no modernism without lesbians allowed

ageha

September 13, 2024

> *"I took the name under Deed Poll, and under English law it is incorrect to speak of it as a pseudonym. My passport is issued to me under that name and no legal document is valid that I sign in any other way."* (Bryher 1962, 188)

In august of 2020, the Women's Prize for Fiction introduced a project they called Reclaim Her Name, through which "25 novels written under male pseudonyms" were republished "under the female authors' actual name for the first time" (Pentelow 2020). The project was received by most journalists as a lovely feminist celebration (Yeung 2020) and by many scholars as ham-fisted and inaccurate (McGreevy 2020).

The problem, as scholars pointed out, is that the project presents a simplistic narrative—women writers wrote under male pseudonyms to avoid anti-female stigma—that ignores several important caveats and alternative motivations. When 紀貫之 (Ki no Tsurayuki) presented his 土佐日記 (Tosa Nikki) as the work of an anonymous woman, he did so not because women's writing held a privileged social position—it didn't—but rather because a woman as author seemed better suited to the style of the piece. This sort of style or branding concern still exists today, with authors changing name and gender according to what 'feels' right for a story, genre,[1] or target audience. Furthermore, the writing identities that authors choose are not always just expedient "pseudonyms" but can sometimes hold deep personal meaning for them. The name Michael Field, for example, served for joint authors Katherine Bradley and Edith Cooper as a symbol of their union, and to replace it with their separate feminine names would be an insult.

Maybe most critically though, there is a third possibility here: that the authors in question were not necessarily all "women". And it's rather telling that this last point—the audacity to wonder if a writer like Vernon Lee[2] might have been something other-than-woman—received the most backlash and contempt, while Reclaim Her Name's defenders made frequent reference to J.K. Rowling. The erasure of trans masculinity has always been a fundamental element of TERF-ism. Janice Raymond saw trans men as an invented token minority meant to deflect criticism and "save face" for "male-to-constructed-females" (Raymond 1980, 27), and modern TERF cultists[3] paint them as products of internalised misogyny or homophobia (Schevers 2021). There is a far more subtle and pernicious variant of this phenomenon, however, which has mainstream reputability. The Reclaim Her Name project is one of it's more obvious manifestations, but it is endemic to nearly all of our biographies and histories. In case of better-known historical figures, like Pauli Murray, it becomes visible through symptoms like wikipedia edit wars over pronouns (Wikipedia contributors 2022). But in some more niche-interest fields trans-masculine erasure remains an accepted norm that goes entirely or near-entirely unquestioned.

There is a certain class of archive-diggers and historians whom, for lack of a better term, i've been calling "academic lesbians"—though how many would refer to themselves as lesbians i can't say, and certainly not all lesbians think the way they do. Together this group has cornered the market on histories at the intersection of modernism, feminism, and sexuality in the first half of the 20th century. Diana Souhami, a prominent example, has been writing biography for some 35 years, claiming various historical figures as "lesbians", despite that term being "not

1. "gender" and "genre" sharing an etymological root is revealing.
2. Lee, one of the project's authors, signed private letters as either "Vernon" or "V.", never "Violet" (Lee 2024).
3. TERF-ism is near always a deeply religious phenomenon. Raymond is a lapsed nun who clung to cherry-picked catholic ideals, and the modern movement centres on dianic witches like Ruth Barrett who work closely with evangelical christians.

much used by them" (Souhami 2020, 3). "Many lesbians", Souhami says in her latest book, "chose their own names" as a way of "breaking from patriarchy and from being the property of men" (13). But, of seven example figures she then lists, i believe that three—Gluck, Radclyffe Hall, and Bryher—would have certainly disagreed. For these three their chosen names, whether masculine or carefully gender-neutral, served instead as just one component in broader patterns of personal self-distancing from the class of womanhood.

Souhami's 300 page biography of Gluck is subtitled pointedly "her biography". The life it details, however, is one of someone who went by an intentionally ungendered name (Souhami 2001, 1), or sometimes Peter (35); dressed only in "men's clothes" (10, 36) and hair and enacted gentlemanly cultural customs (10, 42); angrily rejected being called "miss" in any circumstance (10, 107); though eager to maintain a close relationship with family was unable to compromise on these points or be called by the "dreaded" birth name Hannah (25, 38); and burned all diaries, letters, and photos in order to forget about the past (16, 140). Titular Gluck even once wrote in a letter to loved one Nesta that a criticism of *YouWe*—their self-portrait as "husband and wife"—which called Nesta "too male" and Gluck "too feminine" was intended to "destroy it for me" (124–126). If Souhami has some evidence this behaviour was all for sake of "breaking from patriarchy" she does not share it anywhere, and there is a rather obvious counter-explanation.

As for Bryher, Souhami admits quite clearly the "feeling she was at heart a man" (Souhami 2020, 123) but still includes Bryher as one of her central characters in a book about how 'lesbian women' were the prime movers of modernist culture. "I cannot talk about cisgender for Virginia Woolf, call Bryher they, or struggle with *No Modernism Without QUILTBAG+*" (3). Yet Souhami's open refusal to engage is at least a more honest response than that of other scholars who, if they mention the topic at all, do so only in brief, tortured phrases, explaining that Bryher was "a woman [...] who thought of herself as a boy who had been placed into the wrong body" (Hollenberg 2022, 2) and who had "cautioned H.D. [...] never to refer to her as a 'she' " (Guest 1984, 122). That strangeness dealt with, they then carry on doing just the things Bryher had wished they wouldn't—because well, such unreasonable demands, you can't believe we should take them seriously. Even worse, on wikipedia (Wikipedia contributors 2023) and other public-facing short biographies, "Bryher" is listed as being a pen name rather than legal and personal, with the birth name "Annie" always prominently featured as 'real'.

Before continuing, it is important to note here that the categories "trans masculine" and "lesbian" are not always considered mutually exclusive. activist Leslie Feinberg is a well-known example of someone who personally used both. Feinberg also, however, famously called out the use of "lesbian" and "she" when referring to trans men like Brandon Teena who did not use them (Minkowitz 2018). Like Teena, Bryher was continually placed into the 'lesbian woman' category by contemporaries—including even H.D.—but resented being seen that way.

When the figures in question have themselves rejected your categorisation, it becomes a matter of clear prejudice to force it back onto them. But such prejudice remains the norm, and the trains of this drive to erase all lead back to the next character on Souhami's list, Radclyffe Hall, and the 1928 novel *The well of loneliness*. Lillian Faderman, 'mom of the academic lesbians', began writing her histories a few years earlier than Souhami and presents the 'AL' position far more plainly, with Hall's novel as exemplar:

> *The Well* has had generally such a devastating effect on female same-sex love not only because its central character ends in loneliness but—and much more significantly—because its writer fell into the congenitalist trap. She believed that if she argued that some women were born different, society would free them to pursue their independence; instead, her popular rendition of "congenital inversion" further morbidified the most natural impulses and healthy views. (Faderman 1981, 323)

The idea is that to be lesbian is a normal, healthy state, but the novel presents it erroneously instead as due to an inborn pathology which causes inevitable suffering. And the problem with this reading, of course, is that Hall's novel is not about lesbians. The following are all excerpts from *The well* (Hall 1928):

> you know, Collins—I must be a boy, 'cause I feel exactly like one, I feel like young Nelson in the picture upstairs. (13)

> That night she stared at herself in the glass; and even as she did so she hated her body with its muscular shoulders, its small compact breasts, and its slender flanks of an athlete. All her life she must drag this body of hers like a monstrous fetter imposed on her spirit. (211)

> 'I'm all right.'
> 'No, you're not, you're all wrong. Go and look at your face.'

'I don't very much want to, it doesn't attract me,' smiled Stephen. (Hall 1928, 219)

I've never felt like a woman, and you know it [...] I don't know what I am; no one's ever told me that I'm different and yet I know that I'm different (228–229)

Published today, this would be an almost too obvious rendering of trans experience, at least unremarkable and maybe criticised for saying nothing new. But to the early 20th century public, this sort of 'dysphoria' was known neither in name nor in concept, and so of course it was tied by everyone to, as Faderman says, "female same-sex love". Lesbians reading *The well* expected to see themselves in it, but instead found a character drowning in inexplicable self-hate. And everyone else read the book as indicative of 'lesbianism' being, as expected, something harmful and to be avoided. Unlike that general public, Faderman has at least heard of trans people, but views them as simply gays who have gotten confused. "transsexuals are the modern 'congenital inverts.' [...] convinced (as their earlier counterparts were) that they are trapped in the wrong bodies" (Faderman 1981, 317). And as for the source of all of this confusion, it comes down to sexologists and their "twentieth-century pseudoknowledge" (312).

This is a theory of social contagion, present more or less explicitly throughout the AL canon. Radclyffe Hall, says Souhami, "embraced contentious theories with disconcerting ease" (Souhami 1998, 146) to reach "a theory of lesbian identity about as empirically reliable as the paternity of Jesus Christ" (155). Modernist scholar Susan Stanford Friedman thought similarly that Bryher believed in "lesbians as 'men' trapped in the body of women"—and wrote this experience in the autobiographical *Two selves*—entirely due to close relationships with first the sexologist Havelock Ellis[4] and later Sigmund Freud[5] (Friedman 2002, 447). Nevermind that related themes pervade Hall's work from the first unpublished stories more than a decade earlier (Hall 2016, 2),[6] or the preferred given name of John taken 20 years earlier (Souhami 1998, 42), or having a childhood portrait repainted to look like a boy.[7] And nevermind that Bryher reports having felt like a boy since early childhood (Bryher 1962, 17, 19, 22), and upon meeting H.D. was already on the brink of suicide (Bryher 2000, ix–x), later clinging to psychoanalytic therapy as an alternative to death (Bryher 1962, 178). Of course the exact form of John and Bryher's beliefs was shaped by theories of the day. But the urge to seek out those theories, the need for an explanation of their "two selves",[8] was already present long before.

As for the AL characterisation of sexologists, those pedlars of "twentieth-century pseudoknowledge", it is one-sided and inaccurate. Faderman claims that they saw inverts as unevolved "criminals and deviants", born of degeneracy endemic to the lower classes (Faderman 1991, 40). They saw homosexuality as inextricably linked to masculine behaviour (41, 43) and sought to connect the women's movement to sexual abnormality (48). There is a two-part problem with this picture: firstly, that "sexologists" were not a unified dogmatic front but a diverse and active field with competing ideas developing over time, and secondly, that the most relevant faction—centred on Havelock Ellis who was Bryhers friend and wrote a preface for *The well* in its defence—settled on an understanding that was, broadly, correct.

In 1933, at the age of 74, Ellis published a review book titled *Psychology of sex*. And, despite predating modern understanding of genetics and embryogenesis—much of which has only come to light in the past fifteen years or so following the groundbreaking work of 山中伸弥 (Yamanaka Shinya)—it's overview of the set of conditions that today we call LGBT+ is in many ways remarkably accurate. Ellis places "homosexuality" in its own part separate from the paraphilias and—citing various other researchers, including Magnus Hirschfeld whom Feinberg also mentions—argues that it is neither "vice" nor "insanity" (Ellis 1933, 191) but a common element of human life in every place and time that, outside the sphere of abrahamic influence, has often been considered even virtuous (189).

4. Ellis was a bit like an english Freud, only less stupid and more perverted, and Freud considered him something like a rival.

5. It's pretty funny seeing Freud address letters to Bryher progressively as first "Dear Sir" (Friedman 2002, 7), then "Dear Lady" (137), and in the end "Dear Bryher" (262). "I take the liberty of addressing you the same way that you sign your name; there is something about you that invites this."

6. Hall wrote story after story on 'misfits' trying to escape, by practical or transcendental means, the bodies that have them trapped, and, like Felix Salten, used the hunting of animals as metaphor of the persecution of marginalised groups.

7. Of course, say the ALs, only due to sexologist influence (Rolley 1990).

8. "Two selves. Jammed against each other, disjointed and ill-fitting. An obedient Nancy with heavy plaits tied over two ears that answered 'yes, no, yes no,' according as the wind blew. A boy, a brain, that planned adventures and sought wisdom" (Bryher 2000, 183).

He lists it as one of four "inter-sexual" classes: "genital", "somatic", "psychic" (that is in modern parlance trans), and "psycho-sexual" (homosexuality) (Ellis 1933, 196) and attributes these conditions to hormonal variation, through which even "the sex" itself can be "virtually changed" (8–9). And he makes clear also that, though these classes correlate, changes in one are not necessarily linked to changes in another (8).

All of the above is essentially true, including the characterisation of homosexuality and trans-ness as intersex conditions caused by hormonal disorder.[9] Studies with both humans and model organisms show that hormonal exposures during development can induce 'cross-sex behaviours' (Hines 2006) (Berenbaum and Beltz 2011), and prominent neurobiologist Ben Barres suspected that his own trans-ness was a product of his mother being given, rather than diethylstilbestrol, "a testosterone-like drug", which "may have masculinized my brain" (Barres 2018, 12).

And Ellis goes even further, admitting plainly what the general public some 90 years later still refuses to accept: that though "[i]t may seem easy to say that there are two definitely separated distinct and immutable sexes", that belief has "long ceased to be, biologically, strictly correct". Sex is "mutable, with the possibility of one sex being changed into the other sex", "its frontiers are often uncertain", and "there are many stages between a complete male and complete female" (Ellis 1933, 194).[10] All told, the facts here presented would serve as a decent brief overview for students today as well as those in the 1930s—but for one very important caveat: that bisexuality, and even potentially occasional strict homosexuality, in clever prosocial species like humans, bonobos, and macaques, can serve important evolutionary roles in social bonding and child rearing that cause their being positively selected for, and thus the high prevalence we see in these species today (Barron and Hare 2020).

So, given the state of evidence on these matters, why have the AL crowd, and their more extreme TERF counterparts, been so loathe to accept it? Souhami's biography of Hall (Souhami 1998) is even more a condemnation of *The well* itself than of its censors, beginning with an excuse to 'deadname' John to avoid feeling too "awkward" and going to great lengths painting everything John felt and believed as having been laughably wrong. And, as in Bryher's case, this behaviour extends to other scholars as well. In her introduction to some of Hall's unpublished works, Jana Funke spends 7 pages (Hall 2016, 29–36) arguing that, because a draft version of the story Miss Ogilvy Finds Herself ends with Ogilvy transformed into a normal woman rather than a man as it was later published, this overrides all earlier statements ("My God, my God, my God [...] if only I were a man!" (174)) and proves that the story was at first not meant to be about inversion but only eugenics and racial purity—a position convincing only to someone who hasn't read the manuscript or has no concept of trans experience.[11] What is it about trans masculinity that's so terrifying it has to be this way everywhere erased?

At heart of all this fear is what i call the platonist fallacy.[12] It is the splitting up of the world into simplistic categories and projecting that map back onto the territory, leaving no space for understanding any pieces which don't fit. And, in this case, it is the inability to recognise that other people who look something like us can nevertheless be different. They think that, because they are butch or lesbian women and satisfied in being so, anyone who seems similar must just be women who are confused. And they fear the fallacy being turned back on them from outside, with the 'normals' assuming that, because they seem trans-ish, they must themselves be men. There is an old question that by now has become cliché: 'where have all the butches gone?'—that is 'why have they all gone trans?'—which exemplifies this fear: a feeling of betrayal, that by 'deciding they're really men' they have rejected your understanding that 'women don't have to conform to stereotypes' and invalidated your womanhood in the eyes of the world. But, as Roey Thorpe points out, this is

9. Though the mechanics involved are far more complicated than Ellis could know, including not just over or underproduction of hormones but also variations in enzymes to metabolise them, receptors to detect them, gene networks to respond to them, and so on, along with environmental exposures to hormones, analogue molecules, and other disruptors both in utero and later.

10. This last bit does not go far enough even, as we now know organisms are complex systems (in the technical sense), and the state space "between" male and female does not change two-variable-linearly along a gradient or spectrum but can instead exhibit novel phenomena not present in either extreme.

11. an old refrain: 'If only I had a magic button could change me into a normal member of <birth-assigned sex>, of course I would press it.'

12. E.T. Jaynes called it the mind projection fallacy. Much more on this in a later essay.

to begin with not a case of those others changing but of the questioner's having previously failed to see them as they were.

> Years ago, I asked the same questions, but today, this conversation makes me uncomfortable. Because I am of this older generation, I have seen things change—and not change—for a long time. [...] In the mid 1990s, as a grad student, I wrote about the lesbian history of Detroit. I interviewed 48 women who had lived as lesbians between 1930 and 1970. When I met them, these women were mostly in their sixties and seventies. Of the 48, four—almost 10%—said that if they were young today, they would transition their gender and become men. [...] I have since learned that transition is not a betrayal, a lack of courage, or a desire to escape an unwelcoming community. [...] All our work isn't forgotten; it has been built upon by a new generation seeking to be true to themselves, just as we dreamed they would. (Thorpe 2013)

The blurring of sexual differentiation is a phenomenon inherent to mammalian genetics and development, as the full genome required to produce either body plan is present in every[13] individual. In ancient Rome (Green 1998, 4–5), Heian Japan (anonymous 1080–1100), pre-colonial North America (Driskill 2016), and definitely in modernist-era England as well, there have always existed people who in the modern anglosphere would be called trans and had a shared core of experience. Words and cultural interpretations change, but, like arms and eyes and situs inversis, the physical phenomenon of blurred or mismatched interoceptive sex has been a part of human life largely unchanged for millions of years.

That being said, what i don't want is an over-simple push to replace 'women and men' with 'trans people' in historical narratives. Instead we should be generally cautious of trying to "reclaim" historical figures and project ourselves onto them. In exemplar: from 1935 to 1940, Murray Constantine published four novels focussed heavily on ideas of gender, including *Proud man* which discusses both homosexuality and trans-ness and the narrator of which is an idealised sexless 'true human' from the future who transcends our own "subhuman" ideas of sexed categorisation. These books remained under the Murray name for 40 years until posthumously Daphne Patai[14] badgered the publisher into revealing Murray's 'true' identity of Katharine Burdekin and had them republished under that name (Burdekin 1985, iii). There is not clear evidence here to support a claim that 'Murray was trans', but various hints—Murray once wrote an unpublished sequel to *The well of loneliness* (Burdekin 1989, 173), and an earlier novel, published under "Kay Burdekin", is about "a monk born with the soul of a woman"[15] (177)—make it neither at all clear enough to say otherwise. And in any case i don't believe it's right when the author has chosen an identity, and has held onto that self even unto death, that a third party should decide for it to be overwritten and a 'real' identity reclaimed. We can never fully know the lives of people who have lived before us, but we can at least try not to fill in the gaps with categorical assumptions. Like historian Kit Heyam, what i hope for instead is a future where we consider possibilities openly, leave room for uncertainty, and work before all else at "*seeing* them on their own terms" (Heyam 2022, 227).

references

anonymous. 1080–1100. とりかへばや物語.

Barres, Ben. 2018. *The autobiography of a transgender scientist.* The MIT Press.

Barron, Andrew B., and Brian Hare. 2020. "Prosociality and a Sociosexual Hypothesis for the Evolution of Same-Sex Attraction in Humans." *Frontiers in Psychology* 10. ISSN: 1664-1078. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2019.02955.

13. not prohibitively mutated, e.g. androgen insensitive

14. Patai is more TERF than AL, but of the 'neutral, objective truth!' faction associated with organisations like FIRE (Patai 2018). There is fair irony then in her own work on utopian/dystopian fiction like Murray's emphasising its ability to overcome our "habit of perceptual and psychic economy (strongly reinforced by ideology) that makes us look at our society through invisible frames that structure both what and how we see" (Burdekin 1989).

15. That is *The rebel passion* (1929), as Patai describes it. In my own reading, the protagonist Giraldus is rather another transcendent figure embodying both the feminine and the masculine, and who for that is socially rejected as "woman".

Berenbaum, Sheri A., and Adriene M. Beltz. 2011. "Sexual differentiation of human behavior: effects of prenatal and pubertal organizational hormones." *Frontiers in Neuroendocrinology* 32 (2): 183–200. ISSN: 0091-3022. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.yfrne.2011.03.001.

Bryher. 2000. *Bryher: two novels: Development and Two Selves*. With an introduction by Joanne Winning. The University of Wisconsin Press.

———. 1962. *The heart to Artemis: a writer's memoirs*. Norman Holmes Pearson.

Burdekin, Katharine. 1985. *Swastika night*. With an introduction by Daphne Patai. The Feminist Press.

———. 1989. *The end of this day's business*. With an afterword by Daphne Patai. The Feminist Press.

Driskill, Qwo-Li. 2016. *Asegi stories: Cherokee queer and two-spirit memory*. The University of Arizona Press.

Ellis, Havelock. 1933. *Psychology of sex: a manual for students*. William Heinemann.

Faderman, Lillian. 1991. *Odd girls and twilight lovers: a history of lesbian life in twentieth-century america*. Columbia University Press.

———. 1981. *Surpassing the love of men: romantic friendship and love between women from the renaissance to the present*. Quill.

Friedman, Susan Stanford, ed. 2002. *Analyzing Freud: letters of H.D., Bryher and their circle*. New Directions.

Green, Richard. 1998. "Mythological, Historical, and Cross-Cultural Aspects of Transsexualism." In *Current concepts in transgender identity*. Garland Publishing.

Guest, Barbara. 1984. *Herself defined: the poet H.D. and her world*. Doubleday & Company.

Hall, Radclyffe. 2016. *'The World' and other unpublished works of Radclyffe Hall*. Edited by Jana Funke. Manchester University Press.

———. 1928. *The well of loneliness*. Sun Dial Press.

Heyam, Kit. 2022. *Before we were trans: a new history of gender*. Seal Press.

Hines, Melissa. 2006. "Prenatal testosterone and gender-related behaviour." *European Journal of Endocrinology* 155, no. Supplement_1 (November): S115–S121. ISSN: 0804-4643. https://doi.org/10.1530/eje.1.02236.

Hollenberg, Donna Krolik. 2022. *Winged words: the life and work of the poet H.D*. University of Michigan Press.

Lee, Vernon. 2024. *Selected letters of Vernon Lee, 1856–1935: volume III 1890–1896*. Edited by Sophie Geoffroy. Routledge.

McGreevy, Nora. 2020. "Why a Campaign to 'Reclaim' Women Writers' Names Is So Controversial: Critics say Reclaim Her Name fails to reflect the array of reasons authors chose to publish under male pseudonyms," August 20, 2020. https://www.smithsonianmag.com/smart-news/why-some-authors-used-pseudonyms-throughout-history-180975598.

Minkowitz, Donna. 2018. "How I Broke, and Botched, the Brandon Teena Story: The original writer of the Village Voice story that inspired "Boys Don't Cry" looks back on her reporting—and the huge error she still regrets," June 20, 2018. https://www.villagevoice.com/2018/06/20/how-i-broke-and-botched-the-brandon-teena-story.

Patai, Daphne. 2018. "The Battle Over Pronouns Coming to a College Near You," March 29, 2018. https://www.villagevoice.com/2018/06/20/how-i-broke-and-botched-the-brandon-teena-story.

Pentelow, Orla. 2020. "Reclaim Her Name Will Republish 25 Classics With Their Women Authors' Real Names: So long, male pseudonyms.," August 14, 2020. https://www.bustle.com/entertainment/reclaim-her-name-women-authors-male-pseudonyms.

Raymond, Janice G. 1980. *The transsexual empire.* The Women's Press.

Rolley, Katrina. 1990. "Cutting a Dash: The Dress of Radclyffe Hall and Una Troubridge." *Feminist Review,* no. 35.

Schevers, Ky. 2021. "The Reality Behind the Story I Told: What My Life was Like When I was Interviewed for the Stranger," March 25, 2021. https://reclaimingtrans.com/2021/03/25/the-reality-behind-the-story-i-told-what-my-life-was-like-when-i-was-interviewed-for-the-stranger.

Souhami, Diana. 2001. *Gluck 1895-1978: her biography.* Phoenix Press.

———. 2020. *No modernism without lesbians.* Head of Zeus Ltd.

———. 1998. *The Trials of Radclyffe Hall.* Weidenfeld & Nicolson.

Thorpe, Roey. 2013. "Where Have All the Butches Gone?" Accessed via archive.org, September 5, 2013. http://www.shewired.com/lifestyle/2013/09/05/op-ed-where-have-all-butches-gone.

Wikipedia contributors. 2023. "Bryher (novelist) — Wikipedia, The Free Encyclopedia." Accessed November 19, 2023. https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Bryher_(novelist)&oldid=1182616547.

———. 2022. "Pauli Murray — Wikipedia, The Free Encyclopedia." An edit reversion from March 24, 2022. https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Pauli_Murray&diff=prev&oldid=1078917534.

Yeung, Jessie. 2020. " 'George Eliot' among 25 female writers being republished using their real names," August 13, 2020. https://edition.cnn.com/style/article/george-eliot-reclaim-her-name-intl-hnk-scli.