



A Nietzschean Reading of Androgyny in Virginia Woolf's *To the Lighthouse*¹

Nilay Erdem Ayyıldız *

Lecturer Dr., School of Foreign Languages, Firat University
yalinmedre@hotmail.com

APA Citation:

Ayyıldız, N.E. (2019). A Nietzschean Reading of Androgyny in Virginia Woolf's *To the Lighthouse* *Journal of Narrative and Language Studies*, 7(12), 57-69.

Abstract

Both Friedrich Nietzsche and Virginia Woolf are of the opinion that a human being is comprised of two opposite selves. They are, in Nietzsche's terms, the Apollonian deriving from Apollo, the sun-god associated with self-control, rationality and order, and the Dionysian named after Dionysus, the wine-god, representing passion, irrationality, and chaos. In Woolf's understanding, the human mind is composed of masculine and feminine characteristics. From their perspectives, the patriarchal Victorian culture brought the Apollonian self forward the Dionysian one and associated 'woman' with the Dionysian and feminine traits such as emotion, passion and chaos but 'man' with the Apollonian and masculine properties including reason, self-control and order. Nietzsche notes in *The Birth of Tragedy* (1872) that an artist creates a high-quality art out of the balance between his Apollonian and Dionysian selves, and Woolf claims in *A Room of One's Own* (1929) that the fusion of an artist's masculine and feminine minds is prerequisite for creativity. Therefore, both of them necessitate for a great artist to produce free from gender traits and call for the androgynous mind. Thus, this paper explores the intersection of Nietzsche's Apollonian-Dionysian dichotomy and Woolf's theory of androgyny in *To the Lighthouse* (1927).

Keywords: Nietzsche, *The Birth of Tragedy*, Woolf, *A Room of One's Own*, *To the Lighthouse*.

Being a Woman Artist in the Victorian Age

Patriarchal Victorianism constricted women and men to clear-cut separate spheres; women to the domestic sphere and men to the public one. Women were expected mainly to be 'good' wives and mothers and strive for being so when they were adult. Therefore, they were brought up to be an "angel in the house" or the "household fairy" which were popular Victorian concepts attributed to women. Confined to the domestic life, women were kept away from politics, military, commerce as they were stated to be lack of "logical thought to best effect" in contrast to men (Rowbotham, 1989, p. 6). Accordingly, they were considered to belong in "the more passive, private sphere of the household and home where their inborn emotional talents would serve them best" (Rowbotham, 1989, p. 6). As the reason for this, the Victorian philosopher John Stuart Mill (1806-1873) stated in his preminent work *The Subjection of*

¹ This article is an extended version of the conference paper presented at the 8th International Conference on Narrative and Language Studies held in Trabzon, Turkey on May 2-3, 2019.

* School of Foreign Languages, Firat University, Elazığ, Turkey

Women (1869): “I believe that their [women’s] disabilities elsewhere are only clung to in order to maintain their subordination in domestic life because the generality of the male sex cannot yet tolerate the idea of living with an equal” (1963, p. 485). Woolf also notes: “It would be a thousand pities if women wrote like men, or lived like men, or looked like men” (2015, p. 64). Evidently, the conception of the domestic sphere where women were attributed paved the way for rationalizing that women could not deal with art. Moreover, the “domestic focus of women’s lives, to be narrowly limited to home and family, was justified and given ideological unity in the nineteenth century by a range of arguments, resting on women’s nature, on God’s ordinances, on the evidence of past and present societies” (Rendall, 1985, p. 189); for instance, the claim that women were weak and inferior to men was asserted by Victorian scientists arguing that women had smaller, thus less efficient brains than men did (Showalter, 1977, pp. 76-77). The physicians and anthropologists also put forth that women could not use as much mental energy as men; thus, they “would divert the supply of blood and phosphates from the reproductive system to the brain, leading to dysmenorrhea, ‘ovarian neuralgia,’ physical degeneracy, and sterility” (Showalter, 1977, p. 77). Thus, men had more opportunities to succeed; for instance, had access to better education and a variety of careers, in comparison to women, who were anticipated to go just for the status of an angel or a fairy by learning how to draw, sing and dance well.

The academic lesson the Victorian women had was limited to the basic knowledge of modern foreign languages, with the exception of household chores duties (Rowbotham 99) because they were not believed as knowledgeable as men. As the main Victorian concern about girls to learn how to behave and express themselves in a “proper way,” they were urged to read didactic fiction to learn how to act out their domestic roles in the society by keeping them away from the public sphere and rationalizing their position in the society. In this regard, many Victorian novels such as *Belinda* (1801) and *Patronage* (1814) by Maria Edgeworth may be claimed to have been ‘fictionalized conduct books.’ The women who could not take control of their passion and behave in accordance with their gender roles were called “heinous” and “monstrous” (Daniel 39). Accordingly, women who were eager to learn more were despised and announced to be “blue-stockings” who “were considered unfeminine and off-putting in the way that they attempted to usurp men’s ‘natural’ intellectual superiority” (Hughes page number).

Virginia Woolf elaborated on women’s literary development in her renown work *A Room of One’s Own* (1929), which is also the primary text of this study. Based on two lectures about women and fiction, which Woolf delivered to female students in Cambridge in 1928, *A Room of One’s Own* has been taken as a key text for feminism since then (Marcus, 1983, p. 43, Minogue, 2012, p. 6, Roe and Sellars, 2000, p. 217, Snaith, 2007, p. 101). Throughout literary history, women have been “the other” in the works of men writers who used the pen as their “metaphorical penis” (Gilbert and Gubar, 1996, p. 91). Therefore, as observed by Woolf, the woman was “an odd monster,” “a worm winged like an eagle,” and “the spirit of life” (2015, p. 33). Even “the best woman,” in her words, was thought to be “intellectually the inferior of the worst man” (2015, pp. 39-40). Woolf observed that men were neither indifferent to women writers nor their supporters, rather, they discourage female writers constantly, and “it was impossible for any woman, past, present, or to come, to have the genius of Shakespeare” (2015, p. 34). Claiming that the domestic duties held women back from creating art, Virginia Woolf stated that the Victorian conception of “angel in the house,” which urged women to be “sympathetic,” “charming,” “unselfish,” excellent in housework, self-sacrificial, “pure,” and without “a mind or a wish of her own,” needed to be killed (1979, p. 59) because the Western culture was patriarchal, history is his-story, literature is phallogocentric, language is man-made, and “[s]cience,” Woolf claims, “is not sexless; she is a man, a father...too” (1979, p. 8). Because

of the mentioned claims confirming the pacified status of women in society, women were commonly thought to lack essential characteristics to be a good author. Even if they attempted to write, they were doomed to create in a certain way and subjected to the verbal inhibitions reinforced by critics (Showalter, 1977, p. 25). Women were claimed to be no other than imitators of men writers, and they were excluded from the world of literature which men dominated in the nineteenth century. Therefore, to overcome patriarchal obstacles requires women writers to get rid of the masculine mode of writing.

Woolf's Androgyny: A Way out of Patriarchal Pressures to the Great Art

Woolf considered the psychological pressure of the patriarchy on women as a threat to women writer's creativity. She observed that whenever women felt like writing, they would have to do it in the common sitting-room, where they were "always interrupted" (2015, p. 49). Women's poverty was another reason, for Woolf, that limited women writers' creativity. Correlating intellectuality with money, Woolf quoted Professor of Literature called Sir Arthur Quiller-Couch claiming that "intellectual freedom depends upon material things. Poetry depends upon intellectual freedom. And women have always been poor, not for two hundred years merely, but from the beginning of time" (2015, p. 77). Therefore, she underlines that a woman writer needs her own room and money to create art.

Deriving from Woolf's observations, there were various reasons hindering women writers from writing. Nonetheless, as noted by Elaine Showalter, the Victorian age is often referred to as the period of great women writers such as Jane Austen (1775-1817), Mary Shelley (1797-1851), Elizabeth Barrett Browning (1806-1861), Elizabeth Gaskell (1810-1865), Charlotte Brontë (1816-1855), Emily Brontë (1818-1848), George Eliot (1819-1880), and Anne Brontë (1820-1849) (1977, p. 3).

Considering the presuppositions pertaining to women in the period, it is understandable that the Victorian women writers challenged the notion of the domestic sphere and faced a large number of obstacles to be able to become professional writers. Through the title character of *Jane Eyre* (1847), Charlotte Brontë, through Catherine Earnshaw in *Wuthering Heights* (1847), Emily Brontë and through Maggie in *The Mill on the Floss* (1860), Eliot and through the title character of *Aurora Leigh* (1865), Browning, fictionalize women as neither angelic nor monstrous, but possessing traits which the Victorian society would consider being both masculine and feminine. They embody compassion, passion, love and anger simultaneously. Thus, the authors indicated that women could not be confined to be an angel or a monster, and they defied the notion of gender roles through their heroines. They answered the question raised in *The Madwoman in the Attic* by Gilbert and Gubar indicating that pen is not "a metaphorical penis" (1996, p. 91). To put it another way, they prove that it is not prerequisite to be a man to become a qualified author and deconstruct the association between authorship and gender. Evidently, women writers do not have to repress their femininity to write. About this point, the English activist author Barbara Leigh Smith Bodichon (1827-1891) noted that "the larger-natured a woman is, the more decidedly feminine she will be; the stronger she is, the more strongly feminine. You do not call a lioness unfeminine, though she is different in size and strength from the domestic cat, or mouse" (2001, p. 44). Furthermore, Charlotte Brontë became frustrated when she was looked down on because of being a woman writer, and she wrote to George Henry Lewes (1817-1878), an English critic of literature as follows: "You will- I know- keep measuring me by some standard of what you deem becoming to my sex ... come what will- I cannot when I write think always of myself- and of what is elegant and charming in femininity- it is not on those terms or with such ideas I ever took pen in hand" (qtd. in Barker, 2006, p. 261). Moreover, she confronted the critics who based their criticisms about *Jane Eyre*

on Brontë's femininity. To illustrate, in her letter to a critic that wrote that he would appreciate the book unless it had been written by a woman. Charlotte conveyed her anger in her response to him as follows: "To you I am neither Man nor Woman- I come before you as an Author only it is the sole standard by which you have a right to judge me- the sole ground on which I accept your judgement" (qtd. in Barker, 2006, p. 256). Charlotte's outburst of anger was towards not only the critic but also all the male critics excluding women from the literary world. Apparently, gender, which is culturally constructed rather than biologically determined, became women's obstacle in the field of art.

In Woolf's understanding, women can write well when their minds are free from their gender and coercive expectations of the patriarchal society. As a positive creative force for a way out of gender discrimination and stereotypes in art, Woolf proposes androgyny for women artists. The word "androgyny" derives from the Greek "andro" meaning male and "gyn" referring to female. It is defined as "a condition under which the characteristics of the sexes, and the human impulses expressed by men and women, are not rigidly assigned" (Heilbrun, 1993, p. x). Indeed, the concept of androgyny dates back to Plato who states that "the original human nature was not like the present, but different. The sexes were not as they are now, but originally three in number; there was man, woman and the union of the two, having a name corresponding to this double nature, which has once a real existence, but now is lost... the word 'androgynous'" (<http://classics.mit.edu/plato/symposium.html>). However, Woolf's conception of androgyny pertains not to sex but to mind. It is "destruction of the duality" (Moi, 1985, p. 14) of masculinity and femininity. Thus, she deconstructs essentialist binary thoughts of masculine and feminine characteristics. In *A Room of One's Own*, she conceives the fusion of male and female triggered by the sight of a man and a woman getting into a taxi together. Wondering whether "the two sexes in the mind" can "live in harmony together, spiritually co-operating" (2015, p. 71) to get "complete satisfaction and happiness" (2015, p. 71), Woolf presents an image of true androgyny as follows: "If one is a man, still the woman part of the brain must have effect; and a woman also must have intercourse with the man in her. Coleridge perhaps meant this when he said that a great mind is androgynous" (2015, p. 121). In this regard, androgyny neutralises the gender of the writer in which his/her subject is constructed (Fayad, 1997, p. 59); thus, androgynous mind presents especially women writers "a way of rejecting biological determinism and undoing the privileging of the masculine over the feminine" (Hussey, 1995, p. 5) by proving that there is no distinction between masculinity and femininity in mind, and it is the patriarchy which distinguishes between them to render men superior to women by causing women "to either sacrifice her personality or remain as a negative "other" existing within the male" (Harris, 1974, p. 175). Thus, androgyny may be evaluated as a way of liberating women from the negative forces, which the patriarchy imposes on women. In this regard, for Woolf, "[i]t is fatal to be a man or a woman pure and simple; one must be a woman-manly or a man-womanly" (2015, p. 75).

Asserting that people are born as androgynous; however, man predominates over woman in man's brain whereas woman predominates in woman's brain in time through the patriarchal norms of people, Woolf confirms De Beauvoir's famous quote that "one is not born, but rather becomes, a woman" (283) and Foucault's argument that gender is a product of socially and culturally institutionalised binary discourses (1977, p. 26). According to Woolf, only when the harmony between feminine and masculine is maintained may the ideal state of being be achieved. Accordingly, to sustain the androgynous mind with an ignorant sense of sex is the key to be productive for artists because sex-conscious writing enables the reader to consider who has written rather than what has been written. Therefore, Woolf states that "[i]t is when this fusion takes place that the mind is fully fertilised and uses all its faculties. Perhaps

a mind that is purely masculine cannot create, any more than a mind that is purely feminine” (2015, p. 71).

While some critics such as Carolyn Heilbrun (1993) and Nancy Topping Bazin (1973), regarding androgyny as a balance supplying people with a satisfying pattern of life (p. 38; p. 201), favour Woolf’s theory of androgyny. On the other hand, the others including Julia Kristeva, who considers androgyny as “the maximum intransigence” rather than “some reconciliation” (1980, p. 459) and Elaine Showalter accusing her of escaping from fixed gender identities under the cover of androgyny draw attention to its self-destructive nature, thus, find Woolf as a failure (1977, p. 264). However, just like Charlotte Brontë who was quoted above, Woolf also never fled from her femininity, rather, persevered it by rejecting the gender traits imposed on it.

Although Woolf’s conception of androgyny seems to be female-centred, it also covers male artists whom she urges to have an androgynous mind keeping the balance between the manly side and the womanly side of their minds. She notes that “the mind of an artist, in order to achieve the prodigious effort of freeing whole and entire the work that is in him, must be incandescent, like Shakespeare’s mind,” Coleridge’s poetry and her sister’s painting” (2015, p. 42). As may be inferred from her expressions, Shakespeare and Coleridge were among the greatest sample of an androgynous mind owners, thus, their works have survived until today. Elaborating especially on Shakespeare’s androgyny, Woolf states that his poetry “flows from him free and unimpeded” (2015, p. 42). If ever a human being gets “his work expressed completely,” according to Woolf, it is Shakespeare (2015, p. 42). For Woolf, not only men artists but also women ones should give birth their works out of their androgynous mind. She exemplifies Mary Carmichael who “mastered the first great lesson: she wrote as a woman, but as a woman who has forgotten that she is a woman, so that her pages [are] full of that curious sexual quality which comes only when sex is unconscious of itself” (2015, p. 67). Accordingly, Woolf calls all artists, may it be men or women, for writing with androgynous mind to be creative. To think androgynously provides freedom to think creatively beyond liberal biological determinism.

A View of Nietzschean Apollonian-Dionysian Dichotomy from Woolf’s Theory of Androgyny

Living in the Victorian period, both Friedrich Nietzsche (1844-1900) and Woolf questioned the spirit of Western civilisation and presented a critical approach to it through their philosophies. Concerning the masculinity of the Western culture, Nietzsche adopts a non-Western point of view in relation to masculine and feminine dichotomy by opposing to the usage of woman and the feminine or man and the masculine synonymously as the latter ones are archetypal instead of biological and anthropological (Neumann, 1969, p. xxii). Therefore, while accusing Nietzsche of misogyny, one should not miss the point of his being a severe critic of the Western culture. The feminine traits associated with women in the Victorian period may be ranked as instinct, unpredictability, sensuality, playfulness and nurturing while the masculine ones associated with men were considered to be positive qualities negating femininity such as seriousness, rationality, orderliness, de-sensualization, productivity. Then, eliminating feminine traits in favour of masculine ones is a kind of “exchange of strength for weakness” (Hatab, 1981, p. 334). That is why Nietzsche considers man to be “sick²” (1966, p. 62). Moreover, Woolf states that art is supposed to “have a mother as well as a father” (2015,

² “There is among men as in every other animal species an excess of failures, of the sick” (1966, p. 62)

p. 134). Regarding Nietzsche and Woolf's points of view, the dualities, from reason/instinct, masculinity/femininity to head/body should be equated to free artists' mind from biologism and essentialism. It seems to be good especially for women writer as it would liberate them from phallogocentrism saturating just men's egos as art requires a comprehensive feeling of both sexes; artists should think in a woman-manly manner or man-womanly manner. Woolf states that women writers should have "the state of mind most propitious for creative work", "where no obstacle in it, no foreign matter unconsumed" (2015, p. 42), instead of a void of sexless absence. Thus, what both Nietzsche and Woolf underline not forgetting artists' own masculinity or femininity or having a single-sexed mind, instead, connecting all the masculine and feminine traits to transcend the culturally established dichotomy of sex and gender constraining from their own creativity. Therefore, what they are chasing is to create out of inter-stitched male and female minds through androgyny with "full range of character traits" (Secor, 1974, p. 140) as androgyny provides equality of style which enables the artist to deconstruct and destabilize traditional patriarchal gender roles.

Although it was Woolf who set the theory of androgyny, it may be claimed that in one of his key works *The Birth of Tragedy* (1872), Nietzsche had fed the seeds of androgyny sown by Plato. That Nietzsche asserts that artists should equalise Apollonian-Dionysian binaries inherent in their natures to create qualified works draws parallelism with Woolf's notion of androgyny as a necessity to balance feminine and masculine traits to be creative. This perspective triggers the study which aims at providing a Nietzschean evaluation of Woolf's androgyny through her masterpiece *To the Lighthouse* (1927).

Nietzsche claims that people are inherently embodiment of the Apollonian and Dionysian selves even though one of them often predominates the other one in people. These comprise two opposite sides of human beings. While the Apollonian, named for the sun-god Apollo, represents self-control, order, rationality, isolation, and perfection, Dionysian, called after the wine-god Dionysus, represents passion, self-forgetfulness, irrationality, chaos, and intoxication. Inspired from Greek mythological gods, Nietzsche claims that these binaries are inherently in combat with each other to preside over one another though they are both in need of each other to be efficient. On the other hand, considering the cultural characteristics of the masculine-feminine dichotomy, the masculine refers to consciousness, light, knowledge and construction while the feminine figures unconsciousness, darkness, mystery and destruction (Hatab, 1981, p. 338). In this regard, the Apollonian-Dionysian dichotomy may be matched with the masculine-feminine distinction. Thus, in Woolf's approach, the Apollonian and Dionysian behave like feminine and masculine traits of the human mind requiring both of them to be influential. However, as people are constructed by the culture to which they are born, one side of this dichotomy is always repressed in patriarchal societies. In man, the feminine side is suppressed whereas the masculine side is under pressure in women. In patriarchal thinking, the femininity and the Dionysian go hand in hand and so threatful that they are suppressed by the masculinity, in Nietzschean terms, the Apollonian, which is favoured. Furthermore, that Nietzsche states that he is familiar with women because of his "Dionysian dowry" and calls himself the "first psychologist of the eternally feminine" (2005, 105) asserts the point that the Dionysian self is closely linked to the feminine side of the human mind in Woolf's theory of androgyny. In this context, Nietzsche gives voice to the Dionysian / feminine self, suppressed by the Western culture which elevated the Apollonian/masculine self. Therefore, the allegation of his misogynist identity should be revised.

Moreover, Heilbrun claims that androgyny derives from the spirit of Dionysus as the god Dionysus is described as a man with a feminine manner. He quotes Thomas Rosenmeyer as follows:

Dionysus, who is Euripides' embodiment of universal vitality, is described variously by chorus, herdsman, commoners, and princes. The descriptions cannot be defined. He can perhaps be totalled but the sum is never definitive; further inspection adds new features to the old. If a definition is at all possible it is a definition by negation or cancellation. For one thing, Dionysus appears to be neither woman nor man; or, better, he presents himself as woman-in-man, or man-in-woman, the unlimited personality. (1993, xi)

Evidently, Heilbrun suggests that the ancient Greek Dionysian cult which was originally a women's cult but later included men represented the worship of the feminine principle (Hatab, 1981, p. 338). Therefore, Nietzsche's recognition of the primordial feminine principle, Dionysus, as the spirit of art indicates his objection to the predominant masculine principles in Western art and culture. While his contemporaries despised women artists, as mentioned by Woolf in *A Room of One's Own*, Nietzsche stated in *The Gay Science*: "Woman is so artistic!" (1974, p. 317).

In Nietzsche's understanding, the Dionysian embodies a flow of unrestrained energy which knows no disciplines and boundaries set by the Apollonian. Drawing attention to the suffering, revealed by excessiveness of the Dionysian, Nietzsche pictures a Dionysiac festival as follows: "Excess revealed itself as truth. Contradiction, the bliss born of pain, spoke out from the very heart of nature. And so, wherever the Dionysian prevailed, the Apollonian was checked and destroyed" (47). Thus, it draws an artist or a human being into a drunken frenzy which brings his own end. It is the Apollonian aspect that supplies him with enough strength to form the Dionysian to become creative rather than destructive. On the other hand, the Apollonian self also necessitates passion to be creative thus the Dionysian self in a coherent unity. Thus, they balance each other as the centripetal and centrifugal forces do just like femininity and masculinity.

In regards to art, Nietzsche regards sculpture as the Apollonian while music as Dionysian. For him, tragedy is born out of the union of these two principles as the ultimate expression of art, life and culture. He states: "the intricate relation of the Apollonian and the Dionysian in tragedy may really be symbolized by a fraternal union of the two deities: Dionysus speaks the language of Apollo; and Apollo, finally the language of Dionysus" (130). In Nietzsche's approach, Dionysus personifies self-transcendence whereas Apollo embodies individuation. The Greeks made use of both forces well; the cultivation of form and meaning was sensed in the plastic and poetic arts, and form-shattering annihilation was practiced in the mystery cults (Hatab, 1981, p. 335). Regarding that tragedy as the highest form of art, Nietzsche claimed that it exemplified how the Apollonian and Dionysian may be balanced in a harmony in art. In Hatab's interpretation:

The tragedies could affirm individuation and form (the poetic reflection of the hero) and yet recognize the priority of the annihilating power of flux (the hero's doom). In other words, the tragic world-view held form (the Apollonian) to be "appearance" (a temporary ordering of a primordial chaos) which must consequently yield to a formless power (the Dionysian) symbolized by the priority of destructive fate in the drama. (1981, p. 336)

For Nietzsche, tragedy died with the Greek comedy playwright Euripides as he paralysed the equilibrium between the Apollonian and Dionysian principles. Nietzsche posits that everything has failed to be tragedy and been nothing other than mockery since then. Nevertheless, an artist is supposed to strike a balance between his innate Apollonian and Dionysian natures to produce a qualified piece of work; in parallel to the harmony between feminine and masculine sides of the human mind in Woolf's perspective. In other words, what an artist does need to have is a

“creative, incandescent, and undivided” mind (2015, p. 71) which is the ideal creative force of an artist.

A Nietzschean Approach to Lily's Strive for Androgyny in Woolf's *To the Lighthouse*

Virginia Woolf's *To the Lighthouse* is regarded as one of the masterpieces in modernist fiction (Pease, 2015, p. 1). Comparing her own works in her diaries, Woolf notes about the novel: “My present opinion is that it is easily the best of my books, fuller than J.'s R. [*Jacob's Room*] & less spasmodic, occupied with more interesting things than Mrs D. [*Mrs. Dalloway*] & not complicated with all that desperate accompaniment of madness. It is freer and subtler I think” (117). The novel of which even its author is proud revolves around the Ramsay family and their guests in the summer house on the Isle of Skye. It is striking that apart from the metaphysical philosopher Mr. Ramsay, most of the guests are artists; Lily Briscoe, a modernist painter, Charles Tansley, a young philosopher, William Bankes, a botanist, and Augustus Carmichael, a poet. Among them, Lily Briscoe seems to be entrapped in her femininity, thus, have difficulty in culminating her painting; however, later she succeeds in her strive for androgyny thorough inspiration she gets from Mrs. Ramsay who is a good social artist balancing opposites among her family members and guests. Therefore, the study aims at focusing on Lily to depict her struggle for androgyny as a woman artist.

At the beginning of the novel, Lily is portrayed as a female artist who is frustrated with the patriarchal force on the female body, reflecting her anger through her observation of long-suffering Mrs. Ramsay who devotes her life to her eight children and selfish husband. Mrs. Ramsay seems to be a product and perpetuator of the Victorian patriarchy as she is happy to live in accordance with the patriarchal culture. Mrs. Ramsay does not respect Lily's career as an artist and believes that it would be better for her to focus on marriage because “an unmarried woman has missed the best of life” (Woolf, 1992, p. 215). Thus, she suggests that Lily's art would not be taken seriously as she is single when she thinks about how “she would never marry; one could not take her painting seriously” (Woolf, 1992, p. 191). However, Lily refuses marriage as a reaction to the patriarchy that attempts to pacify her by playing upon her body. Thus, she confirms Judith Butler's point asserting Nietzsche³ and Foucault⁴ who draw attention to the relationship between the performance of power and body: “Cultural values emerge as the result of an inscription on the body, understood as a medium, indeed a blank page; in order for this inscription to signify, however that medium must itself be destroyed” (1990, p. 166). Accordingly, Lily prefers challenging the power on her body by remaining single and thinks: “I'm happy like this” (Woolf, 1992, p. 309). Her feeling “an enormous exultation” with the thought that she would never marry anybody” (Woolf, 1992, p. 310) affirms Woolf's point about the difficulties of continuing marriage and art simultaneously. Therefore, Mrs. Ramsay who is busy with various domestic tasks and depends economically on her husband does not seem to be a good model for Lily. Although she feels angry with Mrs. Ramsay's altruism towards her children, husband and even her guests, Lily discerns in time Mrs. Ramsay's strength characterised with her capability of balancing masculine and feminine or the Apollonian and Dionysian forces, and indeed, this competence renders Mrs. Ramsay as a social artist. Therefore, annoyance and criticalness towards Mrs. Ramsay are replaced by admiration and fascination.

³ Nietzsche claims that “there is no ‘being’ behind doing, effecting, becoming; ‘the doer’ is merely a fiction added to the deed- the deed is everything” and points out that gender identity is constituted through performativity of body (1969, p. 45).

⁴ Michel Foucault states that “the body is the inscribed surface of events.” (1977, p. 148) and asserts that the body is used as a medium of the cultural source to hegemonize through gender.

The Ramsay's summerhouse appears to be Mrs. Ramsay's androgynous art studio which gathering opposites in harmony. The house has a soul with Mrs. Ramsay's essence. Mr. Ramsay says that she "fills the rooms with life": "she created drawing-room and kitchen, set them all aglow; bade him take his ease there, go in and out, enjoy himself" (Woolf, 1992, p. 206). She sets the house for creativity out of opposites. She prepares private rooms where men can write, and Lily can paint. Lily observes that while consolidating her little son James who is eager to go to the lighthouse across the bay from their home but disappointed by Mr. Ramsay who says that the bad weather will not allow this, Mrs. Ramsay achieves stabilizing these opposite father-son characters artistically. She is capable of dissolving James' "private code, his secret language" (Woolf, 1992, p. 181). She functions like Dionysus while blowing out her son Cam the power of imagination by transforming an animal skull in her shawl into "a bird's nest...a beautiful mountain" (Woolf, 1992, p. 264). She also reminds Lily that art is to make "the moment something permanent" (Woolf, 1992, p. 299) by turning a boring day into a beautiful memory as Lily thinks that "she brought together this and that and then this, and so made out of that miserable silliness and spite ... something ... which survived, after all these years, complete ... and it stayed in the mind almost like a work of art" (Woolf, 1992, p. 298). She is also a feminine/Dionysian alluring force on people around herself. For instance, [w]ith James, she becomes the icon of the Madonna and Child framed by the window that Lily tries to incorporate into her painting; alone, she becomes an object of desire, for Lily and the others as well as her husband" (Ronchetti, 2004, pp. 68-69). Her daughter Prue feels proud of her mother viewing her as unique, "the thing itself" (*To the Lighthouse* 174). Even misogynist Mr. Tansley finds something alluring in her and feels "extraordinarily pride" (Woolf, 1992, p. 189) while wandering around with her.

She also has Apollonian sides as an appreciator of physical beauty in men and women. It is so strong that it abstains her from dismissing the gardener called Kennedy as she finds him "so awfully handsome" (Woolf, 1992, p. 227). Moreover, although even she and her husband are opposite characters, their marriage seems to be in harmony due to Mrs. Ramsay. She always compensates for Mr. Ramsay's Apollonian self which is overwhelmed by his dark, sensual feminine/Dionysian side. She knows that what Mr. Ramsay who always thinks that he is "a failure" (Woolf, 1992, p. 207) is "sympathy..., to be assured of his genius" (Woolf, 1992, p. 206). Mrs. Ramsay's influence on his balancing his Apollonian and Dionysian part is evident at the end of the novel. Even if she dies, he decides to take his children James and Cam to the lighthouse, which reminds "penis" (Maze, 1997, p. 89), therefore, masculinity because of its appearance standing like an Apollonian sculpture discouraging access and control and encouraging isolation in a well-built shape. Obviously, the arrival in the lighthouse refers to his reconciliation not only with his James but also with his Apollonian/masculine self. Thus, his Apollonian self enables him to bring order into the chaos he has caused in James by disillusioning him because of his earlier dominant Dionysian self.

After all, Mrs. Ramsay is a great artist who gathers two opposite sides around a dinner table including masculine characters comprised of Charles Tansley, Augustus Carmichael, William Bankes as well as Mr. Ramsay, and feminine ones consisting of Minta, Lily as well as Mrs. Ramsay. Mrs. Ramsay stabilizes the balance between the opposite sides during the dinner. Among them, Lily, who does not feel comfortable with either of these opposite sides because the male ones and the female ones such as Mrs. Ramsay and her daughter Minta who are obsessed with marriage seem to be products and perpetuators of the patriarchy feeding on feminine and masculine traits, which she opposes. However, they all stand for the masculine part of her brain she needs to reconcile with to succeed in her art. She is in a struggle for androgyny. More concretely, Lily is preoccupied with her painting during the dinner, and then she figures out how to continue the painting she has started. Lily decides to move the tree in

her painting. In order to keep that image in her mind, she puts the salt cellar “down again on a flower in the pattern in the table-cloth” (Woolf, 1992, p. 241). Maze regards the salt cellar as a phallic symbol because of its shape and “function of pouring out a white stream” (1997, p. 89). Moreover, as flowers are regarded as the symbol of the vagina (Maze, 1997, p. 89), the act of putting the salt cellar on a flower may be interpreted as an initial imaginative act for combining the male and female sexes in harmony, thus, an act for androgyny.

It is ten years later after this recorded image on the dinner table that Lily achieves figuring out her androgynous mind in her painting. She sits outside between the time-worn summer house and the lighthouse while painting. She is not inside the house anymore because she feels “no attachment...no relations with it” (Woolf, 1992, p. 288). The house is closely associated with femininity, the domestic space. Thus, her feeling distanced from there indicates her impersonality in which she has succeeded by moving from her feminine side towards her masculine part. Therefore, on the other side of her stands the lighthouse representing, as Maze states, masculinity as a symbol of the penis (1997, p. 89). It has also an Apollonian statue-like shape. Therefore, as pointed out by Emery, Lily’s position “between the femininized house and the masculinized lighthouse” indicates her androgynous space (1992, p. 229). She has often felt disrupted with the essence of Mr. Ramsay because whenever “he approached...ruin approached, chaos approached. She could not paint.” (Woolf, 1992, p. 289). Now, Mr. Ramsay, spreading an excessive Dionysian aura is away to his Apollonian side, towards the lighthouse. Moreover, she silences Charles Tansley’s repetitive words in her mind: “Women can’t write, women can’t paint” (Woolf, 1992, p. 214) that make her paintbrush “heavier and went slower” (Woolf, 1992, p. 297). She thinks that he says so to feel better about himself as parallel to Woolf’s statement that women function like mirrors “reflecting the figure of man at twice its natural size” (2015, p. 26). To put it differently, women who are regarded as inferior to men, reassure men’s self-confidence by reflecting men their potential and superiority. Accordingly, the looking-glass vision is essential to men as they may die without this “illusion” (2015, p. 26). Therefore, women occupy an essential part of men’s life even though they refuse discerning or expressing. This way of thinking, which Woolf celebrates, indicates the androgynous nature of her mind helping her abstaining from discouragement of the men around herself.

Evidently, through Mrs. Ramsay’s social artistry, Lily’s perspective of men has changed a lot, and she has attained a new stage in her femininity as an impersonal artist. As Ronchetti notes, “[a]rt in the form of painting and life in the form of Mrs. Ramsay’s psychological legacy to Lily cooperate to stimulate her personal growth as well as her artistic creativity” (2004, p. 69). Lily creates her modernist painting by disrupting the conventional patriarchal obstacles impeding women’s creativity. She paints Mrs. Ramsay, standing beside trees and the summer house. Maze points to the fact that the mass on the right consists of trees which are “always a potential image of male sexuality” (1997, p. 97) while the mass on the left side consists of the house which has strong female connotations. Therefore, indeed, Lily combines the feminine and masculine, the Apollonian and Dionysian in her androgynous mind. She dissolves the question of “how to connect this mass on the right hand with that on the left” (Woolf, 1992, p. 218) “which had tied a knot in her mind” (Woolf, 1992, p. 296) ten years earlier. That Lily culminates her painting by drawing “a line there, in the centre” (Woolf, 1992, p. 334) connecting the masses on the right and on the left indicates her achievement of androgyny by building a bridge of harmony between two opposite parts of the mind, each of which is supplementary for one another. Thus, both Lily and Mr. Ramsay feel peaceful in the end as the feminine/Dionysian and the masculine/Apollonian parts of their minds “live in harmony together, spiritually cooperating” (2015, p. 97).

Conclusion

The Victorian phallogentrism maintained the urge on masculinity by suppressing femininity in the society for years. Challenging the gendered construction of the Western culture, both Nietzsche and Woolf presented a positive force for modern artists through androgyny. With regards to portraying a woman artist's striving in this way, *To the Lighthouse* is a significant work. At the beginning of the novel, Lily stands for the feminist voice raised against patriarchal binary thought in life and art. Woolf indicates through Lily that femininity is not enough in challenging phallogentrism, and she calls for androgyny as a positive force. The author presents her Mrs. Ramsay as a social artist equalising the Apollonian and Dionysian forces around herself and an inspiring source for Lily who achieves androgyny at the end of the novel. Accordingly, artists, may it be female or male, can produce the best piece of art as much as they can strike a harmony between their Apollonian, which refers to the masculine side of the human mind in Woolf's terms, and the Dionysian self, corresponding to the feminine part.

References

- Barker, J. (2006). *The Brontës: A life in letters*. London: Folio Society.
- Bodichon, B. L. S. (2001). Women and work. 1857. In Candida Ann Lacey (Ed.), *Barbara Leigh Smith Bodichon and the Langham place group* Vol. 3. (pp. 36-74). New York: Routledge.
- Butler, J. (1990). Subversive bodily acts. In *Gender trouble*. (pp. 101-163). New York: Routledge.
- Daniel, C. (2006). *Voracious children: Who eats whom in children's literature*. New York: Routledge.
- De Beauvoir, S. (2010). *The second sex* (Constance Borde and Sheila Malovany Chevallier, Trans.). New York: Alfred A. Knopf.
- Emery, M. L. (1992). Robbed of meaning: the work at the center of *To the lighthouse*. *MSF Modern fiction studies* 38 (1), 217-234.
- Fayad, M. (1977). Aliens, androgynes, and anthropology: Le Guin's critique of representation in *The left hand of darkness*. In *Mosaic: A Journal for the interdisciplinary study of literature* 30 (3), 59-73. Retrieved on December 12, 2018 from <https://www.jstor.org/stable/i40167343>
- Foucault, M. (1977). Nietzsche, genealogy, history. In Michel Foucault, Donald F. Bouchard and Sherry Simon (Trans.), Donald F. Bouchard (Ed.), *Language, counter memory, practice: Selected essays and interviews*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Gilbert S. M. & Gubar, S. (1996). The madwoman in the attic. In Mary Eagleton (Ed.), *Feminist literary theory: A reader*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.
- Harris, D. (1974). Androgyny: The sexist myth in disguise. In *Women's studies* 2, 171-184.
- Hatab, L. J. (1981). Nietzsche on woman. *Southern journal of philosophy* 19 (3), 333-345.
- Heilbrun, C. G. (1993). *Toward a recognition of androgyny*. 1973. New York: Norton.
- Hughes, K. (n.d.). Gender roles in the 19th century. The British Library. British Library Board, Accessed January 10, 2019. Retrieved from <http://www.bl.uk/romantics-and-victorians/articles/gender-roles-in-the-19th-century#sthash.uFd1Juyz.dpuf>

- Hussey, M. (1995). *Virginia Woolf A to Z*. New York: Oxford UP.
- Kristeva, J. (1980). *Desire in language: A semiotic approach to literature and art*. Léon S. Roudiez (Ed.). Alice Jardine, Thomas Gora, and Léon Roudiez (Trans.). New York: Columbia UP.
- Marcus, Jane, ed. (1983). *Virginia Woolf: A feminist slant*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.
- Maze, J. R. (1997). *Virginia Woolf: Feminism, creativity, and the unconscious*. Westport, Conn: Greenwood Press.
- Mill, J. S.. (1963). *The subjection of women* Millicent Garrett Fawcett (Ed.). London: Oxford University Press.
- Minogue, S. (2012). Introduction to *A room of one's own*. *A room of one's own*. By Virginia Woolf. London: Wordsworth Editions, 5-25.
- Moi, T. (1985). *Sexual/Textual politics: Feminist literary theory*. London: Routledge.
- Neumann, E. (1969). *The origins and history of consciousness*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Nietzsche, F. (2005). *The anti-Christ, Ecce Homo, twilight of the idols*. Aaron Ridley (Ed.), Judith Norman (Trans.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- . (1966). *Beyond good and evil*. (W. Kaufmann, Trans.). New York: Vintage.
- . (1992). *The birth of tragedy* (1872). In *Basic Writings of Nietzsche*. (W. Kaufmann, Ed. and Trans.). Modern Library, 1-144.
- . (1974). *The gay science*. Walter Kaufmann (Trans.). New York: Vintage.
- . (1969). *On the genealogy of morals*. (W. Kaufmann, Trans.). New York: Vintage.
- Pease, A., ed. (2015). *The Cambridge Companion to "To the Lighthouse."* New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Plato. *Symposium*. (B. Jowett, Trans.). Retrieved on January 20, 2019, from <http://www.classics.mit.edu/plato/symposium.html>
- Rendall, J. (1985). *The origins of modern feminism: Women in Britain, France, and the United States, 1780-1860*. New York: Macmillan.
- Roe, S., & Sellars, S., eds. (2000). *The Cambridge Companion to Virginia Woolf*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ronchetti, A. (2004). *The artist, society and sexuality in Virginia Woolf's novels*. New York: Routledge.
- Rowbotham, J. (1989). *Good girls make good wives-guidance for girls in Victorian fiction*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Secor, C. (1974). The Androgyny Papers. *Women's studies: An interdisciplinary journal* 2 (2), 139-141.
- Showalter, E. (1977). *A literature of their own: British women novelists from Brontë to Lessing*. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton UP.
- Snaith, A., ed. (2007). *Virginia Woolf Studies*. Hampshire: Palgrave Advances.
- Topping Bazin, N. (1973). *Virginia Woolf and the androgynous vision*. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press.

- Woolf, V. (1980). *The diary of Virginia Woolf*. (A. O. Bell, Ed.) Vol. 3: 1925-1930.
London: The Hogarth Press.
- . (2015). *A room of one's own*. 1929. (D. Bradshaw and S. N. Clarke, Ed.). West Sussex: Wiley Blackwell.
- . (1992). *To the Lighthouse*. 1927. *Collected novels of Virginia Woolf: Mrs. Dalloway, To the lighthouse, The Waves*. Ed. Stella McNichol. London: Macmillan. 177-335.
- . (1979). *Women and writing*. (Michèle Barrett, Ed.). New York: Harcourt.