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Introduction

The setting of Virginia Woolf’s Mrs. Dalloway is London, and the story describes people’s thoughts and events that took place in a single day. Even with the constraints of space and duration, few critics have noted that there are a wide variety of animals that appear throughout the story, such as dogs, birds, horses, squirrels, and even antelopes. Wendy B. Faris, like other critics, refers to the avian imagery that is used to describe some characters in Mrs. Dalloway, and she maintains that ‘Clarissa Dalloway’s fragile self, needing her husband’s protection, is repeatedly pictured as a bird’ (113).1 Focusing on animality in the human characters, Vicki Tromhanhauser is one of the few critics who pay attention to the role of animals in Woolf’s works. Tromhanhauser argues:

[H]uman character changes shape in the novel through the representation of animalistic qualities in humans and through the representation of human attributes such as speech, reason, and feeling in animals. Revealing attributes presumed to be exclusive to the human as proper to the nonhuman animal, Woolf attempts to close the affective distance between human and animal, or, in the language of Mr. Ramsay’s philosophy, ‘subject and object’. (189)

Eight years after Mrs. Dalloway, Woolf published Flush, where she gives a dog subjectivity, that is, the dog is an anthropomorphized protagonist capable of conscious experience, like having opinions, feelings, and desires. However, Tromhanhauser claims that in Mrs. Dalloway, Woolf attempts to ‘close the affective distance between . . . subject and object’.

As Marianne Dekoven notes, [a] primary approach to the study of animal representation takes as its object the ways in which literary animals are used to reinforce the denigration of subjugated people or to point toward greater human equality2 and ‘many critics and theorists who work in animal and animality studies are motivated by the parallels between animals and subjugated humans’ (363). This paper examines the conflict that characters face between their humanity and animality through the parallels presented in the novel. For instance, Septimus Warren Smith is one of the most subjugated people in the novel. As his family name, Warren, suggests, he is associated with a rabbit2 that is likely to fall prey to beasts, which are represented by Dr. Holmes and Sir Bradshaw. Unlike Septimus, Doris Kilman attempts to reverse her dehumanization and emancipate herself from her brute body. One of the subjugated animals in this novel is Elizabeth’s dog, which does not appear before the readers. Rather, it can only be heard howling, or else information about the dog is gleaned through the thoughts of characters. The dog, despite being a beloved pet, is shut up downstairs during the party with servants for fear that it may bite the guests. Wendy B. Faris mentions Elizabeth’s dog and claims that ‘. . . misbehaving animals suggest hidden, unsocial selves’ (110); however, the focus of this paper is on the marginalization of the dog from both the family and the novel. In the last section, I briefly examine how Clarissa’s life is shared with the animals around her, although she seems

---

1 David Bradshaw points out in the introduction to the Oxford University Press edition of Mrs. Dalloway that while many characters are identified with birds, Lady Bruton, the Bradshaws, Hugh Whitbread, and Richard Dalloway are not described with any avian imagery (xxxix).

2 David Bradshaw notes that Septimus’s family name is unavoidably associated with ‘the teeming fertility of rabbits’, which spotlights ‘the barrenness of his marriage’ (xiv).
to be the least interested in animals.

I. Septimus’s Struggle with Humanity

In June of 1923, five years after World War I, Mrs. Dalloway depicts events that illustrate how traces of the war remain. One of the main characters, Septimus, is a veteran who voluntarily served in the war. As Woolf writes in a diary entry on 19 June, 1923, that ‘I want to give life & death, sanity & insanity . . .’ (Diary 248), Septimus’s words and actions are often described as madness, and this mental instability, as Teruko Eto points out, is caused by the social demands and constraints of the time. The period’s cultural conception of values coercively suppressed feelings and regarded fear, anti-war ideas, and suicide as unmasculine concepts. The society demanded that the soldiers feel a sense of ‘duty, gratitude, fidelity, [and] love of England’ (44). Septimus loses these feelings after he witnessed his officer getting killed in the war. Woolf writes:

[W]hen Evans was killed, just before the Armistice, in Italy, Septimus, far from showing any emotion or recognizing that here was the end of a friendship, congratulated himself upon feeling very little and very reasonably. The War had taught him. It was sublime. He had gone through the whole show, friendship, European War, death, had won promotion, was still under thirty and was bound to survive. He was right there. The last shells missed him. He watched them explode with indifference. When peace came he was in Milan, billeted in the house of an innkeeper with a courtyard, flowers in tubs, little tables in the open, daughters making hats, and to Lucrezia, the younger daughter, he became engaged one evening when the panic was on him — that he could not feel. (73-74)

After the loss of feelings, he becomes dehumanized. In Politics, Aristotle states the distinction between humans and animals:

[M]an alone among the animals has speech. The voice indeed indicates the painful or pleasant, and hence is present in other animals as well; for their nature has come this far, that they have a perception of the painful and pleasant and signal these things to each other. But speech serves to reveal the advantageous and the harmful, and hence also the just and unjust. For it is peculiar to man as compared to the other animals that he alone has a perception of good and bad and just and unjust and the other things of this sort . . . (4)

The difference that separates humankind from animals, then, is whether they possess complex language abilities and an understanding of ethics. Septimus’s speech capabilities, which define his humanness, become so unstable that his wife, Rezia, cannot understand what he says: “What are you saying, Septimus?” Rezia asked, with terror, for he was talking to himself (79). Another example is the old woman singing in front of Regent’s Park Tube station who articulates incomprehensible words. Her voice is ‘a frail quivering sound, a voice bubbling up without direction, vigour, beginning or end, running weakly and shrilly and with an absence of all human meaning’ (68, emphasis added). Her figure is likened to nonhuman things: ‘. . . a tall quivering shape, like a funnel, like a rusty pump, like a wind-beaten tree for ever barren of leaves which lets the wind run up and down its branches’ (69). Thus, the lack of capacity for language leads to dehumanization as a result.

Septimus has a vision where the birds call him by his name and sing in Greek: ‘[a] sparrow perched on the railing opposite chirped Septimus, Septimus, four or five times over and went on, drawing its notes out, to sing freshly and piercingly in Greek words how there is no crime and, joined by another sparrow, they sang in voices prolonged and piercing in Greek words, from trees in the meadow of life beyond a river where the dead walk, how there is no death’ (21). Tromanhauser claims that the sparrow uses human language as a sign of human reason, which does not simply signify Septimus’s mental confusion (200). It also shows that Septi-
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3 See Eto (139).  
4 See Elaine Showalter (171).  
5 All the quotations from Mrs. Dalloway are taken from the Oxford University Press edition. All further references to the book will include only the page number in brackets.  
6 In To the Lighthouse, Jasper says that he shoots the rooks because ‘they did not feel’ (67) and emotionlessness is often linked with animals.  
7 Woolf writes in a diary entry on 8 June, 1920, about an old beggar woman singing in a London street. She was ‘holding a brown mongrel in her arms’ and ‘clasping her dog as if for warmth’ (Diary 47).
mus’s humanity and animality are blurred, according to the Aristotelian distinction. Furthermore, Septimus is given the attributes of birds to further blur the line between human and animal.

Among the things that Septimus writes on pieces of paper is: ‘little men and women brandishing sticks for arms, with wings — were they?’ — on their backs’ (125). In this example, humans are given an avian attribute. In the same world, as well as in his vision, human characters in Mrs. Dalloway are often identified with animals, especially birds. For instance, when Clarissa is on her way to a florist shop, Scrope Purvis compares her with a bird: ‘a touch of the bird about her, of the jay, blue-green, light, vivacious, though she was over fifty, and grown very white since her illness. There she perched, never seeing him, waiting to cross, very upright’ (3). Her external characteristics, moreover, are described as ‘a narrow pea-stick figure; a ridiculous little face, beaked like a bird’s’ (9, emphasis added). For Clarissa, bird imagery is linked with her past. She remembers looking at the rooks rising and falling, and they were ‘flaunting up and down in the evening pink light’ (29-30). The Smiths are also often identified with birds. Septimus is ‘beak-nosed’, like Clarissa (12). ‘[H]is big nose, his bright eyes, his way of sitting a little hunched, made [Rezia] think . . . of a young hawk’, and she calls him ‘by the name of that hawk or crow which, being malicious and a great destructor of crops, was precisely like him’ (124, 126). When Dr. Holmes arrives, Rezia stands in his way spreading her arms, and the doctor regards her as ‘a little hen, with her wings spread barring his passage’ (126). These figures of speech signify confusion between humanity and animality in both the same and insane world.

Septimus often expresses antipathy toward human nature or humanity, in general: ‘He would argue with [Rezia] about killing themselves; and explain how wicked people were: how he could see them making up lies as they passed in the street. He knew all their thoughts, he said; he knew everything. He knew the meaning of the world, he said’ (56-57). His antipathy is connected to his experiences in the war, where he witnessed the cruelty of humans and wounded soldiers, which represent both mental and physical dehumanization. His friendship with Evans is metaphorically described as that of two dogs: ‘It was a case of two dogs playing on a hearth-rug; one wor-

rying a paper screw, snarling, snapping, giving a pinch, now and then, at the old dog’s ear; the other lying somnolent, blinking at the fire, raising a paw, turning and growling good-temperedly’ (73). However, when the apparition of Evans appears in front of him, Septimus says, ‘It was Evans! But no mud was on him; no wounds; he was not changed’ (59). This means that Evans, in reality, was covered with mud and dying from his wounds.

Septimus meets two psychiatrists, Dr. Holmes, and Sir Bradshaw, and he calls them ‘human nature’ (78-79, 83, 119). The doctors impose a medical treatment on Septimus and attempt to give him a sense of proportion and a rational mind unique to human nature. They are oppressive judges who decide, for example, whether their patients are sane or insane: ‘. . . [they] differed in their verdicts (for Holmes said one thing, Bradshaw another), yet judges they were’ (126). Septimus complicates the description of the doctors by calling them both ‘brute[s]’ with the ‘red nostrils’ (78, 125) as well as ‘human nature’. Furthermore, Bradshaw ‘swooped’ and ‘devoured’ his patients, using ‘this combination of decision and humanity that endeared Sir William so greatly to the relations of his victims’ (86-87). Septimus identifies the doctors as brutes and obscures the positions of humans and animals as belonging in a hierarchy.

To escape from the brutality of humanity, Septimus chooses to fly out of the window and kill himself. Ironically, committing suicide is a very human action, even though he does not use artificial materials, like a knife, razor, or gas. He sits on the windowsill and offers his life to humanity as if he was a sacrificial goat on the altar. However, just before flinging himself to his death, Septimus thinks that ‘he would wait till the very last moment. He did not want to die. Life was good. The sun hot. Only human beings?’ (127). Since Septimus detests humanity, he kills himself rather than surrender to it. However, like Clarissa, who is considered his double, he praises ‘life’ itself.

II. Doris Kilman and Her Pursuit of Humanity

According to Septimus, Shakespeare detested humanity: ‘How Shakespeare loathed humanity — the putting on of clothes, the getting of children, the sordidity of the mouth and the belly!’ (75). He gives three concrete
examples for humanity and Doris Kilman cannot achieve them despite her desire (unlike Septimus) to restore humanity.

First, concerning ‘the putting on of clothes’.10 Kilman’s clothes are unique since she wears a green mackintosh coat that is repeatedly mentioned throughout the novel (10, 101, 104, 106-108). While ‘wearing’ the coat represents humanity, she also fails to ‘put on clothes’, in a sense. She wears the coat because ‘[f]irst, it was cheap; second, she was over forty; and did not, after all, dress to please. She was poor, moreover; degradingly poor’ (104), and she desired to cover her [ugly, clumsy] body (109). Because of her ugliness, she struggles with ‘that violent grudge against the world which had scorned her, sneered at her, cast her off, beginning with this indiginity — the infliction of her unloved body which people could not bear to see’ (109). Not only can she not ‘afford to buy pretty clothes’, but [no clothes suited her’ (109). Thus, ‘she might buy anything. And for a woman, of course, that meant never meeting the opposite sex. Never would she come first with anyone’ (109). Therefore, she fails to fulfill the second condition, which is ‘the getting of children’. She purchases only a petticoat when she finishes shopping at the Army and Navy stores. Moreover, she cannot achieve the third condition, that is, ‘the sordidity of the mouth and the belly’, as her food is ‘all that she lived for; her comforts; her dinner; her tea; her hot-water bottle at night’ (109). After the shopping, Kilman and Elizabeth have tea, but she cannot have the pink cake because a child at the next table took it. She laments her inability to attain what she wants to eat: ‘She had wanted that cake — the pink one. The pleasure of eating was almost the only pure pleasure left her, and then to be baffled even in that!’ (110).11

In addition to pursuing humanity, as Tromanhauser claims, Kilman attempts to refuse animality, as she feels a sense of affinity with the divine (190). Religion, or faith, is one of the most human activities, and this ‘human’ link to God is never shared by animals (DeMello 37). Kilman had her first spiritual revelation two years and three months after World War I and her life had already been changed by the war with the death of her brother. She also suffered from subjugation in the British society due to her nationality: ‘It was true that the family was of German origin; spelt the name Kielman in the eighteenth century; but her brother had been killed’ (104-5). Religion was her salvation in this predicament. Through blessing, Kilman desires to be ‘a soul cut out of immaterial substance; not a woman, a soul’ (114), but she impresses people by ‘her largeness, robustness, and power as she sat there shifting her knees from time to time’, and her approach to God is considered to be ‘so rough’ (114).

Kilman attempts to reinforce her humanity through her approach to God, but she is also linked to a beast or a monster. Clarissa’s hatred toward her is embodied as a hoofed animal:

It rasped her, though, to have stirring about in her this brutal monster! to hear twigs cracking and feel hooves planted down in the depths of that leaf-encumbered forest, the soul; never to be content quite, or quite secure, for at any moment the brute would be stirring, this hatred, which, especially since her illness, had power to make her feel scraped, hurt in her spine; gave her physical pain, and made all pleasure in beauty, in friendship, in being well, in being loved and making her home delightful, rock, querier, and bend as if indeed there were a monster grubbing at the roots, as if the whole panoply of content were nothing but self love! this hatred! (10-11, emphases added)

Kilman stands in front of Clarissa like ‘some prehistoric monster armoured for primeval warfare’ (106). Kilman detests her own ugly body and materiality, so she pursues humanity by praying to God. However, ‘unable to cast off the brute body and sever her animal flesh from the immortal soul, Kilman enacts the impossibility of Cartesian divisions’ (Tromanhauser 190). When Elizabeth, whom she loves, leaves her, Kilman is in agony and imagines that her body becomes more grotesque, as if Elizabeth drew out ‘the very entrails in her body’ and ‘stretch[ed] them as she crossed the room’ (112). As her family name, Kilman, implies ‘kill man’, her pursuit to find humanity ends in failure.

III. Elizabeth’s Sympathy for Grizzle

Unlike Kilman, Elizabeth has ‘the beautiful body’ (115), but she blurs the boundary between humans and

10 As James Naremore points out, Woolf describes Bradshaw’s victims as naked and defenseless (Naremore 108).
11 Lisa Angelella notes that women who eat are often oppressed in literary works, and Woolf links Kilman’s eating with her unattractiveness and moroseness (176).
animals. Just before leaving Kilman, she is described as a quadruped: ‘Like some dumb creature who has been brought up to a gate for an unknown purpose, and stands there longing to gallop away, Elizabeth Dalloway sat silent. . . Right away to the end of the field the dumb creature galloped in terror’ (112). Her sympathy with animals is seen through her relationship with real animals.

The Dalloway family has a dog named Grizzle that is rarely mentioned in previous studies. Although this dog seems to be an insignificant creature, it should not be ignored for this reason. According to Maureen Adams’ meticulous research, Virginia Woolf had several dogs throughout her life, and one of them was named Grizzle as well. Almost every time one of her dogs died, Woolf would write about them in her letters or newspaper articles. However, she did not mention Grizzle’s death except that she gave its name to Elizabeth’s dog in the novel (Adams 228-29). Adams notes that Woolf valued Grizzle as a companion and watchdog, but even more, as an integral part of the contented life she shared with Leonard’ (222). He also said that she ‘simply observed and wondered about Grizzle’s behavior. She made no attempt to shape the dog to fit her experience’ (220), which is what may have led her to write the canine-focused novel, *Flush*, afterward. The fictitious Grizzle, however, does not appear before the reader, and the guests at the Dalloways’ party do not see the dog either. This means that the dog is doubly exiled. We will focus on the significance of this unseen dog, named after Woolf’s favourite pet, and examine the relationship between Elizabeth and her dog.

At the end of the party in *Mrs. Dalloway*, Elizabeth is worried about her dog even though her father makes her happy by complimenting her beauty: ‘He had looked at her, he said, and he had wondered, who is that lovely girl? and it was his daughter! That did make her happy. But her poor dog was howling’ (165). Elizabeth, as Clarissa complains, ‘really cared for her dog most of all’ (10, emphasis added). She was concerned because Grizzle was affected by distemper. Distemper, according to Hilda Kean, was a lethal disease for dogs until it started to be prevented through vaccination in the 1930 s’ (33).

Furthermore, Elizabeth seems to be concerned with Grizzle because it is in the same situation as her. During the party, Grizzle is shut up downstairs and remains unseen by the guests.12 One of the Dalloways’ servants, Jenny, takes care of it: ‘Jenny must remember the dog, Miss Elizabeth’s fox-terrier, which, since it bit, had to be shut up and might, Elizabeth thought, want something. Jenny must remember the dog. But Jenny was not going upstairs with all those people about’ (141). Elizabeth is similarly confined in Victorian values, even though she tries to escape them. The people in her society regard her as ‘poplar trees, early dawn, hyacinths, fawns, running water, and garden lilies; and it made her life a burden to her’ (114). When she moves around London on an omnibus, she gets a sense of freedom, as Peter Walsh does, and this confirms that she has a sense of stagnation in her life:

Suddenly Elizabeth stepped forward and most competently boarded the omnibus, in front of everybody. She took a seat on top. The impetuous creature — a pirate — started forward, sprang away; she had to hold the rail to steady herself, for a pirate it was, reckless, unscrupulous, bearing down ruthlessly, circumventing dangerously, boldly snatching a passenger, or ignoring a passenger, squeezing eel-like and arrogant in between, and then rushing insolently all sails spread up Whitehall. . . . She was delighted to be free. The fresh air was so delicious . . . And now it was like riding, to be rushing up Whitehall, and to each movement of the omnibus the beautiful body in the fawn-coloured coat responded freely like a rider, like the figure-head of a ship, for the breeze slightly disarrayed her; the heat gave her cheeks the pallor of white painted wood; and her fine eyes, having no eyes to meet, gazed ahead, blank, bright, with the staring, incredible innocence of sculpture. (115)

She walks around the Strand, which ‘no Dalloways came down . . . daily; she was a pioneer, a stray, venturing, trusting’ (117). However, she must obey her mother: ‘But it was later than she thought. Her mother would not like her to be wandering off alone like this. She turned back down the Strand’ (117). Thus, both Elizabeth and Grizzle are confined in the social system, like a cage.

Although it is not easy for her to free herself from Victorian values, Elizabeth is inspired by her tutor Miss Kilman. She delineates vague pictures of her future profession:

She liked people who were ill. And every profession

---

12 Scott argues that the confinement of Grizzle downstairs is one of the reasons why Elizabeth does not want to attend the party (170).
is open to the women of your generation, said Miss Kilman. So she might be a doctor. She might be a farmer. Animals are often ill. She might own a thousand acres and have people under her. She would go and see them in their cottages... In short, she would like to have a profession. She would become a doctor, a farmer, possibly go into Parliament if she found it necessary, all because of the Strand. (115-16)

Since she likes sick animals and people, she wants to be a doctor or a farmer in the future. This means that she has inherited characteristics from her parents, as being concerning for sick people was an attribute derived from her mother. For example, Clarissa visits Evelyn Whitbread in a nursing home [times without number] (5). On the other hand, a love for animals is one of Richard’s characteristics. Peter Walsh tells an anecdote about Richard’s gentleness to a dog:

He ought to have been a country gentleman — he was wasted on politics. He was at his best out of doors, with horses and dogs — how good he was, for instance, when that great shaggy dog of Clarissa’s got caught in a trap and had its paw half torn off, and Clarissa turned faint and Dalloway did the whole thing; bandaged, made splints; told Clarissa not to be a fool. That was what she liked him for, perhaps — that was what she needed. ‘Now, my dear, don’t be a fool. Hold this — fetch that,’ all the time talking to the dog as if it were a human being. (65-66)

Richard cannot even tell his wife that he loves her, but he is certain that he feels empathy for the injured dog as if it were a human being.” Like her father, Elizabeth ‘... much preferred being left alone to do what she liked in the country... and London was so dreary compared with being alone in the country with her father and the dogs’ (114). Since Elizabeth suffers the same circumstance as Grizzle and loves to care for sick animals, she sympathizes with ‘her poor dog’ (165).

IV. Clarissa’s Life Shared with Animals

While her daughter and husband prefer being with animals in the country, Clarissa ‘love[s] walking in London’ and thinks ‘[r]eally it’s better than walking in the country’ (5). She does not care for dogs as much as her family, but she did have a dog named Rob, and she ‘disliked all animals, except that dog’ (131). Clarissa says, ‘how extraordinarily sympathetic I am’ and ‘how I love my Rob’ (51) to convey her good-naturedness, however, Peter Walsh criticizes her for using the dog to flatter herself.

While it does not appear that Clarissa feels sympathetic toward animals, it should be emphasized that the ‘life’ Clarissa loves is shared with animals. She loves ‘life; London; this moment of June’ (4) and one of her favourite books from her girlhood is by Huxley, nicknamed ‘Darwin’s Bulldog’ because he advocates for the theory of evolution. His book inspires her to be an atheist. During the daytime in London, people in the novel perceive a variety of animals. For instance, as Rezia implores her husband to notice real things, they see [a] few sheep. That was all’ (22). In the scene that involves skywriting, the spectators not only see the aeroplane but also ‘a flight of gulls cross[ing] the sky’ (18). Gulls appear again in the vision of Septimus and Rezia: ‘He was drowned, he used to say, and lying on a cliff with the gulls screaming over him. He would look over the edge of the sofa down into the sea’ (119). They further describe the scene with gulls: ‘She put on her hat, and ran through cornfields — where could it have been? — on to some hill, somewhere near the sea, for there were ships, gulls, butterflies; they sat on a cliff’ (127). Even in the first pages, Clarissa expresses the peaceful post-war world including animals:

And everywhere, though it was still so early, there was a beating, a stirring of galloping ponies, tapping of cricket bats; Lord’s, Ascot, Ranelagh and all the rest of it; wrapped the soft mesh of the grey-blue morning air, which, as the day wore on, would unwind them, and set down on their lawns and pitches the bouncing ponies, whose forefeet just struck the ground and up they sprung, the whirling young men, and laughing girls in their transparent muslin who, even now, after dancing all night, were taking their absurd woolly dogs for a run... (4, emphases added)

13 Faris points out that Richard, ‘who cares for Clarissa but whose deep feelings for her are not to be expressed in words, is described (erroneously, significantly) as “a man who cared only for dogs”’ (113).

14 One of Septimus’s favourite books in his early life is by Charles Darwin: [Septimus] devour[ed] Shakespeare, Darwin, The History of Civilisation, and Bernard Shaw’ (72, italic in original).
Clarissa also sees animals as she enters St. James’s Park, including ‘the slow-swimming happy ducks; the pouched birds waddling’ (5). Even inside of her house, she hears a dog barking far away (26, 34, 118). Clarissa loves the world and feels that she is part of it. Even though she does not let Grizzle come upstairs and does not care for the dog, she expresses gratitude for animals in daily life. She thinks she ‘must repay in daily life to servants, to dogs and canaries, above all to Richard her husband’ (25, emphasis added). This juxtaposition means that her happy life is shared with both humans and animals.

Conclusion

As discussed above, the representations of animals in Mrs. Dalloway, play a significant role in revealing characters’ conflict or their sympathy with animals. For example, Septimus, as a veteran who experienced the terrible reality of war, regards humanity as ruthless and brutish. Kilman, on the other hand, spends her time turning to religion to escape from her ugly body ‘which people could not bear to see’ (109). Both characters fail to divide humanity from animality. The Dalloway family, especially Elizabeth and Clarissa, blur the boundary between humans and animals through their communication with real animals. Although she could be a farmer, a doctor, or any other profession in the future, Elizabeth remains confined in Victorian values, just as Grizzle is captive in the servants’ room. Not only is she in the same situation as the dog, but she also has sympathy with Grizzle during the party because of her caring nature that she inherited from her parents. Although Clarissa does not seem to care about animals, she enjoys her life that is shared with all kinds of creatures in London. Thus, the mother and daughter positively communicate with animals in the story. After the horrible war that de-humanized people, Mrs. Dalloway shows that some human characters vacillate between humanity and animality, which may suggest Woolf’s critical stance on the Aristotelian dichotomy between humans and animals.
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