Virginia Woolf: Copyright, Intellectual Property and Future Scholarship

Virginia Woolf had a clear sense of the importance of copyright and intellectual property for authors. “One could not but play for a moment with the thought of what might have happened if Charlotte Brontë had possessed say three hundred a year—but the foolish woman sold the copyright of her novels outright for fifteen hundred pounds” (AROO 70).

Woolf also knew that the ownership of copyright was integral, not only to women’s financial freedom but, additionally, to women’s ability to represent and create a wider world. As a publisher herself, Woolf had a keen eye for how different editions of a work might enable authors to benefit from copyright.

Writing to Lytton Strachey in November 1919, Woolf asked Lytton to look for “misprints, obscurities or vulgarities” in his copies of Littlewood’s American vulgarity. She pointed out how different editions of a work create a wider world. As a publisher herself, Woolf also knew that the ownership of copyright was integral, not only to women’s financial freedom but, additionally, to women’s ability to represent and create a wider world. As a publisher herself, Woolf had a keen eye for how different editions of a work might enable authors to benefit from copyright.

Piece may focus on subjectivity; memory; writing as therapy; constructing, asserting and “composing oneself”; the tension between public and private in narrative; the ethics of writing the lives of others; experimental or ‘new’ biography.

Please send relevant articles, short essays and observations (maximum 2000 words) by email to G.Lowe@UCS.ac.uk or mail: Gill Lowe, Senior Teaching Practitioner, University Campus Ipswich, Suffolk, IP4 1QI, England.

Deadline: August 31, 2010

Issue #80—Fall 2011
Amy Smith and Isabel Mª Andrés
Virginia Woolf and Spirituality
Please send 300-word proposals (for essays up to 2000 words) to both Amy Smith and Isabel Mª Andrés by March 30, 2010 at: amycol1@gmail.com & landres@uag.es

Issue #81—Spring 2012
Diana Swanson
Eco-Woolf
Submissions should discuss/demonstrate ways that ecocritical/environmental thought can be applied to Woolf’s fiction/nonfiction. Can ecocriticism open new perspectives on Woolf’s world view? Particularly interesting would be works that do not, in their manifest content, focus on “nature.” Send submissions to Diana Swanson at dswanson@niu.edu

Deadline: January 15, 2011

Since then technology has grown exponentially, with the World Wide Web offering access to, but crucially not necessarily permissions/licence to use, hypertexts on a scale inconceivable when we first started reading Woolf. Possessors of Bloomsbury art, photographs, and texts are disparate in type— including galleries, museums, publishers, libraries, universities and private collectors (non-profit and profit-making)— and equally disparate in their copyright restrictions. Libraries do not necessarily “own” artefacts, but “licence” primary sources. This creates additional burdens for scholars sourcing “owners.”

Permissions acquisitions are very time consuming for academics wishing to illustrate articles or books. Early career researchers (ECRs in the UK) may not realise that a copyright clearance timetable can take considerably longer than the time taken to actually write the article in the first place. ECRs may also not realise that, after publication, they often need a publisher’s permission to quote from their own published work.

There is also a clear link between the types of media tools and the kinds of investigative strategies and interpretations scholars can make. The applications available to us are controlled by holders and owners of such technologies, and how we re-present Woolf is inevitably “controlled” to some extent by such technologies and by our conscious, or unconscious, decisions to seek for some permissions and not others, due to the requisite time, effort and cost. The subtleties and extent of these processes, and their impact on academic scholarship, have yet to be fully explored.

This special issue is therefore very timely and crucial. Diane F. Gillespie’s essay gives a full overview of the work involved in obtaining picture permissions, including useful web sites. Drawing on her own experiences, Gillespie vividly reveals the variety and high costs of picture permissions acquisitions, but concludes that illustrations are crucial to understanding both Woolf’s “creative process” and “verbal medium” (6). Danell Jones provides a detailed account of copyright history, including the differences.

---

1 Woolf received publishing offers from Macmillan and George H. Doran.

2 Gillespie here cites very useful web sites. In addition, general humanities copyright information can be obtained from Ninch (the National Initiative for Networked Cultural Heritage), at <www.ninch.org>, the American Library Association, <www.alaa.org>, and the Digital Future Coalition, <www.dfc.org> has a good history of database law.

3 For example the British Library <www.imagesonline.bl.uk> offers a plethora of images (including historical figures referred to by Woolf, for example, Apha Benn # 075762). But the BL’s organisational digital tool “Lightbox”, in spite of its reassuring name taken from old slide libraries, organises images in particular ways. And, as with many library permissions, BL images, if used, have to be returned or destroyed within 60 working days after use.
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between U.S. and European legislation, and the impact of both on Woolf studies. Karen V. Kukil describes her own digital and media Woolf projects at Smith College—a wonderful collection of Woolf resources—and other very helpful web sites.

My own experiences of obtaining copyright permissions are very diverse. To pick just two quick examples from many over the years:

For *Modern Feminisms: Political, Literary Cultural* (1992), I had to acquire permissions from each excerpted author, each publisher, and, in the case of translations, each translator. The University of Chicago Press required all author and translator permissions to be cleared, and to return copies of these permissions to the Press, in a six-month “window,” in order to obtain its agreement. In a world before internet search engines, this was a horrendous task. Due to the first publisher’s demise, I had to transfer the publication to another publisher, and repeat the whole process. One translator had died in the intervening time, and her estate had to be located and contacted. Rather foolishly, I submitted the originals of permissions letters and so lost wonderfully supportive, handwritten notes from Mary Daly, Julia Kristeva (“de bon accord J”) and other authors but I have my memories.

Although very different in kind, obtaining permissions for *Snapshots of Bloomsbury: the Private Lives of Virginia Woolf and Vanessa Bell* was equally laborious. Clearing acquisition and permissions from the Houghton Library, Harvard and the Tate took almost three years with a total cost of $8,745, a great deal of which I had to spend before contracting with a publisher able to take on such an expensive project. Obviously I will never receive any royalties but felt that making the photographs “available” to Woolf scholars was the reward. Alarmingly, after publication, I received a letter from the National Portrait Gallery, London instructing me that the copyright of Morrell’s photographs was assigned to the NPG in June 2003 and with any second edition, or further reproduction of Morrell photographs, I would need to seek NPG permissions (in spite of the fact that I had already paid Harvard for permissions).

This special issue of the *Miscellany* was initially envisaged for scholars new to all such copyright clearance issues, but hopefully is of use more generally. These accounts, both personal and empirical, offer significant insight into an important area of Woolf studies. Right from the beginning, Woolf scholarship was multi-dimensional as far as textual studies, visual cultures and historiographical work was concerned. This variety gives Woolf scholarship its character and strength. And, by clarifying the work of permissions acquisition for both visual and textual materials, the *Miscellany* will support future multi-disciplinary research.

*Maggie Humm*
*University of East London*
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**MLA 2011—Los Angeles**

**January 6-9**

**The IVWS sponsored panel:**

**“Bloomsbury and Africa”**

Danell Jones, Montana State University Bozeman, Organizer and Chair

Jeanne Dubino, Appalachian State University

“An Anti-Imperialist League of Their Own: The Hogarth Press, Kenya Norman Leys, and Parmenas Githendu Mockerie”

Martyn Downer, Independent Scholar

“Bunga Bunga: The Language of the 1910 Dreadnought Hoax”

Laura Winkiel, University of Colorado—Boulder

“From Cosmopolitanism to Anti-Imperialism: William Plomer, the Hogarth Press, and Colonial Critique”

**Other MLA Panel Possibilities for the IVWS**

Under the new MLA order of business, affiliated organizations such as the IVWS are able to:

1) Definitely host one panel session (which, in 2011, will be “Bloomsbury and Africa,” proposed by Danell Jones);

2) Possibly host a second session, if that session is vetted “yes” by MLA in June 2010 (for the IVWS, this panel, proposed by Jane Garrity for 2011, is “Sartorial Bloomsbury”); and also:

3) Possibly co-host a third session with another organization, also if vetted “yes” by MLA in June 2010 (the panel for 2011 is “Dirt, Desire, Recollection: James Joyce and Virginia Woolf,” jointly proposed by Georgia Johnston on behalf of the IVWS and Anne Fogarty on behalf of the James Joyce Society).

**Planning the MLA party:**

The IVWS officers are seeking a host/ess in Los Angeles who might be able to offer Woolfians a location where they can gather and mingle on one evening during the MLA. In the past, Woolfians have asked friends living in the area to welcome Society members into their homes. So, if you live in the LA area, or know someone generous enough to share her/his home with Woolfians, please contact either: Georgia Johnston <johnstgk@slu.edu> or Madelyn Detloff <detlofmm@muohio.edu>.
The International Virginia Woolf Society is pleased to host its tenth consecutive panel at the University of Louisville Conference on Literature and Culture Since 1900, scheduled for February 24-26, 2011. We invite proposals for critical papers on any topic concerning Woolf studies. A particular panel theme may be chosen depending on the proposals received.

Please submit by email a cover page with your name, email address, mailing address, phone number, professional affiliation, and the title of your paper, and a second anonymous page containing a 250-word paper proposal to:

Kristin Czarnecki
<kristin_czarnecki@georgetowncollege.edu>
by Monday, August 30, 2010

Panel Selection Committee:
Jeanne Dubino
Mark Hussey
Jane Lilienfeld
Vara Neverow

The International Virginia Woolf Society Panel at the University of Louisville Conference 2010

The IVWS hosted another successful panel at the 38th annual Louisville Conference on Literature and Culture Since 1900. Three panelists presented their work on an uncharacteristically warm and sunny February afternoon. Tim Vincent, from Duquesne University, read his paper, “Robert Vischer’s Einfühlung and Virginia Woolf’s Visual Aesthetic.” Vincent began by discussing the late-nineteenth-century German psychologist Robert Vischer’s coining of the term Einfühlung, or “in-feeling,” later translated as “empathy.” A psychological process by which the mind projects meaning and significance onto the object world instead of experiencing a sympathetic identification with it, Einfühlung, Vincent finds, is linked with Roger Fry’s and Bloomsbury’s interest in formalism, in turn relating to some of Woolf’s early fiction. Vincent then focused on the short story “Solid Objects,” analyzing Woolf’s employment of Einfühlung to explore the strengths and limitations of formalism along with a means of creating greater perceptual freedom for women.

Emily Fridlund, from the University of Southern California, presented “Simultaneity and Sequence: Narrative Interruption in Virginia Woolf’s The Years.” Woolf’s penultimate novel is noted for its numerous interruptions, such as ellipses, dashes, and disrupted conversations, all of which create a sense of brokenness, division, and disintegration. Fridlund finds the interruptions in The Years serving another purpose as well: they call to the reader’s attention the things that do the interrupting, demonstrating the adjacency and intimacy of events as much as those events’ disparity and disjuncture. Woolf thereby resists a formal limitation inherent to all novels—that word must follow upon word across the page and proceed sequentially rather than simultaneously. The interruptions in The Years, Fridlund argued, produce the effect of simultaneity. By documenting the collision and overlap of events, Woolf represents the coincident existence of the multiple layers in human experience.

In a paper called “Drive and Perception in the Interludes to The Waves,” Brook Miller, from the University of Minnesota, Morris, argued that interludes in The Waves envision drives and perception as mechanisms which mediate between the self’s materiality and the “perpetual illusion” of the self’s Archimedian vantage. As such, they provide a key for the psychological development of characters in the novel, especially Bernard, whose consciousness of a phenomenological problematic—his simultaneous experience of materiality and the illusion of immateriality—becomes crucial to his development. Miller’s paper correlated key motifs in the interludes to Woolf’s concerns with drive and subject-object relations elsewhere in the novel. He concluded by considering how narrating the emergence of selfhood is a fantasy of transcendence revealed to have a functionalist, evolutionary character. Paradoxically, it is both a necessary part of what makes us human and an epiphenomenon of unconscious drives.

The three papers dovetailed nicely with their attention to form, subject-object relations, and interruptions and interludes. Kristin Czarnecki from Georgetown College chaired the panel and wrote this report.

Call for Papers: Louisville Conference 2011

The International Virginia Woolf Society is pleased to host its tenth consecutive panel at the University of Louisville Conference on Literature and Culture Since 1900, scheduled for February 24-26, 2011. We invite proposals for critical papers on any topic concerning Woolf studies. A particular panel theme may be chosen depending on the proposals received.

Please submit by email a cover page with your name, email address, mailing address, phone number, professional affiliation, and the title of your paper, and a second anonymous page containing a 250-word paper proposal to:

Kristin Czarnecki
<kristin_czarnecki@georgetowncollege.edu>
by Monday, August 30, 2010

Panel Selection Committee:
Jeanne Dubino
Mark Hussey
Jane Lilienfeld
Vara Neverow

“The Contradictory Woolf”

The 21st Annual Conference on Virginia Woolf
University of Glasgow, Scotland
June 9-11, 2011

Organized by Jane Goldman
<J.Goldman@englit.arts.gla.ac.uk>

Website coming soon:
<www.glasgow.ac.uk/woolf>
Greetings, Woolfians:

Let my first words to all of you be those of thanks – to Vara Neverow for trusting me with this project and to all of you readers who have also written the articles and reviews that have informed, delighted, infuriated, moved and amused me over the last two years. I feel as if I have come to you very well while working on this project and I feel honored.

This version of the index is Word© table that lists every article, announcement, review, letter, report and, sadly, obituary published in the *VWM* for the past 36 years. If you decide to order it, you will receive a CD that will include a version of this article, a set of notes to facilitate your searches, and of course, the Index.

The table/index contains six columns: Title, Author, Genre, Issue, Volume, Page and Key Words. Unlike the EbSCO databases which offer electronic access to the *Miscellany*, this index includes every word in all the titles. This means that Book Reviews show all of the bibliographic references provided in the *Miscellany* as well as the prefacer “Review.” Where Authors were not listed I used “Editor” to fill in. I tried to keep the number of Genres to a minimum, but every few years or so, there always seemed to be some new expression that did not fit, so there are a few items in genres of their own, but the bulk of items are listed as Articles, Reviews, Letters, Reports, Announcements, and sadly, Obituaries. The Announcements category includes everything from Calls for Papers to Advertisements. Books dominate the Reviews genre, but there are also Art, Music, Drama, and even Television Reviews aplenty.

I loved doing the Key Words column, but I could not include every Key Word from every article (the index would have been interminable), so I decided that I would try to give each article five Key Words. Many articles have more words than five because the length of their titles created a bigger space in the Key Words column. I used the words that literally appeared most often in their respective articles. When I had to choose between two or more words with the same count, I chose the word that best fit into the space without adding another line. I also decided not to include *Virginia Woolf* as a Key Word. No article in a journal entitled *The Virginia Woolf Miscellany* will ever stray too far from the idea, sense or reality of Woolf so it seemed a bit redundant to include her name, when the space could be used to expand the search options. (Woolf’s name, when used, remains in the Title column unadulterated.) Authors may be surprised at the words that appear in the Key Words column for their articles. You will just have to purchase an index and check it out.

The Index should be available by early summer. Please contact me at <vwmindex@gmail.com> to a request form and/or to ask questions. I hope to hear from you soon.

*Susan Devoe*
*Southern Connecticut State University*
Isota Tucker Epes was in appearance tiny and frail but she actually had pretty good bounce back as I found out when I tried to kill her—two times! Not one might think nice behavior on the part of someone who claimed to be your friend, but true, terribly true. It is part of my karma perhaps that the more I yearn to protect and cherish someone, the more tortures I subject her to, and this is not Southern gothic hyperbole, but just the awful graphic facts which I will here tell, confess even, for the first time (and if her family knew what I had come close to doing, they would have cut me off from ever seeing Isota again except under careful adult supervision, I suspect—and I would not have blamed them…).

Here it is then: how I nearly killed my friend, Isota:

So excited to have Isota coming to visit me in Florida, I met her at the airport and she insisted upon rolling her efficient small suitcase on wheels out to the parking lot where my funky beach buggy awaited us. I opened up the back hatch from the front and called to Isota to wait for me to load up the suitcase. She paid no attention to my order, of course, and heaved it up into the trunk area. Just as she was giving it a shove, the hatch closed down upon her and by the time I got there, nothing could be seen of my friend but the lower part of her tiny legs waving in the wind—the rest of her was closed tight inside alongside of her suitcase. You can imagine with what anguish and trepidation I raised the faulty hatch, what sort of squished mosquito I feared to find, the telegram I was composing to her family in my agitated mind, insisting, claiming that she needed a walk above all things (by this time, I had by an effort of will alone gotten the car off the road to the shoulder of a young couple who stopped right behind us and offered us a ride, of course, and heaved it up into the trunk area. Before I could argue, she had bravely, foolishly one might almost say, freed her suitcase from the voracious trunk hatch and was readying herself to head on down the road on foot, trailing her suitcase behind….

And it could have happened like that, our story, but an even better reassuring tale for Isota’s anxious family, when she finally got around to telephoning them about her “safe” arrival.

And as if those two adventures were not enough, a few years later I presided over a near extinction of that valiant vegetarian, walking along with her at a conference break (The Virginia Woolf conference in Delaware, it was) in a somewhat dubious part of town with very dubious sidewalks. A crack which I had managed fine in my size sevens swallowed up my friend and again I was composing in my frantic mind the information for her family as to how their mother had disappeared down a crack in the sidewalk and was probably conversing with Pluto by now. The Bounce Back girl, after a brief inventory of her moving parts, was up again and continuing her conversation without a gap in syntax or sense whilst I wiped sweat from my brow and wondered if really I was a GOOD friend to be trusted with this precious person….

Now Isota has gone off on her own and we all miss her, but her reputation is as durable as her physique and spirit. Just the other day drink (but just in case any alums are listening…) and asked on the off chance if she remembered Isota Tucker Epes who had, as many of you know, been headmistress at Miss Shipley’s for those lively decades of the 60s and 70s. Oh my yes, she was remembered and in detail and in admiration by her colleague and we had such fun sharing our memories of that lady of many lives and many talents. (I did NOT, however, tell this headmistress of the perils through which I had put dear Isota, did not dare to…..)

J. J. Wilson
Sonoma State University, Ret.

Isota Tucker Epes had first shown her paintings of Woolf on slides at the second conference on Virginia Woolf in New Haven, Connecticut, an event that had been sponsored by Southern Connecticut State University. Isota spoke informally of her own artistic work as a painter at that Woolf conference, and I invited her to speak at the third Annual Conference on Virginia Woolf at Lincoln University, which I had organized.

I particularly remember Isota’s energy and her generosity. Of course, the obvious, that she reminded me of a little bird, and that she reminded me of Issa in Between the Acts. She gave the English Department at Lincoln University a framed copy of one of her works of Woolf, and we kept it in the office for a decade, until all those who’d really liked it retired, and then I inherited it. I think when I retire that it must either go to James Tatum or to the LU Library, but I’ll cross that bridge when I come to it. I especially remember the sympathy between her and James Tatum, the painter here at LU who helped organize her exhibit in what was then called “new” Memorial Hall. He understood her work, and they talked quite a bit about it. Isota talked about the impact of Virginia Woolf’s work upon her (this was along the lines of letters that Beth Daugherty edited for Woolf Studies Annual, terrific, but not full of jargon or “lit crit,” just the human heart and how Woolf had touched hers), and she asked me about my feelings. I had to admit that George Eliot, not Woolf, had brought me up, and that I had felt guilty when I switched my dissertation from Eliot to Woolf. Isota thought that was amusing.

Jane Lilenfeld
Lincoln University

Note: To see some of Isota’s artwork go to: <http://www.ecco.org/exhibition/VPPreview/artists3/epes1.html>.

A Room of Their Own: The Artists of Bloomsbury in American Collections

This exhibit of Bloomsbury art, celebrating the centennial of its origins includes more than 100 paintings, numerous works on paper, and examples from the decorative arts and book arts. Organized by the Johnson Museum of Art at Cornell University with the assistance of the Nasher Museum of Art at Duke University, the exhibit is now at the Smith College Museum of Art, and will then go to the Palmer Museum of Art at Pennsylvania State University.


A Pen and Press of Their Own


Courtesy of the Mortimer Rare Book Room, Smith College.

The Virginia Woolf Miscellany is an independent publication, which has been hosted by Southern Connecticut State University since 2003. Founded in 1973 by J. J. Wilson, the publication was hosted by Sonoma State University for 30 years. The publication has always received financial support from the International Virginia Woolf Society.

The Annual Conference on Virginia Woolf is an independent entity. It was envisioned by Mark Hussey and launched in 1991 at Pace University. The conference is overseen by a Steering Committee consisting of all previous conference organizers. Permission to host a Woolf conference is authorized by Mark Hussey, who chairs the Steering Committee. Those interested in hosting the conference should contact Mark Hussey at mhussey@pace.edu. Each annual conference is organized by one or more individuals associated with the host institution. The host institution finances the event and uses the registration fees of attendees to offset the costs of the event. The Annual Conference has no formal association with the International Virginia Woolf Society or the Virginia Woolf Society of Great Britain or any other Woolf society.

The Selected Papers of the Annual Conference on Virginia Woolf 2001-present (excluding 2004) are published by Clemson University Digital Press under the auspices of Wayne Chapman. The editors of the publication vary from year to year. Electronic versions of the selected papers from 2001-present, including selected works from 2004, are available on the Center for Woolf Studies website at <http://www.csum.edu/woolf_center/> (a subscription is required to access the materials).

The Selected Papers of the Annual Conference on Virginia Woolf 1991-2000, launched by Mark Hussey in conjunction with the conference, were published by Pace University Press under his auspices. While early volumes of the papers are out of print, a number of the more recent ones are still available from the press (see <http://www.pace.edu/press>.)

The IVWS was founded in 1973 as the Virginia Woolf Society. The society has a direct relationship with the Modern Language Association and has had the privilege of organizing two sessions at the annual MLA Convention. MLA is currently in transition in regard to the annual convention. In the new model, the IVWS will continue to have one guaranteed session.

The IVWS website is hosted by the University of Toronto. The website was founded by Melba Cuddy-Kean, Past President of the International Virginia Woolf Society, who continues to oversee the site (<http://www.utoronto.ca/IVWS/>).

The VWoolf Listserv is hosted by the University of Ohio. The list administrator is Anne Fernald. The founder of the list is Morris Beja. To join the list, you need to send a message to the following address: <listproc@lists.acs.ohio-state.edu>. In the body of the email, you must write: subscribe VWOOLF Your firstname Your last name.

You will receive a welcome message with further information about the list. To unsubscribe, please send a message *from the exact account that you originally subscribed with* to the same address: <listproc@lists.acs.ohio-state.edu>. In the body of the email, write: unsubscribe VWOOLF.

Materials from most of these sources mentioned above are included in the IVWS/VWS archive at University of Toronto even though they are entities separate from the Society itself. Individuals who have materials that may be of archival significance should consult Karen Levenback at <ivwsarchive@att.net>.
THE IVWS & VWS ARCHIVE INFORMATION
<http://library.vicu.utoronto.ca/special/F51ivwoolfssocietyfonds.htm>

Thanks to the diligent efforts of Karen Levenback, Past President of the VWS; Melba Cuddy-Keane, Past President of the IVWS; and Carmen Königsreuther Socknat, Head of Bibliographic Services at E. J. Pratt Library, Victoria University, University of Toronto, the archive of the VWS and the IVWS has a secure and permanent home. The archive is now officially housed in the collection. All archival materials such as correspondence, memorabilia and photographs should be sent to the IVWS Historian-Bibliographer who will then arrange the transfer of materials. Contact information for current IVWS officers is on the IVWS website:
<http://www.utoronto.ca/IVWS>

Virginia Woolf Miscellany
GUIDELINES FOR SUBMISSIONS AND EDITORIAL POLICIES

The Miscellany gladly considers very short contributions including scholarly articles, essays, poems, fiction, notes and queries as well as line drawings and photographs.

If you are responding to a call for papers for a themed issue, the submission should be sent directly to the Guest Editor.

Even when individual issues are themed, the Miscellany accepts submissions unrelated to the theme. Such submissions should be sent to the Managing Editor, Vara Neverow, at <neverowvl@southernct.edu> rather than to the Guest Editor.

Submissions should be no longer than 2500 words at maximum and shorter articles are strongly preferred. Articles should be submitted electronically, in .doc or .docx MS Word format and in compliance with the style of the 6th edition of the MLA Handbook (not the 2009 edition).

The Editorial Board reserves the right to edit all submissions for length and to correct errors. If time permits, contributors will be consulted about changes.

Contributors are responsible for obtaining permissions related to copyrights and reproductions of materials.

Contributors must provide the Editorial Board with original written documentation authorizing the publication of the materials.

The Editorial Board will assist contributors to the best of its ability with regard to permissions for publication, including costs of up to $50 per item. However, the Editorial Board has the option to decline to publish items or to pay for items. The Editorial Board will consider requests to publish more than one item per article or more than five items per issue but will be responsible for funding items only at its own discretion.

The Editorial Board takes no responsibility for the views expressed in the contributions selected for publication. Submissions accepted for publication may be published in both hard and electronic copy.

The Miscellany backfile from 2003 to the present is currently available online in full text pdf format at <http://www.home.southernct.edu/~neverowvl/VWM_Online.html> and in digital format through EBSCOhost’s Humanities International Complete and Literary Reference Center.

All rights revert to the author upon publication.
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Publishing Visual Images: A Few Nuts and Bolts

I have been requesting permissions to reproduce visual images in connection with Virginia Woolf’s writing since the 1980s, including primarily art by Vanessa Bell, but also by her associates, predecessors, and contemporaries. I continue to find considerable inconsistency, and occasional surprises, in fees and specifications for publication. Many research libraries, museums, galleries, and artists’ estates sincerely try to facilitate research and reproduction. They recognize that a single-author scholarly book (unless it becomes a widely-used textbook) is often characterized by small print runs, prohibitively priced hardback volumes, and thus small sales and minimal royalties. They also realize that authors of book chapters or journal articles often pay their own permission fees but get none of the royalties, if indeed there are any. Organizations created to act on behalf of artists’ estates, however, have more commercial outlooks and thus are less likely to sympathize with these realities.

Reproducing a visual image usually involves locating its current owner (library, gallery, museum, or private collector). Next comes obtaining, often with the owner’s cooperation, an image suitable for reproduction; and then, if the image is still in copyright, getting permission from an estate or its representatives. My favorite method initially, especially for The Sisters’ Arts: The Writing and Painting of Virginia Woolf and Vanessa Bell (1988), was to travel to find and photograph, for research purposes only, as many potentially relevant paintings as possible. I could select from these examples, most of them little known, and request by mail reproducible photos from the galleries, museums, and private collections where I saw the originals.

Today, however, web searches for an artist by name often provide the location of some works and copyright holders; e-mail addresses for correspondence; and even, in some cases, an option of downloading and purchasing images on-line. A good place to begin a search for both an individual artist’s copyright holder as well as for links to current general copyright information is WATCH (Writers Artists and Their Copyright Holders) <http://tyler.hrc.utexas.edu>, a cooperative effort of the University of Reading and the Harry Ransom Center at the University of Texas, Austin. There are also the Bridgeman Artists’ Copyright Service of the Bridgeman Art Library in London with offices also in New York and Paris <http://www.bridgemanart.com> as well as the Artists’ Rights Society in New York (ARS) <http://www.arsny.com> with affiliated societies in London (DACS) and Paris (ADAGP). Additional profitable venues for Bloomsbury visual arts searches are the increasing numbers of books or exhibition catalogues1 in which an image has already appeared, often with its location. Web sites for individual galleries, including the Tate Gallery, the National Portrait Gallery, the Courtauld Gallery, and the Bloomsbury Workshop are also useful. I’ve found, however, that I still sometimes need generous people—like authors of previous books on Bloomsbury visual and decorative artists, or gallery owners and dealers—to help me track down estate representatives and less well known or more recently sold works now housed in private collections.2

Traditionally, publishers have wanted good quality professional photographs or transparencies taken of original art works. In cases where a work’s location is unknown or it exists only in photographic form in an already published venue, the author and the estate might grant permission for a photograph of the reproduction. More recently, in this age of high-quality digital cameras, some copyright holders and publishers do not inquire about the sources of images an author wishes to reproduce, especially for works out of copyright. For works still in copyright, some estate representatives, like the Bridgeman Art Library, want, in addition to a fee, “a Permission of…” line or, like the Artists’ Rights Society, a copyright symbol with their organization’s name, whether they have provided a photograph or not.

The cost of obtaining images is usually minimal. Reproduction fees, on the other hand, vary widely and mount up quickly. In some cases I have been charged nothing or just asked for a copy of the published book or article. At least twice I was asked for a donation to the Charleston Trust. To those copyright holders who have charged me permission fees, I have paid as much as $100 or more per image. Once, I was asked for “three guineas” (3 x 21 shillings) for each of two Vanessa Bell paintings.3

Another time, when asked for over $200 for a single image, I decided not to include it.4 Then there are publishers who, in cases of drawings used as book illustrations, have wanted fees, even though I had estate permission.

Since holders of copyright often request information about the publication before assessing fees, it is important to stress that the book, article, or chapter is an “academic” or “scholarly” one. Even a “reduced fee,” however, may seem exorbitant, especially to a young scholar who wants to reproduce several images. Copyright holders may also want to know size of print run; geographical market (U.S.? world?); language(s) (English only?); image use (cover?); size of reproduction (1/2 page, less, more?); color or black-and-white; and scheduled publication date. This information, of course, comes from the publisher or editor(s).

Some book publishers pay a portion of, or all permission fees for their authors’ visual reproductions. It is a point worth negotiating. The University of Illinois Press, with help from San Diego State University funds and from grants given by some contributors’ institutions, paid permissions, including those for my chapter on modern/ist women painters, for Bonnie Scott’s Gender in Modernism: New Geographies, Complex Intersections (2007). Many academic institutions and publishers, however, do not have funds to help authors to defray such costs. Before I retired, I was able to tap repeatedly the Dean’s “Project Completion Funds” at Washington State University to help with permission fees, and Syracuse University Press paid 50% of the illustration costs (up to $300) for both Julia Duckworth Stephen: Stories

---

1 Catalogues are collected by several research libraries, including Manuscripts, Archives, and Special Collections at Washington State University Libraries; Pullman, Washington.

2 A genuine search might not turn up a current owner, but if a copyright holder remains elusive, an acknowledgement statement should indicate as much, with apologies.

3 Recalling Eileen Barrett’s estimate that a guinea today is worth “about $75,” I therefore sent the current representative of Vanessa Bell’s estate, Henrietta Garnett, the equivalent of $225. She requested only a copy of the book, however, when I asked permission more recently to reproduce several Bell paintings in a chapter for Humm’s forthcoming edition.

4 The painting in question was Edouard Vuillard’s The Chimneypiece at the cost of $202.50 charged by Vis-Art Copyright Inc. in Montreal.
To cut labor and printing expenses, publishers often severely limit even black-and-white illustrations. For my edited collection of essays called *The Multiple Muses of Virginia Woolf* (1993), for example, the University of Missouri Press restricted me and my contributors to a total of six black-and-white images. For *The Sisters’ Arts*, I was able to have as many black-and-white illustrations as I wanted (82 of them), but none in color, not even on the cover.\(^5\) Although color was central to my discussion of Woolf and her sister’s painting, evidence of Bell’s color sense appeared nowhere in the book. My new treatment of “Virginia Woolf, Vanessa Bell, and Painting” in Maggie Humm’s forthcoming edition of *The Edinburgh Companion to Virginia Woolf and the Arts* fortunately will include some of Bell’s paintings in color, and Edinburgh University Press, although limiting total numbers of illustrations, is paying permission fees for contributors.

It is also often difficult to recoup permission expenditures. The contributors secured and paid for their own photos and permissions, for instance, for the fourteen images used in the selected papers volume, *Virginia Woolf and the Arts* (1997, co-edited with Leslie K. Hankins). Even for the editors, the royalties for this paperback volume were standard, but small, especially when split. If a hardcover book is subsequently republished in paperback, as were my first two books, with reduced royalties (from 10% to 7½%), then there is a bit of additional income to offset permission costs.\(^6\) Among many university-affiliated presses, the theory is that academics will get salary raises from their institutions when scholarly writings appear in print. Given the financial exigencies at many colleges and universities, however, we had better be happy to publish to benefit our teaching and for the satisfaction of having contributed to knowledge in our fields.

New technology, particularly digital publication, is adding a further complication to the reproduction of visual images. When I revised what had been a heavily illustrated feature address for the selected papers, *Woolf and the Art of Exploration* (2006), I could afford only eight visuals. I had been paid a $500 honorarium to present “Godiva Still Rides: Virginia Woolf, Divestiture, and Three Guineas,” and spent the whole of it for permission fees. In all my permission request letters, I mentioned that Clemson University Digital Press planned both a print and an on-line edition. Although some copyright holders charged fees, most ignored the on-line plans. Difficulties arose only with the Artists Rights Society’s permissions for paintings by two of Vanessa Bell’s contemporaries, *Woman Painter and Her Model* (1921) by Marie Laurencin and *Self-Portrait with Nude* (1913) by Laura Knight. If these paintings were to appear only in a print version, the ARS would have waived fees. As there was to be an on-line version, however, the ARS wanted, for “scholarly use,” $78 per painting (total $156). Plus, for the on-line version, permission depended upon very specific attributions and credit lines “on screen and on any computer printouts” as well as “integration of copy protection mechanisms; no alteration or manipulation of the Images; and resolution not to exceed 1024x768 pixels and 72 dpi definition.” The web site also had to include a statement barring “reproduction, including downloading” of the images involved without “the express written permission of Artists Right Society (ARS) New York.” Finally, the on-line display of these images was allowed for only five years, at which time I must reapply and pay another fee, albeit a reduced one. Although only the ARS registered any problems with reproducing the images in the on-line version, I suspect this may be the wave of the future as digital publication increases.

Given the research work and unpredictable permission costs, it is important that visual images reproduced as parts of published articles, chapters, or books be more than fascinating footnotes, as they sometimes are with paper presentations. They should be essential to the argument. I have found, however, that reproducing visual images in connection with Virginia Woolf’s writing is well worth the scholarly, bureaucratic, and financial effort. Visuals help to establish not only how Woolf used the verbal medium, in her view, was more flexible and inclusive.

**Diane F. Gillespie**  
Washington State University, Prof. Emer. of English

**Works Cited**


---

\(^5\) For the cover, a black-and-white reproduction of one of Vanessa Bell’s portraits of Virginia Woof. I had to have the estate’s permission for the publisher to print the book title and my name, as author, over the image.

\(^6\) A U.S. Internal Revenue Service representative once told me that research and publication expenses must be deducted against income derived from the publication. I countered successfully that there may be little or no income from an academic publication, and that, at least at research universities, publication is a stated requirement of the job. If you deduct expenses and are audited, therefore, bring your Faculty Manual, tenure/promotion guidelines, employment contract, and/or a letter from your chair or dean.
The Art of Borrowing: Or What Parroting Woolf Taught Me about the Legal, Ethical, and Economic Consequences of Using Another’s Words

Borrowing language, I would like to suggest, is a delicate art. To do it well, one must have not just ingenuity and a fine ear, but also confidence in one’s own narrative voice. One must know not only the right moment to relinquish one’s own words in favor of another’s, but must also be able to surrender to borrowed language without losing oneself. It is a difficult task, if done well. It is all too easy for harried or inexperienced writers to manhandle their adopted words. Think, for example, of the college essay that launches itself into the world by way of the nearest dictionary. “According to the Merriam-Webster Dictionary” it inevitably begins. What follows is as predictable and heavy-footed as a night watchman. The guiltless term (honor or beauty or freedom) is lashed to a pithy, but unnecessarily narrow definition, which rapidly squeezes all the ambiguity and most of the life out from it. In this pitiful state, the poor term hobble and limps its way through the essay. Anyone who has taught more than one term of First-Year English almost always heaves a sigh of despair when she comes across the ill-fated quotation that begins: “the College English Dictionary defines. . . .”

How alarming to our expectations, then, when we come across the printed version of Woolf’s 1937 BBC radio broadcast, “Craftsmanship.” With a Woolfian audacity, she begins the essay at odds with the very title of her talk. “There is something incongruous, unfitting, about the term ‘craftsmanship’” (Death of the Moth 198), she complains. And there, only three sentences into her essay, she does it. She treads in those well-worn steps of undergraduates through the ages...and she turns to a dictionary definition. But because Woolf is Woolf, her step is light and airy and satisfyingly ironic.

“The English dictionary, to which we always turn in moments of dilemma,” she writes with her trademark hyperbole, “confirms us in our doubts” (DM 198). Woolf puts the dictionary reference to work for her in a way that inexperienced writers rarely do. While she goes on to explore “craftsmanship’s” multiple meanings, she does so under a gauze of ironic laughter. Oh yes, we can use the dictionary, her reference suggests with hint of mischief but words so “late being useful” (DM 206) that not even a dictionary, that icon of authority, can make them mean just one thing.

What Woolf understood about borrowing that our students often do not is that borrowing is not just about evidence and persuasion, but that artful borrowing is also rhetorical. It might be ironic, illuminating, combative, ornery, or amusing. The uses of quotations, like Woolf’s partridges in A Room of One’s Own, are “many and various” (AROO 10). Woolf, then, I would argue, was very skillful in the art of borrowing. But, interestingly, the dueling definitions of craft she offers in her essay bear no marks of quotation at all. The definitions, I suppose, are simply paraphrased. But without knowing the dictionary she used—if she even used one—we can never be certain how much she borrowed from her text. Perhaps it is better that way.

Although the laws that govern the borrowing of language—what we call copyright—developed in England and America in the 18th century, the legal rules for borrowing another’s language have grown increasingly strict since Woolf’s time. Georgetown law professor (and former clerk to Justice Souter of the United States Supreme Court) Rebecca Tushnet (2004) explains that copyright in the U.S. used to be an “‘opt-in’ system” (543), which obligated the writer seeking copyright to complete a several tasks: publishing the work, giving notice of copyright, identifying the author and publication date, and then, after a brief period, renewing the copyright. Moreover, copyright protection lasted for only 14 years, although the owner could apply for an extension for an additional 14 years. The rights included exclusive control of the original work, and in 1909 these rights were extended to include translations or dramatizations as well (541). The U.S. law further expanded in 1976 increasing the protection of original works to 50 years, and also enlarging the kinds of “derivative works” which the owner had the right to control including everything from abridgements to film adaptations to public performances to stuffed animals and t-shirts (542). In other words, since 1976 the copyright holder now has exclusive rights to various kinds of spin-offs and merchandizing.

This expansion of copyright was further extended in the UK in 1996 and in the US through the Sonny Bono Copyright Term Extension Act of 1998. These laws increased Anglo-American copyrights for an additional 20 years. So, if you publish a book now in the U.S., you will enjoy copyright protection throughout your life, and your heirs will inherit this protection for another 70 years after your death. In other words, current copyright law maximizes the possibility for an author and her family to reap the rewards from a successful publication for many decades. However, such laws do pose increasing problems for scholars and others. Imagine the state of scholarship if there were no exceptions to copyright: as a scholar you would be required to get permission from the copyright holder for every single quotation that appears in anything you publish.

Fortunately, the framers of the copyright law understood the need for an exception that allowed for unauthorized borrowing in some
circumstances. This exception to the copyright law is known as the Fair Use Doctrine. It is Fair Use that makes it possible for scholars, critics, and teachers to do their jobs. Fair Use, as Joyce scholar and copyright lawyer Robert Spoo explains, provides the "privilege to quote from copyrighted work without permission of the copyright owner, by those engaged in criticism, comment, teaching, scholarship, and similar activities" (210). So, as scholars or teachers or critics, we are granted an exception to copyright protection. We can quote sparingly from others’ work without having to go through the permissions process every time.

Yet, it is important to understand, as Tushnet explains, that the language of the Fair Use Doctrine is not only non-technical but deliberately vague, allowing the court enormous flexibility of application (554). For example, the law does not specify any specific number of words that might indicate infringement. Instead, each judge considers a number of elements involved with the possible infringement and makes her decision on a case-by-case basis.

Spoo identifies a "famous case" in which "the Supreme Court found that the quoting of three hundred words from a two hundred thousand word manuscript constituted infringement, because [it quoted] from the 'heart' of the copyrighted work" (210). In contrast, he points out, another court allowed a scholar to copy an entire unpublished novel and liberally use quotations from it in a lecture at a scholarly conference. The judge warned, however, that such permission would probably not apply to a printed version of her paper—even if it were identical (211).

Tushnet describes two additional cases where the court limited the scope of Fair Use. In one, a book of trivia questions based on the television show Seinfeld was found to be in violation of copyright, even though the book consisted of original material created by the authors not borrowed from the television show. And a parodic commentary on the O. J. Simpson trial, written in the style of a Dr. Seuss book was also found to be an infringement (Tushnet 544).6

In contrast, Tushnet describes the case of Alice Randall’s the Wind Done Gone, a fictional rewriting of Margaret Mitchell’s Gone with the Wind in which the author not only substantially changes the terms of the narrative but does so in a way that is critical of Mitchell’s book. The court found in favor of Randall, Tushnet argues, because, although this work was derivative, it was also transformative. Transformative is a key idea in copyright cases and essentially means that the new work includes “new material or a new, critical perspective” (Tushnet 550). In this case, Randall not only questioned the racial and political attitudes of the original but openly defied the Mitchell estate which expressly forbids “any authorized derivative works based on Gone with the Wind to mention homosexuality or miscegenation” (Tushnet 551). In this case, Tushnet observes, the court used the Fair Use Doctrine to prevent an estate from using copyright to censor expression. In other words, Fair Use became a means for protecting free speech.

Tushnet is of the opinion that the doctrine of Fair Use is growing increasingly narrow, and she provides a number of examples to illustrate her point, including a 27 second shot in a television show that portrayed part of a copyrighted poster as well as the routine permissions process the novelist Stephen King follows in order to quote song lyrics and other protected pieces of popular culture (Tushnet 584).

I gained some first experience with the copyright of Woolf’s work when my manuscript for The Virginia Woolf Writers’ Workshop was accepted for publication by Random House in 2006. The Virginia Woolf Writers’ Workshop collects Woolf’s ideas about writing from a wide range of sources and incorporates them into a series of fictional workshops. As I was writing the book, I decided that although the scenes were fictional, I wanted Woolf’s dialogue to be her own. Every word she speaks in the book comes directly from her diaries, essays, letters, and novels. While I was writing the book, it didn’t occur to me that I would have to pay for permission to use Woolf’s words. Oh how naïve I was!

Because I quoted from 21 of Woolf’s books, my permissions process was probably more complex than most. The vast majority of my quotations were quite brief (my longest was 114 words) and probably would be considered legitimate under Fair Use. However, because of the nature of the work and the increasing restrictions on Fair Use, my editor advised me to seek formal permission for all the quoted text. The securing of copyright is done by the author, not the publisher, so contacting the copyright holders—in this case, Harcourt, the Society of Authors, and Random House UK—fell to me. Interestingly, it was sometimes difficult to know who held permissions for which works and in which parts of the world. For example, American rights are separate from World rights; UK rights separate from American, etc. To my surprise, it often took more time than I expected for the copyright holders confirm which rights they would allow me to use.

Woolf in the U.S.:
Each book published from 1923 on comes out of copyright 95 years after the publication of the individual works.

Woolf in the U.K.:
All of Woolf’s books come out of copyright in 2011, 70 years after the anniversary of her death in 1941.

* The book is titled The Cat NOT in the Hat! A Parody by Dr. Juice.


6 The ApolloGallery.ie web site reported: "In a popular uprising, ordinary Dubliners defied the warning of the Joyce Estate to desist from public readings of the work of James Joyce. The citizens declared their favourite passages from Ulysses on every street corner of Dublin in order to celebrate Bloomsday 2004. A commentator noted: 'It would have taken a veritable army of copyright lawyers to track the multitude of impromptu readings which occur[red] in a variety of locations, such as Duke Street, that had featured in Joyce’s Magnum Opus.'" Matthew Rimmer writes: "In response to the threats of the Joyce estate, the Irish Government passed emergency legislation entitled ‘An Act to remove doubt in relation to the lawfulness, under the Copyright and Related Rights Act 2000, of displaying certain works in public.’"

7 The Virginia Woolf Writers’ Workshop was accepted for publication by Random House in 2006. The Virginia Woolf Writers’ Workshop collects Woolf’s ideas about writing from a wide range of sources and incorporates them into a series of fictional workshops. As I was writing the book, I decided that although the scenes were fictional, I wanted Woolf’s dialogue to be her own. Every word she speaks in the book comes directly from her diaries, essays, letters, and novels. While I was writing the book, it didn’t occur to me that I would have to pay for permission to use Woolf’s words. Oh how naïve I was!

Because I quoted from 21 of Woolf’s books, my permissions process was probably more complex than most. The vast majority of my quotations were quite brief (my longest was 114 words) and probably would be considered legitimate under Fair Use. However, because of the nature of the work and the increasing restrictions on Fair Use, my editor advised me to seek formal permission for all the quoted text. The securing of copyright is done by the author, not the publisher, so contacting the copyright holders—in this case, Harcourt, the Society of Authors, and Random House UK—fell to me. Interestingly, it was sometimes difficult to know who held permissions for which works and in which parts of the world. For example, American rights are separate from World rights; UK rights separate from American, etc. To my surprise, it often took more time than I expected for the copyright holders confirm which rights they would allow me to use.

8 My first step was to identify and quantify each of the roughly 168 quotations. (Some of them as few as two words.) I developed a chart that numbered the quotations, identified the manuscript page number, listed the quoted words, named the source and counted the number of words. This chart would have to be updated each time I revised the manuscript. As you can imagine, it was very detailed work.
in fact held. At every step, Random House proceeded conservatively. For example, not only my editor, but the permissions director and legal staff reviewed each of my permissions request letters. The very care and attention they paid to this single element of the publication process demonstrated how sensitive they were to the delicate nature of copyright. As a newbie to copyright law, I was extremely grateful for their guidance.

In the end, the privilege of trespassing on Woolf’s private grounds cost me just under $1,000 and granted me the right to use her words for seven years. Personally, it felt like a small price to pay to realize my creative idea. Now and then, I wonder if my students knew that sometimes words (and not time) are money, if they would take a more eager interest mastering the delicate art of borrowing.

Danell Jones
Montana State University Bozeman

Works Cited

Woolf in the Digital World
In June 2003 when Smith College hosted the thirteenth international conference on Virginia Woolf, we mounted an exhibition in Neilson Library. Woolf in the World echoed the theme of our conference and featured photographs from Leslie Stephen’s family album, manuscripts, drawings, and Hogarth press editions. I hoped to publish a catalog of the show for the conference, but I ran out of time. This turned out to be a blessing in disguise.

After the conference we had everything in the show professionally scanned by Pivot Media (www.pivotmedia.com). This local company provided high resolution scans, which were also delivered in medium and large files for the web. Jessica Bumpous, a recent graduate of Smith College, designed an online version of the exhibition with help from her library mentor, Sika Berger. This project cost less than one fifth the price of a published catalog and the high resolution scans continue to be purchased by scholars for fifteen dollars each, generating income for the library.

Before the digital show went public on the Mortimer Rare Book Room’s website, I applied to the copyright holders for permission to publish these rare photographs and manuscripts from our collection <www.smith.edu/libraries/libs/rarebook/exhibitions>. Since our website is non-commercial, educational, and open to the public, the permission process was relatively straightforward.

Finding copyright holders can be tricky. The WATCH (Writers Artists and Their Copyright Holders) database of copyright contacts for writers, artists, photographers, and prominent figures in other creative fields is run jointly by the Harry Ransom Center at the University of Texas at Austin and the University of Reading Library. It is the best place to begin a search for copyright information <www.tyler.hrc.utexas.edu>.

Another good site for general information about fair use is the Cornell University Copyright Information Center <www.copyright.cornell.edu>. Peter B. Hirtle also provides a detailed guide to “Copyright Term and the Public Domain in the United States” on the Cornell site.

All of the literary agencies waived their normal permission fees for our project. At the bottom of our online exhibition Woolf in the World is a list of the copyright holders, including the Society of Authors, which represents the estates of Virginia Woolf, Leonard Woolf, Katherine Mansfield, and Lytton Strachey, among others. We received a three-year license from the Society to display electronic facsimiles of over fifty images on our website. This license can be extended.

The following June during one of the functions in London at the fourteenth international conference on Virginia Woolf, I happened to sit next to Henrietta Garnett. She had a stack of mail in her hand and the top letter was addressed to me. Instead of mailing the envelope, she simply handed it to me. Her letter very kindly gave us permission to reproduce
photographs, illustrations, and dust jacket designs by her grandmother, Vanessa Bell.

I have heard anecdotally that our online exhibitions and library guides are more useful to students and scholars around the globe than a limited run of an exhibition catalog. Mark Hussey added a link to our site in his introduction to the recent Harcourt edition of To the Lighthouse. Various Virginia Woolf societies have also provided links on their websites to “Virginia Woolf in the Virtual World,” our library study guide by Robin Kinder for students <www.smith.edu/libraries/fyi/woolf.htm>.

Our online exhibitions have also attracted new gifts to Smith College. Last fall we received over twenty family photographs from the estate of Mary L. S. Bennett (1913-2005), who was the daughter of Lettice and H. A. L. Fisher. They include Pattle, Fisher, Jackson, and Stephen family photographs by G. C. Beresford, Gabriel Loppé, and O. G. Rejlander, among others.

These photographs and other additions to the collection will be displayed this spring in a new exhibition in Neilson Library, Virginia Woolf and the Bloomsbury Group: A Pen and A Press of Their Own (April 9-July 31, 2010) will supplement the traveling art installation in the Smith College Museum of Art—A Room of Their Own: The Bloomsbury Artists in American Collections (April 3-June 15, 2010). Between the shows in the museum and the library we will display hundreds of paintings, watercolors, prints, drawings, woodcuts, broadsides, photographs, letters, manuscripts, books, dust jacket designs, fabrics, embroidery, furniture, tiles, rugs, pottery, and sculpture associated with the Bloomsbury Group <www.smith.edu/artmuseum/exhibitions/index.php>.

Other digital and media projects to which we have contributed during the past five years will also be featured in my library exhibition. They include the textual project begun by Julia Briggs in 2005 and now online <www.woolfonline.com>. Virginia Woolf’s corrected page proof of the “Time Passes” section of To the Lighthouse is on this site along with photographs from our Leslie Stephen album. With additional funding, we hope the Woolf Online site will eventually include the entire novel.

Over the past three years, Smith psychology professor Michele Wick and videographer Kate Lee have created a website on Woolf, Creativity, and Madness, which features streaming videos about Virginia Woolf and her family. The scripts are Woolf’s words from her journals and memoirs and most of the images come from the Mortimer Rare Book Room. Once permissions are secured, Professor Wick will formally launch the Smith website, complete with a genogram of Woolf’s extended family and links to reliable scientific websites.

This spring we began an archives program for undergraduates at Smith College <www.smith.edu/archives/index.php>. Senior projects in the program may be creative and practical. They can include online exhibitions and finding aids for collections, such as the Mary Bennett photographs. In the future we will be able to link images to the finding aids for collections in the Five College Archives and Manuscript Collections database <http://asteria.fivecolleges.edu/index.html>.

Over the past thirty years I have worked with countless authors, artists, agencies, manuscript repositories, and scholars. The families associated with Virginia Woolf, Vanessa Bell, and other members of the Bloomsbury Group are extraordinary in their generosity and support of scholarship. Jeremy Crow at the Society of Authors is the consummate professional. Bloomsbury scholars are unusually congenial and supportive of each other. Whenever I turn my attention to a Bloomsbury-related project, I feel as if I am entering a green oasis or coming home.

Karen V. Kukil
Associate Curator of Special Collections, Smith College
<www.smith.edu/libraries/libs/rarebook/karenkukil.htm>

Gaming the Text

“Play cricket—that was the very game […] a nice out-of-door game, the very game for her husband.” (Mrs. Dalloway 37)

Frauds have come into fashion. The criminal audacity of the Ponzi schemer dazzles Wall Street. The confidence man games the system, perpetrating his crimes by selling deception, dealing in fiction when some things are too good to be true. Similar scams abound. Such schemes prosper by hiding the ball, so to speak, as elaborate frauds. Not all frauds, however, involve financial schemes. “Language is the only Chimera whose fraudulence is without end,” says Karl Kraus, Austrian satirist. Gaming the text, a similar fraud, entails using the rules for purposes other than those for which they were designed in order to find a creative solution, greater profits, often in the spirit of humor. Such a text, like Virginia Woolf’s Mrs. Dalloway, is considered self-conscious.

When a novel like Mrs. Dalloway is self-consciously fraudulent it “reveals the esthetic criteria by which it seeks to be judged” (Stonehill 10) but obscures its fraudulent conceptual framework (Hutchinson 52). Aware of its literary contents, its own unique composition, Mrs. Dalloway moves toward comic play as a self-contained game thus drawing attention to its methods of feigning the fiction of realism with a series of self-conscious devices. Counterfeit realism in most “realistic” narratives means voodoo semiotics at best. Mrs. Dalloway, in all honesty, spares no effort to demonstrate itself as mere fiction.

Self-conscious, whimsical words like “cabbages” (MD 4), curious words demanding attention, stand out as descriptions of the action of
the text which signals “the story of its own act of creation” (Bradbury 242). Absolutely no one ever says anything about the cabbages which constitute this literary patchwork. Here the fault is serious. “Even the most cryptic of literary games must assert itself in some way if it is to attract the attention of the reader” (Hutchinson 5).

The fraud relies upon false pretenses, i.e., conscious fictions, by which the reader’s attention is subtly directed toward metaphorical language in a glorious display of descriptive structural devices which characterize the novel’s principal appearance: false pretenses. Lady Bruton’s tautological achievement by the way (MD 157) includes publishing the words of others over her own signature, a feature which she shares with the novel itself. Unable to write her own letter, Lady Bruton solicits a pair of ghost writers and appears as an inauthentic artist.

Her words are like cabbages, pieces of fabric that apprentices steal from their employers (Harris 10). Words such as cabbages, here referring to pieces of cloth pilfered by a tailor’s employees for their personal use, self-consciously focus attention on the system of textual fabrication. The term issues in school-boy slang for theft, “to cabbage” (Evans 178). T. S. Eliot links purloined texta as fabric and textiles as overt narrative practice in his discussion of “the way a poet borrows. Immature poets imitate; mature poets steal” (Eliot 125). In the game of intertextual overload, Mrs. Dalloway flagrantly appropriates hundreds of allusions and phrases in liaison with preformed language. Stylistically ostentatious, this novel disregards the copyright of its sources, some in which the ink had hardly dried (Hoff passim) but which are hidden and thus “may pass unnoticed” (Hutchinson 57). Hence we must deal with the significance of Peter Walsh among the cabbages, an objective parallel also characteristic of a series of metaphors for the novel’s principal characteristic. In this case, the artifice is no longer concealed but, rather, openly displayed.

Perception of self-conscious frauds is material to reading the novel composed of pieces of preformed language, the arts and fragments which shape an omnibus volume playfully exposing itself as a cento, a patchwork that challenges the literary sophistication of its readers. Pirated texts such as those found riding “to the cannon’s mouth” (MD 291) have been smuggled into this work of overt fraudulence just as an omnibus volume (“a pirate”) is an omnibus “reckless, unscrupulous […] boldly snatching a passenger, or ignoring a passenger, squeezing eel-like and arrogant in between” (205). Artifice no longer conceals itself but as metafiction “draws attention to its status as an artefact in order to pose questions about the relationship between fiction and reality” (Waugh 2).

This writerly narrative which stresses itself as a container of written forms introduces a further aspect of a novel conscious of itself as a collector of “passengers” pirated from literary history and claims a reality similar to that of the novel as a container, a collection. Miss Kilman’s bag of books, her satchel (MD 197); the man on the steps of St. Paul’s with his leather bag of pamphlets (MD 41); even the “woodenness”(MD 91) of Clarissa, our Mrs. Dalloway, who is cleverly posited as a wooden Trojan horse that contains many faked voices (Homer 4.272), all are devices which draw attention to the novel’s composite status. Such novels are “collecting boxes,” like those Aunt Helena uses for flowers, for shards of text (MD 91). Thus, by way of a confusion of literal and allegorical worlds, the narrative lays bare the basis for the parallel constructions, a bag full of books and a novel full of allusions. These elements describe a novel talking about itself.

The reader’s task involves perception of the issue, i.e., how an omnibus collecting passengers; a bag of books, a satchel; a leather bag holding pamphlets; and a wooden horse filled with Greek soldiers may resemble structurally a novel filled with phrases cabbaged from other novels. Mrs. Dalloway is a book, like a Trojan horse, containing many voices; Clarissa is “wooden” like a Trojan horse. This is no casino—win some, lose some. “Intertextuality is a function of reading, of ‘decoding’” (Hutcheon 233). The reader who makes this discovery has won the game.

Private property, rephrased through false pretences, has been completely plundered (MD 49), and Mrs. Dalloway has thoroughly flaunted its discursive prerogatives. These devices, “metaphorical substitutions taking a literal status in the story” (Waugh 140), refer more to themselves than to any outside reality. The reader’s attention is kept on artifice as well as on message. Ostentatious use of preformed language signifies fictionality (Waugh 113).

In antiquity, centos (patchwork compositions of preformed language in Greek) took their matter from Homer; Latin centos made use of Vergil. Similarly, in Mrs. Dalloway the narrator draws attention to herself as a performing novelist visibly engaged in the activity of selecting components for her collage. “Buckram shapes”(MD 131), which Rezia stitches together “rhapsodically” for her hats are, technically, anything imaginary, anything fictional (OED) (I Henry IV 2.1 and Congreve’s Country Wife, 131, 220); Rezia is a true “centonist.” Similarly, Ellie Henderson who has made an awkward cameo appearance at the party sharing an ostensibly banal conversation with Richard is reminiscent of “a relation whom we snub and scarify daily, but after all, cannot do without” (Common Reader 236). She is seen cutting up fragments of preformed language (such as a poem by Catullus, i.e., the cut-up “underclothes” [MD 291]) as a composing writer writing about writing, the most self-conscious component of all, and rather like a feature which Lady Bruton dislikes in Clarissa, cutting people up (MD 157). As characters, Ellie and Rezia dramatize within the novel the author in charge of the narrative in which they appear, portraits of the artist; self-depiction asserts the novel’s fictivity, while it goes about imitating itself. The artist is part of the scene she paints, the hero of her own fiction. Linda Hutcheon refers to this as a mimesis of process (see Stonehill 179).

Clichéd language and expressions from Shakespeare or from Tennyson (“better to have loved and lost”) and all the other invisible presences of literary parodies and paraphrases, sliced and diced, suggest pegs on which “any number of people had hung up their hats. Even the flies […] had settled on other people’s noses” (MD 235). They have been fetched from the Caledonian market, also known as the thieves’ market, in “bags full of treasures” (MD 231). The mechanics are thus openly revealed as devices of self-depicting artifice. Bags, boxes, and satchels establish a conceptual framework easily overlooked. Such are the playful devices that expose the method of creation.

These devices possess a double role which is not limited to the metaphorical. In a confusion of literal and allegorical worlds, Elizabeth Dalloway may be a passenger on an omnibus going up the Strand but she also incorporates a vehicular image of the many pirated texts at the same time. The treasures obtained from the Caledonian market are not merely loot from a sort of flea market but also the bags of treasures suggest the discarded literary fragments that are often intertextual presences, and so on. Similarly, the jewels of “colored paste” in the jewelers’ windows (MD 6, 171) are as fraudulent as the forgeries masquerading as simple narrative, remarked by a Smith, a blacksmith at the forge, who knows a humbug, a cheat, when he sees one (MD 153). He, as well, is an Upstart Crow, his own forgeries beautified with borrowed plumes (MD 225). Even the plaster cast of Ceres is a fake (MD 129). Furthermore, the presence of Ralph Lyon (my emphasis; MD 258) seems to personify the prevailing mendacity.

Thus, when the world of the novel ceases to represent a parallel universe, there is the possibility of a self-reflexive game in progress. Aware that she is being written into existence, Clarissa can hear “the click of the typewriter” (MD 42) which is “creating the novel in which she is a
character” (Waugh 121). As the novel explores metaphors revealing, contemplating, its own method of creation it gradually reveals having “pillfered” its components and being overtly “never wholly admirable” (MD 282). In such games, narrative structures operate in a different way when they center on play rather than story. Thus obsessed with its own artifice Mrs. Dalloway exploits the illusion of ordinary narrative to disclose its composite status.

The most obscure aspect remaining is that one must see that these admittedly coy devices, hiding in plain sight, refer to the novel itself, a rather elitist obscurantism for the time. The conspiracy requires that admittedlly coy devices, hiding in plain sight, refer to the novel itself, the devices are self-depicting cloak made of fragments and patches, and the devices are self-depicting counterfeit as the narrative explores the process of its own making. Play is designed to be interesting, compelling play when preformed language provides an additional dimension. A skywriting airplane enhances the ostensible narrative calling attention to the writing process. As a sense of competition intensifies, the hope of a payoff gradually emerges. In sum, the storyline is nuanced and the reader challenged with a better chance of playing well and perhaps even winning the game.

Molly Hoff
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An Exchange Regarding Freud and the Hogarth Press

“Doing up Freud”: Virginia Woolf, The Hogarth Press, and Getting Dirty: A Response to Elisa Kay Sparks’ Review in VWM Fall 76

In Elisa Kay Sparks’ review of my book, Modernism, Memory, and Desire: T.S. Eliot and Virginia Woolf (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008), in the Fall/Winter 2009 edition of the Virginia Woolf Miscellany, I believe she makes an inaccurate claim. Sparks contends that my book contains a “serious factual error” in asserting that, “Woolf set the type for the Hogarth Press edition of Freud’s works (148; 163).” Printing of Freud, Sparks insists, “was jobbed out to a professional printer, R. & R. Clark (Woolf 107); had Woolf actually set the type of the multi-volume work by hand, she would hardly have had time to write any novels at all” (25).

In this I beg to differ. Virginia Woolf was involved in multiple capacities at the Hogarth Press, she sometimes set type herself, and she had a physical as well as an intellectual role in helping to bring Freud’s work to the attention of an English-speaking audience when the Hogarth Press took over publishing for the Institute of Psycho-Analysis and the International Psycho-Analytic Library in 1924. We know, for example, from a letter Woolf wrote to Molly MacCarthy in October 1924, that she was most definitely reading Freud’s proofs:

I shall be plunged in publishing affairs at once; we are publishing all Dr Freud, and I glance at the proof and read how Mr A. B. threw a bottle of red ink on to the sheets of his marriage bed to excuse his impotence to the housemaid, but threw it in the wrong place, which unhinged his wife’s mind,—and to this day she pours claret on the dinner table. We could all go on like that for hours; and yet these Germans think it proves something—besides their own gull-like imbecility (Letters 3: 134-5).

Thus, not only was Woolf looking at proof, but she was doing so with sufficient attention to be able to comment on its content. Further, in Woolf’s diary of November 1924, she mentions the physical labor involved in “doing up Freud” at the Press, “I in two jackets, for it is freezing, & hair down; he [Dadie Rylands, the new assistant at the Press] in shirtsleeves . . . being spurred on by wine & sugar cakes” (Diary 2: 322). What else Virginia Woolf might have been doing at the Press with Dadie Rylands on a Monday afternoon in November 1924 with her hair down, while they were publishing Freud, besides the labor associated with printing and/or typesetting, would be interesting to conjecture.

In Sparks’ review she cites J. H. Willis’ meticulously researched study, Leonard and Virginia Woolf as Publishers: The Hogarth Press, 1917-41, as proof that printing of Freud was done by R. & R. Clark rather than by the Hogarth Press itself (25). However, if one looks carefully at Willis’ discussion of the role of R. & R. Clark on the very page Sparks asks us to turn to, we find only that Vita Sackville-West’s and Virginia Woolf’s novels were printed by R. & R. Clark at this time; there is no such claim about who printed Freud. We find simply that R. & R. Clark was “the established printer for Virginia Woolf’s books, who thus became the printer for Sackville-West’s novels. The novel [Sackville-West’s Seducers in Ecuador] was published in November 1924 with books by T. S. Eliot (Homage to Dryden), Roger Fry, John Crowe Ransom, and Sigmund Freud (the first two volumes of his Collected Papers)” (Woolf 107). No mention at all is made of who did the printing for Freud.

Further, contrary to Sparks’ claim that Woolf could not possibly have set type herself for Freud because Woolf did not have this kind of time to spare from her novel writing, Woolf absolutely did set type for the Press. Woolf had, for example, set the type herself for T. S. Eliot’s The Waste Land just 16 months earlier: “I have just finished setting up the whole of Mr Eliots [sic] poem [The Waste Land] with my own hands” (8 July 1923, L3: 55). She also “set most of the type” for Katherine Mansfield’s Prelude (Woolmer 10), among many other pieces, including E. M. Forster’s Pharos and Pharillon, which she set up with Leonard Woolf and Ralph Partridge (L. Woolf 74). In Dadie Rylands’ letter to Mary Gaither that Sparks cites in her response piece, which describes Rylands’ experience at the Press, Rylands records that he “had many happy hours setting up type with Virginia and helping Leonard with the hand press” (Woolmer 17). Sparks infers that such “setting up type” only occurred on the hand press; however I do not agree that we can take that for granted.

As it turns out, as early as 1921 the Hogarth Press had expanded their printing capacity beyond the hand press when they purchased a Minerva—a treadle-operated machine (L. Woolf 72). Further, and
quite strikingly, in his outstanding study, Willis actually insists that the Hogarth Press did do the printing for Freud, but only from late 1924 onward, which could understandably make matters confusing: only with “the second volume of Freud’s Collected Papers in 1924, did the Hogarth imprint appear on the title page jointly with the Institute of Psycho-Analysis, indicating that the volume had been printed and published entirely by the press” (301; emphasis added). Part of the challenge here is that the Hogarth Press unfortunately left no “detailed publisher’s records” (Willis xi), while their practices were sometimes unpredictable. Leonard and Virginia Woolf would, for instance, sometimes initially print a text themselves and then send subsequent printings out to be done commercially, as with Virginia Woolf’s Kew Gardens (Woolmer 12). At times they would hand-set a piece themselves before sending it elsewhere to be printed—yet even when they did so, as with Virginia Woolf’s Monday or Tuesday, one of them might continue to help the printer (Woolmer 15).

Given the first-hand evidence from Woolf’s letters and diary that she (literally) had a hand in the production process while they were publishing Freud, I think we are safe to understand that Woolf had a rather intimate engagement with the process. The evidence of her labor and her history of helping with typesetting were what led me to make the inference that Woolf helped typeset at least some of Freud’s work; I never claimed, nor intended to claim, that Woolf set all of the type for Freud. I agree that I ought to have qualified my inference; however I want to suggest that the difference in Sparks’ reading of the evidence and my own constitutes a divergence of interpretation rather than one of fact.

Very importantly, part of what is at stake here is the need to clarify Virginia Woolf’s roles at the Press, where she absolutely was involved physically with its work—at times she spent entire days at its labor. Woolf writes in a letter of May 1923, for example, “We are printing all day long, Mrs. Joad [the Press’s manager] and I, while Leonard goes to his office” (12/13 May 1923, L3: 36). Then, in the same letter in which Woolf describes setting type for The Waste Land, she makes a fascinating analogy between the labor of the Press and the work of nursing multiple children: “I assure you the Press is worse than 6 children at breast simultaneously. Consider the Sow. She shows no embarrassment. But Woolf describes setting type for The Waste Land, she makes a fascinating analogy between the labor of the Press and the work of nursing multiple children: “I assure you the Press is worse than 6 children at breast simultaneously. Consider the Sow. She shows no embarrassment. But Leonard and I live apart—he in the basement, I in the printing room. We meet only at meals, often so cross that we can’t speak, and generally dirty” (8 July 1923, L3: 55-56; emphasis added).

It also happens that just two months before Woolf mentions looking at Freud’s proof she had explicitly commented that the Hogarth Press kept her occupied and distracted from depression: “Now the point of the Press is that it entirely prevents brooding, & gives me something solid to fall back on” (2 August 1924, D2: 308). That “something solid” involved the business of the Press as well as work with her hands. Indeed, in his autobiography Leonard Woolf recalls that even as late as 1931 Virginia continued to help with all aspects of the Press: “John, Virginia, and I, as well as the ‘staff,’ were expected to be able to take a hand at any and everything” (L. Woolf 173). Again, to suggest that Woolf could not have had time for typesetting at the Press does a disservice to the wonderful versatility of Woolf’s roles there: she was crucial to the Press’s evolution not only in creative and intellectual ways, but also in the emerging material realities of textual production. She was averse neither to the labor nor the dirt involved in working the machines necessary to bringing manuscripts to print.

* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *

This actually brings me to the much more important point of the argument I was trying to make in my book which Sparks disregards when she discounts my arguments and findings. This is simply to stress that Woolf had significant direct exposure to Freud’s writings at least as early as 1924. This is some fifteen years earlier than critics generally accept for Woolf’s first reading encounters with Freud. It is true that dating Woolf’s knowledge of Freud has been challenging, especially since we find Woolf noting in her diary of late 1939, “Began reading Freud last night” (2 December 1939, D5: 248), while more than six months later, in June 1940, Woolf claims in “A Sketch of the Past,” that “It was only the other day when I read Freud for the first time” (108). I think, though, that we underestimate Woolf’s willingness to toy with chronology in her ongoing reluctance to admit to reading Freud until so late. She may have had something to repress, or she may just have had an aversion to his methods that she chose not to address directly.

I realize that my wish to revisit the discussion about Woolf’s knowledge of Freud might be controversial, but I had genuinely hoped that some of the proposals I make in Modernism, Memory, and Desire could encourage new avenues of debate alongside a better understanding of Woolf vis-à-vis psychoanalysis from the mid-1920s—a period during which she happened to be composing Mrs. Dalloway, for example, with its explicit critiques of the contemporary psychiatric profession.

**Gabrielle McIntire**  
Queen’s University
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A Response to Gabrielle McIntire’s “Doing up Freud”

Dr. McIntire seems to think we are arguing over Freud. I think we are arguing over printing techniques. My point was/is simply that while various writings of Freud were published under the imprimatur of the Hogarth Press, and while it is quite possible that Woolf read, proof-read, and/or bound and packed the books, none of Freud’s texts were ever HANDPRINTED by the press. Woolmer’s Checklist of the Hogarth Press has a convenient index listing 34 the books handprinted by Leonard and Virginia. No work by Freud is among them (Woolmer 221-22). I am in no way disparaging or minimalizing Woolf’s work at the press, but that work did not include handsetting the text of Freud.

All of the handprinted works issued by the Hogarth Press were fairly short and were printed in limited editions. At 68 pages, Katherine Mansfield’s Prelude was almost beyond their capacity to print; they had to borrow larger chases (frames in which lines of type are positioned and wedged) and do the actual printing of it on the much larger presses of a local job printer McDermott (Woolmer xxii). According to Willis, it took them nine months of work to print Prelude (21). When the first 150 copies of “Kew Gardens” were sold out, the second edition of 500 was printed commercially (Woolmer xxiii). And in her Introduction to the Checklist of the Hogarth Press, Mary Gaither points out that, in 1920, the Woolfs decided that the pieces by Maxim Gorky and Logan Pearsall Smith (71 and 58 pages respectively) were too long to print by hand and so were printed commercially by Pelican Press (Woolmer xxv). Most books handprinted by Leonard and Virginia were 30-50 pages long and were issued in average runs of 250-500 copies.

Typesetting by hand takes an enormous amount of time, patience, and energy. Each tiny piece of type has to be carefully selected from its proper box in the drawer and set upside down and backwards in the compositing stick; separate pieces of blank metal have to be inserted for spaces at the end of sentences and to separate lines. Then each line or small group of lines has to be transferred to the chase or frame, where even more blank pieces of furniture have to be carefully arranged so that the complete page can be locked into place. On June 24, 1923, Virginia lamented to Barbara Bagenal that the misplacement of the 14 pt quads (blocks of type taking up four blank spaces) into the 12 pt boxes had delayed setting up Eliot’s poem The Waste Land by a whole week (L3: 50). That poem is only 433 lines long, and it was not until July 8, just over two weeks later, that Woolf was able to triumphantly announce that she had finished setting up the whole poem. She seems proud of the fact that she did it ALL by herself, and even remarks on how her hands tremble, presumably from the strain of handling the tiny pieces of type (L3: 56).

The first volume of Freud published by Hogarth Press in 1924 was 359 pages; Vol. II was 404. The longest piece ever handpublished by the Hogarth Press was E. M. Forster’s Pharos and Pharillon at 80 pages. I repeat: there is no way that Virginia Woolf was involved in setting the type for handprinting any of Freud’s work. Further research into Woolmer in fact establishes that the Hogarth Press was not involved in the actual printing of any of the early works in the International Psycho-Analytical Library:

When the Hogarth Press took over the International Psycho-Analytical Library in early 1924 they acquired the bound and unbound sheets of Beyond the Pleasure Principle as well as those for Freud’s Group Psychology and the Analysis of the Ego, and the first volume of his Collected Papers. . . . These unbound sheets were bound up as needed with the Hogarth Press imprint on the covers and the dust jackets. (13)

So I was indeed wrong that printing of Freud in 1924 was jobbed out; the reason why Willis gives us no information about who actually printed the works was that the Woolfs received them already printed and were involved only in their binding and distribution—not in their printing and therefore not in their proofing.

This information also helps explain the mystery of what Virginia Woolf was doing at the press with Dadie Rylands with her hair down. In a letter to Mary Gaither about his time at the Hogarth Press, Rylands said, “I had many happy hours setting up type with Virginia and helping Leonard with the hand press, doing up parcels, selling books to travelers” (Woolmer xxvii-viii; my italics). I suggest that “the physical labor” Woolf mentions “involved in ‘doing up Freud’” was the labor of tying up the packages of books to be sent to booksellers. I would also add, that anyone who has ever been engaged in the horrifically dirty job of setting type (which is never totally clean of ink) would be extremely unlikely to be doing it with their hair down or anywhere near the neighborhood of “wine and sugar cakes”; the last thing you’d want in the type would be cake crumbs or strands of hair.

I certainly do hope Dr. McIntire’s book inaugurates a fuller discussion of Woolf’s knowledge of Freud. But the evidence that Woolf had read Freud thoroughly by 1924 remains debatable.

Elisa Kay Sparks
Clemson University

REVIEW

VIRGINIA WOOLF AND THE RUSSIAN POINT OF VIEW

REMINISCENCES OF LEONARD WOOLF

Roberta Rubenstein’s Virginia Woolf and the Russian Point of View is a pioneering study of Woolf in the context of the great Russian fiction writers whose work she engaged as reader, essayist, publisher, and novelist. The book is the outgrowth of Rubenstein’s 1969 doctoral dissertation and five of her published essays. It includes a valuable set of appendices in which she has transcribed the often difficult hand of Woolf’s reading notes, and each chapter is prefaced by the facsimile of one page of holograph or typescript.

After an introductory chapter in which she discusses Woolf’s numerous reviews and essays, her collaboration with S. S. Koteliansky on translations from the Russian, and the importance to British modernism of Constance Garnett’s translations, Rubenstein devotes one chapter each to Dostoyevsky, Tolstoy, Chekhov, and Turgeniev. Rubenstein’s claim that the Russians stimulated Woolf’s break from tradition is an important step towards the reevaluation of her work in the context
of European languages and cultures. Rubenstein argues that Woolf’s attitude towards Dostoyevsky was an “infatuation” (1), like Orlando’s with the Russian princess Sasha in Orlando. Woolf’s emotional illness, like Dostoyevsky’s, led her to a fresh understanding of time and characterization. Rubenstein traces links between “The Eternal Husband,” which Woolf reviewed in 1917, and “The Mark on the Wall,” published the same year, and between phrases from The Idiot and the themes of Night and Day. Dostoyevsky’s role in Mrs. Dalloway is manifested in Woolf’s understanding of insanity, and of the device of the double as a means of representing one aspect of a character with another—Raskolnikov’s murderous side by Svidrigailov for instance. Rubenstein’s conclusion, that Septimus doubles Clarissa’s suicidal tendency, is not a new interpretation. Although Rubenstein references Bakhtin on the dialogic novel, she does not fully engage the central question of the novel: how the double functions below the limits of a character’s self-awareness.

Woolf’s longing for the spirituality of the Russian “soul” may explain why Chekhov as well as Dostoyevsky played a special role in her development. For instance, while she and Leonard were translating Chekhov’s notebooks, and she was pondering the limitations of British productions of The Cherry Orchard, certain of Chekhov’s preoccupations reappear in the characters of Jacob’s Room. The highlight of the chapter is the discussion of “Tchekhov on Pope,” a strange unpublished essay in which Woolf, as in other essays, sought to distance herself from the magisterial authority of Matthew Arnold, whom she faults for not having read Chekhov and Proust: “In our generation we read Pope by the light of Tchekhov.” (84). The essay is as problematic as it is ambitious, perhaps because Woolf could not free herself of an image of Chekhov as the carrier of a kind of infection, a curious image of perceived helplessness.

The psychological depth and profundity of Tolstoy’s characterizations was the quality that most engaged Woolf, as though, she wrote, a telescope had been put in our hands: “Everything is astonishingly clear and absolutely sharp” (106). Woolf was preoccupied with Anna Karenina, a novel that she read and reread, and that is reflected in Jacob’s Room, To the Lighthouse, The Waves, and in her essay, “The Cinema.” Despite her reservations about Tolstoy’s negative view of Russia in 1868. Half R.[ussi]a is dying of hunger” (223. This question from her notes on On the Eve: “The Russian self-consciousness./when will a man be born?,” followed by Woolf’s “What effect this has on novel?” (212) resonates widely in her own work. One might say that in each of her novels Woolf stages a scene that offers an occasion for the self to preside over the birth of the individual as subject, and develops the consequences for narration.

Reminiscences of Leonard Woolf attests to the years of meticulous work that Rubenstein spent integrating an enormous range of printed material with Woolf’s reading notes. Her friendship with Leonard began in the sixties when he was completing his autobiography, and she was a Fulbright Scholar. Although initially he reserved “a quarter of an hour” to discuss Woolf with a young American, it was the beginning of a friendship that lasted until his death. He revised to an earlier date Woolf’s first acquaintance with the work of Tolstoy and Turgenev, whom he and Lynton Strachey were reading at Cambridge long before 1912. It is notable that even with his help Rubenstein was not able to decipher every word of Woolf’s reading notes, which to my mind are the key to her habits as a reader.

In her critical study Rubenstein uses the vocabulary of “unconscious influence” (33), “vision and form” (131), and “emotional authenticity” (143), that, although appropriate to some studies of Woolf, occludes the specific effect of translation on language. She acknowledges the losses of translation (116, 134), but stops short of asking what is for me a central question about translation as the nexus of Woolf’s roles as reader/writer. That is, since translation transacts anew the elements of the sign, and thus suggests that the sign can in fact be remade, how does translation play itself out in Woolf’s own writing practices, as she sought to remake a language that the woman writer might use for her purposes? The importance of Rubenstein’s book is that it gives us an image of the Woolf who throughout her career constructed for herself a position among her European peers.

Emily Dalgarno
Boston University
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REVIEW

VIRGINIA WOOLF: ART, EDUCATION, AND INTERNATIONALISM. SELECTED PAPERS FROM THE SEVENTEENTH ANNUAL CONFERENCE ON VIRGINIA WOOLF


164 pages. $19.95 paper.

The publication of the selected papers of a conference is often a mix of informal, personal observations directed at a specific audience and intended to provoke dissent and discussion, and formal scholarly presentations suitable for publication. Sometimes, there are revelatory statements that are intensely personal but clearly of interest to the audience. Then there are those essays or presentations, most of
them short, best described as “personal reading.” These are not fully developed arguments and are often designed to be provocative, requiring the interaction of an attentive audience. Finally, there are articles that depend not on a peculiar reading but on information drawn from the text itself. These depend on research for their information, distancing themselves sufficiently from the author of the essay to say something about the author of the text. A good ‘proceedings’ volume has all of these. This variety and depth is the principle strength of the Selected Papers from the Seventeenth Annual Conference on Virginia Woolf.

Diana L. Swanson’s presentation is a tribute to her father Maynard W. Swanson, a faculty member at the host institution, Miami University, whose life’s work revealed the European bias in South African discourse. Swanson, in the words of the volume’s editors, “complicates Leonard Woolf’s anti-imperialism through the lens of her father’s scholarship on British bureaucratic practices in its African colonies” (vii). She identifies the “blind spots” in Leonard Woolf’s anti-imperialism that is rooted in his education and life experiences. While hardly a revelation, this is a useful assessment with which Leonard Woolf, uncompromisingly honest by nature, might well agree.

Plenary speaker Patricia Laurence in “Hours in a Chinese Library” provides details of her study of Chinese writer Ling Shuhua, a member of the Crescent Moon Group that had connections to Bloomsbury. Laurence uses this as an interesting way to demonstrate how the texts of European Modernism might have been seen from a non-Western perspective.

Other readings in this volume involve individual texts. Tracy Savoi and Natasha Allen both focus their attention on The Waves, Savoi to reveal how Louis becomes a colonial subject and Allen in “The Critical Silence of the Other” how “Rhoda’s inability to adapt within the culture suggests both domestic fascism’s silencing of heteroglossia and foreign imperialism’s failure with regards to the colonized Other” (23). Both are absolutely correct to focus on silence. What is not said in The Waves is the key to what is. Silence, however, is not the product of a particular “reading” or the fruits of critical theory. It is alive in Woolf’s text. We can only wonder if the discussion following the reading of these papers probed its nature.

Some in the audience might have noted, for example, that each of the male characters in the novel uses his own name in soliloquy. Bernard refers to himself by name twelve times, Louis four times, and Neville once. None of the female characters ever uses her own name, not once. We don’t need Freud or Bakhtin to see that there is something significant in this reticence. The refusal to identify the self by name, or in Rhoda’s case even to look at herself in a mirror, tells us something about the nature of sexual oppression and repression. There are links to “domestic fascism” in the novel and to how an empire sees the individual, but these voices, first and foremost, are friends who are very alike in their difference. Their monologues tell us about the characters value and devalue not just themselves but each other. If we start by reading the text carefully, we are drawn into the relationship of the characters to each other and to language. Silence then becomes a large part of their message and its observation the best way for us to listen.

There are many other worthwhile essays in this volume that that explore a variety of approaches to Woolf’s texts. Charles Andrews discusses St. Paul’s Cathedral as the central image in Jacob’s Room, explaining how it is both a sign of religious oppression and of the city’s reassuring “Englishness.” Diane F. Gillespie’s “Virginia Woolf’s ‘Ghosts,’” the best researched essay in this collection, tells us what Woolf knew of the history of Christian martyrdom. She advances the argument that whatever else we might say of it, Three Guineas is “an anti-martyrlogy” (79). I was especially happy to see how well her illustrations were reproduced, especially Thoby Stephen’s inscription in Woolf’s volume of John Foxe’s The Book of Martyrs (1776), a book absent from the later reading notebooks.

The conference program is reproduced near the end of the volume, and it lists the papers presented. While it is impossible to present all of conference papers in a single volume, there are several not published here that I would have liked to have read. Among them are Katie Macnamara on “Woolf’s Periodical Preoccupations” (155) and Joanne Campbell Tidwell on “Bloomsbury Aesthetics and The Diary of Virginia Woolf” (158). I also would have liked to have heard Jennie-Rebecca Falcetta’s “Book Jacket Images and the Marketing of Woolf’s Work” (162). This is an important topic that, absent Ted Bishop, rarely draws the attention of serious scholars.

With all of its merits, there is one flaw in the volume that is difficult to ignore: the printing. The paper and the binding are more than adequate, but the tiny typeface (Adobe Garamond Pro 6 pt) makes reading the essays difficult for all and surely impossible for many. Budget restraints were probably the reason for this decision, but it might make us wonder if the purpose was to present the information for understanding and discussion or simply to publish them. I think the authors deserved better.

James M. Haule
The University of Texas—Pan American

How to Write a Love Letter

REVIEW
THE FORMATION OF 20TH-CENTURY QUEER AUTOBIOGRAPHY: READING VITA SACKVILLE-WEST, VIRGINIA WOOLF, HILDA DOOLITTLE, AND GERTRUDE STEIN

In her elegant exploration of four early-twentieth-century women who reshaped the genre of life-writing, Georgia Johnston charts a trajectory from Vita Sackville-West, who seems to accept the going attitude toward lesbians, to Gertrude Stein, who saw such negative views as ridiculous, as she celebrated her own sexuality. Grounding her study in a comprehensive understanding of the strategies for studying patients of Havelock Ellis and Sigmund Freud, Johnston makes clear that these two signal figures insisted on tight control of the “stories” their patients told them. They did this by utilizing the case study method in which they
were observers with superior knowledge of psychological development, able to modify and “shape” the raw material provided them by their patients, most of whom were women, some of whom were lesbian women. All four of Johnston’s subjects—Vita Sackville-West, Virginia Woolf, Hilda Doolittle, and Gertrude Stein—were entirely familiar with the work of Ellis and/or Freud: through reading their work as Sackville-West did; through publishing Freud’s studies, as Woolf did; through knowing and being analyzed by Freud, as was the case of Doolittle; or, by absorbing the theories of both, as Stein did.

The project upon which Johnston embarks is broad and complex: she argues for an alternative theory of autobiographical writing to that held by the dominant culture. This alternative approach becomes what Johnston terms lesbian or queer autobiography. It attempts to “narrate sexuality differently from early-twentieth century medical and psychological representations” (5). Using the term “autobiography” in its most literal sense, i.e., a record of one’s own life, Johnston is able to include several sub-genres including formal autobiography, memoir, dreamscapes, and poetry arising from direct personal experience or vision. Reminding us that a conventional autobiography has a “final unified version of the self” (18), she argues that her four examples “multiply their self-representations so that readers unable to accept the lesbian will not recognize her” (18). Johnston attributes this “double-texting” (18) to the heavy influence of censorship during this time period.

Before discussing her four authors, Johnston summarizes the ideas about lesbianism of Ellis and Freud. While Ellis acknowledges that homosexuality occurs naturally, he surrounds it with biological discourses that undermine the possibility of its existing within any system of morality. Rather it continues to be for him a “perverted form of sexuality” (29). Freud places lesbianism outside the framework of “normal” relations between a man and a woman, ascribing it to the pre-linguistic period and so judging it to be arrested development. Furthermore, his use of a case study methodology allows him to secure control over the “story” that is told, since the analyst edits raw data provided by the patient.

Beginning her trajectory with Vita Sackville-West’s autobiographical sketch, Johnston accents the retrogressive fact that her subject splits herself into two distinct personae: the “good” Vita is wife, mother, and gardener, displaying feminine, submissive behaviors, while the “bad” Vita is the predatory, aggressive lover of Violet Trefusis, who presents as a dominant, masculine person who is the lesbian. Vita’s son Nigel acts as analyst when he publishes A Portrait of a Marriage since he accepts the good person making her life with his father, Harold Nicolson. Vita attacks herself, taking the blame so that Harold emerges as a positive figure even if the institution of marriage is criticized. What is radical, however, is that Vita observes and analyzes herself, not giving that role to someone from the scientific or therapeutic community. Hence, her autobiographical contribution breaks with some aspects of conventionality even as it affirms others.

Virginia Woolf, in contrast, “writes ironically, satirically, and teasingly” (73). In her constellation, perversity lies squarely within the elaborate Edwardian system of cultural constructions, not within herself or other women. She knew of Freud and published his work early, so when she pretends not to understand his project, she is being purposefully disingenuous, turning herself into a “textually conscious ironist” (82). Her positioning the need for women to belong to something she terms the Outsider’s Society is her way of setting up an alternate system in which she can, like Sackville-West, observe herself. In the memoir in which she discusses her half-brother’s sexual abuse, Virginia observes George as he is molesting her. This radical move places her in the position of analyst, which is a position of power. In her fanciful “biography,” Orlando, and in the feminist tract, Three Guineas, she describes a world of women, a lesbian world, where roles of time and gender can be disrupted to create the alternative genre Johnston is arguing for. In such a world, a character can live hundreds of years and change sex along with clothes, or a woman can work with and like another woman for the first time in fiction.

With Hilda Doolittle [H. D.], Johnston’s new lesbian autobiography comes into its own, since Doolittle “integrated her erotic desires for women and her dependence on women into her work” (96). She acknowledged that without her partner, Bryher, she would not have received the visions that became the bedrock of her writing about herself and her world. At times, when she was exhausted amidst a vision, she would simply let Bryher become the vessel so they were equal partners in this aesthetic venture into understanding the self. It seems Doolittle sent some of her work to Havelock Ellis who belittled it; additionally, she was analyzed by Freud in two series of sessions, eventually writing tributes to him for what he could do, even as she critiqued the limitations of his technique and conclusions. At one point in the analysis, after H. D. had been taking notes between sessions, Freud, threatened by Doolittle’s assertion of an independent and cognitive self who does not need him at every turn, forbade her from continuing her self-reflections. Johnston concludes her work on H. D. by saying “Doolittle changes a sexological paradigm based on classification, divisions of abnormal/normal sexuality, and scientific objectivity into a sexualized paradigm based on artistic and creative perception through vision” (105).

In the final section of her study, Johnston conducts a close reading of Gertrude Stein’s “Lifting Belly,” saying that the poem “describes active lesbian sexuality as an ordinary and joyous part of everyday life. In so doing, Stein sets this sexuality and text in a different cultural sphere than the ones in which Ellis and Freud worked” (134). With an acute ear for language, Johnston posits that Stein’s “eternal present” tense, which baffles many a cursory reader of her work, becomes a conscious rejection of Freud’s model of autobiography in which the subject is no more than a “retrogressive spectator,” whose life requires the analyst to observe and make sense of raw experiences. If one relies on Freud’s constructs of an emerging self, Stein can never move beyond being a child as she never replaces love of the mother with love of the father necessary to the continuation of patriarchy. Acknowledging this fact, Johnston goes on to show Stein as a pioneer in the development of lesbian life-writing.

The arc Johnston traces is compelling and well-argued and her four “cases” illustrate her central tenet clearly. Always grounding her own ideas in an exhaustive body of research both in the areas of developing psychological theories in the early decades of the twentieth century and of contemporary literary critical theory, Johnston deftly selects and blends ideas from these sources to give us a work that is simultaneously scholarly and a “good read.” Given her extensive knowledge of this period of literature, I was mildly surprised not to find at least a passing reference to the work of a contemporary of several of the writers with whom Johnston works. Rosemary Manning’s output, published at the same time as Stein and Woolf, includes two overt autobiographies and an autobiographical novel, The Chinese Garden, that tells of a young girl struggling with same-sex desires and the huge campaign of her world to suppress and stigmatize all such feelings. I also would have preferred it if Johnston had been a little more observant of genres, perhaps using a term like “life-writing” as the general category within which she would then place the various forms used by her four subjects. It was mildly confusing at times to figure out if a reference to “autobiography” meant something written within the confines of that generic term or any example of someone reflecting on her own lived experience to see what story it had to tell. But aside from these quibbles, I find Johnston’s work engaging and well-researched, opening up our minds to the emergence of an alternative modality for recounting same-sex desire and for exploring such desire within literary structures that replace or at least question conventional heterosexual models for writing a life story.

Toni McNaron
University of Minnesota
The Persistence of Modernism: Loss and Mourning in the Twentieth Century

213 pages. $90 cloth.

A cursory glance at the title of Madelyn Detloff’s ambitious and absorbing study, The Persistence of Modernism: Loss and Mourning in the Twentieth Century, might suggest an exploration of the undiminished fascination of contemporary readers with Modernism, nearly a century after its peak years in Britain and the United States. However, closer attention reveals a considerably more penetrating and theoretically sophisticated project. Detloff proposes that our contemporary interest in—and debt to—the Modernists pivots on an inescapable “relationality” between past and present: “what it means to live on in a present that is shaped by past events” (2) with special attention to the outsized facts of “war, terror, and trauma” (3). These elements of experience, regrettably as much a part of our contemporary experience as they were during the Modernist period, demand and achieve artistic expression in diverse ways that suggest ethical as well as aesthetic responses to individual and collective trauma and atrocity.

Recognizing parallels between events of the early and the late twentieth century, Detloff sets out to examine the ways in which the responses of Modernist writers to “world-shaping and world-shattering” (4) events and personal trauma “persist” in the works of writers of our own contemporary moment. In doing so, she combines ideas that are typically addressed separately in discourses in trauma studies by examining individual loss and violence alongside of their collective equivalents. However, the relationship between Modernist and contemporary representations of individual and cultural trauma is not a simple or linear one since “modernist cultural productions”—sometimes those by the same writer—may both “reify (even glorify) violence and loss” and “resist the lure of traumatic reification” (14). To narrow the focus of her potentially enormous subject, Detloff focuses on a handful of British and American writers who may be distinguished by their metic or “resident alien” status (in the original Greek sense; see 178 n18). By virtue of gender, sexual preference, racial identity, and/or other indicators of Otherness as defined by the mainstream, these writers were or are uniquely positioned to express cultural constructions of inside, outside, and normalcy.

In the first section of her analysis, Detloff considers selected works by three canonical metic Modernists. Virginia Woolf’s counter-discourses to the “ideology of death,” particularly as demonstrated in her late works—Three Guineas and Between the Acts—demonstrate her resilience in the face of both personal and cultural trauma and loss. Gertrude Stein—whose identity performance (the process theorized by Judith Butler, to whom Detloff refers) as a “Jewish lesbian who flirted with Fascism” (15)—prompts Detloff to ask whether, given such contradictions, one can “like Stein without being like her” (55). Lastly, H. D. ’s apocalyptic poetry and autobiographical writings pose other kinds of ethical challenges for contemporary readers.

Woolfians will especially appreciate Detloff’s fresh focus on Woolf. Through her fiction, her anti-war essay Three Guineas, her biography, and (to invoke Brenda Silver’s term) her iconic afterlife, she figures centrally in Detloff’s examination of the vital relationship between artistic representation and moral awareness. Woolf challenged her readers’ thinking not only about literary conventions but about social norms and beliefs; thus, “her World War II writing might best be considered a project addressed to the future, rather than to her difficult present” (32). For example, to understand Woolf’s strategy for avoiding a tragic denouement in Between the Acts—composed in the shadow of an approaching Second World War that Woolf felt all too keenly—Detloff invokes Michael André Bernstein’s concept of “sideshadowing”: “a gesturing to the side, to a present dense with multiple, and mutually exclusive, possibilities for what is to come” (35). Choosing to set what was to be her final novel in the summer of 1939, before Western powers had grasped that large-scale war in Europe was unavoidable, Woolf could fictitiously “script English history as a satire, rather than a tragedy.” “Sideshadowing” permitted her to “challenge versions of history that script[ed] the onset of war as inevitable” (40).

Like Woolf, Stein refused to glorify war or to make war deaths heroic. Nonetheless, in the chapter on “Stein’s Shame,” Detloff concedes that Stein is a “difficult” writer not only because of her complex, often obscure, style but because of the puzzling inconsistencies of her “complex personhood” (Avery Gordon qtd. in Detloff 59). Analyzing several of her novels, including her less-well-known detective fiction, Detloff argues that Stein’s characteristic refusal of metaphor—immortalized in such often-cited phrases as “a rose is a rose is a rose” and “dead is dead”—reflects the writer’s courageous ethical and philosophical position. Through anti-metaphor, she refused “the substitutive logic that transforms the rose [or death] into something else” (69).

The most difficult chapter in Detloff’s illuminating but occasionally dense theoretical analysis is her close reading of several of H. D. ’s works. In “H. D. ’s Wars,” she focuses on the poet’s World War II long poem, Trilogy; her autobiographical memoir of childhood, The Gift; and her posthumous novel, Pilate’s Wife, to examine the meaning of “apocalyptic rhetoric” (81) and the poet’s strategies for “overwriting” losses (106). In her psychoanalytic reading of The Gift in the context of H. D. ’s traumatic childhood, she also examines the meanings of the poet’s classical allusions, particularly the myth of Isis and Osiris. Detloff focuses on the problem of H. D. ’s troubling tendency to aestheticize trauma, which produces the perverse effect of finding beauty in suffering and violence rather than acknowledging the “repulsive effects” of such experiences (80). Detloff extends her examination of this problem to
H. D.'s contemporary, T. S. Eliot, who also employs war as a backdrop for the celebration of personal renunciation rather than for expressing outrage against collective barbarity. In such observations, one finds Detloff's own passionately argued ethical position.

In the second portion of her study, Detloff turns to several contemporary American and British writers, including Susan Sontag, Hanif Kureishi, and Pat Barker, to illustrate her concept of “the modernist patch” (the title of Part II): parallels she establishes between Modernism and late-twentieth century fiction that represent similar preoccupations, including the difficulty of articulating aesthetically appropriate responses to “world-shattering” events that exceed our imaginative comprehension. In Regarding the Pain of Others, for example, Sontag struggles to express an ethical response to incomprehensible twentieth-century atrocities such as the Holocaust and the Serbian genocide and to understand the limits of individual empathy in the context of political violence that is too often understood to happen “elsewhere.” Writing about photography and war, Sontag criticizes Woolf for her naïve use of photographic images in Three Guineas. Detloff objects that Sontag overlooks significant analyses by Diane Gillespie, Maggie Humm, and others who have illuminated Woolf’s informed understanding of the complexity of photographic “realism.” As she notes, Woolf is less naïve than Sontag suggests, for [her] imagined response to the photographs of ‘dead bodies and ruined houses’ is at the very least embedded within an intricate rhetorical scaffolding that insists on both tracing our political investments in pain-producing practices, and acknowledging the particularities of power, class, gender, and nation that inform them. (135)

The position of Hanif Kureishi—the only male metic writer whom Detloff considers—is different from that of others in her study and perhaps almost anomalous in this context. Kureishi’s characters, who must daily “negotiate complicated hierarchies of race, class, status, and gender” (153), confront trauma and loss not on the collective level that engages Sontag but as witnesses or victims of hate crimes and homosocial violence across racial boundaries.

The last section of The Persistence of Modernism seems a bit of a potpourri whose connections are less smoothly joined than those of the preceding chapters. Returning to Woolf, Detloff considers the culturally-constructed significations that have become attached to her suicide, particularly as represented in Michael Cunningham’s novel, The Hours, and its cinematic adaptation by Stephen Daldry. Teasing out the multiple mirrorings and shadow selves that inhabit Mrs. Dalloway and its novelistic and cinematic spin-offs, she advances readers’ understanding beyond the obvious doubling of Clarissa and Septimus to consideration of the sacrificial victims during the early years of the AIDS epidemic. In her judgment, Daldry, following Cunningham, trivializes Septimus’ suicide. “Tutored by the ‘Mrs. Woolf’ of the film, we are supposed to know that we shouldn’t ask why the poet [named Richard Brown in The Hours] dies, because he dies for us. His death makes for good art and for a pleasing, if painful, retrospective on the AIDS crisis” (164)—as if the crisis were over rather than still with us.

Examining the Modernists in relation to their late twentieth century successors in discourses about these and other matters, Detloff illuminates familiar texts and writers and introduces us to less-familiar ones. In her passionately argued exploration of the “persistence of modernism”—visible in the efforts of these particular writers to give artistic form to personal struggles with trauma and loss as well as to the collective horrors of war, genocide, the AIDS epidemic, and hate crimes—Detloff persuades us that their artistic achievements not only inspire our aesthetic appreciation but deepen our moral awareness.

Roberta Rubenstein
American University
Modernism and the Locations of Literary Heritage prioritizes ordinary practices and domestic spaces. In fact, local itineraries guide the contents and methods of this book, namely its historical investigations, theoretical tactics, and literary interpretations. The narrative is somewhat disjointed as a result. Zemgulys rightly challenges orthodox distinctions between heritage and memory: Michel de Certeau influences her nuanced considerations of banal places. At the turn of the century, for instance, proposed redevelopments in the London neighborhoods that Dickens featured in his stories sparked public debate. When Zemgulys excludes World War I from her commonplace history of English metropolitan heritage, however, she bypasses dynamic contests animating modern quotidian circuits. Overall, she pursues an eclectic approach to interdisciplinary research: strategic engagements with established theorists such as Walter Benjamin and Michel Foucault enrich the discussion without furnishing a systematic methodology. Foucault’s concept of heterotopia enhances the exegesis of Eliot’s poem; otherwise, Zemgulys accentuates archival materials and close readings. She recollects the shifting topographies of London in her examinations of major modernists, yielding mixed results. The extensive discourse on Woolf eclipses the slighter interventions on Forster and Eliot. Zemgulys draws few intersections between these authors as a group: the implications of her contribution to studies of modernism, heritage, and memory warrant elaboration.

The last chapter surveys Woolf’s abiding interest in literary tourism, ranging from her celebrated fiction to her neglected prose. In this manner, Zemgulys links disparate materials seldom combined in Woolf scholarship. More precisely, she construes A Room of One’s Own and “Great Men’s Houses” (1932), an essay on the historical residences of Carlyle and Keats, as the culmination of Woolf’s reformulation of literary heritage. Carlyle’s museum is a pivotal setting in Woolf’s mature critique of the androcentric norms of literary geography although a wry perspective on the veneration of great men emerges earlier in Night and Day. Impersonality, a controversial issue in Woolf criticism by Elaine Showalter, Lisa Low, and most recently, Katerina Koutsantoni, is a key concern. Zemgulys observes that Orlando: A Biography (1928), for example, upholds an impersonal model of creative genius for women writers. This chapter also comprehends the ideal of impersonality as a self-reflexive mode of reading that modulates the unchecked desires and undisciplined habits of the literary pilgrim (159-60). At times, Zemgulys might be more skeptical of Woolf’s own compulsions and investments: contradictions and discontinuities in her oeuvre merit explication. Despite this qualification, Zemgulys persuasively demonstrates the fundamental role of heritage in Woolf’s modernist turn. Along with her contemporaries Eliot and Forster, Woolf is now subject to the vicissitudes of the memorial cultures that she both cultivated and questioned in her lifetime.

Marlene Briggs
University of British Columbia
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REVIEW
MODERNISM AND THE LOCATIONS OF LITERARY HERITAGE

Literary memorials crowd London. Designated Bloomsbury buildings, for example, authenticate the famous haunts of Virginia Woolf and her circle. In the vicinity, a plaque marks T. S. Eliot’s former office at Faber and Faber. The customs of local commemoration thus recall the novelties of cosmopolitan experimentation. This conjunction of innovation and tradition is more typical than ironic. As Andrea Zemgulys explains in Modernism and the Locations of Literary Heritage, the heyday of literary heritage coincided with avant-garde departures in the arts, 1880-1930. Woolf visited the Chelsea shrine of Thomas Carlyle several times, an institution supported, in part, by her father Leslie Stephen. Two of the most popular English museums, those dedicated to the lives and works of Charles Dickens and John Keats, began welcoming pilgrims in the 1920s. Zemgulys discerns complex negotiations rather than decisive ruptures between modern intellectuals and their cultural predecessors. For the most part, she emphasizes humble homes and relics in contrast to the grand estates and monuments of national heritage. The book exhibits the modest ethos that it advocates, encompassing potentially unwieldy developments in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries by carefully restricting its focus and delineating precise distinctions. Despite its uneven synthesis of heritage and modernism, this lucid monograph unsettles schematic conceptions of the period. Notably, Zemgulys offers methodical exposition on a burgeoning topic of special relevance to Woolf scholars.

Zemgulys maintains that British heritage, composite practices of preservation enacted through geography, memorialization, and tourism, shaped modern culture and even fostered aesthetic innovation. She divides her study into two parts: heritage and modernism. The first part situates metropolitan and middlebrow rites, particularly those informed by place-based fantasies of authorship, in the context of the fin de siècle ideological constellation of capitalism, Christianity, and imperialism. Incidentally, the transnational reception of British literature made it a contentious object of collective memory: anxious readers often caricatured American tourists as vulgar consumers. Diligent inquiry into obscure sources and public records, including committee minutes and signature books, also illuminates the contradictions of urban heritage practices. Part two builds on this intriguing cultural genealogy to elucidate texts by Eliot, Woolf, and E. M. Forster, figures associated with Bloomsbury. More specifically, Zemgulys appraises the significance of Chelsea in Howard’s End (1910), churches in The Waste Land (1922), and literary heritage in Woolf’s oeuvre, especially Night and Day (1919) and A Room of One’s Own (1929). The exploration concludes with World War II, referring to the pessimistic late modernist works, England’s Pleasant Land: A Pageant Play (1940), Between the Acts (1941), and Four Quarters (1944). Throughout, Zemgulys is an even-handed critic who highlights the “protean politics” of the social processes that she analyzes (8).

This is the design for the plaques now displayed on the facade of 22 Hyde Park Gate, SW7. The effort was initiated by Jasmyne King-Leeder in 2004. Thanks to Leslie Kathleen Hankins for providing this image.

To see a photograph of these plaques (and Leslie Stephen’s), go to: <http://www.flickr.com/photos/gwyhafyr/3801383958/>
What if Virginia Woolf did not commit suicide on 28 March 1941? What if a war-time political intrigue rather than a mental breakdown drove her from her home that fateful afternoon? And what if she escaped death, if only for a few weeks, by taking refuge in home and arms of Vita Sackville-West? And what if, during this dark time in her own and her country’s history, she not only inspired the vision for Sackville-West’s famous White Garden, but left behind a manuscript fictionalizing her own last days?

These are the fanciful questions that inspire mystery writer Stephanie Barron’s most recent novel. Best known for her popular Jane Austen mysteries and her 2008 A Flaw in the Blood which imagines that Prince Albert did not die from illness but was murdered, Barron has been extremely successful writing imaginative accounts of the lives of historical figures. With a background in history and journalism, and a previous career as a CIA analyst, Barron likes to compose period pieces with a present day mystery focused on Jo Bellamy, a landscape designer, who schemes her way through the novel. With her French-manicured nails, waist-length black hair, Brünnhilde boots, and mini skirts, one wonders that she had the time to write her latest book, Sapphist Writers in Arcadia. She slithers through the novel like a kind of dazzling Mod Squad viper effortlessly entwining men and manuscripts in her grip.

Woolf, of course, never underestimated the value of what she called her “rubbish reading,” books whose main purpose is to entertain. If you crave some fast-paced entertainment grounded in the lives and landscapes Bloomsbury and ornamented with some extravagant flights of fancy, The White Garden offers a pleasing possibility.

**Danell Jones**  
Montana State University Bozeman
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Voyages Out, Voyages Home:
SELECTED PAPERS FROM THE ELEVENTH ANNUAL
CONFERENCE ON VIRGINIA WOOLF

Edited by Jane de Gay and Marion Dell (Clemson, SC: Clemson University Digital Press, 2010), x, 146 pp. $19.95 paper. ISBN: 978-0-9842598-1-6

The Eleventh Annual Conference on Virginia Woolf—hosted by the University of Wales, Bangor, from 13 to 16 June 2001—was the first to be held outside the United States. This voyage across the Atlantic was the stimulus for an exploration of themes of voyaging in Woolf’s works, from her interests in travel and cross-cultural encounters to her imaginative voyages between texts and genres. . . and the subsequent voyages her texts have made into the work of others.

Published nine years after the conference, this selection of papers by international scholars fills a gap in the chronicles of the Woolf conference. For this reason, several papers feature an Afterword outlining developments in research since 2001, and the book also includes a “Bibliography of Publications Arising from the Conference,” facilitating access to research presented at Bangor but published elsewhere. Another special feature of the volume is the tribute to one of the keynote speakers, Julia Briggs, who died in 2007, in which Beth Rigel Daugherty communicates the gratitude of the scholarly community for Julia’s many contributions to Woolf studies. This welcome publication is a fitting record of our collective voyage as Woolf scholars.

To order, send the form below to: The Director, Center for Electronic and Digital Publishing, Strode Tower, Box 340522, Clemson University, Clemson, SC 29634-0522.

VOYAGES OUT, VOYAGES HOME ORDER FORM (Make checks payable to Clemson University)

Name: __________________________  Quantity: ________ x $19.95 (U.S.)
Address: __________________________
_____________________________________
_____________________________________
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Telephone: __________________________
Email: __________________________

Subtotal: ________________
Shipping: ________________ $3 ($6 if overseas) x quantity
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Dear Friends,

A glorious spring has erupted in Southwest Ohio, about 75 miles north of Georgetown, Kentucky, the site of this year’s Virginia Woolf Conference. Things were not quite so sunny a couple of weeks ago when my class and I were reading Orlando. At the time Woolf’s depiction of the Great Frost in early modern London seemed only too vivid. But now the great thaw has brought with it a number of hopeful signs:

For one, it brings us that much closer to the 20th Annual Conference on Virginia Woolf, hosted by Georgetown College and organized by the indefatigable Kristin Czarnecki. I just had the chance to drive through the Lexington area, and I must say that I can’t think of a more fitting setting for a conference on Woolf and the Natural World. I wonder what poetry Orlando, or more likely, Vita Sackville West, would have made of the lush bluegrass fields and the incredible variety of flora and fauna of central Kentucky. I hope to see you there June 3-6. For more information on the conference, go to the conference website at <http://www.georgetowncollege.edu/Departments/English/Woolf>. The IVWS, as usual, will be holding a business meeting at the conference. Please see the conference schedule for time and place. And please don’t hesitate to contact me <detlofmm@muohio.edu> or President Georgia Johnston <johnstgk@slu.edu> if you have ideas, concerns, or questions that you would like us to address at the meeting.

The spring also brought a blossoming of interesting and hopeful articles in the media about the importance of the humanities and literature—complex modernist literature at that! Those of you who have been keeping up with the email conversation on the VWOOLF list have seen the YouTube link shared by Anne Fernald which depicts Jonah Lehrer (author of Proust Was a Neuroscientist) describing how his early experience reading To the Lighthouse led him to an appreciation of modernists who explore “the broth of thought” in their work <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=F_LJ4_9sRNQ>. On March 31, the New York Times ran an article about new research on brain science that indicates that literature makes us better thinkers. According to researchers, reading literature is a way for the mind to train itself to consider complex relationships between things that may be necessary for our survival. Times reporter Patricia Cohen notes that “This layered process of figuring out what someone else is thinking—of mind reading—is both a common literary device and an essential survival skill.” And yes, you guessed it—Woolf is among those who give our minds the most rigorous workout. According to those who study the science of literature, such as University of Kentucky’s Lisa Zunshine, “Modernist authors like Virginia Woolf are especially challenging because she asks readers to keep up with six different mental states, or what the scholars call levels of intentionality” (Cohen). We Woolfians have suspected this all along, but it’s nice to see the New York Times and the rest of the world catching up with us!

On other fronts, the IVWS has had another fruitful year. We witnessed two excellent panels at the MLA in Philadelphia—“The Uses of Illness: Woolf and Medical Narratives,” chaired by David Eberly, and “Twenty-First Century Woolf,” chaired by Elizabeth Outka. We owe our deepest thanks to Alison Lewis for opening her home to us for the IVWS MLA party in Philadelphia. We will be hosting at least one panel at the MLA in Los Angeles, January 6-9, 2011. (Yes, Virginia, the MLA will now take place the week after the New Year begins instead of the week before!) Danell Jones will be chairing a session on “Woolf and Africa.” The MLA recently changed its policy on panels by author societies, thus only one panel is guaranteed. We feel that we have strong contenders for more panels, however, so stay tuned for additional news on Woolf panels at the MLA. We have yet to secure a location for our Los Angeles Woolf party. If you know of any Woolf-loving party friends in LA, now is the time to ask them for a favor! We could always book the Queen Mary in Long Beach for a fancy dinner, but rumor has it that the E.U. will be recommissioning her to ferry passengers across the Atlantic during the current Volcanic Ash Airborne Event. Really, if Woolf can make so much of the Great Frost of 1608 in her fiction, imagine what she would have made of giant cauliflower shaped clouds of ash currently making havoc of European air space? Truth is sometimes stranger than fiction. Luckily for us, our minds have been honed by fiction to take on whatever challenges truth throws our way.

Until June,

Madelyn Detloff
Vice President, IVWS
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