

SPECTRAL WOMEN: FEMINIST PERSPECTIVES ON GHOSTS IN KINGSTON'S THE WOMAN WARRIOR

Dr. Amira Zahra Ben Youssef

Faculty of Letters and Humanities

University of Sousse, Tunisia

DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.15582947

Abstract

Ghosts are the most common sight in Maxine H. Kingston's *The Woman Warrior*. Ghosts exist in the writer's childhood memories and her country of origin, China. They also populate the writer's present life in the American society. Ghosts keep hovering in the writer's memory and text, appearing in different shapes and communicating different meanings. Ghosts cannot be decided to be human or subhuman, pertaining to the past or to the present, Chinese or American, male or female. They cannot easily be anchored in time and space. They cannot even be confined to language since they trespass words and become an invisible power that controls the writer's memory and feelings. The focus of this paper is to detect ghost images in Kingston's text and to give meaning to such a metaphor, referring to feminist theories.

Keywords: Metaphor, Ghost, feminist, implicit, explicit

Introduction

The Woman Warrior is a very telling title of Maxine H. Kingston's novel, for it summarizes a whole situation of distress and oppression in which a female – daughter, sister or wife – is helplessly caught, enduring to voice her feelings and thoughts. The alliteration on the sound “w” in the title *The Woman Warrior* creates a gloomy mood of sorrow and woefulness. Such a mood is further emphasized by the subtitle *Memoirs of a Girlhood Among Ghosts*. The word “ghost” is a key term and a main issue in Kingston's novel which can be read as a rite and a celebration performed by a constellation of “ghosts.” Metaphors of “ghosts” are noticeably recurrent throughout the text echoing the writer's attitudes towards a conventional reality and constructing new ideologies.

“Ghosts” at home, “ghosts” in school, “ghosts” in the street, “ghosts” hovering around the town: these are the immediate pictures that strike the reader of Kingston's novel. Indeed, composed in a postmodernist spirit, the novel questions the reality as presented in classical literary forms. Historical events like World War II, the Vietnam's War, the Communist Movement, the Movement Years in The U.S.A and the supposedly autobiographical element of the postmodernist text have led to the manifestation of the mythical world. Such a world is different from the gothic sphere as it trespasses the boundaries of the castle, the dungeon and the monastery to be strongly rooted in the social corners of real life. Therefore, the image of “ghosts” in *The Woman*

Warrior does not pertain to the classical definition introduced by gothic fiction and referring to a supernatural power, a supreme force, and a curse. It is however, an innovative icon reflecting a social, cultural and a historical reality.

Even the supernatural apparitions in *The Woman Warrior* are functionally employed as a symbolic projection of the real life. Brave Orchid's ghost-haunted study place, for instance, testifies to the presence of the supernatural ghost. Nevertheless, Orchid's challenging reaction against the apparition tames the supernatural ghost and inscribes it into the earthly sphere of reality. The classical interpretation of ghosts as a supernatural apparition would be too simplistic and superficial since Kingston's immediate aim is to project an existing reality through a gathering of ghosts which are part and parcel of her reality as a Chinese American female. Accordingly, ghosts are very real and human, reflecting authentic experiences as witnessed by a Chinese daughter and a Chinese American female immigrant. In some instances, these ghosts appear "wild," "barbarous," "crude" reflecting a postmodernist apocalyptic vision. In other instances, they seem weak and vulnerable voicing Kingston's firm beliefs and deconstructive ideology.

In an article entitled "Questioning Race and Gender Definitions: Dialogic Subversion in *The Woman Warrior*," Malini J. Schuller states that the word "ghost" is the most common term in Kingston's text, for "it describes the experience of living within both Chinese and American cultures" (60). She adds that Kingston defines the word "ghosts" as "shadowy figures from the past" or "unanswered questions about unexplained actions of Chinese, whites and Chinese in America" (60), concluding that the term "ghosts" is a label of "any concept that defies clear interpretation" (60). Going in the same tandem, the main purpose of this paper is to decipher the proliferation of ghosts and their symbolic meanings in Kingston's text. The metaphors of "ghosts" are classified into explicit and implicit images having destructive and constructive roles as far as issues of gender and ethnicity are concerned. The direct reference to the word "ghosts" in the text will be read as an explicit metaphor while implicit metaphors of "ghosts" will be analyzed as Kingston's employment of a sophisticated poetic style turning around the periphery of horror, silence and gloom. Animal imagery, color symbolism, repetition of the dichotomy silence/voice and the grotesque establish the metaphor of "ghosts," which means in this respect an atmosphere of female oppression, marginalization and silencing.

The metaphors of "ghosts" as an overt reflection of a dominant culture are introduced through the girl's memories and her mother's "ghost tales." The patriarchal Chinese traditions, rituals and customs throughout the text are meant to symbolically create a ghost of culture. Indeed, the "ghost" of the No Name aunt and her baby "ghost" still dwell in the girl's thoughts and memories. The girl's mother had a secret and supposedly ghost-haunted study place. The girl's family was also overwhelmed by the "ghost" of the grandfather whose shadow still hovers around and whose words still haunt their memory (Kingston 64). China bridges which are "ghost" dwellings, the Chinese "Sit Dom Kuei" which is equivalent to "ghost" in English (84) and the baby's mother who "said that a

ghost entered him” (80) are “ghost” metaphors through which Kingston introduces a Chinese culture built upon mysterious and horrifying visions of “ghosts.”

In addition to the explicit references to ghost, other ghost metaphors are implicitly created through animal imagery: “I was listening to the dogs bark away, suddenly a full grown sitting ghost loomed to the ceiling and pounced on top of me [. . .]. It was bigger than a wolf, bigger than an ape and growing” (70). Through animal imagery, Kingston unveils a ghostly childhood world constructed within every Chinese woman through horrifying tales associated with female body. It is not coincidental that the narrative starts with the girl reaching the age of puberty. The mother tells her about ghost stories to stimulate her daughter’s awareness of the threat of being female in patriarchal Chinese society which suppresses and obscures femininity.

Dealing with her memories as a Chinese American daughter, Kingston exposes the reader to a conglomeration of “ghosts” constituting a major part of a Chinese culture. In fact, the reader can easily see the ghost horrifying a vulnerable Chinese girl having her “feet bound” to fulfill the conventional norms of female beauty as dictated by a masculine bias: “My mother said we were lucky we didn’t have to have our feet bound when we were seven [. . .]. Sisters used to sit on their beds and let the blood gush back into their veins” (16). The “No Name” aunt is another testimony of the veiled cultural ghost which confines and rapes femininity. Indeed, the unwed aunt’s pregnancy in the absence of her male tragically drives her to be an easy prey of a patriarchal culture which rigidly accuses the female of being raped yet never blames the abuser.

The ghost metaphors are not limited to the cultural boundary. Ghosts populate

Kingston’s memoirs and overwhelm the social realm. As a Chinese American writer, Kingston deals with two utterly distinct worlds, namely the Chinese and the American societies. Though dissimilar, Kingston creates a certain similarity between the two societies through the metaphor of ghosts. For instance, when villagers raided the family’s house, they were metaphorically described as dead ghosts: “Aiaa, we’re going to die. Death is coming.

Death is coming. Look what you’ve done. You killed us. Ghosts! Dead ghosts” (20). In this scene, ghosts are symbolically meant to be the death agents of male-biased Chinese social conventions.

Likewise, in American society ghosts exist and prevail. In the third chapter entitled

“Shaman,” Kingston tells her readers how she grew up seeing “airplanes in the sky and ghosts everywhere.” For her, “America has been full of machines and ghosts – taxi ghosts, bus ghosts, police ghosts, fire ghosts, meter-reader ghosts, tree-trimming ghosts, fire and dime ghosts (90). Ghosts even visit the family’s house as “social worker ghosts,” and “milk ghosts” (91). In “Intelligibility and Meaningfulness in Multicultural Literature in English,” Reed Way Dasenbrock points out that the whole text is “littered with reference to [. . .] ghosts” (164). Dasenbrock argues that the word ghost “does not mean what it does to most English speakers, instead, it means non-Chinese and non-oriental” (164) since Kingston reveals that “the Japanese, though little, were not ghosts, the

only foreigners considered not ghosts by the Chinese” (87). Seen from Dasenbrock’s perspective, the metaphor of ghosts may readily be explained as a projection of the perpetual clash between a mainstream and an ethnic culture.

While the mainstream culture sees the „other“ as inferior, the Chinese ethnic minority finds the dominant „Other“ as a xenophobic ghost.

However, Dasenbrock defines the word “ghost” only from the American perspective and obscures the native Chinese element. In fact, according to ancient Chinese glossary, the Erya, compiled around the third century BC, “„ghost“ (gui) means „to return“ and „to die“” (qtd. in Zetlin 19). According to the Chinese myth, when soul and body disconnect in death, each return to its true place or nature, turning into a ghost:

A ghost means to return, that is, to return to its true home, not to the „false“ home to which the deceased clung when still alive, but to his or her “true” origins elsewhere. A ghost is therefore defined as what goes away and does not come back. (19)

Seen from this angle, the ghost metaphor in Kingston’s *The Woman Warrior* stands for Chinese Americans who are torn between two extremes and who can neither die and return to their true origins nor stay alive in a fake home.

The ghost metaphor is equally used to depict a multicultural American society with different colors and different origins: “I like the Negro students (Black Ghosts) best because they laughed the loudest and talked to me as if I were a daring talker too” (149). In this instance, the “ghost” metaphor can be symbolic reference to a perpetual conflict between colored and white Americans and a cultural clash between ethnic minorities. Such a gap between ethnic communities is metaphorically highlighted through Moon Orchid’s great fear of the “Mexican ghosts” plotting against her life (140). The airport “Immigration ghosts [. . .] stamping papers” (107) are also a symbolic replication of the history of the Chinese immigration to the United States which was stained by racist exclusion and violence. This point in history is reverberated in Brave Orchid’s words:

Lie to Americans. Tell them you were born during San Francisco earthquake. Tell them your birth certificate and your parents were burned up in the fire. [. . .] Give a new name every time you get arrested; the ghosts won’t recognize you. (Kingston 165)

Brave Orchid’s words shed light on the situation of oppression the Chinese immigrants experience from in the American society. Likewise, reference to San Francisco’s earthquake is telling of the history of the Chinese immigrants and their suspected integration within the American society. In “Chinese American Literature,” Shan Qiang He states in this respect: “Not until the 1906 San Francisco earthquake which destroyed government documents, did many Chinese have a chance to falsely claim native-born citizenship status and manage to send for their family members” (47).

As far as the Chinese society is concerned, the “Communist” ghost is implicitly created to occupy the Chinese social corners. Indeed, Kingston’s narrative exposes many instances of the cruel “Communist” specter imposing its ideologies on the Chinese society.

The narrator’s “fourth uncle,” for instance, was a victim of the implicit “Communist” ghost: He sat under a tree to think. When he spotted a pair of nesting doves, [. . .] he climbed up and caught the birds. That was where the communists trapped him, in the tree. They criticized him for selfishly taking food for his own family and killed him, leaving his body in the tree as an example. They took the birds to a commune kitchen to be shared. (Kingston 52)

Color symbolism is functionally employed in the text to disclose the lurking metaphoric ghost of communism. The red color is abundantly employed to create a bloodshed horrifying atmosphere and to establish the implicit image of the communist deadly ghost. The “red kerchiefs” (51), the “two red-dyed eggs” (43), the daylight described as “yellow and red”

(72), the communists wearing “a blue plainness dotted with one red Mao button” (73) and the clock with “red phoenixes” and “red words” (113) project the Chinese society as a realm of horror and violence in which the red ghost of communism is overwhelming.¹

Very startling is the metaphor of the “male ghost” throughout the text. In his article, Dasenbrock gives the metaphors of ghosts a social and multicultural dimension. However, a close scrutiny of these metaphors will reveal that Kingston uses the ghost’s metaphors to lay bare a set of male-gendered jobs. Approaching these very specific jobs from a linguistic perspective, it is revealed that they are rendered conventionally and culturally male through the use of language. Thus, the “milk ghost” can only be the milkman, the “police ghost” is only the policeman and the “mail ghost” is none but the mailman. Interestingly, though linguistically playful, the chapter’s title “Shaman” lends itself to various interpretations. It is indeed a compound noun meaning “shame man” or “sham man.” In both cases, the title is telling of the writer’s silent reaction against established male stereotypes which she links to a shameful and sham patriarchal culture.

Kingston’s terminology meets Deborah Cameron’s critical stand about patriarchal language. In a book entitled *Verbal Hygiene*, Cameron criticizes the fact that language is used in patriarchal cultures to ensure gender differences and establish oppressive stereotypes of femininity. She argues that a language’s main function is political and leads to inequality in social structure because through the medium of language “women are trained for the abdication of autonomy while men are trained for the exercise of power” (41). Cameron’s remark that language contains “gender specializations” (40) is clear in Kingston’s text which, through the repetition of the

¹ While the red color is thought to celebrate the blood of the workers and commemorate their suffering and sacrifices in Chinese culture, it evokes fears of the threat of communism in capitalist Western cultures.

word ghost instead of man as in “milk ghost” or “mail ghost,” uncovers the political function of a masculine-biased language that aims at voicing the masculine and silencing the feminine.

Kingston uses the ghost metaphor to deal the theme of war as male-gendered stereotype in the American society. Brave Orchid, the narrator’s mother, for instance asks: “do you think my son is in Vietnam?” (106). The ghost metaphor is present in Brave Orchid’s description of the males flying to Vietnam: “You had to feel sorry for them even though they were Army and Navy ghosts” (106). The employment of the ghost metaphor reflects in this respect Kingston’s critical standpoint about the conventional “polarization of men as fighters and women as the protected, [. . .] naturaliz[ing] men’s association with war and women’s with peace [and] equating maternal thinking with the politics of peace” (Andermahr 195). Fa Mu Lan, the woman warrior, does not escape this stereotype despite her battles and victories. Likewise, the metaphor of ghost is a projection of Kingston’s critical attitude against cultural norms which place the male in the position of the fighter and the female in a state of passivity and submission to the triumphant male.

Dealing with the Chinese male, the ghost metaphor is implicitly repeated throughout the text. Indeed, the “first opponent” of the woman warrior turned to be a giant, “baron [who] sat square and fat like a god” (45). Some man commanded the narrator’s No Name aunt “to lie with him and be his secret evil [then] masked himself when he joined the raid on her family” (14). Another “fat man sat on little naked girls” (34). These grotesque male images are deliberately meant to create an invisible male ghost who is conventionally and legitimately violent, savage, and ruthless by virtue of his maleness in a patriarchal-biased society which praises masculinity and negates femininity.

Nonetheless, Kingston does not neglect the Chinese female and allows her the privilege of the ghost metaphor. Indeed, through such a metaphor, the female writer portrays the Chinese women as victimized, oppressed and marginalized. The female daughter, sister and wife appear throughout the text suffering from the burden of a violent cultural environment which dehumanizes them. The ghost metaphor, as far as the female character is concerned, is ironically implied as a critical revision of male-oriented cultural and social stereotypes as well as a criticism of the female who willingly succumbs to such male-gendered ideologies. Fa Mu Lan describes the females she encountered during one of her raids: “They blinked weakly at me like pheasants that have been raised in the dark for soft meat [. . .]. They could not escape in their little bound feet [. . .]. They wandered away like ghosts” (46-47).

In the American society, the female character, though different, is not an exception. Brave Orchid describes the “nurse wife” of Moon Orchid’s husband: “She wore pink lipstick and had blue eyelids like the ghosts” (135). Though young and modern, this pretty wife is still confined within female stereotypes of sexually-consumable femininity. Indeed, “she wore pink” which is a stereotyped color. She is also a nurse helping a superior male having the role of a doctor. Therefore, so attractive and modern as she is, the “nurse wife” remains dependent on

a male and her attractive appearances are meant to highlight the stereotypes of the pretty doll and the objectified sexual fetish through which the male fulfills his masculine subject. In *Speculum of the Other Woman*, Luce Irigaray talks about female stereotyping as a way that negates females and objectifies them as an act needed in the establishment of the male subject:

Woman, for her part, remains an unrealized potentially unrealizable, at least by/for herself. Is she, by nature, a being that exists for/by another? [. . .] Is she unnecessary in and of herself, but essential as the non-subjective subjectum? As that which can never achieve the status of subject, at least for/by herself? [. . .]. This „lack of qualities“ that makes the female truly female ensures that the male can achieve his qualifications [. . .]. Theoretically, there would be no such thing as woman. She would not exist. The best that can be said is that she does not exist yet. (165-66)

In Kingston's text, the pretty nurse wife who has to be as pretty as she can so that she will be able to compete (135) is an example of Irigaray's postulation about male subjectivism constructed upon stereotyping females and turning them into objects of desire.

Through the character of Moon Orchid, the implicit ghost metaphor is made manifest.

Indeed, Moon Orchid is described as “tiny, tiny lady, very thin with little flickering hands, [. . .] white hair [and] a face all wrinkled” (109). She is depicted as vulnerable woman who finds all the jobs hard for her (124). Moreover, she is always scared to confront her husband who deserted her so many years ago (132). She turns into a silent shadow under the dominance of her husband: “He looked directly at Moon Orchid the way the savages looked, looking for lies. „What do you want?“, he asked. She shrank from his stare; it silenced her crying” (138). Through the ironic description of Moon Orchid, Kingston creates the implicit ghost metaphor. Moon Orchid is in fact an emblem of submission and complete resignation to rigid stereotypes turning women into anonymous and invalid ghosts.

The confrontation of the female narrator with the silent schoolgirl introduces another instance of the implicit ghost metaphor. Cynthia Wong comments on this encounter: “though supernatural events, whether rationalized or not, are absent, Maxine's encounter with the quiet girl is set in a deserted school yard, in a crepuscular half-light reminiscent of many classic tales of the doppelganger [the shadow]” (86). Though tortured, the school girl keeps silent: „What's your name?“ she shook her head, and some hair caught in the tears; wet black hair stuck to the side of the pink and white face. [. . .] „You have a tongue [. . .] so use it“ [. . .] „ow“ I said just „Ow.“ „Let me alone“ say, „leave alone“ just say „stop“. (Kingston 159-60)

Although her face was “squeezed” and her hair “pulled” (161), the girl remained silent with “quarts of tears but no words [. . .]. Her crying was like an animal's” (161). This scene is very significant insofar as it metaphorically depicts the state of silence in which the Chinese female is confined. Indeed, a Chinese daughter is taught to be silent and not to “tell,” experiencing a state of motionlessness and internalizing the

stereotype of the silent shadow. Such a stereotype symbolically opens the narrative: ““You must not tell anyone,” my mother said „what I am about to tell you”” (11). The “tongue cutting” Chinese rite is another telling practice which uncovers a cultural endeavor to turn females into muted creatures unable to articulate their voice and identity.

The image of the silent girl in Kingston’s text is reminiscent of the metaphor of the “mute body” evoked by Tania Modleski in *Feminism without Women*. Modleski renders metaphor of the “mute body” to a sociocultural androcentric tendency toward erasing female voice. The “mute body” metaphor is used in order to account for a marginalized state women occupy in male-centered cultures. Modleski further talks about the “scandal of the mute body” and argues for the necessity of overcoming such a scandal. In her argument, the deliberate positioning of women outside the masculine discourse and the refusal to permit female articulation is a patriarchal rhetorical form of violence which is “the real historical scandal and which should be addressed by feminist criticism” (51). Modleski points out that whenever a woman speaks in a sociocultural environment that always conspires to silence her, she brings into being a new order and “enacts the scandal of the speaking body in a more profound way than those people already authorized to speak by virtue of their gender” (53). By so doing, a woman becomes a speaking body and subsequently threatens to resist a patriarchal system in which “mute women remain mostly mute [and] cannot speak freely to and of one another” (54). Modleski’s calls for a woman to articulate her voice are echoed in the female narrator’s repeated attempts to make the silent girl speak as a way of overcoming the ghost of silence thrown upon her by a patriarchal culture: “„Talk!” I yelled into each cutworm [. . .] „I know you talk” [. . .]. „Go ahead.” Say it loud enough” (Kingston 160).

Ghosts are then the dominant figures in Kingston’s text. The imagery of ghosts, explicit and implicit, gives the novel its particularity as a neo-gothic piece of fiction. However, as the reader moves from one ghost scene to another, he/she starts questioning the real motives behind such a multitude of ghosts of different social backgrounds, different colors and different sexes. Among many critics, Diane Sauder comments on the abundance of the metaphor of ghosts in the novel:

As a member of a minority cultural group, Kingston had to negotiate between her mother’s cultural values and her adoptive country’s cultural values. As a child, she found that both sides denigrated the other. That is, her mother regarded all Americans, including her children, as barbarians or ghosts, barely human and unmannerly, all because they were ignorant of the Chinese culture. (51)

According to Sauder, the ghost metaphor can be read as a reflection of the cultural clash between a mainstream and a minor ethnic culture. This interpretation is readily sensed in Kingston’s belief that Chinese parents regard their children as “half ghosts” (Kingston 165), for they are partly assimilated in the mainstream American culture. The metaphor of ghosts, in this sense, is Kingston’s subscription in “the tradition of autobiographies by

ChineseAmerican writers [who] try to define their self-identity in a society of racist discrimination where immigrant minorities are re-made in various racist images” (Qiang He 54).

Trying to figure out Kingston’s implicit purpose of employing the ghost metaphor, Dasenbrock states: My point is not that we cannot decide which meaning of the word ghost is intended; my point is that after a while, we do not bother to decide, as we enter into the semantic world of the book. The meaning of the word ghost, as Kingston uses it, is not hard to figure out a serious or insuperable barrier to intelligibility [. . .]. But, it is worth inquiring for a moment why Kingston might want to make on Chinese readers do that work. (165)

Apart from the superficial interpretation of the ghost metaphor as those “outsiders” referred to in Chinese language by a word almost translated as ghost (165), the abundantly recurrent images of ghosts are Kingston’s narrative strategy to force non-Chinese readers to understand the Chinese use of the term (165). By so doing, non-Chinese audience would learn a great deal about Chinese perceptions of the counter culture.

According to Dasenbrock, this narrative strategy would result in a sense of reconciliation between cultures since “the net effect is that a non-Chinese reader can understand Chinese cultural horizons more expertly than before” (165). By offering the reader a crucial role in constructing the text’s meaning, Kingston aims at reconciling cultures, for a non-Chinese reader needs to understand the Chinese culture as a fundamental start to decipher the different meanings of the ghost metaphor. Such an intercultural compromise is symbolically echoed in the American-born writer’s reconciliation with her Chinese born-born mother. So, through the metaphors of ghost, Kingston does not close her text to “outsiders.” She rather lures the non-Chinese reader to penetrate into the depths of an ethnic cultural heritage, decipher its emblems and turn it into an open space.

Likewise, the ghost metaphor can be explained as Kingston’s outlet to enjoy the imaginary female triumphs over a masculine-biased society. Indeed, Brave Orchid is described as “loud” while her sister Moon Orchid is depicted as “voiceless.” Kingston talks boldly while the school girl, though suffering from torture, remains a muted ghost. This silence is what Cynthia Wong defines as “the anti-self” or the “alter ego” (78) which confines females into stereotypes of silence and negation. Bearing in mind the tragic death of Moon Orchid and the No Name aunt and their presence in the text as ghosts haunting Kingston’s memory, it is likely to define the ghost metaphor in this vein as the female writer’s psychological struggle to kill her inner “anti-self” established and dictated by a patriarchal culture. Accordingly, the death of the vulnerable and docile Moon Orchid can be read as Kingston’s act of killing the female Chinese stereotyped as an “angel” and her construction of the “new woman” or “the woman warrior” stereotype. Thus, killing the “angel” is a main challenge for a woman trying to acquire a voice that speaks otherwise. Accordingly, Kingston’s act of killing Moon Orchid is a reverberation of Virginia Woolf’s statement in *Women and Writing*: “Had I not killed her, she would have killed me; she would have plucked the heart out of my writing” (151). It is also a kind of self-defense, for if she does not kill that silent angel culturally imposed on her, a woman will be imprisoned in the confines of silence and will never emerge triumphant.

Likewise, the suicide of the No Name aunt still contains a poetics female empowerment. Drowning herself and her “baby ghost” in the family well, the No Name aunt is constructed as a rebellious ghost perpetually haunting the cultural memory of the family as well as the village. The futile patriarchal attempts to obscure the memory of the nameless aunt testify to a female revenge that creates a perpetual curse transmitted from one generation to another. Kingston’s obsession with the story of the No Name aunt and her unanswered questions about the tale are indicative of the aunt’s triumph over a destructive patriarchal convention and her eternal presence in the memory of different generations.

Ghosts are an important part of the Chinese culture. They take different performances throughout Kingston’s memoirs. They are the spirits of the No Name aunt and her baby ghost. They are the prints of a Chinese folk culture of violence and rape. They are the non-Chinese people who belong to a closed mainstream culture. They are also the rigid stereotypes which victimize the Chinese female and celebrate masculinity. Nonetheless, an important feature of the ghost is that it is neither alive nor dead. Like “Shaman,” it is constantly oscillating between extremes and never reaching an end. Kingston is likewise a “ghost writer.” She keeps oscillating between two distinct cultures with countless questions populating her memory and thoughts. When exposed to such a physical, psychological and cultural mobility and a variety of landscapes and ghosts, the reader is compelled to answer many questions: “ghost” questions which are easy to ask yet hard to answer.

References

Cameron, Deborah. Verbal Hygiene. New York: Routledge: 1995. Print.

Dasenbrock, Reed Way. “Intelligibility and Meaningfulness in Multicultural Literature in English.” Maxine Hong Kingston’s *The Woman Warrior: A Case Book*. Ed., Sau-ling Cynthia Wong. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999. Print.

Irigaray, Luce. *Speculum of the Other Woman*. Trans. Gillian G. Gill. New York: Cornwell University Press, 1985. Print.

Modleski, Tania. *Feminism without Women: Culture and Criticism in a Postfeminist Age*. New York: Routledge, 1991. Print.

Qinag He, Shan. “Chinese American Literature.” *New Immigrant Literature in the United States*. Ed., Alpina Sharma Knippling. Connecticut and London: Greenwood Press, 1985. Print. Sauder, Diane. “Notes on *The Woman Warrior*.” Web. October 2nd 2016.

Schuller, Malini Johar. "Questioning Race and Gender Definitions: Dialogic subversions in The Woman Warrior." Contemporary American Women Writers: Gender, Class, Ethnicity. London and New York: Longman Ltd., 1998. Print.

Teiser, Stephen.F. The Ghost Festival in Medieval China. Princeton, N.J: Princeton University Press, 1988. Print.
Wong, Sau-ling Cynthia. Reading Asian American Literature: From Necessity to Extravagance. New Jersey: Princeton University Press. 1993. Print.

Woolf, Virginia. Women and Writing. Ed., Michèle Barrett. New York: Hartcourt, 1980.
Print.

Zeitlin, Judith T. The Phantom Heroine: Ghosts and Gender in Seventeenth-Century Chinese Literature.

Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 2007. Print.