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CHAPTER I
Rhetoric, Feminism, and the Tradition of the Essay:
Definitions and Syntheses

For feminist critics, . . . not only is the personal the political; the aesthetic is the political, the literary is the political, and the rhetorical is the political.

-- Sandra M. Gilbert
"What Do Feminist Critics Want?"

Introduction: The Critical Problem

When we think of the rhetorical tradition, names such as Plato, Aristotle, Cicero, St. Augustine, Peter Ramus, Bishop Whately, Kenneth Burke, and Wayne Booth first come to mind . . . all names of men . . . men who both conceptualized and practiced the art of rhetoric. When we consider the rhetorical tradition in light of these men, two obvious trends emerge: first, the manner in which the concept of rhetoric has evolved over the centuries and, second, the manner in which females have been excluded from the traditional canon of rhetoric.

With such men in mind, if we try to reconcile an interest in rhetoric, which is traditionally a male province, with an interest in feminism, which is
traditionally a re-vision of such male provinces, we might begin questioning how feminist writers, using a phallogocentric language, have imitated, revised, and/or transcended traditional rhetorical strategies so as to argue their ideas and, in the process, subvert age-old sexist ideas and forms that have been created through this very same language. Such questions, popularized by rhetorical critics such as Kenneth Burke, are becoming more and more interesting to feminist critics too, as indicated in Joseph A. Boone's 1987 article, "How Feminist Criticism Changes the Study of Literature," which calls for a synthesis of feminist and rhetorical perspectives:

In response to the potential deadlock between political agendas and aesthetic criteria, one branch of feminist literary criticism has moved toward analyzing how social or ideological beliefs—especially those concerning the sexes—have been translated into literary forms and conventions that at once encode and perpetuate those values. If we can put our finger on what makes a work tick—that is, how its linguistic, stylistic, and structural elements contribute to a meaning that is never really neutral—we can begin to decipher the ways in which aesthetic and political concerns converge, not only in a given text but also in the culture at large (76).

In this study, I will investigate one particular question: how do feminist essayists—specifically Virginia Woolf and Adrienne Rich—create texts so that readers can first identify with the text and then be
persuaded to action or, as Kenneth Burke contends in *A Rhetoric of Motives*, "'to attitude'" (50)? As a part of this investigation, I intend to examine how the rhetorical strategies in these two women's essays imitate, revise and/or transcend/subvert traditional rhetorical strategies within the essay form. In the process, I will discuss the rhetoric of feminism that emerges, specifically the ways in which ideology is manifested in content and form within given situations.

This original question, however, soon complicates itself by raising another question: specifically, what methodology should be employed to answer this question properly? In *Literary Theory: An Introduction*, Marxist critic Terry Eagleton calls for the reinstatement of rhetorical criticism as a viable means of literary criticism. He argues not for the rhetoric of old, reduced by many latter-day thinkers to a system of tropes and formulaic patterns, but instead for a new rhetoric that draws from such diverse critical schools as formalism, marxism, structuralism, semiotics, reception theory, and deconstruction (206). Drawing from Eagleton's conception of rhetoric, I will employ a rhetorical criticism that interinanimates situation, author, text, and audience to analyze the texts of Woolf and Rich.
For this study, I will focus on only one genre—the
essay, specifically the essays of Woolf and Rich.
These two prominent twentieth-century essayists, who
also happen to be a novelist and a poet, emerge from
a long tradition of essayists. This tradition is
actually comprised of both men and women, but the
official canon of essayists is composed predominantly
of men. This situation confers a strange status upon
Woolf and Rich because it locates them within a
canonized tradition that they are, at the same time,
 apart from. Despite this similarity, Woolf and Rich
have strong differences. They write at different times—
Woolf in the first half of the twentieth-century, Rich
in the latter half. And despite their agreement that
the lot of women must be changed, Woolf and Rich present
different methods to achieve this end. Rich even
frequently disputes premises from Woolf's earlier essays
in an attempt to strengthen her own radical/lesbian
feminist assertions. Moreover, as can be seen in later
chapters, these two feminists have very different
writing styles. I considered analyzing other, less
well-known women, but because I envision this study as a
first step in defining a rhetoric of feminist essays, I
decided, without any intention of creating a hierarchy,
to begin with these two prominent writers whose texts
have probably garnered the widest readership.
Because the essay form is not traditionally as associated with women as is the novel or the diary, the adoption of the essay form by feminist writers may, at first glance, seem slightly eccentric. From this perspective, the synthesis of feminist concerns and the essay form may be seen in a variety of ways: as a branching out to new and unfamiliar territory, as a bid for power (in terms of feminists' obtaining access to all the available means of persuasion), or even as a means of validation, i.e., a means for feminists to prove themselves as talented as their male counterparts.

Yet from another perspective, the merging of feminist ideology and the essay form seems perfectly suited. What better way to establish identification with an audience than by using an accepted, comfortable form? Since the informal essay presupposes a mind in motion on the page, perhaps this expectation by the reader would make the content slightly less threatening. This presupposition would be attractive to the feminist writer too, especially given that, as Shirly Brice Heath contends, the informal essay allows the implied author to assert her own voice, aggressively, and to cite her proofs as personal "observation and internal spirit" (New Hampshire speech).

To contextualize this study, I will trace the tradition of the essay, examine the tradition
of women writers, and present working definitions of rhetoric and feminism along with a discussion of how both fields have been synthesized in previous research.

The Tradition of the Essay: Formal and Informal Essays

As previously noted, I will focus this study only on the essay—both formal and informal—even though the essay is just one genre that feminist writers have employed to promote and perpetuate their particular ideologies. The distinctions between the formal essay and the informal essay, while helpful for definition purposes, are oftentimes ambiguous—hazy and blurred. Although this present study makes no claims of being the definitive history of the essay, a few generalizations about the origins and development of both the formal and the informal essay forms are necessary in order to establish Woolf and Rich as part of an Anglo-American tradition of essayists, specifically a tradition of feminist essayists.

Formal Essay. In The Prevalent Forms of Prose, the formal essay is described as "characterized primarily by its serious purpose, its public orientation, its orderliness, and its dispassionate style (Winchester, Weathers 107). Beginning as a predominantly male-dominated form, the formal essay may trace its origins to the character sketches of Theophrastus, the histories
of Herodotus, and the philosophical writings of Cicero, as well as to the teachings of the authors of Ecclesiastes and the Book of Wisdom, (Williams, The Essay 19; also see Winchester, Weathers 110-112).

Traditionally, from the seventeenth to the twentieth centuries, the canons of English and American literature include mostly men who have influenced the development of the formal essay away from literary aims. The seventeenth century saw the rise in prominence of the formal essay—e.g., John Milton's Areopagitica and John Locke's Essay Concerning Human Understanding (although Locke's method parallels Montaigne's example of generalizing about the world, based mostly on his own experiences). Eighteenth-century English literature gave way to the periodical essay, but nineteenth-century England saw another resurgence of the formal essay, this time as the critical essay, published in periodicals such as the Edinburgh Review and the Westminster Review and written by authors such as T. B. Macaulay, Thomas Carlyle, Leslie Stephen, George Eliot, and Matthew Arnold, to name only a few. In America, though, the formal essay never reached the literary heights that other genres have. Although the American formal essay can trace its roots to the writings of Jonathan Edwards, Benjamin Franklin, Thomas Jefferson, Thomas Paine, and St. John de Crevecoeur and to the critical essays of
Edgar Allan Poe, it survives today, as it does in England, mainly in the form of professional, "factual" articles that concern historic, scientific, business, religious, and educational subjects. In the present form of the formal essay, literary aims, if they exist at all, have become secondary.

The formal essay has sometimes been employed by both British and American feminists, especially in the late eighteenth, early nineteenth centuries, to prove that women can argue their points just as logically and dispassionately as men. Mary Wollstonecraft's *A Vindication of the Rights of Woman* (1792) and Harriet Martineau's "On Female Education," which was published in the Unitarian journal *Monthly Review* (1823), are just two examples. Both writers logically argued against the then popular notion that women's minds were inferior to men's, and both logically argued for the increased quantity and quality of education for women, grounding their claims in the Enlightenment idea of education as the solution to all the world's problems. Most feminist essayists, however, trace their roots to the informal essay.

**Informal Essay.** The informal essay—sometimes called the *familiar essay*, the *personal essay*, or just the *essay*—almost escapes definition. As Edward P.J. Corbett states in *The Essay: Subjects and Stances*,
"The term essay has become so elastic that it no longer clearly designates a distinctive kind of literary discourse" (xv). This elasticity in definition results partially because the informal essay is "an unconscious, rather than a conscious, work of art" (Williams, *The Essay* 20). That is, the thoughts of the informal essayist are recorded seemingly as they appeared to her, demonstrating her attempt, as a specific individual within a specific situation, to understand her topic—hence, the name essay, which is derived from the French verb essayer (to try, to attempt). Despite the existing ambiguity, the informal essay can be generally characterized by its "personal element (self-revelation, individual tastes and experiences, confidential manner), humor, graceful style, rambling structure, unconventionality or novelty of theme, freshness of form, freedom from stiffness and affectation, incomplete or tentative treatment of topic" (Holman 204).

The informal essay originates with Michel de Montaigne, who published his "highly personal, charmingly casual" two-volume *Essais* in 1580 (Corbett 2). The following nineteenth-century version of the creation of the informal essay will no doubt make feminists shudder, personifying as it does the notion of patriarchy as "the great white father," who, isolated and alone, dictates his ideas to the rest of the world:
It is not often that we can date with any approach to accuracy the arrival of a new class of literature into the world, but it was in the month of March, 1571, that the essay was invented. It was started in the second story of the old tower of Castle Montaigne, in a study to which the philosopher withdrew for that purpose surrounded by his books, close to his chapel, sheltered from the excesses of the fatiguing world. (Edmund Gosse, encyclopedia entry; qtd. in Williams The Essay 20)

According to the traditional canon of literature, English writers soon followed Montaigne's example. In 1597, Francis Bacon published his Essays, ten informal essays noted for their practical advice and aphoristic style. Bacon, while still writing from a personal perspective, did not imitate Montaigne's style exactly; instead of generalizing about the world from intimate, personal experience, Bacon's implied author keeps himself more distanced from the reader than does Montaigne's. Both writers, however, serve as models for subsequent informal essayists, who address a plethora of topics from a personal perspective.

Eighteenth-century England generated still more interest in the informal essay, thanks to the rise in newspaper and periodical publications. Probably the most well-known examples of periodical essays are the serious and the occasional essays of Joseph Addison and Richard Steele, published in Steele's Tatler and later in their daily paper, Spectator. These periodical essays expanded the circle of readers to include the
middle class as well as the formally educated audience; moreover, these essays expanded potential topics from a concentration on personal thoughts and experiences to an interest in general societal conditions.

Nineteenth-century England also saw great changes in the informal essay. Essayists of the Romantic Movement, such as Charles Lamb, William Hazlitt, and Thomas DeQuincey, also found an audience in the readers of periodicals, such as London Magazine. Because of the length of these periodicals—approximately 200 pages—and because of the time span between publications—from two weeks to three months—these Romantic writers had time to write and revise longer essays. But length was not their only contribution to the development of the essay. They renewed interest in the personal element of the informal essay and created an essay "more sober in its tone, more impassioned in its rhythms, and more ornate in its style," modelled closely after seventeenth-century essays (Corbett xviii). The Victorian essayists, such as T.B. Macaulay, Matthew Arnold, and Robert Louis Stevenson, reversed this trend toward the ornate. As the century progressed, their writing evolved toward a clearer, cleaner style, more reminiscent of the eighteenth-century essayists than of their immediate predecessors, the Romantics. This Victorian tradition of essays was carried into the
twentieth century by writers, such as G.K. Chesterton, and resulted in the journalistic style so popular during our century.

In America, the first great informal essayists were probably from the nineteenth century—Washington Irving, Ralph Waldo Emerson, Henry David Thoreau, and Mark Twain. They influenced the essay form, generally making it more American, either by discussing only American concerns or by imitating the vernacular of various American regions.

The twentieth century, with its increased number of magazines and newspapers, saw the rise of the article but the decline of the essay, a decline in numbers and in its reputation as a literary form. The New Journalists of the late 1960's, early 1970's—Thomas Wolfe, Jimmy Breslin, Clay Felker, and Gloria Steinhem—tried to revive the informal essay, and for a time were successful. But despite their attempts to renew interest in the essay form, the genre never quite generated as much critical and popular respect as some people hoped. Instead, the essay was relegated to composition classrooms, where student writers now employ a formulaic form of this genre as a means of learning how to write. At present, however, informal essays are once again receiving attention in the publishing world,
appearing in magazines, such as Newsweek, The Atlantic Monthly, Harpers, and The New Yorker.

In terms of the development of the essay, three generalizations may be made. First, the essay and extended non-fiction prose have evolved aesthetically into a much ignored form, a second sister to fiction, poetry, and drama—in Jim Corder's words, "second-class, somehow inferior, other than art" ("Rhetorical Analysis of Writing" 240). Second, oftentimes the essay is misconstrued as an objective form, reflecting reality accurately and factually; thus, it is "made to seem natural when [it is] determined by history, not nature (McCord 747). Third, as evidenced by the above history of the essay, women essayists do not prominently figure into the popular tradition of the essay until the twentieth century, when Virginia Woolf, Joan Didion, Maxine Hong Kingston, and Adrienne Rich, to name only a few, began to command admiration and respect.

Traditions of Women Writers: Feminist, Feminine, or Female?

Although Woolf and Rich belong to a traditional canon of essayists, they also belong to a tradition of women essayists. By the late eighteenth century a few women such as Mary Wollstonecraft were publicly recognized for writing and publishing essays on the condition of women as well as for imitating and revising
the evolving essay form for their own ends. The nineteenth century, especially, saw the adoption of the essay by women writers, such as Agnes Repplier, Harriet Martineau, Margaret Fuller, Margaret Sanger, and Emma Goldman, who produced pamphlets about social, political, religious, economic, sexual, and literary concerns of women. The premise underlying most of these women's arguments is based, surprisingly enough, in sophistic rhetoric, which usually dealt with the antithesis between nature and law—that is, between what is objectively true and what is man-made (Kennedy 25). This dialectic, whose resulting synthesis could conceivably stimulate social change, stimulated many eighteenth- and nineteenth-century feminist essayists, and although few twentieth-century feminist essayists believe in an objective Truth, most would no doubt agree that, within our specific social constructs, certain truths do emerge. Thus, the dialectic of the sophists has often been revised and then employed in feminist essays to justify demands for change. Interestingly, many of these published essays were first speeches, later revised for publication, much like Woolf's A Room of One's Own.

Reference to a feminist tradition, however, precipitates certain definition questions, the most obvious being how to differentiate between a female, a
feminine, and a feminist tradition and their accompanying rhetorics. For the purposes of this study, which focuses on feminist rhetoric, I consider feminist rhetoric to be grounded in ideology; feminine, in socially constructed gender differences; and female, in biological sex differences. While these three types of rhetoric may at times overlap, they can be, and often are, very different. As Viviane Forrester states, just because a woman authors a text is no indication that a feminine rhetoric/ideology exists within that text or, by extension, that a feminist rhetoric/ideology exists within that text. As both Forrester and Shoshana Felman assert, a woman may use a male's language and a masculine perspective, knowingly or unknowingly, to interpret and create her world, thus perpetuating patriarchy (M. Eagleton 35-36).

In A Room of One's Own, Virginia Woolf calls for the creation of a tradition of women writers, believing such a tradition of women would strengthen subsequent generations of women writers, giving them a sense of pride as well as roots from which to grow. Woolf further argues that without such a tradition, women writers will constantly have to start anew, instead of building from one generation to the next. If such a woman's tradition is indeed uncovered and established, Woolf contends that it is then only a matter of time
before the world will see a Judith Shakespeare, the bard's "wonderfully gifted sister" (48). The implication in Woolf's text is that, even though women have been writing for centuries, they have not achieved the greatness of a Shakespeare because of their historical condition: "[t]he plays of Shakespeare are not by you, and you have never introduced a barbarous race to the blessings of civilisation" (116).

The desire to establish a female tradition has also been voiced frequently by more recent Anglo-American feminist scholars--e.g., Mary Ellmann in *Thinking About Women* (1968), Jane Rule in *Lesbian Images* (1975), Ellen Moers in *Literary Women* (1976), Elaine Showalter in *A Literature of Their Own* (1977) and Alice Walker in *In Search of Our Mothers' Gardens* (1983). The main difference between Woolf and these scholars is that, for the most part, these later feminists believe that Judith may have already existed. Her great works, however, have just not been accepted into official canons and, thus, have not been properly preserved. Germaine Greer calls this process "the phenomenon of the transience of female literary fame"; "almost uninterruptedly since the Interregnum, a small group of women have enjoyed dazzling literary prestige during their own lifetimes, only to vanish without trace from the records of posterity" ("Flying Pigs" 784; qtd. in A
Lit. of Their Own 11). Within this school of thought, the task of the woman writer in search of a tradition is to research and recover the neglected works of women writers from years past. Examples of this phenomenon are the resurrection and resulting popularity in the 1960's of Kate Chopin's *The Awakening* and Charlotte Perkins Gilman's "The Yellow Wallpaper."

Yet still another faction of feminists questions the existence not of a female tradition but of a feminine tradition. In *Women's Oppression Today*, Michelle Barrett says that "we still await a substantial account of consumption and reception of texts from the point of view of the ideology of gender" and that this lack results in our being trapped within the dichotomous option presented in the above two paragraphs: either a tradition of great works by women did not exist or it did (34). In "What Women's Eyes See," Forrester argues Barrett's point further, as do many French feminists, contending that since the "feminine" has been repressed throughout history within our patriarchal culture, we cannot, even in a woman's recovered text, discover a feminine perspective; we can discover only a reflection of the dominant masculine perspective. To uncover the feminine, Forrester goes on to say, we must look at the gaps, the fissures, the absences in women's writing (35).
The difference in approaches between the Anglo-American feminist critics and the French feminist critics is succinctly stated by Mary Eagleton:

While Anglo-American critics are looking for women in history, French women writers, Elaine Marks tells us, are: "looking for women in the unconscious, which is to say in their own language. 'Cherchez la femme' might be one of their implied mottos; where repression is, she is" (M. Eagleton 5; Marks 836).

The concept of a tradition of women writers becomes complicated by the concept of established canons. As evidenced by the canon of essays, readers of traditional canons could easily assume that women just did not want to write much until recently, that they were not competent enough to write, or that they were too busy with their homes and families to have much time to compose. But such assumptions are false. The truth is that women were writing all along; they just were not accepted into official canons.

Does this exclusion mean that women's writing was inferior? Does this exclusion mean that their writing was primarily private, having no universal appeal? Does this exclusion mean that their writing should be condescendingly read today, just to prove the reader is of a liberal bent? No. Instead, their exclusion implies more about acceptable social roles for women, about economic opportunities available for them, about patriarchal mindsets that denied women equal status
under God and law. Many women have been aware of their situation and for the last two centuries have striven together, under the banner of feminism, to erase the public's perception of "proper roles" for women and men.

One way women have tried to erase the notion of established roles for men and women is by challenging established canons—canons of rhetoric, literature, history, economics, medicine, etc. Yet challenging accepted canons is a tricky issue. First of all, what are the criteria for acceptance, other than the inherent sexual implications, and how may these other criteria be met by women? Second, if marginal (in this case, female) rhetoricians/authors/historians/economists/doctors/etc. are somehow adopted into an accepted canon, does this acceptance mean these women will have to be twice as capable as men to survive? This idea, if accepted by men, can result in just another means of discrimination and, if accepted by women, can result in reverse chauvinism. Or will women end up being validated only by being compared to men or being hailed as the best the female sex has to offer? Moreover, will these canonized women somehow lose part of the difference that made them effective? And once women are accepted and the overt discrimination is removed, how will they handle the more subtle forms?
On the other hand, if feminists set up a separate list of "the best women" to challenge the hierarchal list of "the best men," then feminists have only imitated the patriarchal tradition, and although they now have some power of their own to create their own list, the philosophy behind its creation resembles the patriarchal ideas and procedures that feminists are trying to subvert. Thus, nothing, except perhaps awareness of these women on the list and their designators, has really changed. As becomes readily apparent, many slippery questions exist, but few truly satisfactory answers.

Despite all these differing theoretical perspectives, the fact remains that, throughout history, women have consciously or subconsciously expressed their own particular feminist ideologies within their texts. Moreover, modern readers have constructed and reconstructed these feminist ideologies in their own readings of these same texts. Thus, both author and reader achieve importance: as Phyllis Frous McCord states, we must "realize that writers are not the only creators of literature; readers produce it in the act of reading, when they pay attention to process" (760). And this phenomenon occurs whether the texts are poems, novels, short stories, journals, or essays.
Rhetoric and Feminism: Definitions and Syntheses

Rhetoric. First conceptualized at least 2300 years ago and then defined differently during each ensuing historical period, rhetoric carries many connotations. Even though some twentieth-century rhetoricians, such as James Kinneavy, are hesitant to use the term rhetoric because of its reductive evolution and because of its classical connotations (A Theory of Discourse 3-4), many other twentieth-century rhetoricians and critical theorists have attempted to rescue rhetoric from its lowly status, creating in its wake a New Rhetoric. According to Jim Corder in "Rhetoric and Literary Study," this New Rhetoric is really many theories of rhetoric and many methods of analysis (223-225). In this study, however, rhetoric grounds itself in a modern epistemic theory, while acknowledging its roots in the theory of Aristotle. According to George Kennedy, rhetoric exists in two forms: primary and secondary. Primary rhetoric is basically the oral art of persuasion; secondary rhetoric, the application of rhetorical techniques to any discourse or art work whose main purpose is not oral persuasion. Although both classes of rhetoric have played an essential role in promoting the goals of feminism, this study will be concerned predominantly with secondary rhetoric—that is, feminist essays which
combine civic and personal life as well as persuasive
and narrative aims (Kennedy 4-6).

Kenneth Burke, one of this century's most famous
rhetoricians and literary critics, contends that
rhetoric "is rooted in an essential function of
language itself, a function that is wholly realistic,
and is continually born anew; the use of language as a
symbolic means of inducing cooperation in beings that
by nature respond to symbols" (Rhet. of Motives 45).

Within the context of this definition, rhetoric
becomes, for better or worse, an instrument of
socialization, its purpose identification
(consubstantiality), its implication that all social
encounters are rhetorical.

For Burke as a social critic, the way we
communicate with one another through the use of a
symbol system, in either oral or written discourse,
determines not only our individual subjects but our
collective subjectivity as well. This idea reflects
reader-response critic Marshall Alcorn's assertion
about rhetoric:

To put the issue in better terms, rhetoric,
as we discover it in texts, always bears
witness to power whereby social and
psychological forces in language
'position' selves in relation to affect. . . .
[T]he concept of rhetoric. . .is a theoretical
juncture where literary theory, rhetorical theory,
and psychoanalytic theory should converge"
Thus, any time we use this symbol system to analyze a situation, determine our purpose, psychoanalyze our audience, and then decide what strategies will be most effective in accomplishing our purpose (whether that purpose involves creating a text as writer or reader), we are taking a rhetorical perspective.

In *Rhetoric and Reality: Writing Instruction in American Colleges, 1900-1985*, James Berlin classifies both classical and modern rhetorics. "Based on epistemology rather than ideology" (6) and focused on the interrelationships among "the nature of the real, the interlocutor, the audience, and the function of language" (7), Berlin's system is comprised of three fields of rhetoric: objective, subjective, and transactional. Objective rhetoric "locate[s] reality in the external world, in the material objects of experience"; subjective rhetoric "place[s] the truth within the subject, to be discovered through an act of internal apprehension"; and transactional rhetoric "locate[s] reality at the point of interaction of subject and object, with the audience and language as mediating agencies" (Berlin 6). Berlin then subdivides transactional rhetoric into three types: classical, cognitive, and epistemic. Classical rhetoric concerns
itself with the rhetor's trying to discover truth communally about those issues that cannot be indisputably proven; cognitive rhetoric, with individuals understanding the cognitive processes within their minds and then manipulating these processes for their own ends; epistemic rhetoric, with the dynamic interaction of the situation, the writer/speaker, the audience and the language. Epistemic rhetoric, the philosophical foundation for this study, defines truth as an evolving concept. Within this system, nothing, not even science, is viewed as an indisputable truth. Instead, all understanding is socially constructed and mediated through language. Thus, the domain of rhetoric is expanded to include all aspects of life (15-19; 155-179).

Berlin's epistemological classification is helpful in categorizing rhetoric; however, the word rhetoric, especially in conjunction with New Rhetorics, suffers from a hazy, multi-layered definition. In order to clarify this definition, Maurice Natanson classifies rhetoric into four somewhat helpful levels in "The Limits of Rhetoric":

(1) "rhetorical intention in speech or writing," (2) "the technique of persuasion," or methodology, (3) "the general rationale of persuasion," or theory, and
Based on what Natanson calls the philosophy of rhetoric and what Berlin calls the epistemic branch of transactional rhetoric, Wayne Brockriede postulates the following five assumptions that help explain rhetoric as employed in this study. Rhetoric is the study of "how interpersonal relationships and attitudes are influenced within a situational context"; the concept of rhetoric "must grow empirically from an observation and analysis of contemporary, as well as past, events"; the rhetorical act "must be viewed as occurring within a matrix of interrelated contexts, campaigns, and processes"; the components of a rhetorical act "are best viewed as dimensional, each reflecting a wide range of possible descriptions and not as expressing dichotomies"; and the "dimensions of rhetoric are interrelational." ("Dimensions of the Concept of Rhetoric," Johanneson 312)

Feminism. As defined in this study, feminism parallels a standard definition presented in many introductory women's studies courses: i.e., feminism is a woman-centered means of viewing and re-viewing social, political, economic, racial, gender, and sexual concerns within a specific culture. Most importantly, this feminist viewing and reviewing is not passive.
Perspectives must be translated into political action—that is, the perspectives must be lived—so that change, not just criticism, is imagined and effected.

This viewing and re-viewing procedure, however, does not include rewriting history and writing the present so as to ignore the roles of men. Men's roles cannot realistically be ignored, nor should they be. But men's roles have always been the primary focus in history, and men themselves have always been the primary interpreters. As Cheris Kramarae states, "those who have the power to name the world are in a position to influence reality," thus facilitating the creation and the perpetuation of a patriarchal culture ("Proprietors of Language" 65).

Some critics of feminism have claimed that men have been discriminated against too, and granted, there is some merit to this argument. But as Gerda Lerner states in her detailed study of the emergence of patriarchy in Western civilization, such an argument is weak because while "[n]o man has been excluded from the historical record because of his sex, . . . all women were" (The Creation of Patriarchy 5). Yet Lerner, who is a Professor of History, holds women accountable for their situation too, refusing, as does the narrator in Margaret Atwood's Surfacing, to view women only as unparticipating victims:
It is a fundamental error to try to conceptualize women primarily as victims. To do so at once obscures what must be assumed as a given of women's historical situation: Women are essential and central to creating society; they are and always have been actors and agents in history. Women have "made history," yet they have been kept from knowing their History and from interpreting history, either their own or that of men (Lerner 5).

Becoming conscious of this dialectic between women's centrality and their marginality within our patriarchal culture has caused some women, and some men, to question the discrepancies in women's existences—the result being the birth of feminism, the formation of a feminist ideology. Yet a feminist ideology no more exists than does a single definition of rhetoric. Many different strands of feminist ideologies have emerged from many different feminist groups—black feminists, lesbian feminists, marxist feminists, liberal feminists, radical feminists, etc.—keeping feminism alive and healthy. Most of these groups seem to agree that women's positions need to be changed; however, they often differ on agendas and methods.

Despite these diverse groups, feminism has often reductively been perceived as the old feminism, or "the Women's Question" of the nineteenth century, and the new feminism, or the Equal Rights Movement of the 1960's. A better means of categorizing the different
stages of the women's movement in America and England appears in Olive Banks' *Faces of Feminism* in which she defines feminism as a social movement and feminist as "any groups that have tried to change the position of women, or the ideas about women" (3). Banks divides her text into four sections: The Early Years, 1840-1870, when evangelical Protestantism, enlightenment ideals, and socialist thought provided momentum for the feminist movement; The Golden Years, 1870-1920, when the ideas of moral reform, the ideal of female superiority, and the campaign for suffrage were major issues; The Intermission, 1920-1960, when women and welfare and the "new woman" were prominent concerns; and The Modern Movement, when the equal rights tradition and radical feminism emerged.

Banks' fourth section is most significant to this study since Virginia Woolf might be considered a forerunner of the Equal Rights Tradition, or Liberal Feminism, while Adrienne Rich belongs to the Radical Feminist camp. Liberal feminists and radical feminists, as well as splinter factions within each group, have defined their positions differently; still, general definitions may be drawn. Liberal feminists, labelled "bourgeois feminists" by their more radical sisters, generally believe that socialized difference explains the status of women (and men) within
patriarchy. For such feminists, difference may be overcome through legislative and political means. Moreover, attaining power within established structures is not only an acceptable goal but also the major means by which they feel change should occur. For radical feminists, however, dominance better describes the subservient plight of women within patriarchy where, from a radical feminist perspective, men reign supreme. Thus, radical feminists strive to dis-cover, un-cover, and create new structures in which they may function without being dominated. They also celebrate female power, closely tied to nature and matriarchy, and discuss constructing new forms of discourse through which they may discover and create "a world other than patriarchy" (Daly 1).

Julia Kristeva categorizes feminism as liberal and radical, but she also adds a third dimension, metaphysical ("Women's time" 32-34). In Sexual/Textual Politics, Toril Moi describes Kristeva's categories as follows:

1. Women demand equal access to the symbolic order. Liberal Feminism. Equality.

2. Women reject the male symbolic order in the name of difference. Radical Feminism. Femininity extolled.

3. (This is Kristeva's own position.) Women reject the dichotomy between masculine and feminine as metaphysical. (12)
But relegating the concepts of feminine and masculine to the metaphysical realm is deemed dangerous by materialist-feminists. When feminine and masculine are perceived as metaphysical, ideas are separated from material reality, which ultimately undermines political goals. Perceiving gender as a social construction that manifests unequal divisions of power between women and men, materialist-feminists are concerned with, among other things, "the importance of ideas, language and culture to women's oppression" (Newton xix) Such concerns "frequently take the form of discussing ideology" and insisting "upon the intersection of ideas and language with the social and historical" (Newton xix; xx).

Rhetoric and Feminism. When rhetoric and feminism are mentioned in the same sentence by feminists or by researchers sympathetic to the goals of feminism, the linking of terms often implies either an analysis of the language feminism has coined or a search for a "feminine" rhetoric, the area that originally generated the most enthusiasm among scholars. For example, Fred Shapiro traces the origin of the terms male chauvinist and sisterhood, among others, in his American Speech article, "Historical Notes on the Vocabulary of the Women's Movement." Also, Robin Lakoff argues in her
often disputed article "Language and Woman's Place" that women's language differs from men's, and Mary P. Hiatt presents a case for a separate "feminine" and "masculine" writing style in her article, "Feminine Style: Theory And Fact," and in her book of the same title.

Some feminists, especially French feminists, are suspicious of synthesizing feminism and rhetoric. They perceive rhetoric as a firmly established patriarchal tradition of male logic and, thus, hold it responsible for the development of discourse forms in which sexist ideas are reflected, associated, and, by this time, innately embedded. Helene Cixous urges the abandonment of patriarchal rhetoric and calls for the creation of a new discourse that will enhance the feminine and be free from all patriarchal connotations. Luce Irigaray posits her own concept of mimesis, which urges women to revise traditional discourse forms knowingly as a first step toward creating a feminine discourse. Such critics refuse to acknowledge the psychological and rhetorical genius of rhetoricians, especially classical ones, whose sexist outlooks permeate their texts. For example, in his Politics, Aristotle states that "[t]he male is by nature superior, and the female inferior, and the one rules, and the other is ruled; this principle of necessity extends to all mankind" (1.A.5.1254 b).
Moreover, many feminists such as Shirley Ardner believe women hold an ambiguous and precarious position within the dominant discourse community— that is, although women are insiders in their own discourse communities, they exist as both insiders and outsiders of the dominant one. Such feminists might use one of Wayne Booth's statements in "The Scope of Rhetoric" to denounce the use of rhetoric for feminist ends:

Rhetoric . . . assume[s] a "band of insiders," sharing a set of fairly obvious places of argument . . . . The Aristotelian tradition is suited best to analyzing the cogency of such rhetoric, from the point of view of someone who is at least in some sense on the inside. (97)

Booth, however, would agree with these feminist critics that such a narrow view of rhetoric results in a "closed rhetoric" (97). And he would then argue for a more open, modern, revised definition of rhetoric, instead of for the annihilation of rhetoric.

When opponents of feminism have mentioned rhetoric and feminism in the same breath, rhetoric as well as feminism has often taken on a derogative, reductive connotation ("It's only feminist rhetoric"), a notion drawn somewhat unfairly from the old sophistic school, implying a concentration on style ("female histrionics"), not ideas ("male logic").

None of these approaches, however, incorporates a complete definition of rhetoric nor, as a result, does
justice to feminist texts. According to James Kinneavy and Nancy Harrison in their chapter "Contemporary Rhetoric" in The Present State of Scholarship in Historical and Contemporary Rhetoric, the synthesis of rhetoric and feminism is an important area of scholarship where much work still remains to be conceptualized and investigated. In the "Women's Voices" section of Kinneavy's article, Harrison generates interesting questions about women's rhetorical situations—i.e., about black women in a white society, about feminists in academia, etc. Although these questions and the others she raises are hardly new or comprehensive, they do provide a nice springboard for thought for those interested in the possibilities of synthesizing rhetoric and feminism.

In this study, I will not place a major emphasis on Kinneavy's speculation about how a feminist perspective can enhance a rhetorical analysis of a text, although this area provides much fertile ground for scholars and, no doubt, influences my study. Nor will this study attempt to prove the existence of a dichotomous, sexual-based rhetoric in the sense that men write one way and women write another. Mary Hiatt's study, which attempts to delineate a feminine and masculine style, is attacked by feminists, especially by Elaine Showalter, for "treating words apart from their
meanings and purposes" ("Feminist Criticism in the Wilderness" 255). Furthermore, as Toril Moi points out in Sexual/Textual Politics, proving such a polemical thesis is not only incredibly complicated but also politically unwise:

> It would seem that the pursuit of sex differences in language is not only a theoretical impossibility, but a political error. The concept of difference is theoretically tricky in that it denotes an absence or a gap more than any signifying presence. Difference, Jacques Derrida has argued, is not a concept. Differences always take us elsewhere, we might say, involve us in an ever proliferating network of displacement and deferral of meaning. To see difference principally as the gap between the two parts of a binary opposition (as for instance between masculinity and femininity) is therefore to impose an arbitrary closure on the differential field of meaning. (153-54)

What I do hope to show, however, is how a feminist ideology, which is situationally grounded in the experiences of females within a patriarchal society, influences the means by which feminist essays are created, by both the author and the reader. Ideology, in this sense, becomes more than a set of doctrines. It becomes, as Terry Eagleton contends, "the ways in which what we say and believe connects with the power-structure and power-relations of the society we live in . . . . the modes of feeling, valuing, perceiving, and believing which have some kind of relation to the maintenance and reproduction of social power" (14-15).
Moi expands this definition even further, asserting that "[o]nly a concept of ideology as a contradictory construct, marked by gaps, slides, and inconsistencies, would enable feminism to explain how even the severest ideological pressures will generate their own lacunae" (26).

Thus, in this study I will attempt to analyze "how . . . ideological beliefs . . . are translated into literary forms and conventions that at once encode and perpetuate those values" (Boone 76). Interest in such an investigation, however, does not originate with Boone or other current feminist and cultural critics. Kenneth Burke proposed a similar relationship between ideology and texts in his 1935 address, "Revolutionary Symbolism in America." Drawing heavily from Burke's address, Frank Lentricchia claims that "the substance, the very ontology of ideology. . .in a broad but fundamental sense is revealed to us textually and therefore must be grasped (read) and attacked (reread and rewritten) in that dimension" (Crit. and Soc. Change 24).

In this study, then, I will place a major emphasis on how a rhetorical perspective can enhance any reader's understanding of feminist essays—that is, how a rhetorical perspective can enhance any reader's understanding of the feminist ideology reflected in
both content and form—specifically in selected essays of Woolf and Rich. Because a rhetorical perspective focuses on the text as "utterance," which in turn implies the Horatian notion of an author's teaching her audience as well as entertaining them (Ars Poetica 11.99-100), rhetorical criticism lends itself well to feminist writings or, in Corbett's words, to any "occasional literature—literary works which were prompted by contemporary events or concerns of some political or social import" (Rhetorical Analyses of Literary Works xxii).

And feminist writings are nothing if not political. Within specific rhetorical situations, feminist writers have had not only to bolster the faith of the faithful but also to confront scoffing, if not overtly hostile, audiences for a specific purpose—that is, to persuade these audiences that the goals of feminism, broad and diverse as they might be, simply seek, for the most part, to establish basic human rights for women and, in the process, benefit all people. In one way or another, feminist writers create texts that interact with readers, challenging these readers to imagine and then to create a new social construct. Consciousness of rhetorical criticism, then, can assist readers of these texts in understanding just how this writer/text/reader relationship produces the
desired effect, how traditional ideas and form are imitated, revised, and/or transcended.

Conclusion

All of us—no matter what our gender, sexual preference, class, or race—have grown up in a predominantly patriarchal culture and, as a result of our communication with one another within this culture, have been, for better or worse, inescapably formed by predominant patriarchal values. As all of us continually struggle to create our individual, evolving, but not autonomous subjectivity, we find ourselves wrestling with these built-in cultural values, either accepting them as a whole or in parts. Most people accept only parts, the percentage of acceptance, of course, varying with each individual. But in any case, some sort of compromise is necessary, and the art of rhetoric provides a non-violent means of resolving our conflicts, compromising through language, while we create and discover our individual selves and our community.

With this idea in mind, feminist essays may be and should be analyzed within a much larger rhetorical context than just discussing style in a limited sense or particular words coined. These two narrow approaches reduce both the concept of rhetoric and the
concept of feminism. For in reality, rhetoric and feminism come into play quite naturally as a means of reconciling, or trying to reconcile, in Hegelian terms, the female's status as "other" within a patriarchal society. In this sense, feminism uses rhetoric in Lloyd Bitzer's sense, "as a mode of altering reality . . . by discourse . . . through the mediation of thought and action" ("The Rhetorical Situation" 4). And it is this potential in feminist essays, the potential for mediating the thoughts and actions of the reader through language, that will be investigated in this study.

Moreover, this project is exciting because, since little work has been done in this field, the option is still open to expand this study beyond Virginia Woolf and Adrienne Rich in later scholarship in order to arrive eventually not at closure but at some general definition about the rhetoric of feminist essays. But definitions can become tricky constructs for feminists, often implying closure, which most feminists suspect, and/or hierarchies, which most feminists struggle to destroy. And while I respect the determined effort many early feminist scholars have made to ensure that feminism and feminist criticism not be narrowly defined, I also believe that, at this time, for feminist writings to assume their rightful
place in academia, flexible boundaries/definitions must be drawn.

Analyzing feminist essays rhetorically is just one means of establishing such flexible definitions. These emerging, shimmering definitions will no doubt be constantly changing, and well they should in order to remain fresh, challenging, and alive. But for today, as feminists, we must not only know what we are against, we must also know what we are for, and just as importantly, we must know how to communicate with "outsiders," if our actions are to be taken seriously, if our actions are to have meaning beyond imitation and revision, if we are indeed to place the complex dialectic of feminism and patriarchy into play in order to transcend our present constraints and imagine a world beyond patriarchy.
Notes: Chapter I

Phallocentric is Derrida's term for describing a situation in which the penis is power; logocentric is his term for describing the emphasis on logos in Western civilization. Phallogocentric merely combines these two terms. Many feminist critics, especially French feminist critics, have combined the two words to describe patriarchy. See Elaine Marks, "Women and Literature in France," Signs 3 (Summer 1978): 832-42; also see Ann Rosalind Jones, "Writing the Body," in Elaine Showalter, ed., Feminist Criticism (New York: Pantheon Books, 1985) 361-364. Jones, quoting Marks, defines phallogocentric: "'I am the unified, self-controlled center of the universe,' man (white, European, ruling-class) has claimed. 'The rest of the world, which I define as Other, has meaning only in relation to me, as man/father, possessor of the phallus.'"


For proof of this assertion, see any traditional anthology of literature; few, if any, women essayists are included.


For criticism of Lakoff's ideas, see Virginia Valian, "Linguistics and Feminism," in Vetterling-Braggin, Sexist Language 68-80; also see Jacqueline Fortunata, "Lakoff on Language and Women" in Vetterling-Braggin, Sexist Language 81-90. Valian, especially, does a nice job of showing how Lakoff, by confusing the terms language and speech, implies that women do not just employ a different speech than men, that they indeed speak a different language than men (71-74).

For more discussion on the synthesis of rhetoric and feminism, see Karlyn Kohrs Campbell, "The Rhetoric of Women's Liberation: An Oxymoron," Quarterly Journal of Speech 59 (1973): 74-86; and Mary E. Hawkesworth,


Transcendence, as used in this chapter, implies creating a new rhetorical strategy, not just imitating what has come before or, as Virginia Woolf has been accused of doing, ignoring/forgetting the problem.
CHAPTER II

A METHODOLOGY OF RHETORICAL CRITICISM:

THE INTERPLAY OF SITUATION, AUTHOR, TEXT, AND AUDIENCE

Not all social power is literature, but all literary power is social power—that is probably my central assumption.

--Frank Lentricchia
Criticism and Social Change

Introduction: A Discussion of Critical Methods

"Method," according to Chaim Perelman, "is often described as a road . . . , but each thinker uses this description in his own way" (Realm of Rhet. 122). For example, although Descartes travels alone while Leibniz travels with people, the road for both is "completely laid out" in front of them; Hegel, on the other hand, believes the road "continues to be constructed as knowledge progresses" (123). This metaphor aptly describes the curious status of methodology in current literary theory. On one hand, certain critics who desire neatly packaged interpretations often invoke a strict methodology, one that allows little room for play, as a means of imposing or prescribing order,
albeit incomplete, upon a seemingly chaotic process—the making of meaning by the reader when interrogating a text. The limitations of such a methodology engender criticism for others, who denounce such a methodology as too rigid, too linear, too narrowly focused. These same critics believe the gaps and holes in the text, which are often overlooked within a structured methodological investigation, provide as much, if not more, insight into the making of meaning as does a reader's structured concentration only on the printed signs.

Of course, this dichotomous view of methodology by no means defines the entire field of criticism. Indeed, as Derrida has asserted, criticism lies not on a spectrum between two binary opposites, but in the realm where differance leads us. Yet even within this multiplicitous realm of differance, lie patterns—i.e., methods through which the interpretation of the critic comes into being. Charting such a method, then, however difficult, assists the critic in understanding and describing, though not in controlling and prescribing, her own acts of interpretation.

The method of rhetorical criticism employed in this study interinanimates situation, author, text, and audience, thus allowing the reader to place herself in relation to the text. Yet this methodology is posited not as the critical method that all critics should
employ, but as an open, fruitful method of interrogating
texts in which aesthetic and political aims collide.
Any method of investigating this collision of aesthetic
and political aims, however, is dependent upon the
theory of rhetoric that underlies it. In this
particular study, the rhetorical methodology employed to
interrogate feminist essays is grounded in the
epistemic view of rhetoric described in Chapter One.

To contextualize this rhetorical methodology,
I will present a selected survey of twentieth-century
rhetorical criticism, an explanation of the specific
methodology employed in Chapters Three and Four, and a
brief comparison of rhetorical criticism to other
critical theories.

Rhetorical Criticism: A Selected Survey

Once a popular and fruitful means of investigating
a text, rhetorical criticism suffered a decline in the
nineteenth century when rhetoric was removed from
traditional school curricula. This decline continued
into the twentieth century with rhetoric being narrowly
defined and, thus, relegated to speech departments. Not
until the mid twentieth century has this trend been
reversed. Scholars such as E.P.J. Corbett, Wayne Booth
and Kenneth Burke, among others, have argued
persuasively not only for "new rhetorics" based upon a
reclaimed or revised tradition, but for the
reinstatement of rhetorical criticism as a valid
critical tool.

According to Corbett, rhetorical analyses of
literary texts have traditionally focused on the
triadic, predominantly textbound relationship between
text, author, and audience. In an attempt to
de demonstrate how rhetorical criticism avoids the
Intentional and Affective Fallacies, Corbett stresses
the text as a focal point, with the critic working
outward from, but never really leaving, the text
("Introduction," Rhetorical Analyses of Literary Works
xix). Within Corbett's definition of rhetorical
criticism, the text is perceived as an "utterance" for
an audience, not just as an artistic "artifact" or pure
expression of the author (xxii). The author, however,
is limited to the implied author within a text (xix;
Booth, The Rhetoric of Fiction 71-76). And the audience
is analyzed in terms of how an immediate audience may
possibly be affected by the rhetorical principles
inherent in a given text (xix). Rhetorical critics,
like Corbett, may talk about classifying discourse into
forensic, deliberative, and epideictic categories;
analyzing the effects on the immediate audience;
examining the discourse in terms of invention,
arrangement, style, and delivery; categorizing
strategies in terms of logical, emotional, and ethical appeals and in terms of stylistic manipulations and tropes. Such are the approaches of most of the contributors in Corbett's *Rhetorical Analyses of Literary Works*.

Although heavily grounded in Aristotelian theory themselves, Wayne Booth and Kenneth Burke have moved beyond text-bound analysis and allowed other factors—i.e., the rhetorical situation, the actual author, the actual audience, and other cultural influences—to influence their methods of interpretation. Booth's pluralistic approach to literary criticism grounds itself in rhetorical theory. In his ground-breaking *The Rhetoric of Fiction*, Booth presents three sources of general criteria: the work, the author and the reader (37-40). Although this particular approach is predominantly text-bound, Booth also hints at some discussion of the author and reader located outside the text. In more recent years, Booth has relinquished any remaining concept of the autonomous critic and instead draws heavily from Bakhtin's notion of language as ideology and self as polyphonic. For example, in "Freedom of Interpretation: Bakhtin and the Challenge of Feminist Criticism," Booth demonstrates that, when language is perceived as the means through which we create our selves and our community, then art and
ideology cannot be separated (51). To try to do so is equivalent to burying one's head in the sand.

Burke agrees that art and ideology cannot be separated. His particular method of rhetorical/social criticism stresses the social construction theory of knowledge. Burke's dramatistic method operates through the pentad, comprised of act, agent, agency, scene, and purpose (A Grammar of Motives xv); later, with the addition of attitude, the pentad became the hexad. Meaning in Burke's system is manifested not only through the details generated by the reader under each isolated category of the hexad, but also, and more importantly, through the details generated by the reader under all the possible ratios of the various components in the hexad. Moreover, the meaning may shift if, for example, the agent is reassigned as the agency; that is, a shift in assignment of terms will change the meanings generated by the various ratios. In the end, the meanings that the reader creates when reading a text alter her perceptions of the world, alterations that may, in some way, alter her world, thus affecting subsequent readings, or writings, by this same reader, which in turn will affect other members of her discourse community. Thus, says Burke, the conversation continues.
But in "The Ecology of Writing" (1986), Marilyn Cooper contends that while "Burke's is perhaps the best contextual model that is applied to writing . . . , it does not enable one to explain how the situation is causally related to other situations" (368). Thus, Cooper calls for an ecology of writing that "encompasses much more than the individual writer and her immediate context" and, by extension, one that allows the critic to examine a larger situation than just the individual work and its immediate context. Thus, the traditional triadic components of rhetorical criticism gain an added dimension: situation.

Situation gained special prominence within the community of rhetoricians with the publication of Lloyd Bitzer's "The Rhetorical Situation" (1968). For Bitzer, a professor of speech, the rhetorical situation is composed of three elements—exigence, audience, and constraints. More fully defined, Bitzer's rhetorical situation is as follows:

. . . a complex of persons, events, objects, and relations presenting an actual or potential exigence which can be completely or partially removed if discourse, introduced into the situation, can so constrain human decision or action as to bring about the significant modification of the exigence." (385)

Within this definition, situation takes precedence over the text, the author, and the audience; indeed, it precedes and thus evokes the rhetorical act, be it oral
or written discourse, as a "fitting response" to the existing exigencies, audience, and constraints (389).

Yet Bitzer's concept of situation as "objective, publicly observable, and historic . . . real or genuine" is called into question, quite rightly, by Richard Vatz in "The Myth of the Rhetorical Situation" (1973). Vatz condemns Bitzer's notion of situation because it implies that "meaning resides in events" instead of in "the perception of its interpreters" or in "the rhetoric with which he [the interpreter/rhetor] chooses to characterize it" (154). From this premise, Vatz unfortunately goes on to claim that meaning is "created by rhetors" (157), an idea as equally one-sided as Bitzer's because it gives scant attention to the readers' responses.

In "Rhetoric and Its Situation" (1974), Scott Consigny continues the Bitzer/Vatz debate, shattering their dichotomous position that either the rhetorical situation controls the rhetor or that the rhetor creates the rhetorical situation. Bitzer, according to Consigny, "correctly construes the rhetorical situation as characterized by 'particularities,' but misconstrues the situation as being thereby determinate and determining" (176). Vatz, on the other hand, "correctly treats the rhetor as creative, but . . . fails to account for the real constraints on the rhetor's
activity" (176). Despite the shift of perspective, Consigny still emphasizes the rhetor's relation to the situation more than the audience's when he discusses the creation of meaning. It will take later cultural critics and reader-response theorists to acknowledge the actual audience—i.e., the actual reader—as a crucial component in the process of making meaning via situation.

But for the rhetorical critic, after investigating what criteria a method of rhetorical criticism considers, the next step is investigating just how these criteria are applied. In one permutation, the critic may analyze a text by applying a rhetoric of the text's times; such a practice reflects I. A. Richard's diachronic categorization of language, which locates language at a certain period of time, as the result of an evolutionary process. An example is Thomas O. Sloan's application of Ramist logic to a poem by Donne in "Rhetorical Analysis of John Donne's 'The Prohibition." This practice, though fruitful and justifiable, should also take into account the critic's perspective, in Sloan's case a twentieth-century perspective, if it is to consider all the interpretative factors. In a second permutation, the critic may cross historical boundaries and apply one century's rhetoric to another century's text; this practice reflects Richards' synchronic categorization of
language, which places language in a specific context, without reference to historical antecedents. An example is Elder Olson's discussion of Aristotelian ethical appeal in "Rhetoric and the Appreciation of Pope: The Epistle to Dr. Arbuthnot." In a third permutation, instead of adhering to an established method of rhetorical criticism, a critic may revise one or devise his own and apply it to any text, thus asserting method over historical periods and perspective over fixed meaning. This approach combines Richards' diachronic and the synchronic categories by assuming a historical perspective but not being controlled by or grounded solely in this perspective. An example is this study.

The Interplay of Situation, Author, Text, and Audience

Because rhetorical criticism has traditionally focused on the text as "utterance," a focus that implies political aims as well as aesthetic ones, rhetorical criticism lends itself well to feminist writings. But for feminists and other politically-minded critics, a textbound rhetorical criticism that examines only the text, the textually implied author, and the textual potentials for affecting an immediate audience is insufficient. Situation must be included. Otherwise, the author, text, and audience are perceived as separate entities, objectified and divorced from history, instead
of as interweaving participants in the process of making meaning. Characterized by the inclusion of situation and by the broadened definitions of author, text, and audience, the rhetorical methodology of this study provides more play than does a more traditional rhetorical criticism. In the following section I will define the criteria that comprise my methodology, criteria that should be viewed not as isolated, autonomous categories, but as fluid, overlapping classifications.

**Situation.** In this study, situation will be studied in terms of its "exigencies" and "constraints," which are created through ideological shifts and tensions within a society and which are located within a historical/cultural dialectical process. Thus, situation is not static, but a living social construct through which the "tensions between readers, writers, and texts" must be recognized and reinstated (Brodkey 397). Essentially, situation achieves its meaning through the perceptions of its interpreters and may be classified in two ways: extra-textual or textual.

Extra-textual situation denotes the exigencies and constraints of the actual author as she composes as well as the exigencies and constraints on the actual reader
as he reads. Moreover, all these exigencies and constraints—i.e., the events, people, objects, and prevalent attitudes in society—can be known only from the reader's perspective. A reader is never capable of reconstructing the exact situation that an author perceives, and he has a somewhat limited perception of his own extra-textual situation. Within the context of extra-textual situation, a text must be interrogated as an utterance from an author within a specific situation to its interpreter/reader in another situation.

This concept is tricky, for a reader's construction of an author's extra-textual situation is really an interpretation of the actual author's interpretation of the world. The reader's interpretation will be colored not only by the distance between herself and the text, but also by the distance between her own cultural preconceptions and those of the actual authors. These distances allow plural readings of the text; however, as Booth states in *Critical Understanding: The Powers and Limits of Pluralism*, certain lines must be drawn. That is, some authority must be given to the signifier, as Thomas Alcorn has asserted in "Rhetoric and the Authority of the Signifier," or else eccentric readings of the text will abound. Granted, interrogating the extra-textual situation of a text can become extremely complex and difficult to document, and can even side-track or
totally interrupt a reader's interaction with a text.
But without some semblance of this extra-textual perspective, the text is reduced to a static, fixed, apolitical object.

Textual situation denotes the exigencies and constraints on the narrator or the implied author as she composes. These exigencies and constraints—i.e., the events, characters, objects, and prevalent attitudes within the text—can become complicated since they are written by the actual author, projected by the implied author or narrator, and then perceived by readers. Readers' perceptions may be judged as valid or eccentric, depending upon the evidence provided by the reader, evidence that is gleaned from within the text.
It is important to remember, too, that a reader's choice of evidence is affected by his own experiences.
Still, the textual situation is slightly more manageable for a critic than is extra-textual situation because the textual situation is either directly described or implied in the text.

Author. In this study, I will consider two facets of the concept, author. First, I will attempt to recover the authorial intentions of the actual author, the implied author, and, if applicable, the narrator. Then I will discuss their respective rhetorical appeals.
Unfortunately, the term authorial intention often connotes the concept of intentional fallacy, which W.K. Wimsatt defines as "a confusion between the poem and its origins" that "begins by trying to derive the standard of criticism from the psychological causes of the poem and ends in biography and relativism" (21). But for many critics who begin from a social, ecological, psychoanalytical, or rhetorical premise, Wimsatt's New Critical standpoint no longer accurately describes the act of interpretation because his view presumes that the text is an object, or an artifact, isolated from the stream of life. Instead, many critics now view the text as a living, evolving subject that changes each time a reader encounters it.

Even without the connotation of intentional fallacy, the mention of authorial intention generally induces skepticism: Who can accurately document the processes that occur when a writer writes? Who can document the honesty of such assessments even if the author herself sets them down? And who/what is the author anyway? Roland Barthes advocates reading a text without "the father's signature" ("From Work to Text" 78). And Michel Foucault asserts that the author--i.e., the individual person speaking or writing--should make no difference in the creation of meaning in a text because "the notion of 'author' constitutes the
privileged moment of individu-alization in the history of ideas, knowledge, litera-ture, philosophy, and the sciences" ("What Is an Author?" 160; 141). Instead, Foucault introduces the concept of "author-function," which is "characteristic of the mode of existence, circulation, and functioning of certain discourses within a society" (148; 148-53).

Other critics, such as Burke and Booth, believe that the actual author and the implied authors are valuable components of the interpretive process because they reintroduce a sense of historicity without falling into the trap of biographical criticism. Burke asserts that "whatever 'free play' there may be in the esthetic enterprise, it is held down by the gravita­tional pull of historical necessities (Attitudes 57). And Booth believes critics should examine on "the intricate relationship of the so-called real author with his various official versions of himself" (Rhet. of Fiction 71). Thus, in spite of my great respect for Barthes and Foucault, I will interrogate actual author, implied author, and, when appropriate, narrator.

Actual Author refers to the writer of the text, in terms of biography and her field of texts. Although a thorough knowledge of the actual author's biography is not needed for a valid reading of a text, certain extra-textual information—such as, diaries, interviews,
speeches, autobiographies, and biographies—may enhance a reader's perceptions of the text. An author's field of texts establishes a life of its own, apart from the author. Foucault problematizes the actual author by discussing the implications of an author's name:

[A]n author's name . . . performs a certain role with regard to narrative [or expository] discourse, assuring a classificatory function. Such a name permits one to group together a certain number of texts, define them, differentiate them from and contrast them to others. In addition, it established a relationship among texts. (147)

For better or worse, an author's field of texts and its reputation can affect a reader's interpretation by molding her preconceptions and by generating difference. Implied author refers to the "various official versions" of an author that are manifested in his different texts (Booth, Rhet. of Fiction 71; 74). The implied author of a text is usually at least slightly different, and sometimes greatly different, from the implied authors in other texts by the same author, although one text may give rise to more than one implied author. In any case, the implied author is always separate from the narrator (73). By analyzing the implied author's qualities and her attitudes toward her topic and her audiences, a reader may gain greater understanding of a text.
As Booth defines the term and as employed in this study, the concept of implied author does not automatically distance an actual author from the ideas and assertions in her text. Instead, this concept allows readers to locate the various selves of a writer within specific historical contexts; then the reader can trace the evolution of an author's ideas by synthesizing the various implied authors.

Narrator refers to the "I" of the text, the person who weaves the narrative. Feminist essayists sometimes employ a narrative strategy, in which the narrator generalizes from particular experiences in an attempt to politicize the personal and to concretize what has been relegated to the realm of abstraction. As Booth contends in The Rhetoric of Fiction, a narrator may (or may not) differ greatly from the actual author or the implied author, and she may (or may not) be classified as personable or impersonable, reliable or unreliable, dramatized or undramatized, with differing degrees of self-consciousness and distance (151-168).

Text. In "From Work to Text," Roland Barthes differentiates between the older critical concept of work, which implies object, and the newer critical concept of text, which implies subject. In this study, I will interrogate texts--i.e., A Room of One's Own and
Blood, Bread, and Poetry—by analyzing two specific components: arrangement and style.

Arrangement simply means that I will study the essays' forms to determine whether classical patterns of arrangement have been imitated, revised, and/or transcended. In addition, I will discuss how feminist ideologies are manifested in both content and form. My investigation will proceed from two basic assumptions: that content does not exist without form (Richards, Phil. of Rhet. 12) and that ideology, sometimes differing ideologies, may be manifested in both content and form.

As employed in this study, form is not a structured framework on which the author hangs her ideas—that is, the abstract and objective concept promoted by formalists. Instead, as Burke says in Counter-Statement, "form is implicated in the reader's belief" (146), and I would add that form is also implicated in the writer's belief. In "The Reasonable Reader," Jeff Porter discusses the ramifications of such a position:

The shape discourse acquires derives less from a priori considerations than from the implied contract between writer and reader. . . . [W]e may be included to set value in a method of inquiry that views the relation between speech occasion and discourse as that between question and answer. This is one way in which the kind of inquiry followed here is dialectical, in the classical sense. But
there is another way critical inquiry is dialectical, and this is in the sense that the final understanding of the readers represents a synthesis of the writer's implied intentions with the readers own beliefs. The result is a kind of "new knowledge" neither writer nor reader alone can make. (342; 343)

Style simply means that I will study how the whole essays, the paragraphs, and the sentences are constructed. Then I will interpret how these constructions inform the content. Such a study is important, for as Fredric Jameson contends in *Marxism and Form*, "any concrete description of a literary or philosophical phenomenon . . . has an ultimate obligation to come to terms with the shape of the individual sentences themselves" (xii).

To design this stylistic study, I have consulted Corbett's *Classical Rhetoric for the Modern Student* and "Teaching Style," and I have consulted Thomas Whissen's *A Way with Words* for definitions. For additional advice on interpretation, I looked to Richard Ohmann's *Shaw, the Style and the Man*. Ohmann claims, for example, that syntactical patterns reflect how a writer views the world. Thus, by comparing the stylistic findings in Woolf's and Rich's essays with their feminist philosophies, I can begin to generalize about their rhetorics of feminism. Specifically, I will investigate the following elements in their essays:
Audience. Rhetorical criticism has traditionally focused on how an immediate audience might possibly be affected by the rhetorical strategies inherent in a text. But both Peter Rabinovitz and Peter Elbow believe that the concept of audience is infinitely more complex than this traditional focus admits. In a classic narrative theory article entitled "Truth in Fiction: A Reexamination of Audience," Rabinovitz posits a four-part categorization of audience: actual audience, authorial audience, narrative audience, and ideal narrative audience. In "Closing My Eyes As I Speak: An Argument for Ignoring Audience," Elbow posits a slightly different audience taxonomy, one geared more to composition theory than to narrative theory:

(a) The actual readers to whom the text will be given;
(b) the writer's conception of those readers—which may be mistaken (see Ong; Park; Ede and Lunsford);
(c) the audience that the text implies—which may be different still (see Booth);
(d) the discourse community or even genre
addressed or implied by the text (see Walzer);
(e) ghost or phantom 'readers in the head'
that the writer may unconsciously
address or try to please. (50)

While keeping Elbow's ideas in mind, I will draw mainly
from Rabinovitz's schemata and examine multiple levels
of audience: i.e., actual reader, authorial audience,
and, when necessary, narrative audience.

Actual reader, in this study, refers to me. I am
the immediate reader reading the texts (Elbows' first
category). The actual reader's purpose is to make
meaning for herself through an interaction with
situations, authors, texts, and other levels of
audiences. To accomplish this goal, the actual reader
must attempt to recover the authorial intentions within
the text, determine the signification suggested by
the signs in the text, and investigate how her own
preconceptions color her interpretation of the text.

Authorial audience refers to real people who
haunt the author as she writers because she knows that
they may indeed read her text and who, as a result, are
built into her text (Rabinovitz 130). Falling under any
of Elbows' second through fifth categories of audience,
the authorial audience serves several functions. They
influence how an author shapes her text. Moreover, they
help actual readers locate a text in an historical
situation, understand authorial intention within a text, and make their own meanings of a text.

**Narrative audience** refers to the characters who are located only within the narrative and who participate in the narrative as the audience of the narrator. This "imitation audience . . . possesses particular knowledge" different from the actual or authorial audiences (Rabinovitz 127). The narrative audience accepts the facts in the narrative as real and reacts accordingly. Understanding the function of the narrative audience in a text will provide a reader with a greater understanding of the rhetorical levels of that text, and by locating himself as the narrative audience, a reader can suspend his disbelief and interact with the story, regardless of his own cultural preconceptions.

Differentiating between the actual, authorial, and narrative audiences as well as determining the distance between these various levels of audience plays an important role in a reader's interpretation of a text. For a reader can only gain full access to a text by recognizing the potential effects that an author hopes to evoke in a reader, via these authorial and narrative audiences.

**Implications.** Like Burke's hexad, much of the importance of these four criteria--situation, author,
text, and audience—lies in their relationships between one another, in the "strategic spots at which ambiguities necessarily arise" (Grammar of Motives xviii). Because authors do not function autonomously, the actual, implied, and narrative authors could easily overlap with situations; moreover, since situation and the intentions of the authors are discovered mainly through the perceptions of the reader, these categories could also easily overlap with audience. Also, depending on the work being analyzed, the importance of each component varies. With these ideas in mind, then, this methodology serves not as a formulaic means of stereotyping or stipulatively defining a text; instead it serves as merely another means of interrogation that may change in emphasis from situation to situation, text to text, author to author, and reader to reader.

Rhetorical Criticism and Other Critical Approaches

In Literary Theory: An Introduction, Terry Eagleton calls for the reinstatement of a rhetorical criticism that accounts for the traditional elements of the communication triangle—i.e., a speaker/writer, a text, and an listener/reader—all of which are inseparable from the cultural situations that, dialectically, both create and are created by these elements. In reintroducing such a theory, Eagleton also notes the areas in
which rhetorical criticism and other critical theories may fruitfully overlap:

Rhetoric, or discourse theory, shares with Formalism, structuralism and semiotics an interest in the formal devices of language, but like reception theory is also concerned with how these devices are actually effective at the point of 'consumption'; its preoccupation with discourse as a form of power and desire can learn much from deconstruction and psychoanalytical theory, and its belief that discourse can be a humanly transformative affair shares a good deal with liberal humanism. (206)

As Eagleton has stated, rhetorical criticism in its broadest sense incorporates elements from many co-existing literary theories. To expand his assertions and to demonstrate the dialectical nature of these theories, I will briefly compare the method of rhetorical criticism employed in this study with other critical approaches in order to differentiate my method in a broad way from all of the other ones.

The historical/biographical criticism of the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries emphasizes the actual author's life and times as a primary interpretive factor. To counteract the excessive extra-textualness of this criticism, Formalism and New Criticism developed to assert the primacy of the text. The concepts of extra-textual situation and actual author might at first be confused with the historical/biographical approach. Such a comparison,
however, would be inaccurate. The rhetorical criticism employed in this study emphasizes more than just the actual author's mind and life, and it moves beyond grounding a text only in a certain historical movement, such as Romanticism, Naturalism, Modernism, etc.

Yet, rhetorical criticism is interested in history, or historical situation, especially when history assumes the connotations implied by Hegel, Jameson, and Said: i.e., history as a broad, flexible, dialectical process that is constantly moving, and, therefore, constantly changing. Interpretations of this history, then, depends on the perceptions of the interpreter and the power structure behind her. This dialectical process is compared to a dialogue, a "conversation," by Frank Lentricchia in *Criticism and Social Change*:

> History, then, is a kind of conversation... whose discourse is rhetorical and without foundation and whose ends are never assured because rhetorical process, unlike teleological process, is free. It assumes that people do things not because they must but because they are persuaded to do them. (13)

The New Historicism, as described by Brook Thomas, begins with the premise that the "[s]tudy of the past starts with a present situation that is always changing, and yet that present situation cannot be understood without an understanding of the past" ("Reflections on New Historicism" 510). Thomas'
perception of situation plays an important role in this study; it implies that the subjectivity of the text is always changing, always evolving, given different readers and their different situations as well as their different perceptions of the original situation that gave birth to the text.

Formalist criticism celebrates form. Interested in the strategic devices in the text, formalists promote the form/content dichotomy, perceiving content as the mere "'motivation' of form" (Eagleton, *Lit. Theory* 3). The process of examining rhetorical strategies within a text, especially the arrangement of ideas via form, might conceivably be misconstrued as a strict formalist approach. But form, as used in this study, bears little resemblance to the Russian Formalist approach to literary analysis. The text is not viewed as a machine, whose importance lies in its form at the expense of its content. Instead, rhetorical criticism assumes that content is innately integrated with form, neither one existing without the other.

New Criticism, probably most famous for honoring the sanctity of the text, provides more emphasis on content than does Russian Formalism. According to Eagleton, "New Criticism . . . stopped short of a full-blooded formalism, awkwardly tempering it with a
kind of empiricism — a belief that the poem's discourse somehow included reality within itself" (Lit. Theory 47). While the rhetorical method described in Corbett's The Rhetorical Analyses of Literary Work seems grounded in the New Critical concept of textual autonomy, the methodology employed in this study discards the concept of a work as an object and embraces the notion of text as evolving subject(s), with plural meanings being dialectically constructed through the interaction of the reader with the text and the criteria of this methodology.

Structuralist criticism, according Lynette McGrath, entails "the deciphering of a coherent system of signs, whose purpose is the discovery of validities in the relationships, not the truths in the references, nor any single meaning" ("Structural and Poetic Theory" 20810). The key phrase in this definition is "validities in the relationships." For as Eagleton states, the core of structuralist theory is "the belief that the individual units of any system have meaning only by virtue of their relations to one another" (Lit. Theory 94).

While the concept of methodology might mistakenly imply a purely structuralist approach, rhetorical criticism is more open than a strict structuralist approach. Although rhetorical criticism considers the
relationships in the text, it also considers the differences, the oppositions. Moreover, rhetorical criticism does not privilege form over content or reduce the text to an algebraic formula, denying the existence of a subject and forcing the form to become the content of inquiry. Nor does rhetorical criticism neatly synthesize opposites (usually perceived by structuralists as binary opposites) within the text in order to create a neat, closed, structural whole. And because it considers political aims, rhetorical criticism is concerned with evaluation, not just "scientific" analysis.

Psychoanalytic criticism informs rhetorical criticism, especially in connection with Eagleton's categorization of psychoanalytic theory into four approaches: author, contents, formal construction, and reader (Lit. Theory 179). Although psychoanalysis focuses on individual subjects, it also has political ramifications because individual subjects, motivated by desire (i.e., an absence), are always created/changed/destroyed within specific situations, situations that the subjects both create and are created by. Patrick McGee explores this concept, via Lacanian theory, in "Truth and Resistance":

Analysis should not seek to strengthen the ego and the subject's sense of reality as something out there to which it must conform
but to decenter it by returning the subject to some understanding of the social and personal (that is, symptomatic) narratives from which it derives. The art of the analyst is not to lead the subject back to self-certainty but "to suspend the subjects' certainties until their last mirages have been consumed" (Lacan, Selection 43). (671)

Julia Kristeva also brings a rhetorical element to psychoanalytic theory, via her interest in "'poetic language' as a signifying practice--that is, as a semiotic system generated by a speaking subject within a social, historical field" (Roudiez l). In Revolution in Poetic Language, Kristeva posits that meanings of a text are affected by its situation, "its total context, be it conscious, unconscious, preconscious, linguistic, cultural, political, literary" (9). Yet she fosters no illusions that reading Mallarme will instigate widespread political revolution; the revolution she envisions is conceptual, within individual subjects who, in turn, effect/affect society. Although she rejects the term author, believing it connotes authority over the text, Kristeva does focus on a "writing subject" as a combination of the writer's conscious and subconscious (repressed) intents that help make meaning in the text (209).

Marxist criticism, much like rhetorical criticism, has traditionally concerned itself with form and the ideology manifested in that form. In "Form, Ideology
and *The Secret Agent,*" Eagleton expands this notion, stating that "forms of the text . . . produce and are produced by an ideological contradiction embedded within it" (25). Fredric Jameson, an American Marxist critic noted for his pluralist tendencies, is also interested in the connection between form and ideology within a rhetorical dimension:

[A text is] a complex field of force in which "messages" emitted by sign-systems peculiar to distinct modes of production may enter into determinate contradiction with one another. Such "messages" are nothing less than the ideology of form itself" (Eagleton, "The Idealism of American Criticism" 59).

In *The Political Unconscious,* Jameson even posits that political criticism comprises the umbrella under which all other criticisms reside.

The Marxist focus on ideology and form, however, has been at the expense of the individual subject, with the subject traditionally subordinated to the cause. In *Inwardness and Existence,* however, Walter Davis posits a slightly different approach. By synthesizing Marxist and Freudian thought, along with Hegelian and existential concepts, Davis integrates the subject into Marxist theory and social/political ideology into psychoanalytic theory. The resulting dialectic breaks the Freud/Marx dichotomy that has haunted the late nineteenth and early twentieth
centuries and also brings a rhetorical dimension to this critical practice.

Post-structuralist criticism is a way of perceiving meaning as "the spin-off of a potentially endless play of signifiers, rather than a concept tied firmly to the tail of a particular signifier" (Eagleton 23127). For J. Hillis Miller, deconstruction "is by no means just one more 'method' of reading. It is a transformation of ways of thinking and doing . . . " ("How Deconstruction Works" 25). First purported by Jacques Derrida, this deconstructive way of thinking separates the signifier from the signified and presupposes a constant deferral of meaning into the realm of difference; thus, there exists no central meaning, no central subject.

This death of the subject has created a furor in the world of literary theory, drawing fire from every side. Still, post-structuralism informs rhetorical criticism in important ways. First, both may consider textual strategies for what is missing--i.e., for gaps and holes--as well as for what is present. Second, rhetorical criticism allows for the play of signifiers yet, at the same time, allows for the existence of constantly evolving subjects, a limited authority in the signifier, and a limited authorial intention.
Reader-response criticism, or reception theory has generated a great deal of interest in recent years, shifting the focus of criticism from text to reader. While traditional rhetorical criticism has focused on how the rhetorical strategies inherent in a text effect an immediate audience, reception theory has added the perceptions of the actual reader to the criteria of rhetorical criticism. In "Which Reader's Response?" Marjorie Godlin Roemer describes the field of reception theory as follows:

As articulated by David Bleich, Wolfgang Iser, Louise Rosenblatt, Stanley Fish, and others, reader-response theory puts its emphasis on what occurs in the transaction between reader and text. For Bleich, the attention is on the way a reader projects his own desires on a text; for Iser and Rosenblatt, the interest lies in the interaction between the reader, and what the reader activates in the text; for Fish, the focus is on the communal assumptions that control the sorts of attention we pay to texts and thereby shape our readings of them. (911)

Eagleton perceives the realm of reception theorists as including both Wolfgang Iser and Roland Barthes, who possess very different approaches (Lit Theory 79-83). In The Act of Reading (1978), Iser states that the actual reader's plural perceptions of the implied reader and of the strategies in the text create meaning; thus, the more open one is, the greater the possibilities of meanings. Eagleton, however, finds Iser's system to be both anti-political and
fairly closed: anti-political because the more political the reader is, the fewer opportunities she possesses to make meaning from the text, and fairly closed because the system assumes that the best reader would be a unified (liberal) self (Lit. Criticism 78-79). On the other hand, in The Pleasure of the Text (1973), Barthes promotes the reader's endless play, her jouissance, almost sexual in nature. This endless play allows for plural readings of the text (especially modernist texts), regardless of the inevitable, accompanying ideology of the reader, yet this play also depoliticizes the interpretive process.

Feminist criticism, in the early 1970's, established a two-fold goal: recovering the often-ignored women's works and points of view and, in the process, revising traditional interpretations of literature and culture that narrowly focus only on males and male values. While all this revisioning was occurring, feminist critics resisted the urge to define feminism and feminist criticism, wanting to keep it from being closed, i.e., usurped and domesticated by patriarchal critics. In the 1980's, however, another equally important goal, which Elaine Showalter claims destroys the imitation/revision dichotomous option, arose: gynocritics, the discussion of women's texts in "the tumultuous and intriguing wilderness of difference
itself" ("Fem. Crit. in the Wilderness" 267). Drawing on Showalters' example, certain feminists now claim that the goal of feminist critics is not to strive for a sexless canon but to celebrate women's writing as a separate phenomenon (266).

Rhetorical criticism and feminist criticism inform one another most in their political implications, specifically in the interrogation of situation and audience. Kate Millet's ground-breaking Sexual Politics refutes the New Critics by arguing that situational contexts must be included in literary interpretation; she also asserts that the interplay between the reader and the text can create valid readings. This idea destroyed the "prevailing image of the reader/critic as passive/feminine recipient of authoritarian discourse" (Moi 25). Moi, herself, calls for the instatement of rhetorical aims into feminist criticism, believing an interrogation of the political nature of an author's aesthetics will generate greater understanding of texts (17).

Conclusion

The rhetorical criticism employed in this study emerges from a dialectical process in which a certain literary theory arises in reaction to previously existing ones, with varying emphases being placed on
situation, author, text, and reader. Although predominantly grounded in a rhetorical perspective, my methodology evolves from several theoretical bases. First, I have included situation as a criterion to recognize the influence of rhetorical critics, such as Bitzer and Burke, who have tried to reinstate rhetorical criticism as a valid literary tool; to recognize the influence of feminist critics, such as Kate Millet and Toril Moi, who deem cultual criticism to be an innate part of feminist criticism; and to recognize the influence of marxist/social critics, such as Foucault, Jameson, and Burke, who also deem social criticism important and who have attempted to reinstate a certain historicity into the critical process. Second, I have included author, both actual and Booth's implied, in an attempt to reaffirm the existence and the importance of a limited authorial intention in the text. Third, I have included text to demonstrate, like Marshall Alcorn, that some authority, though not nearly all, resides in the signifiers on the page and to demonstrate that ideology is manifested in the integration of form and content. Fourth, I have included audience to recognize the influences of reader-response theory, but by including audience with the three other criteria, I also hope to refute the position of radical reader-
response critics, such as Stanley Fish, who may deny the existence of a text or an author.

In his "Conclusion" of *Literary Theory: An Introduction*, Eagleton predicts the rise of a political criticism as the next step in an on-going dialectic of criticisms, a political criticism in which "methodological questions in cultural analysis must be subordinated to political goals" (Eagleton, *Against the Grain* 7). The strength of the rhetorical methodology described in this chapter is that it performs both functions, examining methodological questions while emphasizing political goals. In the next two chapters, I will employ this rhetorical methodology to the texts of Virginia Woolf and Adrienne Rich in order to discover/uncover a rhetoric of feminism in each of the women's essays—that is, to discover/uncover the rhetorical strategies these women writers employ to persuade their audiences to action or to attitude.
Notes: Chapter II

1 Interrogate is a term used by Frank Lentricchia in *Criticism and Social Change* (Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1983) and by Walter Davis in *Inwardness and Existence* (Columbus, OH: manuscript to be published, 1988) to describe a reader's involvement with a text; *interrogate* implies an intense dialogue with the text in a way *investigate* does not.

2 For a brief discussion of the decline of rhetoric in traditional nineteenth-century school curricula see Robert Connors, Lisa Ede, and Andrea Lunsford, "The Revival of Rhetoric in America," *Essays on Classical Rhetoric and Modern Discourse* (Carbondale: Southern Illinois U P, 1984), pp. 1-15. They attribute rhetoric's decline to three causes: the association of rhetoric with the belles-lettres tradition, which was perceived as reducing rhetoric to the study of style; the increased specialization within the university, along with the rise of the English Department; and a greater emphasis on written examinations and written evaluations of students.


4 Feminist reaction to Wayne Booth's attempts at feminist criticism are hesitantly positive. Certain critics, such as Gayatri Spivak who attended a conference on feminist criticism with Booth, see his attempts as sincere but weak. The overall opinion seems divided into two camps, those who view Booth's attempts as valuable in legitimizing feminist criticism and those who fear Booth will set a trend for the domestication of feminism within the academy.

For an example of a feminist critic employing Burke's pentad, see Janet Brown, "Kenneth Burke and The Mod Donna," *Central States Speech Journal* 29 (1978): 138-44; Brown posits that Burke's pentad perfectly suits the aims of a feminist critic because it allows the critic to "cast a woman as agent, the scene as an unjust socio-hierarchy, the agent's purpose as the achievement of autonomy" (140).


For a different perspective of rhetoric situation, see Edwin Black, *Rhetorical Criticism: A Study of Method* (New York: Macmillan, 1965). Black's methodology, which may be described as the inverse of Bitzer's, consists of "rhetorical strategies, rhetorical situations, and audience effects" (134), all of which work to comprise a complex web of events that Black calls "rhetorical transaction" (134). Black's concept of rhetorical transaction, which subsumes situation, implies that an act can be separate from and greater than the situation from which it arose.


The interesting element of rhetoric today may concern the analysis of multiple levels of audience, for when reading is perceived as a constructive act, actual readers become as important as authors in creating meaning.
In developing the criteria for my methodology, I found a good starting point in Richard Ohmann’s discussion of rhetoric as a four-part framework: 1) writing and content, 2) writing and the author, 3) writing and the audience, and 4) writing and world views. “In Lieu of a New Rhetoric,” CE 26 (1964): 17-22.


For a discussion of how implied author relates to the authorial audience and how narrator relates to the narrative audience, see Peter Rabinovitz, "Truth in Fiction: A Reexamination of Audiences," CI (Fall 1977): 125-135.

For an interesting discussion of form as "a 'strategy' for establishing a relation to reality" (630) for both the writer and the reader, see Keith Fort, "Form, Authority, and the Critical Essay," CE 32 (1971): 629-39.

Wolfgang Iser discusses authorial readers, but uses the term implied readers, in The Implied Reader (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 1974).
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CHAPTER III
A RHETORICAL ANALYSIS OF VIRGINIA WOOLF'S
A ROOM OF ONE'S OWN

Vague as all definitions are, a good essay must have this permanent quality about it; it must draw its curtain round us, but it must be a curtain that shuts us in, not out.

--Virginia Woolf
"The Modern Essay"

Introduction

One writer, in particular, has brilliantly synthesized feminist thought and rhetorical principles in her feminist essays: that writer is Virginia Woolf. Although numerous essays with feminist overtones comprise Woolf's corpus, A Room of One's Own (1929) and Three Guineas (1938) are generally considered her feminist tracts. The first, noted for its optimism, envisions a "girl" and a "young man" riding away together, sharing a taxi (100); the second, noted for its pessimism, associates (quite originally for its time) the connection between masculine traits and war. But as with all binary oppositions, such a categorization is too simple. A Room of One's Own is not wholly optimistic, nor
merely, as Quentin Bell states in his biography of his aunt, the product of "a serene voice, the voice of a happy woman" (II.145). Instead, it is the voice of an intelligent, concerned woman who discerns injustices and envisions possible solutions.

This tendency to cast meaning in binary oppositions has haunted the texts of Virginia Woolf. The novels reign supreme in some critics' minds because they are aesthetically brilliant; the feminist essays, on the other hand, get relegated to a second-class status merely because they are essays, because they argue a thesis and, thus, fall into the realm of the political, the polemical. Such a dichotomy, however, is questionable at best. In The Aesthetics of Feminism in Virginia Woolf's Fiction (1976), Dorothy Duff Brown claims that the political ramifications of feminism merge with the aesthetic interests in Woolf's fiction, that "feminism as an intellectual and moral position . . . must inform any aesthetic consideration of Woolf's fiction" (1). In Virginia Woolf and the Problem of the Subject (1987), Makiko Minow-Pinkney echoes Brown's assertion:

Far from being a flight from social commitment into arcane modernism, Woolf's experimental novels can best be seen . . . as a feminist subversion of the deepest formal principles—of the very definitions of narrative, writing, the subject—of that patriarchal social order. (x)
I agree. And in this study, I will also attempt to transcend this dichotomy. Instead of analyzing fiction, however, I will interrogate A Room of One's Own to demonstrate how the aesthetic and the political are synthesized quite effectively in Woolf's most famous feminist essay.

Indeed, A Room of One's Own is a rhetorical masterpiece. In this essay, Virginia Woolf argues that if women writers hope to achieve a status equal to men's, they must first achieve economic and social independence: that is, a woman needs 500 pounds a year and a room of her own if she is to write fiction. In promoting this thesis, which may be interpreted as a metaphor for women in society at large, Woolf demonstrates not only her ability to imitate classical rhetorical principles but also her ability to revise these principles so as, in her words, "to absorb the new into the old without disturbing the infinitely intricate and elaborate balance of the whole" (AR000 89). In order to investigate this imitation/revision phenomenon and ultimately generalize about her rhetoric of feminism, I will employ the methodology described in Chapter Two to interrogate the multiple levels of situation, author, text, and audience that are manifested in A Room of One's Own.
**Situation: Extra-textual and Textual**

As described in Chapter Two, situation may be perceived as a construct that both influences individuals and, in turn, is influenced by these same individuals. Thus, situation may enable and/or hinder their evolution as subjects. As a component of literary criticism, situation may be analyzed on two levels: extra-textual and textual. Both embody the exigencies and constraints that give rise to the text, the main difference being their respective locations in relation to the text.

When trying to construct the extra-textual or textual situations that might assist a reader's understanding of *A Room of One's Own*, I can only pick and choose the information that seems pertinent, being conscious all the while that the situation arising from these pages is not complete, is not exactly the same truth Virginia Woolf might have perceived, is not exactly the same truth another reader might construct. Moreover, in *A Room of One's Own*, the exigencies and constraints of both situations are not fixed. Instead, they slide in and around one another, reflecting Woolf's conviction that context plays a crucial role in determining meaning. To analyze this shifting nature in the extra-textual situation, I will examine its literal and metaphorical implications; to analyze the shifts in
the textual situation, however, I will examine each of
the six chapters separately.

The most obvious extra-textual exigence of A Room
of One's Own is that Woolf had been invited to speak at
Cambridge in October of 1928. First mentioned in her
diary as "Women and Fiction" (18 February 1928), A Room
of One's Own was initially conceived as two lectures
addressed solely to women, one presented to the Arts
Society at Newnham on 20 October 1928, the other to the
Odtaa at Girton on 26 October 1928. Only later were the
two lectures revised, then published in 1929 in their
present form (The Diary of V.W. III.175, 199).

Although Woolf spoke literally about women and
their plight as writers, her description may also be
viewed as a metaphor for the role played by all women in
society, thus her second exigence. By 1928, at the time
of her writing A Room of One's Own, British women had
gained many legislative victories. In 1918, Parliament
granted adult male suffrage but limited female suffrage
to "those over 30 who were local government electors, or
the wives of local government electors, or university
graduates" (Banks 129); complete female adult suffrage
was not achieved until 1928. But during the Twenties,
in an attempt to capture the important, though limited,
votes of women, members of Parliament readily agreed to
other legislative acts that improved the lives of women.
For example, the 1919 Sex Disqualification Act allowed women to enter the professions and learned societies and to sit on juries. Later in the Twenties, women acquired the right to serve as guardians and to receive equal rights in a divorce settlement. Moreover, they qualified for separation support money and civilian widow pensions, and they were legally permitted to manage their own property.

Yet women were still economically and socially second-class citizens. For example, even though women were allowed to enter the professions, they were underpaid and poorly represented, and while they were allowed to attend college, the women's colleges were not officially parts of the universities at Cambridge and Oxford. As a result of women's being socialized into this second-class status and its ensuing subservient state of mind, women's fiction suffered. Or at least, that is what Virginia Woolf believed. Thus, as a proposal to remedy this situation, A Room of One's Own is both an aesthetic and a political text.

A third exigence that triggered Woolf's writing A Room of One's Own is represented by the constraints of her own life. In A Woman of Letters, Phyllis Rose summarizes Woolf's predicament:

Born with an unusual talent as well as an inherited tendency to madness, with a distinguished man of letters for her father
and a charismatic woman, a great beauty, for her mother, she had extraordinary opportunities in childhood, but was also subjected to extraordinary pressures. (xiii)

As a child and young adult, Adeline Virginia Stephen was denied a public education on account of her sex. But such a social constraint, although it weighed heavily on her throughout her life, was not to keep her in the parlor. Instead of a public education, she had access to the library and tutelage of her father, Leslie Stephen, for whom she professed ambivalent feelings. She loved him, yet she also feared his control, even claiming that, had he lived, his continuing domineering influence would probably have prevented her from writing novels. As editor of the *Dictionary of National Biography*, however, Leslie Stephen imbued Woolf with a sense of the biographical, historical, and cultural contexts of texts. This critical practice influenced Woolf throughout her life, eventually complementing her feminism quite nicely; indeed, when she commenced on her long-time goal of writing her own version of the history of English literature, she "repeatedly emphasized the need to write as well the history of the society that produced and responded to the art" (Silver, V.W.'s *Reading Notebooks* 7–8). Attaining such contexts, however, necessitates an incredible amount of reading. Leslie Steppe advised her about the traditional canon of
predominantly male writers, but as Woolf matured, she overcame the constraint of the canon and her father, focusing also on marginalized texts of women writers and their history.

Trying to straddle the canonized tradition of predominantly male writers and the marginalized tradition of women writers created another problem for Woolf, locating her, as a reader and a writer, in an awkward situation: she was simultaneously a part of and apart from both traditions. In a 1903 diary entry, entitled "The Country in London," Woolf demonstrates her painful consciousness of this dual role, writing of an epiphany in the country:

I read some history: it is suddenly all alive, branching forwards & backwards & connected with every kind of thing that seemed entirely remote before. I seem to feel Napoleon's influence on our quiet evening in the garden for instance--I think I see for a moment how our minds are all threaded together--how any live mind today is eene of the same stuff as Plato's and Euripides. It is only a continuation & development of the same thing--It is this common mind that binds the whole world together; & all the world is mind . . . . I feel as though I had grasped the central meaning of the world, & all these poets & historians & philosophers were only following out paths branching from that centre in which I stand. (Holograph Notebook 6/30/03-9/1/03; qtd. in Silver 5)

On her return to London, however, she records that the "atmosphere is too hot--too fretful. I read--then I lay down the book--& say--what right have I, a woman to read
all these things that men have done? They would laugh if they saw me" (Holograph Notebook; qtd. in Silver 6). Woolf is not affecting an unwarranted self-consciousness about her location in society, for she was, indeed, heavily socialized into this dichotomous mindset: mornings were given over to study, afternoons and evenings to social events. Phyllis Rose comments on Woolf's double consciousness in _A Woman of Letters_: "Her father trained her in reading books, to state her reactions clearly and candidly, but the lesson of the tea table was precisely the reverse—to flatter, to sympathize, to console" (Rose 21).

Nevertheless, Woolf turned all these constraints into exigencies for writing; thus, she continued exploring the uncharted realm of women writers, a practice which noticeably affected her own texts. For example, to research her October 1928 Cambridge lectures on "Women and Fiction," Woolf read the letters of Dorothy Osborne, the correspondence of Jane Carlyle and Geraldine Jewsbury, the diary of Fanny Burney, the journals of Dorothy Wordsworth, and the letters and political tracts of Mary Wollstonecraft. Specifically, this reading informed _A Room of One's Own_ (1929), exemplifying how a constraint may turn on itself and become an exigence. Her reading also located Woolf within a tradition of women writers, in which she could
take root and grow. Moreover, her reading gave the
readers of *A Room of One's Own* a sense of tradition,
while encouraging them to read with "an awareness of the
social and cultural restrictions that have led to women's
silence, as well as to their speech" (Silver, *V.W.'s
Reading Notebooks* 9).

The textual situation in *A Room of One's Own* is
definitely influenced by its extra-textual counterpart.
In Chapter One, the narrator's most obvious motivation
to write parallels Woolf's most obvious motivation: the
narrator, like the actual author, must present a lecture
about "Women and Fiction" in two day's time. Writing
this lecture, however, is proving difficult because the
narrator must first define for herself what is meant by
"Women and Fiction" before she can discover and arrange
her thoughts on the subject. Unable to sit down and
quickly write a point-by-point speech, "a nugget of pure
truth to wrap up between the pages of your note-books
and keep on the mantlepiece forever" (*AROO* 3-4), she
recounts her movements of the two days prior to the
speech, hoping to prove, by example, the reasons
underlying her opening assertion: "All I could do was
to offer you an opinion upon one minor point—a woman
must have money and a room of her own if she is to write
fiction" (4). The pressure of a two-day deadline pales,
however, in comparison to the accompanying constraints
that are imposed upon her by individuals and by institutions, constraints that eventually become reasons for writing.

The essay opens with the narrator at Oxbridge, where she is the Other, denied the privileges and secrets of academia. To pass the time before lunch, she is musing along the banks of a river, enjoying her privacy and nature, while comparing her ideas to the swimming fish, which, when displaced on land, soon stop squirming and die. In this natural setting, she problematizes her topic of "Women and Fiction," discovering its slippery nature by positing five possible subjects: 1) women, such as Jane Austen and George Eliot, who have been accepted into the traditional canon of literature, 2) women and "what they are like," 3) women and "the fiction that they write," 4) women and "the fiction that is written about them," and 5) a combination of the above (3). This fifth option interests her most, but it also hinders her, its multiplicity of meaning preventing her from drawing a firm conclusion.

Lost in such thoughts, the narrator strolls toward the university, enjoying the grass beneath her feet, when suddenly she encounters another constraint: a Beadle orders her off the grass and back to the gravel, the only acceptable path for a woman. As a result of this confrontation, she loses her ideas, yet she remains
calm, keeping to the path, just thinking the Beadle a bit absurd. But the Beadle is only the beginning. Walking through Oxbridge on this "fine October morning" (6), she starts thinking about her topic again, which sends her to the library to do research, but the library, like the Beadle's turf, presents another constraint because it is off limits to her unless she is accompanied by a male. The cumulative effect of all these restrictions challenges her calm. She becomes so angry and frustrated that, by the time she has walked to the church where the male academicians are gathering for services, she has no desire to enter. Instead, she amusedly observes, for soon lunch will be served, her real reason for being at Oxbridge anyway.

In addition to these overtly obvious constraints, other more insidious ones are at work. For example, although she is angered at Oxbridge, in the midst of a highly patriarchal society, she is, at the same time, lulled into complacence. With the Ages of Faith and Reason having passed, Oxbridge provides a sense of tradition, continuity, security, a haven where one can easily believe that all is well:

We are all going to heaven . . . --in other words, how good life seemed, how sweet its rewards, how trivial this grudge or that grievance, how admirable friendship and the society of one's kind, as, lighting a good cigarette, one sunk among the cushions in the window seat. (11)
But like her illusions of security, her cigarette burns down, her ashes need to be flicked, and in the process of flicking these ashes out the window, she spots a "cat without a tail" (11), an image implying a plethora of Freudian interpretations.

The "cat without a tail" jars her from her contentment, and in an epiphanous moment she notes that the quality of lunch in October, 1928, differs from other similar luncheons before the war: the building is the same, the people are the same, the food is the same, . . . but a different "humming noise" is in the background (12); a different situation exists. And this current situation is lacking something, rather like the cat who is lacking a tail. Situation, as a dialectical social construct, which the narrator partially helps to construct, either enables or, as evidenced by her experiences earlier in the day, hinders her evolving subjectivity. She is aware now, aware that the one thing lacking from the October, 1928, luncheon at Oxbridge is her innocence. Thus, recognizing the danger of her complacency motivates her to write.

After lunch, with her epiphany still in mind, the narrator walks to Fernham, a women's college, whose atmosphere is another constraint. Losing her way, she has to retrace her steps, locating the back road that leads to Fernham. There she dines plainly, the food
nothing like her sumptuous lunch at Oxbridge, the Fernham atmosphere changing her Oxbridge security to hesitation: "We are all probably going to heaven, and Vandyck is, we hope, to meet us round the next corner..." (18). After dinner, her conversation with Mary Seton outlines the specific constraints of women who desire an education within a patriarchal society. Since there is no public support for women's education, there is no money. Or is it because women have no money that they cannot gain public support? At any rate, another constraint has become an exigence for speaking out.

Chapter Two opens with the narrator at home in London, deciding to research her topic at the British Museum, where, unlike the library at Oxbridge, she is permitted to study. At the British Museum she may imitate the logical process of Oxbridge male academicians, and in the process, find her answer. But once there, she encounters yet another restraint: unfamiliar with the library, she has problems locating appropriate material, and her highly intelligent but untrained mind has difficulty drawing logical, compartmentalized conclusions of her male counterpart. While he outlines his material, neatly recording details in columns, she takes notes haphazardly, ... then scribbles, weaving all her ideas together. ... then angrily and unconsciously draws pictures of the men whom
she envisions as the authors of books about women. Ironically, she discovers more truth through these intuitive processes than she does in the library books. Thus, the British Museum is really no different than Oxbridge; both are closed systems.

Frustrated, she leaves and goes to a restaurant, where, when paying her bills, she feels once again grateful for the inheritance from her aunt, Mary Beton. In light of this gratitude, her anger dissipates, and she generalizes from her particular experience about the necessity for women to achieve economic independence: "Indeed my aunt's legacy unveiled the sky to me, and substituted for the large and imposing figure of a gentleman, which Milton recommended for my perpetual adoration, a view of the open sky" (39). With such thoughts, she returns home to write.

Chapter Three finds the narrator that same evening at home in her own library, where she feels comfortable and unthreatened, where no male researcher emphasizes her lack of formal research skills. Frustrated by her failure at the British Museum to find truth in the books written by males, she goes randomly to her own shelves, hoping to locate women in history and in fiction. But the facts and fancies written about women are so cursory and stereotypical that they constitute another restriction upon the narrator's search for knowledge.
Moreover, the dichotomous position of the women that she discovers amazes her. History, as recounted by mostly male historians, places little value on women, but literature, as produced by mostly male authors, bestows great honor upon them. Intuiting that the truth lies somewhere else, the narrator calls for a re-writing of history that includes the stories of women, a re-writing that will cast current historical accounts in a new light. To demonstrate her point, the narrator combines history and fiction by telling the story of Judith Shakespeare.

Still at home in her own library, the narrator, in Chapters Four and Five respectively, examines the oppression of historical women writers and then the slightly lesser oppression on living women writers, particularly Mary Carmichael. The narrator is searching for roots, for a tradition of women writers on which she may build and, thus, alleviate the constraint of feeling alone. Specifically, she discusses the restrictions of women writers from the sixteenth century to the present and concludes that women who are not sanctioned to write, but who do so anyway, are angry, and their anger contaminates their writing, writing that is further contaminated when they adopt the dominant style (male) of the time.
Women's situations are not reflected in the style of a Francis Bacon or a Charles Lamb, so instead, argues the narrator, women writers need a sentence and sequence that is decidedly female, that reflects "the body" (81). According to the narrator, Jane Austen successfully meets this criteria by creating her own sentence. The fictional Mary Carmichael, too, accomplishes this goal, creating her own sentence and sequence, albeit poorly, which is proof of her evolving androgynous mind. The need to continue this tradition, to celebrate the accomplishments of previous women writers, spurs the narrator to write.

In Chapter Six, the next day, the narrator is still at home, but instead of pouring through books to find logical answers, she taps her intuition to ponder the question of "Women and Fiction." She gazes out her window, observing London traffic. And when a leaf falls, when a young man and woman hail a taxi separately, but end up sharing it, when the taxi drives into the steam of traffic, the narrator experiences another epiphanous moment:

For certainly when I saw the couple get into the taxi-cab the mind felt as if, after being divided, it had come together again in a natural fusion. The obvious reason would be that it is natural for the sexes to cooperate. (101)

This epiphany occurs when she examines life as well as
books, when she synthesizes intuition and logic. What she is really accomplishing is modeling a more open system than the closed academic one, a system that almost anyone can enter. Thus, this epiphany causes her to write, to promote a better life not only for women but for men, a better life that can be achieved only when both sexes recognize the androgynous component of their beings. But Chapter Six does not end there. Instead, the implied author takes over, letting the narrator rest while she lectures the audience in her peroration: only by breaking these constraints, she argues, only by turning these constraints into exigencies for speaking and writing, will society change, will the chance for a Judith Shakespeare arise.

But, as with the extra-textual situation, the textual situation is obviously more complex than the summary presented here reveals. Whether recounting her confrontation with the Oxbridge Beadle or her frustration in the British Museum, the narrator demonstrates that each constraint recorded constitutes an exigence, her anger and resentment spurring her to write. By extension, each moment that the narrator experiences—by definition, her entire life—is an exigence. And so she writes . . . and speaks.
Author: Actual, Narrative, and Implied

As discussed in Chapter Two, author may be examined as a three-tiered construct: the actual author, the narrative author (or narrator), and the implied author. By examining how these three levels manifest themselves in a text, a reader is better able to understand the slides, the gaps, and the subtle shifts in strategies.

Current critical theorists such as Michel Foucault have called for the death of the actual author because they fear what Bell fears in his biography of Woolf:

To know the psyche of Virginia Woolf, one would have to be either God or Virginia Woolf, preferably God. Looking from the outside, one can go no further than what I have called the outline and for the rest one may guess, one may even build upon one's divinations, but never for a moment allowing oneself to forget that this is guesswork and guesswork of a most hazardous kind. (II.109)

While I do not aspire to being Virginia Woolf or God, I do believe that the following biographical emphasis on Woolf as an essayist, feminist, and rhetorician as well as an examination of her field of texts can help provide a flexible context, not a prescribed structure, for readers trying to interpret A Room of One's Own.

Although Virginia Woolf enjoyed writing novels, she also admired the essay: "It was the Elizabethan prose writers I loved first and most wildly" ([Diary] Holograph notebook, 12/25/04--5/31/05; qtd. in Silver
Indeed she fostered great respect for the essay form, for its elasticity and its boundaries. In his introduction to *The Common Reader: First Series*, Andrew McNeillie elaborates:

... [A]s novelist and essayist formal questions greatly absorbed her interest; and in both capacities she confronted them as a purist, intent to find the ideal form not only for the part, in this case the individual essay, but also for the whole. (x)

But the essay form also troubled her: "Have I the power of conveying true reality? Or do I write essays about myself" (*Diary of V. W.* II.248).

In "The Modern Essay," Woolf describes the essay as that which "should give pleasure" (211) and the essayist as one who should synthesize good writing skill and knowledge. "He must know—that is the first essential—how to write. His learning... must be so fused by the magic of writing that not a fact juts out, not a dogma tears the surface of the texture" (212). The art of essay writing, which Woolf discusses in her essay tribute to Montaigne, is comparable to drawing oneself with a pen. This art, for which Montaigne has no peer, should proceed as if the writer is "talking of oneself, following one's vagaries, giving the whole map, weight, colour, and circumference of the soul in its confusion, its variety, its imperfection" ("Montaigne" 58). The difficulty of communicating oneself, there is the
supreme difficulty of being oneself" (59), especially for women.

Woolf's interest in essay writing appeared between 1897 and 1904 when she used to dash upstairs after breakfast "to tackle Sophocles or Euripides or to write letters and essays" (Bell I.73). Her first publication, an unsigned review, was published in the Guardian on December 14, 1904, setting an important trend. On and off for the rest of her life Woolf wrote critical articles that were published in various literary journals, such as The Times Literary Supplement, Life and Letters, The Nation, The New York Herald, The Yale Review, and Figaro. So intrigued was Woolf with the essay form that her novel The Years (1937), originally entitled The Pargiters, began as an experiment with the "essay novel," which, in the fall of 1932, she perceived as her "next stage" (Diary of V.W. IV.129).

In addition to her well-known feminist essays, A Room of One's Own (1929) and Three Guineas (1938), Woolf published other essays during her lifetime. Mr. Bennett and Mrs. Brown (1924) is Woolf's literary manifesto about character in the novel. But Woolf was interested in writing for a broader readership than just an esoteric literary audience; thus, she began her "common reader" project. The Common Reader: First Series (1925) and The Common Reader: Second Series
(1932) owe their name to Dr. Johnson's Life of Gray:

. . . I rejoice to concur with the common reader; for by the common sense of readers, uncorrupted by literary prejudices, after all the refinements of subtlety and the dogmatism of learning, must finally be decided all claim to poetical honors. (qtd in Woolf, Common Reader: First Series 1)

Consisting mainly of essays about literary figures, The Common Readers are written conversationally, with quotations uncited and personal opinions celebrated. In a more political vein, Woolf also wrote the introduction to Life as We Have Known It (1931), a compilation of personal testimonies of the Women's Co-operative Guild. This introduction, later published in Woolf's Collected Essays as "Memories of a Working Women's Guild," is important because it demonstrates Woolf's "own pained recognition of the class-bound nature of her work" and, thus, "undercuts one's impulse to condemn her as mandarin" (Rose 284).

After Virginia Woolf's death, Leonard Woolf published many of her essays, approximately 162, in the following collections: The Death of the Moth and Other Essays (1942), The Moment and Other Essays (1947), The Captain's Death Bed and Other Essays (1950), Granite and Rainbow (1958), and Collected Essays in four volumes (1966-67). These collections include essays with more feminist overtones than those in The Common Readers. For example, "Professions for
Women" discusses the insidious Angel in the House that must be killed before a woman can achieve her own subjectivity, and "Two Women" compares the lives of Emily Davies, founder of Girton College, and Lady Augusta Stanley.

It is interesting to note the location of A Room of One's Own within Woolf's field of texts:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Voyage Out</td>
<td>1915</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Night and Day</td>
<td>1919</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacob's Room</td>
<td>1922</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Common Reader: First Series</td>
<td>1925</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Dalloway</td>
<td>1925</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To the Lighthouse</td>
<td>1927</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orlando: A Biography</td>
<td>1928</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Room of One's Own</td>
<td>1928</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Waves</td>
<td>1931</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Common Reader: Second Series</td>
<td>1932</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Years</td>
<td>1937</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three Guineas</td>
<td>1938</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roger Fry: A Biography</td>
<td>1940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between the Acts</td>
<td>1941</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Death of the Moth and Other Essays</td>
<td>1942</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Moment and Other Essays</td>
<td>1947</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Captain's Death Bed and Other Essays</td>
<td>1950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Granite and Rainbow</td>
<td>1958</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collected Essays 4 vols.,</td>
<td>1966-67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Written at the peak of her career, A Room of One's Own benefitted from the formal experiments of Mrs. Dalloway and To the Lighthouse, in which reality is presented as subjective, as fragmented yet connected by a single focus, much like the line running through the center of Lily Briscoe's portrait of Mrs. Ramsey.

Coming directly after the publication of Orlando, A Room of One's Own no doubt also benefitted from Woolf's
contemplating the roles of men and women in society, from the Renaissance to her present. Orlando, Woolf's most playful novel, examines the 500-year life of a young man who is magically transformed into a young woman. October 1928, the date of her lectures on "Women and Fiction," is the date used to conclude the account of Orlando's long, long life, a life that embodies Woolf's evolving interest in androgyny:

"... Heavens!" she thought, "what fools they make of us—what fools we are!" And here it would seem from some ambiguity in her terms that she was censuring both sexes equally, as if she belonged to neither; and indeed, for the time being she seemed to vacillate; she was man; she was woman; she knew the secrets, shared the weaknesses of each. It was a most bewildering and whirligig state of mind to be in. The comforts of ignorance seemed utterly denied her. (Orlando 158)

And only after the "comforts of ignorance" are gone, after the discomforts of mutual awareness arise, can individuals—men and women alike—commence to build a society in which everyone is entitled to 500 pounds and a room of one's own.

Because of this assertion, Virginia Woolf is considered a feminist by most people today, and well she should be. Interestingly enough, however, Vita Sackville-West notes in her review of A Room of One's Own that "Mrs. Woolf is too sensible to be a thorough-going feminist" (19), implying that Woolf refused to be associated with the suffragists who had taken to
the streets in demonstration. And in Three Guineas, Woolf herself claims that the word feminist should be destroyed since it is "an old word, a vicious and corrupt word that has done much harm in its day and is now obsolete" (154). As a result, some critics could argue that Virginia Woolf might not appreciate my labelling her a feminist essayist, that indeed she might take me to task publicly as Ralph Partridge accuses her of doing with aspiring young female intellectuals of her day (Bell II.97-98).

But many valid reasons exist for associating Woolf with feminism in this study. While she did not march in the streets for equality, Woolf was a long-time sympathiser of the feminist movement, addressing envelopes for the Adult Suffrage movement of 1910 and serving as secretary of the Richmond Branch of the Women's Co-operative Guild from 1917-1921. In 1920, she raised her pen to refute Desmond MacCarthy's review of Arnold Bennett's Our Women, in which MacCarthy agreed with Bennett that women were intellectually inferior to men and that women desired to be dominated (Diary of V.W. II. 339-342). Given these sympathies, her movement from the private to the public sphere in the Thirties, with the publication of her feminist essays, was a natural progression. At that point, for Woolf, the artist and the individual became inseparable from the
political. Moreover, as I discussed in Chapter One, I am using the term feminist broadly, implying a female-centered analysis that attempts to revise male-centered constructs, much as Woolf does in *A Room of One's Own*.

While Woolf, in the common reader's mind, has become closely linked with feminism, literary critics from her generation to the present have, interestingly, been divided in their opinions of her. During Woolf's lifetime, her novels were celebrated mostly for their innovative Modernist formal experiments, not for any feminist content; and because of their feminist content, her feminist essays were considered minor texts. In his 1941 Rede lecture at Cambridge, which he dedicated to Virginia Woolf, E.M. Forster reflects this critical trend when he discusses *A Room of One's Own*:

> In my judgement there is something old-fashioned about this extreme Feminism; it dates back to her suffragette youth of the 1910's, when men kissed girls to distract them from wanting the vote, and very properly provoked her wrath. By the 1930's she had much less to complain of, and seems to keep on grumbling from habit. (Forster, *Virginia Woolf* 23-24)

In a totally different but equally critical vein, Arnold Bennett, of "Mr. Bennet and Mrs. Smith" fame, reports in the *Evening Standard* that "[s]ome will describe her book as a feminist tract. It is no such thing" (259). Vita Sackville-West, however, reacts
differently. While denying Woolf's affiliation with organized feminists, she praises Woolf's views in *A Room of One's Own* and ends her *Listener* review with a call to action: "I hope all men will read this little book; it will do them good. I hope all women will read it; it will do them good, too" (19). Interestingly, Woolf accurately anticipates the critical reception of *A Room of One's Own* in her 23 October 1929 diary entry:

> It is a little ominous that Morgan won't review it. It makes me suspect that there is a shrill feminine tone in it which my intimate friends will dislike. I forecast, then, that I shall get no criticism, except of the evasive jocular kind, from Lytton [Strachey], Roger [Fry] & Morgan; that the press will be kind & talk of its charm, & sprightliness; also I shall be attacked for a feminist & hinted at for a sapphist . . . . It is a trifle, I shall say; so it is, but I wrote it with ardour & conviction. (III.262)

Contemporary feminist critics, too, have had mixed reactions to Woolf. Revived in the 1960's, *A Room of One's Own* inspired a new generation of readers to strive for economic and social independence. But by the mid-1970's Woolf was again under attack, this time from critics such as Elaine Showalter, Patricia Stubbs and Sidney Jane Kaplan, who echoed Queenie Leavis' complaint that Woolf was not radical enough, that her class assumptions and political naivete were insulting. Recently, however, critics such as Toril Moi and Jane
Marcus have attempted to revise our perceptions of Woolf. Moi, especially, believes critics have done a great injustice to Woolf by refusing to acknowledge that the politics of Woolf's writing lie "precisely in her textual practice," which undermines the liberal humanist concept of the unified self (Moi 16).

Virginia Woolf is not a rhetorician in the narrow sense that one might traditionally define a rhetorician. She did not devote her life to the study or the instruction of rhetoric, nor did she conceptualize a system of rhetoric. What she did do, however, was commit her life to language, to the creation of self and reality and social change through language. In this sense, she is a powerful rhetorician or, more precisely, a powerful rhetor of the printed page.

Thanks to her father's traditional conception of literature, Woolf read both Plato's discussions of rhetoric and the essays of prominent writers from every literary age. We know she had read Plato, at least by 1900, for in that year her half-brother George Duckworth escorted her to an intimate dinner party of four where Virginia proceeded to shock the Dowager Countess of Carnavon and her sister Mrs. Popham by discussing a risqué passage from Plato (Bell I.77). Other notes in Bell's biography demonstrate that Woolf was reading Plato in June of 1908 and again during 1923-25 (I.139;
II.105), and citations in her reading notebooks indicate that she read the Symposium in July of 1908 and the Phaedrus in May of 1909 (Silver 168; 169). Woolf read Aristotle, too, but the only citation found concerns the Poetics in 1926-27 (Silver 135). Her use of rhetorical terms, such as narration and peroration, also indicate that she was aware of classical patterns of arrangement for formal essays (AR00 116).

Her own essays—e.g., "The Modern Essay," "Montaigne," "Addison," "De Quincey's Autobiography," and "Mary Wollstonecraft,"—indicate that she was intimately acquainted with the writings of such essayists and the methods of each. In "Montaigne," for example, she compares the arrangement of an informal essay to a journey: "We should start without any fixed idea where we are going to spend the night, or when we propose to come back; the journey is everything" (65). In her essays, Woolf also mentions other essayists such as Francis Bacon, Charles Lamb, J.C. Squire, and Max Beerbohm, to name only a few ("The Modern Essay" 221-22), but although she maintains that Montaigne has no equal, she credits Addison with making prose "prosaic—the medium which makes it possible for people of ordinary intelligence to communicate their ideas to the world" ("Montaigne" 58; "Addison" 105).
To communicate her ideas on women and fiction, she chose the essay form.

When an essay is examined in terms of author, two voices usually appear: actual author and implied author. In *A Room of One's Own*, however, Woolf draws upon her talents as a fiction writer and includes a third level, a narrator whose "showing" takes precedence over the exposition and/or argument so commonly associated with political essays. In *A Room of One's Own*, an interesting relationship develops between the narrator and the implied author: the narrator provides the story while the implied author provides the peroration, as well as an occasional interruption in the narrative. The narrator in *A Room of One's Own* could be classified as first-person, but such a classification of the narrator "will tell us nothing of importance unless we become more precise and describe how the particular qualities [the ethos] of the narrators relate to specific effects" (Booth, *Rhet. of Fiction* 150).

The first qualities projected by the narrator of *A Room of One's Own* are rhetorical astuteness and rationality, as evidenced by her first two sentences: "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? I will try to explain" (3). By
recognizing her audience's possible objection to her text, she validates their importance and demonstrates her ability to comprehend all sides of the situation. By couching her response to this possible objection in logical terms ("I will try to explain"), she presents herself as a reasonable narrator who values proofs, not flippant, ungrounded observations. And by beginning with the word but, the narrator establishes the questioning tone of the entire essay and, in the process, defines her type of rationality: interrogating the status quo, not rationalizing its existence.

Next the narrator tells us she is a novelist and will advance her controversial argument as such:

Fiction here is likely to contain more truth than fact. Therefore I propose, making use of all the liberties and licenses of a novelist, to tell you the story of the two days that preceded my coming here—how bowed down by the weight of the subject which you have laid upon my shoulders, I pondered it, and made it work in and out of my daily life. (4)

Yet this technique is much more than just a convenient exercise of the narrator's literary talents. Since society accepts as truth certain sexist facts that are contradictory to her assertions, she must show, not just tell, how these common assumptions prevent society and individuals from reaching their potentials. Such a technique synthesizes society's stereotypical perceptions of the thought processes
traditionally associated with men (objective logic) and women (subjective emotion). Thus, her content and form foreshadow and reflect her later contention that only androgynous minds can write great fiction.

Another important quality to be noted about the narrator is that she is a woman who is realistic about her station in life. As readers, we suspect that the narrator is female, given the actual author's reputation, the selected topic, and the headnote to the text, but we are not textually aware of her sex until she introduces herself: "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)" (5). Notice, though, that the narrator does not add to the list of possible names the fourth Mary in the old Scottish ballad, Mary Hamilton. For Mary Hamilton is dead, condemned for the admittedly drastic measure she took to retain her subjectivity—i.e., throwing her child into the sea. But even when the narrator's sex is discovered, her individual name is not: "'I' is only a convenient term for somebody who has no real being" (4). While most people might rightly argue that a name is indeed important, Woolf's narrator knows exactly what she is doing. On one level, she is parodying society's practice of identifying women by their functions as wives,
mothers, and housekeepers, instead of by their individual subjectivities. On another level, she is speaking for all women, women who, even if they have a name, may not have an identity, i.e., an evolving subjectivity. And in spite of the narrator's effort and conviction, she recognizes that perhaps "[n]obody cared a straw--and I do not blame them--for the future of fiction, the death of poetry or the development by the average woman of a prose style completely expressive of her mind" (99). Yet the narrator continues to write, to work for change. And her use of "I," though slippery, is not impersonal; instead, it is highly personal and seemingly honest.

The honesty of the narrator is, ironically, first asserted when she warns her audience that may not present the Truth, or even the truth, as she sees it. She may, in fact, lie. More likely, there will be a mixture of both:

[W]hen a subject is highly controversial--and any question about sex is that--one cannot hope to tell the truth. One can only show how one came to hold whatever opinion one does hold . . . . Lies will flow from my lips, but there may perhaps be some truth mixed up with them. (4)

The narrator later continues this line of thought during her walk to Fernham: "As I have already said that it was an October day, I dare not forfeit your respect and imperil the fair name of fiction by
changing the season and describing lilacs . . . and other flowers of spring" (16) Yet she does just that, describing Fernham in a "spring twilight" (17). For the fictitious "spring twiglight" with its connotations of magic, hope, and potential paints a truer picture of Fernham than would a factual description of an October day. Ironically, while telling a "lie," the narrator paints a greater truth. But the slippery truth of the narrator is not the truth of the realists, one for all and all for one. Although she "set[s] out in the pursuit of truth," she finds the process, the pursuit, more important than the goal, for the goal is elusive, subjective, and slippery. The two metaphors she employs to define truth reinforce this notion: first, truth is a fish needing the flow of the water to live, dying if removed from this flow (5; 31); second, truth is an "essential oil" (27), easily slipping through our hands. Thus, the narrator honestly refuses to take full responsibility for truth, recognizing it as a social construction. The narrator's refusal to be pinned down or fixed in a certain position has opened her to the charges of being soft on hard issues. But the narrator is not a total relativist; she believes that the truth she discovers, while not the exact truth of another, may assist another who sets out in the pursuit of truth.
The narrator's honesty is reinforced by another quality, her reflective nature. She refuses to take life at face value. Instead, she actively observes. And her observations trigger associative questions, questions not only about what she sees but also about what she does not see. These questions send her searching for causes and effects: "Why did men drink wine and women water? Why was one sex so prosperous and the other so poor? What effect has poverty on fiction? What conditions are necessary for the creation of works of art" (25). Having formulated such questions, the narrator commences a deductive search. She assumes that books contain the wisdom of the ages; therefore, if she gains access to the books, she will find her answers. When books fail her, the narrator changes her approach, applying the scientific, inductive method to her world, a method strengthened by her intuition ("Instinct rather than reason came to my help" [6]). For example, at Oxbridge she is preoccupied with the effects of her exclusion on herself and other women, but later, reflecting upon the same situation, she tries to understand how this situation also affects men: "I thought how unpleasant it is to be locked out; and I thought how it is worse perhaps [emphasis mine] to be locked in" (24). Also, her musings about her own
economic independence trigger an insight:

Food, house and clothing are mine forever. Therefore not merely do effort and labour cease, but also hatred and bitterness. I need not hate any man; he cannot hurt me. I need not flatter any man; he has nothing to give me. So imperceptibly I found myself adopting a new attitude towards the other half of the human race. It was absurd to blame any class or any sex, as a whole. (38)

This tendency to generalize inductively from her own particular experiences and the experiences of others occurs again and again, establishing an intuitive, dialectical, revisionist posture that allows her to recognize and sometimes to break the social constraints of her situations.

But the narrator's desire to destroy the social conventions that constrain women writers is not grounded in a revolutionary nature. Instead, she works dialectically "to absorb the new into the old without disturbing the infinitely intricate and elaborate balance of the whole" (89). When deciding to include a description of the Oxbridge and Fernham meals in her text, even though menus were usually not recorded in novels, she registers only a polite defiance: "Here, however, I shall take the liberty to defy that convention" (10). But her defiance is important, because it deals with language, which has the power to empower or enslave. And, according to the narrator, for women to empower themselves through
language, "the resources of the English language would be much put to the stretch, and whole flights of words would need to wing their way illegitimately into existence before a woman could say what happens when she goes into a room" (91). Moreover, the narrator's process of acting then reflecting also embodies her concept of how change should occur: the narrator will try to walk on the grass, try to visit the library, try to enjoy her dinner at Fernham, but when not allowed to do so, she will channel her anger into an intellectual quest, hoping to find answers and solutions.

At times, in her quest for answers, the narrator discusses her writing task or interrupts herself, exhibiting yet another quality: self-consciousness. From the first page ("I will try to explain" [3]) to the last chapter ("Even so, the very first sentence that I would write here, . . . [108]), the narrator purposefully draws attention to herself as writer, and by simultaneously emphasizing how rare such an action is for a woman, she politicizes her action. Her interruptions, too, are equally self-conscious. When discussing the novel of Mary Carmichael, she halts in mid-sentence: "... I am sorry to break off so abruptly. Are there no men present? ... We are all women, you assure me?" (85). This interruption to
celebrate women's friendships serves multiple purposes. First of all, it indicates that the narrator is aware of a male audience, which, while not the immediate narratee, certainly intrudes upon the narrator's situation. This awareness is shared by the women listening to the speech; thus, the narrator creates a bond between herself and her audience. Furthermore, the narrator is sending a message to these males, implying through humor and irony that she understands their power but disagrees with how they have traditionally characterized women.

The humorous and ironic qualities of the narrator serve multiple purposes, too. Because her topic is controversial, as she has readily admitted, her ironic asides, such as "Women do not write books about men—a fact that I could not help welcoming with relief," (27), provide a welcome comic relief from the inevitable tensions evoked. But her humor has an caustic edge too, and this biting irony, found throughout the text, is demonstrated in her last two pages, where she comments on the function of poetry in Fascist countries: "We may all join in that pious hope, but it is doubtful whether poetry can come out of an incubator. Poetry ought to have a mother as well as a father" (107). The implication of this metaphor may be extended, too, from Fascist countries
to all societies in which women are regularly excluded from the canon, from the accepted tradition of writers. The narrator's use of irony, sometimes light, sometimes cruel, has triggered various reactions from readers, some calling her brilliant, others calling her cowardly because she refuses to face issues head on. But the main strength of the narrator's irony is that it is situational, not personal. Since the situation is what appears flawed, individuals feel sympathetic, not defensive when they, too, recognize the discrepancies in society's treatment of men and, especially, women that are emphasized by the narrator.

Finally, in relation to the readers, the narrator of _A Room of One's Own_ is distanced but not exactly privileged (Booth _Rhet. of Fiction_ 161). The narrator allows Virginia Woolf as the actual author to be twice removed, via the narrator and the implied author, from any possible hostile reactions of readers. This technique, to some degree, protects Woolf, who anticipates negative reactions from friends such as Lytton Strachey and Clive Bell. Woolf, however, tries not to privilege her narrator. Granted, she writes about the previous two days, recognizing through her use of past tense that these two days have already occurred, that she knows the outcome. But her recounting is not intended as a trick; it is as honest
an effort to recreate her experience and, thus, account for her opinions as she can make. In fact, Booth might term this reliable narrator "a dramatized spokes[person] for the implied author" (211).

Yet according to Booth, the narrator and the implied author are different constructs: the narrator of a text is "the 'I' of a work" who is "seldom if ever identical with the implied image of the author" (Rhet. of Fiction 73). In A Room of One's Own, Booth's definition holds true. Two overt "I's" appear in the text and create a double consciousness: the first is the multi-named narrator who establishes the narrative (3-109) and distances the actual and implied authors from the audiences; the second is the implied author of A Room of One's Own, the textual voice of Woolf, who provides the peroration (109-118) and periodically surfaces throughout the text. Because the narrator functions as the dramatized spokesperson for the implied author, many of the qualities attributed to the narrator may also be associated with the implied author: rhetorical astuteness, rationality, a realistic female voice, honesty, reflectiveness, polite defiance, self-consciousness, humor and irony, and distance but not total privilege. Yet slight but important differences
emerge in the implied author, and she demonstrates qualities that are solely her own.

The implied author's rhetorical astuteness, rationality, and female voice are all demonstrated when she breaks into the text and announces that the narrator's voice has ended: "Here Mary Beton ceases to speak... And I will end now in my own person by anticipating two criticisms, so obvious that you can hardly fail to make them" (109). This break is also physically emphasized in the text by an additional space inserted between this paragraph and the previous one, the only time this technique is employed.

Her rhetorical astuteness manifests itself along with her humor, as indicated in the following statement: "Here I would stop, but the pressure of convention decrees that every speech must end with a peroration" (114). This statement implies that Woolf is not only familiar with classical patterns of arrangement but also capable of employing them at will. In fact, upon closer examination, A Room of One's Own appears to have been developed according to the classical pattern of arrangement outlined by Socrates in the Phaedrus, but because of Woolf's style, this pattern may not be discernable at first glance. The humorous element of this statement also implies that, while Woolf recognizes the power of
traditional conventions, she is not slave to them; she chooses them knowingly. But, like the narrator, her defiance is "polite."

Even though Woolf disguises her form, her honesty cannot really be questioned. The reader just needs to recognize that truth for the implied author, like truth for the narrator, is slippery, "only to be had by laying together many varieties of error" (109). Moreover, this truth manifests itself dialectically in different ways. For example, in the narrative, while the narrator is forthright about her concept of slippery truth, the implied author reinforces this truth, orchestrating a form that truly reflects the narrator's claim, as in the following passage, which compares thinking to fishing, ideas to fish:

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)

The second sentence starts one way, stops, starts another way, just like a hooked fish on the end of a line; however, after the colon, the sentence flows smoothly, just as the reeling in of the fish must be done.
Another example of the implied author's honesty occurs in the peroration. When giving the best advice that her experiences have taught her, she appears strong and fairly straightforward, a bit less ironic than the narrator who preceded her:

Therefore, I would ask you to write all kinds of books, hesitating at no subject however trivial or however vast. By hook or by crook, I hope that you will possess yourselves of money enough to travel and to idle, to contemplate the future or the past of the world, to dream over books and loiter at street corners and let the line of thought dip deep into the stream. (113)

Moreover, in the peroration, she tells us directly what she is feeling by employing rhetorical questions to engage her audience and then answering these questions herself:

Women—but are you not sick of the word? I can assure you that I am. Let us agree, then, that a paper read by a woman to women should end with something particularly disagreeable. But how does it go? What can I think of? The truth is, I often like women. I like their unconventionality. I like their subtlety. I like their anonymity. I like—but I must not run on in this way. That cupboard there,—you say it holds clean table-napkins only; but if Sir Archibald Bodkin were concealed among them? Let me then adopt a sterner tone. (115)

This "sterner tone," which the implied author feels pressured to adopt, garners perhaps the greatest criticism from certain critics who claim that the tone of her peroration is overly preachy. Granted, she does judge her audience harshly, an action that
implies her own moral superiority: "Young woman, I would say, and please attend, for the peroration is beginning, you are, in my opinion, disgracefully ignorant . . . . What is your excuse?" (116). But she then goes on to anticipate the young women's reasons/excuses, she even granting certain excuses some credence. So if her tone here is a bit preachy, it also serves as an effective rhetorical strategy, a call to action:

[I]f we face the fact, for it is a fact, that there is no arm to cling to, but that we go along and that our relation is to the world of reality and not only to the world of men and women, then the opportunity will come and the dead poet who was Shakespeare's sister will put on the body which she has so often laid down. . . . As for her coming without that preparation, without that effort on our part, without that determination that when she is born again she shall find it possible to live and write her poetry, that we cannot expect, for that would be impossible. (117)

The implied author's intent is to inspire, not to coddle, these young women students. They are not to expect special treatment because they are women, and they are not to feel sorry for themselves. To this end, implied author may "sermonize" more than the narrator. Interestingly, all three levels of authors--actual, narrative, and implied--in A Room of One's Own persuasively further their aims by means of logical, ethical, and emotional appeals. As a famous Modern
novelist at her peak when the essay was first published, Virginia Woolf fostered a certain ethical appeal. Her reputation drew attention to this essay, probably garnering a wider readership than if it has been written by another woman, such as Margaret Llewellyn-Davies. But Woolf's ethical appeal had a negative side, too. Because she was recognized and celebrated for her formal experiments in novels, some critics and other readers tended to belittle her prose attempts or to examine *A Room of One's Own* for its narrative and formal features, downplaying the feminist politics. Yet, given the recent resurgence in Woolf's popularity, current readers have evidently succumbed to Woolf's ethical appeal. Feminists read *A Room of One's Own* for its political message; English academicians read the text for its literary merit; and, sometimes, these two purposes merge.

The narrator of *A Room of One's Own* benefits from Woolf's immense ethical appeal, since readers often initially view the narrator, rightly or wrongly, as an extension of Virginia Woolf herself. As the essay progresses, however, the narrator develops her own ethical appeal, emerging as someone in search of truth, not just facts. While in the process of this search, the narrator cites specific details about her life and about the lives of other women, both present and past,
and then reasons inductively, thus establishing a logical appeal. But the narrator allows the reader to know her feelings, to see her anger, her frustration, her humor, and her idealism. This technique cultivates a definite emotional appeal. The reader cannot help but react to the narrator, but the type of reactions evoked depend on the previous assumptions and beliefs of the individual readers.

The implied author, i.e., Woolf as she is manifested in A Room of One's Own, also develops a certain ethical appeal. The synthesis of content and form, the synthesis of male and female, and the synthesis of personal narrative and classical rhetorical arrangement all function to create respect for Woolf's talent, if not agreement about her ideas, on the part of readers. These syntheses demonstrate an integrity on the part of the implied author, an integrity to create a better society dialectically, not just to deride or destroy the existing one. Thus, by the peroration, the audiences have been conditioned to accept the hard-line call to action as an honest manifestation of the implied author, even if they (the audiences) resent her tone. Moreover, because the implied author has created the narrator to present her argument through fiction, she may also claim credit for orchestrating the logical and emotional appeals of the narrator.
Text: Arrangement and Style

The narrator of *A Room of One's Own* informs her readers that she will arrange her ideas about Women and Fiction "fully and freely": "I give you my thoughts as they came to me" (4,6). This assertion, while true, is a bit factually misleading because it sounds as if the narrator will only randomly and wanderingly render a personal narrative. What she does, in fact, is to interject personal narrative impressions into a carefully crafted classical pattern of arrangement in order to arrive at truth, thus defining her own concept of truth by her content and her form.

This technique has fostered many interpretations. Jean Guiguet, for instance, claims that "...it would be vain to seek in this book for any strict method. It is rather a series of vignettes with commentary, illustrating her two chosen themes" (170). On the other hand, starting from a Jungian anima/animus premise, Thomas J. Farrell posits that Woolf employs a two-fold form: a "male" method of formal rhetoric and a "female" method of "indirection," which combines exposition and fiction (919). Ellen Carol Jones furthers Farrell's thesis, dismissing the Jungian premise but asserting a two-fold form:

[Woolf] creates in *A Room of One's Own* a form which is at once fragmented and unified ... through two modes of discourse: the first
mode, the "story" Woolf tells, is that of the rambling, digressive, associative account of the process by which she has arrived at her "opinion" (4). The second mode of discourse is that of the formal rhetorical argument itself: clear and ordered. (Jones 229)

Jones' assessment is, in my opinion, most closely correct. The beauty of this combination of techniques in *A Room of One's Own* is that the narrator's seemingly random wanderings follow a carefully constructed pattern of arrangement. Indeed the implied author employs the classical five-part method for organizing a speech: introduction (3), statement of facts (4), proof and supplementary proof (5-109), refutation and supplementary refutation (109-116), and conclusion (116-118).

Edward P.J. Corbett argues that an introduction, or *exordium*, serves two purposes: "(1) it informs the audience of the end or object of our discourse, and (2) it disposes the audience to be receptive to what we say" (*Classical Rhetoric for the Modern Student* 303). Richard Whately's cites five methods of achieving these two ends in his text, *Elements of Rhetoric*, and surprisingly, the narrator of *A Room of One's Own* introduces her topic, Women and Fiction, by employing four of Whately's suggestions.

In her first sentence the narrator asks, "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?" (3),
simultaneously employing the Inquisitive Introduction to demonstrate the curious nature of her topic and the Introduction Paradoxical to demonstrate its improbability. When the narrator problematizes her topic, Women and Fiction, without reaching any conclusion, she reflects the Introduction Corrective; indeed, her struggle to define this topic indicates how little attention it has received previously, thus her attempt to correct this under-representation of women writers. By its very structure, A Room of One's Own embodies the Introduction Narrative. While the narrator has busied herself employing all these methods of informing her narrative audience, she has managed to ingratiate herself with them, too. In the first sentence, she not only anticipates their questions and then responds, but she also speaks directly to them, locating "you" as the second word of her text.

A statement of fact, or narratio, informs the audience "of the circumstances that need to be known about our subject" and, according to Quintilian, should be "lucid, brief, and plausible" (Corbett, Classical Rhet. 315). In her statement of facts, the narrator of A Room of One's Own presents the opinion that "a woman must have money and a room of her own if she is to write fiction" (4). Then she informs her audience how she intends to prove her assertion:
I am going to do what I can to show you how I arrived at this opinion about the room and money. 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)

These two sentences imply an emphasis on impressionistic narrative techniques, instead of on logical argument; they also demonstrate traces of Whately's fifth type of introduction—the Introduction Preparatory, which may serve to explain an unusual means of development. Whether the narrator meets Quintilian's criteria for a good statement of facts may be debated. She is definitely brief, definitely plausible, yet interestingly "lucid," especially when she states that "[f]iction here is likely to contain more truth than fact" (4).

A proof section, or confirmatio, is "the core, the central part, the main body, of our discourse—the part in which we do what we set out to do, whether that be to explain or to persuade" (Corbett, Classical Rhet. 321). Beginning with the commentary of Mary Beton, Mary Seton, etc., and ending when she/they cease to speak, the proof section is divided into three parts: (1) the narrator recounts her own experiences at Oxbridge, at Fernhamn, at the British Museum; (2) she discusses the plight of historical women writers; (3) she examines the status of current living women writers, via the fictitious Mary.
Carmichael, concluding with her on-going "current of life" image, which is ever-flowing and multi-directional (108-9). It is in this three-tiered proof section that the implied author, through her narrator, presents her main themes: that women are intellectually equal to men; that material items (money, idleness, and a room of one's own) are necessary for intellectual freedom; that this intellectual freedom, at its best, will foster the development of an androgynous state of mind; that this androgynous mind-set does not deny either sex but encompasses them both as man-womanly and woman-manly; that such androgynous minds—like Coleridge, like Shakespeare, like Mary Carmichael—write the best fiction because they are not self-conscious of their sex; that such minds live the most fully aware lives because they are conscious, but not self-conscious, of their status in society and of the traditions (or lack of recognized traditions) which helped create them; and, finally, that women will only achieve this androgynous mindset, i.e., achieve a Judith Shakespeare, if the young women being addressed will work and prepare the way for her.

By far her longest section (5-109), the proof section is where she keeps her promise to show, not merely to tell, how she arrived at her opinions, employing narrative techniques which wander in and
around her argumentative arrangement. The narrator does not just argue cold, dry facts; as she states, "I pondered it, and made it work in and out of my daily life" (6). No longer as innocent as she was at the Oxbridge luncheons before the War [WWI], the narrator, at the time of composing, inductively compiles the facts of her daily life. This process leads her to conclude that women, while intelligent, have not written because they have not had the material necessities to write. The implied author, however, has known this fact all along and has been using the narrator as a means for the reader to inductively arrive at the same conclusion; indeed, the implied author has been working deductively to establish the syllogism, which Ellen Carol Jones describes:

The syllogism informing her arguments begins with the premise that "intellectual freedom," the ability to think of things in themselves, "depends on material things." And poetry, all art, "depends upon intellectual freedom" (p. 112). Therefore, art depends upon material things. The corollary to this argument is that because women are poor, they have no intellectual freedom and, consequently, cannot create art. (230).

A refutation, or refutatio, "anticipate[s] the objections to our thesis and answer[s] those objections" (Corbett, Classical Rhet. 323). The refutation of A Room of One's Own commences when "Mary Beton ceases to speak" and the implied author begins (109). This technique
allows the implied author to explain herself personally, to take whatever praise or blame may be her due, and to silence those who may have objections similar to the ones she discusses. The location of the refutation implies that the implied author believes the narrative audience to be receptive, not hostile, but she takes no chances. Her refutation consists, most obviously, of an appeal to reason; she examines her own argument and evaluates three potential weaknesses in her logic. First, she refutes the possible objection that she should define the nature of women or the nature of fiction (109). Second, she refutes the possible objection that she is over-emphasizing material things (110). Third, she refutes the objection that, for women, writing books is too arduous (and too dangerous) a task (112).

But the implied author also relies on the ethical appeal she has created to this point and an emotional appeal. She emphasizes her ethical appeal by switching from a narrative voice to her own, thus lessening the distance between herself and her audience(s) and seeming more open, more honest, more involved. Lessening the distance between herself and her audience also constitutes a formal emotional appeal, and this emotional appeal is strengthened by her abandoning the predominantly third-person narrative of Chapters Two
through Five and directly addressing her audience—e.g., "So long as you write what you wish to write, that is all that matters" (110). Moreover, this appeal to emotion is accompanied by an appeal to wit, a wit that combines humor and biting irony. For example, the previous quote continues as follows:

... But to sacrifice a hair of the head of your vision, a shade of its colour, in deference to some Headmaster with a silver pot in his hand, or to some professor with a measuring-rod up his sleeve, is the most abject treachery, and the sacrifice of wealth and chastity, which used to be the greatest of human disasters, a mere flea-bite in comparison. (110)

A conclusion, or peroration, provides a natural closure for the argument that has preceded it. According to Corbett, Aristotle outlines four goals that may be accomplished in a peroration:

(1) to inspire the audience with a favorable opinion of ourselves and an unfavorable opinion of our opponents;
(2) to amplify the force of the points we have made in the previous section and to extenuate the force of the points made by the opposition;
(3) to rouse the appropriate emotions in the audience;
(4) to restate in a summary way our facts and arguments. (Corbett, Class. Rhet. 329)

In the peroration of A Room of One's Own, the Woolf's implied author pokes fun at the classical pattern of arrangement even as she employs it: "Here I would stop, but the pressure of convention decrees that every speech must end with a peroration" (114). Yet she purposefully
sidetracks herself by discussing what exactly a
peroration for women is should entail, an evolving
definition as slippery as her other truths: "And a
peroration addressed to women should have something, you
will agree, particularly exalting and enobling about it"
(114); and "Let us agree, then, that a paper read by a
woman to women should end with something particularly
disagreeable" (115). But her wanderings carefully lead
her back to her original intent: "Young women, I would
say, and please attend for the peroration is
beginning, . . . . " (116).

And in this peroration, interestingly enough, the
implied author takes another jab at the rules for
developing perorations by blatantly violating the first
criterion established long ago by Aristotle. Instead of
praising and, thus, inspiring her narrative audience,
the implied author attacks them:

. . . you are, in my opinion, disgracefully
ignorant. You have never made a discovery of
any sort of importance. You have never shaken
an empire or led an army into battle. The
plays of Shakespeare are not by you, and you
have never introduced a barbarous race to the
blessings of civilizations. (116)

But the implied author employs Aristotle's three other
criteria in her last paragraph, reiterating the points
she has already made (116-117), amplifying their
importance (117-118), and rousing these young women to
write (118). This conclusion, as discussed before, has
been criticized by some reviewers for being too preachy, for failing to uphold the tenor of the argument that has come before. And there is some truth to these charges. But by parroting the traditional male line about women's lack of accomplishments, she inspires these young women to work for change, for the emergence of a Judith Shakespeare.

Important ideological stances are reflected in Woolf's pattern of arrangement. This deliberative discourse, concerned with a future goal, i.e., the emergence of a Judith Shakespeare, proves by its very form that just because women are concerned with the personal events of daily life is no indication that they are not also capable of logical argument. But, as the narrator and implied author demonstrate, women are not necessarily bound by the strictly linear approach traditionally associated with men. Indeed, as the narrator states in her discussion of the female sentence and sequence, women should not try to imitate the style of men. Instead, women should revise the predominantly male styles that they have read and assimilated, developing a style that reflects their own minds and bodies.

In light of Julia Kristeva's concept that a revolutionary form of writing can undermine the traditional symbolic order and thus effect a social revolution, the
arrangement of *A Room of One's Own* definitely implies some interesting ideological insights. Trying to determine just how the ideologies of form and content reinforce and contradict one another, however, becomes complicated because both the line between Woolf's traditional and revolutionary strategies is slippery. One one hand, the arrangement is very traditional, i.e., a classical five-part pattern; on the other hand, the choice of a wandering narrative as the controlling structure is far from traditional. Toril Moi focuses on this second aspect of Woolf's arrangement and argues for a political interpretation of Woolf's textual practices: "Woolf's refusal to commit herself in her essays to a so-called rational or logical form of writing, free from fictional techniques, indicates a similar break with symbolic language" (*Sexual/Textual Politics* 11). Another contradiction appears when Woolf argues deductively and inductively, via her implied author and narrator, that women deserve to be educated equally with men and that women will be great writers only if they can acquire the material necessities needed to write and, thus, establish a tradition of women writers from which to draw upon. This argument implies that Woolf wishes women to obtain a traditional humanist unified self, albeit androgynous—i.e., Judith Shakespeare. But when discussing the "'unity of the mind'" that Judith
Shakespeare will need to achieve, Woolf readily admits that "clearly the mind is always altering its focus, and bringing the world into different perspective" (101). Indeed, as Emily Furman argues, even as Woolf pleads for a Judith Shakespeare, she also champions the absence of a psychological subject:

If a woman's reality in a patriarchal society is that of an invisible, inaudible and ineffable signifier, then she cannot simultaneously be a conscious, transcendental subject . . . . It is, therefore, no mere gesture of authorial vanity which makes Virginia Woolf hide the narrator behind the multiple personae of the three Marys . . . but rather the writer's understanding that the use of the pronoun "I" to stand for a pluralized persona can be construed as an indication of a loss of psychological content. ("A Room of One's Own: Reading Absence" 103)

At this point, as Moi has suggested, Woolf's form in A Room of One's Own synthesizes aesthetics and politics. Furman argues that A Room of One's Own also synthesizes gender and genre: "The essay belongs to the world of Oxbridge . . . , a world from which the narrator is partly excluded, while in Fernham she is in the realm of the 'fair name of fiction' (16)" (104). By synthesizing the essay, which is essentially male, with fiction, which is essentially female, Woolf has formally reflected her call for androgynous minds. Thus, it may be argued that A Room Of One's Own is an androgynous text, since it synthesizes both aesthetics and politics, gender and genre.
The mention of style immediately raises questions of definition, since style has acquired many conflicting definitions through the centuries. In this study, however, I am following the examples of Aristotle, Cicero, and Quintilian and considering style as an essential element of the finished product, not just as an artistic embellishment. With this definition in mind, I will investigate the stylistic features of the first four paragraphs of *A Room of One's Own* (5 pages, 1734 words) to provide a general sense of Woolf's style in this essay in terms of paragraph length, sentence length, grammatical sentence types, rhetorical sentence types, functional sentence types, sentence openers, transitions, diction, schemes, and tropes.

In "Teaching Style," Corbett claims that 1000 to 1500 words is "substantial enough to allow for some valid inferences to be drawn" (27); were the focus of this study a stylistic analysis of Woolf's corpus, a much larger sampling would obviously need to be examined. For the purpose of this study, however, these five pages demonstrate the typical synthesis of argument and fiction that has become this text's trademark. For detailed tables of the stylistic data, see Appendix A.

For an essay, *A Room of One's Own* is unusually long, and its unusual length is reflected in its component parts. The entire essay comprises 6 chapters
with a total of 115 pages with 108 paragraphs. Obviously, Woolf has a penchant for long paragraphs. The longest paragraph analyzed contains 21 sentences and 636 words; the shortest, 10 sentences and 229 words; the average, 14.8 sentences and 433.5 words. These long paragraphs serve several functions. First, they provide formal emphasis for the short paragraphs that Woolf occasionally inserts to make a point. Second, the long paragraphs allow the classical pattern of arrangement to be obscured, practically unnoticed until the implied author calls attention to it in the peroration. Third, the long paragraphs provide a vehicle not only for the argument but also for the accompanying fiction techniques—e.g., narrative descriptions of the situation and the narrator's associative pattern of thought. [See Appendix A, Table 1.]

In the four paragraphs studied, which consist of 59 sentences, the longest sentence contains 67 words (paragraph one, sentence six); the shortest, 5 words (paragraph one, sentence two). The average length of the sentences in this section is 29.4 words, a length that is not too unusual for a reading audience to encounter. More interesting is the number of sentences that are 10 words or more above the average, 15 (25.4%). These relatively long sentences indicate that, although A Room of One's Own was originally written as two
speeches, the author of the published essay has a predominantly reading audience in mind; these long sentences also indicate that longer sentences, like longer paragraphs, are needed to reflect accurately the associative thought patterns of the narrator, who as a female is concerned with the details of daily events. Another interesting factor is the number of sentences that are 5 words or more below the average, 20 (33.9%). These shorter sentences complement the longer ones and impart a sense of sentence rhythm. When these shorter sentences are examined for content, they are the ones that make a point or introduce a sudden shift in the thought or narrative—e.g., "I will try to explain" (3) and "Instantly a man's figure rose to intercept me" (6). [See Appendix A, Table 2.]

In "From the Queen of High-Brows," Arnold Bennett praises Woolf's writing talent but deplores her grammar skills:

One thing I have said of her: she can write. A Room of One's Own is further demonstration of this truth. (She has her private notions about grammar. . . .) And I have said that you never know where you are in a book of hers. (258-59)

Although A Room of One's Own is carefully crafted, Bennett is, in a sense, correct. Woolf defies traditional rules of punctuation when it serves her purposes, which sometimes makes analyzing her sentences a bit difficult.
Nevertheless, the results from the grammatical-sentence survey are a bit surprising, considering the average sentence length in *A Room of One's Own*. Of 59 sentences, 13 sentences are simple (22%); 7 are compound (11.9%); 29 are complex (49.2%); and 10 are compound-complex (16.9%). The small number of compound sentences is not too uncommon, given modern writers' tendencies not to employ them. But the fact that together the simple, compound, and compound-complex sentences equal the complex sentences is important. The preponderance of complex sentences may indicates several things: an eye that inspects details, a mind that constantly qualifies, and a consciousness that problematizes situations, not accepting them at face value. All three qualities serve a feminist well. [See Appendix A, Table 3.]

When anguishing in her diary about her own rhetorical style, Woolf states, "I am horrified by my own looseness. This is partly that I don't think things out first; partly that I stretch my style to take in crumbs of meaning. But the result is a wobble and diffusity and breathlessness which I detest" (*AWD* 3.235). She then goes on to comment that she must revise *A Room of One's Own* very carefully. Thus, even more interesting than the survey of grammatical-sentence types is the study of the rhetorical-sentence types.
Given that Woolf's sentences are mostly long and mostly complex, we might expect the majority of her sentences to be loose or cumulative. But that is not the case. Instead, based on the definitions provided by Thomas Whissen in *A Way with Words* (101-106), 18 of the 59 sentences studied are loose (30.5%), and 26 are periodic (44.1%) while only 10 are balanced (16.9%) and 5, antithetical (8.5%). If we accept Richard Ohmann's assertions in *Shaw, the Style and the Man*, then we accept his view that syntactical patterns reflect how a writer views the world. In this light, Woolf's rhetorical patterns demonstrate several ideas: she does not view the world in mostly parallel and/or antithetical terms as does Francis Bacon; nor does she see the world in terms of subordinate hierarchies as does John Henry Newman (Corbett, "Teaching Style" 27). Instead, in her loose sentences, she accumulates levels of meaning as she goes, reflecting her ability to accurately observe and problematize. And in her periodic sentences, which are often quite long, she carefully posits all her information before she asserts her point. This technique may demonstrate some insecurity about her own ethical appeal as a woman and/or her recognition of her audiences' need for a logical appeal. [See Appendix A, Table 4.]
The category of functional sentence types is probably the one that suffers the most from my having studied only an excerpt of *A Room of One's Own*. For, of the 59 sentences studied, 58 were declarative and only 1 (the first sentence) was a question, with no exclamations or commands appearing. Actually, one imperative statement is made in this excerpt—"(call me Mary Beton, Mary Seton, Mary Carmichael . . . )"—but it functions as a parenthetical interruption of another declarative sentence and, thus, does not appear on the chart. This embedded command may reflect the author's attempt to woo, not alienate, her audience at the outset of her text. The preponderance of declarative sentences, however, fits nicely with the high number of periodic sentences, demonstrating that the author, as a woman, is not afraid to state her mind. Yet such a statement, while flattering, is too simple. The first sentence of the text is a rhetorical question, which involves the audience immediately and sets the inquisitive tone of the narrator. In latter parts of the text, which are not analyzed here, rhetorical questions occur more frequently. And in the peroration, the implied author does not hesitate to address the young women with imperative sentences. [See Appendix A, Table 5.]
Handbooks often encourage beginning writers to vary the beginnings of their sentence in order to achieve a smooth, flowing rhythm. Such handbooks, however, could not prove their rule with an example from *A Room of One's Own*. Of the 58 declarative sentences examined, 27 (46.5%) begin with the subject; 9 (15.5%), with a coordinating conjunction, usually *but*; and 9 (15.5%), with an adverb word. The pattern of starting with a subject suggests that the author is not hesitant to state her topic. That idea, coupled with the large percentage of periodic sentences, may demonstrate, however, that she was hesitant to predicate her thought without first explaining extenuating circumstances.

The next highest percentage of sentence-openers, both coordinating conjunctions and adverbs, indicate that the author was concerned with using transitions to provide cohesion between her thoughts. Of the 54 words, phrases, or clauses that are used as transitions between words, sentences, and/or paragraphs in the first four paragraphs of *A Room of One's Own*, 27 (50%) are single words; 11 (20.4%) are phrases; and 16 (29.6%) are clauses, either dependent or parenthetical independent ones. Although transitions function to connect ideas smoothly, they also may jolt the reader by interrupting the flow of the thought; the narrator frequently employs interruptive transitions to qualify her statements and
to apologize ironically for only stating her opinion. This technique personalizes the narrator and the implied author, giving the reader a stronger sense of voice and causing the reader to question commonplace assumptions. For example, in paragraph one, sentence six, the narrator says, "The title women and fiction might mean, and you may have meant it to mean, women and what they are like; or it might mean . . . ." [emphasis mine]. [See Appendix A, Tables 6 and 7.]

The survey of diction rendered, what were for me, surprising results. Of the 1229 substantive words in the first four paragraphs, 791 (64.4%) are monosyllabic, and 438 (35.6%) are polysyllabic, a spread that remained fairly consistent throughout all four paragraphs. As expected, the high proportion of monosyllabic words coincide with a high proportion of concrete nouns, 333 (60.2%). The high number of monosyllabic words may be explained by the fact that the essay was originally conceived as two lectures and, thus, was geared toward a listening audience. But that connection is tenuous. The high number of concrete nouns, I think, is more important. To further her argument, the narrator cited specific details from her life and from other women's life, via concrete nouns, as proof of the unjust position allocated to women. Instead of appealing to abstract, commonly accepted truths, the narrator appeals
to the common sense of her audiences in order to have them re-evaluate their abstract, commonly accepted truths.

Of the 1229 substantive words in the first four paragraphs, 533 (43.4%) are nouns or pronouns, and 199 (16.2%) are verbs. This preoccupation with nouns and pronouns demonstrates, once again, the narrator's ability to observe and name her environment and then use this observing and naming as proof in her argument. Interestingly, of these 199 main verbs (i.e., main verbs of either independent or dependent clauses), 7 (3.5%) are linking verbs; 50 (25.1%) are \textit{be} verbs; and 139 (69.8%) are action verbs, with only 2 (1%) passive voice verbs appearing. The concentration on action verbs makes the writing come alive for the reader and also proves that the narrator can not only name and observe but also make connections and determine cause/effects. [See Appendix A, Table 8.]

After learning that Woolf's sentences are mostly declarative, complex, noun-addicted, and opened by subjects, I wondered what gave the first four paragraphs of \textit{A Room of One's Own} its poetic lilt. I discovered my 20 answer when investigating the schemes of construction, specifically in the 101 uses of assonance and the 94 uses of alliteration. The high incidence of assonance is also accompanied by and, perhaps, partially accounted
for by a relatively high incidence of polyptoton; this repetition of words derived from the same root occurs 46 times. Used in Anglo-Saxon poetry to replace rhyme, both assonance and alliteration are inherently dangerous, for if overused, they reduce a line of prose to a lilting, childish, Madison Avenue jingle. In *A Room of One's Own*, however, such is not the case.

Other schemes that appear to be related in *A Room of One's Own* are parallelism (55 times) and antithesis (19 times) as well as apposition (21 times) and parenthesis (19 times). Parallelism and antithesis overlap when the narrator wants to make a point: "Instinct rather than reason came to my help; he was a Beadle; I was a woman. This was the turf; there was the path. Only the Fellows and Scholars are allowed here; the gravel is the place for me" (6). But the narrator uses parallelism 189% more than antithesis, which indicates that, while she equates certain ideas, she is not, for the most part, positing these equations as binary opposites. The narrator's use of apposition and parenthesis also reinforce one another. They both reflect her ability to name and rename and to problematize her situation. The parenthesis, however, serves another function. It allows the narrator's associative pattern of thought to be reflected in form
and also allows the narrator to establish a closer connection with her audience. [See Appendix A, Table 9.]

The most common trope in the first four paragraphs of *A Room of One's Own* is metaphor, occurring 24 times. Woolf builds her argument by narratively describing the status of women, not by preaching about it, and she uses metaphors that are constructed of concrete nouns to establish audience identification with her plight. For example, a fish dying when laid out on the bank is more understandable to her audience than a woman's subjectivity dying because she is kept off the grass or out of the library. Other metaphors are not as extended, perhaps only implied by a verb, such as "how, bowed down by the weight of subject which you have laid on my shoulders" (4), which implies a collar metaphor that the narrator later revives. Interestingly, the narrator employs simile just 3 times, specifically those times when she wants to call attention to her comparison.

The second most used trope is litotes, a deliberate understatement, which appears 10 times. An effective example of this trope can be found in the incident where, after the Beadle chases the narrator off the turf, the implied author has the narrator say, "... no very great harm was done" (6). The narrator we take literally, but the implied author, who is orchestrating
this argument, knows perfectly well the effect of this understatement on the reader. This double consciousness also surfaces through the use hyperbole and irony. Although the narrator uses these two tropes 6 and 4 times, respectively, such an assessment is misleading. For Woolf allows the situation created, not the specific words stated, to embody irony. Thus, the schemes and tropes in *A Room of One's Own* are more sophisticated than what Elaine Showalter implies when, in a review of *Three Guineas*, she refers to "the stylistic tricks of repetition, exaggeration, and rhetorical questions, [that are] so amusing in *A Room of One's Own* . . ." (*A Lit. of Their Own* 295). [See Appendix A, Table 10.]

**Audience: Actual, Narrative, and Authorial**

As stated in Chapter Two, I will examine three levels of audience in *A Room of One's Own*: the actual reader, the narrative audience, and the authorial audience. The actual reader is a real-life person who is interpreting the text. The narrative audience are the characters who exist only in the text and who participate in the narrative. And the authorial audience are potential real-life readers who haunt the author as she writes and, as a result, may be implied in the text. By classifying the concept of audience
into these respective parts, a reader can gain a
greater understanding of how the rhetorical strategies
in the text function.

Virginia Woolf is acutely conscious of an actual
reader's role in the making of meaning:

Most commonly we come to books with blurred
and divided minds, asking of fiction that it
shall be true, of poetry that it shall be
false, of biography that is shall be
flattering, of history that it shall enforce
our own prejudices. If we could banish all
such preconceptions when we read, that would
be an admirable beginning. ("How One Should
Read a Book? 282)

In the essay from which the above quotation is taken,
Woolf advocates a two-fold reading process: first,
open your mind as wide as possible and try to
accommodate all that the author is attempting to
impart, try, in fact, to become the author; second,
with pen in hand, compare what you are reading to what
you have read before---i.e., establish a context.

Woolf's advice is admirable, but hardly possible.
Preconceptions abound in all readers, and ridding
ourselves of them is impossible, even undesirable,
since to rid ourselves of all preconceptions would be
to destroy our subjectivity, creating in its wake a
blank slate. But as readers we must recognize our
preconceptions; we must question their validity and how
they affect our readings of a text. Moreover, reading
processes, much like writing processes, may vary widely
from individual to individual, and a reader's interpretation will depend on a variety of factors such as the reader's upbringing, education, literacy level, personal interests, etc. Current reader-response theory is trying to come to terms with this phenomenon.

In this study, I am obviously the actual reader of *A Room of One's Own*, and my perspectives are outlined in Chapters One and Two. Chapter One is a statement of my twentieth-century rhetorical, feminist, and academic preconceptions about Woolf's text and about this study. Chapter Two posits my critical approach and its theoretical foundation. This chapter, then, is a statement of my relationship to *A Room of One's Own*.

To say that I approach this study from a twentieth-century rhetorical, feminist, academic perspective and that I admire Virginia Woolf tremendously is important. Such a statement gives the readers of this study a sense of my perspective (and possible prejudices) and proves that, while appreciating the historical context of *A Room of One's Own*, I can also move beyond this context, freeing myself from a prescribed, historically bound interpretation, searching instead for how the text speaks to me here and now. Yet as an actual reader, I cannot fully understand how this text speaks to me unless I also understand how the text is shaped by the narrative and authorial audiences (Rabinovitz,
"Truth in Fiction: A Reexamination of Audiences" 126-127).

In *A Room of One's Own*, the narrative audience--i.e., the "you" in the text who exists only in the text and who assumes the narrative events are real--consists of the young women students at the fictitious women's college, Fernham. This audience, however, is accessible to readers only through the narrator's and Woolf's accounts that appear in the text. One generation removed from Woolf, these young women, while lucky enough to be receiving an education in 1928, are still limited, especially when compared to their male counterparts. At Oxbridge, the men (and their female guests) feast on partridges, roast beef, and rich, delicious pudding; the women at Fernham, on the other hand, eat only gravy, plain meat, and potatoes. And it is this meat-and-potato audience about whom the narrator and Woolf make certain assumptions. Whether such assumptions are correct or not, we cannot really know. What we can know, however, is how these assumptions about the narrative audience shape the text and how, if at all, these assumptions distance the actual reader from the text.

The initial assumption made about the young women at Fernham is that they must be encouraged to think for themselves. They must learn not to accept other
people's truth, not even the narrator's, without some independent thought, which, when you think about it, is a truly radical notion. This assumption reflects the narrator's perception of her audience: they are women younger than she, so she has the freedom to speak thus; and while they have an opportunity for education that she did not, they should not become complacent with their lives and stop questioning. The narrator does not hesitate to state this fact; indeed, she defines the young women's task in her statement of facts: "One can only give one's audience the chance of drawing their own conclusions as they observe the limitations, the prejudices, the idiosyncrasies of the speaker" (4). This concept, so necessary to a feminist perspective, should apply not only to this speech but also, as the narrator implies, to all of life.

Another assumption made about the narrative audience is that they may be slightly skeptical: "But, you may ask, we asked you to speak about women and fiction--what has that got to do with a room of one's own?" (3). Although the narrator feels free to instruct these young women about their lives, she also assumes that they will not readily accept her rather presumptuous encouragement unless she can establish some form of identification. Thus, she creates an immediate rapport with them when, in the first
sentence, she addresses them directly as "you" and when, a few sentences later, she claims that she can only "offer" an opinion [emphasis mine] (3,4).
This overtly polite, overtly unaggressive, but rhetorically astute approach implies that this audience may object either to the narrator or to the focus of her topic. This approach also reflects a double assumption about the narrative audience: they are bright enough to make their own decisions, but they can also be persuaded to accept the responsibility of creating their own truth, not just accepting commonly recited "truths."

Yet another assumption about this audience is that, while they may respond positively to an emotional appeal as a form of identification, they must also be given a chance to evaluate the ideas logically if the narrator's ideal is to make a reality--that is, if the form as well as the content is to reflect her respect for these young women as independent thinkers. Interestingly, the frequent use of you ceases in the middle chapters where the young women are presented with facts about the narrator's own life, the lives of historical women writers, and the lives of living women writers as proof for the eventual conclusion. Yet occasional interruptions to address this audience do occur and are emphasized by their rarity. The few
you's are included to remind the young women that they have not been subordinated to the narrator's topic, and the use, though infrequent, of we and our implies that the narrator identifies with her audience and assumes they are on her side, in the sense that they are all women struggling for a more equal society. Moreover, the focus of the topic—i.e., that women's alienation from the traditional canon of literature mirrors women's alienation from the traditional power structures of a patriarchal society—and its development indicate an assumption that the narrative audience will be receptive to an emotional and a logical appeal. And the classical structure of the argument, which is mocked in the peroration, indicates that these young women will probably appreciate the irony of a logical appeal as well.

Finally, the narrative audience is perceived as a group of young women who, while respected, should not be pampered. In the refutation and peroration, the frequent use of you as a direct address is again resumed. And it serves a two-fold purpose: to praise and to chastise. First, the young women are credited for participating equally in the creation of this narrative: "You have been contradicting her [the narrator] and making whatever additions and deductions seem good to you" (109). The implied author's respect
for this audience, coupled with her frequent use of rhetorical questions and her careful refutation of possible objections, makes these young women slightly more receptive to her ensuing chastisement: "Young women, . . . you are, in my opinion, disgracefully ignorant" (116). She definitely has their attention. Notice, though, that this chastisement is followed by an exhortation in the last sentence, an exhortation that includes the implied author: "But I maintain that she [Judith Shakespeare] would come if we worked for her, and that so to work, even in poverty and obscurity, is worth while" [emphasis mine] (118). Thus, this lecture, in all senses of the word, functions not to distance the implied author from her narrative audience but to unite and encourage them all.

The authorial audience in A Room of One's Own is particularly complex. This audience includes the potential readers of the text, who exist outside the text but who haunt the author as she writes and, thus, are implied in the text in subtle and not-so-subtle ways. And the implied author's assumptions about this audience help, for better or worse, to shape the text and, thus, affect a reader's interpretation. In A Room of One's Own, the authorial audience falls into two categories: receptive and hostile readers.
Although the narrative audience is specified as the young women at Fernham, the authorial audience extends to other women who may also identify with and, thus, be receptive to this text. The you's and we's and the emotional and logical appeals are easily extended to this audience. Moreover, the authorial audience, like the narrative audience, is probably unfamiliar with a tradition of female writers, thus Woolf's decision to keep the lecture format for this text. This audience is also intelligent enough to appreciate the ironic asides, asides that embue the text with humor (feminists need not lack a sense of humor), not cowardice. Moreover, this audience motivates the Woolf to create her narrator, to share her thoughts, in hopes that the emerging truths from _A Room of One's Own_ will help these potential readers to construct their own truths, an act which synthesizes politics and aesthetics.

Another, more publicized authorial audience consists of males, partially hidden from view, who might scoff or disagree with the premise, the proof, the conclusion, and/or even the act of writing. Adrienne Rich recognizes these readers and posits that they receive too much play, almost overtaking Woolf's text:

In rereading Virginia Woolf's _A Room of One's Own_ for the first time in some years, I was astonished at the sense of effort, of pains
taken, of dogged tentativeness, in the tone of her essay. And I recognized that tone . . . . It is the tone of woman almost in touch with her anger, who is determined not to appear angry, who is willing herself to be calm, detached, and even charming in a roomful of men where things have been said which are attacks on her very integrity. Virginia Woolf is addressing a roomful of women, but she is acutely conscious—as she always was—of being overheard by men. ("When We Dead Awaken: Writing as Re-Vision" 37)

While I agree that there is some truth to Rich's charge, I do not feel that "dogged tentativeness" is the tenor of the entire essay. Granted, the narrator and implied author recognize the very real existence of these males and try not to alienate them. The narrator's decision to arrange her text in a classical pattern and her determination not to slip "unthinkingly into praise of my own sex" confirm this fact (89). Woolf herself worried about how her male literary colleagues would accept A Room of One's Own and described the text as follows: "it has much work in it, many opinions boiled down into a kind of jelly, which I have stained red as far as I can (Woolf, AWD 3.223). But, notice, this jelly is red. And the careful handling of this authorial audience may result as much from Woolf's concept of androgynous minds and the role men must play in creating such minds as from an overwhelming fear of this audience. Moreover, when the narrator inquires about the spectre of these males,
she and Woolf are mocking their presence: "Are there no men present? Do you promise me that behind that red curtain over there the figure of Sir Chartres Biron is not concealed? We are all women, you assure me? Then I may tell you . . . ." (89). But this mockery is not necessarily fearful or even cruel, just ironic, emphasizing again the irony of the situation.

These three audiences—actual, narrative, and authorial—function simultaneously to create meaning in *A Room of One’s Own*, with the distance between them playing a crucial role in the making of meaning. The distance separating the narrative audience and the receptive authorial audience is slight: both are familiar with the rhetorical situation in 1928 and intelligent enough to join the narrator/implied author in their quest for truth. The distance between the narrative audience and the hostile authorial audience is, for obvious reasons, greater and, perhaps, influences the shape of the text more than it should. But the distance between the narrative audience and myself as the actual reader is greater still, even if I am sympathetic to Woolf’s goals. But to disregard the narrative audience as irrelevant because my situation is not theirs would be the height of arrogance. Instead, I should respect the text’s context without letting that context dictate my interpretation.
Conclusion

In Chapter Five, I will compare the feminist rhetorics of Woolf and Rich, first discussing and then interpreting their similarities and differences. Here, however, after having just rhetorically interrogated Woolf's text, I will comment on how her ability to imitate, revise, and/or transcend traditional forms and ideas informs her particular rhetoric of feminism.

In "On Female Identity and Writing by Women," Judith Kegan Gardiner posits the two most commonly accepted reasons for why women's writing differs from men's: one, women's experience differs from men's, and two, a female consciousness differs from a male consciousness (348). The first argument has validity; socialization no doubt affects us all. The second argument, however, reduces difference to biology, if this female consciousness is presumed to be innate. Probably a better explanation for why women's writing differs from men's is a synthesis of these two arguments. That is, because women's experiences differs from men's, women's personal bases for proofs differ, and as a result of these differing proofs and their subsequent conclusions, a female consciousness develops in women.

Luce Irigaray, however, believes that such a consciousness cannot truly be manifested in traditional
forms. Instead, she urges women writers to practice "mimetism," which is defined by Mary Jacobus in "The Question of Language," as "an acting out or role playing within the text which allows the women writer the better to know and hence to expose what it is she mimics" (210). As demonstrated in this chapter, Woolf expertly mimics traditional forms and ideas in *A Room of One's Own*. Fully conscious of her mimetism and, just as importantly, fully conscious of her own revisions, Woolf makes the traditional five-part arrangement of an essay and the concept of education as liberation her own strategies by embedding the first in a narrative structure and by applying the second to women.

*A Room of One's Own* reflects in prose many of the concepts that Woolf was experimenting with in fiction: androgyny, time and epiphany, the socialization of both men and women, women's particular roles in society, men and women's contribution to perpetuating the patriarchy, games that are played the sexes, and possible solutions. Such are the concerns of Woolf's feminist consciousness. The solution that Woolf envisions, an androgynous mindset, will emerge from the constant flow of thought, the inductive stream of life, the currents that occasionally provide epiphanies. Woolf's narrator lives in a time between the lights, but she dreams of a
time when women will come into their own, when pin
money received from husband or father will become pen
money earned from their own labors. For with material
independence comes the chance to nurture an evolving
subjectivity and power.

Woolf's proposed solution is not the solution of a
cowering woman or a raving idealist but of a feminist
who perceives life dialectically and cherishes hope for
change. All she asks is that women work to prepare the
way for a Judith Shakespeare who will emerge from the
struggle of the sexes as an individual with an
androgynous mind who can write freely and truly. If
the young women from Fernham will write, if they will
begin to use language as a means to power, they will
have taken the first step. By writing A Room of One's
Own, Woolf herself is participating in this effort.
She does not imitate the style of Bacon or Lamb.
Instead, she orchestrates individual sentences and the
sequence of ideas so that they will reflect her own
feminist ideology.
Notes: Chapter Three

1

According to Quentin Bell, this perception of her work originated with those closest to her. All except Clive Bell liked AROO. But after the publication of Three Guineas, although "[a] great many women wrote to express their enthusiastic aproval, . . . her close friends were silent, or . . . critical. Vita did not like it, and Maynard Keynes was both angry and contemptuous." Virginia Woolf: A Biography (NY: HBJ, 1972): 150; 204-5

2

Clive Bell held this opinion; see Bell VW: A Biography 150. Speaking of AROO and TG, Jean Guiget states: "Each was a contemporary with a novel; written as it were in the margin of Orlando and The Years, A Room of One's Own and Three Guineas provide an ideological commentary to these books . . . . [A]t the same time they suffer from a certain subordinate character." Virginia Woolf and Her Works, Trans. Jean Stewart (London: Hogarth P, 1965): 167

3

While denying Bitzer's positivistic view of rhetorical situation, I do find his definitions of exigence and constraint helpful: an exigence is "an imperfection marked by urgency; . . . a defect, an obstacle, something waiting to be done, a thing which is other than it should be" (Bitzer, "The Rhet. Sit." 386); a constraint is "parts of the situation because they have the power to constrain decision and action needed to modify exigence" (388).
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5

For more information on the role of women in 1928 British society, see Olive Banks, Faces of Feminism (NY: Basil Blackwell, 1981). Banks' bibliography is an excellent resource for both the American and the English women's movement, pp. 264-79.
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For further discussion on Woolf's inclusion in and exclusion from the traditional canon, see Sara Ruddick, "Private Brother, Public World," in Marcus New Fem. Essays; Silver, V. W.'s Reading Notebooks, pp. 4-6.

9

For more information on Woolf's critical articles, Guiguet provides a very good summary/analysis, pp. 126-167.

10

In this essay, Woolf repudiates the Edwardians, such as H.G. Wells, Arnold Bennett, and John Galsworthy, for building characters by associating them with outside objects; she celebrates the Georgians, such as E.M. Forster, D.H. Lawrence, Lytton Strachey, James Joyce, and T.S. Eliot, for creating character by examining the inside, the subjective human spirit.

11


12

Bell records interesting stories about Virginia's involvement in these two groups. Convinced to work for the Adult Suffrage Movement by Janet Case (her Greek teacher), she opted to address envelopes instead of doing other
tasks offered her, such as writing articles for publication or researching the history of suffrage in New Zealand (I.161). As Secretary of the Richmond Guild, Woolf's duties included procuring prominent literary speakers; one speaker, Bessie Ward from the Council of Civil Liberties, spoke about possible Conscription of women and shocked the group when describing the sexual diseases that afflicted young soldiers. Virginia defended her choice of speakers, and after a time the group decided they needed a seminar on sex education (II.35-36).


14 Peter Rabinovitz discusses actual, narrative, and authorial audiences. For my rhetorical analysis, I have also applied his concept to the author. See "Truth in Fiction: A Reexamination of Audience," Critical Inquiry 4 (Autumn 1977): 121-41.

15 Certain modern feminists, such as Adrienne Rich in "Notes on the Politics of Location," Blood, Bread, and Poetry (NY: Norton, 1986): 210-30, disagree politically with Woolf's use of "I" to represent "all women." What "I" usually means in this context is "white, middle-class, western, heterosexual woman."


For an entertaining, but not necessarily scholarly, view of how *A Room of One's Own* is relevant in the 1980's, see Teresa Susskind, *A Room of One's Own Revisited: Virginia Woolf's Masterpiece Fifty Years Later* (San Francisco: San Francisco P, 1979).
CHAPTER IV
A RHETORICAL ANALYSIS OF ADRIENNE RICH'S 

BLOOD, BREAD, AND POETRY

For writers, and at this moment for women writers in particular, there is the challenge and promise of a whole new psychic geography to be explored. But there is also a difficult and dangerous walking on the ice, as we try to find language and images for a consciousness we are just coming into, and with little in the past to support us. I want to talk about some aspects of this difficulty and this danger.

—Adrienne Rich
"When We Dead Awaken: Writing as Re-Vision"

Introduction

Radical feminist . . . prolific poet . . . forceful essayist, Adrienne Rich has inspired millions of women during the contemporary American feminist movement. Recognized predominantly for her poetry, Rich has also published three volumes of prose: Of Woman Born: Motherhood as Experience and Institution (1976), On Lies, Secrets, and Silence (1979), and Blood, Bread, and Poetry (1986). Reissued for a Tenth Anniversary Edition, Of Woman Born explores the institution of
motherhood in terms of its effects upon a woman's evolving subjectivity and the resulting ramifications, both personal and societal. The essays in *On Lies, Secrets, and Silence* focus on the internalized patriarchal socialization that women must identify and overcome if they are to speak honestly about themselves or society and, in the process, empower themselves. Arranged in chronological order, as are all her anthologies of poetry or prose, the essays in *Blood, Bread, and Poetry* offer critiques of the problems in contemporary society from a materialist, radical feminist perspective. That is, within the context of art and politics, the material aspects of sex, race, class, and nationalism as well as their intertwining roots in patriarchy are all explored. In these essays, Rich, like Woolf, draws upon personal experience, generalizing from concrete particulars to demonstrate the ironic injustice suffered by women in a patriarchal society. Unlike Woolf, however, Rich chooses exposition rather than narration as the predominant means though which to posit her beliefs.

For the purposes of this study, I will concentrate solely on the essays in *Blood, Bread, and Poetry*, composed between 1979 and 1986, which represent Rich's most recent thoughts. In this anthology Rich starts from the premise that the stories we tell and the images
we create affect our evolving subjectivities, which in turn affect our decision-making capacities. Thus, becoming aware of the interworkings of all these components in our lives is the first step for change, change for the individual and, once that occurs, change for society. For Rich, feminism provides the best means to effect this change: "I think that feminism is the place where in the most natural, organic way subjectivity and politics have to come together" ("Three Conversations" in Gelpi, 114).

Specifically, I will focus on "Split at the Root: An Essay on Jewish Identity" (1982), "Blood, Bread, and Poetry" (1984), and "Notes toward a Politics of Location" (1984) because they highlight, but do not compartmentalize, different aspects of Rich's radical feminism. Moreover, all three essays address women's concerns in terms of the "simultaneity of oppressions"—i.e., in terms of how gender, sexual preference, race, class, and geography converge to both identify and create the synthesis of literary and political aims (BBP xii). To investigate how Rich imitates, revises, and/or transcends traditional rhetorical strategies and ultimately to generalize about her rhetoric of feminism, I will employ the rhetorical methodology described in Chapter Two to interrogate how the multiple levels of
situation, author, text, and audience are manifested in "JI," "BBP," and "NPL."

Situation: Extra-Textual and Textual

As defined in Chapter Two, situation is a social construct that both influences individuals and, in turn, is influenced by them. As a result, it may enable and/or restrict their evolving subjectivities. Within the context of literary criticism, situation may be examined on two levels: extra-textual and textual. Because of the ever-changing, slippery nature situation, I can only select information that seems relevant, being conscious all the time that the ones of my making are not complete, are not the exact ones Rich might have perceived. But in order to construct an extra-textual or textual situation that might enhance a reader's comprehension of Blood, Bread, and Poetry, I will examine the exigencies and constraints that give rise to the text.

The most obvious extra-textual exigence that caused Rich to write each essay in Blood, Bread, and Poetry is that she "was asked for a review, a lecture, an article, a keynote address" (BBP xv). In the first paragraph of her "Foreward," she makes a concerted effort to describe the context in which she wrote this anthology:
These essays were not written in an ivory tower. But neither were they written on the edge of a political organizer's daily life, or a nine-to-five manual or clerical job, or in prison. My fifteen or so years in the Women's Liberation movement have been spent as a writer, a teacher, an editor-publisher, a pamphleteer, a lecturer, and a sometimes activist. Before and throughout I have been a poet. (vii)

Rich is always careful to document (in the first footnote) the reason she is writing. For example, she tells her readers that "JI" was written in 1982 for publication in Evelyn Torton Beck's *Nice Jewish Girls: A Lesbian Anthology* and was later reprinted in Ursula Owen's *Fathers* (100). "BBP" originated as a 1983 speech for the Institute for the Humanities series, "Writers and Social Responsibility," at the University of Massachusetts, Amherst, and was later published in the *Massachusetts Review* (166). And "NPL," in its first version, was conceived as a speech given at the First Summer School of Critical Semiotics, Conference on Women, Feminist Identity and Society in the 1980's, Utrecht, Holland, June 1, 1984. Later, other versions evolved as speeches for the Women's Studies Research Seminar at Cornell University and for the Burgess Lecture, Pacific Oaks College in Pasadena, California (210).

Rich's desire to record the evolving tradition of the feminist movement also motivated her to anthologize
these separate essays in *Blood, Bread, and Poetry*.

Thus, this anthology reflects a "time line of my travels since 1978" (xi), "indicative of a continuing exploration, not of a destination" (xii). As she states in the "Foreword" to *Lies, Secrets, and Silence*, the constraints of imposed silence must be abolished and a recorded tradition must be established in its place if feminism is to grow and achieve its goals:

The entire history of women's struggle for self-determination has been muffled in silence over and over. One serious cultural obstacle encountered by a feminist writer is that each feminist work has tended to be received as if it emerged from nowhere; as if each of us had lived, thought, and worked without any historical past or contextual present. This is one of the ways in which women's work and thinking has been made to seem sporadic, errant, orphaned of any tradition of its own. (11)

Her personal quest to understand how art and politics may be synthesized within a feminist perspective also prompted Rich to publish this collection. She states her line of inquiry in the "Foreword" to *Blood, Bread, and Poetry*:

More recently, I have written less about poems themselves and more about the social and historical conditions of their making. The title essay attempts to link the two. More and more my question about poetry has been one I ask in that essay: What happens to the heart of the artist, here in North America? (xiv)

As a poet and a prominent leader of the contemporary feminist movement, who grounds herself in a materialist
perspective, she must identify if and how art and politics, which are so often posited as binary opposites, can empower herself and other women.

Rich's interest in the status of women in the 1980's, a decade often cited as the second wave of the contemporary feminist movement, was another driving force behind Rich's decision to anthologize these essays. With feminism somewhat legitimized, new but equally difficult constraints arise. For example, no longer is "all women" the banner for feminists; such a banner has become reductive because it prevents the celebration of difference. Today, Rich argues, women must be recognized and respected as members of particular groups, which are shaped by the politics of location:

But the woman trying to fit racism and class into a strictly radical-feminist analysis finds that the box won't pack. The woman who seeks the experiential grounding of identity politics realizes that as Jew, white, woman, lesbian, middle-class, she herself has a complex identity: her U.S. passport, in this world, is part of her body, and she lives under a very specific patriarchy. (xii)

Thus, it is the body and the body's physical location that Rich explores in Blood, Bread, and Poetry by questioning how this materialist lens affects her focus on contemporary society and contemporary feminism.

Finally, a primary factor that forces Rich to write the essays in Blood, Bread, and Poetry is the
restrictions of her own life, restrictions that began at birth and have taken fifty years to come to terms with. Adrienne Cecile Rich was born on May 16, 1929, in Baltimore, Maryland, to Arnold Rich, a Southern doctor, who never discussed his Jewish heritage with his daughter, and to Helen Jones Rich, a southern woman whose social Christianity established the patterns for Rich's early life. Rich draws strength and talent from her mother and grandmother: "my gentile grandmother and my mother were also frustrated artists and intellectuals, a lost writer and a lost composer between them" ("JI" 102). But it is Arnold Rich who haunts Adrienne Rich's life and art.

Growing up in a predominantly Christian society, aware yet unaware of her father's Jewish tradition, Rich began to question her personal role in such a tradition, especially as the horrible accounts of the Holocaust emerged from World War II during her high school years in Baltimore. Her search for identity continued throughout her college years at Radcliffe, from which she graduated in 1951. And in June of 1953 at the Hillel House at Harvard under a portrait of Albert Einstein, she married her Jewish husband Alfred Haskell Conrad, a Harvard economist who committed suicide in 1970, with whom she had three sons "(more Jewish in ancestry than I)" ("JI" 101). In "JI," Rich details how her
schizophrenic, religious mind-set affected her sense of belonging, her evolving subjectivity, and the decisions she made about her life.

Arnold Rich also worked to shape his daughter as a young poet. During her childhood, he fostered her poetic abilities by having her read predominantly Victorian poets—Blake, Keats, Tennyson, and Arnold, among others—and by criticizing her early poems. This paternal influence both inspired and constrained Rich, as she admitted at a 1964 poetry reading:

For about twenty years I wrote for a particular man, who criticized and praised me and made me feel I was indeed 'special.' The obverse side of this, of course was that I tried for a long time to please him, or rather, not to displease him. (Current Biography 342)

This desire not to displease daddy carried over into her adult relationships with mostly male poetry critics. Indeed, when W.H. Auden selected Rich's poetry to be published in the Yale Younger Poets series, his introduction to her work, A Change of World, proved that her father's lessons had been well learned: "[t]he poems a reader will encounter in this book are neatly and modestly dressed, speak quietly but do not mumble, respect their elders but are not cowed by them, and do not tell fibs" (126-127). The result of this training is that Rich, like Woolf, straddled two conflicting literary traditions, that of the canonized mostly male
poets and that of the marginalized women poets. Rich describes this predicament in "What Women Need to Know":

Much of the first four decades of my life was spent in a continuous tension between the world the Fathers taught me to see, and had rewarded me for seeing, and the flashes of insight that came through the eye of the outsider. Gradually those flashes of insight, which at times could seem like brushes with madness, began to demand that I struggle to connect them with each other, to insist that I take them seriously. (BBP 3)

Eventually, Rich, like Woolf, had to synthesize this dichotomous position, and she did so through her developing feminism.

The shadow of Arnold Rich also shades the development of Rich's radical feminism. As a feminist, Rich recognized the need to revise previous traditions and to imagine her own; as a result, she developed a personal, political writing style for both her poetry and her prose, a style that has made Rich one of the most influential voices of the contemporary feminist movement. In her prose and poetry, Rich employs her father as a symbol of patriarchy, a symbol that she both loves and hates yet one that she must come to terms with--"I have to claim my father"--if she is to move forward and achieve any sense of self ("JI" 100). Her corpus of texts proves that she has, indeed, moved forward, constructing an ever-evolving sense of self by
not allowing her constraints to control her but by turning them into exigences for writing.

The textual situations of the essays in Blood, Bread and Poetry encompass a variety of locations where, between 1978 and 1985, Rich has tried to grasp the role of women and the role of feminism in the 1980's by writing about them. Blood, Bread, and Poetry begins with "What a Woman Needs to Know," which explores how the concepts of privilege, tokenism, and power work within patriarchy; and it ends with "Notes toward a Politics of Location," which explores how material presence affects a woman's means of moving beyond privilege and tokenism to empowerment. Between these two texts is a compilation of essays that examines all aspects of women's experiences: blood, bread, and poetry.

In "JI," the textual situation is established much like the textual situation in most of Rich's other essays, with a description of her physical, intellectual, and emotional state at the exact moment of writing. In "JI," however, Rich faces the difficult task of overcoming her father's continuing influence:

For about fifteen minutes I have been sitting chin in hand in front of the typewriter, staring out at the snow. Trying to be honest with myself, trying to figure out why writing this seems to be so dangerous an act, filled with fear and shame, and why it seems so necessary. It comes to me that in order to
write this I have to be willing to do two things: I have to claim my father, for I have my Jewishness from him . . . ; and I have to break his silence, his taboos; in order to claim him I have in a sense to expose him.

... These are stories I have never tried to tell before. Why now? (BBP 100)

Within this situational context, the essay develops through flashback techniques, starting with stories of her father's life (i.e., his stories from her perspective) and continuing with the stories of her own life, up to the present moment where she is sitting in the chair, chin in hand. Memory, no doubt, alters these stories a bit, but the lies of memory make the recounting of these stories no less important. For it is often these hazy, unresolved memories that constrain our evolution as subjects. So, if we are to rise above such memories, we must reconcile ourselves with them.

In terms of her Jewishness, Rich's memories include stories of simultaneous motivations and restrictions: stories of her Jewish father in a white Southern Christian school; stories of herself practicing the role of Portia in The Merchant of Venice while her father coached her to say the word "Jew" with "more scorn and contempt" ("JI" 104); stories of her meaningless baptism in the Episcopal church; stories of her Orthodox Eastern European in-laws. Rich explores such significant memories about her Jewishness in order to come to terms with her
present inner conflicts. What she finally comes to terms with in this essay is that "this essay . . . has no conclusions; it is another beginning for me" (123). The future she envisions for herself looms more complex than a neatly packaged definition of her identity as only a Jew (or only a mother, or only a feminist, or only a poet) might allow. Indeed, her identity encompasses many selves:

The middle-class white girl taught to trade obedience. The Jewish lesbian raised to be a heterosexual gentile. The woman who first heard oppression named and analyzed in the Black Civil Rights struggle. The woman with three sons, the feminist who hates male violence. The woman limping with a cane, the woman who has stopped bleeding are also accountable. The poet who knows that beautiful language can lie, that the oppressor's language sometimes sounds beautiful. The woman trying, as part of her resistance, to clean up her act. (123)

The restrictions on all these selves motivates Rich to write, "to resist or subvert alienation with words" (Brodkey 409).

In "BBP," the textual situation is unusual. Instead of first recounting her present location as she writes, Rich begins with a memory: "The Miami airport, summer 1983: a North American woman says to me, 'You'll love Nicaragua: everyone there is a poet'" (167). That remark started Rich thinking about the relationship between the artist and his political environment, and as she told her University of Massachusetts audience when "BBP" was first presented as a lecture, that remark
provided "the text on which I began to build my talk here tonight" (168).

To establish why she encourages the marriage of art and politics, Rich reaches once again into her well of stories from the past, stories involving her evolving sensibility about the purpose of poetry:

I had grown up hearing and reading poems from a very young age, first as sounds, repeated, musical, rhythmically satisfying in themselves, and the power of concrete sensuously compelling images . . .

But poetry soon became more than music and images; it was also revelation, information, a kind of teaching. (168-9)

Breaking away from pure textual criticism was just not done when Rich attended high school and college during the Forties and Fifties. But when she took a poetry seminar--Blake, Keats, Byron, Yeats, and Stevens--at Harvard from Francis Otto Matthiessen, she was influenced to do just that. As Rich claims in "BBP," it was the "dialogue between art and politics that excited me in [Yeats'] work, along with the sound of his language--never his elaborate mythological systems" (174). So she signed up for an Irish history course in order to be able to place Yeats, who at that time was her idea of "the Great Poet," within a socio-political context (172). Thus, her first conscious steps toward synthesizing art and politics, toward breaking down the constraints of the educational academy, were taken.
Elaborate mythological systems continued to impress Rich less and less as her career progressed. Indeed, her role within the contemporary feminist movement as poet, essayist, and speaker has been to articulate the constraints of such systems and to imagine ways to transcend them. Transcendence, for Rich, comes with the synthesis of art and politics. Instead of contaminating her work as some critics have warned, this synthesis actually enhances it. As she states, "Nothing need be lost, no beauty sacrificed. The heart does not turn to a stone" (187).

In "NPL," Rich establishes the textual situation in her traditional fashion, by locating herself and her state of mind at a specific spot:

I am to speak these words in Europe, but I have been searching for them in the United States of America. . . .

Beginning to write, then getting up. Stopped by the movements of a huge early bumblebee . . . reeling, bumping, stunning itself against windowpanes and sills. . . .
And I, too, have been bumping my way against glassy panes, falling half-stunned, gathering myself up and crawling, then again taking off, searching. (210-11)

But in describing her constraints, Rich discovers her means of transcending them: perserverance. After each fall, she gets up. Not accepting defeat, she continues to search.
In "NPL," Rich also discusses what she perceives as one of the strongest constraints faced by women in our patriarchal culture, the dichotomy of theory and concrete experience, "abstractions severed from the doings of living people, fed back to people as slogans" (213). Such a practice separates the mind from the body, ideology from action and allows individuals to decline any responsibility for others, a position that promulgates sexism, among other ism's.

For Rich, the key to transcending this dichotomy is to reimagine our concepts of theory and experience. Perceiving existing theories as absolutes, Rich claims, is dangerous: "theory can be a dew that rises from the earth and collects in the rain cloud and returns to earth over and over. But if it doesn't smell of the earth, it isn't good for the earth" (214). If our theories are to smell of the earth, we must locate the material, the body, and then build from there, generalizing from our concrete experience. With each new experience, we must test the theory to see if the fits, affirming it when it does fit, reevaluating it when it doesn't. Moreover, we must be challenged and excited by this process, not threatened. For fear is another constraint.

Separating theory from experience also marginalizes anyone outside the "we" of the speaker. For Rich,
marginalization functions as a multi-leveled constraint. Women are marginalized by men. The poor are marginalized by the rich. Blacks are marginalized by whites. Black feminists are marginalized by white middle-class feminists. And lesbians are marginalized by a heterosexual community. Yet the constraint of marginalization may be turned into an exigence for action by feminists: "My hope is that the movement we are building can further the conscious work of turning Otherness into a keen lens of empathy ... [and] bring into being a politics based on concrete, heartfelt understanding of what it means to be Other" (203). In "Disobedient Daughter," a review of Blood, Bread, and Poetry, Bonnie Zimmerman argues that Rich's concept of politics of location embodies a solution for the world's problems: "In the interplay between selfhood and otherness, center and margin, lies the moral position, or what Rich calls a politics of location, that might heal division and save the world" (Zimmerman 5).

Author: Actual and Implied

As defined in Chapter Two, the concept of author may function as a three-level construct: the actual author, the narrative author (or narrator), and the implied author. Since there are no narrators in Rich's essays, only the actual and implied authors will be
analyzed. To investigate Rich as the actual author, I will broadly focus on her reputation as an essayist, feminist, and rhetorician as well as on her field of texts. To investigate Rich as an implied author in each essay, I will discuss her qualities and attitudes that are confined specifically to "JI," "BBP," and "NPL."

Certain critics, such as Elaine Showalter, who accept the liberal humanist concept of a unified self, might find this double-tiered classification of author problematic. Such critics might argue that in expository essays the concept of implied author distances Rich from her written text and posits her as Other. But nothing could be further from the truth. Rich's implied authors in "JI," "BBP," and "NPL" are all Rich. Each one just posits a slightly different self, depending on where, when, why, and how the essay was written. Understanding each of these implied authors individually, while maintaining a broader sense of Rich herself, allows a reader to trace Rich's development. When a reader synthesizes all of Rich's selves from all of her works, she achieves a greater understanding of Rich as an evolving subject. Thus, as Booth employs it, the term implied author distances Rich no further from her audience than writing distances her or calling her a poet or a feminist distances her.
In the "Foreward" to Blood, Bread, and Poetry, Rich defines herself as a writer, a teacher, an editor-publisher, a pamphleteer, a lecturer, a "sometimes activist," and a poet (vii). Interestingly enough, her interest in poetry led her to prose: "I first began writing prose about poetry . . . . More recently, I have written less about poems themselves and more about the social and historical conditions of their making" (BBP xiii). Yet for Rich, reconciling her role as a poet and essayist within the feminist movement poses particular problems concerning definition and responsibility:

Is the writer a privileged figure who somehow gets the power of definition, of describing the movement to itself? Does the movement inevitably seek to regulate and censor the writer's imagination? Does the writer secretly tame her imagination in order to defend her cause? But how, then, is it "her" cause? Where does the imagination get its images anyway? (xi)

Moreover, how does Rich's evolution from a marginalized outsider of patriarchy to a firmly entrenched insider of the feminist movement affect her and her work? And how does the respect she now commands from feminists and non-feminists alike alter her subjectivity and, thus, her work? These questions haunt the entire anthology. While Rich finds no easy answers, she continues to search.

When she searches with a pen, she finds many forums. In addition to her three anthologies of
collected prose, Rich's essays have appeared in a
diverse group of publications, such as Freedomways,
Signs, Women's Studies Quarterly, Boston Review,
Massachusetts Review, College English, New York Review
of Books, American Poetry Review, Chronicle of Higher
Education, and Heresies: A Feminist Magazine of Art and
Politics. Thus, her influence has been wide-spread.

The location of Blood, Bread, and Poetry within
Adrienne Rich's field of texts is as follows:

A Change of World (1951)
The Diamond Cutters (1955)
Snapshots of a Daughter-in-Law (1963)
Necessitites of Life (1966)
Leaflets (1969)
The Will to Change (1971)
Diving into the Wreck (1973)
Of Woman Born: Motherhood as Institution
and Experience (1976)
Twenty-one Love Poems (1977)
The Dream of a Common Language (1978)
On Lies, Secrets, and Silence: Selected
Prose, 1966-1978 (1979)
A Wild Patience Has Taken Me This Far
Sources (1981)
The Fact of a Doorframe: Poems Selected
and New 1950-1984 (1985)
Your Native Land, Your Life
Blood, Bread, and Poetry (1986)

Written to locate the most recent points in the
evolution of Rich's radical feminist subjectivity,
Blood, Bread, and Poetry benefits from Rich's previous
experience with prose and poetry. Her arguments are
skillfully constructed; her images, brilliantly painted.
But the artistic merit of the essays is not Rich's sole
concern. Functioning from the premise that "[a]ll art is political in terms of who was allowed to make it, what brought it into being, why and how it entered the canon, and why we are still discussing it," she also considers its rhetorical impact ("Toward a More Feminist Criticism" 95). But taking such a position troubles Rich, not on an artistic level but on an ethical one: who is she and what right has she to promote her feminist ideology?

For one thing, Rich is a self-proclaimed feminist. In the "Foreward" to Blood, Bread, and Poetry, Rich discusses the roots and goals of her radical feminism:

"... born in the Civil Rights movement and the Left (many of its initiators literally daughters of the Old Left), trying to separate itself from Leftist sexism and dogmatism, shape a feminist theory based on female experience, and remain connected to a radical imagining of social transformation." (ix)

Such social transformations, she believes, will transpire only each individual learns to redefine power not as something bestowed by others but as something that emerges from within. Such revisioning will shift the power base from an elite group to all people. This empowerment will manifest itself "in the form of knowledge, expertise, decision making, access to tools, as well as in the basic forms of food and shelter and health care and literacy" ("What Women Need to Know" 5).
Rich, however, was not reared as a feminist. She recalls that for "most of my life, I had heard the word feminist spoken in pejoration and derision" (BBP viii). Nor did she adopt feminism simply as a politically correct stance. Instead, her feminism emerged as the embodiment of her own life experiences. As an intelligent poet who also happened to be a woman, Rich spent the 1950's in limbo, writing poetry that was acceptable to male critics while establishing her marriage and rearing three sons. In the 1960's, however, the Civil Rights movement and the Women's movement provided outlets for Rich's talents and provided forums in which she could truly merge her art and politics.

For a while Rich could not separate her feelings toward men from her anger toward the patriarchy; as a result, the one bit of information that is commonly cited about Rich (and often used by non-feminists to denounce her) is her refusal to allow men in her poetry courses. But this stage passed, and now she is careful to assert that "[a]t no time have I ever defined myself as, or considered myself, a lesbian separatist" (viii). Instead, she recognizes that men must participate if the social transformations that radical feminism envisions are to become reality.
For such social transformations to occur, however, two steps must be followed. First, each individual must discover and revise her evolving subjectivity. Then the individual must acknowledge her location as a subject within a specific community. As Zimmerman notes in her review of Blood, Bread, and Poetry, this second step "is particularly urgent because each of 'us' . . . places the I and the we at the center of a world-view, de-centering and marginalizing all other I's and we's" (5). This process, moreover, is not easy, for it locates everything from national pride to personal pronouns as a political problem.

In Rich's opinion, the Anglo-American Women's movement has suffered too long from a generic white, middle-class, heterosexual identity in which the central concern has been that "white women are situated within white patriarchy as well as against it" (BBP x). Such an identity, she argues, cannot speak to "all women," in spite of the movement's good intentions. In order to prevent stagnation within the United States Women's movement, Rich proposes that the following concepts, which are central to ethnic feminists, be recognized as concerns of mainstream feminism: "[t]he concepts of identity politics, of simultaneity of oppressions, of concrete experience as the touchstone for ideology, the refusal to accept "a room of one's own" in exchange for
not threatening the system" ("North American Tunnel Vision" 165). Although Rich calls for threatening the system and grounds her politics of location in a Marxist materialist perspective, she believes the battle must be fought not with guns but with words.

Although Adrienne Rich occasionally employs the word *peroration*, often develops her essays with a four-part pattern of arrangement, and frequently seeks to persuade her audience to action and attitude, she is not a traditional rhetorician in that she has not developed a system of rhetoric in the way that Plato, Cicero, and Quintilian did. Instead, like Woolf, she might be better described as one of the predominant rhetors of the women's movement, a role with which she is not totally comfortable. Such a role, however, is crucial because, as she claims, "[t]he survival of the women's movement, as of any revolutionary movement, depends directly on that of our communications network" ("Toward a More Feminist Criticism" 85).

But for Rich, words do more than just allow us to communicate effectively with one another. Like Kenneth Burke, Rich recognizes the power of language in shaping individual subjects and the world:

I do believe that words can help us move or keep us paralyzed, and that our choices in language and verbal tone have something—a great deal—to do with how we live our lives and whom we end up speaking with and hearing;
and that we can deflect words, by trivialization, of course, but also by ritualized respect, or we can let them enter our souls and mix with the juices of our minds. ("Toward a More Feminist Criticism" 90-91)

Thus, her writing becomes a forum where she may not only discover and state her ideas but also help mold her reader's evolving subjectivity. This interaction between the writer and reader then shapes our world.

In *Blood, Bread, and Poetry*, this interaction occurs between one of Rich's implied authors and a reader. The implied author of the anthology reflects Adrienne Rich from 1979-1985. With her more sharply focused materialist lens, she represents a definite development beyond *On Lies, Secrets, and Change*. Bonnie Zimmerman agrees:

This development in perspective is evident in the contrast between the titles of her two volumes of essays. *On Lies, Secrets, and Silence* highlighted the internal forces that censor honest language, whether about the self or society. *Blood, Bread, and Poetry*, on the other hand, leads us to think about the material necessities of human life, and the political forces of repression, and the way that poetry grows from both. (6)

Slight differences in perspective also exist in the individual essays in *Blood, Bread, and Poetry*. This phenomenon is not too surprising, however, since Rich addresses different topics from a slightly different perspective, depending on when, where, and why she is writing. Yet all of Rich's implied authors possess a
decidedly feminist voice. Their foremost concern is to empower women, but in various essays, Rich explores various means to this end: e.g., establishing a tradition of women writers, imagining a society evolved beyond patriarchy, and taking political action to make these imaginings a reality. Synthesizing these ideas creates the most likely environment for empowerment.

Rich, as she expresses herself in "JI," "BBP," and "NPL," is rhetorically astute. Knowing that the audience will range from blind worshipers to uninformed detractors, the implied authors of these essays share certain techniques--reflectiveness, inductive reasoning, and honesty--that force a reader to respect, if not agree with their attempts to describe their reality. For example, "JI," "BBP," and to a lesser degree "NPL" are shaped by Rich's first locating herself within the present, then remembering stories from the past that stick in her mind, and finally interpreting these stories to explain the present. Any reader can identify with this process, if not with Rich's resultant interpretation. By building arguments through these stories, Rich's implied authors lead readers through an inductive search for answers. This process reflects an intelligence, a logical power that even opponents must respect. Finally, because the stories recounted are so intimate and, at times, painful, only the most cynical
audience could accuse Rich of dishonesty, of falsely manipulating her material to achieve her ends. One reason that this honesty cannot be questioned successfully is that Rich takes full responsibility for her words. In the "Acknowledgement," for example, the implied author of the anthology states: "My individual hand and heart are responsible for the gaps in perception or interpretation" (xv).

While conscious of audiences, Rich's implied authors do not fear them. The polite defiance of A Room of One's Own holds no charm for Rich. Instead, Rich emphasizes her truths—the truths of her present situation, of her stories from the past, and of her interpretations—more than she caters to any reader's possible hostility. In these essays, Rich is not satisfied with an isolated "room of one's own," which is obtained by promising not to threaten the system. Instead, she needs to confront the world directly in hopes of effecting radical social transformations via individual readers. Only by speaking truly and loudly will such change emerge.

Speaking truly and loudly, however, lays Rich's implied authors open to charges of adopting a preachy tone, of trying to proselytize readers to the cause of feminism. But upon closer inspection, Rich is merely asserting her heart-felt, experience-based convictions,
an action that would probably be applauded in any context other than feminism. In these essays, Rich never claims to have the absolute answers for all humankind. Instead, especially in "NPL," she encourages individuals to evaluate their beliefs and actions thoughtfully instead of blindly complying with any established system, be it patriarchy or feminism:

A movement for change lives in feelings, actions, and words. Whatever circumscribes or mutilates our feelings makes it more difficult to act, keeps our actions reactive, repetitive: abstract thinking, narrow tribal loyalties, every kind of self-righteousness, the arrogance of believing ourselves at the center. ("NPL" 223)

Not distancing readers is another technique that Rich's implied authors employ to keep from becoming too preachy. By inviting readers into the writing-as-discovery processes and by evoking concrete images of life, they draw their readers in, making them feel more like close confidantes than parishoners. Thus, the conclusions that are reached seem more like shared discoveries than sermons. Furthermore, because readers perceive each implied author as Rich herself, as located at a specific place, time, and position, these implied authors do not distance Rich (as the actual author) from her readers.

Finally, the implied authors in Blood, Bread, and Poetry inspire many readers. Rich's stories strike emotional chords in readers, forcing readers to place
themselves in her shoes, wonder how they would have acted in such circumstances, and question how their own stories have affected them and their world. When viewed chronologically and in comparison with Rich's previous work, the implied authors demonstrate that a thoughtful life allows one's subjectivity to evolve in surprising ways. Thus, these implied authors embody a reason to live in the present and to hope for a better future.

Because the implied authors in Blood, Bread, and Poetry are perceived as Rich herself, it is not surprising that both levels of authors (actual and implied) further their arguments by similar appeals—logical, ethical, and emotional. First, the inductive approach appeals to modern readers who value this scientific method and respect those who employ it well. Also, because Rich hooks this inductive approach to her personal memories and connects her "conclusions" to her present, her arguments are hard to refute; after all, who knows better than she what she actually experienced or observed? So even if readers disagree with her interpretations, they do not usually fault her intelligence. Second, as poet and feminist, Adrienne Rich commands enormous respect for her writing talent, honesty, and searching intelligence. This ethical appeal carries over to and is reinforced by her works of prose, although surprisingly little has been written about her essays. Third, by grounding her
arguments in personal experience, Rich evokes a tremendous emotional appeal. While her stories and images may not be universal, they certainly reflect a white, middle-class, North American female experience. And her interest in stories of minority women broadens not only her concept of feminism but also her emotional and ethical appeals.

Text: Arrangement and Style

In Blood, Bread, and Poetry, two levels of arrangement are at work: the arrangement of the anthology and the arrangement of individual essays. In her "Foreward," Rich describes the underlying the over-all arrangement: "the essays are indicative of a continuing exploration, not of a destination" (xii). In an earlier anthology of essays, On Lies, Secrets, and Silence, Rich discusses its arrangements in terms that also apply to Blood, Bread, and Poetry:

"The essays in this book represent the journey of my own thought toward the paragraph I have just written. A journey of this kind is not linear. . . . Rather, I trust the contradiction and repetitions in this book speak for themselves. (On Lies, Secrets, and Silence 17-18)

The most obvious pattern of arrangement apparent in Blood, Bread, and Poetry is chronological order. As the implied author states in the essay entitled "Blood, Bread, and Poetry," "[b]y 1956, I had begun dating each
of my poems by year . . . I knew my life was changing, my work was changing, and I needed to indicate to my readers my sense of being engaged in a long continuing process (180). Rich purposefully organizes her poems and her essays in this way so as to emphasize the development of her thought through time and to ground her ideas in a specific historical context, although she readily grants that later readers may create meanings beyond that specific historical context. Interestingly, this practice synthesizes I.A. Richards' diachronic and synchronic perspectives of language. Moreover, the political nature of this decision did not occur to Rich until later, when she realized that such a practice denied New Criticism's basic premise, the autonomy of the text.

A slightly less obvious pattern of arrangement that emerges in this anthology is the shifting, interweaving focus on the political nature of race, literature, and physical location as a means of defining Rich's radical feminism. The following three essays, whose individual patterns of arrangement will be analyzed, represent examples of each. "Split at the Root: An Essay on Jewish Identity" examines the effects Rich's Jewishness on her evolving subjectivity, yet the effects of her Jewishness are closely tied to the effects of her class and her region. "Blood, Bread, and Poetry: The Location
of the Poet" explores the connections between poets, poetry, and society, with Rich's own experience serving as examples. Finally, "Notes Toward a Politics of Location" considers how the location of a person's body—historically, geographically, sexually, and culturally—elates her subjectivity.

The arrangement of these three individual essays appears remarkably similar. Indeed, Rich indicates a fondness for a four-part pattern of development: introduction, statement of facts, proof, and conclusion. But this four-part pattern does not call attention to itself in "JI" and "BBP" because the reader is drawn to the highly imagistic vignettes of Rich's personal experience, which are employed as proofs. Moreover, this pattern does not call attention in itself in "NPL" because the reader is caught up in the seemingly free-association of ideas.

The introductions to "JI," "BBB," and "NPL" perform the dual roles assigned to introductions by E. P. J. Corbett: these introductions both inform the audience of Rich's goal and prepare the audience to be receptive to this goal (Classical Rhetoric for the Modern Student 303). Employing what Richard Whately calls the Inquisitive Introduction, one that stresses the curious nature of the topic, Rich begins each essay in the same fashion: she sets the scene and then problematizes it. That is,
she locates herself physically in a specific place and time, describes the historical/cultural situation, and then, as a thesis statement, question her roles in that very situation:

For about fifteen minutes I have been sitting chin in hand in front of the typewriter, staring out the window . . . . It comes to me that in order to write this I have to be willing to do two things: I have to claim my father, for I have my Jewishness from him and not from my gentile mother; and I have to break his silence, his taboos; in order to claim him I have in a sense to expose him. ("JI" 100)

The Miami airport, summer 1983: a North American woman says to me, "You'll love Nicaragua; everyone there is a poet." I've thought many times of that remark, both there and since returning home . . . .

Clearly, this well-meant remark triggered strong and complex feelings in me. And it provided, in a sense, the text on which I began to build my talk here tonight. ("BBB" 168)

I am to speak these words in Europe, but I have been searching for them in the United States of America. A few years ago I would have spoken of the common oppression of women . . . .

This is not what I come here to say in 1984 . . . . ("NPL" 210-211)

The result of such introductions is that the reader, whether or not he agrees with the ensuing assertions/arguments, is moved to respect Rich for each implied author's intelligence, awareness, inquisitiveness and, at times, painful honesty.

In the statement of facts of each essay, the implied authors present the background that the audience needs to understand the subject, following Quintilian's
advice to "lucid, brief, and plausible." In "JI," Rich presents her statement of facts in paragraphs five and six. In them, she identifies her moment of consciousness in 1960, when she actually articulated her identity crisis in a poem: "Split at the root, neither Gentile nor Jew,/ Yankee nor Rebel." Yet, she cautions her readers, the split began many years before, thus setting up her proof section, which is composed via flashbacks of personal vignettes. In "BBP," Rich employs paragraphs three, four, and five as her statement of facts. In them, she describes the historical/cultural situation of her youth, her initial perception of poetry as an aesthetic, autonomous entity, and her later understanding of poetry as "revelation, information, a kind of teaching" (169). In "NPL," Rich states her facts in paragraphs four through nine. In them, she describes her writing process and tries to pinpoint her own location. She stops writing to observe a bumblebee that is "reeling, bumping, stunning itself against windowpanes and sills" (211), a bumblebee that symbolizes not only her writing process but also her role in the patriarchy. By synthesizing her physical writing process with her role in society, both of which occur at a specific location, the Rich is truly writing the body, as Virginia Woolf and contemporary French feminists have often encouraged women writers to do.
By far the longest section, the proofs in these three essays follow a parallel pattern of development: explanation and persuasion. Rich recreates moments from her life to explain her personal situation to the reader; she then uses these personal vignettes as proofs to persuade the reader to accept the conclusions that she inductively draws from her situation. This combination of showing and telling brings a personal element to the persuasion and establishes one person's experiences as a valid basis for argument. Yet despite the disclaimers of the implied author that she is not speaking for a universal woman, this personal element is what strikes a chord in the reader, forcing him or her to recognize similar experiences in his or her existence. Thus, one person's experience becomes many persons' experiences, making the argument not more valid because of the added weight of evidence but as valid for some readers as for Rich.

In "JI," the implied author asserts that she must assess the influence of race, class, and region on her evolving subjectivity if she is ever truly to know herself, with the implication being that the readers must do likewise. In "BBP," the implied author argues that the poet and his poetry must be recognized as emerging from a particular point in time and space; otherwise, both the poet and her poetry take on a false
larger-than-life persona, which exists purely in the aesthetic realm. And in "NPL," the implied author argues that women must identify their race, class, nationality, sexual preference, and culture if they are to escape the mistaken and dangerous notion that "all women" encounter the same experiences; when the phrase "all women" is used, it usually translates as white, heterosexual, Western, middle-class women. Instead, we must learn to appreciate and accept the differences that both separate and enrich us.

The inductive approach that Rich employs in each essay allows readers to join the search for meaning. It also allows these authors to construct their own truths, truths that are valid for Rich at the time of writing but that may or may not be valid for her tomorrow or next year. Were Rich's implied authors to explore the concept of patriarchy deductively, they would have to work from previously established assumptions about social roles for women instead of imagining new ones based on Rich's experiences. A deductive search might also lead these authors into the trap of searching for particular causes of patriarchy, a non-productive process in which they are no longer interested: "I am less quick than I once was to search for single 'causes' or origins in dealings among human beings" ("NPL" 217-18). For, now, pinpointing what factors initiated
patriarchy is unimportant, except as a speculative what-if game; yet imagining how to cope and evolve beyond patriarchy is crucial.

The reader should never forget, however, that Rich as the orchestrator of each essay and the anthology is working deductively. She starts from the premise that people socially construct truth. Since she desires to know the truth of her situation, she must construct truth for herself by examining her own life and her relationships with others. A corollary to this syllogism is that others, too, may construct meaning out of her experiences and out of their own.

Notice, however, that this four-part pattern of arrangement does not include a separate refutation section. One might argue, then, that Rich's arguments are one-sided, that her implied authors are somewhat less than fair. But such an accusation would be false. The status quo—i.e., the patriarchal assumptions that we live with every day—embody the refutation. Thus, Rich's refutations appear in her personal vignettes, as the advice given her by her father, her mother, her friends, and even Auden.

The word conclusion may imply different ideas: the formulation of an opinion, or the last section of an essay, or a synthesis of the previous two. While Rich definitely formulates opinions, she is careful to leave
the final sections of her essays open-ended. Rich asserts in "JI," "BBP," and "NPL" that the last sections of these essays are not really conclusions at all, at least not absolute ones: "This essay, then, has no conclusions; it is another beginning for me" ("JI" 123); "This kind of art--like the art of so many others uncanonized in the dominant culture--is not produced as a commodity, but as part of a long conversation with the elders and with the future" ("BBP" 187); "This is the ending of these notes, but it is not an ending" ("NPL" 231). Such open-ended closings exert a powerful influence on readers. These final sections imply that no absolute truths have been discovered for the author to leave with the reader, an implication that is slightly misleading because definite assertions have been made throughout each essay. Such closings invite continuing dialogues between the author and herself and between the author and others; in this way, they reflect Rich's concept of the nature of truth. Ultimately, such closings force readers to take responsibility for their own conclusions--that is, to think for themselves.

The patterns of arrangement in Blood, Bread, and Poetry reflect some interesting ideological insights that complement the stated ideology. First, the four-part pattern of arrangement exists but is not readily apparent because of frequent breaks in the text,
especially in "JI" and "NPL. These breaks occur between groupings of paragraphs, but instead of signifying the division of the traditional parts of an essay, they usually signal a shift in time or ideas. Thus, Rich implies a belief in an holistic, rather than a compartmentalized or dichotomized, mindset. These breaks in the text jolt the reader ever so mildly. Thus, the arrangement of the whole essay undermines the Liberal Humanist notion of the unified self and promotes instead the idea that each subject is actually several subjects. At the sentence level, Rich's generous use of fragments--groups of words that have meaning but no definite beginning, middle, and end--also undermine the notion of unified self.

Despite these breaks, the arguments promoted by Rich's implied authors are tightly constructed, with one idea flowing smoothly into the next. Yet few traditional transitional words or phrases (e.g., however, therefore, as a result, etc.) are employed; instead, ideas function as transitions. Such a strategy implies a belief in natural or organic connections, not artificial or superficial ones.

Finally, these essays are developed mainly through exposition and persuasion, but they are strengthened by the inclusion of personal stories, poetic images, and a sense of language play. More important than just a
description of the essays in *Blood, Bread, and Poetry*, this method of development reflects Rich's belief that art and politics can and should be successfully synthesized.

In her "Foreward," Rich posits a definite purpose for her writing style: "Trying to construct ideas and images afresh, by staying close to concrete experience, for the purpose of alleviating a common reality that is felt to be intolerable--that seems to me fair work for the imagination" (*BBP* xi). To determine how well Rich succeeds in her stated purpose, I will examine three essays from *Blood, Bread, and Poetry*: "Split at the Root: An Essay on Jewish Identity" (paragraphs 1-15; 1178 words), "Blood, Bread, and Poetry" (paragraphs 1-12; 1535 words), and "Notes Toward a Politics of Location" (paragraphs 1-19; 1387 words).

The longest essay in *Blood, Bread, and Poetry* is 53 pages; the shortest, 4 pages; and the average, 15.5 pages. Within this context, the three essays being analyzed are fairly long: "JI" has 24 pages/55 paragraphs; "BBP" has 21 pages/32 paragraphs; and "NPL" has 23 pages/69 paragraphs; each respectively averaging 2.3, 1.5, and 3 paragraphs per page. The longest paragraphs analyzed contain 11 sentences and 230 words ("JI"), 8 sentences and 267 words ("BBP"), and 8 sentences 175 words ("NPL"). The shortest paragraphs analyzed contain 1 sentence and 13 words ("JI"), 1
sentence and 28 words ("BBP"), and 1 sentence and 14 words ("NPL"). And the average paragraphs contain 3.3 sentences and 78.5 words ("JI"), 4.5 sentences and 127.9 words ("BBP"), and 3.4 sentences and 73 words ("NPL").

The fact that "JI" was written for publication, while the other two essays were written as speeches, appears to have no effect on the structure. Consistently, "JI" and "NPL," which concern the location of specific individuals, are closer in style to one another than to "BBP," which concerns the location of the more abstract poet. In addition, Rich uses shorter than average paragraphs 54% of the time, and these short paragraphs serve several functions. First, they provide contrastive emphasis for the longer paragraphs, thus imparting a sense of rhythm and visual balance. Second, they parallel her mindset by getting straight to the point, via clear images. Third, they reflect her tendenecy to use clear, concrete, personal experience as proof for her arguments. Finally, Rich's introductory paragraphs create two interesting patterns: they tend to be longer (in number of words) than the average paragraph, and they locate her temporally, spatially, and ideologically, a stylistic technique that reflects her content. [See Appendix B, Table 1.]

Sentence Length. Of the 15 paragraphs studied in "JI," which contains a total of 50 sentences, the
longest sentence has 59 words; the shortest, 2 words; and the average, 23.56 words. Of the 12 paragraphs studied in "BBP," which contains a total of 54 sentences, the longest sentence has 125 words; the shortest, 6 words; and the average, 28.43 words. And of the 19 paragraphs studied in "NPL," which contains a total of 65 sentences, the longest sentence has 83 words; the shortest, 3 words; and the average, 21.35 words.

The average sentence lengths are fairly common for a reading audience to encounter, but more beneficial to this analysis is the number of sentences that are 10 words or more above the average: 9 (18%), 8 (14.8%), and 14 (21.5%) respectively. These longer sentences, along with the ones of average length, build Rich's proof through description:

I traveled then to Nicaragua, where, in a tiny impoverished country, in a four-year-old society dedicated to eradicating poverty, under the hills of the Nicaragua-Honduras border, I could physically feel the weight of the United States of North America, its military forces, its vast appropriations of money, its mass media, at my back; I could feel what it means, dissident or not, to be part of that raised boot of power, the cold shadow we cast everywhere to the south. (220)

The number of sentences that contain more than 5 words below the average sentence—14 (28%), 29 (53.7%), and 32 (49.2%)—function differently. While descriptive, these shorter sentences mainly assert facts crucial to Rich's
developing argument: i.e., "My mother was a Gentile" ("JI" 102). Comparatively, the shorter sentences dominate these essays, especially in the latter two ("BBP" and "NPL") that were written as speeches; in this context, these shorter sentences facilitate the listening audience. [See Appendix B, Table 2.]

The significance of the grammatical sentence-patterns in "JI," "BBP," and "NPL," may be established by examining their respective percentages: 30%, 29.6%, and 26.2% of the sentences are simple; 6%, 9.3%, and 6.2% are compound; 52%, 46.3%, and 30.8% are complex; 4%, 12.9%, and 7.7% are compound-complex; and 8%, 1.9%, and 29.2% are fragments. The occurrence of simple sentences is fairly consistent throughout all three essays. This sentence type (usually shorter than the average sentence) is used to make assertions: "I come here with notes but without absolute conclusions" ("NPL" 211). The low percentage of compound sentences is fairly consistent too, reflecting modern writers' tendency not to employ this sentence type.

More diversity among the three essays occurs in respect to complex, compound-complex, and fragment sentence types. Although the percentage of complex sentences decreases as the years go by, the relatively high frequency of this sentence type indicates an eye for detail—the eye of a poet who carefully builds
images--and a consciousness that problematizes situations:

Coming from a culture (North American, white- and male-dominated) which encourages poets to think of ourselves as alienated from the sensibility of the general population, which casually and devastatingly marginalizes us (so far, no slave labor or torture for a political poet--just dead air, the white noise of the media jamming the poet's words)--coming from this North American dominant culture which so confuses us, telling us poetry is neither economically profitable nor politically effective and that political dissidence is destructive to art, coming from this culture that tells me I am destined to be a luxury, a decorative garnish on the buffet table of the university curriculum, the ceremonial occasion, the national celebration--what am I to make, I thought, of that remark. ("BBP" 167)

The frequency of fragments, however, may be the most surprising statistic in this category. "BBP," which discusses the nature of poetry and the poet within society, has only a minimal number of fragments, but in "NPL," fragments abound. These fragments, usually in a series, tend to be descriptive strategies that emphasize the subject under discussion:

Bones well nourished from the placenta; the teeth of a middle-class person seen by the dentist twice a year from childhood. White skin, marked and scarred by three pregnancies, an elected sterilization, progressive arthritis, four joint operations, calcium deposits, no rapes, no abortions, long hours at a typewriter--my own, not in a typing pool--and so forth. ("NPL" 215)

Perhaps because this essay was originally a speech addressed to European feminists in Holland, Rich tried
to reflect their ideology in her style—i.e., to create a "feminine" discourse that "writes the body" and repudiates the patriarchal, linear model by inserting fragments to jolt the consciousness of the reader/listener to effect a Kristevan revolution. [See Appendix B, Table 3.]

The percentages of the rhetorical sentence-type in "JI," "BBP," and "NPL" are as follows: 28%, 20.4%, and 26.2% are loose; 44%, 53.7%, and 40% are periodic; 26%, 25.9%, and 26.2% are balanced; and 2%, 0%, and 7.7% are antithetical. The loose sentences provide a sense of flowing rhythm and indicate a writer who observes and makes connections:

I was a young white woman who had never known hunger or homelessness, growing up in the suburbs of a deeply segregated city in which neighborhoods were also dictated along religious lines: Christian and Jewish. ("BBP" 168)

The periodic sentences suggest a writer who feels the need not to qualify her assertions but to explain her assumptions before she actually posits her assertions: "If it is true that 'we think back through our mothers if we are women' (Virginia Woolf—and I myself have affirmed this—then even according to lesbian theory, I cannot (or need not?) count myself a Jew" ("JI" 102).

Interestingly, the balanced sentence is are the most consistent rhetorical sentence pattern in all three essays, reflecting a mind that can analyze and classify:
"(Writing this, I feel dimly like the betrayer: of my father, who did not speak the word; of my mother, who must have trained me in the messages; of my caste and class; of my whiteness itself.)" ("JI" 104). But the low frequency of antithetical sentences demonstrates that when analyzing and classifying, Rich tries to avoid binary oppositions, which may be deadly traps. Instead, her use of antitheses attempts to synthesize: "I am to speak these words in Europe, but I have been searching for them in the United States of America" ("NPL" 210). [See Appendix B, Table 4.]

The percentages of the functional sentence-type in "JI," "BBP," and "NPL," respectively, are as follows: 92%, 87%, and 87.7% are declarative sentences; 8%, 11.1%, and 4.6% are questions; 0%, 1.9%, and 7.7% are commands, with no exclamations being used in any of the essays. The preponderance of declarative sentences suggests that Rich is a writer who is not afraid to state her mind and her heart. The slightly higher percentage of declarative sentences in "JI" may be explained by the fact that the essay is about her own personal evolution as an individual. Thus, she is the expert: e.g., "I have been sitting . . ."; "I have to claim . . ."; "I can't quite see . . ."; "And yet I've been on the track longer than I think" ("JI" 100-101). The frequency of rhetorical questions, especially in the
first two essays, demonstrates a questioning intellect and a rhetorically astute writer who wants to engage the reader/listener: "Why, I asked myself sometime last year . . . ?" ("JI" 100). And the frequency of commands, especially in "NPL," might be a bit surprising, except that Rich is not hesitant to state what should be done. But in all fairness, her commands embody not so much orders as urgings: "Begin, though, not with a continent or a country or a house, but with the geography closest in—the body" ("NPL" 212). Finally, the lack of exclamations might be perceived as an attempt to seem less emotional, thus more credible to a reading audience, but a better interpretation might be that Rich believes that the argument speaks best for itself when unemcumbered by superficial stylistic marks. [See Appendix B, Table 5.]

Variety in sentence-openers is not Rich's trademark. Of the declarative sentences examined in "JI," "BBP," and "NPL," 45.7%, 70.2%, and 43.9% begin with the subject; 17.4%, 8.5%, and 17.5% begin with a prepositional phrase; and 10.9%, 12.8%, and 10.5% begin with a coordinating conjunction. The high frequency of sentences in "BBP" that begin with a subject may be explained in that Rich is positionally emphasizing the importance of her topics—poetry, poems, poets, and their world views. Rich's tendency to start with the
subject indicates an assertive desire to get to the point quickly. Combined with the high percentage of periodic sentences, however, this pattern might indicate her need to rename and describe before closing a thought. The only other significant patterns of sentence-openers that emerge are prepositional phrases and coordinating conjunctions, both of which provide coherence between sentences.

The transition data are a bit misleading. Though few traditional transitional words, phrases, or sentences are employed, that fact by no means suggests that Rich's texts are choppy or loosely constructed. On the contrary, they are tightly woven, and coherence is often achieved through building an image and/or expanding an idea:

"I wrote a sentence just now and x'd it out. In it I said that women have always understood the struggle against free-floating abstraction even when they were intimidated by abstract ideas. I don't want to write that kind of sentence now, the sentence that begins 'Women have always . . . .'" ("NPL" 214)

As a result, the reader becomes engrossed in the exposition and argument, as well as Rich herself. [See Appendix B, Tables 6 and 7.]

To study diction in "JI," "BBP," and "NPL," I began by counting 931, 1103, and 963 substantive words, respectively. In all three essays, slightly more substantive words are monosyllabic than polysyllabic—53.7%, 53.7%, and 51.2%; this fact indicates the existence
of slightly more Anglo-Saxon words. As expected, then, more concrete nouns than abstract ones are used. Surprisingly, however, the percentage of concrete nouns—76.6%, 69.9%, and 69.2%—surpass the percentage of monosyllabic ones. This high percentage of concrete nouns reflects Rich's materialist lens, her desire to stay "close to concrete experience" (BBP xi). Concrete nouns also enable her to further her argument inductively by presenting specific details from her own life and from other women's lives as proof for her arguments, arguments that commonly challenge commonly accepted "truths": "The politics of orgasm. The politics of rape and incest, of abortion, birth control, forcible sterilization. Of prostitution and marital sex" ("NPL" 212-13).

Of the substantive words studied in all three essays, 42.6%, 46.1%, and 45.9% are nouns or pronouns while 11.5%, 13.2%, and 12% are verbs. This preoccupation with nouns and pronouns, while not unusual, indicates once again Rich's talent for observing and naming the people, places, and objects in her environment, a talent she utilizes to further her argument through specific details: "My father, Arnold, was sent in adolescence to a military school in the North Carolina mountains, a place for training white southern Christian gentlemen" ("JI" 101-102).
Of the verbs employed, 6.5%, .7%, and 1.7% are linking; 35.5%, 23.9%, and 17.2% are be verbs; 49.5%, 65.1%, and 73.3% are action verbs; and 8.4%, 10.3%, and 7.8% are passive verbs. The percentage of linking verbs are interesting because of their diversity. This diversity, however, can be explained. In "JI," Rich is trying to recreate her childhood experiences, which are vivid yet foggy; so sometimes these experiences "seem" and/or "feel" rather than "are" real to the Adrienne Rich who is writing at that moment. But in "BBP" and "NPL," Rich is dealing with the events of that moment.

The second highest percentage of verbs used, be verbs, further emphasizes Rich's ability to observe herself and her surroundings and then affirm their existence: " . . . I am a woman; I am a lesbian" ("JI" 103). The high percentage of action verbs, however, is what makes the writing come alive for the reader and what proves that the writer is astute in determining cause/effects: "Because of Yeats, who by then had become my idea of the Great Poet, the one who more than others could hook syllables together in a way that heated my blood, I took a course in Irish history" ("BBP" 172). Finally, the low percentage of passive verbs reflects Rich's definition of a female consciousness, "a female consciousness which is political, aesthetic, and erotic, and which refuses to be included or
contained in the culture of passivity" (On Lies, Secrets, and Silence 18). [See Appendix B, Table 8.]

After discovering that Rich's sentences are mainly periodic, declarative, composed of concrete nouns, and opened most frequently by subjects, I looked to the schemes and tropes to help explain the poetic rhythms and images in "JI," "BBP," and "NPL." As in Woolf's text, the most commonly employed schemes of construction are assonance (115, 176, 138) and alliteration (90, 110, 86), both of which are often used in Anglo-Saxon poetry to replace rhyme. Polyptoton, the repetition of a word in different forms, sometimes explains the high incidence of alliteration and assonance, but surprisingly, few instances emerge in Rich's texts (5, 17, 17), a fact which implies that Rich's training as a poet has highly developed her "ear."

Other related schemes that appear in Rich's prose are parallelism (42, 55, 96), asyndeton (25, 30, 45), apposition (24, 23, 16), and antithesis (12, 0, 6). The high rate of parallelism, along with the high rate of apposition, indicates to me a feminist tendency to rename, to state ideas or describe objects in different ways so as to broaden their meanings and to provide more options. This technique, coupled with the frequent use of asyndeton (the omission of conjunctions), indicates Rich's desire to emphasize each idea or object by
forcing the reader to pause with each comma instead of running all the ideas together with and's. The relatively low occurrence of antithesis reflects a mind that refuses to view the world in dichotomous terms; indeed, Rich's antitheses arise mostly when she describes her past, her childhood training that socialized her into seeing the world in terms of men/women, Gentile/Jew, middle-class/redneck, Black/white. Interestingly, no antithetical constructions appear in "BBP," the essay that argues for the synthesis of art and politics, a topic that is frequently discussed in antithetical terms. Notice, though, the low rate of ellipsis and parenthesis. Rich does not leave out inflammatory material, nor does she relegate much information to parentheses, which might trivialize her points by making them seem more like asides than assertions. [See Appendix B, Table 9.]

The most common tropes in "JI," "BBP," and "NPL" are metaphor (5, 10, 7), simile (9, 4, 18), and rhetorical question (7, 10, 3). The numbers signifying metaphors may be slightly low because I counted only obvious metaphors. But the countless metaphors implied by Rich's vivid action verbs (49.5% of verbs) are what make her writing spring to life. Also, considering Rich's ethos, the relatively low number of similes is not surprising. Rich is not wont to imply that
something is like something else; she is more likely to assert that something is. Finally, the rhetorical questions function in two ways: they serve as a heuristic for Rich, leading her not to conclusions but to more questions, and they also work to draw the audience into Rich's dialogue with herself.

More interesting, perhaps, are the tropes not employed: hyperbole (0, 0, 0), irony (0, 0, 0), litotes (0, 0, 0), and synecdoche (0, 0, 0). By labelling herself a radical feminist, Rich runs the risk of possibly threatening certain readers, thus undermining her ethical appeal. To counteract such a risk, she chooses not to alienate such readers further by exaggerating her argument (hyperbole), yet she also chooses not to appease them by purposefully saying the opposite of what she means (irony) or by understating her case (litotes). She simply and courageously describes life as she sees it. The situational ironies of her experiences and observations prove her case—i.e., note her use of paradox (9, 4, 3), especially in "JI." Rich's choice not to employ synecdoche is also appropriate because her feminist philosophy does not permit a part to represent the whole: for example, men cannot represent all people; white, middle-class, heterosexual American feminists cannot represent all women; and Adrienne Rich cannot represent all feminists. [See Appendix B, Table 10.]
Audience: Actual and Authorial

In this study, the actual reader is obviously myself. Thus, this chapter demonstrates my relationship with Rich's text, Blood, Bread, and Poetry, just as Chapter Three demonstrates my relationship with Woolf's text, A Room of One's Own. Moreover, Chapters One and Two provide a statement of my twentieth-century rhetorical, feminist, and academic perspective as well as a description of the theory underlying my rhetorical method of interrogating a text. Chapters One and Two also provide proof that while appreciating the historical context of each of essays in Blood, Bread, and Poetry, I can move beyond a historically-bound interpretation and pursue the ways in which this text speaks to me here and now.

As Rich came to prose through poetry, so I came to her essays through her poems. In her poems, Rich shares her pain and her joy, without holding back or creating a false narrative. After reading these poems, which were sometimes as painful for me to read as they must have been for her to write, I could only admire her for being deeply intelligent and deeply wise. So I went in search of her prose. Once I had read On Lies, Secrets, and Silence, I eagerly awaited the publication of Blood, Bread, and Poetry, and I wasn't disappointed. Again, I encountered an active intelligence, a conscience in
action. While searching for a political definition of art and life, Rich hooked me by a combination of her emotional appeals, her logical appeals, and by this time, her tremendous ethical appeal. To comprehend this text on a more sophisticated level, however, the authorial audiences must be investigated.

An authorial audience consists of actual people who haunt the author as she writes because she knows they may indeed read the text; consequently, such audiences may be implied within the text. The implied author's assumptions about her audience, whether correct or not, shape her text, a fact with which Adrienne Rich is quite familiar: "Every writer is touched by 'influences,' seeks validation of a community (if only of the listening dead), is connected somewhere" (BBP xi). Moreover, the implied author's assumptions about her audience inevitably color the actual reader's interpretations.

In *Blood, Bread, and Poetry*, the authorial audience is complex because the anthology as a whole assumes a more general audience while each essay assumes more particular ones, depending on the original function of each essay. Although these audiences assert their presences just as powerfully in *Blood, Bread, and Poetry* as they do in *A Room of One's Own,* Rich seems less constrained by them than Woolf does. This difference is not too surprising, however, given the different historical and
social climates of each work and given the each author's particular feminist philosophy. To explore the effects of authorial audiences in Blood, Bread, and Poetry, however, I will investigate the assumptions that Rich, as she expresses herself "JI," "BBP," and "NPL," makes about each of her individual authorial audiences.

In "JI," the first authorial audience the reader encounters is an anxious Rich herself. Viewing writing as a means of discovery, thanks in part to an association with Mina Shaughnessey at City College in New York, Rich initially suffers from writer's block in "JI," slightly fearful about what she may finally discover: "I have to face . . . the daily, mundane anti-Semitism of my entire life" (100). But her whole life has brought her to the point where she must now confront her Jewishness. Her search is not just a whim. As she states, "I've been on this track longer than I think." And so she writes.

Another significant authorial audience is the very dead Arnold Rich, who is partially responsible for Rich's anxiety. Rich is concerned about betraying her father, who never spoke of his Jewishness: "I have to break his silence, . . . and I have in a sense to expose him" (100). And given her ambivalent feelings toward him, this task is not easy:
His investment in my intellect and talent was egotistical, tyrannical, opinionated, and terribly wearing. He taught me, nevertheless, to believe in hard work, to mistrust easy inspiration, to write and rewrite; to feel that I was a person of the book, even though a woman; to take ideas seriously. He made me feel, at a very young age, the power of language and that I could share in it. (113)

That Rich overcomes her father's legacy to deny her Jewishness proves not only her intense need to discover a sense of herself but also her intense desire to construct her own truth based on her experiences and observations, instead of blindly accepting the truth of others. As a result of this struggle to write, Rich is stronger. Thus, this text functions not only as a description of her process but also a model for others to adopt and adapt.

The lesson of non-conformity, so evident in all of Rich's essays, addresses yet another authorial audience: women readers. Such an audience includes other Jewish women who are trying to reconcile an extremely patriarchal tradition with feminism, who consider themselves as does the implied author, "both anti-Semite and Jew" (121). This audience also includes lesbians, particularly Jewish lesbians, who will read Nice Jewish Girls: A Lesbian Anthology, the anthology in which this essay was first published, and try to reconcile their heritage with their present location on the margin. This audience also contains any woman who, like the implied
author, feels as if "I have seen too long from too many disconnected angles," who feels "split at the root" (122).

But in no way does Rich limit her authorial audience in "JI" to women. She provides no tirades that might intentionally alienate anti-feminist readers. Neither does she soften her analysis so as not to offend them. Any reader, male or female, who admires a truthful and painful search for identity can appreciate Rich's process and, perhaps, be inspired.

In "BBP," the first authorial audience we encounter is again Rich herself. For Rich, the purpose of this essay is two-fold: to discover how the politics of location affect art and to argue for a synthesis of politics and art. Asking herself, "What happens to the heart of the artist, here in North America?," she traces her development as a poet to demonstrate how art and politics can be successfully merged (185). Because she is addressing herself so often, the essay contains numerous self-reflective questions, questions that she then explores not to find a conclusion but to see where the exploration will lead her.

These self-reflective questions, however, also perform a rhetorical function, which indicates another authorial audience, one skeptical of merging art and politics. Such critics, left-overs from the New
Critical school, are never attacked directly, but they are asked to ponder their position: "What toll is taken of art when it is separated from the social fabric? How is art curbed, how are we [artists] made to feel useless and helpless, in a system which so depends on our alienation?" (185).

Yet another authorial audience present in the text is the people at the University of Massachusetts, Amherst, who attended her talk, "Writers and Social Responsibility." No doubt anticipating a traditionally educated, North American crowd, Rich first employs examples from the poetry of William Blake, poetry that the audience would probably recognize. By the end of the essay, however, she is quoting the poetry of Nancy Morejon, a Cuban poet, and Anita Valerio, a Chicana/ American Indian poet. Such a strategy indicates Rich's desires to educate her audience and to broaden the canon beyond its narrow focus on white North American and British men and a few "special" women.

In "NPL," the first authorial audience we encounter is, once again, Rich herself. She is searching for a definition of her politics of location and, in typical Rich fashion, is unsure of what she will finally say and how she will say it. So she fidgets, "[b]eginning to write, then getting up" (211). By now, readers should
recognize this initial "writer's block" as part of the Rich's invention process, as a time of incubation.

The initial actual audience—the European participants in the First Summer School of Critical Semiotics' Conference on Women, Feminist Identity, and Society, in Holland—loom largely in this text as an authorial audience. Their influence is first demonstrated by the Rich's opening line: "I am to speak these words in Europe, but I have been searching for them in the United States of America" (210). Consisting of French feminists who are searching for a revolutionary feminine writing style, this audience may also account for the disjointed, interrupted flow of "NPL." The frequent breaks in the text between paragraphs, the frequent use of fragments, and the constant references to the body all indicate that Rich is loosely modeling her speech after their techniques as a tribute to their contributions. This audience is also evidenced by the care that Rich takes to explain American feminist theories, which this audience might not be as familiar with l'ecriture feminine.

Another authorial audience is white Americans, particularly white American feminists, specifically the ones who, Rich believes, consider themselves at the the center of the world. Such feminists, Rich asserts, marginalize others feminists and, in the process, narrow
the perspectives and the potentials of feminism. Instead, Rich urges this audience to adopt a more global attitude and consider peoples of other countries and cultures not as inferior beings in need of imperialistic "assistance" but as equal partners, as equal citizens of the earth. How may change in attitude be accomplished? Rich suggests that each time we employ the word we, we ask ourselves, "Who is we?" (231), a question that implies definition and responsibility.

Conclusion

In Chapter Five, I will compare the feminist rhetorics of Woolf and Rich in terms of their similarities and differences. Here, however, after having just examined the multiple levels of situation, author, text, and audience in Blood, Bread, and Poetry, I will comment on how Rich's ability to imitate, revise, and/or transcend traditional forms and ideas informs her rhetoric of feminism.

Like Woolf's writing, Rich's reflects Luce Irigaray's concept of mimesis, i.e., a woman writer's conscious imitation of traditional forms and ideas in order to understand and expose what she is imitating. While Rich's essays are usually developed according to a four-part pattern of arrangement, this pattern does not function as a formula. Reflecting her pattern of
thinking, this pattern is descriptive, not prescriptive. Moreover, Rich has not employed this pattern of arrangement to prove that a woman can reason within traditional forms. Woolf fought that battle for her. But neither has Rich transcended traditional forms by creating a totally new feminine style, although her emphasis on inductive reasoning via personal experience and her breaks in the text exemplify a revision of traditional arguments and form. Interestingly, she also revises Woolf's notion of Judith Shakespeare. True, Rich seems less self-conscious about writing than Woolf, but at the same time she is more conscious of herself as a woman, specifically as a woman writing, than the androgynous Judith Shakespeare could ever be.

Drawn to the women's movement in the 1960's because it affirmed "the solidarity and empowering of women" (BBP vii), Rich became one of the movement's important leaders, first through her poetry, then through her speaking engagements and her prose. But the empowerment that she champions is not an easy process. It involves questioning all that we hold dear—the relationships, the stories, the security—and letting go when necessary. For Rich, language facilitates this process because it allows us to rename, recreate, and imagine.

Using language as a means to power, Rich herself has struggled through a rather painful, and public,
journey against the constraints of her past and her present to emerge as a subject in motion. Ironically, her victories have come to her via a lesson her father taught her: "He made me feel, at a very young age, the power of language and that I could share in it" (113). And Rich has drawn on this power of language in *Blood, Bread, and Poetry*, synthesizing art and politics, to empower herself and Others.
Notes: Chapter 4

1 For convenience and to save space within the text, these three essays will be abbreviated as follows: "Split at the Root: An Essay in Jewish Identity" will be referred to "JI"; "Blood, Bread, and Poetry" as "BBP"; and "Notes toward a Politics of Location" as "NPL."


3 While I refuse to couch rhetorical situation in the positivistic terms that Lloyd Bitzer does, I do find his definitions of exigence and constraints helpful.
Chapter V
Implications for
Rhetoric(s) of Feminism(s), Pedagogy, and Future Research

You have won rooms of your own in the house hitherto exclusively owned by men . . . . But this freedom is only a beginning; the room is your own, but it is still bare. It has to be furnished; it has to be decorated; it has to be shared.

--Virginia Woolf
"Professions for Women"

No one lives in this room without confronting the whiteness of the wall behind the poems, planks of books, photographs of dead heroines. Without contemplating last and late the true nature of poetry. The drive to connect. The dream of a common language.

--Adrienne Rich
"Origins and History of Consciousness"

Introduction
In the first four chapters of this study, I have traced the history of the essay and the tradition of women writers, examined current studies that synthesize rhetoric and feminism, constructed a method of rhetorical criticism for interrogating feminist essays, and employed this methodology to interrogate selected
feminist essays of Virginia Woolf and Adrienne Rich. In this chapter, I will explore the implications of this study for rhetoric(s) of feminism(s), pedagogy, and future research.

**Implications for Rhetoric(s) of Feminism(s)**

Most significantly, this discussion of the rhetorics of Woolf and Rich demonstrates that "the rhetoric of feminism" does not exist, at least not as an absolute construct into which we can force all feminist writers. Instead, many rhetorics of many different feminisms abound, with Woolf's and Rich's being just two examples. But how do the feminist rhetorics of Woolf and Rich fit into a more general category of feminist rhetoric?

In "Feminist Rhetoric: Discourses on the Male Monopoly of Thought," Mary Hawkesworth posits four rhetorics of feminism: the rhetoric of oppression, the rhetoric of reason, the rhetoric of difference, and the rhetoric of vision. For Hawkesworth, the rhetoric of oppression denotes the stage when women first recognize their unequal status and become angry (23). The rhetoric of reason emerges when women concentrate on the similarities between men and women and argue for equal treatment in terms of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness; this tactic, Hawkesworth claims,
results in women's "suppression of gender-specific capacities, the denial of the body" (24). The rhetoric of difference arises when women celebrate their differences from men, a strategy that results in the development of a unified "sex-class, conscious of its indeterminate interests, conscious of its implacable opposition to all that is male" (24). The rhetoric of vision is achieved when this sex-class recognizes its subgroups and perceives differences among women as a means toward empowerment and enrichment (24). Moreover, Hawkesworth posits that there is a dialectical "language-driven progression" to her classification system: "the rhetoric of oppression gives rise to the rhetoric of reason which in turn generates the rhetoric of difference which is superceded by the rhetoric of vision" (23).

Within this framework, Woolf's feminist rhetoric in A Room of One's Own represents the rhetoric of oppression and, especially, the rhetoric of reason. Not only does Woolf recognize and cite specific problems that women encounter within her own social context, but she also argues that women deserve the same conditions that men enjoy—i.e., economic and social independence. On the other hand, Rich's feminist rhetoric in Blood, Bread, and Poetry reflects the rhetoric of vision. Throughout her anthology, Rich celebrates the
differences between women that both empower and enrich us. The most attractive feature of Hawkesworth's classificatory system, in terms of Woolf and Rich, is its dialectical nature, which prevents critics from positing a competition between Woolf and Rich. Instead, each is perceived as serving her own purpose, as fighting the battles appropriate to her own times. Without a Virginia Woolf stretching the limits of language and society to empower women, an Adrienne Rich expressing herself so freely would not be possible. Despite the fact that the rhetorics of Woolf and Rich embody differing ideologies of feminism, these rhetorics reflect as many similarities as differences in situation, author, text, and audience.

Although nearly sixty years separate the publications of A Room Of One's Own and Blood, Bread, and Poetry, the general extra-textual situations that prompt Woolf and Rich to write their essays seem remarkably similar. Most obviously, they write because they have been invited to lecture or to publish their ideas. More to the point, they write because they are concerned about the oppressed role of women in their respective societies. To inspire future writers, Woolf and Rich write to establish a tradition of women writers. Their content recovers the lost or unrecognized traditions; their own writing establishes
a tradition for others to follow. Believing in the power of language to alter perceptions and then actions, they write to break the constraints of their own lives, especially the constraints imposed by their fathers, and in the process establish a precedent for other women.

Located at opposite ends of the twentieth century, however, Woolf and Rich envision slightly different goals for women. Woolf is predominantly concerned with women each obtaining 500 pounds and a room of one's own, thus, achieving individual autonomy and power. Like Woolf, Rich is concerned with empowering the individual. But she also encourages a second, societal stage of empowerment. That is, she urges all these newly empowered individuals to work collectively to effect social transformations and thus create a world beyond patriarchy. She also asks women to question how the "acceptance" of feminism in the 1980's affects the power of feminism to effect such a social change.

While Woolf and Rich both desire to open the traditional literary canon to include women writers, they again serve slightly different, but important, functions. Woolf recovers and then writes about many white middle-class Anglo-American women writers, such as Mary Wollstonecraft, who deserve recognition. Building on the successes of Woolf, Rich works to
broaden this newly established tradition of women writers, to include those groups—e.g., Blacks, lesbians, American Indians, and Chicanas—who have been marginalized within the white, middle-class, heterosexual Anglo-American feminist movement.

Finally, both women write to free themselves from the constraints of their own lives: fathers who both encouraged and constrained them; literary traditions that both embraced and excluded them; and social roles that both complimented and insulted them. Although Woolf and even Rich are, at times, hesitant and a little fearful about breaking these constraints, they both find the courage to write. For both women, writing is a political action that allows them to discover ideas and to assert their own opinions as women, possibly enlightening a reader or two along the way. The resulting changes in perception, of both the authors and the readers, function as the first steps toward changing their respective extra-textual situations.

Woolf's and Rich's respective textual situations find them both writing to define themselves and their world. Woolf's narrator in A Room of One's Own writes to explore her thoughts on Women and Fiction, and Rich writes Blood, Bread, and Poetry to discover the meaning of her present location. Moreover, both Woolf and Rich write about the experiences of and reflections of daily
life. This strategy posits that the concrete experiences of every-day life should be just as important as commonly accepted traditions in shaping people's theories and actions.

Yet the textual situations in *A Room of One's Own* and *Blood, Bread, and Poetry* are manifested in different ways. In *A Room of One's Own*, the argument is presented by Woolf's narrator and implied author. The narrator chooses to narrate two days in her life, including all her actions and reflections that relate to her topic, Women and Fiction, to determine if she can reach any conclusions; the implied author, on the other hand, surfaces throughout the text but is most prominent when she delivers the peroration. Although the narrator distances us, as readers, from the implied author, she also creates a personal textual situation for us to identify with by sharing her thoughts and actions with us. Rich furthers her arguments in her essays not through a narrator or even a distanced implied author but through implied authors who are really Adrienne Rich at different moments in her writing career. These many faces of Rich choose to express themselves through exposition and argument, with narrative vignettes drawn from Rich's entire lifetime employed as proofs. In this way, Rich creates an intimate textual situation within which to
interact with the reader and, in the process, revises
the concept of personal essay.

As demonstrated, Woolf distances herself from her
readers through the use of her narrator and implied
author. Rich, on the other hand, aligns herself with
her implied author. Several factors enter into
their respective choices of strategy. One, narration
is simply Woolf's strength while description is Rich's.
Two, their historical situations and audiences affected
how they shaped their texts. Three, how these writers
locate themselves in respect to other women is
significant. Woolf speaks for all women in A Room of
One's Own because she believes women have suffered
similarly under patriarchy; thus, through her narrator,
she creates (shows) a story as a metaphor for all women
so as to appeal to all women. Rich, on the other hand,
believes that individuals may speak only for themselves
but that once empowered, individuals may work
collectively to effect social change. This third reason
probably best accounts for why Rich focuses on her own
specific experiences and her own evolving subjectivity.
If her experiences speak to others, that is all well
and good. If they don't, she at least has discovered
insights, not conclusions, for herself.

A knowledge of Woolf's and Rich's fields of texts
and of their roles as essayists, feminists, and rhetors
of the women's movement provides the reader with a broader concept of author than is implied by Woolf or Rich in an individual essay. As essayists, Woolf and Rich believe that essays provide a vehicle through which an author may express herself, or "draw herself" in Woolf's words. Because Woolf and Rich are also a novelist and a poet, respectively, their literary talents inform their essays, as evidenced by Woolf's modern narrative techniques and Rich's brilliantly painted images. As feminists, they both believe in the empowerment of women and in the power of language to effect this goal. Yet, their goals differ in degree, with Rich calling for direct action to transform society as a result of personal empowerment. As rhetors for the women's movement, Woolf and Rich are both uncomfortable. Woolf does not want to be associated with the radical suffragists who protested by marching in the streets and by starving themselves. Moreover, Woolf feels the term feminist conjures more negative connotations than positive ones, and for that reason should be discarded. For Rich, being a spokesperson for the women's movement evokes questions not of feminism itself but of the power to define: who speaks, how they speak, and why they speak all work to shape the movement, and the movement, in turn shapes who speaks. Such spokespersons are granted tremendous
power and tremendous responsibility, which necessitates that the rhetor be ethical.

The narrators and/or implied authors in Woolf's and Rich's texts provide another area of provocative similarities and differences. All these voices are female, feminist, intelligent, rhetorically astute, logical, intuitive, realistic, honest, and reflective. Even if a reader disagrees with their assertions, he must respect their intense effort to make sense of their worlds. Moreover, they all effectively create a textual situation that powerfully reflects the irony of their extra-textual situations. Woolf's narrator in *A Room of One's Own* however, uses more humor, irony, and distance than Rich does in *Blood, Bread, and Poetry*. Moreover, the implied author in *A Room of One's Own* seems more self-conscious than the Rich does, a fact that probably partially explains Woolf's adopting a sterner tone near the end of her essay.

In both texts, each level of author adopts a different pattern of argument. In *A Room of One's Own* the narrator proceeds inductively, compiling one by one the events of her daily life as proofs for her assertion about women and fiction—i.e., that women have not written because they have not had the material necessities, money and a room, that would free them to write. At the same time, the implied author reasons
deductively, starting with the premise that material things are necessary for intellectual freedom, thus arguing that if art depends on intellectual freedom, art, too, must depend on material things.

Likewise, in Blood, Bread, and Poetry, the implied authors of each essay—i.e., Rich in each essay—argue inductively, while the implied author of the anthology—i.e., Rich as the shaper of the entire text—functions deductively. In each essay, Rich employs specific incidents from her life as proofs for her eventual assertions, not conclusions, about her present location. For the entire anthology, however, Rich begins with the premise that people construct their own truths. In light of this fact, Rich, then, constructs her own truths, via the inductive process in each essay.

Aside from validating the logical powers of these authors, the combination of inductive and deductive techniques allows the reader to identify with Woolf's narrator and Rich's implied authors in their inductive searches for meaning. This inductive reasoning also assumes the events of daily life as valid proofs. The deductive process also informs the reader, perhaps in an unsettling manner, for the premises argued from are not eternal absolutes, but
socially constructed truths that are relevant at the
time of writing.

No matter who is arguing or how the argument is
being developed, all levels of author exhibit strong
logical, emotional, and ethical appeals. The logical
appeal appears in the clear quality of the inductive
and deductive reasoning just discussed. In addition,
the celebration of the supposedly mundane aspects of
daily life creates an enormous emotional appeal, making
me respond to these essays with a resounding direct,
"Yes." The synthesis of these logical and emotional
appeals, in turn, creates a tremendous ethical appeal.
For even if a reader disagrees with the assertions in
these essays, he or she still must respect the authors'
process.

Both Woolf and Rich employ classical patterns of
arrangement, yet they do not allow these patterns to
dominate the texts. In fact, these patterns are barely
detectable, thanks to the seemingly wandering style of
development and to the breaks in the text. *A Room of
One's Own* is developed according to a classical five-
part pattern: introduction, statement of facts,
proofs, refutations, and conclusion. The essays in
*Blood, Bread, and Poetry*, on the other hand, are
generally developed according to a four-part pattern:
introduction, statement of facts, proofs, and
conclusion. These arrangement strategies demonstrate Woolf's and Rich's talent for imitation of and revision of traditional discourse forms.

Taken together, all the introductions employ what Richard Whately calls Inquisitive Introduction, Introduction Paradoxical, Introduction Corrective, Introduction Narrative as a means of drawing the audience into the essay. These introductions disturb a reader's status quo, forcing her to question her world. The statements of facts provide background material or reasons why the author is writing about her particular topic; thus, these sections serve to strengthen the authors' ethical appeals by showing the experiences upon which their assertions are grounded. The proof sections are advanced inductively and deductively (as has been discussed earlier), with Woolf's narrator concentrating on showing while Rich's implied authors concentrate mostly on telling, with some showing inserted. The refutation section, so prominent in A Room of One's Own, does not exist as a separate section in the essays in Blood, Bread, and Poetry. This strategy does not indicate that Rich refuses to recognize another point of view. She is completely familiar with the refutations of her arguments; they are the constraints of patriarchy that constantly manifest themselves in her daily life.
Finally, the conclusions of these texts fascinate me because, while making very strong assertions, both writers deny that conclusions may be drawn. Woolf opens her text by warning the readers that she may reach no conclusions; then her implied author ironically states in the peroration that only the conventions of the essay force her to include one. On the other hand, Rich honestly states that no conclusions can be drawn, asserting that there are no endings, just new beginnings. Thus, both writers undermine the concept of absolute conclusions and reinforce the social constructionist notion that the truth we create today may be altered by our on-going experiences tomorrow. In the process, these authors also undermine the Aristotelian notion that a discourse must contain a tightly structured, highly linear beginning, middle, and end.

Interestingly enough, the ideologies manifested in the content and form of A Room of One's Own subvert and complement one another. The narrator seemingly celebrates the notion of a unified self, calling for the emergence of Judith Shakespeare, who will be an androgynous mind. At the same time, however, the narrator admits that this mind will be constantly changing. The seemingly wandering narrative arrangement of A Room of One's Own undermines the
concept of unified self, too, yet the essay wanders in a time-honored, five-part classical pattern. The synthesis of each of these two conflicting viewpoints reflects Woolf's tendency to synthesize conflicting concepts—e.g., art/politics and masculine/feminine—into an androgynous definition. Thus, Woolf rejects the concept of binary oppositions, a crucial practice for a feminist consciousness.

In Blood, Bread, and Poetry, the ideology manifested in the content and form complement one another in an attempt to subvert traditional assumptions. Rich's sense of a person as a whole but constantly evolving subject undermines the liberal humanist concept of a unified self. This subversion of the unified self is also reflected in the arrangements of each of her essays. Although each essay definitely forms a whole discourse, each sentence builds on the previous one while establishing a base for the subsequent one, a pattern that reflects Rich's idea that truth is a dialectical, social construction.

A discussion of sentence-shape leads naturally to a discussion of style. Surprisingly, for me, the styles in A Room of One's Own and Blood, Bread, and Poetry have as many similarities as differences. For example, although Woolf writes longer paragraphs than Rich does, their average sentence lengths vary by only a few
words. Their grammatical, rhetorical, and functional sentence types are also similar, with certain exceptions.

Grammatically, Woolf and Rich both prefer complex sentences (49.2%; 52%, 46.3% 30.8%), a feature common to many twentieth-century writers that allows them to problematize ideas and establish the relationships between these ideas. The main difference here is that Rich uses fragments to create breaks in the linearity of her texts. Most commonly, she employs fragment to emphasize concrete objects via her materialist lens. Woolf never does.

Rhetorically, they both prefer periodic sentences (44.1%; 44%, 53.7%, 40%) that build slowly to create suspense and, more importantly, to establish the basis for the eventual assertions. The most significant difference is that Woolf uses more antithetical sentences, comparing what is to what should be, while Rich, who battles against such dichotomous mindsets, employs more balanced sentences.

Functionally, they overwhelmingly prefer declarative sentences (98.3%; 92%, 87%, 87.7%), which implies they are not hesitant to assert their points of view; this idea is reinforced by their practice of frequently opening with the subject. Neither Woolf nor Rich uses exclamations, probably to avoid making their declarations reductive. Rich, however, feels freer to
employ rhetorical questions and commands: the first may engage a reader in Rich's questioning and re-envisioning society; the second may alienate him. But, in all fairness, Rich's commands are less orders than calls to action.

The diction employed by Woolf and Rich also indicates interesting differences. Rich tends to use more monosyllabic words and concrete words than Woolf does, a practice that reflects Rich's materialist perspective. Rich also uses significantly more passive verbs (8.4%, 10.3%, 7.8%) than Woolf (1%), a tactic that may be influenced more by Rich's chosen form—exposition, not narration—rather than by her mindset. Rich also builds her sentences with twice as many adjectives as Woolf, probably reflecting a poet's tendency to describe her images.

Finally, Woolf and Rich employ schemes and tropes to enhance the rhetorical effectiveness of their texts. Both frequently use alliteration and assonance to help build their sentence rhythms. Both also employ apposition and parallelism, which allow them as feminists to define and rename their ideas, actions, and observations. As might be expected from the study of their rhetorical sentence types, Woolf uses more antithesis than Rich. These data reflect Woolf's location within an earlier stage of feminism, one
that concentrates on the differences between men and women, between what is and what should be. These data also reflect Rich's location within a later stage of feminism, one which focuses on the multiplicity of differences between women as a means to empowerment. Moreover, Woolf employs different forms of one word in a sentence (polyptoton) more often than Rich to enhance her sentence rhythm.

As for tropes, both authors use metaphor more than any other one, a choice which is not unusual given our minds' natural tendency to make meaning for ourselves by associating the unknown with the known. Although Woolf and Rich both create textual situations that expose the situational irony of their worlds, Woolf tends to employ more irony, hyperbole, and paradox in her individual sentences than does Rich. Woolf's strategy could be misconstrued as a hesitancy to speak straightforwardly, but instead I believe it reflects the author's rhetorical astuteness in judging all levels of her audience. Rich, on the other hand, tends to use more rhetorical questions than Woolf. This practice implies to me that, like Woolf, she wants to engage her audience and make them think for themselves; unlike Woolf, her form, not just her content, expresses this idea. A final difference is that Woolf uses synecdoche, but Rich does not. This choice probably
reflects Woolf's notion that she can speak for all women as much as Rich's notion that she cannot.

The narrative audience in _A Room of One's Own_—i.e., the young women at Fernham who participate in the narrative by attending the speech—have no counterpart in _Blood, Bread, and Poetry_, for none of Rich's essays are built with a narrative structure. Just as the narrator distances the reader from Woolf, this audience distances an actual reader from the experience in the narration. Yet this strategy is not necessarily a bad one. For a narrative audience allows a skeptical or hostile actual reader to suspend disbelief and get drawn into the narration without being personally threatened. Once the threat is gone, not a few minds may be changed.

The authorial audiences of _A Room of One's Own_ and _Blood, Bread, and Poetry_ are actual people who haunt Woolf and Rich as they write because they know that this audience may indeed read the texts; as a result, these readers may be implied in the texts. These audiences may be similarly characterized as receptive, hostile, and/or indifferent, but they elicit quite different effects in the texts.

In _A Room of One's Own_, this audience includes the young women at Girton who will actually listen to Woolf speak, other women who may read the printed
essay, and males who may read the essay and scoff. All these audiences exert a powerful influence on how Woolf shapes her text. The narrative form will entertain and engage the young women at Girton as well as the other readers. The peroration-as-lecture will apply equally to the women students and to other women readers since they too must work for a Judith Shakespeare. The essay form will predispose hostile readers to expect a mind in motion on the page, even if that mind is a woman's. Woolf has been accused of being afraid of these hostile audiences, especially of the men who will scoff. In my mind, however, she simply makes rhetorical choices that allow the text to reach a broad reading audience.

The authorial audiences of "JI," "BBP," and "NPL" in Blood, Bread, and Poetry include Rich herself, her dead father, and the hostile, receptive, and indifferent listeners and readers that comprise her lecture and publishing audiences. First of all, Rich motivates herself to write in order to discover the meaning of her present situation from various focuses. Ultimately, this reason is most important. Her other authorial readers, including her dead father, give her pause. Yet because Rich is so convinced that language can empower her and others, she pauses only momentarily, only long enough to describe these
audiences and recognize their influences before she proceeds.

After examining the similarities and differences in *A Room of One's Own* and *Blood, Bread, and Poetry* from a rhetorical perspective, I became more convinced than ever that the rhetoric of feminism is a myth but that rhetorics of feminisms abound. And even though Woolf and Rich argue that conclusions may not be possible, some generalizations may be made, if not about the rhetoric of feminism, at least about why the rhetorics of Woolf and Rich are so powerful.

While promoting her new book during a *Today* show interview, Marsha Cohen, author of *The Sisterhood: The True Story of the Women Who Changed the World*, was asked why Betty Friedan, Kate Millet, Germaine Greer, and Gloria Steinhem were/are so successful in conceptualizing and promoting the women's movement. Cohen thought for only a second before replying: they are "well-educated," "verbal," and possessed of a "sense of the theatrical" (*Today* 6/23/88). At first, I was struck by the implicit elitism of Cohen's statement; the same could be said of Marjorie Morningstar. But I had to acknowledge how well it also applies to Virginia Woolf and Adrienne Rich. The difference, perhaps, lies in how these opportunities are channeled.
Being well-educated gave Woolf and Rich access to the historical facts about women's traditional roles. Being verbal gave them the opportunity to translate their discoveries into action by arguing their cases, initially with strong logical and emotional appeals and later with strong ethical appeals. Possessing a sense of the theatrical, or the sensibility of an artist, empowered them as well. This sensibility enabled them to imagine and then to create different roles, different stories, for themselves and for others. It also enabled them to recognize the importance of effective communication with their audiences, communication that has, indeed, changed the world.

The opening of this section details Mary Hawkesworth's taxonomy of feminist rhetorics as well as my attempts to locate Woolf and Rich within it. But to limit this study to Woolf and Rich's contribution to feminist rhetoric is inadequate. They have also contributed to the evolving definition of women's writing. The concept of women's writing is different from the concept of feminist rhetoric in that not all women writers are feminists, nor are feminist writers all women.

The concept of women's writing, however, is problematic. We talk about it, we theorize about it,
but we have little data to document it. Traditionally, stereotypes have evolved to explain the differences in women's and men's speech. Cheris Kramarae notes that women's speech has traditionally been stereotyped as "polite, emotional, enthusiastic, gossipy, talkative, uncertain, dull, and chatty" while men's speech has been described as "capable, direct, rational, illustrating a sense of humor, unfeeling, strong (in tone and word choice), and blunt ("Proprietors of Language," 58). What is important for this study, however, is that these stereotypes often are transferred from women's and men's speech to their writing.

In an attempt to prove or disprove these stereotypes scientifically, Robin Lakoff notes in her pioneering study of language use by men and women that specific differences exist in terms of how women use language and in terms of how women are portrayed through language. In the first category, Lakoff discovered that women name specific colors, use more adjectives and tag questions, and use more courteous meaningless particles (oh dear as opposed to shit). In the second category, Lakoff discovered that more words referring to women have derogatory connotations than do words referring to men. She concludes her study by calling for the contextualization of linguistic study,
although she fails to contextualize her own findings adequately ("Language and Woman's Place" 60-67).

The importance of Lakoff's study, however, is not only her findings but the dialogue she has initiated. In "Linguistics and Feminism," Virginia Valian questions three aspects of Lakoff's study: the method ("Is women's speech inferior to men's?"); the linguistic definitions ("Do men and women really speak a different language?"); and the politics ("What is the relationship between linguistics and social change?") (68). Jaqueline Fortunata echoes Valian's criticism of Lakoff, calling for a greater emphasis on social context in such a study ("Lakoff on Language and Women" 82). Eleanor Kuykendall furthers Fortunata's argument. Only by examining the social context of a remark, Kuykendall claims, can a speaker/writer or hearer/reader accurately reflect on the presuppositions of gender and/or the intentions inherent in that remark. Once this process of reflection becomes ingrained, the potential for social change emerges ("Feminist Linguistics in Philosophy" 144).

But where has this dialogue about the differences in men's and women's speech led, in terms of a concept of women's writing for the 1980's? Mary Eagleton discusses three traditional Anglo-American
positions concerning women's writing in *Feminist Literary Theory* (200-207). The first position, as exemplified by Joyce Carol Oates in *Gender and Literary Voice*, calls for an individual, sexless style. Oates urges writers to transcend political aims while simultaneously being fueled by them. Such a stance, however, reinforces the classic art/politics dichotomy. The second position, advocated by Ellen Moers in *Literary Women*, posits that a definite difference exists between the way men and women write. Moers locates difference in the differing images that historical situations afford men and women, but her interchangeable use of *male* and *female*, *masculine* and *feminine*, hints at a reductive biological concept of difference. The third position, presented by Mary Ellmann in *Thinking about Women*, establishes a masculine and feminine style of writing, "characterizing the 'masculine' in terms of an authority apparently absent in the so-called 'feminine'" (M. Eagleton 201). Such a position privileges cultural influence over biology and allows the differences in women's writing to be perceived as empowering, not divisive.

Most importantly, this third concept of difference has rejected the idea of comparing men's and women's writing in hopes of validating the women's texts. Instead, this concept of difference advocates
comparing the differences among women as a means of defining the multiplicity of talents that empower individual women. Instead of being cast as fixed biological fact, differences between women and men have attained more flexible definitions, more like the one envisioned in Hawkesworth's rhetoric of vision. Nancy Julia Chodorow explains the significance of this third position in "Gender, Relation, and Difference in Psychoanalytic Perspective":

To speak of difference as a final, irreducible concept and to focus on gender differences as central is to reify them and to deny the reality of those processes which create the meaning and significance of gender. To see men and women as qualitatively different kinds of people, rather than seeing gender as processual, reflexive, and constructed is to reify and deny relations of gender, to see gender differences as permanent rather than as created and situated. (16)

Such a concept of difference, however, problematizes the task of describing specific characteristics that embody women's writing? Specific descriptions emerge more readily from theorists influenced by French feminists. In "To Be or Not To Be . . . A Feminist Speaker," Christiane Makward claims that French feminists such as Monique Wittig, Helene Cixous, and Luce Irigaray have developed a perspective of female creativity that may be described as follows: "open, nonlinear, unfinished, fluid, exploded, fragmented,
polysemeic, attempting to "speak the body," i.e., the unconscious, involving silence, incorporating the simultaneity of life as opposed to or clearly different from logical, nonambiguous, so-called 'transparent' or functional language" (96). In a similar vein, Rachel Blau duPlessis adds yet another list: "mutuality, porousness, intimacy, recontacting a both/and, using both sides of the brain, non- hierarchic, anti- or multi-climactic, wholistic, lacking distance . . . perhaps didactic" ("For the Etruscans" 144).

Domna Stanton describes the difficulties Anglo-American feminists encounter when working with French feminist theory in "Language and Revolution: The Franco-Ameican Dis-Connection," and Mary Eagleton summarizes what Alice Jardine sees as the basic difference between Anglo-American proponents of women's writing and their French counterparts:

The Anglo-Americans emphasize 'oppression,' the French 'repression'; the Anglo-Americans wish to raise consciousness, the French explores the unconscious; the Anglo-Americans are governed by humanism and empiricism while the French have developed an elaborate debate on textual theory. (206)

Given the fluid definitions of Makward and DuPlessis, however, determining the influence of Woolf and Rich on the evolving concept of women's writing becomes somewhat easier. Woolf's writing flirts with
several of Makward's descriptions: nonlinear, unfinished, fluid, attempting to "speak the body," i.e., the unconscious, involving silence, incorporating the simultaneity of life. Rich's writing, too, reflects some of Makward's descriptions: open, somewhat nonlinear, unfinished, fluid, fragmented, attempting to "speak the body," i.e., the unconscious, involving silence, incorporating the simultaneity of life. But duPlessis probably best describes the ways in which Woolf and Rich have influenced the evolving concept of women's writing. While mimicking traditional discourse, Woolf and Rich have revised this discourse by inserting "mutuality, porousness, intimacy, recontacting a both/and, using both sides of the brain, non-hierarchic, anti- or multi-climactic, wholistic, lacking distance [Rich more than Woolf] . . . [definitely] didactic."

Implications for Pedagogy

As members of university English Departments, we must accept a two-fold role. We must contribute to the scholarly pool of knowledge through research and publication. And equally as important, we must posit our knowledge in the classroom as the thesis for a dialectical exchange with students in order to create new knowledge.
As a means of fulfilling the first role, I have applied a methodology of rhetorical criticism to the feminist essays of Woolf and Rich in hopes of illuminating the political nature of these texts. The previous statement, however, should not imply that this methodology is the only means of interrogating feminist essays. Indeed, a Marxist or post-structuralist analysis would also provide insights into these texts. Yet Woolf and Rich as feminist authors have had to assess particular situations and audiences in order to determine the best textual strategies to employ. Thus, the rhetorical methodology employed in this study allows a reader to participate in the re-creation of these choices and, in the process, determine the political effect of these choices—that is, determine how ideology is manifested in both content and form.

The second role we must fulfill, teaching, implies enormous responsibilities, responsibilities that we must not take lightly. In "Teaching in Open Admissions," Adrienne Rich describes why:

Language is such a weapon, and what goes with language: reflection, criticism, renaming, creation. The fact that our language itself is tainted by the quality of our society means that in teaching we need to be acutely conscious of the kind of tool we want our students to have available, to understand how it has been used against them and to do all we can to insure that language will not someday
be used by them to keep others silent and powerless. (68)

Rhetorical criticism is just one means of empowering students through language. If this methodology of rhetorical criticism were used in literature and composition classrooms, it can affect not only students but teachers and possibly society as well.

First of all, by examining the multiple levels of situation, author, text, and reader, students can learn that a text does not exist in a vacuum, anymore than a person does. Real people write real books in real historical situations. Thus, students can learn to contextualize not only what they read but also what they say and do as well as what others say and do. Moreover, they can gain an awareness about the political nature of texts and begin asking pertinent questions: Who is allowed to write? Why? Who is allowed to be published? Why? Who is allowed into the canon? Why? Who makes such decisions? How? Why? Who benefits from this canonization process? How? Why? And how are students and others affected by all this?

By studying arrangement in conjunction with content, students can learn that how something is shaped can be as important as what is said, can indeed inform what is said. Students can also learn to
recognize that ideology is reflected in both form and content and that the ideologies in content sometimes differ from the implied ideologies of form. From this perspective, students can learn how and why certain rhetorical strategies of argument and arrangement are appropriate for some situations and not for others, a skill that would enable them to function more effectively at home, at school, at work, and in social situations.

By analyzing the style of various writers, students can learn the unfortunate fact that how something is written may be as important as what is written; conversely, they would recognize that pretty but empty prose counts for little, especially in their careers. By studying style, students can become more conscious of their own styles and how their styles reflect their content and their beliefs. Moreover, by absorbing different writing techniques from different writers, students can imitate these styles in order to make their own styles more versatile and, thus, more rhetorically effective.

Examining the role of the actual reader can inform students about the dialectical, social constructionist theory of knowledge. This concept can give students a sense of their own power in the process of making meaning, whether that power be
exercised in reading, writing, listening or speaking. In turn, this idea can encourage students not to accept traditional roles and ideas blindly but, instead, to build their own ideologies carefully and thoughtfully. The associated implication of individuals as evolving subjects may frighten students at first, but with some thought, it can encourage them to know that people do have some choices about who and what they will become.

Students can also learn to work together. Having every student trace the multiple levels of situation, author, text, and audience for every text read could be incredibly time-consuming and probably discouraging for them. But group work could be instituted so that three or four students would work together, investigating only one aspect of a text and then reporting to the entire class.

Studying this rhetorical methodology in the classroom can also provide students with valid criteria for evaluating writing—their own, their peers, and professional writers. No longer would students respond, "I like it a lot!" or "I think this needs work." Instead they could specify their comments/questions. Developing this criteria can also help students better understand the teacher's role as evaluator; no longer would the process of grading of an essay seem quite as mysterious or unfairly subjective.
Teachers, too, can benefit from the introduction of rhetorical criticism into the literature and the composition classroom. Studying the levels of situation, author, text, and audience prepares the teacher to discuss many ideas: how the author was motivated and constrained by her or his historical situation; how narrators or implied authors function within a text; how the development of ideas, form, and stylistic patterns can be traced; how the text might have spoken to original audiences; and how it speaks to him and to the class.

The results of this study may also alter a teacher's approach to teaching writing. In addition to a cut-and-dried premise that must be proved, an acceptable thesis statement might be a question for exploration. In addition to "at least three sources" from the library, the proof sections of students' essays might be drawn from students' personal experiences. And in addition to summations or calls for actions, more open-ended conclusions might be accepted too, allowing the student time for revision or for exploring the same topic in the next assignment. Such strategies in the classroom can foster critical thinking.

Class size permitting, the teacher can relinquish the role of an authority figure who imparts knowledge,
for this methodology should foster dialogue. Students together with the teacher can work to define terms of the methodology as they apply to particular texts and then to build interpretations. Thus, students can be as responsible for creating meaning as the author and the teacher. This strategy poses a risk for class discussions, which at times might threaten to become chaotic or laborious. Still, each day would pose a different experience, with new (or at least slightly new) knowledge being created. Teachers and students would learn to view one another as thinking human beings whose ideas and opinions should be questioned but respected. The purpose of this classroom exchange, however, is not for students to emerge as clones of the teacher but for them to be aware of the premises underlying their ideas and opinions and to be cognizant of the ramifications of their beliefs.

In the best of all possible worlds, society might also benefit from the introduction of rhetorical criticism into a literature or composition classroom. If the class is established as a microcosm of society, the dialectical interaction, with the resulting rise in communication skills, would better prepare students for their careers and their roles as citizens. If the students, in spite of tremendous pressures to conform,
could transfer all of the above implications to their lives beyond college, who knows what gradual changes might occur in our schools, in government, and in the business world?

**Implications for Future Research**

While working on this study, I have often had to fight the inclination to follow other paths, paths that, while interesting, would have only sidetracked me from my immediate goal. So I thought it appropriate to end, not conclude, this study with a brief discussion of the questions it has generated in terms of future studies for rhetoric and composition.

In the realm of rhetoric and feminism, several studies are possible. First, what would a rhetorical analysis of Virginia Woolf's *Three Guineas* (1938) demonstrate about the evolution of her feminist rhetoric from 1928 to 1938? Likewise, what would an analysis of the feminist rhetoric in Adrienne Rich's *Lies, Secrets, and Silences* prove about the evolution of her feminist rhetoric from 1966 to 1986? With a concentration on style as it reflects ideology, what would a close analysis of Woolf's corpus show about the similarities and differences in her fiction and prose? With Rich's corpus, what would a close
stylistic analysis indicate about the similarities and differences in her poetry and prose?

Moreover, what would a rhetorical analysis of several other twentieth-century feminist writers, particularly those who have been marginalized within the movement, demonstrate in terms of building a stronger base for generalizing about feminist rhetorics? The methodology used in this study could be applied to certain nineteenth-century feminists to determine their rhetorics of feminism and to measure how their rhetorics evolved into and/or differs from Woolf's and Rich's. Also, it might be interesting to discover how the rhetorics of an anti-feminist suffragist reflects and/or differs from the ideology of a feminist suffragist.

In the realm of composition studies, a study could be designed to measure the role that extra-textual situation plays in a teacher's evaluation of his student's essays. Or a study could be designed to determine to what extent a teacher's professed critical approach to literary texts actually complements and/or conflicts with her evaluation of student essays.

At its best, rhetorical analysis functions as a heuristic, one that can open innumerable textual dialogues. By synthesizing the multiple levels of
situation, author, text, and audience, the reader recognizes the broad, open dialectical means through which meaning is created and, in the process, learns to appreciate the political aspects of aesthetic choices.

The predominant thesis in the textual dialogues of this study is that people possess the capacity to empower themselves and others/Others through language. The ramifications of such a position afford tremendous potential. They also raise important questions, such as how may this potential best be tapped? Virginia Woolf answers this question in the closing of *A Room of One's Own*, when she urges the young women in her narrative audience to work toward Judith Shakespeare:

> This opportunity . . . is now coming within your power . . . if we live another century or so— I am talking about the common life which is the real life and not of the little separate lives which we live as individuals— and have five hundred a year each of us and rooms of our own; if we have the habit of freedom and the courage to write exactly what we think; if we escape a little from the common sitting-room and see human beings not always in their relation to each other but in relation to reality; and the sky, too, and the trees or whatever it may be in themselves; if we look past Milton's bogey, for no human being should shut out the view: if we face the fact, for it is a fact, that there is no arm to cling to, but that we go alone and that our relation is to the world of reality and not only to the world of men and women, then the opportunity will come and the dead poet who was Shakespeare's sister will put on the body which she has so often laid down. (117-18)
Fifty-five years later, Adrienne Rich continues this dialogue, describing her own process of awakening:

To write directly and overtly as a woman, out of a woman's body and experience, to take women's existence seriously as theme and source for art, was something I had been hungering to do, needing to do, all my writing life. It placed me nakedly face to face with both terror and anger; it did indeed imply the breakdown of the world as I had always known it, the end of safety, to paraphrase Baldwin again. But it released tremendous energy in me, as in many other women, to have that way of writing affirmed and validated in a growing political community. I felt for the first time the closing of the gap between poet and woman. ("BBP" 182)

In Chapter One, I asked the central question of this study: How do Woolf and Rich imitate, revise, and/or transcend/subvert traditional rhetorical strategies so as to argue their ideas and, in the process subvert age-old sexist ideas and forms. As demonstrated in Chapters Three and Four, the answer is not simple. Neither Woolf nor Rich transcends her situation; neither wants to. Instead, these authors consciously imitate and revise traditional discourse strategies in order to expose the conscious and the unconscious manifestations of sexist assumptions within texts. Using words of their own and forms of their own, they subvert traditional discourse strategies, a process that both creates and reflects their own personal feminist ideologies.
Appendix A
Stylistic Analysis

Title: A Room of One's Own
Author: Virginia Woolf

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Paragraph Length</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This study confines itself to paragraphs 1 to 4.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A. Longest paragraph
   (in no. of sentences) 1
   (in no. of words) 1

B. Shortest paragraph
   (in no. of sentences) 2
   (in no. of words) 3

C. Average paragraph length
   (in no. of sentences) 14.8
   (in no. of words) 433.5
Table 2
Sentence Length

This study considers all the words in the text from paragraphs 1 to 4.

| A. Total number of words in the piece studied | 1734 |
| B. Total number of sentences                   | 59   |
| C. Longest sentence (in no. of words)          | 67   |
| D. Shortest sentence (in no. of words)         | 5    |
| E. Average sentence length (in no. of words)   | 29.4 |
| F. Number of sentences that contain more than 10 words over the average sentence | 15   |
| G. Percentage of sentences that contain more than 10 words over the average sentence | 25.4% |
| H. Number of sentences that contain more than 5 words below the average sentence | 21   |
| I. Percentage of sentences that contain more than 5 words below the average sentence | 35.6% |
Table 3

Grammatical Sentence Type

| A. Total number of sentences in piece studied | 59 |
| B. Total number of simple sentences | 13 |
| C. Percentage of simple sentences | 22% |
| D. Total number of compound sentences | 7 |
| E. Percentage of compound sentences | 11.9% |
| F. Total number of complex sentences | 79 |
| G. Percentage of complex sentences | 49.2% |
| H. Total number of compound-complex sentences | 10 |
| I. Percentage of compound-complex sentences | 16.9% |

Sequence of Grammatical Types: S, Cp, Cx, Cp-Cx

In paragraph 1: Cp, S, Cx, S, S, Cp-Cx, S, Cx, Cp-Cx, Cp, Cx, Cx, Cx, Cx, Cx, Cx, Cx, S, Cp-Cx, Cp-Cx, S

In paragraph 2: Cp, Cx, Cx, S, Cp-Cx, S, Cx, Cx, Cx

In paragraph 3: Cx, Cx, S, Cx, S, Cx, Cx, Cx, S, Cx, Cx, Cx, Cx, Cx, Cx, Cx, Cx, Cx, Cx, Cx, Cx, Cx, Cx

In paragraph 4: Cx, Cp-Cx, Cp-Cx, Cx, Cx, Cx, S, Cx, Cx, Cx, Cx, Cx, Cx, Cp-Cx, Cx, Cx, Cx, Cx, Cx, Cx, Cx, Cx, Cx, Cx, Cx.
### Table 4

#### Rhetorical Sentence Type

This study considers paragraphs 1 to 4.

| A. Total number of sentences in piece studied | 59 |
| B. Total number of loose sentences | 18 |
| C. Percentage of loose sentences | 30.5% |
| D. Total number of periodic sentences | 26 |
| E. Percentage of periodic sentences | 44.1% |
| F. Total number of balanced sentences | 10 |
| G. Percentage of balanced sentences | 16.9% |
| H. Total number of antithetical sentences | 5 |
| I. Percentage of antithetical sentences | 8.5% |

### Table 5

#### Functional Sentence Types

This study considers paragraphs 1 to 4.

| A. Total number of sentences in piece studied | 59 |
| B. Total number of declarative sentences | 58 |
| C. Percentage of declarative sentences | 98.3% |
| D. Total number of questions | 1 |
| E. Percentage of questions | 1.7% |
| F. Total number of commands | 0 |
| G. Percentage of commands | 0% |
| H. Total number of exclamations | 0 |
| I. Percentage of exclamations | 0% |
Table 6
Sentence Openers

This study considers only the total number of declarative sentences: 58. It also encompasses paragraphs 1 through 4.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Openers</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Subject</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>46.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Expletive</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Coordinating conjunction</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Adverb word</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Conjunctive phrase</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Prepositional phrase</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Verbal phrase</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. Adjective phrase</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. Absolute phrase</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Adverb Clause</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K. Front-Shift</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7
Transitions

This study considers paragraphs 1 through 4.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total number of words in piece studied</td>
<td>1734</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of transitions</td>
<td>54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of transitions (in words)</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of transitions (in phrases)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of transitions (in clauses)</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>20.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of transitions (in phrases)</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of transitions (in clauses)</td>
<td>29.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 8
Diction

This study confines itself to paragraphs 1 through 4. It also uses only substantive words: nouns, pronouns, verbs, verbals, adjectives, and adverbs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Total number of substantive words</td>
<td>1229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Total number of monosyllabic substantive words</td>
<td>791</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Percentage of monosyllabic substantive words</td>
<td>64.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Total number of polysyllabic substantive words</td>
<td>438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Percentage of polysyllabic substantive words</td>
<td>35.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Total number of N and PN in the passage</td>
<td>533</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Percentage of N and PN (% of A)</td>
<td>43.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. Total number of concrete N and PN</td>
<td>333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. Percentage of concrete N and PN (% of F)</td>
<td>60.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Total number of abstract N</td>
<td>220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K. Percentage of abstract N (% of F)</td>
<td>39.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. Total number of main verbs in either dependent or independent clauses</td>
<td>199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Percentage of main verbs (% of A)</td>
<td>16.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. Total number of linking verbs</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O. Percentage of linking verbs (% of L)</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P. Total number of be verbs</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q. Percentage of be verbs (% of L)</td>
<td>25.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R. Total number of active verbs</td>
<td>139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Percentage of active verbs (% of L)</td>
<td>69.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. Total number of passive verbs</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U. Percentage of passive verbs (% of L)</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V. Total number of adjective</td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W. Average number of adjectives per sentence</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X. Total number of adverbs</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y. Average number of adverbs per sentence</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 9

**Figures of Speech: Schemes of Construction**

This study considers paragraphs 1 through 4.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Figures of Speech</th>
<th>No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Alliteration</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Anadiplosis</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Anaphora</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Antithesis</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Apposition</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Assonance</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Asyndeton</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. Climax</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. Ellipsis</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Parallelism</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K. Parenthesis</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. Polyploton</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 10

**Figures of Speech: Tropes**

This study considers paragraphs 1 through 4.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Figures of Speech</th>
<th>No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Hyperbole</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Irony</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Litotes</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Metaphor</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Oxymoron</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Paradox</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Periphrasis</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. Personification</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. Rhetorical Question</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Simile</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K. Synecdoche</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B

Stylistic Analysis

Title: Excerpts from Blood, Bread, and Poetry

"Split at the Root: An Essay on Jewish Identity" (JI)
"Blood, Bread, and Poetry" (BBP)
"Notes Towards a Politics of Location" (NPL)

Author: Adrienne Rich

All of the tables in this study confine themselves to "JI" paragraphs 1 to 15, "BBP" paragraphs 1 to 12, and "NPL" paragraphs 1 to 19.

Table 1

Paragraph Length

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>&quot;JI&quot;</th>
<th>&quot;BBP&quot;</th>
<th>&quot;NPL&quot;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Longest paragraph</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(in no. of sentences)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(in no. of words)</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Shortest paragraph</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(in no. of sentences)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(in no. of words)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Average paragraph length</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(in no. of sentences)</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(in no. of words)</td>
<td>78.5</td>
<td>127.9</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;JI&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;BBP&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;NPL&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Total number of words in the piece studied</td>
<td>1178</td>
<td>1535</td>
<td>1388</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Total number of sentences</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Longest sentence (in no. of words)</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Shortest sentence (in no. of words)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Average sentence length (in no. of words)</td>
<td>23.56</td>
<td>28.43</td>
<td>21.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Number of sentences that contain more than 10 words over the average sentence</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Percentage of sentences that contain more than 10 words over the average sentence</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
<td>21.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. Number of sentences that contain more than 5 words below the average sentence</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. Percentage of sentences that contain more than 5 words below the average sentence</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>53.7%</td>
<td>49.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 3

**Grammatical Sentence Type**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A. Total number of sentences in piece studied</th>
<th>&quot;JI&quot;</th>
<th>&quot;BBP&quot;</th>
<th>&quot;NPL&quot;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B. Total number of simple sentences</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Percentage of simple sentences</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>16%.</td>
<td>17%.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Total number of compound sentences</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>29.6%</td>
<td>26.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Percentage of compound sentences</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Total number of complex sentences</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Percentage of complex sentences</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>46.3%</td>
<td>30.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. Total number of compound-complex sentences</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. Percentage of compound-complex sentences</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>12.9%</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Total number of fragments</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K. Percentage of fragments</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>29.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3 continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sequence of Grammatical Types:</th>
<th>&quot;JI&quot;</th>
<th>&quot;BBP&quot;</th>
<th>&quot;NPL&quot;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Paragraphs:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1: S,F,Cp-Cx</td>
<td>Cp,S,Cx,Cp-Cx,Cx,</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cp,Cx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2: Cp</td>
<td>S,S</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cx,S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3: Cx,F,Cx</td>
<td>Cp,S,Cx,Cp-Cx,Cx</td>
<td>Cx,S,S,S,S</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4: Cx</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td>F,F,S,Cp-Cx,Cp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5: Cx,Cx</td>
<td>Cp,Cx,Cp-Cx,Cx,Cp-Cx</td>
<td></td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6: Cx</td>
<td>Cp-Cx</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cp,Cx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7: Cx,Cp,Cx,Cx</td>
<td>Cx</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cp,Cx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8: S,Cx,S,S,S</td>
<td>Cp,S,Cx,Cx,Cx</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9: Cx,S</td>
<td>Cx,Cx,S,Cp-Cx,S,F,Cx</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cx,F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10: S,S,Cx</td>
<td>S,S</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cp-Cx,Cx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11: S,Cp,F,Cx,Cx</td>
<td>Cx,S,Cp-Cx,Cx,Cx,S,Cx,S</td>
<td></td>
<td>S,Cx,Cx,S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12: S,Cx,Cx</td>
<td>Cx,Cx,Cx,S,Cx,S,Cx,S,Cx</td>
<td></td>
<td>F,F,F,F,F,F,F,F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13: S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>S,Cx,F,F,S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14: Cx,Cx,Cp-Cx,S,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>S,S,Cx,F,F,F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cx,Cx,S,S,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cx,Cx</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15: Cx</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4
Rhetorical Sentence Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>&quot;JI&quot;</th>
<th>&quot;BBP&quot;</th>
<th>&quot;NPL&quot;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Total number of sentences in piece studied</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Total number of loose sentences</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Percentage of loose sentences</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>20.4%</td>
<td>26.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Total number of periodic sentences</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Percentage of periodic sentences</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>53.7%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Total number of balanced sentences</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Percentage of balanced sentences</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>25.9%</td>
<td>26.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. Total number of antithetical sentences</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. Percentage of antithetical sentences</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5
Functional Sentence Types

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>&quot;JI&quot;</th>
<th>&quot;BBP&quot;</th>
<th>&quot;NPL&quot;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Total number of sentences in piece studied</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Total number of declarative sentences</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Percentage of declarative sentences</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>87.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Total number of questions</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Percentage of questions</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Total number of commands</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Percentage of commands</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. Total number of exclamations</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. Percentage of exclamations</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Table 6

Sentence Openers

This study considers only declarative sentences.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>&quot;JI&quot;</th>
<th>&quot;BBP&quot;</th>
<th>&quot;NPL&quot;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>46</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A. Subject
Percentage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>&quot;JI&quot;</th>
<th>&quot;BBP&quot;</th>
<th>&quot;NPL&quot;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>45.7%</td>
<td>70.2%</td>
<td>43.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B. Expletive
Percentage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>&quot;JI&quot;</th>
<th>&quot;BBP&quot;</th>
<th>&quot;NPL&quot;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C. Coordinating conjunction
Percentage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>&quot;JI&quot;</th>
<th>&quot;BBP&quot;</th>
<th>&quot;NPL&quot;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

D. Adverb word
Percentage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>&quot;JI&quot;</th>
<th>&quot;BBP&quot;</th>
<th>&quot;NPL&quot;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

E. Conjunctive phrase
Percentage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>&quot;JI&quot;</th>
<th>&quot;BBP&quot;</th>
<th>&quot;NPL&quot;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

F. Prepositional phrase
Percentage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>&quot;JI&quot;</th>
<th>&quot;BBP&quot;</th>
<th>&quot;NPL&quot;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>17.4%</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>17.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

G. Verbal phrase
Percentage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>&quot;JI&quot;</th>
<th>&quot;BBP&quot;</th>
<th>&quot;NPL&quot;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>12.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

H. Adjective phrase
Percentage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>&quot;JI&quot;</th>
<th>&quot;BBP&quot;</th>
<th>&quot;NPL&quot;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I. Absolute phrase
Percentage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>&quot;JI&quot;</th>
<th>&quot;BBP&quot;</th>
<th>&quot;NPL&quot;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

J. Adverb Clause
Percentage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>&quot;JI&quot;</th>
<th>&quot;BBP&quot;</th>
<th>&quot;NPL&quot;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

K. Front-Shift
Percentage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>&quot;JI&quot;</th>
<th>&quot;BBP&quot;</th>
<th>&quot;NPL&quot;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 7

Transitions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>&quot;JI&quot;</th>
<th>&quot;BBP&quot;</th>
<th>&quot;NPL&quot;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Total number of words in piece studied</td>
<td>1178</td>
<td>1535</td>
<td>1388</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Total number of transitions</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Total number of transitions (in words)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Percentage of transitions (in words)</td>
<td>47.8%</td>
<td>58.3%</td>
<td>54.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Total number of transitions (in phrases)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Percentage of transitions (in phrases)</td>
<td>34.8%</td>
<td>29.2%</td>
<td>40.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Total number of transitions (in clauses)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K. Percentage of transitions (in clauses)</td>
<td>17.4%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 8

Diction

This study confines itself to substantive words: nouns, pronouns, verbs, verbals, adjectives, and adverbs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>&quot;JI&quot;</th>
<th>&quot;BBP&quot;</th>
<th>&quot;NPL&quot;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Total number of substantive words</td>
<td>931</td>
<td>1103</td>
<td>963</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Total number of monosyllabic substantive words</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>592</td>
<td>493</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Percentage of monosyllabic substantive words</td>
<td>53.7%</td>
<td>53.7%</td>
<td>51.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Total number of polysyllabic substantive words</td>
<td>431</td>
<td>511</td>
<td>470</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Percentage of polysyllabic substantive words</td>
<td>46.3%</td>
<td>46.3%</td>
<td>48.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Total number of N and PN</td>
<td>397</td>
<td>509</td>
<td>442</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Percentage of N and PN (% of A)</td>
<td>42.6%</td>
<td>46.1%</td>
<td>45.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. Total number of concrete N and PN</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>356</td>
<td>306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. Percentage of concrete N and PN (% of F)</td>
<td>76.6%</td>
<td>69.9%</td>
<td>69.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Total number of abstract N</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K. Percentage of abstract N (% of F)</td>
<td>23.4%</td>
<td>30.1%</td>
<td>30.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. Total number of main verbs in either dependent or independent clauses</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Percentage of main verbs (% of A)</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
<td>13.2%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. Total number of linking verbs</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O. Percentage of linking verbs (% of L)</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P. Total number of be verbs</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q. Percentage of be verbs (% of L)</td>
<td>35.5%</td>
<td>23.9%</td>
<td>17.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R. Total number of active verbs</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Percentage of active verbs (% of L)</td>
<td>49.5%</td>
<td>55.1%</td>
<td>73.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. Total number of passive verbs</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 8 continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>&quot;JI&quot;</th>
<th>&quot;BBP&quot;</th>
<th>&quot;NPL&quot;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>U.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of passive verbs (% of L)</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of adjective</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average number of adjectives per sentence</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of adverbs</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average number of adverbs per sentence</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9

Figures of Speech: Schemes of Construction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>&quot;JI&quot;</th>
<th>&quot;BBP&quot;</th>
<th>&quot;NPL&quot;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A.</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F.</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G.</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J.</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure of Speech</td>
<td>&quot;JI&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;BBP&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;NPL&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Hyperbole</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Irony</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Litotes</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Metaphor</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Oxymoron</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Paradox</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Periphrasis</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. Personification</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. Rhetorical Question</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Simile</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K. Synecdoche</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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