

UNIVERSIDADE FEDERAL DO PAMPA

JAQUELINE LÍDIA SALGADO DE OLIVEIRA

**THE IMPRISONED ANGEL IN THE HOUSE: AN ANALYSIS OF VIRGINIA
WOOLF'S *MRS DALLOWAY* IN A FEMINIST AND DRAMATISTIC PERSPECTIVE**

**Bagé
2018**

JAQUELINE LÍDIA SALGADO DE OLIVEIRA

**THE IMPRISONED ANGEL IN THE HOUSE: AN ANALYSIS OF VIRGINIA
WOOLF'S *MRS DALLOWAY* IN A FEMINIST AND DRAMATISTIC PERSPECTIVE.**

Trabalho de Conclusão de Curso a ser apresentado ao Curso de Licenciatura em Letras Línguas Adicionais: Inglês, Espanhol e Respectivas Literaturas da Universidade Federal do Pampa, como requisito para obtenção do Título de Licenciatura em Letras.

Orientadora: Profa. Dra. Kátia Vieira Morais

**Bagé
2018**

Ficha catalográfica elaborada automaticamente com os dados fornecidos pelo(a) autor(a) através do Módulo de Biblioteca do Sistema GURI (Gestão Unificada de Recursos Institucionais) .

O48t Oliveira, Jaqueline Lída Salgado
The imprisoned angel in the house: an analysis of Virginia Woolf's mrs
Dalloway in a dramatistic and feminist perspective
/ Jaqueline Lída Salgado Oliveira.
53 p.

Trabalho de Conclusão de Curso (Graduação) -- Universidade Federal
do Pampa, LETRAS - LÍNGUAS ADICIONAIS INGLÊS, ESPANHOL E
RESPECTIVAS LITERATURAS, 2018.

"Orientação: Kátia Vieira Moraes".

1. Feminismo. 2. Dramatismo. 3. Retórica. 4. Patriarcado.
I. Título.

JAQUELINE LÍDIA SALGADO DE OLIVEIRA

**THE IMPRISONED ANGEL IN THE HOUSE: AN ANALYSIS OF VIRGINIA
WOOLF'S *MRS DALLOWAY* IN A FEMINIST AND DRAMATISTIC PERSPECTIVE.**

Trabalho de Conclusão de Curso a ser
apresentado ao Curso de Licenciatura em
Letras Línguas Adicionais: Inglês, Espanhol
e Respectivas Literaturas da Universidade
Federal do Pampa,

**Trabalho de Conclusão de Curso defendido e aprovado em 06 de dezembro de
2018 pela Banca Examinadora constituída por:**

**Prof.^a Dra. Kátia Vieira Morais
Orientadora
UNIPAMPA**

**Prof.^a Dra. Simone Silva Pires de Assumpção
UNIPAMPA**

**Prof. Dr. Moacir Lopes de Camargos
UNIPAMPA**

AGRADECIMENTO

To my mother, Terezinha Salgado, for not giving up on me and my sisters, for raising us without anyone's help. For making me understand that we should not wait anything from men, we should not make marriage a life goal, and that women are capable and strong, but we should study in order to become that.

To my advisor, Kátia Moraes, for being the most kind and inspiring woman I have ever met. For teaching me everything I know about writing, feminism and Rhetoric. For believing in her students, being the most strong and intelligent intellectual I am proud to have the privilege to call professor. I could not thank you enough even if I had a lifetime of words.

To Sofia Kichalowsky and Maria Helena Kichalowsky. For being my soulmates. For being the most courageous and perfect children. For being my reasons why.

To Maria Augusta Tellechea Alves, for being the funniest human being alive. For always being there, for not giving up on our friendship, for being sincere, for arguing when I was wrong. For accepting me the way I am. For not accepting injustices, for speaking up. For being a great woman.

To Djulya Veloso, for being my favorite person. For being the best "Halachico", friend, partner, for making me feel the most beautifully pure and true feelings that anyone could feel. For having a gorgeous soul, for having the most beautiful heart. For inspiring me and not letting me give up. For teaching me that we should be free, independent, brave. Most importantly, for teaching me how to love and the meaning behind hook's sentence: "Love is an action, never simply a feeling."

To Melissa Barbieri, for being a sensitive, understanding, accepting and beautiful human being. For being an old soul and confessional writer. For being a friend who is also a twin sister.

To my nephew, Luis Eduardo, whom I consider my son. For being my very first best friend. For loving and supporting me. For being someone who I would die for.

To Virginia Woolf, Simone de Beauvoir, Audre Lorde, Sylvia Plath and Tori Amos, for all your wisdom, for being immortal.

“(...) what can one know even of the people one lives with every day? She asked. Are we not all prisoners?”

Virginia Woolf

ABSTRACT

In this intimist essay, I rhetorically analyze how patriarchy could be a prison for women in Virginia Woolf's book *Mrs Dalloway* in a feminist and dramatic perspective. In *Mrs Dalloway*, Woolf demonstrates how women can be kept captive in their own houses and minds by showing the evanescent process of the soul of a middle-aged woman and the correlative erasure of her identity which results in a state of mourning and ideation of death. In order to reveal the strategies Virginia Woolf uses, I analyze the novel in a dramatic and feminist perspective. Besides, I observe how essential it is to point out what the resources, values, beliefs, and ideologies that can maintain women's soul imprisoned. Lastly, I use Burke's dramatic tools of analysis to identify the motive behind the novel written by Virginia Woolf. The relevance of this study is discussing the underlying subjugation of the submissive women by pointing out the tools they might use to free themselves from the confinement that some of them live in.

Keywords: Rhetorical analysis. Feminism. Dramatism. Patriarchy.

RESUMO

Neste ensaio intimista, analiso retoricamente como o patriarcado pode ser uma prisão para as mulheres no livro de Virginia Woolf, *Mrs. Dalloway*, através de uma perspectiva feminista e dramatista. Em *Mrs. Dalloway*, Woolf demonstra como as mulheres podem ser mantidas cativas em suas próprias casas e mentes, mostrando o processo evanescente da alma de uma mulher de meia-idade e o correlativo apagamento de sua identidade que resulta em um estado de luto e ideação da morte. No intuito de revelar as estratégias que Virginia Woolf usa, analiso o romance numa perspectiva dramatista e feminista. Além disso, percebo como é essencial indicar quais são os recursos, valores, crenças e ideologias que podem manter a alma das mulheres aprisionada. Por último, utilizando a ferramenta de análise dramatista de Burke, identifico o motivo subjacente ao romance escrito por Virginia Woolf. A relevância deste estudo se deve à importância de discutir sobre a subjugação das mulheres submissas cujas ferramentas elas poderiam utilizar para se libertarem do confinamento em que algumas delas vivem.

Palavras-Chave: Análise retórica. Feminismo. Dramatismo. Patriarcado.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

THE BEGINNING OF A JOURNEY TOWARDS FREEDOM	1
FREEDOM FOR THE ANGEL	4
Feminism and Freedom	4
The Angel in the House	7
Power Relations	11
Compulsory Heterosexuality	15
FEMINISM AND DRAMATISM GO ON A WALK TOGETHER	18
Feminist Criticism as a Lens	19
Dramatism as a Means	20
WHEN FEMINISM AND DRAMATISM MERGE	24
THE ANGEL WILL BUY THE FLOWERS HERSELF	26
The Angel - Agent and Coagents	26
Victorian Patriarchal Society - Scene	33
Purposelessness - Purpose	37
Lack of Conditions - Agency	40
Throwing a Party - Act	42
VICTORIA'S RATIOS - VIRGINIA WOOLF'S MESSAGE RECEIVED	46
THE END IS THE BEGINNING	50

THE BEGINNING OF A JOURNEY TOWARDS FREEDOM

In this study, I analyze Virginia Woolf's book *Mrs Dalloway*, a novel which was written in 1923, in a feminist and dramatistic perspective in order to discover Virginia Woolf's motive for writing this novel. In order to better understand Virginia Woolf's message, I enter a journey of discovery, I am looking at a character who is imprisoned: Clarissa Dalloway in *Mrs Dalloway*. My hypothesis is that, in *Mrs Dalloway*, Woolf demonstrates that women are fundamentally imprisoned as society dictates how they should be and act. The prison I mean is not the physical prison--the incarceration--but, rather, the symbolic prison that many women live inside - their thoughts and actions dictated by the patriarchal ideology. Therefore, in my analysis, I have two objectives: first, identifying the relations between the novel and the patriarchal society by exploring the concepts of feminism, imprisonment and the angel in the house; second, analyzing the novel in a dramatistic and feminist perspective to reveal Virginia Woolf's motive in writing the novel.

Thus, the first objective is to trace the relations between her novel and the patriarchal system in which she lived in. In order to do so, first, I focus my research on pointing out the resources, values, beliefs, and ideologies that can keep Mrs. Dalloway imprisoned by theorizing about feminism and imprisonment. To come up with this research, I had to realize that, often times, women are not even able to comprehend how the power relations corrupt their capacity to create their own reality. I also realize that this was one of the messages Virginia Woolf conceives on her writing of *Mrs Dalloway*. I consider that the structures of our patriarchal society seem to mislead women to think that being confined and alienated means being happy. The correspondent to the illusion of happiness is the destruction of women's identities. The author does it by showing the grieving process of a middle-aged woman for the erasement of her identity.

Moreover, about the first objective, I discover why being "normal" for the character is so risky. In order to understand it, I have been asking myself the following questions: What is normalizing for Mrs. Dalloway? Is she able to make her own choices or are they being made for her? It seems essential to me to discover the reasons why she is being kept captive and controlled. Virginia Woolf writes about

Clarissa Dalloway, who is, by whomever were to analyze her, happy, “normal” and free. Here, we can see one of the problems that I shall encounter: being “normal”. Fitting the normality shoes, for her, seems something dangerous, if we look closely, as she loses her opportunity to shape her own identity. Putting the normality mask on seems to undermine her chances to be free as it means following the construct of the angel in the house. Therefore, in my analysis, I explore what it means to be an “angel in the house”.

I need to enter in a journey, just as Clarissa Dalloway did, and Woolf did as well. In “Professions for Women”, Woolf describes the figure of the “angel in the house”:

She was intensely sympathetic. She was immensely charming. She was utterly unselfish. She excelled in the difficult arts of family life. She sacrificed herself daily. If there was chicken, she took the leg; if there was a draught she sat in it--in short she was so constituted that she never had a mind or a wish of her own, but preferred to sympathize always with the minds and wishes of others. Above all--I need not say it--she was pure. Her purity was supposed to be her chief beauty--her blushes, her great grace. In those days--the last of Queen Victoria--every house had its Angel. And when I came to write I encountered her with the very first words. The shadow of her wings fell on my page; I heard the rustling of her skirts in the room (WOOLF, 1942, p.242).

In this quotation, we realize Woolf’s struggles and attempts to describe the women’s role in the 1930s and how it bothered her to the depths of her soul. The phantom—angel in the house—bothered her because it hindered the way of her creativity: the phantom tried to tell her that she should be kinder, that she was not allowed to have thoughts of her own. It seems that she is describing what it is like for a woman, being born and raised in a patriarchal society. The “angel in the house” is the phantom who lives inside women, some way or another.

It is true, Woolf is talking about the women of her time and place. However, unfortunately, it seems like Woolf, being a human of a great intellect and a soul ahead of her time, saw into the future of women: it seems that being an angel in the house is what is expected for women even in the present days, despite all efforts of the feminist movement, efforts of women like Woolf herself in deconstructing this image (killing the angel in the house, in her own words). If we were to analyze the lives of many women nowadays, we would discover that being “an angel in the

house” is still our ultimate goal: being nice and kind, being a mother, being a good wife, serving people, and putting our own needs aside in order to please others is what is expected of women. I am not ambitious enough to talk about or in the name of all the women in the world; rather, in this paper, I want to study the image of the angel in the house and I want to discover if this angel lived inside Clarissa Dalloway.

My second and last objective is revealing the strategies Virginia Woolf uses by analyzing the novel in a dramatistic and feminist perspective. By using Kenneth Burke’s dramatistic theory, I identify the motive behind Virginia Woolf’s artifact by doing a pentadic circumference. So, I analyze *Mrs Dalloway* in a feminist perspective to better understand how patriarchy and power relations shape Clarissa Dalloway’s way of being and acting. In order to do that, I create a mixture of two kinds of analytical tools, the feminist analysis and the dramatistic analysis. I plan to put the dramatistic analysis in my “recipe” because I see the relevance of achieving a deeper understanding on the novel from a rhetorical point of view.

Here, I start my own journey to comprehend women’s lack of freedom. I, too, want to kill the “angel in the house”, or, in less drastic words, I want to free her. For I also think that to write about and to women is an attempt to free ourselves. It seems that to break the chains of control of the mind and soul, we need to challenge everything that is imposed to us. But how can we free ourselves of something we don’t see? In the words of Woolf, “It is far harder to kill a phantom than a reality” (1942, p. 244). As Clarissa Dalloway walks through the streets of London in a sunny day in June, she goes into a self-discovery process. By analyzing Woolf’s stream of consciousness novel, we can start our healing process as well. For I think that we can start healing when we watch other people heal. Thus, to heal, we need, first of all, to be aware we have a disease and open our eyes. I go further, it is not possible to free ourselves if we are not aware we are imprisoned.

FREEDOM FOR THE ANGEL

Thinking about women's subjugation is to think about the opposite of subjugation, and, in my view, it is freedom. For my purposes, to understand the views of Virginia Woolf on women's role and its underlying captivity, I explore the concepts of feminism and imprisonment. So, first and most important of all, I, based on bibliographical research I have read during my undergraduate studies, I define the feminist movement, for I think that this movement was generated in order to free all women from their subjugation. As I go further in my journey, I explore the image of the angel in the house according to Woolf's perspective and explain why it is important to think about this representation for us to explore Mrs. Dalloway's role in society. Then, I explore briefly the concept of power relations as I see the essentiality of understanding how the power relations can shape the way the character interacts with other characters and sees the world. Lastly, I explain how compulsory heterosexuality can undermine the possibility of freedom and can also be a prison as it obligates women to act and love in a certain way. I write about compulsory heterosexuality as I realize that Clarissa Dalloway is also imprisoned due to her lack of conditions to live her true sexuality.

Feminism and Freedom

I understand feminism as the social movement created to end women's subjugation. That being said, the feminist movement can liberate women. It is a movement that helps women to think how, throughout all of their history, they have been oppressed, mistreated, subjugated, silenced, manipulated, among others. Simone de Beauvoir argues that women have been denied education, to create, to work and to make their own choices. They have been manipulated into thinking they have only one choice of being. The customs of society maintain women subjugated and the subjugation is reinforced by tradition (BEAUVOIR, 1974, p. 9).

Feminism is a movement that can serve also to open women's eyes to the maneuvers of the patriarchal society that can be dangerous for women's progress and freedom. Unless women open their eyes, they can be manipulated. The manipulation maneuvers are much more complex than we might think of. In the

words of bell hooks “(...) all of us, female and male, have been socialized from birth on to accept sexist thought and action” (HOOKS, 2004).

Manipulative tactics happen in the realm of ideas, in the realm of language which result in a system of violence and oppression towards women. The widespread discourse is full of controlling tactics that maintain women in the position of captivity. Of course, the possibilities and conditions for women are widening, as a result of the many efforts of feminist movement itself which has been opening possibilities of freedom, but women are still living under a threat. The controlling tactics are still there, but they are subtler. Some women are still being controlled by forces they do not always realize. Some of them just accept whatever is imposed to them. Their beliefs, truths, right to be happy or unhappy can be denied to them. It happens because many women are not aware of the injustices they have suffered. Women, sometimes, do not even know what it is to be free. Therefore, one of the reasons why the feminist movement can be important is that it can show women their own lack of freedom. bell hooks¹ defines feminism:

Simply put, feminism is the movement to end sexism, sexist exploitation, and oppression. (...) Practically, it is a definition which implies that all sexist thinking and action is the problem, whether those who perpetuate it are female or male, child or adult. It is also broad enough to include an understanding of systemic institutionalized sexism. As a definition it is open-ended. To understand feminism it implies one has to necessarily understand sexism (HOOKS, 2004, p.2).

Another possible definition of feminism the author Mary MacNamara presents to us. According to MacNamara, feminism is “the movement towards creating a society where women can live a full, self-determined life” (1985, p. 159). It seems that this concept works well with what I intend to realize with my objectives in this study. I have been taught, as a little girl, that women do not determine their lives. Instead, their lives are determined for them. The discourses people (men and, unfortunately, women) reproduce have some characteristics in common: they are authoritarian, insensitive, impersonal, biased formulas of how women should live their lives. Moreover, hooks does not put the blame on men “(...) all sexist thinking

¹ bell hooks chooses to use her name in small caps and I follow her wishes.

and action is the problem, whether those who perpetuate it are female or male, child or adult“ (HOOKS, 2004, p. 2). It is important to point out as people generally and superficially do -- put the blame on men --, rather, she challenges this act of projecting the blame onto men and she goes way deeper. She argues that the problem does not reside on men, but it is much more complex and profound than that. The real problem is the ideology of domination behind their behavior. Nonetheless, it does not justify men’s abusive, condescending and controlling behavior towards women. hooks (2004, p.1) understands that the problem is the patriarchal system and that she defines the political-social system “that insists that males are inherently dominating, superior to everything and everyone deemed weak, especially females”. hooks argues that the patriarchal thinking is dangerous, because it generates violence against women and undermines their chances to be free—to be liberated. The ideas--are passed to children from women and men. In her words, “patriarchal gender roles are assigned to us as children and we are given continual guidance about the ways we can best fulfill these roles” (HOOKS, “Understanding Patriarchy”, p.1). Thus, when we are born, our paths were already chosen for us. Nevertheless, despite what many people think, that the ideas from patriarchy are generated only through men, many women are still reproducing patriarchal ideas and passing them to their children in ways that maintain women in an inferior level than men, ideologically speaking. That is one of the many reasons why patriarchy is so dangerous, it is maintained through a discourse that both men and women produce and reproduce, very often without even knowing the consequences that arise from the discourse. In conclusion, feminism can serve as a tool to free women from captivity. It is also important to say that, in my study, I am not focusing on women who are independent and free. Rather, I analyze and discuss about a character who is not. However, when women study about feminism, they are able to see that they live on the terms of patriarchy. Even women who consider themselves free, after facing what patriarchy means, might realize that some aspects of their lives are still being imposed by the rules of the patriarchal system.

The Angel in the House

In this section, I show how women can succumb to patriarchy, which result in the loss of freedom. To do so, I show how women can be constructed under patriarchal views of what is a woman and how they are expected to behave in such patriarchal conditions. First, I analyze the poem *Angel in the House*, written by Coventry Partmore. The poem is a product of a society -- Victorian society -- that had a group of values and beliefs that reinforced the submission of women. Afterwards, I show how the construct of the angel in the house can be created by using the theory created by Simone de Beauvoir.

The angel in the house is a social construct that represents what is the expected behavior of a woman, it is role model of femininity taking shape. Thus, what it means to be feminine in a broader sense and it is the construction of femininity that I explore in this paper. It first was mentioned in the poem written by Coventry Patmore, published in 1854, when he was trying to express what he, and society in general, thought the model of the perfect woman was --“the angel”, the ideal woman. Here is an excerpt of the poem:

[...]

Man must be pleased; but him to please
Is woman's pleasure; down the gulf
Of his condoled necessities
She casts her best, she flings herself

[...]

And whilst his love has any life,
Or any eye to see her charms,
At any time, she's still his wife,
Dearly devoted to his arms;

She loves with love that cannot tire;
And when, ah woe, she loves alone,
Through passionate duty love springs higher,

As grass grows taller round a stone.
(PATMORE, 1885, p.74)

We can realize that women, in the view of the poet, were born simply to please her husband, to raise children, to be a housewife and, above all, to spend their time and life, to dedicate themselves to men. Partmore is describing his wife, the Victorian ideal of women, the one who is never angry or tired, always passive, always loving. In my first reading of this poem, it seems that this kind of woman is not real, it is not possible to exist such a woman. But the problem is that she is indeed real; she lives. She is inside us, because she is a social construct of the ideal woman. She is the feminine in us fitting the patriarchal gender role described by bell hooks when she exemplifies the workings of patriarchy in her childhood. The author writes, "I was taught that it was my role to serve, to be weak, to be free from the burden of thinking, to caretake and nurture others" (HOOKS, 2004, p.1). We may find ourselves extremely guilty when we are not able to be, in a way or another, the angel in the house.

According to Beauvoir, women are not born women, but they become women. Here I use the words of Simone de Beauvoir to help us understand how a woman is made, how she is constructed, by whom and why. In her words,

One is not born, but rather becomes, woman. No biological, psychic, or economic destiny defines the figure that the human female takes on in society; it is civilization as a whole that elaborates this intermediary product between the male and the eunuch that is called feminine (BEAUVOIR, 1974, p.330).

Being a woman is not something given to women in the moment they appear in the world, but, rather, it is something that is constructed by others. Beauvoir argues that, from a very early age, a girl begins to be modeled:

Through compliments and admonishments, through images and words, she discovers the meaning of the words "pretty" and "ugly"; she soon knows that to please, she has to be "pretty as a picture"; she tries to resemble an image, she disguises herself, she looks at herself in the mirror, she compares herself to princesses and fairies from tales (BEAUVOIR, 1974, p.340).

So, here, in my view, the image of the angel in the house begins to be formed, it is created through what others say and think that is valuable for a woman. Society dictates how they are going to be since the day they are born. Thus, the first thing a girl learns that is valuable is the appearance. Her appearance has to be just like the appearance of the dolls and the princesses that she, very soon in her life, learns to idolize. If she is beautiful just like the princesses, then she gains validation from the world, and this validation begins to be shown to her through the compliments of her mother and father, or other caregivers. What the others think of her, especially her parents, and other caregivers, is extremely important for a little girl, and for any child. It is from a very early age that the little girl learns what is expected from her. In the words of Beauvoir:

(...) it is not because mysterious instincts immediately destine her to passivity, coquetry, or motherhood but because the intervention of others in the infant's life is almost ordinary, and her vocation is imperiously breathed into her from the first years of her life (BEAUVOIR, 1974, p.330-331).

In other words, it is from an early age that a girl may learn her place of passivity in the world, her subjugation begins very soon in her life. She learns to be passive, not because of a biological trait, but because society and her teachers tell her to be docile and passive. If boys, on the one hand, learn to challenge the world, to dare, to be creative, to be curious, to be autonomous, to be active, among other traits; girls, on the other hand, learn how to be quiet, permissive, submissive and kind. A girl's value, in this sense, is equal to her capacity to accept what is imposed and asked of her.

A woman's lack of autonomy arises from this ideal of femininity in her passive behaviour. Beauvoir shows that,

(...) for the woman there is, from the start, a conflict between her autonomous existence and her "being-other"; she is taught that to please, she must try to please, must make herself object; she must therefore renounce her autonomy. She is treated like a living doll, and freedom is denied her; thus a vicious circle is closed (...) (BEAUVOIR, 1974, p. 342).

The author demonstrates that, as long as a girl does not learn to be autonomous, she will not be able to explore the world for herself, she simply will not have the tools to

explore it, she will not know that they are available, and it will undermine her chances to be creative. So, the girl will learn how to be a pleaser, someone whose only value in this earth is defined by how much she can please and serve others. Beauvoir argues:

So she is given other little girls as friends, she is entrusted to female teachers, she lives among matrons as in the days of the gynaeceum, books and games are chosen for her that introduce her to her destiny, her ears are filled with the treasures of feminine wisdom, feminine virtues are presented to her, she is taught cooking, sewing, and housework as well as how to dress, how to take care of her personal appearance, charm, and modesty; she is dressed in uncomfortable and fancy clothes that she has to take care of, her hair is done in complicated styles, posture is imposed on her: stand up straight, don't walk like a duck; to be graceful, she has to repress spontaneous movements, she is told not to look like a tomboy, strenuous exercise is banned, she is forbidden to fight; in short, she is committed to becoming, like her elders, a servant and an idol (BEAUVOIR, 1974, p. 343).

According to Beauvoir, as we might conclude, the normality for a woman is femininity and it is the patriarchal role inherited by little girls. She learns how to be feminine very early in her life: she learns through her mother, her grandmother, her sister, and society in general, that to be accepted she must be feminine. Even if she, because of the achievements of the feminist movement, can go after education and work, she must, at least, be a real woman. A real woman, in this sense, is to be feminine, to be a mother and a wife. Again, Beauvoir, in other words, argues that there is no such a thing as a maternal instinct; rather, there is imposition of the society for the little girl, early in her life, to learn her place and role in the world.

bell hooks compliments the idea of the construction of gender in a patriarchal society. hooks in her essay "Understanding Patriarchy," talking about her own childhood, exemplifies the difference between the roles of a woman and of man,

As their daughter I was taught that it was my role to serve, to be weak, to be free from the burden of thinking, to caretake and nurture others. My brother was taught that it was his role to be served; to provide; to be strong; to think, strategize, and plan; and to refuse to caretake or nurture others. I was taught that it was not proper for a female to be violent, that it was "unnatural" (HOOKS, 2004, p.1).

Here, she shows how different it is for a girl and a boy to be raised. To the girl are assigned the characteristics that are considered weak and secondary. Also, for her, will be given the “characteristics of the mother”, who nurtures and cares for her babies. The one who puts her needs aside in order to please others. Opposite, to the boy are assigned the “strong” qualities, the “logical” ones. He should be the provider, the one who rules and the one who is served by the others. He will be able to develop these traits, as he will receive it as a gift from his caregivers. His mother and father will teach the boy to take care of himself, to embrace the world as if it is his own little object that he can dominate. On the contrary, the little girl will learn how to accept, how to take care of the others, to take care of the house, the children, the husband, whomever. In exchange, she will receive little to nothing gratitude, as this is her obligation. Beauvoir sums up for us the construction of gender—the angel in the house:

No “maternal instinct,” innate and mysterious, lies therein either. The little girl observes that child care falls to the mother, that is what she is taught; stories told, books read, all her little experience confirms it; she is encouraged to feel delight for these future riches, she is given dolls so she will already feel the tangible aspect of those riches. Her “vocation” is determined imperiously (BEAUVOIR, 1974, p.344).

In this section, I have described how the angel in the house persona is created. It is a social construct that has been inherited, passed from generation to generation. It is important to point out that it is extremely dangerous as it undermines women’s chances to be themselves. To understand how the angel in the house is constructed means to understand the rhetor’s point of view when she wrote the novel as it can give me a starting point to go into her reality, the Victorian patriarchal society. Also, by understanding the angel in the house, I can understand the character I analyze. Such as Virginia Woolf -- the rhetor--, Clarissa Dalloway lives under the same values as Virginia Woolf did. She inherited the values of the Victorian society and, for this reason, is constructed as an angel in the house.

Power Relations

In this section I intertwine the construction of gender—the angel in the house

—with the concept of power relations and the control of the body disseminated through discourse, for me to be able to understand the character I analyze -- Clarissa Dalloway. To do so, I see that the construction of gender of the angel in the house might be something that I can better look at with the lens of power relations.

In *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*, Michel Foucault analyzes the penal system of our western society by describing the tactics and strategies that aim at punishing and “correcting” people’s behavior. Foucault argues that there are two kinds of punishment: to the body and to the soul. Both punishments relate to women's rights and freedoms. They are important concepts for us to understand yet another concept: the political technology of the body. The angel in the house is a product of the technology of the body.

The first punishment that Foucault explains is the punishment directed to the body. In his words:

It might be objected that imprisonment, confinement, forced labour, penal servitude, prohibition, from entering certain areas, deportation - which have occupied so important a place in modern penal systems - are physical (...) they directly affect the body. But the punishment-body relation is not the same as it was (...) The body now serves as an instrument or intermediary: if one intervenes upon it to imprison it, or to make it work, it is in order to deprive the individual of a liberty that is regarded both as a right and as a property. The body, according to this penalty is caught up in a system of constraints and privations, obligations and prohibitions (FOUCAULT, 1991, p. 11).

Moreover, in the words of Foucault (1991, p.11), punishment went “From being an art of unbearable sensations punishment has become an economy of suspended rights.” So, here, Foucault begins to explain the history of the penal system by showing the changes that occurred in it. He argues that the penal system no longer built a spectacle for everyone to see it, as when torture and hangings were permitted ways of punishment. Rather, the punitive still hurts the body, in a different level: from taking the rights of the ones who are imprisoned.

Then, Foucault argues that, since it was no longer the body that was the focus of the punitive tools of the system, it became the soul the target of the punishment. We can realize the relation between women’s lack of opportunities and rights to the imprisonment of the soul. This lack, symbolically, punished women from the day they

were born. Since they had no opportunity to work or to be creative, they were obliged to live in the incarceration of their father's houses, then, in their spouse's houses. This is true for our main character Clarissa Dalloway, who married a rich man in order to have security. The character has no job, only a family to serve, and ends up by feeling confused and not understanding the symbolic incarceration she lived under. Woolf writes,

That she held herself well was true; and had nice hands and feet; and dressed well, considering that she spent little. But often now this body she wore (she stopped to look at a Dutch picture), this body, with all its capacities, seemed nothing — nothing at all. She had the oddest sense of being herself invisible; unseen; unknown; there being no more marrying, no more having of children now, but only this astonishing and rather solemn progress with the rest of them, up Bond Street, this being Mrs. Dalloway; not even Clarissa any more; this being Mrs. Richard Dalloway (WOOLF, 1985, p. 8).

In the quotation above, it is possible to realize the relation between Foucault's concept of punishment of the soul and Woolf's writing about upper-class women. Even though they seem privileged, they have no rights. They become a property the minute they marry and become isolated feeling "invisible, unseen, unknown".

Nonetheless, the relevance of Foucault's study of the penal system in the Western society, for the purpose of this analysis, is his concept of 'political technology of the body'. He explains,

The body is also directly involved in a political field; power relations have an immediate hold upon it; they invest it, mark it, train it, torture it, force it to carry out tasks, to perform ceremonies, to emit signs. (...) The body becomes a useful force only if it is both a productive body and a subjected body. This subjection is not only obtained by the instruments of violence or ideology; it can also be direct, physical, pitting force against force, bearing on material elements, and yet without involving violence; it may be calculated, organized, technically thought out; it may be subtle, make use neither of weapons nor of terror and yet remain of a physical order (FOUCAULT, 1991, p.25-26).

Through Foucault's concept of technology of the body we can start to understand how the power relations operate in relation to the body. Foucault explains that power relations are entangled in what seems to be the subjection of the body. It helps us understand that subjugation can happen subtly, in the realm of unconscious obligations and tasks. As we had seen previously, the construction of the angel in the

house results into women feeling obligated to be performing numerous kinds of tasks: taking care of the house, pleasing, acting nice, being sweet. Woolf exemplifies,

How much she wanted it — that people should look pleased as she came in, Clarissa thought and turned and walked back towards Bond Street, annoyed, because it was silly to have other reasons for doing things. Much rather would she have been one of those people like Richard who did things for themselves, whereas, she thought, waiting to cross, half the time she did things not simply, not for themselves; but to make people think this or that; perfect idiocy she knew (and now the policeman held up his hand) for no one was ever for a second taken in. Oh if she could have had her life over again! she thought, stepping on to the pavement, could have looked even differently! (WOOLF, 1985, p. 8).

In the quotation above, Clarissa Dalloway reflects upon the fact that she wants to please people so badly, and also wants to people look pleased by her pleasing. So, we realize that the reason why Clarissa do nice deeds to people is not because she likes them, but to fulfill her role in society. In fact, she knows it is an “idiocy”, and she knows that if she was a man, she would not have to act this way. But, she ends up feeling unconsciously obligated to act this way, she is imprisoned. Her body is subjugated due to her role in society.

Nonetheless, it is extremely important to understand that, according to Foucault. Power is not something that is possessed by one person over the other: “Power is everywhere’ and ‘comes from everywhere’ so in this sense is neither an agency nor a structure” (FOUCAULT, 1998, p. 63). Rather, power is in every relation and everywhere. It is not something made, stable, and static, but it is an extremely complex process constituted by strategies and tactics that, in a last instance, constitute what he calls “the regimes of truth” that are, in a sense, discourses society, mass media, and people in general, produce and maintain. Taking the concept of “regimes of truth” into account, I see the relevance of questioning the power relations that are maintained under the umbrella of the patriarchy. My way of doing it is writing about a novel that questions the power relations itself, *Mrs Dalloway*.

After writing this section, I am able to realize how power relations are intertwined with the construction of gender -- the angel in the house. Even though Foucault argues that power is not something a person possess over another, he also argues that power is maintained by tactics that form the regimes of truth. That being

said, Clarissa Dalloway lives under the regimes of truth of the Victorian society, and it is a society that do not give conditions for women to strive in terms of education and work, at least, in her time. Moreover, it is a society that imposes for women to live in the domestic sphere, rather than the public one (LEMMER, 2007, p. 30). In fact, the character is imprisoned by the same society as regimes of truth of the Victorian society dictate that a woman has limited tasks she can perform, and her place is at home, pleasing her husband. I realize that the prison the angel in the house lives is unconscious as she is unconsciously obligated to perform tasks she does not really know why she performs (WOOLF, 1985, p. 8).

Compulsory Heterosexuality

Another concept that might be important to understand the construction of the angel in the house is what Adrienne Rich calls compulsory heterosexuality. It is important as it enables me to understand another aspect of women's lives that can be imposed by society. I realize that it is what happens with the character I analyze in this study.

In 1980, Rich writes an article called "Compulsory Heterosexuality and Lesbian Existence". In this article, the poet and theorist argues that one of the ways in which women are oppressed and subjugated is in their sexuality. She criticizes the treatment given to women's relations with other women in history and literature. According to her, there has been a total negligence towards women's homosexuality, even in feminist research. Nevertheless, in what it concerns the methods of domination towards women, the author defends that,

(...) prescriptions for 'full-time' mothering at home; enforced economic dependence of wives (...) use of women as 'gifts'; bride price; pimping; arranged marriage; use of women as entertainers to facilitate male deals - e.g., wife-hostess, cocktail waitress required to dress for male sexual titillation, call girls, 'bunnies,' geisha, kisaeng prostitutes, secretaries (...) These are some of the methods by which male power is manifested and maintained. Looking at the schema, what surely impresses itself is the fact that we are confronting not a simple maintenance of inequality and property possession, but a pervasive cluster of forces, ranging from physical brutality to control of consciousness, which suggests that an enormous potential counterforce is having to be restrained (RICH, 1980, p.132).

Rich shows that heterosexuality is imposed onto women and that we are controlled by men and society in what it concerns our right to love women and to be who we choose to be in terms of our sexuality. Also, in this quotation, she shows the many ways in which the control over the body and soul of women are maintained through this heterosexuality imposition. She cites some of the ways in which power over women is manifested and reproduced “(...) prescriptions for 'full-time' mothering at home; enforced economic dependence of wives (...) use of women as 'gifts'; bride price; use of women as entertainers to facilitate male deals“ (RICH, 1980, pg 132). Then, she explains that these are dangerous tactics that undermine chances of freedom to women. Men and society not only dictate the way a woman should be, but also with whom she can explore her sexuality. Rich comments,

Some of the forms by which male power manifests itself are more easily recognizable as enforcing heterosexuality on women than are others. Yet each one I have listed adds to the cluster of forces within which women have been convinced that marriage, and sexual orientation toward men, are inevitable, even if unsatisfying or oppressive components of their lives. The chastity belt; child marriage; erasure of lesbian existence (except as exotic and perverse) in art, literature, film; idealization of heterosexual romance and marriage—these are some fairly obvious forms of compulsion, the first two exemplifying physical force, the second two control of consciousness. (RICH, 1980, p.132).

The author explains that heterosexuality is enforced via the manifestation of male power. Also, Rich shows how that it is done through the control of consciousness and also by physical force. In fact, some women feel obligated to navigate in the world as heterosexual as it is how they were constructed to be. This is true for the main character of *Mrs Dalloway*. Even though the happiest moment in her life happens when she is kissed by a woman, she “chooses” to marry a man.

To conclude, the sexuality can be considered as one more aspect in which women are oppressed. Tradition leaves little choice for women in terms of whom to love and to have sexual relations with. Women learn from a very young age that they should be with men. They receive unconscious and conscious messages that being heterosexual is the only option.

Thus, working with the construction of gender—the angel in the house—through the concepts of power relations, political technology of the body, and

compulsory heterosexuality should allow me to rhetorically analyze Clarissa through feminist and dramatist perspectives.

FEMINISM AND DRAMATISM GO ON A WALK TOGETHER

Here I show how to methodologically proceed with this study that aims at exposing the patriarchal system behind women's actions, pointing to the image of the angel in the house, if there is one, in *Mrs Dalloway*. I plan to uncover the strategies that society uses to control women by using two different kinds of rhetorical analysis: feminist and dramatist

The first method of analysis that I explain is the feminist analysis that helps me understand why and how gender identities in the novel are being portrayed and constructed., Also, with this theory I intent to understand the tactics of maintenance of power that men use through language as I understand that Woolf is trying to show the process of self-discovery and healing of a woman who is not well aware of the chains that imprison her.

Besides that, the second method I analyze the novel is a dramatic perspective to understand the motives behind the actions of the characters in the novel. I do that in order to have profound comprehension of the rhetorical strategies that are being used by Woolf to show how and why women are kept in such a situation of submission. I realize that in *Mrs Dalloway*, Virginia Woolf conveys a message to women, the author shows how women are fundamentally imprisoned when they are obligated to perform tasks dictated from the patriarchal society. To prove my hypothesis, I mix these two kinds of analysis by walking through these two different theoretical pathways at the same time. By creating the dramatic criticism, Kenneth Burke comes up with the concept of terministic screen, in the words of Rutten et al (2012 - p. 635), "He introduced the concept of terministic screen to explain how every language (terminology) we use always constitutes a corresponding 'screen' that 'directs the attention' to a particular selection of reality". Taking this concept under consideration, I understand that, in order to do a dramatic analysis, we are obliged to declare our standpoint. As a feminist myself, I analyze the world with the glasses of feminism. That being said, feminism is my terministic screen. It is essential that I begin my methodology by showing of what feminist criticism is made of.

Feminist Criticism as a Lens

The rhetorical scholar Sonja K. Foss in order to explain what feminist criticism is, in *Rhetorical Criticism - Exploration & Practice*, offers a historical overview of the feminist movement as she understands that it is not possible to comprehend the method without understanding its standpoint. The scholar explains that there are three stages, or waves of the feminist movement that are the following: the first wave, that happened in the middle of the nineteenth century to 1920s, (the main focus of this wave was guaranteeing for women the right to vote); the second wave, that started in the 1963 and ended in the 1980s (the focus of this wave was fighting for the equality of opportunities for women and men without problematizing gender), and, lastly, the third wave, that began in the 1980s and focus on understanding the different contexts that people live in and gathering alliances with intersected groups in order to fight against patriarchy.

Despite the fact that each wave and kind of feminism has different objectives and definitions and the fact that the concept of feminism can be open-ended for discussion, all these feminisms and waves of the movement share the same essence. In the words of the scholar the essence of feminism is agency. She explains,

Feminism is rooted, then, in choice and self-determination. Although they may go about it in different ways, what all feminists seek is the assumption of agency by all individuals, where all individuals are able to make their own choices for their lives. Assumption of agency means that people are unconstrained by the definitions or expectations of others or by material conditions that work to constrain their choices (FOSS, 2004, p.154).

Feminist criticism appears as a theoretical method of criticism when the feminist rhetoricians realize that there was an emergence of dedicating themselves and focusing their researches into the study of rhetorical strategies of analysis that would have as standing points both rhetoric and the essence of the feminist movement. According to the scholar, feminist criticism is

[T]he analysis of rhetoric to discover how the rhetorical construction of gender is used as a means for domination and how that process can be

challenged so that all people understand that they have the capacity to claim agency and act in the world as they choose (FOSS, 2004, p.157).

Foss argues that she has chosen to put this method of criticism under the heading of the feminist movement because it explores the domination on the base of sex, and also because she wants to acknowledge the efforts of the ones who began to use this method of criticism-- feminist scholars.

Nonetheless, the method is constituted by a four-step process: selecting the artifact, in the words of the scholar "because gender, race, class and other dimensions of identity are present in most artifacts (...) almost any artifact can be used for feminist criticism" (FOSS, 2004, p;158). The second step is the one in which we analyze the artifact. It happens in two steps: "(1) analysis of the construction of gender (...) (2) exploration of what the artifact suggests about how the ideology of domination is constructed and maintained or how it can be challenged and transformed" (FOSS, 2004, p.158).

In conclusion, I make use of the feminist method as I see the relevance of understanding how the angel in the house construction is shown by Virginia Woolf in the novel *Mrs Dalloway*. I realize that the author of the novel understands very well how the upbringing of women and men happen in divergent ways. So, I shall encounter in her writing the strategies she uses to show how different it is for men and women to live, and how power is manifested to keep women imprisoned.

Dramatism as a Means

In this study, my main goal is to understand Woolf's motive (the message that Woolf conceives and why she does so) in writing *Mrs Dalloway*. To do so, I undertake the challenge to show that patriarchy is an ideology that undermines Clarissa Dalloway's (the main character of the novel) chances to choose her pathway. I am willing to have a deeper understanding into Clarissa's world. To do so, I use the pentadic criticism as I understand that it will enable me to have a profound comprehension of this novel. So, in this section, my focus is on explaining what dramatism is and how to perform a pentadic criticism based on dramatism.

In 1945, Kenneth Duva Burke, a rhetorician, philosopher, literary theorist, and a “word man”, as he liked to call himself, understood that it is through language that we create the world, our reality, and our relationships. He wrote an extensive book called *A Grammar of Motives* in which he presented a method or a grammar to analyze human motives, discover what human beings’ motivation in doing what they do, might be, and interpret human beings’ actions by understanding the symbols they use. In his words,

We sought to formulate the basic stratagems which people employ, in endless variations, and consciously or unconsciously, for the outwitting or cajoling of one another. Since all these devices had a “you and me” quality about them, being “addressed” to some person or to some advantage, we classed them broadly under the heading of a Rhetoric. There were other notes, concerned with modes of expression and appeal in the fine arts, and with purely psychological or psychoanalytic matters. These we classed under the heading of Symbolic (BURKE, 1969, p. xvii).

So, here Burke starts to explain that his dramatistic theory is in nature a rhetorical theory as Burke understands rhetoric as “the use of words by human agents to form attitudes or to induce actions in other human agents” (BURKE, 1969, p.41). When a rhetor creates an artifact, she or he is trying to conceive a message, even if this is not yet clear for her, or for him. That is what he means when he posits that we can produce meaning “in endless variations, and consciously or unconsciously”. Burke shows that everything we do is done for some purpose, and behind every action there is a motive and it is addressed to an audience. Moreover, talking about Burke’s theory, Blakesley shows that,

The dramatistic view of the world holds that language is not simply a tool to be used by people (actors), but the basis for human beings acting together and thus, of all human relations. Words act, in other words, to define, persuade, appease, divide, identify, entertain, victimize, move, inspire, and so on (BLAKESLEY, 2001, p.5).

Nonetheless, we can analyze every situation in life, and every artifact created by human beings, of course, just like a novel, if we are willing to discover what is behind it, through Burke’s theory of Dramatism.

In what concerns the method that I analyze Virginia Woolf's novel, in the end of this section, I use the words of Foss about dramatism. Referring to Burke, she says, "the label the Burke gives to the analysis of human motivation through terms derived from the study of drama" (Foss, p.383, 2004). It is important, here, to acknowledge two concepts that Burke defends in order to create his theory of drama. These concepts are how he defines "motion" and "action". According to Burke, motion is the name we give to the biological aspects of our humanity, the ones that we are not able to control (e.g. digestion and respiration); to the rest of the aspects, the ones that we control and create, he gives the name "action". Everything we perform, create, do, say, are actions because we use our will to make them exist. These actions are symbolically created by humans for a reason. We have a motivation in doing such things, so, they are rhetorical acts, because all of them have a meaning, consciously or unconsciously. As I said before, we are always conceiving a message. The ultimate scenery of our actions is life; as lived in a big play, creating meaning and using the symbols as our tools to conceive and interpret them.

Nonetheless, in this sense, life itself is a play in which we can use the same terminology used on a play to analyze situations enacted by human beings. Again, according to Burke,

Dramatism is a method of analysis and a corresponding critique of terminology designed to show that the most direct route to the study of human relations and human motives is via a methodical inquiry into cycles or clusters of terms and their functions (BURKE, 1989, p.135).

It is essential to notice that, in order to apply such a method, we need to face the group of five terms called "the pentad": the agent (the one, or the ones, who enacted the action), the act (the action performed by the agent), the agency (the means and instruments used by agent to do the action), the scene (the ground in which the agent performed the act), and last but not least, the purpose (why the agent performed such act). When Burke mentions "a methodical inquiry", he means that we need to carefully observe and reflect about these terms and take every information that we can out of them in order to rhetorically understand the motivation behind rhetor's piece of work. Hence, every rhetorical act can be analyzed if we are willing to look at them deeply and with the perception of someone who watches a

play. Why would we want to watch a play facing its full complications and complexity? Simply because, as humanity we are willing to face the consequences of understanding and finding out the motives behind our sisters' and brothers' actions in order to reflect upon them, change them, if do not feel satisfied, do it differently, see ourselves in them, heal, as Clarissa Dalloway tried to do in her path of life when she decided to throw a party. Also, when Virginia Woolf created this rhetorical artifact, she was trying to say something, what was it? Why? Virginia Woolf was well aware of the power that language has upon people's actions. Just like Burke, she understands the world through language inasmuch Burke thought language as the basis of society.

WHEN FEMINISM AND DRAMATISM MERGE

Thus, before I go further about the mentioned method -- Dramatism, I need to explain more thoroughly why I am using Burke's principles of Rhetoric and how can they be applied to a feminist analysis of the novel written by Virginia Woolf. It might seem ambiguous, but, the essence, I shall explain here. As I said before, Burke sees Rhetoric as the way people use words -- symbols, in order to form behaviors. This notion is best revealed by Sonja Foss, when she explains,

Rhetoric functions in a number of ways, but one that Burke sees as particularly significant is how it functions to name or define situations for individuals (...) Rhetoric does not simply provide a name for a situation, however. It also represents a creative strategy for dealing with that situation or for solving the problems inherent in it. Rhetoric offers commands or instructions of some kind, helping individuals maneuver through life and helping them feel more at home in the world. Because rhetoric is a rhetor's solution to perceived problems, it constitutes "equipment for living"-- a chart, a formula, manual, or map that the audience may consult in trying to decide on various courses of action (...) The rhetor not only names the situation but names it in a particular fashion or style (FOSS, 2002, p. 194).

So, if Rhetoric functions also as a way of showing and naming situations, it also can function as a way out of that situation, as transforming a situation, and changing the world. First of all, I need to face the rhetor in a way that I try to understand what she is trying to say: I use dramaturgical theory to understand that and my framework is Feminism. What is a rhetor, you would ask. A rhetor is someone who creates a rhetorical artifact in a way that she tries to convey a message to a certain audience. Let's name rhetor, already, then, you would say. Virginia Woolf is our rhetor, herself, and all the women, whomever she is able to touch with her words, her audience.

Burke's concept of terministic screen explains how dramatism and feminism can merge automatically when the person who analyzes the artifact is a feminist. Rutten et al argue on what a terministic screen is "every language (terminology) we use always constitutes a corresponding 'screen' that 'directs the attention' to a particular selection of reality". My selection of reality is one in which I refuse to ignore how men and women have different conditions to navigate in the world. Also, I see that in terms of gender, women have been the ones who have had the less rights and

privileges. Women have been imprisoned and they have been punished when they refuse to ignore the prison they live in. Moreover, I argue that Virginia Woolf's selection of reality is one in which the writer understands the lack of conditions women have had throughout history. The author acts on it by writing about women for women. The rhetor is a feminist in the most essential and truthful way.

Thus, I create a new fashion here. In which I analyze Virginia Woolf's novel in a dramatist and feminist perspective in hope it gives me a thorough understanding on Clarissa Dalloway's subjugation. By analyzing the novel in a feminist perspective, I undertake the challenge to face the main character's lack of autonomy and conditions to shape her own life. Also, I see the construction of the angel in the house utilizing this tool of analysis. By analyzing the novel with dramatist tool of analysis, I face the motive behind the novel.

THE ANGEL WILL BUY THE FLOWERS HERSELF

“Thus marital power outlives the feudal regime. The paradox still being perpetuated today is established: the woman most fully integrated into the society is the one with the fewest privileges in the society (...) The rich woman pays for her idleness with submission.” (BEAUVOIR, 1974, p.110)

I face the motive behind Woolf's novel. My analysis takes under consideration the aspects that are unique for women in society, as I understand that it is impossible not to look and face that women have had different historical, social, and economic upbringing than men. The analysis is a feminist one, as I posit myself in the world as a feminist woman and the rhetor, Virginia Woolf, is also someone who writes for and about women; it means that we refuse to ignore that a big part of the world has been taken from women. I realize Mrs. Dalloway discovers herself feeling an inessential and invisible being. Beauvoir argues that, “If woman discovers herself as the inessential and never turns into the essential, it is because she does not bring about this transformation herself” (BEAUVOIR, 1974, p.8). Following this line of thought, I analyze Mrs. Dalloway through a dramatist terminology--agent, purpose, scene, agency and act.

The Angel - Agent and Coagents

In *Mrs. Dalloway*, Clarissa Dalloway, Peter Walsh, Sally Seton and Septimus Smith are the agent and co-agents. In order to analyze who the agent becomes as mid-aged woman in the Victorian era it is crucial to understand the people around her -- the ones who affect her.

Clarissa is trying to figure out what she has done with her life, she is questioning her decisions and trying to understand herself. I, too, try to understand them, for I have undertaken this challenge. The agent is a mid-aged woman who goes out in a sunny morning to buy some flowers to her party. When she is walking through the streets of London she starts reflecting upon her past as she observes every detail of the landscape that surrounds her. She goes back and forth in a timeline of twenty years in a narrative method used by Woolf called stream of

consciousness -- a method with which the rhetor lets us know every thought of the characters in her novel.

Clarissa's name is the title of the book, well, not her name, the name of her spouse -- Dalloway, her last name, the one she received when she married. The title of the book is very important to understand who Clarissa is, or even better, who she becomes: a property. Oftentimes, when a woman, such as the main character of the book, marries and takes the name of her husband, she becomes not herself, but a false self, objectified, even if it is in a covert way. It can be done by a choice -- as women can freely chose to take their last name of their husband as a symbolic act of love, or it is a mean of subjugation. In this analysis, for my purpose, I see the latter. By naming the book *Mrs Dalloway*, Woolf makes an important rhetorical decision -- she shows us that her protagonist is married.

The act of naming the book contributes to construct the representational angel in the house, as we can perceive from the following quote, when Clarissa thinks about life. Woolf writes,

But often now this body she wore (she stopped to look at a Dutch picture), this body, with all its capacities, seemed nothing — nothing at all. She had the oddest sense of being herself invisible; unseen; unknown; there being no more marrying, no more having of children now, but only this astonishing and rather solemn progress with the rest of them, up Bond Street, this being Mrs. Dalloway; not even Clarissa any more; this being Mrs. Richard Dalloway (WOOLF, 1981, p. 8).

Here we begin to realize Clarissa's resentment towards her life. In fact, she realizes she is "invisible, unseen, unknown" in the eyes of society. One of the patriarchal system rules is to define women by marriage and maternity, after performing these two acts, their lives can become meaningless, that can be the truth for many mid-aged women. This could also be true when talking about upper-class women, when they have no other job than to please, to stay at home, and, in the case of Clarissa, to throw parties.

The first description of the agent that we read in the book is that she is a woman that looks fragile because of her illness; at the same time, she looks vivacious and serious. The thought is made by a man who lives in the same city, a mere acquaintance. Woolf writes:

A charming woman, Scrope Purvis thought her (knowing her as one does know people who live next door to one in Westminster); a touch of the bird about her, of the jay, blue-green, light, vivacious, though she was over fifty, and grown very white since her illness. There she perched, never seeing him, waiting to cross, very upright (WOOLF, 1981, p. 3).

We are introduced to how people perceived the agent: a fragile, distracted, upright, mid-aged woman, affected by her illness. At the same time, vivacious as a young person who waits to discover something out of life that she does not really know. As it is the very first description of the agent, it is here when we discover her through the eyes of other people.

Clarissa Dalloway, as we start to realize, is well aware of how people thought of her and that determines who she is. According to Beauvoir, when a person is seen as inferior, the person becomes inferior as society do not give this individual chance to get out of this position. So, people become what other people see them to be. (BEAUVOIR, 1974, p. 12). Peter Walsh, one of the coagents in this story, a man who proposed to her when she was young, and someone who she resents and admires at the same time, told her she was the “perfect hostess”. The agent remembers this event with a feeling of resentment and pain. Woolf writes,

But Peter — however beautiful the day might be, and the trees and the grass, and the little girl in pink — Peter never saw a thing of all that. He would put on his spectacles, if she told him to; he would look. It was the state of the world that interested him; Wagner, Pope’s poetry, people’s characters eternally, and the defects of her own soul. How he scolded her! How they argued! She would marry a Prime Minister and stand at the top of a staircase; the perfect hostess he called her (she had cried over it in her bedroom), she had the makings of the perfect hostess, he said (WOOLF, 1981, p. 6).

This passage is extremely important for us to understand what it means to be an angel in the house for Clarissa: being an angel in the house for Clarissa is, among all, being a hostess. The passage is also essential for us to realize how the rhetor understands how women and men are soon differentiated in their lives. This differentiation is shown by Virginia Woolf when she writes how the two characters see and perceive the world in totally opposite ways. Their traits are distinctive because their identities are constructed in divergent ways. On the one hand, the

agent, the angel of the house, the perfect hostess, is seen as someone who has a great ability to be attentive over the details of the world with her enormous capability to feel, to be sensitive. The coagent, on the other hand, Peter, is interested in the matters of intellectuality and logical thinking: politics and poetry.

This dichotomy of emotion and logic can be explained because the rhetor, Woolf, understands that the conditions of women and men are completely different. Women are historically robbed from the right to study and to have a career of their own, much less to pursue a career that demands intellectuality as society raise women to be mothers and wives. (BEAUVOIR, 1974, p. 381). People become what they are conditioned to be. And men are historically benefited because people live under a patriarchal system that ideologically robs women from their right to be truly free, and by free, it can mean doing what they truly want to do. Culturally, women do not even know what they want, as society placed them in a spot of inferiority for so long, they have been trying to know themselves rather than discovering what they want (BEAUVOIR, 1974, p. 12). That is true about our agent; she becomes what other people perceive her to be, even though she is in a journey of self-discovery as she realizes she does not really know why she does the things she does. This lack of knowing why one does the things leaves a sense of pure confusion.

Nonetheless, in Clarissa's youth, the construction of the angel was not yet shaped. Clarissa Dalloway is upset and remembers Peter saying, "She would marry a Prime Minister and stand at the top of a staircase; the perfect hostess he called her (she had cried over it in her bedroom), she had the makings of the perfect hostess." (WOOLF, 1981, p. 6). She realizes that it was exactly what she has become, a hostess. A woman who throws parties as an attempt to please, to fit in the shoes society has given to her. But, Clarissa was not always this way, when she was younger she was rebellious and had intellectual curiosity. As we can see when she remembers a very important figure in her life, Sally Seton, her friend from when she was younger. Woolf writes

There they sat, hour after hour, talking in her bedroom at the top of the house, talking about life, how they were to reform the world. They meant to found a society to abolish private property, and actually had a letter written, though not sent out. The ideas were Sally's, of course — but very soon she

was just as excited — read Plato in bed before breakfast; read Morris; read Shelley by the hour. (WOOLF, 1981, p. 25).

Sally Seton is one of the most important coagents in this story, as she represents the only woman (character) who was truly free and showed Clarissa what being free was. As she shows Clarissa that a woman can be free and can have ideas of her own and that a woman can choose not to follow what is imposed by society, she represents a rupture from what has been taught to Clarissa. Both characters, however, know what their destiny is- getting married, being a good wife, being an angel of the house. Woolf writes:

It was protective, on her side; sprang from a sense of being in league together, a presentiment of something that was bound to part them (they spoke of marriage always as a catastrophe), which led to this chivalry, this protective feeling which was much more on her side than Sally's. For in those days she was completely reckless; did the most idiotic things out of bravado; bicycled round the parapet on the terrace; smoked cigars. Absurd, she was — very absurd. But the charm was overpowering, to her at least, so that she could remember standing in her bedroom at the top of the house holding the hot-water can in her hands and saying aloud, "She is beneath this roof. . . . She is beneath this roof!" (WOOLF, 1981, p. 25).

We can realize after reading this passage that both characters know what is going to happen to them. Even though they fantasize about a "changed world", that, by my interpretation is one in which women can be free, they know what has been taught to them. They know they will end up by having to fit in. Both characters ended up by marrying and having a family, fitting the woman's role, following what they already knew was going to happen. Following their destinies.

The characters, Clarissa and Sally Seton were in love with each other, but they never even talk about it. They do not confess their feelings, they do not dream to be together, and they see the end of their time together. It is when they are to get married. So, they see marriage as a catastrophe, but never question it when they are proposed. Woolf writes,

But this question of love (she thought, putting her coat away), this falling in love with women. Take Sally Seton; her relation in the old days with Sally Seton. Had not that, after all, been love? (...) She was wearing pink gauze — was that possible? She SEEMED, anyhow, all light, glowing, like some bird or air ball that has flown in, attached itself for a moment to a bramble. But

nothing is so strange when one is in love (and what was this except being in love?) as the complete indifference of other people. (WOOLF, 1985, p. 24-26)

In the quotation above, the rhetor shows that the only person Clarissa loved was Sally Seton. The agent is well aware of her love for Sally, but never acts upon it. The person who acts upon the attraction both of the characters share, is Sally. Woolf writes,

Then came the most exquisite moment of her whole life passing a stone urn with flowers in it. Sally stopped; picked a flower; kissed her on the lips. The whole world might have turned upside down! The others disappeared; there she was alone with Sally. And she felt that she had been given a present, wrapped up, and told just to keep it, not to look at it — a diamond, something infinitely precious, wrapped up, which, as they walked (up and down, up and down), she uncovered, or the radiance burnt through, the revelation, the religious feeling! (WOOLF, 1985, p. 26)

The quotation above is about the moment in which, in her youth, Clarissa is kissed by Sally Seton. Clarissa describes this moment as the happiest moment in her life and remembers it with joy. In the novel, the only moments in which Clarissa Dalloway is happy is in her memories with Sally, her true love. Clarissa also describes her love for women as "what men felt. Only for a moment; but it was enough. It was a sudden revelation, a tinge like a blush which one tried to check and then, as it spread (WOOLF, 1985, p. 54). So, not only Clarissa loved women in her youth, but her love towards women is still vivid. But, as the character describes, it is the love that "men felt", it is not something that is acceptable for her, she is well aware of that. Her sexuality is oppressed and it is hidden, as she conforms with the rules dictated by the society.

Nevertheless, Clarissa Dalloway is far from being happy. The feelings Clarissa has are resentment, regret, and, at the same time, a character who is trying to maintain the appearances even to herself. Woolf writes:

How much she wanted it — that people should look pleased as she came in, Clarissa thought and turned and walked back towards Bond Street, annoyed, because it was silly to have other reasons for doing things. Much rather would she have been one of those people like Richard who did things for themselves, whereas, she thought, waiting to cross, half the time she did things not simply, not for themselves; but to make people think this or that; perfect idiocy she knew (and now the policeman held up his hand) for no

one was ever for a second taken in. Oh if she could have had her life over again! she thought, stepping on to the pavement, could have looked even differently! (WOOLF, 1981, p.8)

After reading this passage, we can realize how much Clarissa wants to please and to be recognized by her pleasing behavior. So, throwing parties is not the only way Clarissa tries to look good in the eyes of society; she has this preoccupation all the time. At the same time, she resents herself for it; she really does not know what the origin of this preoccupation is, as it is rooted in her womanhood. By the same token, it is essential to identify, in this quotation, the grieving process being formed in Clarissa. The character realizes that she could have been different if she was a man, or if she was liberated. The agent's grief in this novel is overwhelming as we can see that, at the same time Clarissa realizes her life is empty of meaning, she does not see a way out of it. The only way out would be death.

Moreover, the thought of death is present is another co-agent, Septimus Smith. Woolf writes,

People must notice; people must see. People, she thought, looking at the crowd staring at the motor car; the English people, with their children and their horses and their clothes, which she admired in a way; but they were "people" now, because Septimus had said, "I will kill myself"; an awful thing to say. Suppose they had heard him? She looked at the crowd. Help, help! she wanted to cry out to butchers' boys and women. Help! Only last autumn she and Septimus had stood on the Embankment wrapped in the same cloak and, Septimus reading a paper instead of talking, she had snatched it from him and laughed in the old man's face who saw them! But failure one conceals. She must take him away into some park (WOOLF, 1985, p.12).

Septimus Smith is a character that appears in the novel and never meets with Clarissa Dalloway. He suffers from post-traumatic disorder as a result of being a soldier in the World War I and seeing a close friend dying right in front of his eyes. The character undergoes innumerable difficulties to adapt back to the English society, such as psychotic episodes in which the character hears voices telling him to kill himself. Also, the character experiences deep pain and confusion resulted by his traumatic experience at war. In the quotation above Lucrecia Smith, Septimus' wife, describes his suicidal behavior. Although Septimus never has an encounter with Clarissa, later on the novel we can realize the connection between the two characters. Both of them look in the eyes of death and embrace the thought of it as a

release from the imprisonment that the characters are inside. The characters' prisons are different, but both are oppressed by the values of society. Just as society does not give conditions to women to strive and be free, society does not give conditions to people who have mental illnesses to thrive. I go deeper into the relation between the two characters when I write about act. Women and people who have mental illnesses both are outsiders in the eyes of society; they can try to adapt themselves or they end up by being marginalized.

To conclude, If, on the one hand, the descriptions of Clarissa's appearance and personality depict her as weak and fragile; on the other hand, she is perceived as cold and serious. As for herself, she does not really know who she is, and it indicates her lack of wisdom about herself. She is confused about her identity and her low intellectual self-esteem. Nonetheless, after performing the analysis of the agent, I clearly see the interrelation between the coagents and the agent as the backbone of my analysis. Every encounter Clarissa has in the novel is important for me to understand the way she becomes: the angel in the house. Peter Walsh and Sally Seton affect directly the way she is and perceives the world as they soon participated in her life as a young woman. However, Septimus Smith affects her life just as well, even though they never meet, as both of the characters share important traits and sorrows.

Victorian Patriarchal Society - Scene

Here, I continue my analysis with an important feature of it, the term scene. I do it as I understand that scene deeply affects the agent, so it is a path that I must take in order to understand the motive of Virginia Woolf in writing this novel. The scene, as I defined before, is where the act takes place. I could say London, in a June day, a whole life in a day, post first war, but my aim is to understand the angel in the house through a feminist perspective. So, I see the scene in broader and more ideological way: the angel performs the act in a patriarchal society. Previously, in this paper, I define patriarchy and I understand it as the ideological system under which, women and men live (hooks, 2004, p. 1). Men are benefited by it, women, robbed from their right to choose how their lives are going to be like. It could all be

different if the rights were equal, if women were not historically robbed and made invisible. Women are the part that is posited in history as the inessential as they are prescribed with femininity chains (BEAUVOIR, 1974, p. 3). However, to write about Virginia Woolf's novel, it would be superficial to overlook the rhetor's time and place. It is important to understand what is the context in which the rhetor and the agent are placed in the world, so that scene can be better understood.

Virginia Woolf was born in 1882 in England, it means that she lived many years of her life under the monarchy of Queen Victoria. Even after the death of Queen Victoria, that happened in the year of 1901, England was impregnated by ideals and values inherited by her reign. The Victorian era was imprinted in Virginia Woolf, it does not mean she accepted its values, she resented them --In my research I talk about the angel in the house, as mentioned by Virginia Woolf as dangerous. As a construct she wanted to kill (WOOLF, 1942, p.242). To understand the scene, I continue my analysis by looking to the Victorian era. Lemmer argues:

The Victorian era is not merely part of continuity greater than itself, but contains within itself many discontinuities and incongruencies. Yet the ideal of respectability, which permeated every aspect of the conscientious Victorian's life, remained constant throughout (LEMMER, 2007, p. 10).

When Lemmer writes that "The Victorian era is (...) greater than itself", the author means that it goes way beyond than just the years in which the Queen Victoria reigned. When analyzing this era we have to take into consideration the values that continued to be spread and reinforced throughout the years after it ended. Also, it is essential in this research to mention that, despite all the beneficial changes that happened in this period, that came, above all, as a result of the Industrial Revolution, such as economic growth, life for women was difficult and they were considered as secondary. Women, in the Victorian era, had less than few rights. The group of values that Lemmer writes about in her dissertation when she uses the term "respectability" encompasses the oppression of women, the lack of opportunities to work, the discouragement to study and to be free to make their own choices. Moreover, Lemmer comments: "Feminine morality was associated with home while masculine morality was displayed in public, although the husband's home became his most striking symbol of moral status" (LEMMER, 2007, p. 30). So,

feminine morality is connected with oppression, as the gender roles in Victorian era served to maintain women captive in a domestic atmosphere. After my brief explanation on the scene shared by the rhetor, Virginia Woolf, and, the agent, Clarissa Dalloway, I write how the scene is shown in the novel itself.

I previously, in my research, write about how Mrs. Dalloway is not free to be herself as she is imprisoned by the patriarchal society. One of the characteristics of having to live under such a system, for women, is having to adapt themselves and follow the rules prescribed by the gender, having to fit the role of femininity. Now I show in the novel the workings of patriarchy in Clarissa's mindset. Woolf writes:

Nothing that would serve to amuse her and make that indescribably dried-up little woman look, as Clarissa came in, just for a moment cordial; before they settled down for the usual interminable talk of women's ailments. How much she wanted it — that people should look pleased as she came in, Clarissa thought and turned and walked back towards Bond Street, annoyed, because it was silly to have other reasons for doing things. Much rather would she have been one of those people like Richard who did things for themselves, whereas, she thought, waiting to cross, half the time she did things not simply, not for themselves; but to make people think this or that; perfect idiocy she knew (and now the policeman held up his hand) for no one was ever for a second taken in. Oh if she could have had her life over again! she thought, stepping on to the pavement, could have looked even differently! (WOOLF, 1981, p. 8).

In this passage, Clarissa is describing her visit to one acquaintance of her, who is also a woman and ill. This part of the book takes us directly to the scene as it shows how women are in a way imprisoned by their thoughts of duty of being nice and pleasant as the scene, patriarchal society, prescribes roles that are imprinted in their feminine morality. The angel must please and serve, when she does not, there is a estrangement coming from the other women. Clarissa wants badly that her acquaintance looks pleased when she comes in. This way, her acquaintance would fit the role prescribed by patriarchy, and, she, Clarissa Dalloway would have achieved her goal, to please. This passage represents the scene inasmuch as patriarchal construction of the angel in the house dictates that women should seek for external approval. Clarissa starts to question why she seeks external and her husband seeks internal approval. She asks herself why her husband is free to do things for himself and she, oppositely, does the things in order to amuse the others, to entertain. She even wonders if she was like her husband, all of her life would be

different. This is very strong because it is when the agent questions the scene. She resents the scene or patriarchy, that dictates how life should be and the way she should perform.

Another passage that is important in order to understand the scene is one in which a coagent thinks about Clarissa and her place of passivity. Woolf writes:

In all this there was a great deal of Dalloway, of course; a great deal of the public-spirited, British Empire, tariff-reform, governing-class spirit, which had grown on her, as it tends to do. With twice his wits, she had to see things through his eyes — one of the tragedies of married life. With a mind of her own, she must always be quoting Richard — as if one couldn't know to a tittle what Richard thought by reading the Morning Post of a morning! These parties for example were all for him, or for her idea of him (to do Richard justice he would have been happier farming in Norfolk). She made her drawing-room a sort of meeting-place; she had a genius for it. Over and over again he had seen her take some raw youth, twist him, turn him, wake him up; set him going. Infinite numbers of dull people conglomerated round her of course. But odd unexpected people turned up; an artist sometimes; sometimes a writer; queer fish in that atmosphere. And behind it all was that network of visiting, leaving cards, being kind to people; running about with bunches of flowers, little presents; So-and-so was going to France — must have an air-cushion; a real drain on her strength; all that interminable traffic that women of her sort keep up; but she did it genuinely, from a natural instinct (WOOLF, 1981, p. 57).

So, after having an encounter with Clarissa, the coagent, Peter, reflects on how the agent's life revolves around appearances. For Clarissa, hierarchy and amusements are important. This passage is also essential to understand the depth of confusion and duality of Clarissa's identity. At the same time as she adapts to the scene, as being the angel in the house and by taking over her husband's views and pleasing other people, as we can see when the coagent thinks about the fact that she spends her life trying to amuse people, she has judgmental views about the world and people, she is an intransigent angel.

To conclude, Clarissa does not rebel against the scene, but she is not fully adapted to it either. When the character questions the system, and is in the midst of confused feelings, we can realize that she does not fully accept the system of patriarchy. However, the character ends up by perfectly fitting in the shoes of the angel in the house as it also encompasses a group of moral values from the Victorian age. She is submissive and the scene imposes its values upon her. The way Clarissa acts comes down to the scene also. The adaptation to the scene is not a conscious

choice, it happens as a result of the way the agent is constructed. The agent only adapts to the scene because she feels unconsciously obligated to follow the rules of the patriarchy and the morality of Victorian era.

Purposelessness - Purpose

By the same token, here, I start to analyze the purpose. I mean, what leads the agent, Clarissa Dalloway to perform the act, throwing a party. I move on with my analysis looking at the term purpose, as I recognize the evident connection between purpose and scene.

The agent struggles to find meaning in the act she performs when she experiences the feeling of overwhelming sadness. Woolf writes:

It was a feeling, some unpleasant feeling, earlier in the day perhaps; something that Peter had said, combined with some depression of her own, in her bedroom, taking off her hat; and what Richard had said had added to it, but what had he said? There were his roses. Her parties! That was it! Her parties! Both of them criticised her very unfairly, laughed at her very unjustly, for her parties. That was it! That was it! Well, how was she going to defend herself? Now that she knew what it was, she felt perfectly happy. They thought, or Peter at any rate thought, that she enjoyed imposing herself; liked to have famous people about her; great names; was simply a snob in short. Well, Peter might think so. Richard merely thought it foolish of her to like excitement when she knew it was bad for her heart. It was childish, he thought. And both were quite wrong. What she liked was simply life (WOOLF, 1981, p. 89)

When Clarissa starts to feel an overwhelming sadness, she looks for reasons why she is having this feeling. She realizes she feels this way because people judge her for throwing parties. When the judgmental comments and expressions of other people towards the act happens, she has to question herself, “defend herself” for giving these parties. She convinces herself that she gives parties for the sake of “life”. Later on, she even questions herself what life means to her. She does not conclude about what is life. Moreover, her justification for throwing parties is fragmented and confusing as she connects throwing parties to life. The agent does not know what life means to her, and, afterwards, elaborates that the act is an act of offering parties for the sake of offering parties. Woolf writes,

An offering for the sake of offering, perhaps. Anyhow, it was her gift. Nothing else had she of the slightest importance; could not think, write, even play the piano. She muddled Armenians and Turks; loved success; hated discomfort; must be liked; talked oceans of nonsense: and to this day, ask her what the Equator was, and she did not know. All the same, that one day should follow another; Wednesday, Thursday, Friday, Saturday; that one should wake up in the morning; see the sky; walk in the park; meet Hugh Whitbread; then suddenly in came Peter; then these roses; it was enough. After that, how unbelievable death was! — that it must end; and no one in the whole world would know how she had loved it all; how, every instant... (WOOLF, 1981, p. 89).

Throughout the novel, Clarissa desperately tries to convince herself why she does the things she does. but the agent never concludes about anything. This fact can be explained by her lack of knowing herself. Also, the attempts to please other people corrupt her ability to live her life to please herself. In this quotation it is possible to realize that, although Clarissa knows what she likes and what she does not like, she still struggles in finding meaning in her life. The mere fact that she knows her preferences does not mean that she knows herself. She says that her only gift is to throw parties, and this is a way in which she thinks she is giving back, as it is her only ability, to amuse other people.

After trying to convince herself that she throws parties for the sake of offering something to someone, the agent struggles with another feeling: confusion. When Clarissa thinks her party is a failure, Clarissa soon questions herself again. Woolf writes,

Oh dear, it was going to be a failure; a complete failure, Clarissa felt it in her bones as dear old Lord Lexham stood there apologising for his wife who had caught cold at the Buckingham Palace garden party. She could see Peter out of the tail of her eye, criticising her, there, in that corner. Why, after all, did she do these things? Why seek pinnacles and stand drenched in fire? (WOOLF, 1981, p. 122).

So, after realizing her party might not achieve the success she hoped it would be, she reflects why she throws them, when it is so risky. She reveals to herself that her goal was not to give an offering for “life”, but to fulfill her role in society, to be a hostess, someone who pleases. If her purpose was clear, she would not question it all the time, especially when she sees it as a failure. It is confusing how she is

questioning herself and never concludes. The rhetor, Virginia Woolf, leaves it open to the reader to understand why Clarissa throws parties, but offers many answers to it at the same time. The very feeling of confusion experienced by Clarissa Dalloway gives us the answer that her purpose might not exist.

Peter Walsh, the coagent, argues that Clarissa gives parties to please her husband. In the following quotation, the coagent, hypothesises about Clarissa's purpose in giving parties. Woolf writes,

The obvious thing to say of her was that she was worldly; cared too much for rank and society and getting on in the world — which was true in a sense; she had admitted it to him. (You could always get her to own up if you took the trouble; she was honest.) (...)These parties for example were all for him, or for her idea of him (to do Richard justice he would have been happier farming in Norfolk). She made her drawing-room a sort of meeting-place; she had a genius for it. Over and over again he had seen her take some raw youth, twist him, turn him, wake him up; set him going. Infinite numbers of dull people conglomerated round her of course. But odd unexpected people turned up; an artist sometimes; sometimes a writer; queer fish in that atmosphere. And behind it all was that network of visiting, leaving cards, being kind to people; running about with bunches of flowers, little presents; So-and-so was going to France — must have an air-cushion; a real drain on her strength; all that interminable traffic that women of her sort keep up; but she did it genuinely, from a natural instinct (WOOLF, 1981, p. 57).

In this quotation, Peter Walsh thinks that Clarissa throws parties because of her husband. I align with the coagent line of thought as I understand that maintaining women captive also means that the women have to perform acts against their will. Against one's will is not only when men put a gun against women's head, it means that society constructed Clarissa as an angel in the house and it is done subtly -- even unconsciously-- by power maneuvers. Rich comments that it can be done by "use of women as "gifts"; bride-price; pimping; arranged marriage; use of women as entertainers to facilitate male deals, e.g., wife-hostess(...)" (RICH, 1980, p. 939). Being a hostess, in the case of Clarissa, is her prison as she gives in to the power maneuver that is being imposed upon her. So, yes, she throws parties because of her husband, as he is the male figure she "owes" her life to.

To conclude, I see the purpose as nonexistent because Clarissa is unaware of her prison. Her confusion in explaining to herself why she performs the act is interpreted by me as a lack of purpose. Her unconscious purpose is to please and to

perform the role society has given to her. Her purposelessness is a result of the way she was shaped to be, an angel in the house. In fact, all of her attempts to find a purpose becomes useless in face of her lack of knowing herself. Woolf writes, “walking towards Bond Street, did it matter that she must inevitably cease completely; all this must go on without her; did she resent it; or did it not become consoling to believe that death ended absolutely?” (WOOLF, 1985, p. 7). In this passage, Woolf demonstrates the melancholy of women who are purposeless. Women who are not active, who do not create, rather, they observe. This points out the angels do not have a purpose for doing what they do. Woolf elucidates the lack of purpose of the agent by using the concept of death in her consciousness to show that death would alleviate Clarissa from the burden of not having a purpose in life, it would alleviate the burden of having to face the emptiness of a life without purpose. it would not matter if she died, she thinks, she sees death with the eyes of a friend, she questions why she does not resent it, rather, she embraces it.

Lack of Conditions - Agency

Here, I continue my analysis by looking to the term agency. Agency is defined by the means the agent has to perform the act. So, here, I want to know what the means that Clarissa Dalloway has to give a party are.

I understand that the agency is her mind. In fact, the agency is how her mind was shaped to think in a way that fitted the patriarchal society in the Victorian era. Lemmer writes,

Queen Victoria provides a dichotomy in the ideology of respectability. She embodied respectability's feminine ideal. She was charming, pure, hardworking and excelled in the tricky arts of family life. Yet, at the same time, she was its antithesis; she was strong-willed, opinionated and firmly held the position as her country's sovereign. Thus, she is an example of the many incongruencies characteristic of her age (LEMMER, 2007, p.10).

Clarissa throws the party in 1923, in this time, the reign of Queen Victoria had already ended, but the values were widespread all through England. The feminine respectability ideal was imprinted in women and the rhetor, Virginia Woolf is well aware of that. Girls were shaped to be a nice angel in the house and also to think like one. Although Clarissa is far from being strong-willed, she embodies all of

characteristics cited above related to Queen Victoria. The characteristics the representation of Queen Victoria and Clarissa share are the ones that fit in the construct of the angel in the house.

Clarissa is a very opinionated woman, but she does not perceive herself as a woman who excelled in intellectuality. Woolf writes,

(...) Not that she thought herself clever, or much out of the ordinary. How she had got through life on the few twigs of knowledge Fräulein Daniels gave them she could not think. She knew nothing; no language, no history; she scarcely read a book now, except memoirs in bed; and yet to her it was absolutely absorbing; all this; the cabs passing; and she would not say of Peter, she would not say of herself, I am this, I am that (WOOLF, 1985, p.6).

As mentioned on the quotation above, Clarissa does not define herself as clever. It reveals that she has a low intellectual self-esteem even though she spends most of her time thinking and reflecting about her past and present, about life and the world, she does not consider these reflections valuable. She does not have the means to perceive herself as a human of great intellect, she has a gigantic capability to analyze life but she lacks the self-esteem to be intellectually autonomous, not only this is a matter of low self-esteem, but also reveals the limited conditions that women have. Demir writes,

Victorian families raised their daughters in such an atmosphere that submission to men, being good at housework and looking after children were the fixed gender roles imprinted on their memories at their early ages. They were confined to their private spheres. Higher education was seen as unnecessary by their family and the society. They just could find works which didn't require high qualifications, such as needle work, cleaning, baby sitting. Men even didn't condescend to talk to them about politics, art, business and science. What was expected from a woman was to be a charming and decorative housewife who made the home and food ready for her husband and children (DEMIR, 2015, p. 55).

The Victorian era is the environment that both the rhetor and the agent grow up in. In such an environment, a woman is seen as secondary and her conditions to strive in matters of work and intellectuality are less than few. Demir argues that only in 1870 education became compulsory for girls. However, higher education continued to be basically impossible for women, as the values shaped the line of thought of society making them to encourage only men to pursue education (DEMIR, 2015, p.

55). maintaining women in a place of captivity inside the homes of, first their fathers, then, their husbands.

To conclude, agency for Clarissa is the lack of opportunities, because her identity is constructed as the angel in the house -- a construct of the Victorian era, in which women had no conditions to study and to work, even if they wanted to. That being said, she does not have the intellectual means to understand the society in which she lives in, nor the life she has accepted to endure. So she alienates herself. She throws parties and tries to please as those are the only skills she has been trained to perform. The lack of tools to understand her situation maintains her imprisoned in this very situation.

Throwing a Party - Act

I continue my journey to understand Virginia Woolf's motive by looking at the act. The act can be defined by what the agent does. It seems, by whoever looks, one of the most important terms. In fact, all of the terms together are important as they make it possible for me to understand the big picture of the novel written by Virginia Woolf. I already analyzed where the act is performed, why it is performed, with what means it is performed and the character that performed the act. I see that it all comes down to the act and I undertake the challenge to look at the act itself. I realize that because everything Clarissa thinks, she thinks because the mere thought of having to perform the act triggers all sort of other thoughts. In fact, the name of the novel already suggests what is her role in society.

I hereby posit the act as throwing a party. When I face the act, I acknowledge a social event full of superficiality. Woolf writes,

“How delightful to see you!” said Clarissa. She said it to every one. How delightful to see you! She was at her worst — effusive, insincere. It was a great mistake to have come. He should have stayed at home and read his book, thought Peter Walsh; should have gone to a music hall; he should have stayed at home, for he knew no one. (...) It was extraordinary how Peter put her into these states just by coming and standing in a corner. He made her see herself; exaggerate. (...) Life was that — humiliation, renunciation (WOOLF, 1985, p. 122).

In the passage above, Peter Walsh reflects upon the fact that the agent is being insincere towards her guests. It is possible to confirm the coagent's views on the insincerity of the agent as the agent thinks how the presence of the coagent -- Peter -- makes her see her own lack of depth on performing the act. I see this passage as an example of how the act was underlined by superficiality as externally the agent tries to appear delighted "How delightful is to see you", but internally she is struggling with confusion and pain "Life was that — humiliation, renunciation". In fact, Clarissa is not delighted to see anyone, but she tries to maintain her appearance as the perfect hostess, confirming her role of the angel in the house. The superficiality of the event is overwhelming for Clarissa. Woolf writes,

Colonel and Mrs. Garrod . . . Mr. Hugh Whitbread . . . Mr. Bowley . . . Mrs. Hilbery . . . Lady Mary Maddox . . . Mr. Quin . . . intoned Wilkin. She had six or seven words with each, and they went on, they went into the rooms; into something now, not nothing, since Ralph Lyon had beat back the curtain. And yet for her own part, it was too much of an effort. She was not enjoying it. It was too much like being — just anybody, standing there; anybody could do it; yet this anybody she did a little admire, couldn't help feeling that she had, anyhow, made this happen, that it marked a stage, this post that she felt herself to have become, for oddly enough she had quite forgotten what she looked like, but felt herself a stake driven in at the top of her stairs. Every time she gave a party she had this feeling of being something not herself, and that everyone was unreal in one way; much more real in another. It was, she thought, partly their clothes, partly being taken out of their ordinary ways, partly the background, it was possible to say things you couldn't say anyhow else, things that needed an effort; possible to go much deeper. But not for her; not yet anyhow. "How delightful to see you!" she said. Dear old Sir Harry! He would know every one. And what was so odd about it was the sense one had as they came up the stairs one after another, Mrs. Mount and Celia, Herbert Ainsty, Mrs. Dakers — oh and Lady Bruton! (WOOLF, 1985, p. 124).

The passage above is profoundly essential for me to understand the act. Clarissa says she is not enjoying the party, even though she spends much of the time trying to defend it. I see that the character is completely lost in terms of identity awareness and she tries to maintain the appearance, even to herself, that she is not. Externally, it makes her seem a happy person who is enjoying the presence of her guests -- her insincerity is apparent only to Peter Walsh. But the rhetor, by showing the reader the agent's thoughts, makes the reader know her false happy self. Thinking about the act as "too much of an effort", Clarissa appears to be bored and tired of all the superficial encounters that she has to undertake "Colonel and Mrs.

Garrod...Mr. Hugh Whitbread...Mr. Bowley...Mrs. Hilbery... Lady Mary Maddox(...) She had six or seven words with each, and they went on” (WOOLF, 1985, p. 124). By writing the passage above, the rhetor also shows how, when she throws parties, the character dissociates of her own imprisoned body “Every time she gave a party she had this feeling of being something not herself, and that everyone was unreal in one way” (WOOLF, 1985, p. 124). So, the character is well aware of the superficiality of her social events, and the way her mind finds in dealing with it is by dissociating. Nonetheless, the pinnacle of the act happens when Clarissa finds out about the suicide of a young man called Septimus Smith. Woolf writes,

What business had the Bradshaws to talk of death at her party? A young man had killed himself. And they talked of it at her party — the Bradshaws, talked of death. He had killed himself — but how? Always her body went through it first, when she was told, suddenly, of an accident; her dress flamed, her body burnt. He had thrown himself from a window (...) She had once thrown a shilling into the Serpentine, never anything more. But he had flung it away. They went on living (she would have to go back; the rooms were still crowded; people kept on coming). They (all day she had been thinking of Bourton, of Peter, of Sally), they would grow old. A thing there was that mattered; a thing, wreathed about with chatter, defaced, obscured in her own life, let drop every day in corruption, lies, chatter. This he had preserved. Death was defiance. Death was an attempt to communicate; people feeling the impossibility of reaching the centre which, mystically, evaded them; closeness drew apart; rapture faded, one was alone. There was an embrace in death. (WOOLF, 1985, p.133-134)

To give context to the quote above, it is important to say that the character William Bradshaw is a psychiatrist who treats Septimus Smith right before the character commits suicide. When Clarissa Dalloway hears about his suicide she is shocked by the mere fact that the couple brings such news to her party: “What business had the Bradshaws to talk of death at her party? (WOOLF, 1985, p. 133). Clarissa’s acknowledgment about Septimus Smith’s suicide is the pinnacle of the act as it is when the agent is able to reflect about everything she goes through as she realizes the similarities between herself and Septimus Smith. Throughout the novel, I can see that Clarissa desperately tries to maintain the appearances even to herself, and it means that she also tries to convince herself that she is happy. When she realizes that Septimus killed himself, she is able to have enlightenment about her grief. All the fragments of her memory, her confusion, her resentment, her superficiality comes down to the grief she feels. She faces her own isolation and

corruption of her soul through the eyes of the deceased Septimus. The agent identifies with Septimus in a deep level as she can see that both of them have been corrupted and see that his death is language, as it is a tool to communicate. According to the agent, Septimus Smith saves himself by killing himself, as the agent is aware of the suffering people have to undertake when they are being corrupted by society.

The suffering the agent has in having the unconscious obligation to fulfill her role of angel in the house is so deep that she does not realize it until her identification with Septimus. Woolf writes,

(...) she must have perished. But that young man had killed himself. Somehow it was her disaster — her disgrace. It was her punishment to see sink and disappear here a man, there a woman, in this profound darkness, and she forced to stand here in her evening dress. She had schemed; she had pilfered. She was never wholly admirable. She had wanted success. Lady Bexborough and the rest of it. And once she had walked on the terrace at Bourton (WOOLF, 1985, p.134).

In the passage above it is possible to realize that, when facing the death of the person she identifies with, Clarissa has to face her own pain in having the burden of being an angel in the house. The agent is able to put it all together like a puzzle of memories. Her past, the one which she spends the whole day thinking about, becomes like a picture of a dead person and she has to grieve it. In the passage, the rhetor shows us the pain Clarissa is going through, the pain the agent is obligated to see and to reflect upon. She lives, but the boy dies. Septimus chooses freedom, Clarissa is obligated to stay in her prison. One character completes the other as their sorrows merge.

Even though Septimus is not considered a hero when he is alive, for Clarissa, he represents the courage in interrupting the corruption that life can be. Woolf writes,

The young man had killed himself; but she did not pity him; with the clock striking the hour, one, two, three, she did not pity him, with all this going on. There! the old lady had put out her light! the whole house was dark now with this going on, she repeated, and the words came to her, Fear no more the heat of the sun. She must go back to them. But what an extraordinary night! She felt somehow very like him — the young man who had killed himself. She felt glad that he had done it; thrown it away. The clock was striking. The leaden circles dissolved in the air. He made her feel the beauty; made her

feel the fun. But she must go back. She must assemble (WOOLF, 1985, p.135).

As Clarissa identifies with Septimus, she does not pity him, she is glad he is able to free himself from the sorrow she knows he felt; she feels it too. I realize that this moment is the most important moment of the act due to what Septimus represents to Clarissa, a part of herself, as she is able to feel empathy for him, she feels something real, apart from all superficiality and appearances she tries to maintain. After spending all day thinking about her past, Clarissa can focus on the present and future as she comes to the realization that even though life is a prison, she chooses to be alive. The rhetor leaves it open for us to decide what Clarissa Dalloway is doing after the realization of her grief.

In conclusion, after analyzing the term act and arguing that the act is the party Clarissa Dalloway throws, I am able to notice the relevance this party has for Clarissa as it is the moment she is able to put all the pieces of her life together and grief. It is important to explain that grief is not something bad that happens for Clarissa as it is the only moment she has to face her truth. For Clarissa, finding relief in the fact Septimus kills himself is enlightening. It is the moment she realizes she is not alone in her suffering. The party is the act because, not only it represents the performance of Clarissa's obligation to please, it is also the moment she realizes her pain and can liberate herself by facing the pieces of her shattered soul.

VICTORIA'S RATIOS - VIRGINIA WOOLF'S MESSAGE RECEIVED

My objective, in this paper, is to find out why Virginia Woolf writes this novel. So, here, I put the terms together to understand the message Virginia Woolf wants to conceive. I, in the previous sections, identified the terms: scene (Victorian patriarchal society), agent (Clarissa Dalloway), act (throwing a party), purpose (unconscious obligation to please and conscious non-existent), and agency (lack of intellectual conditions to strive). I realize that It is not enough to just identify the terms, to complete my task, I elect the most important one and put this term close with the others, so that I can show why this term is the most important. So, in this section, I do

the impairment of the terms and argue that the predominant one is scene -- Victorian patriarchal society. Afterwards, I write on Virginia Woolf's motive.

I start with scene-agent. The agent, Clarissa Dalloway is affected by the scene as her life revolves around fulfilling her role in the society she was born in. The rhetor starts to show that with the title of the book "*Mrs Dalloway*". The title of a married woman serves the agent her whole life as the patriarchal society that inherited values from the Victorian era did not give other conditions for women than to fulfill their roles of married women in society. Clarissa Dalloway's role is to be the married perfect hostess: "She would marry a Prime Minister and stand at the top of a staircase; the perfect hostess he called her (she had cried over it in her bedroom), she had the makings of the perfect hostess, he said" (WOOLF, 1981, p. 6). It is possible to realize that, if Clarissa Dalloway had been born in a different era, one in which did not have patriarchal regimes of truth, she would have been a whole different person. In fact, the character is well aware of that when she wonders: "Oh if she could have had her life over again! she thought, stepping on to the pavement, could have looked even differently" (WOOLF, 1985, p.8).

By the same token, I look at scene-purpose. Clarissa's purpose in throwing a party is also affected by the scene as it can be explained by the lack of opportunities to do anything else than to please. Clarissa's conscious purpose is non-existent. However, unconsciously, the character is driven by her obligation to please and her lack of opportunities to strive leaves her no choice than to fulfill her role as the hostess of society: "An offering for the sake of offering, perhaps. Anyhow, it was her gift (...) could not think, write, even play the piano (...) must be liked; talked oceans of nonsense: and to this day, ask her what the Equator was, and she did not know" (WOOLF, 1981, p. 89).

Likewise, I look at the scene-agency ratio. The agency in my analysis is the lack of condition women had in the Victorian and patriarchal society in general. So, it is clear that the connection between agency and scene is very direct. As I say before in this analysis, even though Clarissa's time is not the Victorian, Clarissa and Virginia Woolf --the rhetor--inherit the values and conditions of the Victorian age. In this time, rare were the possibilities for women to work, even less to study. Some can argue that women were free to pursue a career in the beginning of the 19th century. But,

the fact is that it was hard, and the tradition kept women in a place of captivity. In the words of Simone de Beauvoir, “Even when their rights are recognized abstractly, long-standing habit keeps them from being concretely manifested in customs” (BEAUVOIR, 1974, p. 9). This is true for the agent, even though society abstractly offers women rights for them to liberate themselves from submission, the tradition of the society in which she lives in offers her no conditions to be independent.

I hereby face the scene-act ratio. The patriarchal society in which Clarissa lives indicates the act as Clarissa is clearly clueless why she throws parties and argues it is her only “gift”. In the words of Virginia Woolf, “An offering for the sake of offering, perhaps. Anyhow, it was her gift (...) could not think, write, even play the piano (...) must be liked” (WOOLF, 1981, p. 89). So, the rhetor, in this passage, informs us that the agent could not do anything other than to be hostess. The act only happens because Clarissa is raised to perform the duty of being a hostess, in fact, she is trained to perform acts of pleasing.

After identifying scene as the predominant term and putting the terms together I am able to identify Virginia Woolf’s motive. Virginia Woolf, in *Mrs Dalloway*, criticizes patriarchal society with values inherited from the Victorian age underlined by the superficiality of the English morality. She does so by writing about a woman who looks back into her life with grief. Clarissa Dalloway, a woman who is constructed to be an angel in the house, is the exemplification of womanhood in the time of the rhetor. Clarissa Dalloway does not have a home, a career or a life of her own; her identity is shattered by the memories of a time she could have been more than a hostess, a mother, and a wife. Instead, she follows her destiny of submission. The backbone of Virginia Woolf’s critique is constituted by the feelings of confusion and grief the novel encompasses. The rhetor makes us enter in the mind of a woman who has her identity erased and desperately tries to put the pieces together. The result of putting the pieces of one’s life together is grief. In fact, Clarissa finds enlightenment in grief, as it is the only way to face the unhappiness of having no purpose in life.

I see Virginia Woolf’s motive also as a warning to most women who feel imprisoned . We can follow the destiny of womanhood, and let it dictate our lives, or we can look at the lives of women who have their souls shattered by the patriarchal

society and kill the angel inside of us. Virginia Woolf tells us to free ourselves from the shadow of the angel that follows us, so that we do not have to grieve our souls afterwards. By writing *Mrs Dalloway*, Virginia Woolf does an attempt to kill the angel in the house, but, unfortunately, to show us the angel lives inside women who accept the impositions of femininity without even questioning it. The angel will only stay alive as long women refuse to kill it and set her free. The only way we can kill the angel is by realizing we are not free, that we are imprisoned since the day we are born. Only then, we can transcend by fighting for our freedom.

THE END IS THE BEGINNING

Here, I come to the end of my journey. In this study, I have two major objectives. The first one is to trace a journey in which I could understand how the construction of the angel in the house happens. So, for that, I write about the construction of gender, feminism, imprisonment and patriarchy and I find out how they are all connected. My first objective seems to be achieved, as I am now able to understand how and why women are imprisoned. Also, I am able to show the imprisonment happening in the novel I analyze. My second objective is to analyze the novel *Mrs Dalloway* by creating a new tool of analysis that merge two different analyses: the feminist and the dramatist. I also seem able to achieve this objective, even though it makes me more curious about the complexity of Virginia Woolf's writing.

I realize that none of my objectives in this paper were easy tasks to do. As a woman, it is not easy to face women's imprisonment. In fact, to face women's imprisonment is to see my own imprisonment right in the eye. I see that what all women have in common is that we are constructed to be imprisoned angels in the house. Although women have different upbringings, we certainly have major characteristics in common, characteristics which we inherited and learn from a very young age. Every now and then, we may encounter ourselves trying to please someone who has hurt us, laughing at sexist and homophobic jokes not to cause any embarrassment in the perpetrator; excusing them by saying "they were just kidding". We may encounter ourselves following scripts that are given to us on how to act, how to laugh, how to speak, how to live our lives. We may find ourselves being someone we do not recognize. We may identify with women like Clarissa in levels we do not really want to admit.

In fact, after writing this paper I figured out that we should all be Clarissas. So, let us all be Clarissas Dalloway, let's grieve a bit for every moment we followed scripts on how to live, every time we try to convince ourselves we are happy, when, deep down, we know we are not. Every time we let someone else decide how we should live our lives. We should all be Clarissas in terms of questioning our own reality. Only by facing the truth, we can free ourselves.

To grieve is not negative for women. It can mean we look at the pieces of our identities and lives that we have lost, that were not our choice, that were imposed onto us, and find peace by, for the first time, choosing to let it go and transcending. So, I come to the end of this journey, but I am not happy with what I found out. But, I realize, I should not be happy, but I should see the relevance in keep fighting the angel inside of me, as I understand that we have to change ourselves in order to change the world. The end of the journey of understanding Virginia Woolf's motive is only the beginning of the journey of understanding myself.

Lastly, I see the relevance in keep analyzing novels written for women about women, with women authors, in a dramatic and feminist perspective as I realize that using these two analytic tools together we can figure out the strategies women authors use to show their own and our reality mixed together. Again, not an easy task to face their reality and realize that the reality of women who lived before us is so alike our own. We, then, have to realize why and how it did not change. I see that the reason I see so many similarities between Clarissa and many women I know, including myself, is due to the scenery, the patriarchal system still functioning, whether we want to acknowledge it or not.

REFERÊNCIAS

- BEAUVOIR, Simone. **The Second Sex**. New York: Vintage Books, 1974.
- BURKE, Kenneth. D. **A Grammar of Motives**. New York: Prentice Hall, 1945.
- _____. **A Rhetoric of Motives**. New York: Prentice Hall, 1950.
- _____. **On Symbols and Society**. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1989.
- CRUEA, S. M. Changing Ideals of Womanhood During the Nineteenth-Century Woman Movement. **General Studies Writing Faculty Publications**, Bowling Green, v.1, n.1, p. 187-204, 2005. Disponível em: <<https://scholarworks.bgsu.edu/>> Acesso em 16 dez. 2018.
- FOSS, Sonja. K. **Rhetorical Criticism: Exploration & Practice**. Illinois: Waveland Press, Inc., 2004.
- FOUCAULT, Michel. **Discipline and Punish: the birth of a prison**. London: Penguin, 1991.
- _____. **The History of Sexuality: The Will to Knowledge**. London: Penguin, 1998.
- HOOKS, Bell. **Feminism is for everybody: passionate politics**. Cambridge: South End Press, 2004.
- _____. Understanding Patriarchy. **Imagine No Borders**. Louisville: No Borders. Disponível em: <<http://imagine noborders.org/pdf/zines/UnderstandingPatriarchy.pdf>> Acesso em: 10 jul. 2017.
- LEMMER, Chaterine. **Victorian Respectability: The Gendering of Domestic Space**. South Africa: University of Pretoria, 2007. Disponível em: <<https://repository.up.ac.za/handle/2263/26917>> . Acesso em: 16 dez. 2018.
- MACNAMARA, Mary. What is Feminism? Another View. **Wicca: "Wise Woman" Irish Feminist Magazine**, Dublin, v. 21, n. 13, p. 6-7, 1982.
- PATMORE, Coventry, K., **The Angel in the House**. London: Andesite Press, 2015.
- RICH, Adrienne. Compulsory Sexuality and Lesbian Existence. **Feminism and Sexuality**. New York: Columbia University Press, 1996.
- RUTTEN, Kris; GRIEF, Roets; RUDI, Roose; RONALD, Soetaert. The Rhetoric of Disability: a Dramatistic-narrative Analysis of One Flew over the Cuckoo's Nest.

Critical Arts-south-north Cultural and Media Studies. v. 26, n. 5, p. 631–647, 2012.

WOOLF, Virginia. **Mrs. Dalloway.** New York: Houghton Mifflin Harcourt Publishing Company, 1981.

_____. **The Death of the Moth and Other Essays.** San Diego: A Harvest Book, 1942.