TO THE READERS

J. J. Wilson’s “European” edition of VWM was a great success and VWM anticipates more and more contributions from abroad. She modestly neglected to tell you that she was in London for the launching of her book with Karen Petersen, Women Artists, published here by Harper and there by the Women’s Press. J. J. also helped Stephanie Dowrick with the production of the stunning Working Women Artists Calendar 1979 (13 color prints from international artists 16x20 and available from Quartet Books, 27 Goodge St., London at £4.95 or from Women in Distribution, Box 8858, Washington, D.C. 20003 for $9.95.) We also hear that the Women’s Press is working with Michele Barrett on the long awaited edition of Woolf’s feminist essays in one volume. I have also seen some wonderful prints and etchings of Virginia Woolf by the artist, Robin Roy Rubin, particularly a triangular newspaper etching and a portrait with a room of her own in Woolf’s head (here reproduced). These have been produced in limited editions and VWM readers may send inquiries to the artist at 35 College St., Brockport, New York 14420.

There has been some grumbling about Quentin Bell’s “bottom of the barrel” letter in the last issue. Perhaps the objections can best be summed up by remembering the narrator’s frustrations in A Room of One’s Own, for she was angry as a woman writer at being denied entrance to the Oxbridge libraries and the British Museum to see the manuscripts and drafts of her favorite works. Scholars feel the same way about the drafts of Virginia Woolf’s works, and want to see how they grew. There has been enormous excitement about Graham’s studies of The Waves and Leaska’s of The Years. Virginia Woolf herself longed to see the drafts of Meredith’s novels and her feeling is an understandable one.

The Miscellany has been the subject of a little literary teapot tempest. In May the TLS in an editorial entitled “Woolf Whistles” mocked our existence, our Americanism, our feminism, our contributors and Woolf herself. I replied indignantly, incidentally mentioning E.M. Forster’s anti-feminism. Oliver Stallybrass gallantly leaped to Forster’s defense. Again I responded, and so the matter rests. The TLS has since printed an unusually savage attack on Mitchell Leaska’s latest book, but their reviewer of the new political biography of Leonard Woolf gives Virginia some credit for political ideas, so there is no measuring effects.

One Wednesday evening in August in London I saw Miss LaTrobe in person on television. My family were watching a British film from 1943 and I had come in just as Margaret Rutherford was blustering and bullying a local village into a pageant of English history while their neighbors were watching and bombs were falling. No one could remember the title of the film, but obviously it was wartime propaganda and hasn’t been shown since as the plot concerned the solidarity of English and Russian workers and was unblushingly pro-communist. Can anyone name the film or director?

The MLA in New York: Do not miss the session on The Waves, chaired by Lucio Ruotolo, with papers by Professors Graham, Heine, Schlack and Wilson. Virginia Woolf as a letter-writer will be the subject of papers by Joanne Trautmann and Catherine Stimpson in the 20th century Literature session. James Holt McGavran, Jr. is giving a paper on The Prelude and The Waves at Special Session No. 29, Romantics and Moderns: From Page to Stage to Screen; he reassures us that “there is nothing in my paper about either stage or screen.” The Virginia Woolf Society will give a party in their own suite at the Hilton, December 28 at 8:30 p.m. Members, non-members and friends are cordially invited to attend and to contribute, for the party will be a benefit for the Miscellany. Your editor urges you to come and to contribute as generously as you can, because the Newberry Library is in dire financial straits as well and could not come up with printing costs for this issue. The Virginia Woolf Society board will meet at 7 p.m. previous to the party to elect new officers since Carolyn Heilbrun, Morris Beja and Elaine Unkeless will be retiring. Suggestions for nominations should go to Carolyn Heilbrun at Columbia University.


News and Gossip: On return to the U.S. I have heard several people refer to “the Virginia Woolf Mafia” and wonder whether it might be better to be called a lupine. Blake scholar David Erdman, already responsible for the 1977 Bulletin of the New York Public Library revaluation of The Years, and Mitchel Leaska’s edition of The Pargiters, is now working with Woolf scholars again on The Voyage Out. He plans a special issue of Bulletin of Research in the Humanities on the manuscripts with essays by Louise DeSalvo, Madeline Moore, and Elizabeth Heine, and will probably chair the 1979 MLA Woolf Seminar to discuss the manuscripts. Louise DeSalvo is working with him on an edition of the manuscript of Melvynbroxia. Ralph Freedman of Princeton has edited a volume of essays called Virginia Woolf: Revaluation and Continuity. A Chorus of Voices to be published by University of California Press at Berkeley in the spring. The contributors are Harvena...
Leonard and therefore may have wished to present him in a favorable light in a work essentially commissioned by him.

Yet it is interesting that Leonard’s relationship to Virginia has never been criticized by acquaintances of the Woolfs or by members of the Bloomsbury circle. After Leonard’s death, those who had observed the Woolfs’ marriage could have commented critically, if so inclined, even if they had felt compelled to keep such views to themselves while Leonard was still alive. It is true that Leonard has been criticized by friends and associates, especially John Lehmann who found Leonard a most difficult person to work with; however, this criticism has not extended to the marriage or to his influence on Virginia’s literary work.

[Ed. Note: See Review of Roger Poole’s book in this issue.]

How does one, then, approach an evaluation of the personal, emotional, and literary relationship between Leonard and Virginia Woolf, considering that it may well provide a better understanding of the lives and work of both writers?

George Spater and Ian Parsons present little in their new work which contradicts the conventional portrait of Leonard and Virginia’s marriage. Although they include some primary material and photographs not previously available in print, they are essentially developing biographical information which is already familiar to readers of Leonard’s autobiography and Bell’s biography of Virginia. On the question of the happiness of the Woolfs’ marriage, they detail Leonard’s affection for Virginia, his realistic appraisal of her temperament, and the general course of the Woolfs’ domestic and social life. Spater and Parsons conclude that Leonard satisfied Virginia’s need for love and constant support and protection; his devotion to her made the marriage a success from the point of view of Virginia’s temperament and lifestyle. Unlike Spater and Parsons who evaluate the Woolfs’ lifestyle as harmonious and who feel that Leonard and Virginia fostered each other’s work and found the other a satisfying marriage partner, Elaine Showalter views the Woolfs’ marriage relationship as destructive. Showalter sees Virginia’s nervous breakdowns as related to crises of female identity, arguing that Virginia connected femaleness with death and that this mental attitude was aggravated by Leonard. To Showalter, Leonard is not Virginia’s benefactor, nor is he a martyr and saint devoting all his energies to Virginia regardless of consequences to himself (nerves, work, sexual fulfillment). Instead, she sees Leonard as a contributor to Virginia’s failure to confront her sexuality and to achieve identity as a woman. For example, Virginia’s longing for children was frustrated by Leonard who, in agreement with male doctors, decided that childbirth and motherhood might be too much of a strain on Virginia’s sanity. Showalter feels that Leonard acted less out of concern for Virginia’s well-being than out of his own fear of fatherhood. Similarly, Showalter argues that the rest cures that male doctors prescribed and Leonard supported, were a “sinister parody of idealized Victorian femininity” (274) with their enforce passivity, physical isolation, and emphasis on weight gain which represented a pseudo-pregnancy. Virginia’s outbursts of anger against Leonard during these times might well have been her only honest expressions of the real anger that she suppressed at other times. Showalter further links Virginia’s suppression of female anger and inability to achieve sexual identity as a woman with her concept of androgyny which Showalter characterizes as emphasizing transcendence of emotion and sex. This, to Showalter, is an inhuman condition, leading to a vision of womanhood which is “as deadly as it is disembodied” (297). Thus, she sees in the Woolfs’ marriage relationship a male-female interaction that was destructive to Virginia both as a woman and as an artist.
The title of the Spater and Parsons' work leads one to expect some evaluation of the deeper implications of Leonard's role in Virginia's life, specifically his influence on her intellectual development and work, and her influence on Leonard's political and literary concerns. Spater and Parsons do point out the autobiographical elements of _The Voyage Out_ and similarities between Virginia's _Night and Day_ and Leonard's _The Wise Virgins_ which portray the Virginia-Leonard relationship and aspects of the Bloomsbury circle. Yet they treat the remainder of the Woolfs' literary careers independently. Showalter, likewise, does not probe the intellectual or literary relationship that may well have been a most important bond in the Woolfs' marriage. It is, however, apparent that Leonard and Virginia influenced each other's work and thought. Their _Hogarth Press_ publishing efforts must have involved continual exchange of opinion about new manuscripts, new authors, finances, and the literary and political philosophy of the Press. Moreover, there are striking similarities in Leonard and Virginia's concern with political issues. Both of them emphasized the connection between the structure and ideology of the class system and sexism, facism, and war. Paralleling their political interests and works thus reveals that Virginia was not antagonistic to Leonard's political philosophy, and that, unlike what many of Virginia's critics claim, her political and feminist ideas were not naive. Virginia consistently recognized the important influence of social and economic experience on individual consciousness and the writer's art. Like Leonard, her political thinking was shaped by her response to history and contemporary experience.

Spater and Parsons perhaps have chosen to describe the Leonard-Virginia relationship as "a marriage of true minds" to suggest emotional harmony and intellectual equality, because they feel that both Leonard and Virginia fulfilled their needs as individuals and artists. Elaine Showalter's view of that same relationship as contributing toward a "flight into androgyny" suggests Virginia's fear and desire for escape, from herself or Leonard or the marriage which, although it may have brought protection and emotional support, may also have restricted her psychological and artistic growth. It may be that these two divergent evaluations of the Woolfs' marriage now need to be counterbalanced by a thorough analysis of the intellectual relationship between Leonard and Virginia, a study of the similarities and divergences in their literary and political thought and work.

---

Phyllis Rose, _VIRGINIA WOOLF: WOMAN OF LETTERS_ (Oxford University Press, 1978)

In her essay "The Art of Biography," Woolf wrote that the facts of biography are not like the established facts of science, but are subject to changes of interpretation as the times change. "The accent on sex," she pointed out, "has changed within living memory." Phyllis Rose's new and highly readable biography of Woolf illustrates this change of accent in Woolf scholarship since Rose says her book is an attempt to see the "feminist perspective" in Woolf's work, although she leaves that overly familiar phrase largely undefined. She also says that she wants to revise Woolf's image as an "isolated and somewhat precious technician" (ix) and lay the ghost of her invalidism to rest. Miscellany readers may protest that these projects have been well launched in our own decade both by new scholarship on the feminist politics and aesthetics of Woolf and by the publication of the letters and diaries which show her spirited immersion in everyday life. But beyond our own circles of Woolfian enthusiasm, such changes may still be needed.

Relying on _Moments of Being_ and the manuscript collections, Rose presents what she sees as Woolf's "personal mythology" (ix) to guide her through the biographical data. Her retelling of the early life includes a new emphasis on Woolf's ambivalent feelings toward her mother. Rose also brings a fresh insight to Woolf's relationship with Lytton Strachey, arguing that her temptation to marry Strachey was a temptation to resume that passivity inherent in her former position as Leslie Stephen's daughter. She sees Woolf's decision to marry Leonard as a move away from Strachean exclusiveness to a more common and humane way of life. She discusses the early short fiction, _Night and Day_, and _Jacob's Room_ together as "Transitions and Experiments" and goes on to elaborate on Woolf's relation to her mother and Violet Dickinson. The first six chapters are far more useful and perceptive, I feel, than the six that follow.

One has an increasing sense that something crucial is missing as one reads Rose's chapters on _Mrs. Dalloway_, _To the Lighthouse_, and _androgyny_; a sense which clarifies in her chapter on the thirties. One realizes then that Rose's understanding of Woolf's feminism goes only as far as the internalization of patriarchal authority. She says that Woolf liberated herself from the ghosts of her parents and the Victorian values of her past in writing _To the Lighthouse_ and killed the angel in the house. Woolf warned, however, that the murder of the angel was merely the first step and the second step, the discovery of self, was far more difficult and perilous. But Rose lets her discussion of Woolf's feminism rest largely in that first negative stage and does not follow her explorations into the second dangerous, but creative one. She fails to see the ways in which Woolf attempted to develop a uniquely "feminine form"--a development that Ellen Hawkes presented lucidly in her important article, "A Form of One's Own." Woolf described that form, with which she experimented repeatedly, as open and transparent; one that would invite participation and push the reader downward into an underwater world of deep perception. Rose's appraisal of _The Waves_ as monotonous, despite its poetic beauty, implies that she is insufficiently aware of Woolf's revolutionary attempts to create this new form. Similarly her charge that Woolf refuses "to define a central character or to shape the narrative" (213) in _The Years_ suggests that she has not considered seriously either its experiments in aesthetics or its feminist politics. She ignores the spectrum of women in the novel and the mystical perceptions of relationship that occur to certain wise responsive characters such as Eleanor Pargiter, whom Rose never mentions. She speaks of a "crazy seesaw" between Woolf's works of poetry and fact: those

---

1 Jane Marcus (in " ‘No more horses’: Virginia Woolf on Art and Propaganda," _Women's Studies_, 4, 1977, 265-290), among others, discusses the importance of Virginia's political ideology and suggests that Leonard and Quentin Bell attempted to make Virginia appear to be less political than she was by denigrating her political ideas, making her political and artistic growth. It may be that these two divergent evaluations of the Woolfs' marriage now need to be counterbalanced by a thorough analysis of the intellectual relationship between Leonard and Virginia, a study of the similarities and divergences in their literary and political thought and work.

2 The relationship between Leonard and Virginia Woolf's early fiction and social and political literature, especially that written during the 1930's, was explored in the 1977 MLA Special Session "Leonard and Virginia Woolf: Correlations."

Selma Meyerowitz
San José
State University
of "genuine originality" that use the self and those of "academic discipline" (256) that suppress it and retreat into traditional form. These categories are not only limiting, I feel, but dangerously distortional since poetry and fact are frequently blended and the self moves in and out of all Woolf's novels.

The book ends with a vivid portrait of Woolf that includes a provocative discussion of her duplicity in terms of R.D. Laing. But Rose's decision to omit most of the story of Woolf's illness causes her to leave much of Woolf's writing motivations in shadow as well as many of the reasons why she examined her feminine identity and evolved her feminist beliefs.

Rose asserts that because the problems of achievement for women have a certain similarity the exploration of the "dynamics of a miracle" (xii), such as Woolf's work, can be illuminating for others. This short absorbing biography may well make Woolf more accessible to numerous readers. But I feel that Rose has left some crucial elements of that miracle unexplored--Woolf's vision of a new feminine form and her sense of relationship.

Notes:

Ann L. McLaughlin
20 Campo Belto, Menlo Park, California 94025

Roger Poole, THE UNKNOWN VIRGINIA WOOLF
(London: Cambridge University Press, 1978)

The premise of Roger Poole's The Unknown Virginia Woolf is that Virginia Woolf was never insane. Poole sees that her earlier "breakdowns" of 1895 and 1904 are understandable "collapses" attendant on the deaths of her parents. In order to disprove Virginia Woolf's violent anger at Leonard Woolf's assessments of his wife's "madness" in 1912 to 1915, and again in 1941, Poole investigates Leonard Woolf's personality.

To Poole, the Woolfs' marriage, though it did grow into a mutual commitment, had founded at its inception. "... marriage seems [to Virginia Stephen] to have been seen as a means of having or achieving 'a room of one's own', a status in society, a social identity." (p.59) Further, Leonard Woolf's "narrow rationalist presuppositions" (p.131) which Poole uses Leonard Woolf's writings to establish, kept Leonard from accepting statements of a vision different from his; hence he was unable to credit the existence of his wife's version of reality. For both members, too, the shadow of Victorinan social and sexual prudery darkened any hope for their sexual life. Poole argues that neither spouse could feel passionately, but in his opinion it was Leonard Woolf who decreed an end to their sexual intimacy. The increasing pressure on Virginia Woolf to exist in a world of marriage in which her husband denied the very basis of her vision of the world drove her into an understandable panic and rage--thus her "madness," so-called.

Poole is particularly moving as he documents how abusive Virginia Woolf felt her "rest cure" and her forced feedings at the hands of four mental nurses to have been in 1913 through 1915; he makes vivid to the reader the attacks such treatment must have seemed. No doctor, no sister, and certainly not Leonard Woolf, according to Poole, tried to see Virginia Woolf's pain and anger from the inside of her consciousness; no one believed in her world and she was punished for falling to accede to that shared by the aggressors against her. Virginia Woolf's violent anger at Leonard Woolf during this period is seen as a sensible reaction to the coercion to which she perceived him subjecting her.

Poole discusses as part of the pain of the marriage, Virginia Woolf's "embodiment," a subject he debates at length. He follows the usual biographical tack of taking as literal rather than symbolical reality Virginia Woolf's reports of her attacks at the hands of her two half brothers. Although Poole sees that "Woolf angrily defined the coming war as a male phenomenon. But to Poole, Woolf's angry voice was singular, not an outgrowth of a tradition of women's writing, creativity, and criticism which Woolf's myriad historical analyses had revivified: "She is, in fact, trying to think in a way which no woman ever succeeded in achieving before: a way which is peculiarly female." (p.265)

Problematic as are parts of the book the end is especially moving. Poole sees Woolf's suicide as the act of a sane mind rationally assessing the true situation of 1941: "The evolution of Virginia's fear was part and parcel of the psychological and mental history of an entire nation in 1939-41..." (p.278) Roger Poole has tried to partake of Virginia Woolf's lived empathically and felt life, and the result of his visions is a courageous and moving book.

Jane Lilienfeld
Assumption College, Worcester, Mass. 01606

Dear VWM:

Readers of contemporary fiction might be interested in looking at Gus in Bronze by Alexandra Marshall. Gus, a middle-aged woman who is dying of cancer, spends her last days reading through the novels of Virginia Woolf. As the book opens she has reached The Years, and quotations from that work lend Marshall's novel a depth and breadth of vision this work might otherwise lack.

Woolf readers may also notice that the structure of Gus in Bronze parallels that of To the Lighthouse, especially near the end; after Gus's death, her husband and children make a journey to their Cape Cod summer home to scatter her ashes there. The tensions between father and children, the sense of loss, the thoughts of the woman friend who accompanies them, all echo the final section of Lighthouse.

Grace Radin
26 Franklin Street, Piermont, N.Y. 10968
Tillie Olsen, SILENCES
(New York: Delacorte Press/Seymour Lawrence, 1978)

Readers of Virginia Woolf will want to see the use made of the many Woolf quotations in Tillie Olsen's recently published Silences. This is a startlingly original book of great passion and impact. Its core concern is the vast range of reasons why writers do not write—from personal halts and damages to general barriers, such as sex, color, class, religion, opportunity, which delay or prevent many from coming to writing, or continuing in it. Through a unique form the lives and opinions, the outrages of triumph and despair of many writers are interwoven with Tillie Olsen's own perceptions. The result is a revealing study of the nature and needs of "the incomparable medium" of writing, and, at the same time, a requiem for the blank spaces that haunt our literature.

As might be expected of Tillie Olsen (author of Tell Me A Riddle, an already classic work of fiction) she has made an art itself from her telling of the needs of and for art. Throughout Virginia Woolf's life, thoughts, and writings are extensively used. They could have no more fitting setting.

Mary Gray Hughes
(Mary Gray Hughes is an American writer whose most recent short stories appear in Southwest Review and Texas Stories and Poems I, one of many non-academic readers of Virginia Woolf and the Miscellany.)

VWM FOLLOW-UP ARTICLES

KATHERINE MANSFIELD AND VIRGINIA WOOLF'S REVISIONS OF THE VOYAGE OUT

Ann L. McLaughlin's Virginia Woolf Miscellany article "The Same Job: Notes on the Relationship Between Virginia Woolf and Katherine Mansfield" (Winter, 1977) offers significant insights into that most complicated of friendships.* Yet another facet to the relationship is added when one assesses the circumstances surrounding Woolf's 1919 and 1920 revisions of The Voyage Out for its first American appearance and for a second English edition that was never published. Katherine Mansfield's review of Night and Day was published in The Athenaeum on 21 November 1919, just days before Woolf began revising. This review of Woolf's second novel—the one which seems to have affected her the most—possibly helped her to determine the direction of her revisions for Voyage. Mansfield's critique of Night and Day implied that she preferred Woolf's first novel to her second, a preference hinted at in the title of the review, "A Ship Comes Into the Harbour." 1 Throughout, Mansfield implies that this second novel is less audacious, less experimental, and less venturesome than Voyage. Indeed, her implicit negative assessment of the second novel in comparison with the first is indicated throughout in the extended metaphor of Night and Day as the ship returning to harbour, a metaphor which reverses the central metaphor of Voyage, although Voyage is never once mentioned by name in the review.

Before Mansfield's review appeared, there is little doubt that Woolf preferred her second novel to her first one. A diary entry made on 21 October 1919, the day after Night and Day was published, reads: "this time I've had a fair chance & done my best ..." But soon, Woolf was recording the opinions of others who preferred Voyage to her second novel. Among them was E.M. Forster and on 6 November she summarized his preference for the "vague & universal" Voyage over the tightly-constructed "strictly formal & classical work," Night and Day. That her attitude toward Night and Day might have been changing is indicated in a 19 November letter to Janet Case where she concluded that the form of N and D perhaps "sits too tight; as it was too loose in The Voyage Out." 2 A few days later, Mansfield's review appeared, and although it might not have changed Woolf's preference for her second novel, it might have led her to reconsider the merits of her first.

Mansfield began her review by speculating upon the fate of the contemporary novel, concluding that the only appropriate generalization was to see this age as an age of experimentation: "If the novel dies it will be to give way to some new form of expression; if it lives it must accept the fact of a new world." It is within this context that Mansfield passed judgment upon N and D. She viewed it as a safe work, as a kind of literary throw-back. The review is of the sort that damned by praising:

To us who love to linger down at the harbour, as it were, watching the new ships being builted, the old ones returning, and the many putting out to sea, comes the strange sight of "Night and Day" sailing into port serene and resolute on a deliberate wind. The strangeness lies in her aloofness, her air of quiet perfection, her lack of any sign that she has made a perilous voyage—the absence of any scars.

The second novel was being reviewed with metaphors drawn from the first, and one can infer that Mansfield found Voyage more satisfying. And then, after having stated, initially, that experimental novels were the only hope for the continuance of the novel:

It is impossible to refrain from comparing "Night and Day" with the novels of Miss Austen. There are moments, indeed, when one is almost tempted to cry it Miss Austen up-to-date ... As in the case of Miss Austen's novels we fall under a little spell; it is as though, realizing our safety, we surrender ourselves to the author, confident that whatever she has to show us, and however strange it may appear, we shall not be frightened or shocked.

After explicating the relationship between Woolf's and Austen's works, Mansfield assesses Woolf's characters and she asks: "but how much life have they? We have the queer sensation that once the author's pen is removed from them they have neither speech nor motion ..." Although Mansfield believed that the essence of N and D was "Katherine Hilbery's attempt to reconcile the world of reality with what, for want of a better name, we call the dream world," she concluded that nothing could be so far removed from the real, from the contemporary world, nothing "could be more remote than the house at Cheyne Walk ..."

One can imagine how Woolf must have felt when she read Mansfield's concluding paragraph:

We had thought that this world was vanished for ever, that it was impossible to find on the great ocean of literature a ship that was unaware of what has been happening. Yet here is "Night and Day," fresh, new and exquisite, a novel in the tradition of the English novel. In the midst of our admiration it makes us feel old and chill; we had never thought to look upon its like again!

On 26 November 1919, a few days after the review, Woolf wrote Lytton Strachey about her plans for revising Voyage and Night and Day and asked him to send her his corrections. She apparently wanted them immediately because she stated that she would be sending both books off "on Monday ... and only 2 days to do it in!" She also stated in this letter that "the whole thing must be re-written from the beginning." She had certainly read Mansfield's review by 27 November when she wrote Olive Bell: "I couldn't grasp what Katherine meant but thought she disliked the book and wouldn't say so ... Murry, however, tells me that she admires it, but thinks my 'aloofness' morally wrong." 3 That the review hurt immensely, however, can be understood by the diary entry she made on 28 November: "K.M. wrote a review which irritated me—I thought I saw spine in it. A decorous elderly dullard she describes me; Jane Austen up to date."
Because of Woolf's letter to Strachey, one would expect that she revised Voyage drastically for its American appearance. Woolf did make significant changes to Voyage at this time, particularly to Chapter XVI, the scene where Rachel Vinrace and Terence Hewit exchange stories about their earlier lives. In her revision of the chapter, Woolf has deleted specific details about their past histories; descriptions of what Rachel's days in Richmond were like; of how her aunts behaved; Terence’s writing plans; a detailed summary of the end of his novel; and some glimpses into his life in Devonshire. The effect of these alterations is to make Rachel's and Terence's pasts more shadowy. The American edition underscores their inability or unwillingness to reveal their pasts to one another. 6

The changes Woolf made to this chapter and to other parts of Voyage right after Mansfield's review did affect the form of the entire novel, indicating that Woolf was trying to remedy structural weaknesses that she and others had perceived in Voyage. But Katherine Mansfield's negative assessment of N and D and her implicit praise of Voyage just might have been instrumental in Woolf's revising Voyage less than drastically and certainly not from beginning to end, resulting in her retaining much more of its central, enigmatic design than she had originally intended. In this case, Mansfield's carefully-worded critique (or condemnation) of the second novel might have inspired Woolf, not only to retain what was best in her first novel, but also to change certain aspects of it that did not fit the novel's design. Whatever else Mansfield's criticism did for Woolf (and it is entirely possible that it pushed Woolf into the direction of the more experimental Jacob's Room), I believe that it helped her to revise The Voyage Out into a more satisfying work of art for its first American edition, while Mansfield's implicit preference for Voyage might have led Woolf to retain what was best in that work.

Louise A. DeSalvo
Fairleigh Dickinson University

1 The review appears on p.1227 and quotations are from this text. See my "Virginia Woolf's Revision for the 1920 American and English Editions of The Voyage Out." Bulletin of Research in the Humanities, forthcoming.

2 Woolf probably revised from roughly 26 through 30 November 1919 for Voyage's first American edition and during the early part of 1920 for the second English edition, never published. Woolf was also revising Night and Day at this time. A comparison of the first English and first American texts did make significant changes to Voyage at this time, particularly to Chapter XVI, the scene where Rachel Vinrace and Terence Hewit exchange stories about their earlier lives. In her revision of the chapter, Woolf has deleted specific details about their past histories; descriptions of what Rachel's days in Richmond were like; of how her aunts behaved; Terence’s writing plans; a detailed summary of the end of his novel; and some glimpses into his life in Devonshire. The entire concordance underscores their inability or unwillingness to reveal their pasts to one another.


4 Ibid., No.1097, p.401.

5 Ibid., No.1099, p.403.

6 I have collated the first American and English editions of Voyage and all variants are listed in my dissertation “From Melymbrosia to The Voyage Out: A Description and Interpretation of Virginia Woolf's Revisions,” New York University, 1977. Woolf deleted roughly 2700 words and substituted roughly 550 new ones in Chapter XVI which contains the greatest number of changes of any chapter.


"THIS IS THE DROP FORMING": CONCORDING THE WAVES

Since the Virginia Woolf Miscellany was kind enough to print my call for ideas as Phil Smith and I began the awesome task of assembling A Concordance to the Novels of Virginia Woolf, I thought it might be helpful to let everyone know of our progress. We are particularly pleased with one special feature of The Waves concordance. We have been able, by assigning a system of "markers" to the text, to indicate next to each line the speaker of the word and the level of speech (or the condition of the word in the text). An example might help explain this. The user of the concordance would see the following notations and text presented in a single line:

TW.3.875 "'B'N I too snap my fingers in the face of 'destiny.' Yet Byron never made tea as you do, who fill the

" 'Destiny!' would be identified not merely by its location in section 3, page 87, line 5, but also as spoken by Bernard who is quoting another character, Neville. This means not just that we will be able to identify context in a much more precise way than ever before, but that other exciting possibilities are accessible to us. For example, we have produced a concordance keyed not to words listed by alphabet, but to words listed by speaker. We can isolate and inspect direct and indirect address, character vocabulary and usage; in short, we have at last begun to search context, not simply alphabet.

All this information, of course, would not easily fit between the covers of a traditional bound concordance. For reasons of economy and ease of handling, we have already produced working versions of The Waves concordance in microfiche form. We are able to produce this directly from the computer tape, saving the expense and bulk of paper preliminaries. Half a dozen microfiche can contain the information of many pounds of paper for less than 25% of the cost. This raises yet another possibility: the production of a complete concordance in fiche (including words normally deleted that we have been asked specifically to include, such as articles and conjunctions) of all the novels in an alphabetical Key-Word-In-Context fashion and a contextual concordance by novel. The entire concordance package in all its variety would then be able to be produced for a fraction of the cost of its heavily edited traditional counterpart. In final fiche form such a concordance would be accessible to the individual scholar financially and occupy no more space on a book shelf than a modest paperback. The one encumbrance to such an edition would be the necessity of using a fiche reader. This does not seem to us to be a great difficulty. Libraries have not one but many, often including one or more reader/copiers. Having used both a paper and a fiche version of The Waves concordance, I have found the fiche a truly convenient and versatile tool. I have been able to check and re-check multiple entries in fiche with greater ease than in paper.

All of this leads to a rather important question: what do other Woolf scholars think of these possibilities? Accessibility is nearly as important a consideration to us as format. Many scholars have raised extremely helpful textual concerns, most notably Louise DeSalvo on The Voyage Out. Now what about considerations of final form? Let us know what you think.

James M. Haule, Department of English
Pan American University, Edinburg, Texas 78539
WHERE WAS JAMES WHEN HIS MOTHER WENT TO TOWN? [see VWM No. 10]

David Lodge poses an interesting question in his discussion of the opening pages of To the Lighthouse. I had never noticed Charles Tansley’s mysterious absence from the luncheon during which he seems to be discussed, but I think Professor Lodge is right when he says that this is a puzzle which the text does not solve. I have been bothered by a similar question: where does James go when Mrs. Ramsay takes Charles Tansley off to town with her? She leaves the dining-room holding James by the hand (pp.17-18, Harcourt Brace edition). When she sees that Charles Tansley, deserted by everyone else, has followed them into the drawing-room, she takes pity on him and invites him to join her on her “dull errand in the town.” No further mention is made of James until this flashback has ended and we return (on page 26) to the time present of the novel. It is surprising that James, who “would not go with the others,” should be left behind now with such apparent ease.

As Professor Lodge suggested, these anomalies can be illuminated, though not really explained, by examining the first draft of the novel.* Unfortunately, I have not uncovered any subsequent drafts of To the Lighthouse so all I can present here is an account of the first version of these opening passages. In these, the criticisms levelled against Tansley by the Ramsay children are basically the same as in the published novel. Their irritation with him is prominent in the opening pages and it was clearly an important aspect of Virginia Woolf’s exploration of the differences that divide people, for references to this theme and to Tansley are found in the earliest notes for the novel.

In the first draft, the complaints against him found on pages 12-16 of the novel are expressed apart from any dramatic context. Neither time nor the place is given. As in the final version, Mrs. Ramsay’s daughters are said to sit “beneath their mother’s eyes” (I, 17 and p.14), but this posture metaphorically expresses their reverence for her, and it was only in a later draft that the phrase “at table” was added. Similarly, the phrase, “the other day,” was later added to the account of Tansley’s mother-derof response to Mrs. Ramsay’s lively description of “waves mountains high.” (p.15) The condemnation of Tansley is much more extensive at this point in the manuscript than it is in the published novel. His faults are expounded in part by the omniscient narrator as well as by Mrs. Ramsay and her children. Tansley is said to be joining them at the same table for an entire week (I, 27) and this is the only specific reference to time which occurs in the early passages.

A shift from exposition to action occurs when the children are said to disappear from the table immediately after the meal. (I, 29 and p.16) As Professor Lodge suggested, this meal only became the one during which Tansley’s many faults are discussed and the luncheon which apparently was served earlier on this particular day, when Virginia Woolf revised the novel. In the first draft, Mrs. Ramsay walks from the dinner table holding James by the hand, as she does in the published novel. But then she lets him go because he wants to be with the others. (I, 31) When Virginia Woolf changed this detail later, she apparently forgot that the narrator had already described “the eight sons and daughters of Mr. and Mrs. Ramsay” seeking their bedrooms after the meal. The discrepancy might be explained by seeing the description of the children escaping to their bedrooms as a reference to their habitual actions and the account of Mrs. Ramsay walking with James into the drawing-room as part of the scene which took place earlier that afternoon. Along with the account of the children complaining of Tansley, these scenes flow into one another without being grounded in historical time. The narrative moves as the mind moves, free of the rigid structure imposed by the clock. Perhaps Virginia Woolf later decided to keep James with his mother at this point because she had in mind the scene with which the novel opens and to which she returns on page 26. In doing this, however, she overlooked the fact that the luncheon scene leads into another one in which James plays no part.

When Virginia Woolf revised the opening pages of the novel, she dramatized much of the material which was originally presented in an expository form. As in her revision of the novel as a whole (which she judged “hopelessly undramatic”) as she was about to finish the first draft [WD, 99] scenes were added which provided a dramatic context in which the thoughts and actions of the characters could be expressed. The luncheon was expanded to provide a scene in which the complaints against Tansley could be voiced. The trip to the town, which does occur in the first draft, then follows naturally after the luncheon and Mrs. Ramsay’s gesture of sympathy seems a response to the unkind things her children have just been saying about their guest. Because the narrator in the published text never specifies the time when these comments are made, the question of where Tansley is (and like Professor Lodge I don’t think he was meant to overhear them) probably never occurred to her. Similarly disposal of James must not have seemed to her to be a problem. These small anomalies may reflect Virginia Woolf’s impatience with “this appalling narrative business of the realist: getting on from lunch to dinner.” (WD, 139) I think she would have been amused to see us taking the time to discuss them.

Susan Dick
Queen’s University, Kingston, Ontario

*The manuscript of To the Lighthouse is in the Berg Collection of the New York Public Library, Astor, Lenox and Tilden Foundations. Page references are to volume 1.

She was a great furry sleek black otter a giant seal with a snaky decor. Long writhing, long writing along her back snake coiling.

People paralyzed on their verandas, in their houses “It is she!” “She!” not a snake a giant black sleek never seen before she had shown only a small part before.

Maddened, longing, crying with open doggy mouth she threw herself again and again against the window her wrinkled working face

will she get in? she slid into the room no one knew what they had never recognized never wanted to? they were wondering.

Rachel Blau DuPlessis
Temple University
[Rachel Blau DuPlessis is an American poet and scholar and an editor of Feminist Studies.]
WOOLF PUBLICATIONS from The New York Public Library

Praised in review articles in the TLS, the New York Review of Books, and The American Scholar, the Virginia Woolf Issue, Volume 80, number 2 (Winter 1977) of the Bulletin of The New York Public Library, features stimulating essays on The Years and Three Guineas, and includes reproductions of previously unpublished episodes cut from the galley proofs of The Years. It is available for $3.50 per copy or $12 for the complete volume from the Library’s distributor: Readex Books, 101 Fifth Avenue, New York, NY 10003 (please enclose payment). Also available from Readex is the first edition of Virginia Woolf’s The Pargiters: The Novel-Essay Portion of The Years, edited by Mitchell A. Leakska ($16)—“dazzlingly illuminating on Woolf’s procedure as a novelist, a feminist, and a modernist”—Ellen Moers.
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