English novel from its origins to the present day*, Oxford University Press, New York, 2006.

PERKIN, Joan, *Women and Marriage in the Nineteenth-Century England*, Routledge, 1989.

PETERSON, M. Jeanne, *The Victorian Governess: Status Incongruence in Family and Society*, vol. 14, no. 1, University of California Press, 1970, pp.7-26. Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3826404>

POOVEY, Mary, *The Anathematised Race: The Governess and Jane Eyre*, Jane Eyre, Contemporary Critical Essays, Ed. Heather Glenn, Macmillan Press, London, United Kingdom, 1997.

PORTER, Roy, *English Society in the Eighteenth Century*, Penguin Books, England, 1991.

RICH, Adrienne, "When the Dead Awaken: Writing as Representation", *On Lies, Secretes, and Silence: Selected Prose 1966-1978*, Norton, New York, 1979.

ROE, Sue ed, *Women Reading, Women's Writing*, Critical Assessments, vol. 4 New York, Saint Martin's Press, London Harvester Press, 1987.

ROSSI, Alice ed, *Essays on Sex Equality*, The Chicago University Press, 1970.

SCHWARZ, Daniel R, *The Transformation of the English Novel, 1890-1930: studies in Hardy, Conrad, Joyce, Lawrence, Forster and Woolf*, Macmillian Press, 2nd ed, 1995.

SELLERS, Susan ed, *The Cambridge Companion to Virginia Woolf*, Cambridge Companions to Literature, Cambridge University Press, 2010.

SHORTER, Clement K, *Charlotte Brontë and Her Circle*, Hodder and Stoughton, London, 1896.

SHOWALTER, Elaine, *A Literature of Their Own: From Charlotte Brontë to Doris Lessing*, Virago, London, 2008.

SIGURDARDOTTIR, Elizabeth, *Women and Madness in the 19th Century: The Effects of Oppression on Women's Mental Health*, Sigillum Universitatis Islandiae, Iceland, 2013.

STUBBS, Patricia, *Women and Fiction: Feminism and the novel, 1880-1920*, The Harvester Press, United Kingdom, 1979.

TUCKER, Herbert F. ed, *A Companion to Victorian Literature & Culture*, Blackwell Publishing Ltd, 1999.

USSHER, Jane, *The Madness of Women: Myth and Experience*, Routledge, London, United Kingdom, 2011.

WOLLSTONECRAFT, Mary, *A Vindication of the Rights of Woman*, Dover Thrift Editions, London, England, 1996.

WOOLF, Virginia, *A Room of One's Own*, Penguin Classics, London, England, 2000.

_____ (2003) *Orlando*, Wordsworth Editions, Hertfordshire, United Kingdom.

WYATT, Jean, *A Patriarch of One's Own: Jane Eyre and Romantic Love*, Tulsa Studies in Women's Literature, vol. 4, no. 2, 1985, pp. 199-216, University of Tulsa. Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/463696>.

ZWERDLING, Alex, *Virginia Woolf and the Real World*, University of California Press, 1986.

Web

BLACKSTONE, William *Commentaries on the Laws of England*, vol 1, 1765, Chapter 15 – Of Husband and Wife, p. 442. Lonang Institute, 2005.

<http://lonang.com/library/reference/blackstone-commentaries-law-england>

Access: September 24, 2015.

PATMORE, Coventry, *Poems*, Poem Hunter – The World's Poetry Archive, 2012.

http://www.poemhunter.com/i/ebooks/pdf/coventry_patmore_2012_3.pdf

Access: September 24, 2015

WOOLF, Virginia, “Jane Eyre and Wunthering Heights”, University of Adelaide, Australia, July 15, 2015.

<https://ebooks.adelaide.edu.au/w/woolf/virginia/w91c/chapter14.html>

Access: September 24, 2015.

WOOLF, Virginia Woolf, “Professions for Women”, *The Death of the Moth and other essays*, University of Adelaide, Australia, September 14, 2015.

<https://ebooks.adelaide.edu.au/w/woolf/virginia/w91d/>

Access: September 24, 2015.