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Chapter One

Introduction

The International Reception of Woolf

Even during her lifetime Virginia Woolf was already a famous figure as her works had successfully attracted attention both at home and abroad. After her death in 1941, her works continued to be read and reviewed by readers around the world, and recent studies have shown that for a number of reasons her popularity keeps on growing and her work enjoys even wider readership today. A look at some recent publications may illustrate this increasing popularity of Woolf. *The Reception of Virginia Woolf in Europe*, edited by Mary Ann Caws and Nicola Luckhurst, came out in 2002 as a collection of essays by a wide range of Woolf scholars and critics on how Woolf has been read and translated in Continental Europe. This collection features Woolf’s reception studies in Catalonia, Denmark, France, Galicia, Germany, Greece, Italy, Poland, Portugal, Spain and Sweden. Spanish scholar Alberto Lazaro, for one, claims that, based on a study of Spanish scholarship on Woolf, in his country Woolf’s work “has steadily risen to prominence.”¹ In her study of Woolf’s influence on Denmark, for another, Ida Klitgard comes to a similar conclusion that Woolf’s work has, over the past two decades, “inspired Danish responses which are filled with enthusiasm, admiration and respect for her visions and achievements as woman and writer.”²

Despite Woolf’s surging popularity, not all countries appreciate Woolf in similar ways and to similar extents. It has seemed that, as the authors have argued, Woolf’s reception has been determined largely by factors such as political climate, cultural environment, literary tradition and/or milieu, and economic conditions. In France, for example, cultural and literary traditions were obviously at work. While her contemporary James Joyce, according to Pierre-Eric Villeneuve, was already received as the leading exponent of modernism in Britain and hailed as “the guiding light of literary life across the Channel,” Woolf was not enthusiastically embraced from the very beginning. ³ Although, like James Joyce, Woolf was first introduced as a modernist writer, with the translation of “Time Passes” being her first work read in France in as early as 1926, at around the same time Joyce was received, her reception was nothing remarkable. Mary Ann Caws attributes this to a prevalent notion, which persists even today, among French intellectuals that “a woman cannot write a novel like Joyce or Proust.” ⁴

Socio-cultural milieu also played a part, and it was socio-cultural milieu that had finally attracted French readers’ attention to Woolf. In response to the rise of French existentialism and phenomenology, as Villeneuve points out, Woolf began to be received more as a philosopher than a writer. In the 1950s, feminist theorist Simone de Beauvoir’s influential book *The Second Sex* was much indebted to Woolf’s notion on women, and the book in turn helped spread Woolf’s name after World War II. Carol Rodier’s study of Woolf’s reception in France also makes clear that, for the past three decades, the challenging dimensions of Woolf’s work have been appropriated by theorists such as

---


Gilles Deluze and Julia Kristeva as the touchstone of their theoretical tools such as narratology, linguistics, and psychology.\(^5\) Judging by the fact that today French intellectuals are still showing unusual interest in Woolf as ever, with the number of articles on Woolf on the rise every year, Caws predicts that “[i]nterest in Virginia Woolf is unlikely to subside: it will, no doubt, increase, even with a French…twist to it. Virginia herself would, no doubt, have been amused by it all” (Caw 64).

Elsewhere in Europe, however, Woolf’s reception often followed a route in the opposite direction. In Germany, for example, it was the literary curiosity that started Woolf’s reception there. As in France, the reception of Woolf in Germany started as early as the 1920s, though with much less “twist.” Ansgar and Vera Nunning’s study shows that in the early years Woolf did not gain much attention from the wide reading public, despite serious critical efforts to convince the readers of her first-rank writing.\(^6\) It was not until the 1950s, with her unique formal properties finally recognized by German philologist Erich Auerbach and the Austrian narrative theorist Franz Stanzel, the Woolf’s work begin to attract serious attention. It is interesting to note that what had failed Woolf in France now won her a prestigious place in Germany. Auerbach placed her in the first place among the modernists, while Stanzel’s favorable criticism contributed significantly to the popularity of Woolf’s works in the German-speaking countries. During this period, as Ansgar and Vera Nunning note in their essay, Woolf’s name was largely associated with modernist and experimental writers, with interest predominantly in her aesthetics and innovative narrative techniques. Beginning in the 1970s, Woolf was turned into a


feminist icon and role model with women’s movements in Germany. The accessibility of her writings such as ROO and TG has gradually altered Germans’ impression of her. Over the years her image has changed from “the old cliché of Woolf as an apolitical aesthete, impressionist novelist and fragile invalid,” to “the figurehead of feminism” (Nunning and Nunning 69). Ansgar and Vera Nunning stress that the huge impact of contemporary literary theories on the studies of Woolf in Germany during this period cannot be overlooked, as new critical approaches have led to reassessment of her work. Today the once largely ignored political and ethical themes in Woolf’s work became the focus, and her works are now examined beyond their Englishness towards a wider humanistic concern.

While Woolf was introduced to the general reader in West Germany in the 1920s, in East Germany the public reception of Woolf, as Wolfgang Wicht’s study shows, did not start until the translation of MD appeared in 1977. The disparity in Woolf reception between East and West Germany before their unification in 1990 may shed some light on the extent to which political climate can determine the literary and cultural scene of a country. According to Wicht, the publication of Woolf was at different speeds between East and West Germany because for a book to be published in East Germany, approval must be sought from the advisory board of the Ministry of Culture. The quality of a book was partially measured by whether or not it contained elements that are in accordance with socialist culture, such as critiques of capitalism and sympathies for the working class. Unfortunately, western modernist works did not seem to fall in this category.

---

7 See the end of Chapter One (p.16) for abbreviations of the works of Virginia Woolf used here.
Instead, communist rulers labeled western modernist literature and art as “decadence” since they feature individualism and nihilism (Wicht 107-109).

Wicht further points out that the interest in modernist literature had seemed absent until the mid-1970s when East German intellectuals and critics began to cast doubt on “the Stalinist ultra-dogmatic repudiation of modernism” (Wicht 103). Intellectuals and critics in the post-Stalinist era began to approach modernist work from a new perspective. When anti-dogmatism gradually formed a political trend, many found Woolf’s innovative style of “subverting the ruling ideological pattern of dogmatism” particularly appealing, as it demonstrated a mode of resistance that reflected the spirit of the time (Wicht 102). Another instance of political influences on reception is the popular appeal of Woolf’s notion of women, which coincided with the social emancipation of women in East Germany during this period.

Political climate as a determiner of Woolfian reception was also observed in Poland. Urszula Terentowicz-Fotyga’s essay indicates that censorship enforced after the Second World War contributed significantly to the silence on Woolf’s works. Literature was manipulated as a tool to rebuild a national identity after many years of turbulence in Polish history, and Woolf’s works, along with other modernist works, were censored largely because they did not contain enough social messages to serve this end. Aside from that, the “bourgeois” characters of her works also failed to meet the needs of communist ideology and propaganda (Terentowicz-Fotyga 128-130).

---

From the 1960s onward, the gradually lightened political and social pressures in Poland enabled Woolf’s works to become much more accessible to the reading public. Terentowicz-Fotyga claims that the gradual turning away from the realist novel in favor of the modernist novel and the increased availability of the translation of Woolf’s more popular work to the common readers also helped widen Woolf’s readership. The growing number of articles devoted to the study of Woolf as a modernist writer also indicates a tendency today in Poland that “Woolf receives higher acclaim than does James Joyce” (Terentowicz-Fotyga 128).

As evidenced in the studies cited above, Woolf reception in Europe appears to vary from country to country, and the responses she is capable of evoking are largely determined by historical, cultural and socio-political specificities. In fact the concept of “Woolf” has been in a state of flux, all the more so when her image is constantly being shaped and reshaped in different geographical locations and historical contexts. If the general image and concept of Woolf is dynamic and changing in Europe as just described, what does she look like beyond the European borders? Does assimilation into other cultures take on a similar pattern or should we expect more dramatic changes or even transformations? How do some of the local problems make themselves felt in the path of her reception? Which aspects of Woolf find more resonance in non-European cultures?

Woolf’s place in the global arena can be discerned from the changes in ways her reception is being researched. In a symposium of *Woolf across Cultures* held at the Russian State University for the Humanities and Leo Tolstoy Estate Museum Yasnaya Polyana in 2003, Woolf’s works were approached from comparative and cross-cultural
perspectives. While the goal of Woolf reception studies in Europe used to be limited to Woolf’s contribution to only European history and culture, this symposium set out to investigate Woolf’s border-crossing power. 10 According to Natalya Reinhold, the editor of the essay collection, Woolf should be viewed not as a British or European writer, but as a “world writer.” 11 This suggestion was based upon the fact that, as Maria DiBattista reminds us, even though Woolf has entered the realm of world literature, her image as “the lady-novelist from Bloomsbury” persists to this day, and many still confine her to the English cultural domain, thus localizing her world vision. 12 It is only through viewing Woolf as a world writer, as DiBattista stresses, can one truly recognize “her exemplary achievement in excavating common ground between and across cultures” (DiBattista 20).

But the “common ground” Woolf excavated could be manipulated to serve practical interests. Mark Hussey’s essay on Woolfian reception in the U.S. argues that appropriation is an issue not to be overlooked in American Woolf studies. The American reception of Woolf in the 1970s and 1980s was made synonymous with feminist criticism, which was so markedly different than that in her home country. 13 The American academy during this period passionately embraced Woolf as a feminist exemplar. Her notion of women provided scholars and critics justification of the feminine ways of knowing and writing, and gender difference was thus made a legitimate field of inquiry

10 The Reception of Virginia Woolf in Europe is part of a series of study examining the impact of British authors felt in Europe. The aim of these research projects, according to the series editor Elinor Shaffer, is to study British authors beyond a single and narrow perspective. The goal is to gain a better insight into their contribution to intellectual and cultural history of Europe as a whole.
that attracted enormous critical attention across the country. As Hussey points out, some English cultural critics actually see the “Woolf” received in the U.S.A. as being largely an American phenomenon (Hussey 51). In objection to the American appropriation and reductive reading of Woolf, Jane Marcus, a decade ago, urged American feminists to “quit holding Woolf hostage” and stop fetishizing her.\footnote{Jane Marcus, “Wrapped in the Stars and Stripes: Virginia Woolf in the U.S.A.,” The South Carolina Review 29.1 (Fall 1996): 17.}

For Woolf to be freed from being held hostage, her influences as a “world-scale social thinker” should be examined globally. In this picture of Woolf’s global, border-crossing influences, the eastern part appears most incomplete, if not missing. How does Woolf’s thinking fit in the east? How could her work find resonance in such vastly different cultures? What have her narrative technique and vision contributed to this side of the globe? How does she grow on Eastern national soils? What are the new responses she is capable of stimulating and calling forth there? How do the reception studies of Woolf in this region have so far informed our understanding of her influence and contribution; and what remains to be understood?

Myunghee Chung’s essay on Woolf’s reception in South Korea offers a vision of what the complete picture of Woolf’s reception in Asia might look like.\footnote{Myunghee Chung, “Mediating Virginia Woolf for Korean Readers,” Woolf across Cultures, ed. Natalya Reinhold (New York: Pace UP, 2004) 95-109.} Despite her growing popularity today, particularly in the academic world, Woolf’s journey to Korea has been a bumpy one, according to Chung. She was received, in Marxist Lukacs- and Leavis-oriented criticisms in Korea, as a fragile aesthete. The fragile aesthete was also a source of fear thanks to Edward Albee’s 1962 play “Who’s Afraid of Virginia Woolf.” The lack of both translation and influential Korean literary figures to promote Woolf’s
works had made the already rocky road of her reception into this country even bumpier. The misfortune underwent a reversal during the 1990s. Women’s movements during this period, as Chung notes, helped uplift Woolf as the feminist figurehead in South Korea.16 Various other efforts have also been made by academic professionals to spread her name. Beginning in 1994, The Virginia Woolf Society of Korea (VWSK), in collaboration with Sol, a prestigious local publishing house, has launched a long-term translation project of Woolf’s works to disseminate the “proper Woolf” among Korean readers, for it is to many Woolf scholars’ belief that the reception of her has been “mis-directed” and should therefore be “updated” (Chung 103-104).

Since Woolf’s reception varies from country to country, a legitimate question to ask as part of the efforts to reveal the complete picture of Woolf’s global impact would be “How and to what extent has Woolf been received in other parts of Asia, especially Chinese-speaking countries, namely China and Taiwan, which enjoy the highest population not only in Asia but in the whole world as well?” More specific questions can branch from this overarching one: Has her reception undergone similar stages as those in other cultural contexts due to transcultural interaction? Or, even more specifically, do cultural and socio-political factors play a part in Woolf’s reception in the Chinese-speaking world, especially after the separation of the Republican China in 1949 into the communist China and the Nationalist, democratic Taiwan? Given the reported different paths of Woolf’s reception in respectively East and West Germany, it is reasonable to expect that, in terms of Woolf’s reception, Taiwan and China may demonstrate analogical effects caused by differences in socio-political ideologies.

Description of Thesis

To answer these questions, a systematic study of the Chinese reception of Woolf is in order, and this study represents one such effort. Looked at from the perspective of a literary historian, Woolf’s reception in China and Taiwan from the 1920s to the 2000s will be examined, first in terms of socio-cultural milieu and then, after their 1949 separation, in terms of the impact of socio-political differences. Except in Chapter Two, where Woolf’s reception before the 1949 separation will be discussed, that is, Taiwan and China will be taken as two separate terrains in terms of both geography and recent history since, after their split in 1949, the two have actually experienced very different, sometimes even mutually exclusive, sociopolitical and even cultural developments. As Sheldon Lu argues, the history of Great China (i.e., the Mainland China, Taiwan and Hong Kong) is “one of migration, diaspora, colonialism, nationalism, political rivalry, military confrontation and cultural interflow all at the same time;” and if one is to reduce these three regions to one history, this would amount to suppression of their own cultural and political specificities.17

The selection among the three regions raises yet another question. That is, why is it that only Taiwan and China are compared but not Hong Kong. The latter has been excluded from the present study on the ground that it had been a region predominantly influenced by British cultures for over a hundred and fifty years until its handover to China in 1997. This former British dependent territory’s heavy and longtime exposure to British traditions and cultures has resulted in unique hybrid socio-political and cultural experiences of its own and is therefore excluded for its incomparability in terms of the

---

“foreignness” of British cultures. One may argue that Taiwan had been similarly under colonial government by Japan (1895-1945) and the same considerations should apply. However, unlike that for Hong Kong, the extent of “foreignness” of the British cultures in which Woolf was raised remains similar to both Taiwan and China Chinese, but not to those of Hong Kong. Most importantly, Woolf reception during the early period of the Nationalist government of Taiwan was initiated predominantly by those having migrated from China to Taiwan, a fact that warrants an equal starting line, hence better comparability of Woolf’s reception in Taiwan and China in terms of later impact of socio-political differences.

Given that Woolf’s reception began as early as in the 1920s, when Taiwan was still under the colonial government of Japan, her reception during this early period can only be discussed in the mainland China context. In this study, that is, the early reception of Woolf will be first assessed under the rubric of China during the Republican period until 1949, when Mainland China and Taiwan split themselves into two political entities, each with its own socio-political specificities developed within the past six decades. The reception of Woolf after 1949 will then be separately considered. More specifically, the reception of Woolf in Mainland China (People’s Republic of China, or China hereafter) and that in Taiwan (Republic of China, or Taiwan, its better known name, hereafter) will be treated as two separate phenomena each with its own path and phases of Woolf reception. This decision was informed by the history of Woolf’s reception in countries where similar political separation has been observed, i.e., East and West Germany. The political ideological differences between the two have been shown to play an important part in the shaping of cultural and literary milieu and the resulting differential reception.
of Woolf. As Taiwan and China were separated by similar differences in socio-political ideologies, the status quo of Woolf reception in these two regions apparently merits separate considerations. As the split, moreover, between the two Chinese-speaking entities is critical to the understanding of Woolf’s differential reception in these two regions, a brief account of the relationship between the two in political climates and cultural environments is in order.

As far as the study of foreign literature is concerned, the Taiwanese government under the leadership of Chiang Kai-shek 蔣介石 appeared relatively more open in attitude. However, martial law (1947-87) was enforced two years before the ROC government retreated to Taiwan and remained in effect in Taiwan until forty years later, which had offered legal justification for the government’s censorship of and control over literary productions. Some intellectuals and young artists thus found the environment during this period highly unfavorable to the development of local arts and cultures since publication was under tight control, censorship was strictly enforced, and their freedom in producing cultural artifacts using local themes and materials were restricted. This had led to a shift of attention to the western modernist aesthetics for artistic inspiration, and made especially evident the western influences in Taiwan during the 1950s and the 1960s particularly in terms of movements in art and literature, though the influence of western aesthetics continued to be felt in Taiwan during the 1970s and thereafter.

Literature and politics were inseparable in Communist China, in contrast. Literature, among other cultural productions, has often been employed as a powerful means for constructing national identities, and China was certainly not alone in such literature manipulation. As discussed earlier, in both East Germany and Poland for
example, acceptable literary pieces were limited to those that either showed “sympathies for the working class” or contained “critiques of capitalism” and “social messages,” according to Wicht and Terentowicz-Fotyga. Communist China during Mao’s era was basically resistant to foreign cultures, particularly during the decade-long Cultural Revolution (1966-1976), except for those that could help with “the development and enrichment of China’s social literary art,” according to Mao Ze-dong毛澤東, so that China could “absorb the advanced culture of foreign countries to be the raw materials of her own culture.” After Mao’s death in 1976, China became more lenient toward foreign cultures and interest in western culture began to emerge. In their essay tracing Woolf’s passage to China, Melba Cuddy-Keane and Kay Ki claim that “[t]he opening of China, since 1976, to the study of Western materials has meant a resurgence of interest in Western writers and in Virginia Woolf” (Cuddy-Keane and Ki 139). They further call for attention to the varying accessibility of western literary work at different times in Mainland China since “[t]he study of foreign literature in China cannot be considered apart from its cultural and political history and the effects of this history on the academy” (Cuddy-Keane and Ki 137).

With this historical background in mind, one should expect socio-political influences to have played a major part in the development of Woolf’s reception in the Chinese-speaking world. As we shall see, the socio-political influences were not limited to political ideological differences; differences in readerships and their ramifications also characterize Woolf’s reception in these two brother political entities. With the rapid rise of China both economically and politically at the turn of the century, however, the force

---

of globalization appears to have resulted in more similarities than differences in the two regions’ reception of Woolf. In this study, I will trace the different stages of Woolf’s reception in these foreign lands. I will begin, in Chapter Two, with a discussion of Woolf’s reception before the mid-twentieth century. It is a time when we were still able to occasionally spot Woolf’s Chinese contemporaries making direct correspondence, if not direct contact, with Woolf herself, and a time when Woolf’s reception occurred solely on Mainland China during the Republic period. Her reception, however, was limited to the elite few and Woolf was still largely unfamiliar or unheard of to the general Chinese public.

The retreat of the ROC government to Taiwan in 1949 also marks the beginning of differential receptions of Woolf in Taiwan and in China. Until the turn of the century, Woolf had experienced very different treatments in these two regions—one being steady and warm and the other being drastic but critical, and therefore her reception in the later half of the twentieth century will be separately discussed, first in Taiwan and then in China. A similar division into two periods, as we shall see, can be further discerned in both regions. Chapter Three recounts Woolf’s reception in Taiwan, where her works first received little attention but became gradually popular in the latter two decades. In both periods, however, her readers were confined largely to scholars of English or foreign literature majors. Woolf’s reception in China before the end of the twentieth century, in contrast, as we shall see in Chapter Four, was drastic—in the sense that she was totally silenced at first, but when she began to be heard again, her popularity grew at such a speed that Woolf herself might not have been able to imagine it. The incredible speed at which Woolf’s popularity picked up in China has enabled China to catch up with Taiwan
in its reception of Woolf. As will be shown in Chapter Five, similar phenomena began to be observed in both Taiwan and China, such as the appropriation of Woolf’s fame to commercial ends, evidence of Woolf’s high popularity. While it was political ideologies that had started Woolf’s differential reception on these two geographical locations, it is globalization that has shrunk the differences in their reception of Woolf.

It is my hope that a preliminary investigation of Woolf’s reception and influence in the Chinese-speaking worlds could provide useful information to interested readers, including Western Woolf scholars, scholars of modern Chinese literature, comparatists, literary historians in general, and scholars in cultural studies and translation studies. For those working in related fields—Chinese reception of western modernism or western modernity for example, I hope the framework built up here would also prove of help. It is my belief that a clearer and more complete picture of Woolf’s global reception should emerge through the efforts of this study.

Before going on, a word about spelling of Chinese names and text titles is in order. To maintain notation consistency, Pinyin system is used in romanizing Chinese names and text titles throughout. Spelling in Wade-Giles romanization system is nevertheless retained for the names of Taiwanese writers and critics, followed by their Pinyin equivalents given in parentheses, except where spellings in Pinyin and Wade-Giles are identical. All English translations of Chinese passages and titles are mine unless otherwise indicated, for example, with an asterisk (*).
Abbreviations of Woolf’s Works

BTA  Between the Acts
FB   Flush: A Biography
JR   Jacob’s Room
MD   Mrs. Dalloway
ND   Night and Day
O    Orlando
ROO  A Room of One’s Own
TG   Three Guineas
TL   To the Lighthouse
TW   The Waves
TY   The Years
VO   Voyage Out
Chapter Two
The Early Encounter:

Virginia Woolf in China during the Republican Period (1920s-1940s)

The first appearance of Virginia Woolf’s name in the Chinese-speaking world can be traced as far back as in the 1920s, when various forms of foreign thought and literary trends began to swarm in Republican China. Before her works were to be more widely read in their Chinese translations, that is, Woolf had already been known to a number of elite Chinese readers in her multiple roles—a writer, a critic, and a feminist figure—and had even exercised some, even if sporadic, cultural influences. Among the Chinese elites were western-educated young intellectuals and writers who had spent years studying abroad and who championed new literary forms and models for modern Chinese literature. In this chapter, Woolf will be seen against this historical context from the

19 The May Fourth Movement that took place in 1919 in Beijing prompted many sociopolitical reforms that were to bring about significant impact on the modern Chinese history. The younger generation, students and intellectuals mostly, strongly protested against foreign imperialists and warlords that had dominated the fragmented nation at the time. They also opposed the old values carried along in the Confucian tradition, blaming them for their failure to make China a strong nation. The May Fourth Movement was a turning point for the development of modern Chinese culture as well. The disappointment at Confucian teachings, for instance, caused many young intellectuals to turn to foreign ideologies for a change. A large variety of foreign thoughts and literary trends thus began to set in. For some, this new cultural movement is the Chinese Renaissance in the twentieth century. For further discussion of this movement, see Chow Tse-tsung, The May Fourth Movement: Intellectual Revolution in Modern China (Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1960).

20 The foreign invasion into China in the mid 19th century not only forced the Chinese government to sign unequal treaties and terms of trade with western powers, but also opened up Chinese contact with the west on a larger scale. The Opium War (also known as the Anglo-Chinese Wars; 1840-1842) ignited a series of foreign invasions that were to last for more than half a century, and every war, in Zhou Xiaoming’s words, had “ended with China’s defeat and humiliation” 均以中國的失敗與屈辱告終. On the positive side, this has finally obliged the Chinese to face the difficult reality they had been grounded in. Young Chinese intellectuals, funded by the government or otherwise, began to pursue higher education in Europe, America, or in its neighboring country Japan as a result. According to Zhou’s estimate, for example, as many as 3300 Chinese students were studying in Japan in 1911, compared to the recorded 159 students in 1900, when the Yihetuan shijian 義和團事件 (The Boxer Uprising), one of the final invasions of foreign forces, broke out. See Zhou Xiaoming 周曉明, Duoyuan yu duoyuan: Cong Zhongguo liuxuezuo dao Xinyuepai 多源與多元: 從中國留學族到新月派 (Multiple Sources and Multiplicity: From Chinese Students Studying Abroad to the Crescent Moon Group) (Wuchang: Huazhong shifan daxue, 2001) 22-23, 50.
1920s to the 1940s in China, when direct correspondence with Woolf as a contemporary was not impossible, and her reception will be discussed in connection with these elite readers. The goal is to reveal that Chinese Woolf reception in and shortly after her lifetime bears cultural and historical significance, and that the images shaped of her through personal and impersonal contacts are mediated through the fact that she was received as part of western Modernism. The reading of Woolf as a literary writer and critic, the interpreting of her social-political concern in light of women’s rights, and the traces of her influence in the Chinese contexts will be discussed in succession to bring out the specificity of the Chinese reception of Woolf in the first half of the 20th century.

**Woolf Readership**

A brief account of Woolf’s readership in China helps prepare the ground for a better understanding of the early reception of Woolf in this geographical location. Available cultural and literary documents have shown that Woolf’s works were, given the limited availability of their translations, circulated mostly among readers who had been exposed to western literature and/or had had the language ability to read the original texts. Literary intellectuals after the May Fourth Movement (1919) actively looked for foreign models to renovate Chinese literature. Beginning in the late 1920s, there emerged three major groups of writers, namely the left-wing writers 左翼作家, the Shanghai school writers 上海派 and the Beijing school writers 北京派, each having its own agenda working toward this goal. The left-wing writers (later forming the League of Leftist Writers 左翼作家聯盟 in Shanghai in 1930) were greatly influenced by Russian realist writings and advocated revolution literature 革命文學. When the Nationalists led by Chiang Kai Shek and the Communists led by Mao Zidong were struggling for ruling
power, these writers, most of whom were supporters of Mao, held that literature should serve as a tool for social revolution. The Shanghai school writers and the Beijing school writers, in contrast, were less political and more involved with western modernism. The two were nevertheless distinguishable in the characteristics of the types of work they produced: whereas the former’s works were often market-oriented, that of the latter’s was more academic in nature, and it was mainly through the Beijing school writers that Woolf was introduced.

Whether or not the term “school” could be appropriately applied in the grouping of the writers in Beijing and Shanghai has been subject to debate by critics today, though. According to Wang Furen 王富仁, the so-called Beijing School is no more than a term of geographic convenience referring to the group of writers who were active in Beijing and its neighboring cities in northern China from the late 1920s and to the 1930s. Other than that, they actually shared more differences than similarities, as each had his or her own literary notions and styles. Marked differences, likewise, can be found among the Shanghai school writers. Even the left-wing writers were not always in agreement with one another in their literary assertions. 21 Such an account may explain why there were constant debates not only among so-called schools of writers but also among writers within the same schools, some even lasting for years, on issues about the nature of literature. One most notable issue concerns the functions of literature—should literature serve political and/or commercial ends, should it function to reveal everyday life (the

advocacy of art for life), or should it serve nothing but art itself (the advocacy of art for art)?

Even if the grouping is problematic, it was nevertheless the writers so categorized under the Beijing School that facilitated the introduction of Woolf into China. Among them, the most notable ones include the former members of the Xinyue She 新月社 (Crescent Moon Society; 1923-1933). The Crescent Moon Society was made up of a like-minded literary coterie in Beijing who shared similar interests in art, culture, and/or concerns for socio-political issues. It was a loosely organized literary group whose members were an elite group of intellectuals who had pursued or were about to pursue higher education in the United States or the United Kingdom. Xu Zhimo 徐志摩 (Hsu Chih-Mo, Tsemou Hsu, C. Hamilton Hsu; 1897-1931) was the central figure of this group and all other members were friends of his. The society derived its name arguably from a book whose author Xu greatly admired: The Crescent Moon (1913), a collection of poems by Indian poet Rabindranath Tagore (1861-1941).

---

22 For the articles generated from these debates, see Chen Shuyu 陈漱渝 ed., Lu Xun lunzhengji 鲁迅論爭集 (A Collection of Lu Xun and Debates), 2 vols. (Beijing: Zongguo shehui kexue chuban she, 1998).
23 Mainly because of the loosely organized nature of the Crescent Moon Society, there has been no general agreement among scholars regarding when and how the society came into being in the 1920s. For an overview of some major discussions on this as well as the latest findings, please see Liu Qun 刘群, “Guanyu xinyueshe chengli de shijian, didian ji xiangguan qingkuang de kaoshu” 关于新月社成立的時間地點及相關情況的考述 (A Study of the Time and Place and Other Related Issues Concerning the Establishment of the Crescent Moon Society), Zhongguo xian dai wenxue yanjiu congkan 中國現代文學研究叢刊 (Modern Chinese Literature Studies) 3 (2007): 299-306.
24 According to Chen Yuan 陈源 (Chen Xiying 陈西滢; 1896-1970), one of the core members of the society, “the Crescent Moon Society was a group made up of Zhimo’s friends. The members were constantly changing. There were always friends coming from elsewhere every time we gathered for lunch or dinner. Zhimo would invite whoever he met to join us” 新月社是志摩朋友的團體，人員大都在變動，聚餐時常有自他處來的朋友，只要志摩遇見即邀請來參加. Chen’s remark is quoted in Fang Hui 方慧, Bainian jiazhu—Xu Zhimo 百年家族—徐志摩 (A Clan in Centenary: Xu Zhimo) (Taipei: Lishu, 2002) 67.
25 Tagore paid a two-month visit to China in April 1924, giving lectures in various places. Xu served as Tagore’s interpreter during his stay in China and accompanied him to Japan for another month before they
Initially seven or eight in total, the society’s affiliates would meet on a regular basis in Xu’s rented residence in Beijing for idea exchanges as well as entertainment. They founded Xinyue Shudian (Crescent Moon Bookstore) in 1927 in Shanghai and subsequently started the influential literary magazine *Xinyue yuekan* (The Crescent Moon Monthly, or Xinyue hereafter; 1928-1933), publishing literary and critical writings, translations, local and foreign book reviews, and articles on socio-cultural issues at the time. Some critics have likened the Chinese Crescent Moon group to the British Bloomsbury group (1905-) for their similarities in both intellectual bonding and distinctive literary taste. As Patricia Laurence points out, the Crescent Moon group was “identified with English liberalism and literature” and was “part of a more academic modernist movement in Beijing.”

In the Chinese literary context, members of the Crescent Moon Society were categorized as the “Anglo-American returnees” in view of the western perspectives they brought in, as opposed to, for example, those “Japanese returnees”, who enjoyed no less influence during the same period. However, since the 1950s, due to the political climate in the early days of the communist Chinese Mainland, the Crescent Moon scholars had been dismissed as decadents for their bourgeois taste, which had caused their contributions to modern Chinese literature to be greatly under-evaluated until the late 1970s.

---

parted in Hong Kong in July. Xu was given an Indian name “Susima” by Tagore. For more details please see Fang Hui, *Bainian jiazu—Xu Zhimo*, 75-80.

Woolf as a literary writer and critic

The Crescent Moon members began their first contact with the Bloomsbury members through the deliberate effort of Xu during the early 1920s. Xu, a poet himself, translated a number of English poems into Chinese and has been thus credited as one of the first to introduce English meter to Chinese poetry. But his major contribution has been his effort in bridging the intellectual circles of both sides, which has won him the delayed reputation of ambassador of cultural exchange. Sinologist Arthur Waley wrote in 1940 that England owed a debt to China for failing to acknowledge the contribution of Xu in drawing attention of Chinese intellectuals to English literature and culture.\(^27\)

Xu earned a master degree from the Columbia University. After that, he went on to study at the University of Cambridge as a research student at King’s College under the sponsorship of Goldsworthy Lowes Dickinson (1862-1932).\(^28\) Over the course of his stay there (1920-1922), Xu had made a wide acquaintance with his English contemporaries, the majority of them being reputable scholars such as the philosopher Bertrand Russell (1872-1970), the writer H.G. Welles (1866-1946), and the linguist Charles Kay Ogden (1889-1957).\(^29\) Members of the Bloomsbury group were also found on his lengthy list of friends, most notably the art critic Roger Fry (1866-1934). It is in fact through Fry that Xu had tried to get in contact with Woolf. In 1928, on his third visit to England, Xu wrote to Fry expressing his wish to meet with Woolf,

---


\(^{28}\) Dickinson was a pacifist who contributed to the establishment of the League of Nations, an international organization founded as the result of the Treaty of Varsilles in 1919-1920. The organization was replaced by the United Nations after the Second World War.

\(^{29}\) Ogden was the founder of the Heretics Society at Cambridge in 1909.
I am reading Virginia’s *To the Lighthouse* and find it more than interesting. Do find out, Roger, if by any chance I could place observance at the shrine of this beautiful and sensitive writer. I should like so much to carry away from England bits of unforgettable memories.30

That was not the first time Xu had heard about Woolf. Ironically, though, Woolf had not always appeared so “goddess-like” to him, if one is to contrast his admiration for Woolf with his description of her “kind” some five years ago. For all his fondness for modernist concepts of art and literature, Xu’s initial impression of modernists was far from being an agreeable one. As a romantic poet who had constantly found flowers his favorite simile for feminine beauty, he nevertheless noted women modernists only for their personae eccentricities and shabbiness. This is perhaps best illustrated in a eulogy to Katherine Mansfield (1888-1923) in which Xu describes his brief encounter with Mansfield in July 1922, six months before she died of tuberculosis. He marveled at her “fairylike graceful manner” 仙姿靈態 and the way she carried herself, which, however, was not in the least like any of her shabby and heavy smoking contemporaries such as “Rose Maccanlay, Virginia Woolf, Roma Wilon, Mrs. Lucas, [and] Vanessa Bell…” whose “loud laughter would flood even the talks of the gentlemen at the same table. And they walk with their chest and belly protruding, losing marks that have distinguished them as descendents of Eve. And when they speak, they utter words even men would find

---

embarrassing to utter….” 譽笑的聲音十次裡有九次蓋過同座的男子，走起路來也是挺胸凸肚的，再也辯不出是夏娃的身後；開起口來大半是男子不敢出口的話….

Xu’s great interest in modernist narrative techniques might have triggered the later dramatic change in his impression of the women modernists. Stream of consciousness novels had intrigued Xu since his arrival at Cambridge. In 1923, for instance, upon reading Ulysses he wrote, “The last one hundred pages of the book [with around 710 pages] are purely ‘prose,’ smooth like cheese and shiny like the altar of a church.” 在書最後一百頁 [全書共七百幾十頁] 那真是純粹的‘prose,’ 像牛酪一樣潤滑，像教堂裡石壇一樣光澄。 Such admiration led Xu to try his hand at this narrative technique in his short story “Lunpan” (Roulette; 1929). Though it is not clear whether Fry did make any arrangement for Woolf and Xu to meet, the change in Xu’s attitude toward Woolf was clearly revealed in his preface to his collection of short fiction bearing the same title as his aforementioned stream of consciousness short story,

I have read Flaubert, and I admire him. I have read Conrad, and I feel excited. I have read Chekhov, Mansfield, and I am charmed. I have read Mrs. Woolf, and I worship her. After reading works by these masters, I told myself, “This is what writing ought to be: perfect artistic conception expressed in perfect wording.”

31 Xu Zhimo, Xu Zhimo quanji 徐志摩全集 (The Complete Work of Xu Zhimo), vol. 3 (Hong Kong: Shangwu, 1983) 8-9. The eulogy entitled “Mansfield” 曼殊斐兒 was first published in May, 1923.
I have read Flaubert, I admire. I have read Kipling, I am excited. I have read Nietzsche, I am devoted. I have read Huلف夫人, I am prostrated... To these great works, I say to myself, this is what an article is! Writing must be written in such a way: perfect sentences express the perfect meaning.

Xu may not be the only Chinese writer showing great interest in modernist work, but his effort incorporating modernist narrative technique into modern Chinese literature has been well acknowledged. For instance, Wen Jieruo, one of the translators of James Joyce’s *Ulysses*, has a section on Xu and Joyce in her article “Qiaoyisi zai zhongguo” 喬伊斯在中國 (Joyce in China; 2007). In this section she seconded Bian Zhilin’s 卞之琳 (1910-2000) claim that Xu’s short fiction might be the first to introduce to China the writing of stream of consciousness.

Xu was not the only one interested in Woolf’s work among the Crescent Moon elites, either, though it might very well be he who had started the interest. In 1932, a translation of “A Mark on the Wall” (1921) was published in *Xinyue*. This is the first piece of writing by Woolf that appears in Chinese translation. The translator was Ye Gongchao 葉公超 (Yeh Kong-Choa, George T. Yeh;1904-1981), then an editorial staff of the magazine. Ye was a regular contributor to *Xinyue*, writing reviews of foreign books, Anglo-American publications mainly, with an intention of exposing Chinese readers to western literature. Like Xu, Ye also received his academic training in both the United

---

33 Xu Zhimo, “‘Lunpan’ xu” 輪盤序 (Preface to “Lunpan”), *Xu Zhimo quanjí*, vol. 4, 150-51.
34 Wen Jieruo 文潔若, “Qiaoyisi zai zhongguo” 喬伊斯在中國 (Joyce in China), *Waiguowenxue yenjio 外國文學研究* (*Foreign Literature Studies*) 6 (2007): 10-16. The Chinese translation of *Ulysses* 尤利西斯 (1995) is a collaboration of Wen with her husband Xiao Qian 蕭乾. The work took four years to complete. Bian Zhilin was a translator, poet and literary critic.
State and the United Kingdom. He had a good acquaintance with T. S. Eliot and, as a result, contributed significantly to disseminating the latter’s poems in China. His translation of “A Mark on the Wall” marked yet another effort of his to introduce western literature to Chinese readers.

In his translator’s note to the translation, Ye says that Woolf “caused a sensation” 轟動一時 in the British literary circle in the 1920s and 1930s for her innovative narrative technique and that her works, like the works of French painter Henri Matisse (1869-1954), often go beyond the imagination of her readers. For Ye, Woolf is a modernist writer who has no intention of criticizing life and who pays little attention to social problems. He says,

Simply put, Woolf has absolutely no intention to teach the world or to criticize life…. Her attention is focused neither on struggles of feelings nor on social and life issues but on feelings that are extremely vague, abstract, and sensitive, i.e., on the so-called subconscious activities in psychoanalysis.

簡單的來說，吳爾夫芙絕對沒有訓世或批評人生的目的……她所注意的不是感情的爭鬥，也不是社會人生的問題，乃是極渺茫，極抽象，極靈敏的感覺，就是心理分析學所謂下意識的活動。(Ye 2)

---

35 Ye was a graduate of Amherst College and earned his master degree in literature from the University of Cambridge.
Ye further notes in the preface that Woolf’s writing of the character’s consciousness and her disregard for reality has constantly invited attacks from those who hold traditional conceptions of literature, such as her contemporaries Arnold Bennett and John Galsworthy. They consider a novel worthless if it depicts largely the character’s mind without touching on real issues in life. On this Ye apparently has an utterly different opinion. He speaks highly of Woolf’s subject matter and regards her literary innovation as “absolutely of value” (Ye 2).

Ye’s admiration for Woolf appears to be well grounded in his critical stance and conception of literature. As a literary critic, Ye’s approach to literature is one that stresses the freedom of artistic creation on the part of the author. For him, literature as an artistic means of expression should neither serve a social function nor attempt to answer moral questions; it simply provides a site for writers to express their individual understanding and experience of life and to create a world of art meant as a substitution for the real world. As he asserts,

…Fiction carries no responsibility for social reform. Even if social reform is possible, it should not be under the writer’s intentional manipulation. Fictional writings belong with creative arts, not with journals of morals and ethics. The author cannot and should not assume responsibility for the unintended impact, if any, a work might have on society after its publication.

38 See Ji Guiqi 李桂起, “Ye Gongchao wenxue piping de guannian he fengge” 葉公超文學批評的觀念和風格 (The Notion and Style of Ye Gongchao’s Literary Criticism), Beifang conglun 北方論叢 (The Northen Forum) 6 (2004): 54-59. According to Ji, Ye’s literary notion is a hybrid one. It is somewhat Classicistic, at time Romantic, but is more inclined to Liberal. Under the influence of his good friend T. S. Eliot, New Criticism also shaped his notion of literature.
...novel根本就沒有改造社會的責任。社會就是可以改進的也用不著一般小說作家故意的來作弄。小說著作是一種創作的文藝，並不是什麼道德倫理的記載。至於，一部小說出初版之後對於社會有什麼無意的影響，這是作者不能也不該去負責任的。39

With such a conception of literature, Ye certainly would not agree to the Realist claim that a literary work should bear verisimilar, or true-to-life, quality and render people and objects of everyday life with as little interpretation as possible. This, Ye argues, will consequently relegate an author to a mere indifferent recorder, such as a scientific researcher. Neither would he agree with his Leftist contemporaries such as Lu Xun (1881-1936) and to their claim that literature should be used as propaganda or mobilizing tools for social reform and revolution40. Woolf’s work, with all its lack of traditionally defined reality and practical uses according to Ye’s understanding, appears to harmonize with Ye’s literary stance.

Along with “Kew Garden,” “A Mark on the Wall” is largely viewed as an artistic precursor of Woolf’s major works because similar techniques and subject matters—the connection between external reality and internal reality, the crossings of the private and public boundaries, and the Woolfian perspective on history, society, life and art—recur in

40 Lu was an attacker of Chinese tradition in the period of the May Fourth movement. He founded Zuoyi zuojia liemeng (The League of Leftist Writers) in 1930, and was hailed as one of the most influential leftist writers since the thirties. Nevertheless, the label of “leftist” may sometimes be misleading as it does not do full justice to the complexity of Lu’s writings. For more discussion of Lu and his work, please see Leo Ou-fan Lee, Voices from the Iron House: A Study of Lu Xun (Bloomington: Indiana UP, 1987); David Der-Wei Wang (王德威), Cong Liue dao Wang Zhenhe (From Liu E to Wang Zhenhe: On Chinese Contemporary Realist Novels) (Taipei: Shibao, 1986).
all of her later works. In “A Mark on the Wall,” the narrator, supposedly Woolf herself, conveys her emotions and thoughts in a fragmented and non-linear manner, as triggered by a mark on the wall above the mantelpiece, which is actually a snail. Such unconventional techniques appear to have drawn so much of Ye’s attention that he was able to see only the formal aspects of her writing, that is, her “exquisite” 玲瓏 and “vivid and cute” 生動得可愛 writing style, while ignoring by and large the thoughts embedded within, including Woolf’s notion of patriarchy. For Ye, “A Mark on the Wall” exemplifies his notion of what literature should be; that is, he approached Woolf from a set criterion, regarding only certain aspects of the work as representative of her art in general. It thus seemed that Woolf was read less as Woolf in her entirety than as a handy tool to support his aesthetic claims.

Ye’s seeming failure to address Woolf’s social concerns may have testified to the challenging dimensions of Woolf’s work for readers in the first half of the 20th century. In writing the stream of consciousness, for instance, the absence of clear boundaries between the interior and exterior constantly blurs the fine line between imagination and reality. The novelty of such unconventional technique may have distracted the reader, in this case Ye, from Woolf’s intended message. Accordingly, he tells his readers that “A Mark on the Wall” deals with nothing more than “vagueness” 渺茫 and “imagination that comes out of nothing at all” 无中生有的幻想(Ye 3), a property he argued to have made this piece of work appealing, in spite of Woolf’s apparent criticism of patriarchy, as evident in the following passage,

Ye Gongchao, translator’s note, “Qiangshang yi dian henji,” 3.
Men perhaps, should you be a woman; the masculine point of view which governs our lives, which set the standard, which establishes Whitaker’s Table of Precedency, which has become, I suppose, since the war, half a phantom to many men and women, which soon, one may hope, will be laughed into the dustbin where the phantoms go….42

The absence of gender-oriented studies in the first half of the 20th century in general may have further contributed to Ye’s disregard for Woolf’s social-political concerns, as evident in his translation of the following passage where a gender issue is involved,

I understand Nature’s game—her prompting to take action as a way of ending any thought that threatens to excite or to pain. Hence, I suppose, comes our slight contempt for men of action—men, we assume, who do not think.

我明白自然的把戲—遇著了驚痛人的思想，她立即就要用盡手腕來阻止。因此，我們對於積極實行者暗含著藐視—我們當作他們是不思想的人。43

Here, what is certain is that by “men” Woolf means male, since her usage of this term is consistent throughout her writings. In Ye’s translation, however, he reads “men” in its sense of “human beings,” i.e., without reference to sex. This has led him to translate “men of action” into “積極實行者” (people of action), and “men…who do not

“think” into “不思想的人” (people who do not think). By mistakenly replacing “men” with “people” in his translation, Ye blurred the message Woolf had intended to convey.

Ye’s partial reading of Woolf, again, is nothing unusual, if we review the history of her reception in the world during the first half of the 20th century. Woolf’s innovative form and unconventional treatment of subject matter, which was not immediately recognizable, often posed great challenge to her readers. She was thus often misread, so much so as to be labeled as a “apolitical aesthete, impressionist novelist and fragile invalid” in Germany. Her work was not enthusiastically embraced by French intellectuals, either, as her work “has neither the grandeur nor the architectural solidity of certain works by male authors….” It is only the emergence of new critical approaches after the 1950s that has equipped interested readers with helpful tools to reassess the value of her work.

In addition to “The Mark on the Wall,” two other pieces of Woolf’s writings were also available in Chinese translation in the 1930s. Bian Zhiling 卞之琳 (Pian Chi-Ling; 1910-2000), another Beijing School writer and critic, translated Woolf’s critical essay “The Russian Point of View” (1925) and her short fiction “In the Orchard” (1923). Bian, a favorite student of Xu, was known as a representative figure of modern poetry of the Crescent Moon Society. He went to the University of Oxford as a researcher in 1947 but returned a year later due to the breakout of a Chinese civil war. Bian translated a wide range of western work of the 1920s and 1930s, and the majority of them have been

---


labeled as modernist literature today. The translation of “The Russian Point of View”
was published in 1934 in the literary supplement of Dagongbao (Takungpao) 大公報文
藝副刊, known as the “battlefield” 陣地 for the Beijing School writers, a site where they
were engaged in many debates with writers of different literary assertions, such as the
Shanghai School writers. 46 Woolf’s essay was selected for translation partly due to
Bian’s admiration for Woolf and partly due to the literary milieu of the time. Since the
May-fourth movement, Russian literary work in translation began to disseminate in China
and attract attention of many intellectuals, particularly those of the left-wing writers. The
translation of Woolf’s essay was intended, as Bian explains in the translator’s note, to
allow Chinese readers to find out how Russian literature had been received by its foreign,
i.e. British, readers. To this end, the translated version of this essay was entitled “Run
yingguoren du erguo xiaoshuo” 論英國人讀俄國小說 (On the British Reading of
Russian Novels) in place of its original title,

Most Chinese people prefer Russian novels to English novels. There must
be numerous reasons for this, but if we would manage to read through this
essay with patience, we should be able to figure out some of them. The
author Virginia Woolf is a contemporary British well-known writer…the
original title [of this essay] is Erguoren de guandian (The Russian Point of
View. See the author’s collection of critical essay The Common Reader)...
We may assume the role of a third-party observer and make some self-
introspection as we read this essay.

46 Dagongbao published its first issue on June 17, 1902, in Tianjing. It is the first Chinese newspaper not
only in China but in the world as well.
Despite the scarcity of translation, Woolf’s reputation as a literary critic traveled along with her reputation as a writer to China in early days. Back in 1929, Xiaoshuo Yuebao 小說月報 (The Short Story Magazine, or Xiaoshuo hereafter) published, in its July and August issue, a series of articles on modern world literatures, and Woolf’s name appeared in “Ershi nienlai de Yingguo xiaoshuo” 二十年來的英國小說 (British Novels in the Past Two Decades; 1929), an article outlining modern British novels and authors from 1909 to 1929 by Zhao Jingshen 趙景深 (1902-1985). In the section about Woolf, Zhao says that Woolf, like James Joyce and Dorothy Richardson, has the reputation of portraying in words the stream of human mind. To understand Woolf, Zhao suggests that one first reads her critical essay “Mr. Bennett and

---

47 Bian Zhilin 卞之琳, trans., “Run Yingguoren du Erguo xiaoshuo” 論英國人讀俄國小說 (On the British Reading of Russian Novels), by Virginia Woolf, Dagongbao 8 Feb. 1934, Tianjing ed.: 12+. The date of translation of “In the Orchard” is unknown, but it was most probably published in 1934. The short story is available in Bian Zhilin 卞之琳, Xichuangji 西窗集 (West Window Collection) (Jiangxi: Renmin, 1981) 176-179.

48 Xiaoshuo Yuekan 小說月刊 was a wide circulation monthly literary magazine published in 1910 and ended in 1932 when the publishing house was destroyed by war. At first the magazine provided only entertainment to the reading public, but beginning from 1921, the magazine became the backbone for the new literary movement initiated by the May Fourth movement. It was the base for writers of the Wenxue yenjiohui 文學研究會 (1921-1931), the first literary society founded after the May forth Movement.

49 Zhao Jingshen 趙景深, “Ershi nienlai de Yingguo xiaoshuo” 二十年來的英國小說 (British Novels in the Past Two Decades), Xiaoshuo Yuebao 小說月報 (The Short Story Magazine) 20.8 (1929): 34495-34510. Zhao was a writer and translator.

50 Dorothy Richardson (1873-1957) was regarded as the first British writer who wrote about the stream of consciousness of fictional characters in English-language literary work.
Mrs. Brown” (1919, 1924) because it gives a full picture of Woolfian aesthetics and ideals of how human character (represented by Mrs. Brown) should be described. Quoting Woolf that “…we are trembling on the verge of one of the great ages of English literature. But it can only be reached if we are determined never, never to desert Mrs. Brown,” Zhao claims, “Woolf is the woman writer capable of catching Mrs. Brown. In representing a character, she does not limit her description only to the individual; attention is also given to the surroundings.” 吳爾芙就是能抓住白朗夫人的女作家。她所寫的人物並不限於個人，還注意到周圍 (Zhao, 34508). From the list of work provided by Zhao to illustrate Woolfian aesthetics, one can tell that Woolf publications attracted considerable attention in the Chinese literary arena in those days. Except for *Monday or Tuesday* (1921), all of Woolf’s major publications available in the market then—*The Voyage Out* (1915), *Night and Day* (1919), *Jacob’s Room* (1922), *Mrs. Dalloway* (1925), *The Common Reader* (1925), *To the Lighthouse* (1927), *Orlando: A Biography* (1928)—appeared on Zhao’s list.

**Woolf as a Feminist writer**

Reception varies with the reader’s background and the amount of reading s/he has had about the writer. Such variation could result in different interpretations, hence varied evaluations of a writer and her work. The reception of Woolf in China is no exception, especially before the 1940s. While some readers were knowledgeable enough to be able to appreciate her work against the social background where she had been born, there were also occasions when she was misunderstood as a result of a partial and thus biased impression of her. Woolf’s book-length essay *ROO*, based on two lectures she gave at two women’s colleges at the University of Cambridge, is one example. The essay came
out in 1929, and Xiaoshuo announced its appearance soon after. In just a few sentences the editor presents a simplistic understanding of the work:

[It] roughly says that if a woman writer is to produce quality work, she must have a good living environment, an annual income of five hundred pounds, and a room of one’s own... Such a view is absolutely ridiculous. If what she says is true, then the works by the poor guys Hamsun, Anderson, and Balzac must be very very bad.”

大意謂女作家想要寫出好作品來，必定要環境好，每年須有五百磅的收入，還要有自己一個人的房間。這種見地甚為可笑，照她所說，大約哈姆生、安徒生、巴爾紮克這些窮鬼的作品都是很壞很壞的了。51

While such simplistic reading of Woolf is unlikely to be incidental, given the limited exposure to foreign thoughts at the time, there were fortunately knowledgeable others who were able to assess Woolf based on a more comprehensive understanding of her and her cultural heritage. Xu Zhimo and Xiao Qian 蕭乾 (1910-1999) are two such figures, though they do not necessarily agree with each other in their reception of Woolf. In 1928, Xu was invited to give a speech at Su-Chou Girls’ High School 蘇州女中 on a topic of his choice, and the speech was later turned into an essay entitled “Guanyu nuzi” 關於女子 (About Women;1929). Woolf is tangential to the content, but she was nevertheless hailed as the inspiration that had made this article possible.52 Xu claims that

51 See “Xiandai Xiaoshuo zahua” 現代文學雜話 (Mixed Topics on Modern Novels), Xiaoshuo yuebao 小說月報 (The Short Stories Magazine) 21.1 (1930): 35609. This section announces the latest foreign literary activities and publications. Knut Hamsun (1859-1952) was a Norwegian writer. Hans Christian Anderson (1805-1875) was a Danish writer. Honore de Balzac (1799-1850) was a French writer.
52 Xu Zhimo, “Guanyu nuzi” 關於女子 (About Women), Xu Zhimo quanji 徐志摩全集 (The Complete Work of Xu Zhimo), vol. 3 (Hong Kong: Shangwu, 1983) 68-90. This article was first published in Xinyue yuekan 新月月刊 (The Crescent Moon Monthly) 2.8 (1929): 1-18.
he had no idea what to talk about at first, but finally opted for “mixed topics about women” 關於女子的雜話 (Xu 74). He was not aware, as he acknowledges, how he came up with the topic; all that he knew is that it was a result of his stream of consciousness triggered by a couple of things, one being an essay that he had recently read about women and writing. The essay, he says, was written by a famous British novelist who argues that a woman needs to be financially independent in order to become a writer:

I have read an article by a famous British novelist. In it she says it requires two conditions for a woman to become a writer: the first is that she needs to have a room of her own which can be closed or locked any time at her will, and the second is that she needs to have an annual income of five hundred pounds (which is equivalent to six thousand dollars our money).

我看到一篇文章，英國一位名小說家做的，她說婦女們想從事著述至少得有兩個條件：一是她得有她自己的一間屋子，這她隨時有關上或鎖上的自由；二是她得有五百一年（那合華銀有六千元）的進益.

(Xu 75; boldface mine)

Xu did not mention the title of the essay, neither its author, but his thesis is somewhat modeled upon Woolf’s argument about women being denied accessibility to resources and consequently opportunities to establish themselves, although, unlike Woolf’s focus on the situation of English women, Xu’s article has a broader scope to involve Chinese as well as European women. In his speech to the girl students, Xu echoes, time and again, Woolf’s defense against women’s being “intellectually, morally,
and physically inferior to men”\textsuperscript{53} and being incapable of becoming a great writer like Shakespeare. Xu says,

But the far inferiority of women to men in cultural history naturally has its various explanations and men can by no means prove women’s inferiority in terms of natural tendency. In fact, the efforts on the women’s part for the past hundred years have clearly shown that, given equal opportunities, women are no inferior to men in any aspect….

但這文化史上女性遠不如男性的情形自有種種的解釋，自然的趨勢，男性當然不能藉此來證明女子的能力根本不如男子…在事實上在這百年來女性自強的努力也已經顯明的證明，女性只要有同等的機會不論在那樣事情上都不能比男性不如… (Xu 80-81)

It is puzzling why Xu should have failed to point out the work and the author, and this does not seem to be incidental. When Xu paraphrases Woolf on the impediments that might have lain in Jane Austen’s path to becoming a writer, he does not give credit to Woolf herself but simply to “a critic.” He says,

…a hundred years ago there was a woman writer in Britain —Jane Austen. Her literary achievement, according to a critic, was not very far from that of Shakespeare…she did not have a room she could shut up and open at will, neither did she have a steady annual income…

\textsuperscript{53} Virginia Woolf, \textit{A Room of One’s Own} (London: Penquin, 1945) 110.
Once again Woolf remained anonymous. It was not until much later when Xu enumerated the achievements of women in the literary field that he ever brought up, though in passing, the name of Woolf. He said the Anglo-American novelists such as George Eliot, Bronte Sisters, Katherine Mansfield and Virginia Woolf were among “those who had added brilliance to the literary history” (Xu 82).

Why should Xu have referred to Woolf simply as “British novelist” and “critic” is an interesting question in its own right. One possible reason could be that in the 1920s while Woolf might have aroused interest in some elite readers, she was relatively unknown to the general reading public, particularly those high school students whom Xu addressed, so it makes little difference identifying her or not. Another, more plausible, reason could be that ROO was yet to be published when Xu delivered the speech, so there was no point mentioning the author and the title of the essay. A check on the time of publication of the two essays appears to support the latter view. Woolf gave her lecture at Newnham College (20 October 1928) and Girton College (26 October 1928) but the essay ROO did not come out until a year later, i.e., in October 1929. Xu’s speech, on the other hand, was delivered on Dec. 17, 1928, some two months after Woolf’s lectures and ten months before the official publication of ROO (Xu might have drafted the manuscript two days before he gave the speech because it was dated December 15). “Kuanyu nuzi” and ROO then appeared in written form at about the same time in 1929. Xu thus must have had read the manuscript of ROO prior to its publication, which could have
prevented him from revealing Woolf’s name and her new work. If Xu indeed had read the manuscript, one would naturally wonder from where and from whom he got the manuscript. The most likely source would be Roger Fry, a close friend to both Xu and Woolf, though Xu could also have obtained the manuscript directly from Woolf herself, if arrangement had been made for the two to meet.

Woolf’s major works were not translated until the mid 1940s. In fact, the only novel that appeared in Chinese translation in her lifetime was *FB* (1933). That made her major work accessible only to Chinese intellectual elites with a good command of English. Though relatively unknown to those who cannot read her works in English, Woolf, interestingly, was not a total stranger to the Chinese common readers as her name was brought up time and again in newspaper as well as literary magazines, thanks to Xiao Qian 蕭乾, a Beijing School writer, who has been accredited for spreading Woolf’s name among the general reading public in China. Compared with Xu’s wholehearted embrace of Woolf, however, Xiao appears, though still enthusiastic, more critical and ambivalent in his attitude toward her.

A sub-editor of the literary supplement of *Dagongpao*, Xiao has been identified as one of the few Chinese critics who have contributed to Woolf criticism in the 1940s. His contact with Woolf’s works began to increase when he was holding the position of a lecturer at the School of Oriental and African Studies (SOAS), University of London, where he stayed from 1939 to 1942 before he became, through the recommendation of E. M. Foster, a research student of the University of Cambridge for two years. While lecturing at SOAS, he also worked as the correspondent for *Dagongbao* and covered

---

54 Xiao was a journalist, critic, and translator. He is known for his translation of *Ulysses* into the Chinese language at 80.
stories of the British society based on his firsthand observations. Since then, Woolf began to be mentioned time and again in his reports. In 1944, he resumed his appointment as *Dagongbao*’s United Kingdom correspondent and meanwhile was also made the first full-time Europe war correspondent during World War II. Among the Beijing School writers, Xiao has been categorized—although he himself denied it—as among those advocating the “art for life” idea, as his novels often depict the everyday life of the lower class society. As we shall see later, this appears to be accountable for his unique view of Woolf and her work.

Some critics suspect that, judging from his interest in modernist work, Xiao’s autobiographical novel *Mengzhigu* (Dream Valley), published in 1937, may have been influenced by Woolf. Xiao himself refuted it, but he did not deny his interest in Woolf. In “Cha zai yingguo” (Tea in England; 1990), for instance, Xiao reveals that Woolf played an important part in his life in Cambridge. The tea party, as Xiao describes it, is a social occasion for the faculty members and students of the University of Cambridge as well as the general public. His personal experience having tea with his advisor was that Woolf was among their favorite subjects of conversation,

> In those years my advisor… would often invite me to his house for tea.

> We would discuss Virginia Woolf or D. H. Lawrence while having tea together.
When you think of Virginia Woolf, you might think of her as a writer or a literary figure, but she was also known for her love of dogs. In her essay "Babies Are Suffering—British Domesticated Animals under the Air-raid" (1941), she justified her topic by conjuring up Woolf:

…you may ask, what does dog have to do with war?...Do keep in mind that domesticated animal is an inseparable member in the British household. Famous female writer Mrs. Woolf, for instance, once made the dog Flush, a beloved pet of the 19th century female poet Mrs. Browning, the major character of her work. Why cannot we get to peek at the characteristics of a race through these four-legged heroes?

Chinese text:

當年我那位導師就經常約我去他寓所用茶。我們一邊飲茶，一邊就
討論起維吉尼亞・伍爾芙或戴維・赫・勞倫斯了。55

Woolf was found not only among Xiao’s favorite topics of conversation but also in his reportage in *Dagongbao*. In those articles written during his stay in Europe, which covered a wide range of topics, Woolf is referred to very frequently. One example is the coverage of a topic regarding British domesticated animals in war. In “Babies Are Suffering—British Domesticated Animals under the Air-raid,” he justifies his topic by conjuring up Woolf:

…你可以問，狗與戰爭有甚麼關係呢？...須記得，家畜在英國家庭生活中是不可分的一個成員。著名女作家伍爾芙夫人就曾把十九世紀女詩人勃朗寧夫人的愛犬弗勒施作為一部作品的主角。難道我們不能由這些四足英雄們窺視一個民族地特性嗎？56

---


56 Xiao Qian 蕭乾, “Huobaomen zai shonan: Kongxi xia de Yingguo jiachu” 活寶們在受難—空襲下的英國家畜 (Babies Are Suffering—British Domesticated Animals under the Air-raid), *Xiao Qian xuanji: Baogao wenxue* 蕭乾選集 (二) 報告文學 (*The Selected Works of Xiao Qian: Reportage*), vol. 2 (Taipei: Shangwu, 1992) 241. This article was first published in *Dagongbao* 大公報 15 March 1941,
Woolf is also referred to in Xiao’s criticism of Phyllis Bentley’s *Some Observations of the Art of Narrative*. As he notes, though British novelists such as Henry Fielding (1707-1754) and George Eliot (1819-1880) did discuss techniques of fiction writing in passing, it was novelists in the 1920s and 1930s that have truly focused their attention on technique issue. E. M. Foster, for one, wrote *Aspects of the Novel* (1927); Woolf, for another, also made explicit her literary notion in her essays:

> Virginia Woolf published two collections of literary criticism, *The Common Reader*, which is itself an expression of her theories of writing, and *Mr. Bennett and Mrs. Brown.*

Xiao’s attitude toward Woolf remains ambivalent, however, probably due the nature of his occupation as a journalist. His position as a war correspondent afforded him the opportunity to observe, at a short and thus convenient distance, various aspects of European society during and shortly after the Second World War. The Women’s rights movement as an important social phenomenon in England naturally caught his attention. In 1941, for instance, Xiao wrote “Funu zai zhanzheng zhong” 婦女在戰爭中 (Women in War) to report the roles English women took on, both in the military and on the home front, while their country was facing war. Having witnessed that women were capable of

---

57 Phyllis Bentley (1894-1977) was an English novelist.
not only caretaking but driving trucks or tanks as well, Xiao appeared to find his attitudes
toward of women altered. “In the past I thought women were best suitable for cheering up
[the army] and showing appreciation [of their service]. Apparently I failed to realize that
women had been born with hands capable of doing both delicate and rough chores.” 以前我以為婦女最宜做些慰勞工作，但顯然我不知道婦女有的是一雙怎樣能粗能細的手。59  Xiao thus argues that war has provided, despite its destructive nature, the best
opportunity for women activists to prove that women are as capable as men, and this
recognition has probably led to English women’s being granted voting rights after the
First World War.

In his discussion of Woolf and feminism, Xiao acknowledges that the concern for
women’s rights constitutes a major part of Woolf’s work. In 1913, as he illustrates,
Woolf and her husband Leonard showed up in Newcastle for the Women’s Co-operative
Guild. Woolf also published books dedicated to helping raise women’s consciousness.
However, for Xiao Woolf is not a suitable spokeswoman for women in general, as her
social class is likely to disqualify her as a representative of the less privileged of her
gender; instead, he notes, “Woolf will always be remembered by the general public and
in literary history as a lady in the ivory tower…” 一般人心目中以及將來文學史上的
伍爾芙，都是位象牙塔中的貴婦…. 61  Xiao does not seem to believe, either, that

59 Xiao Qian 蕭乾, “Funu zai zhanzheng zhong” 婦女在戰爭中 (Women in War), Xiao Qian
xuanji: Baogao wenxue 蕭乾選集（二）報告文學 (The Selected Works of Xiao Qian: Reportage), vol. 2
(Taipei: Shangwu, 1992) 235. This article was first published in Dagongbao 大公報 18 Jan. 1941,
Chongqing edition.

60 An organization founded in 1883 in Oxford in support of women’s suffrage and equal rights with men. By 1910, it had 32,000 members. The number increased to 72,000 by 1933. The Guild still exists today
but no longer enjoys the same visibility as it once did.

61 Xiao Qian 蕭乾, “Virginia Woolf yu fuquan zhiru” 维·伍爾芙與婦權主義 (Virginia Woolf and
Feminism), Xiao Qian xuanji: Zawen 蕭乾選集（四）文論 (The Selected Works of Xiao Qian: Literary
Woolf, for her “lack” of experience of being poor, can truly come close to the core problems of the working class. Accordingly, he dismisses Woolf’s feminist work such as ROO, TG, and “A Society” as flops because they are “meant for an outlet of her feminine grumbles” is 為宣洩她的女怨而寫的 (Xiao 320).

An example of Xiao’s criticism is his description of “A Society” as an act of “Mrs. Woolf’s unrestrained taunting of every man in the world, civil and military alike, through the mouths of three girls and with an absurd plot structured in a higgledy-piggledy fashion” 用雜亂無章的荒唐情節，藉三個女孩子替伍爾芙夫人把天下文武男人痛痛快快嘲罵了一陣 (Xiao 350). For him, TG is no better; it “is simply a book full of quarrels one would find in the streets…she puts all the blames for war on men” 簡直是吵嘴罵街的書…她把戰爭的責任整個放在男人身上 (Xiao 350). Xiao’s harsh criticism seems lightened somewhat with ROO, though. He regards it as better worth reading than the other two because, firstly, the advice Woolf gives to other women writers indicates her own artistic ideal; and secondly, “financial independence” appears to be one of the few claims Woolf has made that are “quite unemotional and practical” 頂不動感情而又是頂切實的 (Xiao 356). Xiao nevertheless finds fault with ROO for its deviation from the truth. That is, women’s situations depicted in the book are unlikely to occur to women of a privileged social class, much less so to someone like Woolf who has a caring husband, has no kids to attend to, enjoys effortless financial independence through inheritance, and lives in a nice residential area in Bloomsbury (Xiao 357). As a result, Xiao claims, “[Woolf’s] indignation and requests appear uncalled for, even

Criticism), vol. 4 (Taipei: Shangwu, 1992) 350. This article was first published in 1948 in Hsinlu 新路 (New Path).
strange, in the eyes of the women weavers from Manchester, washer-women from Liverpool or women mineworkers from South Wales” 她的憤慨，她的要求，由曼徹斯特的紡織女、利物浦的浣衣女工或南威爾士的女工看來，卻顯得隔膜，甚至陌生 (Xiao 357).

In Xiao’s interpretation, Woolf appears to have come to some sort of “self-knowledge” 自知之明 that has stopped her from continuing to make women’s rights an overt subject in her work, an awareness resulting from a couple of unsuccessful attempts:

She was stern in self-criticizing. She came to the realization that, though that sort of writing [of women’s rights] was good and powerful for some writers, it was not meant for one with her breeding and capability. After a few attempts, she finally decided to restrain her indignation. Without sacrificing artistic integrity, she turned to the use of symbolism to carry [the issue of women’s rights] in her work in a subtle way. Such self-knowledge is a key to her success. Otherwise, though the 20th century English association for women’s rights might have obtained an additional bunch of propaganda pamphlets, the history of English literature would have forever lost a miraculous pen.
Xiao’s roles as an academic and a journalist having spent a long time in England afford him a vantage point in discussing Woolf’s social concerns right against the very society in which she was a part of. His evaluation of Woolf was apparently influenced by his personal observation of the lower class of the society, which is consistent with his ideal of “art for life.” Controversial as his questioning of Woolf’s representativeness in speaking for women in general may be, he has nevertheless been able to provide Chinese readers with a more in-depth description and evaluation of Woolf. Compared with many of his contemporaries, that is, his occupational training as well as his direct, long-term contact with the British society and culture has enabled him to see a more rounded, contextualized Woolf surrounded by not only admiration but criticism as well, a picture perhaps less romanticized but by all means more true to life than that drawn by others, such as, Xu Zhimo and Ye Gongchao.

Woolf as an Influence

While Xu Zhimo’s contact with his western friends opened up opportunities for cross-cultural exchanges in the 1920s, it was the friendship of Ling Shuhua 凌叔華 (Su Hua Ling Chen, Sue Ling; 1900-1990) with Woolf during the 1930s that has most furthered the interaction of modernist literary activities between China and England. For Ling, Woolf’s role was manifold: she was a gifted writer, a role model, and above all, an encouraging mentor making possible the emergence of her autobiographical novel Ancient Melodies (1953).
Ling was a well received writer and painter and was hailed by her literary friends as the “Chinese Katherine Mansfield” for her writing style and subject matter. Her writing was painterly and she wrote mostly about women’s psyche and their struggles in the conservative patriarchal society in China. Ling’s father, a government official, hired reputable teachers to train Ling in English and painting from an early age. As a painter, she was able to get to know Roger Fry through their common friend, Xu, who helped her collect Fry’s lithographs while he was at Cambridge. Fry’s sister Margery also brought Ling her brother’s lithographs when she visited China in 1933 to lecture and at the same time to observe the local culture. If it were not her father who had stopped her, Ling would have gone to England to study painting with Fry (Welland 253). This did not stop her contact with the Bloomsbury group, though.

In 1935, as a result of Margery Fry’s recommendation, Julian Bell (1908-1937), son of Woolf’s sister Vanessa Bell, traveled to Wuhan University to teach modern English literature. Ling’s husband Chen Yuan was then the Dean of the School of Humanities when Bell was appointed. When Bell was at Wuhan, Ling attended his class in which he introduced Bloomsbury writers. Bell labeled Ling as a “Chinese Bloomsurian” (Laurence 100), and in his letter to Woolf he described Ling as a passionate admirer of her work, and a woman, eight years his senior, with whom he was

---

62 Ling claimed that it was not Mansfield but Russian writer Anton Chekhov (1860-1904) who had a tremendous influence on her. Interesting enough, Mansfield was hailed as “the English Chekhov.” For discussion about Ling’s writing, see Chen Xueyong 陳學勇, “Lun Ling Shuhua xiaoshuo chuangzuo” 論凌叔華小說創作 (On Lin Shuhua’s Fiction), Zhongguo wenhua yanjiu 中国文化研究 (Chinese Culture Research) 1 (Spring 2000): 122-28.

63 Ling had once been in love with Xu before she was married to Chen Yuan 陳源, Xu’s close friend. In 1929 Xu dedicated his collection of short fiction Lunpan to this couple.

“platonically in love” (Laurence 46). But in 1936, only halfway through his three-year teaching appointment, Bell’s scandalous relationship with Ling forced him to leave China. A year later, Julian was killed in the Spanish civil war while driving an ambulance.⁶⁵

Partly due to the sorrow they shared for losing a loved one, and partly due to the intellectual curiosity on both sides, Ling developed a friendship with Vanessa Bell and Virginia Woolf after Julian Bell’s death. They began to exchange letters and gifts. Though Ling and Woolf never met, their correspondence, initiated by Ling, started in 1938 and ended some six months before Woolf died in 1941.⁶⁶ In those letters, Woolf assumed the role of a mentor to Ling and encouraged her to work on an autobiography in English. Ling’s literary ambition as a Chinese woman writer began long before her contact with Woolf, though. Back in 1923 when Ling was still an undergraduate at Yenching University, she wrote to Zhou Zuoren 周作人 (Chou Tso-Jen; 1885-1967), a Beijing School writer who was then a professor of Chinese, to ask for guidance in writing. She laid bare her ambition in her letter to Zhou:

All these years I have decided to become a writer in the future…Chinese women writers are far too scarce, and that is why the world knows very little about how Chinese women think and live their lives. This is rather irresponsible as far as contribution to human civilization is concerned.

---

⁶⁵ For more about Bell’s Chinese experience and his story with Ling, see Sasha Su-Ling Welland, A Thousand Miles of Dreams: The Journeys of Two Chinese Sisters, 241-65; Patricia Laurence, Lily Briscoe’s Chinese Eyes: Bloomsbury, Modernism, and China, 37-100.

⁶⁶ Ling wrote to Woolf for advice after she had read ROO.
More than a decade later when Julian Bell was in China, Ling made Bell her English tutor and collaborated with him on translating some of her short fiction from Chinese into English. Regarding this Bell wrote to his friend:

[Ling] turns her own Chinese into English…Then I cross-examine her on the exact shade of meaning she wants, which usually includes some literal character translation…Having got the exact idea of the meaning, I proceed to invent an English sentence and type it, putting in a good deal, particularly tenses, after expanding compressed words into images and supplying roughly parallel English idioms and conventions etc. (qtd in Welland, 254)

As a writer who had an aspiration from a young age to make Chinese women’s voices heard by the world, it is not surprising that Ling should have been excited to have Woolf as her literary and English advisor after Julian’s death. Woolf made an excellent, if not the best, tutor to Ling because, when their correspondence began, Woolf was already an acclaimed British modernist writer, and, above all, she showed strong support for women to write. Ling’s seeking literary advice from an established writer like Woolf should not be interpreted as an action of subordination, however. Before they started to exchange letters, Ling had already published most of her important work and made a name for herself.

---

67 Zhou Zuoren 周作人, “Jifengxin de huiyi”幾封信的回憶 (Recollections of Several Letters), Fanhou xuibi 飯後隨筆 (Essays after Meal) (Hebei: Renmin, 1994).
In their correspondence, Woolf was encouraging to this Chinese friend from afar. To build her confidence in English, for instance, Woolf told Ling, “Your English is quite good enough to give the impression you wish to make….“  

68 To give Ling role models she sent the biography of Charlotte Bronte and the essays by Charles Lamb because, as she says in her letter, “[the] life of Charlotte Bronte will perhaps give you a feeling for the lives of women writers in England in the 19th century—their difficulties, and how she overcame them” and that “Lamb wrote very good English prose.” 69 Knowing that it was never easy for a woman in those days to write openly her mind, all the more so when it has to be expressed in a foreign language, Woolf showed her ample generosity to Ling by saying, “Please remember how glad I shall be to give you any help I can in reading [your work] and correcting any mistakes. But write exactly as you think—that is the only way.” 70

Woolf advised Ling to work on an autobiography for her first book in English. In her letter she says, “…as a work that would be of great value to other people… I find autobiographies much better than novels.” 71 Ling took her advice and began to work on an autobiography about her life growing up in a big family with one father and six mothers (i.e. her father had six wives). She wrote to Woolf, “If my book could give English readers some pictures of real Chinese lives, some impression about Chinese who are as ordinary as any English people, some truth of life and sex which your people never have a chance to see but is even seen by a child in the East, I shall be contented” (qtd in

71 Ibid., 221. Letter to Ling, 5 April, 1938.
Welland 282). When Woolf read chapters sent by Ling, she was immediately fascinated with its exoticness. She encouraged Ling to write on:

Now I write to say that I like it very much. I think it has a great charm. It is also of course difficult for an English person, at first, there is some incoherence, and one does not understand the different wives...But this becomes clear after a time...I find the simile strange and poetical...Please go on; write freely; do not mind how directly you translate the Chinese into the English. In fact, I would advice you to come as close to the Chinese both in style and in meaning as you can. Give as many natural details of the life, of the house, of the furniture as you like. And always do it as you would were you writing for the Chinese....

The nature of the advice and encouragement Woolf offered, however, has not always been unanimously agreed upon among critics. While many see her as a good mentor, some do not. Shi Shumei, for one, suspects that an asymmetrical relationship existed between the two, and that hegemony was at work in the interaction between Woolf and Ling. It was Woolf’s “subtle Eurocentric attitude” and “a hierarchical conception of language and audience,” she argues, that led her to advise Ling to work on an English autobiography. Woolf’s suggestion that Ling gave as many details about the setting and scenery as possible was, according to Shi, a call for Ling “to exoticize herself in the gaze of the West.” Patricia Laurence, on the other hand, claims that Woolf and Ling’s correspondence, in her understanding, “generates not imperial gestures but relationship... Each brings to the conversation ... a different aesthetic and

culture” (Laurence 250), and that they “connect as women writers writing from a site of change and war, the British under the threat of World War II and the Chinese in the midst of the Sino-Japanese War and the civil war” (Laurance 251-52). Further research is obviously in need to decide whether it was Woolf’s Eurocentricity that had prompted Ling to write in English, but if one examines Ling’s background and other relevant documents, one can see that to try her hand at English was not a totally new idea to her and that she ostensibly had an agenda of her own when she decided to write in English.

Ling graduated from foreign language (i.e. English) department, and her literary friends, including the members of the Crescent Moon Society, were mostly Anglo-American returnees very much exposed to western thoughts and culture. These along with the fact that her husband Chen Yuan was also English educated (i.e. he graduated from Cambridge) suggest that English language must have played a significant role in her development as a writer. The nature of Woolf’s advice aside, one thing that seems certain is that what Ling was aspiring for, as evident in her article discussing Michael Sullivan’s *Chinese Art in the Twentieth Century* (1959), is to present the authentic Chinese art and culture to the world rather than just catering to the market:

When we write a book in a western language, are we supposed to make its appeal to the western readers our top priority? Many believe that a book written in western languages will not sell if it does not cater to western tastes. This may be true, but can we “forbid eating simply to avoid being choked?” Must we only look for writing materials that interest western readers?
In a letter to Leonard Woolf dated July 6, 1952, she made herself even clearer about the importance of keeping her story authentic:

There are many books about China in the West, most of them were written to satisfy the curiosity of the West. The authors sometimes tried to make stories about Chinese people from their imagination only. Their attitude towards their readers is not honest. Chinese people then appear to be a sort of half ghost and half man beings in the West. (qtd in Welland 305)

The correspondence between these two privileged women writers continued until Woolf’s suicide in 1941. Ling’s writing project was consequently brought to a stop. She moved to London in 1946 when her husband was appointed the Chinese representative to the UNESCO, then headquartered in Paris. The couple continued to live in England and Paris until 1989, a year before Ling died at 90. While in London, Vanessa Bell was instrumental in introducing Ling to members and friends of the Bloomsbury group. With the support of these new friends, particularly Venessa Bell, Ling now picked up her paintbrush again. She held several exhibitions in Europe and America in the subsequent years.  

---

74 Ling Shuhua, “Ershi shiji de zhongguo yishu” 二十世紀的中國藝術 (Chinese Art in the Twentieth Century), Chen Xiying Ling Shuhua xuanwen 陳西瀟凌叔華散文, ed. Liu Hong and Xia Xiaofei 柳红 夏曉非 (Beijing: zhongguo guangbo dianshi, 1992) 92.

75 See Patricia Laurence, Lily Briscoe’s Chinese Eyes: Bloomsbury, Modernism, and China, 234-246.
Ling’s writing project resumed when she befriended Vita Sackville-West (1892-1962), Woolf’s one time lover, who was intrigued by Ling’s exquisite style and poetic language. When she realized that Ling was the Chinese woman writer whom Woolf used to mentor, she showed, together with other Bloomsbury members, strong support for Ling to continue her earlier work. Ling’s autobiographical novel titled *Ancient Melodies* (published under her married name Su Hua Ling Chen) was eventually finished and published by Leonard Woolf’s Hogarth Press in 1953.\(^7_6\) In her introduction to the book, Sackville-West wrote, “Su Hua is blessed…with the soul and eye of an artist and a poet…. Every letter she writes contains some phrase reflecting her thirst for beauty….\(^7_7\)

*Ancient Melodies* became a best-seller and was translated into many other languages. The Chinese translation, entitled *《古韻》*, did not come out until 1991, some forty years after the novel made its first appearance.

Although Woolf did not live to see the book published, she undoubtedly played a crucial role in making Ling’s project possible. She started out as a role model to Ling, and subsequently spent time giving writerly advice to her writing. Even in her absence, her connections in Bloomsbury continued to influence Ling until the book was finally finished. We can go as far as saying that the emergence of *Ancient Melodies* represents not only Ling’s personal unthwarted ambition to give voice to Chinese women but the embodiment of Woolf’s influence in China.

Ling is probably the most discussed Chinese writer insofar as Woolf’s influence to China is concerned, but she is not the only one who has been inspired by and indebted to Woolf. In fact, the writings of Woolf also attracted the attention of other writers who

were exposed to western modern literature, particularly those Beijing school writers who welcomed formal and stylistic innovation. Li Jianwu 李健吾 (1902-1986) is one example. In his psychological novel *Xinbing心病* (*Affliction;* 1933), he largely portrays the fragmentary thoughts of his characters living under social constraints. By inserting chapters, narrated in first person, in the stream of consciousness of the character who commits suicide later in the story, Li successfully interrupt time and again the storyline. In a review by Zhu Ziqing朱自清 (Chu Tsu-Ching;1898-1948), Li’s fiction is distinguished from conventional narrative modes by its focus on the individual mind in depth, with little attention paid to a conventional plot. On this account Woolf is given credit to:

> Until recently… the long novel *Xinbing* should be deemed the first … [novel] whose emphasis is not placed on the plot but is instead on the psychology [of the characters]…. In some parts of the story Mr. Li records only the stream of consciousness. This is an innovative technique, and Mr. Li himself claimed that Mrs. Woolf and other writers have influenced him in this respect.

直到近兩年，不以故事為主而專門描寫心理的…長篇要算這本《心病》是第一部….李先生卻有些處只是意識流的記錄；這是一種新手法，李先生自己說是受吳爾夫人等的影響.

---

78 Li was a prolific writer, translator, literary critic and playwright. He translated *Madame Bovary* into Chinese in 1948.

79 Li Jianwu 李健吾, *Xinbing心病* (*Affliction*) (Shanghai: Kaiming, 1933).

Woolf’s contribution to modern Chinese literature can also be discerned in the work of Lin Hui-Yin 林徽因 (Lin Whei-yin, Phyllis Lin, 1904-1955). A poet, writer and architect, Lin was a University of Pennsylvania graduate before she stayed for a year in London with her father until 1921. She was also a member of the Crescent Moon Society. Given her exposure to Western influence and her literary friends being mostly Anglo-American returnees, Lin’s works are deeply imbued with modernist features. One good example is the stream of consciousness short story “Jiushijiu du zhong” 九十九度中 (In Ninety-nine Degree) she published in 1934. According to Lu Qianqian呂倩倩, this short story is modeled upon Woolf’s MD. In plot, the story takes places in one hot summer day in Beijing and centers on the preparation for an old lady’s (Mrs. Chang’s) birthday, much like the preparation for Mrs. Dalloway’s evening party in MD. In terms of narrative technique, there are some forty characters in twenty scenes in the story, and perspectives keep shifting from character to character. The technique of montage is also lavishly employed, just as Woolf did in MD, to place together fragmented and unrelated spatial and temporal scenes and thus to break the linear progression of the story. If, as Lin’s contemporary Li Jianwu claims, the modern features of a literary work are indeed reflected not only in the subject matter, but in its author’s “observation, selection and technique” as well, Lin’s short fiction, as how Li reads

81 In the 1930s, Lin’s residence in Beijing became a literary salon for her friends, most of whom were now known as writers of the Beijing school. It was nicknamed “Tai-tai de keting” 太太的客廳 (Madam’s Drawing Room), which was derived from the title of a novel Wo men tai-tai de keting 我們太太的客廳 (Our Madam’s Drawing Room; 1933) written probably out of jealousy by Lin’s contemporary Bing Xin 冰心 (Ping Hsin, 1900-1999).
82 Lin Huiyin 林徽因, “Jiushijiu du zhong” 九十九度中 (In Ninety-nine Degree).
it, should be considered “richest in its possession of modern characteristics” 最富有現代性. 84 He says,

The author presents to us a variety of activities that take place in one day, in ways so organized that there seems no organization, so orderly that there seems no order, so full of story that there seems no story—and there are so many stories, and so full of craftsmanship that there seems no technique.

作者把一天的形形色色披露在我們的眼前，沒有組織，卻有組織；沒有條理，卻有條理；沒有故事，卻有故事；而且那樣多的故事；沒有技巧，卻處處透露匠心。(Li 28)

Lin’s unconventional treatment of form and content leads Li to wonder “to what extent she is under the influence of English novels” 她承受到了多少現代英國小說的影響 (Li, 28). In contrast to Li’s insinuation, Wang Zengqi汪曾祺 (Wang Tseng-Chi; 1920-1997) is straightforward in pointing out Woolf’s influence on Lin. 85 For him, Lin is “the first Chinese woman writer who deliberately used the method of stream of consciousness and whose work resembles that of Virginia Woolf” 作者有意識地運用意識流方法，作品很像弗‧吳爾芙的女作家, 86 and Lin’s fiction “Jiushijiu du zhong” is “the first novel in China resembling Woolf’s stream of consciousness novel” 作品像弗‧吳爾芙的小說

85 Wang was a writer, poet and editor. He self-claimed that western stream of consciousness novels had some influence on his literary works.
The arrival of Woolf’s work in China during the Republic period has been outlined. Woolf’s early reception during this period in China, though sporadic, has its historical and cultural significance. Aside from her work being an object of academic study and an inspiration and influence to literary writers of the time, the 1920s and 1930s is also the only period during which some, even though few, Chinese writers were able to have direct correspondence with Woolf herself. This period meanwhile witnessed a

---

87 Quoted in Lu, “Virginia Woolf dui Zhongguo xiandai wenxue de yingxiang,” 72.
moment in history when foreign thoughts and cultures began to exercise their influence on Chinese intellectuals, and it was in such a literary milieu that Woolf, along with other western writers, began to attract Chinese attention. This enabled Woolf’s work to become accessible to and consequently be read by her Chinese readers in the 1920s, around the same time when her work also began to circulate in European countries such as France and Germany. That is to say, in her lifetime, her name traveled not only in the West but to as far as the other side of the globe, and China is an important, if not the only, stop for her early journey to the east.

Until the translation of her major works came out in the mid 1940s, Woolf’s Chinese readership was limited mainly to the elite intellectuals who had had the luxury to be exposed to western literature. Even though during this period serious Woolf scholarship was yet to be established and many facets of her work remained to be explored, the diverse reception of her, as shown in the cases of Xu Zhimo, Ye Gongchao, Xiao Qian and others, points to the complexity of her work and the varied interest in her. Woolf’s work is indeed never easy to exhaust, but that does not imply it is impossible to comprehend. Judging from her early reception in China, one may find that a more justified appreciation of Woolf requires at least some knowledge of her commitment to women’s issues, as preoccupation with only her techniques and styles could risk the danger of obscuring Woolf’s message. Ling Shuhua’s admiration of Woolf may, as evidenced in her seeking mentorship in the latter, moreover, be partially based on her identity as a woman, but the gender of the reader should not stand in the way of how well Woolf can be read. In Xu’s case, making *ROO* a source of inspiration for his speech indicates that male readers were similarly capable of relating to female experiences.
despite their opposite gender. Other ways of reading Woolf add further to the variety. Xiao’s criticism of Woolf affords a close-up of Woolf’s work in its natural setting, a perspective few foreign critics were privileged with. Ye’s view of Woolf, though biased, was nevertheless able to focus his contemporary readers’ attention on her exquisite and innovative style. In fact, available information indicates that the stylistic and formal aspects of Woolf’s work received the most attention during the Republican period.
Chapter Three

The Critical Reception of Woolf in Taiwan (1950s-2000s)

Woolf reception in the Chinese contexts after the 1950s basically follows a trajectory similar to that in most other countries of the world. Woolf was first received as a modernist writer for her innovative form and literary theories. Her feminist thought was not discussed until much later. Only towards the end of the century did the interest in her sociopolitical thinking over, say, war and gender issues grow wider in the academy. In the popular cultural realm, around the same time, she also became an iconic figure as a pioneering feminist.

The reception of Woolf in the first half of the twentieth century was interrupted by the civil war between the Nationalists and the Communists and the ensuing separation of China, in 1949, into the People’s Republic of China (PRC, or China hereafter) and the Republic of China (ROC, or Taiwan hereafter) across the Taiwan Strait. Some time after the separation Woolf’s reception resumed but at very different speeds in these two regions. Until the 1980s, in China Woolf was totally silenced due to China’s hostility to western modernist works. In Taiwan, reception of Woolf was picked up much sooner—in the late 1950s, but at the time her criticism was still sporadic and her translated works scarce. The gap in the speeds of Woolf reception between these regions, however, began to narrow after the 1980s, and Woolf’s popularity has since become on a steady rise.

This and the following chapter focus on the discussion and assessment of the reception of Woolf in the Chinese contexts from the 1950s to the 2000s. Since political ideologies exercised critical influence on the literary milieu in which Woolf arrived and was received on these lands and these two regions differed precisely in their political
ideologies, particularly before the 1980s, Woolf reception in Taiwan and China obviously needs to be dealt with separately. Since, moreover, Woolf’s reception started earlier in the former, the discussion will begin with her reception in Taiwan, with her reception in China to be discussed in the next chapter. The goal is to show that while, in both Taiwan and China, Woolf had first appeared as a modernist literary writer and critic before wider interests in her sociopolitical concerns began in recent decades, when approaches to her works also became diversified, discernable differences in receptions of Woolf nevertheless existed between Taiwan and China—not only in speeds of reception but in the disciplinary trainings of their readers as well.

The Writer and Critic Woolf from the 1950s to the 1970s

Woolf’s reception in Taiwan from the 1950s to the 1970s was just budding. None of her major novels were translated, and only a few of her short fiction and essays were available in Chinese during this period. As a result, Woolf criticism was scarce at the time and Woolf scholarship was almost non-existent—with the exception of one thesis that appeared in 1978. The few available works of Woolf were published mainly as part of the package deal introducing modernist writers and, probably because of this, the criticism was limited to that of her innovative form and literary criticism.

Woolf was at the time read primarily by intellectuals trained in western literature, English in particular. There were nevertheless attempts to introduce modernist writers, Woolf included, to the general readers through introductory articles and translations. Such attempts were made mainly through three important journals related in lineage but separated somewhat in time. They were, in chronological order of their first appearance, Wenxue zazhi 文學雜誌 (Wen-hsueh tsa-chih, Literary Review, or Wenxue hereafter;
1956-1960), Xiandai wenxue 现代文学 (Hsien-dai wen-hsueh, Modern Literature, or Xiandai hereafter; 1960-1973, 1977-1984), and Zhongwai wenxue 中外文学 (Chung-Wai Literary Quarterly, or Chung-Wai hereafter; 1972-present). These journals have been recognized as the three most important “‘academic’ literary journals” 「學院派」文學雜誌 in the second half of the 20th century in Taiwan, sharing a common base in the department of foreign languages and literatures at the National Taiwan University. They have been also grouped together, of all the “pure literary journals” published in Taiwan since 1949, as ones sharing the genealogy of modernist literature 現代主義文學系譜. Given the significant roles these three journals have played in the Taiwanese academic and literary arena (particularly in foreign literature education) and in the introduction of modernism into Taiwan, Woolf will be discussed in relation to them and to the literary milieu that contributed to their formation.

**Woolf and Wenxue zazhi in the 1950s**

In the first decade after the Republic of China (ROC) government retreated to Taiwan in 1949, this island had witnessed mass media manipulation as a means of calming political turmoil and social chaos. Since tension remained high on both sides of the Taiwan Strait (i.e. the communist China and the democratic Taiwan) in the midst of hostility, literary and cultural productions in Taiwan were often censored and sometimes

---

89 Mei Chia-Ling, 梅家玲, “Hsia Tsi-an, Wenxue zazhi and Taiwan daxue—Jianrun Taiwan ‘xueyuenpai’ wenxuezazhi ji qi yu ‘wenhua changyu’ he ‘jiaoyukongjian’ de hushe laiyuan” 夏濟安、《文學雜誌》與台灣大學─兼論台灣「學院派」文學雜誌及其與「文化場域」和「教育空間」的互涉 (*Hsia Tsi-an, Literary Review and Taiwan University: On Taiwan ‘academic’ literary journals and their interaction with the ‘Cultural Field’ and the ‘Educational Space’), Taiwan wenxue yenjio jikan 台灣文學研究集刊 1 (2006): 64.

manipulated for launching anti-communism propaganda. This had given rise to the so-called “anti-communism literature” 反共文學 as the mainstream in the literary arena as it was strongly encouraged and even funded by the government to serve political needs. Political themes such as anti-communism, patriotism and combat 反共，愛國，戰鬥 thus took the center stage at the time. 91

Despite the political zeal, not everybody was wholehearted in yielding the center stage to such political literature as a mobilizing tool. To counterbalance, those who had viewed propaganda literature as artistic creation going astray turned their head to western literature for salvation, as exemplified in the emergence of the literary magazine Wenxue zazhi by Hsia Tsi-an 夏濟安 (Xia Jian; 1916-1965). 92 Featuring academic writing, creative writing, translation of foreign work, literary theory and criticism, Wenxue was a representative literary magazine in the 1950s dedicated to advocating the autonomy of literature at a time when literature was largely reduced to vehicles of political propaganda. It was a revolt against such reduction that gave birth to Wenxue, as Hsia made clear in the first issue of the journal,

Even though we live in an age of [political] tumult, we hope that our articles are not “tumultuous.” What we advocate is a plain, rational, and

91 See Chang Su-chen 張素貞, “Wulin niandai Taiwan xinwenxueyundong” 五 0 年代台灣新文學運動 (The New Literary Movement in Taiwan in the 1950s), Zhongwai wenxue 中外文學 (Chung-Wai Literary Quarterly) 14.1 (1985): 129-146. Novel of homesickness 懷鄉小說 also features literature in the 1950s in Taiwan. The ROC government declared martial law soon after its retreat to Taiwan and did not lift it until thirty-eight years later in 1987. Consequently, the communication between Taiwan and Mainland China was put to a halt. No Taiwan citizens were allowed to travel to China within this period. Many writers who migrated to this island along with the government were hence involuntarily cut off from their homeland. These writers, as a result, filled their pages with stories that serve as outlets for their homesickness.

92 Hsia was a literary critic and a professor of English. He founded the magazine with Wu Lu-Chin (Wu Luqin; 1918-1983) 吳魯芹 and Liu Shou-Yi 劉守宜 (Liu Shouyi). Wu was an essayist and English professor. Liu ran Minghua Bookstore 明華書店 (1953-1960), the distributor of the magazine.
sober style … We believe good writings can indeed be found in propaganda writings, but literature is not meant for disseminating propaganda alone; literature carries in itself values independent of the time.

我們雖然身處動亂時代，我們希望我們的文章並不「動亂」。我們所提倡的是樸實、理智、冷靜的作風。 … 我們認為 宣傳作品中固然可能有好文章，文學可不盡是宣傳，文學有它千古不滅的價值在。93 

To break free from the rigidity characteristic of the writings of the 1950s and to defy political involvement in literature, Wen-hsueh opted for strategies that included inviting literary work that covered a wide range of subject matters and encouraging translation, 

This journal welcomes…literary creation and translation of all subject matters and styles …Literary theories and criticisms of Chinese and Western literature are capable of stimulating research interest…. [and] are conducive to better literary creation. Submissions of this sort are therefore especially welcome.

本刊歡迎 … 各種題裁的文學創作與翻譯 … 文學理論和有關中西文學的論著，可以激發研究的興趣…可以誘導出更好的文學創作。這一類的稿件，我們特別歡迎。(Hsia 70) 

The decisions to return to literature itself and to look to the west for creative stimulation have later proven to be of historical significance. Short-lived as it was, Wenxue has nevertheless earned itself a place in Taiwan’s literary history as a nurturing home for young promising local intellectuals, most of whom later became influential

93 Hsia Tsi-an 夏濟安, Editor’s Note, Wenxue zazhi 文學雜誌 (Literary Review) 1.1 (1956): 70.
scholars and writers. The magazine has also been recognized, moreover, as a landmark in the study of modern western literature. In the 1950s when most western work was still strange to readers in this geographical location, this magazine had helped push forward western literary theories and criticisms, Anglophone mainly, to appear in Chinese translation. According to Zhang Xinyin’s 趙欣穎 survey, of all the translations published in Wenxue, modernist works outnumber literary works in all other periods. He considers it a result of the journal’s being “implicitly keeping in pace with the global trend” 暗合世界的潮流, since Modernism was the mainstream in the first half of the 20th century. 94

It was in such literary milieu that Woolf was first formally presented to the Taiwanese readers, that is, as part of the western modernism package. Woolf was favorably introduced, though the readers’ first encounter with her did not seem to have left much impression. In1959, Wenxue published a translation of William Tindall’s “The Stream of Consciousness,” a chapter from his book Forces in Modern British Literature, 1885-1947.95 Tindall’s article was highly informative as it gave detailed introduction to the development of the art of stream of consciousness as well as the works of a number of renowned British writers. For some reason, among all the modernist writers introduced, Tindall appeared to have paid most attention and given greatest space to Woolf. This gave Woolf’s work a great opportunity to be favorably received by the Taiwan general readers.

According to Tindall, the art of stream of consciousness is indebted to the theoretical frameworks provided by the American psychologist and philosopher William James (1842-1910) and the French philosopher Henri Bergson (1859-1941) and, of utmost concern here, their conceptions of consciousness as stream and time are best represented in Woolf’s novels. As a James Joyce scholar, Tindall does find Mrs. Dalloway (1925) somewhat indebted to Ulysses (1922) in structure. He nevertheless concludes that Woolf’s novels are “far more representative than Ulysses of Bergson’s ideal and that of William James,” and that Woolf’s “Modern Fiction,” a critique of the objective method of realist novels, “is the manifesto of this streaming art” (Tindall 301). Tindall gives no less credit to Woolfian aesthetics, either. Woolf, for him, “surpassed her contemporaries in sensitive fidelity to the most evanescent moments of consciousness.” She does not merely records consciousness, however. She is a poet, “a symbolist to the end,” “a novelist of rare distinction” who, through rhythm and symbol, gives poetic rendering to “the immersion and quality of thoughts” (Tindall 303, 307-308).

Unfortunately, Tindall’s admiration of Woolf’s work does not seem to have found echoes in Taiwan readers in the 1950s, and this could be attributable to the heavy demands of sensitivity to words imposed upon her readers. Indeed, prior to the translation of Tindall’s article, Woolf was already mentioned in Xiandai xiaoshuo 现代小说 (Modern Fiction; 1952), a textbook introducing various trends of western fiction writing spanning from the 17th to the 20th century by Ke Hsien-ning 葛賢寧 (Ge Xianning; 1907-1961). Ke considers Woolf, like Katherine Mansfield and Dorothy Richardson, a “master” 聖手 of psychological novels (Ke 23). However, he also observes that “in order
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96 Ke Hsien-ning 葛賢寧, Xiandai xiaoshuo 现代小说 (Modern Fiction) (Taipei: Zhonghua wenhua, 1952).
to have a good grasp of her novels, the readers must possess sharp senses of sight, hearing, touch, taste, and smell.” 读者须要有靈敏的視覺、聽覺、觸覺、味覺、及嗅覺，纔能領略她的小說 (Ke 123). This is perhaps why Ke seems to have paid scant attention to Woolf among her British contemporaries and why—even though Ke does commend Woolf for her artistic achievement—he gives no evaluation to her themes the way he does those of her contemporaries such as D.H. Lawrence and James Joyce. Ke overlooks Woolf in his assessment of modernist writers’ success dealing with gender issues but, in contrast, acknowledges Lawrence’s contribution to them. He even skips Woolf when giving credit to British writers who deal with war and British society after The First World War.

**Woolf and Xiandai Wenxue in the 1960s**

In 1960, the literary magazine *Xiandai Wenxue* published its first issue, not long before *Wenxue* ceased publication due to financial difficulties and the death of Hsia. 97 *Xiandai* was the continuation of *Wenxue* as it basically followed the path of the former, though with even greater emphasis on western modernist work. It has won itself a reputation of being the fountainhead of Taiwanese modernist literature for having brought forth a group of young writers who later took center stage in the development of Taiwanese modern literature. It was these young writers who founded the journal, and the majority of them had been contributors of *Wenxue* and students of Hsia. They were college students of foreign languages and literature majors exposed to and illuminated by western literary traditions. The magazine’s editor in chief Pai Hsien-yung白先勇 (Bai Xianyong; b.1937) claimed that, in retrospect, they were greatly indebted to Hsia for his

---

97 *Xiandai* ended in 1973 due to financial difficulty. It was taken up by publisher in 1977 and enjoyed seven more years of successful publication.
guidance in creative writing and that the “Wenxue he edited was actually the precursor of Xiandai” 他主編的《文學雜誌》其實是《現代文學》的先驅. 98

Aside from continuing the style of Wenxue, Xiandai also introduced modernist literature on an even larger scale and in a more systematic way than its predecessor. 99 Xiandai published a series of special issues on modernist writers, among whom were Kafka, Mann, Joyce, Lawrence, Woolf, Potter, and Fitzgerald. Woolf was introduced in the sixth issue (1961). Four pieces of her short fiction, namely “Kew Garden” (1919), “A Haunted House” (1921), “In the Orchard” (1923), and “The New Dress” (1927), as well as her famous critical essay “Mr. Bennett and Mrs. Brown” were translated for this special issue. Included in it, in addition, were also translations of William Troy’s “The Novel of Sensibility” (1932) and Robert Peel’s “Virginia Woolf” (1933), both criticisms published during Woolf’s lifetime. Though the translations of Woolf’s work were few and Woolf criticism was made from purely western perspectives, this special issue nevertheless marks the first direct contact of Woolf’s work with the general readers in Taiwan, even if it came as a package deal with other modernist writers.

99 According to Pai, there were two major reasons why modernist works should become the emphasis of this journal. In addition to the (student) editors’ abundant exposure to modernist works as foreign literature majors, the identity crisis they were facing as a result of the sudden changes in socio-cultural environments in the second half of the 20th century also forced them to seek out for their orientation in an unstable, changing world. The Chinese Mainlanders who had migrated to Taiwan with the ROC government in 1949 were compelled to lose contact with their homeland, hence their culture, due to the separation. It was, however, not only the new immigrants but the Taiwan natives as well who had suffered from identity crisis, though of a different nature. The latter had been just cut off from the fifty years of Japanese colonization (1895-1945), hence the colonizer’s culture that had had a heavy influence on their daily lives. A stabilizing new culture specific to this island was therefore highly desirable. The same held true for the literary arena. The spirit of Modernism featuring innovation and a break from the past apparently served the purpose well. The task of introducing modernist literature, as Pai noted, was thus imperative, as it could potentially contribute “to establishing a new writing style for Taiwanese Literature” 為台灣文學創立一種新的風格 (Pai 13).
Here again, however, the difficulty of and unfamiliarity with Woolf’s innovative style seemed to impede her works from being duly appreciated or even approached. In the editor’s note, Woolf was introduced as an important modern British novelist, literary critic, and essayist. However, as he went on, her “work is indeed difficult to read; and it takes a patient reader with keen sensibility and the capability of putting temporarily aside all old concepts to really appreciate her fine writings” 她的作品的確難讀，只有感覺敏銳，能夠暫時拋棄任何舊觀念的讀者，細細研讀之下才能體會她的琬琰之章。100

In fact, due to the editor’s insufficient academic training in Woolf’s work, the majority of his evaluation of Woolf in the editor’s note had to be based on Troy’s and Peel’s criticisms. This seemed a common problem with the young scholars of Xiandai—as Leo Ou-fan Lee李歐梵 also remarked, in tracing back the early history of the modernist reception in Taiwan, most young editors of Xiandai “were not capable of making independent judgment apart from parroting Western scholarly opinion.”101

Despite its reputed difficulty, Woolf’s work was not entirely lacking for admirers, even if few. Included in this special issue, in fact, was also Chang Hsiu-ya’s 張秀亞 (Zhang Xiuya; 1919-2001) essay on ROO，the first critical essay of Woolf by a Taiwanese intellectual. 102 This is an important piece in Woolf’s reception history in Taiwan not only because it represents the earliest response to Woolf’s work on this island but also because it evidenced to the nature of the reception of Woolf during the 1960s as
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100 “Wuerfu furen xiaozhuan”吳爾芙夫人小傳 (A Sketch of Mrs. Woolf), editor’s note, Xiandai wenxue 現代文學 (Modern Literature) 6 (1961): 4.
102 Chang Hsiu-ya 張秀亞, “Wuerfu furen de Ziji de yijian wuzi” 吳爾芙夫人的「自己的一間屋子」(A Room of One’s Own by Mrs. Woolf), Xiandai wenxue 現代文學 (Modern Literature) 6 (1961): 35-38. Chang was a translator and essayist.
predominantly literary, probably due to the prevailing modernist tendency at the time. Chang was among the earliest critics of Woolf in Taiwan. In addition to the said critical essay, she also translated *ROO* in 1973, which has enjoyed far wider circulation than all the other three translations that came out later. The edition that came out in 2000, for instance, went through eight reprints in only five years. Strangely, however, her attention to Woolf’s work was squarely focused on her literary form.

Take *ROO*, the essay she translated, for example. This book-length essay grew out of two lectures Woolf gave in 1928 specifically addressing issues of women and writing. For all the powerful arguments Woolf makes against patriarchal system, which she holds responsible for deprivation of women’s material conditions and literary training necessary for writing, however, Chang’s attention was nevertheless drawn solely to the literary aspects of *ROO*. It is apparent that she admires her, as her evaluation of Woolf was full of favorable expressions like magic and wonder. She sees, for example, Woolf’s work as the creation of “a magical pen”神奇的筆 empowered by the “imagination”想像 and “fantasy”幻想 of a sensible mind (Chang 36-7). Woolf’s work is to her, that is, “a miracle created out of language”以文字形成的一種奇蹟 that is full of “spiritual and intellectual illumination, philosophic exploration, and artistic criticism, not to mention those extremely exquisite passages depicting landscapes and sentiments. When you open this book, you will find so much ‘beauty’ bursting out all over that you cannot stop your eyes rolling after it for even a moment”富有靈智的啟示, 哲理的探討, 藝術的品評, 更不乏一些極其綺麗的寫景抒情的片段, 打開這本書, 你會發現到處有「美」在迸發著, 使你目不暇給 (Chang 35). Chang’s fixation on the stylistic beauty of Woolf’s work was so strong that Woolf’s socio-cultural concerns were seemingly
invisible to her. And she was consistent in this—even some twelve years after she had produced the translation, she did not appear to have changed her mind a bit. In the translator’s note in the latest version, Chang’s praise for Woolf is still focused on Woolf’s formal qualities and exquisite style. Even where she did seem to notice Woolf’s feminist concern, interestingly, Chang reduced it to a casual complaint on the part of Woolf made for her great grandmothers. While introducing ROO as a result of two lectures of Woolf’s intended to stress the materials conditions necessary for woman to write, Chang comments,

Under this topic, being a “Great British Empire” woman just freed from the constraints of old traditions, she also grumbles moderately on behalf of her 17th and 18th great grandmothers and grandaunts and comes to this conclusion: If a woman is to write, she needs a room of her own, and some steady annual income.

在這個題目下，她因身為才自古老傳統中解脫出來的二十世紀「大英帝國」女子，所以也代她十七、十八世紀的祖姑母們，發了點不大不小的牢騷，而達成一個結論：女子如想寫作，應該有一個屬於自己的房間，以及一年有點固定的收入。^{103}

Compared with the important role ROO has played in the development of feminist discourse in other parts of the world, Chang’s relegation of the work’s socio-political concerns to merely “moderate grumbles” is apparently disproportionate. According to Jane Marcus, for example, back in the 1970s and 1980s ROO “was a major text for integrating women writers into the all-male university English curriculum” in the United

States, and “[it] was (and still is) the primary text in Women’s Studies courses at U.S. colleges and universities as well as an important text in Feminist Theory courses.”

There have been discussions among feminist critics and scholars in the 2000s regarding Chang’s indifference to Woolf’s feminist concerns. Interestingly, the explanations offered so far vary to the extent that some even contradict each other. While, for example, Cheng Chih-hui 鄭至慧 (Zheng Zhihui) attributes Chang’s oversight to her lack of women’s consciousness because in the 1970s women’s movement in Taiwan was yet to begin, Fan Ming-ju 范銘如 (Fan Mingru) argues just the opposite. She claims that Chang mentioned so little about feminist thoughts in ROO because she “had already had woman’s consciousness and therefore found it unnecessary to discuss it any further.”

According to Fan, Taiwanese women writers in the 1950s and 1960s, such as Chang and her contemporaries, belonged to a highly educated and financially independent elite group. These women, quite unlike those isolated and silenced women described in ROO, had support groups of their own and were granted opportunities to voice themselves in public. In addition, women’s rights to vote, education, employment, and property as asserted by liberal feminism and represented in ROO had already been achieved in a large part when Chang did the translation in 1970s. Under such circumstances, Chang’s lack attention the
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106 Fan Ming-ju 范銘如, “Jingpai; Wuerfu; Taiwan shouhang” 京派‧吳爾芙‧台灣首航 (The Beijing School; Woolf; A Maiden Voyage to Taiwan), *Wenxuedili: Taiwan xiaoshuo de kongjianyuedo 文學地理：台灣小說的空間閱讀 (*Literary Geography: Spatial Reading of Taiwanese Fiction*) (Taipei: Maitian, 2008) 122. Fan claims, based on her research of the writings by women writers of Chang’s generation and her personal contact with them, that Taiwanese women writers of the 1950s and 1970s in fact demonstrated very strong women’s consciousness in their literary work and in life.
gender issues in *ROO* can be attributed to, as Fan argues, the irrelevance of these issues to Taiwanese society. That is to say it was out of conscious choice that Chang paid little attention to the social issues addressed in *ROO*. For a belletristic writer like Chang, as Fan goes on, to translate *ROO* can be regarded as “simply an act of artistic appreciation” 純粹只是藝術性的欣賞. 107 Whether Chang was aware of Woolf’s feminist concerns in *ROO* or not, the absence of feminist reading of Woolf’s work itself is a fact in the 1970s in Taiwan, even in the translations and criticism of a critic so familiar with *ROO*, a work regarded elsewhere as apparently embodying feminist concerns.

**Woolf and Chung-Wai Literary Quarterly in the 1970s**

The youngest of the three major literary journals/magazines, *Chung-Wai Literary Quarterly* became the leading academic journal in Taiwan since the 1970s, whence bearing witness to the changes of literary and cultural environments over the years. Like its predecessors, it has been intended as a window on the latest literary theories and criticisms from the west. Unlike the other two, which were founded by intellectuals and friends sharing similar interests, *Chung-Wai* is institutionalized, and it goes even farther by also holding domestic and international conferences on a regular basis and producing scholarship that has taken the lead nationwide. 108 Up until the 1980s, *Chung-Wai* Literary Quarterly
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107 Fan Ming-ju, “Jingpai, Wuerfu, Taiwan shohang.” 122. Chang’s work is renowned for its poetic beauty. Fan attributes this to the influence of Ling Shuhua whom Chang met while she was still a high school girl in China. Both Chang and her contemporary Lin Hai-yin 林海音 (whose publishing house published the Chinese translation of *ROO* in 1973), as Fan claims, are followers of Lin Shuhua. Like Ling, Lin Hai-yin wrote critically about women’s social situations and domestic lives in the patriarchal society. But Chang’s work bears resemblance to Ling’s more in styles and narrative techniques. According to Fan, the fact that Chang favored *ROO* over any other books by Woolf could be also viewed as an example of Ling’s influence, as the book was also Ling’s favorite--Ling started her correspondence with Woolf after she had read *ROO*.

108 In 1970, National Taiwan University (NTU) started the doctorate program of Comparative Literature. A year later Comparative Literature Association of Republic of China (CLAROC) was founded. *Chung-Wai Literary Quarterly* was published in the following year as a result of the joint-effort of the Department of
nevertheless continued its forerunners’ effort in introducing modernist literary works and theories. As a continuation of such an effort, as earlier embodied in the translation of William Tindall’s chapter from his *Forces in Modern British Literature: 1885-1944* in *Wenxue* and that of the several pieces of criticisms of Woolf in *Xiandai*, an excerpt of Robert Humphrey’s *Stream of Consciousness in the Modern Novel* (1954) had also been translated to appear in *Chung-Wai* in 1977. \(^{109}\) In this excerpt, Woolf’s literary ideas expressed in her critical essays such as “Modern Fiction” are referred to as the key to her purposes presenting the stream of consciousness of her characters in fiction. Even before that, a translation of “Modern Fiction” had appeared as early as in 1973 in *Chung-Wai*, evidencing the theoretical value and importance the journal has attached to Woolf’s critical essays. \(^{110}\)

If one looks back again at the three journals for works that are either Woolf’s own or introduction to hers, one might be surprised to find that few of Woolf’s literary works had actually been made accessible to the general readers, despite the continued efforts of the three journals in introducing her. Until the 1970s, that is, available translations of Woolf’s literary works were limited to the four pieces of her short fiction published as a collection in *Xiandai*. In contrast to the limited accessibility to Woolf’s literary works, translations of her critical essays appear relatively abundant. “Mr. Bennett and Mrs. Brown,” for example, appeared as early as in 1961 in *Xiandai* and there were two

---


versions of both ROO and “Modern Fiction,” all translated in the 1970s. One possible reason for such disproportionate interests might lie in the length of the works in question—both “Mr. Bennett and Mrs. Brown” and “Modern Fiction” are short essays and even the book-length ROO is short relative to her novels. Language barriers, again, might also have contributed to this phenomenon and, certainly, the innovative, hence challenging, forms might constitute yet another factor. All these point to the fact that Woolf as a writer received little attention during this early period in Taiwan, though the critic Woolf attracted somewhat greater, though still limited, attention during the same period. It was not until the 1980s before Woolf began to be embraced more as a writer in this island country.

Woolf as a Writer, Critic, and Feminist from the 1980s to the 1990s

Woolf reception in Taiwan since the 1980s onward is marked by an increase, though at varying speeds, in the number of translations, the emergence of Woolf scholarship and a switch of attention from Woolf as a literary figure to Woolf as a feminist pioneer. The last twenty years of the twentieth century may be seen as a transition period between the 1970s and the 2000s of Woolf’s popularity in Taiwan, as the gradual increase of her reception began to pick up at an unprecedented speed as soon as the twenty-first century begun. To properly assess Woolf’s reception in Taiwan during these two decades, two measures are used: the number of translations and that of scholarly works. Translations are considered indicative of the market demands for foreign thoughts and ideas. Although they do not necessarily reflect reception per se, their
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111 Hsu Shun-de 許順德 trans., Yijian Ziji de Wuzi 一間自己的屋子 (A Room of One’s Own), by Virginia Woolf (Taipei: Chengwen, 1976); Ho Hsin 何欣, trans., Lun xiandai xiaoshuo 論現代小說 (Modern Fiction), by Virginia Woolf, Cong Kafka dao Backett: Xiandai xiaoshu luncong 從卡夫卡到貝克特--現代小說論叢 (From Kafka to Backett: Critical Theories of Modern Fiction), eds. Ho Hsin and Cheng Chen (Taipei: Shuijing, 1970) 15-26.
number can nevertheless be viewed as the general readers’ exposure opportunity to foreign thoughts. Included in the category of scholarly works, on the other hand, are both student essays like theses and dissertations and critical essays published in major literary journals like Chung-Wai. As incomparable as they may seem, especially in quality, both can be viewed as the results of attempts to understand, hence to receive, foreign thoughts. The supposed difference in quality and perhaps in sensitivity to trends, however, did seem to account for their different speeds in switch of focus to Woolf’s feminist concerns. More specifically, while the critics’ changes in their critical attention began as early as in the 1980s, it was not until the 1990s before feminist perspectives of Woolf were first observed in student essays.

**The Growing Popularity of Woolf**

Woolf’s increasing popularity is most obvious in student essays. As shown in Figure 1, there was only one master’s thesis written about Woolf before the 1980s, but the number increased to as many as nine in the 1980s and thirteen in the 1990s, showing a steady growth in Taiwan graduate students’ interest in Woolf. In all the nine theses in the 1980s, moreover, Woolf began to be seen not only as a literary critic but as a canonical British writer as well, with attention paid especially to her narrative techniques, styles and themes. The 1990s witnessed yet another turn in attention, when Woolf started to be seen also in the feminist light by some students—there were four out of the thirteen theses written during that decade addressing her feminist concerns. Such a shift actually began much earlier in critical essays. Before the 1980s, only Chang Hsio-ya wrote about Woolf, and that was in as early as the 1960s and from a purely literary perspective. Beginning in the 1980s, Taiwan critics’ interest in Woolf’s concerns other than literary
ones became manifest. Of the two main critical essays in the 1980s, there was already one dealing with Woolf’s feminist thoughts. When it came to the 1990s, her feminist concerns were addressed in all of the three available critical essays during that decade.

Somewhat surprisingly, the number of translations made during this period (please see Figure 2) did not seem to match this growing popularity of Woolf with her scholarly readers: before the 1980s, there had been already two translations of Woolf’s works; the 1980s, however, saw only three more translations of hers and the 1990s, two. This stands in sharp contrast to the apparent increase in the scholarly attention to Woolf’s work discussed above and stands in even sharper contrast, as we shall see in the next chapter, to the apparent, steady increase of Woolf’s translated works in China. This indicates the possibility that the attention Woolf received during this period was still limited to the highly educated elites. The difficulties encountered by the earlier Taiwanese readers in trying to understand Woolf’s works might still hold true, including, for example, their difficult language. The last two decades of the twentieth century in Taiwan, however, do witness serious critical attention paid to Woolf. Although few in number, the critiques were good enough in quality. Along with the growing interest on the part of graduate students, therefore, they had prepared the ground for the polyphonic reception of Woolf of the last decade, to be presented shortly, and even her cultural impact in the 2000s, discussed in Chapter Five.

**The Onset of Woolf’s Reception as a Feminist**

As earlier discussed, Woolf’s arrival as part of the modernist reception did not seem to have made much impact in the Taiwanese literary scene. Even until the first half of the 1980s, Woolf was still relatively unknown due to the lack of major criticisms by
local scholars. Reading of Woolf continued to rely on western perspectives. For example, as late as in 1984, one still sees in Chung-Wai a translation of Avrom Fleishman’s “Virginia Woolf: Tradition and Modernity” (1975), where Woolf’s allusion to and quotation of western classics were discussed. As soon as the next half of the 1980s began, however, increase in criticisms of Woolf became evident and her works were for the first time read in feminist light. All this may be attributed to the social milieu beginning in around the mid-1980s.

The 1980s saw the first significant rise of women’s consciousness in Taiwanese society. The Awakening Magazine, initiated by a group of women activists, for example, published its first issue in 1982. Soon afterward, in 1987, the Awakening Foundation was officially founded as the women activists’ base to raise public awareness of women’s issues. Around the same time, the first research institution of women in Taiwan, the Center for Women’s Studies at National Taiwan University, was also founded in 1985. Since then, more research centers and organizations began to shoot up. One immediate effect of this social atmosphere was that starting in the 1990s courses addressing women’s and gender issues began to be offered in colleges and universities. Given that Woolf had then already been well received by the western feminist scholars as a pioneering feminist on the one hand and, on the other, most of the instructors teaching these courses in Taiwan had been trained either in the United States of America or the United Kingdom, it is natural that


113 This center was later known as the Women’s Research Program 婦女與性別研究組 in 1999, organized under the Population and Gender Studies Center at National Taiwan University. It publishes The Journal of Women’s and Gender Studies (1990-), the first journal dedicated to the study of gender in Asia.
Woolf’ s name began to be known not only as a literary figure but a feminist theorist as well. This possibly explains the graduate students’ relative unfamiliarity with the feminist Woolf in the 1980s but their gradual intimacy with her, with four out of the thirteen theses on Woolf dealing with her feminist ideas, in the 1990s.

In synchrony with this wave of feminism and women’s movement then in Taiwan, Chung-Wai published in 1986 a special issue on feminist literature in which Song De-ming’s 宋德明 (Song Deming) feminist reading of Woolf, perhaps the first local journal article on Woolf, was published. Included in the same issue was also a translation of “Shakespeare’s Sister,” an excerpt from ROO. The feminist wave was perhaps so strong that it took only three years for Chung-Wai to publish yet another special issue, this time on feminism and feminist consciousness. In this issue, interestingly, some of Woolf’s letters were translated. This indicates that the interest in the literary dimension of Woolf still lingers, even where a focus on feminism had been proclaimed. According to the translator Liu Joyce Ji-hui 劉紀蕙 (Liu Jihui), the letters were translated to offer more facets of Woolf as a writer, as “they [i.e., these letters] touch on Virginia’s complicated sentiments, her mental state, and her attitude toward writing.” 它們觸及維琴妮亞的複雜情感，她的精神狀況與她的寫作態度.\footnote{See Liu Joyce Ji-hui 劉紀蕙, trans., “Weiqinniya Wuerfu shuxinxuan” 維琴妮亞吳爾芙書信選 (Selected Letters of Virginia Woolf), Nuxing zhuyi / Nuxing yishi 女性主義 / 女性意識 (Feminism / Feminist Consciousness), spec. issue of Zhongwai wenxue 中外文學 (Chung-Wai Literary Quarterly) 17.10 (1989): 176.}

However, the fact that Woolf is the only writer whose works were included in both issues on feminist literature also indicates a switch in focus in the reception of Woolf.

The switch in attention to the feminist Woolf was first observed in Song De-ming’s critical essay on her published in Chung-Wai in 1986. Song points out that critics
in the past have paid attention to Woolf’s innovative techniques such as stream of consciousness to such an extent that the apparent connection between her writings and her sociopolitical thinking has been, intentionally or not, largely ignored. For him, Woolf’s feminist concerns, which mirrored the social conditions of her time, are among the most important messages she has made great efforts to communicate to her readers. In evaluating Woolf’s works, therefore, one should not stop at the immediate, though subtle, rendition of the main characters’ internal reality—Woolf is equally capable of capturing the external surroundings. As he argues,

If one reads Woolf closely, one would realize her status as a [recognized] writer has been earned not merely for the rich content achieved by “[efforts spent on] rendition of the internal [reality].” In fact, to the extent the “rendition of the external” is concerned, Woolf’s achievement is equally brilliant. In defining and evaluating Woolf as a woman writer, [therefore,] the feminist Woolf cannot be ignored.

細讀吳爾芙之作品，便知其作家地位絕非僅限於「築內」所獲致之豐富內涵。事實上，在「見外」的領域中，吳爾芙也表現了相等程度之成就… 在界定與評估吳爾芙的女性作家角色時，女性主義者的吳爾芙是不可被漠視的。115

Even in Liou Liang-ya’s 劉亮雅 (Liu Liangya) critical essay on Woolf published in the same journal the next year (that is, 1987), where her critical concerns are mainly literary, Woolf’s feminist influence is still duly acknowledged. One of the only two
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critical essays available during the 1980s, Liou’s essay draws on Woolf’s concept of
androgy and “moments of being,” or “epiphany” in the Joycean sense, in her
discussion of the relation between time and artistic imagination in MD, TL, and TW. It is
also the first article in Taiwan to read Woolf in light of her philosophy as embodied in
issues such as self, existence, death, and eternity. For Woolf, according to Liou, reality,
internal and external alike, is chaotic and can be given an order only through artistic
imagination created out of an androgynous mindset. Liou praises the way Woolf realizes
in language her characters’ vision, which transcends time and the chaotic physical world:
“her unique contribution to modern literature lies in her observations of the process
constructing aesthetic experience through artistic imagination” 她對藝術想像建構美感
經驗過程的體察，是她對現代文學的特殊貢獻.116 Despite her focus on Woolf’s
narrative art and vision of reality, Liou is nevertheless well aware of the feminist
presence in Woolf’s works, as is obvious when she comments that,

\[\text{…in } \text{Mrs. Dalloway, To the Lighthouse and The Waves, three of her}\]
\[\text{representative works, women’s consciousness has merged with her}\]
\[\text{universal human concerns. Rather than social or political, these concerns}\]
\[\text{represent an ontological view of the way human beings endeavor to create}\]
\[\text{“moments of being” to cope with the nothingness and time they have been}\]
\[\text{confronting…}]

\[\text{…在其三部代表作《戴樂葳夫人》(Mrs. Dalloway)、《燈塔行》(To}\]
\[\text{the Lighthouse)、《海浪》(The Waves) 中，女性意識已融合在具普}\]

116 Liou Liang-ya 劉亮雅, “Shijian yu yishu xiangxiang: Lun Wuerfu sanbu zuoping” 時間與藝術想像:論
吳爾芙三部主要作品 (Time and Artistic Imagination: On Three Novels of Woolf), Zhongwai wenxue 中
Woolf’s feminist concerns received full critical attention during the 1990s, with all of the three available critical articles on her being mainly feminist in perspective. While most critics before and after him during the 1980s and 1990s base their discussion of Woolf’s feminist ideas mainly on her characters, Chou Ying-hsiung 周英雄 (Zhou Yingxiung) focuses his discussion on the evolution of Woolf’s own feminist perspective itself. Chou notes that Woolf’s feminist vision had been fundamentally androgynous before it turned essentialist in her later works, when she began to stress the basic differences between men and women. Chou attributes the change to Woolf’s strong resistance to the rise of Fascism in the 1930s, an ideology she believes growing out of patriarchy. Moreover, while Chou agrees with Woolf that a woman needs to have a room of her own and a steady annual income to bring about privacy, economic independence and intellectual freedom so that she can write, he nevertheless considers them insufficient, though necessary, conditions for literary production. For him, social and ideological factors also play significant roles in determining literary production.

Chang Hsiao-hong’s 張小虹 (Zhang Xiaohong) 1994 critical essay, the other criticism on Woolf during the 1990s, provides an intertextual, feminist reading of Woolf’s O and its filmic adaptation by Sally Potter, first released in 1993. Chang


118 Chang Hsiao-hong 張小虹, “Li zhi zhong Olanduo: wen zi/yin xiang hu dong yu xing bie/wen ben zheng zhi 兩種《歐蘭朵》：文字/影像互動與性別/文本政治 (Two types of Orlando: The Interaction
compares the treatments of androgyny in these two art forms in light of sexual/gender politics and their means of representation, i.e., words in one and images in the other. While, according to Chang, the verbal representation of androgyny in the original text presents the “vacillation, deconstruction and displacement” 擺盪、解構與置換 of gender/sex, the cinematic representation of androgyny “develops the visual vocabulary for homosexuality and the camera movement modes of ‘melting’ and ‘shifting’” 發展同性戀的視覺語彙與「融解」、「轉換」的攝影機運動模式 (Chang 88). In terms of textual politics, in addition, Chang argues that Woolf’s mock-biography, a literary hybrid made up of a variety of genres, brings to the fore the indeterminacy of genre/text, just like the indeterminacy of gender/sex of Orlando. Potter’s adaptation, on the other hand, breaks the fourth wall when her actress acknowledges the presence of the audience, thus creating an effect of “passionate detachment” 深情疏離 on the part of the audience (Chang 88). The concept of androgyny in O has aroused heated discussion since the 1970s among western Woolf scholars such as Heilbrun, Showalter, and Moi, but in Taiwan Chang was the first to take part in the discussion when her 1994 criticism was published. Since then, Chang’s article has remained one of the major discussions of Woolf within the feminist theoretical framework in Taiwan, and it has been read in a number of women’s literature, gender, and film courses offered in colleges and universities.

The last piece of available critical essays on Woolf before the end of the twentieth century, Lee Hsiu-chuan’s 李秀娟 (Li Xiujuan) analyses of VO provides a timely

transition from the literary or feminist Woolf before the twentieth century to the polyphonic Woolf beginning in the twenty-first century, when interest in Woolf was no longer satisfied by her familiar works. In time with the vogue of travel discourse in cultural studies, Chung-Wai published in 1999 a special issue on women and travel literature, in which Lee Hsiu-chuan analyzes VO—Woolf’s first novel, though having barely been studied by Taiwan critics before the 2000s—with a focus on its discourse of travel to reveal Woolf’s treatment of women’s travel and her endeavor giving voice to her female character’s desires. In line with notion of travel and the masculine gender often associated with it in the discourse of cultural studies of the 1990s, Lee argues that Rachel Vinrace’s sea voyage on Euphrosyne starts out as masculine/imperial travel led by male figures, represented by her father, until male dominance is subverted when female figures, as represented by Mrs. Ambrose, begin to intervene. Mrs. Ambrose becomes the mentor to Rachel and changes her itinerary by taking her to Santa Marina in South America for vacation in her father’s absence. For Lee, the “feminine” travel in the narrative is also the journey for Rachel to explore her own body and desires as a woman.

In addition to the formal, academic critical articles appearing in literary journals, Woolf’s criticism also took other forms during the last two decades of the twentieth century in Taiwan. Some assumed the form of prefaces or introductions to translation works and others, newspaper or magazine articles. One notable instance is Liou Liang-ya’s introduction to a collection of nineteen pieces of Woolf’s short fiction that she had translated herself. She chronologically ordered the collected short fiction to give an
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organized view of the various stages of Woolf’s writings. By so doing, Liou was able to analyze, in the Introduction, the innovative techniques, values and beliefs in respectively the early, the middle and the later stages of Woolf’s fiction, meanwhile directing her readers’ attention to the feminist issues underlying them. This is one of the important early efforts constructing Woolf’s image as a feminist as well as a modernist writer, since this translation has been included among the sixty volumes of *The Twentieth Century World Fiction*, which aims to provide the general reader an access to the canon of modern world literature.120 Other forms of Woolf criticism can be exemplified by Josephine Ho’s newspaper article published in 1991, when the Gulf War was taking place.

In that article, Ho brought up Woolf’s anti-war stance in *TG* as a way to think about the unequal distribution of resources in the society.121 She argues that Woolf’s anti-war stance is a strategic call for attention to male dominance, hence to women’s less-privileged status, in the British society. For her, the African-Americans, who took up the largest portion in the anti-war movement against the Gulf War, were availing themselves of an anti-war stance to call attention to their less-privileged social status, a status so deprived that had forced their younger generation to go to the battlefield to earn for themselves better welfare.

**The Polyphonic Woolf in the 2000s**

The 2000s witnessed both a rapid growth in translation of and scholarship on Woolf and greatly diversified interest in her. Beginning in the 2000s, more specifically, Woolf was valued no longer for her contribution as a modernist and feminist writer alone.
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120 Liou Liang-ya 劉亮雅, trans., *Wuerfu 吳爾芙 (Woolf)* (Taipei: Guangfu, 1987).
121 This article is also available in Josephine Ho 何春蕤, “Wuomen meiyou (guo) jia—Ruoshizhe de fanshan lichang 我們沒有(國)家--弱勢者的反戰立場” 我們沒有(國)家--弱勢者的反戰立場 (We Have No Home/Country: The Anti-war stance of the less-privileged), *Budongguo nuren: Xing/bie, ziben yu wenhua 不同國女人: 性/別,資本與文化 (Women from Different Countries: Gender, Capital, and Culture)* (Taipei: ziliwanbao, 1994).
The various sociopolitical concerns she voices in her works began to be heard—not only by the highly educated elites but also, thanks to the substantial amount of translations now available, by the general public. What is more, her works appear to have been received to such an extent that they appeared to have crossed the boundary of literature, as they started to be read by students of other disciplines as well. Even in literature itself, people began to read her works in light of other contemporary literary theories. Moreover, the line earlier drawn between Woolf’s image as a literary writer and that as a feminist icon became even finer now that her “territory” in the popular cultural realm had grown larger. Her pictures were now seen displayed in the local chain bookstores for public view and sometimes printed on mugs, bookmarks, and canvas bags that were displayed for sale. The mass media, Hollywood movies and TV broadcasts alike, further spread Woolf’s name to an even wider audience/ readership. In a TV show aired in 2003 discussing Woolf’s *Mrs. Dalloway* and Michael Cunningham and Stephen Daldry’s film adaptation of *The Hours*, in which Woolf critic Liou liang-ya was invited as the only guest discussant, the host began the show by commenting that, “*The Hours* allows those who have no knowledge of western literature to learn about a new figure, whose name is Virginia Woolf.”

**The Translation of Woolf**

Though not all but only a portion of Woolf’s work, novels and short fiction mainly, has been translated in Taiwan, the total number of translations that appeared in
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this decade outnumbers the total number of translations previously published. The trend appears obvious, as shown in Figure 2: while there were thirteen translations in the 2000s alone, there were only two in the 1970s, three in the 1980s, and two in the 1990s. This substantial increase consisted of not only works translated for the first time but also those that were re-translated by other translators. The major works of Woolf such as TG and TW, for example, were translated for the first time; other better studied works, such as MD, TL, O, and ROO, were re-translated, and some of them even for several times. There were, for instance, three versions of O and two versions of ROO published in the 2000s alone. Probably a result of market economics, which places market demands on top of its decision criteria, none of Woolf’s critical essays, letters, and diaries have been translated by Taiwanese translators in book form. Several collections of critical essays that are circulating in Taiwan were actually translated by Mainland Chinese scholars, though some of them were printed in Taiwan, again evidencing market considerations involved in translation decisions.

Interestingly, some translations of Woolf’s less well-known but more accessible work became also available in Taiwan, suggesting that the market demands for Woolf had grown wider. FB, whose first translation appeared during the Republican period in China in the 1930s, for example, has its second version of translation published in Taiwan. This book is recommended to Woolf’s fans and dog fanciers, as noted in the blurb, for its fun and the humor of Woolf rarely found in her other novels. Woolf’s only play, Freshwater-A Comedy, even lesser known to most Chinese-speaking readers, was
Woolf’s popularity seems to lie behind the publication decision, as it is suggested in the translator’s notes that Woolf’s face is the most recognizable among a group of great thinkers and leaders shown on the wallpaper in the local bookstores. Woolf’s biographies detailing the various aspects of her life, such as those authored by John Lehmann and Nigel Nicholson, also became available during the 2000s. Intriguingly, in Taiwan, the two biographies are available only in their Chinese translations. What is even more intriguing is that both books seemed to have targeted the general readers. The subtitle “女性主義文學的創始人,” literally The Founder of Feminist Literature, for example, has been added to the translation of Lehmann’s Virginia Woolf (1999). The title of Nigel Nicholson’s Virginia Woolf (2000) was even renamed in its translation as 找不到出口的靈魂：吳爾芙的美麗與哀愁, literally The Soul that Finds No Exit: The Beauty and Sorrow of Woolf, obviously to cater to the public impression of Woolf—a beautiful and talented feminist writer who ended her life due to depression. All this diverse interest in Woolf during this last decade suggests that Woolf must have been well received—as we shall see also in Chapter Five, where her influence is shown. The growing interest in and curiosity about Woolf was reflected not only in the translations of but the critical essays on Woolf as well, to which we now turn.

Diverse Perspectives on Woolf

In addition to translations, the 2000s also witnessed sharply increasing numbers of criticism on Woolf. Critical essays published in literary journals increased from two in

---

123 Yang Tsu-yi 楊子宜, trans., Danshui: Yige Wuerfu de xiju 淡水: 一個吳爾芙的喜劇 (Freshwater—A Comedy by Woolf), by Virginia Woolf (Taipei: Dangshan, 1990). Both the 1923 version and the 1935 revised version of this play were translated in this book.
the 1980s and three in the 1990s to a total of nine in the 2000s. A similarly steep rise was also observed in student essays, master theses and doctoral dissertations alike: while there were nine master theses in the 1980s and thirteen in the 1990s, the number increased to as many as thirty-four in the 2000s, which is greater even than the summed total of all theses written before the 2000s. Doctoral dissertations, meanwhile, were available for the first time in the 2000s, with a total of four compared to none before the 2000s. Like the phenomena observed in translated works, moreover, the period is marked by the diversity of interest in Woolf. It is not only that Woolf’s less known works began to draw attention but that Woolf’s works were examined in various lights and even by students of disciplines other than literature or foreign languages. Together, they presented the twenty-first century Woolf in Taiwan as a multifaceted figure and her works as polyphonic.

One example of the diverse views of Woolf during this period is Kuo Chia-chen’s 郭家珍 (Guo Jiazhen) reading of her short fiction “Kew Garden.” This work had often been discussed for Woolf’s stream of consciousness techniques and her multiple narrative perspectives. Kuo, however, gives it a cinematic reading, which was novel in interpreting this piece of short fiction. Appropriating Deleuze, the article points out how cinematic forms in the silent film era had informed Woolf’s treatment of images and sounds in her early works.\textsuperscript{124} Theoretical approaches like that adopted in Kuo’s criticism were popular during this decade, but this popularity was perhaps nowhere else better illustrated than in the reading of \textit{MD} against various theoretical paradigms. Derridian reading, for one, is observed in one of the articles discussing the nature of time articulated in \textit{MD}. For

another, the haunting effect of war and shell-shock in the novel is examined in the discourse of trauma. When urban modernity and women’s city experiences began to attract wider scholarly attention in recent years, moreover, *MD* became the touchstone for Taiwanese critics to try their theoretical knives. Three different readings of *MD* illustrate this well. Treating the department store as a public space in the city, Chen Yinyi 陳音頤 discusses women’s participation in modernity by examining their relationship with the commodity culture and commodity spectacle in *MD* from the perspective of consumerism.\(^{125}\) Tseng Ching-fang 曾靜芳 (Zeng Jingfang) employs the concept of flaneur (city walker) in the Benjaminian sense to account for Woolf’s portrayal of women’s experience of urbanity, i.e., their engagement in flaneurie (city walking), which had been underrepresented in most modernist novels.\(^{126}\) Her study also shows that home, a stereotyped domestic/private, thus female, space, has been reconfigured by Woolf as a social space, as exemplified by Clarissa Dalloway’s party. Inspired by Zizek, Hsu Jen-Yi’s anamorphic reading of the gothic vision in *MD* and three of Woolf’s other essays, all having their background set in London, makes explicit Woolf’s attempt to reveal fear and anxiety as linked to colonialism, capitalism, Empire and war. For Hsu, the ghostly representations found in these writings were meant to show
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\(^{125}\) Chen Yinyi 陳音頤, “Baihuogongsi mengxiangqu: Nuxingzhanshi xiaofeizhengzhi he shijizhijiao de Lundun xiaoshuo” 百貨公司夢想曲：女性展示消費政治和世紀之交的倫敦小說, *Zhongwai wenxue* 中外文學 (Chung-Wai Literary Quarterly) 34.2 (2005): 59-81. Other than Woolf’s novels, Chen also discusses novels by George Gissing and Henry James in her article.

the dark sides of modernity. Altogether, these three essays argue that Woolf was, far from being an apolitical aesthete, very much aware of the social and political issues in her own time.

In addition to theoretical approaches, there were also criticisms basing their assessment of Woolf on more traditional, literary reading of her works, sometimes in relation to her sociopolitical thinking. Liu Yu-yen 劉于雁 (Liu Yuyen), for example, studies Woolf’s aesthetics in the context of her feminist ideas as well as in her association with the Bloomsburians. She argues that, based on her analyses of plot in JR and vision in TL, Woolf's art of writing was informed by Bloomsbury aesthetic theories, Roger Fry’s concept of formalism in particular. To reach a full understanding of Woolf’s formalist aesthetics, however, as Liu stresses, it is obligatory that her feminist concerns be also taken into consideration because the latter is integrated in her quest of the former.  

Tseng Rui Hua’s 曾瑞華 (Zeng Ruihua) article offers yet another example of the traditional approach in her interpretation of Woolf’s mysticism. She argues that the influence of Leslie Stephen’s and Walter Pater’s Platonic morality and aesthetics that Woolf had been exposed to paved the way for her later acceptance of her Quaker aunt Caroline Stephen’s vision. The joint influences of these three figures, in Tseng’s view, contribute significantly to the distinctive mystical dimension in Woolf’s writings.

Woolf’s popularity during this decade was manifested also in other ways, including the screening of filmic adaptations of her works or of her and translation
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studies that compare different versions of her translated works. *The War Within: A Portrait of Virginia Woolf* (1995), an acclaimed documentary on Woolf directed by John Fuegi and Jo Francis, for one, was screened in the 2006 Women Make Waves International Film Festival. Marleen Gorris’s adaptation of *Mrs. Dalloway* (1997), for another, was screened in the 2007 festival. Even the translation studies in Taiwan began to take notice of Woolf as more translations of her have become commercially available, with some of them existing in several versions. From the perspective of “self” and “other” in translation studies, Wang Chi-hong’s 王志弘 (Wang Zhihong) compares two Chinese versions of *ROO*, one by the female translator Chang Hsiu-ya and the other by the male translator Song Wei-hang 宋偉航 (Song Weihang). His finding argues against the claim that women can always make better readers when it comes to reading works written by women writers. Though Wang’s effort is tangential to Woolf study, the presence of a comparative itself makes evident Woolf’s rooted popularity in Taiwan beginning this century.

Woolf’s reception in Taiwan, as discussed, can be cut into three rough phases. The first phase dates from the 1950s, when the Nationalist party, or KMT, just retreated to Taiwan after its defeat in the Chinese Civil War, to the 1970s, during which both Woolf’s scholarship and translation were at best sporadic. Beginning in the 1980s, however, a steady rise in the interest in Woolf was observed until the 2000s, when a sharp increase in Woolf’s popularity was manifested in both criticisms and translations of

---

130 Women Make Waves Film Festival 女性影展 (WMWFF) is held annually by Taiwan Women’s Film Association 台灣女性影像學會 founded in 2000.
Woolf’s literary as well as critical works. Approaches to her works, moreover, also became diversified during this last decade. The growing interest in her during the last two phases, however, did not develop at equal speeds. The number of translation has had the slowest rate of growth, compared to those of student essays and critical articles, before the 2000s. During the same two decades, on the other hand, both types of critical essays showed a steady rise in number, with student essays far outnumbering the critical essays, though. This suggests that, until the 2000s, Woolf’s reception was limited to highly education elites, as then translations were still limited in number. Critical attention, however, was aroused rather early, i.e., during the 1980s. A turn of attention, moreover, could be observed, from the literary to the feminist Woolf in the 1990s. Beginning in the 2000s, Woolf became both popular and polyphonic.

A number of reasons could have contributed to Woolf’s steep rise in popularity in this century. Her image as a feminist figurehead, for instance, has successfully promoted the sales of her book. To take ROO, Woolf’s most representative feminist work, for instance, there have been four different versions of Chinese translation published in Taiwan alone. Among them, the best-selling version has undergone several reprints. The several movie adaptations of Woolf’s novels, which help turn her into a cultural icon, too, might also contribute to the spread of her name. The first Chinese O came out soon after Sally Potter’s adaptation had been in the market. When the third translation of O came out over a decade later, the commercial success of Potter’s movie was still mentioned on the front cover to boost the sales. Whatever the reason, one thing for sure is that, in the beginning of the twenty-first century, Woolf had become well received on this island country. As we shall see in the next chapter, the same rooted popularity occurred in
China around the same time as well. The rooted popularity further implies that the beginning of this century might also be a time when Woolf’s reception was solid enough to become influential, as we shall see in Chapter Five.
Chapter Four
The Reception of Woolf in China (1950s-2000s)

The communist’s taking over of China in 1949 has had significant impact on China, especially before 1978, during which period China’s communication with the western world was minimal due to the political atmosphere at the time. In 1978, the Reform and Open-up Policies 改革開放政策 was enforced, marking a significant change in China’s attitude toward international society. The year 1978 thus serves a great watershed in communist China’s history of foreign policies and, since the reception of foreign cultures is inevitably intertwined with foreign policies, Woolf’s reception in China can be accordingly divided into two periods: the pre-1978 period, when the reception of Woolf, or actually western modernism in its entirety, was almost non-existent, and the post-1978 period, when Woolf’s works began to attract a substantial readership. Compared with Woolf’s reception in Taiwan, the first period was obviously different, given the near inaccessibility of Woolf in China before 1978. Beginning in the 1980s, however, Woolf’s popularity in both Taiwan and China followed roughly the same paths, though they still differed somewhat in their paces as well as the constituents of their readerships.

It is generally agreed that, compared to the ensuing decade of Cultural Revolution 文化大革命, the first seventeen years of the pre-1978 period saw greater, though still limited, cultural imports in the form of translation. During this period, foreign literature continued to be introduced through translation. However, the translations were confined to foreign classic and Russian literature mainly, and western modernist works were never
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132 The reform and open-up policies initiated in the 1978 by the Communist Party of China have brought about great changes to China in many aspects, most notably in its economic system.
seen on the short list. Translation soon came to a halt when the Cultural Revolution broke out in 1966. During this dark age in the history of Chinese culture, the number of foreign literature translation reached a record low. This is especially true during the first half of this decade, as Ma Shikui’s study shows, “for more than five years there was not even one single volume of foreign literature translation that had been published” 五年多的時間內竟沒有出版一部外國文學譯作. The silence was no longer tolerated beginning in 1978, which witnessed the implementation of the Reform and Opening Policies. The transition obviously took some time, though. When Woolf was read again in China, that is, it was already in the beginning of the 1980s. As the 1990s and the 2000s, like those in Taiwan, also witnessed some significant changes in Woolf’s reception in China, the post-1978 period can be further divided into three periods, i.e., the 1980s, the 1990s, and the 2000s, along the sequence of which the post-1978 reception of Woolf in China will be discussed. Unlike that of Woolf’s reception in Taiwan, however, the discussion in this chapter relies mainly on the translations of and critical essays on Woolf’s works as the main materials out of which the development of her reception in China has been sketched. Degree essays, an important indicator of Woolf’s reception in
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133 See Ma Shikui, “Wenge qijian de waiguo wenxue fanyi” 文革期間的外國文學翻譯 (*The Translation of Foreign Literary Works during the Cultural Revolution), Zhongguo fanyi 中國翻譯 (*Chinese Translation Journal*) 24.3 (2003): 65. According to Ma, both public and internally circulated translations were available during the Cultural Revolution. However, both the quantity and the type of the translations were limited. In terms of type, Ma says that “only some renowned Russian and Japanese literature that had been earlier published in China were reprinted, republished, or retranslated. The remaining translations were based on new works from friendly countries” 以前已在國內出版過的蘇聯和日本文學名著的重印、再版或重譯，其他主要是來自一些友好國家的新作品(65). However, he also believes that “during the ten years of Cultural Revolution, literature translation reached a record low level since the large-scale translation of foreign literature in the late Qing Dynasty” 文革十年，文學翻譯進入了自晚清起大規模譯介外國文學作品以來的最低潮(65). This is evidenced in the fact, as Ma notes, that “the number of foreign literature translation publicly published nationwide during the one year 1978 is larger than the total number of translation produced during the entire decade of Cultural Revolution” 僅一九七八年一年，全國公開出版的外國文學譯作的數量即超過了文革十年期間的總量(65).
Taiwan as discussed in the previous chapter, were given little weight here because of the unreliability of their available sources. More specifically, there have been practical problems tracing degree essays on Woolf before 1997 in China.

There are two databases that have been generally agreed to be most comprehensive in their collections of, among others, degree essays in China, namely the China Knowledge Resource Integrated Database 中國知識資源總庫, which has grown out of the China National Knowledge Infrastructure (CNKI) 中國知識基礎設施工程, the fourth largest infrastructure in China, and the Wangfang Data 萬方數據庫. Although the most comprehensive, the CNKI was ruled out in the very initial exploration of Woolf’s academic influences in China as reflected in degree essays, as the official date of its collection began as late as in 1999. The Wangfang Data, on the other hand, claims a starting date as early as in 1980. Further exploration of the database showed, however, that the earliest traceable degree essay in it appeared in 1997. This means degree essays cannot serve as a reliable measure of Woolf’s popularity in China as they can in Taiwan, given the lack of information before 1997. In fact, other ways of tracing Woolf’s reception through degree essays in China universities, including checking on the
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134 An initial search on this database showed that there were only two master theses during the 1990s, with the earlier of the two published as late as 1997, while there were as many as one hundred and twenty-seven master theses as well as six dissertations during the 2000s. The results were surprising, since there had been an implied period of “modernist literature fever” 現代派熱 from 1978 to 1987 according to Chinese scholar Yuan Kejia 袁可嘉 [see “‘Xiandaipaire’ jiangwen zhiho” “現代派熱” 降温之後 (After the Cooling-off of the Modernist Literature Fever), Waiguowenxue pinglun 外國文學評論 (Foreign Literature Review) 4 (1987): 45-47] and there were a number of critical papers appearing during both the 1980s and the 1990s. To ensure the reliability of this collection, a few names familiar to most Chinese were entered as key words, including the famous writers Lu Xun and Xu Zhimo as well as “modernism,” and the earliest available degree essay resulting from the search turned out to be also 1997. This is almost impossible, if the collection indeed began in 1980. Attempts to contact the company running the database were made, and a call made to the local representatives in Taiwan confirmed that most collected works in the field of literature in this database started in 1997.
physical library entries themselves, have been considered but had to be given up because of practical difficulties.

The data provided by the Wangfan Data, however, are not entirely lacking in useful information. If inference made of the whole picture from a part of it is valid, we may be able to infer the number of degree essays for the decade of the 1990s from the limited data available in the Wangfan Data. That is, since there are two degree essays during the three years from 1997 to 1999, the total number of degree essays should be around seven or less for the whole decade of the 1990s, if their collection had begun in 1990. Seen from this perspective, it seems that a similarly steep rise could have been observed in the number of degree essays just like that of the critical essays, since their numbers in the 2000s are both more than ten times those of the 1990s.

**Woolf in the Pre-1978 Period**

Until the re-entry of western modernist works to China in the late 1970s, Woolf was basically silenced in China. Beginning in the 1950s in China, political ideology was the only yardstick measuring the artistic achievements of literature; socialist literature thus became the mainstream. Western modernist literature, in contrast, was seen as bourgeois literature that had been descended from capitalist decadence and was thus capable of nothing but degradation of morality and pollution of the mind. The political ideology of pre-1978 China had thus deemed modernist works as being anti-revolution 反動 and anti-government, and any effort introducing them to the Chinese readers was banned. However, before western modernism was totally blacked out during the decade of Cultural Revolution from 1966 to 1976, translations of modernist works were still available, though in a very limited way. That is, they were circulated only internally.
among a limited number of government officials and researchers and the sole purpose of their existence, for most of the time, was to serve as samples of western modernism for the officials and researchers to find fault with. There were also limited modernist criticisms available during this period, but they shared similar purposes with those of the translations, grumbling about the problems and harms of modernist literature.

China’s hostility toward western modernism during the pre-1978 period is perhaps nowhere else better illustrated than in the exclusion of modernist works from the monumental *Gudian wenyi lilun yicong* (The Translation Series of Classical Theories of Literature and Art), a comprehensive collection of influential academic publications introducing and translating foreign critical theories of literature and art, western mainly, by a group of scholars trained in foreign literatures. *Gudian* represents a decade of academic efforts that started in 1957 but ended in 1966 due to the ensuing Cultural Revolution and consists of as many as eleven volumes that cover important works spanning a long period of time from the ancient Greco-Roman period to the 20th century. It opened a new and rare window to the western world for Chinese readers and, according to Liu Mingjiu, the influences it had exercised on the academic and cultural arena before the post-1978 reform could never be overstated by critics today, since “it has laid a solid foundation for our nation’s research on both western cultures and the decades of literary critical history of the west.”
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文化，為後來幾十年西方文藝批評史的研究打下了堅實的基礎。\textsuperscript{136} For all its importance and comprehensiveness, \textit{Gudian} deliberately excludes any critical works on western modernism. According to Zhu Guangqian 朱光潛, one of its editors, simply because of the decadent nature of modernist works, “there is no need to waste any ink on them” 無須為它們浪費筆墨。\textsuperscript{137}

The hostility toward western modernism did not grow overnight. According to Liu, the Russian theorist Andrei Zhdanov’s (1896-1948) influence on Chinese scholars’ reception of foreign literature could have contributed greatly to the ways modernist works were received in China. In his speech given in 1934 at the Soviet Writers Congress, for example, Zhdanov says,

The present state of bourgeois literature is such that it is no longer able to create great works of art. The decadence and disintegration of bourgeois literature, resulting from the collapse and decay of the capitalist system, represent a characteristic trait, a characteristic peculiarity of the state of bourgeois culture and bourgeois literature at the present time…

Characteristic of the decadence and decay of bourgeois culture are the orgies of mysticism and superstition, the passion for pornography. The “illustrious persons” of bourgeois literature-- of that bourgeois literature


\textsuperscript{137} See Zhu Guangqian 朱光潛, \textit{Xifang Meixueshi} 西方美学史 (The History of Western Aesthetics) (Beijing: Renming wenxuei, 1963) 7.
which has sold its pen to capital-- are now thieves, police sleuths, prostitutes, hooligans.  

Up until the 1950s, the Chinese literary field had been looking to Russian literary critics for critical ideas, and Zhadnov’s arguments naturally became, as Liu notes, the “guiding thought” for foreign literary studies in China. This is evidenced in the fact that his speech was widely cited by Chinese critics and scholars in their criticizing of western modernist works as products of political and social crisis, without actually looking into their cultural background.

As negative labels such as decadence, pornography, annihilation had been attached to modernist works, it was natural that there were few, if any at all, translators who would take the risk introducing them, and when there were, they had apparently other purposes than literary ones. In 1962, Yuan Kejia 袁可嘉 compiled a collection of selected modernist writings entitled Xiandai yingmei zhanjiejie wenxue lilun xuan 现代英美资产阶级文学理论文选 (Selected Modern Anglo-American Bourgeois Literary Theories). Not surprisingly, Yuan had been assigned by the government for the work, and the translated writings had been selected as targets of criticism.


Five hundred copies of this book (in two volumes) were issued for internal circulation only. For detail see Wang Yichuan 王一川, “Xifang wenlun de zhishixing jiqi zhuanxiang—Jiantan zhongguo wenlun de xiandaixing zhuanxiang” 西方文论的知识型及其转向—兼谈中国文论的现代性转向 (On the Episteme and Turn of Western Literary Theories—Also on the Modernist Turn of Chinese Literary Theories), Dangdai Wentan 当代文坛 (Modern Literary Magazine) 6 (2007): 4-8.


140 Five hundred copies of this book (in two volumes) were issued for internal circulation only. For detail see Wang Yichuan 王一川, “Xifang wenlun de zhishixing jiqi zhuanxiang—Jiantan zhongguo wenlun de xiandaixing zhuanxiang” 西方文论的知识型及其转向—兼谈中国文论的现代性转向 (On the Episteme and Turn of Western Literary Theories—Also on the Modernist Turn of Chinese Literary Theories), Dangdai Wentan 现代文坛 (Modern Literary Magazine) 6 (2007): 4-8.
Criticism on Anglo-American stream of consciousness novels, possibly the only criticism on Anglo-American stream of consciousness novels during the pre-1978 period according to Sun Huijun and Sun Zhili. In this rare work, eight modernist works renowned for their technique of stream of consciousness are given detailed analysis. In both, unfortunately, modernist literature was uniformly attacked with extremely negative labels.  

Woolf in the Post-1978 Period

As soon as the Reform and Open-up Policies were implemented in 1978, modernism was also revived. However, it took some time for preparation before it became accessible to the public. According to Yuan Kejia, in the very year 1978, researchers from the Institute of Foreign Literature of the Chinese Academy of Social Sciences（中國社會科學院）got together for a seminar on issues related to reevaluation of modernist literature, and soon in the following year, the voluminous *Waiguo xiandaipai zuopinxuan* （外國現代派作品選 *Modernism: A Selection*) began to be compiled and was subsequently published, starting in 1980, over a period of five years (1980-1985). Included in this selection was Woolf’s short fiction “The Mark on the Wall” and part of her *MD*. Merely the first edition of this selection was estimated to have reached 150,000 readers within around a decade’s time, roughly corresponding to the
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“modernist literature fever” in post-1978 China. The new social environment of post-1978 China allowed assessment of modernist works to be based on their own merits, rather than on their political correctness, and it was within this favorable sociopolitical milieu that Woolf along with her modernist contemporaries gained her re-entry into China.

During the 1980s, the initial stage of Woolf’s re-reception in China, evaluation was focused solely on the literary forms embedded in her works and her literary theories. The 1990s saw both a switch in some critics’ attention to Woolf’s feminist concerns and a substantial growth in her popularity, as observed in the rapid rise in the numbers of critical essays from about fifteen articles in the 1980s to about fifty in the 1990s. The switch in attention to non-literary aspects of Woolf’s works in China appeared disproportionate to that in Taiwan—where her feminist concerns were noticed as early as in the 1980s and, in the 1990s, almost all critical works had a focus on her feminist issues—and its timing was somewhat belated too, probably due to their late entry into China. Similar to that in Taiwan, however, in the 2000s, a more multifaceted Woolf began to be seen in China, even though not as polyphonic as in Taiwan during this period.

**Woolf in the 1980s**

Like her reception elsewhere in the world, Woolf’s reception in the 1980s started as part of the re-entry of modernism into China. Along with her contemporaries such as Joyce and Eliot, Woolf re-entered this land in several large-scale attempts on the part of China to catch up with the western modernism. Not long after the Open-up policies
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implementation, there arose a “modernist literature fever” that was to last for around a decade. According to Yuan, among the estimated four thousand foreign works translated during this period, the majority of them were modernist, and by 1988, “western modernist literature study as a discipline has been formally established in China” 西方現代派文學研究這門學科已在中國正式建立起來了. 144 Subsequent to the publication of the above-mentioned popular collection of modernist works in the first half of the 1980s, the Institute of Foreign Literature of the CASS went on editing yet another voluminous collection, *Xifang wenyisichao luncong* 西方文藝思潮論叢 (The Collective Criticisms on Western Theories of Literature and Art), a special volume of which *Yishiliu* 意識流 (*Stream of Consciousness*), edited by Liu Mingjiu, was published in 1989. In addition to Woolf’s widely quoted essay “Mr. Bennett and Mrs. Brown,” also included in this volume is a criticism of stream of consciousness fiction based on Woolf’s works by Zhang Feng 張烽. In his article, Zhang refers to Woolf’s *MD* and *TL* to exemplify the technique of stream of consciousness employed in modernist novels, while commenting on Woolf’s themes and ideas in these works in passing. 145

Aside from her diminutive figure against the modernist crowd in these collections, Woolf in the 1980s nevertheless began to attract a serious readership who wanted to zoom in on her works, and there even appeared a whole book introducing and discussing her, which is remarkable for a foreign writer whose works have reentered China for less

than a decade. Criticism on Woolf during this period focused primarily on her literary theories and the formal properties of her works. Many critics, moreover, appeared to have based their criticism on the original texts rather than their translations. This is because, on the one hand, translations during this period, including both newly as well as earlier translated works of Woolf, was limited—there were in actuality only five new translations in the 1980s, including *MD, TL, ND, ROO*, and a volume of selected essays translated by Qu Shijing 瞿世鏡. Most criticism produced during this period, on the other hand, appeared to have been based on Woolf’s works whose translations were not yet available at the time. For example, *The Common Reader* and *The Second Common Reader* on which Xie Chulan 解楚蘭 bases her 1985 criticism were available only in English during the 1980s. Since Woolf’s reception during this period centers on her literary achievement, in what follows, criticism on Woolf’s literary theories will be discussed first, followed by those on her literary expression. The renowned Woolf scholar Qu Shijing, on the other hand, given his significant contribution to China’s early understanding of Woolf, appears to deserve a discussion in his own right.

Criticism of Woolf during the 1980s was mainly formal in focus and there were few dealing with her literary theories, which is not surprising given that interest in literary works usually precedes that in the writer’s theories. Xie Chulan’s 解楚蘭 critical essay is one of the few in the 1980s specifically focusing on the literary theories of Woolf. Based on Woolf’s essays in *The Common Reader* and *The Second Common Reader*, in this article Xie attempts to delineate Woolf’s theoretical perspectives by giving accounts of her literary background and criticisms of her contemporary writers,
such as A. Bennett, H.G. Wells, and J. Galsworthy. Xie’s discussion also sheds light on the extent to which Woolf put into practice her literary theories in her novels.146

Most criticism during this early period of Woolf’s reentry was still quite traditional, i.e., concerned mostly with the formal properties of her works. Wang Jiaxiang, for one, gives an overview of the nine major novels of Woolf by discussing the innovative techniques and vision of reality employed in them.147 Zeng Dawei’s essay, for another, compares the formal properties of Woolf’s TL with those of Faulkner’s Sanctuary. For him, the differences in style of the two works reflect the different notions of art of the two authors.148 Zhang Feng’s discussion of MD also focuses on Woolf’s innovative uses of style. The plot, as he indicates, upon which the structural framework of a traditional novel is normally based, is played down in this novel by placing the emphasis on the portrayal of the mental activities of its characters instead. For Zhang, Woolf’s innovative form and structure invite a new aesthetic in literary writing.149 An essay by Qu Shijing published in the same year also pays attention only to the form of Woolf’s MD. He argues that the artistic values of this novel lie not in the events of the story but the characterization of the female character Clarissa
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147 Wang Jiaxiang 王家湘, “Weiginiya Wuerfu dute de xianshiguan yu xiaoshuo jiqiao zhi chuangxin” 维吉尼亚·吴尔夫獨特的現實觀與小說技巧之創新 (Virginia Woolf’s Unique Notion of Reality and Innovation of Narrative Technique), Waiguo wenxue 外國文學 (Foreign Literature) 7 (1986): 58-63.
Dalloway by means of the structure and multi-perspectival narration of the novel as well as by the rendition of her in multiple layers. In a later essay of his, Qu compares the symbol of the sea in Woolf’s *TW* with the symbol of the sea in the Chinese writer Wang Meng’s *Hai de meng* (Dream of the Sea; 1980). Again, attention is drawn to their shared poetic qualities and the depiction of human relationship to nature and fate.

There were perhaps no other critics as comprehensive and as systematic as Qu Shijing in their research on Woolf and, indeed, as we shall see presently, his contribution to Chinese readers’ appreciation of Woolf cannot be overstated. Qu’s translation of and critical essays on Woolf appeared as early as 1982. A collection of Woolf’s critical essays in Chinese translation entitled *Lun xiaoshuo yu xiaoshuojia* (*On Novels and Novelists*) came out later, in 1986, in which Woolf’s famous pieces such as “Modern Fiction,” and “Mr. Bennett and Mrs. Brown” are all included. In 1988, Qu turned his attention to how Woolf had been looked at in the western world by compiling the book *Wuerfu Yianjio* (*Woolf Studies*). Included in it are thirty-six pieces of Woolf criticism by a number of American, European, and Russian critics, which enable Chinese readers to gain access to Woolf scholarship from foreign perspectives.

152 Qu Shijing (瞿世鏡) trans., *Lun xiaoshuo yu xiaoshuojia* 論小說與小說家 (*On Novels and Novelists*), by Virginia Woolf, (Shanghai: Shanghai Yiwen, 1986); Qu Shijing (瞿世鏡) ed., *Wuerfu Yianjio* 伍爾夫研究 (*Woolf Studies*) (Shanghai: Shanghai Wenyi, 1988).
Qu’s academic endeavor culminated in his 1989 book entitled *Yishilio xiaoshuojia* "意識流小說家伍爾夫 (*Woolf, a Novelist of Stream of Consciousness)* where he gives an account of Woolf’s life and her literary heritage and an evaluation of her position in history. With a clear focus on her literary theories and criteria aesthetic in essence in his evaluation of Woolf’s achievement, he undertakes a detailed review of most of her major publications in a chronological order illustrated with Woolf’s own theoretical notions such as subjective reality, character in fiction, and experimentation of form, though, for unknown reasons, *TG*, her anti-war and anti-patriarchy essay, was left out. Unlike many other critics who label Woolf only as a stream of consciousness writer, however, Qu does not consider Woolf a stream of consciousness writer from the very outset. For him, her early works were traditional in form. It was not until the later stage of her writing career that her narrative techniques become innovative and her works begin to demonstrate an “integration of art forms” 綜合性的藝術形式, which is characteristic of stream of consciousness novels as they often combine elements of, among others, music, poetry, and painting. He thus concludes that, “I think it is more appropriate to call her a courageous experimental explorer than to call her a stream of consciousness writer” 我認為把她稱為一名勇敢的實驗探索者，要比把她稱為意識流小說家更為恰當(Qu 8). Qu also disagrees with other critics in their judgment of Woolf as anti-traditional. Woolf’s form has actually evolved from the traditional to the innovative and has been influenced by various literary traditions, such as British and Russian, to varying degrees. Qu thus argues that Woolf “not only greatly respects tradition but also excels at inheriting tradition” 不僅極其尊重傳統，而且善於繼承傳統.
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given the traceable historical origin of her literary notion and innovative techniques (Qu 240).

Qu’s interest in Woolf was well grounded. As he claims,

The reason why I chose Woolf as the focus of my research on stream of consciousness is two-fold. It is partly due to the fact that Woolf is not only a novelist but a critic as well and she has been among the major exponents of the theories of stream of consciousness novels. In her novels, on the one hand, there are no negative factors such as pornography, violence, and nihilism, and there are no chaotic nightmares on the level of the subconscious, either. Therefore, for writers of our country, her techniques are easier to model on and, for readers of our country, her works are easier to understand.

我之所以選擇伍爾夫作為我的意識流研究的重點對象,是出於兩方面的考慮。一方面,由於伍爾夫不但是小說家而且是評論家,她是意識流小說理論的主要闡述者。另一方面,由於她的小說中沒有色情、暴力、虛無主義等消極因素,也沒有潛意識層面混亂不堪的夢魘,對於我國的作家來說,她的技巧比較容易借鑒,對於我國的讀者來說,她的作品比較容易理解。(Qu 13)

Not every critic was as enthusiastic about Woolf as Qu, however. Some critics in the 1980s did find limitations in Woolf and her writings, even though they usually take up only a small space in their articles. In Xie Chulan’s article discussed above, for instance, she thinks that Woolf’s concern was confined to women of her class only. However, this limited concern of Woolf, as Xie argues, is apolitical because Woolf
simply urged women to stand up for their rights to education without actually telling them that they could resort to political action for equality. In Wang Jiaxiang’s article, furthermore, Woolf is considered to be so cut off from the external world that her “views of life and reality are partial. She ignores the social nature of humans, observing and writing about the relationship between humans and their subjective feelings in a social vacuum. She对生活和现实的看法是片面的，她忽视了人的社会性，把人与人的关系和人的主观感受，放在社会的真空来观察和描写.”

Sun Ling, on the other hand, obviously has opinions different from those of Xie’s and Wang’s, as expressed in his preface to the Chinese MD that he co-translated with Su Mei in 1987. For him, Woolf, along with some of her contemporaries, is among “intellectuals with social consciousness and democratic inclination.” Sun nevertheless considers Woolf limited otherwise. More specifically, due to her upbringing and social environments, “Woolf is relatively narrow in vision, more limited in scope…her description of objective reality and social life is also rather shallow.”

After the 1980s, as we shall see shortly, very different readings of Woolf are given by critics regarding the social and political concern in her works.

---

Woolf in the 1990s

Similar to that of Taiwan, Woolf’s popularity on the rise during the 1990s in China. The speed at which her popularity has increased, however, appears much higher in China, as reflected in the rapid increase in both the number of translations (from the traceable five in the 1980s to twelve in the 1990s) and critical papers (from around ten in the 1980s to well over forty in the 1990s) 156, as compared with that in Taiwan, which showed only a mild fluctuation during the 1990s. In actuality, interest in Woolf during the 1990s in China not only increased in readership but became wider and deeper in scope as well: critics began to notice Woolf’s non-literary concerns, and the life of Woolf also started to draw the attention of some critics. The changes in quantity, breadth, and depth in the interest in Woolf are best reflected in translations of her works. Among the twelve translations appearing during the 1990s, five novels were either re-translated, including Woolf’s most popular works, MD and TL, or newly translated, including TW, TY, and O. There are five collected essays out of the twelve translations, which is similar in proportion to the 1980s. What seems noteworthy is the appearance of translations of Woolf’s selected diaries and selected letters, which probably reflects attempts to understand Woolf beyond the texts.
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156 Critical essays are based upon magazine articles, which are relatively few, as well as academic articles that have appeared in either university-published journals or well recognized literary journals such as Waiguo wenxue pinglun 外國文學評論 (Foreign Literature Review, 1987-present, published by the Institute of Foreign Literature of the Chinese Academy of Social Science), Waiguo wenxue yenyin 外國文學 研究 (Foreign Literature Studies, 1978-present, a bimonthly published by Huazhong Normal University華中師範大學), Waiguo wenxue 外國文學 (Foreign Literature, 1980-present, a bimonthly published by Beijing Foreign Studies University北京外國語大學), Guowai wenxue 國外文學 (Foreign Literatures, 1981-present, a quarterly published by Beijing University 北京大學), and Wenyi liun yanjiu 文藝理論研究 (Theoretical Studies of Literature and Art, 1980-present, a bimonthly published by Huadong Normal University華東師範大學 and the Association of Chinese Theoretical Studies of Literature and Art 中國文藝理論學會). These literary journals have also been well recognized as important resources on Woolf studies by many critics, e.g., Cao Xiaoqin (2009).
The Literary Wolf

In light of literary reception, Woolf scholarship in the 1990s can be seen as basically a continuation from the 1980s, though its quantity had obviously increased. Except for TW, whose Chinese translation was available for the first time during this period, critical discussions still centered mainly on her two most popular novels, i.e., TL and MD, and the focus was likewise placed mostly on the forms, themes and ideas present in her works. Critical works during this period, however, also became more varied and wider in scope. Fan Yihong’s 范易弘 article, for example, delineates the development of Woolf’s stream of consciousness technique in her three most popular stream of consciousness novels MD, TL, and TW against the uses of the same techniques in Joyce’s and Faulkner’s works.¹⁵⁷ For Fan, Woolf’s attempt to take care of every character in MD is achieved at the cost of losing depth in the development of the characters that have characterized Joyce’s and Faulkner’s stream of consciousness. The same problem, fortunately, is no longer observed in TL, suggesting her ongoing efforts at improving her skills of stream of consciousness. For him, in actuality, aside from maturity in skill, the three works also represent a gradual switch from the realistic to the symbolic: while MD still belongs with the category of realistic novel, TL is already symbolic, and TW is the most abstract of the three.

Zhu Wang 朱望 and Du Wenyen’s 杜文燕 structural reading of MD exemplifies the more popular formal analyses during the 1990s, some of which however are quite

¹⁵⁷Fan Yihong 范易弘, “Lun Wuerfu de yishiliu xiaoshuo” 論伍爾夫的意識流小說(On Woolf’s Stream of Consciousness Novels), Shodu shifandaxue xuebao 首都師範大學學報 (社會科學版) [Journal of Capital Normal University (Social Science)] 3 (1990): 78-83.
elaborated and in-depth. For them, the plot of *MD* has a twofold structure, namely, the surface plot structure, which provides external framework for the story, and the deep plot structure, which is “the soul of the work.” Since characters in a stream of consciousness novel cannot interact through the manipulation of the plot as in traditional novels, the surface structure in *MD* serves to facilitate the switches in “the characters’ perspectives and the narrative foci of events” as well as to provide the historical background in which the characters are set in. According to Zhu and Du, it is precisely through the twofold structure that Woolf is able to move freely in and out of the internal and the external worlds of the characters. Han Shiyi’s discussio of Woolf’s narrative angle and discourse mode based on *TL* and *MD* is another example of formal analysis during this period. Based on Gerald Genette’s concept of narratology, he argues that Woolf minimizes the presence of an omnipotent narrator, a narrative mode usually employed to create zero focusing effect, to avoid portraying external reality in a direct manner. First person narration, a narrative mode capable of creating internal focusing effect, is abundantly used instead to allow the readers to experience the external world the way Woolf’s characters experience it. For Han, Woolf’s use of free indirect discourse, i.e. intermingling of the voices of the narrator and the characters, in delineating the mental activities of the characters not only allows her to give order and logic to the discourse but also allows some desirable effects to be created. One such effect is the identification on the part of the readers with the narrator.

---


Relatively frequently, Woolf was also approached from contemporary literary theories during the 1990s. Feng Wenkun馮文坤, for one, compares and contrasts the deconstruction of the traditional sense of self-identity, as represented by the signifier “I,” in Woolf’s and Derrida’s writings.160 Based upon German reception theories, moreover, Zhu wang朱望 assesses the aesthetic values of TL by analyzing the plot, character and narrative mode (zero and internal focus) of the story. 161 For Zhu, new aesthetic values as well as experiences become possible only after the readers are willing to take on the challenges posed by Woolf’s innovative forms, which function to lift, in Hans Robert Jauss’s aesthetic terms, their horizon of expectation that has been informed, hence limited, by their previous reading experiences.

The Critical Wolf

Studies on Woolf’s literary theories during the 1990s are more limited in number, compared to those of formal analyses, and are often introductory in nature. Wang Jiaxian’s王家湘 “Woolf Criticism in the Twentieth Century” is one example, in which the major criticisms of Woolf by western scholars since the 1970s were introduced.162 Wu Jun’s吳俊 article offers an overview of Woolf’s literary theories, including her notion of fictional character, her experimentation with new forms, and the literary tradition, e.g., Shakespeare’s plays, based upon which her emphasis on characters and
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their subject realities in fiction writing is justified. He also quotes debates among A. Bennett, E. M. Foster and T. S. Eliot to give a picture of how Woolf’s theories were received by her contemporaries. Zhang Huiren 張慧仁 takes a step further by discussing Woolf’s literary ideals against her works. She traces, in a chronological order, how Woolf develops her ideas over time, and how she reflects such changes in her major novels. It should be interesting to note that, during the 90s, while the interest in Woolf increased in both quantity and in scope, resistance to her reception appeared to decrease. That is, criticisms during this period were better focused on evaluating Woolf’s work itself while decreasing in caveats that were negative in nature. The fact that the presence of Woolf’s work began to be somewhat taken for granted suggests that Woolf’s reception in China started to take root in the 1990s.

The Feminist Woolf

A major watershed that separates the 1990s from the 1980s is a switch in focus on Woolf’s feminist concerns. Feminist discussion in China in fact began quite early in the post-1978 China. Western feminist theories and criticisms began to appear in translation in the 80s, during which period Chinese women’s writings also started to be discussed in feminist terms. When Woolf began to be discussed in the 1990s, therefore, the socio-political atmosphere had already matured and Woolf was received as a feminist spokesperson with relative ease. The feminist reading during the 1990s in China, however, remains focused on Woolf’s literary concerns, with her socio-political concerns

little discussed. Before detailing how Woolf was received as a feminist during this period, an introduction to the rise of women’s consciousness during the earlier decade appears in order, as it is in the presence of such awareness that Woolf began to be seen as a feminist writer.

Women’s consciousness in China arose rather soon after the implementation of the Open-up Policy in 1978. As early as 1984, China Women’s University 中華女子學院 already offered a women’s movement major 婦女運動專業, which was later to become a Women’s Studies department 女性學系. In 1987, the first Women’s Studies Center 婦女研究中心 was founded at Zhengzhou University. The number continued to grow since then and, up to now, there are already over a hundred universities nationwide having women’s studies centers. In the late 1980, courses addressing women’s issues began to be offered in institutes of higher education.

The introduction and translation of western feminist writings also contributed to this vogue. In 1983, Zhu Hong 朱虹 edited Meiguo nuzuojia duanpian xiaoshuo xuan 美國女作家短篇小說選 (Selected Short Stories by American Women Writers) in which feminist literary writings such as “The Story of an Hour” (by Kate Chopin) and “The Yellow Wallpaper” (by Charlotte Perkins Gilman) were included. The editor’s note gives an account of women’s movement history in the United States and its impact on the development of western feminist literature. In 1986, The Second Sex (by Simone de Beauvoir) was translated, and in 1989, ROO was also translated.

---

165 China Women’s University, founded in 1949, is affiliated with the All-China Women’s Federation (ACWF 中華全國婦女聯合會), a mass organization for Chinese women founded in the same year.
166 Zhu Hong 朱虹 ed., Meiguo nuzuojia duanpian xiaoshuo xuan 美國女作家短篇小說選 (Selected Short Stories by American Women Writers) (Beijing: Zhonggue shehui kexue, 1983).
Western feminist literary criticism continued to be introduced in the 1990s. Starting in this decade, however, Chinese scholars also became conscious of the influences, hence biases, of western feminist criticism on local Chinese feminist criticism, and began to examine differences between Chinese and western women’s consciousness, which resulted in heated debates and criticisms among Chinese scholars. While the 1980s, according to Lin Shuming 林樹明, witnessed the first wave of feminist literary criticism in post-1978 China, the World Conference held in Beijing in 1995 saw the beginning of the second one.  

Woolf’s major feminist criticisms were found among this second wave. Feminist discussions about Woolf during this period were still focused mainly on her literary notions, especially androgyny, and little on her sociopolitical concerns. This somewhat one-sided Woolf in the 1990s stands in contrast with the multifaceted Woolf in the 2000s. In fact, even before the beginning of the twenty-first century, there were already attempts to trace Woolf’s influences on French feminism, as we shall see shortly.

Reception of the feminist Woolf did not seem so favorable during this period. In Dong Yenping’s 童燕萍 discussion of women’s situations and writing in ROO, for example, doubts were cast upon Woolf’s notion of the androgynous mind as the best mental state for creative writing.  

As Dong argues, the gender of a writer necessarily has an impact on the style of a creative work, as do the readership and the artistic goal of a writer, and therefore the androgynous mind can only remain an ideal. Dong also finds
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Woolf’s arguments self-contradictory, because while Woolf stresses that harmony between man and woman can be achieved through the unity of the mind, the content of her essay nonetheless reveals her strong woman’s consciousness.

Similar hesitation towards Woolf’s ideal of androgyny was also observable in Jiang Yunfei’s 東云飛 critique of the relationship between androgyny and literary creativity in Woolf’s theories. Based on his analysis of the works by contemporary Chinese writers Zhang Jia 張潔, Wang Anyi 王安憶, and Can Xue 残雪—who Jiang believes to be sharing with Woolf an androgynous mind—in terms of their concepts of gender, androgynous characteristics, and treatments of androgynous characters, Jiang argues that Woolf’s metaphorical description of the concept of androgyny is likely to not only weaken the productive power of theories but also lead to misunderstanding. He also finds that Woolf’s theory of androgyny can be limited by her “tendency to avoid conflict” and by the transitory nature of the primal process of creativity she has placed so much emphasis on. For Jiang, conflicts are facilitative of rather than harmful to creativity, and the spontaneous free flow of creativity found in the primal stage has to undergo a secondary process to make creativity last.

While Woolf’s literary theories have encountered challenges, interestingly, her socio-political concerns, even if little discussed, were relatively well treated. Lin Shuming 林樹明 is one of the few to approach Woolf from the perspective of her sociopolitical concerns in the discussion of Woolf’s feminist thoughts in a favorable

light. Arguing against the impression that Woolf was apolitical and that Woolf was a novelist writing in a social vacuum, Lin demonstrates, based on TG and a number of war novels by Woolf, how deeply concerned she is with war and how closely connected are her criticisms of war and her criticism of patriarchy. His analysis also draws attention to the fact that Woolf’s aesthetic practice is informed by her sense of life and death, brought about by the threat of war she has personally experienced.

An interesting but somewhat puzzling switch in attention to Woolf is discussion of her influences on French feminism. Yang Yuehua, for example, argues that French feminist literary criticism basically develops out of Woolf’s philosophical and literary ideas and embodies endeavors to theorize and systematize, among others, her concepts of and innovation in literary creation. Woolf’s political and social concerns, in contrast, are obviously ignored. In her article discussing western feminist critiques of patriarchal culture, Ma Rui also brings up a similar argument. She takes Woolf and Cixous as examples to illustrate how the use of first person narration, metaphor and fictional elements in their critical writings contributed to the transformation of western theoretical discourse conventions. Woolf’s and Cixous’s practice of female/feminine writing, according to Ma, serves as a strategy to subvert the phallocentric logic of language on the one hand and, on the other, to demonstrate that alternative forms and
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172 Ma Rui 馬睿, “Cong Wuerfu dao Xisu de nuxingzhuyi piping”（Feminist Criticism from Woolf to Cixous）, Waiguo wenxue yenjiu 外國文學研究 (Foreign Literature Studies (Studies) 15.3 (1999): 1-7.
structures of theoretical discourse which enable women to express their minds freely are possible.

**Woolf in the 2000s—literary, critical, and feminist figure**

The first decade of the twenty-first century witnessed an unprecedented popularity of Woolf in China as well as in Taiwan. The speed at which her popularity grew in China, however, is unequalled. Degree essays alone have exceeded one hundred thirty, including one hundred and twenty-seven master theses and six doctoral dissertations, which is remarkable compared to the total of thirty-eight in Taiwan during the same decade. Even if degree essays are not considered, as their pre-1997 sources (i.e., the Wanfang Data) are unreliable, the number of critical essays published during the 2000s is still impressive. That is, there are almost six hundred pieces of Woolf criticism published during this period, a number thirteen times as great as that of the 1990s (which is less than fifty). Growth in Woolf’s newly translated works, in contrast, appears relatively stable. This appears understandable, given that responses to a work are usually larger in number than the work itself and that there is always a limit to the number of publication of a writer’s work. However, the nature of the translated works published during this period appears to differ from that in Taiwan.

In Taiwan during the 2000s, as discussed in the previous chapter, there was a sharp rise in Woolf’s works in Chinese from the 1990s. Among the thirteen translations published during the 2000s, only four are collected essays—two of which are actually different translations of *ROO*. Even if all translations published after 1949 are considered, there are only three volumes of Woolf’s essays that have ever been published in Taiwan, i.e., *ROO*, *TG* and *Book and Portraits*. There are, in contrast, as many as
seventeen volumes of collected essays published in China during the first decade of the twenty-first century alone, which is a steady increase from the seven volumes in the 1990s. Despite the small number of translated essays of Woolf’s in Taiwan, there have been nevertheless substantial critical works, if degree essays are included. This means many critics in Taiwan have been basing their criticism mainly on the original texts. This further indicates that Woolf’s readership in Taiwan, relative to that of China, is still restricted mainly to readers who are proficient in English.

Another apparent difference between Taiwan and China lies in the most frequently translated novels. That is, while MD and TL can be similarly placed in both regions among the top three most popular works during the 2000s, their places in the short lists are different in the two. In China, they are the two most frequently retranslated works—there are three new translated versions of MD and two versions of TL. In Taiwan, however, the first place was taken by the even more popular O, which enjoys three new translations during the 2000s alone. Again, if all translations after 1949 are considered, it would seem that Woolf’s readership in China remain quite consistent over the years, with MD and TL being their favorites, as they enjoy most translated versions—there have been five versions of MD and four versions of TL. In Taiwan, on the other hand, the first place is again given to O—while there have been two translated versions of MD and three versions of TL published in Taiwan, there have been four versions of O. It is worthy of note that three out of the four appeared during the 2000s, which is probably due to, as discussed in the earlier chapter, the influences of the mass media.

The sources of differences in Woolf’s published translations may lie in the somewhat different nature of readerships in Taiwan and China, especially in terms of
their educational backgrounds. As the period during which the translations were published also plays a role in explaining the said differences, they will be discussed in the order of periods, with the turn of the century as the cutoff point. Before the 2000s, to begin with, Woolf had been read in Taiwan mainly in universities and by mostly English majors who, as argued above, had had the required language proficiency to approach Woolf’s work in its original texts. This may explain why there had been only three of Woolf’s novels, along with ROO and a collection of her short fiction, translated over a period of half a century, despite attempts to introduce Woolf as early as in the late 1950s; in the 1970s, there were already two translated versions of ROO and even one master’s thesis on Woolf. In China, in contrast, there were as many as six different novels and five collections of essays translated during the two decades between 1978 and 1999 alone. The contrast again may be explained by Woolf’s different readership in China. That is, Woolf was read in China by not only English majors but non-English majors as well, especially students of theories of literature and art and comparative literature & world literature (both being programs offered in the Chinese Department), most of whom read modernist works in their Chinese translations.

Beginning in the 2000s, translation of Woolf’s work appears to have been differently motivated in Taiwan and China. In Taiwan, both newly translated novels and newly translated essay collections are limited in number: the former include two novels, FB and TW, and the latter include also two, TG and Book and Portraits. In contrast, three different translated versions of O were published in this decade alone, which is probably due to, as we shall see in the next chapter, the promotion of the mass media. In China, in contrast, half of the translations published on Woolf during the same period are those of
essay collections (fifteen out of a total of thirty). Attempts at a comprehensive coverage of Woolf’s critical works are apparent: Woolf’s *The Common Reader I and II* were translated twice in this decade alone; during the same decade, the voluminous *Complete Essays* was also published (in four volumes) to include translations of all of Woolf’s critical works. The great number of translations of both Woolf’s novels and her critical essays thus enables general readers in China to also appreciate Woolf without the hindrance of language. The huge number of critical works and degree essays on Woolf produced during this period is therefore unsurprising. Indeed, when the disciplines in which the degree essays were produced were examined, it is found that around one-third (forty-four out of one hundred and thirty) of master theses produced during the 2000s were by non-English majors and written in Chinese. This stands in contrast with that of Taiwan, where only one-tenth of master theses produced during the same period were by non-English majors.

The easy accessibility to Woolf’s work to general readers in China is also evidenced in her presence in popular media, including both television programs and popular (literary) magazines. In 2002, for example, Woolf scholar Huang Mei黃梅 gave a talk on *ROO* on a popular television program entitled “Baijia Jiangtan”百家講壇 (*Lecture Room), an education program produced by the China Central Television (CCTV) with the objective of providing an “open university” to the general public. In this program, scholars and specialists are invited to give talks that cover a wide range of topics. Huang’s lecture, entitled “Woolf, Women Writing, and Women,” 吳爾夫·女性寫作·女性 is the third of the seven of a series called “Women’s Topics by Women Scholars”女性學者談女性話題, in which women scholars are invited to discuss
women-related topics such as women and law, philosophy, writing, and women’s movements. According to Huang, the influence of Woolf’s discussion of women and writing in **ROO** is both literary and socio-political, and the insights it offers continue to lure back readers today for illumination and inspiration. 173

Woolf’s increasing popularity with general readers as exemplified in the introduction and discussion of her in popular magazines is also apparent from the rapid growth in their number from around four in both the 1980s and the 1990s to well over forty in the 2000s. In popular magazines published in this decade, Woolf was mainly approached as a woman and feminist writer. Many of the reviews and discussions are published in popular literary magazines such as *Mingzuo Xinshang* 靈作欣賞 (Masterpieces Review; 1980-) and *Zuoja* 作家 (Writer Magazine; 1956-) that have targeted general readers for their readership. This in a way limits the discussions to the more easily accessible form, themes, imagery and feminist thoughts of her major novels, such as **TL**, **MD** and **O**. As elsewhere in the world, moreover, **ROO** is the most popular among all her critical essays and is often discussed for issues of women’s consciousness and independence raised in it. In the latter half of the 2000s, her popularity was further fueled by the staging of the film adaptation of **The Hours**, which may have aroused in her readers a further interest in her personal life and her suicide. Woolf began to be discussed, as a result, both as a character in the film and a writer in real life. Discussion

---

173 Huang Mei 黃梅, “Wuerfu; Nuxingxiezuo; Nuxing” 吳爾夫・女性寫作・女性 (Woolf, Women Writing, and Women), Lecture Room, CCTV, Beijing, 6 March 2002. Television. Huang’s lecture was aired on March 06, 2002 as the third of the seven lectures in the series entitled “Women Scholars on Women’s Issues”女性學者談女性話題. Huang’s lecture was the third of the seven lectures in the series entitled “Women Scholars on Women’s Issues”女性學者談女性話題. Lecture Room debuted in 2001.
of this type can be found in popular movie magazines such as *Dianying Wenzue* 电影文学(*Movie Literature*, 1958-) and *Dianying Pingjie* 電影評介(*Movie Review*, 1979-).

Reception of Woolf in China during this period continues its focus on the literary Woolf from the 1990s; that is, roughly three-fourths of the critical essays on Woolf discuss her critical ideas and the formal properties and themes of her literary works. *TL* and *MD* again are the most studied novels, but her other major novels, such as *O, TW, BTA, VO* and *ND*, and some of her short fiction also began to attract attention. The almost six hundred pieces of her criticism produced in the 2000s, which is ten times more than that of the 1990s, means that the perspectives for discussing her must be wider. Indeed, Woolf as a writer has been approached from multiple perspectives, including music, painting, style, social psychology, and even philosophy. Critical theories about the critic Woolf also begin to take on different interpretations, especially self-determinism. Discussions of the non-literary Woolf, including both her feminist ideas and her sociopolitical concerns, account for the remaining criticisms. While androgyny remains the center of discussion, it is interpreted in a sociopolitical light, and its reception becomes more positive and favorable.

**The Literary Wolf**

While the mainstream readings of Woolf still focus on form and theme, the 2000s begins to see her from nonliterary perspectives in the formal analysis of her work. Notable instances include the several critical studies on the formal elements of music and painting in her novels. Yu bing’s 余冰analysis of *TL* shows that Woolf appeared to have borrowed the formal elements of music, as reflected in her attention to rhythm of her
language and her use of leitmotif, counterpoint, and sonata in structuring her story.¹⁷⁴

Wan Yongfang 萬永芳 studies the painting technique employed in TL in terms of the post-impressionistic figures found in it, i.e., light and color.¹⁷⁵ For Wan, Woolf’s search for spiritual essence—the ultimate truth—is expressed through her repeated use of these two elements as vehicle of meanings in the story. Besides cross-disciplinary readings, critical attention has also been drawn to the evolution of her styles. Li Hongmei 李紅梅, for instance, argues that Woolf’s later novels become more prosaic in style. In her two later novels TY and BTA, as an example, Woolf no longer focuses her main attention on the perception of her characters; instead, she replaces subjective narration with objective narration in an attempt to construct a new discourse mode, one that is more accessible to the common readers.¹⁷⁶

In addition to the transition in style, Li also points out the tremendous impact Woolf’s self-claimed “outsider” identity—a gesture of rejection of mainstream values—and her public stance have exercised on her writing of TY and BTA, this time in light of their themes. In these two, great importance is attached to people’s history by giving precedence to daily events over major historical events, such as the Great War and women’s movements. For her, mainstream values only serve to alienate people from

¹⁷⁶ Li Hongmei 李紅梅, “Gonggonglichang shang de zhaoyue—Wuerfu houzixiaoshuo chuangzuo zhuansxing de yenju” 公眾立場上的超越—伍爾夫後期小說創作轉型的研究 (Surpassing the Public Stance: A Study of the transformation of Woolf’s Later Novels), Suzhou Daxue Xuebao 蘇州大學學報 (哲學社會科學版) [Academic Journal of Suzhou University (Philosophy and Social Science)] 1 (2006): 75-78.
their communities and families. Another discussion of Woolf’s literary themes is Chen Zhijie and Li Huiqin’s 2004 article, where a postmodernist reading of *TL* is presented. According to Chen and Li, the concept of binary opposition undergoes elaborate deconstruction throughout the novel. Woolf destabilizes the central position occupied by Mr. and Mrs. Ramsay by pushing them to the peripheral in the narrative. The legitimacy of binary opposition is challenged by the refusal of Mrs. Ramsay and Lily Briscoe to choose from dichotomous choices; the dividing line between the polar opposites of real world vs. fairy-tale world is also made blurred in the story through the strategic use of different viewpoints. To show that identity is actually constructed through language, and that its meaning is therefore indefinite, fragmentary, and unclear, Woolf writes and re-writes the presence of the deceased Mrs. Ramsay based on the memories of different characters, which are mutually repeating, conflicting, and contradicting.

**The Critical Wolf**

Woolf’s literary criticism continues to receive attention during this period but efforts spent on evaluating her theories are more often supplementary in nature. Yin Qiping, for example, in an attempt to complement Qu Shijing’s analysis in the 1980s of Woolf’s critical theories, reexamines the seven constituents of her theories that Qu has come up with—namely, her notion of the change of era, subjective reality, fictional character, breakthrough in convention, experimentalism, future fiction, and

---

177 Chen Zhijie 陳志杰, and Li Huiqin 李慧勤, “Dianfu eryuanduili—Dao dengta qu de houxiandaizhuyi jiedu” 頓覆二元對立—到燈塔去的後現代主義解讀 (The Postmodernist Reading of *To the Lighthouse*), *Ximan Minzu Dexue Xuebao* 西南民族大學學報(人文社科版) [Journal of Southwest University for Nationalities (Humanities and Social Science)] 25.10 (2004): 270-272.
literary ideal. For Yin, some of the constituents are actually overlapping, and Qu’s interpretation and overemphasis on the subjective aspect of Woolf’s notion of subjective reality is likely to mislead readers into thinking that it is unrelated to objective reality for Woolf. Instead of coming up with modified classifications, however, Yin sums up the entirety of Woolf’s literary theories in one single notion of Woolf’s, i.e., life-determinism. Woolf’s critical views of fiction, according to Yin, stems from her notion that the writer’s life determines the content of his or her work, and novelists are especially susceptible to their life experiences, which keep on stimulating them. Gao Fen’s (2008) review of Woolf’s literary notion is another example of supplementary characteristics. While she basically agrees with Yin’s complementary assessment of Woolf, however, she sees the relationship between the novel and life in Woolf’s theories the other way around, i.e., the novel is an artistic form that records life. Unlike Yin’s notions, that is, Gao regards life as a passive rather than an active participant in novel creation.

Critical attention during this period is also drawn to Woolf the writer and her life, which in an interesting way echoes Woolf’s theory about life-determinism. In addition to her critical writing, Woolf’s personal writings such as diaries and letters and her biographies began to be translated and read, which enables some critics to assess Woolf

---

in relation to her life. Li Rusho李儒壽,\textsuperscript{180} for instance, traces Woolf’s life for her connection with the University of Cambridge and the influence of its academic tradition on her. Lee claims that while Woolf’s father, a senior researcher at Cambridge, laid a solid foundation for Woolf’s later development in literary writing, her Bloomsbury friends, Cambridge graduates mainly, served as role models in her seeking of the spirit of genuineness and innovation, an important influence on her feminist thought and literary notions. Jiang Hong蒋虹discusses the influence of Russian literature on Woolf’s writing, based on Woolf’s discussion of this literary tradition.\textsuperscript{181} She claims that Woolf found Russian literature intriguing not simply out of cultural curiosity. What also drew Woolf’s attention is that Russian literature, as represented by the works of Dostoevsky and Chekhov, is formless and having an emphasis on the soul of the characters, two features which Woolf found “strange.” What Woolf found strange later become what her readers find familiar in her writing, i.e., her innovative form and emphasis on subjective experiences.

**The Feminist and Sociopolitical Woolf**

Varied feminist discussion of Woolf and growing attention to her sociopolitical concerns mark the non-literary reception of Woolf in China during the first decade of the twenty-first century. In terms of feminist discussion, while focus is still placed by some critics on her criticisms of women and writing, Woolf started to be discussed more on her criticisms of gender relationships and patriarchy. In terms of her socio-political concerns,


Woolf is no longer seen as an apolitical writer of privileged class writing in a social vacuum. Instead, she began to be approached as a feminist writer or a writer with feminist thoughts and awareness of the social-political issues of her time and one taking issue with the hegemonic patriarchy and the resulting conflicts of gender relationship. Even voice of the political Woolf began to be heard, though it remained relatively weak and usually heard as part of the discussions of her criticism of patriarchy. Gu Xiangna谷香娜, for example, notes that, through characterization of the male figures of a privileged class in *MD*, Woolf shows that patriarchy is the source of male violence that leads to war.\(^{182}\) Hu Xinmei胡新梅, in a similar vein, also argues that the aftermath of war revealed in *MD* is a powerful accusation of war and the patriarchal system.\(^{183}\) All these indicate that, compared to her reception before the 2000s, Woolf started to be seen in a more favorable light when the twenty-first century began.

One notable instance is the sharp contrast between Wu Qinghong’s吳慶宏 reading of “A Society” (1921) in 2003 with that of Xiao Qian’s in the 1948. As reviewed in Chapter Two, for Xiao Qian, “A Society” is a flop as it shows Woolf’s “unrestrained taunting of every man in the world, civil and military alike, through the mouths of three girls and with an absurd plot structured in a higgledy-piggledy fashion.” What Xiao sees as a flop, however, Wu sees as “the harbinger of new [second wave] feminism”新女性

---

that started in the 1960s and lasted throughout the 1970s in the west.¹⁸⁴

According to Wu, while women in Woolf’s time were still fighting for their suffrage, Woolf already took issue, as early as the 1920s, with the myth of male superiority and social systems laden with patriarchal values. Woolf’s avant-garde foresight, however, was not paid its due attention until several decades later when second wave feminism in the west started to bloom, and gender differences and discrimination began to attract attention. An even more comprehensive assessment of Woolf’s pioneering status and her contribution to feminism is given in Wu’s 2005 book entitled *Virginia Woolf and Feminism*, in which she gives a systematic account of Woolf’s feminist thoughts and the role she has played in the development of western feminism, including the first, the second, and the third wave feminism. For Wu, Woolf is a pioneering figure of western feminism:

```
Virginia Woolf is a representative figure with outstanding contribution in the history of the development of western feminism. Her analysis of the concept of feminism laid bare the inadequacy of the old feminism of the period from the end of the nineteenth century to the beginning of the twentieth century that stressed the legal equality between man and woman. Her feminist analysis also motivated the new feminist in the 1960s and 1970s of the twentieth century to deconstruct the male political hegemony, established women’s perspectives, and foretold the direction of the development of post-feminism in the 1990s of the twentieth century.
```

弗吉尼亞·伍爾夫是西方女權主義發展史上具有突出貢獻的代表人物，她對女權概念的分析，洞穿了19世紀末、20世紀初片面強調男女法律上平權的舊女權主義的不足，啟發了20世紀60、70年代的新女權主義者去解構男性政治文化霸權、確立女性視角，預視了20世紀90年代後女權主義的發展方向。185

Woolf notion of androgyny continued to be discussed, but in this decade it started to be seen in a sociopolitical light, whereby androgyny is taken both as a means to deconstruct patriarchal culture and as a potential resolution to gender conflicts. Su Yongchen’s 束永珍 reading of Woolf’s TL, for one, points out that Woolf uses Mr. and Mrs. Ramsay to expose the male-female dichotomy hidden in western culture that has grown out of phallogocentrism and come with the similarly dichotomous values of dominance and subordination.186 To stress the polar opposites, Mr. Ramsay is labeled in the story as belonging to the society and Mrs. Ramsay the domestic, and Mr. Ramsay as the rational and Mrs. Ramsay as the emotional. It is to break free from this concept, according to Su, that Woolf creates the androgynous characters, including Lily Briscoe, a painter friend of the family, and the youngest son James, in whom masculine and feminine qualities are integrated. Binary opposition is thus subverted through the fusion of masculinity and femininity. For Yuan Suhua 袁素華, a similar endeavor to promote androgyny in O is meant to achieve gender harmony. According to Yuan, Woolf brings

185 Wu Qinghong 吳慶宏, Virginia Woolf yu nuquanzhuyi 弗吉尼亞·伍爾夫與女權主義(Virginia Woolf and Feminism) (Beijing: Zhongguo Shehui Kexue, 2005) 4.
186Su Yongchen 束永珍, “Qubia yu zhenghe: Dao dengta qu de nuxingzhuyi jiadu” 區別與整合到燈塔去的女性主義解讀(Differentiation and Integration: A Feminist Reading of To the Lighthouse), Waiguo wenxue yenyu 外國文學研究(Foreign Literature Studies) 1 (2001): 61-66.
in the concept of androgyny to refute gender hegemony, male and female alike, and to promote gender equality. Woolf’s ultimate concern, however, lies not only in equality but in further harmony between sexes/ genders as well.  

Woolf’s attempt to deconstruct patriarchy is not limited to her use of androgyny. For Pan Jian 潘健, the same deconstructive attempt is embodied also in the symbolic breaking of the dividing line between the public and the private spheres. In Pan’s analysis, Woolf’s public and private sphere has been gendered as male and female in patriarchal values. Her act of blurring the division of the two spheres, in both literary rendition and real life experiences, thus symbolizes the deconstruction of patriarchal values. In the fictional world Woolf allows her female characters to move about in the city (a male, public sphere), and in reality Woolf herself was also an active member of women’s liberation and often gave lectures to women upon invitation. Pan argues that to further deconstruct patriarchal systems, Woolf was strategic in making the central male figures in the literary world “absent”, as in JD and TW, to take away the dominant position they have traditionally occupied. In her essay TG, she even urges women to found an “Outsiders’ Society” that is not structured according to the power structure and model of a patriarchal society, since women are viewed as outsiders in a patriarchal society according to Woolf.

Issues of gender and identity in her novels are also widely discussed in the feminist reading of Woolf in this century. O is often the object of study when Woolf’s works are analyzed from a gender studies perspective, as it provides a theoretical

framework for sex/gender to be discussed in light of social construction. Lu Qi and Liu Shuming argue that Woolf’s idea of transgender as a way to subvert the binary dichotomy of gender/sex is revealed when she renders Orlando’s gender ambiguous by emphasizing both the femininity and the masculinity in him/her and by cross-dressing him/her regardless of the sex he/she appears in. Based on his reading of *O*, Pan Jian argues that it is mainly through cross-dressing that Woolf presents the indeterminacy of Orlando’s sex/gender and, in so doing, criticizes the mainstream phallogocentric culture in which the concept of sex/gender is constructed. Lu Hongling carries the discussion of Woolf’s idea of gender and identity a step further. Based on Woolf’s concept of “other sexes” raised in *ROO*, where the concept of androgyny was also raised, and its rendition in *TW*, Lu argues that Woolf’s idea of gender actually transcends the oppositional dichotomies. For Lu, Woolf’s concept of “other sexes” is inclusive, for it not only acknowledges gender differences as the concept of androgyny does but also implies the multiple features and complexity of gender and identity, as indicated in the six characters in *TW*.

---


In the 2000s, in summary, one sees the rapid rise of Woolf’s popularity in China, as reflected in both the great variety of her works translated into Chinese and the great number of critical essays that address the various aspects of her literary and critical writings. Unlike that in Taiwan, Woolf has been received on this huge land first with some resistance in the form of negative reviews, and the reception of her began to turn favorable only rather recently. The sociopolitical atmosphere, as discussed, apparently has played an important role in this development. Another discernible difference in Woolf’s reception in Taiwan and China, moreover, lies in their somewhat different readerships. Woolf has been more accessible to the general public in China since the 1980s, as evidenced in both the quantity and variety of her translated works. In Taiwan, in contrast, Woolf’s readership is still limited in the sense that, though some of her more popular works like *ROO* and *O* have become available to general readers, the more comprehensive Woolf, i.e., the Woolf in her various roles and with her various concerns, is still accessible mainly to the academic world. Both in Taiwan and China, however, Woolf in the twenty-first century appears to have become so well received that her influence has started to be felt, as we shall see in the next chapter.
Chapter Five

The Influence of Woolf in China and Taiwan

The influence\textsuperscript{192} of Woolf in Chinese cultural contexts can be considered a result of the reception of Woolf and growing familiarity with her and her work to such an extent that Chinese readers were able to respond to it with artistic or literary creation. This chapter looks at Woolf in China and Taiwan in light of major cultural productions in various forms that have been either directly inspired by, indebted to, or modeled upon her ideas or, at a later stage of her reception, produced through appropriation and/or manipulation of her established fame. The goal of this chapter is to show that her images as a feminist and as a literary writer have stood out among Woolf’s multifaceted imagery as best received by artists and writers from China and Taiwan, which in turn has led to numerous cultural productions and borne witness to Woolf’s unique contribution to Chinese popular culture. These cultural productions emerged mostly in the late twentieth and early twenty-first century when Woolf’s popularity surged globally. This is a time when China began to catch up with developed countries in terms of not only economics but also popular culture as well. The global popularity of Woolf has similarly reached China. This is evidenced in the fact that, though Woolf’s reception in China had lagged behind that in Taiwan for as long as twenty years when her influence was first felt in the latter, in this global surge of Woolf’s popularity China appears to have caught up with its

\textsuperscript{192} Reception and influence are used sometimes interchangeably and at other times distinctively in the literature. Interested readers are referred to Ulrich Weisstein’s \textit{Comparative Literature and Literary Theory: Survey and Introduction} for their various uses in the literature. In this thesis, a distinction is made between the two. Roughly, reception refers to the understanding, and hence acceptance of a foreign production, cultural or literary, for elements that are similar to or compatible with the receiving culture. An influence is observed in cultural or literary productions made in the receiving culture based on or inspired by the received production, though it may also occur only psychologically, i.e., without manifested production.
same-language peer at an amazing speed. As a result, the gaps in Woolf’s reception lying between these two lands, separated by sovereign differences as well as the 180-km-wide Taiwan Strait, have shrunk to such an extent that few differences in her reception remain clearly discernable.

Although globalization began early, its presence is probably best felt by most people in the form of the Internet. China started late in this global surge, but it soon caught up and its “number of Internet users or netizens topped 137 million by the end of 2006...and 162 million by June 2007, making China the second largest Internet user after the United States, according to China's Ministry of Information Industry (MII).” 193 China’s fast growing economy obviously has played an important part in this drastic change. Its economy has grown at an incredible speed since 1990, and in 2006 its total trade had grown to such an extent that it became “the world’s third-largest trading nation after the U.S. and Germany.” 194 This has caused many mass media to consider the twenty-first century as the “Chinese century.” In his 2005 news article for The Times, “This is the Chinese Century,” William Rees-Mogg wrote,

THE 18TH and 19th centuries were the British centuries.... The 20th century was the American century....We all assume, as Washington undoubtedly assumes, that we are still living in the era of American hegemony, though it is already clear that China may be an emerging superpower.... My own optimism is not only based on the growth of the economy, though that is the outstanding economic growth record of the past two decades. China has also understood the importance of domestic

194 Ibid. Web 22 March, 2010
and international freedom of trade and the need for the best possible
relations with trading partners. With direct material and financial support,
China has been one of the large contributors to the relief of the Indian
Ocean countries after the tsunami disaster. The economic maturity of the
new China has been accompanied by increasing political maturity. That is
the best guarantee for the future of what is beginning to look like the
Chinese century.¹⁹⁵

In a recent poll held jointly by the ABC News and The Washington Post and reported in
February, 2010, even Americans are beginning to believe in the twenty-first century as the
Chinese century:

Facing high unemployment and a difficult economy, most Americans
think the United States will have a smaller role in the world economy in
the coming years, and many believe that while the 20th century may have
been the "American Century," the 21st century will belong to China.¹⁹⁶

Successful trade necessarily accompanies global communication, which in turn
necessitates socio-cultural imports. While Taiwan has long been used to cultural imports
given its island economy, hence heavy reliance on international trade, China has proved
to be also quick in picking up since the late twentieth century. Its globalization has
matured in the beginning of the twenty-first century to the extent that its resistance to
foreign cultures has become barely detectable. The thinned-down differences in Woolf’s

¹⁹⁵ William Rees-Mogg, “This is the Chinese Century,” Times Online, 3 January 3 2005. Web. 20 March
2010. <http://www.timesonline.co.uk/tol/comment/columnists/william_rees_mogg/article407883.ece.>
¹⁹⁶ John Pomfret, and Jon Cohen, “Poll shows concern about American influence waning as China’s
<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/story/2010/02/25/ST2010022500027.html?sid=ST2010022500027>. See also Mike
reception between Taiwan and China appear to be an example of this globalization maturity in the latter. Artistic creations in response to Woolf by Taiwan artists began to be seen in Hong Kong, which become part of China in 1997. The Taiwanese stage director and playwright Wei Ying-chuan, for example, premiered her *ROO* in Hong Kong. Works of writers from China, in a similar vein, have also been shown in Taiwan. Hong Ying, a writer from China, for example, first published her controversial novel *K* in Taiwan in 1999. Cultural globalization in light of Woolf’s reception is perhaps best exemplified in Dominic Cheung’s work, “Two Poems Dedicated to Mrs. Woolf,” where he compares a famous Hong Kong actor who has committed suicide to Woolf. Cheung is a Macau-born poet and scholar who has been educated in respectively Hong Kong, Taiwan, and the United States and is now teaching in the United States. Although the poems concern a Hong Kong actor, it has been, interestingly, published in Taiwan, first in a literary journal and later in a book. In fact, some translations of Woolf’s work such as *Book and Portrait* (selected essays), 2005, were done by Chinese translators but have been published/printed only in Taiwan. Given the substantial overlapping of the global influence on Taiwan and China in the twenty-first century, therefore, little distinction will be made between the two in the discussion of Woolf’s reception in the Chinese-speaking world.

Based on the two major images the Chinese-speaking population has had of her, Woolf will first be discussed for her feminist influence and later, in somewhat better detail, as a literary writer. The inspiration by, and sometimes the appropriation of, Woolf and her work will be dealt with in each to give a sketch of her influences on these foreign lands. Part one begins with a discussion of the feminist images of Woolf in the Chinese-
speaking world. The cultural products in response to her works as a vehicle of feminist thoughts are further classified in terms of the extent to which her original symbols have been retained in the works under her sway. Discussion in part two and three will focus on Woolf’s literary influences as well as reception, especially her critical theories (part two) and literary techniques (part three) that have been introduced into the Chinese literary realm through her works. With the popularity of her works, as will be shown in the final part, Woolf’s reception may take yet another form—one that is only, if at all, remotely related to her feminist and literary influence. In this part, discussion will concern how the fame derived from her feminist and literary popularity has been taken advantage of as an index to the extent of her reception in these areas.

A Woolf of One’s Own

The Chinese reading public, especially those who do not read her English originals, know Woolf best as a feminist. An important reason for this is that the majority of her translations appeared only when feminist discourse began to receive mainstream attention in the Chinese-speaking world. In the case of Taiwan, labels such as “feminist pioneer” or “feminist writer” are readily found attached to Woolf in the editor’s/translator’s note, or on the back cover blurb of the circulating translations, making it impossible for anyone who reads her to forget her feminist identity. Marketing strategies, too, have played a role in this respect. Local bookstores, for instance, displayed posters of Woolf or offered giveaways featuring Woolf as the spokeswoman for feminism in their attempt to whet the public’s reading appetite.197

197 For more see Lee Kengfang, “The Multiple Faces of Virginia Woolf in Taiwan,” In Other Words 13 (Summer 2008): 3-11.
Among Woolf’s feminist essays, both *TG* and *ROO* have been received as most representative. However, the two are not equally well received in all foreign lands. This perhaps has to do with the degrees of universality, hence receptibility, of the main imagery carried in the two. That is, while the anti-war and anti-fascism conception lying in the background of *TG* has appeared as more socially and historically specific, the imagery of a room, no matter how varied its symbolic meanings may be in different cultures, is a common human experience and, as such, can be easily received, though not necessarily with its original symbols remaining intact. This is perhaps why *ROO* has been used as a major index to the feminist Woolf’s popularity outside of the United Kingdom. In Germany, for one, Ansgar and Vera Nunings maintain that the re-assessment in feminist terms in the late 1970s of Woolf’s non-fictional writings, such as *ROO* and *TG*, had resulted in the rapid increase of Woolf’s popularity, “with *ROO* being German feminists’ all-time favorite.” 198 A similar popularity of *ROO*, according to Myunghee Chung, is also found in Korea, where its title was appropriated in a play dramatizing Korean heroines in history. 199 Likewise, this famous piece of Woolf is again the all-time favorite of Chinese-speaking readers taking an interest in her feminist thought, as indicated by the fact that there exist as many as seven versions of *ROO*’s Chinese translation today. Among these versions, one was by Chinese a translator during the republican period, two were translated by Chinese translators and four were translated by Taiwanese translators in Taiwan in the second half of the 20th century.

Although *ROO* appears to be the most popular among Woolf’s feminist works, the shape its influence takes are not entirely uniform. As will be shown below, a rough division of the works bearing witness to the varying influences of *ROO* can be drawn along a line on the one side of which much of the room as a symbol for financial independence, hence freedom in artistic creation, has been retained; on its other side, the room has been attached to other meanings, while its original symbols have gone almost or entirely untraceable. For the present purpose, this is a rough yet useful distinction between expansion and pure appropriation of the original work.

Literati and artists alike should find the feminist idea in *ROO* most neatly summarized in the famous statement that “a woman must have money and a room of her own if she is to write fiction,” a catch phrase that has appeared in most of the said translations as a feature of this book-length essay and been highlighted on most of their covers. Such a symbolic sense of room is cleverly alluded to in the poem, “*Wuerfu yu tade fangjian*” 吳爾芙與她的房間 (Woolf and Her Room) by the Taiwanese poet Ling Yu 零雨. The symbolic room is conjured up in this work as a desired object that is at the same time so close and yet so far as to bring out a woman’s struggle between the desire for artistic creation and the overwhelming family obligation that takes up a large portion of her time in everyday life, even if she does have her private room. The narrator, obviously a wife and mother, says that the living room, which is located right next to her private room, is where she has spent most of her life, not for herself, but for her family.

---

200 Ling Yu 零雨, “*Wuerfu yu tade fangjian*” 吳爾芙與她的房間 (Woolf and Her Room), *Xinshi sanshijia: Taiwan wenxue sanshinian jingyinxuen* 新詩 30 家: 台灣文學三十年菁英選 (Selected Poems of Thirty Poets) (Taipei: Jioge, 2008) 91-92.
Even if her private room is as close as next to the living room, she rarely has the luxury to stay inside and make time for herself,

We always stay in the neighboring room,

To build a family

To sit across from our husbands, to help our children

With their home work

...

We have rooms of our own

--but time does not reside in it

From the neighboring room, we always

Look at each other

In embarrassment.

我們總是在隔壁

建立家庭

與夫對坐，與子女一起

做功課

... 

我們有自己的房間

——時間也不住在裡面

我們總是，在隔壁

尷尬地

與他對看. (4-7, 21-25)
As it seems, for Ling Yu at least, a room is not the only thing that is required. Time of one’s own is yet another necessary ingredient in the making of a woman’s dreams.

Taiwanese writer Lee Li 李黎 apparently seconds Ling Yu on this. Adopting the title of Woolf’s, Lee L wrote about the “room” of many writers, including her own, in the essay “Ziji de fangjian” 自己的房間 (A Room of One’s Own). She stresses that a room is a place for reading and writing, but in her case as a wife and a mother, having a room of her own does not necessarily means having a totally autonomous and undisturbed place to write, as Woolf claims in ROO, because her family can come and go at will:

I am lucky, for I am not like the “Shakespeare’s sister” in [Woolf’s] pen who was born at the wrong time, and I am also lucky to own a small room which belongs to me, which is capable of being termed as a “study.”

Though there is a door in my room, it is always open. My family can go inside at any time and at will, reminding me that “a room of one’s own” is not one’s fortress…. Virginia Woolf might not have anticipated this: even when a woman has had “a room of one’s own,” she still needs to face such an irresistible situation...

我生而有幸，沒有像她筆下的「莎士比亞的妹妹」那樣生不逢辰，更幸而能擁有一間屬於自己專用、且可稱之為「書房」的斗室。只是我家的書房門雖設而常開，家人隨時隨興皆可長驅直入，提醒我「自己的房間」並非自己的堡壘…維琴妮亞．吳爾夫大概未曾料及：女子有了「自己的房間」之後，還是會面臨這般無可抗拒的情況...

Lee Li 李黎, “Ziji de fangjian” 自己的房間 (A Room of One’s Own), Meiguuhualet de mingzi 玫瑰花蕾的名字 (The Name of the Rose Bud) (Taipei: Unitas, 2000). 160-161 (158-161)
Taiwanese writer Ho Yu-fen 何裕棻 (He Yufen) points out yet another element required if a woman is to write. This element, as she stresses in her essay adopting Woolf’s title “Ziji de fangjian” 自己的房間 (A Room of One’s Own), is a focused mind. While referring to Woolf’s ROO for the need of a physical quiet room for writing, she adds, based on her personal experiences, that having a quiet room in the mind is equally important,

In her famous essay A Room of One’s Own, British writer Woolf claims that if women can be financially independent, and can have rooms of their own, then they can shine in the area of creative writing as well…. In my view, if the room in the mind is diffused, this goal is unattainable, no matter how many rooms women may have.

英國作家吳爾芙在知名的短文「自己的房間」裡，主張女人如果能夠有自己獨立的經濟能力，以及一個專屬於自己的房間，那麼女性也能在創作上發光發熱。…我想，內心空間分散了，有多少房間也罔效。202

Woolf is exalted to a mentor-figure when the Chinese writer Jie Chen 潔塵 writes about the relation of room and writing in her essay “Xiejuo de fangjian” 寫作的房間 (A Room for Writing). She says that since she cannot write in public space, such as a café, to own a private room is therefore crucial to her career as a writer since her productivity hinged on how much privacy she could get. She expresses her indebtedness to Woolf for her influence regarding this:

I have a room of my own, which is even more crucial to my writing productivity. I have since very early on accepted Virginia Woolf’s teaching that I need to have a room of my own. The so-called “a room of one’s own,” in my understanding, is a safe place where one is free from the worry of being peeked at.

我有一間自己的房間，這更關乎我是否繁茂。很早就受維吉利亞·伍爾夫的教誨，要有一間自己的房間。所謂自己的房間，在我的理解就是不會被窺視的安全的地方。203

Woolf’s influence as a leading feminist figure on artistic creation in the Chinese-speaking world is probably most notably felt in the Taiwanese installation artists Wu Mali 吳瑪俐.204 Wu is a woman activist as well as an artist notable for her avant-garde installation and public art. Art for Wu, as for Woolf, is also an effective venue to express her social concerns. Wu’s early artwork, produced mainly in the 1990s, largely addresses the conditions of Taiwanese women in a patriarchal society. Her installations give voice to women-related issues underrepresented in the mainstream culture, ranging from women and history, manual labor, prostitution to women’s desires. According to art critic Elsa H. C. Chen 陳香君, Wu’s works embody her long-standing critical reflection on Taiwanese patriarchy and its mechanism. They call attention to the outsider role women have been willy-nilly assigned in the patriarchal system.205 An example is her

203 Jie Chen 潔塵, “Xiejuo de fangjian” 寫作的房間 (A Room for Writing), Tibijiolao: Jie Chen Nurenshu 提筆就老：潔塵的女人書 (Jie Chen’s Woman’s Book) (Beijing: Zhongguo Sheke, 2005).
204 Wu, an artist and professor, studied art at National Art Academy in Dusseldorf, Germany. She self-claimed that feminist artist Judy Chicago has been an influence to her.
site-specific installation “Formosa Club” (1998), modeled upon a brothel in Taipei and exhibited after the Taipei city government had decided to prohibit licensed prostitution, as an attempt to bring to the fore the self-contradictory nature of men’s exploitation of women’s bodies while denying their social rights as sex workers.

One should be able to easily detect the similarity between Woolf and Wu in their similarly dual role as an artist and a feminist and their concern for women’s status under an oppressing patriarchal system. Given the resemblance, it is natural that Wu should have sought inspiration in Woolf as a feminist predecessor. To defy the patriarchal system that has been argued to give rise to patriotism, which in turn leads to war, in *TG* Woolf adopts an outsider stance and claims that as a woman she has no country but having the whole world as her country. In a similar attempt to subvert patriarchy by means of re-definition, Wu opts to limit rather than to, as Woolf did, expand the country border. For her, “as a woman, my skin is my home/nation” (qtd. in Chen 52). As different as their strategies to reject the patriarchal system may seem, the freedom thus regained remains the same here as that suggested in *TG*. As the skin “represents direct contact between a person and the external world,” as Elsa Chen argues, and hence follows wherever the human body goes, the freedom can be limited by nothing but the person herself (Chen 52).

Woolf’s feminist influence is felt in Wu also through *ROO*, especially in her later art projects. In the 2003 International Women’s Art Festival organized by Taiwan Women’s Art Association (WAA), Wu displayed her installation entitled *The 21st Century Woolf* 21 世紀的吳爾芙 in an exhibition of the theme *From My Fingers: Living*
in the Technological Age 網指之間--生活在科技年代.  The installation takes the form of a room with a chair, a desk and a computer showing a boat on the monitor screen. The caption of the installation reads,

Virginia Woolf of the 20th century says if a woman is to write/create, she needs some money and a room of her own. The 21st century Woolf says that if a woman is to write/create, she needs some money and a boat that is sailing toward the ocean.

20 世紀初，維琴尼亞·吳爾芙 (Virginia Woolf) 說，女人創作，需要有一點錢，有自己的房間。21 世紀初的吳爾芙說，女人創作，需要有一些錢，有一艘航向大洋的船。  

Wu, or “the 21st Century Woolf,” keeps basically everything found in the original Woolfian room, but replacing pens and paper with a computer to fit the technological age of today. Moreover, the little journey necessary for varied life experience as described in Woolf’s original conception appears to have become symbolized by boat in Wu’s work. Woolf stresses, in ROO, that had a great writer such as Tolstoy lived in seclusion and cut off from the world, he could scarcely have written War and Peace.  

Similarly, in “The 21st Century Woolf,” a boat capable of leading one out of one’s seclusion is needed in addition to a room of one’s own for a woman to write.

---

207 The exhibition was held in Kaohsiung Municipal Art Gallery in 2003, May 08 to July 23. It examined the extent to which the age of science and technique has impacted women’s lives and their artistic creations. The Taiwan Women’s Art Association (WAA) 台灣女性藝術協會 is a national art organization founded in 2000 in Taiwan.


209 Virginia Woolf, A Room of One’s Own (Penguin: 1945) 70-71.
In fact, the installation is the latest addition to the series of Wu’s artwork bearing the same title and featuring boat and water imagery. The first work of the series, entitled *Collective Dreams*, was produced in 1996 when Wu saw Hong Kong people lining up for days waiting to apply for British passports a year before Hong Kong would be officially handed over to China. Curious about what dreams these people might have been sharing in common, Wu collected some five thousand paper boats folded by Hong Kong people with their dreams written on it. The boats were then lined up at the Hong Kong Art Center for display. They were later carried on a boat to cruise around the Victoria Harbor. Taking paper boats to sail about the harbor, according to Wu, was a way to give blessings to those dreams as well as to give voice to the Hong Kong people in the midst of the uncertainty about and apprehension for the handover. The boat for Wu is thus a symbol of dream as well as a vessel carrying one’s dreams. Boat as a symbolic element of dream is found in all other works of this series as well, namely *Follow the Dream-Boat*, *Noah’s Ark*, *Barcarola*, *Boat-building Project* (yet to be completed), and *Water Ritual*. Taken together, the boats in this series of work appear to represent the dreams or aspiration for varied life experiences.

---


212 As an artist Wu has been making unceasing effort to incorporate events of everyday life into her work. She notes that building boats is her long-term goal aiming to raise environmental consciousness through art. What she intends to remind her audience, particularly those who live in an island country such as Taiwan, is the role river plays in the big picture of human history. Driven by dreams for a better future, according to her, the Chinese ancestors traveled from places to places on boats to build cities along the riversides, but their dreams have been forgotten by today’s generation, and so have the rivers. The boat and water imagery in the series of work in *The 21st Century Woolf* have therefore been designed to reflect upon
While Woolfian feminism has been received in more or less its entirety by Ling Yu, Lee Li, Ho Yu-fen, Jie Chen, and Wu Mali, for others Woolf’s work represents handy materials to shape their own ideas with. Among such artists the stage director and playwright Wei Ying-Chuan (Wei Yingjuan) is one.\(^{213}\) Wei founded *Shakespeare’s Wild Sisters Group* (SWS) 莎士比亞的妹妹們的劇團 in 1995 and gave it a name that was apparently derived from the story of Woolf’s imagery female figure in *ROO*, Judith Shakespeare.\(^{214}\) In Woolf’s version, Judith the talented yet oppressed sister of Shakespeare in the 16th century ended up pregnant and killed herself when unable to achieve her dream in the theater. For Woolf, women’s literary achievement was limited not by themselves but by the prevailing patriarchy of their time. As patriarchy system was so very dominant in her time, however, Woolf was not even afforded the opportunity to experiment with women in a society with less patriarchal dominance to see if women’s success was indeed conditioned on patriarchy. This experiment impossible in Woolf’s time, interestingly, is implemented in Wei’s theater. In sharp contrast to the miserable life of Shakespeare’s poor sister in Woolf’s story, the achievement of the SWS group is splendid. The group stages two plays annually addressing a wide range of social issues, including gender and sexual identity. It has been invited to theater festivals in many

\(^{213}\) Wei is a core member of Creative Society 創作社劇團, a theater group that was founded in 1997 in Taiwan and joined by established local choreographers, directors, playwrights, etc.

\(^{214}\) In fact, the appropriation of Woolf’s imaginary sister can be traced back in the 1980s in the UK. English all-male rock band, The Smiths (1982-1987), released a song in 1985 entitled “Shakespeare’s Sister,” which was inspired by Woolf’s *ROO*. In 1988, Siobhan Fahey, former member of Bananarama (a all-female pop group) founded a pop group *Shakespears sister*, named after The Smith’s song, and was joined by Marcella Smith. They split in 1993.
countries in Asia, Europe, and North America. In 2004, most notably, SWS was in residence at Watermill Center for International Summer Programs, a significant recognition of the group’s achievement. As Shakespeare’s sisters in Wei’s modern theater are relatively free from patriarchal oppression, their success thus speaks loud for Woolf’s argument that women can have achievement as great as men can under the social systems where women are given opportunities that Woolf’s Judith was denied.

Woolf’s influence on Wei’s took on a more concrete shape in one of her plays after the title of Woolf’s *ROO*. In 1997, *A Room of One’s Own*, the second theatrical production of SWS, premiered at the McAulay Studio in the Hong Kong Arts Center.

Woolf’s symbolic use of the room—the four-walled room as a sign of autonomous space, intellectual liberation and freedom, however, functions merely as a point of departure to explore the problems of space—concrete or imaginary, private or public—that can have enormous impact on one’s life experiences. Wei puts two actors and two actresses on the stage, and through props such as trashcan, toothbrush, toilet brush, umbrella and rug she presents the many ways “room” can be conceptualized and defined. She clothes her actors and actresses first in white and later in colors to signify the numerous “rooms” they inhabit, be they private, such as one’s own room, or public, such as society. While

---

215 Watermill Center was founded in 1992 by American avant-garde stage director and playwright Robert Wilson. The center is located in Long Island, New York State. SWS was the recipient of a fellowship created by both Watermill Center and Taipei Cultural Center in 2004, and was hence invited to participate in the prestigious International Summer Program offered by the center for five weeks. SWS performed *Plastic Hole* at Watermill Center on August 14 that summer.

216 Wei had been active in the theater since college but her talents did not draw much attention until SWS was founded in 1995. Over the years SWS features originality and no restriction in subject matter and form in its productions. Wei’s emphasis on stylized body movements has received much attention. She is nicknamed “the witch of theater” for her gifts creating innovative theatrical experience, and her group is viewed as one of the leading Taiwanese little theaters for its highly stylized form, costume, and avant-garde theatrical aesthetics.

217 SWS was invited to perform on March 27, 1997 for the program entitled *The Other Space, Taiwan Focus* launched to celebrate the 20th anniversary of Hong Kong Arts Center. The performance runs about 112 minutes.
some rooms provide space for personal memory, emotion, relationship and artistic 
imagination to take place, others put mind and body in confinement. Clearly, Wei’s 
notion of room is different from Woolf’s in the sense that while Woolf sees “room” as a 
necessity for the freedom of mind for women, while for Wei it poses, to men and women 
alike, more threat than promise. Wei therefore claims, as far as producing literary and 
artistic works are concerned, that “[the physical] room is not important; what is important 
is the confidence in one’s self.” 空間不重要，重要的是對自我的肯定. 218 Such a 
development can be considered developmental in nature, though. That is, when the needs for 
a private room are satisfied, other needs necessarily arise, as one can never be satisfied. 
Despite the differences between the two works bearing the same title, Wei’s stage 
production, given the popularity of its borrowed title, nevertheless conjures up Woolf and 
her feminist thoughts and even reactions to them. For instance, when “A Room of One’s 
Own” was invited to perform in Hong Kong, there was an article published before the 
play was even staged, claiming that Hong Kong people did not need feminism because 
they already had many successful women there. 219

Not everyone treating Woolf as a feminist regards her as a pure theorist. For the 
poet Dominic Chueng 張錯 (Zhang Chuo) at least, Woolf is not so much a feminist 
thorist as a social activist. 220 In 2005, Chueng wrote “Two Poems Dedicated to Mrs.

---

220 Dominic C.N. Chang is a Macau-born poet. However, he received his secondary education in Hong Kong, his tertiary education in Taiwan, and his graduate degrees in the U.S. Beginning in 1974, he has
Woolf” 致吳爾芙夫人兩首, which consist of two poems, forty-five and forty-four lines in length respectively. 221 In the second poem he compares her to an underground revolutionary head, Jin, in the 1930s in Shanghai fighting against the government of the Republic of China in the Hong Kong movie Hongse Lianren 紅色戀人 (A Time to Remember, 1998) starring the famous Hong Kong popular icon Leslie Cheung 張國榮 (1956-2003). 222 ROO is, as should be familiar to her readers, based on two lectures Woolf gave at, respectively, Newnham College and Girton College. In this poem, the imagery of Woolf standing on the podium, giving a speech addressing her audience about women’s vision and rights is fused into the imagery of Jin giving a pep talk to his fellow comrades,

The humor you purposely express in your speech
Cannot conceal the indignation in you
Your thrust into the air the fist of your lean left hand
Like waving a bright-colored flag
Reminds us of him on the first of April223

In God’s mission falling off the building in brilliant rays
To die in the red blossoms of spring silk cotton
…

In his robe he gives his speech

been a professor of East Asian Languages and Cultures and Comparative Literature at the University of South California.

221 Dominic Chueng 張錯, “Zhi Wuerfufuren liangsho” 致吳爾芙夫人兩首 “Two Poems Dedicated to Mrs. Woolf,” Lianhewenxue 聯合文學(Unitas) 254 (2005): 88-89, 90-91. These two poems can also be found in his collection of poems Yongwu 詠物.

222 Ye Daying 葉大鷹, dir., Hongse Lianren 紅色戀人 (A Time to Remember), China: Forbidden City Films, 1998. Leslie Cheung was perhaps better known to the international audience for his homosexual role in the much-acclaimed film Bawang bie ji 霸王別姬 (Farewell my Concubine; 1993).

223 Leslie Cheung ended his own life on April 1, 2003.
Like you he shakes his fist
Attacking the rotten-apple-like universities and political parties
In the low voice of his Southern accent
...
Just like the grace and charm of yours
But was soon executed...

妳演講時故作的幽默
無法掩飾內心憤慨激昂
瘦削的左手，握拳揮向半空
像舞動一面鮮明旗幟
令人想起四月一日的他
自神的使命中光芒萬丈墜樓
死在春天的木棉紅裡，
...
他穿著長袍演講
像妳一樣揮著拳頭
抨擊爛蘋果的大學或政黨
微帶南方腔調的磁性嗓音
...
一如妳的風韻媚力
然而不久就被處決了......(20-26, 35-38, 41-42)
Jin shares with Woolf not only their similar charisma but also their suffering from excruciating periodic headaches. While Woolf’s headache is genetic, however, Jin’s comes from epileptic attacks due to shrapnel left from a shot in his head, as hinted at in the last line of the poem where Cheung mentions the shrapnel found in Jin’s ashes years after he was executed.

As is obvious from a footnote to the poem, which points out the first of April as the day of Leslie Cheung’s suicide, *Hongse Lianren* is interesting to Dominic Cheung not only because of the character of the eloquent revolutionary leader but also because of Leslie Cheung. Like that of Woolf, the life of Leslie Cheung is a story in itself. Leslie Cheung was, like Woolf, celebrated for his gifts (as a singer, song composer and actor), and it was already an open secret even during his lifetime that he was homosexual. Famous and successful as he had been, Leslie Cheung nevertheless ended his own life at the age of forty-six, possibly due to depression. As this poem is the second of the two poems dedicated to Woolf, and the first poem begins with the very suicidal scene of Woolf’s, the attempt to link the two appears conspicuous; and this is an ingenious design. If there is a reason for Cheung to mention both Jin’s illness (signified by the shrapnel) and Leslie Cheung’s death (signified by the date) in the poem, it must be the intention to conjure up “madness and death,” a recurring theme that has been attached to

---

224 In his two poems dedicated to Woolf, Dominic Cheung open the first poem with the suicide scene of Woolf. He writes,

*Madam, how does it feel like walking slowly down the deep water?*
*The chill of the water, the increasing weight of the dress*
*The growing difficulty in movement?*

*夫人，緩慢走入水深處感覺是甚麼？
水的冰冷，裙裾逐漸沉重
移動越加困難？(1-3)*
the literary Woolf and resulted in a large number of publications on Woolf studies over
the past decades.

Not all reception of Woolf has to be based on a more or less complete picture of
her. Some women artists and writers who admire Woolf may find her inspiring even on a
partial basis. In 2002, the Taiwanese award-winning singer-songwriter of independent
music, Shi Chen-lan 史辰蘭, produced an album bearing exactly the same English title A
Room of One’s Own with its Chinese equivalent Ziji de fangjian 自己的房間. This is an
album containing thirteen songs written, composed, and sung by the artist herself, and
among the thirteen songs, one is specifically entitled “Zai ziji de fangjian li” 在自己的房
間裡 (Inside My Own Room). Although the room plays a major role in this song, the
necessity of a room to women’s artistic creation is entirely missing. In Shi’s description,
instead, a room represents a comfort zone and a faithful companion,

Inside my own room

I feel very comfortable

It used to play games with me

It also used to cry with me…

在自己的房間裡

感覺到非常舒適

它曾陪著我遊戲

也曾陪著我哭泣…

Shi Chen-lan 史辰蘭, “Zai ziji de fangjian li” 在自己的房間裡 (Inside My Own Room), by Shi Chen-
lan, Ziji de fangjian 自己的房間 (A Room of One’s Own) (Taipei: Fengchao, 2002). CD
As Shi gives no credits to Woolf, one may argue that the identical title may be simply coincidental. However, the more usual ways of translating the Chinese title of the album *Ciji de fangjian* would be either “My Own Room” or “A Room of My Own” instead of “A Room of One’s own.” One more plausible explanation would thus be that for Shi, a room is just imagery enabling her to fill in her own interpretation. Such a pure appropriation is not uncommon.

In a news article discussing single women and the status of their home ownership in the major cities of China, Woolf was quoted in support of its author’s argument for the significant roles a house plays in a modern woman’s security and independence, both psychologically and realistically. 226 Citing the title of *ROO* in Chinese translation, the article states:

“Woolf has already mentioned this long ago: a woman needs to have a room/house of one’s own. This statement has been taken as canon by single women today. For them, on the psychological level, a room/house is tantamount to pride, independence, and sense of security; on the practical level, it is equivalent to investment intention and economic revenue.

伍爾夫早就說過：女人需要自己的一間屋。如今，這句話，已經被單身女子奉為經典。一間房子，在單身女子的心理層面等同於自尊、獨立、安全感；在現實層面，則等同於投資意向、經濟收益。227

226 In Chinese language, “wuzi”屋子 (i.e. room) and “fangzi”房子 (i.e. house) are sometimes used interchangeably. For this reason, the Chinese translation of the title *A Room of One’s Own* can sometimes be misunderstood as *A House of One’s Own*.

227 “Danshennuzi jingji: nushen yieyao maifang shu liangli erwei” 單身女子經濟：女生也要買房 需量力而行 (The Economic Status of Single Women: Women Need to Buy a House According to Their
As far-fetched as the abrupt interpretation may seem, such appropriation is not unusual, neither is it found only in China. In a housing advertisement targeting women living in cities in Taiwan, one also finds similar appropriation in the commercial slogan,

Virginia Woolf says that the starting point for women’s creative writing begins with owning a room of one’s own. CityNet helps you find your home.

維吉妮亞.吾爾芙說，女人創作的起點，在於擁有自己的房間。在城市，幫你找到家。228

The news article and the commercial obviously support the interpretation of Shi’s song lyric and album title as a case of appropriation. More relevant to the present study, however, they all serve to indicate the popularity of ROO and its far-reaching influence in the Chinese context today. Woolf probably would never have imagined her essay as the basis for free and convenient advertising.

The Woolfian Literary Ideal

Few of those attracted to Woolf by her feminist insights would not find her literary originality attractive as well. In the Chinese-speaking world, likewise, Woolf has been well received both as a feminist and a literary figure. Her influence as a literary figure, however, is mainly manifested in the cultural productions either based on or inspired by three of her major works, namely, ROO, O, and MD. To give a big picture of the cultural productions under her sway, in this section, Woolf’s literary influence will be discussed as exemplified by these works. Among the three, ROO’s influence is two-

---

sided in that it has been valued not only for its place in feminist theories but for its literary influence as a critical piece, especially the androgynous ideal she has been known to advocate and promote.

Dominic Cheung’s “Two Poems Dedicated to Mrs. Woolf” тестифікація ROO’s two-sided influence. While its second poem, as discussed earlier, apparently refers to Woolf as a woman activist, the first represents the poet’s tribute to Woolf as an influential literary theorist. Adopting the same narrative mode in ROO, namely the second-person narrative, this poem summarizes Woolf’s argument that the state of mind for writing is not independent of literary tradition and material necessities. With “you” referring to Woolf to draw closer the narrator and the addressee, it recounts what Woolf has presented using fictional strategies in her book—from Shakespeare’s sister’s tragic life seeking her dream as a writer, to women’s exclusion from the public sphere and education, and to the necessity of having money and rooms for women to write. The poem culminates in an imagery of androgyny, which Cheung seems to believe to be Woolf’s most cherished literary ideal:

The sight that satisfied you the most in your life
Should be the one you see beneath your window--
A girl in boots and a young man in maroon overcoat
Meet in the street, get into the taxi together.
A sudden palpitation, then comes the epiphany:
In the world where a woman’s body and mind are rent
The unity of the mind is attained only through androgyny.
妳一生最愜意的景象
應該是在窗下窥看穿皮靴女孩
及披褐色大衣年輕男子
在街頭碰面，一同坐進計程車。
蓦然心頭的一陣悸動，然後頓悟：
女人身心被割裂的世界裡
所有心靈契合皆須雌雄同體。(39-45)

Cheung’s interest in Woolf’s literary theory, particularly her concept of androgyny, is not coincidental. In his emphasis on the inseparability of prose and poetry, he writes,

[The relation between] poetry and prose is like Virginia Woolf’s androgyny: there is always a woman in a man, and vice versa. That is to say, there is always prose in poetry, and there is also poetry in prose.

詩與散文，猶如維琴妮亞·吳爾芙說的雌雄同體，一個男人裡都面會有一些女人，反之亦是。也就是說，詩中定有文，文中亦有詩。229

If one looks again at Cheung’s “Two Poems,” one may find that the androgyny image actually links and plays a central role in the two poems, as ingeniously designed. While the first poem gives a brief sketch of Woolf’s death, her work ROO, and her literary theories, in the second Woolf was made to come back to life in the body of the revolutionary leader. Most importantly, while the first poem provides a montage of Woolf’s literary theories, her androgynous ideal in particular, the second embodies her androgyny in the image of famous actor Leslie Cheung, known for his bisexuality. Being

229 Dominic Chueng 張錯, afterword, Jingjing de yinghe 靜靜的螢河 (Taipei: Sanmin, 2004) 201.
a famous movie star and a popular singer, Leslie has been featured largely for his queer identity—be it his cinematic representations on the screen, his live stage performances, or his music videos, especially in his later, more mature works. For that reason his performance has generated a wide discussion in the Chinese-speaking popular cultural realm even till this day, years after his death. Leslie himself was comfortable with this androgynous identity when he said, during an interview by *Time* magazine, “I love the film *Gone with the Wind*. And I like Leslie Howard. The name can be a man’s or woman’s, it’s very unisex, so I like it.”

The appropriation of Leslie’s image in the second poem to echo Woolf’s concept of androgyny in the first can be felt when one takes the two poems in “Two Poems Dedicated to Mrs. Woolf” as a unity and reads them not in isolation, but in complement to each other. Cheung skillfully incorporates a Chinese cultural figure—a popular icon—into his poems to highlight Woolf’s concept of androgyny.

**The Chinese-speaking Orlando**

Reception to a large extent depends on cultural readiness in terms of the availability of cultural structures that are similar to or at least compatible with those that the to-be-imported ideas have been embedded in. Literary ideas that share a similar cultural structural basis tend to find their reception easier and thus earlier in the receiving land, and this seems evident in the contrasting receptions of Woolf’s androgyny in two foreign cultures, namely, Japan and the Chinese-speaking world. According to Noriko Kubota, *O* was the first translation of Woolf’s novel into Japanese in as early as 1931, three years after its publication in London. The Japanese literary tradition of sex change,

---

Kubota notes, could be the major reason for the reading public to show so much interest in this novel.\textsuperscript{231} The first $O$ in Chinese language, in contrast, came out as late as 1993 in Taiwan, probably thanks to the appearance of Sally Potter’s *Orlando* in 1992, as suggested by the timing of its publication and the way it was packaged and marketed. Stills from Potter’s $O$, for example, were placed on the front and back covers, as well on the first seven pages in order to boost the sale of this translation.

Interestingly but not surprisingly, though Potter claims that the movie is true to Woolf’s spirit, her adaptation has been subject to various, even opposite evaluations. Chang Hsiao-hung argues that Potter’s $O$ should not be taken simply as a film adaptation, and therefore a translation, of the original work. Rather, Potter re-constructs her hero/heroine according to the sexual/textual politics of the 1990s.\textsuperscript{232} Leslie Hankins dismisses Potter’s adaptation as a misreading of Woolf. She claims that the movie misses the point of Orlando’s sex-change and erases the lesbian narrative of the novel.\textsuperscript{233} In contrast, for the Taiwanese choreographer Tao Fu-lan 陶馥蘭,\textsuperscript{234} the founder of Tao’s Dance Theater (1989), Potter’s narrative structure and cinematic expression throw light on Woolf’s idea of the contrast between the eternal/spiritual vs. the ephemeral/material, which Tao regards as central to the novel. In her view, Orlando’s idealism is what Woolf


\textsuperscript{234} Tao received her training in choreography at the University of Kansas. She self-claimed that her artistic vision is indebted to German choreographer Pina Bausch (1940-2009).
believes can ultimately lead to the liberation of the mind.\textsuperscript{235} Tao’s interest in the mystical vision of Woolf thus contributed to how Orlando was to be represented when this character was first put on the stage to speak in Chinese.

For Tao and her associates, the issues addressed in \textit{O} are not limited to those concerning only women, but the entire human race. Less than two years after the release of Potter’s movie, Tao’s Dance Theater produced the first Chinese stage adaptation of \textit{Orlando 奇幻女子歐蘭朵穿越時間 400 年} that premiered in Taipei in 1994.\textsuperscript{236} It is a fifty-minute work directed and scripted by Jade Y. Chen 陳玉慧, with Tao herself playing the role of Orlando. Chen claimed that it was for admiration of Woolf that she adapted the novel, and that she did it for fun, which is in accordance with the spirit of Woolf while she was working on this novel. Chen shares with Tao her rejection of the feminist label placed on them. She refused to be considered as a feminist because she thought it was only on the social and biological levels that equal rights for women were voiced in Taiwan women’s movements at the time.\textsuperscript{237} As she considers herself more literary than political, what she cares about is finding a voice for women amidst the male-dominating literary and artistic tradition: “I do not want to follow or imitate the voice of men, what I want is pure women’s perspectives.” 我不要依仿男性的聲音，而是純女性的觀點.\textsuperscript{238}

Tao, too, cares little about her feminist identity. She has been regarded, quite against her own intention, the first feminist choreographer in Taiwan, as her works

\textsuperscript{235} Chang Wei-lun 張維倫, “Xingbie, routi, yongbumomie de ziyuoyizi: Duomianxiang xinzuo Zihuannuzi \textit{Orlando} 性別、肉體、永不磨滅的自由意志--多面向新作《奇幻女子歐蘭朵》 (Gender, Body, and Unflinching Free Will: Orlando by Tao’s Theather), \textit{Biaoyenyishu 表演藝術 (PAR)} 26 (1994): 18-19.

\textsuperscript{236} The show premiered on Dec. 16, 1994.

\textsuperscript{237} Please note that Chen was referring to Taiwan women’s movements in the 1990s.

mostly address women issues and their awakenings. But her concern is not limited to one gender only. Tao says, “Human will always be my concern—my initial and ultimate concern. Body movement is used as a means to manifest this concern.” 人，永遠會是我的關心--最初與最終關心。動作是體現這個關心的媒介。239 The only reason why she deals only with women, not men, is because, as she confesses, being a woman she can only watch and observe from a woman’s perspective and convey her experiences by means of woman characters. But Tao sees no conflict in this with her ultimate concern with all human beings because “… woman, too, is human, and she must have universal human experiences.” …女人也是人，也必定有普同、人性的經驗 (qtd. in Chu 4).

Since neither Chen nor Tao considers the issue of gender their major concern, their collaboration can only focus on other elements than what a feminist analysis of the text would have articulated. According to Chang Wei-lun’s 張維倫 (Zhang Weilun) review, Chen and Tao’s adaptation examines not only the issues of gender, history, and social class; it explores also the relation of mind and body—a philosophical issue in the novel which has received scant attention in Chinese and Taiwanese Woolf scholarship. With deliberate stage design—simple yet abstract—to highlight Orlando’s disenchantment with the values of each era s/he has lived through and her/his ardent passion for the ideal as embodied in his/her love for poetry, the adaptation “strongly reveals the transitory and disillusive nature of materials 強烈透露物質的短暫、幻滅性, meanwhile “guiding the audience to give up illusions that shackle the physical body and

---
to seek instead the liberation of mind, which is devoid of desire. 指引著觀眾拋棄肉體桎梏的幻象，而尋求無欲而為的性靈解脫 (Chang 4).

Chen and Tao’s *Orlando*, however, did not attract much attention from either feminists or Woolf readers, as reviews are sporadic and hard to come by. This is probably a result of the historical and cultural contexts of the 1990s in Taiwan, when Woolf’s novels were mainly circulated among the limited few in the academia or those having received training in western literature, which was also limited in number. The scale of the performance might have also prohibited it from reaching a wide audience.

Another adaptation of *Orlando* was staged some fifteen years later when Robert Wilson, an American avant-garde stage director and playwright, known particularly for his innovative visual theater, worked with Wei Hai-min 魏海敏 to make Orlando speak Chinese again.240 Wei is an award-winning Beijing opera actress, or “diva” according to some, who has a long and successful career in performing art. For western or non-Chinese speaking audience, she is probably better known for her leading roles in the much-acclaimed Chinese stage adaptation of Shakespeare’s *Macbeth* (1986), the Greek tragedies *Medea* (1993) and *Oresteia: Queen Clytemnestra* (1995), some of which are still being performed on an irregular basis outside of Taiwan. According to Wei, Wilson chose to work with her on *O* “because the training and memory in me appeal to him” 因為我身上的訓練記憶被他看中.241 By this Wei meant her training as a Beijing opera actress as well as her former experience rendering western female protagonists in Chinese

---

240 The stage adaptation was co-directed by Ann-Christin Rommen with Wang An-chi, Xie Bai-chi, Wu Ming-lung as the librettists. It premiered on 21 Feb. 2009.
241 Geng Yiwei, 耿一偉, “Cong meitian yiduo meiguihua kaishi de chuangzaoxin pohuai”從每天一朵玫瑰花開始的創造性破壞 (*The Constructive Destruction Which Begins with a Rose a Day*), *Biaoyenyishu 表演藝術 (PAR)* 193 (2009) : 81
style. Wilson requires that his Orlando perform solo for two hours on the stage as a young man, a person going through gender/sex transformation, and a woman with precise choreographed gestures and movements.\(^\text{242}\) For Wei, this poses little challenge because “as a Beijing opera performer, I am highly sensitive about gender change and the use of my body. You can say that both genders co-exist in me.”\(^\text{243}\) Here the reader may be reminded of the close relationship between reception and cultural readiness earlier discussed, the only difference being that, this time, the readiness takes place in an individual and can be said to be psychological readiness. Wei nevertheless admitted that until she had come to a full grasp of Wilson’s goals, she had been constantly nervous and full of anxiety. When she did understand his goals, however, “she readily came to the realization that Robert had opened another door to performing arts that involve East-West collaboration, and she was meanwhile made to rethink about the creation origin of Beijing opera language and the multiple possibilities of applying it in modern theaters”

她就知道羅伯已經為東西方合作的表演藝術開啓了另一扇大門，也讓她重新思考京劇語言創始的原點和運用於現代劇場更多的可能性.\(^\text{244}\)

Wilson began to stage *Orlando* in 1989. He was drawn to this novel because it is a “very visual text.” Wilson claims that his theater is non-interpretative; his objective is to get the audience to ask “what is it?” or “what is Wilson trying to do with the text?”\(^\text{245}\)

---

\(^\text{242}\) Wilson’s *O* is a three-act play. In the first act, the soliloquy of Orlando is made from the first-person narrative point of view. In the second act, the soliloquy is made from the second-person narrative. The First-person narrative returns in the third act.


That is to say, he invites reflection on rather than offers interpretation of his work. While Wilson may have numerous reasons to adapt Orlando and multiple methods to handle the text, his ambition about bringing together different cultural sensibilities to his work is beyond doubt. Prior to the Chinese version of O, Wilson had produced the German version in 1989, the French version in 1993, and the British version in 1996, in each of which he worked with outstanding actresses coming from their respective cultures, namely Jutta Lampe, Isabella Huppert and Miranda Richardson. In the Chinese cultural context, he worked with Wei in an attempt to fuse eastern and western cultures as well as theatrical traditions. Wilson says,

Orlando is a true collaboration in that it incorporates a Western vocabulary of movement and images, based on Virginia Woolf’s text of Orlando and deriving from my background as an architect, from my life in the theater, and from my work as a visual artist. This work is counter-pointed and complemented by the classically trained Beijing opera star Wei Hai-ming, which definitely brings an ancient sense of Chinese culture to the work—a culture where movement, language, the difference between spoken and sung words, are all very different from what I’ve inherited from my Western roots.²⁴⁶

Assessing Wilson’s work from a formal perspective, Wang An-chi王安祈，247 one of the three adapting librettists of the Chinese version of Orlando, claims that it is to his own artistic end that Wilson works on Woolf’s novel, an ambition much like what Woolf had and put into practice in her time,

While Virginia Woolf employed the technique of stream of consciousness to override the dominance of Realist Literature in the early twentieth century, Robert Wilson, who adapted Woolf’s novel, must have his ambition to fulfill his arguments that images can replace language and become the center of theatre. Both of them create in their individual ways, and ignite a movement in their respective field in different times.”248

It should not be surprising to find Wilson’s adaptation of O receiving far more attention than Chen and Tao’s back in 1994; after all, it represents an internationally collaborative effort by leading figures such as Wilson and Wei from their respective fields, and in terms of publicity, it opened the First Taiwan International Festival in February, 2009. Woolf’s high popularity in the late 2000s as marked by the translation of her work on a large scale is also an important factor. However, even Wilson’s adaptation attracted little discussions from Woolf readers, academic and general readers alike. Perhaps even more crucial among the causes of scant attention was that, since Woolf was discussed mostly for her narrative form and style in the early days and for her feminist thoughts in recent decades, Wilson’s predominant focus on the theme of solitude is likely to result in more

247 Wang is a playwright and professor of Chinese. She is also the art director of the National Guo Guang Opera Company國光劇團 of Taiwan.
248 Orlando歐蘭朵 (Taipei: National Chang Kai-Shek Center, 2009) 15. This is the show program of Wilson’s Orlando.
disappointment than appreciation. The androgynous Orlando, sex change, and stereotypical notions about gender roles in Woolf’s mock biography have entered the mainstream discussion today, thanks to feminist discourse and gender studies, but what remains in Wilson’s adaptation, is so very limited: to quote theater critic Lu Ai-ling 陸愛玲, “…his artistic world portrays only the word “solitude.” …其藝術世界刻劃的惟「孤獨」二字而已.” 249 Orlando indeed is described by her/his biographer, namely Woolf, as a person who “naturally loved solitary places, vast views, and to feel himself for ever and ever and ever alone.” 250 Wilson set this lonely Orlando to take the center stage by giving him/her the line “I am alone” taken from the text and dramatizing his solitutude through stylized lighting, sound, props, and stage design. Wei sums up Wilson’s construction of Orlando well when she describes her role in the adaptation: “I perform a solo act that portrays someone who begins alone, and ends up alone in search of the greatest creation of poetry in life.” Wilson himself gives no particular account of his choice on this. It might be for his own artistic ends that Woolf’s novel is illustrated as such, or it might be due to personal preference, as Wang notes, that Wilson places so much emphasis on solitude: “I assume, being an artist who employs the theatre to expose himself, it is natural that Robert Wilson should have an appreciation for solitude.” 251

**Stream of Chinese Consciousness**

In addition to the introduction of the literary ideal of an androgynous mind and literary themes such as mystical vision and solitude, the narrative skill of stream of consciousness is another important element of Woolf’s reception in the Chinese-speaking

---

251 Quoted from the show program of Wilson’s *Orlando*, 13.
world. As mentioned in an earlier chapter, in her lifetime Woolf was already a role
model to writers such as Lin Huiyin 林徽因 and Lee Jianwu 李健吾 in China during the
Republic period. So was she in Taiwan as early as the 1960s. Strangely, however, it
took a long time for her influence to be duly acknowledged. The renowned Taiwanese
writer Pai Hsien-yung 台先勇 (Bai Xianyung), for example, spoke of his indebtedness to
Woolf only after nearly four decades.

Woolf was formally introduced into Taiwan when the literary magazine Xiandai
Wenxue 現代文學 (Modern Literature), founded by Pai and his college friends, devoted a
special issue to introducing her and her works in the 1960s. Xiandai has played a
significant role in Taiwan’s literary development by providing a site for young writers to
experiment with western modernist literary forms at a time when most Taiwanese, elites
in particular, were experiencing identity crisis and censorship due to local political
turmoil. As such, according to Hsia Chi-ching 夏志清 (Xia Zhiqing), “Xiandai wenxue
has nurtured the most brilliant group of writers of the younger generation.”《現代文
學》培養了台灣年輕一代最優秀的作家群.252 Pai is apparently on Hsia’s list of
brilliant writers, in view of his leading role in the Taiwanese literary history.

In 1966, Pai published his canonical work “Youyuan jingmeng” 遊園驚夢
(Wandering in the Garden, Waking from a Dream) in Xiandai.253 a long story bearing the
same title as that of a classic Kunqu Opera (Kungchu Opera) episode, which furthermore

252 Quoted in Ying, Feng Huang 應鳳凰, “Sanbuo wanzipianhong: Cong sige leixing kan Taiwan
wenyizazhi fazhanlicheng” 散播萬紫千紅：從四個類型看台灣文藝雜誌發展歷程 (On the
Development of Four Types of Literary Magazine in Taiwan), Quanguo xinshu zixun yuekan 全國新書資
253 This work is also available in the collection of his fiction Taiheiren 臺北人 (Taipei People), whose
English translation was published in 1982.
had been excerpted from the popular Ming Dynasty play *Mudan ting* (Peony Pavilion; 1598). “Youyuan jingmeng” tells of the story of Mrs. Chien and her recollection of the past while attending a party. Mrs. Chien (Lan Tien-yu) had been a Kungqu Opera actress in China before she was married to General Chien. When she migrated to Taiwan after China was taken over by the Communist Party, she had become a widow. The story begins when she just arrives at Mrs. Dou’s home for a party. Guests in the party are mostly old-day acquaintances of Mrs. Chien who have also migrated to Taiwan for the same reason. Amidst the party, one of the guests was urged to sing a part from the Kungqu “Youyuan jingmeng.” Upon hearing it, Mrs. Chien recalls her life back in Nanjing, China, with all her memories and secrets not to be disclosed to anyone. To capture the inner turmoil of Mrs. Chien, Pai had tried different techniques but finally decided on stream of consciousness. Pai says, in retrospect,

> I wrote this novel five times. The first three times I used more traditional narrative methods to depict activities of the mind, but I was satisfied with neither. The technique of stream of consciousness did not occur to me at first. The female protagonist has very strong emotions when she recalls

---

254 Kungqu Opera (Kungchu Opera) is one of the oldest varieties of Chinese opera and has influenced many other forms of Chinese opera, including Beijing Opera (Peking Opera). *Mudan ting*, a play by Tang Xianzu (1550-1616), is the most famous Kungqu and has been regarded as the peak work in Chinese dramatic history. For Pai, it is the Chinese equivalent of *Romeo and Juliet* except that the Chinese Juliet in this play comes back to life at the end. *Mudan ting* is comprised of fifty-five episodes. Its tenth episode “Jingmeng” (Waking from a Dream) has been the most frequently staged episode in Kungqu Opera. Its title was later changed to “Youyuan jingmeng” because one can easily identify two parts in its content, one being “Youyuan” (Wandering in the Garden) and the other, “Jingmeng” (Waking from a Dream). “Youyuan Jingmeng” deals with the romance of a sixteen-year-old girl Du Liniang, daughter of a government official, with Liu Mengmei, a young scholar she met only once in her dream. Du falls asleep in a garden after having a stroll with her maid on one fine spring day. In her dream she encounters Liu and quickly falls in love with him. Du becomes preoccupied with Liu even after waking up, until lovesickness finally takes away her life.
her past, and there is also music and opera in the background. In order to express them better, I tried the technique of stream of consciousness.”

我寫這篇小說寫了五次。前三次用比較傳統的手法寫內心的活動，我都不滿意。起初我並沒想到要用意識流手法。女主角回憶過去時的情緒非常強烈，也有音樂、戲劇的背景，為了表達得更好，嘗試用了意識流手法。255

Pai’s experimentation with western literary techniques in this novel is favorably reviewed. Leo Ou-fan Lee 李歐梵 considers this work “a remarkable example of Pai’s ability to fuse Western techniques with Chinese themes.”256 Evaluating from a western perspective, Susan Mcfadden claims that “[t]his story is in my opinion Pai’s most successful work and is an important example of how western technique can be assimilated into Chinese fiction.”257 Liu Lili 劉俐俐 also notes that the techniques of stream of consciousness is skillfully incorporated into the first and third person narrative throughout the story. Since Mrs. Chien’s life in Pai’s novel is reminiscent of the life of Tu Li-niang (the female protagonist) in Mudan ting, Liu further points out that it is its intertextuality, i.e., the echo of Mudan ting in “Youyuan jingmeng,” that has made this narrative technique distinctive.

---

In my view, the success in the use of stream of consciousness technique in “Youyuan jingmeng” results from its placement of the content of stream of consciousness on a platform rich with Chinese traditional cultures so that it can fuse with Chinese traditional literature and culture. And this is further related to the issue of intertextuality of this text.

…在我看来，《游園驚夢》成功的採用意識流手法，得益於將意識流的內容放在中國傳統文化豐富內涵的平台上，與中國傳統文學、文化互相交融，這就涉及到這個文本的互文性問題了。258

Given the popularity of this novel, Pai’s story was immediately a sensation when it was first put on the stage. The stage adaptation of “Youyuan jingmeng,” premiered in Taipei in 1982, quickly became a major event in the local art scene that very year. The show ran for eight days to capacity audiences. Two more shows were added in response to the audience’s ardent request. Several years later it was also staged in various places such as Hong Kong, Shanghai, Guangzhou, Beijing, and New York.

Having been trained in western literature, Pai never denies the influence of western, modernist in particular, literary forms on his work. Faulkner and Joyce are among the names he frequently mentions. This may explain why his work has often been the object of discussion in east west comparative studies or often analyzed in relation to western literary tradition. Most critics, for instance, would compare the title of his collection of short stories Taibeiren (Taipei People, 1973) to that of Joyce’s Dubliners (1914) on grounds that both depict lives in big cities, namely Taipei and Dublin. The

influence of Woolf he has felt, in contrast, was not revealed until much later. In 2003, after Pai had given a speech at the Institute of Chinese Literature and Philosophy in Academia Sinica Taiwan, Li Sher-siueh 李奭學 (Li Shixue), who was in the audience, raised a question regarding the western influences on “Youyuan jingmeng.” In his reply to him, Pai mentioned Woolf for the first time. As Li describes the occasion,

I was in the audience when I seized the opportunity to raise a question concerning “Youyuan jingmeng”: Has the stream of consciousness technique in *Taiberen*, the publicly recognized canonical piece, been inspired by any leading western novelists? In a calm and composed manner Pai provided his answer, and he shifted immediately to the American tradition beginning with William Faulkner (1897-1962) and Katherine Anne Porter (1890-1980). As for the British tradition, he mentioned the modern canon of stream of consciousness: *Mrs. Dalloway* by Virginia Woolf.

我忝為座下聽眾之一, 嘗抓住機會就《遊園驚夢》就請教了一個問題: 《臺北人》裡這篇公認的經典之作中的意識流 (stream of consciousness) ，是否受過西方小說巨擘的啟發? 白先勇好整以暇, 一回答就轉進福克納 (William Faulkner, 1897-1962) 與波特 (Katherine Anne Porter, 1890-1980) 以來的美國傳統。在英國方面，他則拈出近
代意識流的經典之作：維吉妮亞吳爾芙 (Virginia Woolf, 1882-1941) 的長篇小說《戴洛維夫人》 (Mrs. Dalloway, 1925).\textsuperscript{259}

Apparentely inspired by Pai’s candid reply, Li worte “Towards a Poetics of Parentheses: A Reading of Pai Hsien-yung’s ‘Youyuan jingmeng’ in Light of Virginia Woolf’s Mrs. Dalloway.” This article represents an effort to explore the connection between the two based on their shared technique of stream of consciousness. ‘Dreams of Red Chamber,’ as Li points out, has often been cited for its technical influence when Pai mentioned Yuoyuan. If it were not for Pai’s response at the said occasion, few would have considered any possible connection between Yuoyuan and Mrs. Dalloway.

Though Li stresses that his reading is only one among the many approaches to “Youyuen Jingmeng,” he has nevertheless shed new light on the influence of Woolf on Pai in terms of plot, characterization, narrative techniques and symbolism never before discussed by any other critics. Li’s study, in brief, shows that Woolf’s and Pai’s works both explore the sensations and thoughts occurring to a woman within as short as a few hours against the background of a party. The female protagonists in their stories, both wives of high-ranking government officials, recall their earlier lives and former lovers when triggered by objects, scenes or people around them. Li points out that the memory scenes in both literary works are treated with the same effective narrative technique: “Be it Mrs. Dalloway’s memory or Mrs. Chien’s recollection, Woolf and Pai represent them by means of stream of consciousness, a technique capable of reaching the very subtlety of

\textsuperscript{259} Li Sher-shiueh 李奭學, “Kuohu de shixue—Cong Wuerfu de Dalowei furen kan Pai Hsien-yung de ‘Yuoyuan jingmeng’”括號的詩學—從吳爾芙的《戴洛維夫人》看白先勇的〈遊園驚夢〉(*Towards a Poetics of Parentheses: A Reading of Pai Hsien-yung’s ‘Youyuan jingmeng’ in Light of Virginia Woolf’s Mrs. Dalloway), Sankan Pai Hsien-yung 三看白先勇 (Three Readings of Pai Hsien-yung) (Taipei: Yunchen wenhua, 2008) 98.
the human mind.” 戴洛維夫人的憶往也好，是錢夫人的追念也罷，吳爾芙和白先勇
都用直指人心幽微的「意識流」來呈現 (Li 104).

Parallelism, Li claims, is yet another technique that brings Pai’s work close to
Woolf’s. Though Pai’s story lacks the character of Septimus, commonly interpreted as
the double of Mrs. Dalloway, Pai’s characters and scenes often echo one another, in ways
much like Woolf’s parallel treatment of Mrs. Dalloway and Septimus. In a broad sense,
Li argues, Mrs. Chien’s relationship with her former lover Chen Ching-yien can be
compared to that between Mrs. Dalloway and Septimus Warren on the ground that “their
hearts are linked and spirits matched” 心印神合, making two halves to become a
complete whole, just like Adam and Eve (Li 116). Li further argues that the music from
the bamboo flute in “Youyuan Jingmeng,” a recurring symbol of time, functions just like
the strike of Big Ben to Mrs. Dalloway in MD to awake, time and again, Mrs. Chien to
the reality of life from her memory/dream. In order to shift back and forth in time,
 furthermore, both Woolf and Pai employed the technique of montage to fuse past and
present scenes, thus creating multiple perspectives in their stories.

Li’s pioneering effort, ignited by Pai’s candid reply to his question, represents an
important attempt in assessing the reception of Woolf in the Taiwanese literary arena. It
is the first scholarly work to testify to Woolf’s influence on Taiwanese literature, an
influence that actually started as early as the 1960s, when Taiwan literary circle just
began to feel interested in western modernism. More importantly, given that Pai’s
influence as a leading literary figure reaches not only Taiwan but the entire Chinese-
speaking world, results from Li’s study may actually imply that Woolf’s impact on the
Chinese literary circle and culture could be far more profound and thus deserves more critical attention.

Li’s work actually begs the question of what it could have been that has diverted critics’ attention from noticing Woolf’s literary influence on this novel for so long. Theme could be a reason. Pai himself says that the major theme of this novel concerns the reflection of “the impermanence of life” 人生無常, a recurring theme in Chinese philosophy.²⁶⁰ What has been usually discussed about Woolf’s _MD_, in contrast, is the destructive force of war and patriarchy. Such seemingly huge thematic distance might have prevented critics from linking the two. Another plausible reason for this delayed justification may lie in the usual emphasis on intertextual reading of Pai’s novel with other Chinese classics. Leo Ou-fan Lee, for instance, indicates that Pai’s novel is indebted to Chinese classics _Hungloumeng_ 紅樓夢 (Dream of the Red Chamber) and _Mudan ting_.²⁶¹ Woolf as a foreign, modernist writer obviously stands beyond an immediately visible horizon.

**Woolf in the Backdrop**

Soon or late, Woolf’s well-established popularity in the Chinese-speaking world is certain. One reliable indicator of full reception of a foreign writer on the local soil is when he or she is no longer always foregrounded but begins to appear in the background as well. Being backgrounded presumes familiarity with, hence full reception of, the author and is often an act of appropriation. The news article in China (2007) and the Internet rental service advertisement in Taiwan (2009) cited in the first section of this

²⁶¹ Ibid., 267. _Hungloumeng_ (Dream of the Red Chamber), authored by Cao Xueqin, was written in the mid-18th Qing dynasty.
chapter are two good examples of mass media appropriation of Woolf’s *ROO*. But
appropriation can occur in literary works as well, and the Chinese poet and novelist Hong Ying 虹影 appears to be an old hand in this respect. Her *Who’s Afraid of Hong Ying*, for one, while highly suggestive of Edward Albee’s *Who’s Afraid of Virginia Woolf*, refers to neither Woolf nor Albee in the entire book except for only once in the author’s foreword, where how the title has been derived is explained. But Hong Ying’s appropriation of Woolf appears most successful and comprehensive in her controversial work *K* (1999), in which Woolf does make her appearance.

*K* was a cultural phenomenon in the late 1990s when the translated work of Woolf began to appear on a large scale in China and Taiwan. It is a work in which Woolf’s image as a Bloomsbury writer was successfully manipulated for the consumption of the Chinese cultural population. In *K* the short-lived affair of Julian Bell and Ling Shu-hua dominates the narrative. According to Hong Ying, she read the British poet Julian Bell’s letters in a library and learned about his two wishes: one being to die in the battlefield rather than in bed and the other, to find the most beautiful lover in the world. Deeply impressed, she wrote into her novel Bell’s visit to China that had been prompted by his sympathy for the Chinese revolution in the 1930s.262 Also written into the novel and actually dominating it is Bell’s love story with Ling, a Dean’s wife at Wuhan University where he taught English literature. For her, it is a history-based fictional work with documented historical materials. To establish the authenticity of her story, Hong Ying stressed in the foreword the archival research she had conducted for half a year. As she

---

262 Xu Gehui, “Yigeren de cunzai caishe feizhang zhongyao de—Hong Ying yu Xu Gehui” 一個人的存在 才是非常重要的—虹影 vs.許戈輝 (One’s Being is the Utmost Important Matter: Hong Ying vs. Xu Gehui), *Huohu hongying* 火狐紅影 (Taipei: Jiuge, 2004) 206-207. This is Xu’s interview with Hong Ying.
argues, “every event is real, but all have been re-worked through my imagination.” This very specific claim, however, has led Hong Ying to face a legal suit in China. Soon after the book had been published, Ling’s daughter Chen Xiaoying filed a lawsuit against Hong Ying for defamation of her late parents. Though Hong Ying denied that Ling Shu-hua was the prototype of her female protagonist, the court nevertheless ruled that the novel be prohibited from publication in China in any form. Hong Ying meanwhile was also penalized monetarily for the pornographic content of the book. A year later, Hong Ying reworked the novel and published it in China under the title Yingguo qingren (The English Lover; 2003).

Ironically, while Hong Ying insisted that her story was simply fictional when legal action was being taken against her in China, the English version of the novel, entitled K: The Art of Love (2002), was advertised as being “based on a true story” in the western market. Patricia Laurence’s review of the novel is an interesting piece in this “fiction or history” mystery. Laurence published her scholarly work Lily Briscoe’s Chinese Eyes: Bloomsbury, Modernism, and China (2003) in which the story of Bell and Ling is part of her research. Her study of historical events convinces her that the romance of Bell and Ling did take place. She nevertheless takes issue with Hong Ying’s

263 Hong Ying 虹影, foreword, K (Taipei: Erya, 1999) 2.
264 Hong Ying revealed in her interview with Xu that Sichuan Youth Daily 四川青年日报, which published a digest, and the Writer magazine 作家杂志社, which serialized part of the novel, and herself were ordered to pay RMB 210,000 in total. See Ke,”Yigeren de cuancai caizhang zhongyao de—Hong Ying yu Xu Gehui,” 205.
265 Hong Ying 虹影, Yingguo qinren 英国情人 (The English Lover) (Shenyang: Chunfeng wenyi, 2003).
266 Hong Ying, K: The Art of Love (London: Marion Boyars, 2002). The phrase “based on true story” is printed on the front cover of the novel.
claim that the novel $K$ is based on a true story. In her view, the way Hong Ying treats the romance of Bell and Ling is “never quite living up to the psychological and cultural dimensions of the historical relationship.” Certain events, she claims, are simply exaggerations resulting from Hong Ying’s erotic imagination. The sensational sexual relationship between Bell and Ling is one example, and Woolf’s “full-blown affair” with Clive Bell, her brother-in-law, is another. Accordingly, for Laurence $K$ reads more like an erotic than historical novel. In her view, the only thing that is perhaps commendable about the novel is its eroticism: “Some of the book’s best-written passages, if we can judge from translation, are Hong Ying’s sensuous descriptions, her articulation of desire in that Chinese bed now spinning in international fictional space.”268

Whatever the criticism, the novel is undeniably a commercial success, and the clever involvement of Woolf as well as its claimed historic basis appears to be an important contributor to such success. The romance of Bell and Ling is portrayed in the novel against the backdrop of the East-West literary exchanges between the two famous literary groups—the Bloomsbury group of England and the Crescent Moon Society of China. Hong Ying further adds credibility to the novel by incorporating into it historical materials such as Bell’s correspondence with his mother Vanessa Bell. Woolf’s novel and her interaction with other Bloomsburians, including her own sister, moreover, are time and again referred to. In a narrative so historically structured, the presence of Woolf cannot but be constantly felt. Casting Julian Bell alone can achieve the end, for he was Woolf’s nephew and the bridge for Ling to start her correspondence with Woolf. He was also the reason for Ling’s later personal contact with other Bloomsburians, including

Vanessa Bell, who helped her with her painting exhibition in London, and Vita Sackville-West and Leonard Woolf, who facilitated the publication of her English novel *Ancient Melody* (1953). The background settings involving the Bloomsbury and Crescent Moon also help to build up a cultural milieu in the story in which the spotlight readily falls on Woolf. The focus on Woolf was made not only because of her kinship to the male protagonist and her friendship with the female protagonists, but also because of the fact that, at least among the Bloomsburians, she is most recognizable to the Chinese readership due the availability of her letters, diaries, and essays as well as her global iconic status today.

Appropriation of big names, Woolf in particular, in *K* seems evident as judged also from the strong reactions generated among the reviewers regarding Hong Ying’s self-claimed intent for the novel. During an interview, Hong Ying gives her reason for the inclusion of East-West literary figures in her work. She says, “in fact this novel is not only about love; my point of departure lies in delineating the relationship between Chinese and Western cultures, and the disparity in their notions of love.” 其實這個小說並不僅僅是個愛情小說，我的出發點在於當時中國和西方在文化上是什麼樣的關係，中西愛情觀怎樣不同。 269 Unfortunately, her treatment of the East-West cultural relationship does not live up to her self-claimed intent. At least in terms of characterization, the major literary figures in *K* are simply flat and undeveloped. Glen Jennings, for instance, openly expresses his disappointment in his complaint that, “[f]amous names are dragged in at will, and dropped and discarded with little or no character development, including Virginia Woolf, E. M. Forster, Julian’s ‘spiritual father’

269 Zhang Yin 張英, *K ji qita: Hong Ying fangtanlu* (Interview with Hong Ying) (Shijiazhuang: Huashan, 2002) 270.
Roger Fry and the [Chinese] painter Qi Baishi.” 270 For David Der-Wei Wang 王德威, such perfunctory treatment of the literary figures as well as the cultural settings serves only as a foil to Hong Ying’s love story, 

Hong Ying shows her great ambition in dealing with a subject matter like this. … By interlacing and contrasting London and Wuhan, Bloomsbury group and Crescent Moon group, and tens of characters that are actually present or alluded to, such as Woolf, Foster, Hsu Chi-Mo, Qi Baishi, the novel is populated with personae…The complicated historical conditions Hong Ying renders with her pen are meant to make her notion of desire and sex stand out.

虹影處理這樣一個題材，可謂深具野心。... 倫敦與武漢、“布魯姆斯勃裏”集團與“新月派”、伍爾芙、弗斯特外加徐志摩、齊白石等數十明場、暗場人物，其間的種種交錯對比，算是夠熱鬧的了。

她的筆下複雜的歷史因緣，是寫來用以烘托她的情慾、性愛觀的。271

Whatever Hong Ying’s real intent, she is obviously skillful in her strategic appropriation of Woolf. Success of appropriation hinges heavily on timing, and her K came out just at a time when Woolf’s high popularity was unprecedented, a result of which is, for example, that Bell is often identified as a son of Vanessa Bell and nephew of


Hong Ying’s narrative strategy and her manipulation of the cultural resources have proven extremely successful. Despite the censorship in China, the copyright of *K* has been sold in twenty-one countries, though the unanticipated lawsuit may also have increased the exposure of this book to a certain extent. Most importantly, the very success of Hong Ying’s strategic appropriation speaks for Woolf’s popularity in the Chinese-speaking world.

Compared to her status in her native land and the European continent, Woolf’s influences are necessarily substantially reduced against the different socio-cultural background of the Chinese-speaking world. Viewed as a foreign writer or feminist, however, her reception is noteworthy and widespread. A writer or a feminist, she has been similarly well received, digested, and responded to with cultural products indebted to her, and her influences, remarkably, take various forms—visual, performing, and literary. Most interestingly, even though her work might not be as well understood by the general public in these lands as by the artists or writers under her sway, she and her work have nevertheless made a name for themselves to the extent that they have even been appropriated for commercial ends.
Chapter Six

Conclusion

Woolf’s reception in the Chinese contexts as discussed thus far appears to fall readily into four roughly cut periods, namely, the pre-separation period, the pre-1978 period, the pre-21st century period, and the 2000s, each manifesting unique characteristics of its own, with some further qualification by regional differences as a result of radical changes in political atmospheres. The three decades before the Republic of China (ROC) government retreat to Taiwan enjoy privileges that the other three periods can only imagine, i.e., the possibility of direct contact or correspondence with Woolf herself and her contemporaries. Such privileges were nevertheless limited to the elite few, which in turn limited Woolf’s overall reception. The next period, ranging somewhere between the 1950s and the 1970s, witnessed a Woolf perhaps never so forlorn in the Chinese-speaking worlds. In China, she was totally silenced along with her modernist comrades. Her reception in Taiwan appeared somewhat better but was still hardly commensurate with the efforts introducing her and her contemporaries. The last two decades of the twentieth century saw her reception on the rise in both Taiwan and China. Their somewhat different readerships, however, distinguished the ways in which she had been received: while Taiwan was warm and quick to notice her social concerns, China was more critical in attitude and focused more on her literary theories. In either case, this period had helped prepare the path for Woolf’s ripen reception on these geographical locations, which was to be observed in the beginning of the next century. During the 2000s, that is, Woolf’s reception has matured to such an extent that it turns into influences. This is evidenced in the various artistic creations in response to her works and the various
appropriations of her image as a feminist writer, both of which presume familiarity, hence ripen reception, of Woolf and her works. From the sporadic budding in the first half of the twentieth century to its full blossom in the last decade, in each case, Woolf’s reception appeared to be dependent on the receiving environment.

The reception of foreign cultures began as a natural development in the wake of the May Fourth Movement in 1919, which signifies a revolt against the foreign imperialism at the time, a gesture of disappointment at Confucian teachings, and a break from the old literary tradition. Woolf was introduced as part of the western modernist package deal and the focus was thus placed mainly on her modernist identity. The way she was received hinged much on the literary stances of her Chinese contemporary readers, most of whom, though limited in number, had received training in western literature in either England or the States. Being contemporaries of Woolf had afforded a few Chinese writers such as Ling Shu-hua to feel Woolf’s influence on a personal level, a privilege impossible for later comers to enjoy. The limited reception of Woolf to elites, however, was not to last long, especially after the political and military turmoil that ended in the ROC government’s retreat to Taiwan in 1949. Woolf had since become silenced on the mainland of China until some thirty years later.

In Taiwan, Woolf appeared better treated during this post-civil-war period. History seemed to repeat itself in her reception in Taiwan during this period, though. Woolf, that is, was again introduced as part of a modernist package deal, and the reason for introducing western modernism to Taiwan was again a revolt—only this time against the mainstream propaganda literature encouraged by the government at the time. Like that in pre-separation China, moreover, Woolf’s reception in Taiwan remained
introductory in nature and limited to the few capable of reading her works, literary and
critical alike, in their original texts, as in the case of Chang Hsio-ya. Like that in China,
again, more serious scholarship of Woolf has to wait until the 1980s, when Woolf’s
reception began to increase in both Taiwan and China.

Beginning in around the 1980s, that is, both Taiwan and China witnessed growing
popularity of Woolf. Attention, moreover, was no longer confined to Woolf’s
achievements as a modernist writer and literary critic. Some critics also showed their
interests in her feminist thoughts. The “modernism fever” as an offshoot of the
implementation of the reform and open-up policies in China, for example, while drawing
attention back to Woolf and her literary achievements in the 1980s, started to take notice,
in the 1990s, of her feminist contribution. The same period in Taiwan also witnessed a
switch in attention to Woolf’s feminist concerns. The speeds at which Woolf’s reception
picked up, however, differed greatly in these two regions. While a sharp rise was
apparent from the 1980s to the 1990s in China as evidenced in the numbers of both
translations of her works and the critical essays on Woolf, the same decades in Taiwan
saw only mild fluctuation in her reception. Differences in readerships seem accountable
for the observed differences. In Taiwan, Woolf was mainly read by English or foreign
language majors or scholars who were able to approach her works in their original texts,
which explains why translations were relatively few in number. The limited number of
translations further placed limit on Woolf’s reception by students of other disciplines as
well as general readers. Woolf in China, in contrast, was studied by students of Chinese
literature as well as English majors, and the surge of her critical popularity was
apparently associated with the increasing number of her works in Chinese translation,
which helped expand her readership beyond those educated in English or foreign languages.

The differences in readership appeared to have further ramifications than the accessibility issue. That is, they seem to have also influenced the way in which Woolf’s works were received in Taiwan and China: Taiwan scholars appeared more readily accepting of Woolf than their China counterparts. Such receptive differences may again be accounted for by differences in disciplinary training. More specifically put, the English literature training from their college years onward might have better oriented Taiwan scholars for western perspectives. Many critics of Woolf in China, on the other hand, came from Chinese literature backgrounds and read Woolf in her Chinese translations. Their earlier training in Chinese literature thus provided ready reference or even frameworks in their attempts to understand Woolf. Their attempts in reading Woolf were therefore more assimilative in nature, as shown in their more critical attitudes toward Woolf, which seemed to reflect attempts to fit Woolf into their already existent knowledge structure. For readers who were proud of their own culture, this appears natural, as attempts to assimilate foreign cultures into their own usually characterize initial reception. However, the wave of globalization has brought in fundamental changes in Chinese’s view of the world, creating a literary milieu more favorable to foreign literature. This seems to be what has happened when the twenty-first century began, i.e., when Woolf became more favorably reviewed and received due to globalization.
The steep rise in Woolf’s popularity in the beginning of the ensuing century in both Taiwan and China indicates a qualitative transformation of Woolf’s reception into influences on both regions. Meanwhile, this new century also witnessed shrinking cultural and economic distances between these two regions, which have been drawn close by a rising China carried forward on its own globalization waves. Artists from Taiwan and China alike began to respond to Woolf’s ideas and theories with their own artistic creation; commercial activities appropriating Woolf’s popular image as a backdrop to foreground their commodities also started to be seen. The act of commercial appropriation points to a Woolf who has been well received as part of a global culture in both regions, as commercials have to depend for their success on their audience’s familiarity with the person or the image it appropriates. The cultural products in response to her works further indicate that Woolf’s works are no longer passively received and that some of their ideas or concepts must have been integrated with the existing culture for artistic creation to find inspiration in it. That is, Woolf’s reception at the turn of the century has grown into a cultural influence, and this is witnessed in both Taiwan and China as manifested in the cultural productions she has inspired in both. Another outgrowth of the qualitative transformation of Woolf’s reception during this decade is diversification. That is, Woolf began to be approached from various contemporary literary theoretical paradigms. This has resulted in a new multifaceted Woolf in this new century as seen in her polyphonic reception, which is manifested in interest not only in her aesthetics but in her concerns for social and political issues as well.
The history of Woolf’s reception in the Chinese-speaking world, like that in many European countries, thus seems to have been determined largely by political and economic factors as well as literary and cultural milieu. The separation of Republican China into Taiwan and China in 1949 not only signifies the two political entities’ political-ideological separation but also started Woolf’s differential receptions in these two Chinese-speaking regions. The political-ideological influence continued for decades until the beginning of China’s inclusion in globalization. Woolf’s differential reception during these decades in many respects resembled that in East and West Germany, especially the different speeds at which Woolf’s popularity has grown. What distinguishes Woolf in the Chinese worlds appears to lie in the additional factor of readership. That is, Woolf’s reception in the Chinese-speaking world has been conditioned also by the disciplinary backgrounds of her readers, which is further responsible for the different attitudes toward Woolf before the end of the twentieth century. Beginning in the next century, however, the economic forces of globalization have greatly increased China’s communication with the world, which further minimized the receptive differences earlier observed between Taiwan and China. Reception of Woolf has since become a cross-regional phenomenon and, most interestingly, has transformed itself into cultural influences that gave rise to artistic creations in response to her works. The rendition of Woolf’s reception as given in this study thus contributes to a more complete picture of Woolf’s reception in Asia.
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Figure 2
Number of translation by year. Source: National Central Library of Taiwan.
## Appendix B: Translations of Virginia Woolf’s Major Works (by Year)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Translator</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Translator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1935</td>
<td>Flush</td>
<td>Shi Pu</td>
<td>1973</td>
<td>A Room of One’s Own</td>
<td>Chang Hsu-ya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1945</td>
<td>To the Lighthouse</td>
<td>Xie Qingyau</td>
<td>1976</td>
<td>A Room of One’s Own</td>
<td>Hsu Shun-de</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1947</td>
<td><em>A Room of One’s Own</em></td>
<td>Wang Huan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td><em>Night and Day</em></td>
<td>Tang &amp; Yin</td>
<td>1987</td>
<td>Selected Short Fiction</td>
<td>Liu Liang-ya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>Selected Essays</td>
<td>Qu Shijing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td>To the Lighthouse+</td>
<td>Qu Shijing</td>
<td>1988</td>
<td><em>To the Lighthouse</em></td>
<td>Kong Fan-yun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td>Mrs. Dalloway+</td>
<td>Sun &amp; Su</td>
<td>1988</td>
<td>Mrs. Dalloway</td>
<td>Chen Hui-hua</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>A Room of One’s Own</td>
<td>Wang Huan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>Selected Essays/Short Fiction</td>
<td>Li Naikun</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td><em>Orlando</em></td>
<td>Chu Nai-chang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>The Waves</td>
<td>Wu Junxie</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>Selected Essays</td>
<td>Huang &amp; Kong</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td><em>Orlando</em></td>
<td>Chu Nai-chang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td><em>Orlando</em></td>
<td>Wei &amp; Min</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td><em>Orlando</em></td>
<td>Chu Nai-chang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>Book and Portraits</td>
<td>Liu Bingshan</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td><em>Orlando</em></td>
<td>Chu Nai-chang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>Select Letters</td>
<td>Wang et.al</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td><em>Orlando</em></td>
<td>Chu Nai-chang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>Selected Diaries</td>
<td>Dai &amp; Song</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td><em>Orlando</em></td>
<td>Chu Nai-chang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td><em>To the Lighthouse+++</em></td>
<td>Ma Aiong</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td><em>Orlando</em></td>
<td>Chu Nai-chang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>Mrs. Dalloway+++</td>
<td>Gu Qian</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td><em>Orlando</em></td>
<td>Chu Nai-chang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>The Years</td>
<td>Jin Guanglan</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td><em>Orlando</em></td>
<td>Chu Nai-chang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>Selected Essays</td>
<td>Wu and Wang</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>To the Lighthouse</td>
<td>Song De-ming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>Selected Essays</td>
<td>Qu Shijing ed.</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>To the Lighthouse</td>
<td>Song De-ming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>The Waves</td>
<td>Cao Yuanyong</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>A Room of One’s Own</td>
<td>Song Wei-hang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>Selected Essays/Short Fiction</td>
<td>Huang Mei ed.</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>A Room of One’s Own</td>
<td>Song Wei-hang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>Selected Essays</td>
<td>Hu Jialuan ed.</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>A Room of One’s Own</td>
<td>Song Wei-hang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>Freshwater</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>To the Lighthouse+++</td>
<td>Wang Jiaxiang</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Three Guineas</td>
<td>Wang Chan-chen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Jacob’s Room+++</td>
<td>Wang Jiaxiang</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td><em>Orlando</em></td>
<td>Pui Ya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Mrs. Dalloway</td>
<td>Wang Jiaxiang</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td><em>Orlando</em></td>
<td>Pui Ya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>A Room of One’s Own*</td>
<td>Wang Yiguo</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Freshwater</td>
<td>Tang Chia-hui</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Three Guineas**</td>
<td>Wang &amp; Wang</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td><em>Orlando</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Complete Essays I</td>
<td>Shi Yunlong et.al</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Freshwater</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Complete Essays II</td>
<td>Huang Yiguo et.al</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Freshwater</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Complete Essays III**</td>
<td>Huang Bin et.al</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Freshwater</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Complete Essays 1V</td>
<td>Huang Yiguo et.al</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Freshwater</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Selected Essays</td>
<td>Huang &amp; Zhang</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>Selected Short Fiction</td>
<td>Huang Mei et.al</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>Taiwan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003 <em>Mrs. Dalloway</em></td>
<td>Cui &amp; Qin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003 <em>Night and Day</em></td>
<td>Dang Yi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003 <em>Jacob’s Room</em></td>
<td>Pu Long</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003 <em>The Years</em></td>
<td>Pu Long</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003 <em>Orlando</em></td>
<td>Lin Yen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003 <em>Between the Acts</em></td>
<td>Gu Qinan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003 <em>The Voyage Out</em></td>
<td>Wang Yisi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003 <em>The Common Reader I</em></td>
<td>Ma Aixin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003 <em>The Common Reader II</em></td>
<td>Shih Yongli et.al</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003 <em>A Room of One’s Own</em></td>
<td>Jia Hufeng</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004 <em>To the Lighthouse</em></td>
<td>Lin Zhihe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005 <em>The Common Reader I&amp;II</em></td>
<td>Liu Bingshan et.al</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006 <em>Selected Essays</em></td>
<td>Liu Wenrong</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007 <em>The Waves</em></td>
<td>Huang Hui-min</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008 <em>Orlando</em></td>
<td>Chang Yen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Works followed by identical (number of) asterisks and plus signs appear in the same book.
Appendix C: Translations of Major Novels and Essays (by Work)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Translator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1947*</td>
<td>A Room of One’s Own</td>
<td>Wang Huan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973</td>
<td>A Room of One’s Own</td>
<td>Chang Hsiu-ya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td>A Room of One’s Own</td>
<td>Hsu Shun-de</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989*</td>
<td>A Room of One’s Own</td>
<td>Wang Huan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>A Room of One’s Own</td>
<td>Song Wei-hang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>A Room of One’s Own</td>
<td>Wang Yiguos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>A Room of One’s Own</td>
<td>Jia Huifeng</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>A Room of One’s Own</td>
<td>Chen Hui-hua</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Translator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1945*</td>
<td>To the Lighthouse</td>
<td>Hsieh Ching-yao</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td>To the Lighthouse</td>
<td>Kong Fan-yun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td>To the Lighthouse</td>
<td>Qu Shijing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>To the Lighthouse</td>
<td>Ma Ainong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>To the Lighthouse</td>
<td>Song De-ming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>To the Lighthouse</td>
<td>Chang Hsiao-tang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>To the Lighthouse</td>
<td>Wang Jiaxiang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>To the Lighthouse</td>
<td>Lin Zhihe</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Translator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td>Mrs. Dalloway</td>
<td>Chen Hui-hua</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td>Mrs. Dalloway</td>
<td>Sun &amp; Su</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>Mrs. Dalloway</td>
<td>Gu Qinan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>Mrs. Dalloway</td>
<td>Shih Lan-ting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Mrs. Dalloway</td>
<td>Wang Jiaxiang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Mrs. Dalloway</td>
<td>Chen Yuanbiao</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>Mrs. Dalloway</td>
<td>Cui &amp; Qin</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Translator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>Orlando</td>
<td>Chu Nai-chang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>Orlando</td>
<td>Wei &amp; Min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Orlando</td>
<td>Pai Ya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>Orlando</td>
<td>Lin Yen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Orlando</td>
<td>Chen Hui-hua</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Orlando</td>
<td>Chang Yen</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Translator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>The Waves</td>
<td>Wu Junxie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>The Waves</td>
<td>Cao Yuanyong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>The Waves</td>
<td>Huang Hui-min</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Translator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>The Years</td>
<td>Jin Guanglan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>The Years</td>
<td>Pu Long</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Translator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Three Guineas</td>
<td>Wang Chan-chen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Three Guineas</td>
<td>Wang &amp; Wang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Translator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td><em>The Voyage Out</em></td>
<td>Wang Yisi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td><em>Night and Day</em></td>
<td>Dang &amp; Ying</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td><em>Night and Day</em></td>
<td>Dang Yi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td><em>Jacob’s Room</em></td>
<td>Wang Jiaxiang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td><em>Jacob’s Room</em></td>
<td>Pu Long</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td><em>Between the Acts</em></td>
<td>Gu Qinan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix D: Chinese Bibliography of Translation

A Room of One’s Own

王飈譯.《一間自己的屋子》. 上海: 文化生活, 1947.

Between the Acts


Flush: A Biography

石璞譯.《狒拉西》. 上海: 商務, 1932.

Freshwater: A Comedy in Three Acts


Mrs. Dalloway


Night and Day

Jacob’s Room


Orlando: A Biography


Three Guineas


To the Lighthouse

謝慶垚譯. 《到燈塔去》. 上海: 商務, 1945.
馬愛農譯. 《到燈塔去》. 北京人民文學, 1997. ++

Voyage Out


The Waves

The Years


SHORT FICTION, ESSAYS, DIARIES

王正文等譯. 《維吉尼亞·吳爾夫文學書簡》. 合肥: 安徽文藝, 1996.
戴紅珍、宋炳輝譯. 《伍爾芙日記選》. 天津: 百花文藝, 1997.
刘炳善等譯. 《普通讀者》. 北京: 北京十月文藝, 2005.

1 Note: Works followed by identical (number of) asterisks and plus signs appear in the same book.
Appendix E: Versions of Virginia Woolf’s Name in Chinese

In Traditional Chinese Characters
(Woolf, Virginia)

吳爾夫，維吉妮亞
吳爾夫，維琴妮亞
吳爾夫，維琴尼亞
吳爾芙，維琴尼亞
吳爾芙，維金尼亞
吳爾芙，維吉尼亞
吳爾芙，維吉妮亞
吾爾芙，維吉妮亞
渥芙，維吉妮亞
沃夫，維珍尼亞
伍爾夫，維吉尼亞
伍爾芙，維吉尼亞
伍爾夫，維吉尼亞
伍爾孚
沃爾夫
沃爾芙
渥爾芙
武爾芙

In Simplified Chinese Characters
(Woolf, Virginia)

伍尔夫，弗吉尼亚
伍尔芙，弗吉尼亚
伍沃夫
吴尔夫
吴尔芙
沃尔夫
沃尔夫
沃尔芙
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