

EDITING WOOLF FOR THE NINETIES

by *Julia Briggs*

COMPETITION and deregulation are fashionable concepts in British economics, and their impact on the publication and sales of Virginia Woolf in Britain has been much in evidence since 1991, when Woolf's copyright lapsed, fifty years after her death. British copyright rules differ from those of the States (and since 1991 have changed again to accord with a European Community ruling that lapses at seventy, rather than fifty, years after the author's death). Competition between publishers soon followed with hardback editions of Woolf's major novels issued by Hogarth, Blackwell's Shakespeare Head imprint and Everyman, and paperbacks from Macmillan, Penguin Classics, Routledge, Verso, Virago (an edition of *Orlando* came out to coincide with Sally Potter's film) and World's Classics, in addition to the old Triad Grafton reprints. The good news is that so many publishers considered Woolf's work worthy of investment; the bad news is that both booksellers and readers are finding it difficult to distinguish between a good reprint series and a bad, let alone between two different editions of the same novel. Despite careful surveys by Jeri Johnson in the *Times Literary Supplement* and Jane Marcus in the *Women's Review of Books*,¹ it is still largely a matter of chance whether the paperback you pick up will supply a carefully edited text with a helpful introduction and notes, or whether it reproduces a corrupt, much reprinted text with no supporting material at all. Neither packaging nor size is a reliable indicator.

Before 1991, an anomalous situation existed in which, largely under the supervision of the Bells, Woolf's *Diaries*, *Letters* and *Essays* had become available in modern editions, fully supplied with notes, index and even brief biographies of walk-on parts, while editions of the novels lagged far behind, available in degenerating texts, with no annotation; *Orlando*, *Flush* and *Three Guineas* were regularly reprinted without their original photographs. Hogarth, the press that Leonard and Virginia Woolf had founded three-quarters of a century earlier, published them in hardback or leased out the paperback rights to Penguin or Triad Grafton. Now all that has changed: there is a bewildering variety of editions of the novels available, most of them offering reset texts, critical introductions and notes, and some provide textual notes and lists of variants, maps, chronologies and passages from holograph material. The comparatively small group of British Woolf scholars has been somewhat overworked in the process: Gillian Beer, Rachel Bowlby, Kate Flint, Sandra Kemp, Hermione Lee and Stella McNichol all contributed not only to the Penguin reprints but to other series as well. Despite the vitality of Woolf studies in the States, American academics have been confined mainly to Blackwell's Shakespeare Head series, essentially a transatlantic enterprise, based at Toronto and Oxford — but this is scarcely surprising in view of the

fact that British editions are not available for sale in the U.S., except for the earliest novels, because of the different copyright laws. The Penguin series, for which I acted as general editor, was the only one to be conceived explicitly as a feminist project. It includes introductions to *Orlando* by Sandra Gilbert and to *Mrs. Dalloway* by Elaine Showalter; other Woolf scholars I had hoped might contribute had already been signed up exclusively for the Shakespeare Head series.

The Shakespeare Head series began by holding a conference at Toronto in March 1991 to inquire what good practice in editing Woolf might consist of: no real consensus emerged, and the only answer was "controversial." In what follows I shall try to give some impression of how the various series have addressed the problems of providing critical context, text editing and annotation, recognizing that their shortcomings were unavoidable, and finally setting their determinacies against Woolf's own fluid texts and changing opinions. I shall say least about what are obviously the most memorable and distinctive features of the individual volumes, their introductions. If you want to know more about these, you should consult Jane Marcus's review, which grades them on a temperature scale from "cool" to "sizzling." Argument raged at the Toronto Conference as to whether interpretative — or even worse, "political" — notes were allowable, but the problem that confronts the editor is not so much one of interpretation versus information, as of the relevance and bearing of the information itself. Information is, after all, no less explosive or politically weighted than interpretation — indeed it is rather more so since it travels under the guise of objectivity, concealing any suasive intent.

Where the texts themselves are concerned, whatever attention they have received has been all to the good, but at best investigation has led only to a clearer understanding of what still needs to be done. The reprints usually reset the first British editions, since these were the texts that had come out of copyright, but though we are becoming more conscious of textual issues, their full implications have not yet been fully recognized or understood. In the case of the major novels, it is now known that Woolf established two independent textual traditions by marking up British and American proofs separately, but there has been little recognition that the British texts were then sometimes subject to further changes, such as those made in the 1930 edition of *To the Lighthouse*, for example; there are cases (rare, one hopes) where a substantive change is made between impressions, within an edition.² As far as I know, no one has yet attempted to collate all the major editions of a particular text issued by the Hogarth Press during Woolf's lifetime, let alone all the individual impressions within each edition.

One widely adopted solution to the problem of the differences between the British and American editions was to record at the end of the text the variants listed by James M. Haule and Philip H. Smith in their *Concordance to the Novels* (1988), but despite the fact that their listings were generated by a computer scan of the British and American texts, this turns out to provide a less complete record than that fact might suggest: in the case of *Night and Day*, the first text I worked on, the *Concordance* failed to record the text's largest single variant (occasioned by a hanging participle, pointed out to Woolf by Lytton Strachey), as well as several

other minor typographical corrections.³ Since then I have come to rely upon my own “home-made” collations, produced by reading the American and British first editions against one another; this consistently produces different results from the *Concordance*.

The most textually self-conscious of the reprints are the Shakespeare Head editions, hardly surprisingly since they were produced under the auspices of Andrew McNeillie, who had co-edited the *Diaries* with Anne Olivier Bell, and gone on to edit the *Essays* in a textually meticulous and wonderfully informative edition (four volumes are now available, with two more to come). The Shakespeare Head series reflect the greater sophistication and textual awareness of Woolf scholarship in the United States. With the exception of McNeillie himself, Stella McNichol was virtually the only British scholar with any practical experience of editing Woolf that I could turn to.⁴ But while the Shakespeare Head volumes have aimed for the highest textual specifications, these come at a price: their cost is eight or ten times as much as the paperback reprints by World’s Classics or Penguin, and they have been slow to appear: of thirteen texts projected, only five have been published so far. Moreover, in one case, their choice of copy text looks odd, even if adventurous: Susan Dick’s edition of *To the Lighthouse* uses Woolf’s corrected American proofs as her base or copy text, on the grounds that Woolf’s handwritten corrections are a guarantee of authenticity: it is “a choice based on the certainty of her intentions.”⁵ But although the British proofs have not apparently survived, Woolf actually made more corrections to the British first edition than she did to the American. So a text derived from American proofs represents an interesting point in mid-process, but is not obviously any more “authoritative,” and is certainly not more “final” than the text of the British first edition; in relation to the American first edition, it has the disadvantage of not having had a previous independent and historical existence.

Susan Dick’s interest in the American proofs is at its most rewarding when she reprints as an appendix a canceled passage from the third section of the book, “The Lighthouse,” in which James recalls his father lecturing, after his mother’s death. The passage had originally appeared in Woolf’s manuscript, had been revised in proof and then at the last moment was cut altogether. Such near-inclusions are particularly intriguing and, taken with the fluid changes in the text, invite us to consider the restoration of such canceled material. *The Years*, which Woolf cut drastically to reduce it to publishable dimensions, as she saw it, seems to call for the restoration of Grace Radin’s “Two Enormous Chunks,” and these are included at the back of Hermione Lee’s edition for World’s Classics.⁶ Less urgent, but no less interesting is “A Woman’s College from the Outside,” the canceled tenth chapter of *Jacob’s Room*, which Sue Roe reproduces as an appendix to her edition of the novel for Penguin. Kate Flint, editing *Jacob’s Room* for World’s Classics, reproduces other passages from the holograph at the back of her edition, but not the tenth chapter (on the grounds that Woolf had published it elsewhere).⁷ Taken together, these two paperback editions give a strong impression of the manuscript, in the absence of an independent edition of it.

By printing such passages at the end, these editors offer their readers the opportunity to consider how the excluded passages might have affected the text, had they been present, without going to the lengths of actually reinstating them, and thus overriding Woolf's own later decisions. One can thus have one's text and read it, as it were, a strategy comparable to that which Woolf herself deployed in her use of brackets in *To the Lighthouse*: Hermione Lee, following Ruth C. Miller's observations in *The Frames of Art and Life*, enlarges on this point, citing Woolf's diary entry on the problem of how to make Mr. Ramsay reach the lighthouse and Lily Briscoe finish her painting simultaneously: "Could I do it in a parenthesis? so that one had the sense of reading the two things at the same time?"⁸ Brenda Silver in her important essay "Textual Criticism as Feminist Practice" describes the complex relationship between the published texts and their ghostly precursors in a sentence that similarly conveys the sense of a double vision: "the words that are both there and not there on Woolf's pages have proved resistant to any single 'truth.'"⁹

Brenda Silver's essay, in tracing the impact of the publication of earlier versions, the holographs and typescripts, pointed, in the phrase quoted above, to the way these had opened up "the vexed issue of self-censorship."¹⁰ Woolf herself had admitted in "Professions for Women" that women writers felt "impeded by the extreme conventionality of the other sex," and that "telling the truth about my own experiences as a body"¹¹ was a problem that she had failed to solve. Such a confession seems to endorse the restoration of suppressed material. Woolf's sense that self-censorship might pose problems arose particularly acutely during the writing of *Orlando*. The process of writing fiction threw up problems that she subsequently addressed in her essays, as she hinted in a letter to a would-be biographer: "a novel is an impression, not an argument. The book is written without a theory; later, a theory might be made."¹² *Orlando* is a key example of such self-censorship, the novel whose originating impulses had to be concealed, as the trial of Radclyffe Hall's *Well of Loneliness* a month after *Orlando*'s publication would underline. Once again the corrected American proofs reveal passages that came close to inclusion but were canceled at the very last; at least one of these is itself concerned with the process of censorship and exclusion. Nick Greene in the course of his conversations with *Orlando* produces anecdotes about Shakespeare, followed by a letter:

Considering what phrases we should have to use, what customs to refer to, what oaths to leave undeleted, it has seemed better to take all such records between poker and tongs and commit them to the chastity of the fire. Nevertheless we own that it was with some compunction that we dropped into the kitchen grate two days ago Shakespeare's own account of his sonnets which Greene happened to have on him and gave to *Orlando* as a keepsake. . . . But when truth and modesty conflict, who can doubt which should prevail? In they went, and for all time to come people will be talking about Mr. W.

H. and the dark Lady when, as Shakespeare himself confessed frankly and fully — but hist; some young person from behind the counter at Selfridge's may be listening. Silence is best.¹³

This passage draws attention to the novel's other conspicuous acts of censorship — the masque of Purity, Chastity and Modesty that quite literally masks Orlando's change of sex in chapter III, the act of smuggling Vita's lesbian verses past the "spirit of the age" and the digressive excursion to Kew that distracts attention from Orlando's pregnancy in chapter VI, as well as the several references to the way that the form of biography then current silenced or desexualized writing about the body. Woolf's reworkings, omissions and changes are always informative, signs of tension in a text that help us to experience its rhythms as a whole. Rising excitement is often expressed in the form of an increase in textual variants: for example in *Flush*, there is virtually double the number of variants between the British and American editions in the Whitechapel chapter, a chapter that records classic class anxiety, the sense of a second London living back to back with respectable middle-class Wimpole Street, a London waiting only a few yards away to disrupt and destroy the comfortable tenor of life, as if it were the city's rejected unconscious.

The differing versions of the texts found in the various British and American editions and the American proofs, where these have survived, record the complexity and intensity of the creative process for Woolf, while suggesting that for her there was no final version — she would simply go on tinkering with a text until she lost interest in it. Like the earlier holographs whose impact Brenda Silver discusses, they deepen our understanding of her work. In the last few years, a technology has evolved which would allow us to record all these different states side by side, so that the reader could plot the changes without privileging one over another: the multiple texts or hypertexts that electronic processing can make available may be the medium that Woolf was unconsciously waiting for.

Multiplicity and indeterminacy are features of Woolf's writing, reflecting her constant readiness to experiment, and ideally an editor would try to reproduce these elements, to achieve that quality of simultaneity that the very structures of her later novels reach out for. But the provision of additional material does not always expand the meaning of a text, and sometimes it can reduce it. Editors introduce further material with the intention of deepening appreciation and enlarging meaning, advancing information they consider essential to a proper understanding of the text, but, as the cases made for the death of the author used to argue, meaning can be fixed and limited in the very act of trying to release it. In the second half of this essay, I shall look at some of the ways in which the new Woolf editions have made use of annotation, in order to consider its disadvantages, as well as its value.

As pointed out earlier, the distinction between interpretation and information is too blunt an instrument to be useful: the question is rather what information the good editor should supply, and how much. A good example of the value of annotation in bringing out just that cultural critique that Brenda Silver discusses

in her essay¹⁴ occurs in *Between the Acts*, in the scene where Isa, suffering from toothache, goes to the library and picks up the copy of *The Times* that her father-in-law has been reading. At first her attention is only lightly engaged:

“A horse with a green tail . . .” which was fantastic. Next, “The guard at Whitehall . . .” which was romantic and then, building word upon word, she read: “The troopers told her the horse had a green tail; but she found it was just an ordinary horse. And they dragged her up to the barrack room where she was thrown upon a bed. Then one of the troopers removed part of her clothing, and she screamed and hit him about the face.”

That was real¹⁵

Isa finds herself reading an account of a rape. While the passage does not create any obvious difficulties for the reader, it is annotated in both the Penguin and the World's Classics editions. In the latter, Sir Frank Kermode glosses “Whitehall: The headquarters of the Horse Guards are entered from this street, a center of government.”¹⁶

Gillian Beer in the Penguin edition refers the reader to Stuart Clarke's article in the *Virginia Woolf Miscellany* for Spring 1990 (which was also available to Kermode, of course), and to two pages of her introduction in which she discusses this passage in detail using the information given by Stuart Clarke, and explaining that the incident had indeed been “real”: the rape had taken place on the 27 April 1938, and newspapers that summer had been preoccupied first with the trial and sentence of the guardsmen, and subsequently with the trial of a well-known gynecologist, Aleck Bourne, for performing an abortion on the impregnated victim. He was acquitted, the judge extending the meaning of the let-out clause “to preserve the mother's life,” yet despite this precedent, abortion remained illegal under any circumstances in Britain for a further 29 years.

Woolf transposed the paragraph from *The Times* from June 1938 to June 1939, when the action of her novel takes place, but otherwise she scarcely altered it. Stuart Clarke's article opened up Woolf's stark reference to reveal a striking episode in the history of women's bodies, and one that was very widely discussed at the time: indeed my mother had long ago told me about the case, minus the names and details. Here is a sequence of events that would have been known to Woolf's contemporaries and clearly should be made available to modern readers of the novel. Woolf's quotation from *The Times* needed to be recognized as an allusion requiring elucidation. As Beer goes on to observe, the trial occurred while Woolf was awaiting the publication of *Three Guineas*, a work specifically concerned to expose the connections between militarism and violence, and in particular violence against women, which Woolf had documented for herself in part from carefully collected newspaper cuttings. She had always read newspapers with attention, but since the beginning of the 1930s she had been recording the misogyny of her society in a special scrapbook of such cuttings (photographs from it are included in the back of the Penguin edition of *Three Guineas*).

In this instance, the information Stuart Clarke provided was at once incontrovertibly “political,” but equally incontrovertibly “relevant.” More often, annotation is merely a question of correct identification, though even that sometimes poses problems. In meeting the deadline of January 1992, several of the Woolf reprints went through in a hurry, and mistakes were certainly made. One edition of *Night and Day* misidentifies Hertford House (home of the Wallace Collection) with a Hertford Villa in Regent’s park, and the “ducal palace” seen by Katharine from Kew Gardens as Kew Palace, instead of Syon House on the other side of the river. This in turn creates further problems: the “rigid tail of the Ducal lion” on Syon House which amuses Katharine Hilbery is then identified with the Chinese lions by Kew pond (which, like Manx cats, have no tails).¹⁷ But even correct identification is not always as straightforward a process as it appears. The sorts of problem that arise may be illustrated from Woolf’s treatment of Lincoln in chapter 18 of *Night and Day* and Scarborough in chapter 2 of *Jacob’s Room*, while bearing in mind her own early comment, that “A writer’s country is a territory within his own brain; and we run the risk of disillusionment if we try to turn such phantom cities into tangible brick and mortar.”¹⁸ It is difficult to establish whether Woolf visited either Lincoln or Scarborough, and her description of their landmarks may derive from memory, or have been shaped by articles, guidebooks, or mere invention. The Platonic existence of Lincoln and Scarborough stands in direct contrast with Woolf’s vivid and concrete evocations of London in the same books — of the Embankment and Bloomsbury, of the City and the West End, even of Kew.

Woolf’s inventiveness and sense of symbolic fitness explain such solecisms as Mrs. Hilbery’s triumphant return from Stratford with leaves and flowers from Shakespeare’s tomb (actually inside Holy Trinity Church).¹⁹ She was at once amused and annoyed when pedantic readers picked her up on her mistakes and mock allusions. In *Orlando*, she attributes a set of almshouses on the Sheen Road to the Earl of Cumberland’s fright upon seeing Orlando and Sukey making love on shipboard, and mistaking them for ghosts: “Twelve poor old women of the parish to-day drink tea and tonight bless his Lordship for a roof above their heads; so that illicit love in a treasure-ship — but we omit the moral.” The almshouses actually exist, being just round the corner from Hogarth House in Richmond, where the Woolfs lived from 1915 to 1924, but they had been built in the early nineteenth century. In 1932 Woolf replied to an inquirer that “having some recollection of old almshouses in that neighborhood, she fathered them upon Lord Cumberland on the spur of the moment.”²⁰

Orlando is a consummate example of the secretive text. Part of its purpose, like that of her essay “The Sun and the Fish,”²¹ was to create an area of shared but private knowledge between herself and Vita Sackville-West where the reader could not follow and was thus excluded from, though Woolf increasingly built her hidden bowers in the absence of their brilliant inspirer. These games of secrecy inevitably make annotation difficult: most of the walk-on parts in *Orlando* have some private significance, and are in this respect very different from those in *Jacob’s Room*, for example. Orlando’s friend Giles Isham of Norfolk in Chapter II was

Virginia's second cousin; Lady Derby in Chapter V had been Vita's great aunt.²² As well as memorializing Vita herself, the book recreates Knole, offering it back as an imaginative recreation to Vita, in compensation for her losing it as a consequence of her father's death and the British laws of inheritance that operate through the male line. But the identification of the various furnishings at Knole has been complicated by the intervention of the novel itself. Vita's account of *Knole and the Sackvilles* (1922) was subsequently revised in the light of her reading not only of the book of *Orlando*, but also of the manuscript (which Virginia had given her), so that, for example, Vita's guidebook to Knole written for the National Trust in 1948 identifies the tapestries in the Venetian Ambassador's room as depicting scenes from Ariosto's *Orlando Furioso*, whereas earlier accounts, including her own, identify their subjects as classical. References to Shakespeare's love letters and to John Donne preaching in the chapel occurring in the fourth edition of Vita's *Knole* (1958) seem likely to derive from Woolf's intense re-imagining of it, rather than from existing Sackville legend.²³ It is always difficult to distinguish myth from history, and a vision as strong as Woolf's of Knole quickly finds a place among other and older traditions.

In the course of working on the manuscript of *Orlando* at Sissinghurst, Brenda Lyons, Penguin's textual editor for that volume, met Nigel Nicolson, who agreed to annotate a copy of the novel for her. His notes are fascinating, and throw light on many puzzling features of the text (so much so, that I shared them with Rachel Bowlby who was editing *Orlando* for World's Classics). But they also pose a characteristic problem concerning the scholars and men of letters of his generation who had known the Woolfs and Bloomsbury at first hand, and could supply information that a younger generation would otherwise never have come across. Yet what they knew was highly colored by the nature of their contact with it. Nicolson's notes inevitably emphasize the accuracy and detail of Woolf's portrait of Vita: "all this an exact description of Vita"; "So was Vita"; "where Vita often wrote"; "This [cabinet] belonged to Vita and she kept all her most intimate letters in it"; "Exaggerated but true of Vita's childhood," etc. A reference to Orlando hearing the (Armada) guns in the Channel is explained by a note that "Vita had just told V.W. about hearing from Knole the W[orld] W[ar] I bombardments in France." Yet Virginia had also heard them quite independently, had even described their effect in an essay of 1916, "Heard on the Downs."²⁴

Valuable though Nicolson's help was, it told us what we already knew about Orlando, that its real subject was Vita, a point he had already made in *Portrait of a Marriage*, where he described the novel as "the longest and most charming love-letter in literature."²⁵ But there may be another sense, hinted at in Woolf's first conception of the book as she described it in her diary. It is to be a fantasy

on the ladies of Llangollen; on Mrs. Fladgate; on people passing. No attempt is to be made to realize the character. Sapphism is to be suggested. Satire is to be the main note — satire and wildness. The Ladies are to have Constantinople in view. Dreams of golden domes.²⁶

Here it is the unidentified Mrs. Fladgate who figures, indeed stands in for the missing Vita. For if Orlando is Vita, she is also many other things — the English language, perhaps, or even Virginia herself growing up, moving in slow motion from her own prepubertal readings of literature as if she were a boy, passing from the male world of the Elizabethan lumber room (with which the novel opens) to a reluctant puberty, and the onset of menstruation that defines the adolescent body as female, into her twenties, a Victorian age in which preoccupation with marriage leads her to the altar with a man who, like Shel, is a pilgrim and a stranger, to a birth that is not that of Vita's sons ("We said to V.W. 'But there are two of us! Which one is this supposed to be?' 'Both of you,' she replied," according to Nicolson's note) but rather that of the book itself, begun in October 1928 and born on 20th March, 1929.

The problem with Nigel Nicolson's notes is a problem inherent in the genre itself: notes that present themselves in the guise of objective and relevant information have their own underlying agenda, and bear out or perpetuate one particular interpretation rather than another. The more difficult or *recherché* the meaning of any particular passage within a text, the more anxious the professionals become to smooth the wrinkled pillow of the reader. In the final chapter of *Orlando*, a chapter that Vita Sackville-West did not care for but which, sixty years on, looks proleptically forward to our own post-modern consciousness, Woolf describes Orlando's drive from London and the way in which the car's speed seems to disrupt and fragment her experience of the world around her, leading her to a sense of selves as various and multiplex, a sense that had earlier been suggested but has not yet been stated explicitly in the text. The disruption is figured partly as a sequence of half-read signs:

Here a procession with banners upon which was written "Ra— Un," but what else? . . . Amor Vin — that was over a porch. A woman looked out of a bedroom window, profoundly contemplative, and very still. Applejohn and Applebed, Undert—. Nothing could be seen whole or read from start to finish.²⁷

One anxious editor, in a desperate effort to unravel the complexities, comments:

The words on the banner probably stand for "Rally of the Unemployed" or "Rally against Unemployment" (popular demonstrations against unemployment had begun again in the spring of 1928, when Woolf was writing this section); "Amor Vin —" is the opening of the Latin tag, "amor vincit omnia" ("love conquers all," perhaps an indication that this is the porch of a brothel), and Applejohn and Applebed are undertakers, thus completing the cycle of love and death.²⁸

The trouble with such a note is that it closes more doors than it opens: "un" may be a negating prefix, but can also suggest un-*ity* or un-*ion*, as Kermode points out

in his introduction to *Between the Acts*, where he suggests that antithesis may be a principle of the novel's world, "as if one could arrange this world in two columns, one headed *un-*, or unity, and the other *dis-*, or dispersity, and thus account for the whole."²⁹ And it later figures with yet another sense in the word "Undert—." In attempting to clarify the meaning of a passage such as this, written to interrupt the usual smooth conveyance of meaning, the editor inevitably limits, flattens and tames the author's effect. Such is the danger of letting academics loose on readerly texts (and I write as one of them, and the author of that note) .

Woolf, of course, would have been horrified: "To think of being battered down in the hold of those University dons fairly makes my blood run cold," she wrote in 1925, celebrating her refusal to write a book for the Home University Library series, and delightedly proclaiming her freedom from "series and editors."³⁰ Nor did she care for footnotes; if she came to use them seriously in *Three Guineas*, it was only in a last-ditch effort to get her warning heard in a world looking in another direction. For the young Woolf, misreading, mystery and the unknown were the essence of life, and she believed that they should play a larger part in the reading experience, as she demonstrates through the creative nature of the misreadings in her short stories, "Sympathy" and "The Unwritten Novel."³¹ As her essay "Modern Fiction" shows, she rejected the existing protocols of fiction writing, but even more deeply, of fiction reading. Her great sequence of experimental novels was partly inspired by a desire to free her readers from traditional straitjackets, and even where her criticism was concerned, inevitably a more dogmatic mode, she originally planned to frame her essays in an "Otway [i.e. family] conversation,"³² thus fitting them into a dialogic mode that would reduce the weight of any single set of arguments. Her commitment to textual indeterminacy and to plenitude of meaning evident in the characteristic contrasts and dialectic generated by her work should act as an awful warning to those of us who have, with the best of intentions, enchained her flying texts and tied them down to the stone-breaking apparatus of notes, commentaries and appendices.

NOTES

1. Jeri Johnson, "Woolf woman, icon and idol: The canonization of a sceptical Modernist," *The Times Literary Supplement* (21 February 1992), 5-6; Jane Marcus, "An embarrassment of riches," *The Women's Review of Books*, vol. xi, no. 6 (March 1994), 17-19.
2. Brenda Silver, "Textual Criticism as Feminist Practice: Or, Who's Afraid of Virginia Woolf Part II," in *Representing Modern Texts: Editing as Interpretation*, ed. George Bornstein (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1991), describes Woolf's creation of two independent textual traditions, 196; *To the Lighthouse*, ed. Stella McNichol, introduced by Hermione Lee (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1992), lists variants from the 1930 "New Edition" in its first appendix, 260-2; *A Room of One's Own* and *Three Guineas*, ed. Michele Barrett (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1993), lists a substantive change made between impressions in "A Note on the Text" for *A Room of One's Own*, lviii.
3. For further details, see *Night and Day*, ed. Julia Briggs (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1992), "A Note on the Text," xxxix-xli.

4. As the editor of *Mrs Dalloway's Party* (London: Hogarth, 1973).
5. *To the Lighthouse*, ed. Susan Dick (Oxford: Blackwell, 1992), xxxiii.
6. Grace Radin, "Two Enormous Chunks": Episodes Excluded during the Final Revisions of *The Years*," *Bulletin of the New York Public Library*, 80 (1976-7), 221-51; *The Years*, ed. Hermione Lee (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1992), 414-66.
7. *Jacob's Room*, ed. Sue Roe (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1992), appendix ii, 189-92; *Jacob's Room*, ed. Kate Flint (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1992), appendix, 254-70.
8. *To the Lighthouse*, introd. Hermione Lee, x, citing Woolf's *Diary*, vol. 3, 1925-30, 5 September, 1926, 106.
9. Silver, "Textual Criticism," 195.
10. Silver, "Textual Criticism," 195.
11. "Professions for Women," *The Crowded Dance of Modern Life*, ed. Rachel Bowlby (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1993), 105.
12. To Harmon H. Goldstone, 16 August 1932, *Letters* vol. 5, 1932-5, ed. Nigel Nicolson and Joanne Trautmann (London: Chatto and Windus, 1979), 90-1.
13. Alison M. Scott, "Tantalising Fragments: The Proofs of Virginia Woolf's *Orlando*," *Publications of the Bibliographical Society of America*, vol. 88. no. 3 (September 1994), 299.
14. e.g. Silver, "Textual Criticism," 200, 201
15. *Between the Acts*, ed. Gillian Beer (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1992), 15.
16. *Between the Acts*, ed. Frank Kermode (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1992), 198 note 18.
17. *Night and Day*, ed. Suzanne Raitt (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1992), 545 notes 383, 346.
18. "Literary Geography" (1905), *The Essays*, vol. 1, 1904-1912, ed. Andrew McNeillie (London: Hogarth, 1986), 35.
19. *Night and Day*, ed. Briggs, 408 and 444 note 3; 452 note 1.
20. *Orlando*, ed. Brenda Lyons, introd. Sandra M. Gilbert (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1993), 22 and 237 note 19.
21. *Essays*, vol. 4, 1925-8, ed. Andrew McNeillie (London: Hogarth, 1994), 519-24 (the visits here described, to see the eclipse and to the Zoo, were made in Vita's company).
22. *Orlando*, ed. Lyons, 58 and 242 note 15; 179 and 258 note 33.
23. *Orlando*, ed. Lyons, esp. General Note, 233; 245 note 37.
24. *Essays*, vol. 2, 1912-18, ed. Andrew McNeillie (London: Hogarth, 1987), 40-2; see also *Orlando*, 17 and 236 note 13.
25. *Portrait of a Marriage* (London: George Weidenfeld & Nicolson, 1973, 1990), 186.
26. *Diary*, vol. 3, 1925-30, ed. Anne Olivier Bell and Andrew McNeillie (London: Hogarth, 1980), 14 March 1927, 131.
27. *Orlando*, ed. Lyons, 211-2.
28. *Orlando*, ed. Lyons, 263 note 28.
29. *Between the Acts*, ed. Kermode, xxv.
30. *Diary*, vol. 3, 22 September 1925, 43.
31. *The Complete Shorter Fiction*, ed. Susan Dick (London: Hogarth, 1985, 1989), 108-11, 112-121 "An Unwritten Novel" appeared in *Monday or Tuesday* (1921), but "Sympathy" was not published by Woolf.
32. *Diary*, vol. 2, 1920-24, ed. Anne Olivier Bell and Andrew McNeillie (London: Hogarth, 1978), 17 August 1923, 261. The Otways were Katharine's large family of cousins in *Night and Day*.