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General Editors’ Preface

The only advice, indeed, that one person can give another about reading is to take no advice, to follow your own instincts, to use your own reason, to come to your own conclusions.

VIRGINIA WOOLF, ‘How Should One Read a Book?’

How should we read the writings of Virginia Woolf? This is not so much a question of interpretation as of practice. How are we to read this writer for whom reading is an activity that requires almost the same talents and energies as the activity of writing itself? For Woolf responds to the question, ‘How should one read a book?’, as a person of immense, virtuosic skill and experience in both activities. She understands the reader to be the ‘fellow-worker and accomplice’ (E5 573) of the writer. The ‘quickest way to understand [...] what a novelist is doing is not to read’, she suggests, ‘but to write; to make your own experiment with the dangers and difficulties of words’ (E5 574); and ‘the time to read poetry’, she recognises, is ‘when we are almost able to write it’ (E5 577). Not only has Woolf left a richly rewarding oeuvre, but she has also left ample documentation of her meticulous processes of composition and of her detailed involvement in the production and publishing of many of her works, all of which her active and conscientious reader will wish to negotiate. If we are going to read Woolf creatively and critically, if we are to follow our own instincts, use our own reason and come to our own conclusions, as she herself advises, we need to read her

1 VW, ‘How Should One Read a Book?’ (1926), E5 573. Subsequent references to this and other works by VW appear in the text. For full bibliographical details see this volume’s List of Abbreviations and Bibliography.
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works in a form that provides us with the fullest means possible to exercise these powers, one that gives us as much unmediated access as possible to the record of these processes. This Cambridge edition of Woolf’s writings consequently aims to provide readers and scholars, Woolf’s fellow-workers and accomplices, with an extensively researched, fully explicated and collated text.

READING WOOLF

What does it mean to be the ‘fellow-worker and accomplice’ of Virginia Woolf? She published ten novels, as well as numerous short stories, essays and works of biography and criticism. Her posthumously published volumes of letters, diaries and memoirs are testimony to a life of constant writing, private as well as public. An erudite writer with an apparently encyclopedic knowledge of English letters, Woolf also knew Greek, Latin, German, French and Russian. She was denied the formal education afforded her brothers, yet was able to hold her own in intellectual exchange with them and their fellow Cambridge graduates. She did not attend school but received a thoroughgoing education at home, the beneficiary of personal tuition from her father, the esteemed literary critic, Leslie Stephen, and she enjoyed the free run of his considerable library. However, Woolf undertook a serious programme of studies at King’s College Ladies’ Department (at 13 Kensington Square) ‘for five years between 1897 and 1901, between the ages of 15 and 19’, as Christine Kenyon Jones and Anna Snaith have shown: ‘She was not only registered for courses in a range of subjects, but reached degree-level standard in some of her studies, and also took examinations. The archives also show that Vanessa Stephen was also registered for classes at the Ladies’ Department of King’s College London between 1898 and 1900 and that the sisters studied Latin together there’ (Kenyon Jones and Snaith 4). Virginia Stephen, according to the records, enjoyed ‘sustained enrolment in a range of subjects at the Ladies’ Department, including History (Continental and English), Greek (Intermediate and Advanced), Latin and German’ (Kenyon Jones and Snaith 6–7). She was tutored in Classics by Dr G. C. W. Warr, by Clara Pater, sister of the essayist and critic, Walter Pater, and by Janet Case, one of the first graduates of Girton College, Cambridge and a committed feminist.

xii
All too aware of the historical and continuing hypocrisies and inequities of most formal academic education, in its exclusions along lines of gender, class and race, Woolf was notoriously ambivalent in her dealings with scholars and academic critics, and she pointedly refused a number of honorary degrees from distinguished universities. She nevertheless did engage in some aspects of academic life, and not only as a student. She taught for a spell at Morley College, an evening institute for working people in South London, and during her career as a writer she gave several lectures and papers both to university students and to the Workers’ Educational Association. A number of these lectures and papers constituted the first drafts of some of her most significant and influential contributions to literary criticism, including her founding work on feminist aesthetics, *A Room of One’s Own*, and her great modernist manifestos, ‘Mr Bennett and Mrs Brown’ [Character in Fiction], ‘The Narrow Bridge of Art’ [Poetry, Fiction and the Future] and ‘The Leaning Tower’. Actively engaged in feminist, socialist, pacifist and anti-fascist politics, she probed in all her writings the complex relations between art and the real world. Woolf scholarship has flourished in tandem with the rise of modern feminism and under the impetus of its intellectual transformations of the academy. Woolf’s writings have been studied, with increasing attention, in universities since their first publication; and it is testimony to the revisionary force of many of her works that they are now studied in universities by the very outsiders to such institutions that she first championed, even if her egalitarian vision for school and university entrance still remains far from realised: ‘Money is no longer going to do our thinking for us. Wealth will no longer decide who shall be taught and who not. In future it is we who shall decide whom to send to public schools and universities; how they shall be taught; and whether what they write justifies their exemption from other work.’

But Woolf’s readers have always been, and remain, equally numerous outside the academy too. Even her most experimental works sold well to the general public from the start, and she has never been out of print. One of her best-selling novels was *Flush*, her spoof biography of a dog, which academic studies tended to overlook until very recently. Woolf understands literature as common ground open to all: ‘Let us trespass at once. Literature

\[2\] VW, ‘The Leaning Tower’ (1940), *E6* 277.
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is no one's private ground; literature is common ground. It is not cut up into
nations; there are no wars there. Let us trespass freely and fearlessly and find
our own way for ourselves’ (E6 278). She was scornful too of institutionalised
academic literary authority: ‘To admit authorities, however heavily furred and
gowned, into our libraries and let them tell us how to read, what to read, what
value to place upon what we read, is to destroy the spirit of freedom which is
the breath of those sanctuaries. Everywhere else we may be bound by laws and
conventions—there we have none’ (E5 573). In setting out her ‘philosophy’ in a
late memoir, Woolf went so far as to declare the redundancy, if not the death,
of the author: ‘the whole world is a work of art; [...] we are parts of the work of
art. *Hamlet* or a Beethoven quartet is the truth about this vast mass that we call
the world. But there is no Shakespeare, there is no Beethoven; certainly and
emphatically there is no God; we are the words; we are the music; we are the
thing itself.’ Following Dr Johnson she famously ‘rejoice[d] to concur with
the common reader’; and she was proud of her own independent, professional
status as a writer. She was, from youth, a prolific reviewer of literature, for
various organs, including the *Times Literary Supplement*.

In tandem with her career as a professional novelist, short-story writer and
eyessayist, Woolf also became an influential independent publisher. The
Hogarth Press, which was launched by Leonard and Virginia Woolf in 1917,
was not only a vehicle for putting their own work into the public realm, but it
was also responsible for publishing works by numerous important modern
writers and thinkers, including John Maynard Keynes, T. S. Eliot, Katherine
Mansfield, Gertrude Stein, W. H. Auden, Christopher Isherwood, Louis
MacNeice and Sigmund Freud. ‘The powerful intellectual developments that
made modernism a pan-European phenomenon’, as Michael Whitworth
observes, ‘were sustained at a local level by material institutions like the
Hogarth Press’ (Whitworth 2000: 150). In short, Woolf as writer, critic,
reviewer, lecturer and publisher was a consummate public intellectual.

EDITING WOOLF

So, how should we edit the writings of Virginia Woolf? Already the danger
and difficulties of words are upon us. ‘We’ as editors cannot forget that we

are already committed and diverse readers of Woolf. Asking ourselves questions about how to edit Woolf, ‘we’, as general editors of this Cambridge edition (and also as editors of individual volumes in the edition), very soon recognised the need to respond as ‘we’, three active and different readers of Woolf. Yet, whatever our own often very different instincts, reasonings and conclusions, we nevertheless share a recognition of the intense attention to the text that Woolf’s writing demands of all her readers. This is the case in respect of its textual genesis, structure and variants, as well as in its possible – and its manifest – cultural and historical referencing, and regardless of our own individual interpretations. In our role as editors we conceive of ourselves as readers in need of access to a transparent record of textual process, rather than as readers who arrive at interpretative conclusions.

One challenge to editors of Woolf is the difference between British and American first editions of her major novels, and most subsequent editions have fallen on one or other side of this first fissure. Ever since Woolf sent differently corrected proofs across the Atlantic, American readers have not been reading the same text as British readers. The American copyright resides with Harcourt, so American readers and scholars, in the several decades since Woolf’s death, have not had ready access to the editions published by Woolf’s own press, the Hogarth Press (and vice versa). There are other editions published in Woolf’s lifetime that also merit attention, such as the first British editions of the first two novels by the Duckworth Press, the Hogarth Uniform edition and editions by publishers such as Dent.

Methods for addressing the notorious transatlantic differences have varied in practice, either by plumping for the American or British first editions (following the copyright), or by claiming that the ‘authentic’ or ‘authoritative’ text resides in one particular set of extant proofs (or even in holograph or typescript). In attempting to gain access to an unpolluted record of textual variance and genesis, readers must then negotiate the sometimes unhelpful biases of editorial argument and often idiosyncratic and silent textual impositions, derived from a less-than-intact legacy of evidence of the processes of composition and publication. Debate rages on how a more democratic and transparent methodology might work. A parallel edition of the British and American editions of To the Lighthouse has been suggested, for example, and the digital age certainly makes such
hybrids possible in electronic form. But such solutions sacrifice important material elements of signification in Woolf’s texts. It is vital that attention is given to her quite specifically designed and designated spacing and typography. It is also important not to lose sight, in the inevitably compromised pursuit of ‘authenticity’ and ‘authority’, of the historical, material text as it was first published.

The Cambridge edition, therefore, has invited editors of the novels normally to map out published and proof variants from the first British edition as copy text, with minimal interference on the page where possible, and with no silent emendation. The Textual Apparatus and the Textual Notes allow for a transparent account of process and variance. The extant draft material has been consulted by editors and is systematically listed and referenced in each volume. The Textual Notes alert the reader to significant points of departure and interest, and in some volumes there are appendices reproducing key (extracts of) draft material. The surviving draft material for Woolf’s novels, however, is so copious that no edition could accommodate its reproduction in entirety in the formal Textual Apparatus. Separate holograph editions are necessary. Woolf’s non-fiction, essays, short stories and autobiographical works present further editorial challenges. The Cambridge edition aims to give readers access to variants in all extant proofs and in all editions published in Woolf’s lifetime and, in the case of unpublished works, to establish the text as accurately as possible from all extant sources.

Our aim, therefore, in preparing this edition of Woolf’s writings is to provide scholars and readers with a fully researched text. This Cambridge edition recognises that no emendation of spelling, syntax, punctuation, hyphenation, paragraphing or spacing should occur silently. It affords generous exploration of and reference to archival material, holograph work, drafts and proofs. In annotation we aim to be more thorough than in any previous edition, with regard to historical, factual, cultural and literary allusions, in long overdue homage to the remarkable density and breadth of reference in Woolf’s work. Each volume includes a substantial

5 In the case of VW’s final novel, Between the Acts, which was posthumously published and seen through the press by LW, the typescripts she left behind are necessarily more prominent, forming as they do the basis for the first British edition.

6 Much of VW’s archive of draft material has been made available on microfilm, and transcriptions have been published in basic holograph editions of some of the novels.
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introduction mapping the text’s composition and publishing history, and explores its critical reception during Woolf’s lifetime, except where the text was published posthumously.

However, we would be foolish to ignore the fact that the act of editing is always and already bound up with reading precisely as an interpretative act. Cherishing our differences as critics, we also cherish the opportunity to engage as closely with the processes of Woolf’s writing as any active reader could wish, and to make these processes available to fellow readers as fully and transparently as possible. Transparency, not fur and gowns, is our editorial ideal, and we are guided, as Woolf has been, by King Lear: ‘Through tattered clothes great vices do appear: / Robes and furred gowns hide all’ (Lear 4.5.156–7).

ANNOTATING WOOLF

We have been guided too by Woolf’s own recorded thoughts on editorial achievements. For example, reviewing as a lay reader a new scholarly edition of Walpole’s letters, she ‘assert[s], though not with entire confidence, that books after all exist to be read—even the most learned of editors would to some extent at least agree with that’. And as editors, we do indeed agree with that. We cannot ignore Woolf’s inclusion of the common reader as part of a true scholarly community: ‘Aeschylus, Shakespeare, Virgil, and Dante […] if they could speak—and after all they can—would say, “Don’t leave me to the wigged and gowned. Read me, read me for yourselves”’ (E6 277). Woolf worries that the weighty apparatus of scholarly editions hampers readers:

But how, the question immediately arises, can we read this magnificent instalment […] of our old friend Horace Walpole’s letters? Ought not the presses to have issued in a supplementary pocket a supplementary pair of eyes? Then, with the usual pair fixed upon the text, the additional pair could range the notes, thus sweeping together into one haul not only what Horace is saying to Cole and what Cole is saying to Horace, but a multitude of minor men and matters […] (E6 171)

In Night and Day, Mr Hilbery is preparing an edition of Shelley that ‘scrupulously observe[s] the poet’s system of punctuation’ (ND 108–9). Her novelist’s sensitivity to the comedy of this undertaking does not wholly

7 VW, ‘Two Antiquaries; Walpole and Cole’ (1939), E6 171
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undermine his endeavour: Mr Hilbery, the narrator tells us, ‘saw the humour of these researches, but that did not prevent him from carrying them out with the utmost scrupulosity’ (ND 109).

In preparing this scholarly edition of Woolf’s writings, we share her concerns for the readability of books. Resisting the temptation to issue ‘in a supplementary pocket a supplementary pair of eyes’, we have devised ways of alerting the reader, on the page, to the relevant parts of the Textual Apparatus. But if Woolf worries about ‘how great a strain the new method of editing lays upon the eye’, she does come to acknowledge that ‘if the brain is at first inclined to jib at such perpetual solicitations, and to beg to be allowed to read the text in peace, it adjusts itself by degrees; grudgingly admits that many of these little facts are to the point; and finally becomes not merely a convert but a suppliant—asks not for less but for more and more and more’ (E6 172). As editors, we also respond to this spur to feed the insatiable wants of the enquiring reader, once roused.

Sharing Woolf’s own readerly desire for ‘more and more and more’, and recognising the same urgency in our fellow readers, we have made this refrain one of our guiding principles. But, we know too that while the scholarly scope afforded by a Cambridge edition can certainly give more, no edition can ever give all. The concept of such a totality is meaningless. The work of the editor is to engage the reader in a process of informed exploration and interpretation that continues beyond the edition. We understand our readers, then, to be accomplices in a process that can impose no finite interpretation on Woolf’s writings. It is our hope that our work enables and enriches the continuing process of readerly collaboration. Another refrain taken from Woolf has also frequently sounded to us, particularly during the preparation of Explanatory Notes: ‘nothing [is] simply one thing’ (TL 286). We would emphasise the open-endedness of all such annotation, and we have conceived ours in dialogue with the work of past and present readers and scholars of Woolf, with the hope of enabling and continuing the dialogues of the future.

It is nevertheless worth comparing the extreme attention now extended by critics to every minor detail of Woolf’s writing, including street and shop names, as David Bradshaw urges (Bradshaw 2002: 109), with some earlier critical approaches that tended to assume her other-worldliness as a writer remote from the fabric of things in the real world and possessed of a vague, visionary aesthetics considered factually inaccurate and even deliberately careless. The attribution of factual indifference and ‘essential feminineness of […]

xviii
mind’ (Bennett, J. 79) initially deflected interest from the fine detail and precision of Woolf’s cultural and intellectual referencing that scholars now investigate with considerable care. It was not so long ago that critics felt able to presume Woolf’s lack of classical scholarship, rather than acknowledge her satirical characterisation, in her account of Mrs. Dalloway’s mistaken assignation, in *The Voyage Out*, of Clytemnestra to *Antigone*. (Woolf’s own translation of the *Agamemnon*, languishing in the archives, points clearly to her knowledge of the classical play in which Clytemnestra is to be found.) Explanatory Notes must also address the inevitable receding of Woolf’s social and political references into a historical period and cultural context now becoming distant enough from many of today’s readers to require elucidation. The research undertaken for the Explanatory Notes draws on the new wealth of scholarly work engaged in the detailed exploration of the myriad and sparkingly allusive surfaces of Woolf’s texts as well as their deeper layering of cultural referencing and valences. We would also emphasise that where critical works are cited in the Explanatory Notes it is to point out the information they yield on Woolf’s rich weave of literary, cultural, historical and other allusions, rather than with regard to how these allusions and references are interpreted in those works.

Reading is a sacred and infectious pleasure for Woolf, and an end in itself. So much so that she celebrates its power even to dispense with the mythic Day of Judgement itself: ‘the Almighty will turn to Peter and will say, not without a certain envy when he sees us coming with our books under our arms, “Look, these need no reward. We have nothing to give them here. They have loved reading”’ (*E5* 582). A declared atheist, Woolf resisted all notions of final judgement, religious, literary or political. We understand this Cambridge edition of Woolf’s writings as continuing, and not capping, the ongoing processes of reading and rereading her work. We hope our fellow readers will recognise, in making use of it, the shifting processes and conditions that are implicit in following instincts, using reason and coming to conclusions about Woolf’s work. For ‘who reads to bring about an end, however desirable? Are there not some pursuits that we practise because they are good in themselves, and some pleasures that are final? And is not this among them?’ (*E5* 582).

**Jane Goldman**
University of Glasgow

**Susan Sellers**
University of St Andrews

**Bryony Randall**
University of Glasgow
Notes on the Edition

Woolf's Spelling and Punctuation

In quoting from her letters, diaries and from the drafts of her published work Virginia Woolf's sometimes idiosyncratic spelling and punctuation have been retained. Unless otherwise indicated [by use of editorial square brackets], all emphases, ellipses, etc. are in the original texts cited.

The Text

The Textual Apparatus normally records all extant states of the text from proof and includes every edition published in Woolf’s lifetime. Each volume maps out published and proof variants from the first British edition as copy text, with minimal interference on the page where possible, and with no silent emendation. The Textual Apparatus and the Textual Notes allow for the most transparent possible account of process and variance. All extant draft material has been consulted by editors and is systematically listed and referenced in each volume.

Introduction

As well as an account of the editorial challenges presented by Woolf’s text, the Introduction in each volume includes a composition history, a publication history and an account of the early critical reception normally concluding at Woolf’s death in 1941.
NOTES ON THE EDITION

Explanatory Notes

Each volume provides extensive and thorough annotation of Woolf’s cultural and historical allusions and literary intertexts and attempts to do justice to her modernist playfulness with the multivalences of particular references. The fabric of life in the late nineteenth century and the first part of the twentieth century is often elliptically documented by Woolf in fleeting fragments. Close editorial attention is therefore paid to every character’s name, shop name and place name, however passing.

JG, SS and BR
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Chronology of Virginia Woolf’s Life and Work

1878  Leslie Stephen and Julia Duckworth (née Jackson) marry (26 March).
1879  Vanessa Stephen born (30 May).
1880  Thoby Stephen born (8 September).
1883  Adrian Stephen born (27 October).
1887  First extant dated VW letter (to James Russell Lowell, 22 February).
1891  Along with Vanessa and Thoby, begins writing the family newspaper, Hyde Park Gate News (January–February). Leslie Stephen resigns from the DNB.
1892  Writes, with Thoby, ‘A Cockney’s Farming Experiences’ (22 August–26 September) and ‘The Experiences of a Paterfamilias’ (10 October–19 December) for Hyde Park Gate News.
1893  Meets Rupert Brooke (summer).
1894  Stephen family spend their last summer at Talland House.
1895  Julia Stephen dies (5 May).
1896  Keeps a diary for a short period of time. Travels to France (November).
1897  Begins her first extant diary (3 January). Half-sister Stella Duckworth marries Jack Hills (10 April), but dies soon afterwards (19 July). Begins classes in Greek and History at King’s College London (November).
1898  Begins studying Latin with Clara Pater (October).
1899  Takes up German in the autumn, achieving ‘class II’ in ‘German (Elementary)’ examination at King’s College. Thoby goes up to
TRINITY COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE, WHERE HE MEETS CLIVE BELL, LYTON STRACHEY, SAXON SYDNEY-TURNER AND LEONARD WOOLF (3 OCTOBER).

ACHIEVES ‘CLASS II’ IN ‘GERMAN GRAMMAR AND READING’ EXAMINATION AT KING’S COLLEGE. TAKES UP BOOKBINDING (OCTOBER).

BEGINNS STUDYING GREEK WITH JANET CASE (EARLY JANUARY). WRITES ‘FRIENDSHIPS GALLERY’ (AUGUST–SEPTEMBER).


JULIAN BELL BORN (4 FEBRUARY). TRAVELS TO WALES, ITALY AND FRANCE (18 AUGUST–30 SEPTEMBER).

ENGAGED, FLEETINGLY, TO LYTON STRACHEY (17 FEBRUARY). MEETS LADY OTROLLINE MORRELL (30 MARCH). TRAVELS TO ITALY (23 APRIL–9 MAY) AND GERMANY, WHERE ATTENDS THE BAYREUTH FESTIVAL (5 AUGUST–3 SEPTEMBER). WRITES ‘MEMOIRS OF A NOVELIST’ (REJECTED BY CORNHILL, 10 NOVEMBER).


RENTS LITTLE TALLAND HOUSE IN FIRLE, SUSSEX. TRAVELS TO TURKEY (22–9 APRIL). NEGOTIATES RENTAL OF ASHEHAM HOUSE IN BEDDINGHAM, SUSSEX.
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(October). Moves to 38 Brunswick Square with Adrian, Duncan Grant and Maynard Keynes (20 November). LW moves in with them (4 December).

1912 Marries LW (10 August). Travels to France, Spain and Italy (18 August–3 October). Moves to 13 Clifford’s Inn, London (late October).

1913 Delivers manuscript of The Voyage Out to Duckworth (9 March); accepted for publication (12 April).

1914 House-hunting in London, first at 65 St Margaret’s Road, Twickenham (9 October), then 17 The Green, Richmond, Surrey (17 October).


1916 Nellie Boxall and Lottie Hope begin working for the Woolfs (1 February). Begins writing Night and Day (reaches Chapter 12 by October). Meets Katherine Mansfield (early November?).


1919 Hogarth Press publishes Kew Gardens (12 May). Buys Monk’s House, in Rodmell (1 July), moves in (1 September). Duckworth publishes Night and Day (20 October).

1920 First meeting of the ‘Memoir Club’ (4 March). Begins writing Jacob’s Room (May). LW publishes Empire and Commerce in Africa.

1921 Hogarth Press publishes Monday or Tuesday (7 or 8 March) – all VW’s subsequent major publications are with the Hogarth Press.
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1924
Buys lease for 52 Tavistock Square (9 January), moves in (13–15 March). Publishes ‘Mr Bennett and Mrs Brown’ (30 October).

1925

1926

1927
Travels to France and Italy (30 March–28 April). Publishes To the Lighthouse (5 May). Travels to Yorkshire to witness the first total eclipse of the sun to be visible from Britain in several hundred years (29 June). Begins writing Orlando (5 October).

1928

1929
Travels to Germany (1–21 January) and France (4–14 June). Publishes A Room of One’s Own (24 October). Begins writing The Moths, later published as The Waves (2 July). LW resigns from the Nation and Athenaeum (31 December).

1930
Meets Ethel Smyth (20 February).

1931

1932
Lytton Strachey dies (1 January). Turns down invitation to give Clark lectures at Cambridge (February). Dora Carrington dies (11 March). Travels to Greece (15 April–12 May). Publishes A Letter to a Young Poet (1 July) and The Common Reader: Second Series (13 October). Begins writing The Pargiters, later published as The Years (October).

1933
Refuses honorary degree from Manchester University (3 March). Travels to Italy, via France (5–27 May). Turns down invitation to
CHRONOLOGY OF VIRGINIA WOOLF’S LIFE AND WORK


1935 First performance of Freshwater (18 January). Travels to Holland, Germany, Austria, Italy and France (1–31 May). Serves on the committee organising the British delegation to the International Congress of Writers in Paris and assists in establishing the British Section of the International Association of Writers for the Defence of Culture (IAWDC) (June). Attends pilot meeting of For Intellectual Liberty (FIL) (December).


1937 Publishes The Years (15 March). Julian Bell killed in Spain (18 July).


Abbreviations

PEOPLE

ESW     Edward (‘Eddy’) Sackville-West
HN      Harold Nicolson
LW      Leonard Woolf
NN      Nigel Nicolson
VB      Vanessa Bell
VSW     Vita Sackville-West
VW      Virginia Woolf

ARCHIVE LOCATIONS

Berg      The Berg Collection of English and American Literature, New
          York Public Library, Astor, Lenox and Tilden Foundations
MHP       Monks House Papers, Special Collections, University of Sussex
NLS       R & R Clark Archive, National Library of Scotland, Edinburgh
Nat. Trust The National Trust
Reading    Archives of the Hogarth Press: 1922–1955, Department of
          Archives and Manuscripts, University of Reading
Smith     Mortimer Rare Book Room, Neilson Library, Smith College,
          Northampton, MA
WSU       The Library of Leonard and Virginia Woolf, Washington State
          University Library, Pullman, WA [Catalogue online at: wsulibs.
          wsu.edu/MASC/OnlineBooks/woolflibrary/woolflibraryonline.
          htm]
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Introduction

On 14 December 1922, Virginia Woolf met a swarthy aristocrat she described the next day as ‘a grenadier; hard; handsome; manly; inclined to double chin’. But in spite of the double chin, this lengthy diary entry shows the ‘moustached’ grenadier already inspiring a flood of words from Virginia, who felt herself ‘virgin, shy, & schoolgirlish’ by Vita’s side (15 December 1922, D2 216–17). Over the next six years, the encounter blossomed into a love affair and eventually a published novel, built around Virginia’s fascination with Vita Sackville-West, the woman she had come to love. The day after she wrote the last word of Orlando, Virginia Woolf noted in her diary that it was ‘all a joke’ (18 March 1928, D3 177). But in fact, Orlando is one of her most ambitious and complex texts. In it, Virginia experiments with a new form for the novel; she tells a playful version of Vita’s life-story; she re-writes the history of the Sackville family; she re-imagines the genre of biography; she offers a detailed social history of England; she recreates some of the golden moments of British literature; and she sketches a detailed geographical history of the city of London. With Orlando, Virginia hoped to dazzle and punish the wayward Vita with her affection, her eloquence, her erudition and her erotic mastery. The novel was a gift in more ways than one: after it was published on 11 October 1928, Virginia had the manuscript bound in leather and presented it to Vita. It remains in Knole House, the extensive Sackville estate near Sevenoaks in Kent.

Composition history

When Virginia Woolf started to toy with the idea of a literary pastiche in March 1927, she had been intensely involved with Vita for about eighteen
months. Almost as soon as they met, Virginia was asking to read *Knole and the Sackvilles*, Vita’s recent history of her aristocratic family and their centuries of splendour at Knole: ‘I should never have dared to dun you if I had known the magnificence of the book. Really, I am ashamed, and would like to say that copies of all my books are at your service if you raise a finger’ (3 January 1923, *L.3 1*). Much of *Knole and the Sackvilles* – its turns of phrase, its historical information and its characters – later found its way into the pages of *Orlando*. Virginia found herself excited by Vita’s combination of aristocratic panache and boyish clumsiness (‘the poor girl looks divinely lovely, a little tousled, in a velvet jacket’ [VW to Clive Bell, 23 January 1924, *L.3 86*]), and a visit to Knole in July 1924 impressed her tremendously, even as her left-wing hackles rose at the thought of the ‘solitary earl’ (Vita’s father) in the midst of that huge, empty, lavish building (5 July 1924, *D.2 306–7*). ‘Knole almost crushed me’, she told Vita: ‘I detest being unable to express anything of what I feel, and certainly couldn’t’ (VW to VSW, 6 July 1924, *L.3 118*). The two women became lovers in late December 1925, when Virginia wrote with satisfaction that she had ‘wound up this wounded & stricken year in great style’ (21 December 1925, *D.3 52*). In May 1926, she was asking herself: ‘I like [Vita’s] presence & her beauty. Am I in love with her? But what is love? Her being “in love” (it must be comma’d thus) with me, excites & flatters; & interests’ (20 May 1926, *D.3 87*). By the time Virginia started thinking explicitly about *Orlando*, Virginia and Vita had a committed romantic – though not always erotic, and certainly not always monogamous – relationship.²

In March 1927, when Virginia first conceived *Orlando*, her relationship with Vita Sackville-West was relatively stable, despite the fact that Vita was at that time visiting her diplomat husband Harold Nicolson on a posting in Teheran with another lover, poet Dorothy Wellesley, in tow. The idea for *Orlando* came to Virginia just as she was feeling slighted because a fortnight had passed without a letter from Vita. Vita’s prolonged absences had begun to annoy Virginia. The previous year, Vita had left for Teheran in January just weeks after the two women became lovers. That separation both sharpened and deepened their mutual longing. Two days after they said goodbye, Vita told Virginia that she was ‘reduced to a thing that wants Virginia’ (21 January 1926, *LVSW.89*); Virginia responded: ‘I miss you, I miss you’ (31 January 1926, *L.3 237*). But a year later, in 1927, being apart made Virginia feel impatient and bored, rather than amorous. She repeatedly
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suggested that Harold should give up the Foreign Service and settle permanently in England (18 February 1927, L3 332; 28 February 1927, L3 338), and she toyed restlessly with ideas for a new book. ‘It struck me, vaguely, that I might write a Defoe narrative for fun. Suddenly between twelve & one I conceived a whole fantasy to be called “The Jessamy Brides” – why, I wonder?’ (14 March 1927, D3 131). Pairs of women – including the famous Ladies of Llangollen, who ran away together in 1778 – were central to her fantasy: ‘Two women, poor, solitary at the top of a house. […] the Ladies of Llangollen; […] Sapphism is to be suggested. Satire is to be the main note—satire & wildness. The Ladies are to have Constantinople in view’ (D3 131). Vita was clearly behind this fantasy. She lived in Constantinople with Harold for a few months in the winter of 1913–14, her lineage was both aristocratic and literary (she was the daughter of the 3rd Lord Sackville, and could boast several authors among her ancestors) and Virginia felt for her at once an intense erotic admiration and an amused condescension.

However, while Virginia was impressed and fascinated by Vita’s lengthy and illustrious family history, her aristocratic arrogance and her casual acceptance of enormous wealth and privilege, she was also made uneasy by it. She always believed that the material ease of Vita’s life had made her aesthetically unadventurous, and she had no very high opinion of Vita’s intellectual abilities (she ‘has no very sharp brain’ [5 July 1924, D2 306]; ‘dear old obtuse […] Vita’ [21 December 1924, D2 325]; ‘In brain & insight she is not as highly organised as I am’ [21 December 1925, D3 32]). Shortly before starting to plan Orlando, Virginia told Vita in a ‘parting lecture’ as Vita prepared to leave for Teheran that ‘with your sense of tradition and all those words… you help [your art] too easily into existence’ (31 January 1927, L3 321). And a month before she wrote the diary entry in March 1927 in which she started to imagine Orlando, Virginia was reading Vita’s Passenger to Teheran, an account of her journey to Persia in 1926, which the Hogarth Press had published that same year. ‘Vita’s prose is too fluent’, she wrote, ‘Were I writing travels I should wait till some angle emerged: & go for that. The method of writing smooth narrative cant be right; things don’t happen in one’s mind like that’ (12 February 1927, D3 126–7). However, in spite of her scepticism, some of PT would eventually find its way into the description of Orlando’s stay in Turkey.
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But if Vita’s wealth and opulence blunted her creative edge, they gave her licence to rebel in her personal life. The ups and downs of Vita’s romances—she had a scandalous extra-marital affair with Violet Trefusis from 1918 to 1921, and was seldom without a lover after that—sometimes irritated Virginia, but they gave her a language for her own flirtation with Vita: she told Jacques Raverat in 1925 that she planned to ‘incite my lady to elope with me next’ (24 January 1925, L 3 156). In the spring and summer of 1927, as she mused on Orlando, Virginia was preparing to rebel in her own way, with words. Alongside her disdain for Vita’s unadventurous prose, she was becoming increasingly frustrated by the conventions of her favourite literary forms, the novel and the biography. When Vita came back from Persia in May 1927, Virginia took her to Oxford for an overnight trip—‘Let us hope for nightingales, moons, and love’ she wrote to her sister Vanessa Bell (15 May 1927, L 3 377)—when she gave a lecture (later published as ‘Poetry, Fiction and the Future’) to the Oxford University English Club. As usual, Virginia was fascinated by Vita’s aristocratic arrogance: Vita pulled down her stockings in public to apply some ointment that would protect her against insect bites, picked all the lemon cream out of her tart without eating the crust, and left the college porter an ostentatiously large tip (see VW to VB, 22 May 1927, L 3 380–1).

If Virginia lacked Vita’s social daring, she was quite capable of intellectual boldness. Describing the novel of the future to her young, ‘callow’ audience (VW to VB, 22 May 1927, L 3 380–1), she anticipates Orlando almost exactly:

It will give, as poetry does, the outline rather than the detail. It will make little use of the marvellous fact-recording power, which is one of the attributes of fiction. […] For under the dominion of the novel we […] have come to forget that a large and important part of life consists in our emotions toward such things as roses and nightingales, the dawn, the sunset, life, death and fate; we forget that we spend much time sleeping, dreaming, thinking, reading, alone; […] we long sometimes to escape from the incessant, the remorseless analysis of falling into love and falling out of love […]. We long for some more impersonal relationship. We long for ideas, for dreams, for imaginations, for poetry. (‘Poetry, Fiction and the Future’, 1927, E 4 435–6)

Inspired by Vita’s social fearlessness, dismayed by her literary conformity, Virginia started to look for her own ways to challenge tradition. In June she
read a review copy of Harold Nicolson’s experimental volume of brief biographies, *Some People*, and was enchanted by it (VW to HN, 15 June 1927, L3 392). It occurred to her that she could try to write a book that was simultaneously novel, poem and biography.

But first she had to deal with her own insecurities. Although her letters to Vita during the summer of 1927 were more insistently flirtatious than ever, doubts were starting to creep in. When in June Vita did not respond to a telegram Virginia sent her saying ‘Come then’ after Vita told her about a fantasy of throwing stones at her window and spending the night secretly in her bed, Virginia commented robustly but a little sadly: ‘a good thing too I daresay as I am elderly and valetudinarian’ (she was ten years older than Vita) (VW to VSW, 14 June 1927, L3 391). She was jealous and scornful of Vita’s literary success when, later in the same month, Vita won the Hawthornden Prize for her long poem *The Land*. With praise for the poem all over the press, Virginia, ‘with some relics of jealousy, or it may be of critical sense’, couldn’t ‘quite take the talk of poetry & even great poetry seriously’ (23 June 1927, D3 141). Vita dealt her an even sharper blow at the end of June when she spent a night with Mary Hutchinson (see EN 6:14.1), who was also entangled in a long and stormy affair with Virginia’s brother-in-law Clive Bell (Glendinning 178). When Vita confessed to Virginia during a weekend at Long Barn, Vita’s home in Kent, in early July 1927, Virginia felt both hurt and scornful: ‘Bad, wicked beast! […] You only be a careful dolphin in your gambolling, or you’ll find Virginia’s soft crevices lined with hooks’ (VW to VSW, 4 July 1927, L3 395). A few weeks later she threatened: ‘By God, at 3 this morning I’ll ring you up. Noodles [butler], or whatever his name is, will catch you in the act’ (VW to VSW, 24 July 1927, L3 402). But the encounter with Mary Hutchinson seems not to have been repeated, and Dorothy Wellesley remained for the moment firmly ensconced as Vita’s primary companion. Virginia tried to weaken that attachment as well, by agreeing to publish the Hogarth Living Poets series, edited and funded by Dorothy Wellesley. She told Vita: ‘Lady G. Wellesley has bought me. […] however, I wont belong to the two of you, or to the one of you, if the two of us belong to the one. In short, if Dotty’s yours, I’m not’ (2 September 1927, L3 415). But her threats went unheeded, and Vita continued to spend time with Dorothy.
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As the summer wore on and autumn began, Virginia threw herself into work, reading and writing furiously as ideas for ‘The Jessamy Brides’ continued to percolate in her mind. She signed an agreement with the New York Herald Tribune to produce a series of weekly reviews in September and October, and then cursed that she had to ‘drive my pen through one article after another—Hemingway, Morgan, Shelley; & now Biography’ (20 September 1927, D3 157–8). In reaction to this drudgery, her ideas about ‘The Jessamy Brides’ became more ambitious and more concrete. ‘One of these days, though, I shall sketch here, like a grand historical picture, the outlines of all my friends. […] It might be a way of writing the memoirs of one’s own times during peoples lifetimes. It might be a most amusing book. The question is how to do it. Vita should be Orlando, a young nobleman. There should be Lytton [Strachey]. & it should be truthful; but fantastic’ (20 September 1927, D3 156–7). This diary entry is the first time that the name ‘Orlando’ surfaces. The ‘pairs of women’ around whom the original idea was built (see above, p. xxxix) have been replaced by men. Virginia’s mind turned to her gay friend, Lytton Strachey (see EN 6:23.1), and to a fantasy about Vita as a man. It is tempting to interpret the choice of name as a reference to several texts in which cross-dressing is central, that is Shakespeare’s As You Like It and Ariosto’s Orlando Furioso (see EN 13:3), but it may also have been a veiled and ambivalent tribute to the poem that Woolf so disliked, Vita’s prize-winning The Land (see EN 72:3).

If Virginia’s jealousy of Vita’s winning the Hawthornden Prize made its way into the name of her new novel’s central character, this only set the tone for what was to come. In early September Vita started a passionate new romance with the dashing Mary Campbell, who quickly moved into one of the outlying cottages at Long Barn with her husband, the South African poet Roy Campbell (Glendinning 179). Vita’s new amour coincided neatly with the end of Virginia’s commitment to the New York Herald Tribune and the sudden crystallising of her plans for Orlando on 5 October: ‘a biography beginning in the year 1500 & continuing to the present day, called Orlando: Vita; only with a change about from one sex to another’ (5 October 1927, D3 161). In a state of excitement, Virginia summoned Vita to tea the next day to tell her about the new book (VW to VSW, 6 October 1927, L3 427), and was treated in return to the news about Mary. Immediately Orlando became a weapon in Virginia’s hands.
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The idea of a book whose central character lived for several centuries may not, originally, have been Virginia’s. In 1921, Princess Marie Louise, King George V’s cousin, commissioned architect Sir Edwin Lutyens, a close friend of Vita’s mother, to design a dolls’ house for her childhood friend Queen Mary. The house was to include not just furnishings – all perfectly to scale – but also ornaments, kitchen utensils, newspapers, and books; 170 writers were persuaded to write stories that were then bound as miniature books and placed in the dolls’ house library. The dolls’ house was first displayed at the Empire Exhibition in Wembley in 1924, and in July 1925 it was moved to Windsor Castle (Royal Collection Trust Online).

Vita was one of the 170 writers invited to contribute a book to the dolls’ house library. The list of other authors reads like a who’s who of the British literary establishment: John Buchan; G. K. Chesterton; Joseph Conrad; John Galsworthy; Thomas Hardy; and Somerset Maugham, among others – but not Virginia Woolf, who was as yet the author of only two relatively obscure novels. Vita, however, was by the early 1920s a well-known writer who had recently been invited to become a member of the PEN Club. Her mother’s relationship with Lutyens may also have been a factor in her involvement in creating the library for the dolls’ house.

Vita may well have been working on – or have recently finished – her tiny book when she first met Virginia in 1922. There is no record of their ever having discussed it, but Vita’s little book – entitled A Note of Explanation – bears an uncanny resemblance to Orlando. The book purports to explain why, every morning, the ‘guardians’ of the dolls’ house find the house in disarray: ‘the lights turned on, the baths full, the beds disarranged, the blinds raised’ (Sackville-West, V. 2017: 38). It turns out that the house is inhabited by the ghost of a woman who, like Orlando, has survived for centuries, only to arrive in London in 1924 ‘to establish herself in the doll’s house that had been built for the Queen of England’ (Sackville-West, V. 2017: 22). A Note of Explanation devotes a number of paragraphs to descriptions of the ghost’s exploits in the land (and the time) of fairy tales: she was present ‘when the Prince kissed the Sleeping Beauty’, for example (Sackville-West, V. 2017: 20). The ghost, we are told, also heard the tales of Scheherazade, and visited China to hear the Emperor’s nightingale (Sackville-West, V. 2017: 24, 26). When she arrives in the dolls’ house, she is disconcerted – just like Orlando in Virginia’s book – by the amenities of modern life: ‘she found in the doll’s house a great many things
she had never seen before and whose use she was obliged to discover for herself’ (Sackville-West, V. 2017: 31). Both A Note of Explanation and Orlando list among those mysterious amenities passenger lifts, electric light and hot-water systems (see EN 271:11, 271:28, 273:5). It is tempting to wonder whether, as well as telling Virginia about her miniature book, Vita may also have shown her the manuscript. If so, perhaps the ghost of Queen Mary’s dolls’ house is partly responsible for the development of the book that became Orlando.

Virginia started writing on 8 October, sketching in some brief notes on the verso of the opening page. Some of them are clearly ideas for Orlando; others anticipate The Waves.

Suggestions for short pieces.

A Biography
This is to tell a persons life from the year 1500 to 1928. Changing its sex.

taking different aspects of the character in different Centuries. the theory being that character goes on underground before we are born; & leave leaves something afterwards [sic] also.

A. poem
Something about an island. landscape.
dream. people with canoes. the trees.

Moments of Being.
Something Comic. (OHD 2)

She seems to have started writing immediately after making these notes. Two weeks later she reflected on the speed and energy with which she had begun the book:

Talk of planning a book, or waiting for an idea! This one came in a rush; I said to pacify myself, being bored & stale with criticism & faced with that intolerable dull Fiction, “You shall write a page of a story for a treat: you shall stop sharp at 11:30 & then go on with the Romantics”. I had very little idea what the story was to be about. But the relief of turning my mind that way about was such that I felt happier than for months; as if put in the sun, or laid on cushions; & after two days entirely gave up my time chart & abandoned myself to the pure delight of this farce: which I enjoy as much as I’ve ever enjoyed anything. (22 October 1927, D3 161–2)
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For a while, the book took over her writing life. Her usual routine – to write in longhand, and then type up what she had written – was disrupted by the speed with which the words poured onto the paper. On 20 November, she wrote: ‘this is our happiest autumn. […] My morning rushes, pell mell, from 10 to 1. I write so quick I can’t get it typed before lunch’ (20 November 1927, D3 164; emphasis in original). In only three weeks, Virginia drafted the first chapter of Orlando and was well into the second. She assumed she would have finished the book by Christmas, and would then return to the book of literary criticism, Phases of Fiction (‘that intolerable dull fiction’), which she had reluctantly been working on for two years already.7

Part of the intensity and the joy with which she approached Orlando was bound up with her continuing fascination with Vita, and her desire to reinvigorate her erotic connection with her in spite of Vita’s entanglement with Mary Campbell. Virginia peppered Vita with questions, veiled threats and flirtatious appeals. Virginia picked up Knole and the Sackvilles again – given to her by Vita only a few days after their first meeting – and read it avidly, mining it for her own book, in which it is frequently quoted verbatim (VW to VSW, 9 October 1927, L3 428). Telling Vita that she could no longer write her love letters now that their intimacy had been invaded by Mary, she transferred all her excitement into Orlando:

But listen; suppose Orlando turns out to be Vita; and its all about you and the lusts of your flesh and the lure of your mind (heart you have none, who go gallivanting down the lanes with Campbell) […] Shall you mind? Say yes, or No: Your excellence as a subject arises largely from your noble birth. (But what’s 400 years of nobility, all the same?) and the opportunity thus given for florid descriptive passages in great abundance. Also, I admit, I should like to untwine and twist again some very odd, incongruous strands in you: going at length into the question of Campbell; and also, as I told you, it sprung upon me how I could revolutionise biography in a night: and so if agreeable to you I would like to toss this up in the air and see what happens. (VW to VSW, 9 October 1927, L3 428–9)

Vita was unperturbed by Virginia’s plans, and eagerly offered herself up for dissection:

My God, Virginia, if ever I was thrilled and terrified it is at the prospect of being projected into the shape of Orlando. What fun for you; what fun for me. You see,
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any vengeance that you ever want to take will lie ready to your hand. […] I think that having drawn and quartered me, unwound and retwisted me, or whatever it is that you intend to do, you ought to dedicate it to your victim. (11 October 1927, LVSW 238)

Armed by her need to do research, Virginia became more and more insistent in her questioning and her requests for meetings, and Vita, half-flattered and half-apprehensive, obliged. In late October, they went together to Knole to choose illustrations for Orlando from the many portraits of Vita’s ancestors that hung on the walls there (L3 434 n). Virginia also demanded that Vita give her some of the photos taken by Lenare when she won the Hawthornden Prize, and that she sit for a photographic session with Vanessa Bell (VW to VSW, 30 October 1927, L3 434; VW to VSW, 11 November 1927, L3 435). Virginia wanted to see her ‘in the lamplight, in your emeralds’. She wanted to know if it was really true that Vita ground her teeth at night. She demanded details of Vita’s quarrels with Violet Trefusis. And all the time she was painfully aware that the increased intensity of their relationship perhaps betrayed only her own ‘melancholy […] and desire to […] keep you half an instant longer’ (VW to VSW, 13 [14] October 1927, L3 430). To cap it all, Harold Nicolson was posted to Berlin in October, which meant that Vita would certainly be travelling again soon (D3 163 n).

But Harold Nicolson was an inspiration too. In June 1927, he sent Virginia an early copy of his collection of biographical essays, Some People. Virginia, always fascinated by biographies, loved the book. ‘I must scribble a line in haste to say how absolutely delightful I think it—how I laughed out loud to myself again and again’ (VW to HN, 15 June 1927, L3 392). Some People was an unusual book. As Nicolson wrote, ‘many of the following sketches are purely imaginary. Such truths as they may contain are only half-truths’ (Nicolson 1927: vi). Virginia, always to some extent in thrall to her father’s generation and the weighty tomes of the Dictionary of National Biography that he had edited for so many years, was enchanted by Nicolson’s wilful dismissal of biographical fact.

Nor was Nicolson alone in trying to reimagine biographical form. Virginia’s friend Lytton Strachey (see EN 6:23.1) – mentioned in one of Woolf’s earliest diary entries about Orlando (20 September 1927, D3 157) – also pioneered in Eminent Victorians (1918) and Queen Victoria (1921) a new
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biographical style, brief, witty and ironic. Virginia read and responded to drafts of the essays in *Eminent Victorians*, critiquing an early version of ‘The End of General Gordon’, the last essay in the volume, for unconvincing characterisation, and ‘putting in a claim for the novel form’ (VW to Lytton Strachey, 28 December 1917, L2 205). But she loved *Queen Victoria*, and was flattered that Strachey dedicated it to her (VW to Lytton Strachey, 25 January 1921, L2 456; 17 April 1921, L2 465). She also gobbled up André Maurois’ readable, romantic biographies of Shelley (1924) and Disraeli (1927), telling Ethel Sands that she could not ‘swallow quick enough Ariel [the biography of Shelley] by your friend Maurois […] It amuses me infinitely more than all the works of Leo Myers, Percy Lubbock, Arnold Bennett and Virginia Woolf’ (VW to Ethel Sands, 24 April 1924, L3 101). Three years later, she borrowed *Disraeli*, and reported that she ‘enjoyed [it] very much’ (VW to Ethel Sands, 2 September 1927, L3 417). By the time she read *Some People*, Virginia was ripe to perform a biographical experiment of her own.

Virginia’s review of *Some People*, ‘The New Biography’, appeared at the end of October 1927 in the *New York Herald Tribune*. In it, Virginia wrote her own history of the form she had loved since childhood. Opening the essay with a quotation from Sidney Lee, who succeeded her father as editor of the *Dictionary of National Biography*, Virginia immediately positions herself as the defender of a new understanding of biographical truth, one that rejects the ‘dull[ness]’ and ‘unreadabl[ility]’ of the biographies of her father’s generation and their Edwardian successors. Contrasting ‘truth’ with ‘personality’, she noted that ‘in order that the light of personality may shine through, facts must be manipulated; some must be brightened; others shaded’ (‘The Art of Biography’, 1927, E4 473). James Boswell’s *The Life of Samuel Johnson* challenged the dominance of a biographical style that focused on ‘a series of exploits’, but Victorian and early Edwardian biographers managed to deaden once again ‘the personality which Boswell’s genius set free’ (E4 474). In biographies of figures such as Hallam Tennyson’s *Life of Alfred Tennyson* (1897) and John Morley’s *Life of Gladstone* (1903), she complained, ‘we go seeking disconsolately for voice or laughter, for curse or anger, for any trace that this fossil was once a living man’ (E4 475). Nineteenth-century biography, like so much else from her parents’ generation, was excoriated for its conventionality, its hypocrisy and its pomposity.
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However, as so often, Virginia heralds the dawn of a new age of biography in the work of her friends and contemporaries. Works by both Strachey and Maurois are mentioned as examples of a new, slimmed-down, more egalitarian style. The author of the ‘new biography’, Virginia commented approvingly, ‘is no longer the serious and sympathetic companion, toiling even slavishly in the footsteps of his hero. Whether friend or enemy, admiring or critical, he is an equal. [...] He has become an artist’ (E4 475). She celebrates the way that Nicolson’s ironic style extends even to himself as biographer: ‘He lies in wait for his own absurdities’ (E4 477). The new biography has not yet fully evolved: she cannot name ‘the biographer whose art is subtle and bold enough to present that queer amalgamation of dream and reality, that perpetual marriage of granite and rainbow. His method still remains to be discovered’ (E4 478). But she thought she saw in the pages of Some People the emergence of a new genre; and in Orlando, she picked up on all the best qualities of Some People – the mockery of the biographer, the blend of fiction and fact, the laughter – in an attempt to ‘revolutionise’ a form that was already well on its way to a profound transformation. As she worked on the novel, Nicolson’s book and her essay lingered in her mind, with metaphors straying across from one to the other. ‘Nature’, she wrote, ‘has played so many queer tricks upon us, making us so unequally of clay and diamonds, of rainbow and granite’ (72). In Orlando, she tried to write the ‘new biography’ that her review of Some People so eagerly anticipated. A preface with acknowledgements, illustrations and an index, all evoked even as they parodied the typical Victorian biography. Readers were invited to speculate about the factual foundations of the text, while delighting in its mockery of the genre after which it was named (Orlando: A Biography).

As the autumn of 1927 wore on, Virginia watched with some satisfaction as Vita’s relationship with Mary Campbell became increasingly tumultuous. On 6 November, Mary’s husband Roy found out about the affair, drew a knife on Mary and threatened her with divorce (VSW to HN, 10 November 1927, V&H 187). The ensuing drama lasted for weeks. When Vita confided in Virginia, Virginia was disdainful, noting in her diary that she told Vita she was making a boring muddle of her life, and reduced her to tears (20 November 1927, D3 165). Writing to Virginia the next morning, Vita was humble and self-critical: ‘I felt suddenly that the
whole of my life was a failure, in so far as I seemed incapable of creating one single perfect relationship [...] My darling, I'm grateful to you; you were quite right to say what you did; it has given me a pull-up; I drift too easily (11 November 1927, LVSW 242). Virginia, feeling her power at last, was gracious but continued to drive the knife in: 'you can't help attracting the flounders—Nor you can; and its not your fault, or only partly. And I'm half, or 10th, part, jealous, when I see you with the Valeries and the Marys: so you can discount that. [...] I'm happy to think you do care: for often I seem old, fretful, querulous, difficult (tho' charming) and begin to doubt' (VW to VSW, 11 November 1927, L3 435).

In spite—or perhaps because—of the tensions between them, Virginia felt comforted as she always had by Vita’s presence, telling her after a visit in late November that it was ‘odd that, driven and hunted as you are, you should yet be to me like a sunny patch on a hot bank’ (22 November 1927, L3 440). In the meantime, she went exultantly on with Orlando, which she had begun to see as ‘[t]oo much of a joke’ (20 November 1927, D3 164). By December she was drafting the final pages of what became Chapter 4, when Orlando meets Nell and goes back to her room with her (197–201).

Even though she had to give up on her plan to finish by February, she was excited at this stage about what she had done, and thought of the book as a huge canvas: 'I want to write it all over hastily, & so keep unity of tone, which in this book is very important. It has to be half laughing, half serious: with great splashes of exaggeration’ (20 December 1927, D3 167–8).

There was less laughter in the second part of the book than Virginia had planned. Looking back several months later, as she prepared to send the final typescript to the printer, she noted: ‘The truth is I expect I began it as a joke, & went on with it seriously’ (31 May 1928, D3 185). The first three months of 1928 were unexpectedly sombre, especially for Vita, and some of her sorrow seeped into the pages of Orlando, muting its high spirits. In early January, Vita’s father, Lord Sackville, who was only sixty-one, fell ill with influenza, which developed into pericarditis. Vita was distraught, not only because she loved her father—who was separated from her erratic mother, and living with his companion Olive Rubens at Knole—but also because losing him meant losing Knole—‘the passion of her life’, as Virginia told her sister—to an uncle (VW to VB, 29 January 1928, L3 451).

As a woman, Vita could not inherit. All through January, as Lord
Sackville’s state of health improved and then worsened again, Virginia kept up a steady stream of tender, loving letters to Vita. The teasing and the demands of the past few months were put aside. Virginia wrote only of Vita and what she was going through. ‘I am your entirely devoted but helpless and useless creature’, she told her, and offered to come and visit ‘any afternoon’ (22 January 1928, L3 449): ‘I wish, I wish I could do anything, but the only thing I can do is to be your loving creature Virginia, which I am’ (27 January 1928, L3 449). Other losses saddened Virginia also. Thomas Hardy died on 11 January, and she went to his funeral a few days later, where she pondered the revisions she would have to make to a tribute she had started to write seven years earlier (17 January 1928, D3 174). When Vita’s father finally died on 28 January, Virginia wrote not only to Vita – ‘This is only to send you my love.—You don’t know how much I care for you’ (29 January 1928, L3 450) – but also to Harold, asking if there was anything she could do (29 January 1928, L3 450). In the aftermath of Lord Sackville’s death in February, while Vita resumed her affair with Mary Campbell, Virginia struggled with feelings of futility and intermittent bouts of illness, and found herself ‘hacking listlessly’ at the last chapter of Orlando. ‘Always always the last chapter slips out of my hands’, she wrote in her diary in the middle of February, ‘One gets bored. One whips oneself up. I still hope for a fresh wind, & don’t very much bother, except that I miss the fun, which was so tremendously lively all October, November & December. I have my doubts if it is not empty; & too fantastic to write at such length’ (11 February 1928, D3 175).

Still, she worked on. In spite of Mary’s presence, she saw Vita regularly at Long Barn and in London, and was fascinated and horrified by Vita’s stories of her mother’s behaviour. Lady Sackville, who was living a reclusive and eccentric life in a chilly house on the edge of Brighton, had never forgiven her husband for taking up with Olive Rubens, and was determined to obstruct the execution of his will. Virginia told her sister that Lady Sackville ‘has done her best to upset everything, has insulted Vita, made off with Marie Antoinette’s diamond necklace, won’t answer lawyers letters, and holds up the whole will—But Vita has twenty dogs, some with lice, others pregnant, and seems more or less composed’ (11 February 1928, L3 457). Vita escaped to Berlin to see Harold for a month in late February, but she hated Germany, and to console herself, she started another romance, this time with an American literary agent called Margaret...
Voigt. Virginia, apparently unaware of Vita’s new love interest, struggled with the final pages of *Orlando* and wrote suggestive letters to Vita: ‘Why lecture the Danes on poetry when you might give Virginia (who is worth all Copenhagen) a practical demonstration in the art of love? […] I feel like a moth, with heavy scarlet eyes and a soft cape of down—a moth about to settle in a sweet, bush—Would it were—ah but thats improper’ (6 March 1928, L3 468–9). The flirtatiousness that Virginia had partly diverted to *Orlando* when Vita took up with Mary Campbell had returned to their correspondence, and the waning of her interest in *Orlando* is perhaps linked to the return of her erotic confidence in her letters.

On 17 March, while Vita was still in Berlin, Virginia finally wrote the last word of the first draft of *Orlando*, just a few days before she and Leonard were due to leave for a month’s holiday in France with her sister. She was relieved, but felt that the manuscript still needed an enormous amount of work. ‘Orlando was finished yesterday as the clock struck one’, she wrote in her diary, ‘Anyhow the canvas is covered. There will be three months of close work needed, impevratively, before it can be printed; for I have scrambled & splashed, & the canvas shows through in a thousand places. But it is a serene, accomplished feeling, to write, even provisionally, The End’ (18 March 1928, D3 176–7). She was less serene and even aggressive in a letter to Vita announcing her accomplishment:

Did you feel a sort of tug, as if your neck was being broken on Saturday last [17 March] at 5 minutes to one? That was when he died—or rather stopped talking, with three little dots… Now every word will have to be re-written, and I see no chance of finishing it by September—It is all over the place, incoherent, intolerable, impossible—And I am sick of it. (20 March 1928, L3 474)

It was a relief when she and Leonard boarded the boat for France and she could leave *Orlando* behind for a while. While she was away, Vita returned to England. Margaret Voigt saw her off at the station in Berlin, and Mary Campbell met her in London. Two weeks later, Virginia and Leonard returned, just in time to arrange for Margaret Voigt to spend an extended visit to London in Vanessa Bell’s unoccupied flat. By now Virginia knew what was going on between Margaret and Vita, and she told Vita ‘how vulgar, pushing, crude, coarse, American, I thought her voice—This is one of the effects of jealousy’. She asked if she and Leonard could stop in at
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Long Barn to take photos of Vita for *Orlando*, but only if she could be sure of avoiding ‘that voice inside a woman’ (27 April 1928, *L* 3 488).

It took Virginia Woolf only six weeks to revise *Orlando*. She had been typing the first draft as she went along, writing in the morning and then typing up what she had written during the afternoons. Now she returned to the initial typescript, made extensive revisions to it, and re-typed it. (Neither typescript has survived.) All the joy of the first few months was gone, replaced by feelings of obligation and drudgery. She told Vanessa Bell a few days after her return from France that she had spent ‘an hour or two at *Orlando*, which is wretched, and must be entirely re-written in one month’ (19 April 1928, *L* 3 485); she told herself on 21 April that the novel was ‘damned rough’ (*D* 3 180), and noted a few days later that she needed to type ‘10 pages daily till June 1st. Well, I like being an ass on a mill round’ (24 April 1928, *D* 3 182).

The changes she made were fairly substantial, despite her apparent lack of enthusiasm. The version of the novel that Leonard Woolf sent to the printers on 1 June 1928 was significantly more fanciful, stylised and ‘literary’ than the manuscript version, and Virginia Woolf continued to revise the text even at proof stage. The early sections and the last pages of the book were the most heavily revised, as if she had difficulty entering and leaving the text. She re-thought the structure too, breaking the manuscript up into six instead of four chapters in order to emphasise Orlando’s change of sex and her marriage, which in the revised version appear at the ends of chapters, instead of in the middle.11 Once she had introduced additional chapters, she decided to get rid of the section breaks that punctuated the manuscript version, so that the published novel is less broken up and more rhapsodic.

In making these and other changes, Woolf moved *Orlando* a little further away from biography and a little nearer to being a novel. She was already experimenting with her style in the manuscript, for example in the long passage towards the end of the book, when Orlando is driving through traffic from London to Kent. But in the published version, the passage is much more elliptical and much closer to what we now recognise as ‘stream of consciousness’, tracking Orlando’s thoughts and playing on the idea of multiple selves (284–5). In keeping with the more fantastic and surrealist character of the final book, throughout the novel many of the specific references in the manuscript to the Sackville family, dates for particular
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events, allusions to actual people and places, and descriptive detail about historical settings were removed. For example, in the excerpt from John Fenner Brigge’s (fictional) account of Orlando’s investiture in Constantinople, the manuscript notes that ‘English ladies & gentlemen of the highest rank were took part in represented the Masque of Comus by our +renowned+ English poet . . . . Milton’ (OHD 102). Brigge goes on to remark that ‘there were to be seen the fairest in the land, the bearers of some of +the+ our greatest names, in England, such as Howard, Stanley, Herbert, Sackville, Talbot’ (OHD 102). The published version says only: ‘we could see a tableau vivant or theatrical display in which English ladies and gentlemen repres...ented a masque the work of one . . . . The words were inaudible’ (118). Anticipating scenes such as the inaudible chorus of the villagers at the pageant in Between the Acts, Woolf opted here for satire and mystery over spoof historical accuracy.

Historical details about Sackville-West’s ancestors, the Sackvilles, are also much rarer in the published novel, as Charles G. Hoffmann has shown. It is as if Woolf decided to protect Sackville-West by loosening the text’s ties to her biography, and encouraging readers to use their imaginations. For example, on the fourth page of the manuscript, Woolf introduces ‘Lady Anne’ Clifford, third Countess of Dorset, who lived at Knole from 1609–24 and whose diary Vita edited in 1923, coming out with her dogs, & her pet monkey to feed the peacocks & to cut the roses back (OHD 4). In the published novel, the details are reduced and the lady has become simply ‘his [Orlando’s] mother’ (15). Likewise, a few pages into Chapter 5, Woolf cut several pages that included specific and lengthy quotations from works by Sackville-West’s ancestors, including seven lines from the ‘Induction’ from the Mirror for Magistrates by Thomas Sackville, Lord Buckhurst and 1st Earl of Dorset (1536–1608); two stanzas from a ‘Song’ and a few lines from ‘The Countess of Dorchester’ by Charles Sackville (1636/7–1706), 6th Earl of Dorset and Earl of Middlesex (also quoted in Knole and the Sackvilles); and several lines from Sackville-West’s prize-winning poem The Land (1926), although it is quoted later in the novel (OHD 197).

Woolf also removed from the manuscript some of the more intimate and revealing comments about her lover, especially those that hinted at Sackville-West’s aggressive tendencies. (During the early stages of writing, she asked Vita: ‘Is it, true you love giving pain?’ (13 [14] October 1927, L3, liii
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430). For example, in the first pages of the manuscript, Woolf describes Orlando’s jousting with the skull in much more sadistic terms than those that survived into the published novel:

he would strike so violently that the a little bit of the leathery skin would be sliced through; of such rages the battered head bore many tokens: for if Orlando loved, he also hated. […] he was also +[then?]+ tormented with a the desire to +hurt;+ give things pain; Even +a [this?]+ inanimate things; like the Moors skull. +to see it suffer;+ (OHD 4)

Later in the draft, Woolf listed Orlando’s qualities: ‘all the turbulence of his youth, his sense of unfitness & discomfort, his boredom, his violence, his long walks, & lon meditations – all his sense of unlikeness to his friends’ (OHD 64). But she removed the references to feelings of not belonging and to violence before the novel was published. The revised version reads: ‘the turbulence of his youth, his clumsiness, his blushes, his long walks, and his love of the country proved that he himself belonged to the sacred race [poets] rather than to the noble’ (77).

However, even as she cut the more indiscreet comments, she added remarks (‘his clumsiness’) that make it even clearer to those in the know that Orlando is Vita: Nigel Nicolson, Vita’s son, noted in a marked-up copy of the novel that Vita was known for being a trifle clumsy (O1992 319; see EN 17.4). Woolf also included the Sackville-West family motto, ‘Jour de ma vie’, in the description of Orlando’s elopement plans (he whispers it in Sasha’s ear as a signal that they will leave that night) in the published novel, but not in the manuscript (53, see EN 53:30); and, even more daringly, Sackville-West’s own elopement with Violet Trefusis is alluded to in the published text, but not in the draft. In February 1920, Harold Nicolson and Denys Trefusis had arrived together by aeroplane in Amiens in northern France to bring their errant wives home, stimulating a great deal of gossip and rumour (see EN 46:22, 300:17). This episode entered Orlando some time after the first draft was finished: ‘there were many stories told at that time, as, that she […] fled with a certain lady to the Low Countries where the lady’s husband followed them’ (202–3). It is as if in her revisions, Woolf removed many identifying features so that she could be even more revealing about her subject, within the bounds of a certain decorum that is, of course, gleefully mocked in the novel itself.

liv
The most intimate revelation in the novel – Orlando’s change of sex – was camouflaged not only by the reduction in explicit references to Sackville-West (whose picture did, after all, still appear three times in its pages), but by its entirely fantastic nature. There was a certain daring to Woolf’s plans for the novel even before she decided to base it explicitly on the life of her own lover. As we have seen, in the very first mention of Orlando in her diary in March 1927, she listed ‘Sapphism’ among the topics it would explore, and in July 1927 she wrote a ‘little Sapphist story’ (VW to VSW, 13 [14] October 1927, L3 431), ‘Slater’s Pins Have No Points’ (1928; CSF 215–20) that ends with a kiss between two women. But it was not until, in October, she came up with the idea of writing about Sackville-West and including a change of sex, that she was able to actually start writing, as if that was the image she needed to unleash her imagination and to allay her fears about ‘writing the memoirs of one’s own times during peoples lifetimes’ (20 September 1927, D3 157). Orlando’s transformation from a man into a woman allowed Woolf to write about love between women as a surreal flight of fancy, as if it were an accident of circumstance. As she cut out some of the specific references to Sackville-West in the novel, she substantially expanded its reflections on gender, sexuality and lesbianism. The lengthy discussion of the relationship between clothes and gender that culminates in the observation that: ‘In every human being a vacillation from one sex to the other takes place’ (173) is much shorter in the manuscript, although its basic premise is the same. Near the end of Chapter 4, when Orlando is living in London, the reader is told: ‘From the probity of breeches she exchanged the seductiveness of petticoats and enjoyed the love of both sexes equally’ (202) – a reference to lesbian activities that is missing from the manuscript.

As Woolf increased the novel’s references to lesbianism, she reduced its satire of men. This was a common pattern in Woolf’s texts: Louise DeSalvo notes, for example, that Woolf toned down the more explicitly feminist and anti-imperialist aspects of The Voyage Out before publication (DeSalvo). In the manuscript of Orlando, Orlando’s thoughts during her journey in the coach with Pope are scathing about women’s duty to men:

Is not the Deity a man? How humble, how grateful, how docile. should I not be therefore? And dare I think even to myself that man is ugly, base, & mean: when I am in every respect so much viler myself. Let it be my joy to serve honour & obey
him, all day, all night; & never ask & only beg that he may continue to think me worthy of his protection. (OHD 164)

Later, in a long passage that was cut completely from the published novel, Orlando is sceptical about the male poets whose tea she pours, and mistrusts their compliments:

Orlando knew perfectly well & it is that the whole never believed a word that these great wits a word that these great men said in praise of her, understanding, & but went on pouring out tea, & scrawled never troubled, after & so kept her heart free, & her head clear for those little sarcastic observations upon the vanity of the other sex which +so+ sweeten the intercourse of men & women +together+ & mitigate its torpors. (OHD 169)

It may be that these ‘spasm[s] of pain’ (AROO 110), as Woolf called them the following year in A Room of One’s Own, were a direct result of some of the reading she was doing during the summer and autumn of 1927, when she was planning and writing Orlando. In June 1927 she was reading and reviewing Margot Asquith’s Lay Sermons for the Nation and Athenaeum, and she found them extremely annoying: ‘Woman haters depress me, & both Tolstoi & Mrs Asquith hate women’ she grumbled in her diary (22 June 1927, D3 140). In the review she wrote simply: ‘Mrs Asquith cannot find anything nice to say about little girls’ (‘The Governess of Downing Street’, 1927, E4 427). In October she reviewed Hemingway, and remarked that: ‘Mr Lawrence, Mr Douglas, and Mr Joyce partly spoil their books for women readers by their display of self-conscious virility; and Mr Hemingway, but much less violently, follows suit’ (‘An Essay in Criticism’, 1927, E4 454). Lord Chesterfield, whose letters to his son she was reviewing in March 1928 while she was revising Orlando (see EN 195:26–30), is also mocked for his chauvinism in the manuscript of Orlando, along with Arnold Bennett, Desmond MacCarthy and Orlo Williams (all these references were removed from the final text).14 Just as Woolf suggested Charlotte Brontë should do, she removed the raw anger of the diary entries and the manuscript from her published essays and from Orlando, but behind the polished jocularity of Orlando’s mockery of men lies a darker and more painful feeling of humiliation at the hands of men – one that resonated, perhaps, with Woolf’s other feelings of humiliation at the hands of Vita Sackville-West.
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As well as removing some of the satire of men from the published version of *Orlando*, Woolf also toned down her mockery of the rich, as Madeline Moore points out (*TCL* 305–6). In the description of the great flood, Woolf allows herself to suggest that there were fewer lives lost among the nobility than among the common people: 'which seemed to show that the upper sort had received warning & made for safety before those great hammer blows of the which Orlando had heard in his misery had rent the ice asunder. The loss of life must have been enormous' (*OHD* 46). The bitterness of this passage becomes gentle triumph in the following passage on the decline of the aristocracy, which was also deleted before publication. Orlando is driving through crowds of people in London in the early years of the twentieth century:

Nor did they pay any attention to the seem in the least aware that Lady Orlando was the lady driving was entitled to two or three coronets, & a coat of arms so criss-crossed with [clustered?] with emblems picked up +on half+ from all the famous battle fields of history. +France & England+ of English history . . . And, what with taxes, & only, nowadays, what with taxes, death duties, [&?] one or two misadventures, & the sale of property for an old song that should have fetched millions, she was no match, in wealth, for many grocers. (*OHD* 266)

In spite of her fascination with Sackville-West’s social and economic power, Woolf was not above noting the rise of the middle class with some satisfaction, at least when her guard was down. But almost none of this resentment and vulnerability is revealed in the published novel.

Instead, Woolf managed the complexities of her own relationship with her subject through self-consciously ironising her own role as a biographer, and the passages in which she reflects, tongue-in-cheek, on her own practice and the practice of the biographer she was pretending to be, are among the most heavily revised in the novel, as if she struggled to get the tone just right. Between manuscript and proofs, she added the long passage near the beginning of the novel about the ‘thousand disagreeables which it is the aim of every good biographer to ignore’ (15), and a few pages into Chapter 2, she inserted (and continued to amend in the proofs) almost an entire page of discussion of the ideal reader of biography, noting that ‘it is for readers such as these that we write’ (68; *APiR* 67). But some comments on the art of biography, especially those mocking the prudishness and self-censorship of conventional biographers, were cut from the
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initial draft: for example, the biographer notes that he cannot reveal what was in the diplomatic boxes that Orlando regularly received in Constantinople: ‘People’s feelings might be hurt’ (OHD 99). The biographer’s self-consciousness about sex and gender is still evident, of course, in the novel, but Woolf seems to have decided not to make it such a focus of attention in the final version, perhaps because she herself started to think twice about disclosing some of the things she knew about Vita Sackville-West.

As she shifted the text further from classic biography, Woolf also dramatically reduced the number of explicit discussions of literary style and literary historical periods. Although Orlando in its final form remains a parodic but shrewd account of English literary history, in its manuscript version it was much more specific and devoted much more space to an analysis of the evolution of English literary styles. In general, Orlando’s writing is taken more seriously and given much more extensive attention in the manuscript than in the published book. For example, her writing during the eighteenth century is described in the manuscript as ‘light satires & love poems which took the taste pleased the taste of the town well enough’ (OHD 178), and the biographer notes that: ‘her style, though not in the strict eighteenth century tradition, had improved, or at any rate, altered; was no longer so stiff as it had been, & did very well for such light pieces as a gallant may toss over his ladies garden wall’ (OHD 178). None of this appears in the published text, which scarcely mentions Orlando’s writing during this period. Similarly, some pages later in the manuscript Orlando reflects on her own changing styles: ‘if a poem is put by & taken up & put by again & again +over a number of years something in the very constitution of the+ the style may change’ (OHD 195).

+Orlando+ She was the very same person now as she had been in the reign of Queen Elizabeth; but undoubtedly experiences love, some such as love & treachery, [sea?] her change of sex, her travels, her intercourse with the wits of Queen Anne’s day, had changed her style; let alone those other impalpable but +[but?]+ powerful forces – the chairs & curtains & drains, [f?] linen, hot water; so that when she now read a stanza which she had written in the age of Elizabeth & compared it with one written in the time of Charles the Second she & that with one written in the time of George the Third, she detected a +great tho’ perhaps superficial+ / difference. (OHD 195)

lviii
INTRODUCTION

The manuscript goes on to ponder whether it is Orlando’s different phases of life – the ‘seriousness of boyhood’ and the flippancy of early manhood & womanhood’ (OHD 197) – or ‘the spirit of the age, which one cannot exorcise’ (OHD 197) that is affecting her work. Orlando herself starts to seem like a figure for English literature. But a few pages later, such questions are mocked, along with the literary critics who ask them. Why plain matter of fact should be tossed into metaphor by one age; another: why poetry should turn to prose; why epics should become lyrics; why grief should become merriment; & satire sympathy; [... all this the professors of literature debate do year in year out’ (OHD 202). In the final version of Orlando, Woolf made the references to literary historical change deliberately vague, rather than appear too much like the ‘professors of literature’ whom she had mocked in the early draft of the novel.

She took other steps to conceal her antipathy to the literary establishment in the final version, perhaps partly out of respect for Sackville-West. For example, she deleted a long satirical description of the Burdett-Coutts Memorial Prize, which is mentioned only in passing in the final pages of the novel (284; see EN 284:24), but which is ridiculed in the manuscript. It is Sir Nicholas Greene’s idea to submit ‘The Oak Tree’ for the prize, when he takes the manuscript from Orlando in the nineteenth century, and he tells her that the prize was endowed by a cousin of his friend, the Baroness Burdett-Coutts, who died in a shipwreck when she was returning home from Barbados, young and pregnant. The prize honours ‘the poem which should best express the thoughts that a young married woman returning from the Barbadoes & about to bear a child might have cherished before she died’ (OHD 242). As we have seen, Woolf was dismissive when Sackville-West won the Hawthornden Prize for The Land while Woolf was planning Orlando, although the history of the prize bears only scant resemblance to that of the Burdett-Coutts Prize. Woolf went to the presentation ceremony and was scathing about writers, herself included: ‘A horrid show up, I thought: not of the gentry on the platform [... of us all: all of us chattering writers. My word! How insignificant we all looked!’ (18 June 1927, D3 139). In the manuscript, Orlando feels the same way, dubbing the prize a ‘tribute to my impeccable [mediocrity?]’ (OHD 271). After the ceremony, Woolf seems to have tormented Sackville-West: a terse note in her diary states that ‘Vita cried at night’ (18 June 1927, D3
INTRODUCTION

140. So perhaps she toned down the satire in the manuscript—written, of course, months after the event—in part to spare Sackville-West’s feelings.

As if to dignify further Orlando’s status as a writer, in the novel (but not in the manuscript) he is explicitly aligned with Shakespeare—at least as his muse (see EN 20:22). The passage in which Orlando first spots the writer he later assumes to be Shakespeare is significantly expanded in the published version, where he appears, unnamed: ‘a rather fat, rather shabby man’ (20) in the housekeeper’s sitting-room at Knole, rolling his pen between his fingers and at last writing a few lines. The passage describing Orlando returning, after his betrayal by Sasha, to the memory of Shakespeare writing is significantly expanded in the published text: he ‘substituted for the face of the Princess a face of a very different sort. [...] Memory still held before him the image of a shabby man with big, bright eyes’ (73–4). Near the end of the novel, she thinks of him again: ‘Was it old Mr. Baker come to measure the timber?’ she muses. ‘Or was it Sh—p—re?’ (285). In the manuscript, Shakespeare is not mentioned: Orlando simply notes that she has been ‘haunted all my life by that rather fat man’ (OHD 278). Woolf notes in her diary on 24 April 1928 that she ‘was reading Othello last night’, presumably for Orlando, and that she was, ‘As usual, impressed by Shpre.’ (D3 182). Woolf also added a specific discussion of the play Orlando and Sasha watch together in London on the ice: ‘The frenzy of the Moor seemed to him his own frenzy, and when the Moor suffocated the woman in her bed it was Sasha he killed with his own hands’ (53). Act V of the play is explicitly quoted in the published text. In the manuscript, however, Orlando and Sasha watch ‘a masque by one of the popular Elizabethan poets—Jonson, Shakespeare, or another: [...] & full of fine devices, & some very sweet madrigals’ (OHD 38). The increased specificity in the novel dignifies and contextualises Orlando’s jealousy, as well as intensifying the focus on Shakespeare as the embodiment of English writing at its best. Of course, another effect of the increased emphasis on him as Orlando’s inspiration is to marginalise the less well-known writers who are cited in the manuscript, and in this regard at least, the published version of Orlando offers a more conventional account of English letters than the manuscript.

As she always did before the typescript went off to the printer, Virginia finally gave it to Leonard to read. She was distracted while he looked through it, noting in her diary: ‘No I cannot read Proust at the moment’
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(31 May 1928, D3 183). Once Leonard had finished it, she felt as if she had almost no interest in it any more, and she recorded his responses in fits and starts, as if they no longer mattered. I have half forgotten Orlando already, since L. has read it & it has half passed out of my possession. I think it lacks the sort of hammering I should have given it if I had taken longer: is too freakish & unequal. Very brilliant now & then. [...] Not, I think “important” among my works’ (31 May 1928, D3 184). But she did remark that Leonard called it ‘a satire’ and ‘takes Orlando more seriously than I had expected. Thinks it in some ways better than The Lighthouse; about more interesting things, & with more attachment to life, & larger. [...] He says it is very original’ (31 May 1928, D3 184–5). But his compliments do not seem to have given her any particular pleasure. Instead, she immediately started to plan her next projects: ‘some very closely reasoned criticism; book on fiction; an essay of some sort; [...] Something abstract poetic next time—I dont know. I rather like the idea of these Biographies of living people’ (31 May 1928, D3 185). To celebrate, she went off with Vita to have her ears pierced.

PUBLICATION HISTORY

But Orlando was very far from ‘finished’. On 17 May 1928, approximately three and a half weeks from the time Virginia Woolf had begun to type out her final draft of the novel (see D3 182), Leonard Woolf had written to R & R Clark, the Edinburgh printing firm with whom the Hogarth Press had worked since Jacob’s Room in 1922. In his letter, he had advised the printers that he hoped that the typescript of the novel would be ready by 1 June, and estimated that the extent would be between sixty and seventy thousand words with an as yet unspecified number of halftone illustrations.16 His instructions indicated that Orlando should have the same typeface, dimensions and so on as Vita Sackville-West’s Passenger to Teheran, which R & R Clark had printed for the Hogarth Press in September 1926 (which is to say, a demy octavo volume printed in 12 point Caslon Old Face).17 Stressing the urgency of the matter, and in particular with regard to the timetable for American publication (that is, at the beginning of October, which meant that Crosby Gaige and Harcourt, Brace needed a set of proofs as soon as practically possible), Leonard Woolf enquired as to how soon after receipt of the typescript R & R Clark could deliver the page proofs.18 Virginia
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Woolf completed the typescript two weeks later, and on 31 May, when Leonard Woolf had finished reading it, she noted in her diary that it ‘goes to the printer tomorrow’ (D3 183). However, for reasons unknown, on Friday 1 June, Leonard Woolf only sent the opening 179 pages of the typescript; he told R & R Clark that the remainder would be sent on Monday, 4 June, with the preface to follow at a later date. As the extent of the preface was still not determined, he suggested that Roman numerals should be used for the front matter – a contingency which would have allowed R & R Clark to begin setting the pages of the rest of the text without delay (this suggestion was not acted upon: Arabic numerals are used throughout the page proofs). In a postscript Leonard Woolf also informed R & R Clark that they should leave space at the end for an index four pages in extent. Only three of the eight photographs for the illustrations in the novel were sent on 1 June (R & R Clark were asked to remove the original names and other extraneous details below two of these pictures), and while mention was made of a halftone block for the cover, no photograph for this was enclosed. The reason for this delay was that the Press was still in the process of gaining permission from Worthing Art Gallery, the holders of the image rights of the painting being used for the jacket – it took until 19 June for this to be granted. Leonard Woolf did not confirm that R & R Clark had the contract to print and bind Orlando until 16 June, several days after they had finished printing the proofs (see below). In his letter to Clark he also advised them that Orlando should be printed using 80 lb. antique laid paper, and that he would arrange for the Hogarth Press’s preferred manufacturer, the London firm of Spalding and Hodge, to send a sufficient quantity of this paper to Edinburgh. The five other photographs required for the illustrations were sent to R & R Clark on 28 June (one of these also required trimming to remove the identity of the original subject), several days after Woolf had finished correcting the proofs; in his covering letter, Leonard Woolf also finally confirmed the finish and colour for the binding (as supplied by the Manchester-based Winterbottom Book Cloth Company). A reproduction of the jacket for the Hogarth Press first edition can be seen facing p. iv; the origins of the illustrations used in Orlando, and the identities of their original subjects, are explained in the EN (see pp. 305–6, 323–6).

The five sets of proofs requested by Leonard Woolf were printed by R & R Clark between Saturday 9 and Thursday 14 June (details of the
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date-stamps on the proofs are given in the headnote to the TA – see pp. 545–46). It is probable that these proofs were delivered by overnight rail, and that Virginia Woolf began her revisions the following day (Leonard Woolf’s letter had requested a delivery date for the full set of proofs, and there is no indication that R & R Clark dispatched any individual signatures before this was complete). On 17 June, Woolf complained in a letter to Sackville-West, ‘Oh heavens what a bore Orlando is—worse in his death than in his life: I think: I’m so tired of him’ (L3 510). She noted in her diary on 20 June that she was ‘sick of Orlando’; ‘I have corrected the proofs in a week’, she explained, ‘5, 6, or 7 hours a day, writing in this & that meticulously’ (D2 186). Four days later she wrote to Edward Sackville-West: ‘I have been blind and deaf: nothing but proofs do I see; and the entire worthlessness of my own words. I have been correcting for 6 hours daily’ (L3 510). Woolf corrected two sets of proofs: a now lost set of ‘British’ corrected proofs, intended for R & R Clark in Edinburgh; and the surviving set of ‘American’ corrected proofs, which were sent to Harcourt, Brace in New York (Crosby Gaige, the publishers of A1, the US limited edition of the novel, also used these American corrected proofs – see below). Woolf’s usual method of doing this was to correct one set of proofs to begin with (correcting first in pencil, and then in purple ink), and then copy over her corrections onto a second set of proofs (see W2011, lxiii–lxiv). The absence of any documentary evidence (such as a marginal comment, a diary entry or a mention in a letter) means that we cannot know for sure which set of Orlando proofs Woolf worked on first. However, the multiple layers of extensive revisions and re-revisions to the American corrected proofs would seem to make these the more likely candidate (see, for example, TA 28:15, 175:1, 209:28, 259:14.2, 278:30.1, 279:6, where Woolf appears to have tried out a number of different revisions in APrR before settling on a reading that agrees with – or is at least very close to – the ‘final’ reading in B1). But if this was the case, then it appears that when she moved on to correct the British proofs Woolf must have rethought many of her revisions to the American proofs, and either ignored them (see, for example, TA 35:11, 51:21, 58:28, 76:20, 92:6, 122:29) or rejected them in favour of different revisions (see, for example, TA 46:21, 91:16, 112:1, 260:29–261:1, 295:26). Crucially, it seems that Woolf did not go back afterwards and update the first set of proofs she had corrected with the
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new or rethought revisions she had made to the second set, and hence a significant number of the variants between the British and American editions of the novel were introduced at this stage – creating, in essence, two noticeably different texts of Orlando (see ‘Editing Orlando’, below, for the implications of this with regard to the choice of copy text for this present edition).

The extent of Woolf’s corrections to the proofs of Orlando can be gauged from R & R Clark’s invoice (dated 28 July 1928) for the first print run of the novel, which included a charge of £28 3s 6d for alterations – a considerable sum when one considers that their original charge for composing the type was £42 13s 1d. Woolf made numerous punctuation changes in the proofs, a significant number of which appear to have been in the British proofs only (see, for example, TA 41:13–2, 42:16, 42:21, 44:13). There are other, less frequent instances where Woolf changed the punctuation in the American proofs but not the British ones (see, for example, TA 17:27.1, 19:1, 73:22, 89:24), although on occasion her instructions in such matters seem to have been ignored by the American typesetters (see, for example, TA 14:5, 14:6, 64:10), and in other cases the American typesetters made changes to the punctuation when there was no instruction from Woolf to do so (see, for example, TA 23:3, 38:3, 78:23). In addition to the many revisions she made to individual words, phrases and sentences (and often doing so differently in the British and American proofs), Woolf also made several major revisions to the text. These included cutting a whole paragraph in Chapter 2 in which the narrator regrets being unable to recount any of the details of the ‘anecdotes of Shakespeare’ that Orlando and Nick Greene had been discussing, and then admits to having burned, on the grounds of ‘chastity’ and ‘modesty’, Shakespeare’s own account of his sonnets which Greene happened to have on him and gave to Orlando as a keepsake (see AP 83–4, TA 84:20). In Chapter 6, she also drastically cut down several long passages, including one in which Orlando and ‘Lady A.’ go to visit Carlyle in Chelsea and Tennyson in Farringford, and are refused permission to see either (Carlyle was ‘asleep’, Tennyson ‘writing’ – see AP 261, TA 266:10–16); and another where she is in the department store Marshall & Snelgrove’s and catches sight of ‘that tiresome Mrs. Dalloway!’ (see AP 268, TA 273:1–3). These two rewritten passages were both part of signature ‘R’ (AP 257–72), the most heavily revised signature in the corrected proofs. In a letter to Alice Ritchie, who ‘travelled’ books for the
Hogarth Press, and who was one of the first people to read Orlando, Woolf commented: ‘I altered the proofs a little at the end, and tried to do away with one very awkward break. But I daresay I made it worse’ (3 August [1928], L6 522). It seems likely that what Woolf was describing here are her revisions to signature ‘R’ of the proofs. These were so extensive that a replacement signature (AP3) had to be sent to Harcourt, Brace. Printed on 18 July 1928, and received in New York on 22 July, AP3 was stamped ‘THIRD PROOF’ (see AP3 257). The missing ‘second proof’ of Orlando has not survived, but it is likely that this would have been a set of revisions of either the whole novel, or of just the troublesome signature ‘R’, printed by R & R Clark and sent to Woolf for review/correction prior to them printing AP3. Woolf made no corrections to the ‘American’ third proofs, but the existence of four punctuation variants between B1 and AP3/At (see TA 263:27, 270:27, 273:11, 275:17) would seem to indicate that she did make corrections to a now lost ‘British’ set (again, see below for the editorial implications of this). In total, it appears to have taken Woolf about six weeks to correct the proofs of Orlando. A full account of Woolf’s revisions is given in the TA and TN.

On 22 September 1928, nineteen days before her novel was due to be published, Woolf reported in her diary that ‘the news of Orlando is black’:

We may sell a third that we sold of The Lighthouse before publication—Not a shop will buy save in 6es & 12es. They say this is inevitable. No one wants a biography. But it is a novel, says Miss Ritchie. But it is called a biography on the title page, they say. It will have to go to the Biography shelf. I doubt therefore that we shall do more than cover expenses—a high price to pay for the fun of calling it a biography. And I was so sure it was going to be the one popular book! (D3 198)

The first British edition of Orlando (B1) was published by the Hogarth Press on Thursday 11 October 1928, selling for 9s (although Woolf had second thoughts about the price, complaining in her 22 September diary entry that ‘it should be 10/6 or 12/6 not 9/- Lord, lord!’ [D3 198]). The print run at R & R Clark had been 5,082, but only 3,004 copies of the novel were bound at this stage (in plain orange cloth, stamped gold on the spine); the remaining 2,076 copies did not get bound until 24 October. However, Woolf’s fears in the build up to publication proved to be unfounded. ‘The sales are good’, she told Sackville-West on 22 October 1928; ‘We’ve got to reprint’, she added in a postscript (L3 547–8). A second impression of 3,000 copies (B2)
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was printed on 3 November 1928; 1,006 copies of B2 were bound at this time, with a further 1,000 on 5 December, but there is no record of when the final 964 copies of this print run were bound.26 One interesting discovery that was uncovered in our research for this current edition is that two new variants were introduced at this stage: two of the five instances of ‘Pepita’ in the first edition were changed to ‘Lolita’ (see TA 123;10.2 and 155;20). A full collation of B1, B2 and B3 uncovered no further variants in the three editions. The origin of this ‘Lolita’ variant in B2 (retained in B3) is as yet unknown, but it is possible that it might be related to the ‘bitter letter’ about Orlando Woolf received from Vita Sackville-West’s mother (see VW to ESW, 22 October 1928, L3 548–9), and that this (rather than the sales figures) is what Woolf was referring to when she told Sackville-West ‘We’ve got to reprint’ (see EN 123;10 for further discussion of the names Pepita and Lolita, and the possible significations of these two changes in B2 and B3).27 R & R Clark’s journals do not have a record of the invoice for the print run of the third impression (B3), which again ran to 3,000 copies, but they do record that 499 copies of B3 were bound on 20 January 1929. Clark’s journals record a further seven other invoices for binding copies of Orlando, presumably all from the B3 print run: 500 copies on 16 March 1929; 494 on 19 October 1929; three on 8 January 1930; 245 on 21 December 1930; five on 14 April 1931; 250 on 26 February 1932; and 100 on 20 February 1935 (which leaves another 904 copies of B3 unaccounted for).28 On 15 June 1929, when between a third to one half of the print run of B3 had been published (as well as several re-impressions of the American edition of the novel – see below), Woolf noted in her diary that she had ‘made £2,000 out of Orlando’ (D3 232). It seems probable that R & R Clark would have broken up and redistributed the type after printing B3 as on 2 May 1933 Leonard Woolf wrote to two printing firms inviting estimates for a photo offset reprint of Orlando for the Press’s ‘Uniform Edition of the Works of Virginia Woolf’; the contract was awarded to the Bradford firm Percy Lund Humphries, who had premises in Bedford Square, London (see BU 299), and who had provided an estimate for printing 4,000 copies.29 The contract for binding was awarded to the ‘Ship’ Binding Works, of Great Saffron Hill, London, whose estimate was based on a figure of 4,250 copies.30 The final print run for the ‘Uniform’ edition of Orlando ran to 4,270 copies (Kirkpatrick and Clarke 63), and was published on 5 October 1933, selling for 5s. This would be the last edition of Orlando published in the UK during Virginia Woolf’s
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In 1935, Leonard Woolf turned down requests from John Lane (Penguin) and Nelson’s Classics to publish editions of the novel. But *Orlando* did appear as a Penguin paperback in 1942, in a print run of 75,000.

Two American editions of *Orlando* were planned for publication in October 1928: a ‘trade’ edition published by Harcourt, Brace, and which would be typeset in accordance with the set of corrected R & R Clark page proofs sent to New York; and a ‘limited’ edition (AT), which would be printed using Harcourt, Brace’s type, and published by Crosby Gaige of New York. During the summer, there had also been talk of a cheap ‘book club’ edition. Harcourt, Brace had telegrammed the Hogarth Press on 16 June 1928 to inform them that they had suggested to Carl Van Doren, editor of The Literary Guild, that *Orlando* might be a possible addition to the Guild’s list (The Literary Guild was founded in 1927, the year after The Book of the Month Club; both organisations selected, printed and sent out to their subscribers discounted special editions of a title published that month). Carl Van Doren read *Orlando* when he was in London in June/July 1928, and his wife Irita Bradford Van Doren (book editor at the *New York Herald Tribune*) later read a copy of the novel in New York, but in the end this came to nothing, and a ‘Literary Guild’ edition of the novel did not appear. Donald Brace read the whole of *Orlando* for the first time in late June/early July. On 3 July 1928, he wrote to Woolf full of praise for the novel – ‘I feel I must tell you that no more satisfying and moving experience has come my way in a long time. The expectations raised by the first chapter are more than realized by the later ones. What an instrument the language becomes in your hand!’ – and then observed: ‘Such a book is a challenge to a publisher. May a little of what inspired you descend on our unworthy heads!’ (*WSA*, letter 22). Brace received the corrected American proofs, along with some of the photographs, in early July 1928. The revised ‘third’ proofs, the rest of the photographs – with the exception of the photograph used on the dust jacket of the Hogarth edition – and six extra sets of page proofs (presumably for ‘travelling’) arrived in New York by late July. The dust jacket photograph was not required as Donald Brace had anticipated from the outset that there might be problems with booksellers assuming that *Orlando* was a biography, rather than a novel, and he had therefore decided to use a different dust jacket design (Brace’s letter explaining this would not have arrived in London until after R & R Clark...
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had printed the novel, so there would have been no opportunity for the Woolfs to review the dust jacket design for the Hogarth Press edition – see above and $D_3$ 198). The American trade edition of Orlando was published with a dust jacket in a simple ornamental design: the title on the front cover was given as a single word, ‘Orlando’, although the cloth spine and title page still bore the full title, ‘Orlando / A Biography’. There was no dust jacket at all for the American limited edition of Orlando, which also omitted the illustrations and made a number of one-off changes to the text of the novel (see TA, p. 548). Virginia Woolf had consented to Crosby Gaige’s request to omit the illustrations from their limited edition. But the question of whether or not she agreed to such things as the addition of subtitles to the chapter headings is less certain (no evidence has been uncovered to show that Woolf knew that they intended to do this). Orlando was the first of Woolf’s books on which Harcourt, Brace had worked in conjunction with a limited edition publisher, and the process was not without its difficulties. In late July 1928, Leonard Woolf wrote to Donald Brace to query a clause in the contract which stated that Crosby Gaige would be selling several hundred copies in the UK via the London booksellers and publishers Dulau. Donald Brace replied to this in early August, explaining that these copies would still be ‘American’ books, published under the Crosby Gaige imprint; the reason for doing this, he added, was that if the limited edition was either published or placed on sale on the same day in both the UK and US then this ought to be sufficient to secure the UK copyright, prior to the publication of the Hogarth Press edition. It was a familiar scenario: the problem of anticipating or interpreting how a certain situation might or might not affect the copyright of a publication was a regular feature of Donald Brace’s correspondence with Leonard Woolf in the 1920s and 30s. It resurfaced again on 14 September 1928, when Donald Brace had to write to Leonard Woolf to request that he send two copies of the Hogarth Press edition of the novel, this time in order to preserve the US copyright. The intention in early August 1928 had been for the British and American trade editions of the novel to be published simultaneously on 11 October. However, by mid-September Harcourt, Brace had still not received the typeset plates of the novel from Crosby Gaige. Donald Brace was restrained in his explanation of why this was so, but his frustration at the tardiness and inaccuracy of Crosby Gaige’s printing (and the difficulty
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of working with an external designer) was plain to see: he told Leonard Woolf that the US trade edition would now likely be published on 18 October; it was possible, he added, that the limited edition might be published as late as 11 October, the same day as the Hogarth Press edition. In the end, Crosby Gaige’s limited edition was published on Tuesday 2 October 1928. A total of 861 copies had been printed, although only 800 of these went on general sale at the price of $15 (these were all individually numbered, and signed by Woolf). Crosby Gaige also produced a special limited edition, ‘printed on greenpaper and bound in marble boards with black morocco spine letter in gold and with a slip-case’, of which there appear to have been either eleven or fifteen copies (see Kirkpatrick and Clarke 61). It took some time for Woolf to see a copy of this green paper edition, but when she did her verdict was damning. Writing to Edward Sackville-West on 22 October 1928, she apologised for not sending him a copy of the novel sooner: ‘I have been waiting for the American copies to come to send to you what you so rightly demanded—a three guinea copy’, she explained. ‘But they never came’. ‘At last’, she continued, ‘4 weeks late, one miserable specimen, on pale green paper bound like a widows hymn book, has arrived. I dont think you can wish for this; so I’ll wait for the white paper ones, and send you what I trust may be less cadaverous. The Americans have surpassed themselves, in pretention [sic], fuss, and incompetence’ (L3 548–9). The Harcourt, Brace trade edition of Orlando was indeed eventually published on Thursday 18 October 1928. A total of 6,350 copies were printed, and these were sold at the price of $3. A second edition followed in November 1928, and by January 1929 the American sales of Orlando had reached 13,000 (VW to VSW, 8 January 1929; L4 4). Six impressions from the Harcourt, Brace type, 21,300 copies in total, were printed between October 1928 and February 1933; a seventh impression, which appeared under the ‘Harbrace’ imprint, was published on 27 July 1937 (this numbered 2,500 copies, and sold at $1.49 [Kirkpatrick and Clarke 63]). The American Penguin paperback of Orlando was not published until 29 April 1946 (203,175 copies, selling at 25 cents); the next impression from the Harcourt, Brace type (1,500 copies) was published on 24 August 1948 (Kirkpatrick and Clarke 63–4).

Negotiations over the dramatic rights for Orlando continued for much of 1930. In early April, Harcourt, Brace telegraphed Virginia Woolf to alert her that an offer for the dramatic rights was forthcoming. ‘I have just had
a cable from my American publishers’, Woolf wrote to Hugh Walpole several days later, ‘saying that someone wants to make a play of Orlando; and he offers me half profits (also £100 down on the option.) Is this the usual offer?—or ought one to hold out for more? Any advice would be welcome’ (VW to Hugh Walpole, 5 April 1930, L4 154). Ten days later, Woolf wrote to Walpole again: ‘I am being sent a contract by my American playwright and will then if you dont mind ask your advice on details’ (L4 157). The contract was posted in early May. 46 The adaptation of Orlando for the stage was to be undertaken by ‘Mrs. Metcalf’ (her first name is never mentioned) assisted by James Whittaker, although the Woolfs were never in direct contact with them: they dealt instead with the agents Ann Watkins, Inc. of New York. The initial offer had been for $500 for the option to produce the play, subject to Woolf giving her approval to the script – crucially, the sum of $500 would be non-returnable, even if Woolf turned down the script, or if the play was never produced. However, over the following months, attempts were made to make this $500 returnable, and to change other details of the contract (such as adding a clause preventing Woolf from selling the film rights, for instance), and the Woolfs were forced to bring an end to the discussions in mid-September. 47 Nothing also seems to have come of Lydia Lopokova’s ‘illusory’ proposal (as Woolf termed it) ‘to set a scene in Orlando to music and to dance to it behind a microphone at Savoy Hill [B.B.C.]’, an idea which would have required Woolf to ‘rearrange the words to suit music to be written by Constant Lambert’ (VW to Clive Bell, 19 January 1931, L4 279). An extract from ‘the frost and thaw’ section of the novel was, however, broadcast on the BBC on 20 February 1929. 48 And further requests by the BBC to broadcast extracts from the ‘Great Frost’ were made in December 1931, February 1933, December 1935 and November 1940 – in each instance, permission was given by the Hogarth Press, for the payment of an appropriate fee (typically one guinea). 49 The broadcast on 3 December 1940 was recorded as part of the BBC’s contingency planning for wartime emergencies, and in January 1941 they wrote again to the Hogarth Press to ask permission to re-broadcast the extract from Orlando if and when required (again, the Press agreed, for the usual fee). 50 More requests from the BBC to broadcast extracts from Orlando would follow in the years 1943–7 (Reading).
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The first paperback edition of *Orlando* was published in February 1929 by the Leipzig publisher Tauchnitz, as vol. 4866 of their long-running ‘Collection of British and American Authors’ series (another of Woolf’s novels, *Mrs. Dalloway*, was published as no. 4867 in this series). The copy text for this paperback appears to have been either the Hogarth Press second or third impression, since ET retains the substitution of ‘Lolita’ for ‘Pepita’ at 122:10.2 and 153:20 (see TA). ET introduces a further instance of the substitution of ‘Lolita’ for ‘Pepita’ which appears in neither B2 or B3 (see pp. 601, 637). Tauchnitz’s ‘British and American Authors’ paperbacks were ‘Continental Copyright’ editions, ‘Published […] by special arrangement with the authors’ (ET back pages), and came with the warning: ‘Not to be introduced into the British Empire’ (ET front cover). Woolf does not seem to have had any involvement in this ‘Continental’ edition. In January 1930, Woolf became embroiled in the debate surrounding the merits of the forthcoming French translation of *Orlando*. As she explained to E. M. Forster, the French publishers, Stock, ‘are very critical and have turned down several translators, and so far seem to give [Charles] Mauron the preference over others’ (VW to E. M. Forster, 3 January 1930, L4 125). However, she added, ‘a friend of William Plomers whom she met at a party had recently been to a lecture given by Mauron, and from this he had gained the impression [that he talked bad French, had a bad accent, and was not on the strength of the lecture, intelligent]; some Parisian friends of Clive Bell had also remarked how well Mrs Dalloway was translated [by S. David] compared with the Passage [Forster’s *A Passage to India*, translated by Mauron], which they professed to find very bad: but who they were I dont know. Raymond’s [Mortimer] evidence was of the same kind’ (L4 125). ‘Why, I wonder, this hostility to Mauron in Paris?’ she continued, ‘Is it disinterested criticism, or is there some motive behind? I shall tell Stock that I have no views, and will abide by them. From their letter to me, I didn’t realise that they had already commissioned Mauron’ (L4 125). On 14 January 1931 Woolf wrote to Edmund Blunden to thank him for sending what was ‘Possibly part of Charles Mauron’s French translation of *Orlando*’ (L4 278 n. 1); ‘delighted with the improved version’, she told him, ‘which I think I shall let stand’ (L4 278). The translation was published at the end of May 1931 (see VW to VSW, 19 June 1931, L4 345). One week after receiving her copies, Woolf wrote to Jane Bussy to ask: ‘if I sent you, with my love, Orlando in English and French could you tell me if Orlando
by [Charles] Mauron has any relation to Orlando by Woolf?—I’ve heard conflicting reports—not that it much matters. Only 2 passages need be compared and those short ones (L4 347). Bussy’s response was reassuring:

I must say it is amazingly good of you to have ploughed through so much of the translation [of Orlando], and I accept your word as gospel truth. [Charles] Mauron is much blown upon in certain quarters and I was told that any competent French scholar would see through him. As you’re more than competent, I’m greatly relieved by your report, and shall bruit it abroad. (VW to Jane Bussy, 28 June? 1931, L4 349–50)

Soon after this, an extract from Mauron’s translation of the ‘Great Frost’ section of the novel was published in the journal Échanges.51 Five other translations of Orlando were published in Woolf’s lifetime: a Czech translation by Staša Jilovská for Symposium (Prague 1929); a German translation by Karl Lebs for Insel-Verlag (Leipzig 1929); a Japanese translation by Masanobu Oba for Shunyodo (Tokyo 1932); an Italian translation by Alessandra Scalerò for Mondadori (Milan 1933); and a Spanish translation by Jorge Luis Borges for Editorial Sudamericana (Buenos Aires 1937). The 1933 Italian translation of Orlando was notable for including the illustrations (Villa 219); these were printed from the original halftone blocks, which were sent to Milan by R & R Clark on 8 June 1933.52 Orlando was also the first of Woolf’s books to be translated into Spanish (a version of the ‘Time Passes’ section of To the Lighthouse had appeared in 1931), and Borges’s 1937 translation of the novel is frequently credited with having a significant role in the emergence of Latin American ‘magic realism’: Gabriel García Márquez, for instance, has cited Borges’s Orlando as ‘a major influence on his work’ (DeWald 246–7).

EARLY CRITICAL RECESSION

Orlando was published just before one of the most controversial cases of literary ‘obscenity’ England had ever seen was due to be heard in court. Radclyffe Hall’s lesbian novel, The Well of Loneliness, had appeared on 27 July 1928. Three weeks later, it had become the object of an excoriating attack by James Douglas, editor of the Sunday Express, who published an editorial on 19 August 1928 describing the book as ‘a seductive and insidious
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piece of special pleading designed to display perverted decadence as a martyrdom inflicted upon these outcasts by a cruel society’ (Douglas 28). As public indignation – both for and against the novel – mounted, Virginia Woolf was simultaneously anticipating the publication of her own lesbian novel, and joking about Hall’s with her family and her friends.

One night we got drunk, & talked of sodomy, & sapphism, with emotion – so much so that next day [E. M. Forster] said he had been drunk. This was started by Radclyffe Hall & her meritorious dull book. They wrote articles […] all day, & got up petitions; & then Morgan [Forster] saw her & she screamed like a herring gull, mad with egotism & vanity. Unless they say her book is good, she wont let them complain of the laws. (31 August 1928, D3 192)

Woolf’s dismissive attitude to Hall and her novel did not prevent her from signing a letter published in the Nation on 8 September (L3 130, n1) protesting its ban, nor from attending the trial of the book for obscenity on 9 November, about a month after Orlando was published. Woolf and a number of other witnesses, who were ready to testify in defence of The Well, were in the end not called ‘to my relief’, as she wrote in her diary: ‘we could not be called as experts in obscenity, only in art’ (10 November 1928, D3 207). Woolf had discouraged Vita Sackville-West from signing a petition in defence of the novel ‘for your proclivities are too well known’, but Vita did attend the trial, presumably with Woolf (Glendinning 200).

Orlando was launched and publicised, then, in an atmosphere of intense scrutiny of lesbian texts. It was dedicated to Sackville-West, contained photographs of her and made little attempt to disguise its reliance on her family history and life story. After the affair with Violet Trefusis, Sackville-West’s sexual identity was common knowledge. It would have taken only a little sleuthing – even for someone who was not privy to details about the lives of Woolf and her circle – to uncover the identity of its protagonist. Yet Woolf was as unconcerned about appearing at the trial of The Well in the company of Sackville-West as she had been about taking her to Oxford in May 1927 (see above, p. xl), or to Cambridge in October 1928 (Lee, H. 564). Where The Well of Loneliness and its author were vilified by the establishment, Orlando and its serenely confident author sailed through with scarcely a murmur of controversy (though see below, pp. lxxix–xxx).
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Various explanations have been suggested for the disparate treatment of the two texts and their very different authors. One of the authors of the present introduction has argued that ‘strategies of evasion and concealment’, notably remaining publicly and happily married to men, allowed Woolf and Sackville-West to evade the censors, both in their lives and in their texts (Raitt 89). Radclyffe Hall, on the other hand, made no attempt to hide her lesbianism and maintained public, committed sexual partnerships with women. Others have argued that it was the style of Orlando itself that kept the authorities at bay. Hermione Lee maintains that ‘through its fantasy and jokiness, Orlando escapes the public suppression which The Well of Loneliness notoriously encountered in the same year’ (Lee, H. 1996: 524). The Well, on the other hand, deliberately spelled out its advocacy of ‘inversion’, and insisted on its debt to a highly gendered sexological version of lesbian identity by the inclusion of a ‘Commentary’ by sexologist Havelock Ellis at the beginning of the book.

It would be a mistake, however, to categorise Orlando as a text that insists on ambiguity and fluidity as part of a strategy of evasion. As Patricia Morgne Cramer has observed, a ‘preoccupation with the erotics of “fluidity”, “instability”, and “undoing categories” is a product of late-twentieth-century queer sexual politics, not of Woolf’s time’ (Cramer 132). In Orlando, Woolf appears to espouse Sackville-West’s own understanding of her sexual identity as a kind of congenital bisexuality in which part of her was male, and part female, even if there was a ‘vacillation’ (O 171) between the two (see EN 173:31). Orlando is both male and female, throughout the novel, and her sense of herself and her memories are stable and immutable. Furthermore, as our research has shown, what seems to be a fantasy turns out to be grounded not only in a series of established and verifiable facts and texts associated with Sackville-West’s family, but also in a minute accounting of the evolving customs of everyday life (see, for example, the careful mention of coffee supplanting port as an after-dinner drink, EN 208:17). Woolf’s representation of Sackville-West’s sexuality in the novel she wrote for her can be seen as a faithful portrait of Sackville-West’s own self-imaginings, as well as a playful attempt to disrupt conventional understandings of what it meant to be both gendered and sexed.

Vita Sackville-West did not see a word of Orlando (apart from the ones she had translated for Woolf – see EN 36:25) until the day the novel was
INTRODUCTION

published. ‘It came this morning by the first post’, she wrote to Harold Nicolson on 11 October 1928, ‘and I have been reading it ever since, and am now half-way through’:

It seems to me more brilliant, more enchanting, more rich and lavish, than anything she has done. It is like a cloak encrusted with jewels and sprinkled with rose-petals. I admit I can’t see straight about it. Parts of it make me cry, parts of it make me laugh; the whole of it dazzles and bewilders me. [...] I scarcely slept with excitement all night, and woke up feeling as though it were my birthday, or wedding day, or something unique [...] it seems to me a book unique in English literature, having everything in it: romance, wit, seriousness, lightness, beauty, imagination, style; with Sir Thomas Browne and Swift for parents. I feel infinitely honoured at having been the peg on which it was hung; and very humble. (V&H 205–6)

Sackville-West waited till 5 pm, when she had finished reading the novel, before writing to Woolf – although they did speak on the telephone earlier in the day (see LVSW 288–9). ‘For the moment’, she explained, ‘I can’t say anything except that I am completely dazzled, bewitched, enchanted, under a spell. It seems to me the loveliest, wisest, richest book that I have ever read, —exceling even your own Lighthouse’ (LVSW 288). Sackville-West had to admit that reasoned appreciation of Orlando was beyond her at this stage: ‘I can only tell you that I am really shaken, which may seem to you useless and silly, but which is really a greater tribute than pages of calm appreciation’ (LVSW 288). Towards the end of her letter she added that Woolf had ‘invented a new form of narcissism, —I confess, —I am in love with Orlando—this is a complication I had not foreseen’, concluding with the postscript: ‘You made me cry with your passages about Knole, you wretch’ (LVSW 289). Sackville-West also telegraphed Woolf, and Woolf had replied, either to this or to her letter, to say: ‘Your biographer is infinitely relieved and happy’ (qtd LVSW 289 n). The following day, Woolf wrote to her again:

What an immense relief! I was half sick with fright till your telegram came. It struck me suddenly with horror that you’d be hurt or angry, and I didn’t dare open the post: Now let who will bark or bite; Angel that you are—But I’m rather rushed: and wont write, except this line. Sales much better. Enthusiasm in the Birmingham Post [Mail]. Knole is discovered. They hint at you. (L3 544)

lxxv
Sackville-West’s unabashedly erotic response to the novel, and the feeling that the two women now shared a secret, encouraged a return of the flirtatious tone that dominated Woolf’s early letters about the book. On 2 December 1928, Woolf wrote to Sackville-West about a planned visit to her a few days later. ‘I’m coming on Thursday, just as the lamps are being lit in Sevenoaks, so that I can see you in the fishmongers in a red jersey holding a paper bag, rather heavy and damp. Full of smelts. And then we turn up the lights in your room, and I get into my chair and you—ah well—too soon over, that’s the worst of it. And I make it sooner over by my terrific sense (aged 46—that’s what it does) of the flight of time, so that these moments are seen by me flying, flying’ (L3 561). Sackville-West responded by invoking Orlando: ‘Yes,—what a pity you cannot work magic on time in real life as you can in books. Then we could make Thursday last for 300 years’ (3 December 1928, LVSW 299). It was during this visit that Woolf surprised Sackville-West by presenting her with a bound copy of the first holograph draft of the novel, with a simple inscription on the first page, ‘Vita / from / Virginia / Dec. 6th 1928’ (OHD 1). Speculation, and more than a little confusion, about the setting and subject of Orlando would continue for some considerable time: as late as 1948, Leonard Woolf received an enquiry from a reader questioning the veracity of the early photographs in the novel, and their apparent similarity to Sackville-West.55

One of the first reviews to appear was by Desmond MacCarthy in the Sunday Times on 14 October 1928 (MacCarthy, a friend of Woolf’s, was one of the people she had thanked in her Preface to the novel). ‘It is a pleasure to be among the first to hail a book which is beautiful and original’, MacCarthy began, ‘of a beauty and originality too, which is not only certain to be at once recognised—for Orlando is a work of contemporary youthful sensibility—but will continue, in my opinion, to seem beautiful and original to readers of the future’ (VWCH 222). MacCarthy confessed to being ‘almost a reluctant admirer of Mrs Woolf’s fiction, although To the Lighthouse impressed [him]’, and so set out first of all to give a survey of Woolf’s fiction to date (focussing on The Voyage Out and Mrs. Dalloway, and Woolf’s 1924 essay, Mr. Bennett and Mrs. Brown – see VWCH 222–5) in order to demonstrate that with ‘Orlando, which is pure fantasy, [Woolf] appears to have found herself more completely than ever before’ (VWCH 222). ‘To tell the story of Orlando would be absurd’, he observed:
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There is no story. It would not be a theme made to her hand if it had one. [...] It is a wonderful phantasmagoria, in which imagination has all its own way and all matter-of-factness is exorcised from the start; in which, not without frequent flashes of laughter at her own extravagance, the writer combines images and historic facts, possibilities and impossibilities, reflections upon history and manners with scenes from a dream-world. (VWCH 225)

MacCarthy praised the ‘softly glittering splendour’ of Woolf’s descriptive passages, in which she displays ‘a definiteness mingled cunningly with imprecision’, and drew attention to her ‘Sterne-like faculty for impish divagation [which] frequently relieves the tension of this orgy of romance’ (VWCH 225). His review concluded with a sequence of quotations from the novel, and then a peroration: ‘Critics are suspect when they praise contemporary work enthusiastically, but ruling out the judgement of the unduly liberal, I have no fear in this case that praise will not be corroborated’ (VWCH 226).

Two of Woolf’s old adversaries, J. C. Squire and Arnold Bennett, on the other hand, took a much dimmer view of Orlando. Writing in the Observer on 21 October, J. C. Squire began by stating that Orlando ‘is easier to read than describe. It is, indeed, very easy to read and very difficult to describe’ (VWCH 227). Squire thought that Woolf’s prose exhibited a ‘charming manner’, but her characterisation of Orlando was lacking in its realism (‘Orlando is not a person’, ‘a character which does not exist’), and the novel was entirely lacking ‘any allegorical significance’ (VWCH 228). He conceded that Woolf was, ‘On occasion [...] not merely interesting but amusing’, but regretted that ‘the amusing passages are not very frequent’ (VWCH 229). Squire continued: ‘this book is a very pleasant trifle, and will entertain the drawing-rooms for an hour [...] But even of its kind it is not of the first order’ (VWCH 229). Orlando lacked ‘enthusiasm’, he claimed, it was ‘conceived frivolously and chancily’, it lacked ‘spontaneity’, and showed ‘too little affection or respect for the reader, the intelligence in it being immeasurably in excess of the mirth’ (VWCH 229). Sackville-West reacted badly to this review: ‘I shall never speak to Squire again’, she wrote, ‘I never read anything like it for sheer idiocy’; she signed her letter ‘V. / very angry’ (LVSW 292). ‘I’m so sorry old Squire annoyed you’, Woolf replied, ‘But I dont think he ought to. And as for being angry with him—no, no, no. It was my fault largely—I had a hit at him, which was silly’; Woolf then added a warning in her postscript: ‘Arnold Bennett will be far worse than
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Squire—so be prepared’ (L3 548). Bennett’s review, ‘A Woman’s High-Brow Lark,’ was published in the Evening Standard on 8 November 1928, and began with the observation: ‘You cannot keep your end up at a London dinner-party these weeks unless you have read Mrs Virginia Woolf’s Orlando’ (VWCH 232; the Hogarth Press subsequently quoted this opening sentence in an advertisement for Orlando that appeared that same month – see Young 187). ‘For about a fortnight I succeed in not reading it’, Bennett noted, but then after he had seen positive reviews from two critics of whom he had ‘a great opinion’ (Desmond MacCarthy [see above]; and Hugh Walpole [see below]), he gave in, ‘bought the book and read it’ (VWCH 232). His initial reaction was one of puzzlement: ‘It is a very odd volume’, he observed, ‘I surmise that Orlando is intended to be the incarnation of something or other—say, the mustang spirit of the joy of life, but this is not quite clear to me’ (VWCH 232–3). He went on to express grave disappointment:

The first chapter is goodish. […] The second chapter shows a startling decline and fall-off. […] The succeeding chapters are still more tedious […] I shall no doubt be told that I have missed the magic of the work. The magic is precisely what I have indeed missed. […] Her best novel, To the Lighthouse, raised my hopes of her. Orlando has dashed them and they lie in iridescent fragments at my feet. (VWCH 233)

‘Shall I say that Bennett in the Ev[ening] Standard hurt me less than Squire in the Observer?’ Woolf asked herself in her diary on 10 November, ‘Not at all, I think;—an odd thing, though, how I am praised & abused: & what a sting I am in the flanks of Squires & Bennetts’ (D3 206).

On 27 October 1928 (that is, after Squire’s review had been published, but before Bennett’s), Woolf noted in her diary:

The reception, as they say, surpassed expectations. Sales beyond our record for the first week. I was floating rather lazily on praise when Squire barked in the Observer, but even as I sat reading him on the backs last Sunday in the showering red leaves & their illumination, I felt the rock of self esteem untouched in me. “This doesn’t really hurt” I said to myself; even now; & sure enough, before evening I was calm, untouched. And now theres Hugh [Walpole] in the Morning Post to spread the butter again, & Rebecca West—such a trumpet call of praise—that’s her way—that I feel a little sheepish & silly. (D3 200)
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Woolf’s opening comment here might be a reference to the letter Helen McAfee (or MacAfee), editor of the Yale Review, had written to Woolf from New Haven on 23 October 1928, in which she said: ‘I hear “Orlando” being talked of wherever I go […] It is as noble and rich as Orlando’s country seat, which I like to think of as Knole, remembering a happy day I spent there last June. […] I hope the reception of the book will add something, though it cannot add much, to the sense of accomplishment you must have had in writing it’ (WSA12, letter 25). In her own review of the novel, which appeared in the Yale Review in 1929, McAfee repeated another of the comments which she made in her letter to Woolf: ‘This extraordinary work, bearing as it does the clear stamp of her mind in its maturity, might in a sense have been called an autobiography’ (VWCH 237). McAfee added that ‘Orlando is a boldly conceived and finely executed dramatisation of the civilised current of three centuries […] It is a book rich in humanity, a spirited prose epic of intellectual adventure’ (VWCH 237).66 Hugh Walpole’s review of Orlando, ‘On a Certain New Book’, had appeared in the Morning Post on 25 October 1928. It is a measure of how well known Orlando had become, that Walpole could write a review which made no mention at all of either the title of the novel or the name of its author (see Walpole 1928). Woolf wrote to thank him on 28 October:

A certain article on a Certain new book faces me. Dare I add certain letters to your O-? Can I take to myself so much praise? […] I wear it like an ermine fleece to protect me from the blast. But (except for Squire) they have been rather nice. […] Seriously, I am more than grateful, and very proud into the bargain. Don’t you, after all, share my passion for Waverley?—and lots of other things. (L3 552; see also L3 567)

Rebecca West’s review in the New York Herald Tribune (21 October 1928) had hailed Orlando as ‘a poetic masterpiece of the first rank’ (qtd D3 200 n).

The progress of the novel was still not serene. As Celia Marshik has discovered, ‘a handwritten register of correspondence received by the Home Office in 1928 records an anonymous letter regarding Orlando and summarizes the author’s point thus: “Considers shd. be suppressed”’; the original letter appears to have been ‘destroyed or misplaced and is not indexed in the contemporary catalogue of the National Archives’, but it does raise the possibility that Orlando was closer than many have suspected to suffering the same fate as Radclyffe Hall’s Well of Loneliness (Marshik 8). Unaware of
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this potential development, in addition to the brickbats of Squire and Bennett, Woolf also had to contend with Vita’s mother, Lady Sackville, who had informed her on 14 October 1928: ‘You have written some beautiful phrases in Orlando, but probably you do not realise how cruel you have been. And the person who inspired the Book, has been crueler still’ (qtd. _L_ 3 548 n; emphasis in original). Woolf told Vita Sackville-West that her mother’s reaction was ‘milder than I expected’, ‘But heaven knows what she means’ she added (_L_ 3 545). Writing to Edward Sackville-West, she described the letter as ‘bitter’ (_L_ 3 548). As the editors of Woolf’s letters note, unbeknownst to Woolf, ‘In her own copy of _Orlando_ Lady Sackville pasted a photograph of Virginia and wrote alongside it: “The awful face of a mad woman whose successful mad desire is to separate people who care for each other. I loathe this woman for having changed my Vita and taken her away from me”’ (_L_ 3 548 n). But then Vita in turn passed on praise from various others, including Harold Nicolson (‘What a wonderful book! The whole thing has a beauty which makes one catch one’s breath’ [15 October 1928, _LVSW_ 290]; see also _LVSW_ 291), and Clive Bell (‘Orlando is a masterpiece’ [17 October 1928, _LVSW_ 291]). She also reported to Woolf on 7 November 1928 that ‘Rose Macaulay has the sense to like _Orlando_’ (_LVSW_ 294; Vita had presumably seen an advance copy of Macaulay’s review of the novel, which was published in _T. P.’s Weekly_ on 10 November). On this same day, Henry S. Canby, editor of the _Saturday Review of Literature_ (New York), wrote to Woolf enclosing ‘the necessarily inadequate appreciation of mine of your _Orlando_’ – inadequate because you have put so much into that book which suggests comment that a thoroughgoing study would have been so long to have been an impertinence’, he asked Woolf’s forgiveness, if she felt that he had ‘said some foolish things’, adding that ‘had I felt that I could write ten thousand words one half as brilliant as your 60,000 I should have risked the impudence of letting so much annotation weight upon an admirable text’ (_WSA_r2, letter 29; see Canby). Among the others who wrote complimentary letters to Woolf about _Orlando_ were Harold Nicolson (via telegram – see _L_ 3 548 n), Edward Sackville-West (late October 1928, see _L_ 3 548–9), Enid Bagnold (late October 1928, see _L_ 3 552), Lady Robert Cecil (October 1928, see _L_ 3 553), C. P. Sanger (October 1928, see _L_ 3 554), Lady Cunard (early November 1928, _WSA_r2, letter 28; see also _D_ 3 201–2), Daphne Sanger (November? 1928, see _L_ 3 561), Roger Fry (early December 1928, x
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see L3 562), Frederick Pollock – one of her father’s friends (4 December 1928, WSA12, letter 32), the popular novelist Berta Ruck (22 December 1928, WSA12, letter 33; see also Gillespie), Katherine (Ka) Arnold-Forster (early February 1929, see L4 21), and David Garnett (early March 1929, see L4 32).

One of the first American reactions to Orlando came from Cleveland B. Chase in the New York Times on 21 October (three days after the publication of the Harcourt, Brace edition of the novel). Chase observed that Woolf had ‘once more [...] broken with tradition and convention’ (VWCH 230). ‘Not that she has abandoned the “stream of consciousness” method which she used with such conspicuous success in her previous novels’, he added, ‘but with it she has combined what, for lack of a better term, we might describe as an application to writing of the Einstein theory of relativity’ (VWCH 230). Chase appeared to have been unconvinced by most of Orlando, selecting for praise only ‘the closing pages of the novel’, where, he noted, ‘Mrs Woolf welds into a compact whole what had seemed to be a series of loosely connected episodes’ (VWCH 231). ‘She has carried the “stream of consciousness” technique a step further’, he added, and ‘has pointed out the direction in which it must develop’ (VWCH 231). In a long article on ‘Virginia Woolf and Lytton Strachey’ for the Bookman (New York) in February 1929, Raymond Mortimer observed that ‘[the] first thing to say about the book is that it is a lark [...] written in tearing high spirits. The style modulates, sings tunes by Sterne, by Browne, by Emily Bronte [sic], by De Quincey, yet remains individual to Mrs Woolf’ (VWCH 241). As a friend of Woolf’s, and Harold Nicolson’s long-term lover, Mortimer knew better than most the background to the novel:

The book is listed as biography. And it is no secret that Orlando is a portrait of Mrs Harold Nicolson, who writes under her unmarried name, V. Sackville-West. [...] The rich historical background of the Sackvilles has awakened a thousand associations in Mrs Woolf’s mind. For Knole, their house that is like a town, is English history made visible in stone and velvets and silver. (VWCH 241)

Mortimer went on to enumerate many features of the history of Knole, of the Sackvilles, and of The Land:

But it is in The Land, placid and slow moving as a deep river, that we find the literary counterpart of this ancient house. And the author of The Land is Orlando.
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The portrait Mrs Woolf has given her must be judged as a painting, not as a likeness. Perhaps it should be put on the record that the likeness is remarkable. But not, of course, photographic. Mrs Woolf is always free and easy with her facts. […] Mrs Woolf believes in the imagination. She takes a glance at the world. The horses of her fancy bolt and she throws the reins over their heads. Literature is not an imitation of life, it is another life. (VWCH 242)

Writing in the Bookman five months later, Storm Jameson was likewise full of praise for the style of Orlando: ‘Mrs Woolf is, beyond comparison, a master of language’ (VWCH 244). ‘And yet’, she added, ‘Something is missing. […] Why is it that the author of Orlando is not a very great novelist?’ (VWCH 245). The answer, she suggested, was that Woolf ‘lacks humanity’: ‘Doubtless she suffers, weeps, laughs herself—but not as a man does. As a fallen angel might. Or a changeling. She has no roots in our common earth’ (VWCH 245). After reading this review, Woolf seems to have been more amused than upset (see VW to VSW, 23 February 1929, L429). A very different view of Woolf’s connection with ‘our common earth’ appeared in R. M. Fox’s review for The Irish Statesman on 8 June 1929, which drew attention not only to the way in which Orlando captured ‘the essential qualities of [the] centuries with their changing tones and colours’, but also its presentation of ‘the common stuff of life […] behind this pageantry of the ages’ (qtd in Southworth 216–17).

Two French reviews of the English text of Orlando appeared in April 1930. Writing in the Revue anglo-américaine, Jean-Jacques Mayoux compared Woolf favourably with Proust:

Orlando in one sense is a Time Regained, with a radical difference, a difference in tone. The painful tension in Proust’s work comes from the anguish which passing time causes him and the importance he attaches to regaining it. The total lack of dramatic pressure, of emotive tonality in Orlando comes from the absence of the flow of life and of the peril of death. Orlando is the happy solution to a problem which is not posed. (VWCH 249)

Paul Dottin, writing in the Revue de France, on the other hand, was more critical: ‘although it contains some magnificent pages, for example those which describe the Great Frost in the times of James I, Mrs Woolf’s novel leaves the impression of something incomplete, disappointing and imperfect’ (VWCH 254). Dottin took particular exception to the fact ‘that Orlando is full of anachronisms, most of them deliberate’, but he at least concedes...
INTRODUCTION

that the novel ‘marks a considerable effort towards clarity, an almost complete renunciation of the Joycean pattern’ (VWCH 254). Discussion of this and many other aspects of the novel appears to have continued. On 12 June 1930, Woolf wrote to Ernest Rhys, editor of the ‘Everyman’s Library’ books, to thank him for a recent letter: ‘It is very good of you to write to me so kindly about Orlando’, she told him, ‘If you knew how many letters I get pointing out the mistakes in that book, you would understand that your appreciation is very valuable’ (L4 178).

EDITING ORLANDO

The general policy of the Cambridge edition is that the first British edition is normally the copy text for each edition, and the copy text for this Cambridge edition of Orlando is indeed the first British edition of the novel (B1), published by the Hogarth Press on 11 October 1928, for the reasons outlined below. The typescript of the novel Woolf sent to the printers R & R Clark has not survived, but in addition to the manuscript of the novel, a substantial amount of other ‘avant-texte’ material is still available: the ‘American’ corrected proofs are now in the Mortimer Rare Book Room in the Neilson Library at Smith College in Northampton, Massachusetts (these constitute a full set of first proofs – minus the index – plus one signature of the third proofs, and some typescript inserts); a set of uncorrected first proofs is held at the Harry Ransom Humanities Research Center, University of Texas at Austin; and a typescript draft of the ‘Preface’ and ‘Chapter I’ is currently in private hands. There are also significant holdings of letters, telegrams, invoices and other materials related to the composition and publication of Orlando in The Berg Collection of English and American Literature at New York Public Library, the Monks House Papers in Special Collections at the University of Sussex, the Archives of the Hogarth Press (1922–55) in the Department of Archives and Manuscripts at the University of Reading, and the R & R Clark Archive at the National Library of Scotland in Edinburgh.

The manuscript can be discounted from consideration for adoption as the copy text, as it represents an early stage of the novel which is superseded by the extant proofs and the published texts. Likewise, the Crosby Gaige limited edition was printed with what appear to be non-authorial additions (e.g. the chapter subtitles) as well as ‘authorised’ omissions (e.g. lxxxiii
INTRODUCTION

the illustrations), all of which were subsequently either removed or put back for the Harcourt, Brace trade edition. The uncorrected proofs are of no help either, given that there is a set of corrected proofs. The Tauchnitz paperback can likewise be discounted, as it was published under licence with no authorial intervention in the text; the same applies to the subsequent re-impressions of the two trade editions, none of which appear to carry any authorial corrections. This leaves three options remaining for the choice of copy text: the American corrected proofs of the novel ($AP_{1}$ and $AP_{1R}$); the Harcourt, Brace first trade edition ($AT_{2}$); and the Hogarth Press first trade edition ($BT$). Two immediate issues with the American corrected proofs are that they are not complete (they lack the index), and that they are partially superseded by the third (uncorrected) proofs ($AP_{3}$), which do not themselves represent the ‘final’ text of the proofs in that there are four punctuation variants in the Hogarth Press edition which post-date these proofs (see above, p. lxv). The American corrected proofs can thus only work as a copy text if they are adopted as part of a hybrid or composite copy text, one that includes readings and variants from the third (uncorrected) proofs and also the Hogarth Press first edition (see O 1998: xxvi–xxvii). However, wherever possible it is the practice of the Cambridge edition to use as copy text a published version Woolf herself oversaw, generally the first British edition (but see the Cambridge edition of Between the Acts for a special exception to this), and it is our contention that the American corrected proofs do not have a sufficiently strong enough case to argue against this practice. The choice, therefore, appears to lie between the Harcourt, Brace and the Hogarth Press first trade editions. Both $AT_{2}$ and $BT$ have their merits, as well as their drawbacks (see TA, passim) as copy texts. However, on balance, we find that we cannot agree with J. H. Stape’s assessment that Woolf’s corrections to the (now lost) Hogarth Press edition proofs were ‘slipshod’ (Stape 2001: 166), nor that she took less care over the proofs for the Hogarth Press edition than she did with the Harcourt, Brace proofs. On the contrary, while it does indeed seem likely that the first set of proofs Woolf would have corrected were the ones destined for Harcourt, Brace, a comparison between these corrected proofs and the published text of the Hogarth Press edition suggests that Woolf made later revisions to the Hogarth Press proofs (and also ‘rejected’, rather than overlooked, some of her earlier revisions)
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which she then failed to transfer over to the Harcourt, Brace proofs (see above, p. lxv). On these grounds, one might argue that it is the Harcourt, Brace proofs which received the more cursory attention, and were treated as a working draft in which Woolf ironed out certain issues in the text before she revised the ‘clean copy’ of the Hogarth Press proofs. As was discussed in the Cambridge edition of The Waves (see W2011), there is an underlying logic to such an argument: Woolf was a co-owner of the Hogarth Press, and the Hogarth Press edition of the novel would be the one which most of her friends and almost if not all of the critics whose opinions she might take notice of would read. Woolf would also have had the opportunity to make last-minute revisions to the Hogarth Press proofs (R & R Clark would have been contactable by telephone, as well as overnight post), and she is likely to have seen not only the first proofs, but also a full set of revisions (the unaccounted for ‘second’ proofs) for the Hogarth Press edition (in addition to this, there is the question of the ‘Lolita’ variants introduced in the B2 print run – see above – but as it has not yet been satisfactorily established that these two variants originated with Woolf, and given that BU reverts to Bt, the case for B2 as a copy text is not sufficiently compelling). In comparison with this, the Harcourt, Brace edition was typeset in New Jersey (using the Harcourt, Brace proofs as the author’s ‘typescript’ of the novel), and proofed and printed in New York, all with no direct input from Woolf (a process which introduced its own errors into the text: see, for example, TA 228:29). There is, in short, a compelling case for the adoption of Bt as copy text, in preference to A1.2, since the first Hogarth Press edition is the closest we are likely to get to the novel Woolf ‘intended’ to publish.

In the text of the novel presented in this current edition the occasionally inconsistent spelling and capitalisation of the Hogarth Press edition has been retained, as has its inconsistent placement of commas and full-stops inside and outside closing quotation marks. We have also retained the Bt layout of the Index (pp. 301–3), with double columns and ‘the end’ in the middle of the page at the end of the index. The page numbers in the index in this edition refer to this volume’s pagination, directing readers to the places in this volume that correspond to the original references in Bt. In the TN, we have also provided information about unindexed references to items in the index, as well as pointing out inaccuracies in the index in Bt.
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All editorial emendations to the text are noted in the TA. Further discussion of these emendations, as well as other textual matters, can be found in the TN. In compiling the EN, we have endeavoured, as is the policy of the Cambridge edition, to provide as full an account as possible of the many and varied literary allusions Woolf habitually seeded throughout her prose, as well as to elucidate any historical, cultural, etymological (or indeed punctuational, botanical, entomological, geographical and chronological) aspects of the text with which the modern reader might not be familiar.

As we pursued our research, we were struck by a number of things. First, we found multiple subtle and not-so subtle references to the shifting practices of everyday life, most of which have not been noted in any previous editions. For the first time, Orlando can be read as a social history, documenting the changing habits of everyday life with minute precision. When did people start to drink coffee and not port after dinner, for example? (See EN 208:17). When did men start to wear beards? (See EN 208:11, 271:25). Orlando is intent on reconstructing how people actually lived at different historical moments, especially in Chapters 5 and 6, which cover periods that Woolf herself remembered or was living through at the time of writing.

Orlando is also, of course, one of the most richly allusive of Woolf’s novels, with its deliberate attempt to invoke the literature and literary styles of each period its author-reader-protagonist passes through, and our annotations explore many of these allusions for the first time. Chapters 1 and 2, set in the Renaissance and the Restoration, centre on a series of references to works by William Shakespeare, Ludovico Ariosto, Thomas Dekker, Richard Hakluyt and Ovid, with references to Thomas Browne, Andrew Marvell, Robert Herrick, Richard Burton, Robert Greene, Christopher Marlowe, Ben Jonson and John Donne thrown in. Chapter 3, set in Turkey, moves away from the emphasis on British literature, and relies more on personal correspondence, and presumably conversations, between Woolf and Sackville-West. The latter’s experiences in Constantinople immediately after her marriage, and visits to Teheran in 1926 and 1927, are clearly the basis for this episode in Orlando (see EN 109:17). Chapter 4, set in eighteenth-century London, is populated by such luminaries as John Dryden, Alexander Pope, Jonathan Swift, Joseph Addison, Lord Chesterfield, Mme. du Deffand, Lady Suffolk, Samuel Johnson, James
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Boswell and Anna Williams. Chapter 5 largely skips over the Romantic period (with the exception of a few allusions to Percy Shelley and Thomas De Quincey), and lands securely in the Victorian era, with extensive references to John Ruskin, Charles Darwin, Thomas Carlyle, the Brontë sisters, Charles Dickens, Letitia Elizabeth Landon and Alfred, Lord Tennyson. In Chapter 6, Woolf started experimenting with modernist techniques, such as stream of consciousness, in an obvious nod to James Joyce and Dorothy Richardson, and there are allusions also to D. H. Lawrence, T. S. Eliot and Post-Impressionism. The Victorian era remains strikingly present, however, with references to Edmund Gosse, Samuel Smiles, Martin Tupper, Thomas Carlyle and George MacDonald. All these literary resonances unfold alongside an increasing attention in later chapters to the details of everyday life – the asphalting of roads (EN 273:4), for example, or the advent of the motor-car (EN 270:18).

As our research progressed, what also became striking was just how widespread and complex were Woolf’s references and allusions to Vita Sackville-West’s personal biography and family history, not least in the almost forensic dissection Woolf appears to have undertaken of Sackville-West’s *Knole and the Sackvilles*. Some of the book is quoted almost verbatim, and there are also multiple references to the house and to the family that can only have come from Woolf’s personal knowledge of, and interaction with, Sackville-West. In that sense, *Orlando* is like an extended conversation about a place and its people, some of it accurate and verifiable, and some of it clearly the scattered fragments of a half-remembered visit or comment (see, for example, the reference to the Knole tapestries, EN 14:9).

Of course, some other personal allusions in the novel have proven to be much more difficult to pin down, as ought to be expected with such an elusive/allusive writer as Woolf. Woolf said that she ‘began [Orlando] as a joke, & [then] went on with it seriously’ (31 May 1928, D3 185), and at times the editors have had to hold up their hands and acknowledge that not all of the novel’s ‘jokes’ are receptive to annotation. Such cases, however, were few and far between, and while the task of annotating a text can never be said to have been ‘completed’, it is hoped that the very substantial amount of editorial material that is included in this volume will prove to be both interesting and illuminating for scholars and readers, and will in turn lead on to yet more new insights into and discoveries about what must surely be
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reckoned to be one of the most original, innovative and remarkable novels of the 1920s.

NOTES

1. See Introduction, p. xxxvii, for details about the presentation and current whereabouts of the manuscript.

2. ‘Virginia [Woolf] – not a muddle exactly; she is a busy and sensible woman. But she does love me, and I did sleep with her at Rodmell. That does not constitute a muddle though’ (VSW to HN, 28 June 1926, V&H 150); ‘I love Virginia, as who wouldn’t? but really, my sweet, one’s love for Virginia is a very different thing: a mental thing, a spiritual thing if you like, an intellectual thing, and she inspires a feeling of tenderness which I suppose is because of her funny mixture of hardness and softness – the hardness of her mind, and her terror of going mad again. She makes me feel protective. Also she loves me, which flatters and pleases me. Also – since I am embarked on telling you about Virginia, but this is all absolutely padlock private – I am scared to death of arousing physical feelings in her, because of the madness [...] I have gone to bed with her (twice) but that’s all’ (VSW to HN, 17 August 1926, V&H 158–9).

3. The ‘Jessamy Bride’ was a nickname given by Oliver Goldsmith to Mary Horneck, one of the two beautiful Horneck sisters whose family he met in 1762. Joshua Reynolds’ engraving of Mary Horneck in Turkish dress was bequeathed to the National Gallery in London in 1927, where Woolf may have seen it.

4. Jones 1993 notes that the cross-dressing Ladies of Llangollen were a particularly significant inspiration for O.

5. VSW’s literary ancestors include Thomas Sackville, Lord Buckhurst and 1st Earl of Dorset (1536–1608), author of Gorboduc (1561), ‘Induction’ to the Mirror for Magistrates (1563) and The Complaint of the Duke of Buckingham (1563); Richard Sackville, 3rd Earl of Dorset (1589–1624), patron and friend of writers Ben Jonson, Beaumont Fletcher, Michael Drayton and Henry King; and Charles Sackville, 6th Earl of Dorset (1636–1705), author of ‘To all you ladies now at land’ and friend of John Dryden, Alexander Pope and others. See the Sackville biographical table, pp. cviii–cxi, and EN, throughout, for more details about VSW’s ancestors.


7. It eventually appeared in three instalments in the Bookman (NY), April, May and June 1929 (E5 40–88).

8. One of VB’s photographs was eventually included in the novel (see EN 11:7).
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10. See EN 6:18.2 for 'Valeries'.
11. Chapter 2 in the manuscript begins in the same place as in B1/A1/A1.2, just after the great thaw and Sasha’s desertion; Chapter 3 in the manuscript begins several pages later than Chapter 3 in B1/A1/A1.2, during the sleep that precedes Orlando’s change of sex [ms: ‘Orlando still slept’; Br. 122/A1/A1.2: 133: ‘And still Orlando slept’]. Chapter 4 in the manuscript begins in the same place as Chapter 5 in B1/A1/A1.2 (the beginning of the nineteenth century). Chapter breaks in the manuscript are indicated in TN.
13. See KS 122, 136. VSW comments about the ‘Induction’ that it ‘has never met with the recognition [it] deserves, save for the discriminating applause of men of letters’, and claims that the ‘more admirable portions […] contain much of the genuine stuff of poetry, impressive imagery, a surprising absence of cumbersome expression […] and a diction which is consistently dignified and suitable to the gravity of the theme’ (KS 54). She quotes three stanzas from it, but the quotation in the manuscript of Orlando is not among them.
14. ‘M’ Pope, +&+ / M’ Addison (but not D’ Swift) paid her the most +polished+ extravagant compliments/. +& Dr Swift the [swiftest?];+ all three delighted in her came constantly to her house & drank her tea & her wine; she was the recipient of the to her they read their poems; & of her they asked They read her their poems; they gave her their works, they +books+ & pressed flattered press a praised her judgment, solicited her criticism. +She should have lost her head entirely.+ Should she not have been at their feet? +[through?] + into a +? or two in the [arbour?]+ And perhaps at their feet she would have been had she not been aware (& as this was in the 18 th century when women read less than they do now / it is to the credit of a native shrewdness very noticeable in her) had she not known as plainly as if she had read the letters of Lord Chesterfield & +Tho’+ they ask their opinion they do not take them.+ the works of M’ Arnold Bennett & M’ Orlo M’ Desmond MacCarthy & M’ Orlo Williams, to name +only+ / the most illustrious +Tho’+ they flatter us, they despise. The Though they drink our tea they + of the tribe of + of our modern+ masculinists, that though men say these things to +us+ women they do not mean them’ (OHD 169). See EN 6:9 for Arnold Bennett and Desmond MacCarthy; Orlo Williams’s ‘The Good Englishwoman’ was cited in MacCarthy’s review of Our Women (see EN 6:9).
15. The Hawthornden Prize for Imaginative Literature was founded in 1919 by Alice Warrender, and named after the Scottish poet, William Drummond of Hawthornden (1585–1649). Drummond’s Poems: Amorous, Funeral, Divine, Pastorall: in Sonnets, Songs, Sextains, Madrigals (1616) commemorated Mary Cunningham of Barns, who died just before her planned marriage to Drummond in 1615.
16. LW to R & R Clark, 17 May 1928 (Reading MS 2750.367).
17. See LW to R & R Clark, 26 August 1926 (Reading MS 2750.421).

lxxxix
INTRODUCTION

18. LW to R & R Clark, 17 May 1928 (Reading MS 2750.567).

19. See LW to R & R Clark, 1 June 1928 (Reading MS 2750.567). LW’s letter also referred to a letter from R & R Clark dated 21 May, presumably R & R Clark’s response to his enquiries on 17 May (see above). This letter is not in the ‘Orlando’ folder in the Hogarth Press Archive at Reading. LW must also have written a short note, at the very least, to accompany the rest of the ts, on or around 4 June, but this too is not in the ‘Orlando’ folder.

20. See LW to The Librarian, The Public Library, Worthing, 1 June 1928; Marian Frost to LW, 6 June 1928; LW to Marian Frost, 7 June 1928; Marian Frost to LW, 19 June 1928 (Reading MS 2750.567).

21. LW to R & R Clark, 16 June 1928 (Reading MS 2750.567).

22. LW to R & R Clark, 28 June 1928 (Reading MS 2750.567).

23. R & R Clark Invoice Journal 1927–9 (NLS Dep. 229.54, f. 341). To put this in perspective: of the eleven books of Woolf’s printed by R & R Clark between 1922 and 1940, the cost of the alterations to Orlando is only surpassed by that of The Years, for whose ‘Very extensive alterations’ R & R Clark charged £90 11s 6d, and Roger Fry, the alterations for which cost £31 15s (R & R Clark Invoice Journal 1937–8, NLS Dep. 229.59, f. Books 1937, 24; R & R Clark Invoice Journal 1939–40, NLS Dep. 229.60, f. Books 1940, 72). But then these later figures need to be readjusted for inflation, and also tempered by the consideration that The Years and Roger Fry were first of all set in slips/galley proofs before the page proof stage, and that The Years in particular was a much more extensive volume (469 pages of text, compared to Orlando’s 299). In percentage terms, the cost of the alterations for Orlando works out as equivalent to 67% of the original charge for composing the type, whereas in the case of The Years the proportion is only 58%; it is even lower for Roger Fry.

24. It is important to note here that Ritchie would have read the novel in uncorrected proof, a rough bound ‘travelling’ copy of one of the five sets of proofs printed by R & R Clark in June 1928 (‘travelling’ copies were used as samples to show to booksellers to persuade them to place advance orders). Ritchie is also often cited as the first person after Leonard Woolf to have read the novel, but it seems clear that at least two others read Orlando before she did: Ritchie wrote to Woolf on 31 July 1928 (see WSA, letter 253); Donald Brace and Carl Van Doren both read the novel in late June/early July—see below.


27. Our thanks to Stephen Barkway for suggesting this link.

28. R & R Clark Invoice Journal 1927–9 (NLS Dep. 229.54, f. 645); R & R Clark Invoice Journal 1930–1 (NLS Dep. 229.55, ff. 142, 200, 461); R & R Clark Invoice Journal 1932–3 (NLS Dep. 229.56, f. 133); R & R Clark Invoice Journal 1935–6 (NLS Dep. 229.58, f. Books 1935, 8). Orlando was the last of Woolf’s books to be bound by R & R Clark; from A Room of One’s Own onwards, R & R Clark would
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deliver her books in sheets, and the Hogarth Press would contract out the binding to specialist firms closer to London.

29. LW to Percy Lund Humphries, 2 May 1933 (Reading MS 2750.567); LW to Lowe & Brydone, 2 May 1933 (Reading MS 2750.567); Percy Lund Humphries to LW, 3 May 1933 (Reading MS 2750.567); LW to Percy Lund Humphries, 15 May 1933 (Reading MS 2750.567).

30. ‘Ship’ Binding Works to LW, 27 May 1933 (Reading MS 2750.567).

31. The next edition of BU was published in May 1942 (Kirkpatrick and Clarke 63).

32. LW to John Lane, 25 September 1935 (Reading MS 2750.567); LW to Thomas Nelson, 5 December 1935 (Reading MS 2750.567).

33. The novel’s publication notice states that it was published in ‘APRIL 1942’ (O 1942 [4]), although as Kirkpatrick and Clarke note: ‘Owing to wartime difficulties the date of publication is uncertain. […] The publishers think that the date was probably 21 July 1942’ (Kirkpatrick and Clarke 64).

34. Harcourt, Brace to Hogarth Press [telegram], 16 June 1928 (Berg).

35. See Donald Brace to LW, 2 August 1928 (Berg).

36. VW to Donald Brace, 16 July 1928 (L4 513); LW to Donald Brace, 19 July 1928 (Berg).

37. Donald Brace to LW, 2 August 1928 (Berg).

38. Donald Brace to LW, 2 August 1928 (Berg).

39. LW to Donald Brace, 19 July 1928 (Berg).

40. LW to Donald Brace, 28 July 1928 (Berg).

41. Donald Brace to LW, 10 August 1928 (Berg).

42. Donald Brace to LW, 14 September 1928 (Berg).

43. Donald Brace to LW, 2 August 1928 (Berg).

44. LW to Donald Brace, 14 September 1928 (Berg).

45. Harcourt, Brace to VW [telegram], 2 April 1930 (Reading).

46. Harcourt, Brace to VW, 6 May 1930 (Reading).

47. See LW to Donald Brace, 23 May 1930; VW to Ann Watkins, 23 May 1930; Ann Watkins to VW, 22 July 1930; VW to Ann Watkins, 6 August 1930; Monica McCall to VW, 8 September 1930; LW to Ann Watkins, 19 September 1930 (Reading).

48. See VW to VSW, 19 February 1929 (L4 27); VW to VSW, 23 February 1929 (L4 29).

49. BBC to VW, 1 December 1931; Hogarth Press to BBC, 3 Dec 1931; BBC to VW, 3 Feb 1933; Hogarth Press to BBC, 6 Feb 1933; BBC to Hogarth Press, 20 Dec 1933; Hogarth Press to BBC, 23 Dec 1933; BBC to Hogarth Press, 27 Nov 1940; Hogarth Press to BBC, 29 Nov 1940 (Reading).

50. BBC to Hogarth Press, 8 January 1941; Hogarth Press to BBC, 10 Jan 1941 (Reading).

51. ‘La Fin du grand gel’, trans. Charles Mauron, Échanges, 4 (1931), 11–18; see also VW to Allanah Harper, 7 July 1931 (L4 355).
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53. See EN 51:9 for a discussion of the importance of this image to the relationship between VW and VSW.
54. This volume is the only existing holograph draft. Its 292 unnumbered leaves have a pre-printed red line down the left-hand side which creates a margin 1.35 inches wide, and the left-hand margin is punched with two holes three inches apart. Virginia wrote on the recto side only with the exception of scattered notes and calculations on selected versos (OHD 12v, 16v, 19v, 20v, 30v, 36v, 37v, 62v, 64v, 78v, 139v, 156v, 157v, 158v, 159v, 162v, 178v, 180v, 181v, 197v, 202v, 218v, 220v, 221v, 228v, 257v, 263v, 277v, 281v). MS 250 is written on upside down with the margin on the right. The manuscript is written in violet ink and bound in niger leather, tooled in gold on the front and back and on the spine. The spine bears a device with ‘ORLANDO/MS/VSW’ inside it. End-papers are mottled and a first page, in a different paper from almost all the rest (though the same as a blank page following the last page of the manuscript) is inscribed in black ink: ‘Vita / from / Virginia / Dec. 6th 1928’. The following page contains notes dated (in the margin) ‘Oct 8th 1927’ (see Introduction, p. xlv, for a discussion of these notes). The novel begins on the third page. The manuscript is now held by the National Trust, which acquired ownership of Knole and some of its contents in 1947 (see EN 290:7).
55. Stanley Scott to LW, 29 Nov 1948; LW to Stanley Scott, 3 Dec 1948 (Reading).
56. ‘McAfee’ is the spelling used in WSA12; the headnote to the reprint of her review in VWCH uses ‘MacAfee’. Both spellings appeared in print in her lifetime.
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Chronology of the Composition of Orlando

VW first had the idea for the book that developed into O in March 1927. This chronology includes all relevant items – including publications by VW and VSW, significant events etc. – after that date. We have included some significant dates in the development of the relationship between VW and VSW before March 1927, since the book is so intimately tied to the evolution and events of their friendship, including some brief quotations of language from diaries or letters before March 1927 that later found their way into O, or formed part of VW’s slow incubation of the idea for the novel. We have also included dates and language relating to experiences that later featured in O (for example VW’s visit to Knole in July 1924), even if they have no specific relevance beyond that. We have limited our inclusion of items before March 1927 to the above categories.

1922

14 December VW and VSW meet for the first time at a dinner at Clive Bell’s (D2 216–17)

1923

3 January VW thanks VSW for KS, presumably sent to her at VW’s request (L3 1)

18 February VW receives ‘a surprise visit from the Nicolsons [. . .]. Snob as I am, I trace her passions 500 years back, & they become romantic to me, like old yellow wine’ (D2 235–6)

15 March VSW and HN attend a dinner party at 46 Gordon Square (where VB was living), with LW, VW, Clive Bell, Duncan Grant and Lytton Strachey: ‘we judged them both incurably stupid’ (D2 239)
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1924

19 March VSW lunches alone with VW and stays for the afternoon (L3 94)
21 May VW solicits a book from VSW for Hogarth Press (L3 110; see also 21 June, D2 304)
5 July VW visits Knole and Long Barn, with VSW, HN, Dorothy Wellesley (see EN 6:22.2) and Geoffrey Scott (architect and diplomat, 1883–1929, VSW’s lover from October 1923 to March 1924) (D2 306–7)
8–21 July VSW and HN on walking holiday in the Dolomites; VSW writes SE
16 July VSW invites VW to come on a trip with her: ‘Look on it, if you like, as copy,— as I believe you look upon everything, human relationships included. Oh yes, you like people better through the brain than through the heart, — forgive me if I am wrong’ (VSW to VW, LVSW 51)
19 August VW to VSW: ‘I enjoyed your intimate letter from the Dolomites. It gave me a great deal of pain — which is I’ve no doubt the first stage of intimacy — no friends, no heart, only an indifferent head’ (L3 125)
14 September VSW delivers ms. of SE to VW in Rodmell and spends the night there (D2 313)
November SE published (Hogarth Press)

1925

7 September VW ill in bed and writes to VSW: ‘I try to invent you for myself’ (L3 204)
10 October VW hears news that HN has been posted to Teheran: ‘But for how long? / For ever? / I am filled with envy and despair. Think of seeing Persia — think of never seeing you again’ (L3 217)
4 November HN goes to Teheran
17–20 December VW spends two nights alone with VSW at Long Barn, and VW and VSW become lovers. They are joined by LW for the last night. ‘Please don’t think that / (a) I shall fall in love
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with Virginia / (b) Virginia will fall in love with me' (VSW to HN, V&H 134–5); 'These Sapphists love women; friendship is never untinged with amorosity' (D3 51)

1926

19 January VSW makes a farewell visit to VW in London before leaving for Teheran the next day

20 January VSW in Teheran with HN; VSW and VW write frequent, affectionate letters

February–March VV reads a typescript of VSW's The Land: 'it must be good, I think: one can break off crumbs and suck them. [. . .] I imagine it wants a little central transparency: Some sudden intensity: I'm not sure' (L3 244)

15 March VSW to VW: 'you upset me dreadfully about the central transparency. Because it is what I have always felt myself. Only how to do it?' (L/VSW 115)

16 March 'Oh look here: your book of travels [PT]. May we have it? Please say yes, for the autumn' (VW to VSW, L3 247)

16 May VSW returns from Teheran

Summer VSW and VW visit each other regularly, sometimes spending nights at each other's houses, and frequently selecting dates when LW will be absent or arranging for him to join them for only part of the visit (see VW to VB, 13 June, L3 275; VW to VSW, 22 June, L3 277; VW to VSW, 19 July, L3 281; VW to VSW, 19 August, L3 287)

28 June 'Virginia – not a muddle exactly; she is a busy and sensible woman. But she does love me, and I did sleep with her at Rodmell. That does not constitute a muddle though' (VSW to HN, V&H 150)

15 September VW reading the proofs of PT (L3 291)

20 September The Land published (Heinemann)

27 October Sir Edmund Gosse (see EN 242:111, 253:18) introduces VSW as a speaker at the Royal Society of Literature

November PT published (Hogarth Press)
**Chronology of the Composition of Orlando**

1927

17–19 January VW spends two nights at Knole with VSW (D3 123–5)

28 January VSW spends morning with VW and leaves for Teheran in afternoon

12 February VW is reading *PT*: ‘Vita’s prose is too fluent. I’ve been reading it, & it makes my pen run’ (D3 126)

8 March ‘I’ve thought of an entirely new book’ (VW to VSW, L3 344)

14 March ‘I must record the conception last night between 12 & one of a new book +Orlando leading to The Waves. (July 8th 1933)+’ (D3 131)

27 March ‘What is a Novel?’ published in *Weekly Dispatch*

30 March–28 April VW and LW in France and Italy

2 April ‘A Giant with Very Small Thumbs’ published in *Nation and Athenaeum*

23 April ‘Two Women’ published in *Nation and Athenaeum*

5 May VSW and HN return to England. TL published in UK and USA

18 May VW, accompanied by VSW, gives lecture on ‘Poetry, Fiction and the Future’ at St Hugh’s College, Oxford


14 June VW reading VSW’s *Challenge* and an early copy of HN’s *Some People*

16 June VW attends presentation ceremony of Hawthornden Prize to VSW for *The Land*

28 June VSW spends night with Mary Hutchinson (see EN 6:14.1)

29 June VW, LW, VSW, HN and Quentin Bell travel to Yorkshire to watch the eclipse of the sun

2–4 July VW spends weekend with VSW at Long Barn; VSW tells her about Mary Hutchinson

8 July Revising ‘Slater’s Pins Have No Points’

15 July LW and VW radio broadcast: ‘Are Too Many Books Published?’

15–16 July VW and LW visit VSW and HN at Long Barn
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21 July VV and VSW visit Kew Gardens
23 July Writing ‘Phases of Fiction’ (D3 149–50)
27–30 July VV visits Ethel Sands and Nan Hudson (see EN 6:20) in France
30 July ‘The Governess of Downing Street’ published in Nation and Athenaeum
5 August VV reading Katherine Mansfield
11–13 August VSW visits VV at Monks House
14 August First part of ‘Poetry, Fiction and the Future’ published in New York Herald Tribune
17 August ‘Life Itself’ published in New Republic (New York)
21 August Second part of ‘Poetry, Fiction and the Future’ published in New York Herald Tribune
22 August Working on ‘Romance’ section of ‘Phases of Fiction’; asks VSW if she can borrow Ann Radcliffe, The Mysteries of Udolpho and ‘the most romantic novel of Mrs Behn’s’ (L3 412)

September VSW and Mary Campbell become lovers
10 September ‘Katherine Mansfield’ published in Nation and Athenaeum
20 September ‘One of these days, though, I shall sketch here, like a grand historical picture, the outlines of all my friends. [. . .] Vita should be Orlando, a young nobleman’ (D3 156–7)
5 October ‘a biography beginning in the year 1500 & continuing to the present day, called Orlando: Vita; only with a change about from one sex to another’ (D3 161)
6 October ‘I’m frightfully excited: I will tell you why’ (VV to VSW, L3 427)
8 October Begins writing O
9 October ‘But listen; suppose Orlando turns out to be Vita; and its all about you and the lusts of your flesh and the lure of your mind (heart you have none, who go gallivanting down the lanes with Campbell)’ (VV to VSW, L3 428–9). VV reading KS. ‘An Essay in Criticism’ published in New York Herald Tribune
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11 October  ‘if ever I was thrilled and terrified it is at the prospect of being projected into the shape of Orlando’ (VSW to VW, LVSW 238)

13 October  ‘I am writing at great speed. [. . .] The truth is I’m so engulfed in Orlando I can think of nothing else. [. . .] Look here, I must come down and see you, if only to choose some pictures. [. . .] It will be a little book, about 30,000 words at most, and [. . .] I shall have it done by Christmas’ (VW to VSW, L3 430)

14 October  Begins ‘chapter which describes Violet [Trefusis] and you meeting on the ice’ (VW to VSW, 13 October, L3 430) (OHD 9?/12?/19?)

16 October   ‘Is Fiction an Art?’ published in New York Herald Tribune

21 October  ‘My questions about your past can wait till you’re in London’ (VW to VSW, L3 433)

22 October  ‘[I] am launched somewhat furtively but with all the more passion upon Orlando: A Biography. It is to be a small book, & written by Christmas’ (D3 161)

23 October  ‘What used you and Lord Lascelles [see EN 105:7] to talk about? [. . .] I’ve sold Orlando in America’ (VW to VSW, L3 433). ‘Not One of Us’ published in New York Herald Tribune. HN leaves to take up diplomatic post in Berlin

24 October  Begins section: ‘It was their signal’ (OHD 41; 53)

28 October  VW and VSW visit Knole to choose pictures for O (L3 434 n)

29 October  Begins Chapter 2 (OHD 48; 61)


October  ‘Street Haunting: A London Adventure’ published in Yale Review

1 November  Begins section ‘As this pause was of extreme significance’ (OHD 58; 72; date appears in both MS and Bi)
**Chronology of the Composition of Orlando**

2 November

VSW, accompanied by VW, is photographed at Lenare’s studio in London. One image may have been used for *Orlando on Her Return to England* (see EN 11:6).

4 November

‘Was Orlando presented at court?’ (VW to VSW, *L3 434*)

6 November

‘If you haven’t already got the man to do the photographs [at Knole], would you wait a little? ’ (VW to VSW, *L3 434–5*). Mary Campbell’s husband Roy finds out about her relationship with VSW, threatens her with a knife (*V&H 187*).

10 November

VSW tells VW about the situation with the Campbells; VW is unsympathetic (*D3 165, 165 n*).

11 November

‘I have been so really wretched since last night. [. . .] you were quite right to say what you did; it has given me a pull-up; I drift too easily’ (VSW to VW, *LVSW 242*). ‘You make me feel such a brute – and I didn’t mean to be [. . .] you cant help attracting the flounders’ (VW to VSW, *L3 435*).

14 November

VB and Duncan Grant take photographs of VSW for use in *O*.

16 November

‘Orlando’s bad and wont be out, if at all, till the Autumn’ (VW to VSW, *L3 437*).

20 November

Begins Chapter 3 (*OHD 106; 110*): ‘Do I learn anything? Too much of a joke perhaps for that; yet I like these plain sentences; & the externality of it for a change. It is too thin of course; splashed over the canvas; but I shall cover the ground by Jan. 7th (I say) & then re-write’ (*D3 164*).

22 November

VW asks VSW if she can borrow a copy of *Gorboduc* (see EN 16:15; *L3 441*).

29 November


3 December

‘Ruskin Looks Back on Life’ published in *T.P.’s Weekly*.

5 December

Begins section ‘But now Orlando was to learn’ (*OHD 132; 155*). ‘The photographs are perfect, and the two Orlando’s [sic] fit like a glove. [. . .] I’m rather excited.
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about Orlando tonight: have been lying by the fire and making up the last chapter’ (VW to VSW, L3 442–3).
The photographs are most likely of the three paintings at Knole that were used for illustrations: Orlando as a Boy (see EN 2:1); The Archduchess Harriet (see EN 11:4); Orlando as Ambassador (see EN 11:5)

20 December 'I am still writing the 3rd Chap. of Orlando. I have had of course to give up the fancy of finishing by February & printing this spring’ (D3 167). VW reading Lord Chesterfield's letters

21 December '[Orlando] is the wittiest and most profound book in the world: the very spit and image of you into the bargain’ (VW to VSW, L3 443)

1928

4 January Begins section 'So then one may sketch’ (OHD 179; 202)

7 January Lord Sackville, VSW's father, develops pneumonia

11 January Thomas Hardy dies

14–15 January VW visits VSW at Long Barn

19 January 'Thomas Hardy's Novels' published in TLS

23–7 January VW in bed with a headache

28 January Lord Sackville dies

January 'Slater's Pins Have No Points' published in Forum (New York)

1 February Writes final discarded paragraph of Chapter 4 and begins Chapter 5 (OHD 183; 207)

3 February 'The Sun and the Fish’ published in Time and Tide

9 February 'The Novels of George Meredith’ published in TLS

10 February VW visits VSW at Long Barn

11 February Unsigned review of Memories and Notes, by Anthony Hope, published in Nation and Athenaeum. 'I am hacking rather listlessly at the last chapter of Orlando, which was to have been the best’ (D3 175)

18 February 'I had thought to write the quickest most brilliant pages in Orlando yesterday—not a drop came [. . .] instead of writing O. I've been racing up & down the whole field of my lecture’
**CHRONOLOGY OF THE COMPOSITION OF ORLANDO**

*(D3 175) ['Women and Fiction', read at Newnham College, Cambridge, in May]*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20 February</td>
<td>VW in bed with influenza: ‘So cross: I was just finishing Orlando’ (VW to VSW, L3 461)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 February</td>
<td>‘I have only just time to finish Orlando before we go abroad’ (VW to VB, L3 464)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 February</td>
<td>VW visits VSW at Long Barn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 February</td>
<td>VSW in Berlin with HN. Unsigned review of <em>The Cornish Miner</em>, by A. K. Hamilton Jenkin, published in <em>Nation and Athenaeum</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 March</td>
<td>Begins section ‘She could remember’ (OHD 247; 264)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 March</td>
<td>‘We are going to Rodmell for three or four days, and there I shall finish Orlando, I hope’ (VW to VB, L3 466)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 March</td>
<td>‘This damned Orlando – I want to finish it, and I cant finish it [...] You are driving down to Knole [in O; 279–87], and as you go, you exhibit the most profound and secret side of your character’ (VW to VSW, L3 469)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 March</td>
<td>‘An English Aristocrat’ published in <em>TLS</em>; ‘the influenza has unmanned me; and what is worse – for I don’t much mind that – got me so behindhand with a wretched silly thing [O] I have to finish this summer’ (VW to Pernel Strachey, L3 470)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9–12 March</td>
<td>VW and LW at Monks House, Rodmell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 March</td>
<td>In Berlin, VSW and Margaret Voigt become lovers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 March</td>
<td>‘So parched and frozen was I [at Rodmell], I couldn’t write a word of Orlando, and have brought him back, like an old man of the sea, to finish here’ (VW to VSW, L3 471)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 March</td>
<td>Finishes first draft of <em>O</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 March</td>
<td>‘There will be three months of close work needed, imperatively, before it can be printed; for I have scrambled &amp; splashed, &amp; the canvas shows through in a thousand places’ (D3 176)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 March</td>
<td>‘Did you feel a sort of tug, as if your neck was being broken on Saturday last [17 March] at 5 minutes to one? [...] Now every word will have to be re-written, and I see no chance of finishing it by September’ (VW to VSW, L3 474)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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22 March  
‘There are the last pages at the end of Orlando [. . .] Yes its done—Orlando—begun on 8th October, as a joke; & now rather too long for my liking. It may fall between two stools, be too long for a joke, & too frivolous for a serious book’ (D3 177)

26 March  
VW and LW in France

28 March  
VSW returns to England; met by Mary Campbell

**April**

3 April  
‘if you like, – no, love, – me one trifle less now that Orlando is dead, you shall never set eyes on me again’ (VSW to VW, LVSW 266)

7 April  
Unsigned review of *Stalky's Reminiscences*, by L. C. Dunsterville, published in *Nation and Athenaeum*

11 April  
‘Waxworks at the Abbey’ published in *New Republic* (New York). ‘Yes – you have survived the death of Orlando: but as I must re-write him entirely, he’s only suspended, not dead’ (VW to VSW, L 3 483)

15 April  
‘Preferences of Four Critics: Virginia Woolf’ published in *New York Herald Tribune*

17 April  
‘Would you bring a bookplate or something with your Arms on it – very important – also the photograph of the man at Worthing [for jacket illustration: see EN 11:11]: Did you get Shelmerdine photographed [for *Marmaduke Bonthrop Shelmerdine, Esquire*: see EN 11:8]? I’m being pestered to send all these things to America at once, and see that every word will have to be re-written’ (VW to VSW, L 3 484)

19 April  
‘Orlando, which is wretched, and must be entirely re-written in one month’ (VW to VB, L 3 485)

21 April  
‘Mr. Yeats’ (unsigned) published in *Nation and Athenaeum*. ‘Orlando is to tell the truth, damned
rough. [. . .] I vow I wont spend longer at Orlando, which is a freak; it shall come out in September, though the perfect artist would revoke & rewrite & polish – infinitely’ (D3 180–1)

24 April

‘I should be typing O. in the basement. Must now do 10 pages daily till June 1st’ (D3 182)

Late April

Margaret Voigt arrives in England; Mary Campbell leaves to join her husband in France

27 April

‘I wanted to ask if it would be convenient should we call in on Sunday [29 April] on our way back; at Long Barn. It has now become essential to have a photograph of Orlando in country clothes in a wood, to end with [Orlando at the present time, see EN 11:9]. If you have films and a camera I thought Leonard might take you’ (VW to VSW, L3 488)

28 April

Unsigned review of Behind the Scenes With Cyril Maude, by himself, published in Nation and Athenaeum

29 April

‘Please send the photograph of Angelica [as Sasha in O] as soon as you can [The Russian Princess as a Child, see EN 11:3]. Harcourt Brace is badgering my life out to get the whole book and pictures during May’ (VW to VB, L3 489)

2 May

VW, accompanied by VSW, collects the Femina – Vie Heureuse Prize for TL. VW writes that she has ‘to finish an extremely foolish book [O] all of a sudden’ (VW to Quentin Bell, L3 491)

4 May

‘I think I must tell Eddy [ESW, see EN 6:13:2] about you [and O]’ (VW to VSW, L3 492)

5 May

Crosby Gaige comes to tea with VW and LW. Unsigned review of Behind the Brass Plate, by A. T. Schofield, published in Nation and Athenaeum

6 May

‘I am scribbling away to finish my nonsense book. Have I your permission to mention you in the Preface? Because I’ve done it’ (VW to Quentin Bell, L3 493)
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26 May
Unsigned review of *The Book of Catherine Wells*, with an introduction by H. G. Wells, published in *Nation and Athenæum*

31 May
LW gives reaction to O. ‘I think it lacks the sort of hammering I should have given it if I had taken longer: is too freakish & unequal. [. . .] The truth is I expect I began it as a joke, & went on with it seriously’ (D3 184–5)

1 June
pp. 1–179 of MS sent to printers (R & R Clark), along with three photographs but without the preface (Reading MS 2750.567)

4[?] June
Remaining pages of MS sent to printers

5 June
‘I have finished my bad joke—that is the last book I have written in which you occur in the preface. It should be written again; but it wont be’ (VW to Quentin Bell, L3 506)

17 June
‘we must have 2 copies, on glossy paper of the Lord Lascelles picture [The Archduchess Harriet, see EN 11:4]. [. . .] Oh heavens what a bore Orlando is – worse in his death than in his life I think: I’m so tired of him’ (VW to VSW, L3 510)

20 June
‘So sick of Orlando I can write nothing. I have corrected the proofs in a week; & cannot spin another phrase. [. . .] Correcting proofs 5, 6, or 7 hours a day, writing in this & that meticulously’ (D3 186)

24 June
‘nothing but proofs do I see; and the entire worthlessness of my own words. I have been correcting for 6 hours daily, and must now write my name 800 times over [for Arliss]’ (VW to ESW, L3 510)

28 June
Remaining five photographs sent to printers

Summer
Works on ‘Phases of Fiction’

30 June
Unsigned review of *On the Stage: An Autobiography*, by George Arliss, published in *Nation and Athenæum*
**Chronology of the Composition of Orlando**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 July</td>
<td>‘I am as dry as a bone and as barren as a burnt moor [. . .] having written 60,000 words in 5 months’ (VW to Hugh Walpole, L3 512)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 July</td>
<td>VW visits VSW at Long Barn: ‘a good rather happy visit. [. . .] Lay by the black currant bushes lecturing Vita on her floundering habits with the Campbells for instance’ (D3 187–8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 July</td>
<td>Unsigned review of <em>Clara Butt: Her Life Story</em>, by Winifred Ponder, published in <em>Nation and Athenaeum</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 July</td>
<td>‘It is extremely kind of you to write to me so generously about Orlando’ (VW to Donald Brace, L3 513)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mid-July–September</td>
<td>VW and LW at Monks House, Rodmell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 July</td>
<td>‘For Promiscuous you are, and thats all there is to be said of you. Look in the Index to Orlando – after Pippin and see what comes next – Promiscuity passim’ (VW to VSW, L3 514)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 July</td>
<td><em>The Well of Loneliness</em> published</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 July</td>
<td>VSW visits VW at Monks House, Rodmell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 August</td>
<td>‘11th Oct. sees the end of our romance’ (VW to VSW, L3 515)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 August</td>
<td>Unsigned review of <em>Day In, Day Out</em>, by Mrs Aubrey Le Blond, published in <em>Nation and Athenaeum</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 August</td>
<td>‘Miss Ritchie [traveller for Hogarth Press] praises Orlando, &amp; I was pleased till I thought, perhaps this is gratitude for our £20’ (D3 191)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 August–mid-September</td>
<td>VSW in Berlin with HN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 August</td>
<td>‘For many days I have been so disjected by society that writing has been only a dream – something another woman did once. What has caused this irruption I scarcely know – largely your friend Radclyffe Hall (she is now docked of her Miss owing to her proclivities) they banned her book [Well of Loneliness]; and so Leonard and Morgan Forster began to get up a protest, and soon we...’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*cv*
were telephoning and interviewing and collecting signatures – not yours, for your proclivities are too well known’ (VW to VSW, L3 520)

8 September
‘The New Censorship’, Letter to Editor from VW and E. M. Forster protesting against banning of The Well of Loneliness, by Radclyffe Hall, published in Nation and Athenaeum

19 September
‘I was in a bookshop in London yesterday and the bookseller said to me knowingly, “I saw an advance copy of Orlando”’ (VSW to VW, LVSW 284)

22 September
‘But the news of Orlando is black. We may sell a third that we sold of The Lighthouse before publication [. . .] No one wants biography. But it is a novel, says Miss Ritchie. [. . .] Also it should be 10/6 or 12/6 not 9/- Lord, lord!’ (D3 198)

23 September
‘A Sentimental Journey’ published in New York Herald Tribune

24 September
Travels to Burgundy with VSW

28 September
VSW ‘thinks Lady Sackville may write me either a violent or seducing letter about Orlando – may ask me to go and see her, and abuse Vita. [. . .] I think we shall have a very happy and exciting autumn, in spite of the complete failure of Orlando’ (VW to LW, L3 539)

29 September
Unsigned review of The Diaries of Mary, Countess of Meath, edited by LW, published in Nation and Athenaeum

2 October
Crosby Gaige edition of O (A) published in USA

7 October
‘I am horribly nervous about Thursday [the British publication date of O]’ (VW to VSW, L3 540); ‘Yes – I’m very nervous about Thursday and Orlando – I’m sending you a copy; but be silent; I shant expect either thanks or praise’ (VW to HN, L3 541)
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9 October  ‘But you will send me Orlando? before 4. o’clock?
I need hardly say that I can hardly exist till I get it’
(VSW to VW, LVSW 287)

11 October O (B1) published in UK

18 October O (At.2) published in USA
Sackville Biographical Table
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Owners of Knole</th>
<th>Dates</th>
<th>Date when Knole was acquired</th>
<th>Relationship to previous owner</th>
<th>Brief biography</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Sackville,</td>
<td>1536–1608</td>
<td>1605; extensively rebuilt</td>
<td>Bought from the Crown (the story that Elizabeth I gave it to him is probably apocryphal, see EN 13:8–11)</td>
<td>A 'grave and solemn personage and a 'true poet' favoured by Elizabeth I; Lord Treasurer 1599–1608; co-author of Gorboduc, earliest blank verse drama in England performed in front of Elizabeth I in 1561, and of Induction to the Mirror for Magistrates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lord Buckhurst and 1st Earl of Dorset</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Sackville,</td>
<td>1561–1609</td>
<td>1608</td>
<td>Son</td>
<td>'A byword for extravagance [. . .] weak, vain, and prodigal' (KS4 67, 68)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Earl of Dorset</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Sackville,</td>
<td>1589–1624</td>
<td>1609</td>
<td>Son</td>
<td>'A byword for extravagance [. . .] weak, vain, and prodigal' (KS4 67, 68)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd Earl of Dorset</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owners of Knole</td>
<td>Dates</td>
<td>Date when Knole was acquired</td>
<td>Relationship to previous owner</td>
<td>Brief biography</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Edward Sackville, 4th Earl of Dorset | 1590–1662 | 1624 | Brother | married to Ann whose diary VS edited in 1923; friend and patron of authors including Ben Jonson, George Drayton and John Donne. ‘The embodiment of Cavalier romance’ (KS4 9); Ambassador to Louis XIII; Lord Chamberlain to Charles I; fought with Royalists during the Civil War.
Charles Sackville, 1643–1706
6th Earl of Dorset

Son

1677

‘let us call him the Restoration Earl [. . .] jolly, loose-living, magnificent’ (KS4 119); author of ‘To all you ladies now at land’; lover of Nell Gwyn (later the mistress of Charles II); friend and patron of poets John Dryden, Matthew Prior, Alexander Pope and others; Lord Chamberlain

Lionel Sackville, 1687–1766
7th Earl of Dorset, 1st Duke of Dorset

Son

1706

‘an indistinct figure [ . . . ] worthy, honest, good-natured’ (KS4 151); Lord Steward; Lord Lieutenant of Ireland and Kent

Charles Sackville, 1711–69
2nd Duke of Dorset

Son

1766

‘a dissolute and extravagant man of fashion, who squandered large sums of money upon producing operas’ (KS4 154)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Owners of Knole</th>
<th>Dates</th>
<th>Date when Knole was acquired</th>
<th>Relationship to previous owner</th>
<th>Brief biography</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>John Frederick Sackville, 3rd Duke of Dorset</td>
<td>1746–99</td>
<td>1769</td>
<td>Nephew</td>
<td>‘handsome, rich, charming (KS4 173); Ambassador to France during the French Revolution’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Sackville, 4th Duke of Dorset</td>
<td>1794–1815</td>
<td>1799</td>
<td>Son</td>
<td>‘very little record of that short life’ (KS4 173); became Duke of Dorset aged 5; friendship with Byron as a schoolboy; killed in a hunting accident</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arabella Cope, Duchess of Dorset and Countess of Whitworth</td>
<td>1769–1825</td>
<td>1815</td>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>‘a severe and not very sympathetic woman’ (KS4 173); under the will of her first husband, the 3rd Duke of Dorset, she became the owner of Knole; her son, the 4th Duke of Dorset, died. The title passed to a cousin, Charles Sackville Germain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Years</td>
<td>Role</td>
<td>Knole Passing Details</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Sackville, Countess of Plymouth</td>
<td>1792–1864</td>
<td>Daughter</td>
<td>Knole passed to Mary under the terms of her parents' will.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth Sackville-West, Countess de la Warr and Baroness Buckhurst of Buckhurst</td>
<td>1795–1870</td>
<td>Sister</td>
<td>Knole passed to Elizabeth under the terms of her sister Mary's will.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reginald Sackville-West, Baron Buckhurst, 7th Earl de la Warr</td>
<td>1817–96</td>
<td>Son</td>
<td>Chaplain to the Queen; Knole passed to him under unusual terms of his aunt Mary's will; Reginald became 7th Earl de la Warr and moved to Buckhurst on the death of his elder brother Charles, 6th Earl de la Warr, in 1873</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mortimer Sackville-West</td>
<td>1820–88</td>
<td>Brother</td>
<td>Knole passed to him when his elder brother Reginald passed it under unusual terms.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1873</td>
<td></td>
<td>Continued</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owners of Knole</td>
<td>Dates</td>
<td>Date when Knole was acquired</td>
<td>Relationship to previous owner</td>
<td>Brief biography</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Lord Sackville</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lionel Sackville-West, 2nd Lord Sackville</td>
<td>1827–1908</td>
<td>1888</td>
<td>Brother</td>
<td>became 7th Earl and moved to Brazil; diplomat; took as mistress Spanish dancer Pepita Duran (d. 1871); had five illegitimate children; his eldest daughter Victoria went to Knole and took charge of the household.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lionel Sackville-West, 3rd Lord Sackville</td>
<td>1867–1928</td>
<td>1908</td>
<td>Nephew</td>
<td>Married his cousin who was already living at Knole when they met; father of VSW.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Sackville-West, 4th Lord Sackville</td>
<td>1870–1962</td>
<td>1928</td>
<td>Brother</td>
<td>Major-General in the British Army; handed Knole over to the National Trust in 1946 but continued to live in it until his death.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Trust</td>
<td></td>
<td>1946</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Sackville Family Tree
Sackville Family

- ROBERT SACKVILLE, 2nd Earl Of Dorset
  - Born 1561, Died 1609

- RICHARD SACKVILLE, 3rd Earl Of Dorset
  - Born 1589, Died 1624

- Lady Anne Clifford
  - Born 1561, Died 1679

- Cicely Baker
  - Died 1615

- THOMAS SACKVILLE, Lord Buckhurst (1567), 1st Earl Of Dorset (1604)
  - Born 1536, Died 1608

- ROBERT SACKVILLE, 2nd Earl Of Dorset
  - Born 1589, Died 1609

- Margaret Howard
  - Died 1679

- LIONEL SACKVILLE, 7th Earl Of Dorset, Cr. 1st Duke Of Dorset
  - Born 1687, Died 1765

- CHARLES SACKVILLE, 2nd Duke Of Dorset
  - Born 1711, Died 1736

- Mary Compton
  - Died 1679

- Frances Cranfield
  - Died 1687

- Charles Leveson-Gower

- Frances Baker
  - Died 1615

- Mary Curzon
  - Died 1645

- Margaret Howard
  - Died 1591

- Cicely Baker
  - Died 1615

- Thomas Sackville, Lord Buckhurst (1567), 1st Earl Of Dorset (1604)
  - Born 1536, Died 1608
Figure 1 Title page of the first British edition of Orlando