

**MA SEMESTER II
PAPER VI
UNIT III**

ELAINE SHOWALTER

TOWARDS A FEMINIST POETICS



**Prof Madhu Singh
Department of English & Modern European Languages
University of Lucknow**

ELAINE SHOWALTER: "Towards a Feminist Poetics"

From: *Twentieth-Century Literary Theory: A Reader*
edited by K. M. Newton

216 TWENTIETH-CENTURY LITERARY THEORY

43 ELAINE SHOWALTER: 'TOWARDS A FEMINIST
POETICS'

Feminist criticism can be divided into two distinct varieties. The first type is concerned with *woman as reader* – with woman as the consumer of male-produced literature, and with the way in which the hypothesis of a female reader changes our apprehension of a given text, awakening us to the significance of its sexual codes. I shall call this kind of analysis the *feminist critique*, and like other kinds of critique it is a historically grounded inquiry which probes the ideological assumptions of literary phenomena. Its subjects include the images and stereotypes of women in literature, the omissions and misconceptions about women in criticism, and the fissures in male-constructed literary history. It is also concerned with the exploitation and manipulation of the female audience, especially in popular culture and film; and with the analysis of woman-as-sign in semiotic systems. The second type of feminist criticism is concerned with *woman as writer* – with woman as the producer of textual meaning, with the history, themes, genres and structures of literature by women. Its subjects include the psychodynamics of female creativity; linguistics and the problem of a female language; the trajectory of the individual or collective female literary career; literary history; and, of course, studies of particular writers and works. No term exists in English for such a specialised discourse, and so I have adapted the French term *la gynocritique*: 'gynocritics' (although the significance of the male pseudonym in the history of women's writing also suggested the term 'georgics').

The feminist critique is essentially political and polemical, with theoretical affiliations to Marxist sociology and aesthetics; gynocritics is more self-contained and experimental, with connections to other modes of new feminist research. ...

As we see in this analysis, one of the problems of the feminist critique is that it is male-oriented. If we study stereotypes of women, the sexism of male critics, and the limited roles women play in literary history, we are not learning what women have felt and experienced, but only what men have thought women should be. In some fields of specialisation, this may require a long

Reprinted from *Women Writing and Writing about Women*, ed. Mary Jacobus (London, 1979), pp. 25–40.

Feminist Criticism 217

apprenticeship to the male theoretician, whether he be Althusser, Barthes, Macherey or Lacan; and then an application of the theory of signs or myths or the unconscious to male texts or films. The temporal and intellectual investment one makes in such a process increases resistance to questioning it, and to seeing its historical and ideological boundaries. The critique also has a tendency to naturalise women's victimisation, by making it the inevitable and obsessive topic of discussion. ...

In contrast to this angry or loving fixation on male literature, the programme of gynocritics is to construct a female framework for the analysis of women's literature, to develop new models based on the study of female experience, rather than to adapt male models and theories. Gynocritics begins at the point when we free ourselves from the linear absolutes of male literary history, stop trying to fit women between the lines of the male tradition, and focus instead on the nearly visible world of female culture. ...

... Before we can even begin to ask how the literature of women would be different and special, we need to reconstruct its past, to rediscover the scores of women novelists, poets and dramatists whose work has been obscured by time, and to establish the continuity of the female tradition. ... As we recreate the chain of writers in this tradition, the patterns of influence and response from one generation to the next, we can also begin to challenge the periodicity of orthodox literary history, and its enshrined canons of achievement. It is because we have studied women writers in isolation that we have never grasped the connections between them. When we go beyond Austen, the Brontës and Eliot, say, to look at a hundred and fifty or more of their sister novelists, we can see patterns and phases in the evolution of a female tradition which correspond to the developmental phases of any subcultural art. In my book on English women writers, *A Literature of their Own*, I have called these the Feminine, Feminist and Female stages. During the Feminine phases, dating from about 1840 to 1880, women wrote in an effort to equal the intellectual achievements of the male culture, and internalised its assumptions about female nature. The distinguishing sign of this period is the male pseudonym, introduced in England in the 1840s, and a national characteristic of English women writers. ... The feminist content of feminine art is typically oblique, displaced, ironic and subversive; one has to read it between the lines, in the missed possibilities of the text.

In the Feminist phase, from about 1880 to 1920, or the winning of the vote, women are historically enabled to reject the accommodating postures of femininity and to use literature to dramatise the ordeals of wronged womanhood. ...

218 TWENTIETH-CENTURY LITERARY THEORY

In the Female phase, ongoing since 1920, women reject both imitation and protest – two forms of dependency – and turn instead to female experience as the source of an autonomous art, extending the feminist analysis of culture to the forms and techniques of literature. Representatives of the formal Female Aesthetic, such as Dorothy Richardson and Virginia Woolf, begin to think in terms of male and female sentences, and divide their work into 'masculine' journalism and 'feminine' fictions, redefining and sexualising external and internal experience. ...

In trying to account for these complex permutations of the female tradition, feminist criticism has tried a variety of theoretical approaches. The most natural direction for feminist criticism to take has been the revision, and even the subversion of related ideologies, especially Marxist aesthetics and structuralism, altering their vocabularies and methods to include the variable of gender. I believe, however, that this thrifty feminine making-do is ultimately unsatisfactory. Feminist criticism cannot go around forever in men's ill-fitting hand-me-downs, the Annie Hall of English studies; but must, as John Stuart Mill wrote about women's literature in 1869, 'emancipate itself from the influences of accepted models, and guide itself by its own impulses'¹ – as, I think, gynocritics is beginning to do. This is not to deny the necessity of using the terminology and techniques of our profession. But when we consider the historical conditions in which critical ideologies are produced, we see why feminist adaptations seem to have reached an impasse. ...

The new sciences of the text based on linguistics, computers, genetic structuralism, deconstructionism, neo-formalism and deformalism, affective stylistics and psychoaesthetics, have offered literary critics the opportunity to demonstrate that the work they do is as manly and aggressive as nuclear physics – not intuitive, expressive and feminine, but strenuous, rigorous, impersonal and virile. In a shrinking job market, these new levels of professionalism also function as discriminators between the marketable and marginal lecturer. Literary science, in its manic generation of difficult terminology, its establishment of seminars and institutes of post-graduate study, creates an élite corps of specialists who spend more and more time mastering the theory, less and less time reading the books. We are moving towards a two-tiered system of 'higher' and 'lower' criticism, the higher concerned with the 'scientific' problems of form and structure, the 'lower' concerned with the 'humanistic' problems of content and interpretation. And these levels, it seems to me, are now taking on subtle gender identities, and assuming a sexual polarity – hermeneutics and hismeneutics. Ironically, the existence

Feminist Criticism 219

of a new criticism practised by women has made it even more possible for structuralism and Marxism to strive, Henchard-like, for systems of formal obligation and determination. Feminists writing in these modes, such as Hélène Cixous and the women contributors to *Diacritics*, risk being allotted the symbolic ghettos of the special issue or the back of the book for their essays.

It is not because the exchange between feminism, Marxism and structuralism has hitherto been so one-sided, however, that I think attempts at syntheses have so far been unsuccessful. While scientific criticism struggles to purge itself of the subjective, feminist criticism is willing to assert (in the title of a recent anthology) *The Authority of Experience*.² The experience of woman can easily disappear, become mute, invalid and invisible, lost in the diagrams of the structuralist or the class conflict of the Marxists. Experience is not emotion; we must protest now as in the nineteenth century against the equation of the feminine with the irrational. But we must also recognise that the questions we most need to ask go beyond those that science can answer. We must seek the repressed messages of women in history, in anthropology, in psychology, and in ourselves, before we can locate the feminine not-said, in the manner of Pierre Macherey,³ by probing the fissures of the female text.

Thus the current theoretical impasse in feminist criticism, I believe, is more than a problem of finding 'exacting definitions and a suitable terminology', or 'theorizing in the midst of a struggle'. It comes from our own divided consciousness, the split in each of us. We are both the daughters of the male tradition, of our teachers, our professors, our dissertation advisers and our publishers – a tradition which asks us to be rational, marginal and grateful; and sisters in a new women's movement which engenders another kind of awareness and commitment, which demands that we renounce the pseudo-success of token womanhood, and the ironic masks of academic debate. How much easier, how less lonely it is, not to awaken – to continue to be critics and teachers of male literature, anthropologists of male culture, and psychologists of male literary response, claiming all the while to be universal. Yet we cannot will ourselves to go back to sleep. As women scholars in the 1970s we have been given a great opportunity, a great intellectual challenge. The anatomy, the rhetoric, the poetics, the history, await our writing. ...

...The task of feminist critics is to find a new language, a new way of reading that can integrate our intelligence and our experience, our reason and our suffering, our scepticism and our vision.

220 TWENTIETH-CENTURY LITERARY THEORY

This enterprise should not be confined to women; I invite Criticus, Poeticus and Plutarchus to share it with us. One thing is certain: feminist criticism is not visiting. It is here to stay, and we must make it a permanent home.

NOTES

[Reorganised and renumbered from the original]

1. J.S. Mill, *The Subjection of Women* (London, 1869), p. 133.
2. Lee Edwards and Arlyn Diamond (eds), *The Authority of Experience* (Amherst, Mass., 1977).
3. [Ed.] See Pierre Macherey, *A Theory of Literary Production*, trans. Geoffrey Wall (London, 1978).

44 ELIZABETH A. MEESE: 'SEXUAL POLITICS AND CRITICAL JUDGMENT'

In 'Literature as an Institution: The View from 1980', Leslie Fiedler cynically observes: 'We all know in our hearts that literature is effectively what we teach in departments of English; or conversely what we teach in departments of English is literature. Within that closed definitional circle, we perform the rituals by which we cast out unworthy pretenders from our ranks and induct true initiates, guardians of the standards by which all song and story ought presumably to be judged.'¹ The effects of this kind of exclusion are transparent: it places literature almost entirely in the service of white, male elite culture. ...

... In his collection of essays, *Is There a Text in this Class? The Authority of Interpretive Communities*, Stanley Fish presents a view of critical judgments as issuing from an interpretive community, which, when examined from a feminist perspective, provides a useful means of describing the nature of critical bias. Perhaps inadvertently, Fish helps us to see clearly what we have always intuited. A strong insider-outsider dynamic, taking the form of a gender-based literary tribalism, comes into play as a means of control. Critics who permit the possibility of variations in critical

Reprinted from *After Strange Texts: The Role of Theory in the Study of Literature*, ed. Gregory S. Jay and David L. Miller (Alabama, 1985), pp. 86-100.

READING GUIDE

The Traditions of Feminist Criticism: Introduction

FIRST WAVE FEMINISM: Men's Treatment of Women

In this early stage of feminist criticism, critics consider male novelists' demeaning treatment or marginalisation of female characters. First wave feminist criticism includes books like Marry Ellman's *Thinking About Women* (1968) Kate Millet's *Sexual Politics* (1969), and Germaine Greer's *The Female Eunuch* (1970). An example of first wave feminist literary analysis would be a critique of William Shakespeare's *Taming of the Shrew* for Petruchio's abuse of Katherina.

SECOND WAVE FEMINISM: Gynocriticism

Elaine Showalter pioneered gynocriticism with her book *A Literature of Their Own* (1977). Gynocriticism involves three major aspects. The first is the examination of female writers and their place in literary history. The second is the consideration of the treatment of female characters in books by both male and female writers. The third and most important aspect of gynocriticism is the discovery and exploration of a canon of literature written by women; gynocriticism seeks to appropriate a female literary tradition. In Showalter's *A Literature of Their Own*, she proposes three phases of women's writing, also mentioned in the essay "Towards a Feminist Poetics"

The Madwoman Thesis

Sandra Gilbert and Susan Gubar's *The Madwoman in the Attic* (1979), the eponymous madwoman is Bertha Jenkins of Charlotte Brontë's *Jane Eyre*, Rochester's mad wife is hidden away in the attic of Thornfield Hall. Gilbert and Gubar's thesis suggests that because society forbade women from expressing themselves through creative outlets, their creative powers were channelled into psychologically self-destructive behaviour and subversive actions. Another example of the madwoman thesis is Charlotte Perkins Gilman's 1892 short story 'The Yellow Wallpaper'.

French Feminism

French Feminism, led by critics such as Julia Kristeva, Hélène Cixous, and Luce Irigaray, relies heavily on Freudian psychology and the theory of penis envy. French feminists postulate the existence of a separate language belonging to women that consists of loose, digressive sentences written without use of the ego.

THIRD WAVE FEMINISM responds to the “category of women” debates of the late 1980s and early 1990s that began with a critique of the second- wave contention that women share something in common as women: a common gender identity and set of experiences. Much of its impetus derives from the writings of women of colour. Naomi Wolf’s *Fire with Fire*(1993) in many way fits the third wave mould particularly in her dismissal of ‘victim feminism’-where women are supposedly encouraged to see themselves rendered passive by oppression within a second wave formulation.

TOWARDS A FEMINIST POETICS

One of the most influential essay by the American critic Elaine Showalter, “Towards a Feminist Poetics” calls for a separate and autonomous model of literary theory by rejecting the inevitability of male models and theories and recalling women’s literary tradition to the present.

She divides feminist criticism into **two** distinct modes:

1. *Woman as reader* — “woman as the consumer of male-produced literature, and with the way in which the hypothesis of a female reader changes our apprehension of a given text, awakening us to the significance of its sexual codes.”

It is also called the *feminist critique* which is “a historically grounded inquiry which probes the ideological assumptions of literary phenomena.”

Its subjects are: images and stereotypes of women in literature, the omissions and misconceptions about women in criticism, and the fissures in male-constructed literary history.

It is concerned with the exploitation and manipulation of the female audience, especially in popular culture and film; and

The analysis of ‘**woman-as-sign in semiotic systems**’.

[**Note: Woman-as-sign** is a semiotic construct developed by feminist scholars trying to explain the ways in which women's status in patriarchal society is understood, communicated, and acted on through institutional practices. Film scholar Laura Mulvey's (1975) application of psychoanalysis to film theory was foundational to the construct's development. Mulvey argued that woman stands in patriarchal culture “as signifier for the male other” within a symbolic system in which men are permitted to live out their fantasies of domination both linguistically and through images they create (7). Feminist anthropologist Elizabeth Cowie (1978) coined the term “woman as sign” on the basis of her work with Claude Lévi-Strauss on kinship systems that featured the exchange of women (e.g., a bride leaves her father's house to live in her husband's house). Woman's status in such systems, she said, is economic but also that

of a sign, which conveys an understanding of subordination and enables her to be exchanged physically among men”]

From: Carolyn M Byerly “Woman as Sign” (2008)

2. *Woman as writer* — Woman as the producer of textual meaning, with the history, themes, genres and structures of literature by women.

Its subjects are: **psychodynamics of female creativity**; linguistics and the problem of a female language; the trajectory of the individual or collective female literary career; literary history; and studies of particular writers and works.

No term exists in English for such a specialised discourse, and so she adapts the French term *la gynocritique*: ‘gynocritics’.

[**Note:** Psychodynamic Feminism has its philosophical roots in the second and third waves of feminism in the United States and in psychoanalysis. It seeks to articulate the unique experiences of an individual while at the same time contextualizing those experiences within a socio-political, cultural, and economic framework. Not simply a treatment for women, it has evolved since its inception in the late 1960s as a theoretical and clinical approach that addresses sexism, heterosexism, ableism, racism, classism, and other injustices based on power differentials.]

From: [The SAGE Encyclopaedia of Psychology and Gender](#)

ASSIGNMENT

Read the essay carefully to answer the following questions:

1. What are the problems of feminist critique?
2. What is ‘the program of gynocritics’?
3. Showalter’s believes in reconstructing women’s literary tradition to see how their work was “different and special” and to rediscover the works of women writers whose works have been obscured by time and to establish the continuity of female tradition. How does she classify the different phases of women’s literary tradition?
4. What is the task of feminist critics?