

## Abstract:

Both Katherine Mansfield in her short story 'Miss Brill' and Virginia Woolf in her 'mock' biography **Orlando: A Biography** depict social identity as a performance, complete with costume and dialogue; however, Woolf's work acknowledges a self beneath the creation—a deeper, more authentic self, free from the artificialities of society's demands. Woolf's 'biography' celebrates this deeper selfhood, and the nourishing, authentic albeit fleeting moments of tapping such states; whereas Mansfield's Miss Brill is incapable of escaping the chains of social roles and the misery accompanying the knowledge that she is a single woman aging alone in society. Though both writers explore the power of social roles in defining the individual, Mansfield's Brill sees all as a performance and is ultimately devastated when she overhears a teenager define her differently than she defines herself. Orlando, on the other hand, is able to break free from all roles and masks, including gender, and celebrate the self beneath artificial constructions. These writers' contrasting approaches to identity are reflected in their references to names, solitude, and nature. The most striking technique Woolf and Mansfield use to explore identity, however, can be epitomized in the dominant symbol of each book. The freedom and untamed nature of Orlando's 'wild' goose represents the untamed, fleeting freedom of deeper selfhood, a respite from all social constructions and constrictions; whereas the weary, weathered fur that initially represents possibility in 'Miss Brill' and in the conclusion is stuffed back in the box and cupboard with a tone of disillusionment reflects an inescapable tragic selfhood solely defined by society and the other, a selfhood which is the opposite of that which Woolf embraces

‘It’s a terrible thing to be alone -- yes it is -- it is -- but don’t lower your mask until you have another mask prepared beneath -- as terrible as you like -- but a mask.’

— Katherine Mansfield

Letter to her future husband, John Middleton Murry (July 1917)

‘It was like a play. It was exactly like a play....’ ‘Yes. I have been an actress for a long time.’

Katherine Mansfield ‘Miss Brill’

‘And it’s a sort of duty, don’t you think—revealing people’s true selves to themselves?’

Virginia Woolf to Vita Sackville-West

**Letters**, 18 October 1932, V

‘For now she need not think of anybody. She could be herself, by herself. And that was what now she often felt the need of – to think; well not even to think. To be silent; to be alone.’ – Virginia Woolf, **To The Lighthouse**

‘Orlando naturally loved solitary places, vast views, and to feel himself for ever and ever and ever alone.’

Virginia Woolf, **Orlando**

#### Beneath the Performance:

#### Identity in Katherine Mansfield’s ‘Miss Brill’ and Virginia Woolf’s **Orlando: A Biography**

There are plenty of differences between Katherine Mansfield’s short story ‘Miss Brill’ published in 1920 and Virginia Woolf’s **Orlando: A Biography** published in 1928. Miss Brill is an aging teacher living alone in France. The highlight of her life is her weekly visit to the park to not only listen to the band but also the conversations of those around her. She is isolated and romantic, an English major after all, a combination that fosters her creation of multiple stories about those around her, about even herself. She begins her day with hope and expectation, brimming with optimism and buoyancy. But by the conclusion of the story and the end of the day, Miss Brill is disillusioned and defeated. Reality is incompatible with her creation. Orlando, on the other hand, is dynamic, colorful, always in flux. Orlando is a boy, man, woman, spanning the years from 1558 to 1928. Orlando is both in the world and of it, as opposed to Miss Brill solely observing life from the periphery. However, no matter how lavish the life, there are moments in **Orlando** where Woolf illustrates a richer self beneath the surface, expressing that there is a source beneath external identity and social roles, which Orlando occasionally taps. This deeper

selfhood is manifested in the symbol of the Wild Goose, an untamed bird, beautiful, majestic, but never still for long, apt because tapping moments of deep selfhood are always momentary in Woolf's works. The Wild Goose reflects the fluctuating, flowing self beneath the rigid forms of social identity. Miss Brill, on the other hand, is incapable of tapping anything beneath the surface. Her identity is solely superficial: how she looks, what she does, what she wears, how others see her. The symbol of the fur she dusts off in joyous preparation for her day at the park, then later puts away with sadness and utter disillusionment is symbolic of Miss Brill's attachment to an external identity with no awareness of a self existing beneath the surface.

Virginia Woolf's fascination with the self permeates her works. James King, noted Woolf biographer, finds that she perpetually probes the 'world beyond appearances.'<sup>i</sup> Even as a child, Virginia Woolf recognized the difference between rich and intense moments of being fully alive and those other times, the more prevalent moments, which simply pass in a rather quotidian manner.<sup>ii</sup> In her diary entries, she writes of having the frequent sensation of 'non-being' and of a 'heightened sensibility.'<sup>iii</sup> Woolf wanted to 'discover the real things beneath the show'.<sup>iv</sup> I suggest that these experiences result from respites from social roles and performances, those more traditional modes of being, and a subsequent immersion in deep selfhood. These are moments Orlando penetrates; and also, precisely, moments Miss Brill is incapable of tapping.

A Virginia Woolf diary entry from August 8, 1928 explores the superficiality and artificiality of external identity.

Something illusory then enters into all that part of life. I am so important to myself: yet of no importance to other people: like the shadow passing over the downs. I deceive myself into thinking that I am important to other people: that makes part of my extreme vividness to myself: as a matter of fact, I don't matter; & so part of my vividness is unreal; gives me a sense of illusion.<sup>v</sup>

This entry is a fitting description of Miss Brill herself as she relishes her crucial role in the performance at the park. Woolf examines the individual's obsession with surfaces, how concerned humanity is to present a particular self and make a certain impression. These 'illusions' of self dictate behavior, distancing one from a more remote and in Woolf's view a more authentic self. According to Woolf, the performance, costumes, roles, even one's name defines the exterior, but these dramas are illusory, removed from a more authentic self. In this entry Woolf, herself, is

liberated by the freedom from these restrictions. Miss Brill, however, upon making the same revelation that she is not crucial in the social arena suffers a type of death because the social self is the only self she knows.

In society both Orlando and Miss Brill ascribe to social roles. But in **Orlando**, Woolf illustrates that the exterior others perceive does not reflect the interior of the individual. Essentially, Woolf defines society as a drama of consensus: all members, usually subconsciously, agree on their roles and participate accordingly. We see this quite pointedly in ‘Miss Brill’ as well: Miss Brill’s entire sense of self is that which is defined by the other: ‘No doubt somebody would have noticed if she hadn’t been there; she was part of the performance after all.’<sup>vi</sup> Miss Brill feels the need to be connected to the larger performance, finds value in this way. As a matter of fact, she invests her self-worth in how she is perceived by the other and her crucial role in the drama of society; she furthermore, creates how the other sees her. But the ‘illusion’ to which Woolf so frequently refers in **Orlando** is precisely the behavior Miss Brill identifies with. Deeper selfhood, therefore, can only be captured in pure solitude, free from the pressures of the other, precisely when we are **not** making an impression. Woolf implies that when there is another, there is always some sort of performance; and where there is performance, there can be not deep selfhood.

Because the performance is the summation of Miss Brill’s existence, when she overhears the young girl say, ‘Why does she come here at all—who wants her? Why doesn’t she keep her silly old mug at home?’<sup>vii</sup>she is devastated. This is the great tragedy of her life, that her role in the elaborate play she has created is inconsistent with how others see her. To them, she is an old, odd woman, a prop incompatible with **their** play. To hear that she is actually not a crucial part of the performance crushes her, leading to the tragic ending where she packs away the fur, which once represented so much potential on this brilliant day. The crying we hear is that of Miss Brill, unable to ever realize that she is more than how others see her.

**Orlando**, too, depicts society as performance. Woolf illustrates the forces of society suppressing and steering the individual to various personae. Mikiko Minow-Pinkney accurately finds that ‘social/historical factors’ create the subjects in Woolf’s works<sup>viii</sup>; however, I emphasize the power of Orlando to escape these forces, if only momentarily. These moments of escape for-

tify and nourish Orlando, but Miss Brill is incapable of tapping such depths, leading to her despair in the conclusion

The concept of the name is a helpful tool for understanding the significance of social signifiers in these works. The name is crucial in social performance. The fact that both works' titles are also the names of the protagonists highlights their significance: **Orlando: A Biography** and 'Miss Brill'. The name represents society's need to quickly label and recognize an individual. However, Woolf's treatment of names in the text calls into question this tool for defining identity, a tool traditional biography cannot afford to question. Woolf's version of the biography completely invalidates the label.

**Orlando** delineates the contrasts between the simplicity of the name and the complexity of the individual beneath the label, thus, distinguishing between external and internal identity. One's title or name—essentially for Woolf they are the same—is a distraction from deeper selfhood. No matter how elaborate, the name never comes close to approximating the complicated deeper self, and as we will see, often serves solely as a springboard for perceivers' connotations, having nothing to do with the actual individual named. A name—like gender, roles, articles of attire—is invariably inadequate at representing all facets of identity because like all labels, a name is limited; whereas deeper selfhood is multidimensional, changeable, comprising more than one signifier can ever express. Woolf anticipates a poststructuralist view with her treatment of names in that the sign, the name, is removed from the signified, identity. The name is merely a springboard for perceivers' connotations and, like language, will always be limited.

Woolf uses names in **Orlando** to dismantle social identity. As reflective of ethnic origin, family background, gender, economic status, marital condition, even historical period names are obviously limited and incapable of representing the deeper components of the individual, which move beyond all these surface features. As designating a symbolic role a character plays within the social arena, a title will always fail to encapsulate the essence of the self.

The name 'Orlando' itself is case in point. The protagonist's interactions with other characters in the novel illustrate the contrasts between a romantic and culturally resonant name and Orlando's deeper self. As a young boy, Orlando possesses a romantic fascination with roles, his own and the others in his perceived drama. He has multiple interludes with his created **illusions**

of girls. He is not so interested in the actual person, the self beneath the name, but in his personal creation of the girl, the other. This is effectively illustrated in his interest in how well a girl's name will fit into his poetry: 'Doris, Chloris, Delia, or Diana, for he made rhymes to them all in turn.'<sup>ix</sup> Orlando gauges his romantic counterpart according to her potential to enhance his image as the quintessential poet. This explains why he can change her name depending on the particular poem he is writing. He is clearly more concerned with the label of his romantic other—the name—than with the person beneath the name. The name is just an extension of his artistic creation in the same way social identity is a construction. Orlando artistically creates his identity and reality in the same way he creates his poetry: The names he uses for the girls in his sonnets—Chlorinda, Favilla, Euphrosyne—become the names by which everyone calls them<sup>x</sup>, whether they are the girls' actual names or not. This scene illustrates Orlando's power in naming others based on his artistic purposes; it also suggests his complete immersion in his personal drama. The women's names—in this case, but Woolf suggests in all cases—reflect the one who names in order to propel the namer's constructed drama and has nothing to do with the self behind the name.

Mansfield makes no reference to a self beneath the social persona. We see this in the name she uses for her character. The name 'Miss Brill' distances the reader from a deeper more complex identity beneath the role. Miss Brill is out of touch with herself, unable to tap anything beneath the surface; consequently, through her narration, readers are limited to these superficialities as well. The title of the story and name of the character—Miss Brill—is immediately limiting. We are not even given the dimensionality of a first name. The honorific firmly establishes Brill's rigid role in society as single, removed from a more complex identity. It would seem that the protagonist even thinks of herself as 'Miss Brill', Her name suggests a static, limited persona; though she clearly desires to be more complex: She'd relish being a crucial part of the performance she envisions.

Miss Brill is how her English students address her, also the name the old man she reads to as he sleeps would refer to her, if he referred to her at all. Brill is the name of a European flatfish, certainly not the way the character would wish to see herself. This reference reminds us of the young girl's brutal remarks that the fur Miss Brill wears so proudly at the beginning of the story, looks 'exactly like a fried whiting'.<sup>xi</sup> Overhearing this insult leads to the protagonist's demise.

Miss Brill has invested so much in how she is perceived by others that the realization that she is perceived far differently is crushing.

The less common, but also deeply contrasting definition of brill as an adjective meaning excellent and marvelous, resonates with the word ‘brilliance,’ a word the character uses frequently while building her steep expectations of her afternoon in the park and her role in the drama surrounding her: ‘it was so brilliantly fine’.<sup>xiii</sup> The contrast of brill, the flatfish, and brill meaning excellent and marvelous epitomizes both Miss Brill’s immersion in an exaggerated and hyperbolic world of her creation contrasted with the less sparkling reality of her life as more mundane and ugly.

Miss Brill is a limited character; consequently, her interpretations of the world are also limited. The observations of those around her are devoid of names because she doesn’t truly even know who these characters are outside the context of an afternoon at the park. They are significant only as they will fit into her creation, much like Orlando as poet uses the other. Readers only know who Brill is by how she interprets others, which is merely to categorize them. Her isolation prevents her from understanding the complexity of humanity and even her own complexity. Her interpretations are self-serving and, consequently, harsh and judgmental, indicating a lack of empathy. The old man she reads to does not contribute to her ‘creation’; therefore ‘If he’d been dead, she mightn’t have noticed for weeks; **she wouldn’t have minded**’ (my emphasis).<sup>xiii</sup> This observation from Brill’s perspective illustrates a selfish immersion in her own world: others are significant only as they fit into her creation. She lacks the multidimensionality to empathize and understand others.

She censors her story of self and others as much as she is able to try to maintain her self-image, but ultimately what lies beneath the superficialities surfaces, a truth Brill does not want to acknowledge. Her harsh criticism of the ‘odd’ old people—they seem ‘as though they’d just come from dark little rooms or even—even cupboards’.<sup>xiv</sup>—actually reflects a truth she is attempting to suppress: that she, too, is of this generation, and her home is indeed quite cupboard-like. In truth, her observations of the old people are a reflection of her own life. When references to her age and isolation creep through her observations, she must suppress these details with an-

other story, struggling to edit any dark truth that surfaces in the same way she dabs ‘black sealing wax’ on the nose of the fur she wears that has clearly taken some blows from reality.

Miriam Mandel accurately illustrates how Miss Brill ‘reduces and dehumanizes’ those around her: People become props and are basically no more multidimensional than what they wear.<sup>xv</sup> She further finds that it is Miss Brill’s sole determination to limit all around her and force details into a world of her creation that causes her downfall: ‘Miss Brill herself created the smallness of her life.’<sup>xvi</sup> The complete absence of any names in the story, except for the limited name of Miss Brill, further supports that the protagonist’s interpretations have more to do with her and less with what is interpreted.

Woolf shows that Orlando, too, creates the other depending on how he/she will foster the protagonist’s self-perception and agenda. Woolf makes clear that we interpret others only to the point that they will fit nicely within our stories of self—our own interpretations of self—but this process always backfires eventually if we get to know the other more deeply. We see this when another reality inevitably intrudes on Orlando’s interpretations. The more experiences Orlando has with another, the less capable he is of deleting those details that do not coincide with his creation. Eventually Orlando is incapable of editing out those factors that do not bolster his own self-image. When Orlando notices traits he finds unappealing, inconsistent with his romantic image of the other, the entire interpretation shifts from idolization to disparagement. He now focuses solely on negative characteristics to corroborate his judgment. Once Orlando, ‘a passionate lover of animals’<sup>xvii</sup>, sees Favilla, a potential mate, brutally punish a dog for tearing one of her stockings, he then begins to notice **everything** unappealing about her: for example, her crooked teeth, which he never noticed while venerating her. Woolf illustrates that all interpretations of the other are transient, based on superficialities, and shift constantly; however, she alludes to a deeper self beneath the artificial constructions, performances, and interpretations of others—the eternal, abiding essence of self.

The final, dramatic scene of **Orlando** presents a culmination of Woolf’s theories on identity. This passage, spanning over twenty pages, depicts vividly and thoroughly Orlando’s interior self. Her solitude in this scene is a crucial component in understanding the nature of the deeper selfhood. Due to the protagonist’s isolation, this passage is practically devoid of dialogue, high-



lighting one of Woolf's necessities for a moment of deep selfhood: solitude, silence, and the resulting respite from society's demands. Within this uninterrupted meditative moment, Woolf traces the characteristics of deep selfhood and contrasts them with those of the performing, social self. Communicating with others requires one to play a role; Orlando's moment of deep selfhood is a silent, solitary scene.

Woolf illustrates that these moments of deep selfhood are similar to the nebulous and hazy states of sleep, where nothing is clearly defined and there are no contextual social cues to lead the individual to expected action and directed behavior. We better understand this through Woolf's pervasive water imagery, capturing the fluidity and flow of deep states of selfhood:

...sleep so deep that all shapes are ground to dust of infinite softness, water of dimness inscrutable, and there, folded, shrouded, like a mummy, like a moth, prone let us lie on the sand at the bottom of sleep.<sup>xviii</sup>

Because Orlando's perspective here is fluid and free, everything, including her surroundings, appears to be in flux; thus, each object Orlando observes reminds her of or represents something else in a continual stream-of-consciousness flow of metaphors: 'her mind had become a fluid that flowed round things'<sup>xix</sup>; 'Nothing is any longer one thing.... Someone lights a pink candle and I see a girl in Russian trousers.'<sup>xx</sup> During moments of deep selfhood in **Orlando**, the mind moves, always in flux; thus, there is no static identity, not one lens through which to view the world, but more of a meditative immersion with the flow of the mind and a culmination of all experience. Language, the traditional biography, rigid narratives, social roles impose a grid on reality and identity, thus, misrepresent the complexity of both. Woolf, acutely aware of these restrictions, rebels against rigid structures in these unrestrained passages of **Orlando**.

There are no such moments in Mansfield's 'Miss Brill'. The protagonist is immersed in narratives, of herself and others. From the moment she dusts off the fur she wears to the park, she is creating a story of expectation: 'like a chill from a glass of iced water before you sip'.<sup>xxi</sup> Throughout her entire day at the park, she is creating stories of all around her, placing characters into categories. As Miriam Mandel shows she reduces her surroundings to fit her interpretation, preventing those she observes from leading their individual, fleshed out lives.<sup>xxii</sup> I attest that the 'nose' [of the fur], which was of some black composition, wasn't at all firm. It must have had a

knock somehow' alludes to the fact that Brill has been down this road before. This is not the first time she has been beaten up by a reality uncooperative with her creative construction. But she is resilient: 'Never mind—a little dab of black sealing-wax when the time came —when it was absolutely necessary' will cover up the bruises from a harsh reality.<sup>xxiii</sup> Miss Brill, is crying at the conclusion of the work and so out of touch with her deeper self that through her narration she must project the crying onto the fur: it is the fur that cries. Though she is defeated in the conclusion, she will rise again to observe, create, and pretend that she is participating in the social performance surrounding her. As long as she is alive, she will perform, for the performance is her life.

Though Miss Brill is solitary throughout the entire story, a crucial component in tapping deep selfhood in **Orlando**, she never taps the core self beneath the performance as Orlando does. The primary symbol in the story, the fur, denotes Brill's relationship to the concept of identity. The fur is reflective of the costume Brill wears in her performance and also suggests how the character lives her life, in a box in the cupboard. The fur is an extension of Miss Brill herself. This static, quite literally **dead** symbol is the opposite of the very much alive wild goose, which represents the deeper selfhood of Orlando. As a matter of fact, it is significant that Brill is so immersed in the artificiality of the social performance, that her few observations of nature, reflective of what is real and untainted, are practically non-existent. When she does notice nature, she forces these natural details into her created artificial performance:

Who could believe the sky at the back wasn't painted? But it wasn't till a brown dog trotted on solemn and then slowly trotted off, like a little 'theatre' dog, a little dog that had been drugged, that Miss Brill discovered what it was that made it so exciting. They were all on the stage. They weren't only the audience, not only looking on; they were acting. <sup>xxiv</sup>

The natural elements of the dog and sky are merely props in her play. Miss Brill herself is nothing more than a part of the play. She is trapped in the social role she plays, unable to tap a self beneath the performance. So it is no surprise that she forces the human beings surrounding her into social roles as well. Consequently, when she overhears that a teenage girl (the prototype of one most trapped in social performances) does not see Miss Brill as she sees herself, her world is destroyed. Anyone who intimately knows teenage girls will applaud Mansfield's choice of this character to relay the news that Miss Brill is old, ugly, and should've just stayed home. Stereo-

typically this type is absorbed in a separate drama and brutally eschews any type that does not fit in the narrative in much the same way Brill does. Tragically, Miss Brill has invested her entire existence in the performance she has created and is, therefore, devastated to hear that another views her radically differently from how she views herself.

This moment of revelation in 'Miss Brill' has the potential to lead the character within, to find respite and solace through a meditative exploration of what lies beneath the surface of the individual. Alda Correia finds parallels between the styles of Woolf and Mansfield, in that they both highlight moments of epiphany and revelation.<sup>xxv</sup> We see this in Miss Brill's sudden shock in the penultimate scene of the story, which resonates with Orlando's moments of revelation as well. The key difference is that Woolf would've taken this Mansfield moment and led Miss Brill to an epiphany of something deeper, alive, sustained beneath the surface. Miss Brill, however, is incapable of tapping the self beneath the role. Her entire sense of self is encapsulated in the role she plays.

All Virginia Woolf's works gravitate in some respect to inspecting life and identity. In a diary entry of July 28th, 1940, she writes, 'The life-writer must explore and understand the gap between the outer self (the fictitious Virginia Woolf whom I carry like a mask about the world) and the secret self.' In a letter to Vanessa Stephen, Woolf's sister, dated October 1908, Clive Bell writes that Woolf has the incredible power of 'lifting the veil and showing inanimate things in the mystery and beauty of their reality'.<sup>xxvi</sup> Woolf accomplishes this feat in **Orlando**, exploring identity and showing that beneath all the social roles and performances, there is something deeper, more substantial and natural, which sustains and nourishes. Mansfield's Miss Brill is so entrenched in the roles she plays, she can not comprehend a life beneath the performance. Consequently, both conclusions and the symbols used to relay the themes of identity are radically different in the two works. Miss Brill is so out of touch with her deeper self that through her narration she projects her crying onto the worn, tattered, literally dead fur she puts into the box. The performance of her life has shifted to a tragedy: She is the old fur, living in a box put into the cupboard. Orlando's conclusion is strikingly different: Orlando is one with nature, 'bearing her breast to the moon'<sup>xxvii</sup>; her pearls glow in the dark, and she experiences an epiphanic moment of

deep selfhood, free from age, gender, roles, names, performances, and time, very much alive, and, though fleeting, as beautiful as the wild goose soaring above.

## Notes

<sup>i</sup> James King, *Virginia Woolf* (New York: WW Norton & Co, 1995), p. 114.

<sup>ii</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 39.

<sup>iii</sup> Virginia Woolf, *Moments of Being : Unpublished Autobiographical Writings* ed. by Jeanne Schulkind (London: Chatto and Windus for Sussex UP, 1976) p. 70.

<sup>iv</sup> King, p.140.

<sup>v</sup> Virginia Woolf, *The Diary of Virginia Woolf 5 Volumes* ed. by Anne Oliver Bell (London: The Hogarth P, 1977) Vol 3, p. 188.

<sup>vi</sup>Katherine Mansfield, 'Miss Brill', in *Literature: An Introduction to Reading and Writing 5th edn*, ed. by Edgar V. Roberts and Robert Zweig (New York: Longman, 2012), p. 185.

<sup>vii</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 186.

<sup>viii</sup>Makiko Minow-Pinkney, *Virginia Woolf & The Problem of the Subject*, (New Brunswick: Rutgers, UP, 1987), p. 135.

<sup>ix</sup> Virginia Woolf, *Orlando: A Biography*, (New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1928), p. 28.

<sup>x</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 31.

<sup>xi</sup>Katherine Mansfield, 'Miss Brill', p. 186.

<sup>xii</sup> *Ibid.*, p. (183).

<sup>xiii</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 183.

<sup>xiv</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 184.

<sup>xv</sup> Miriam B. Mandel, 'Reductive Imagery in Miss Brill', *Studies in Short Fiction*, 26 Fall 1989, 473-77, (p. 475).

<sup>xvi</sup> Katherine Mansfield, 'Miss Brill', p. 477.

<sup>xvii</sup> Virginia Woolf, *Orlando*, p. 33.

<sup>xviii</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 295.

<sup>xix</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 314.

<sup>xx</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 305.

<sup>xxi</sup> Katherine Mansfield, 'Miss Brill', p. 183.

xxii Miriam Mandel, p. 476.

xxiii Katherine Mansfield, 'Miss Brill', p.184.

xxiv Ibid., p. 178.

xxv Alda Correia, *Virginia Woolf Miscellany*, 86 (2015), 23-5 (p. 25).

xxvi Virginia Woolf, VS to Clive Bell, 25 December 1908, *The Letters of Virginia Woolf Vol 1* ed. by Nigel Nicholson and Joanne Trautmann (New York: Harcourt Brace P 1979): p. 376.

xxvii Virginia Woolf, *Orlando*, p. 328.