

INFORMATION TO USERS

This manuscript has been reproduced from the microfilm master. UMI films the text directly from the original or copy submitted. Thus, some thesis and dissertation copies are in typewriter face, while others may be from any type of computer printer.

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted. Broken or indistinct print, colored or poor quality illustrations and photographs, print bleedthrough, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send UMI a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyright material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.

Oversize materials (e.g., maps, drawings, charts) are reproduced by sectioning the original, beginning at the upper left-hand corner and continuing from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps.

Photographs included in the original manuscript have been reproduced xerographically in this copy. Higher quality 6" x 9" black and white photographic prints are available for any photographs or illustrations appearing in this copy for an additional charge. Contact UMI directly to order.

ProQuest Information and Learning
300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346 USA
800-521-0600

UMI[®]

A WRITER'S INTERIOR VOYAGE TOWARD WRITING: A CASE STUDY OF THE
CREATIVE PROCESSES OF VIRGINIA WOOLF

by

Kai-Ni K. Fu

Dissertation Committee:

Professor Gregory W. Hamilton, Sponsor
Professor James Albright

Approved by the Committee on the Degree of Doctor of Education

Date SEP 24 2001

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the Degree of Doctor of Education in
Teachers College, Columbia University

2001

UMI Number: 3027035

UMI[®]

UMI Microform 3027035

Copyright 2001 by Bell & Howell Information and Learning Company.

All rights reserved. This microform edition is protected against
unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code.

Bell & Howell Information and Learning Company
300 North Zeeb Road
P.O. Box 1346
Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346

A WRITER'S INTERIOR VOYAGE TOWARD WRITING: A CASE STUDY OF THE
CREATIVE PROCESSES OF VIRGINIA WOOLF

by

Kai-Ni K. Fu

Dissertation Committee:

Professor Gregory W. Hamilton, Sponsor
Professor James Albright

Approved by the Committee on the Degree of Doctor of Education

Date SEP 24 2001

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the Degree of Doctor of Education in
Teachers College, Columbia University

2001

ABSTRACT

A WRITER'S INTERIOR VOYAGE TOWARD WRITING: A CASE STUDY OF THE CREATIVE PROCESSES OF VIRGINIA WOOLF

Kai-ni K. Fu

This dissertation is a research on a writer's interior creative process. It equates a writer's completion of a written product with the writer's creation of a "personal identity," a goal that the writer has to achieve through the writer's conscious and unconscious efforts. This "personal identity," also defined as a new being and a new "identity" in this study, always varies or grows from the one that has been established. The major theory of this study is composed of Helene Cixous's writing theory, Julia Kristeva's approach of carnivalesque discourse to literary works, and Mikhail Bakhtin's dialogic theory.

This study uses Howard E. Gruber and Doris B. Wallace's case study method to analyze Virginia Woolf's interior creative processes of generating *To the Lighthouse* and *A Room of One's Own*. Using Cixous's, Kristeva's, and Bakhtin's theories as lenses to examine Woolf's creative processes, this study shows that Woolf's creative process of making *To the Lighthouse* went through three major stages: (1) one inner creative experience (a sequence of drive-desire-revision), (2) a renouncement of Woolf's present self/ego, and (3) an interplay between her as the other and language/voices/characters. Besides the last two stages, she used the other type of inner creative experience (a sequence of vision-desire-drive) in *A Room of One's Own*. The results lead the study to conclude that our creativity comes from our instinctual desire in our nature and a deliberate act that is socially constructed.

Acknowledgments

Among others, I want to thank my advisor, professor Greg W. Hamilton, who helped me organize and clarify my thoughts and went over each chapter of this study again and again with patience and encouragement. I also want to thank professor Ruth A. Vinz, who introduced me to Norman N. Holland's *The Brain of the Robert Frost* (1989), which made a significant breakthrough in this study. My special thanks go to my parents who support me without conditions and to my friends Ann, Ming, and Esther, who gave me their spiritual support. This dissertation is dedicated to all of the people who helped me go through the vicissitudes at the time of writing this work.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter

I. Introduction.....	1
A. Introduction to Various Researches in Creativity.....	1
B. Three Approaches to a Writer's Creative Process.....	3
1. A Writer's Felt Sense.....	3
2. Themes of a Writer's Work or a Writer's Writing Philosophy.....	5
3. A Writer's Mind at Work.....	6
C. Holland's Study.....	7
D. Problem, Focus of the Study, Purposes, and Research Questions.....	11
Problem.....	11
Focus of the Study.....	12
Purposes.....	16
Research Questions.....	16
E. Overview of the Study.....	20
II. Literature Review.....	22
A. Introduction.....	22
B. Writers' Thoughts on Their Creative Processes.....	25
Interviews.....	25
Writers' Reflections on Writing.....	34

Summary.....	43
III. Establishing a Theoretical Framework: A Writer's Interior Voyage toward Creating a New Identity.....	46
A. Helene Cixous.....	49
1. Six Elements in Cixous's Creative Process.....	49
2. A Sequence of Drive-Desire-Vision.....	54
3. A Sequence of Vision-Desire-Drive.....	58
4. A Renouncement of One's Self.....	61
B. Julia Kristeva.....	72
1. Carnavalesque Discourse.....	72
2. An Interplay between a Speaking Subject and Language.....	75
C. Mikhail M. Bakhtin.....	78
D. Summary.....	82
IV. Methodology.....	84
A. Assumptions and Research Guiding Principles.....	85
Assumptions.....	85
Research Guiding Principles.....	86
B. Rationales for the Selection of a Creative Writer and Texts.....	87
Virginia Woolf.....	87
Woolf's Two Works.....	89
1. <i>To the Lighthouse</i>	91
2. <i>A Room of One's Own</i>	92

C. Research Design.....	94
D. Procedures.....	104
E. The Application of the Results.....	112
F. The Researcher's Roles.....	113
G. The Validity of the Study.....	114
H. Limitations.....	114
V. Virginia Woolf's Interior Creative Process for <i>To the Lighthouse</i>	117
A. Woolf's Relevant Work Enterprise.....	121
1. Woolf's Original Writing Idea for <i>To the Lighthouse</i>	121
2. Woolf's Plans for the Story.....	122
3. Woolf's Writing Philosophy and Her Ability to Perceive "Shocks".....	126
B. Woolf's Professional Milieu.....	131
C. Woolf's Work as a Whole.....	140
1. Drive: Woolf's "deeply felt emotion".....	141
2. Desire: Woolf's Groping in the Darkness.....	145
3. Vision: Woolf's "Soul's eye".....	149
4. Becoming the Other/a New "Identity".....	152
D. Woolf's Text <i>To the Lighthouse</i> : The Completion of a New "Identity".....	157
1. Woolf's Writing Habits.....	159
2. The Window.....	163
3. Time Passes.....	173
4. The Lighthouse.....	177

E. Summary.....	185
VI. Virginia Woolf's Interior Creative Process for <i>A Room of One's Own</i>	188
A. Woolf's Relevant Work Enterprise.....	191
1. Woolf's Original Writing Idea.....	191
2. Woolf's Talks at Newnham and Girton: "Women and Fiction".....	193
3. Cixous's Six Elements Examined in Woolf's Creative Process of Initiating a Writing Idea and Developing It into a Book <i>A Room of One's Own</i>	196
a. Relating Cixous's Six Elements to Woolf's Creative Process of Initiating a Writing Idea.....	196
b. Relating Cixous's Six Elements to Woolf's Creative Process of Making the Book <i>A Room of One's Own</i>	200
B. Woolf's Professional Milieu.....	203
C. Woolf's Work as a Whole.....	209
1. Vision: Woolf's Engagement with External Stimuli.....	210
2. Desire: Woolf's Continuous Pursuit.....	214
3. Drive: Woolf's Being a Woman Novelist and Publisher.....	216
4. Becoming the Other: Woolf's Renouncement of Her Self to Make Room for the Other/a New "Identity".....	218
D. Woolf's Text <i>A Room of One's Own</i> : The Completion of a New "Identity".....	222
1. The Creation of a New Language: Woolf's Train of Thought.....	223
2. Woolf's Recreation of Her Predecessors' Lives: An Interplay between the Other and the Other Voices/Characters.....	228

VII. Conclusion: A Reflection on My Creative Process for the Study and Its Implications for Teaching of Creative Writing.....	235
A. My Interior Creative Process of Generating This Study.....	235
1. The Story of My Interior Creative Process.....	236
2. A Review of My Creative Process from the Perspective of My Other “I”.....	242
B. The Pedagogical Implications of the Study for Teaching of Creative Writing.....	247
1. The Source of a Writer’s Creativity: An Interplay between the Conscious and Unconscious.....	248
2. Creative Writing: An Organic Process of Creating a New “Identity”.....	254
C. The Limitation of This Study.....	259
Appendix Glossary.....	263
Bibliography.....	266

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1 Overview of Methodology for <i>To the Lighthouse</i>	97
Table 2 Overview of Methodology for <i>A Room of One's Own</i>	100

INTRODUCTION

"I try to organize it: beginning with silence. With the conditions of retreat, yes, the conditions of an interior voyage" (Helene Cixous and Mireille Calle-Gruber, *Helene Cixous Rootprints: Memory and Life Writing*, 105).

Since Freud, various approaches have been used to understand creativity. His psychology has inspired many of his followers to look at creative people's creative processes with different research disciplines in neurology, cognitive psychology, psychoanalysis, and biography (Greenacre, Kubie, Piaget, Holland, et al.). It is important that researchers of developmental psychology (Gruber, Wallace, et al.) have stressed the unique creative process of each creative person rather than attribute all features found in some creative people to a large range of people. It is Gruber and Wallace's approach to a creative person's personal inputs and social influences on a person's creative development that reinforces my study of a writer's mind at work. I focus mainly on a writer's "interior voyage" toward writing, a term borrowed from Helene Cixous, to understand a writer's internal creative process.

Virginia Woolf, a world-known novelist who created two unique narrative styles in *To the Lighthouse* and *A Room of One's Own* respectively, is the subject of this study that gives insight into a creative writer's interior creative process. Helene Cixous's writing theories, Julia Kristeva's carnivalesque approach to literature, and Bakhtin's dialogic theory in novel act as lenses to look into Woolf's interior creative processes.

A. Introduction to Various Researches in Creativity

The study of creativity can be traced back to the theories of Plato, Aristotle, and the Stoics. In *Creative Characters* (1991), Elizabeth Young-Bruehl points out that Plato equated

creativity with human beings' aspiration to immortality; Aristotle thought creativity was evolutionary and could be reached through poets' "enactment" on it; the Stoics believed that creativity resided in our "microcosmic soul" when it attuned itself to its proper condition in accord with "divine Reason" (27 & 33). Based on the three major philosophies, many researchers and scholars of various disciplines approached creativity with the dominant doctrines in their times. Before Freud, our understanding of creativity was mostly limited to the studies of a creative person's mentality and physiognomy. The former endowed creativity to the people of great intellectual gifts; the latter judged creative people from their looks and characters. It was not until Freud, who related a person's character to his/her childhood and "stressed the evolution of creative character and the mutability or flexibility of the creative person's psyche," that we began a new approach to creativity (*Creative Characters* 44).

Drawing from Freud's theory of creative character, the Freudian psychologists took a creative person's ability to elevate his/her instinctive drives to a creative product--that is, a process of sublimation--as a key element in the evolutionary process of creative people. Then, Freudian psychology branched out in different directions. For example, Phyllis Greenacre's biographical approach emphasizes a creative person's struggle to set free their creative selves from their ordinary selves. By arguing against the misconception of relating creativity to neurosis, Lawrence Kubie stresses that the play of the unconscious in a person's creative process is as free as the one in a non-creative person (*Creative Characters* 44-45). Piaget's cognitive psychology also had a great impact on the research of creativity. The enormous contributions of Freud, Greenacre, Kubie, and Piaget, to name a few, have made the study of creativity become psychologically or, more precisely speaking, psychoanalytically oriented in

the twentieth century. Almost every field that involves humanities cannot escape from the permeation of psychology or psychoanalysis. In other words, people with training in humanities have shifted their attention to creative people's psyches in the study of creativity. One of the earliest examples was Freud's biography, "Leonardo da Vinci and a Memory of His Childhood" (1909). Among the latest studies in creative people, Howard Gruber and Doris B. Wallace's evolving system approach is important. They no longer apply the features found to all creative people but single out the uniqueness of each creative person.

B. Three Approaches to a Writer's Creative Process

Unavoidably, with psychology as a dominating trend in humanities, the understanding of a writer's mind becomes essential. Three major approaches have been developed from psychological disciplines: (1) a study of a writer's felt sense that runs through a writer's prewriting and in-writing stages; (2) an analysis of themes of a writer's work or a writer's writing philosophy; (3) and an exploration of a writer's mind at work crystallized through the theories of cognitive psychology, psychoanalysis, and neurology.

1. A Writer's Felt Sense

Rather than focus on a writer's skills to solve writing blocks, recent studies of a writer's creative process have taken a different direction toward a writer's psyche in the prewriting and in-writing phases. Some researchers categorize a writer's initial idea or vision into the writer's "felt sense" which "occurs inside the writer, to what is physically felt" at the prewriting stage (*The Writer's Mind* 45). Those researchers think, by paying attention to "what it evokes in us," our felt sense may lead us to find out what we want to write about (47). For example, Monica

R. Weis SSJ in her article "Current Brain Research and the Composing Process," collected in *The Writer's Mind* (1983), gives more credit to a writer's intuitive senses in which "in the history of great ideas, the flash of insights has triumphed and made people famous" (30). D. Gordon Rohman in the article "Pre-Writing: The Stage of Discovery in the Writing Process," compiled in *Theory and Practice in the Teaching of Composition* (1983), thinks that a writer's "felt sense" is a conscious process in which a writer can transform "from something happening *to* us into something happening *in* us. And something to which we happen" (89). He names it the "personal context," in which a person "stands at the center of his own thoughts and feelings with the sense that they begin in him" (88). In other words, a writing idea has to be internalized first in the writer no matter how it is initiated because "writing is one important form of self-actualization" (89). Opposing the cognitive writing process models that emphasize the development of a writer's problem-solving skills in different composing stages, Michael A. Pemberton in his article "Modeling Theory and Composing Process Models" employs Alice Brand's *The Psychology of Writing* (1989) to draw on the "emotions writers experience as they compose" (*College Composition and Communication*, Vol. 44, no. 1, 1993, p. 53).

Besides research on a writer's "felt sense," scholars who have been attempting to crystallize a writer's creative process used their own creative works and themselves as subjects. We learned what caused those scholars' writings and their problem-solving skills throughout the whole in-writing process. Examples can be found in Carl Anthony Winderl Jr.'s dissertation *A Creative Process That Produces an Autobiographical Novel: An Aesthetic Historical Study* (1985), Susanna Lippoczy Rich's *Mirror, Mirror: An Autobiographical Study in Creative Process* (1987), and Carolina Mancuso's *From Real Life to Tall-Tale--and Back*

Again: Using Autobiographical Fiction-- Writing to Understand Self, Others, and the World (1998). Unfortunately, the new approach to a writer's "felt sense" in the 80s is not even explored in these studies.

2. Themes of a Writer's Work or a Writer's Writing Philosophy

The second approach to a writer's creative process used by many researchers is to explore common themes that appear in the writer's works or to draw on the writer's own writing philosophy. While this approach helps us understand more about the writer's works, it only constructs a fragmentary picture of the writer's interior creative process from prewriting to in-writing stages. For example, Amy Rosen in her dissertation, *The Pulse of Colour: A Study of Virginia Woolf* (1981), discusses that the usage of colours in Virginia Woolf's works is a vital part of her writing and a unique way of expressing her feelings. Phebe Jewell's dissertation, *The Foreign Mirror* (1994), discovers that "exile" is an indispensable factor for Stendhal, Gertrude Stein and Samuel Beckett to create themselves again in their writings (1994). Lisa Ellen Bernstein has a similar view in her dissertation *"Self-Othering" as a Strategy of Women's Creative Expression in Literature and Art* (1998). The difference between Jewell's and Bernstein's works is that the former emphasizes the relationship between self, other, and place, and the latter focuses on the re-creation of selves by either othering selves or merging with others. Among those researchers, Thomas Michael Tammaro is one of the few to directly employ William Stafford's writing philosophy and the poet's views of himself and the world to construct the poet's creative process (1980).

3. A Writer's Mind at Work

The third approach to a writer's creative process exploits cognitive psychology, psychoanalysis, and neurology. Patricia N. McLaughlin's dissertation *The Intelligent Eye, The Thinking Hand, and The Interpretive Ear: A Multisensory Model for Teaching Composing Processes to Basic Writers* (1995) is a typical example of applying cognitive theory to writing processes. McLaughlin thinks since writing involves "three sensory modalities: visual, gestural (or kinesthetic), and verbal," the composing process is a cognitive behavior pattern which demands a writer first to be a dreamer who initiates writing ideas, then a realist who acts on them, and last a critic who "evaluates them" (54 & 61). In his work *The Brain of Robert Frost* (1988), Norman N. Holland employs cognitive psychology, psychoanalysis and neurology to explain how Frost's brain works in engaging with a creative act and responding to literature. Holland assumes a unique identity that exists in every writer, a writer's working style, which sets up a standard (desire) for canons (the writer's politics, values, and beliefs). Then, the writer's canons establish codes (rules shared by the members of a society, e.g., alphabets, numbers, grammars, etc.) which direct the writer's physical movement to write a text that, in turn, must fulfill the writer's standard (102, 104, & 137). And it is the writer's standard (desire) that decides the uniqueness of the writer's writing and reading styles. Where does the standard (desire) come from? From our unconsciousness? According to Holland, emotions (limbic system) that lie at the bottom of our behaviors govern the whole writing process, and not even the most abstract and intellectual can avoid the effect of emotions. Therefore, our abstract skills in reading and writing can no more be separated from emotions than conscious acts from the unconscious (85).

It seems the third resolution has led us to a deeper understanding of a writer's writing process, especially a writer's internal creative process. Compared with Holland's research, McLaughlin's motor-sensory approach looks simple, but both of their studies lack a complete picture of the interior voyage a writer has to go through--that is, from a writer's recognition of a writing idea until the writer's completion of a written product. The three approaches combined--a writer's felt sense, themes of the writer's works or his/her writing philosophies, and the analysis of the writer's mind at work that involves the theories of cognitive psychology, psychoanalysis, and neurology--have reached the crucial element of a writer's creative process, that is, the interplay of a writer's unconscious and conscious in the whole creative process. Holland's study of Frost's brain has indicated the importance of our unconscious and conscious in the creative process. But his research continues without delving into how a writer becomes aware of the writing ideas in the writer's unconscious (standard/desire) and cultivates it inside him/her (a conscious effort). Neither does he explain how the writer's unconscious continues to affect the direction and self-evaluation of the writer's in-writing process and what other conscious acts have to be taken inside the writer to complete the creative process.

C. Holland's Study

Since Holland's study of Robert Frost's brain, especially his theory of "personal identity," is a stepping stone to my study, I summarize his central ideas in this section. Holland's major theory about Frost's brain at work reveals that a writer's "personal identity" (standard/desire) controls "a hierarchy of feedbacks that uses shared codes, canons, and physical realities to

make experiences, literature among them" (*The Brain of Robert Frost* 179). The major difference that makes a writer's works distinctive from his/her contemporary writers' resides in the "personal identity."

According to Holland, the "personal identity" is a writer's style developed from the writer's sense of "I," which involves three factors "heredity, environment, and personal activity" (8). The combination of the three elements establishes the writer's standard/desire, which is very individual. Holland uses feedback theory to demonstrate how our standard/desire works. For example, our various reactions to the temperature asks us to find out ways to match our "internal standards for comfort" (11). He states:

In the jargon, my senses try to match representations of temperature from inside the brain or body against representations of the physical stimulus outside. If the room feels too warm or too cold, I act to make it right. Or I may act on my own body by raising goose pimples or shivering. Then I test again. If the temperature feels right, I subside. If it doesn't, I act again. My standard is an individual one . . . (11-12).

To apply the feedback theory to a writer's creative process, Holland finds out that once a writer writes down a line, the writer has set out his hypothesis. In reading the line he has written, the act of reading "tests the hypothesis and he feels good or bad about what he has written" (91). What decides the writer's feeling for the line he writes is his standard/desire which he has built up into his personal identity without his consciousness of it. Within his standard/desire, it is "the sudden leaps of his imagination" that make his unique creativity stand out besides his "values, his vocabulary, his ideas of what will 'work' with a reader" that contribute to his unique writing style. The writer's imagination (or creativity) "involves an individual's talents and unconscious inspiration" (91). Transforming this traditional thinking about creativity into his feedback and hypothesis theory, Holland defines creativity: "we can

imagine writing as the reading-hypotheses preceded by a set of special and highly personal writing-hypotheses that we regularly identify as 'creativity'" (91 & 92).

The "highly personal writing-hypotheses" are composed of codes and canons-- the fundamental values that decide how a writer reacts to what he/she creates. They work in a hierarchical process in which our mind, monitored by our consciousness, gives order to the lower levels (from mind to behaviors to the workings of organs and limbs to heartbeat, blood pressure, and hormonal balances) (93). While codes are "rules that are absolutely fixed for all the people in a given culture" such as "the rules governing letters of the alphabet, numbers, grammar, recognizing a given word as that word," canons refer to "politics or values or beliefs, a person's 'philosophy' in the loose sense, a mental 'set'"(101 & 104). Canons shift in accord with the changes of the intellectual climate of an era when they are "viewpoint-canon" which reflect "opinions and beliefs" (104). Only the greatest geniuses like Descartes or Nietzsche or Freud, writes Holland, can change the canons they are born into, and the others follow their lead.

To relate codes and canons to reading and writing, Holland thinks our interpretations of a literary work are built on codes, the groundwork that leads us to the infinite possibilities of canons which each of us is born into. Our choices of canons which change with individuals and societies are the key factors that decide how and why each individual's strategy for reading and writing is different. But it should not lead us to conclude that reading and writing are totally an individual or subjective matter. Rather, it is the result of our conscious (cultural training) and unconscious needs. But if we want to distinguish why each person chooses differently, "our 'subjective' personality-selves" come into play (108).

It is we, our “subjective selves” that use codes and canons we are born into. Working through a feedback system, our “inner standards,” composed of codes and canons we are born into and learn from, express our feelings and emotions toward a text we read or a work we create. To use Holland’s words, our “inner standards are in turn functions of our respective identities” (108). But the question still goes back to what makes our interpretations of the text or the world different and unique if codes and canons, “inner standards,” are learned? Holland attributes this to a person’s “personal identity,” the highest level of a feedback hierarchical system. He explains by telling us how he sees Frost’s brain is at work:

Frost had purposes and goals at the top of his brain. I can guess at those higher goals and put them into words as my perception of Frost’s identity. These goals set the references and signals for simpler reflex processes. This identity directed sight and taste and touch at the lowest levels of Frost’s brain and at the edges and boundaries of his body. In the same way, his identity set standards for his literary behavior. We all share the English language, but no one will write a poem just like Robert Frost. Further, no one will *interpret* a poem just like Robert Frost (108).

To further elucidate this hierarchical system from our identity down to our basic senses, Holland thinks that at the bottom level of reading a text each of us shares the same codes which are fixed in the culture we are born into, like alphabetic letters and words and grammars. We use the canons that we learn from the culture to express our ideas and feelings toward the text. At this level, we begin to show different interpretations of the text from different perspectives. Once we reach the highest level, abstraction, “our understanding becomes more and more personal” because our identity that stands on the top level in a hierarchy decides our unique interpretation of a literary work (110). And Holland, I think, implies here that it is at the highest level, our “personal identity,” that distinguishes a person’s unique reading and writing style, though he never directly says so.

D. Problem, Focus of the Study, Purposes, and Research Questions

Problem

From the above introduction to the studies in creativity, we can find that creativity is still a mystery to us. Holland has given us a better picture of how a person's brain is at work in reading and writing a text by attributing a writer's unique writing style to the writer's "personal identity." This "identity" is still a very abstract concept which only tells us its components (codes and canons), the combination of our conscious and unconscious needs. If codes and canons belong to our conscious and unconscious (because they have become part of us and we are not even aware of them when using them), they do not explain how a writer generates a writing idea under the interplay of codes and canons and why and how the writer lets it germinate inside him/her and carries it with him/her until it is fully developed and can be translated into words. What Holland deals with is the moment a writer engages in the act of reading and writing, like his example of driving which requires an immediate response to a stimulus. Holland leaves out the long preparation for the establishment of our personal identity--that is, the process of internalizing codes and canons. And I think the long process of creating a "personal identity" must be examined carefully because our "personal identity" is not built up right after we are born. Although the codes we are born into have already been out there (such as alphabets and grammars), we have to learn them and make them become part of us. A complete learning process needs practice, and so does our learning of canons (such as values and beliefs), though it may take different kinds of practice from our learning of codes.

The establishment of our "personal identity" takes time. It is like a child who has to go

through different cognitive stages to be able to read, write, and think on its own. It is the same as how a writer comes to acknowledge a writing idea inside him/her. The writing idea cannot just occur to the writer. It must have been germinated inside the writer's unconscious until it surfaces to become the writer's conscious effort. But Holland's theory about "personal identity" has paved a good path for my study. Applying his ideas about codes, canons, and conscious and unconscious needs to this study, I assume that the fruition of a writing idea is a process of reaching its "personal identity." Once the writing idea is acknowledged by its writer, it will work in the feedback process that asks its "personal identity" to govern "a hierarchy of feedbacks that use shared codes, canons, and physical realities to make experiences, literature among them" (179). Therefore, the connotation of "personal identity" used in this study is slightly different from Holland's. While the "personal identity" in both Holland's and my study is seen as a writer's "inner standards," mine makes the "personal identity" more like a goal that a writer has to achieve through the writer's conscious and unconscious efforts, instead of just acting as an already-established system that requires the working of a hierarchy of feedbacks to match its standards. And each time when the writer works on a new writing project, he/she must build a different "personal identity" that suits or goes beyond the creative standards the writer requests for the new creative work. In other words, the "personal identity" that a writer creates for each creative work always varies or grows from the one that has been established into a new "identity."

Focus of the Study

Concluding human creativity, Holland writes, "At root, then, literature rests on a pre-

verbal habit of constructing worlds, something visceral, emotional, and personal rather than an act of purely linguistic interpretation" (*The Brain of Robert Frost* 178). Taking this thought as an assumption in this study, I focus on two processes that a writer goes through inside: (1) a writer's "pre-verbal" process and (2) a writer's creative process of turning "visceral" feelings into words. I explicate a writer's "pre-verbal" process of generating a writing idea before it grows into a "personal identity" that can fully work on its own to operate a hierarchy of feedbacks until the whole creative process is done. In other words, I see this "pre-verbal" process as part of a writer's interior voyage toward writing before the creative process becomes neurological and physical acts. The second major part of a writer's interior creative process is to transform writing ideas (feelings or thoughts) into words. I connect this part with a writer's creation of a new "personal identity" besides his/her present one. Both processes involve the working of a writer's unconscious and conscious which do not act in a sequence but are interlaced.

I use the terms "the unconscious" and "the conscious" in this study to explain a writer's interior creative process for two reasons. First of all, no other word can substitute "unconsciousness" because it implicates infinite resources that contain our deepest desires, feelings, and thoughts as well as all the information and messages that pass by us every day and are not to our awareness. They come to our use when we receive certain stimuli. Secondly, this study intends to emphasize the importance of summoning our creativity. In other words, creativity has to become a "conscious" effort. In this study creativity is seen more as an action, not just some fantasies that only exist in our mind. Imagination will always be imagination if it cannot be expressed in certain forms.

Since this study focuses on a writer's interior creative process and recognizes the uniqueness of each creative writer, my approach is both psychological and sociological. That is, I assume that creativity exists in each person and can be cultivated. It is a capacity that each of us is born into. The only difference between creative and non-creative people resides in creative people's deliberate effort of making his/her unconscious conscious and the conscious unconscious. In other words, while sometimes our creativity comes from our sense of something unspeakable, it may start from the known because our creativity is also built upon other people's creative ideas. The moment of acknowledging more space that can be expanded on other people's thoughts is our creativity at work--that is, our conscious at work to acknowledge what is in our unconscious. We sense that something more can be said or done, though we may not know exactly what that "something" is at the moment. This sense comes from our unconscious which stores our unique standards that decide our unique creativity. A creative person pursues the "something" and tries to explain it. The continuous pursuit is our conscious effort of becoming creative. In the conscious process, we have to keep going back to our unconscious (the unique sense) to match our conscious expression with our unique standards and then coming back to revise or change our creative design. Both the unconscious and conscious occupy an equal importance in a person's interior creative process. They affect each other and stimulate each other for the formation of a creative idea. And most important of all, their mutual influence and stimulation continue until a creative product is completed.

What makes a creative idea unique relies on the unique taste of the creative person. And the unique taste is composed of the creative person's unique "'subjective' personality-[self]" and particular social background (*The Brain of Robert Frost* 108). We may come up with the

same creative idea, but each of us presents it uniquely. Because when our creativity performs at its most, it works at our most personal level. But the unique taste or the most personal level changes or becomes even more personal when a creative person tries to go beyond his/her present self/ego to explore in the unconscious. Such an exploration is a continuum that keeps building a person's creative standards, or inner standards in Holland's words. Therefore, in this study, creativity means a person's exploration of his/her uniqueness and the person's unique way of turning his/her unique feelings or thoughts into a design (a new "personal identity") that creates a fresh perspective for its audience.

No clear line can be drawn between our unconscious and conscious because understanding the process of exploring our unconscious is always hindsight. When a writer is inspired, he/she has already made his/her unconscious conscious. How we become aware of a creative idea pulling from our unconscious is an ambiguous part in the creative process. And this study acknowledges the impossibility of demonstrating the moment of recognizing the thoughts and feelings that surface from our unconscious. The only explanation we can make is to use Holland's theory about our unique taste or our unique inner standards. Various values and beliefs pass by us every day. Not all of them become part of our thinking system. Our inner standards (codes and canons) do the selective work for us. Thus, when a creative idea comes to us, it has already gone through the strict review of our inner standards.

Besides some literary critics' theories, I want to use professional writers' thoughts on creative processes to crystallize a writer's interior voyage toward writing. Professional writers' theories have never been seriously considered when it comes to the study of creativity under the academic discipline. What we have had for the theories of creative processes are either

from philosophers, psychologists, or literary critics. Although a few researchers use their own creative works to explore their in-writing creative processes, they do not set up a substantial theory on creativity, nor the study of their interior voyage toward writing. I think after learning the theories made by the experts in creativity, we need to hear how professional writers' talk about their creative processes, especially in pre-writing.

Purposes

This study has two purposes: (1) to form a more complete picture of a writer's interior voyage toward creating a self-sufficient "identity" to construct its own world, though fictional, and (2) to apply the result of the study to a theoretical pedagogy in teaching of creative writing. With the achievement of the first goal, I in the last chapter talk about why writing teachers should place equal importance on their students' internal creative process with their acts of developing their writing ideas in the actual writing process and what they have to notice while guiding students to generate writing ideas. With appropriate writing instructions, students can be aware of what they have to go through to crop their writing products and lessen their anxiety in the whole writing process. Most important of all, making our students automatically initiate writing projects and equipping them with abilities to take on the whole interior creative process out of school should be the ultimate goal of any composition class.

Research Questions

One major research question establishes the whole research direction of this study: What is a writer's interior voyage toward writing, that is, toward creating a "personal identity"? Specifically, what I want to find out is whether a writing idea has been planted inside a writer

long before the writer begins to be aware of it; that is, a writing idea is not a mysterious inspiration, but something that has lived in the writer's unconscious. If this is true, then what is the process that a writer has to go through to cultivate it until it breaks out of the writer's unconscious, to claim its own life in words? Four subquestions grow out of the major question: (1) Where does a creative writer find his/her writing idea? Does it come from an exterior source or something that has been planted inside the writer? Or is it a process that has to involve both outer and inner sources? (2) If a writer's writing idea comes from both sources, what is the interior creative process that a writer has to go through to cultivate the writing idea until it turns into words? (3) What can professional writers' creative processes contribute to this study? Can they give us some insight into a writer's interior creative process? (4) Besides cognitive psychology, psychoanalysis, and neurology, what are other research disciplines that we can borrow from to crystallize a writer's interior creative process toward creating a "personal identity" or a new "identity" if each creative written work by the same writer is made by different, unique creative standards that the writer has to set up for each of his/her writing projects? In a word, I want to stand on the shoulder of Holland's "identity" theory to examine a professional writer's creative process that Holland does not delve into.

To answer these questions, I introduce some twentieth-century professional writers' writing experiences and reflections on the creative processes. In the following chapter I find out from where they drew their writing ideas and how they developed them into a written product. The professional writers contain European and American novelists, poets, and essayists. In the third chapter, I establish a theoretical framework regarding a writer's interior creative process from Helene Cixous's writing theory, Julia Kristeva's theory on carnivalesque

discourse, and Mikhail Bakhtin's dialogic theory in novel. Cixous is one of the very few writers who, as a professional writer, scholar, and teacher, has systematically talked about her own creative processes, especially the one before she engages in her actual writing. She sees her creative process as a death-and-life process that starts from her body, her feelings felt inside, her desire for death, and the mysteries they create that urge her to solve them through writing them out. In the process of desiring death, she renounces her narcissistic self to transform into the role of a writer, the other, a new "personal identity." Kristeva's theory about death as a drive to push writers to go beyond themselves further assists us in understanding what Cixous means by her "desire for death." For Kristeva, the death of a writer's old self is the key for the writer to be able to re-live, to create. Using writing as a medium, the writer creates "the other" which, once activated in the writing process, always stays in an unsettled, questionable position, in the margins. Bakhtin's dialogic theory about novel helps clarify why Cixous has to transform into "the other" to be able to write. Instead of using "the other," he borrows a psychological term, "second consciousness," to explain how a creative work begins to form (*Mikhail Bakhtin: Creation of a Prosaics* 72). With Cixous's, Kristeva's, and Bakhtin's theories forming a theoretical framework for the study in the third chapter, I complement Holland's theory of a hierarchy of feedbacks governed by the "identity" and construct a theory on a writer's interior voyage toward creating and completing a "personal identity."

One major research question is posed to understand Virginia Woolf's interior creative processes: What is Virginia Woolf's interior creative processes in generating *To the Lighthouse* and *A Room of One's Own*, and how is my theory related to Woolf's creative processes? Following are the subquestions for the two works:

- a. How did Woolf's first writing idea come to her mind? What was that?
- b. How did the title *To the Lighthouse* appear in her vision of the whole story she planned to write?
- c. What was Woolf's writing philosophy and how did it affect her creative process?
- d. How are Cixous's six elements (body, desire, death, blindness, self, and otherness) related to Woolf's creative process? How do Cixous's six elements reinforce our understanding of Woolf's creative process?
- e. What were the outer influences at the time of Woolf's aesthetic in writing fiction?
- f. How did the outer influences affect Woolf as a novelist?
- g. How are Cixous's six elements related to Woolf's realization of becoming the novelist she wanted to be?

Above are the subquestions that help us discover the historical background of Woolf's interior creative process. Those questions are answered from the first-hand written documents of Woolf. Cixous's six elements are employed to give us a deeper understanding of Woolf's interior creative process. Following are the subquestions that frame my analysis and interpretation of Woolf's interior voyage toward creating a new being, a "personal identity":

- a. What is Woolf's interior voyage toward creating a new being, a "personal identity"?
- b. How are the two inner creative experiences--a sequence of drive-desire-vision and a sequence of vision-desire-drive--and a writer's renouncement of his/her self/ego reinforce our understanding about Woolf's creation of a "personal identity"?
- c. How did Woolf integrate heterogeneous elements into creating a "personal identity"?
- d. How did the "personal identity" interweave with the writing of the two works?

The results I gain from my analyses of Woolf's interior creative processes lead to the last research question I pose for the pedagogy of this study: How do Woolf's interior creative processes contribute to the pedagogy of teaching of creative writing? I focus on two issues to answer this question: (1) What is the source of a writer's creativity, and (2) what distinguishes a writer's unique creativity and writing style? The first issue is answered by Woolf's interior creative processes that I analyze in the fifth and sixth chapters along with the theory that I formulate through Cixous's, Kristeva's, and Bakhtin's theories in the third chapter. The second question is elucidated not only by Woolf's interior creative processes as examples but also by the idea that a writer's interior voyage toward writing is a process of creating a new "identity," a unique writing style expressed in the writer's written product.

E. Overview of the Study

In the second chapter, I review professional writers' interior creative processes which have been sparsely touched on throughout their interviews and their own reflections on their creative processes. The professional writers' writing experiences form a basic structure for the play of the central idea in the study: an interplay between a writer's conscious and unconscious in the writer's interior creative process. Supported by the professional writers' creative processes in the second chapter, the third chapter analyzes Cixous's writing theories in depth and detail. As a linguist and professional writer, Kristeva's carnivalesque theory complements the internal process that Cixous experiences, especially at the stage of becoming "the other," a "personal identity." Bakhtin, as a literary critic and theorist, enriches the study with his dialogic theory on novel. His discovery of one important novelistic element, an inner dialogue

between a writer and the writer's characters crystallizes the complex process of building up a "personal identity," a process of challenge, compromise, and innovation.

The fourth chapter constitutes a research method of the study to analyze Virginia Woolf's interior voyages toward writing *To the Lighthouse* and *A Room of One's Own*. I employ Doris E. Wallace's case study method which is developed from Howard E. Gruber's evolving systems to establish four contextual frames in analyzing Woolf's creative processes. Besides the six contextual frames originally made by Wallace, which I condense into three (relevant work enterprises, work as a whole, and professional milieu), I add text to understand if Kristeva's carnivalesque discourse and Bakhtin's dialogic theory are also two essential elements for Woolf's creative processes. The two published texts and their manuscripts are analyzed in the fourth contextual frame. The rationales of using Gruber's evolving systems approach and selecting Woolf and her two literary texts she created as the subjects of the study are elucidated within the same chapter. I also list the steps I take to analyze Woolf's internal processes of the two works.

Based on the research method I develop in the methodology chapter, the fifth and sixth chapters, exploring Woolf's internal creative processes of producing her two works respectively, are shaped in accord with the four contextual frames (relevant work enterprises, professional milieu, work as a whole, and text). In the last chapter, I discuss my own interior creative process in generating this study, the implications of the study for the pedagogy of teaching of creative writing, and the limitations of the study.

Chapter II

LITERATURE REVIEW

A. Introduction

Holland combines theories of cognitive psychology, psychoanalysis, neurology and his training as a literary critic to understand Robert Frost's brain at work. He concludes that our "personal identity" is the key to our different and unique reactions to the same literary text through the working of a hierarchy of feedback in our brain, though we share the same codes and canons in a culture. To further get to the bottom of the cause of a writer's unique and individual writing style, he traces it back to our limbic system, "the organ of depth personality with its primeval instincts, emotions, and appetites," quoting from Ludwig von Bertalanffy (*The Brain of Robert Frost* 80). And it is believed by brain science, according to Holland, that while our limbic system dominates our emotional behavior, it also affects our intellectual activities. This concept leads Holland to locate our "personal identity" in human's more developed limbic system that also controls our "perceptual and symbolic systems by which we write and read literature" (84).

Holland's neurological and psychological approach has given us insight into the complex procedures of our brain at work when we are reading and writing literature. This cognitive process usually takes a long period of time for codes and canons to be established in our memory. But his study only deals with the moment our brain is at work in the act of reading and writing. He does not discuss the long process that leads us to build up a "personal identity" in us. In other words, he leaves out the process that results in a writer's unique writing style. If,

according to Holland, a writer's "personal identity" decides the writer's unique writing style, then crystallizing the process of creating a "personal identity" becomes as important as understanding a writer's brain at work in the act of writing.

Based on Holland's theory on "personal identity," the consequence of our conscious and unconscious needs, I, in this and next chapters, fill in the part that Holland has omitted. I elucidate how a writer's conscious and unconscious are at work to create a "personal identity." Therefore, while Holland creates this term out of his study of neurology and psychology to explain how a writer's "personal identity" acts as a decisive factor to determine the writer's individual style, I take it as the goal that a writer has to achieve in the interior voyage toward writing. In other words, the formation of a writer's "personal identity" is an organic process that has to grow into an entity with a full-grown body and character, that is, a second self, a new "identity," besides a writer's present one.

Since a creative process contains not only the act of writing but the invisible one germinating inside a writer before actual writing takes place, a writer's interior nurturing process of generating a writing idea needs to be noticed and examined. Some scholars in the 80s found that a writer's "felt sense" initiates a written product and further thought it as a conscious process in which a writer turns the "felt sense" into his/her "personal context," the writer's thoughts and feelings. They attribute a writer's "felt sense" to the writer's "intuitive senses," like some kind of "inspiration" people usually endow to writers when they cannot explain from where writers get their writing ideas. Holland's theory on "personal identity" has come very close to solving the mystery except that he does not dig into a writer's interior creative process that has to take place before and in the act of writing. Holland only implicates

that reaching a “personal identity” is a cognitive process. Borrowing this idea, this study assumes that there must be a phased process activated inside a writer to grow a writing idea whatever the various ways that initiate it.

Building on the “felt sense” theory made by the scholars in the 80s and Holland’s contribution, this study reveals the process working in a writer’s “felt sense” and assumes that it is a cognitive process in which a writer goes through some interior stages until the writer creates a “personal identity” that can function on its own to govern the act of writing. To understand this interior creative process, I first discuss professional writers’ writing experiences, especially the “felt sense” which they relate to their feelings or thoughts that have already existed inside them. Their creative experiences illustrate that they are aware of the interior process that works inside them, though for them the “felt sense” or “intuitive senses” still belong to their unconscious that they take as a mystery. This chapter intends to bring out the fact that a writer needs to work on both their unconscious and conscious to create a written work. My categorization of a writer’s particular act into the unconscious or conscious does not mean that they work separately but demonstrates their importance in a writer’s interior creative process.

The professional writers discussed in this chapter come from Alfred Kazin’s *Writers at Work: The Paris Review Interviews* (3rd series, 1967), George Plimpton’s *Women Writers at Work: The Paris Review Interviews* (1989), and Janet Sternburg’s *The Writer on Her Work* (1980). Those professional writers’ revelations of their interior creative process form a solid base for the theoretical framework that I construct in the following chapter to demystify the interior creative process a writer has to experience.

B. Writers' Thoughts on Their Creative Processes

This section contains two major parts: the first one focuses on professional writers' interviews collected in *Writers at Work: The Paris Review Interviews* introduced by Kazin and *Women Writers at Work: The Paris Review Interviews* edited by Plimpton; the other is writers' reflections on their writing from *The Writer on Her Work* edited by Sternburg and one article "Where do You Get Your Ideas from?" written by Ursula K. Le Guin in her book *Dancing at the Edge of the World: Thoughts on Words, Women, Places* (1989).

Interviews

Writers interviewed in *Writers at Work* introduced by Alfred Kazin are world-known. Each writer has published a considerable number of works that are worldly respected, including male and female writers, such as William Carlos Williams, Louis-Ferdinand Celine, Lilian Hellman, Edward Albee, etc. George Plimpton's *Women Writers at Work* also contains various types of writers who are also wildly acknowledged. They are female poets, novelists, critics, and playwrights, such as Isak Dinesen, Marianne Moore, Karthine Ann Porter, and so on. All of the writers in their interviews talked about their creative process, though briefly. Their ways of approaching their writing vary in their uses of techniques, but their pre-writing and in-writing stages stationed in their minds are alike.

Those writers' "interior voyages" toward writing are initiated either through a voice they heard, an image, or a certain feeling formed inside them. While they could not explain where the voice, image, and feeling came from, they attributed them to their unconscious at work that made them hear a voice, envision an image, and feel a certain feeling. But a voice, image, or

feeling itself could not create a piece of work. They had to be related to the things known or experienced by those writers in the past or present. Their effort of connecting certain mysterious voice, image, or feeling with things familiar to them was their conscious at work. And the voice, image, or feeling could not disappear until those writers transformed them into the forms of poems, novels, plays, or essays. In the process, those writers went through an inner struggle of bringing out what hid in their unconscious to their conscious.

Since a writer's unconscious is the key to unravel the mysterious creative process according to the writers reviewed in this chapter, I begin with two French writers, Louis-Ferdinand Celine and Jean Cocteau, who directly address their unconscious as the primary source of their creative process to frame the discussion. Then, I introduce Katherine Anne Porter, Marianne Moore, Evelyn Waugh, Blaise Cendrars, and William Burroughs, who in the beginning of their creative processes are drawn to their five senses, words, a title, or dreams as their first-hand creative sources and then in the process go into their unconscious to make what they feel, see, or hear become presentable with the effort of their conscious--that is, with their habitual techniques in writing--to transform them into words.

A certain enigmatic feeling that stirs inside a writer is usually the first sign that the writer draws on to start the creative process. Louis-Ferdinand Celine, a French novelist, thinks it is "emotion" before the words take place (*Writers at Work* 86). Jean Cocteau, a French poet, novelist, and playwright, also had a similar statement about his creative process. He said, "I have never written unless deeply moved about something" (77). What "deeply moved" him resulted in an "emotion" that motivated him to start writing. In other words, it was an inexplicable feeling, a mysterious force growing inside him that pushed him to translate it into

words. Cocteau took this “emotion” as “another” or one of many his others that “speaks in me” (61). Cocteau employed his writing of the novel *Les Enfants Terribles* to explain what he meant by the “another”:

I feel myself inhabited by a force or being--very little known to me. It *gives* the orders; I follow. The conception of my novel *Les Enfants Terribles* came to me from a friend, from what he told me of a circle: a family closed from societal life. I commenced to write: exactlyseventeen pages per day. It went well. I was pleased with it. Very. There was in the original life story some connection with America, and I had something I wanted to say about America. Poof! The being in me did not want to write that! Dead halt. A month of stupid staring at paper unable to say anything. One day it commenced again in its own way (66).

The “force or being” in him which he knew little about instigated him to write. Even though he did feel that he had something he could say about the story, the “force or being” inside him made him feel he had no control over the development of the story he made up. What is the “being” and where is it in him? His “other” self unknown to him in his unconscious. Reflecting on his writing process, Cocteau said interestingly, “I long said art is a marriage of the conscious and the unconscious. Latterly, I have begun to think: Is genius an at-present undiscovered form of the memory?” (66). Cocteau’s interviewer connected “the conscious” with “the memory,” an available material at our hand, and “the unconscious” with the creator. But Cocteau thought it was more complicated.

What does Cocteau actually mean when he said “genius” is “an at-present undiscovered form of the memory”? Later in the interview Cocteau’s talk about Picasso’s creation gives us some clues. Cocteau said, “Art is but an extension of the life process for him [Picasso], not differentiated” (74). Cocteau quoted Picasso’s own words to explain:

. . . by judging Buffet’s art he [Picasso] said, “I do not look at his art. I do not like the way he lives.” When he had been particularly heartless and inaccessible in a human

situation, I confronted him with it. "I am as I paint," he said (74).

Picasso's attitude toward art is closely connected with his own life. His memories, of course, without exception, were part of his life. But what makes his creation a work of art is not his memories, but the "undiscovered form of the memory," which has another name, "originality."

Cocteau said:

. . . it takes great courage to be original! The *first* time a thing appears it disconcerts everyone, the artist too. But you have to leave it--not retouch it. *Of course* you must then canonize the "bad." For the good is the familiar. The new arrives only by mischance. As Picasso says, it is a *fault*. And by sanctifying our *faults* we create. "It is too easy when you have a certain proficiency to be right," he says (74).

Cocteau's words explained what he meant by "an at-present undiscovered form of memory."

The "at-present" moment is the artist's ongoing life that is full of possibilities, chances, even including the "mischance," the "faults." A work of genius is produced at the crossing point of an artist's memory and the possibilities. "Mischance" or the "fault" is created out of the crossing point. To live by our memories only results in "familiarity." To follow by the possibilities without our past lives, the memories, as the source of our creation, can only lead us to the void. It is in the combination of the two that we create a work of art. In other words, a creative work resides in the collaboration between an artist's conscious (memories) and unconscious (possibilities).

To apply Cocteau's idea about "originality" to his own writing process, the "at-present undiscovered form of memory," which has not yet really taken the form of words, can be explained as the "force or being" living inside Cocteau before his writing took place. The "force or being" is the "other" that does the work of creation. Although he thought that it was a "tragedy" that it was not him who spoke for himself but the "other" him, his acceptance of the

other's existence was an act of renouncing his present self (the familiar one) to make the possibilities, the "mischance," or "faults" happen.

While Celine and Cocteau drew on their "emotion," the enigmatic feeling that surfaces out of their unconscious, Katherine Anne Porter (an American novelist), Marianne Moore (an American poet), Evelyn Waugh (a British publisher and critic), Blaise Cendrars (a Swiss poet and novelist), and William Burroughs (an American critic and novelist) attributed their initial writing idea to five senses, words, titles or dreams. But whatever their various approaches, they acted on the interplay between their conscious and unconscious to turn their writing ideas into words.

Porter relied on her five senses to create. She had to be there "by hearing the story, by witnessing the thing, by hearing just a word perhaps" (*Women Writers at Work* 60). She responded to her interviewer's question about how she turned the "visual impression" into "a narrative":

All my senses were very keen; things came to me through my eyes, through all my pores, everything hit me at once; you know. That makes it very difficult to describe just exactly what is happening. And then, I think the mind works in such a variety of ways. Sometimes an idea starts completely inarticulately. You're not thinking in images or words or--well, it's exactly like a dark cloud moving in your head. You keep wondering what will come out of this, and then it will dissolve itself into a set of--well, not images exactly, but really thoughts. You began to think directly in words. Abstractly. Then the words transform themselves into images. By the time I write the story my people are up and alive and walking around and taking things into their own hands. They exist as independently inside my head as you do before me now (61).

To be able to "think directly in words" initiated Porter to write a story about them. But it was a long way before words took the lead. For Porter, the preparation stage was indispensable. She had to be able to see, hear, or feel something first before she could transform her writing idea

into “thoughts,” and then had words to turn them into “images” after her search in her unconscious by “keep[ing] wondering what will come out of this [something].” Porter’s “interior voyage” toward writing, unavoidably, had to go through herself first (her five senses), where she could relate what she saw, heard, or felt to what she already had stored in her unconscious, like what Cocteau did when he connected the story he heard with something about America that he had long grown in him.

For Moore and Waugh, they were fascinated by words and had a very technical way of piecing together the broken bits of people’s lives or human experience into a poem, a story, or an essay. They also had to see something in their minds, but words got them first. Then, some thoughts or some visions that accompanied the words appeared at the same time. Moore told her interviewer about how she started writing a poem: “A felicitous phrase springs to mind--a word or two, say--simultaneous usually with some thought or object of equal attraction . . .” (*Women Writers at Work* 29). She emphasized, “I have a passion for rhythm and accent, so blundered into versifying” (29). But she did not just directly write down any words that occurred to her without having those words heard or seen in her vision first.

Moore’s “passion for rhythm and accent” was a good example of her interior creative process. A creative composition of words and the effects it produced fascinated her. It acted as a drive in her to have words appear in her mind. If the sound of those words resonated her thoughts at the moment or some object she was familiar with, she had a poem. Her preference to “light rhymes, inconspicuous rhymes and un-pompous conspicuous rhymes” was her nostalgia that hid deeply inside her, or in her unconscious (29). And whenever the words that sprang to her mind echoed her nostalgia, a poem could be born.

Evelyn Waugh experienced a similar creative process to Moore's, except that he did not write poetry, but biographies, novels, and travel books. He said in his interview, ". . . there are always words going round in my head; some people think in pictures, some in ideas. I think entirely in words. By the time I come to stick my pen in my inkpot these words have reached a stage of order which is fairly presentable" (*Writers at Work* 111). He did not further explain how he managed the words in his head and how he ordered them on paper. But his few words to his interviewer help crystallize his creative process. He stated concisely, "Yes, that's true--the word made manifest" (111).

Undoubtedly, Waugh was "haunted" by words which he felt he had to release by writing them out. And, according to Waugh, no pictures and ideas were formed in his head to initiate his writing except words. But words cannot compose a novel on their own if they do not carry some special meaning to their writer. The words that "haunted" Waugh could be a phrase that came to mind or a sentence that he heard from other people. Whatever the source of the words, they must have connected to certain thoughts or feelings inside him, and he felt he could write about them. Without this connection, those words would not mean anything to him, and they could not be transformed into a novel, a biography, or a travel book.

Obviously, according to Waugh, the words that hovered in his head could not just pour out of him onto a piece of paper. They had to be organized and ordered first in his mind until they were "fairly presentable." In other words, he had to "see" these words make sense in his mind before he began writing them down. Infinite words passed through Waugh's mind every day, and not all of them stayed. The words that stuck in his mind must have meant something to him at certain moment of his life. In the beginning of receiving them, he might not know why

they came to him. They created a puzzle in him that made him desire to solve it, to search for an answer in his unconscious. Without any connection to his feelings that stirred in him, those words could not form a story after another.

For Blaise Cendrars, it was the title he came up with that motivated him to write. His creative process seemed more like an assignment given by his teacher. And what he had to do was to finish it. His way of doing it was organized, or we can say, scientific. He built up “dossiers stuffed with notes and sketches” to help him accomplish his assigned project (*Writers at Work* 45). But it was not as simple as it seemed to be. When asked if each of his works took a long time, for example ten years for him to finish his poem *La Panama ou Les Aventures de Mes Sept Oncles*, he gave details to his creative process in general:

I first find the title When I have my title, I give myself to reflection. Things pile up. A crystallization both conscious and unconscious is produced around the title and I write nothing solid as long as I don't know everything about my characters, from the day of their birth to the day of their death, and can't make them evolve in all circumstances possible and imaginable according to their character and their situations fictional or real. This can last for years (45).

Unlike Waugh, who was haunted by words, Cendrars was fascinated by the title he found. He reflected on it and had his characters grow until he had a whole story of the characters. Like a baby's growth, Cendrars' creative process could take many years to be finished. Creating “dossiers” could not completely explain Cendrars' long process. It involved both his conscious and unconscious. He said that it was “a very long incubation. There's a whole unconscious labor of bringing to a point that must be carried out” (45).

His “unconscious labor” was the source of his creation because he had to give lives to his characters out of his creativity and imagination, including every detail from “the day of their

birth to the day of their death.” Without knowing all of his characters, he could not “make them evolve in all circumstances possible and imaginable . . .” whatever their character and situations were from real people, real life, or fiction. But it was also a conscious labor. He had to search hard in his unconscious to bring out his characters in one whole piece. Therefore, even though Cendrars started a poem or a novel by finding a title first, he still had to go through a searching process inside himself, a search for the part unknown to him to make a bridge between his conscious and unconscious.

Among all the writers interviewed in Kazin's *Writers at Work* and Plimpton's *Women Writers at Work*, William Burroughs may be one of the most extreme kinds who flung himself directly in associations and dreams, his unconscious, when it came to his writing. He was also known for his “efforts to apply to his writing the most advanced techniques of painting, music, and film” (*Writers at Work* 141). To credit his experimental techniques in writing as a unique merit to his works, he was a writer who allowed himself the greatest freedom he could get for his creative works. He talked about his creative process when seen by his interviewer as one of the few writers who “bypass[ed] the conscious, rational apparatus to which most writers direct their efforts”:

. . . but I am quite deliberately addressing myself to the whole area of what we call dreams. Precisely what is a dream? A certain juxtaposition of word and image. I've recently done a lot of experiments with scrapbooks. I'll read in the newspaper something that reminds me of or has relation to something I've written. I'll cut out the picture or article and paste it in a scrapbook beside the words from my book. Or, I'll be walking down the street and I'll suddenly see a scene from my book and I'll photograph it and put it in a scrapbook. . . . I've found that when preparing a page, I'll almost invariably dream that night something relating to this juxtaposition of word and image. In other words, I've been interested in precisely how word and image get around on very, very complex association lines. I do a lot of exercises in what I call time travel, in taking coordinates, such as what I photographed on the train, what I was thinking about at the time, what I was reading and

what I wrote; all of this to see how completely I can project myself back to that one point in time (149-150).

At first sight, it seemed that Burroughs was completely free from any restraint of human experience that pinned him down on the ground. But he was not. His associations and dreams were always traceable. They were either related to something he had read or written before, or connected to anything he had been thinking about. Actually, they were not wild dreams, but an extension of what he had been doing. He was looking for any possibility for the “juxtaposition of word and image.” He deliberately entered the area of dreams, the unconscious, to make sense out of it by doing a lot of exercises in associations between word and image. He did not do the “juxtaposition” randomly. He only cut out the article or picture that reminded him of or related to “something I’ve written.”

His plunge into the unconscious demonstrates how much he was drawn to the unknown part of him, and he was very aware of it. He was not that different from most other writers according to his interviewer, except that he pushed his desire for any possible “juxtaposition of word and image” to the extreme. His creative process happened in his mind. His scrapbook was just a record of his mind processing the messages sent out from the unconscious and the ones he received from the outside.

Writers' Reflections on Writing

In Janet Sternburg's book *The Writer on Her Work* (1980), women writers reflect on their writings. Each article in the book is written by those writers themselves. Unlike the writers in the interviews whose thoughts were directed or sometimes interrupted by their interviewers' questions and responses, those women writers invited by Sternburg to write about their own

writings tend to focus more on their inner feelings about writing, for example, how writing transforms them and what they feel in the process. Therefore, while the writers in the interviews explored their creative processes more technically, the writers who reflect on their own writing in *The Writer on Her Work* touch on their creative processes more emotionally. But those women writers' sensibility, in a way, shows that most parts of their creative processes operate in their hearts. They struggle to express how they really feel inside. It is like a combat between the obvious self (the known) and the authentic one (the unknown) that is, between their conscious and unconscious.

Among these writers, Maxine Hong Kingston, a novelist, is an exception in finding her writing idea, though she also experienced the same struggle as the other writers discussed in this section. Her creation was launched by another writer's work she read a long time ago. This work led her to envision a new book of her own. In the end of the section, Ursula K. Le Guin's ideas about a writer's feeling and the imagery that a writer creates give us a more complete view about a writer's interior voyage toward writing. But first let us enter into some women writers' inner worlds to discover their "interior voyages" toward writing.

Michele Murray wrote about her struggle between her socialized self and the authentic one in a personal journal style titled "Creating Oneself from Scratch" collected in Sternburg's book *The Writer on Her Work*. Murray recorded what she felt inside her and how those feelings created a strong desire in her to write them down:

I feel that my authenticity is trapped inside me by fear, habit, custom, and I will die without being able to express it in my words, my poems. What I feel is joy, vulnerability, a desire to create, a coming to God--a sense of grasping what is deeper and stiller--and a hesitation about expressing this, an unconquered shyness (*The Writer on Her Work* 93).

Murray's desire to write came from an urgent need to let out her real feelings, "joy, vulnerability," and her drive in writing. She felt them so strongly that she wanted to break through the walls of "fear, habit, custom" built up inside her at the same time. Those feelings that trapped her made her feel that her "desire to create, a coming to God" was illicit. She hesitated because of "an unconquered shyness." But this desire was so strong that she would "die without being able to express it in my words, my poems." Her struggle was like two selves fighting inside her. She had to let one of them go; otherwise, she could never have peace with herself.

Murray knew which self she should choose, and it would only happen under one condition; that is, she had to set herself free from any bondage. She wrote:

The question of freedom is an essential subject for any writer. Without freedom, personal and social, to write as one pleases and to express the will of the people, the writer is in bondage. This bondage may seem to be to others outside oneself but closely related by blood or kinship in some human fashion . . . (102-103).

She understood deeply how important "freedom" was to a writer because a writer's true feelings are the best source of a great work. If the sources are cut out, the writer's writing life is dying. Even though she still can write, her writings would become political or social propaganda. Murray also knew that the "bondage" was not just caused by some external infection that could be removed by surgical amputation. The desire to be set free to write what she really felt ~~inside~~ lived in her "blood." Therefore, she thought that it was "an essential subject for any writer" who had to face the desire to create, to write something "deeper and stiller" (93 & 102). Ironically, the existence of bondage is necessary because without the bondage we do not have an issue like freedom, and any writer cannot feel the need of freedom

or the desire to create. It is like a never dying dialogue between the two selves (the continuously socialized one and the authentic one that keeps wanting to renew itself) ignited to create a dynamic force to break through the “bondage” as long as the writer continues to desire “freedom” to write.

Susan Griffin had a similar creative experience to Murray’s when she was working on her book *Woman and Nature*. She also struggled between two voices fighting hard inside her. She wrote in the article “Thoughts on Writing: A Diary”:

So in writing *Woman and Nature* I moved toward joy but often with great weariness and full of fear and even sometimes anguish. Because indeed the voice of protection and order is a resistance, and it takes great strength (courage, rigor, discipline, decisiveness) to struggle with this voice. But finally the joy was in the writing itself, to witness and be part of this process whereby the words and shape of the book began to embody its meaning, so that the very process of writing seemed a proof and to illuminate existence (*The Writer on Her Work* 118-119).

The voice of “protection and order” was her familiar self who fought hard to harness her feeling of being set free, being creative. Once the feeling of “joy” escorted by “courage, rigor, discipline, and decisiveness” overcame her feelings of “weariness,” “fear,” and “anguish” caused by the familiar self, the book she was working on started to possess a life of its own, “to embody its meaning,” and “the very process of writing” proved it and witnessed its “existence.” The familiar self had disappeared to make room for the existence of the other, the book, the product of her “joy.”

Griffin felt she was changed in the process. She said, “And finally I was changed by the writing of the book” (119). The appearance of the other, the book, led her to walk out of her familiar self, the “protection and order.” She explained the reason for her change:

So all that I ask of my writing I ask of the rest of my life too. *Here (I say) the words are*

too thin. I have heard this before, I say, and there is more to this than is being revealed. I have said the obvious and expected. But beyond this must be something shocking, something satisfying. And so I mark out these old words and write again. I cross out the words except those that affect me deeply, those for which I have some “irrational” love. I keep those and build again. And again. All the while knowing that deeper meaning will rise to the surface like the form in a piece of stone, or the grain of a polished wood, if I have faith in this knowledge inside me (119).

Writing for Griffin is a process of destroying her old self and reconstructing a new one. As a writer who wanted to go beyond her present self, she let her “irrational” love for certain words, a mysterious force, lead her to walk toward the unknown, her unconscious, to push out the old “order” of her. The two selves, “the obvious and expected” and the one that was always restless and wanted to be set free from the “bondage,” keep fighting with each other. When the latter came out on top, the former disappeared to give room to “something shocking, something satisfying,” which was the result of her faith in the “knowledge” inside her, the one in her unconscious. It was a process of re-creating her self, and in the process she was “transformed” into the other, the one beyond “the obvious and expected” (112-113).

Toni Cade Bambara in her article “What It is I Think I’m Doing Anyhow” gives us some insight into the relation between a writer’s present self and the other that the writer becomes in the creative process. She sees her self being placed in this kind of relation all the time once she engaged in writing. She wrote, “My talent to write may propel me into places and situations I wouldn’t otherwise find myself in, but in the dark of night, having insomnia, I think the thoughts the same as you or you” (*The Writer on Her Work* 175). “I” and “you” are two different entities who cannot think the same or feel the same when there is no crossover between them. But they can once the “I” renounces itself and makes room for the “you,” the other. It is at that time that they can share the same thoughts and same feeling. Writing, as

what Bambara said, could put its writer's present self and the other inside the writer in such an impossible situation.

But what leads the writer's present self to walk toward the other and want to think exactly the same as the other? For Bambara, it is "the unknown" that makes the writer desire for the other--that is, writing--though she approaches from a feminist angle. She wrote:

As artists, the unknown beckons to us, singing its siren song and making our hearts pound with fear and desire. Let us not tie ourselves to the mast of anger but sail into the unknown, fearful of the future, yet not letting the fear control us. This is the ultimate test of our blood and guts. Those who pass it will discover new worlds and create a new literature by women truly worthy of our courage, our imagination, and our craft (179).

Being attracted to "the unknown" is like exploring in the darkness. It is exciting and challenging to walk into "the unknown." But a writer's feeling in the process is like what Griffin said she had no control of her writing once she handed herself to it. She had planned the structure of the book *Woman and Nature* in the beginning and lost the control of it in the process because the "work took on a life of its own, and began to resemble the patterns of the universe that it envisioned" (113). "The unknown" is always ahead of us. Griffin's writing experience on *Women and Nature* is a good example.

Writing is also a "test" as Bambara described because it takes great courage for a writer to sail to "the unknown." In the journey, "the unknown" challenge the writer's present self--that is, the known. The one who is able to change and engage in "the unknown" "discover[s] new worlds and create[s] a new literature" because writing is a journey of discovery (179). And the sailing always starts from a writer's heart. The writer who has "faith" in his/her "inside knowledge," the unconscious, will be the one who arrives on the shore.

Maxine Hong Kingston's description of her writing processes parallels with a writer's

sailing to “the unknown.” Her article, “The Coming Book,” may help us understand more about Bambara’s metaphor that a writer’s creative process is like sailing to “the unknown.” In the beginning of the article, Kingston brings us to her dentist’s clinic where her idea of a book occurred, and then she describes how her idea of a book of “No” comes out opposite to Joyce’s “Yes”:

Once at the dentist’s, I shut my eyes and saw The Book -- a volume as thick as Joyce’s *Ulysses* but not *Ulysses* -- fly at me and fly past. Just before its appearance, I heard words from Joyce like music; not having read Joyce for years, I was surprised at the independence of memory. His words reeled out in entrancing rhythms flowing in small and large figure eights looping into infinity without periods and commas. The Joyce ended on the last Yes, and I heard No, no, no, no, and again No (*The Writer on Her Work* 181-182).

Kingston’s book of “No,” of course, had nothing to do with her visit to the place itself, her dentist’s office. Joyce’s *Ulysses*, which Kingston read a long time ago, just dropped in Kingston’s mind out of nowhere. According to Kingston, it was an independent “memory” that jumped in her train of thought without any warning or hint. It just happened. Ulysses’ words flooded her right away. But she did not end up with a similar book to Joyce’s *Ulysses*. It turned out to be a book of “No” to Joyce’s a book of “Yes.” Kingston’s idea about a book of “No” hit her without her deliberate efforts to squeeze out a plan for her “coming book.” The moment she closed her eyes at the dentist’s she gave herself to her unconscious and let it sail her to “the unknown.” In the journey, she discovered a book of “No” which balanced Joyce’s “Yes.” When reaching that point, she suddenly found that “the universe had doubled” or actually “more than doubled; it was multiplying by millions” because, she explained, “Joyce’s day was but one day in a few people’s lives, and there are millions of days more, millions of people more” (182).

Kingston’s idea that there were infinite stories waiting for her out there to be told made

the appearance of a “No” book more realistic. Her vision of the book worked fast in her mind as though she were writing the book already by visualizing words rolling in. “The unknown” made her desire to finish the book of “No.” But she could not because what she just discovered in “the unknown” was just one of the million secrets of the universe, or only a page of the life book. Even though she had already been in the world of “the unknown,” she felt that she had not walked to the end of the world. She said, “So far we have only written approximations” (182).

Kingston’s reflection on her creative process showed how overwhelmed she felt by stepping one foot in “the unknown.” The secret of the universe lived inside her. She did not have to deliberately create a drama or literally go somewhere to own it. Many things passed by her every day. She was just not conscious to each detail or message that the universe sent her. The message did not disappear, but was stored in her memory. The disclosure of one piece of her ~~memory~~ made her realize that “visions probably don’t come from nowhere but grow from what we see everyday and live everyday . . .” (184). We have had visions inside us; they pass by us every day. Only artists, including writers, do not let them slip away from their mind’s eye.

Among all the literature that I have studied for this dissertation, Ursula K. Le Guin’s article “Where do You Get Your Ideas from?” collected in her book *Dancing at the Edge of the World* (1989) was the only one who directly talked about a writer’s interior creative process. The points she made in the article are very similar to many other writers’ I have discussed earlier. Le Guin thinks that a writer’s idea of a story in the very beginning “does not come from anywhere outside the mind that can be pointed to; it arises in the mind, from psychic

contents that have become unavailable to the conscious mind, inner or outer experience that has been . . . composted" (194). In other words, a writer's writing idea has been hidden in the writer's unconscious, or more precisely, the one that has long been rooted inside the writer whether it originally comes from the writer's "inner or outer experience." According to her own writing experience, Le Guin emphasizes that the idea "has to be transformed into oneself, it has to be composted, before it can grow a story" (194).

Drawing on a writer's "psychic contents," Le Guin goes further to analyze how a writer's idea surfaces out of his/her unconscious, and she admits that the process is "mysterious":

The inception of the work, that mysterious stage, is perhaps their coming together: when in the author's mind a feeling begins to connect itself to an image that will express it, and that image leads to an idea, until now half-formed, that begins to find words for itself, and the words lead to other words that make new images, perhaps of people, characters of a story, who are doing things that express the underlying feelings and ideas that are now resonating with each other (195).

Le Guin's theory on a writer's interior creative sequence (feeling, image, idea, words, more words, and images) is a combination of all the other writers' internal creative processes that I discussed earlier in this chapter. A writer's writing idea does not come from nowhere according to Le Guin, and it should be agreed by other professional writers that I reviewed above. The writing idea can appear like a certain feeling that surges in the writer. The feeling takes shape when the writer associates it with an image that can "express" it. What the writer sees in the image serves as the soil of a writing idea. Once the idea takes shape, words come out from the image and finally form a bigger picture composed of "new images" that results in a written work.

But an "image" does not just pop up in a writer's mind. The writer's ability to imagine is

an active medium to bridge a mysterious “feeling” with its image and with its words.

Imagination, for Le Guin, is “the one through which all the others connect” and “the meeting place of the thinking mind with the sensing body” (196). In other words, it is an interplay between a writer’s conscious acknowledgment of a writing idea and unconscious where deep emotions reside and can only be felt bodily without words to express. Since “the great writers share their souls with us--‘literally,’” a writer’s “imagination” in writing involves the renouncement of the writer’s “ego” according to Le Guin, though she does not directly explicate their relation (197). Instead, she states strongly that if the writer “fails to imagine, to *image*, the world of the narrative, the work fails” (197). But in what way does the writer fail?

She explains:

The usual result is abstract, didactic fiction. Plots that make points. Characters who don’t talk or act like people, and who are in fact not imaginary people at all but more bits of the writer’s ego got loose , glibly emitting messages. The intellect cannot do the work of the imagination; the emotions cannot do the work of the imagination; and neither of them can do anything much in fiction without the imagination (197).

In other words, working solely on the conscious destroys a writer’s creativity which is based on the writer’s ability to imagine. What stands in the way for the writer to enter an imaginative world is the writer’s “ego” which the writer has to renounce in order to transform into the “other,” the imaginative world. It is at the moment of separating from the writer’s ego that the writer begins to engage in the world of imagination.

Summary

Most writers in the interviews and their own reflections either implicitly or explicitly talk about how important the roles of the conscious and the unconscious play in their creative

processes. Their conscious refers to their “thinking mind,” “the known,” or “the old order,” to use their terms. The unconscious, in some writers’ words, means “psychic contents that have become unavailable to the conscious mind,” a writer’s “authenticity,” the “knowledge inside [a writer],” “the unknown,” a writer’s long lost “memory,” and a writer’s inside “force or being.” Whatever the names those writers give to their conscious and unconscious to explain their creative processes, the conscious belongs to a writer’s deliberate effort to hold on to a writing idea and make it grow by keeping exploring the unknown, their unconscious. The unconscious serves as their major source for them to get writing ideas and create images. In other words, they perceive each message from their “psychic contents” with all of their senses until it surfaces to their conscious and becomes written words, an interplay between the conscious and the unconscious. This interplay continues until they complete a written product.

My study fully acknowledges the long creative process: an interplay between a writer’s conscious and unconscious. Helene Cixous’s thoughts about her creative process, which I discuss in the next chapter, engage on the same level as those professional writers’; that is, she starts to write from “where there is no explanation,” something “mysterious and concrete” (*Helene Cixous Rootprints* 43). She exemplifies the process by illustrating one of her friends’ sudden tears at a certain place without a logical explanation. She said, “it is there that I begin to work” (42-43). Writers, including Cixous, are pushed down into their bottomless unconscious. The only way they can save themselves from being totally drowned in it is to come to their conscious and find an answer to the mystery they fall into. Even though they may not find a definite answer, expressing what they have been experiencing deeply inside releases them from the mystery, the unknown. They need to transform the unconscious into the

conscious; otherwise, their writing idea might die of being stuck in the unconscious. Murray has experienced such a feeling that she “will die without being able to express it in my words, my poems” (*The Writer on Her Work* 93).

To use Cixous’s words that her writing starts from “where there is no explanation,” my study begins from the same curiosity about the mystery of a writer’s interior creative process that has made writers feel “extremely difficult to talk about” (*Dancing at the Edge of the World* 193). Cixous’s creative process, which I discuss in the next chapter, sheds light on the mystery, a writer’s unconscious at work, though I cannot claim that it has been fully crystallized by Cixous, and neither can Cixous. But, at least, through Cixous, part of the mysterious process working inside a writer may be clarified and help us understand what a writer has to go through to be conscious of a mysterious feeling or experience that has been growing in the writer’s unconscious. Kristeva’s theory about carnivalesque discourse and Bakhtin’s dialogic theory on novel will serve to solidify Cixous’s writing theory and illustrate how a writer weaves the conscious and unconscious into a written text. Also, some researchers’ research studies in the field of creative writing will assist to clarify and strengthen the theoretical framework that I create through Cixous, Kristeva, and Bakhtin.

Chapter III

ESTABLISHING A THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK:

A WRITER'S INTERIOR VOYAGE TOWARD CREATING A NEW IDENTITY

Standing on the shoulders of my predecessors (Holland and professional writers discussed in the previous chapter), in this chapter I crystallize a writer's interior creative process of reaching a "personal identity" outside a writer's original one. In other words, I discuss how a writer lets go of his/her "ego" and releases what is inside his/her unconscious to create a new "identity" that governs the writer's unique writing style. In the meantime, this study illuminates how a writer searches for (an conscious act) thoughts or feelings in the unconscious to develop the writer's writing idea.

The process of creating a new "identity" embodies an interplay between a writer's conscious and unconscious, that is, a journey either setting out from the unconscious to the conscious or from the conscious to the unconscious and back to the conscious again. But whatever the starting point of a writer's interior voyage toward creating a new "identity," a writer has to go through two interior stages: (1) the emergence of a writer's felt sense which demands an involvement of a writer's body/physical senses and emotional satisfaction with the deepest desire that surges in the writer's unconscious and (2) an everlasting inner dialogue between the writer's present self/ego (the conscious) and the new "identity" that is taking shape in his/her unconscious. At the second stage, the writer experiences three types of desire that arise in the writer's unconscious: (1) a desire for the death of the language he has used to express who he has been and what he has stood for, (2) a desire to create a new language, a

unique writing style that replaces the old, familiar one practiced in his/her previous creative works, and (3) a desire to create a complete world for the new "identity" (the written product) which requires the involvement of a creation of a culture, a society, a world that contains other voices/characters.

Cixous's thoughts on the relation among a writer's body, self, and the other explicates the first interior stage of this complicated creative process. Six important elements compose Cixous's creative process: body, desire, death, self, blindness, and otherness. They are also the elements that catalyze her renouncement of her ego/self to be transformed into the other, a new "identity," an interior voyage toward writing. Out of the six elements, I construct two types of inner creative experiences that a writer goes through in his/her interior creative process--a sequence of drive-desire-vision and a sequence of vision-desire-drive. To expound upon Cixous's writing theory and my construction of the two inner creative experiences, the section on Cixous is divided into four parts: (1) the six elements in Cixous's creative process, (2) a sequence of drive-desire-vision, (3) a sequence of vision-desire-drive, and (4) a renouncement of one's self.

Once a writer has reached the point of renouncing his/her present self/ego, a "personal identity"--that is, a new "identity" that differs from the writer's old one created for his/her previous creative works--begins to take shape. To complete the creation of the new "identity," the second stage of the interior creative process takes over. This stage contains two phases: (1) a writer's engagement on the language level, a carnivalesque discourse with the new "identity," the writer's conscious effort to adapt to the inner standards (heterogeneous elements) of the new "identity" and (2) an interplay between the new "identity" and the other voices/characters

(heterogeneous elements). In the first phase, the writer needs to create a language that can fully express the standards of the new “identity.” In the process of adapting to the standards, the writer’s new “identity” embarks on an endless dialogue with the writer’s present self/ego. While a new language, a unique writing style, is taking shape as a consequence of the ongoing dialogue between the writer’s present self/ego and the new “identity,” the next phase steps in to finish the rest of the creative process. To prevent the new “identity” from falling into private murmurings, the new “identity” has to bring in other voices/characters to create a world of its own that can communicate fresh thoughts or feelings to its readers. It is at this level that a writer’s interior creative process is accomplished.

The first phase is expounded upon in the section on Kristeva, whose theory in carnivalesque discourse from a linguistic approach to literature explicates why, in the process of creating a new “identity,” a writer needs to create a new language, a unique writing style, to meet the inner standards that the writer’s deepest desire is establishing for the formation of the new “identity.” In the section on Bakhtin, his dialogic theory about novel illuminates the second phase when a writer reaches the point of creating other voices/characters for a fully-developed life of the new “identity” which should have its own values, culture, society, and world--a written product. For the section on Kristeva, I break it down into two parts: carnivalesque discourse and an interplay between a speaking subject and language. No subdivision is made Bakhtin section.

A. Helene Cixous

1. Six Elements in Cixous's Creative Process

The nature of writing, for Helene Cixous, a French writer and critic, is “a matter of *passage*, of all kinds of passages, of delimitation, of overflowing” (Cixous, *Three Steps on the Ladder of Writing*, 129). It is an “interior voyage” in which her writing starts from the unnamed, that is, “without you, without I, without law, without knowing, without light, without hope, without bonds ...” (*Coming to Writing* 38). It is a “passage” or a process of “in the searching, not the finding” (*Three Steps* 88). In other words, her writing is initiated in the state of darkness (blindness) where she “[has] written to see; to have what [she] never would have had ...” (*Coming to Writing* 4). What leads her through the dark tunnel is her “felt sense” which has to precede her act of writing. She said, “when we feel and there is not yet a name for it” (*Stigmata: Escaping Texts* 141). But where does her “felt sense” come from? How does she translate it into words? She claims that she never deliberately works on the “felt sense”:

... it is at the crossing of my thinking body and the flux of living events that the thing is secreted. I will only be the door and the spokesperson supplying words. The linguistic receptor. The scribe (*Stigmata* 144).

What mediates the two worlds, her “thinking body and the flux of living events,” from where her “felt sense” rises? It is her body at work that turns her “felt sense,” hidden deep down inside her, into flesh, to engage in the outer forces, “living events,” coming inside her. Cixous uses her reading of Hofmannsthal’s *The Wanderer* to explain what has to happen inside her in her interior voyage toward writing. In the text, its narrator travels through “Greek and Turkish lands” where he meets a strange traveler, never named, who “has apparently been walking for centuries” (*Three Steps* 64). Cixous recognizes this strange person right away: he

is Rimbaud, for she has “lived in the country of poets” (64). Then, she tells us how she comes to identify this person:

To meet Rimbaud we have to walk to Austria, to the Greece that is hidden within Austria; we have to travel to the heart of the country of the unconscious, where we may again find those countries we have lost, including Algeria and the Jardin d'Essais. But for this we have to walk, to use our whole body to enable the world to become flesh, exactly as this happens in dreams. In dreams and writing our body is alive: we either use the whole of it or, depending on the dream, a part. We must embark on a body-to-body journey in order to discover the body (64-65).

For Cixous, writing starts right off from her journey, with her body, to “the heart of the country of the unconscious.” She has to go, to displace her self in an “other” world. This world may exist in her dream or any other world she has to go, and it is where her writing begins. She states strongly, “One must go on foot, with the body. One has to go away, leave the self . . . One must walk as far as the night. One’s own night. Walking through the self toward the dark” (65). “The dark” leads her to the other world (otherness), but she has to take her body with her during the whole journey because her “felt sense” has to be fleshly felt. In that darkness, the other world, she sees with her “Soul’s eye,” and writes “from the tips of the fingers that transcribe by the sweet dictates of vision . . .” (*Coming to Writing* 4).

But how is her “felt sense” transported through her body to the “tips of the fingers”? One of her writing experiences may help explain the process and what she means by her fleshly “felt sense”:

I undergo writing! It came to me abruptly. One day I was tracked down, besieged, taken. It captured me. I was seized. From where? I know nothing about it. I’ve never known anything about it. From some bodily region. I don’t know where. “Writing” seized me, gripped me, around the diaphragm, between the stomach and the chest, a blast dilated my lungs and I stopped breathing. Suddenly I was filled with a turbulence that knocked the wind out of me and inspired me to wild acts. “Write.” When I say “writing” seized me, it wasn’t a sentence that had managed to seduce me, there was absolutely nothing written, not

a letter, not a line. But in the depths of the flesh, the attack. Pushed. Not penetrated (*Coming to Writing* 9).

But what was exactly “pushed” out of “the depths of the flesh” that makes Cixous write?

Desire. She concisely describes the process, “A desire to write rises in my body and comes to occupy my heart. Everything beats faster. The entire body readies itself” (*Stigmata* 144). And that’s when the “tips of [her] fingers” filled with “desire” start writing. Harold Rugg’s explanation of the relation among gesture, feeling, and body adjustment in his book *Imagination* (1963) may shed light on the process of how Cixous transfers her “felt sense” to her act of writing. Rugg takes gesture as “felt-thought” which needs the cooperation of our body to project out our feelings:

. . . gesture as felt-thought . . . is the label I give to the total motor adjustment of the skeletal frame, muscles, tissues, organs, nervous system, circulatory and reverberatory systems, of the endothalamic and the autonomic systems. All of these reverberate through the self, through the agency of many senses. The essence of the point of view is that gesture is feeling in tensed body movement (282).

If we take Cixous’s writing as a gesture, her body is an indispensable medium, expressing the feeling or “desire” that has to come out of her. Rugg says it well when concluding, “Thus in my theory of the flash of insight and of knowing, communicating, and imagining, the tensed body acts as a sounding board responding to the world in the form of feeling” (282).

But, then, the next question should be: what causes Cixous’s “desire to write”? Norman Holland thinks that our desire to write is engendered by our desire to name. He states in *The I* (1985), “in all naming desire speaks, that is, the naming announces both the desire and the absence of what is desired” (88). In other words, our desire to write or name is our creativity at work that asks for the existence of a new identity. While Holland does not tell us what makes

us desire to write or name, Cixous leads us to the bottom of her desire, that is, her death. It means two things: (1) her desire to know what is beyond her; (2) her desire to lose everything in order to be able to have everything she would not have had. She says, “the author wants to die because it is over there that ‘it’ happens” (*Three Steps* 34). She does not explain what the “it” means. But it is no doubt that “it,” here, refers to the author’s writing, her new identity. And the creative process of building up a new identity, a written product, will not be completed as long as the writer’s desire is still in need.

But why is it important for Cixous to desire to die when it comes to writing? Because she wants to write about the “truth,” which “is equivalent to death” (37). “Truth” is forbidden, unspeakable, and hurts. It hurts everyone. But it is only “in death we know the greatest, the most repellent suffering” (*Coming to Writing* 37). Life, a new self, comes out from death because our closeness to death makes us feel alive. And her desire to die, to be born again, is the greatest incentive to push her to “cross over, to leap,” to know what she cannot know, the unknown--the truth (37). Jean-Michel Oughourlian in her *The Puppet of Desire* (1991) also emphasizes the relation between desire and the creation of a self. She elucidates it from a psychological point of view:

Because desire is the only psychological motion, it alone, it seems to me, is capable of producing the self and breathing life into it. The first hypothesis that I would like to formulate in this regard is this: *desire gives rise to the self and, by its movement, animates it*. The second hypothesis, which I have adopted unreservedly since I first became aware of it, is that *desire is mimetic*. . . . Desire is the source of the self. The self is thus, in fact, a self of desire [moi-du-desir]. Because the self is engendered by desire, it cannot lay claim to the ownership of that desire (11-12).

Oughourlian’s view is further reinforced by Holland’s theory about our limbic system in which our emotion--that is, our deepest desire--is located, and it is the limbic system that decides our

individual taste, our “personal identity,” who we are, and how each of us is made unique.

To continue Cixous’s desire to die in order to go to where it is unknown, she uses a “foreign home” to refer to what she means by where it is unknown is the home of the truth (*Three Steps* 38). Cixous explains:

The thing that is both known and unknown, the most unknown and the best unknown, this is what we are looking for when we write. We go toward the best known unknown thing, where knowing and not knowing touch, where we hope we will know what is unknown. Where we hope we will not be afraid of understanding the incomprehensible, facing the invisible, hearing the inaudible, thinking the unthinkable . . . Painting is trying to paint what you cannot paint and writing is writing what you cannot know before you have written: it is preknowing and not knowing, blindly, with words (38).

Walking toward the “foreign home” is to “give up all our family homes” (38). In other words, to know the unknown is to lose everything we have had, to get lost in order to have everything we would not have had. And it is at the crossing of knowing and not knowing, life and death, that writing begins:

. . . when you have lost everything, no more roads, no direction, no fixed signs, no ground, thoughts able to resist other thoughts, when you are lost, beside yourself, and you continue getting lost, when you become the panicky movement of getting lost, then, that’s when, where you are unwoven weft, flesh that lets strangeness come through, defenseless being, without resistance, without batten, without skin, inundated with otherness, it’s in these breathless times that writings traverse you, songs of an unheard-of purity flow through you, addressed to no one, they well up, surge forth, from the throats of your unknown inhabitants, these are the cries that death and life hurl in their combat (*Coming to Writing* 38-39).

When we come to realize what Cixous has to go through in her interior voyage toward writing, using “felt sense” to summarize the journey is ambiguous and insufficient to cover all the six elements—**body, blindness, otherness, desire, self, and death**—that necessitate Cixous’s act of writing. Even though each of the six elements can be more or less categorized into the “felt sense,” their carried meanings cannot be fully explicated by the “felt sense.” Therefore,

built on the six elements, in the next section, to make the whole picture of Cixous's interior voyage clear and more organized, I attempt to break down the "felt sense" into two types of inner creative experiences that Cixous goes through in writing: a sequence of drive-desire-vision and a sequence of vision-desire-drive. I will mainly draw on her interview by Mireille Calle-Gruber collected in the book, *Helene Cixous Rootprints: Memory and Life Writing* (1997), in which she has a better and more systematized understanding of her interior voyage toward writing.

Helene Cixous Rootprints was first published in France in 1994, which was right between the publications of her other three books that I mainly drew on in this section, *Coming to Writing* (1991), *Three Steps on the Ladder of Writing* (1993), and *Stigmata: Escaping Texts* (1998). Body, desire, death, self, blindness, and otherness, are the recurring themes mentioned in Helene Cixous's interview while asked about her writing process by Mireille Calle-Gruber in *Helene Cixous Rootprints* (1997). Besides the six elements, Cixous proposes another idea about one's renouncement of one's self when she stresses the importance of becoming the second character in one's life in order to be less resistant to the otherness, to "make room for the other" (*Helene Cixous Rootprints* 110). It corresponds to her thoughts in *Coming to Writing* when she talks about how "writings traverse [us]" and how it is a battle between "life and death."

2. A Sequence of Drive-Desire-Vision

My tentative organization of Cixous's interior creative processes into the two types of sequences of drive-desire-vision and vision-desire-drive is based on Cixous's six elements

(body, desire, death, self, blindness, and otherness). In her interview by Calle-Gruber, Cixous specifies more about where her writing starts and draws more on the relation between mystery and writing, that is, where “the crossing of knowing and not knowing” is:

Thinking deeply
 Waiting
 Where does this thought come to us from: from the body
 It is the place that writes (*Helene Cixous Rootprints*, Cixous's notes, 42).

“Body” is the place where Cixous’s interior creative process starts. She further uses an inexplicable physical phenomenon that happened to one of her friends to explain her creative process. This friend shed tears suddenly “at the corner of *boulevard Jordan* and *rue Deutsch de la Meurthe*,” a place where no particular event could have ever caused this friend’s tears (42). The occurrence of her friend’s tears shows no logic at all. This inexplicable phenomenon creates mystery. And it is from this inexplicable phenomenon that Cixous’s writing starts. The desire to write, surging within her body, driven by the unknown, the mysterious place and the emergence of tears, create a blind person’s vision inside her that pushes her to solve the mystery. She does not directly work on the specific physical phenomenon, human tears, for it will always be a mystery. Instead, she works from “where there is no explanation; and where it’s a question of fortune, good fortune, or bad fortune, that arises deep inside, of an intimate shock” (43).

Cixous further explains this interior experience by comparing it with “an alarm,” a signal that asks her to think with “its violence and with its strangeness”—that is, to plunge herself into the unknown (43). And the thinking process is “physical” as what she states earlier in the interview:

Writing is a physical effort, this is not said often enough. One runs the race with the horse that is to say with the thinking in its production. It is not an expressed, mathematical thinking, it's a trail of images. And after all, writing is only the scribe who comes after, and who has an interest in going as fast as possible (40).

In other words, it is the “unexpressed” “thinking,” working as “a trail of images” inside her that produces a piece of work with the assistance of scribe which verbalizes her “thinking,” the “trail of images.” If “tears” are the drive making her desire to solve the mystery, then the “thinking” or “trail of images” is the production of her desiring, that is, her vision. Brewster Ghiselin in *The Creative Process* (1952) has a similar description of such a process—a sequence of drive-desire-vision: “the creative urge may be at first so extremely vague as hardly to identify itself. The terms of its expression are not to be found in the world, but must be invented: the simplest terms of the new order have yet to be discovered and made explicit” (14). Instead of “drive,” Ghiselin uses “urge” to portray such a process. The desire to find, to invent an “expression” of such an “urge” is a must because the vague thought needs to be “made explicit” to form a “new order,” a vision, to start the writing. Then, what does Cixous do before she transforms her vision into language? She says, “I listen to this phenomenon, I listen to it with my eyes, with organs I do not know, that are in me” (43-44). Listening to “a voice, words, a line of speech playing in [her] mind” is also how Carolina Mancuso starts her writing. Such an “auditory impulse” makes her desire to figure out what that is (*From Real Life to Tall Tale--And Back Again* 81). And in the composing process, a vision, a “movie of the mind” as she calls it, plays along (80). This process is an interplay between both writers’ conscious and unconscious where their unconscious provides the source of their senses to direct their visions while their conscious brings them to the thinking level to verbalize them.

But this interior creative process does not stop when writing starts its work for Mancuso and Cixous. Mancuso relies on the “movie of the mind” to guide her throughout the whole writing process, even in revision. She says, “I depend upon the opening voice to be the strongest anchor in recalling mood” (81). Cixous corrects what she writes with a similar internal process operating inside her. She feels right away that something goes wrong when she “begin[s] to go deeper, that is to paint the picture of the tears ...” (*Helene Cixous Rootprints* 44). The “thinking” or “trail of images” which she verbalizes through the act of writing is a physical experience, her “felt sense,” that keeps reminding her and leads her to the “right” direction. Her correction of the writing also demonstrates that her “thinking” with the participants of her senses always precedes the act of writing. She describes what she feels and thinks in the process of correcting her writing:

. . . I feel I do not recognize, in what was just written, the vibration, the truth, the music of the thing I have glimpsed. And I know it is a weakness; it is a *less* language. It is that the machine did not do its job well. Did not furnish me right away with the expression, the word, the sentence or the rhythm that would have been the closest possible to that experience. And I sense it right away (*Helene Cixous Rootprints* 44).

When revising her works, she needs to feel the “vibration” again that leads her to write in the first place. In other words, she has to feel she is “understanding something in flashes, in dazzles” (44). Once she can verbalize her glimpse of “the moments of revelation,” she knows right away whether she stays on the “right” track because “that experience” guides her to correct the misleading of language (44). She keeps correcting along the way: “. . . since I adjust incessantly--I am constantly moving closer--sometimes I leave ‘rough copy’. I leave traces of the adjustments that are not necessary. And I cut them when I reread” (45). She knows where to cut the unnecessary parts when she rereads her work for she carries the breath

of “that sensical experience”--the “felt sense” or drive-desire-vision--all the way to the end.

3. A Sequence of Vision-Desire-Drive

But, does language served as the expression of our thoughts and feelings have no effect on the drive-desire-vision process at all since our senses in our body always run ahead of our verbalized expression according to Cixous's “physical” experience? Of course not. Language, as long as it is a living one, evolves with continuous imposition of a new meaning on a signifier, a word, or an expression by its users. Our body is not only full of senses but also signifiers, words, or expressions that form a substantial world in us. Then, how does language work as the role of a writer's senses to initiate a writer to write? In this case, Cixous's interior voyage toward writing begins from vision, then desire, and drive. If we have to distinguish between these two types of inner creative experiences, the sequence of drive-desire-vision is a spontaneous act, and the vision-desire-drive is a re-discovery/re-description of the already existent events, objects, or phenomena, though the latter also involves the working of spontaneity inside the writer.

Cixous borrows Stendhal's inner creative experience of his work *Vie de Henry Brulard* to exemplify the sequence of vision-desire-drive at the prewriting stage. It happens when Stendhal is in the Italian countryside “on a certain day, at a certain hour” (*Helene Cixous Rootprints* 58). He sets his mind free by letting any thought come into his head:

. . . he lets a double plural time unfold, a passing present past: on the one hand, the contemplation of a marvellous landscape arouses numerous affects; on the other, and from hill to hill, one thing leading to another, from present to past, from past to present, he comes to think about *The Transfiguration* of Raphael. He is overcome as he says: and to think that this painting was closed up for 250 years, and that now it is exposed in a way that makes it visible. What is magnificent is also that without his saying it, without our

perceiving it, what he sees--this is where the secret work of writing is done--is a motivating metaphor of what is going to happen (58).

The Italian landscape received first by Stendhal's eyes as he lets time flow freely in his mind is transformed into Raphael's *The Transfiguration* as if Stendhal could see the painting in front of him. Then, he is overwhelmed by the 250-year distance between Raphael's painting and the landscape he is seeing at the present moment. The way he thinks about *The Transfiguration* is like discovering a long-hidden window in him. But he does not directly pick up the painting that suddenly comes to his mind for his writing material. Instead, he listens very hard to the 250 years: ". . . two hundred and fifty, two hundred and fifty, fifty . . . That says something to me . . . Good God, I'm going to be fifty years old" (59). The 250 years are transformed into his age, and it sounds so right that it becomes "his own interior portrait" (59).

The Italian landscape is a signifier that catalyzes Stendhal's own vision or to use Calle-Gruber's words that "it is the echo of the landscape in him, which turns his own vision around" (59). Cixous extends Calle-Gruber's response by landing on the level of signifiers: "The echo in himself verbalizes a certain vision . . ." (59). In other words, the "certain vision" produced in Stendhal, because of the visible Italian landscape, becomes a signifier that signifies "his own interior portrait" of his upcoming age of fifty, his drive. The processes of turning the exterior, the landscape, into the interior, the vision of his age, and then the interior into the exterior, his verbalization of his vision, all proceed in him, his body. Even the reception of an exterior object has to go through his eyes first. Then, visions can be created one after another until it touches something significant inside him. And it is his desire to know what he would not have known to make him reach to his drive, his upcoming age of fifty, his "interior portrait." But

most important of all, he has to “liberate [himself] from [his] own interior despots”; otherwise, no outside signifiers, like the Italian landscape Stendhal receives through his eyes, can enter into him to bring out the signifiers that have already existed in him and then create a new vision out of the catalyzing touch (60). Without such a liberation of his mind, his writing--that is, the literature--would not happen.

But we do have literature. That is because we have the capacity of verbalizing any vision that forms inside us. In other words, we have the language already, and our body is the medium of the literature that we create. Cixous says well: “It is not because we do not have the language, but because we do not have the body. The language is there, one can do what one wants with it” (61). Calle-Gruber confirms Cixous’s view about Stendhal’s interior voyage toward writing, “Stendhal reminds us: it is always on our own skin that we write” (60). Carolina Mancuso’s own creative process of “What To Do If They Come” analyzed in her dissertation *From Real Life to Tall Tale* (1998) may also help explain such a procedure--a sequence of vision-desire-drive:

In this piece, unlike many others I’ve written, the original vision was an image, a strong though undetailed picture of a plot, the core of a plot, since I had no idea how the story would unfold. The image was grounded in a friend’s statement--part exaggeration, part joke, part memory--that her grade school nun-teacher had drilled the class on how to behave if the communists invaded (80).

Obviously, what motivated Mancuso to write this piece did not originate from what already existed inside her, but through her friend’s statement about the school experience outside of Mancuso’s. That statement from her friend created an image in her “mind’s eye” which pictured “the setting and the characters *en masse*,” and gave her “a vague idea of what was going on there” (80). The picture in her “mind’s eye” was not clear until she started to write it

down. Although she did not explain how she could connect her friend's school experience to turn it into her own, her friend's story did create a common feeling, that is, "the feeling of terror" which she could relate to (80). Built on such a feeling stored inside her, she was able to make it become her drive to visualize a mind-picture of what might have happened in her friend's school and then verbalize it. And such an interior creative process--a sequence of vision-desire-drive--is an interplay between a writer's conscious and unconscious. The writer perceives a vision consciously first before the writer can find something in his/her unconscious to relate to. The writer, thus, has to play with his/her conscious and unconscious at the same time to weave a vision that has to be felt right by his/her desire and drive.

Cixous's example of "tears" demonstrates that writing starts from our drive, the physical phenomenon, which makes us desire to understand by creating "a trail of images," that is, our vision. Stendhal's "Italian landscape" as a signifier received by his eyes forms a vision that makes him desire to discover a drive, his arriving age of fifty, which initiates his writing of *Vie de Henry Brulard*. Mancuso's "What To Do If They Come?" goes through a similar prewriting process to Stendhal's, except that she has to listen to a voice playing in her mind that guides her writing. Both of the inner creative experiences, a sequence of drive-desire-vision and a sequence of vision-desire-drive, have to run through a writer's body first that houses the writer's five senses--the starting point of any creative work.

4. A Renouncement of One's Self

To bridge the gap between the prewriting and in-writing stages, a writer needs to renounce his/her narcissistic self. In other words, the writer has to be able to write from the

eyes of the others/characters/language. And in the process of writing from the eyes of the others, the writer has to create a desire toward the others in order to satisfy the loss of his/her self in the process; that is, one needs to clear out a space for the others in one's self. It also means that, in the process of writing, part of the self must disappear in order to be revived again after the completion of a creative work, a creation of a new identity.

Cixous explains her relationship with the others who act as her eyes when she writes: "The origin of the material in writing can only be myself. I is not I, of course, because it is I with the others, coming from the others, putting me in the other's place, giving me the other's eyes" (*Helene Cixous Rootprints* 87). I cannot write I itself, just like the two eyes on the I's face who cannot see each other unless they are in front of a mirror. But what else do the eyes see in the mirror? The reflection of the I. In other words, the I has been put "in the other's place" to become the "other" I in the mirror and given "the other's eyes" to examine and observe the I standing in front of the mirror, the "origin of the material in writing."

What Cixous means here regarding I as the source of writing material is that "I" cannot exist without the others. What makes the observed "I" in the mirror the other I/writer is through the eyes of the others hidden in the I's unconscious. "Is the other thus innumerable? Are they also of all sorts, my others?" asked Calle-Gruber while confirming Cixous's view that "I does not exist. I is nothing. I is only with the other, and it is the other who gives me I" (13). Cixous answers beautifully:

The other in all his or her forms gives me I. It is on the occasion of the other that I catch sight of *me*, or that I catch *me* at: reacting, choosing, refusing, accepting. It is the other who makes my portrait. Always. And luckily. The other of all sorts, is also of all diverse richness. The more the other is rich, the more I am rich. The other, rich, will make all his or her richness resonate in me and will enrich me (13).

Therefore, on the one hand, the observed "I"/the other seen in the mirror can be reflected in many different ways. And it all depends on how many others the other has. However, the I/self in front of the mirror disappears. The I/self is replaced by the observed "I"/the other in the mirror in the act of writing. The I/self is transformed into the other I/writer that other voices/characters/language reflect on or project onto. The eyes in front of the mirror are replaced by the ones in the mirror, the others' eyes.

To apply this thought to writing, writing is like another mirror through which the I/self is examined; that is, in writing, the I/self is observed on the text by the other I/writer. The I/self is subordinate to the other I/writer in the act of writing. With an encounter with the other I/writer in writing, the I/self is varied, transformed, and expanded by how rich the other I/writer can be. And the richness of the other I/writer is induced by the other I's/writer's desire, the incarnation of the I/self, for the other voices/characters/language. The desire carries a devouring power over the other voices, but is restrained at the same time not to destroy the others; otherwise, writing would not happen because it would have been devoured by the writer's uncontrolled desire, his/her narcissistic self. Cixous uses the relationship between lovers to explain:

It is known that love is devouring. It is the great drama of love: we want at once to devour the other and not to devour the other. To not want to devour the other is not a mark of love, but a mark of disinterest. So it's the two at the same time: we want at any price to devour the other, and so it is an homage (the desire for the other, in this form, is a sign of love), and at the same time, we know that if we devour them . . . there will be no more . . . We must perform this double movement all the time. One must desire above all, be ready to kill for it, and at the same time be able to renounce the satisfaction of ones' desires *in extremis* (111).

But how does the renouncement of the self's satisfaction stop the self from killing the other?

Cixous tells a story about a wolf who does not eat a lamb, and how the wolf surpasses his ego and at the same time has his own satisfaction:

The wolf loves the object he does not eat and thus to which, on the occasion of which, he manifests his magnanimity, his generosity, his capacity to deprive himself for the sake of the other--to do without both food and the exercise of an activity that defines him. He is capable of 'unwolfing' himself [*laughs*] out of love. But at this moment, if he loves the lamb it is also because he receives in return the brilliance, the irradiation, the emanation of his greatness, of his abnegation. And he feeds on his spiritual brilliance, rather than lamb flesh (108).

To be able to surpass one's ego is to renounce "the affirmation of an identity" (110). This renouncement does not mean the abandonment of one's self, but is an act of making room for the other in one's self; that is, "a reduced resistance of the ego," which is very difficult since it asks one's self not to be "the first character of one's life, but the second" (110).

This love relationship can be applied to one's writing act. It is built on two levels. On the first, writing acts as the other/writer to desire the others/characters/language; on the second, writing is an interplay between the other/ writer and the others/characters/language created by the other/writer. Both of them are discussed in the sections of Kristeva and Bakhtin.

To be able to write, "one needs an immense narcissistic force to begin," says Cixous (110). It is a loving act of one's self because "we love to love" and "in loving, we love our loving selves" (109). In other words, writing starts from the desire of a writer's narcissistic self to be transformed into the other/writer, the "loving" object. The story and the characters a writer creates are the world of the transformed self presented through writing; that is, the created story and characters are the self's desiring world. But it is not autobiographical writing; it is always a work of fiction because it is layered with different others that have augmented the self and transformed it, because for Cixous, the so-called autobiography is "the blind

person's version" (87). Cixous considers herself like a blind person who uses her ears to "see better," her imagination to see what she cannot see during "the nocturnal hours" (89). She does not believe that anyone's eyes can "see 'the world as-it-is-supposed-to-be-seen-by-seeing-human-eyes'" (89). In other words, "we are always in fiction," responded Calle-Gruber (91). And "the blind person's version" not only exemplifies the fictional nature of our world but also the relationship between one's self and the others, which rely on each other to survive. In her notebook, Cixous writes, "I know that it's by being unknown to myself, that I live" (8). Writing that acts as the other, "the blind person's version," in relation to one's self, is engendered by one's desire to live, to solve the mystery, to survive in the darkness, which, to go further, is impelled by one's instinct to defy death, the original drive of creative writing.

Some scholars or researchers also have touched on the self-othering topic when they study either some professional writers' creative processes and writing philosophies or their own. Amazingly, those scholars' research studies implicitly or explicitly settle on the same conclusion that one's self has to be transformed into the other to start the creative process, though with the use of different terms to describe the same process. For example, Carl A. Winderl in his dissertation *A Creative Process that Produces an Autobiographical Novel* (1985) states that when he was absorbed in the act of writing, he was not himself any more but "the text" (1342). It was his "subconscious being" that was doing the magic. Even when he was away from his typewriter, he could still feel that he was split into two selves: "the conscious being is doing other things, the subconscious being is still flowing" (1355). And his "subconscious being" would not rest as though something in it was pushing at him "to stick with it until the point was made in the section" (1362).

Mancuso thinks that the art of fiction-writing functions like a “second language” into which a writer has to switch because “the convention of fiction offers another measure of distance from experience.” It is a process of changing the writer’s subjective self into an objective one or to use Mancuso’s words, from “‘insider’ to ‘outsider’” (*From Real Life to Tall Tale* 38). For instance, in the character Andrea she creates in “What To Do If They Come?” to whom she feels deeply related, she can see the “I” and “not-I” parts in the character. The “not-I” gives her imaginative space to construct the character’s “circumstances and characteristics at will” and makes her see the character’s experience both from “the inside and the outside at the same time.” While writing the character in the third person, Mancuso as a writer is very aware that this character is the combination of her imagination and her “constructed self” (91). But when she writes in the first person narration, she has to become “another character in order to tell a story, e.g. me as Mamie in the story ‘Mamie’” (109). She becomes an “actor” and “director” of the made-up character. As a writer, she must distance herself from the story more than she does with the third person in order to convince “the reader that writers can speak from epistemologies other than their own” (110).

The above research studies implicitly address that a writer has to transform his/her present self into the other, that is, in those researchers’ words, bringing out the “subconscious being” or changing a writer’s role from “insider to outsider.” The following cases that I am going to draw on from some researchers’ studies of professional writers’ creative process use “self” and “other” directly in their researches. For example, Lisa Ellen Bernstein in her dissertation *“Self-Othering” as a Strategy of Women’s Creative Expression in Literature and Art* (1998) talks about how women writers use “others to re-create [themselves], by recasting the self as other

and by merging with others” (1). Although Bernstein’s view of women writers’ creative process is constructed by an ideological approach that sets her research background from the perspectives of culture, ethnicity, gender, and nationality, her recognition of the self-othering characteristic common to women writers’ works also reveals that a writer needs to transform his/her self into the other in the creative process.

Bernstein first defines what she means by “self” and “other.” Except for her deficient definition of “other,” her exposition of “self” can be applied to my study which deals with how a writer achieves a new “personal identity” before the writer employs it to govern his/her writing style. Bernstein thinks that “self” refers to “images, impressions, sensory perceptions, and memories an individual experiences over time.” To distinguish self from other, she continues that “self is where we draw the boundary around our experiences and perceptions as separate from our surroundings, the rest of the world, other individuals” (5). Then, what is “other”? She explains:

The “other is thus all that we exclude in constructing our “self.” Because “other” has historically signified cultural, ethnic, sexual, or national groups not belongs to the dominant group, this term cannot be referenced without invoking these meanings as well (5).

Yes, it is hard to draw a line between self and other without utilizing culture, ethnicity, sexuality, or nationality as defining factors for distinction when we talk about “other” that is outside of our personal experiences. But, here, I want to add to what Bernstein leaves out; that is, our sense of “other” does not necessarily come from our awareness of different cultures, ethnicity, sexuality, or nationality. Even people who grow up in the same milieu still tend to draw a boundary between themselves and the others. Richard Rorty makes it clear in *Contingency, irony, and solidarity* (1989), “Anything from the sound of a word through the

color of a leaf to the feel of a piece of skin can, as Freud showed us, serve to dramatize and crystallize a human being's sense of self-identity" (37). Rorty's view corresponds to Holland's "limbic system," the cause of our personal taste. In other words, the distinction between self and other should not be limited to "cultural, ethnic, sexual, or national" differences. It does not mean they do not count. Of course, they do. What I want to emphasize here is that when we consider writing as creative process, those differences naturally account for what makes a person's self-identity different from the others'. But they do not explain why a writer's unique writing style differs from the others'. The "other" that a writer has to become involves more than Bernstein's "other." It is a combination of Bernstein's, Holland's "limbic system," and Rorty's self contingency, especially the latter that asks for a redescription of one's self that "the past never knew," "a self to be which her precursors never knew was possible" (*Contingency, irony, and solidarity* 29). And Rorty's self contingency carries the same significance as Cixous's journey to the unknown, to be at the crossing of the known and unknown, for that is where her writing starts.

But Bernstein's theory still can shed some light on how a writer turns his/her present self into the other, though she takes it as a woman writer's "strategy for finding a voice and attempting to come to wholeness in the face of hostile, oppressive social conditions" (7). Bernstein tells us three methods a woman writer employs to create a subjectivity of her own: first, "through creating a self that is another character"; secondly, "through a narrator who 'others' herself in order to approach a woman different from herself"; thirdly, "through reconstructing the life of a woman in history or myth" (24-25). Either way, a women writer is creating a new self other than just presenting her original one in the creative process of fiction

writing. It is impossible to “achieve ‘true’ self-representation” in writing because writing is a process of “self-othering, recreating the ‘I’ in different forms through [a writer’s] various characters” (23-24).

Self-othering is also a major theme in Phebe Jewell’s study of Stendhal’s, Gertrude Stein’s, and Samuel Beckett’s creative process in her dissertation *The Foreign Mirror* (1994), except that Jewell thinks the three writers try to break down the boundaries made between their selves and the others in their creative moments in order to see “the full range of possibilities for being” (197). Unlike Bernstein who sees women writers in an oppressed social condition that makes those women writers feel the need to reclaim their subjectivities in their works, Jewell points out the intimate and detached “relationship between place and being” for Stendhal, Stein, and Beckett (4). Jewell argues that a person’s awareness of his/her being relies on the subject’s recognition of an entity existing outside of itself, “which in turn requires the ability to get beyond itself” (4). The existence of the other is important because our inner world is filled and enriched by the other. In other words, the existence of our self is created by the other. Jewell uses Proust as an example to explain:

Without the presence of the other there would be no inner life, no inner event which is vital to Proust’s work. The self creates and recreates itself through contact not only with others, but with ways in which the others define that self. By being as specific as possible about its own experience, which by its very nature, includes the presence of the other, the poet is most fully able to articulate the process of being known as self (48).

Our self needs the other to complete our existence, but it is the space, the distance that the self senses between them is the key for the self to claim its subjectivity. Stendhal’s creative process is a good example. Jewell thinks while Stendhal cannot escape the other because “the core of his experience and thought is built around this other,” ironically his running away from the

other makes him closer to understanding himself (70).

What ties up such a paradoxical relationship between self and other? Desire. And it is through desire that self can reach what is beyond to know the unknown. Jewell defines this term: "Desire stems from the need to have or belong to something which lies *outside or beyond* our reach" (49). Because of such a distance inherited in the relationship, self is always "in motion towards some object of desire, thus underscoring the ability of the self to travel across and through the space to the other or the desired object or being" (49). The effort made to reach the other, the unknown, begins the self's journey to create and express itself with the self's recognition of "distance, separation, the need to go from one state to another" (49). But self's desire for the other is also a process which will never be fully completed because the other as an entity has its own will and desire which can never be totalized by the self's desire. In other words, self never settles down at one place for the object of its desire is also constantly in motion towards its desired object. Then, what makes the encounter between self and other be always on the move? The self's encounter with the world. Jewell explains:

The self, which is both self and other, constantly looks out at the world, responding to that world depending on how it interprets what it sees. What it sees depends in turn on how it perceives and understands its own place in the world. In this way Ricoeur's explanation of the self allows for an appreciation of the experience of self which is both fixed and elastic, universal and individual. It is through its encounter with the other that the self interprets both the world and its own being (54).

When the self is interpreting the world from where it stands, it is expressing itself, recreating itself, which means that as Stendhal, Stein, and Beckett write, "they are, in essence, writing a self. They enter into the immediacy of being, in that moment of creation in which all that exists is the sheer potentiality of being" (176). In other words, during the creative process,

their sense of themselves and the others become oblivious. In the creative moment, the boundary that distinguishes self from other has to disappear or dissolve in order to allow the existence of a space for a potential being, created and extended by the “union of [the self’s] perspective and the other’s” (185). But in the very beginning of the creative process, the self is forced out of itself by the other that the self encounters. When the self sees the world from the other’s perspective, it discovers infinite possibilities out there. In the process of engaging in the other, the self has to “define and redefine its being without losing a sense of the core qualities making up that being” (197). This means that the self, which is both the self and the other, cannot be totally erased by the other’s entry into the self. Instead, the self has become the medium of its created work as “creator and created, perceiver and perceived” by being its self and the other at the same time (197). Jewell’s conclusion of her study about the creative process of Stendhal, Stein, and Beckett perfectly summarizes the importance of becoming the others “in order to create an artistic work that reflects their own sense of being” for their creativity/their dynamic desire motivates them to engage in an unknown world beyond themselves:

. . . the world they have left behind is formed from an intricate network of boundaries which promote a single cohesive and static sense of meaning. This fixed world cannot understand their need to embody the movement of creativity in their works. In order to continue this dynamic process Stendhal, Stein, and Beckett must be able to perceive multiple levels of meaning. They must not merely see themselves as other, they must make themselves other. This desired alienation of being can be achieved most readily by a willed removal from the constraints of familiar contexts and places: in the foreign (209).

The self’s desire to go to the unknown, the “foreign” place, to become the other in order to create plays an essential part in a writer’s creative process, whatever it is in Cixous’s understanding of her own creative process, Bernstein’s analyses of women writers, or Jewell’s

discussion of the three male writers. Even though their beginning approaches are different, they all end up with the same conclusion that a writer has to renounce his/her present self to be transformed into the other in the interior creative process.

B. Julia Kristeva

1. Carnavalesque Discourse

The second interior stage a writer activates in a writer's interior voyage in writing is an inner dialogue between the writer's present self/ego and the new "identity" that is taking shape in the writer's unconscious and conscious, that is, carnivalesque discourse. The dialogue begins when the writer renounces his/her present self/ego to "make room for the other" (the new "identity") and tries to see the world from the other's perspective and, in the meantime, not to lose the sense of self. When the writer makes it to this level, he/she is at the stage of struggling to express the new being/the other/the new "identity" through language. It is a struggle because the new being means two things to language: one is that the language we have used to express who we are and what we stand for is insufficient to fulfill the meaning created by the new being; the other is the creation of a new language is needed to express the potential meaning.

Jewell has a touch on the role of language playing in the self-othering process in her research study. She describes such a struggle: "Because of the gap between word and meaning, the use of language always implies a stepping aside from experience. The attempt to articulate being forces us outside our being at the same time that it demands that we enter into that being . . ." (173). The process of leaving our being and entering the new being is a "dialogue between actual and potential being," and language required in the process is used "to

acknowledge the presence of another, be it a physical person, a different perspective, or a sense of self" (173-174). Jewell's view of language in a writer's self-othering process illustrates a typical carnivalesque discourse. To deal with this issue in depth, a writer's desire for "death" in order to know the unknown according to Cixous may shed some light on why and how carnivalesque discourse is played in a writer's interior voyage toward writing. Kristeva's theory in carnivalesque discourse, though from a linguistic perspective, leads us to understand its play more. But before I discuss Kristeva's theory, I clarify why a writer's desire for death has to do with the play of carnivalesque discourse.

Ralph J. Mills' view on why Theodore Roethke's poetry is in advance of his contemporaries by trying the "process of a 'Second Birth'" explains why a writer's desire for death is related to carnivalesque discourse (*Cry of the Human* 3). What is "Second Birth"? Mills explains it from James Dickey's definition, which Mills borrows from Dickey's *The Suspect in Poetry*: "the Second Birth is largely a matter of self-criticism and endless experiment, presided over by unwavering effort to ascertain what is most satisfying to the poet's self as it develops . . ." (3). Instead of just seeing a poet's "Second Birth" as the poet's writing process, Mills takes it as a poet's "breakthrough," "intense imaginative liberation . . . in which the poet, like a snake shedding his dead skin, frees himself of the weight of imposed styles and current critical criteria to come into the place of his own authentic speech" (3). In a word, it is a process of a poet's death and rebirth. The "self-criticism and endless experiment" are actually dialogues between the poet's self and the other he encounters in his unconscious, a carnivalesque discourse. They are the channels that the poet has to go through to have a "Second Birth." Without putting death to what the poet inherited from his predecessors and the

influence of his contemporaries, the poet would not be able to let the other enter his self to create a new being. And the process of making the “imposed styles and current critical criteria” die is the play of carnivalesque discourse.

Kristeva raises a writer’s desire for “death” in the writer’s interior creative process to the level of language, that is, the death of a language as the drive to push the growth of a new one. Her theory also parallels with Cixous’s renouncement of self to make more room for the “other.” The birth of a new language relies on rewriting a language that we have been familiar with. Kristeva borrows Bakhtin’s concept about “literary word” that embodies “a dialogue among several writings: that of the writer, the addressee (or the character), and the contemporary or earlier cultural context” to explain the process of renewing a language. She places the “literary word” or “poetic word” (Kristeva’s another term for the literary word) in social and historical texts, which a writer has to read in order to rewrite (*Desire in Language* 65). The act of rewriting the texts is to transform the “earlier cultural context” into the current moment of the writer’s time. This transformation of diachrony into synchrony allows the writer access to history. And Kristeva sees the time displacement as the result of reading-writing, a carnivalesque discourse, “that is, through the practice of a signifying structure in relation or opposition to another structure” (65).

Before I go further, I should explain what Kristeva means by “signifying practice” for it is the key point to understanding where she comes from when she applies Bakhtin’s carnivalesque discourse to her study of literature from a linguistic approach. Kristeva defines “signifying practice” as follows:

I shall call signifying practice the establishment and the countervailing of a sign system.

Establishing a sign system calls for the identity of a speaking subject within a social framework, which he recognizes as a basis for that identity. Countervailing the sign system is done by having the subject undergo an unsettling, questionable process; this indirectly challenges the social framework with which he had previously identified, and it thus coincides with times of abrupt changes, renewal, or revolution in society" (*Desire in Language* 18).

The process of rattling a sign system parallels with a carnivalesque discourse which "breaks through the laws of a language censored by grammar and semantics and, at the same time, is a social and political protest" (65).

2. An Interplay between a Speaking Subject and Language

While the speaking subject (author) engages in a carnivalesque discourse, he/she is situated in at least two split roles, "actor and spectator" (*Desire in Language* 46). And it results in a novelistic enunciation where "the phonetic (referential utterance, narration) and written (textual premises, citation) intersect," that is, an interplay between the speaking subject and language (46). To apply the dialogic concept of the "literary word" discussed earlier to this carnivalesque effect, "the phonetic" refer to its "writer," and "the written" "the addressee (or the character)" and "the contemporary or earlier cultural context." All of the elements that compose the novelistic enunciation are "irreducible," but a "compromise "between testimony [narration] and citation, between the voice [referential utterance] and the book [textual premises]" (46). In other words, novel as a literary genre with carnivalesque characteristic can never be simplified into one fixed sign system.

To extend the thought to a novelist's creative process, the novelist's I/self has to transform into the other, "a heterogenous, destructive causality," to defy a fixed sign system (27). The use of the "heterogeneous" element is the key to create a new meaning for the established sign

system. Kristeva uses “sun” as a metaphor to explain an eternal struggle between the “other,” the “poetic ‘I’” used in the following quoted passage, and a systematized language/death:

Sun: agency of language since it is the “crown” of rhythmic thrust, limiting structure, paternal law abrading rhythm, destroying it to a large degree, but also bringing it to light, out of its earthy revolutions, to enunciate itself. Inasmuch as the “I” is poetic, inasmuch as it wants to enunciate rhythm, to socialize it, to channel it into linguistic structure if only to break the structure, this “I” is bound to the sun. It is a part of this agency because it must master rhythm, it is threatened by it because solar mastery cuts off rhythm. Thus, there is no choice but to struggle eternally against the sun; the “I” is successively the sun and its opponent, language and its rhythm, never one without the other, and poetic formulation will continue as long as the struggle does (29).

Therefore, the “other,” the “poetic ‘I,’” situates itself in between. It avoids a fall into the trap set up either by a sign system or rhythm. The poetic “I” is always unsettled, undecidable, and most important of all, ambivalent. It works as a “signifying apparatus” (135). From Cixous’s perspective, it is the wolf who does not devour the lamb whom he loves.

But what drives “the countervailing of a sign system,” the carnivalesque discourse? To answer the question, it is necessary to understand two important concepts that dominate Kristeva’s thoughts about language. They are the semiotic and the symbolic, two main signifying processes. According to Kristeva’s definition of signifying practice, if the symbolic is the establishment of a sign system, the semiotic is more the “countervailing” one. The former relates to “paternal function, grammatical and social constraints, symbolic law,” that is, a sign system (7). The latter embodies “the actual organization, or disposition, within the body, of instinctual drives (hence the ‘semiotic disposition’) as they affect language and its practice . . .” (18). The semiotic is manifested by poetic language, “polyvalent and multi-determined,” which “adheres to a logic exceeding that of codified discourse and fully comes into being only in the margins of recognized culture” (65).

Poetic language is not limited to the present language structure. The former goes beyond the latter, even though the former has to be “in the margins” of the symbolic, the sign system, the unchanged, the death. It is this death, the death of a language, which acts as the drive to countervail itself, to initiate a carnivalesque discourse. Its speaking subject makes the sign system “perceive what it doesn't want to say, provide it with its matter independently of the sign, and free it from denotation. For it is this *eminently parodic* gesture that changes the system” (31). In other words, it is not until the discovery of a dead sign system that a desire to survive it “causes the signifier to appear as heterogeneous” (116).

Writing a novel embodies such a heterogenous force, a manifestation of carnivalesque discourse. It is a signifying process which builds up tensions between a speaking subject/author/the “other” and the “others”/a sign system/death. Both the semiotic and the symbolic operate at the same time in the signifying medium, language. They put the speaking subject in complex relations between “‘nature’ and ‘culture,’ between the immemorial ideological and scientific *tradition*, henceforth available, and the *present*, between *desire* and the *law*, the body, language, and ‘metalanguage’” (97). Writing a novel, a literary practice, can set the subject free from the signifier, death, by placing those tensions “within historical contradictions,” that is, displacing the subject’s consciousness. Through such a displacement, it destroys normative meaning, brings in heterogeneity, and makes the subject free from the threat of death, the symbolic. In the meantime, it disintegrates a linear movement of the subject’s historical sense by augmenting it into three dimensions. And the subject’s “ego,” placed within the signifier, sign, structure, system, “becomes outside-of-self, objectivized, or better, neither objective nor subjective, but both at the same time, and consequently, their ‘other,’ to which Barthes has

given its name: writing" (97).

The whole process of writing a novel is a carnivalesque discourse, a transformation of the subject's "self" into the "other." Functioning as a mirror, writing reflects such a displacement between a writer's present self and its other seen in the mirror.

C. Mikhail M. Bakhtin

The last phase of a writer's interior voyage toward writing is the interplay between the other/ new "identity" and the story characters. Bakhtin's dialogic theory on novel articulates such a complex interplay. In Gary Saul Morson and Caryl Emerson's book *Mikhail Bakhtin: Creations of a Prosaics*, they summarize Bakhtin's words through their translation of Bakhtin's work *Avtor I geroi v esteticheskoi deiatel'nosti* [*Author and hero in aesthetic activity*]: "... the aesthetic project always begins with the creation of a whole human being, a *second consciousness* in addition to the author's" (72). Here, Bakhtin refers the *second consciousness* to the others/characters created by the author whose values are projected onto the characters because "only the other[s] can be a value-endowing center and wholeness must be bestowed from without." That is why a creative writer in the process of producing an "aesthetic project" has to go beyond his/her present self/ego to become the other--that is, to create "a second consciousness" that can carry the new values or aesthetics originated by the writer. Bakhtin sees the author as "not yet," whose task is "to find a fundamental approach to life from without" (76-77). In other words, the "not yet" author is always engaging with a process of creating "a whole human being," a creative product, that transcends what his/her predecessors' have accomplished. And the process will never be finalized as long as the author keeps going

beyond his/her present self/ego.

But from what or whom does the author create the “*second consciousness*”? More precisely, how does the author create “from without”? The author creates from the never-finalized dialogues that take place in our daily lives. In writing, the dialogues proceed between the author and the world “whose unity is essentially one of multiple voices, whose conversations never reach finality and cannot be transcribed in monologic form” (61). In other words, while the conversations can never be finalized, the others/characters have to be created, finalized, in the act of writing. The I/self cannot write itself without the finalized other who reflects the image of the I/self:

The “I” cannot achieve an image of myself, just as I cannot be aware of how my mind works when I am unself-conscious, and cannot know how I really appear to the world by looking in a mirror. An integral self, a tentative self-definition, requires an *other*. To know oneself, to know one’s image in the world, one needs another’s finalizing outsideness (91).

But how does the “other,” the “outsideness,” differ from the “I,” the “unself-conscious”? The “other” is distinguished through the consciousness of other different voices in the “I” because “one language can see itself only in the light of another language” (Bakhtin 12). To understand this point, let’s break language into words first. For Bakhtin, a word “is born in a dialogue as a living rejoinder within it; the word is shaped in dialogic, interaction with an alien word that is already in the object” (279). But why is the word born in a “dialogue”? Because the world of language is a discourse in nature. No one speaker can name the objects in the world without the “already-spoken-about,” the already “articulated, disputed, elucidated and evaluated in various ways” (*Mikhail Bakhtin: Creation of a Prosaics* 137). Any word the speaker uses to enter the world is to answer the others that have already been spoken. To go

further, the word is always anticipating a future “answer-word”:

Forming itself in an atmosphere of the already spoken, the word is at the same time determined by that which has not yet been said but which is needed and in fact anticipated by the answering word. Such is the situation in any living dialogue (*The Dialogic Imagination* 280).

No uttered word is innocent as it is spoken by the “other,” the reflection of the “I” in the mirror. The “other” is the intersection of “earlier utterances” and how we sense them “as hostile or sympathetic, authoritative or feeble, socially and temporally close or distant” (*Mikhail Bakhtin: Creation of a Prosaics* 137). An uttered word is composed of its speaker’s tone which can reaccent the “already-spoken-about.” The tone of the word plays the role of the “other” that authorizes in writing. It is how “the other” intones the word that renews the “already-spoken-about”:

In using a word, speakers may intone the word so as to question the values present in its aura and the presuppositions of its earlier usage. In other words, the word may be “reaccented” (as *sentimental* was in the nineteenth century). As they accumulate and come to be shared, reaccentuations add to and alter the already-spoken-about quality of the word. This process is an essential factor in sharing a word’s evolution (139).

And “this process” continues as long as the word is spoken about, and reaccented by speakers and those who are yet to come. As more value systems keep participating in the word, it becomes “dialogized, disputed, and reaccented in yet another way as [it] encounter[s] yet another” (143). The role of the “other” whose tone plays with the word must sustain to be always in a dialogic situation. This unique “dialogized” characteristic, or even better expressed, the interplay between the “other”/author and the “others”/characters created for the undergoing of a dialogue in the act of writing, is best manifested in the literary genre, novel. Bakhtin states strongly:

The dialogic orientation of a word among other words (of all kinds and degrees of otherness) creates new and significant artistic potential in discourse, creates the potential for a distinctive art of prose, which has found its fullest and deepest expression in the novel (*The Dialogic Imagination* 275).

While using Pushkin's verse novel *Eugene Onegin* as an example to demonstrate the basic constitutive element of a novelistic style, Bakhtin explains how the "other"/author (Pushkin) interplays with the "others" (here, the "others" are the images that the author creates out of his unique way of speaking when characterizing and criticizing Lensky's "song" which sounded absurd in the author's time):

. . . the author is far from neutral in his relationship to this image: to a certain extent he even polemicizes with this language, argues with it, agrees with it (although with conditions), interrogates it, eavesdrops on it, but also ridicules it, parodically exaggerates it and so forth--in other words, the author is in a dialogical relationship with Onegin's language; the author is actually *conversing* with Onegin, and such a conversation is the fundamental constitutive element of all novelistic style as well as of the controlling image of Onegin's language (*The Dialogic Imagination* 46).

Therefore, looking from Bakhtin's dialogic theory on novel, the interplay between the "other"/author and the others/language is a constant, internalized dialogue that has to be carried out in a writer's "interior voyage" toward writing.

And this internalized dialogue must be realized or "externalized," to use Bakhtin's words, when it comes to the artistic level--the creations of characters in the novel (*The Dialogic Imagination* 45). The "other"/author is "outside" of the "I"/self to tell a story only when a character is given a body, "a body with 'surroundings'" (*Mikhail Bakhtin: Creation of a Prosaics* 188). It is also a rise to an ethical level since the author does not "merge with or duplicate" the "already-spoken-about," but to "supplement . . . to take full advantage of [the author's] special fields of vision" (185). The creation of a character is the act of the I/self

seeing the “other” in the mirror. In other words, this creative process is a journey from the self to the “other” in the mirror, the self’s “surplus and outsideness” (185). It is not until the character has a body that the author/the other “can be ‘outside’ it and the aesthetic act is born” (188). As a footnote, Bakhtin’s idea about form concludes the interplay between the “other”/author and the “others”/characters beautifully:

. . . selves are creative in response to images of themselves given by others. The other bestows form, an aesthetic act, and, as part of my inner life, I react to that form. I-for-myself is never identical with but always learning from the image of I-for-others, transcending that image, and so giving rise to yet other aesthetic acts that bestow on me new kinds of form (191).

D. Summary

Cixous’s creative process, body-desire-death-other, parallels with Bakhtin’s and Kristeva’s theories about the carnivalesque discourse. Although Bakhtin does not directly talk about our body as the starting point of writing, he does think that “the aesthetic project always begins with the creation of a whole human being, a second consciousness in addition to the author’s” (*Mikhail Bakhtin: Creation of a Prosaics* 72). Kristeva directly relates the signifying process, writing, to body, through language, its heterogeneous side: “This heterogeneous object is a body, because it is a *text*” (*Desire in Language* 163). Like Cixous, she also uses narcissism to explain a writer’s prewriting stage:

First, narcissism crumbles and the superego says, “So much the better, there’s one problem out of the way.” But the body seems to need an identity, and it reacts -- matures, tightens, like stone, ebony. Or else it cracks, bleeds, decays. All according to the symbolic reaction that is more or less likely. Then, the symbolic covering (constituted by acquired knowledge, the discourse of others, and communal shelter) cracks, and something that I call instinctual drive (for lack of a better term) rides up to destroy any guarantees, any beliefs, any protection, including those comprised by father or professor (162).

For Cixous and Kristeva and Bakhtin, writing is a process of destroying one's present self and reconstructing a new one. And this process continues as long as "the instinctual drive" keeps stirring inside us and desiring growth. Such a pushing force is the spirit of a carnivalesque discourse that lives inside a writer.

To summarize, according to Cixous, Kristeva, and Bakhtin, a writer's "interior voyage" toward writing is a process of going beyond the writer's present self/ego to create a written product originated from the unconscious that always engages in a never-finalized dialogue with the conscious, that is, the fixed sign system. Kristeva's insights into this carnivalesque spirit help summarize this process:

A carnival participant is both actor and spectator; he loses his sense of individuality, passes through a zero point of carnivalesque activity and splits into a subject of the spectacle and an object of the game. Within the carnival, the subject is reduced to nothingness, while the structure of *the author* emerges as anonymity that creates and sees itself created as self and other, as man and mask (*Desire in Language* 78).

And the created "*author*" is the writer's new "personal identity," which will govern the writer's writing style in the actual writing process. The process of creating the "personal identity" is acted out in a writer's renouncement of his/her present self/ego to make room for the other-- that is, a process to bring out the potential being hidden inside a writer's unconscious and sail to the unknown, a creative product.

Chapter IV

METHODOLOGY

"The approach is *experientially sensitive* (or phenomenologically aware): The creator is not considered simply as the doer of the work, but also as a person in the world. Such a person has emotions and aesthetic feelings as well as social awareness of the relation of his or her work to the world's work, its needs, and feelings" (Wallace & Gruber 5).

Using the theories I formulated in the third chapter and Howard E. Gruber's evolving systems, this study attempts to construct an entire story about a professional writer's interior voyage toward creating the other, a new being, an identity outside the writer's original one, to engage in the act of creative writing. The theories I draw from Cixous, Kristeva, Bakhtin, professional writers, scholars, and researchers act as lenses to bring out the story behind a professional writer's actual writing process. Gruber's evolving systems work as a methodological guide to frame a research design for the study. Virginia Woolf and her two creative works *To the Lighthouse* and *A Room of One's Own* are the subjects of the study and serve as examples of a writer's creative process of achieving a new "personal identity."

To ground my study, I talk about my assumptions and my research guiding principles. Then, I explain why I chose Virginia Woolf and her two works *To the Lighthouse* and *A Room of One's Own* as the subjects of the study. After that, I give my rationales for using Gruber's evolving systems as my research method and make two methodological tables (Table 1 and 2) separately on Woolf's creative processes of producing the two works. Then, I elucidate the procedures of my analyses of Woolf's creative processes according to the research question: What was Virginia Woolf's creative process in creating the novel *To the Lighthouse* and *A Room of One's Own*, and how is my theory that a writer needs to cultivate a

writing idea into a “personal identity” related to Woolf’s creative processes? Following the procedure section, I discuss how I approach the implications of the study for the pedagogy in teaching of creative writing. Then, I talk about my roles in the study. The validity of the research method is explicated in the next section. Finally, I discuss the limitations of the study.

A. Assumptions and Research Guiding Principles

Assumptions

This research study is based on the assumption that any really great writer must go through an “interior voyage” to create a new “personal identity” before the writer can transcribe it in words. A creative work starts from some ineffable feeling or some idea or vision that haunts its writer and desires an explanation by this writer. To clarify what I mean by “a creative work,” I shall define it here as the one that transcends the bounds imposed by its predecessors and its contemporaries. To borrow Harold Bloom’s summary of Blake’s words about a poet’s ambition to go beyond his/her precursors, a great writer of any genre should possess the same desire to be liberated from the influence of his/her forerunners: “To be enslaved by any precursor’s system, Blake says, is to be inhibited from creativity by an obsessive reasoning and comparing, presumably of one’s own works to the precursor’s” (Bloom 29). In other words, a creative work of any genre expands human experience, the accumulation of human cultures.

The other assumption is that the six elements (body, desire, death, self, blindness, and otherness) that I find in Cixous’s “interior voyage” toward writing are a writer’s instinctual reactions to his/her body’s need to expand its territory conditioned by language and its social

context, if we assume that one's body is a signifier itself. These reactions lead to a writer's renouncement of his/her present self to engage in an inner dialogue with the *other* to create a new being, a new "personal identity." In other words, the act of renouncing one's self is to accept the second place of his/her self/ego in order to be able to engage in the act of writing. Therefore, in this study, the inner dialogue between self and the other is a study of a writer's prewriting stage through the inquiry of a body as a signifier and its need to wrestle with the limit imposed by language, its social context. The six elements activated in a writer's "interior voyage" toward writing embody this approach.

Research Guiding Principles

Cixous's six elements (body, desire, death, self, blindness, and otherness) activated in her internal creative process are used as guiding principles to help the study delve more into Woolf's. Since Kristeva's carnivalesque discourse and Bakhtin's dialogic theory about how a novel begins are the common characteristics of each creative work, we can be sure that these two features must exist in Woolf's works. But in this study, instead of just taking the two features as the basic elements of any novel, they are considered parts of Woolf's interior creative process, two other guiding principles that this study follows.

Woolf's creative processes of producing the two works examined through these guiding principles serve to answer my research question: What is a writer's interior voyage toward writing? Specifically, what is the process that a writer has to go through to turn a writing idea into a "personal identity" before it can be transcribed into words? Although the second and third chapters have already answered the question contributed by various writers and scholars,

it has not yet been examined as a whole in one writer's creative process. A complete study of one writer's interior voyage toward writing gives us a clearer and better picture of the interior process a writer has to go through to achieve a new "personal identity" to govern his/her actual act of writing.

B. Rationales for the Selection of a Creative Writer and Texts

To give the whole picture of a professional writer's interior voyage toward creating a new "identity," I chose Virginia Woolf and her two works, *To the Lighthouse* and *A Room of One's Own*, as the subjects of the study. My analysis of Woolf's creative processes illuminates a writer's internal creative process from the initial cause of the writer's writings until the completion of a new "identity." Following are my rationales for choosing Woolf and two of her works.

Virginia Woolf

Virginia Woolf fits into this study because as a writer she initiated her writings by drawing on her unconscious where her feelings were not words yet. Woolf herself talked about how she began a novel in a letter edited by Trautman Joanne Banks:

I believe that the main thing in beginning a novel is to feel, not that you can write it, but that it exists on the far side of a gulf, which words can't cross; that it's to be pulled through only in a breathless anguish. Now when I sit down to write an article, I have a net of words which will come down on the idea certainly in an hour or so. But a novel, as I say, to be good, should seem, before one writes it, something unwriteable, but only visible . . . I assure you, all my novels were first rate before they were written (*Congenial Spirits: Selected Letters of Virginia Woolf* 238).

"Felt sense" here, according to Woolf, is her initial motive to write a novel. She had to feel something first before she could transform that feeling into words. Most important of all, she

felt that she had to be able to envision with what that feeling resonated. Howard Gardner in his book *Extraordinary Minds* categorizes Woolf into an introspector whose “primary challenge is to peer deeply into his own psyche, to understand himself in a way that others do not routinely understand themselves, as individuals, as members of a group, or as human beings” (96). In the case of Woolf, her autobiographical novel *To the Lighthouse*, deals with her emotional obsession with her late parents. To write the novel, she explored deeply “her own psyche, including its most vulnerable crevices” (*Extraordinary Minds* 102). In the process, she had to rely on her “intuition, inspiration” to mediate between what actually happened and what she remembered. And in the meantime she had to detach herself from her past as the other/a writer to be able to describe what she had experienced as a child and find a way to explain her mysterious feelings toward her parents and to make peace with them.

It took her more than thirty years to finally write the novel *To the Lighthouse* through which she could detach her personal feelings as a writer. The long process demonstrates Gardner's review on Woolf as a writer and her creative process:

Her writings also bear witness to Woolf's continuing efforts to capture the operation of consciousness, momentary experience, the mysterious moves of the mind. Probably more than anything else, Woolf came to believe that she had been put on earth as a writer in order to document what it was like to be a thinking, feeling, sensing human being (103).

This study intends to resolve “the mysterious moves of the mind” and build up a whole picture of a writer's mind at work by giving a life to the terms that Cixous, Kristeva, Bakhtin, and some other scholars create for a writer's creative process.

Although Woolf's other creative work *A Room of One's Own* is presented in essay form, she still had to go through a similar process of becoming the other to write the book except

that what caused her to write this work is different from *To the Lighthouse*. While the latter comes from what has lived inside her, the former is initiated by an article she wrote to respond to a critic's degrading view of women. That woman's intellectuality and creativity are not inferior to man's was her original arguing point in response to patriarchal views about women in her time. This initial writing idea later developed into the topic, "Women and Fiction," for the two lectures she gave at two colleges in Cambridge. One year after the two lectures, she transformed them into the book *A Room of One's Own*, whose major argument became that women should have money and a room of their own to write fiction. The whole writing process from her initial idea until the completion of the written product took her nine years. During the nine years, she kept reading different writers' works and made them her "spur, my mind being what it is . . . to write on Geraldine Jewsbury, on Hardy, on Women . . ." (*The Diary of Virginia Woolf* III, edited by Bell, 201). With a similar intention and method to approach *To the Lighthouse*, I crystallize Woolf's different creative process of creating *A Room of One's Own* and illustrate a more complete picture of the whole process.

Woolf's Two Works

Virginia Woolf's *To the Lighthouse* (1927) and *A Room of One's Own* (1929) are the two texts I use to find out a writer's "interior voyage" toward creating a new "identity." I choose these two texts for two reasons. First, they should be the works whose forms and contents advance their contemporaries. Setting up such a strict rule is based on the belief that not all of the published works from the past to now are made creatively. Most of them are just imitations of their predecessors. And this study is to promote real creative works with originality. If I did

not distinguish the creative from fake, Cixous', Bakhtin's, and Kristeva's theories that emphasize great writers' creativity, the evolution of language, and writers' anxiety to surpass their forerunners, would become invalid in the study. This is also the reason why I do not choose the works of my contemporaries. Their status in originality and creativity should be established by the examination of their next generation.

To demonstrate the creativity and originality of Woolf's works, I draw on two aspects: form and content. Woolf (1882-1941) was one of the few writers at the time who adopted stream of consciousness in the form of her novels. *To the Lighthouse* is one of them. For example, its storyline is developed with the shift of the time frames moving between the past and the present and with the revelation of different characters' minds at work simultaneously. Her train of thought leaves traces of the new writing style in *A Room of One's Own* with her free association in different periods of time. Therefore, we have the stories of Shakespeare's sister, Jane Austen, and the Brontes, that Woolf created to demonstrate her ideas.

The content of *To the Lighthouse* is one of the precursors in feminism with the presentation of two female characters, Mrs. Ramsay's caring and Lily Briscoe's independence, which show how hollow and meaningless the world of men is in the story. Woolf's *A Room of One's Own* further explicitly presents Woolf's feminist spirit of asking for women's financial independence. The ideas illustrated in the book are often borrowed by modern feminists to liberate women from the bounds of family and marriage. In terms of form and content, both of the works which go beyond Woolf's predecessors and contemporaries are great works.

The second reason to choose the two texts is to exemplify a writer's interior voyage toward creating a new "identity." I use two texts instead of one because while Woolf's internal

creative processes of producing the two works may go through the same elements (Cixous's six elements, a sequence of drive-desire-vision and a sequence of vision-desire-drive, Kristeva's carnivalesque discourse, and Bakhtin's dialogic theory), Woolf's idea to write *To the Lighthouse* was originated in the order of drive-desire-vision, and *A Room of One's Own* a sequence of vision-desire-drive. But relating those elements to the two works of Woolf's is not to twist Woolf's creative processes. Instead, it helps us understand more about Woolf's creative processes of creating the two works. Although Woolf has a theory about "cotton wool" and "being" moments to explain her creative process, Woolf's writing philosophy, which I analyze in the fifth chapter, does not go beyond the theories that I discover for the study in the second and third chapters. Using those elements made by Cixous, Kristeva, Bakhtin, and Holland as lenses to approach Woolf's "interior voyage" toward writing not only helps clarify Woolf's condensed thoughts of her creative processes but also give us a clear picture of her whole writing process from her initial reception of the writing ideas until the completion of the two works.

To prove my point that the sequences of drive-desire-vision and vision-desire-drive hold different pictures of Woolf's "interior voyage" toward writing, I introduce the backgrounds of the two works here.

1. *To the Lighthouse*

To the Lighthouse is an autobiographical fiction about Woolf's mother who died when Woolf was only thirteen. Woolf had her first breakdown one month after her mother's death. And since then, she had been obsessed with her mother. She saw her mother and heard her

voice all the time. But after she finished this novel, all her hallucinations about her mother were gone. She psycho-analyzed herself when talking about this novel in "A Sketch of the Past" collected in *Moments of Being: Unpublished Autobiographical Writings* by Jeanne Schulkind: "I expressed some very long and deeply felt emotion. And in expressing it I explained it and then laid it to rest. But what is the meaning of 'explained' it?" (81). She sounded like Freud. But in spite of the psychological factor, her "deeply felt emotion" is like Cixous's example about "tears" which act as a drive inside her to desire an expression. And her need to express the "deeply felt emotion" was not accomplished until thirty-two years later. All this time, she had let this "emotion" live inside her for such a long time and let the vision of her mother grow until after thirty years she could verbalize it. Her vision is fully shown in the first line of the novel: "Yes, of course, if it's fine tomorrow,' said Mrs. Ramsay" (*To the Lighthouse* 3).

With the beginning of this vision about a "fine tomorrow," Woolf as a writer/the other starts a long carnivalesque discourse with her self, her mother, her past and present to finalize the long struggle she had been through. What she "explained" is the mysterious drive that haunts her. The only way to solve it is to desire a vision of it. When this vision grows big enough in her, she can understand what has happened to her. And it is then the writing of her novel begins.

2. *A Room of One's Own*

A Room of One's Own, which came from two lectures she gave in two colleges at Cambridge, Newnham and Girton, demonstrates the other sequence of a pre-writing stage, that

is, vision-desire-drive. Woolf was asked originally to talk about women and fiction in the two colleges in 1928. It was not until early the next year that this topic led to the theme of a book that a woman writer needs money and a room of her own to write fiction. But, in fact, Woolf's very original idea of writing *A Room of One's Own* had been planted in her mind much earlier than the time she gave the two lectures. The original writing idea came from her two articles written in 1920, which argued against people's general view of women's inferiority to men intellectually and creatively. These two articles formed the base of her vision that women were as capable as men. Since then, a desire to know more about the relationship between women and fiction motivated her to make a long-time commitment to the topic. In the first chapter of the book, Woolf detailed her thinking process on the topic "Women and Fiction" and how she arrived at the central idea that a woman needs a room of her own to write fiction. The opening chapter helps us understand how her vision grew with her desire to deconstruct the myth of women's intellectual inferiority to men.

In the very beginning of the first chapter, to make her different view of women verifiable, she thought about her forerunners, such as Fanny Burney, Jane Austen, the Brontes, George Eliot, and so on. But "at the second sight," she feels that the topic "Women and Fiction" is not just about those women writers before her, but "women and what they are like," "women and the fiction they write," or "women and the fiction that is written about them," or three of them altogether (*A Room of One's Own* 3). The last thought interested her the most because all these possible themes that she could think of were related to one major problem which could not be solved at that time; that is, "a woman must have money and a room of her own if she is to write

fiction . . . ” (4). In other words, she proposed a problem she could not solve at that time. But still she tried to “make some amends” by telling her audience how she came up with the idea about a woman who needs money and a room of her own to write fiction. She stated, “I am going to develop in your presence as fully and freely as I can the train of thought which led me to think this” (4).

Woolf’s process of arriving at the theme, “a room of one’s own,” parallels with Stendhal’s seeing the Italian countryside, the 250 years, and his own upcoming age of fifty. It is a process of turning the exterior signifiers, women and fiction/vision, into a desire to go deeper inside the receiver of the vision, and then into the result of an interior dialogue with her self/dive, her being a woman and a novelist at the same time. The theme “a room of one’s own” comes out of her so right that it becomes her “interior portrait” (*Helene Cixous Rootprints* 59). With her “interior portrait,” her imaginative and creative arguments about the theme began and evolved into a book. The pre-writing stage of *A Room of One’s Own* is the illustration of the order of vision-desire-drive.

C. Research Design

Basically, this is an in-depth qualitative study of written documents which inquire valid and relevant information to examine Virginia Woolf’s interior voyages toward writing *To the Lighthouse* and *A Room of One’s Own*. By employing Gruber’s evolving systems to construct a research design, this study has already assumed that Woolf’s creative process is unique and different in each of her works. The theory of a professional writer’s interior voyage toward creating a new being, an identity outside of its own, that I formulated in the second chapter

from Cixous, Kristeva, Bakhtin, professional writers, scholars, and researchers is not directly applied to Woolf's creative process, but acts as a lense to deepen our understanding of Woolf's interior voyage toward writing *To the Lighthouse* and *A Room of One's Own*. In other words, to respect and capture the uniqueness of Woolf's prewriting stages of the two works, this study is true to the story of Woolf's interior creative process in accordance with the valid data found in any written documents relevant to this study.

Since the purpose of the study is to illuminate a writer's creative process at the prewriting stage, Wallace's case study method which aims to analyze a creative person at work is employed as the main research method. Wallace's case study method is based on Gruber's evolving systems. Five major approaches develop from Gruber's evolving system: (1) developmental and systematic, (2) pluralistic, (3) interactive, (4) constructionist, and (5) experientially sensitive (*Creative People at Work* 4-5). That is, being talented should not count as the only reason to make a person creative. An innovative work is a combined effort of a person's long cultivation of a creative idea, discipline, various interests, interactions with the work of others, skills, and world view. The five approaches applied to understanding a writer's creative process parallel with a writer's interior voyage toward creating a unique "identity," a theory that I have formulated in the third chapter. Both theories place a creative person (a writer) in the center of the whole creative process and view it as an organic process that need many other interior and exterior nutrients--e.g., a writer's desire to go beyond his/her predecessors and his/her interaction with the world--to sustain a creative idea (a writing idea).

The five approaches constitute a creative person's "network of enterprise" which assumes a creative work "as complex human activity organized to achieve specified ends" (*Creative*

People at Work 11). Since in this study achieving a “personal identity” is assumed the result of a writer’s effort to engage in the actual act of writing, a writer’s interior voyage toward writing can also be seen as a microcosm of a “network of enterprise” that requires the combined work of the writer’s body, desire, death, self, blindness, and otherness. Gruber’s five approaches provide ways to understand how the six elements are working in a writer’s interior creative process; that is, this study uses Gruber’s evolving systems to build a methodological framework to understand a creative person’s mind at work while furnishing it with Cixous’s six elements, Kristeva’s carnivalesque, and Bakhtin’s dialogic theory to bring out Virginia Woolf’s creative processes of *To the Lighthouse* and *A Room of One’s Own*.

Based on Gruber’s evolving systems, Doris B. Wallace proposes five contextual frames to form a case study method: relevant work enterprise(s); professional milieu; work as a whole (oeuvre); family and personal life; sociohistorical period (*Creative People at Work* 37). Investigating the five frames leads a researcher to view a creative person as an integrated whole because it reveals not only the common characteristics found in creative people but each creative person’s unique creative process. All of these five frames tend to examine Woolf as a creative writer and her interior voyages toward creating a new “identity” to engage in the actual act of writing the two works *To the Lighthouse* and *A Room of One’s Own*. Because the last two frames, family life and sociohistorical period, are the causes of Woolf’s creative processes of generating the two works, they are combined into the third contextual frame. Thus, three contextual frames—relevant work enterprises, professional milieu, and work as a whole (oeuvre)—form the major research design of the study. Besides the three frames, I add one to them: the analyses of the two texts as another contextual frame to understand if

Kristeva's carnivalesque discourse and Bakhtin's dialogic theory play an important role in Woolf's internal processes of creating the two works. Each contextual frame is examined through Cixous's six elements, two types of a writer's inner creative experiences (a sequence of drive-desire-vision and a sequence of vision-desire-drive), a writer's renouncement of his/her present self/ego, Kristeva's carnivalesque discourse, and Bakhtin's dialogic theory to elucidate the interplay of a writer's unconscious and conscious in the process of creating a new being, a "personal identity." An overview of the research designs of Woolf's *To the Lighthouse* and *A Room of One's Own* are respectively illustrated in Table 1 and 2.

<p>Table 1 <u>Overview of methodology for <i>To the Lighthouse</i></u></p>	
<p>Research question: What was Virginia Woolf's interior creative process in creating the novel <i>To the Lighthouse</i>, and how is my theory that a writer needs to cultivate a writing idea into a "personal identity" related to Woolf's creative process?</p>	
<p>Four contextual frames: I-A. Relevant work enterprises, I-B. Professional milieu, I-C. Work as a whole, (I-D) Text</p>	
<p>I-A. Research questions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> When did Woolf's first writing idea come to her mind? What was that? How did the title <i>To the Lighthouse</i> catch her in her vision of the whole story she planned to write? What was Woolf's writing philosophy and how did it affect her creative process? How would Cixous's six elements (body, desire, death, blindness, self, and otherness) be related to Woolf's creative process? How does Cixous's six elements reinforce our understanding of Woolf's creative process? 	<p>Process:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Examine Woolf's diaries (1924 to 1930) and her "A Sketch of the Past" to find out her original writing idea and how it was changed into the published title. Analyze Woolf's writing plans in her "Notes for Writing" and the one in her diary of May 1925. Examine Woolf's "A Sketch of the Past" to understand her writing philosophy and how it affected her creative process. Probe Cixous's six elements in Woolf's writing philosophy and her creative process.
<p>Sources of Data: Woolf's diaries written from 1924 to 1930; Woolf's "A Sketch of the Past" in 1939; Woolf's original writing plan in her "Notes for Writing" and her diary in May 1925.</p>	

I-B.

Research questions:

- a. What were the outer influences at the time on Woolf's aesthetic in writing fiction?
- b. How did the influences affect Woolf as a novelist?
- c. How would Cixous's six elements be related to Woolf's realization of becoming the novelist she wanted to be?

Sources of Data:

Woolf's diary from 1908 to 1928;
 Woolf's biography by Quentin Bell in 1972;
 Woolf's biography by Leaska in 1998;
 Woolf's letters to Jacques Raverat in 1924,
 Roger Fry in 1927, and Ethal Smyth in 1930.

Process:

- a. Find out the outer influences that affected Woolf's writing philosophy of fiction writing.
- b. Analyze how those influences helped Woolf develop her aesthetic in writing fiction and applying to her novel writings.
- c. Examine Woolf's interior creative process through Cixous's six elements.

I-C.

Research questions:

- a. What is Woolf's interior voyage toward creating a "personal identity" to prepare her to write the novel?
- b. How would one of the inner creative experiences—a sequence of drive-desire-vision—and Cixous's theory on a writer's renouncement of his/her present self/ego be related to Woolf's creation of a "personal identity" for the novel?

Sources of Data:

Woolf's diaries in 1925 and 1928;
 Woolf's "A Sketch of the Past" in 1939;
 Woolf's biography by Leaska in 1998;
 Woolf's letters to Vita in 1926;
 Woolf's letters to Ethal Sands in 1927.

Process:

- a. Examine Woolf's diary of 1925, "A Sketch of the Past," and her biography by Leaska to understand what drove Woolf to write the novel.
- b. Examine the same documents used above to find out what made Woolf desire to work on the novel.
- c. Analyze Woolf's letters to Vita in 1926 and Ethal Sands in 1927 to find out how Woolf raised her private vision to an artistic one.
- d. Analyze Woolf's "A Sketch of the Past" and her biography by Leaska to understand how Woolf renounced her present self/ego to create the other, a new "personal identity."

I-D.

Research questions:

- a. How did Woolf integrate heterogeneous elements into creating a new "identity"?
- b. How did the new "identity" interweave with the writing of the novel?

Sources of Data:

To the Lighthouse (version of 1981);
 Woolf's "A Sketch of the Past" in 1939;
 Woolf's biography by Leaska in 1998;
 Woolf's diary in 1926;
 Woolf's original manuscript edited and introduced by Susan Dick in 1982;
 Woolf's plans for the three parts of the novel.

Process:

- a. Examine Woolf's "A Sketch of the Past," Leaska's biography of Woolf, Woolf's diary in 1926, and her manuscript of the novel to understand Woolf's writing habits.
- b. Examine Woolf's earliest plan (March 1925) and later one (August 1925) to find out what she intended to write about originally and how she wove her characters into the scenes she made up in the first part of the novel, "The Window."
- c. Apply Kristeva's carnivalesque discourse and Bakhtin's dialogic theory to the first part of the novel to examine the interplay among Woolf as the other (a new "identity"), language, and her characters.
- d. Examine Woolf's plans (March 1925, August 1925, and April 1926) for the second part of the novel, "Time Passes," to understand how Woolf pictured the scenes on her mind.
- e. Analyze Woolf's interplay with language.
- f. Examine Woolf's plan made in August 1925 for the third part of the novel, "To the Lighthouse," to understand how Woolf played with language and the characters to embody a carnivalesque discourse.
- g. Summarize Woolf's interior voyage toward creating a new "identity" for writing the novel.

Table 2 Overview of methodology for <i>A Room of One's Own</i>	
Research question: What was Virginia Woolf's interior creative process in creating the work <i>A Room of One's Own</i> , and how is my theory that a writer needs to cultivate a writing idea into a "personal identity" related to Woolf's creative process?	
Four contextual frames: II-A. Relevant work enterprises, II-B. Professional milieu, II-C. Work as a whole, II-D. Text	
<p>II-A.</p> <p>Research questions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> How did the first writing idea of the work occur to Woolf? When was that? What were other factors that initiated Woolf's writing idea of the work? How would Cixous's six elements (body, desire, death, blindness, self, otherness) be related to Woolf's creative process of generating the work? <p>Sources of Data:</p> <p>Woolf's diaries from 1920 to 1929; Woolf's published newspaper articles in October 1920; The introduction section of Woolf's manuscript by S. P. Rosenbaum in 1992.</p>	<p>Process:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Examine Woolf's diary written in 1920 and her published newspaper articles to find out where and how Woolf's writing idea of the work originally came from. Follow the fray between Woolf and a columnist whose opinion about women that Woolf was opposed to find out how Woolf came to develop her writing idea. Use Woolf's diaries written from 1920 to 1929 and her two lectures given at Cambridge to examine how Cixous's six elements are related to Woolf's interior creative process.
<p>II-B.</p> <p>Research questions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> What were the outer influences at the time on Woolf's creative process of the work? What did Woolf do to enrich the topic of the work? How would Cixous's six elements be related to Woolf's internal process of creating the work? <p>Sources of Data:</p> <p>Woolf's diaries written from 1905 to 1929; Woolf's manuscript of the published text; Woolf's article "The Intellectual Status of Women" in 1920; Woolf's published text <i>A Room of One's Own</i> in 1981; Woolf's biography by Leaska in 1998.</p>	<p>Process:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Read Woolf's diaries from 1920 to 1929, her biography, and the introduction part to her manuscript to find out what outer influences affect her creative process. With the same sources, examine whether Woolf took on some other writing projects to prepare her to write <i>A Room of One's Own</i>. Employ Cixous's six elements to understand how the outer influences and Woolf's continuous writing projects affected Woolf's interior creative process of producing the work.

<p>II-C.</p> <p>Research questions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> What is Woolf's interior voyage toward creating a new "personal identity" that made her ready to create the work? How would the other type of a writer inner creative experience--a sequence of vision-desire-drive--and Cixous's theory on a writer's renouncement of his/her present self/ego be related to Woolf creation of the new "personal identity"? <p>Sources of Data:</p> <p>The same as the ones used in II-A;</p> <p>Woolf's manuscript of <i>A Room of One's Own</i> edited by S. P. Rosenbaum in 1992;</p> <p>Woolf's letter to one of her readers in 1929 [1930?]</p>	<p>Process:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Examine the same documents used in II-A to explore Woolf's initial step to develop her writing idea by applying the "vision" theory from Cixous's writing theory. With the same documents, analyze what sustained Woolf to pursue the same writing idea until the work was completed nine years later by borrowing the "desire" theory from Cixous's writing theory. Read the same documents and Woolf's manuscript of the work to explore how Woolf related herself to the writing idea and drove her to evolve it by employing the "drive" theory learned from Cixous's writing theory. Examine Woolf's manuscript, its published text, and her letter to one of her readers to understand how Woolf created a new "personal identity" by recreating her predecessors' lives in the text to support her point. Cixous's writing theory in one's otherness assists here to understand Woolf's interior process of creating the other, the new "personal identity."
<p>II-D.</p> <p>Research questions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> How did Woolf integrate heterogeneous elements into the creation of a new "identity"? How did the new "identity" interweave with the writing of the work? <p>Sources of Data:</p> <p>Woolf's manuscript of <i>A Room of One's Own</i> edited by Rosenbaum in 1992;</p> <p><i>A Room of One's Own</i> (version of 1981).</p>	<p>Process:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Examine Woolf's play with language/thoughts to create a unique writing style of the work. Kristeva's and Bakhtin's theories are employed here to give a thorough understanding of Woolf's interior creative process at this stage. Analyze Woolf's play with her re-creations of her forerunners' lives. Kristeva's and Bakhtin's theories are again applied as lenses to understand Woolf's interior creative process of transforming her vision into words. Summarize Woolf's interior voyage toward creating a new "identity" for the published work.

The first contextual frame, relevant work enterprise, examines the first-hand documents written by Woolf herself about her own understanding of her creative process of producing the two works, which include her journals written from 1924 to 1930 for *To the Lighthouse* and from 1920 to 1929 for *A Room of One's Own*, her autobiographical writing in 1939, and her letters to her sister Vanessa and friends from 1926 to 1927 for *To the Lighthouse* and from

1920 to 1929 for *A Room of One's Own*. Besides those documents, her biography, Mitchell Leaska's *Granite and Rainbow* (1998), will be one of the major sources in understanding how she proceeds with her creative processes before she starts writing the two works. Cixous's six elements--body, desire, death, self, blindness, and otherness--will serve as lenses to delve into Woolf's creative process.

The second contextual frame, professional milieu, considers what roles the people, such as "teachers, colleagues, collaborators, critics, and so on" play in the subject's creative process (*Creative People at Work* 36). The major sources used for this part are the documents applied in the first contextual frame. Since Woolf never had a formal education and always worked alone, I mainly draw on the current thoughts and cultural and social events she came across before the two works were published. The focus is on Woolf's formulation of her aesthetics in writing that she expressed in her letters with a few artist friends (Jacques Raverat, Roger Fry, et al.) and how they, at the time, affected her writing philosophy and further directed her internal processes of writing the two works. Cixous's six elements (body, desire, death, self, blindness, and otherness) help us understand Woolf's creative process in depth.

The third contextual frame, work as a whole, which deals with a creative person's "oeuvre and overall purposes, revealed in the network of enterprise," is analyzed also through the documents employed in the first contextual frame to understand how Woolf's writing ideas of the two works sustained a long time without being deflected until they came out as full-grown "identities" to take full responsibilities for the laboring work of actual writing processes (*Creative People at Work* 36). To be able to endure a long time is one of the important factors for the appearance of a serious creative work, but there must be a purpose behind it to

motivate the creative person to continue developing the original idea. Most of the time, the purpose appeals to a high human purpose “in response to the imperfections of adaptation, the uncertainties of the world, and the inadequacies of the our knowledge and skills” by starting from “a vision of things as they are not, that anticipates difficulties—surmounting some and avoiding others—that responds to surprises without losing sight of its goals” (10). In other words, such purposes attempt to challenge the known and explore the unknown. Two types of a writer’s inner creative experiences that I theorize from Cixous’s six elements, a sequence of drive-desire-vision and a sequence of vision-desire-drive, and a writer’s renouncement of his/her self/ego to make room for the other, give insight to the third contextual frame when examining Woolf’s purposes of creating the two works. The fourth and fifth contextual frames, family and personal life and sociohistorical period, are not separately discussed but are combined in the third contextual frame. The death of Woolf’s mother and her father’s ignorance of her need for caring was one of the main reasons why she wrote *To the Lighthouse*. As a woman novelist, Woolf particularly felt for the women of her time who were deprived of social support for the development of their creativity and intellectuality. And her work *A Room of One’s Own* was a result of people’s discrimination against women’s intelligence at that time. Both of the contextual frames are dealt with when Cixous’s writing theory of drive is examined in Woolf’s writing philosophy.

The fourth contextual frame, an analyzation of the two texts, which I add to Wallace’s five frames, is to understand how carnivalesque discourse and dialogic theory work as two more necessary nutrients for the development of Woolf’s writing ideas of *To the Lighthouse* and *A Room of One’s Own* before she was able to transcribe them into words. Kristeva’s and

Bakhtin's theories on these two factors respectively serve to illuminate how Woolf had to go through an internal argument between her as a writer/the other and other voices/language/characters to complete the creation of the other, a new "identity," that gives life to her two works. The major sources for this part come from the two published texts, her manuscripts, and her writing plans for the two works.

Woolf's creative processes of the two works should only be seen as examples of a writer's interior voyages toward creating two new beings, two "personal identities," for the actual acts of writing the two works. They cannot represent all writers' creative processes because each creative individual is unique, and so is each creative work. Using Wallace's five contextual frames and the one that I add only aims to understand the uniqueness of Woolf's creative process in each case. The six contextual frames also serve to give a complete picture of a writer's interior voyage toward creating a new "identity."

Since this study employs Cixous's six elements (body, desire, death, self, blindness, and otherness), drive, desire, vision, these terms are defined in the appendix not to be confused with people's common usage of them in their daily lives.

D. Procedures

To give the whole picture of a professional writer's interior voyage towards creating a new being, a "personal identity," what causes a writing idea that initiates such an interior journey and how a writer keeps it alive until it grows into the other, a new "identity," constitute the focal points of the study. It requires the incorporation of Wallace's five contextual frames and the one I add. Therefore, this study starts from how a writing idea emerges until its writer

has successfully transformed the writer's present self into the other, a new "identity." To understand the whole process, following are the three main procedures of how I am going to undertake the methods I established in the last section:

1. The study traces back to the original time or place that initiates a writer's writing idea and finds out if it comes from a drive that has existed inside the writer without the writer's awareness of it or from an external stimulus which connects with something that has already been in the writer.
2. Then, I examine the significance of the writing idea to the writer and what the writer does to keep the writing idea alive.
3. Finally, I find out how the writer cultivates it into a new being, a "personal identity," which has its own thoughts, culture, and society.

I. Woolf and *To the Lighthouse*: What was Woolf's creative process in creating the novel *To the Lighthouse*, and how is my theory that a writer needs to cultivate a writing idea a "personal identity" related to Woolf's creative process?

I-A. Woolf's initial writing idea, its development, her writing philosophy, and Cixous's six elements examined in Woolf's creative process of generating a writing idea are sought and analyzed in the first contextual frame: relevant work enterprises.

Step 1: Woolf's diaries written from 1924 to 1930 and her autobiographical writing in 1939 are examined to find out what her original idea of the novel was and how it was changed into the published title *To the Lighthouse*.

Step 2: Woolf's original writing plan (March 1925) of the novel first jotted down in her "Notes for Writing" and a more developed one in her diary (May 1925) are analyzed to

understand what she wanted to write about in the first place and what characters she had on her mind.

Step 3: Woolf's writing philosophy written in her autobiographical writing "A Sketch of the Past" (1939), in which she reflected on her writing of the novel, is discussed to crystallize more on her creative process of the work.

Step 4: Cixous's six elements (body, desire, death, self, blindness, and otherness) are probed in Woolf's writing philosophy and creative process of generating a writing idea.

I-B. Woolf's contacts with the current thoughts and her artist friends (Jacques Raverat and Roger Fry) at her time are examined in the third contextual frame: professional milieu.

Step 1: Woolf's early thoughts on fiction writing are sought in her "Reminiscences" written in 1907 and her journal sketching Clive Bell in 1908.

Step 2: The influence of Woolf's visit to Italy to see Perugino's frescoes in 1908 is discussed to find out how her understanding of art affected her thoughts on fiction writing.

Step 3: The impact of the first Post-Impressionist exhibition mounted by Roger Fry in London on Woolf is analyzed to understand how this exhibition reinforced Woolf to innovate conventional narrative in fiction writing.

Step 4: Woolf's experiment with short stories is examined to see how Woolf came to master her innovative narrative in fiction writing in *To the Lighthouse*.

Step 4: Woolf's discussion with Jacques Raverat in 1924 is analyzed to understand how Woolf came to use painters' skills applied to a canvas to solve the time problem in fiction writing.

Step 5: Cixous's six elements are applied to examine how Woolf matured her innovative

thoughts in fiction writing.

I-C. A sequence of drive-desire-vision and the concept of otherness in Cixous's writing theory are applied to the second contextual frame: work as a whole.

Step 1: What drove Woolf to write the novel is examined in her diary (1925), her "A Sketch of the Past" (1939), and her biography by Mitchell Leaska (1998).

Step 2: What made Woolf desire to work on the novel is discussed through the same materials used in step 1, except that the diary quoted was written in 1928.

Step 3: What turned Woolf's private vision into an artistic one is understood from her letters to a friend Vita in 1926 and a critic Ethal Sands in 1927. In the letter to Vita, Woolf talked about what "style" is for her. In the letter to Sands, she drew on her inner vision of writing the novel.

Step 4: How becoming the other played in Woolf's creative process of producing the novel is examined from Woolf's "A Sketch of the Past" and Leaska's biography of Woolf.

I-D. Kristeva's carnivalesque discourse and Bakhtin's dialogic theory are explored in the fourth contextual frame: the written text--Woolf's *To the Lighthouse*.

Step 1: Woolf's three major writing habits are examined to form a basic understanding of how Woolf wove her ideas and visions in her mind into the novel. Her "A Sketch of the Past," Leaska's biography of her, Woolf's diary written in 1926, and Susan Dick's introduction to Woolf's original manuscript edited in 1982 are the major sources.

Step 2: The analyzation of the text is divided into three parts according to Woolf's own naming of them: The Windows, Time Passes, and The Lighthouse. The major sources for the three sections come from Woolf's manuscript of the novel, her writing notes, her diary

(1925-1926), her letter to Roger Fry in 1927, the published text, and her “A Sketch of the Past.”

- a. Combined with the analyzation of the text itself, Woolf’s earliest plan made in March 1925 and her later plan in August of the same year are cited to find out her initial writing plans about the story and how she wove her characters into the scenes she made up. Kristeva’s carnivalesque discourse and Bakhtin’s dialogic theory are applied to the first part of “The Window” to examine the interplay among Woolf as a writer, her characters, and language.
- b. Woolf’s plans for the second part of the novel “Time Passes” made in March 1925, August 1925, and April 1926, are introduced to understand how Woolf pictured the scenes in her mind when tackling the hardest part. An analyzation of Woolf’s interplay with language is the focus of this part: for example, Woolf’s use of four seasons to deal with a 10-year passing time.
- c. Woolf’s only and earliest plan for the last part “The Lighthouse” made in August 1925 is presented to be compared with the text she actually worked on. This plan helps us understand how Woolf as a writer embodying a carnivalesque discourse by playing with language and the characters she made up. For example, the use of a question asked by Lily Briscoe in the beginning of the third part present the struggles of the characters throughout the scenes.

Step 3: Woolf’s interior voyage toward creating a new being, a “personal identity,” for writing the novel is summarized and reviewed.

II. Woolf and *A Room of One’s Own*: What was Woolf’s creative process in creating the work

A Room of One's Own, and how is my theory that a writer needs to cultivate a writing idea into a “personal identity” related to Woolf’s creative process?

II-A. Woolf’s initial writing idea, her two lectures given at Newnham and Girton, Cixous’s six elements examined in Woolf’s creative process of generating a writing idea and developing it into a book are explored in the first contextual frame: relevant work enterprises.

Step 1: Woolf’s diary written in September 1920 and her published article in October of the same year in response to a columnist’s newspaper article are probed to find out where and how the writing idea of *A Room of One’s Own* originally came from.

Step 2: The fray between Woolf and the columnist is followed to understand how Woolf came to develop her ideas more about women’s capability of being creative and intellectual.

Step 3: Woolf’s diary in 1928 and Rosenbaum’s introduction to Woolf’s manuscript of the book are applied here to understand how Woolf developed her talks at Newnham and Girton on the topic “Women and Fiction” into the book *A Room of One’s Own*.

Step 4: With a thorough examination of Woolf’s diaries and letters written from 1920 to 1929 and two lectures that Woolf gave to two colleges in 1928, Cixous’s six elements are explored in Woolf’s interior voyage toward developing and organizing her ideas about “Women and Fiction” into the book *A Room of One’s Own* published in 1929.

II-B. The women’s movement that claimed for women’s political rights in the first two decades of the twentieth century, Woolf’s teaching at Morley College, her establishing Hogarth Press, the acceptance of her novels, and her owning a room of her own to write fiction are analyzed to find out how the five events affected Woolf to reach her theory that women need money and

a room of their own to write fiction in *A Room of One's Own* in the second contextual frame-- professional milieu. Cixous's six elements are examined in the five events to give an in-depth look at how Woolf grew as a woman novelist and confirmed her belief in women's intellectuality and creativity. Woolf's diaries from 1905 to 1928, her article "The Intellectual Status of Women," the published text *A Room of One's Own*, and Leaska's biography of Woolf are the documents used in this section.

Step 1: Woolf's understanding of the values that women's movement was promoting is analyzed to find out how they affected Woolf's view about women's intellectuality and creativity expressed in "The Intellectual Status of Women" against patriarchal view about women.

Step 2: Woolf's teaching at Morley College from 1905 to 1907 is examined to see how this experience influenced her on her theory that proper education was unavailable to women because they were confined to domestic duties.

Step 3: Woolf's owning half of the Hogarth Press with her husband is discussed to find out how this business set her free to write whatever she wanted to and further made her believe that women need to have "liberty of experience" to write fiction.

Step 4: The acceptance of Woolf's experiment with an innovative narrative is analyzed to see how it stabilized her finance and led her to reach the point that women should be financially independent in *A Room of One's Own*.

Step 5: Woolf's having her own workroom is analyzed to find out how owning a space of her own to write fiction led her to emphasize the importance of a woman having her own room if she wants to write fiction in *A Room of One's Own*.

Step 6: Cixous's six elements are employed to examine how Woolf internalized the values she learned from the five events that made her write the book *A Room of One's Own*.

II-C. Woolf's interior voyage toward creating a new "identity" for the completion of the book is further crystallized through Cixous's creative process in the order of vision-desire-drive and one's otherness in the third contextual frame: work as a whole.

Step 1: The same documents used in II-A are applied to this section and examined from another perspective by employing Cixous's writing theory in vision to understand Woolf's initial step she took to develop her idea of the book.

Step 2: Using the same documents in II-A, this section discusses Woolf's continuous pursuit of the topic on women. Cixous's theory in desire explains how Woolf carried the topic with her until it had grown into a book nine years later.

Step 3: The development of Woolf's initial writing idea is examined with Cixous's writing theory in drive. This theory helps us understand how Woolf associated the topic "Women and Fiction" with herself as a woman novelist. Besides the same documents applied above, Woolf's manuscript of *A Room of One's Own* edited by S. P.

Rosenbaum (1992) is used here as one of the sources.

Step 4: Cixous's writing theory in one's otherness is analyzed through Woolf's re-creation of her predecessors' lives in the text to support her points. Woolf's manuscript, the published text, and her letter to one of her readers are the major sources of the section.

II-D. Kristeva's carnivalesque discourse and Bakhtin's dialogic theory are applied to understand how Woolf integrated heterogeneous elements to create a new "identity" that creates the work in the fourth contextual frame: the written text--Woolf's *A Room of One's*

Own.

- Step 1: Using Woolf's manuscript and the published text, Woolf's interplay with language/thoughts is examined through Kristeva's and Bakhtin's theories to understand how she plays with language and lets her thoughts flow freely back to her predecessors' time to have a dialogue with them.
- Step 2: Using the published text, this section analyzes Woolf's interplay with her re-creation of her forerunners' lives through Kristeva's carnivalesque discourse and Bakhtin's dialogic theory.
- Step 3: Woolf's interior voyage toward creating a new being, a "personal identity," is reviewed and summarized to give a complete picture of her creative process toward writing the book.

E. The Application of the Results

The results that I gain from my analyses of Woolf's interior creative processes in producing *To the Lighthouse* and *A Room of One's Own* would contribute to the pedagogy in teaching of creative writing. I would emphasize two issues: (1) What is the source of a writer's creativity, and (2) what distinguishes a writer's unique creativity and writing style? Woolf's interior creative processes would exemplify the source of a writer's creativity and what the writer can do to notice his/her creativity. The two types of a writer's inner creative experiences--a sequence of drive-desire-vision and a sequence of vision-desire-drive-- would provide models for a writer to generate a writing idea, develop it, and create a unique writing style, a new "identity." The whole theory of this study that a writer's interior voyage toward

writing is a process of creating a new “identity” would give an answer to the second issue that I would tackle. Besides using Woolf’s interior creative processes as examples and the theory that I formulated in the third chapter, I also introduce William Zinsser’s ideas about how fiction writing is a process of going back to our past and reconstructing it with our imagination. Zinsser’s theory supports my concept that a writer’s interior creative process is a living process that each of us has access to and does not only belong to the few gifted.

F. The Researcher’s Roles

Based on Gruber’s evolving systems that I use to analyze a writer’s creative process, this inquiry asks for my involvement in two roles: a phenomenological role and a critical one. The phenomenological role asks me to “enter the mind of the subject [a writer] to reconstruct the meaning of the subject’s experience from the latter’s point of view” (*Creative People at Work* 31). In the critical role, I have to be “outside the subject to appraise the data of the case and to explain and interpret them” (31).

By playing the phenomenological role, I describe the subject’s, that is, Woolf’s interior voyage toward creating a new being, a “personal identity,” with as many first-hand documents as I have access to, which include her journals, letters, manuscripts of the two works, and autobiographical writings. Playing the critical role, I explicate Woolf’s “interior voyage” toward writing when sorting out data and interpreting them by employing the second-hand documents, such as Leaska’s biography of Woolf and the theory of a writer’s interior creative process that I formulated in the third chapter of the study.

G. The Validity of the Study

This study uses Gruber's evolving systems that are composed of five contextual frames (relevant work enterprises, profession milieu, work as a whole, family and personal life, and sociohistorical period), plus the sixth one (a writer's written texts) that I add to the study, to form a case study method. I combined the family and personal life and sociohistorical period into the third contextual frame, work as a whole, for they are the causes of Woolf's creative ideas of her two works *To the Lighthouse* and *A Room of One's Own*. The data collected for this study are in accordance with the six contextual frames to understand Woolf's interior voyages toward creating "personal identities" for her creative works. The validity of the analysis of the data are triangulated by Cixous's six elements, the two types of a writer inner creative experiences (a sequence of drive-desire-vision and a sequence of vision-desire-drive), Kristeva's carnivalesque discourse theory, and Bakhtin's dialogic theory in novel. But this study does not rule out any negative results from the analysis of the data because either the positive or negative results help us further understand a writer's interior voyage toward an actual act of writing out of the writer's creative idea. Also, the negative results help clarify if there are more or different elements or schemes a writer has to experience or operate while the positive ones reassure the theories that apply to the study.

H. Limitations

Through my choice of the two texts, *To the Lighthouse* and *A Room of One's Own*, I would accomplish the reconstruction of a writer's "interior voyage" toward creating a new being, a "personal identity," for the writer's creative work. But unavoidably my

accomplishment is limited by the case study method I choose and the three major theories I employ for the study--Cixous's writing theories, Kristeva's carnivalesque discourse, and Bakhtin's dialogic theory. In other words, Woolf's internal processes of creating the two works are limited by my unique approach to a writer's "interior voyage" toward creating a new "identity." There may be other equally important contextual frames that this case study method does not contain. It is also possible that the contextual frames that I use to analyze Woolf's creative processes cannot help this study to fully uncover Woolf's interior voyage toward writing. There may be other factors activated during the internal processes that are not to my acknowledgment. The three theories applied to a writer's creative process can only explain part of the interior path that the writer has to walk. Woolf's "interior voyages" toward writing the two works may have gone through more than the three theories that I propose for the study while she worked on *To the Lighthouse* and *A Room of One's Own*. Because of my unique approach to the case study method and the theories, this study is my version of a writer's interior creative process. Woolf's creative processes presented in this study should also be seen as only one interpretation.

Due to the impossibility to interview Woolf in person, who died in 1941, I cannot confirm the results of my study with Woolf. Thanks to the publication of her diaries and letters and many biographies about her, the documents I can use are resourceful enough to understand how Woolf created the two works, *To the Lighthouse* and *A Room of One's Own*. Although her diaries and letters "were not entirely trustworthy" because she allowed her imagination to fly in them, they still provide useful information for my analysis of the two texts (*Granite and Rainbow* 3). Even though the information I employ is all her imagination, it still sends out

important messages about her as a writer and her works. Reflecting on Cixous's comment on her own work *Deluge* about her weak "presence of others-in-literature," Calle-Gruber reminds us that "we are always in fiction":

. . . you rewrite your others-in-literature, you restage them. You move them, transport them onto your own stage and onto others, you extend them, echo them (Cixous & Calle-Gruber 91).

This dissertation is based on the belief that any text is fictitious and composed of the others, including its preceding texts and its contemporary thoughts. Even this study itself is crossed over by many others, such as the researcher's, Cixous's, Bakhtin's, Kristeva's, Woolf's, etc. No text is original, not even the very personal diaries. Therefore, because of the fictitious nature of any document, this study cannot claim that the method used for the analyses of Woolf's two works reveal the whole naked truth of Woolf's interior voyages toward creating new identities, except that it uncovers a touch of truth that shines through the darkness of a writer's internal creative process. But, it is also because of the fictitious nature of any document that we can say that we create, and by saying so, I can have this study, and we have Woolf's great works and many other great works of literature created by all the great writers in the world from the past to now.

Chapter V

VIRGINIA WOOLF'S INTERIOR CREATIVE PROCESS FOR *TO THE LIGHTHOUSE*

"As a child then, my days, just as they do now, contained a large proportion of this cotton wool, this non-being. Week after week passed at St Ives and nothing made any dint upon me. Then, for no reason that I know about, there was a sudden violent shock: something happened so violently that I have remembered it all my life" (Virginia Woolf, "A Sketch of the Past," collected in *Virginia Woolf: Moments of Being*, edited and introduced by Jeanne Schulkind, 71).

Using the four contextual frames (relevant work enterprise, professional milieu, work as a whole, and text), I take on a phenomenological role and enter Woolf's mind to "reconstruct" her interior creative process (*Creative People at Work* 31). By "stand[ing] outside" Woolf's creative process and using the theories (Cixous's, Kristeva's, and Bakhtin's) that I constructed in the third chapter, I examine, explain, and interpret Woolf's internal creative process in depth. With the two research approaches (phenomenological and critical), I intend to give an authentic report of Woolf's interior voyage toward writing the novel and an in-depth understanding of her inner creative experience.

I divide this chapter into four major parts with the four contextual frames: (A) relevant work enterprise, (B) professional milieu, (C) work as a whole, and (D) text. In the first two contextual frames that concern the projects and activities that Woolf used to create the novel, I reconstruct Woolf's creative process from her writing philosophy and outer influences at the time that affected her aesthetic in fiction writing. For the last two contextual frames, I examine the relation between Woolf's creative process and the theory I formulated from Cixous, Kristeva, Bakhtin, and Holland.

In the first contextual frame, relevant work enterprise, I aim to discover the projects and activities Woolf used to work on her writing idea. Specifically, I discuss when her first writing

idea came to her mind, what that was, how the title of the novel came to her vision of the whole story, what her writing philosophy was, and how the writing philosophy affected her creative process. Cixous's six elements serve as lenses that lead us into Woolf's interior creative process. The major materials I use for this section are Woolf's diaries from the first occurrence of the original idea for the novel until her last reflection on it, her original writing plan, and her autobiographical writing "A Sketch of the Past." Her diaries give us a clear picture of how she came up with the writing idea of the novel, how she planned the scenes and her afterthoughts. Her original plan for the novel gives us some ideas about how she structured it. "A Sketch of the Past" collected now in *Virginia Woolf: Moments of Being* edited by Schulkind (1976) illustrates her writing philosophy, the key to understand how she used her life as the major source of her writing.

The second contextual frame, professional milieu that reveals if Woolf's creative process was influenced by her contemporaries and any theory in literature or art at the time, serves to understand if her writing philosophy was changed or reinforced by those influences which gave her a new direction to work on the aesthetic part of her novel. Cixous's six elements are applied here again to crystallize if those influences on Woolf helped her create the other/a new "identity." Quentin Bell's (1972) and Mitchell Leaska's biographies of Woolf (1998) and Woolf's letters to her contemporaries will be the major sources for this section.

The third contextual frame, work as a whole, reviews Woolf's creative process as a whole from the theory that I construct for a writer's interior creative process. I examine if this theory can be related to Woolf's creative process. Woolf's relevant work enterprise and her professional milieu are the data used for this section. The theory I apply to this part contains

one type of the inner creative experience, a sequence of drive-desire-vision, that I theorize from Cixous's six elements. This theory gives us insight into what drove Woolf to write the novel, what kept her desire to work on it, and how she turned her private vision into an artistic one. Cixous's theory on a writer's renouncement of her present self/ego helps us understand how she created the other, a new "identity."

In this section, Woolf's diaries and letters to her friends Vita and Ethal Sands are the major sources that reveal how her parents haunted her until she finished the novel and how she had to catch a rhythm of the novel in order to be able to write the story. Leaska's biography of Woolf allows us to go deep down inside Woolf's world as a writer drawn to the blurring region of her memories to create a story of her own, to gain power over the pains she suffered from the loss of her mother at the age of thirteen. Cixous's theory about the renouncement of a writer's self/ego explains why such a renouncement is a key step for Woolf to transform what she had suffered from her past into words. Without this step, her past would never be developed into a fiction that released her pain--her mother's death which had haunted her and heavily bore down on her heart and mind for a long time.

The fourth contextual frame, text (the novel), is applied to understand how Woolf's new "identity" had to complete itself by creating a new "language" (presenting simultaneity of things) for the novel and how her new "identity" engaged in an interplay with other voices/characters. For example, Woolf, with the presence of her new "identity," put her characters together with her play with language. This allowed her to have her characters' inner feelings and thoughts act on each other without real dialogues being carried among them. Her play with language also introduced the shift of time in the second part of the novel such as a

description of four seasons and pronouncements of death news that come one after another. Her unique writing style paralleled Lily Briscoe's painting on the beach with the other scene of the Ramsays' sailing to the lighthouse in the third part of the novel. In the meantime, she presented Mr. Ramsay's character through both scenes with her unique vision. Kristeva's carnivalesque discourse and Bakhtin's dialogic theory are lenses to see through Woolf's creative process of integrating heterogeneous elements into creating a new "identity" with the creation of a new language (Woolf's unique writing style--simultaneity of things) and characters to bring the new "identity" to its fruition.

For this section, I analyze her writing habits and her plans for the three parts of the novel. Those plans came from Woolf's vision of and reflections on her past. I put emphasis on the text itself with the same materials I use for the first three contextual frames. Woolf's interplay with her re-interpretation of the past scenes on language level and the characters' different points of view about Mrs. Ramsay are two main focuses to illustrate how Woolf/the other/a new "identity" plays with language and other voices/characters in the novel. On the level of creating a new "language," I focus on (1) her creation of an image and (2) her arrangement of the simultaneity of things. I discuss her vision of an image and her struggle to find words to match the vision. I compare her manuscript with the published version to illustrate how she adjusted the rush of her original vision of the image to a more refined one. Then, I illuminate how she presented the simultaneity of things. She had practiced and experimented with this unique writing style first in her writing of three short stories starting from 1917 until 1920. Then, she applied it to two novels *Jacob's Room* (1923) and *Mr. Dalloway* (1925) before she perfected her experiment in *To the Lighthouse*. As for her play with the characters, I analyze

how she introduced her characters' inner thoughts with her unique writing style.

A. Woolf's Relevant Work Enterprise

To understand Woolf's creative process of generating the novel *To the Lighthouse*, we need to trace her own written records about this work and the activities she did to turn her writing idea into the novel. Thus, in this section, I mainly focus on (1) when her first writing idea about the novel came to her mind and what that was, (2) her plans for the novel, and (3) her writing philosophy. How the title of the novel *To the Lighthouse* came to her vision of the whole story is discussed as an example to explain Woolf's writing philosophy in the third part of this section. Cixous's six elements are paralleled with Woolf's terms for her writing philosophy to reinforce our understanding of Woolf's creative process.

1. Woolf's Original Writing Idea for *To the Lighthouse*

According to the earliest documents left by Woolf, "The Old Man" was her original idea for the later fully-developed story of *To the Lighthouse*. This writing idea first appeared in her diary entry on October 17, 1924. She did not have the title *To the Lighthouse* and a plan for the story, except "The Old Man" that stood out from her vision of the story during the period of writing *Mrs. Dalloway* (*The Diary of Virginia Woolf* II 317). While the focus of the beginning of her diary entry on that day was regarding how smooth and fast she worked on *Mrs. Dalloway*, "The Old Man" was mentioned as an example to express how hard it was for her to only concentrate on the major work because her mind always wandered somewhere else to write "others" (Bell 317). She wrote, "My cull-de-sac, as they called it, stretches so far, and shows such vistas. I see already The Old Man" (317). Her vision of a story about "The Old

Man” did not fade away, though she did not talk about it until the next year in her diary on January 6, “Here I conceive my story--but I’m always conceiving stories now. Short ones--scenes--for instance The Old Man (a character of L.S.) The Professor on Milton--(an attempt at literary criticism)...” (*The Diary of Virginia Woolf* III 3). “L.S.” refers to her father Leslie Stephen. Although “The Professor” was written into *Mrs. Dalloway*, this character must have brought out other characters and some ideas for *To the Lighthouse*, which she began writing in August 1925, because more characters and ideas were found in her plan for the new project in March of the same year. However, at the time “The Old Man” had changed into “To the Lighthouse.”

2. Woolf’s Plans for the Story

Woolf’s scarce elucidation of her ideas for the story of “The Old Man” was added by her brief notes written on March 6th, 1925 in her plan for *Mrs. Dalloway*. But “The Old Man” had changed into “To the Lighthouse” as an official title for the later published novel. She already had almost all of her main characters in mind and some scenes that she intended to write into the story. For example, she created Mrs. Ramsay, the character of Woolf’s mother, and a general image of this character whose beauty made a great impact on the people around her. She also had sketches of Mr. Tansley, “the product of universities,” Mr. Carmichael, a poet whom the Ramsays liked, and Mr. Ramsay, the character of Woolf’s father (*To the Lighthouse: The Original Holograph Draft* 48-49). Her thoughts about “divisions between people” as “the source of all evil” were expressed in this plan, too (49). A detailed and complete plan appeared on August 6th of the same year. Between the rough plan in March and

the next record of her idea about the story remained a gap of two months. The next time she talked about the story was in her diary of May 14, 1925. She wrote:

I'm now all on the strain with desire to stop journalism & get on *To the Lighthouse*. This is going to be fairly short: to have father's character done complete in it; & mothers; & St Ives; & childhood; & all the usual things I try to put in--life, death &c. But the center is father's character, sitting in a boat, reciting We perished, each alone, while he crushes a dying mackerel--However, I must refrain. I must write a few little stories first, & let the Lighthouse simmer, adding to it between tea & dinner till it is complete for writing out (*The Diary of Virginia Woolf* III 18-19).

Woolf's other diary entry about "To the Lighthouse" was written one month later. During this one-month period, she took on another writing project to finish "6 little stories" (*The Diary of Virginia Woolf* III 29). Writing short stories was usually her custom of breaking off from a major work that she had just completed in order to concentrate on another major work. Or, according to Woolf's husband, Woolf wrote short stories "whenever an idea for one occurred to her, to sketch it out in a very rough form and then to put it away in a drawer," or "to rest her mind by working at something else for a time" (*An Haunted House and Other Short Stories* v). Although Leonard Woolf did not say that Virginia Woolf might have used the short stories as the sources of her major novels, "Mrs. Dalloway in Bond Street" (1923) and "The New Dress" (1924) are two short stories used by Woolf as the "genesis of the novel *Mrs. Dalloway*" (*Mrs. Dalloway's Party: A Short Story Sequence by Virginia Woolf* 14). However, the "6 little stories" that Woolf had finished no later than May 25, 1925, show no direct connection with her engagement in writing *To the Lighthouse* a few months later. Even though she detoured to write the six short stories, she still found time to think about *To the Lighthouse*. In the same diary entry on June 14, she wrote, "I've . . . thought out, perhaps too clearly, To the Lighthouse" (*The Diary of Virginia Woolf* III 29).

To the Lighthouse appeared in Woolf's diary entry again on June 27, where she briefly mentioned that she planned to make the sound of the sea "to be heard all through [the novel]" (34). In less than one month, on July 20, 1925, she had a more organized plan for the novel. In this diary entry, she thought that the theme she was developing for the novel was "sentimental," which includes "father and mother and child in the garden; the death; the sail to the lighthouse" (36). She was thinking of enriching them and had some ideas but did not know how to at the time. She wrote,

I think, though, that when I begin it I shall enrich it in all sorts of ways; thicken it; give it branches & roots which I do not perceive now. It might contain all characters boiled down; & childhood; & then this impersonal thing, which I'm dared to do by my friends, the flight of time, & the consequent break of unity in my design. That passage (I conceive the book in 3 parts: 1. at the drawing room window; 2. seven years passed; 3. the voyage:) interests me very much. A new problem like that breaks fresh ground in ones mind; prevents the regular ruts (36).

This diary entry unveiled a little bit of Woolf's interior creative process. She laid the groundwork by visualizing the whole picture of the story first; the details came later. She did not know how the story would end, and two more important characters, Lily Briscoe and William Bankes, were not formed on Woolf's mind, either; or they had been, but not yet been fully thought through by Woolf to write them into her plan. What she had in mind was the stories she knew the best, that is, her parents, her childhood, and the place she used to live when she was little. What excited her the most was an experiment she was tempted to use for the second part of the project, "seven years passed," to give a sense of time passing, though she still had no idea how to present it. The theme of the story, "to the lighthouse," anticipated from the very beginning of the story until the end, was ambiguously mentioned in her plan for the third part "the voyage." A more detailed plan for the novel came on August 6, in which we

have a much clearer picture of how Woolf was going to develop the story for the three major parts. It was also the date that she officially gave the title *To the Lighthouse* to the novel.

Besides the plan she made on that date, she did not write anything else until late August, and from then onward to September 5, in less than two weeks, she had written twenty-two pages.

If her plans before the one she made on August 6 can be seen as the bones she built up for the novel, then the plan made in August fills in flesh, from which Woolf drew more concrete details on the picture she was visualizing (see the plan in the fourth section of the chapter). For example, she had seen where her characters should be situated in the first scene in the beginning of the first part and arranged their conversations with her reflection and description inserting within. She set the beginning of the story in the dusk of a day and knew the direction she aimed to accomplish, that is, to display Mrs. Ramsay's character. For the second part, she still had no idea how to present the sense of time passing. The third part, "the voyage to the lighthouse," is still vague. She only knew what characters she wanted to write into this part.

The theme of the novel, "to the lighthouse," was set up in the very beginning of the first part to create a sense of waiting that runs through the whole story. A voyage to the lighthouse seemed to be a significant symbol to tie up the whole story, like a vision with an invisible arrow darted out from Woolf's mind eye. At what did the "arrow" aim? According to the August plan, Woolf did not know about it either. But this vision in a way raised this novel up to an artistic level and became the key for us to understand Woolf's creative process. It leads us to ask: In what way did Woolf see the relation between the theme she made up and the story she was about to tell? Or, to put it in another way, how did Woolf come up with the motif of the story, "to the lighthouse," which manifests a literary and artistic design for the whole

work? I think the answer to this question can be found through Woolf's writing philosophy and in Woolf herself as a creative writer who wanted to raise this autobiographical novel up to an artistic level.

3. Woolf's Writing Philosophy and Her Ability to Perceive "Shocks"

One major concept dominated Woolf's creative process: her thought on what her life was like. She used metaphors "cotton wool" and the "non-being" moments to describe the parts of her life she was unconscious of (*Virginia Woolf: Moments of Being* 70). And the conscious part was the "being" moments or "shock[s]" she perceived and stored right away (71). The "being" moments or "shocks" became her writing sources and keys to uncover what was hidden behind the "cotton wool" (her unconscious) to fill up the gaps between the being moments. Knowing first how Woolf came up with the theme, to the lighthouse, prepares us to further understand her writing theory about cotton wool/non-being moments and shocks/ being moments she received. Through the understanding of this writing philosophy, we can discover how Woolf exploited her traumatic childhood as the major source of her writing material drawn from the being moments and how she turned her private vision into an artistic one by plunging herself into the non-being moments. Cixous's six elements are examined here to give depth to Woolf's creative process.

Woolf did not reveal how she came up with the theme of the novel, "to the lighthouse," until years later after the publication of the novel on May 5, 1927. She reflected on the moment when the idea came to her in her autobiographical writing, "A Sketch of the Past" (1939), collected in *Virginia Woolf: Moments of Being* (edited by Jeanne Schulkind, 1976):

Then one day walking round Tavistock Square I made up, as I sometimes make up my books, *To the Lighthouse*, in a great, apparently involuntary, rush. One thing burst into another. Blowing bubbles out of a pipe gives the feeling of the rapid crowd of ideas and scenes which blew out of my mind, so that my lips seemed syllabbling of their own accord as I walked (81).

Did the idea of writing *To the Lighthouse* about her parents and her childhood just strike her like that? On Tavistock Square, irrelevant to the novel she was planning to write? Was the story just developed like “blowing bubbles out of a pipe” (81) ? Woolf’s words like “in a great, apparently involuntary, rush” and “feeling of . . . ideas and scenes” give us some clues about how she perceived the title “To the Lighthouse.” Those words have two layers of meaning. First, the idea that Woolf received must have run through her senses first for the “great rush” was a feeling surged in her that she sensed through her body. Perceiving this feeling was an “involuntary” action because ideas rushed out of her lips that forced the lips to say the words that she had no control over. Such an “involuntary” body movement started from a surge that rushed to the action of her lips is like how Cixous’s body was at work when writing “seized” her (*Coming to Write* 9). For Cixous, her feeling of being “seized” by writing acts like an “attack” from “the depths of flesh” where her feeling of writing was “pushed. Not penetrated” (9). The whole movement from a feeling arisen from the “depths of the flesh” to the lips at work was also a “felt-thought” in Rugg’s term that “gesture as felt thought . . . is feeling in tensed body movement” (*Imagination* 282).

Secondly, the “ideas and scenes” that came to Woolf were felt first. They were not yet words and lines at the moment when they surged in her. In other words, they came to her over the waves of her “feeling.” And such a “feeling” created a desire in her to name the “feeling of the rapid crowd of ideas and scenes.” To use Cixous again, the process of turning the feeling

about the idea "To the Lighthouse" into words was a journey guided by the desire to know the unknown, the "truth," that is only known to the unconscious (*Three Steps* 37). This journey was initiated by the desire to go beyond her familiar self, the culturally, socially, and regionally bounded self. Led by the desire not by the common sense, the journey happened in the dark where the familiar self had no use and had to turn its regular vision into a **blind** person's to grope a way out. The act of turning into a blind person's vision is a renouncement of the present self/ego "to make room for the other," the "truth," the written product *To the Lighthouse*. The process of renouncing the present self/ego and walking toward the unknown is also a process of going through **death**; that is, to lose everything Woolf has had in order to own everything she would not have had. In other words, she had to **die** first in order to be born again because to know the "truth" is to touch the forbidden, the unspeakable (*Three Steps* 37). The idea of "To the Lighthouse" was born out of the death of Woolf's present self/ego. And it all started when her feeling of the idea surged in her unconscious and made way to her body from where she could receive the feeling and then turn it into her desire. Her desire to name the feeling meant that she had to make room for the other, the "ideas and scenes," to come out from her unconscious, the non-being moments. The process of making room for the other led her to discover the story *To the Lighthouse*, the truth behind the "cotton wool," the non-being moments.

"Cotton wool" and the "being" moments of her life are the terms Woolf used to describe her creative processes of writing novels. The former refers to the part of her life she lived unconsciously, the blurred moments of her life, the "non-being" part. The "being" moments were the "shocks" she received and never forgot. In other words, she could pick out essential

moments of her life, the “being” parts, such as the moment she “walked over Mount Misery and along the river,” or when she “began a book--the memoirs of Madame de la Fayette--which interested me,” but the rest of the moments in the course of her doing those things were blurred or became “cotton wool,” to use her term. She explained:

These separate moments of being were however embedded in many more moments of non-being. I have already forgotten what Leonard and I talked about at lunch; and at tea; although it was a good day the goodness was embedded in a kind of nondescript cotton wool. This is always so. A great part of every day is not lived consciously (*Virginia Woolf: Moments of Being* 70).

For Woolf, her life was composed of the “being” and “non-being” moments, in which as a writer what she had to do was to plunge herself into the “cotton wool” to sort out the details that had been left out. Woolf thinks that “the real novelist can somehow convey both sorts of being” (70). And the work cannot be done without struggle. Woolf was troubled by how to describe the “non-being” every time she engaged in writing a novel. *To the Lighthouse*, which deals with her loss of her mother and her painful childhood, is a typical example of her struggle between the “non-being” and “being.” If pain was one of the “being” moments that she picked out from her “non-being” ones, writing was her way to be freed of the pain, to find out other feelings that she may have had at that time that may have comforted her and alleviated the pain. She pieced together the broken bits of “being” into a whole picture by filling up the gaps between them with her made-up “non-being” parts to gain power to overcome her sufferings. She wrote:

It is only by putting it into words that I make it whole; this wholeness means that it has lost its power to hurt me; it gives me, perhaps because by doing so I take away the pain, a great delight to put the severed parts together. Perhaps this is the strongest pleasure known to me (*Virginia Woolf: Moments of Being* 72).

But, how did she compose the “wholeness”? What did she see behind the “cotton wool,” the “non-being”? How did she link it to the “being” moments? After more experiences of writing novels, she reflected on her creative process and philosophized it in “A Sketch of the Past”:

It is the rapture I get when in writing I seem to be discovering what belongs to what; making a scene come right; making a character come together. From this I reach what I might call a philosophy; at any rate it is a constant idea of mine; that behind the cotton wool is hidden a pattern; that we--I mean all human beings--are connected with this; that the whole world is a work of art; that we are parts of the work of art. *Hamlet* or a Beethoven quartet is the truth about this vast mass that we call the world. But there is no Shakespeare, there is no Beethoven; certainly and emphatically there is no God; we are the words; we are the music; we are the thing itself. And I see this when I have a shock (*Virginia Woolf: Moments of Being* 72).

What she uncovered behind the “cotton wool” was “a pattern,” “the truth” of a human world. She realized that the greatness of the world is already inside us and its “truth” or “a work of art” is revealed through us. For Woolf, the process of creating “a work of art” was a journey of discovering what had already existed inside her. And it was her capacity of receiving the “shock” that made her see the “wholeness” of her story. The “shock” she received was the “being” moment that led her to discover the “pattern” hidden behind the “cotton wool,” the “non-being” moments. She gave us three examples to illustrate what she meant by the “shocks” she received. The first one happened when she was little, fighting with her brother. A sudden feeling that she did not want to hurt another person rose inside her and stopped her fist from hitting her brother. This realization shocked her and made her “aware of something terrible; and of her own powerlessness” (71). The second one was her sudden perception of what “the whole” meant when she was “looking at the flower bed” and realizing that “the flower itself was a part of the earth; that a ring enclosed what was the flower; part earth; part flower” (71).

The third shock came to her when she somehow connected the “horror” of one of their family friends' suicide to the “apple tree” in their garden. She described how that happened:

I stood there looking at the grey-green creases of the bark--it was a moonlit night--in a trance of horror. I seemed to be dragged down, hopelessly, into some pit of absolute despair from which I could not escape. My body seemed paralysed (71).

Woolf's capacity of receiving “shocks” made her know immediately what had made a great impact on her, and she kept such a revelation (a “being” moment) inside her right away. She did not exactly know what was happening to her, but she knew the “shocks” she just received meant something big, though she could not figure out at those moments. What she could do was to store them in her mind until she grew older and had the ability to understand them. In the beginning, it was her **body**, her senses, her instincts, that experienced those “shocks,” which she carried inside her until one day she could make up an explanation, a “pattern” (**otherness**) for them. Looking back the interior path she had walked by as a novelist (that is, putting her self to death throughout her search for the non-being moments, her **blindness** or **unconscious**), she could assure herself that her “shock-receiving capacity is what makes me a writer,” and “a shock is at once in my case followed by the desire to explain it” (72). Her “desire to explain it” led her to explore what was hidden behind those “shocks.” She stated, “I feel that I have had a blow . . . it is or will become a revelation of some order; it is a token of some real thing behind appearances; and I make it real by putting it into words” (72).

B. Woolf's Professional Milieu

Besides Woolf's own writing philosophy which she had gathered through her own personal experiences, three broad tendencies also influenced Woolf's creative process in

writing novels at that time. One is the burgeoning theories in psychology. William James's *Principles of Psychology* published in 1890, which proposes the "stream of consciousness" metaphor to explain human thought, and Freud's *The Interpretation of Dreams* in 1899. Another is French Post-Impressionism, which tries to catch the fleeting impressions of our real-life experience. Woolf's sister Vanessa was one of the first painters who took up this painting style. The other is art and literary theories in expressionism and romanticism that emphasize the interior realities instead of the truthful representation of the exterior (Marcel Proust's *A la recherche dur temps perdu* in 1913 and James Joyce's *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man* in 1914-1915, which both focus on characters' emotions and individual feeling).

A devouring reader of any book she could find (from Greek classics to Freud's, James Joyce's, Proust's, and T.S. Eliot's works, etc.) who also had frequent contacts with artists (her own sister Vanessa, her sister's circle, Roger Fry, and French artist Jacques Raverat), Woolf unavoidably must have known about those three avant-garde approaches to art and literature. Her ideal in fiction writing cohered with them. While most of her contemporaries still adopted a conventional style in narration and creation of characters, her acceptance of those approaches was bold and criticized by her peers. But her recognition of those avant-garde theories was not out of curiosity. It had more to do with her traumatic childhood experience that taught her the "discord and incongruity" of the true reality run underneath the harmony of life seen from outside ("Reminiscences" written by Woolf in 1907 and collected in *Moments of Being* by Schulkind 37). This reflection on her past was further developed into her writing. In 1908, in her journal sketching Clive Bell, her to-be-brother-in-law, she had already had a very clear vision for her own writing:

I begin to distrust description, & even such humorous arrangement as makes a days adventure into a narrative; I should like to write not only with the eye, but with the mind; & discover real things beneath the show (*A Passionate Apprentice: The Early Journals 1897-1909*, edited by Leaska, 384).

Her thought of “discovering real things beneath the show” was congruous with French Impressionism, which was given its first formal introduction in London by Roger Fry, who mounted the first French Post-Impressionist exhibition of Cezanne's, Van Gough's, Gauguin's, Matisse's, and several others' works from November 1910 to January 1911.

It was around the same time in 1908 during her visit to Italy soon after her humorous sketch of Clive Bell, Woolf had another journal entry about seeing Perugino's frescoes in the Collegio del Cambio in Perugia. His work made her brood on the relation between lines and colors and how the artist formed his view of “beauty” in his mind, “the momentary appearance of human beings,” and transformed it onto the plastered wall. As a writer, she could not help relating the artist's composition in painting to her writing. She wrote in her journal,

I attain a different kind of beauty, achieve a symmetry by means of infinite discords, showing all the traces of the mind's passage through the world; and achieve in the end, some kind of whole made of shivering fragments; to me this seems the natural process; the flight of the mind” (393).

Her ambition to realize her experiment with fiction writing at the time did not come true until nine years later when she wrote a short story *The Mark on the Wall* (1917). She began such an experiment by breaking down the linear timeline of conventional narration; by doing so, time and space become fragmented and give emotional weight to human thought which always drifts with the flow of time, human beings' “mental time” (*Granite and Rainbow* 212). After *The Mark on the Wall* (1917), she continued to practice it in *Kew Garden* (1919) and *An Unwritten Novel* (1920). In them, she explored her characters' inner thoughts, broke the

timeline of traditional storytelling, and used only the third-person narrative to create a fictional world. These three short stories opened a door for her to unify all her experimental techniques into her novels *Jacob's Room* written from 1920 to 1922, *Mrs. Dalloway* from 1923-1925, and *To the Lighthouse* from 1925 to 1927. In reflecting back on how she got inspiration to write, Woolf mentioned her break from conventional style in a letter to one of her friends, Ethal Smyth, on Oct. 16, 1930:

I shall never forget the day I wrote *The Mark on the Wall*--all in a flash, as if flying, after being kept stone breaking for months. The Unwritten Novel was the great discovery, however. That--again in one second--showed me how I could embody all my deposit of experience in a shape that fitted it--not that I have ever reached that end; but anyhow I saw, branching out of the tunnel I made, when I discovered that method of approach, *Jacob's Room*, *Mrs. Dalloway* etc--How I trembled with excitement . . . (*A Reflection of the Other Person: The Letters of Virginia Woolf* IV 231).

Actually, Woolf's experimental writings are based on her understanding of how a painter works on his/her painting. Different ideas and images can be presented on one canvas simultaneously, but when it comes to writing, they have to come in order, in sequence. If a painter works on space, then a writer deals with time. In other words, simultaneity of things could not happen in writing. In reality, people's thoughts and feelings do not work in a linear way, but "all over the place," like how a painter paints (*Letters of Virginia Woolf* III 136). Realizing this, Woolf wanted to give us back the "truth" of human reality in fiction writing, to present what Jacques Raverat (a French painter that Woolf kept contact with in letters) said that a word can arouse many associations, like "splashes in the outer air in every direction" when a pebble is thrown into a pond (*Virginia Woolf* II 136). It echoed back to her early thought on writing when she saw Perugino's fresco in Italy in 1908: the wholeness of a literary work is composed of "infinite discords" and "shivering fragments."

Woolf's experiment reached its perfection in *To the Lighthouse* after her major break from conventional style in *Jacob's Room* and *Mrs. Dalloway*. But how to present the simultaneity of things was yet to be resolved in the process of writing *To the Lighthouse*, especially towards the end of the third part, in which she wanted to deliver a sense of simultaneity of two scenes (Lily Briscoe painting at the beach and Mr. Ramsay and his two children sailing to the lighthouse). She stated this problem in her diary entry on September 5, 1926, but one week later, another diary entry revealed that she was finishing the novel. The problem that bothered her was hardly mentioned. It seemed that she had overcome the problem of presenting the simultaneity of things in two scenes and felt "triumphant" about it. Almost no records could be found to know how she tackled the problem except the mention of using "symbolism" and how she was "forced to be more direct and more intense," though she was afraid that she might have gone into "sentimentality" (*The Diary of Virginia Woolf* III 109-110). But it seemed that she was not worried about this. She even felt the revelation of her feeling showed her "peculiar qualities" (110). Woolf saw herself as a writer in control.

Among the critics Woolf had contacts with, Roger Fry, an artist and art critic, stood out as the one who understood the most how Woolf strived to present the simultaneity of things in *To the Lighthouse*. She knew Fry through her sister Vanessa, who met him in 1910. Soon, Vanessa invited him to lecture her Friday Club, her circle of painters. In the autumn of the same year, Fry was asked by the Grafton Gallery to mount the first French Post-Impressionist exhibition in London, in which Fry aimed to show that the emphasis on catching the momentary appearance had shifted to the presentation of a stronger image and an expressive illustration of the scene that was painted. This exhibition made Woolf claim later in her essay

“Mr. Bennett and Mrs. Brown” (1923) that “on or about December 1910, human character changed” to dispute Arnold Bennett’s statement that the “foundation of good fiction is character-creating and nothing else” (*Granite and Rainbow* 12 & 233). What Woolf tried to say in this essay echoed her letter to Raverat one year later that the earlier novelists’ treatment of characters is false by presenting their thoughts and feelings in a linear narrative. The truth is that human thoughts and feelings are crowded simultaneously in our heads and scattered “all over the place.” Therefore, the more expressive a character’s inner world is depicted like Woolf’s approach to presenting her characters’ world in fragments and incongruity, the more personal and individual the aesthetic experience becomes. And to make a literary experience whole, readers need to piece together the broken bits that story characters splash out in the text. Interpretation of a scene would become unique and subjective, like what the French Post-Impressionists did on their canvases.

Roger Fry, as an art critic and painter who was drawn to French Post-Impressionists, especially Cezanne’s works, understood what Woolf tried to accomplish in fiction writing. The exhibition he mounted at the end of 1910 opened up a door for the change that was going to affect how people in Britain looked at art and literature. Undoubtedly, this exhibition made a great impact on Woolf; in the following year she felt that the world was changing. The spirit of freedom from the tradition put Woolf into the crisis of adjusting to the quickly changed new world. She pulled through this chaotic period somehow. But Roger Fry, as a kind of father figure to Vanessa’s circle, had become a very important intellectual and spiritual figure for Woolf too since then. He knew about Woolf’s works and the problems she was striving to solve in writing, especially in the aspect of breaking through the time problem in novel

writing. Soon after the publication of *To the Lighthouse*, he congratulated her for her solution to the time problem in a letter:

You're no longer bothered by the simultaneity of things and go backwards and forwards in time with an extraordinary enrichment of each moment of consciousness. I'm sure that there's lots I haven't understood . . . that arriving at the Lighthouse has a symbolic meaning which escapes me. But I wonder if it matters (*Virginia Woolf* II 128-29).

Roger's response to this work pointed out exactly what Woolf had tried to accomplish in this novel. In reply, Woolf thanked him for his aesthetic guidance that kept her writing on "the right path," and then she continued:

I meant *nothing* by *The Lighthouse*. One has to have a central line down the middle of the book to hold the design together. I saw that all sorts of feelings would accrue to this, but I refused to think them out, and trusted that people would make it the deposit for their own emotions--which they have done, one thinking it means one thing another another. I can't manage Symbolism except in this vague, generalised way. Whether its right or wrong I don't know, but directly I'm told what a thing means, it becomes hateful to me (*Letters of Virginia Woolf* III 385).

Two things are worth noticing here in her reply to Fry: (1) the theme of the lighthouse is designed from a painter's perspective not a writer's; (2) this work is meant for a subjective or individual interpretation which echos the Post-Impressionist theory. To sum up, Woolf's creative process is paralleled to how a painter works on her/his canvas.

French Post-Impressionism opened a door for Woolf, but her awareness of the relations between writing and painting went back to her visit in Italy in 1908 when she saw Perugino's fresco. And her realization of such an intimacy between writing and painting even went far back to her childhood. She witnessed her parents' marriage smooth on the surface but rocky below, which led her to think that wholeness was made of discords and fragments. But this understanding only came to her in 1907 when she was writing Vanessa's life, long after the

death of her parents (respectively in 1895 and 1904). It was not a coincidence for her to become the writer as she was when writing *To the Lighthouse*. Her creative process, like how a painter works on a canvas, had been rooted in her (body) that had shaped her unique way of looking at things and further been incorporated into her writing. Of course her painter sister Vanessa was the one that introduced her a painter's way of tackling the space problem. Through Vanessa, she had a frequent contact with various painters, their works, and their theories. All of these inescapably led her to relate painting to writing. The strong impact of the French Post-Impressionist show (1910) further pushed her to abdicate the conventional narrative style (death). Seeing the collapse of old values and beliefs made her start to wonder about her self and redefine who she was as a writer. Her identification with Post-Impressionism was the first step in walking toward the invention of a new narrative style that would be practiced first in her short story writings (the process of becoming the other)--*The Mark on the Wall* (1917), *Kew Garden* (1919), and *An Unwritten Novel* (1920)--and then would gradually reach the fully matured new writing style through writing *Jacob's Room* (1923), *Mrs. Dalloway* (1925), and *To the Lighthouse* (1927). She even claimed that she "write[s] easily" when working on *To the Lighthouse* (*Letters of Virginia Woolf* III 386). Woolf as the writer (the other) was the "pebble" (Raverat's metaphor in describing how writing a word would be like from a painter's perspective in which the word could only exist graphically), thrown into a "pond" (a fictional world that a writer creates). When creating the fictional world, she had to use her mind's eye (blindness) not only to reach down to the dark corners (where her characters' deep emotions lie) to where the "pebble" led her but also find a way back to the shore to describe "all over the place" out where the "splashes" radiated (her

characters' feelings and thoughts) by the "pebble."

Strictly speaking, Woolf was a writer of her own. Her breakthrough in presenting "simultaneity of things" cannot be particularly attributed to any of her contemporaries or French Post-Impressionism. Surely, Proust's work *A la recherche du temps perdu* greatly fascinated her for his handling of "mental time" when she first read it in 1922. She would later on develop and apply it to *Mrs. Dalloway* by employing the method she called "tunneling process" to "stop the mechanical clock to capture selected moments of the past," a Bergson's concept which proposes "the presence of all the past states of consciousness in the present moment of experience" (Leaska, note, 220). This method was even more perfectly accomplished in *To the Lighthouse*. But as I stated above, Woolf had noticed that human thoughts and feelings are fragmented and dissonant very early in her life which led her to discover that the traditional narrative cannot present the truth of the human world. Post-Impressionism, Proust's work, or Joyce's only acted as conspirators to innovate or reinforce her creation of a different kind of narrative in fiction writing. The outer influences were indirect forces that made Woolf walk toward the writer that she would become. It was Woolf herself that ignited a fire inside her to make all the outer influences burn more fiercely to brighten up her way to creation. And it was a journey that started from her childhood experience embedded deep down in the darkest corners (body). A desire to explain that experience led her to redefine her self (becoming the other by putting death to her old self) with the help of her contemporaries she acknowledged. And in the end of this journey, she created a new narrative style (a blind person's vision).

C. Woolf's Work as a Whole

The first two contextual frames, relevant work enterprise and professional milieu, have introduced a background to Woolf's creative process of writing *To the Lighthouse*. With Woolf's basic creative process in mind--that is, after laying out a big picture--this section fills in the details (the dark corners and splashes). It aims to find out what kind of interior creative process she embarked on to write the novel *To the Lighthouse*--Woolf's interior voyage toward creating a new "identity," the other. My construction of one of Cixous's creative processes, a sequence of drive-desire-vision, and her theory on a writer's renouncement of one's self/ego (becoming the other) are employed here as lenses to see through the dark corners of Woolf's creative process. Woolf's writing philosophy serves as a macro picture to understand Woolf's inner struggles, that is, from the first moment when a certain significant event struck her until one day she was able to write it.

According to Woolf's writing philosophy, "cotton wool/non-being," "being/shock," and "pattern" form an invisible chain that directed Woolf to piece together characters and scenes she made up. In other words, driven by a "shock" she received, Woolf would look for a "pattern" behind it. And it was her "desire to explain" that motivated her to turn the "pattern" into words. Her desire to make sense of it enabled her to envision what had been hidden in the "cotton wool," the "non-being" moments of her life. In searching for an answer to the "shocks" she received, Woolf as a novelist had to form a blind person's vision--that is, to work on her imagination--to discover the "pattern" or "order" (to become the other) that raised her work to an artistic level. With her writing philosophy as a basic concept of her creative process, I analyze Woolf's interior voyage toward writing and divide it into four parts: (1) her capacity of

receiving a “shock” as her drive, (2) her urge to solve the mystery behind it as her “desire to explain,” (3) the process of groping through the “cotton wool,” the non-being moment, as her artistic vision, and (4) the found “pattern” or “order” as her becoming the other (a process of renouncing her self/ego). If we directly apply her writing philosophy to her writing of the novel, *To the Lighthouse*, it will look too broad and general. The sequence of drive-desire-vision and her renouncement of her present self/ego that strung together her broken bits of memories and the ones that she left in the “cotton wool” should reveal a “real” path that Woolf had gone through. It means that the sequence of drive-desire-vision and a renouncement of her self/ego should not be generally labeled as “shock,” “desire to explain” and “pattern.” Instead, they should bear the underneath story that Woolf had carried inside her for over thirty years before she engaged in the act of writing *To the Lighthouse*. Simply put, Woolf’s interior path toward writing the novel, a sequence of drive-desire-vision and a renouncement of her self/ego (becoming the other), should be understood in accord with Woolf’s true feelings in the process and how she managed to bring out her painful memories of her childhood and gain strength by figuring out a “pattern” or “order” (becoming the other) behind the “cotton wool” to make sense of what she had been through.

1. Drive: Woolf’s “deeply felt emotion”

If writing *To the Lighthouse* was a way to gain power over the pain she suffered from her childhood, Woolf’s interior creative process of writing the novel must have dealt with a great deal of emotions that she hid inside. In “A Sketch of the Past,” Woolf reflected on how the completion of the novel helped her relieve the pains: “I expressed some very long felt and

deeply felt emotion. And in expressing it I explained it and then laid it to rest," though she still had some doubts about it (*Virginia Woolf: Moments of Being* 81). If her "very long and deeply felt emotion" was her drive to push her to write *To the Lighthouse*, then what kind of "emotion" was it? When and where did such an "emotion" start stirring inside her and make her feel restless? Or the question should be: What "shock" did Woolf receive that motivated her to discover a "pattern" or "order" behind it which gave birth to the novel *To the Lighthouse*? To understand Woolf's "deeply felt emotion," we have to go back to the time when the seed was buried, that is, her drive that led her to envision the "non-being" part of her past in order to connect it to her "being" moment, the "shock" that she had lived with for over thirty years.

The "shock" to Woolf was her mother's death at the age of thirteen. Her hallucination of her mother started from that moment because the "merry world" created by her mother had stopped since that moment. She described that day and her feeling about it in "A Sketch of the Past":

For after that day there was nothing left of it. I leant out of the nursery window the morning she died. It was about six, I suppose. I saw Dr. Seton walk away up the street with his head bent and his hands clasped behind his back. I saw the pigeons floating and settling. I got a feeling of calm, sadness, and finality. It was a beautiful blue spring morning, and very still. That brings back the feeling that everything had come to an end (*Virginia Woolf: Moments of Being* 84).

Undoubtedly, her mother's death shocked her. But what shocked her even more was the co-existence of life and death. She witnessed on that day the lively movement of "the pigeons floating and settling" and the death news of her mother brought out by Dr. Seton's dispirited body language. She was also shocked by how peaceful that day seemed to appear even when

something very tragic just happened. That “beautiful blue spring morning” which should have been the sign of a merry day formed a sharp contrast with her feeling of “calm, sadness, and finality.” As a very sensitive and intuitive person, Woolf stored her sense of incongruity between appearance and true feeling underneath, though she did not really understand what the “shock” she just received meant to her at the time. That day as any other day had already gone, but the feeling of “calm, sadness, and finality” continued living with her and stirring inside her as a drive that pushed her to understand what really had happened on that day and what it meant to her and her life.

That day was also a day that eternally froze her childhood with the image of her mother as a “creator of that crowded merry world which spun so gaily in the center of my childhood” (Schulkind 84). The feeling of “calm, sadness, and finality” on that day was clearly separated from the days she had when her mother was still alive. And those “merry” days with her mother in the center had haunted her since “there was nothing left of it” after her mother’s death. It was not until she finished the novel *To the Lighthouse* she came to realize why her mother had haunted her for more than thirty years. Woolf explained it in the letter on May 25, 1927 to her sister Vanessa right after the novel was published:

. . . it is a psychological mystery why she should be: how a child could know about her; except that she has always haunted me, partly, I suppose, her beauty; and then dying at that moment, I suppose she cut a great figure on one’s mind when it was just awake, and had not any experience of life (*Letters of Virginia Woolf* III 383).

Her feeling of “calm, sadness, and finality” on that “beautiful blue spring morning” was new to her since her mind was “just awake, and had not any experience of life.” She was not prepared for the adult world which contained more complicated feelings besides joy. As she grew up

with more experiences of life, her vision of her mother started to be expanded by the understanding of her own life.

Mitchell Leaska's comment on Woolf as a person and writer may further assist us in understanding Woolf's creative process of *To the Lighthouse*. Leaska noticed in his biography of Woolf, *Granite and Rainbow: The Hidden Life of Virginia Woolf*, that what mattered to Woolf was "the world of emotional and sensory experience eddying endlessly in atmospheres of the mind, in twilit regions of memory where past and present merge and blur It was not concerned with what life was like, but more with what the actual experience of living felt like" (10). Leaska accurately captured what writing was like for Woolf because her writing came from an "actual" living experience with her entwined "non-being" and "being" worlds. Woolf wrote in her diary on March 18, 1925 about how she came to realize that her feeling of the present was always incomplete and it was only at the present moment when her feeling toward some moments of the past was fully recognized: "At the moment I can only note that the past is beautiful because one never realises an emotion at the time. It expands later, and thus we don't have complete emotions about the present, only about the past" (*The Diary of Virginia Woolf* III 5). Therefore, it was her haunted past that accrued her "deeply felt emotion," the "being" moment that kept coming back to the present moment of her life to initiate a writing idea and make her able to explore the "non-being" moments in the past.

Leaska's comments on why Woolf had to enter the world of fiction in order to make a connection between her "non-being" and "being" worlds help us realize how her past obsessed her:

Writing novels permitted her to externalize much of what, locked within, might have

remained dissonant, fragmentary, and devastating. It might also be said that Virginia turned instinctively to fiction because there were satisfactions in fantasy that she couldn't find in the real world (7).

What had “locked within” her was the “non-being” and “being” moments of her life both in her past and present. Her “fantasy” was a way that helped her express those moments. In order to make her feelings at the moment complete, she let her past keep coming back to her. And it was not until she turned it into words that she finally made peace with the past. *To the Lighthouse* was the result of her obsession with her parents and her childhood. And writing the novel released her pain of feeling powerless she had carried inside her since the age of thirteen when her mother died.

She wrote in “A Sketch of the Past” about how she felt after she finished *To the Lighthouse*: “. . . and when it was written, I ceased to be obsessed by my mother. I no longer hear her voice; I do not see her” (*Virginia Woolf: Moments of Being* 81). Obviously, her unresolved feeling toward her past was her drive to motivate her to write, to gain power over the pain and her obsession with her mother. In the case of *To the Lighthouse*, it was her feeling of “calm, sadness, and finality” on the day of her mother's death that drove her to write. And what made her carry such a “deeply felt emotion” for over thirty years was her “desire to explain it.”

2. Desire: Woolf's Groping in the Darkness

What bridges Woolf's drive and visions was her “desire to explain” the “non-being” and “being,” those blurred memories and the ones that stood out in her mind (*Virginia Woolf: Moments of Being* 72). Without the “desire” that kept pushing her to decode the “shock” she

received on the day of her mother's death, the novel *To the Lighthouse* would never be written after thirty-one years. But what was it like to live with her "desire to explain it" for such a long time? Or, I should ask: what was the process that Woolf must have gone through before she could find a "pattern" or an "order" behind the "shock"? The only way for her to accomplish this long journey was to plunge herself in the "cotton wool" and down into "the dark corners" to create her own story of her parents and childhood, to make sense of the "shock" she received. In other words, she had to put herself in the darkness in order to gain a blind person's vision to find a way out. But why was this exploration in the darkness alone necessary?

Because she needed to rely on her imagination or fantasy to fill up the "non-being" moments. And it was a process of groping in the darkness to find a way out, a blind person's desire to "see" in order to get out of a terrified feeling of being lost. That is why after plunging herself in the "cotton wool," in the darkness, her physical sight became useless. Her desire to "see," to get her out of the darkness made her form a blind person's vision to prevent her from getting lost. It was a process of making sense of what had happened to her. Thus, in the case of her desiring to write *To the Lighthouse*, saving herself from being haunted by her mother (a process of groping in the darkness) became her desire to figure out her unresolved feeling toward her past to understand what caused those "long felt and deeply felt emotion." She reflected on why she was obsessed with her mother and felt the need to write *To the Lighthouse* in "A Sketch of the Past":

I could hear her voice, see her, imagine what she would do or say as I went about my day's doings. She was one of the invisible presences who after all play so important a part in every life. This influence, by which I mean the consciousness of other groups impinging

upon ourselves; public opinion; what other people say and think; all those magnets which attract us this way to be like that, or repel us the other and make us different from that; has never been analyzed in any of those Lives which I so much enjoy reading, or very superficially (*Virginia Woolf: Moments of Being* 80).

Woolf's hindsight revealed that she tried hard to make sense of why she acted or did things such ways in her daily life. Unlike many people who had never tried to understand, had just accepted, or had merely scratched the surface of why their lives were affected by other people, Woolf wanted to gain insight into why she was obsessed with her mother. As she grew up, her "deeply felt emotion" accrued from her past had formed an enormous pressure on her to push her to figure out what that "emotion" was. And it was only by understanding it that she could make peace with her "deeply felt emotion" that kept stirring inside her for over thirty years. Her effort was not wasted. She wrote in her diary on November 28, 1928 about how she thought of her parents differently before and after the completion of the novel:

I used to think of him [her father] & mother daily; but writing *The Lighthouse*, laid them in my mind. And now he comes back sometimes, but differently. (I believe this to be true--that I was obsessed by them both, unhealthily; & writing of them was a necessary act.) He comes back now more as a contemporary (*The Diary of Virginia Woolf* III 208).

But Woolf's parents still haunted her. There was something too tragic to be healed by just explaining it. As Leaska said in Woolf's biography, Woolf did not walk out of her parents' shadows for the rest of her life. Writing *To the Lighthouse* "merely smothered the feeling and weakened the volume of the prevailing dissonance" (267). For example, instead of telling the whole truth that she felt excluded when her father stormed out her mother's death room and ignored her "outstretched arms," she transposed her feeling of being abandoned by her father to her father's loss of his wife while describing this horrible scene in the novel. In the second part of the novel, she wrote:

[Mr. Ramsay, stumbling along a passage one dark morning, stretched his arms out, but Mrs. Ramsay having died rather suddenly the night before, his arms, though stretched out, remained empty] (*To the Lighthouse* 128).

The wound of being ignored by her father after her mother's death was too painful to be uncovered. It still hurt so much that she had to distribute her pain to other people and let them carry it for her. Her "deeply felt emotion" had never been completely appeased. The biographer commented:

Much as she tried to lay her mother and father to rest, she could not. Their sour music would continue to assail her from the grave, haunt her to the very end. As long as she could write, however, she would protect herself by resurrecting them in benign worlds of her own making (*Granite and Rainbow* 267).

Her desire to make peace with her sufferings from her childhood by writing *To the Lighthouse* is the dynamic source of her writing. It kept bothering her and stirring up more desire to make her continue writing. The last bit of the unresolved feeling can still be found in her other novel *The Years* (1937) and her autobiography "A Sketch of the Past" (1939). In other words, her desire to write was generated from her unresolved feelings in the past.

It was her "emotional and sensory experience," the "shock" that she was gifted to receive, that drove her to engage in writing *To the Lighthouse* and many of her other works. And it was all activated by her desire to explain it, the "shock." She wrote in "A Sketch of The Past," ". . . I go on to suppose that the shock-receiving capacity is what makes me a writer. I hazard the explanation that a shock is at once in my case followed by the desire to explain it" (*Virginia Woolf: Moments of Being* 72). Woolf had already noticed that she could not resist the calling of her "shock-receiving capacity," or "intuition," another name she used to describe it. She stated, "This intuition of mine--it is so instinctive that it seems given to me, not made by me--

has certainly given its scale to my life . . ." (72). The "shock" she received or her "intuition" kindled her "desire" to discover a "pattern" or an "order." Once such a "desire" was initiated in her, it never died down. It would keep stirring inside her to fight for the "invisible influences" on her. She had a vivid sentence to describe her situation as a socialized person whose acts and thoughts would always be affected by the change of society throughout her lifetime: "I see myself as a fish in a stream; deflected; held in place; but cannot describe the stream" (*Virginia Woolf: Moments of Being* 80). But as a writer, she had already signed a life-long contract to go beyond her self, to create a "stream" of her own that she could "describe." She perceived life with her senses, her emotions. With incessant nourishment from her "desire to explain," she was able to form visions of the world in the long, dark journey.

3. Vision: Woolf's "Soul's eye"

How Woolf shaped a vision should be discussed on two different levels. One group of visions came from the broken bits of her memories of her parents and childhood which she perceived effortlessly. The other was in her "Soul's eye," to borrow Cixous's term, which raised her private vision up to an artistic level, a discovery of a "truth" or "pattern" behind the "cotton wool," with her unceasing efforts to grope a way out of the darkness, a long journey she committed herself to. Since Woolf's gift to receive "shocks" was already in her, the visions that stood out of the "cotton wool," it would be pointless to discuss her ability to form visions on this level. What I want to analyze in this section is the second level that Woolf had achieved, which should shed some light on how she formed a "blind person's version" as a creative writer when groping in the darkness, in the "cotton wool." And it was not just a **vision**

that she saw in the darkness, but more like something that came from her “intuition” and echoed the “truth” that she tried to capture behind the “cotton wool.”

During the period of writing *To the Lighthouse*, Woolf talked about her “intuition” when discussing “style” with Vita, her friend whom she considered as a substitute of her mother, in the letter she wrote her on March 16, 1926. Although “intuition” was not mentioned directly, she thought “a sight, an emotion” was the key to capture a proper “rhythm” for it led her to find the right words to describe her ideas, visions, and feelings. She used herself as an example:

Style is a very simple matter; it is all rhythm. Once you get that, you can't use the wrong words. But on the other hand here am I sitting after half the morning, crammed with ideas, and visions, and so on, and can't dislodge them, for lack of the right rhythm. Now this is very profound, what rhythm is, and goes far deeper than words. A sight, an emotion, creates this wave in the mind, long before it makes words to fit it; and in writing (such is my present belief) one has to recapture this, and set this working (which has nothing to do with words) and then, as it breaks and tumbles in the mind, it makes words to fit it . . . (*Letters of Virginia Woolf* III 247).

What Woolf meant by “a sight, an emotion” has nothing to do with her actual memories of her past, but more like Cixous's experience of “walking through the self toward the dark” (*Three Steps* 65). Waiting for the “right rhythm” was Woolf's journey toward a certain feeling or vision that she had to sense inside her, feel the “wave in the mind” that touched her. And after that she could write “from the tips of the finger that transcribe by the sweet dictates of vision . . .,” to use Cixous's words (*Coming to Writing* 4). In other words, although at this stage she had already had some ideas and visions for her story, those ideas still needed the push of her “emotional and sensory experience” to materialize them into words. It means that she still had to go through the same process as the one when she conceived a story, that is, an

order of drive-desire-vision. Only this time she had to use her “Soul’s eye” to find out “a sight, an emotion” to string together the broken bits of her memories, to make sense of them. And the “sight” or the “emotion” she tried to “recapture” was the drive that made her break through the thick crust of her pain from her childhood to bring her writing to a creative act. In other words, in the interior voyage toward writing, she was looking for a vision from her non-being moments (the unconscious) to transform her memories into a work of art.

And the process happened all inside her. She did not go outside of her to find the answer. In her letter to Ethel Sands on June 23, 1927 about his comment on *To the Lighthouse*, which he thought was a vision that Woolf drew from the external world, Woolf contended, “The Lighthouse seemed to me almost too much the inner world. But that’s the beginning. You’ll have to rub up your memories, and stand a lot of questioning (*Letters of Virginia Woolf* III 393). Woolf’s acts of “rub[bing] up” her memories and “questioning” herself in the course of writing the novel demonstrated that she was taking the writing journey in the darkness and was trying to see through it in the dark tunnel with her “Soul’s eye” to grope a way out. “Rub[bing] up” her memories meant that some part of them was blurred already. The blurred part required her to fill the gap by making up some scenes between the ones she still could remember clearly. The “making-up” part needed her “Soul’s eye” to work out a scene that could explain the “being” moments. Her act of “questioning” herself was a way that she chose to help her make up a reasonable scene which needed her “Soul’s eye” to examine if this scene she made up was true to what she really felt in those “being” moments and “bridge the gap between *feeling* and *fact*,” or we should say, the “non-being” and “being” (*Granite and Rainbow* 267). Once the “non-being” and “being” moments came closer and formed one clear vision, it meant

that she found the “pattern” behind the “cotton wool,” that is, her so-called “right rhythm.” And it was at that reconciled moment that she put herself on the first step of walking toward her actual writing.

4. Becoming the Other/a New “Identity”

Finding the “pattern” behind the “cotton wool” was how Woolf entered the world of art; otherwise, *To the Lighthouse* would only be pages of a person’s private memories in broken bits. To be able to transform them into a novel on an artistic level, Woolf must have become an observer of her “private vision,” rather than a participant (*Granite and Rainbow* 267). She had to detach herself from her own story. In other words, she needed to renounce her self/ego in the process to be able to change her “private vision” into “the structures of public design” (267) and in the meantime preserve the uniqueness of her vision. And it was the same process as finding the “pattern” behind the “cotton wool,” a process of becoming a writer/the other, or to use Woolf’s own words, “the words,” “the work of art” itself.

Leaska in his biography of Woolf also points out:

. . . only with distance in time and space could Virginia Woolf, at the most personal level, exercise the solipsistic power of *re-creating on her own terms* a world in which, as a child, she had once felt so powerless. Only by giving voice and patterns to that past could she bridge the gap between *feeling* and *fact*, and experience the triumph of having exhumed from those ancient vaults of private history the tableaux vivants which the outside world might be persuaded to accept as a work of art (267).

Up until now we have theories and Woolf’s writing philosophy to demonstrate that the renouncement of one’s self/ego was a necessary step for Woolf to be able to cross her “private vision.” But how did Woolf detach her self/ego from her past and make some room for the other/the writer to transform her past into a work of art?

One example is Woolf's design of Mrs. Ramsay's character (Woolf's mother) which has taken the central place in the first and third parts of the novel. Reflecting on her creative process of writing *To the Lighthouse*, Woolf described how difficult it was for her to write about her feeling toward her mother, and her mother itself. She wrote, "I see myself as a fish in a stream: deflected; held in place; but cannot describe the stream" (*Virginia Woolf: Moments of Being* 80). As a person who lived by her "emotional and sensory experience," Woolf tried to analyze her years between 1882 and 1895 spent in Talland House and how her memories of that time became unstable and shady when she tried to catch those past moments:

A great hall I could liken it to; with windows letting in strange lights; and murmurs and spaces of deep silence. But somehow into that picture must be brought, too, the sense of movement and change. Nothing remained stable long. One must get the feeling of everything approaching and then disappearing, getting large, getting small, passing at different rates of speed past the little creature That is what is indescribable, that is what makes all images too static, for no sooner has one said this was so, than it was past and altered. How immense must be the force of life which turns a baby . . . into the child who thirteen years later can feel all that I felt on May 5th 1895--now almost exactly to a day, forty-four years ago--when my mother died (*Virginia Woolf: Moments of Being* 79).

Her "indescribable" feeling about the day her mother died made her feel that she had "left out the most important--those instincts, affections, passions, attachments--there is no single word for them, for they changed month by month--which bound me . . ." (79-80). Ever since the day her mother died, her memory of that day had been frozen deep down in her mind in a "static" form, and after that day her consciousness of other people began (80). She lived in that "indescribable" feeling until she turned forty-three and started working on *To the Lighthouse*. It was at that time that the frozen moment of that day melted. Her "indescribable" feeling became dynamic and was joined by "public opinion; what other people say and think; all those magnets which attract us this way to be like that, or repel us the other that make us different

from that . . ." (80).

She was not the thirteen-year-old child on that day any more, though the memory of that moment stayed. Her consciousness of other people changed her and let her gain power to resist the drag of her powerlessness on that day. Thinking of other people's influences on any individual as "invisible presences," she stated that "the 'subject of this memoir' is tugged this way and that every day of his life; it is they that keep him in position" (80). At the moment in Woolf's life, she surpassed the child inside her and was capable of describing her feeling toward her mother and for herself. Her memory of her mother was not a broken piece among all the others any more. Her mother became "the whole thing; Talland House was full of her; Hyde Park Gate was full of her" (83). When Woolf envisioned her mother as life itself that embodied the commonalities that all human beings shared, she let go the moment of that day when her mother died, and in the meantime she made room for the other/the writer. And it was why one day when she was walking around Tavistock Square, "rapid crowd of ideas and scenes" came out of her mind for the novel *To the Lighthouse* (81). She came to realize that her mother was no longer a particular, private memory of hers:

I see now that she was living on such an extended surface that she had not time, nor strength, to concentrate, except for a moment if one were ill or in some child's crisis, upon me, or upon anyone . . . The later view, the understanding that I now have of her position must have its say . . . I see now that a woman who had to keep all this in being and under control must have been a general presence rather than a particular person to a child of seven or eight (83).

The moment she understood that her mother was "a general presence," she had left the private part of her self/ego for a universal truth. She stood from a distance to observe her mother and portray her. She said, "if one could give a sense of my mother's personality one

would have to be an artist" (85). And she was an artist, a great writer who could picture the wholeness of that day, and then she had a story for her mother and her childhood. This long silent process of renouncing her self/ego opened a door for the growth of the other/a new "identity."

Leaska in Woolf's biography analyzes this process of renouncement in a more objective way. He raises Woolf's emotional and personal narration up to an artistic level in general. He explained Woolf's art of making the novel *To the Lighthouse*:

. . . when a memory was recalled from a chronologically distant past, that memory would become instantly alive and *re-experienced* during the moment of recall. So that when Woolf tunneled into a character's past, the memory was experienced in the *present* (by the character and the reader) and *not* as an event of the past (*Granite and Rainbow* 15).

In other words, when a memory was called by Woolf and channeled into "a character's past," it did not belong to Woolf's "private vision" any more. It was shared by "the character and the reader." Reaching this level, Woolf accomplished the renouncement of her self/ego to allow the other to come in. Leaska further clarified this process when distinguishing Woolf's artistic achievement from Vita Sackville-West, one of Woolf's contemporaries:

There was one big difference between them, however. Virginia, like many another writer, shielded herself from the "shocks" of living with pen and ink; but her intellectual superiority, coupled as it was with her emotional submissiveness, permitted her as a novelist to surrender completely to the mental atmosphere of her characters, as she was now doing in *To the Lighthouse*. With astonishing ease she could crawl in and out of her characters' minds, however different from one another they might be, to record their deepest feelings . . . What this meant was that Virginia Woolf was sure enough of herself as an artist, and submissive enough emotionally, to surrender her Self during the creative act, to imagine, freely, without inhibition, the thoughts and feelings of her characters (*Granite and Rainbow* 257-258).

Woolf's capacity to be submissive to her characters emotionally came from her ability to renounce "her Self," so that she could become the other/her artistic other and make her writing

progress without her self's being in the way.

To look back at Woolf's interior voyage toward creating the other, a new "identity," for *To the Lighthouse*, we can find that Woolf experienced Cixous's six elements (body, desire, death, blindness, self, otherness), a sequence of drive-desire-vision, and a renouncement of one's self/ego to become the other. To put it another way, her creative process of the novel was also an interplay between her "being" and "non-being" moments, her conscious and unconscious. In order to make meaning out of the "non-being," she must, to a certain degree, surpass her pain and powerlessness (a conscious effort) by plunging her self into the "non-being" part to reach the "dark corners" in order to revive her vision to "see" what was going on in the "non-being" moments of her life (her unconscious part), to catch the "splashes" that she created "all over the place." It was not a coincidence that thirteen years later in an essay "The Leaning Tower" (1940) she directly used a writer's "conscious" and "unconscious" to describe a writer's mind at work. She wrote:

Unconsciousness, which means presumably that the under-mind works at top speed while the upper-mind drowns, is the state we all know. We all have experience of the work done by unconsciousness in our own daily lives. You have had a crowded day, let us suppose, sightseeing in London. Could you say what you had seen and done when you came back? Was it not all a blur, a confusion? ... the sights and sounds and sayings that had been of most interest to you swam to the surface, apparently of their own accord; and remained in memory; what was unimportant sank into forgetfulness. So it is with the writer. After a hard day's work, trudging round, seeing all he can, feeling all he can, taking in the book of his mind innumerable notes, the writer becomes--if he can--unconscious. In fact, his under-mind works at top speed while his upper-mind drowns. Then, after a pause the veil lifts; and there is the thing--the thing he wants to write about--simplified, composed. Do we strain Wordsworth's famous saying about emotion recollected in tranquillity when we infer that by tranquillity he meant that the writer needs to become unconscious before he can create? (*Moment & Other Essays* 134)

D. Woolf's Text *To the Lighthouse*: The Completion of a New "Identity"

The accomplishment of Woolf's renouncement of her self/ego to become the other/a new "identity" also has to involve one last stage of her interior creative process of *To the Lighthouse* which should be understood on two levels of Woolf's mind at work: (1) a creation of a new "language" (simultaneity of things) to complete the creation of a new "identity" and (2) an inner dialogue between the new "identity" and other voices/characters. In other words, in this section, I want to find out how the creation of a new "language" (simultaneity of things) was integrated into creating the new "identity" and how the new "identity" was fully shaped by catching the inner thoughts of her characters to present "simultaneity of things." Before I analyze Woolf's interior voyage toward writing in the aspects of her creation of a "new language" and her play with other voices/character, Woolf's writing habits need to be discussed first, especially the ones she utilized to work on *To the Lighthouse*. These habits can be easily noticed in her first draft which helps lead us to enter her mind and understand her interior creative process when writing the novel. Since Woolf had made plans for each of the three parts composed of the novel, it is proper to analyze Woolf's play with language and her characters in accord with the three parts: (1) The Window, (2) Time Passes, and (3) The Lighthouse. Kristeva's carnivalesque discourse and Bakhtin's dialogic theory help articulate (1) the interplay between Woolf's new "identity" and a new "language" that she employs to convey the meanings or the potential, infinite meanings she invites her readers to participate, and (2) between the new "identity" and other voices/characters. Thus, this section is divided into four parts: (1) Woolf's writing habits, (2) The Window, (3) Time Passes, and (4) The Lighthouse.

For the language part, I focus on (1) the scenes that demonstrate the new narrative style--

the simultaneity of things (the embodiment of a carnivalesque discourse which integrates heterogeneous elements to renew a dead language) to understand how Woolf as the other/new “identity” played with the “splashes all over the place” that she dug out from the dark corners of her self and her characters. I study her writing plans first and then choose the scenes out of the first and second parts of the novel to demonstrate how Woolf has successfully achieved the effect of simultaneity of things by comparing her plans with the text. I also analyze (2) how she reshaped again and again an original vision of an image to complete the unique vision of the new “identity.” One revision she made for one of the scenes in the third part will be served to demonstrate it. As for the second part, I bring out how Woolf’s mind at work when she was dealing with a sense of ten years passing. She employed four seasons to describe the time passing without just jumping directly to the time after ten years or using her characters to deliver the message. She thought this innovation would be “an interesting experiment” in her August plan in 1925 (*To the Lighthouse: The original holograph draft 2*). I also compare her writing plan with the text to see how she carried out a carnivalesque discourse on the language level.

For the part of characters, I focus on how Woolf was able to reach down into the “dark corners” of her characters. She was submissive to her characters’ inner thoughts to make them alive. She thought entering her characters’ minds created the effect of the vibrancy or the “central transparency” that a novelist should instill into or bring out from his/her characters, which she did not see in many other writers (*Letters of Virginia Woolf* III 302). Woolf’s emotional submissiveness to her characters was itself an act of a carnivalesque discourse in which Woolf as the writer had to be split into two roles, “actor and spectator” (*Desire in*

Language 46). Both of the roles could not be reduced to one fixed sign system, but had to be compromised. According to Bakhtin, the form of a novel embodies a dialogized structure which needs “the creation of a whole human being, a *second consciousness* in addition to the author’s” (*Mikhail Bakhtin: Creation of a Prosaics* 72). In Woolf’s case, since the central purpose of the novel is to bring out Mrs. Ramsay’s character, I will analyze how Woolf used other characters to present Mrs. Ramsay’s; that is, she presents Mrs. Ramsay’s character by swimming deep down into the “dark corners” of other characters’ inner thoughts of Mrs. Ramsay. If Mrs. Ramsay was the “pebble” that Woolf threw into the “pond” (the text--Woolf’s view of the world revealed through the eyes of her characters), the “splashes” dropping “all over the place” on the shore were Woolf’s as the new “identity’s” reflections and re-interpretations of the character, her mother in her real life, through the radiation of the other characters’ inner thoughts (heterogeneous elements) spun around Mrs. Ramsay, an interplay between the new “identity” and her characters.

1. Woolf’s Writing Habits

Three major habits were employed in writing this novel. First, she did not work out every aspect of the novel before she started to write it. She sketched first and then went back to refine and give more details. When revising, Woolf did not make major changes. In other words, she had a pretty firm plan for the development of the novel. Susan Dick stated in her introduction to Woolf’s original manuscript:

Throughout the first draft of the novel, Virginia Woolf’s grasp of the direction the narrative would take, the relationships between the characters, and even the dominant image patterns and the main ideas she would explore, is firm. Each of the three sections has the shape in the first draft it would have in the final one (*To the Lighthouse: The*

Original Holograph Draft 13).

When Woolf revised the novel, she also found out how “sketchy” her first draft was and was surprised at how this method worked out perfectly. Comparing with her first two novels, Woolf felt that *To the Lighthouse* was “fuller than J.’s R. [Jacob’s Room] and less spasmodic, occupied with more interesting things than Mrs. D. [Mrs. Dalloway] and not complicated with all that desperate accompaniment of madness. It is freer and subtler I think” (*The Diary of Virginia Woolf* III 117). She also thought that this method helped her bring in “fresh subjects in view, because I saw the chance of being able to say them” (117-118).

And this method resulted in her second writing habit, that is, “the great number of incomplete sentences” in her first draft. According to Dick’s speculation, these incomplete sentences had to do with the “right rhythm” that Woolf had emphasized in her letter to Vita, which I have already quoted in the “vision” section of this chapter. Dick guesses:

The incomplete sentences found throughout the manuscript give the impression that she was often writing a kind of shorthand; when she could find the right rhythm, the words she put down would be directed by that and would probably enable her to find that rhythm again. When she was failing to recapture that ‘wave in the mind’ the sentence fragments may represent her attempt to overcome the barrier (*To the Lighthouse: The Original Holograph Draft 15*).

Besides Dick’s speculation, I think Woolf’s making of incomplete sentences had to do with her crowded ideas that came to her so fast that her pen could not catch up with her mind. Woolf described this uncontrolled situation in “A Sketch of the Past”:

One thing burst into another. Blowing bubbles out of a pipe gives the feeling of the rapid crowd of ideas and scenes which blew out of my mind, so that my lips seemed syllabbling of their own accord . . .” (*Virginia Woolf: Moments of Being 81*).

Her shorthand and fragmentary sentences were completed and given more detail when she

revised it after the first draft.

Thirdly, besides her complete plan for the novel, she took “mental notes” whenever an idea or a vision came into her mind. Leaska comments on this, “. . . she remained always observant, taking mental notes which next day would be recast into the more permanent stuff of fiction” (171). In his memoir, Leonard Woolf (Virginia's husband) also talked about two different stages that Woolf went through when writing fiction, especially the first stage which may further clarify how she took “mental notes.” In the beginning stage, Woolf experienced “long periods of, first, quiet and intense dreamlike rumination when she drifted through London streets or walked across the Sussex water-meadows or merely sat silent by the fire” (*Downhill All the Way* 57). The second phase usually came after she finished her first draft when she became very critical of what she had written. This writing habit in the first phase means that she had to live in the story that she created. She wrote in her diary on November 23, 1926, “. . . I am now and then haunted by some semi mystic very profound life of a woman . . .” (*The Diary of Virginia Woolf* III 118). I guess this might be one of the reasons that she wrote *To the Lighthouse* so quickly she felt “never ever have I written so easily, imagined so profusely” (58). She recorded this excitement of her fast writing in her diary on February 23, 1926:

. . . I am now writing as fast & freely as I have written in the whole of my life; more so—20 times more so—than any novel yet. I think this is the proof that I am on the right path; & that what fruit hangs in my soul is to be reached there . . . I live entirely in it, & come to the surface rather obscurely & am often unable to think what to say when we walk round the Square . . . It is, I feel, that I can float everything off now; & “everything” is rather a crowd & weight & confusion in the mind (59-60).

She finished her first draft of the novel on September 15, 1926, which had been one

whole year since she started. She began to revise it one month later with “some parts 3 times over” (*The Diary of Virginia Woolf* III 123). Her revision of the novel came to an end the following year in mid January. She wrote on that day that she had “finished the final drudgery,” and “no doubt I should work at it again” (123). In the meantime, reading Vita’s “fluent prose” made her aware of her distinctive writing method (simultaneity of things) from the conventional “smooth narrative” that “cannot be right” when proofreading herself *To the Lighthouse* in type in February. She wrote in the diary entry on February 12, “. . . owing to my curious methods, for the first time. I want to read largely and freely once: then to niggle over details” (127). Right after a few days, she wrote to Vita about her despair of working on the punctuation, “I go on crossing out commas and putting in semi-colons in a state of marmoreal despair” (*Letters of Virginia Woolf* 333). She finished the boring work in one month and felt satisfied with the novel except the scene of “Lily on the lawn” (*The Diary of Virginia Woolf* III 132). This novel was published on May 5, her mother’s death day.

Examining Woolf’s revising process will undoubtedly give us insight into her interior creative process. But I will not go through her revision one page after another because most of her revisions were either to finish her thoughts or complete the fragmentary sentences. Instead, I will only choose one major revision that she made in the third part of the novel to show how she worked on getting her vision of an image focused. And I think this kind of revision exemplifies how she, on the last stage of accomplishing a new “identity,” played with language by trying out various images to match what she wanted to express--an interior creative process that takes on her body, desire, death, self, blindness, and otherness (Cixous’s six elements).

Her writing habits form a basic structure for us to further understand how she wove her

ideas and visions in her mind into the novel *To the lighthouse*. Although there have been many studies about this novel (*To the Lighthouse: The Marriage of Life and Art* 1987, *Virginia Woolf and the Madness of Language* 1990, *Virginia Woolf: To the Lighthouse and The Waves* 1998, etc.), I approach it from another angle. That is, while other studies discussed the novel either from the traditions of literary criticism or psychoanalysis to analyze its content, I make the text itself an example of Woolf's interior creative process of her play with language and characters.

2. The Window

Woolf's earliest plan or her vision for the novel *To the Lighthouse* after going through the creative process of drive-desire-vision was made on March 6th, 1925 with her notes for *Mrs. Dalloway*. In this plan, Woolf had already had a rough idea about the characters. Following are Woolf's earliest notes written in March 1925 for the novel I quote from *The Original Holograph Draft* edited by Susan Dick, and I only quote the parts that are employed in the novel; in these notes, "she" refers to Mrs. Ramsay:

How her beauty is to be conveyed by the impression that she makes on all these people. One after another feeling it without knowing exactly what she does to them, to charge her words. Episode of taking Tansley to call on the poor. How they see her. The great cleavages in to which the human race is split, through the Ramsays not liking Mr. Tansley. But they liked Mr. Carmichael. Her reverence for learning and painting. Inhibited, not very personal . . . They did not speak to each other. Tansley shed/Tansley the product of universities had to assert the power of his intellect (48-49).

After a few months, her vision of the story became clearer and clearer. On August 6th, Woolf made a more concrete and complete plan for the three parts of the novel, especially the first one. Also from the same source, I quote the plan for the first part:

. . . Mrs. Ramsay (?) sitting at the window: while Mr. R. walks up & down in the dusk: the idea being that there shall be curves of conversation or reflection or description or in fact anything, modulated by his appearance & disappearance at the window: gradually it shall grow later; the child shall go to bed; the engaged couple shall appear: But this is all to be filled up as richly and variously as possible. My aim being to find a unit for the sentence which shall be less emphatic & intense than that in Mrs. D: an everyday sentence for carrying on the narrative easily. The theme of the 1st part shall really contribute to Mrs. R's character; at least Mrs. R's character shall be displayed, but finally in conjunction with his, so that one gets an impression of their relationship: To precipitate feeling, there should be a sense of waiting, of expectation: the child waiting to go to the Lighthouse: the woman awaiting the return of the couple (1.5).

According to the plan, the characters of Mr. and Mrs. Ramsays and their relationship were mainly what Woolf had in mind, and they should be interwoven with "to go to the lighthouse" as the theme throughout the first part. In the process of working out the plan, she had already had a pretty complete idea and vision of how to present them. Although she did not write details in the plan about what kind of a character she wanted for Mr. and Mrs. Ramsay, she had already known them pretty well as her real parents whom she had lived with for twenty-two and thirteen years respectively. For Mrs. Ramsay, the character of her real mother, Julia Stephen, she pictured a beautiful, caring person who provided comforts to everyone around her. In contrast, Mr. Ramsay, a character of her father, Leslie Stephen, was described as a tyrant who always asked for sympathy from his wife, Mrs. Ramsay. She did not create them, but drew them out of her memories of them. But her memories had already been blurred because it had been thirty years since the death of her mother. And to pull them out of their graves and give them lives was achieved by the incorporation of her imagination and creativity. She put herself in the state of unconsciousness as she stated in the essay "The Leaning Tower" in order to create a "simplified, composed" character--that is, a "second consciousness" in Bakhtin's words. In the process of transforming them into fictional

characters, she had to detach her conscious of being their daughter from her memories of them to become an observer, a writer, to create a new “identity”/characters.

As a writer who tended to visualize her story from a painter’s perspective, she needed a method to present them in a subtle way and to find a theme that could link her views and other characters’ views about them, like how a painter works on her canvas. She must have played with her characters and rehearsed them in her mind canvas. As any painting she had been familiar with which needs certain kind of a focus to present the subject matter, she had to find a theme to put all her characters together. “To go to the lighthouse” was the theme that she made up one afternoon when walking in the square. She did not intend to make any meaning out of it. Instead, she just needed it to “have a central line down the middle of the book to hold the design together” (*Letters of Virginia Woolf* III 385). She explained it in the letter to Roger Fry on May 27th, 1927:

I saw that all sorts of feelings would accrue to this, but I refused to think them out, and trusted that people would make it the deposit for their own emotions--which they have done, one thinking it means one thing another another. I can’t manage Symbolism except in this vague, generalised way (385).

By making the meaning of “to go to the lighthouse” ambiguous, she detached herself from her past--becoming the other--by playing with the ideas and visions that were flooding out of her mind. Her memories of her parents and her childhood (her conscious parts) were the original resources of the novel which she placed among the scenes she made up (the unconscious ones) in the process of writing the novel. Facts and feelings were woven into a fiction by an alignment of different points of view, including the narrator’s and her characters’, a compromise “between testimony [narration] and citation, between the voice [referential

utterance] and the book [textual premises]" according to Kristeva (46).

To use Kristeva's theory about the carnivalesque discourse, Woolf's memories of her parents and her childhood were displaced in the scenes she made up at the present moment of her thoughts. Actually, in the novel, the past time and space have been effaced because of this displacement in the flow of current time and space. Woolf had come to realize this in revising the novel. She wrote in her diary on November 23, 1926:

. . . time shall be utterly obliterated; future shall somehow blossom out of the past. One incident--say the fall of a flower--might contain it. My theory being that the actual event practically does not exist--nor time either (*The Diary of Virginia Woolf* III 118).

The first scene that Woolf made up in the first part of the novel is a typical example of how Woolf interwove her memory and her made-up theme, "to go to the lighthouse." And by doing so, she subtly illustrated the different characters of Mr. and Mrs. Ramsay. They were seen differently in their child's eyes and also Woolf's, who wrote them from a child's perspective. Woolf as a narrator/the other played with the dialogue and the mind of her child character, James. The opening sentence is a reply to the child character's inquiry about whether they can go to the lighthouse tomorrow, which is not written into the text:

"Yes, of course, if it's fine tomorrow," said Mrs. Ramsay. "But you'll have to be up with the lark," she added (*To the Lighthouse* by Woolf 3).

Then, in the writer's narration, we find out the joy that James got from his mother's comforting words. In this narration, time does not exist because when Woolf thought from a six-year-old boy's mind, she also aligned the vision that she had foreseen in the last part of the novel, which would be ten years later in the story time:

To her son these words conveyed an extraordinary joy, as if it were settled, the expedition were bound to take place, and the wonder to which he had looked forward, for

years and years it seemed, was, after a night's darkness and a day's sail, within touch (3). This pleasant feeling does not last long. Woolf disrupted it by adding another voice, another point of view, a disagreeable one: "But," said his father, stopping in front of the drawing-room window, "it won't be fine" (4). Then, Woolf's narration came in again to describe James's different attitude toward his father. In the meantime she indirectly described Mr. and Mrs. Ramsay's relationship which she wanted to accomplish in her writing plan through a child's eye:

Had there been an axe handy, or a poker, any weapon that would have gashed a hole in his father's breast and killed him, there and then, James would have seized it. Such were the extremes of emotion that Mr. Ramsay excited in his children's breasts by his mere presence; standing, as now lean as a knife, narrow as the blade of one, grinning sarcastically, not only with the pleasure of disillusioning his son and casting ridicule upon his wife, who was ten thousand times better in every way than he was (James thought) . . . (4).

In this passage, Woolf moved in and out of her character's mind, James's, to the narrator's, and then back to the character's. Woolf was playing two voices, and by doing so, she enriched the text. She as a writer/the other/a new "identity" was interplaying with the others/her characters/second consciousness she created.

This tactic was also used when Woolf as the narrator entered one character's inner thought after another's from her arrangement of some characters' walking, painting, meditating in the garden, out of the dressing-room window, from where Mrs. Ramsay could see them all. With Mrs. Ramsay's inner thoughts of other characters in the garden, Woolf as the narrator, the voice behind Mrs. Ramsay, transferred her thoughts to the other characters with Mrs. Ramsay's description of them. For example, first Woolf let her train of thought, that is, Mrs. Ramsay's in the novel, wander to Lily Briscoe, who was painting Mrs. Ramsay:

But the sight of the girl standing on the edge of the lawn painting reminded her; she was supposed to be keeping her head as much in the same position as possible for Lily's picture . . . With her little Chinese eyes and her puckered-up face, she would never marry; one could not take her painting very seriously; she was an independent little creature, and Mrs. Ramsay liked her for it . . . (17).

Then, in the next passage, we heard Lily's inner voice about her painting and through painting, we found William Bankes, other character. Woolf did not stop her train of thought on one character. She usually continued her exploration of the other characters through one character's inner thoughts of the others. Lily Briscoe's views of the others, including Mr. Tansley, William Bankes, Mr. and Mrs. Ramsay came to her mind sometimes in pair with association, or more precisely speaking, the narrator's. The way Woolf explored her characters' inner thoughts from one character's thought of another character to the other appeared again and again in the novel. Such a play with characters' inner thoughts produced the effect of "the simultaneity of the moment" (*Granite and Rainbow* 265). Time stopped in the novel when Woolf presented the narrator's and her characters' inner thoughts on the same object. For example, William Bankes' thoughts of Mrs. Ramsay's beauty followed the narrator's thoughts of hers:

But was it nothing but looks, people said? What was there behind it--her beauty and splendour? Had he blown his brains out, they asked, had he died the week before they were married--some other, earlier lover, of whom rumors reached one? Or was there nothing? nothing but an incomparable beauty which she lived behind, and could do nothing to disturb? (28).

Then, after a few more narratives about Mrs. Ramsay, we heard William Bankes' voice in parentheses talking about her beauty:

("Nature has but little clay," said Mr. Bankes once, much moved by her voice on the telephone, though she was only telling him a fact about a train, "like that of which she moulded you." He saw her at the end of the line very clearly Greek, straight, blue-eyed. How incongruous it seemed to be telephoning to a woman like that. The Graces assembling seemed to have joined hands in meadows of asphodel to compose that face. He would catch

the 10:30 at Euston. "Yet she's no more aware of her beauty than a child," said Mr. Bankes, replacing the receiver and crossing the room to see what progress the workmen were making with a hotel which they were building at the back of his house. And he thought of Mrs. Ramsay as he looked at that stir among the unfinished walls. For always, he thought, there was something incongruous to be worked into the harmony of her face . . .) (29).

Actually, Mr. Bankes's thoughts of Mrs. Ramsay did not run the same time as the narrator's or even the time of the scene in the novel with Mrs. Ramsay knitting socks for the Lighthouse keeper's little boy. Woolf's disruption of the scene by bringing in Mr. Bankes' inner thought at another time suspended the flow of the story time in the novel. Even the time in parentheses was not consistent. First we had the time when Mr. Bankes was on the phone with Mrs. Ramsay, and then, in the progress of the phone conversation, we had Mr. Bankes' inner thoughts of the Mrs. Ramsay he knew in another time. Woolf did not deliberately design this. The simultaneous presentation of different times in one scene was composed of her memories of her mother and the ones she heard from other people, which came to her simultaneously in the progress of writing the novel. She let the narrator and her characters speak for her. At the moment of interweaving the narrator's and characters' voices, she was not her conscious self any more, but the other/a new "identity" that she created in her unconscious.

Another example is her play with the theme, "to the lighthouse," which brings out the inner thoughts of Mr. and Mrs. Ramsay toward each other. This theme recurs throughout the first part. We keep reading the sentences like "No going to the Lighthouse, James," "Perhaps you will wake up and find the sun shining and the birds singing," "And even if it isn't fine tomorrow, it will be another day," spoken in turn by Mr. and Mrs. Ramsay. Between these sentences, time did not move forward, but buried dead by the flow of the two characters' inner thoughts. For example, we heard Mr. Ramsay's words to his son, "No going to the lighthouse,

James,' he said, as he stood by the window, speaking awkwardly, but trying in deference to Mrs. Ramsay to soften his voice into some semblance of geniality at least" (14). Then, immediately, we had Mrs. Ramsay's inner thought of Mr. Ramsay, "Odious little man, thought Mrs. Ramsay, why go on saying that?" (15). Actually, these two passages sound like the ones we had already read in the very beginning of the first part, though Woolf changed the words used to express the same attitudes carried respectively by Mr. and Mrs. Ramsay. As the theme keeps running through the first part, the exact length of time that the story had was only one day. But most of the time while reading the first part, readers lost the story time because they were led by the narrator's and her character's inner thoughts. The displacements of time and space in the first part were used from its very beginning until its end, the presentation of the "simultaneity of things."

Woolf's interplay with her characters can also be noticed when she used Lily to describe her view of Mrs. Ramsay and, in turn, through the character of Mrs. Ramsay in Lily's eyes, we came to know how people looked at Lily:

. . . insist that she must, Minta must, they all must marry, since in the whole world whatever laurels might be tossed to her, or triumphs won by her, and here she saddened, darkened, and came back to her chair, there could be no disputing this: an unmarried woman, an unmarried woman has missed the best of life (49).

These examples are countless in the first part of the novel. They were not made up by Woolf at the moment of her writing the novel. Instead, they were bits of her own memories of her mother and what other people said about her mother, and she picked them up when opening up her memories combined with her own creation. In other words, Woolf's interior creative process of making the novel had been taking place since the death of her mother. It was a long

process that only took place in her mind until after thirty years her visions of the novel became mature enough for her to write them down. Her interplay with her characters' views of her mother had played repeatedly again and again in her mind before she turned them into words. Woolf discovered the pattern behind the "cotton wool." The intermittent insertions of her characters' inner thoughts (heterogeneous elements) among the narrator's was the pattern which formed a carnivalesque discourse that breaks the consistency of time and space, and by doing so, Woolf achieved the artistic level of writing a novel.

Besides various characters' inner thoughts and feelings that Woolf used to assemble multiple points of view about Mrs. Ramsay's character, she also portrayed a character, for example Mr. Ramsay's conceit in his "splendid mind," by paralleling two different scenes (*To the Lighthouse* 33). Her treatment of placing two different scenes together to emphasize a character was her interplay as a writer with language. In the novel, we find that after a few debates between Mrs. Ramsay and Mr. Ramsay about if it was fine tomorrow to go to the lighthouse, Mr. Ramsay deduced that "some one had blundered" (33). Then, a voice mixed with the narrator's and Mrs. Ramsay's inner thoughts ridiculed these words of Mr. Ramsay's. Living in another world, Mr. Ramsay was unaware of his wife's mocking smile and fell into a long thought. Woolf, here, inserted an irrelevant train scene to express how Mr. Ramsay felt about himself:

He was safe, he was restored to his privacy. He stopped to light his pipe, looked once at his wife and son in the window, and as one raises one's eyes from a page in an express train and sees a farm, a tree, a cluster of cottages as an illustration, a confirmation of something on the printed page to which one returns, fortified, and satisfied, so without his distinguishing either his son or his wife, the sight of them fortified him and satisfied him and consecrated his effort to arrive at a perfectly clear understanding of the problem which now engaged the energies of his splendid mind (33).

The two scenes, Mr. Ramsay's confident thought of himself affirmed by seeing his wife and son in the window and a traveler's confirmation of something he read with the sceneries he spotted outside of the train he was riding, are two irrelevant images. When they were magically aligned together, they obscure the central idea of the passage. But this ambiguity not only indirectly reinforced readers' understanding of the character of Mr. Ramsay but also produced an effect of a text within a text, a potential meaning for its readers to interpret. And the interpretation can be various. This overlap of two images expanded the time and space of the window scene in that passage, a carnivalesque discourse. Woolf was not seeing the words themselves and the effect they could create, but seeing through them, like they had become transparent. What she saw through the words were the infinite possibilities of creating new meanings. Her hindsight from a reader's angle articulates her sensitivity to the potential meanings that words can create: "I had a feeling of transparency in words when they cease to be words and become so intensified that one seems to experience them; to foretell them as if they developed what one is already feeling" (*Virginia Woolf: Moments of Being* 93). The effect she created to parallel two irrelevant scenes was poetic and a manifestation of her unique perception of the world in the role of the other/a new "identity." Leaska commented on Woolf's poetic writing style:

Through all her writing, even in her adolescence, the stylistic feature that stands out most prominently is that elegant turn of phrase that is poetic, undetermined, and suggestive. She, the writer, *suggested*, and we, the readers, *supplied*. When she spoke of the poetic aspect in writing, she invariably meant the degree of semantic density and the range of semantic resonance--the possible stretch of meanings a word or phrase might generate (*Granite and Rainbow* 14).

In the process of placing the two different images in one passage, Woolf had dialogized the

images she created, and the implied meaning that Woolf extended was the result of an interplay between her as the other/a new “identity” and language. To borrow again Bakhtin's idea about the relationship between the author and the images he/she created, “. . . the author is far from neutral in his relationship to this image: to a certain extent he even polemicizes with this language, argues with it, agrees with it, interrogates it . . . in other words, the author is in a dialogical relationship with . . . language” (*The Dialogic Imagination* 46).

3. Time Passes

Although Woolf said herself that the ideas of the novel *To the Lighthouse* came to her easily and she was writing 20 times faster than her first two novels, she felt it was difficult to write the second part, *Time Passes*. Like the first part, she also made a plan for the second one. Her earliest outline for this part had no obvious relation to her first draft. The outline looked like a list of ideas that she brainstormed. Few of them were kept in the novel except “Now the question of the ten years,” “The seasons,” “The War,” “Change,” and “Darkness” (*To the Lighthouse: The Original Holograph Draft* 51). Then, on August 6th, 1925 the same day she made the plan for the first part, she sketched a general idea of what the second part was about: “The passing of time, I am not sure how this is to be given: and interesting experiment, giving the sense of 10 years passing” (1.5). On April 18, 1926 in her diary entry, the day after she just finished the first part of the novel, she had a clearer idea about what she wanted to write about for the second part, though she still thought it was “the most difficult abstract piece of writing”: “. . . I have to give an empty house, no people's characters, the passage of time, all eyeless & featureless with nothing to cling to” (*The Diary of Virginia Woolf* III 76).

According to her plan for the second part, she was not going to deal with her characters' inner thoughts, but to handle the "10 years passing." In other words, she as a writer had to focus on her play with language. In her draft and final versions of the second part, seasons and darkness were the two major images she employed to describe the time passing, though parentheses were also used to tell readers what had happened during the ten years.

The story time in the first part continued to the beginning of the second part except that the daytime turned into the night time and the dinner party was over. Woolf saw with a writer's eye the lights in the house "all extinguished" gradually except for Mr. Carmichael, "who liked to lie awake a little reading Virgil, kept his candle burning rather longer than the rest" (125). Then, we had the darkness where Woolf wiped off her characters and left us only the sense of time passing:

Not only was furniture confounded; there was scarcely anything left of body or mind by which one could say, "This is he" or "This is she." Sometimes a hand was raised as if to clutch something or ward off something, or somebody groaned, or somebody laughed aloud as if sharing a joke with nothingness (126).

Our sense of time passing became even more intense when Woolf's "Soul's eye," her new "identity," led us into her wandering mind in the darkness. Her description of it with the effect of her words, "Night, however, succeeds to night," suddenly drowned altogether the day we witnessed at Mr. and Mrs. Ramsay's house. Then, with the infinite nights still lingering on, Woolf let the four seasons take over to describe the destructive power of darkness:

The winter holds a pack of them in store and deals them equally, evenly, with indefatigable fingers. They lengthen; they darken. Some of them hold aloft clear planets, plates of brightness. The autumn trees, ravaged as they are, take on the flash of tattered flags kindling in the gloom of cool cathedral caves where gold letters on marble pages describe death in battle and how bones bleach and burn far away in Indian sands. The autumn trees gleam in the yellow moonlight, in the light of harvest moons, the light which

mellows the energy of labour, and smooths the stubble, and brings the wave lapping blue to the shore (127).

The darkness sent out the news about Mrs. Ramsay's sudden death in parentheses. Then, Woolf continued playing the image of darkness and four seasons. Even the spring, the celebrating season of life, could not escape the destructive clutch of darkness under Woolf's pen:

Moreover, softened and acquiescent, the spring with her bees humming and gnats dancing threw her cloak about her, veiled her eyes, averted her head, and among passing shadows and flights of small rain seemed to have taken upon her a knowledge of the sorrows of mankind (132).

Here, Woolf told us the sad news that in that summer Prue Ramsay, Mr. and Mrs. Ramsay's daughter, died "in some illness connected with childbirth" (132). Then, Woolf's interplay with language brought in the image of "an empty house" and "The War" as Woolf had planned:

And now in the heat of summer the wind sent its spies about the house again. Flies wove a web in the sunny rooms; weeds that had grown close to the glass in the night tapped methodically at the window-pane. When darkness fell, the stroke of the Lighthouse, which had laid itself with such authority upon the carpet in the darkness, tracing its pattern, came now in the softer light of spring mixed with moonlight gliding gently as if it laid its caress and lingered stealthily and looked and came lovingly again. But in the very lull of this loving caress, as the long stroke leant upon the bed, the rock was rent asunder; another fold of the shawl loosened; shawl loosened; there it hung, and swayed (132-133).

The death of Andrew Ramsay, Mr. and Mrs. Ramsay's son, sneaked in the picture that Woolf described above. The story time and space were continuously resurrected through Woolf's description of the passing of "night after night, summer and winter, the torment of storms, the arrow-like stillness of fine weather" (134).

Besides the images of darkness and four seasons that visited the house in turn, Woolf introduced Mrs. McNab's recollections of the family and the hostess of the empty house, Mrs.

Ramsay. Mrs. McNab came occasionally to clean the house. Her touch on the dusted furniture drew back her memory of Mrs. Ramsay and her children and how “many things had changed” (136). Woolf also used this character to emphasize Mrs. Ramsay’s importance in the house and how her children and her husband had relied on her for her comforts. With Mrs. McNab’s inner thoughts carrying on, Mrs. Ramsay’s death was eternalized and disrupted readers’ sense of the story time. It seemed that the clock had stopped at the moment of Mrs. Ramsay’s death and everything else had been spun around it.

But the story time continued after Mrs. McNab “banged the door . . . turned the key in the lock, and left the house alone, shut up, locked” and left that eternal moment locked in that house (137). In the end of the second part, Lily Briscoe’s re-visit at the house resumed the flow of time. The War had ended, “the house was full again,” and “the voice of the beauty of the world came murmuring” (142). The destructive power of darkness faded away with Woolf’s interplay with language to bring back lives into the house:

. . . the sun lifted the curtains, broke the veil on their eyes, and Lily Briscoe stirring in her sleep. She clutched at her blankets as a faller clutches at the turf on the edge of a cliff. Her eyes opened wide. Here she was again, she thought, sitting bolt upright in bed. Awake (143).

In the process of writing the second part, Woolf let her “feeling of transparency in words” lead her. The transparency of the two images, the darkness and four seasons, takes over our sense of time and strings out the events that had walked by during the ten years. The emptiness of the ten years passing was filled by the images and enriched by the meanings they generated. And the lives of the two words, “darkness” and “seasons” with images endowed by the writer, evolved and tinged with layers of meaning. Woolf’s writing of the second part was a creation

of a carnivalesque discourse. a renewal of language.

4. The Lighthouse

Woolf's plan for the third part of the novel began from her plan for the whole novel on August 6th, 1925. It was a very sketchy plan, similar to the second part. The main focus was the voyage to the lighthouse with Mrs. Ramsay's character threading through the whole part:

This is the voyage to the Lighthouse. Several characters can be brought in: the young atheist, the old gentleman: the lovers: Episodes can be written on woman's beauty; on truth: but these should be greater & less knobbly than those in Mrs. D [Mrs. Dalloway]: making a more harmonious whole. There need be no specification of date. Whether this will be long or short, I do not know. The dominating is to be of Mrs. R's character (*To the Lighthouse: The Original Holograph Draft* 1.5).

Basically, most of them were achieved in Woolf's actual writing of the third part except that she had not had a more specific plan about how she was going to accomplish it. She started writing the third part on May 27, 1926, two days after she finished the second one. And as usual she did not work out every aspect of the part to start writing. She let her ideas fly on paper with a big picture in mind. She wrote fast and freely.

The third part began with Lily's preparation to paint Mrs. Ramsay she did not finish ten years ago at Mr. and Mrs. Ramsay's house. Woolf did not mention this scene in the plan. This design illustrated how Woolf was very aware of her position as a writer/the other/a new "identity," instead of a participant/self of her past who was only attentive to the fragments of her memories. The opening sentence of the third part that starts with Lily's self-questioning, "What does it mean then, what can it all mean?", embodied Woolf's exertion of a carnivalesque discourse. In this case Lily was split into two roles. One was the "actor," to use Kristeva's terms, in search for an answer of the question, and the other the "spectator"/observer

who watched the whole answer-searching process and provided comments (*Desire in Language* 46). Using the character Lily to play her role as a narrator/observer, Woolf detached her personal voice from the novel. She let Lily play the other voice that questioned the images/fixed sign systems (the caring Mrs. Ramsay and tyrannical Mr. Ramsay) Woolf had established in the first two parts of the novel. By doing so, she broadened the depth of her characters.

Lily's broad and ambiguous question did not lead to a specific answer, but multiple interpretations and speculations. Lily did not only ask for herself but also for Woolf who had determined to resolve her obsession with her mother in the last part of the novel. With such double implications for the direction of the novel and Woolf's effort to make peace with her memories of her mother, Woolf successfully brought in the character of Mrs. Ramsay again when Lily related this question to her coming back after Mrs. Ramsay was dead: "For really, what did she feel, come back all these years and Mrs. Ramsay dead?" (145). Then, the aim of the third part, "the voyage to the lighthouse," came in naturally. Soon after the expedition was pointed out, more specific questions were brought out by Mr. Ramsay's "What's the use of going now?" and Nancy's, "What does one send to the Lighthouse?" (146). These questions would not be asked if Mrs. Ramsay were still alive. Her absence from the expedition to the lighthouse in the last part nurtured the growth of a carnivalesque discourse. Woolf's real text of her past and the scenes she made up in the text of the last part in the novel wove into a signifying process. To borrow Kristeva's theory, this signifying process is "the establishment and the countervailing of a sign system. Establishing a sign system calls for the identity of a speaking subject within a social framework, which he recognizes as a basis for that identity.

Countervailing the sign system is done by having the subject undergo an unsettling, questionable process . . ." (*Desire in Language* 18). The result of the process was the occurrence of a poetic language that goes beyond or survives from the already-identified, that is, in Woolf's case, her memories of her parents and her childhood, her pain. Those questions asked in the very beginning of the third part and her capacity of entering her characters' minds and speaking through their positions manifested her countervailing of her past. Detaching from her past was her attempt to figure out a new meaning for her suffering from her mother's death and her father's ignorance of her vulnerable feeling. A passage she wrote in the letter to Vita Sackville-West on February 3rd, 1926 illustrated such a signifying process undergoing in her mind:

I am back again in the thick of my novel, and things are crowding into my head: millions of things I might put in--all sorts of incongruities, which I make up walking the streets, gazing into the gas fire. Then, I struggle with them, from 10 to 1 . . . (*Letters of Virginia Woolf* III 238).

Her effort of making up "all sorts of incongruities" directed her toward the making of a carnivalesque discourse in the novel. They were "unsettled, questionable" and "one of the obscured elements in life" that Woolf as a writer tried to reveal through transforming them into words (*Virginia Woolf: Moments of Being* 73).

Woolf's design of Lily's attempt to finish the painting that she did not finish ten years ago and the Ramsays' voyage to the lighthouse exemplified the carnivalesque discourse in which both scenes brought in the explorations of the unknown and rattled the fixed sign system that had been established in the first two parts; that is, by aligning these two scenes side by side throughout the whole third part of the novel, Woolf made her characters change their attitudes

toward each other. For example, after a long struggle with the overwhelming image of Mrs. Ramsay and through her gradual understanding of the question, "What is the meaning of life?", Lily surrendered to Mr. Ramsay's demand for sympathy, which she felt she could not give him in the beginning of the third part (161). She suddenly realized, through her intermittent recollections of Mrs. Ramsay, that life was composed of "little daily miracles, illuminations, matches struck unexpectedly in the dark . . ." (161). Woolf continued to develop this thought by endowing it with another image which did not dance with Woolf in the first draft. She played with different images such as wave and light to express the reflective thought: "A thousand waves follow each other, smooth--small, and then one lifts itself; high. above the rest," "All these moments were high waves," "flashes of torches lit in lighting up the dark cave" (*The Original Holograph Draft* 293). She rephrased the wave image in the next line, but was still not satisfied with it. She crossed it out. Then, she reorganized her thought about what our constant, unchanging daily routines meant for us. The image of "flash and jerk" came into play: "what is there except flash and jerk; this and that," "things happened . . . in flashes and jerks, and in flashes and jerks--lights were pressed in one's eyes; and the things flashed and jerked" (293). She continued a little bit on the "flash and jerk" image, but in the published version those images were replaced by "a drop of silver": "It was like a drop of silver in which one dipped and illumined the darkness of the past" (*To the Lighthouse* 172).

This image, "a drop of silver," must have been worked out some time later when her major revision work started. But through her play with different images to express her thought on the meaning of life, her body must feel the pulse or the "rhythm" that the images created; if not, they are not the ones that correspond to her "deeply felt emotion" (desire). She had to try

it again and again until she could go beyond her self (her death, the fixed sign system) by groping in the darkness (a writer's blindness) to gain a new vision (otherness), that is, in this case, from "wave and light" and "flash and jerk" to "a drop of silver" in "the darkness of the past." Not only did she have to go through Cixous's six elements all over again, but also she was trying out the potential meanings that language can create--a process of renewing a dead language, a carnivalesque discourse.

On the level of playing with her character, Woolf employed the character of Lily as the observer of her own reflection on life. Through Lily, Woolf as a writer argued with herself to break the myth that her mother, the character of Mrs. Ramsay, imposed on her:

Beauty had this penalty--it came too readily, came too completely. It stilled life--froze it. One forgot the little agitations; the flush, the pallor, some queer distortion, some light or shadow, which made the face unrecognisable for a moment and yet added a quality one saw for ever after. It was simpler to smooth that out under the cover of beauty. But what was the look she had, Lily wondered, when she clapped her deer stalker's hat on her head, or ran across the grass, or scolded Kennedy, the gardener? (177-178).

By placing Mrs. Ramsay among the mortals, another sign system, Lily, or we should say Woolf here, started to see the real Mrs. Ramsay, Woolf's real mother in life. And it was at the moment that Lily felt that she gained power "to stand up to Mrs. Ramsay--a tribute to the astonishing power that Mrs. Ramsay had over one. Do this, she said, and one did it. Even her shadow at the window with James was full of authority" (176).

Woolf's forgiveness of her father, the character of Mr. Ramsay, was in the meantime carried on by James and Cam who were sailing in a boat to the lighthouse with their father. Woolf, here, also used James and Cam as observers and participants of her past to come out of the shadow of her father's tyrannical dominance of her. Woolf's sufferings at her childhood

from her father's tyranny were reflected in Cam's description of Mr. Ramsay:

But what remained intolerable . . . was that crass blindness and tyranny of his which had poisoned her childhood and raised bitter storms, so that even now she woke in the night trembling with rage and remembered some command of his; some insolence: "Do this," "Do that," his dominance: his "Submit to me" (170).

To achieve the aim of "making a harmonious whole" in her plan, Woolf countervailed the sign system by making up a scene to let James and Cam be reconciled with their father. Mr.

Ramsay's words "Well done!" to his son James, who was steering the boat the whole voyage and never expected to hear any praise from his father, changed the tense atmosphere between the father and his children when they were arriving at the lighthouse. Woolf again, as an observer and the other/the new "identity," relieved her pain from her childhood by letting the three characters interpret the whole process of her forgiving her father undergoing in her mind.

Another major theme of the third part in the novel was to accomplish the voyage to the lighthouse. How to end the novel with the Ramsays' arrival at the lighthouse and Lily's completion of the painting puzzled Woolf. She wrote about this in her diary on September 5, 1926:

The problem is how to bring Lily & Mr. R[amsay]. together & make a combination of interest at the end. I am feathering about with various ideas. The last chapter which I begin tomorrow is In the Boat: I had meant to end with R. climbing on to the rock. If so, what becomes [of] Lily & her picture & summing up R.'s character? In that case I lose the intensity of the moment. If this intervenes, between R. & the lighthouse, there's too much chop & change, I think. Could I do it in a parenthesis? so that one had the sense of reading the two things at the same time? (*The Diary of Virginia Woolf* III 106).

She did use parentheses to tell readers what had been happening in one scene when the other was taking place at the same time, which she had used in the second part to inform us the death of Mrs. Ramsay and her children Prue and Andrew. But besides the use of parentheses,

she aligned the two scenes with her intermittent description of Lily's eyes following the Ramsays' sailing to the lighthouse from the beach where Lily was finishing the painting:

. . . she looked at the bay beneath her, making hillocks of the blue bars of the waves, and stony fields of the purpler spaces, again she was roused as usual by something incongruous. There was a brown spot in the middle of the bay. It was a boat. Yes, she realised that after a second. But whose boat? Mr. Ramsay's boat, she replied. Mr. Ramsay; the man who had marched past her, with his hand raised, aloof, at the head of a procession, in his beautiful boots, asking her for sympathy, which she had refused. The boat was now half-way across the bay (182).

The "incongruous" distraction of Mr. Ramsay's boat from Lily's painting and Lily's inner thoughts of Mrs. and Mr. Ramsay was a typical performance of a carnivalesque discourse that countervails the fixed sign system, that is, in Lily's case, her coherent thoughts of her painting and her inner thoughts. Woolf here acted as a pure observer/the other to arrange the two scenes simultaneously as though she was painting two different scenes that happen at the same time on a canvas, except that she used words, not lines and colors, to paint the images in her mind.

Most of the time in the third part Woolf tried to resolve her obsession with her mother and make new meaning out of her past, using Lily's reflections on Mrs. Ramsay and Lily's regret not to give the sympathy that Mr. Ramsay needed. Even so, she did not forget about the boat scene she made up in this part. She used Lily's inner thoughts to make a connection to the boat scene:

Her eyes rested on the brown speck of Mr. Ramsay's sailing boat. They would be at the Lighthouse by lunch time she supposed (192).

Then, Woolf made up the scene in which the boat was about to arrive at the Lighthouse and James and Cam's surprise at Mr. Ramsay's praise to James. Toward the end of the third part, Woolf led us to enter James' and Cam's inner thoughts of Mr. Ramsay and their arrival at the

lighthouse:

They watched him, both of them, sitting bareheaded with his parcel on his knee staring and staring at the frail blue shape which seemed like the vapour of something that had burnt itself away. What do you want? They both wanted to ask. They both wanted to say, Ask us anything and we will give it you. But he did not ask them anything. He sat and looked at the island and he might be thinking, We perished, each alone, or he might be thinking, I have reached it. I have found it; but he said nothing (207).

What Mr. Ramsay did say was “Bring those parcels” and “The parcels for the Lighthouse men” (207). Woolf here still used the characters of James and Cam to describe how she felt about Mr. Ramsay, the character of her father, which, by doing so, further detached herself from involving her personal feelings toward the character of Mr. Ramsay:

He rose and stood in the bow of the boat, very straight and tall, for all the world, James thought, as if he were saying, “There is no God,” and Cam thought, as if he were leaping into space, and they both rose to follow him as he sprang, lightly like a young man, holding his parcel, on to the rock (207).

Although she did not directly describe the character of Mr. Ramsay or his inner thoughts, this passage expressed clearly what kind of a person Mr. Ramsay or her father was in her eyes.

To achieve the effect of the simultaneity of things, Woolf made the two scenes--Lily's completion of her painting at the beach and the Ramsays' arrival at the lighthouse--happen at the same story time. She led us to Lily's inner thought to connect the two scenes:

“He must have reached it,” said Lily Briscoe aloud, feeling suddenly completely tired out. For the Lighthouse had become almost invisible, had melted away into a blue haze, and the effort of looking at it and the effort of thinking of him landing there, which both seemed to be one and the same effort, had stretched her body and mind to the utmost. Ah, but she was relieved. Whatever she had wanted to give him, when he left her that morning; she had given him at last (208).

Actually, “the effort of thinking of him landing there, which both seemed to be one and the same effort,” belonged to Woolf's as a writer/the other/the new “identity.” She receded her

self/ego in the process of writing these two scenes in order to make some room for James', Cam's, and Lily's views (heterogeneous elements). To conclude her personal visions of her parents and her childhood, she used Lily's painting to make them a wholeness, an artist vision, shared by anyone who read it:

Quickly, as if she were recalled by something over there, she turned to her canvas . . . It would be hung in the attics, she thought; it would be destroyed. But what did that matter? she asked herself, taking up her brush again. She looked at the steps; they were empty; she looked at her canvas; it was blurred. With a sudden intensity, as if she saw it clear for a second, she drew a line there, in the centre. It was done; it was finished. Yes, she thought, laying down her brush in extreme fatigue, I have had my vision (208-209).

With the Ramsays' landing at the lighthouse, Lily finished her painting, her vision, and also the writer's. And when the vision was done in the act of writing, it no longer belonged to Woolf's. She had accomplished a work of art, a new narrative style, with the other's/the new "identity's" eye to "see" to it.

E. Summary

The death of Woolf's mother launched the drive for the novel. With her desire to make sense of the non-being moments and turn them into an artistic one to relieve her pain, she detached her self and searched the other/a new "identity" inside her. To make the novel a work of art, she had to keep going in and coming out of her characters to reach a compromise between her self/ego and the other/the new "identity" and accomplish her experiment of presenting things simultaneously. This unique narrative reveals that human thoughts and feelings do not act in a linear way, but radiate out "all over the place." She succeeded to countervail the conventional narrative in fiction writing, a fixed sign system. With an introduction of the possibility to transform a written text into a painter's canvas, she

compressed the linear time into the present moment with a play with her characters' inner thoughts—that is, an interplay between the other/the new “identity” and her characters/language. Her whole creative process of the novel was an interior voyage, like the voyage to the Lighthouse in the story. To complete the voyage and the role as the other/the new “identity,” she argued with the characters/language, agreed with them, eavesdropped on them, and ridiculed them (Bakhtin 46). It was an everlasting inner dialogue between Woolf as the other/the new “identity” and her characters/language.

To produce a novel out of this reasoning process, Woolf had to transmit people's various opinions and her own memories and imagination to her characters, whose inner thoughts and feelings portrayed the soul of the novel, Mrs. Ramsay, Woolf's mother in her real life. And while Woolf employed her characters to write about her mother, she was engaging in a carnivalesque discourse that marginalized her private memories of her mother. In other words, in the process, playing the role of a writer (a new “identity”), she broke off her painful memories and endowed new meanings to her past by convening various points of view and applying a new image to one scene with a subtle, critical tone to detach her self/ego from her intimate memories. Her reflections on the past and the struggle to leave her past behind continuously play with one another in her mind throughout the whole actual writing process. Without the interplay between Woolf/the writer/the other/a new “identity” and her characters/language that had silently proceeded in her mind, the novel would just be the writer's self-pitying or narcissistic murmurings of her past. It would not become a form of novel, but a series of dull reminiscences (conscious thoughts and feelings). In order to overcome it, the important element, the carnivalesque discourse, had been acted out and well-

planned in Woolf's unconscious (an interplay between the conscious and unconscious) long before the novel came into being. It was seeded first, and then it grew, like a life that needs various elements to sustain, a process of becoming the other/a new "identity."

Chapter VI

VIRGINIA WOOLF'S INTERIOR CREATIVE PROCESS FOR *A ROOM OF ONE'S OWN*

"This essay, which is largely fictitious, is based upon the visit of an outsider to a university and expresses the thoughts suggested by a comparison between the different standards of luxury at a man's college and at a woman's. This leads to a sketch of women's circumstances in the past, and the effect of those circumstances upon their writing." (A blurb by Virginia Woolf for the first edition of *A Room of One's Own* of the Hogarth Press quoted by S. P. Rosenbaum in *Virginia Woolf: Women & Fiction--The Manuscript Version of A Room of One's Own* xli).

This chapter aims to explore Woolf's interior creative process when she wrote *A Room of One's Own*, an essay, which Woolf claimed to be "fictitious." The "fictitious" quality of the essay signifies that this is a work of Woolf's imagination and creativity, similar to her creation of novels. Structured also by four contextual frames, the analysis of Woolf's interior voyage toward creating *A Room of One's Own* in this chapter is modeled on Wallace's case study method that I applied to Woolf's *To the Lighthouse*: (1) relevant work enterprise, (2) professional milieu, (3) work as a whole, (4) and text. The first two contextual systems bring out Woolf's creative process of generating the book from her point of view. I analyze the factors that launched the book and why the book was made. Using the data obtained from the first two contextual systems, the last two interpret Woolf's interior creative process from the theory that I construct for a writer's interior creative process. Besides Cixous's six elements and Kristeva's and Bakhtin's theories, I use the second type of inner creative experience (a sequence of vision-desire-drive), instead of the first one (a sequence of drive-desire-vision) applied in the fifth chapter, to explain Woolf's creative process.

The first contextual frame, relevant work enterprise, focuses on how and when the original writing idea of the book was initiated, what other projects Woolf engaged in to develop her original writing idea, and how Cixous's six elements are related to Woolf's interior creative

process of originating and developing the writing idea. Besides Woolf's diaries written from 1920 to 1928, two articles she published in the *New Statesman* are the major sources I use to understand the factors that originated Woolf's writing idea about women and fiction.

Rosenbaum's introduction to *Women & Fiction: The Manuscript Versions of A Room of One's Own* (1992) provides important information about when and why Woolf decided to include two lectures at two women's colleges at Cambridge in 1928 in the book. The second contextual frame, professional milieu, introduces other outer influences that affected Woolf's creative process and how Cixous's six elements are related to Woolf's interior creative process. The data used for this part are Woolf's diary written in 1920, Leonard Woolf's autobiography *Downhill All the Way* (1967), and Leaska's biography of Virginia Woolf *Granite and Rainbow* (1998).

The third contextual frame, work as a whole, tends to examine Woolf's interior creative process while making *A Room of One's Own* as a process of creating a new "personal identity," a unique writing style. Using the other type of inner creative experience (a sequence of vision-desire-drive) and Cixous's theory on a writer's renouncement of his/her present self/ego to make room for the other, I re-interpret Woolf's creative process of the project started in 1920 and carried on by her intermittently for nine years until she had it published in 1929. The data applied in this section comes from the first two contextual frames.

The last contextual frame, text, emphasizes how Woolf "creatively develop[ed] her arguments through reasoning and association in images and scenes"--an interplay between Woolf as the other/new "identity" and the others/language/characters (*Women & Fiction* xi). Woolf's "reasoning" of her major argument that a woman should be financially independent

and have a room of her own to write fiction was exemplified by the disadvantaged lives of her forerunners. In other words, through “reasoning,” she challenged patriarchal views about women's inferiority in intellectuality and creativity. Her train of thought led her to express her arguments--a unique writing style, a new “language” she created through her play with the language hidden in her unconscious. With “association,” she created “images” such as a fish to explain how her train of thought was at work. Taking on the role of a novelist, she re-created the “scenes” such as the story of Shakespeare's sister to support her “reasoning.” This kind of writing skill, “reasoning and association,” embodied an interplay between the other/a new “identity” and the others/language/characters. Throughout the whole text of *A Room of One's Own*, except for the first two pages of the first chapter, such an interplay was employed throughout the entire text. Therefore, I do not divide the fourth contextual frame into six small parts according to the six chapters that Woolf made in the text. Instead, the fourth contextual frame in this chapter is separated into two parts: (1) the creation of a new “language”: Woolf's train of thought and (2) Woolf's re-creation of her predecessors' lives: an interplay between the other and the others/characters. For the first part, to exemplify how Woolf created a new “language” when writing this book, I discuss how Woolf made up the fish metaphor to illustrate her thoughts at work. For the second part, I chose the story of Shakespeare's sister that Woolf created to demonstrate how Woolf as the other played with other voices/characters in support of her theory that women need money and a room of their own to write fiction. The published text *A Room of One's Own* and its manuscript edited and introduced by Rosenbaum are the major data sources used in the last contextual system.

A. Woolf's Relevant Work Enterprise

This section first aims to give an overview of Woolf's creative process from her diaries, two articles published in the *New Statesman*, her husband's autobiography, Leaska's biography of her, and Rosenbaum's introduction to the manuscript of the book. Then, I examine the relation between Cixous's six elements and Woolf's creative process in depth. Based on these two goals, this section intends to find (1) when and how the first writing idea of the work was launched by Woolf, (2) other projects Woolf took on to develop her original writing idea into a book she made years later, and (3) the relation of Cixous's six elements (body, desire, death, blindness, self, and otherness) to Woolf's creative process of originating a writing idea and developing it.

1. Woolf's Original Writing Idea

Woolf developed *A Room of One's Own* from her writing of *Women and Fiction*, which originated from her two lectures given to two women's colleges, Newnham and Girton at Cambridge, in 1928. But Woolf's ideas in the two talks can be traced back to Woolf's diary entry on September 26, 1920, in which she wrote that she wanted to write "a paper upon Women, as a counterblast to Mr. Bennett's adverse views reported in the papers" (*The Diary of Virginia Woolf* II 69). We do not know if Woolf did really write this paper because no manuscript has survived, and there has been no record of its publication. But she fired her anger at Mr. Bennett's views about women in her response to Desmond MacCarthy, "the columnist 'Affable Hawk' for the *New Statesman*" (*The Diary of Virginia Woolf* II, Appendix III, 339). MacCarthy, in his weekly column reported on October 20, 1920, "agreed with Mr.

Bennett that 'no amount of education and liberty of action will sensibly alter' the fact that women are inferior to men in intellectual power, and that women's indisputable 'desire to be dominated is . . . a proof of intellectual inferiority'" (339). The following week Woolf published an article, entitled "The Intellectual Status of Women."

In this article, Woolf refuted Bennett's and Affable Hawk's (MacCarthy's pen name) views about women's intellectual inferiority by listing women writers such as Jane Austen, Emily Bronte, George Eliot, Jane Harrison, etc., to argue that women's "advance in intellectual power seems to me not only sensible but immense; the comparison with men not in the least one that inclines me to suicide; and the effects of education and liberty scarcely to be overrated" (*The Diary of Virginia Woolf* II, Appendix III, 339). Then, she continued her argument by bringing out Sappho, who was considered a great poetess in ancient Greece. Emphasizing Sappho's achievement in literature, Woolf wrote, "Plato and Aristotle placed [Sappho] with Homer and Archilocus among the greatest of their poets" (340).

The fray did not stop because Affable Hawk fought back with his conclusion "on the question of education" (340). He insisted that first of all men were superior to women intellectually. Even though women were placed in the same favorable conditions as men, their achievements could not surpass men's. Secondly, having the same access to literature, poetry, music, and painting as men did, women's achievements in those areas could hardly be compared with men's, except for fiction perhaps. Thirdly, women did not come anywhere close to men's pursuits of pure intellect, although in the meantime he emphasized that he did not mean that "a small percentage of women are not just as clever as any clever men, just as good artists . . . only that it seems that they fall short of the few men who are best of all"

(340).

Writing under the same title "The Intellectual Status of Women," Woolf immediately responded to Affable Hawk's views by indicating that women's poor intellectual performance was due to "some external restraint upon their powers" (340). For one, women had been deprived of a proper education. And it was not the only reason because women's lack of "liberty of experience" also accounted for the intellectual limits imposed on them. Woolf concluded that women,

should differ from men without fear and express their difference openly (for I do not agree with 'Affable Hawk' that men and women are alike); that all activity of the mind should be so encouraged that there will always be in existence a nucleus of women who think, invent, imagine, and create as freely as men do, and with as little fear of ridicule and condescension" (342).

Woolf's points expressed in these two articles under the same title "The Intellectual Status of Women" in 1920 continued in her much later talks at Newnham and Girton in October 1928, and were preserved and extended in *A Room of One's Own*, published on October 24, 1929. For example, her idea that women need a room of their own to write in the published version is an extension of her reason that women had been deprived of "liberty of experience." And her reason accounted for women's inferiority in creativity. Her arguments regarding Sappho and Shakespeare were also preserved and broadened in the published text.

2. Woolf's Talks at Newnham and Girton: "Women and Fiction"

The central idea of *A Room of One's Own*, that women should have a room of their own in order to write, did not occur to Woolf until the two lectures she gave at Newnham and Girton at Cambridge in October 1928. The topic of her two speeches was "Women and

Fiction." The original papers written for the two lectures cannot be found. According to E. E. Phare, the president of the Newnham Arts Society at the time, whose report about Woolf's speech is one of the few records we can rely on, Woolf encouraged her audience to write novels and send them to the Hogarth Press, which Woolf and her husband owned. Phare wrote about Woolf's visit for the Newnham magazine *Thersites*:

Mrs. Virginia Woolf ... spoke in College Hall on "Women and Fiction". The reasons why women novelists were for so long so few were largely a question of domestic architecture: it was not, and it is not easy to compose in a parlour. Now that women are writing . . . they should not try to adapt themselves to the prevailing literary standards, which are likely to be masculine, but make others of their own; they should remake the language, so that it becomes a more fluid thing and capable of delicate usage (*Women & Fiction* xv-xvi).

Invited by the Girton ODTAA Society, Woolf's speech at Girton was one week after her talk at Newnham. Speaking on the same topic "Women and Fiction," Woolf must have slightly varied her talk at Girton from Newnham because ODTAA's interests were not limited to arts and literature only. (ODTAA stood for "one dame thing after another" taken from John Masefield's title of a novel). Thus, the Girton speech may have covered "the ignorance of women, chastity, and war" besides "women and fiction" (*Women and Fiction* xvii). And all of these themes were written into *A Room of One's Own*. The only record we have for the Girton speech from Woolf was found in her diary entry on October 27, 1928, one day after the speech. She wrote about her impression of the audience, "Starved but valiant young women--that's my impression." Revealing a little bit of what she said in the speech, she continued, "I blandly told them to drink wine and have a room of their own" (*The Diary of Virginia Woolf* III 200).

The two speeches given at Newnham and Girton were soon developed into an article at

the end of the same year titled "Women and Fiction," published in the *Forum* in America in March 1929, in which Woolf claimed in the end that women write better novels as long as they "have what has so long been denied them--leisure, and money, and a room to themselves" (*Women and Fiction*, Appendix 4, 201). But the idea of making a book out of the two lectures given at Newnham and Girton did not occur to Woolf until early 1929. She composed the book in her head with the same title "Women and Fiction" in mind the first three weeks when she was ill in bed after she came back from her visit to Vita Sackville-West in Berlin in late January. In the following three weeks, she transformed her idea into writing, though she did not totally recover from the illness after the trip to Berlin. She noted in her diary about how she was excited about it, "I . . . have spent my energy since in one of my excited outbursts of composition--writing what I made up in bed, a final version of Women and Fiction" (*The Diary of Virginia Woolf* III 218-219). Her quickness of drafting the book within one month was made of the form, "half talk, half soliloquy" (*Diary* III 221). She wrote in the same diary entry that this form "forced itself upon me (in this form--the thinking had been done and the writing stiffly and unsatisfactorily 4 times before) as I lay in bed after Berlin" (221-222). A month later, in her diary entry on May 12, she announced that she had just finished her "final revision of Women and Fiction" (223). The title "Women and Fiction" was somehow changed into *A Room of One's Own* during this time when Leonard Woolf, on May 16, wrote a letter to Donald Brace, who planned to publish the book the following spring, to tell him that his wife preferred to have "Women and Fiction" published under a different title (the first time that the new title was mentioned) in the autumn of 1929. There was no record to show why she changed the title, but it seemed that the change of the title did not bother her for she noted in

her diary on August 19 that she had finished “the last correction to *Women & Fiction*, or a *Room of One's Own*” (*The Diary of Virginia Woolf* III 242).

3. Cixous's Six Elements Examined in Woolf's Creative Process of Initiating a Writing Idea and Developing It into a Book *A Room of One's Own*

Using the data obtained from above that analyzed the background of Woolf's creative process, this section tends to explain Woolf's mind at work. I provide an alternative interpretation of her interior creative process by applying Cixous's six elements to examine Woolf's creative process. My analyzation of Woolf's creative process is divided into two parts: (a) Woolf's creative process of initiating a writing idea about women and fiction and (b) her creative process of developing the writing idea into the book *A Room of One's Own*.

a. Relating Cixous's Six Elements to Woolf's Creative Process of Initiating a Writing Idea

Woolf's creative process of making *A Room of One's Own* seems simple and unconvincing if we only trace the relevant writing projects and activities--“The Intellectual Status of Women, two lectures given at Newnham and Girton, and the “Women and Fiction” article published in the *Forum* in America-- and then conclude that they result in Woolf's making of the book. How Woolf's mind was at work must be illuminated. Therefore, this section aims to give a solid understanding of how Woolf ignited her creativity and imagination. Specifically, what did she experience inside to create a new “identity” for *A Room of One's Own*? Cixous's six elements--body, desire, death, self, blindness, and otherness--that reveal what a writer goes through inside to turn his/her creativity and imagination into words (that is, how a writer goes to the unknown, the unconscious to create) should shed light on Woolf's

interior creative process. To examine how Cixous's six elements are related to Woolf's interior creative process, we have to start from how Woolf initiated a writing idea until it evolved into a book. The writing projects and activities that contributed to Woolf's making of the book are important clues (data) for the in-depth analysis of Woolf's interior creative process.

Originated by her reading of Arnold Bennett's book *Our Women* and Desmond MacCarthy's column, Woolf's writing idea in "the Intellectual Status of Women" (that women are just as good as men in every mental aspect) did not just occur to her. She did not just borrow the idea from the women's movement that had long been launched before she was born and was still taking place in the early twentieth century in America. Her quick and thoughtful response to MacCarthy's column showed that she must have lived such an idea for a long time. She felt she could argue against them by "making up a paper upon Women" right after the publication of Bennett's book *Our Women* in September 1920. She did write one, "The Intellectual Status of Women," one week after MacCarthy's column appeared in the *New Statesman* on October 2 of the same year, which supported Bennett's view about women. Before Woolf was able to get her pen in the ink and start to scribble on paper, Woolf as a woman and a writer must have first sensed and received the attack personally. Her sense of the attack was reflected in the very beginning of "The Intellectual Status of Women." She wrote, "Sir,--Like most women, I am unable to face the depression and the loss of self respect which Mr Arnold Bennett's blame . . . would certainly cause me . . ." (*The Diary of Virginia Woolf* II, Appendix III, 339). Seeing herself as one of her gender, she took Bennett and MacCarthy's insult on women's intellectual inferiority not only personally but emotionally. Her emotional response to the insult imposed by Bennett and MacCarthy was her deeply felt anger projected

on paper. Such an anger was fleshly/bodily felt first before it became words like “depression and the loss of self respect.” This anger urged her to write, to pour out everything that the anger aroused. Cixous’s “breath” metaphor to describe what she felt inside that pushed her to write helps us understand the anger that Woolf experienced inside and formed a great force to make her write it out. Cixous wrote,

An urge shook my body, changed my rhythms, tossed madly in my chest, made time unlivable for me. I was stormy. “Burst!” “You may speak!” And besides, whose voice is that? The Urge had the violence of a thunderclap. Who’s striking me? Who’s attacking me from behind? And in my body the breath of a giant, but no sentences at all. Who’s pushing me? Who’s invading? Who’s changing me into a monster? Into a mouse wanting to swell to the size of a prophet? (*Coming to Writing* 9-10).

If for Cixous it is the “breath” that “wants’ a form,” then it was the anger instigated by Bennett and MacCarthy’s insult on women’s intellectuality and creativity that begged Woolf to “write me” (*Coming to Writing* 10). In other words, Woolf’s emotionally charged statement was her felt-thought at work, which, to quote Harold Rugg’s definition, “is feeling in tensed body movement” (*Imagination* 282).

After she fired her anger, Woolf had to go beyond her personal emotion, her self, to bring out what was behind the anger, that is, her deeply buried desire to know what is beyond her, in her unconscious/the unknown which tells the forbidden, unspeakable “truth, the “equivalen[t] to death” (*Three Steps* 37). In the case of Woolf’s “The Intellectual Status of Women,” the “truth” was the great women writers before her. To fight against Bennett and MacCarthy’s view about women, she brought her predecessors back. She stated:

When I compare the Duchess of Newcastle with Jane Austen, the matchless Orinda with Emily Bronte, Mrs Heywood with George Eliot, Aphra Behn with Charlotte Bronte, Jane Grey with Jane Harrison, the advance in intellectual power seems to me not only sensible but immense; the comparison with men not in the least one that inclines me to suicide . . .

(*The Diary of Virginia Woolf* II, Appendix III, 339).

Bringing in her predecessors' achievements in literature dissolved Woolf's own emotion, her anger. To detach from her own feeling, she renounced her present self/ego to make room for the other, her role as a writer. As the other/writer, she set out on an adventure to the unknown/the unconscious--that is, groping in the dark like a blind person--to imagine why few women's voices were heard in the fields of literature, music, and painting from the past till her time. With a blind person's vision drawn from the unknown that "stops the least, that encloses the least," she concluded that women and men were different (*Coming to Writing* 10). Woolf wrote,

It is that women should have liberty of experience; that they should differ from men without fear and express their difference openly (for I do not agree with "Affable Hawk" that men and women are alike); that all activity of the mind should be so encouraged that there will always be in existence a nucleus of women who think, invent, imagine, and create as freely as men do, and with as little fear of ridicule and condescension (*The Diary of Virginia Woolf* II, Appendix III, 342).

Such a bold statement was a result of Woolf's imagination and creativity at work. She plunged herself into her unconscious, the unknown, creating a theory to explain the reason why we had few women writers, musicians, and painters. Seeing with a blind person's vision, applying Cixous's words to Woolf's interior creative process, Woolf transformed her personal emotion into "a prophet's" words that came "from an inconceivable region, deep down inside [her] but unknown, as if there might exist somewhere in [her] body . . ." "without a frame, without skin, without walls, the flesh that doesn't cry, doesn't stiffen, doesn't clot the wild blood that wants to stream through it--forever": her unconscious that provided limitless possibilities for the use of her creativity (*Coming to Writing* 10).

b. Relating Cixous's Six Elements to Woolf's Creative Process of Making the Book *A Room of One's Own*

The fray between Woolf and MacCarthy ceased, but it took her eight years to come to the conclusion that women need their own space to become a novelist in *A Room of One's Own*. Her original idea that women were inferior to men intellectually due to women's lack of education and liberty evolved into her speeches given at Newnham and Girton eight years later. In the two lectures, she emphasized that the reason for fewer women novelists was the "domestic architecture" which did not allow a woman to develop her creativity. She did not reach the answer by accident. During the eight years, she had established herself as a novelist with the publications of *Jacob's Room* (1923), *Mrs. Dalloway* (1925), and *To the Lighthouse* (1927). Her experimental approach to the three novels with a creation of her unique narrative (simultaneity of things) proved that she could create as a woman. *To the Lighthouse* particularly gained more notice both in London and the States than the other two works. She literally practiced the theory that she developed in "The Intellectual Status of Women" that women need liberty to create. She had a room of her own to write fiction--a workroom at the Monks House, where she moved in 1919. Without the experience of being a successful novelist, she could have never urged the students at Newnham and Girton to "have a room of their own" to write novels while drawing on the topic "Women and Fiction." After the two lectures at the two schools, she still thought about them and wanted to make a book out of the two speeches. They became an article first with a few pages first published in the *Forum* in America, and then a book *A Room of One's Own* with six chapters soon after.

Developing two lectures into a book within a few months (from February 1929 to April 1929), Woolf combined the points she made in the two speeches (the thoughts she had worked on--the conscious part) with the made-up part (her imagination/a blind person's vision--the unconscious one) that turned a criticism on "Women and Fiction" into a "fictitious" essay as she claimed for the publication of the first edition of the book. But what was her interior creative process in creating the book and how are Cixous's six elements (body, desire, death, self, blindness, and otherness) related to her creative process?

Woolf did not start writing the book until early February in 1929. The idea of making a book out of the two lectures given at Newnham and Girton in October of the previous year came to her right after she came back from Berlin on January 16th, 1929. She might have thought about it before that, though there was no record to prove that she had planned to write a book on "Women and Fiction" before she went to Berlin. It was not until March 28, 1929 in her diary entry that we were first told she was writing the "final version of Women and Fiction" (*The Diary of Virginia Woolf* III 219). An interim version was the article she finished at the end of the previous year and published in the *Forum* in New York in March. The "final version" was to become *A Room of One's Own*.

Woolf revealed a little bit of her interior creative process in generating the book in her diary entry on March 28. She wrote, "I . . . have spent my energy since in one of my excited outbursts of composition--writing what I made up in bed, a final version of Women and Fiction" (*The Diary of Virginia Woolf* III 218-219). Her excitement disclosed that her writing of the book not only involved her mind but also her emotion, which came to her so strongly that she described it "excited outbursts of composition." To borrow Cixous's words in

describing how writing “captured” her, such a strong emotional “attack” was fleshly received by Woolf first--that is, by her **body**--before she could transform her excitedness about the book into words (*Coming to Writing* 9). She sensed a writing idea rising inside her and it made her excited. And the excitement must have come from her feeling of being able to make up, to create a book out of the two talks given at Newnham and Girton. The excitedness pushed her to **desire** to know what was beyond her, to adventure into the unknown, her creativity. Once the journey toward the unknown/her creativity was begun, she could not stop it. She described what it was like to let her “excited outbursts of composition” lead her to write the book:

It made itself up and forced itself upon me . . . as I lay in bed after Berlin. I used to make it up at such a rate that when I got pen and paper I was like a water bottle turned upside down. The writing was as quick as my hand could write . . . but this way gives one freedom and lets one leap from back to back of one's thoughts (*The Diary of Virginia Woolf* III 221-222).

The “freedom” she gained from her venture beyond her meant that the wall between her present self/ego and the other/the made-up part/her imagination she was searching in the unknown/the unconscious had been torn down. Given the “freedom,” her imagination could fly and create a “fictitious” essay. Like how Cixous portrayed what it was like to be urged to write, Woolf had no control over her downpouring “urge”/excitedness. She described this urge/excitedness as “a water bottle turned upside down.” This “urge” streamed through the forbidden, the unspeakable--that is, the **truth/death**--to swim in a world that “stops the least, that encloses the least . . . without a frame, without skin, without walls” (*Coming to Writing* 10). In this world, her imagination took over because she was groping images and scenes in the **dark/blindness**/her imagination.

Cixous's six elements have given us an alternative way to interpret Woolf's interior

voyage toward making *A Room of One's Own*. But my analysis of Woolf's interior creative process through Cixous's six elements in this section is based on the writing projects ("The Intellectual Status of Women," "Women and Fiction" published in the *Forum*) and activities (two lectures given at Newnham and Girton) she took to complete the book. Some other outer factors might have contributed to her completion of the work. Understanding those factors helps us understand more about how Woolf came to the conclusion that women need a room of their own to write fiction in *A Room of One's Own*. Therefore, in the next section, I explore other factors that resulted from her professional milieu to examine how those factors affected her interior creative process and how Cixous's six elements are related to them.

B. Woolf's Professional Milieu

Woolf's interest in the topic "Women and Fiction" was reinforced by five major events that took place during the first three decades of the twentieth century: (1) the women's movement in America where women fought for the right to vote in the first two decades of the twentieth century, (2) her teaching at Morley College (1905-1907), (3) running Hogarth Press with her husband, Leonard, as publishers in 1917, (4) the increasing admiration of her works in America from 1925 onwards, and (5) owning a room of her own to write novels.

The first event that initiated Woolf's interest and continuous pursuit of the topic "Women and Fiction" was the women's movement. Its initial goal was to gain women's right to vote. In 1920 women finally won their political rights nationwide in the States. But women were still denied proper education, barred from certain occupations, and confined to home and family after the women's suffrage movement. Although no record tells us that Woolf was interested in

the women's movement taking place in America, she must have been aware of its development and those unresolved issues. In "The Intellectual Status of Women," her idea of women's lack of proper education to write was not new. She just borrowed it to demonstrate her point why there were few women novelists, artists, and musicians in history. This known theory written into the article "The Intellectual Status of Women" and later on in *A Room of One's Own* showed that her thought on women's educational rights was affected by the women's movement that started from the mid nineteenth century.

The second event that left a deep impression in her mind was teaching at Morley College from 1905 to 1907, "an evening institute in South London for working people" (*Granite and Rainbow* 107). She taught literature and English history to working women and essay-writing to working men and women. While teaching there, she found that her female students were "enthusiastic . . . [about] books" and "refreshing after the educated" even though they were from the working class (*A Passionate Apprentice: The Early Journals* 218). Woolf's personal experience with working women made her aware of working class men and women's lack of access to education. This experience also laid groundwork for her to develop her theory about women's unavailability to have education because they were confined to domestic duties. This theory of hers was evolved and written into "The Intellectual Status of Women," in which Woolf reasoned that even though raising children had taken much of women's "time and strength," women "have improved" which "shows that they may still improve," even without money and proper education (*The Diary of Virginia Woolf* II, Appendix III, 342). Woolf wrote this theory into *A Room of One's Own*, where she argued that it was hard for working class women to have proper education because "to endow college would necessitate the suppression

of families altogether," not to mention the fact that women had to bear "thirteen children" in the meantime (22).

The third thing that led Woolf to write that women need "liberty of experience" to write fiction in "The Intellectual Status of Women" came from her personal experience as a woman novelist and half owner of Hogarth Press. Because of Hogarth Press, Woolf claimed that she was "the only woman in England free to write what I like," which I think partly made her realize how important it was for a woman to have the "liberty of experience" to write whatever she wanted to write. She thought that women and men were different in terms of their intellectuality and creativity and both women's and men's thoughts and feelings had to be respected (*The Diary of Virginia Woolf* II 43). This idea was extended to *A Room of One's Own*, in which she pointed out that "the values of women differ very often from the values which have been made by the other sex; naturally, this is so" (73). While male voices dominated the world of literature, Woolf emphasized that "literature is open to everybody" because "there is no gate, no lock, no bolt that [anyone] can set upon the freedom of [her] mind" (75-76).

The next major event that directed her thoughts expressed in *To the Lighthouse* was the increasing popularity of her novels *Jacob's Room* (1923) and *Mrs. Dalloway* (1925), in which she experimented with different narrative (mental time) from the conventional one (chronological time). She felt relieved that her experimental style was accepted, and it gave her more freedom to write whatever she liked. The popularity of *To the Lighthouse* (1927), in which she had perfected her experiment in presenting the simultaneity of things, was not only a great achievement in her breakthrough to create a new narrative but also stabilized her

finances. Over three thousand copies of the novel were sold in two months right after it was published. This book also won more favorable reviews. It made her more confident to write in *A Room of One's Own* that women's literature, though dealing with "the feelings of women in a drawing room" which would be criticized as "insignificant" compared with men's treatment of "war," should not be downgraded (74).

The fifth major event that led Woolf to claim that women need a room of their own to write fiction was embodied in Woolf's real working environment at home, the Monks House, in the rear of which she had her own workroom. She had a large table "covered with filth[y] packets, papers, letters, manuscripts, and large bottles of ink" on it, though she never used it, according to Leonard Woolf's autobiography (*Downhill All the Way* 57). She usually sat in an armchair with a writing board across her lap, writing her first draft of all her novels in big notebooks with pen and ink every day from ten to one in the morning and typed out what she wrote in the notebooks in the afternoon (*Granite and Rainbow* 231-232). Therefore, it was not a coincidence that in her speech to the women students at Girton she urged them to "have a room of their own" which later became the subject and the published title of *A Room of One's Own* (*The Diary of Virginia Woolf* III 200).

To relate Cixous's six elements to the five outer factors that affected Woolf's interior creative process, we have to first analyze how Woolf internalized the new values and beliefs that the women's movement had broached. The learning process of Woolf's new values and beliefs on equal political rights, equal pay, and an equal opportunity in receiving proper education is like how we learn canons. To borrow Holland's theory, canons refer to our "politics or values or beliefs, a person's 'philosophy' in the loose sense, a mental 'set'" (*The*

Brain of Robert Frost 104). Two types of canons decide a person's sense of who he/she is: background-canons and viewpoint-canons. The former are a person's "heritage, education, and life experiences"; the latter reflect a person's "opinions and beliefs" (104). While our background-canons stay with us, the viewpoint-canons get changed more easily. To use Holland's theory, Woolf established her viewpoint-cannons with the values and beliefs she gained from the women's movement. But those values could not become part of her thinking system if she had not identified herself as a woman novelist with informal education as her background-canons first. The process of internalizing the new values and beliefs, through corresponding to her background-canons, took time to become part of her--that is, to be fleshly/bodily felt--before she could turn what was internalized into her own words, her own beliefs.

And this internalized process was not completed until Woolf transformed the viewpoint-canons into background-canons. In other words, it has to become part of her life experiences, "to use [her] whole body to enable the world to become flesh," to use Cixous's words--a process of sensing what she is and what she can be, a journey "to the heart of the country of the unconscious," "a body-to-body journey in order to discover the body," a written product (*Three Steps* 65). Woolf's teaching at Morley College was part of the internalized process of turning the viewpoint-canons to be fleshly/bodily felt. Her contact with her working-class students who were "enthusiastic" about books and "refreshing after the educated" was her first step to assimilate the viewpoint-canons into her life experiences and further make her look at things differently and go beyond her self who had easy access to various kinds of books, though had never taken formal education, to engage with the other, that is, her writing of "The

Intellectual Status of Women.”

This internalized process went even deeper into Woolf’s “heart of the country of the unconscious” while she and her husband started building up their own business, the Hogarth Press. With the Hogarth Press, she could publish the books she wanted to, including her own experimental short stories and novels. The “freedom” to publish any books she liked further made her “desire to name” the other (her own words and stories) that she discovered in the “body-to-body journey” (*The I* by Holland 88; *Three Steps* by Cixous 65). In the process of discovering the other, she set her self free from the popular taste of her contemporary in fiction writing--a process of desiring to know what is beyond her in order to tell the forbidden, unspeakable truth (death).

Becoming a woman novelist whose experimental novels *Jacob’s Room*, *Mrs. Dalloway*, and *To the Lighthouse* were accepted by her readers further internalized her viewpoint-canon that she learned from the women’s movement and her teaching experience at Morley College. Her journey to the unknown (to become what she could be) instigated by her contact with the new values and beliefs brought up by the women’s movement let her go deeper down into “the heart of the country of the unconscious” to discover more words and stories inside her--a process of going beyond her present self/ego to know what she would not have known, the other.

Having a room of her own to write, to create, the “liberty of experience” finally completed her internalized process of turning the viewpoint-canon into her background-canon. It was then that she could “use [her] whole body to enable the world to become flesh,” that is, to fully come to recognize who she had become--a woman who had money and a room

of her own to write fiction, a major point she made in her book *A Room of One's Own*. In the long process of nurturing herself to engage with the other, *A Room of One's Own*, to use Cixous's words, Woolf was groping in the dark, journeying to the unknown/the forbidden truth/the unconscious, an interior voyage "without you, without I, without law, without bond . . ." towards creating a new "identity," the other she could become, with a blind person's vision to reach a theory that guides her out of the darkness (*Coming to Writing* 38).

C. Woolf's Work as a Whole

In this section, I aim to understand Woolf's interior creative process as a whole. Using one of the inner creative experiences--a sequence of vision-desire-drive--and a renouncement of one's present self/ego, I intend to illuminate what Woolf might have engaged with while she groped in the dark, in the interior voyage toward creating the theory that women can write fiction only under the conditions of being financially independent and owning a space in *A Room of One's Own*. Through an examination of Woolf's interior creative process, I, taking on a critical role, give a more organized explanation of her interior creative process by employing the data learned from the first two sections, relevant work enterprise and professional milieu.

Vision should be understood here as an external stimulus (vision) that a writer receives to lead him/her to search in "the heart of the country of the unconscious." A writer's desire is to name certain feelings/thoughts discovered in the unconscious the writer would not have known. And the discovered feeling/thought serves as the writer's drive. In the process of finding the drive, the writer has to go beyond his/her self, that is, to renounce the writer's present self/ego in order to make room for the other/a new "identity" that can transform the

drive/certain feeling/thought into words.

With vision, desire, drive, and one's renouncement of one's present self/ego as categories to understand Woolf's interior voyage toward creating the other/a new "identity," this section is divided into four parts: (1) vision--Woolf's engagement with external stimuli, (2) desire--Woolf's continuous pursuit, (3) drive--Woolf's being a woman and novelist, and (4) becoming the other/a new "identity"--Woolf's renouncement of her present self/ego to give way to her creation of a theory that women need money and a room of their own to write fiction.

1. Vision: Woolf's Engagement with External Stimuli

Unlike the writing idea generated from within her self for *To the Lighthouse*, Woolf created *A Room of One's Own* from her contact with external stimuli: her reading of Bennett's book *Our Women* and MacCarthy's articles about women (1920) and the two lectures on "Women and Fiction" (1928) at Newnham and Girton. Her article "The Intellectual Status of Women" published in 1920 was the result of the stimulus caused by her reading of Bennett's book and MacCarthy's columns published in the *New Statesman*. Their degrading opinion about women's intellectuality and creativity formed a backdrop for Woolf to instigate an opposing view/vision against theirs. MacCarthy's words that "no [amount] of education and liberty of action will sensibly alter [the fact that women are inferior to men in intellectual power]" stimulated Woolf's vision of her predecessors who, she thought, "have improved" because "the seventeenth century produced more remarkable women than the sixteenth, the eighteenth century than the seventeenth, and the nineteenth than all three put together" (*The Diary of Virginia Woolf* II, Appendix III, 339).

Cixous's theory of how Stendhal began his writing of the *Vie de Henry Brulard* may help us understand why Woolf's positive vision of women was stimulated by her reading of Bennett's book and MacCarthy's columns--external stimuli. The example of Stendhal also gives us some insight into how Woolf turned the vision into "The Intellectual Status of Women" and extended it to *A Room of One's Own*. According to Cixous, when Stendhal saw the Italian countryside, this led his mind to wander among the past, the present, and future, and in his journey to "the heart of the country of the unconscious," Raphael's painting, *The Transfiguration*. This painting that surfaced from his search in the unconscious served as a "motivating metaphor of what is going to happen" in his writing, and it is "where the secret work of writing is done" (*Helene Cixous Rootprints* 58). Cixous imagines what Stendhal would say about his discovery of the painting: "and to think that this painting was closed up for 250 years, and that now it is exposed in a way that makes it visible" (58). What causes this particular painting to appear in his search "from present to past, from past to present"? (58). What does the painting mean for Stendhal since it was a work of art completed a long time ago? As a writer, the stimulation of the Italian landscape made him start to associate anything about Italy. Raphael's *Transfiguration*, though dealing with Christ's transfiguration, came to his mind. He does not write about the painting itself in his book *Vie de Henry Brulard*, but sees *Transfiguration* as a metaphor to lead him further down into his unconscious to find something hidden from him. What catches his attention in this painting is not its subject matter or its composition, but the years that the painting has been done, that is, "250 years," which is the "motivating metaphor" that he "jumps on" (59). His vision of the "250 years" leads him to discover his own age. He is turning fifty years old. This discovery is made by the Italian

landscape he sees, and “verbalizes a certain vision” in himself (59).

In Woolf’s case, her reading of Bennett’s book and MacCarthy’s columns was like Stendhal’s seeing the Italian countryside, a stimulus that caused Woolf to search certain feelings/thoughts in “the heart of the country of the unconscious.” Like Stendhal, her mind wandered “from present to past, from past to present” (*Helene Cixous Rootprints* 58). Through searching for something to fire her anger at Bennett’s and MacCarthy’s contemptuous view of women’s intellectuality, she found her predecessors such as Sappho, Jane Austen, Emily Bronte, and George Eliot, like how Stendhal discovered Raphael’s *Transfiguration*. The thought of how her predecessors “have improved” became a metaphor for Woolf to draw on to express her opposing views against Bennett’s and MacCarthy’s, like the “250 years” Stendhal picks out from the painting as a metaphor. Woolf’s thought of women’s improvement “verbalize[d] a certain vision” in herself. In other words, her writing of the article “The Intellectual Status of women” was originally inspired by MacCarthy’s columns that led her to discover a different vision from MacCarthy’s. Her discovery of her predecessors “verbalize[d]” her vision of women’s improvement. Finally, this vision led to her discovery of the forbidden, unspeakable truth for *A Room of One’s Own*.

The other external stimuli that resulted in Woolf’s final discovery of the truth about women who need money and a room of their own to write fiction were her visits to Newnham and Girton to give two lectures on the topic “Women and Fiction.” It was eight years after her reading of Bennett’s book *Our Women* and MacCarthy’s columns in the *New Statesman*. The women students she saw at Girton especially left a deep impression on Woolf, though not totally a positive one. She described them in her diary on October 27, 1928 as “intelligent

eager, poor; and destined to become schoolmistresses in shoals," which made her feel an urge to tell them just to "drink wine and have a room of their own" (*The Diary of Virginia Woolf* III 200). Her impression of the school building of Girton was not too good, either. She continued, "the corridors of Girton are like vaults in some horrid high church cathedral--on and on they go, cold and shiny-- with a light burning" (201). She thought those "intelligent" women should set themselves free from the bounds of career choices by not squandering their time on wanting to become "schoolmistresses" only. Women like the secretary of the Newnham Arts Society and the members of the ODTAA Society, who participated in various activities, should be those women students' new models (200). Woolf as another living example, who had never had a formal education, made herself a novelist, book reviewer, and publisher.

Woolf could not forget about her talks given at Newnham and Girton and those young "intelligent" women who thought being "schoolmistresses" was the best they could do for their career. Her disappointment about the "egotistical" women students at Girton and the "cathedral[-like]" school led her to reflect on how the world had "change[d]" (201). Her reflection made her go deep down into "the heart of the country of the unconscious" to "verbalize a certain vision" that her visits to the two women colleges evoked (*Helene Cixous Rootprints* 59). And such a vision about the changing world led to another one. Woolf continued her thought,

I think I see reason spreading. But I should have liked a closer and thicker knowledge of life. I should have liked to deal with real things sometimes. . . . How little one counts, I think: how little anyone counts; how fast and furious and masterly life is; and how all these thousands are swimming for dear life (*The Diary of Virginia Woolf* III 201).

She sounded pessimistic but this passage shows that her talks at the two colleges had caused

her to re-think where women stood in the changing world. Her vision expressed in "The Intellectual Status of Women" eight years ago was changing, deepening, and broadened on her journey toward the "heart of the country of the unconscious" and would further lead her to conclude that women need money and a room of their own to write fiction.

2. Desire: Woolf's Continuous Pursuit

Reaching the idea that women need a room of their own to write took more than the formation of an initial vision and the influences from the professional milieu that I have discussed above. It was Woolf's continuous efforts of pursuing and expanding on the same topic--a desire to know what was beyond her, to name, to verbalize, one vision after another that she discovered in her interior voyage toward the "heart of the country of the unconscious"--that motivated Woolf to develop her theory throughout her writing projects in fiction theory, women novelists, and her own fiction writings.

The first major project after her criticism on Bennett's and MacCarthy's view about women's creativity was to write a theory on fiction instigated by her dissatisfaction with E. M. Forster's lectures at Cambridge, which later was collected in Forster's book *Aspects of the Novel*. In her review of the book in 1927, she said that "Forster had not paid enough attention to the *art* of fiction" (*Women and Fiction* xx). But before that, she had wanted to "write a book on the theory of fiction for the Hogarth Press Lectures on Literature series that Leonard Woolf and George Rylands were editing" at the end of 1925 (xx). She did not begin the book until 1926 which was called "Phases of Fiction" but was intervened by her writing of *Orlando*. She resumed the writing of "Phases of Fiction" again and finished drafting before she went for the

two lectures given at Cambridge in October 1928. Before "Phases of Fiction," she wrote a paper "Character in Modern Fiction" to be read to the Society of Heretics at Cambridge in May 1924. This paper was adapted later into *Mr. Bennett and Mrs. Brown* published in October 1924, which was originally written in December 1923 in response to Arnold Bennett's article that claimed the "foundation of good fiction is character-creating and nothing else" (*Virginia Woolf: The Critical Heritage* 113). Her interest in the theory of fiction was also demonstrated in her talk to the undergraduates at Oxford in 1927 on "Poetry, Fiction, and the Future," and then her two lectures given at Newnham and Girton at Cambridge in October 1928 on "Women and Fiction." In the following spring, she started to think of making up a book out of her talks given at Cambridge and entitled it "Women and Fiction," later changed to *A Room of One's Own*.

As for her writing on women novelists, few of Woolf's writing projects after "The Intellectual Status of Women" dwelled on the same topic except for her reviews of some women novelists such as Jane Austen (1924) and her two speeches on "Women and Fiction" given to Newnham and Girton in 1928. Although not very productive in the aspect of developing more theories on why there were few women writers in history, Woolf wrote four novels in the meantime--*Jacob's Room* (1923), *Mrs. Dalloway* (1925), *To the Lighthouse* (1927), and *Orlando* (1928)--to establish herself as a women novelist who had applied her aesthetic and fiction theory to her own writings. All these writing projects and talks manifested her **desire** to go beyond herself to know what she would not have known, that is, to be set free from the bounds imposed on women and from the traditional narrative in fiction writing.

But what made her **desire** to write a book on "Women and Fiction" was the two lectures

she gave at Newnham and Girton. The desire to know what was beyond her was rekindled. In her diary entry on October 27, 1928, the day right after her lecture at Girton, she wrote, "I get such a sense of tingling and vitality from an evenings talk like that" (*The Diary of Virginia Woolf* III 201). Her contact with the young "intelligent" women at Newnham and Girton and the "cathedral[-like]" school building created "a sense of tingling and vitality" inside her, a desire, to verbalize the forbidden, unspeakable truth she had found in "the heart of the country of the unconscious," to set herself free from the old values and beliefs that limited women's "liberty of experience" (*The Diary of Virginia Woolf* II, Appendix III, 342). She continued in the same journal entry, "one's angularities and obscurities are smoothed and lit" (201). In other words, her desire to name, to "verbalize a certain vision" formed by her contact with those young women and the schools they studied led her to go farther and deeper down into "the heart of the country of the unconscious" to find the thoughts and feelings she would not have known.

3. Drive: Woolf's Being a Woman Novelist and Publisher

What did Woolf find in "the heart of the country of the unconscious" that made her want to make a book out of the two lectures she gave at Newnham and Girton? She found that she had re-created herself by becoming a woman novelist and publisher. Those were the roles among many others that women should have been allowed to experience and the young "intelligent" women at Newnham and Girton could have become. Because Woolf was a woman novelist and publisher as well as a wife and daughter, she realized the "liberty of experience" she emphasized in "The Intellectual Status of Women." Her contact with the

young “intelligent” women who studied in the “horrid high church cathedral[-like]” schools created an impact which led her to understand what she had become, though it also made her “[feel] elderly and mature” (*The Diary of Virginia Woolf* III 201). Such a feeling that she had become so different from the young “intelligent” women who only determined to become “schoolmistresses” reflected her vision of infinite possibilities for women.

The recognition of being a woman novelist and publisher, the roles most women would not have had at the time, acted as a **drive** that motivated Woolf to develop the vision that women should be allowed to have “liberty of experience” to become who they could be. This drive had long been buried inside her without full acknowledgment of what it meant for women and the development of their intellectuality and creativity. It was through her vision caused by her visits to the two women colleges that led her to discover the drive, the long hidden thought and feeling in “the heart of the country of the unconscious.” Like Stendhal’s discovery of his “interior” (his turning into age of fifty) made by the “exterior” source (his vision of the 250-year-old painting *Transfiguration* by Raphael), Woolf found the drive/the “interior” (the meaning of her being a woman novelist and publisher) through the “exterior” (her positive vision of women). It was a signifying process that created meaning to connect the “exterior” source/vision with the “interior”/drive/feeling/thought. And the signifying process was instigated by her **desire** to know what she would not have known, to discover the **drive**. With the discovery of the drive, Stendhal has “his own interior portrait” and Woolf had hers. The “unforeseen discover[ies]” (the drives) in their interior voyages toward “verbaliz[ing] a certain vision” were originated by their receiving of “exterior” sources/external stimuli first through their eyes in Stendhal’s case or their “Soul’s eye” in Woolf’s (*Helene Cixous*

Rootprints 59; *Coming to Writing* 4). Woolf's creative process in generating *A Room of One's Own* illustrates one of the two inner creative experiences: a sequence of vision-desire-drive. It was part of her voyage toward completing the written product. But this inner creative experience would lead her to the next stage in her interior creative process, that is, to renounce her self/ego.

4. Becoming the Other: Woolf's Renouncement of Her Self to Make Room for the Other/a New "Identity"

In her interior voyage toward writing, Woolf had to renounce her present self/ego to make room for the other, a new "identity." In the process, she turned her private thoughts and feelings into a public design. In other words, in writing "The Intellectual Status of Women," she had to transform her anger/babbling fired at Bennett's and MacCarthy's degrading view about women into a theory that could be understood and accepted by her readers. To build up such a theory, she had to set aside her personal emotions to engage with other voices to bring in different perspectives against Bennett's and MacCarthy's. Such an act of withdrawing one's egotistic voice to let other voices come in is an enthusiastic act to welcome the other, to let the other become part of one's life: an act of love, to use Cixous's words, a "generosity," one's "capacity to deprive [oneself] for the sake of the other" (*Helene Cixous Rootprints* 108). To do so, one has to reduce the resistance of one's present self/ego to "make room for the other" and "accept an entirely amazing change in economy that is produced: *less self*" (110). Writing is a process of becoming "less self," a journey to forget oneself a bit so as to enrich oneself from his or her "non-[self], something in [oneself] that [one] can only encounter by going out"

(112). It is an act of “augmenting oneself, indirectly” to become the other, a new “identity” (112).

In the case of writing “The Intellectual Status of Women,” Woolf could not just draw on her anger at Bennett’s and MacCarthy’s view about women to formulate her theory that women need the “liberty of experience” to “think, invent, imagine, and create as freely as men do” (*The Diary of Virginia Woolf* II, Appendix III, 342). In creating *A Room of One’s Own*, Woolf could not depend on her disappointment about the young “intelligent” women whose ultimate career goal was to be a “schoolmistress” and conclude that “a woman must have money and a room of her own if she is to write fiction” (*A Room of One’s Own* 4). She reached these theories through her re-creation of her predecessors’ lives such as Sappho and Shakespeare’s sister. She withdrew her personal emotions, to leave her self/ego “way in the back,” to “make room for the other part of [herself] who is the other[/her predecessors], who can only exist . . . if [she] is there to receive” (*Helene Cixous Rootprints* 112). In other words, the other/her predecessors had lived inside her without her recognition. She could only acknowledge the other/her predecessors by going outside of her “self”/her conscious to create a space to “receive” the other from her unconscious.

In re-creating and imagining her predecessors’ lives, Woolf had to enter her predecessors’ “state of mind”/the other such as Sappho’s and George Eliot’s to imagine their creative processes--an interior creative process of searching in her unconscious (*Women and Fiction* xxxiii). She had to cease to think from her own views of the world and try to identify herself with her predecessors’ ways of thinking at their times. By doing so, she renounced her self/ego to make room in her for her subjects’ “state of mind.” Her predecessors’ stories exemplified

her theory on “Women and Fiction.” To allow her predecessors’ “state of mind” to enter hers meant that she had to move out of her egotistic self to reside in the *other* (her unconscious). Then, she could observe the flow of her thoughts on the past, the present, and the future of “Women and Fiction.” And this was why she felt she could identify with Shakespeare’s “state of mind” in which his personal likes and dislikes had been put aside to engage with the others to create. She wrote:

For though we say that we know nothing about Shakespeare’s state of mind, even as we say that, we are saying something about Shakespeare’s state of mind. The reason perhaps why we know so little of Shakespeare--compared with Donne or Ben Jonson or Milton--is that his grudges and spites and antipathies are hidden from us. We are not held up by some “revelation” which reminds us of the writer. All desire to protest, to preach, to proclaim an injury, to pay off a score, to make the world the witness of some hardship or grievance was fired out of him and consumed. Therefore, his poetry flows from him free and unimpeded. If ever a human being got his work expressed completely, it was Shakespeare. If ever a mind was incandescent, unimpeded, I thought, turning again to the bookcase, it was Shakespeare’s mind (*A Room of One’s Own* 56-57).

Such an “incandescent, unimpeded” mind was the mind that had cleared out its egotistic self (“his grudges and spites and antipathies”) and had been broadened up to engage, receive, and reflect on universal themes. This was why, according to Woolf, “we know so little of Shakespeare,” his personal life. To be able to imagine and create as freely as Shakespeare and let her mind fly from the past to future without the restraints of the present time she was living, when writing *A Room of One’s Own*, Woolf as a novelist fictionalized the real people that she met in her life, gave fake names to the places she visited for lectures, and made up scenes and stories, such as the famous story of Shakespeare’s sister. No wonder that even Woolf herself called *A Room of One’s Own*, though in a form of essay, “the product of a highly unscientific mind” in the letter to her reader Dorothy Tyler on January 1, 1929 [1930]

(*A Reflection of the Other Person: The Letters of Virginia Woolf* IV 123). Her “unscientific mind” fueled with imagination and creativity (the working of her unconscious) pushed her to break the bounds of the present moment that her self/ego lived in. Therefore, out of the need for the biographies of Elizabethan women which she called “lives of the obscure,” she was “forced into fiction, and the result [was] . . . a version of her famous myth of Shakespeare’s sister” (*Women and Fiction* xxvi). With little knowledge of how Sappho wrote poetry, she still could write about Sappho and imagined that “writing poetry was, in one island and for a certain group of women, the habit at a certain period, and that Sappho was not a unique writer but supported by many other poetesses” (123). Her imaginative capacity came from her willingness to engage in the things that only existed in “the heart of the country of the unconscious,” an interior voyage she took in becoming the other, a new “identity.”

It was only by renouncing her self/ego to make more room for the **other** that she could elaborate her vision that she originated in 1920 when writing “The Intellectual Status of Women.” Finally, the broadened vision led her to write *A Room of One’s Own* nine years later and claim that “a woman must have money and a room of her own if she is to write fiction” (4). The huge gap between these two times was filled with her continuous acts of reading and writing that made her “professional” enough to write on “Geraldine Jewsbury, on Hardy, on Women,” a long and interior creative process of renouncing her self/ego to learn to become the other/a new “identity,” *A Room of One’s Own* (*The Diary of Virginia Woolf* III 210). The reward that she gained was “the brilliance, the irradiation, the emanation of [her] greatness, of [her] abnegation. And [she] feeds on [her] spiritual brilliance, rather than lamb flesh,” to borrow Cixous’s “story of the wolf who loves the lamb he does not eat” (*Helene Cixous*

Rootprints 108).

Woolf was fully aware of her becoming the *other* when writing *A Room of One's Own*. To describe how she started her creative process of the book, she acknowledged her exploitation of her role as a novelist to fictionalize the essay by emphasizing that the narrator "I" in the book could be anyone:

Fiction here is likely to contain more truth than fact. Therefore I propose, making use of all the liberties and licences of a novelist, to tell you the story of the two days that preceded my coming here . . . I need not say that what I am about to describe has no existence; Oxbridge is an invention; so is Fernham; "I" is only a convenient term for somebody who has no real being. Lies will flow from my lips, but there may perhaps be some truth mixed up with them . . . (*A Room of One's Own* 4).

She confessed that she separated her self from her role as a novelist and denied that the "I" used in the book was her self. The "I" was even fictionalized for it had "no real being" when used in the "fictitious" essay. In other words, when she was in the process of thinking of the subject "Women and Fiction" for the book, she had renounced her present self/ego to make room for the *other*, her role as a speaker, a writer. She believed that the *other* told the unspeakable "truth" that she found in her journey toward the "heart of the country of the unconscious" (*Three Steps* 37 & 65).

D. Woolf's Text *A Room of One's Own*: The Completion of a New "Identity"

After becoming the *other*, the next step that Woolf had to take in her interior creative process of making the book *A Room of One's Own* to complete the *other*, a new "identity," was to create a new language, a unique narrative style that could fully express her thoughts and feelings that she searched in her unconscious. And then, the unique narrative would lead her to go further down into "the heart of the country of the unconscious" to have an inner dialogue

with her predecessors' "state of mind" to make the new "identity" fully grown and complete, the "fictitious" essay *A Room of One's Own*. In this section, using the manuscript and the published text *A Room of One's Own*, I first analyze (1) how Woolf created a new language (a unique narrative) to fulfill the standard that the other/the new "identity" had set up when engaging with her train of thought and then (2) how Woolf as the other/a new "identity" entered her predecessors' "state of mind" to re-create their lives in her imagination (her unconscious) to support her main theory that women need money and a room of their own to write fiction.

I do not compare her manuscript with the published text to reveal the changes of the details she made. She kept, in the final printed version, most of her writing ideas, images, and metaphors she made up in the first draft. When revising it, she only re-ordered the words and completed her fragmentary sentences, cancelled out and complemented some scenes she made up, and added more details. Instead, I use the manuscript as a source to demonstrate how major writing ideas surfaced out of her unconscious were carried on to the final version, even though sometimes a very sketchy one written in her first draft.

1. The Creation of a New Language: Woolf's Train of Thought

In the manuscript, Woolf divided the book into six chapters which remain in the final and published version, *A Room of One's Own*. The first paragraph in the first chapter was written after she finished the first draft of "Women and Fiction" (the original title of *A Room of One's Own*). This passage shed light on how her mind was at work when drafting it and how Woolf created her unique language for the book. The opening paragraph begins with an address to her

readers as though she were speaking to the audience at Newnham and Girton, where the subject "Women and Fiction" was spoken first and later developed into *A Room of One's Own*. "But, you may say, we asked you to speak about women and fiction--what has that got to do with a room of one's own?" (*A Room of One's Own* 3). This upfront announcement of the main topic by questioning herself invited her audience/readers to enter her mind immediately, to solve the question with her. She even stated it directly in the middle of this long passage, "I am going to develop in your presence as fully and freely as I can the train of thought which led me to think" the main point of the book that "a woman must have money and a room of her own if she is to write fiction" (4). With this open announcement of how she reached this opinion, she was revealing her creative process of making this book. Letting her train of thought take control of her creative process created a unique narrative. By doing so, she was able to go back to the past to enter her predecessors' "state of mind" and make up their life stories to support the points she made in the book. When creating her forerunners' stories, Woolf was engaging in a carnivalesque discourse that brought in heterogeneous elements to countervail "a sign system" and questioned the old value that women were inferior to men intellectually and creatively (*Desire in Language* 18).

But Woolf's train of thought could not just jump on her predecessors' "state of mind." This journey to "the heart of the country of the unconscious" started from where her mind was at the present moment, that is, to start from the familiar to the unfamiliar, a signifying process of discovering "another structure" to challenge, question prevailed thoughts or customs (*Desire in Language* 18 & 65). Woolf's playing with her thoughts exemplified such a process. Her revision of this part also demonstrated a carnivalesque discourse, an interplay between her

unconscious and conscious.

Starting the voyage toward “the heart of the country of the unconscious” to engage with her predecessors or anything her mind wandered to, she asked us to call her any name we like.

She wrote:

Here then was I (call me Mary Beton, Mary Seton, Mary Carmichael or by any name you please--it is not a matter of any importance) sitting on the banks of a river a week or two ago in fine October weather, lost in thought (*A Room of One's Own* 5).

Then, her train of thought took over. Searching in the unconscious, Woolf in becoming the other was absorbed into the dark without boundaries where infinite ways of telling the “truth” about “Women and Fiction” flooded her. She lost control of her thoughts and feelings and where they went. Her unique narrative began with the present moment of where the “I” was:

To the right and left bushes of some sort, golden and crimson, glowed with the colour, even it seemed burnt with the heat, of fire. On the further bank the willows wept in perpetual lamentation, their hair about their shoulders. The river reflected whatever it chose of sky and bridge and burning tree . . . (5).

In this passage, her thought of the subject, “Women and Fiction,” on which she aimed to focus was not even in the picture. She took advantage of all the liberties she had as a novelist not to restrain her thoughts. She even played with the “thought” itself:

Thought--to call it by a prouder name than it deserved--had let its line down into the stream. It swayed, minute after minute, hither and thither among the reflections and the weeds, letting the water lift it and sink it, until--you know the little tug--the sudden conglomeration of an idea at the end of one's line: and then the cautious hauling of it in, and the careful laying of it out? (5).

Then, she went on playing a metaphor of a fish returned by a fisherman to the water to describe how she nurtured her thought and implied that it was how she played with her thoughts throughout the rest of the book:

. . . the sort of fish that a good fisherman puts back into the water so that it may grow fatter and be one day worth cooking and eating. I will not trouble you with that thought now, though if you look carefully you may find it for yourselves in the course of what I am going to say (5).

Amazingly, her idea of fictionalizing the “I”/her present self/ego, the description of her train of thought, her as the other’s play with the “thought,” and the fish metaphor were all written in her first draft already without too much change made in the final version, though in the manuscript they were loose and needed to be condensed. For example, Woolf was struggling with the meaning of the fish metaphor in the first draft:

. . . the sort of fish a food fisherman puts back so that it may grow fat--worth catching: but I offer it to you, because if I do not keep it till the end of the paper, where it rightly belongs, you will not notice that it is a fish at all--a conclusion . . . (*Women and Fiction* 5).

Then, it appeared that she was not satisfied with it. She continued it by connecting the fish put back in the water with the working of our mind when a thought was dropped in the “waters of the mind” (The words in < > are the insertions that Woolf made in the following quote):

put back in the water and the swimming and floating, diving among the contents of the brain it seemed <wonderful> and strange . . . everything rocked and swayed, and life seemed filled of excitement and importance-- with such <the> <thrown into such by little fish> commotion taking place, in the waters of the mind it is impossible to sit sill . . . (6).

But in the final printed version, her rampageous thought was condensed, and the fish metaphor was dissolved into the “thought” working in our mind:

. . . put back into the mind, it became at once very exciting, and important; and as it darted and sank, and flashed hither and thither, set up such a wash and tumult of ideas that it was impossible to sit still (*A Room of One’s Own* 5-6).

Her successful integration of the fish metaphor with her thought at work in the final version was a signifying practice that brought in a heterogeneous element (the fish metaphor) to give a new life, a new meaning, to the “thought” image she was trying to explicate. But the

completion of a signifying process was not done without a struggle.

Writing her first draft very fast as usual, Woolf just poured out the ideas that the *other/the* fictionalized “I” discovered in her unconscious without a “conscious organization” that she changed into when she came back to revise it. At the moment of drafting the first time with the fish metaphor, her train of thought dictated her hand to scribe the idea. Her imagination of how the fish moved after it was put back into the water came out from “the heart of the country of the unconscious.” And in the process of imagining, her awareness of her self being Virginia Woolf as a person must have been drowned in the sea of her unconscious; that is, she had to become the *other*, the fish. She swam, floated, dived as she imagined the fish would do. Following the *other's/the* new “identity's” standard to become the fish, the “commotion” that the *other* stirred in the unconscious was pacified when Woolf revised it. In the process, Woolf in becoming the *other/the* written product had to put her mind back to the state of unconscious to sense the *other's/the* new “identity's” standard again, but this time the *other* brought the conscious (with a clearer picture in mind after the first draft was completely done) with it to organize and tailor the helter-skelter “mess” that the *other* had pulled out from the unconscious. Then, Woolf as the *other* could parallel the fish metaphor with her “thought” at work, the implied meaning behind the fish metaphor--a combined effort of and an interplay between the unconscious and conscious. Thus, a fish's “swimming,” “floating,” and “diving” in the manuscript changed into her “thought” that “darted, sank, and flashed hither and thither” in one's mind in the final printed version.

Letting the train of thought lead the fictionalized “I”/the *other* to pull out the ideas from the unconscious (a signifying practice), Woolf in becoming the *other* had created a unique

narrative (a new language) for the book *A Room of One's Own*. The revising process for the fish metaphor was an interplay between the unconscious and conscious--part of the journey that the other/the new "identity" took to complete itself, the written product. With the first step of leading us from the familiar (the banks where her thought was at present moment) to the unfamiliar (the fish metaphor to demonstrate how her train of thought was at work) in the journey to "the heart of the country of the unconscious," Woolf was able to lead us to her predecessors' "state of mind." Her re-creation of her forerunners' stories was her last step to make the other/the new "identity" fully grown and self-contained, an interplay between the other/the new "identity" and the other voices/characters.

2. Woolf's Recreation of Her Predecessors' Lives: An Interplay between the Other and the Other Voices/Characters

Woolf's train of thought brought out ideas through her interior voyage toward "the heart of the country of the unconscious" for the subject "Women and Fiction" of the book *A Room of One's Own*. Embarking on such a journey, she created a new "language," a unique narrative for the work. In this "fictitious" essay, she "reasoned" with her train of thought. Through her "association in images and scenes" such as the fish metaphor, she utilized "all the liberties and licenses of a novelist" to weave her creativity and imagination into her "reasoning" (*A Room of One's Own* 4; *Women and Fiction* xi). It was an interplay between her as a novelist/the other/the new "identity" and her thoughts/language. But her interior creative process was not finished yet until she went further down into the unconscious to re-create and bring her predecessors' lives/other voices back to the present moment to countervail the sign system that

dominated the prevalent thought about women's intellectual inferiority.

As a novelist, her intention to discover "truth" instead of just "fact" governed how she created the book. Novelistic elements were found in *A Room of One's Own*. They made the essay look more like fiction rather than a pure criticism. First, she used fake names for the real people that she met and the places she went to give lectures. By doing so, it gave her a larger imaginative space to develop her arguments. Second, since few records about women's living and learning conditions were left from the past, Woolf created stories for the blank pages of women's lives such as Shakespeare's sister.

With the employment of the fictitious scenes and characters in the book, Woolf developed her visions of women and fiction. In the process of creating them, Woolf undertook an interplay between her as a novelist/the other/the new "identity" and the other voices/characters, that is, her countervailing of a sign system by challenging "the social framework" with which most people had "previously identified" (*Desire in Language* 18). In the case of *A Room of One's Own*, it was people's stereotypical views of women that Woolf wanted to challenge. She let her mind, the mind that had been occupied by the other/the new "identity," fly into the past to bring out her forerunners from Sappho to George Eliot to dispute people's view of her time that women were inferior to men intellectually and creatively. Placing her forerunners and the current point of view together created an effect of a historical displacement that generated a new meaning, a different interpretation of MacCarthy's statement that Woolf as the other/a new "identity" intended to overthrow.

Woolf's play with the re-creation of her predecessors' lives was threaded through her train of thought. But her train of thought did not went straight to her predecessors. It led her to think

about some male writers first. Then, with her “association in images and scenes,” her train of thought brought her to the subject “Women and Fiction” and finally guided her to create stories for her predecessors’ lives. Walking around the campus of Oxbridge, the fake name for Cambridge, where she gave her two lectures, with her train of thought, she thought about an old essay written one hundred years ago and the person who wrote it came to mind right after:

Strolling through those colleges past those ancient halls the roughness of the present seemed smoothed away; the body seemed contained in a miraculous glass cabinet through which no sound could penetrate, and the mind, freed from any contact with facts . . . was at liberty to settle down upon whatever meditation was in harmony with the moment. As chance would have it, some stray memory of some old essay about revisiting Oxbridge in the long vacation brought Charles Lamb to mind . . . (*A Room of One’s Own* 6).

Then, she had an inner dialogue with Charles Lamb, whose essays, Woolf thought, were “superior even to Max Beerbohm’s . . . because of that wild flash of imagination, that lighting crack of genius in the middle of them which leaves them flawed and imperfect, but starred with poetry” (7). Her thought of Lamb’s art of writing led her to associate with an essay Lamb wrote one hundred years ago when he revisited Oxbridge. Having discovered the manuscript of Milton’s *Lycidas*, Lamb was shocked “to think it possible that any word in *Lycidas* could have been different from what it is” (7). To follow Lamb’s footsteps, she decided to go to the same library where Lamb read Milton’s manuscripts. Carrying on this thought, Woolf recollected that the manuscript of William M. Thackeray’s “most perfect novel” *Henry Esmond* was also preserved in the library (7). It excited her, though she did not quite agree with people’s praise on this novel. She wanted to find out if Thackeray’s alterations of his manuscript “were for the benefits of the style or of the sense” if she could read the manuscript. But when she arrived at the door of the library, she was sent away because “ladies are only admitted to the library if

accompanied by a Fellow of the College or furnished with a letter of introduction" (8).

Immediately, her thought of Lamb, Milton, and Thackeray, was led astray to her anger at the unfair treatment to women who wanted to use the library. And her thought about women being discriminated brought her to the subject "Women and Fiction" she intended to draw on originally.

Above was an example of Woolf's interior creative process of wandering to her predecessors' time. This kind of unique narrative that let the train of thought lead her writing was carried on throughout the whole book. But how did Woolf argue her point that "a woman must have money and a room of her own if she is to write fiction"? It was her re-creation of her forerunners' lives that Woolf was able to make her argument that women's achievements in literature would not have been less than men's if given the same amount of time and money and a room of their own. The comparison between Shakespeare and the women in Shakespeare's time was a typical example that Woolf employed to make her argument.

Right after Woolf imagined Shakespeare's state of mind that was "incandescent, unimpeded" at the end of chapter three, in the beginning of next chapter she argued that it was impossible to find the same state of mind like Shakespeare's in women at that time. She wrote:

That one would find any woman in that state of mind in the sixteenth century was obviously impossible. One has only to think of the Elizabethan tombstones with all those children kneeling with clasped hands; and their early deaths; and to see their houses with their dark, cramped rooms, to realise that no woman could have written poetry then (*A Room of One's Own* 58).

The devastating living environment for women at that time was brought up by Woolf to argue that the reason women could not write poetry was because their creativity was suppressed by the disadvantaged conditions imposed on them. The creation of Shakespeare's sister, Judith,

was an example of the interplays between her as the other/the new “identity” and the other voices/characters. She had to imagine the whole story because of the shortage of facts. Thus, she created the character of Judith through Shakespeare, whose life, though scarce, was known:

Shakespeare himself went . . . to the grammar school, where he may have learnt Latin--Ovid, Virgil and Horace--and the elements of grammar and logic. He . . . had, rather sooner than he should have done, to marry a woman . . . who bore him a child rather quicker than was right. That escapade went him to seek his fortune in London. He had, it seemed, a taste for the theatre; he began by holding horses at the stage door. Very soon he got work in the theatre, became a successful actor, and lived at the hub of the universe, meeting everybody, knowing everybody, practising his art on the boards, exercising his wits in the streets, and even getting access to the palace of the queen (46-47).

But what had happened to his sister who possessed the same extraordinary gift as his brother?

In contrast to Shakespeare’s success, Woolf told a different story about his sister:

Meanwhile his extraordinarily gifted sister, let us suppose, remained at home. She was as adventurous, as imaginative, as agog to see the world as he was. But she was not sent to school. She had no chance of learning grammar and logic, let alone of reading Horace and Virgil. She picked up a book now and then, one of her brother’s perhaps, and read a few pages. But then her parents came in and told her to mend the stockings or mind the stew and not moon about with books and papers Perhaps she scribbled some pages up in an apple loft on the sly Soon, however, before she was out of her teens, she was to be betrothed to the son of a neighbouring wool-stapler. She cried out that marriage was hateful to her She made up a small parcel of her belongings, let herself down by a rope one summer’s night and took the road to London. She was not seventeen She had the quickest fancy, a gift like her brother’s, for the tune of words. Like him, she had a taste for the theatre. She stood at the stage door; she wanted to act, she said. Men laughed in her face. The manager . . . bellowed something about poodles dancing and women acting--no woman, he said, could possibly be an actress Yet her genius was for fiction and lusted to feed abundantly upon lives on men and women and the study of their ways (47-48).

At the end of the story, she was pregnant with an actor-manager and “so killed herself one winter’s night and lied buried at some cross-roads where the omnibuses now stop outside the Elephant and Castle” (48). Then, Woolf brought us back to the real time and reflected on how

it was out of the question that a woman from “the working classes” at her time could have Shakespeare’s genius:

For genius like Shakespeare’s is not born among labouring, uneducated, servile people. It was not born in England among the Saxons and the Britons. It is not born today among the working classes (48).

Then, Woolf changed her tone to emphasize that there should have been a genius of this kind among women, even among the working classes. She wrote, “Now and again an Emily Bronte or a Robert Burns blazes out and proves [a woman genius’s] presence. But certainly [genius] never got itself on to paper” (49).

Woolf sighed for the unfair treatment between men and women. As a novelist herself who had the same passion as and similar gift to her character Judith, Woolf could not help but identify with all the gifted women that should have existed but had been killed or driven crazy by “all the power of law and custom” (48). Instead of making it personal, she stated with a critic’s analytical tone,

For it needs little skill in psychology to be sure that a highly gifted girl who had tried to use her gift for poetry would have been so thwarted and hindered by other people, so tortured and pulled asunder by her own contrary instincts, that she must have lost her health and sanity to a certainty (49).

Woolf’s mind that operated as the other/the new “identity” had made room for her to bring her predecessors back to her time, a process of engaging with the other voices/character in her journey to “the heart of the country of the unconscious.” By becoming the other/the new “identity” to enter the women’s lives in the sixteenth century, Woolf successfully challenged the common belief that women’s intellectuality and creativity were inferior to men’s.

Woolf’s argument kept growing, and her mind as a novelist wandered to all the great

English writers since Shakespeare's age. She thought of Rousseau, Carlyle, Flaubert, and Keats and their "confession and self analysis that to write a work of genius is almost always a feat of prodigious difficulty" (51). Not to mention those women with the same gift whose living conditions were worse than those great male writers', which made "these difficulties" become "infinitely more formidable" (52). Similar arguments recurred almost everywhere in the book *A Room of One's Own*. She kept going into her predecessors' time to explore her imagination (her unconscious) as a novelist and bring out more stories about those gifted women. Those creative women's stories countervail the common belief (the sign system) that women were incapable of creating great works like those of Shakespeare. When coming back to the present time (her conscious), she could use those stories to establish another sign system by presenting her view why women could not write works of genius. Woolf's *A Room of One's Own* has gone beyond the bounds of a fixed sign system (death), and has further made "language perceive what it doesn't want to say, provide it with its matter independently of the sign, and free it from denotation" (*Desire in Language* 31). Such a novelistic treatment of displacing the past time and space with her present time, she brought out her arguments through her re-creation of her predecessors in her unconscious. This interior creative process was an act of an interplay between her as the other/the new "identity" and the other voices/characters. And through such an interplay, Woolf completed her interior voyage toward creating a new "identity" for the written product *A Room of One's Own*.

Chapter VII

CONCLUSION: A REFLECTION ON MY CREATIVE PROCESS FOR THE STUDY AND ITS IMPLICATIONS FOR TEACHING OF CREATIVE WRITING

"So the nature of my research begins with something as ineffable and as flexible as a dimly recalled figure, the corner of a room, a voice" (William Zinsser, *Inventing the Truth*, 116).

This chapter intends to accomplish three things: (1) the story of my interior creative process of generating this study, (2) pedagogical implications of this study for teaching of creative writing, and (3) the limitations of this study. Providing my interior voyage in creating this study gives me a chance not only to reflect on my own interior creative process but also to reassess creativity. With the theory of a writer's interior voyage toward writing in mind, I discuss pedagogical implications of this study for the teaching of creative writing. The two types of inner creative experiences, a sequence of drive-desire-vision and a sequence of vision-desire-drive, are the focal points for the section of the pedagogical implications. Since this is a study to create a theory for a writer's interior creative process, what it can contribute to the pedagogy of teaching of creative writing would be theoretical. The applications of my theory is out of the scope of this study. In the end, I talk about the limitations of the study for further research.

A. My Interior Creative Process of Generating This Study and My Reflection on It

In this section, I give a general picture of my creative process in generating this study first. Then, I review the process from the view of the other "I" as a woman from another country. Finally, I reassess creativity with the results of my analysis of my creative process and Woolf's.

1. The Story of My Interior Creative Process

Before I decided to write this dissertation, I had been drawn to the idea that the whole process of writing a work of fiction amounts to a writer's new "self" which does not stay but keeps changing and growing with the writer's completion of another work and yet another. But I got stuck when coming up with a satisfactory definition of the new "self." Then, I came across the book *Helene Cixous Rootprints: Memory and Life Writing* by Helene Cixous and Mireille Calle-Gruber. I finished reading the interview part of this book in three days with excitement. Cixous's talk about how a creative process involves the participation of our body and our desire to go beyond the fear of our death touched me. I felt writing should be like that. It should make us feel the deepest desire inside us, that is, to feel alive, to outgrow the fear of our death, to know what we would not have known, to have what we would not have. I felt I should write about this. A vision for this study was forming. I thought I could write about a writer's interior voyage toward writing. I theorized Cixous's six elements into two types of a writer's inner creative experiences, that is, a sequence of drive-desire-vision and a sequence of vision-desire-drive. My original idea of writing about a new "self" that a creative writer would turn into was put aside. I was so involved in the ideas I learned from Cixous that I could not see the relation between my initial idea about a writer's new "self" and a writer's interior creative process at the time.

The vision that I gained from reading Cixous grew with more of my reading of Cixous's relevant works about writing. Her idea about a writer's desire to write and go beyond death led me to re-read Kristeva's *Desire in Language*. My vision of a writer's interior voyage toward

writing was further established while I discovered carnivalesque discourse in Kristeva's book, an important characteristic embodied in poetic language that always arms itself against the threat of its death because a poet, a creative writer, "wants to perceive what it doesn't want to say, provide it with its matter independently of the sign, and free it from denotation" (*Desire in Language* 31). From Kristeva, I re-discovered Bakhtin's dialogic theory on novel and found out he talked about how a writer has to create "a whole human being, a second consciousness" to engage in the creation of a novel, that is, an "aesthetic project" in Bakhtin's words (*Mikhail Bakhtin: Creation of a Prosaics* 72). From Kristeva, I learned that after the two types of inner creative experiences that a writer goes through, an interplay between the writer/the other/the "second consciousness" and language takes place. From Bakhtin, I found that the writer/the other has to play with other voices/characters to complete the writer's interior creative process. With the stimulations of Kristeva's and Bakhtin's theories, my vision of a writer's interior voyage toward writing seemed to have taken shape. I felt I had a complete theory about a writer's interior creative process, though I knew the vision of mine was still vague for the connections between those theories I learned from Cixous, Kristeva, and Bakhtin needed to be established.

Then, I started writing, turning my vision into words. I wrote fast. Within two months, I drafted six chapters, including introduction, literature review, methodology, my analysis of Woolf's creative processes of creating *To the Lighthouse* and *A Room of One's Own*, and the conclusion chapter. I only built up a big picture in the first draft of the study like a painter who only finished drawing the contours of a body on a canvas. The contents of the study were yet to be filled in, organized, thought through, and developed in depth, though it had covered

almost all the essential theories in the final version, except for the theory on a writer's creation of a "personal identity" borrowed from Holland. It was not until I went back to revise the six chapters and discovered Holland's theory about a writer's "personal identity" that governs the writer's unique writing style that my study began to fall into place, make sense, and give depth.

In the process of drafting the study, extrapolating Cixous's idea that it is not her "I" who writes, but the "I with the others" that writes was one of the most difficult and fun parts of writing the dissertation (*Helene Cixous Rootprints* 87). I had to imagine and enter the world of the few words she used to explain that her writing is "a blind person's version" (87). Her theory that "I is not I" but the "I" that "coming from the others" looked simple, but each word is so weighty that I had to find a way to get into the heart of each word to loosen up its intensity (87). To do so, I had to forget about my present self to try to think from Cixous's position. In search of the relation between "I" and the "other," a mirror image came to me. Then, I searched further inside me, trying to imagine what it would feel like to look at the "me" in front of the mirror from the position of the "me" in the mirror. I even literally did so, standing in front of the mirror in my bathroom. Then, after a few times of trying, I found that the "me" in front of the mirror became an object, and the "me" in the mirror became an observer/the other. This finding excited me and made me able to understand what Cixous means by "I is not I" because acting only on "I" cannot make writing happen. The "I" has to be turned into an object to be observed. And it was when the "I" becomes the "other," the "other" I in the mirror can journey to "the heart of the country of the unconscious" of the "I" in front of the mirror. And what the other "I" sees is a composite of many other "Is," including the "Is" animated by multiple social and cultural desires and the visceral desires only known to the

unconscious of the “I” in front of the mirror. And then, I realized what Cixous means that “the other of all sorts, is also of all diverse richness” (13). The “I” standing in front of the mirror is never an original entity. It is a text itself accumulated with ancient-old memories of various human feelings, thoughts, and desires. My whole process of understanding the relation among “I,” the “other,” and many “others” could not have gone any deeper if I did not search in my unconscious to discover what I would not have known.

Before I started my analysis of Woolf’s interior creative process of writing *To the Lighthouse*, I thought mine began from a vision gained from my reading of Cixous. But my finding that Woolf’s obsession of her mother was her drive that motivated her to write the autobiographical fiction reminded me of my own obsession of an ineffable feeling that first arose in me when I wrote my first poem eight years ago. That was a mixed feeling of exhilaration and some nameless anxiety which had opened up something inside me that I can not forget and want to taste it again and again. Cixous’s description of her creative process echoes that part of me and explains what that feeling of mine was and how it was produced. Her talks about what Stendhal writes on and her story of the wolf who loves the lamb he does not eat seemed to solve the mystery of why I feel that writing has become part of me, an other presence in me.

Before I read Cixous and Calle-Gruber’s book, I must have been pursuing the topic on a writer’s creative process half consciously and half unconsciously. At that time, I was not sure what exactly I was looking for; I only knew that any topic on creativity would always draw my attention. A Chinese fiction writer once wrote on a Chinese newspaper that he only reads the books he likes and refuses to read the ones out of needs because what he likes is what he really

needs. My pursuit of the study was like how the Chinese writer chooses what he reads. If Woolf's obsession of her parents acted as her drive to create the novel *To the Lighthouse*, then my experience of writing a poem the first time eight year ago acted as my drive that triggered my desire to sustain my interest in the topic of creativity and create this study. The efforts that I had made all the way to the point of deciding to write a writer's interior creative process were to my unconscious. Reading *Helene Cixous Rootprints* made my crave for creativity surface out from my unconscious.

But what really made me "verbalize" my vision of writer's interior creative process was my renouncement of my self/ego, my private desire to taste the exhilaration of writing a poem, to allow Cixous's story of the wolf (the other) to become part of my thinking system, that is, to substitute my egotistic indulgence (*Helene Cixous Rootprints* 59 & 107). I had to become the other, the researcher, to be able to argue, agree, interrogate, eavesdrop on, and ridicule what I was reading in order to let my ideas/the others grow (*The Dialogic Imagination* 46). At this stage of renouncing my self to become the other/a researcher, I thought out my readings, found out Cixous's six elements by reading other books of hers on writing, and theorized two types of inner creative experiences. In search for the others/ideas in my unconscious and letting them surface from the darkness with a blind person's vision to imagine what a writer's interior creative process should be like, I selected what would be useful for the study, ordered it, and made sense out of it. It was the work of the other/the researcher, not of my self/ego.

The process of renouncing my self/ego was also a process of my interplay as the other/the researcher with the others/the materials I was working on. To establish a new sign system I discovered, that is, the theory for the study, I challenged (1) the common usage of the

ambiguous terms, the conscious and the unconscious, which are generally applied by professional writers to explain the obvious and mysterious parts of their creative process and (2) the traditional literary approach to a writer's creative process through an analysis of the themes of a writer's works or the writer's writing philosophy. I provided more explicit expressions--Cixous's six elements (body, desire, death, self, blindness, otherness), a sequence of drive-desire-vision and a sequence of vision-desire-drive, and the renouncement of the writer's present self/ego, and an interplay between the other/the writer and the others/characters/language--to specify how a writer's unconscious and conscious on which most professional writers touched play in the writer's interior creative process. Despite the facts that Bakhtin's dialogic theory on novel and Kristeva's carnivalesque discourse on literature from a linguistic approach have been widely employed by many researchers to define novelistic elements and the evolution of language, I borrowed them to understand the interplay between the other/the writer and the others/characters/language, which should run through a writer's mind when the writer makes up scenes or arguments to develop his/her ideas on paper.

But while going back to revise the first three chapters, I found I needed to solidify them by tracing the approaches to creativity that have been done by my predecessors from Plato, Aristotle, the Stoics, Freud, to Norman Holland, etc. I buried myself again in more readings. Holland's theory on "personal identity" which governs a writer's unique writing style in his study of Robert Frost's brain was particularly important to me. It completes my vision of a writer's interior creative process, echoing my original idea for this dissertation that a writer forms a new "self" in the process of writing a fiction and the new "self" continues to grow and change with the writer's creation of another fiction and yet another. Holland's "personal

identity” theory was an external stimulus that pushed me back again to my unconscious/the darkness to engage with the others/the ideas that had hidden from my conscious at some dark corners. Borrowing Holland’s theory of “personal identity” and twisting it a little bit to fit into my vision, I/the other “me” who had renounced her present self/ego and internalized the “personal identity” in the conscious was able to accomplish my vision of a writer’s interior creative process by diving into my unconscious/the darkness/imagination again to swim to the “unforeseen discovery”/the others to “see” the whole theory of a writer’s interior voyage toward creating a new “identity”/the written product. In the process of reaching the theory of a new “identity,” I/the other had gone through a carnivalesque discourse by building up a new sign system when engaging in an inner dialogue with Holland, Cixous, Kristeva, and Bakhtin to create a theory of my own, my creation of a writer’s interior creative process, my fiction.

2. A Review of My Creative Process from the Perspective of My Other “I”

By the look of my interior creative process, my study seems a work of my eight-year pursuit of a resolution to my addiction to the taste of exhilaration and anxiety in writing my first poem and continuous input of my readings and reflections I have been digging into for this study. But to examine my creative process from the perspective of the other “I” who is a female researcher from another country, I find this study is a composite of two cultures, different lives, the alive and dead, that continuously flowed in and out of my mind, and the thoughts of my predecessors (Freud, Woolf, Gruber, Cixous, Kristeva, Bakhtin, etc.) who live inside me with and without my conscious.

As a female student from Taiwan nine years ago to set foot in New York, a multicultural

place, a door to creativity opened to me in the teaching of poetry class that I took in the English Education Program at Teachers College, Columbia University. In the class, I wrote my first poem and was encouraged by my instructor and peers. My learning experience in my country had never exposed me to any form of creative writing except one short fiction written for a Chinese class in high school. And that only one creative experience was even accused of plagiarism. Ironically, I found my creativity in another culture where I wrote a poem in English, my second language. Because of my personal creative experience, I have to ask: Does creativity have to be initiated and explored deliberately, or should it come to us naturally without a push if it is already in us? Or the question should be: What is creativity? Is it socially constructed because we have broadened its meaning and use in education especially in America, or is it only privileged to the particular few whom we call geniuses? If our creativity is socially constructed, then can we equate creativity with uniqueness?

My creative experience in composing a poem and generating this study and Virginia Woolf's creative processes may shed some light on the questions I posed above. But to answer these questions, we have to define in what sense we can say a person is creative. My definition of creativity for this study, which I have made in the introduction chapter, is that it is a person's exploration of his/her uniqueness and the person's unique way of turning his/her unique feelings or thoughts into a design that creates a fresh perspective for its audience (see page 14). In other words, this study has assumed that creativity must be acted out if it needs recognition of the public. Otherwise, it is just a person's day-dreaming or fantasy that only exists in the person's mind. Cixous's theory on the renouncement of one's self/ego to make room for the other, Kristeva's on one's desire for death to go beyond, and Bakhtin's on the

creation of the “second consciousness” all support that creativity should be “seen” or expressed in certain creative form. Thus, the answer to the question that whether creativity has to be explored deliberately is definite. Woolf’s creative processes of generating *To the Lighthouse* and *A Room of One’s Own* are good examples because both of the works did not come to her overnight but were made deliberately by her action of brooding on them and search in her unconscious for at least more than nine years. My creative process in creating this study is not arbitrary, either. It took me six years to know what I wanted to write about for this dissertation. When I came up with the research question (What is a writer’s interior voyage toward writing?), I was embarking on a journey to search for an answer to the question. And the process of finding the answer was a creative process similar to Woolf’s. Writing *To the Lighthouse* was to solve her obsession with her mother; making *A Room of One’s Own* was to look for an answer to the question that why women were considered inferior to men intellectually and creatively.

Then, is our creativity socially constructed if it is an act of exploration? The answer is both yes and no. It is yes because our creativity is not an innocent act. Its mode has been established and re-established again and again by our predecessors. I created my first poem out of the requirement of the class I took. Without the push from the class, I might never write a poem. Also, without the introduction of the poems written by some English writers, I would never know how to write one. In other words, my creativity was socially constructed because it was encouraged and accepted by my instructor and peers who set me in the literary frame with which they identified. My writing of the poem made me one of them. Woolf’s writings of the two works also corresponded to the literary trends (stream of consciousness and

expressionism) at the time. But had I never come to study at Columbia University in the States, would I never be able to discover my creativity? Probably not in the area of creative writing. I would have used my creativity in teaching English to the junior high students in my country or in some other areas. Creativity is inside me and it always arises in me no matter where I am because that is the instinctual drive shared by all human beings that pushes us to go beyond our death by creating new lives. Therefore, our creativity is not totally socially constructed. It is already inherent in us. Were Woolf born in Shakespeare's time, would she be recognized as a creative person? Of course not. But it does not mean she did not have creativity. It was just forbidden by the unfavorable social conditions.

If our creativity is socially constructed, can we still equate creativity with uniqueness? Or to ask it more directly, are this study and Woolf's works unique? The answer is positive. Our creativity is not totally socially constructed as I have explained in the above paragraph. What makes Woolf's works and mine unique resides in our "subjective' personality-selves," to use Holland's words (*The Brain of Robert Frost* 108). The social conditions or any literary movements in which we lived could affect the ways we presented our creative ideas and even the choices of our creative topics. Still, our deepest personal desires--that is, the parts that make our inner standards unique from others'--decide the uniqueness of our works even though we deal with the same topics as the others' and adopt certain literary theories and forms to write our works. Then, what makes our personal desire? It can be our unique life experience that determines our unique needs, feelings, thoughts, and desires. Even though two people make the same comment on coldness, such as freezing, the extent of their feelings about this word varies. And it is such a difference that makes a person's work unique. What I want to

emphasize here is that creativity is in each of us but expressed in different forms because of our unique feelings towards the things around us. For example, my selection of the theories for this study will be different from another person who also deals with the same topic. It is my personal preference, unique ways of looking at things, and my own creative experience that make my study different from this person's. In Woolf's case of creating *To the Lighthouse*, what amounted to the unique writing style of this work was her obsession with her mother, her unique metaphor "to the lighthouse," and her previous creative experience in experimenting with the "mental time" applied to *Jacob's Room* and *Mrs. Dalloway*. Because of those unique experiences, Woolf's *To the Lighthouse* is unique itself and different from her other works, though all were created by her.

Therefore, creativity should be understood both as our personal desire in our nature that contributes to our uniqueness and a deliberate act that is socially constructed. How great our creativity is or how much more we are willing to explore our creativity depends on how deeper our desire is and how much space that we can make for the others/voices/characters. To be creative requires creative experience and the social and cultural dimensions we are willing to be exposed to. We may never know how many writing exercises Shakespeare had practiced before he was able to create *Hamlet* and all other great works. But it was sure that he was allowed to venture out and no one would restrain his creativity. The more freedom he had for him to venture out, the deeper his desire would be. If I never experienced another culture, I would never be able to write this dissertation. If Woolf lived in Shakespeare's time, she could never write *A Room of One's Own*. We develop the greatest creativity when we are allowed to have the greatest freedom. Most important of all, we have to initiate our creativity whatever

we discover it on our own or are made aware of it. Creativity in my case and Woolf's were not arbitrary. We had to explore it to make it happen. Creativity is in our unconscious (in our deepest desires) and the culture and society we are familiar with or the ones that are strange to us because creativity happens when we engage in a dialogue with it, an interplay between our conscious and unconscious.

B. The Pedagogical Implications of the Study for Teaching of Creative Writing

My theory about a writer's interior voyage toward writing has been verified by Woolf's interior creative processes of generating *To the Lighthouse* and *A Room of One's Own* and mine of this study. Then, what is it in the theory that can contribute to the pedagogy of teaching of creative writing? Four pedagogical concepts come out of this study. First, creative writing is a combined effort of a writer's conscious and unconscious. Second, a writer's creativity or inspiration does not come from nowhere but can be worked out from a writer's deliberate effort to notice the surge (a drive that echoes a vision already formed) in the writer from his/her unconscious. Third, a writer's unconscious is the major source of creativity for the writing idea evoked by an exterior stimulus (a vision that echoes a drive inside the writer). Fourth, a writer's creative process is an organic one that results in a creation of a new "identity" which governs a writer's unique writing style for the writer's written product. Since the second and the third pedagogical concepts branch out from the first one, I divide this section into two parts: (1) the source of a writer's creativity--an interplay between the conscious and unconscious; (2) creative writing--an organic process of creating a new "identity" that distinguishes a writer's unique writing style.

1. The Source of a Writer's Creativity: An Interplay between the Conscious and Unconscious

A writer's creativity is usually thought as a myth that only belongs to a few gifted people. But Woolf and many other twentieth-century professional writers have kind of cleared out the myth and indicated that it was their unconscious into which they plunged themselves before they could create. To be in the state of unconsciousness means that the writer has to renounce his/her present self/ego to become the other in order to engage with the others/feelings/ideas that the writer's present state of mind (being conscious) is unaware of. The others that the writer/the other discovers in the unconscious are the sources of the writer's creativity.

Yet, the writer's creativity cannot be completed without the help of the writer's consciousness. Staying in the dream-like state, like how Woolf did when creating, cannot transform the images or visions that the writer discovers in the state of being unconscious into words. The writer has to swim back to his/her conscious to materialize the dream-like/sensational images or visions into the ones that can be described in words, a process of a deliberate effort. The process of diving into one's unconscious and striving back to one's conscious goes through Cixous's six elements (body, desire, death, self, blindness, otherness); that is, the image or vision that the other/writer gains from his/her unconscious has to be fleshly felt (body) first. Then, to make such a fleshly/bodily felt vision or image that exists in the dream-like state/in the darkness (in a state of blindness) visible, a desire to break through the darkness/the bounds that impede the materialization of the vision or image has to be created. Once the fleshly felt image or vision is pushed upward toward the shore by the desire from the deep dark corners of the unconscious to be consciously felt, it becomes an effort of

going beyond the bounds/death to countervail the fixed sign system/the writer's present self/ego, an act of a carnivalesque discourse. When the visible words transformed from the dream-like vision or image appear, the writer completes his/her creativity.

The process of turning an image or vision drawn from the unconscious into a conscious breakthrough of a fixed sign system embodies in a carnivalesque discourse, an interplay between the other/the writer and the others/language/characters. To facilitate and explicate such a process, I name the image or vision searched in a writer's unconscious a "private" one because it is different and unique with each individual. The written product is an artistic design which needs the writer's combined effort of the unconscious and conscious to transform the image or vision gained from the unconscious into words. Carrying out a carnivalesque discourse, a writer/the other has to converse with his/her "private vision" discovered by the writer's/the other's exploration in the unconscious. Although at the beginning stage the conversation between the writer/the other and his/her "private vision" is still very private as if the writer/the other is murmuring a secret to himself/herself, the writer/the other has already activated a lively dialogue shared by the writer/the other and the private vision. There may be not too much disagreement between them but compliance and connivance. But as the dialogue goes on with an excavation of more images or visions coming out of the deepest dark corners of the unconscious, a countervailing force increases. Then, conflicts and an urge to rebel against cliché, the fixed sign system (death) will come into being and break the balance of the connivance between the writer/the other and the private vision built up in the beginning of the encounter.

It is when the balance is broken, a full interplay between the other/writer and the

others/characters/language occurs. But how does the writer/the other break the bounds that restrain the countervailing force from surfacing out? The breaking force exists in the writer's/the other's instinct to defy the threat of death, a drive that pushes the writer to go beyond the bounds confined by their forerunners. But the "private vision" must be transformed into a design that can be shared and acknowledged by the writer's/the other's readers; that is, the unique vision has to be translated into the one related to a universal truth that the writer's readers can understand. Otherwise, it would still be a "private" vision that belongs to the writer only. "To the lighthouse" was the "universal" vision, a pattern (conscious realization) that Woolf found "behind the cotton wool" (in her unconscious), transformed from her "private" vision of her parents. Woolf's writing philosophy explicates the necessity of such a transformation. She wrote, "one's life is not confined to one's body and what one says and does; one is living all the time in relation to certain background rods or conceptions" (*Virginia Woolf: Moments of Being* 72 & 73). The vision, "to the lighthouse," which occurred to her one afternoon when she was taking a walk in Tavistock Square, was the pattern she discovered "in relation to certain background rods or conceptions." Those conceptions did not belong to the writer/the other only. They were shared by her readers out there in the world where she was living. At that moment of receiving the vision, a "shock" as she described, she felt that she could see the completion of the novel. Ideas flooded out of her mind one after another. She had no notion how it happened. She wrote quickly not as her self, but as a writer/the other who talked to the others/her characters, let her characters talk to each other, and made up images and scenes. She was engaging in a "novelistic enunciation" and "a carnivalesque discourse," to borrow Bakhtin's and Kristeva's words (their theories are detailed in the third chapter).

To see to the happening of creativity in creative writing (that is, an interplay between the writer/the other and the others/language/characters), teachers of creative writing should acknowledge that a writer's creativity does not come from nowhere but a writer's deliberate effort of plunging into the unconscious to engage with the others/feelings/thoughts, the source of a writer's creativity. Their writing idea can come from their search into their unconscious. Even though the writing idea is produced by an external stimuli, like Stendhal's encounter with the Italian countryside and Woolf's reading of Bennett's book and MacCarthy's columns, they still have to turn to their unconscious to find the others/feelings/thoughts to call for their creativity.

Two types of a writer's inner creative experiences--a sequence of drive-desire-vision and a sequence of vision-desire-drive--may help explain where a writer finds his/her writing idea. They can be considered two models of a writer's interior creative process that teachers of creative writing should notice when helping their students generate a writing idea, develop it, and turn it into a written product. The first type of the inner creative experience--a sequence of drive-desire-vision--requires a writer to get a writing idea from certain feeling that has stirred inside the writer for a while. The other--a sequence of vision-desire-drive--asks a writer to notice an exterior source that resonates with something inside the writer.

The first type of a writer's inner creative experience asks a writer to bring out any feelings that the writer has suffered or enjoyed for a while. Whatever it is a pain or a joy, it can become the source of the writer's writing idea; that is, the writer can turn that feeling, something stirred inside him/her, a drive, into a writing idea. Woolf's interior creative process of writing *To the Lighthouse* is a good example. She made her obsession of her parents, a

drive with which she had lived over thirty years, into a writing idea. But having a writing idea does not mean the rest part of the work will come naturally. The private feeling, a joy or a pain or Woolf's "deeply felt emotion," has to be turned into a design that can communicate with the public and present its uniqueness in the meantime. To do so, a writer needs to go into his/her unconscious to bring up a vision or an image that can echo and verbalize the drive/the feeling. It is how Woolf found out the image "to the lighthouse" one day when "[dream-]walking round Tavistock Square" (*Virginia Woolf: Moments of Being* 81). But what motivates a writer to pursue a writing idea, to develop it? It is the writer's desire to know what he/she would not have known, to go beyond the private feeling/drive. To still use Woolf's writing of *To the Lighthouse* as an example, it was her "desire to explain" what had happened to her after her mother's death, to gain power over her obsession with her parents, that instigated her to go into her unconscious to discover the image "to the lighthouse" (72). Without the "unforeseen discovery," Woolf's obsession with her parents would have stayed as her private feeling and would not have become a written product, *To the Lighthouse*.

The other type of a writer's inner creative experience requires a writer to get a writing idea from exterior stimuli; that is, things that pass by a writer daily can be a writing idea, including memories, the ones received by the writer's eyes, any thoughts that may drop by the writer's train of thought, or any values or beliefs against the writer's, like Stendhal's seeing the Italian countryside, Maxine Hong Kingston's vision of a book of "No" engendered by James Joyce's *Ulysses*, and Woolf's different vision of women's intellectuality and creativity from Bennett's and MacCarthy's. But not everything that passes by us can be caught by the writer and be turned into a writing idea. The writer still has to search in his/her unconscious to

discover something/a drive inside him/her that can be related to the vision that the writer gains from his/her first contact with the exterior stimuli. A vision can become a writing idea only when the writer internalizes it. And this is how Stendhal internalized Raphael's *Transfiguration* completed for two hundred and fifty years into his own coming age of fifty, his drive, which eventually became the book *Vie de Henry Brulard*, how Kingston found her own book of "No" against Joyce's book of "Yes" while discovering inside her that there are infinite stories (her drive) out there waiting for her to tell, like "the universe had . . . more than doubled," and how Woolf related herself as a woman novelist (her drive) to her predecessors that finally led her to create *A Room of One's Own* (*The Writer on Her Work* 182). And it is a writer's desire to go beyond their private vision such as Stendhal's vision of Raphael's *Transfiguration*, Kingston's vision of a book of "No" against Joyce's *Ulysses*, and Woolf's different vision of women from her male contemporaries, that makes the writer be able to develop the private one into a written product. A writer's desire to know the unknown acts as a bridge that leads a writer's initial vision to the drive that "verbalizes [the] vision," "the unforeseen discovery," a written product.

The two types of a writer's inner creative experiences--a sequence of drive-desire-vision and a sequence of vision-desire-drive--are also part of the process taking place in the interplay between a writer's unconscious and conscious. And in creative writing, it is never a one-person effort, but the incorporation of the writer/the other and the other voices in his/her unconscious. Once the engagement with the other voices/feelings/thoughts starts, the other is involving in an unfinalizable dialogue with the others/the countervailing forces, like human daily life that is always ongoing, creating new lives to conquer the threat of death, according to Bakhtin and

Kristeva. In other words, a writing teacher should let students realize that their interior creative processes are like their living lives that have pains, conflicts, sorrows, and joys, which they cannot escape and they have to touch on in their writings because writing is life itself, a living process, the co-existence and co-operation of our conscious and unconscious, the major source of our creativity.

2. Creative Writing: An Organic Process of Creating a New "Identity"

With this thought in mind that writing is a living process, it leads to the next pedagogical concept to which this study contributes: Creative writing is an organic process of making a new "identity" that distinguishes a writer's unique creativity and writing style. The organic part of this concept is similar to the common belief that we write to learn, heal, and re-create ourselves, though each dwells on a different purpose. I discuss such a popular belief first and then take on a carnivalesque discourse with this belief to make it grow, a demonstration of an organic process.

For some creative writers who believe in the power of writing to re-create themselves, writing is a time tunnel in which they make sense of their pasts, make the present meaningful, and envision their futures. Mary Catherine Bateson in her book *Composing a Life* compares this process to "a day-by-day process of self-invention--not discovery, for what we search for does not exist until we find it" because "the past and the future are raw materials, shaped and reshaped by each individual" (28). According to this belief, our daily living details become the best sources of our writing materials. A thread of our lives can be developed into a writing piece. To continue using Bateson's words, writing is a process of "composing a life":

Composing a life involves a continual reimagining of the future and reinterpretation of the past to give meaning to the present, remembering best those events that prefigured what followed, forgetting those that proved to have no meaning within the narrative (29-30).

In other words, writing is our continuous conversation with our past because each present moment of our life is the next-minute past. Whatever we are thinking about, we are dealing with our past. And our past keeps coming back to us whatever it happened a long time ago or just a few minutes ago. The act of “reimagining of the future” is a re-creation of our past. Our blurring memories play an important role in the process of “re-creation” because we always try to figure out what happened to us, to make meaning out of it. Bateson said well, “With every retelling, words that barely fit began to fit the stereotype” (32). Even when it comes to our recent memories where distortion is almost impossible, “memories are modified and details supplied to fit cultural expectations” (32). To summarize, we always try to create a world that makes sense to us, to reconcile the conflicts between our instinctual drives and the expectation of our social milieu. A writer’s work can never escape the fictional component threaded through the whole writing piece whatever it is in a form of memoir or reporting literature, because a writing piece is produced from the blurring regions of the writer’s memories, Woolf’s “cotton wool,” our unconscious.

William Zinsser’s thoughts on writing in his book *Inventing the Truth: The Art and Craft of Memoir* may further help us understand the idea that writing is composed of writers’ imagination and their past, including their ancestors’, as the only source they can have to reimagine their futures:

If writing is thinking and discovery and selection and order and meaning, it is also awe and reverence and mystery and magic. I suppose I could dispense with the last four if I were not so deadly serious about fidelity to the milieu out of which I write and in which my

ancestors actually lived. Infidelity to that milieu--the absence of the interior life, the deliberate excising of it from the records that the slaves themselves told--is precisely the problem in the discourse that proceeded without us. How I gain access to that interior life is what drives me and is the part of this talk which both distinguishes my fiction from autobiographical strategies and which also embraces certain autobiographical strategies. It is a kind of literary archeology: on the basis of some information and a little bit of guesswork you journey to a site to see what remains were left behind and to reconstruct the world that these remains imply. What makes it fiction is the nature of the imaginative act: my reliance on the image--on the remains--in addition to recollection, to yield up a kind of a truth (111-112).

Reconstructing our past in order to "give meaning to the present," though involving the re-
interpreting of the past, reimagining of the future, and re-creating of the blurring parts, is a
passive thought. The process of imagining and creating should carry more profound and
constructive meaning. This process should also be seen as a writer's continuous effort of
creating a new "identity" that grows and changes with the writer's deeper and deeper
involvement with other voices/feelings/thoughts hidden in the unconscious as one writing
project comes after another and yet another. The creation of a new "identity" is a process of
making a contingent self, a non-stop engagement with creativity that distinguishes a writer's
unique writing style. Or to borrow Bateson's language, a writer's creative process is a unique
presentation of how the writer composes a life, a new "identity." And this process is organic
and never comes to an end as long as the writer keeps breaking the bounds, the threat of death,
to countervail each sign system that is built into each of the writer's works that comes one
after another.

To use Woolf's writing of *To the Lighthouse*, she overcame her obsession with her
parents by turning her "deeply felt emotion" into a universal truth that can be acknowledged by
her readers. By doing so, she raised her old self to another level, a new "identity" that had re-

interpreted her past, re-created the “blurring parts” in the past, and re-imagined her future. She countervailed the fixed sign system (her obsession of her parents) that she had carried for over thirty years until she was able to create a new one in *To the Lighthouse*. Another example is her creation of *A Room of One's Own*. Although her idea that women's intellectuality and creativity were not less than men in the article “The Intellectual Status of Women” (1920) written in response to Bennett's and MacCarthy's patriarchal views about women was carried to her writing of *A Room of One's Own*. But the idea that a woman needs money and a room of her own to write fiction came to her nine years after. Her continuing effort of re-making her self was the key element that led her to reach such an innovative idea that women should be given various opportunities to become who they want to be. She, for example, made herself a renown publisher and well-established woman novelist who kept experimenting with innovative narratives from her short-story practices to her novels *Jacob's Room* (1923), *Mrs. Dalloway* (1925), and *To the Lighthouse* (1927). These two roles had led her to create a new “identity” that most women at her time could never have dreamed of. She found the new “identity” through her continuous engagement with different writing projects and novel writings, and her new “identity” would never stop growing as long as she kept exploring the other voices/thoughts/feelings inside her, her unconscious, to re-create herself incessantly.

However, the process of creating or growing a new “identity,” a unique writing style, may take a long time, for to cross a “private vision” is hard. In Woolf's cases of writing *To the Lighthouse* and *A Room of One's Own*, her creative processes of generating the two books took thirty years for the former and nine years for the latter, though her actual writing time for them was one and a half years and one year respectively. But such a long preparation process

was not deliberately planned by Woolf. It lived inside her naturally like her breath. The only deliberate thing she did was to be very aware of what was going on in her mind and heart. With a desire to solve the mysteries, the drives that stirred in her, she resolved her obsession with her mother in *To the Lighthouse* and confirmed her innovative ideas about women and fiction in *A Room of One's Own*. In other words, Woolf's creative process does not start from the present moment of her actual writing. It should have been started long time ago with or without her acknowledgment of it. In the long creative process before the writing idea was transcribed into words, she was cultivating her writing idea into a new "identity," a unique writing style, her creativity. Long before she could find words to fit into the standards of the new "identity," she had to feel the "right rhythm," or "a sight, an emotion" that tingled in her mind (*Letters of Virginia Woolf* III 247). Most important of all, her cultivation of the new "identity" should be continuously fueled with her desire. Without the strong desire to know more, to find out the truth, the writer's drive and vision would either be forgotten, disappear, or become his/her life-long problem that never rests. Woolf's case seems unusual, but it should hold some truth to the length of time that other professional writers worked on their writing projects.

Such a long cultivation of a new "identity," a unique writing style, is organic, like our breathing, which, I believe, does not only belong to the so-called gifted such as Shakespeare and Virginia Woolf. The more we know about their creative processes, their minds at work, the more we will believe that each of us can be as creative because we have been practicing such a creative process for our individual interests. The only difference between us and those great creative writers is that we do not make a conscious effort to explore and materialize our

feelings/thoughts hidden in our unconscious, the source of our creativity, into a creative work. Woolf made what was in her unconscious her conscious effort to realize her innovative thoughts in art and fiction writing into *To the Lighthouse* and *A Room of One's Own*. Her creative processes of generating the two works were not some kind of miracle or inspiration that fell on her suddenly. They were the combined work of her predecessors and her conscious determination to break free from the old values imposed on women and fiction writing. By letting her feelings and thoughts in her unconscious surface, she could create the new "identities" for the two works that distinguish her unique writing styles from her forerunners and her contemporary. And I believe that each of us possesses such an ability to create our new "identities," our unique writing styles. With a reference to Shakespeare's sister who was not given a chance to write poetry, Woolf had declared such a belief for us:

She [Shakespeare's sister] died young--alas, she never wrote a word. She lies buried where the omnibuses now stop, opposite the Elephant and Castle. Now my belief is that this poet who never wrote a word and was buried at the crossroads still lives. She lives in you and in me . . . (113).

C. The Limitation of This Study

Although I have completed my analyses of Woolf's interior voyages toward creating new "identities" in her creations of *To the Lighthouse* and *A Room of One's Own*, there is still one major problem that this study cannot solve: How a writer's mind proceeds in the interplay between the other/the new "identity" and other voices/thoughts/feelings--that is, how a writer discovers other voices/thoughts/feelings in his/her unconscious.

According to Kristeva and Bakhtin, a writer has to countervail a fixed sign system, a familiar language if the writer wants to create a new one. In the process of countervailing, the

writer is engaging in argument, reconciliation, and polemics, that is, an interplay between the other/writer and the others/characters/language (an interplay between the conscious and unconscious). I know that such an interplay is a necessary step that a writer has to take if he/she wants to turn ideas into a creative work, to go beyond his/her predecessors. In the case of my interior creative process of generating this study, I as a researcher/the other, totally acknowledge the necessity of my inner dialogue with the knowledge I learned from the readings applied to my work. Although I employ Bakhtin's and Kristeva's theories to develop my own ideas, I could not have done it without going through a dialogic process with them. I quoted their theories to support my ideas in the study. In the process I had to engage in an argument with those theories. I absorbed the parts that were useful for the development of my ideas and discarded the ones that did not fit into the design of the study. What I presented in the study was not just a combination of Bakhtin's, Kristeva's, and my ideas, but a new product refined by a catalyst of the three major sources. And this process has been commonly employed by Virginia Woolf and many other writers in their works.

But even though I know a writer has to take on such an inner dialogue, I do not know how the inner dialogue proceeds in a writer's mind. In other words, I still do not understand how I theorized the ideas hidden in my unconscious in the process of writing this dissertation. I only know that I took Kristeva's and Bakhtin's to argue, absorb, and remove the ideas that came to me from my unconscious. Did each point I made in this study just come to me from my reasoning with the other voices/thoughts/feelings in my unconscious? Was my argument a logic ordering, like counting numbers from one to ten? If so, why had I already discovered the idea that a writer creates a new "identity" when the writer completes each of his/her creative

works before I found Holland's study of Robert Frost's brain? If the other voices/thoughts/feelings in our unconscious do not come to us in order, then how is a writer's unconscious at work while engaged by the writer as the other? Argument, polemics, and confirmation are terms that help us understand what we were doing. They are our reflections on what we have already done, not the steps that our complicated mind takes to reach a compromise or an innovation. Those terms do not tell us what is going on in our mind in the process. In other words, this study only provides a broad view of the process at the stage of a writer's play with language and other voices/thoughts/feelings. I only used the text, for example *To the Lighthouse*, and Bakhtin's and Kristeva's theories to explain how Woolf achieved the presentation of the simultaneity of things. How Woolf, during her/the other's contact with the others in her unconscious, proceeded her reasoning in her mind is still in the dark. But, maybe, because the language for the procedures is yet to be discovered, or those procedures happen too fast for us to capture, this study cannot propose more specific details about how the interplay proceeds. The final versions of the two books *To the Lighthouse* and *A Room of One's Own* that we have are certainly not the exact copies of her inner dialogues which should have been enacted more liberally and went far beyond the bounds of the written language. Her inner thoughts could fly to the past, the present, and future without the limits of time and space. And it is the mystery of human mind that upon until now no one can give an appropriate explanation.

William Zinsser's words in his book *Inventing the Truth* help summarize the mysterious or the unconscious part of our mind in writing:

If writing is thinking and discovering and selection and order and meaning, it is also awe

and reverence and mystery and magic. I suppose I could dispense with the last four if I were not so deadly serious about fidelity to the milieu out of which I write and in which my ancestors actually lived (111).

If a writer's inner thoughts are the resources of his/her writing, then the writer's interior creative process is a process of sorting out other voices/thoughts/feelings from the unconscious (the mysterious and magical part) and ordering his/her entangled thoughts with the help of the conscious and unconscious. Neither of them can be left out in the whole creative process. But as what Zinsser says that writing is also "mystery and magic," most part of a writer's interior creative process still remains unknown to us, like how a writer's mind is at work when the writer/the other engages in an interplay with other voices/thoughts/feelings. My theory of a writer's interior voyage toward writing is still a broad view of how a writer proceeds his/her interior creative process.

I hope my study of a writer's interior voyage toward writing, a combined effort of and an interplay between a writer's conscious and unconscious, can shed some light on further researches on this topic. My study has just revealed one small corner of the whole complicated creative process. And I believe my theory as a new "identity" I have just created will continue to grow and change with more people contributing their creative thoughts to a writer's interior creative process.

Appendix

GLOSSARY

Introduction

Following are the definitions of the terms used in the study. They are based on Cixous's concepts of her interior creative process. The term "personal identity" originally comes from Holland's concept of a writer's brain at work in reading and writing (1988), but its meaning is broadened in this study by being combined into Cixous's concept of otherness. The term blindness is defined with vision because one is better understood in the light of the other. Self and otherness are also put together to clarify their complicated relationship.

Definitions

Body

Wherever the initial writing idea starts, it has to go through a writer's body first which acts as a medium between the writer's felt sense and his/her physical writing activity. The body should also be seen as a signifier, a border, that a writer tries to go beyond or extend in order to let the unknown come out, to put the writer on the crossing of the known and the unknown.

Death

Death here does not mean the death of the writer literally, but the writer's effort to put his known into death to engage in the unknown.

Desire

Desire is a writer's urge to go beyond the bounds that confine the writer. And death is usually the greatest motivation behind to push the writer to desire the impossible, the unknown.

Drive

Drive works as the original cause of a writer's writing. The cause may arise from the inside of a writer who wants to resolve the mystery that has haunted him/her for a long time. It may be invoked by an exterior encounter which connects with something that has already existed inside the writer.

"Identity"

"Identity," employed in this study, is borrowed from Holland's term "personal identity" in his book *The Brain of Robert Frost*, which is not limited to our narrow understanding of a person's national, ethnic, and cultural identity. It is a term used to describe the result of a writer's self-othering, a creation of the writer's known and unknown which stands for a new being that decides the uniqueness of a creative work.

Self and Otherness

One's otherness refers to a new being that one has to create by walking out of one's self/ego, the original self/the known, to become the other, a new "personal identity." In other words, one's transformation into the other is the key element to transcribe a writer's drive, desire, and vision. One's otherness also refers to one's fight with one's self/ego. Without the appearance of the other, one will always indulge in one's self, and writing, split off from one's

ego, will never happen.

Vision and Blindness

Vision is the result of a writer's desire for death in the creative process that the writer has to create for the realization of the writer's drive and desire. Before the revelation of a vision in a writer's mind's eye, the writer has to grope in the dark, the writer's blindness, that the unknown put him/her into. But, sometimes, vision will come to the writer before his/her drive and desire. In this situation, vision acts as a mind picture that leads to one after another until it touches something deep down inside the writer.

Bibliography

- Bakhtin, M. M. *The Dialogic Imagination*. Ed. Michael Holquist. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1981.
- Banks, Joanne Trautmann, ed. *Congenial Spirits: The Selected Letters of Virginia Woolf*. London: The Hogarth Press, 1989.
- Bateson, Mary Catherine. *Composing a Life*. New York: The Atlantic Monthly Press, 1989.
- Bell, Anne Olivier, ed. *The Diary of Virginia Woolf*. Vol. 2. New York and London: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1978.
- . *The Diary of Virginia Woolf*. Vol. 3. New York and London: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1980.
- Bell, Quentin. *Virginia Woolf: A Biography*. 2 vols. San Diego, New York, and London: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1972.
- Bernstein, Lisa Ellen. *"Self-Othering" as a Strategy of Women's Creative Expression in Literature and Art*. Dissertation, University of Maryland at College Park, 1998.
- Bloom, Harold. *The Anxiety of Influence: A Theory of Poetry*. London and New York: Oxford University Press, 1981.
- Cixous, Helene. *"Coming to Writing" and Other Essays*. Ed. Deborah Jenson. Cambridge, Mass. and London, England: Harvard University Press, 1991.
- . *Stigmata: Escaping Texts*. London and New York: Routledge, 1998.
- . *Three Steps on the Ladder of Writing*. Trans. Sarah Cornell and Susan Sellers. New York: Columbia University Press, 1993.
- Cixous, Helene and Mireille Calle-Gruber. *Helene Cixous Rootprints: Memory and Life Writing*. Trans. Eric Prenowitz. London and New York: Routledge, 1997.
- Dick, Susan, ed. *Virginia Woolf: To the Lighthouse--The original holograph draft*. Toronto and Buffalo: University of Toronto Press, 1982.
- Freud, Sigmund. *Leonard da Vinci and a Memory of His Childhood*. Trans. Alan Tyson. Ed. James Strachey. New York: Norton, 1989.

- Gardner, Howard. *Extraordinary Minds: Portraits of Exceptional Individuals and an Examination of Our Extraordinariness*. New York: BasicBooks, 1977.
- Greenacre, Phyllis. *Swift and Carroll: A Psychoanalytic Study of Two Lives*. New York: International Universities Press, 1955.
- Gruber, Howard E. *Darwin on Man: A Psychological Study of Scientific Creativity*. 2nd ed. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1981.
- Hays, Janice N., Phyllis A. Roth, Jon R. Ramsey, and Robert D. Foulke, eds. *The Writer's Mind: Writing as a Mode of Thinking*. Urbana, Illinois: National Council of Teachers of English, 1983.
- Holland, Norman N. *The Brain of Robert Frost*. New York and London: Routledge, 1988.
- . *The I*. New Haven, CN.: Yale University Press, 1985.
- Jewell, Phebe. *The Foreign Mirror: Exile, Identity, and the Creative Process in Stendhal, Gertrude Stein, and Samuel Beckett*. Dissertation, University of Washington, 1994.
- Kazin, Alfred, intro. *Writers at Work: The Paris Review Interviews*. Third Series. New York: The Viking Press, 1967.
- Kristeva, Julia. *Desire in Language: A Semiotic Approach to Literature and Art*. Ed. Leon S. Roudiez. New York: Columbia University Press, 1980.
- Kubie, Lawrence S. *Neurotic Distortion of the Creative Process*. Lawrence: University of Kansas Press, 1958.
- Le Guin, Ursula K. *Dancing at the Edge of the World: Thoughts on Words, Women, Places*. New York: Grove Press, 1989.
- Leaska, Mitchell A., ed. *A Passionate Apprentice: The Early Journals 1897-1909 of Virginia Woolf*. London: The Hogarth Press, 1990.
- . *Granite and Rainbow: The Hidden Life of Virginia Woolf*. New York: Farrar, Straus, and Giroux, 1998.
- McLaughlin, Patricia N. *The Intelligent Eye, the Thinking Hand, and the Interpretative Ear: A Multisensory Model for Teaching Composing Processes to Basic Writers*. Dissertation, University of Oregon, 1995.
- McNichol, Stella, ed. and intro. *Mrs. Dalloway's Party: A Short Story Sequence by Virginia*

- Woolf*. New York and London: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1973.
- Majumdar, Robin and Allen McLaurin, eds. *Virginia Woolf: The Critical Heritage*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1975.
- Mancuso, Carolina. *From Real Life to Tall Tale--And Back Again: Using Autobiographical Fiction--Writing to Understand Self, Others and the World*. Dissertation, New York University, 1998.
- Mills, Ralph J., Jr. *Cry of the Human: Essays on Contemporary American Poetry*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1975.
- Morson, Gary Saul and Caryl Emerson. *Mikhail Bakhtin: Creation of a Prosaics*. Stanford, California: Stanford University Press, 1990.
- Nicolson, Nigel and Joanne Trautmann, eds. *A Reflection of the Other Person: The Letters of Virginia Woolf*. Vol. 4. London: The Hogarth Press, 1978.
- . *The Letters of Virginia Woolf*. Vol. 3. New York and London: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1977.
- . *The Letters of Virginia Woolf*. Vol. 4. New York and London: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1978.
- Oughourlian, Jean-Michel. *The Puppet of Desire: The Psychology of Hysteria, Possession, and Hypnosis*. Trans. Eugene Webb. Stanford, California: Stanford University Press, 1991.
- Pemberton, Michael A. "Modeling Theory and Composing Process Models." *College Composition and Communication*. 44.1 (1993): 53.
- Piaget, Jean. *The Language and Thought of the Child*. New York, N.Y.: New American Library, 1974.
- Plimpton, George, ed. *Women Writers at Work: The Paris Review Interviews*. Intro. Margaret Atwood. New York and London: The Viking, 1989.
- Rich, Susanna Lippoczy. *Mirror, Mirror: An Autobiographical Study in Creative Process*. Dissertation, New York University, 1987.
- Rohman, D. Gordon. "Pre-Writing: The Stage of Discovery in the Writing Process." *Theory and Practice in the Teaching of Composition: Processing, Distancing, and Modeling*. Eds. Miles Myers and James Gray. Urbana, Illinois: National Council of Teachers of English, 1983. 88-89.

- Rorty, Richard. *Contingency, irony, and solidarity*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1989.
- Rosen, Amy. *The Pulse of Colour: A Story of Virginia Woolf*. Dissertation, University of New York at Buffalo, 1981.
- Rosenbaum, S. P., ed. Introduction. *Virginia Woolf: Women and Fiction—The Manuscript versions of A Room of One's Own*. Oxford, UK: Blackwell Publishers, 1992.
- Rugg, Harold. *Imagination*. New York: Harper & Row, 1963.
- Schulkind, Jeanne, ed. *Virginia Woolf: Moments of Being*. London: Sussex University Press, 1976.
- Sternburg, Janet, ed. *The Writer on Her Work*. New York and London: W. W. Norton & Company, 1980.
- Tamaro, Thomas Michael. *To Love What Is Near: Self, Language and World in the Poetry of William Stafford*. Dissertation, Ball State University, 1980.
- Wallace, Doris B. and Howard E. Gruber, eds. *Creative People at Work*. New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1989.
- Winderl, Carl A., Jr. *A Creative Process that Produces an Autobiographical Novel: An Aesthetic Historical Study*. Dissertation, New York University, 1985.
- Woolf, Leonard. *Downhill All the Way: An Autobiography of the Years 1919-1939*. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1967.
- Woolf, Virginia. *A Haunted House and Other Short Stories*. San Diego, New York, and London: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1972.
- . *A Room of One's Own*. Forward by Mary Gordon. San Diego, New York, London: Harcourt Brace & Company, 1981.
- . *The Moment and Other Essays*. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company, 1948.
- . *To the Lighthouse*. Foreword by Eudora Welty. San Diego, New York, and London: Harcourt Brace & Company, 1981.
- Young-Bruehl, Elisabeth. *Creative Characters*. New York: Routledge, 1991.
- Zinsser, William. *Inventing the Truth: The Art and Craft of Memoir*. Boston: Houghton

Mifflin Company, 1987.