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In 1923 when Katherine Mansfield succumbed to tuberculosis at the age of thirty-four Virginia Woolf wrote in her diary:

\[G\]radually, blankness & disappointment; then a depression which I could not rouse myself from all that day. When I began to write, it seemed to me there was no point in writing. Katherine wont [sic] read it. Katherine’s my rival no longer. More generously I felt, But [sic] though I can do this better than she could, where is she, who could do what I can’t! ¹

This unique friendship and professional rivalry has been explored by various authors and critics over the years. In her 1999 publication *Katherine Mansfield and Virginia Woolf: A Public of Two*, Angela Smith writes that Woolf would be haunted by the ‘faint ghost’ of Mansfield throughout her life.² Woolf acknowledged their like-mindedness when she wrote that from Mansfield she would receive ‘the queerest sense of echo coming back to me from her mind the second after I’ve spoken’.³ In a diary entry in 1920 Woolf writes, ‘I feel a common certain understanding between us - a queer sense of being “like”’.⁴ It is partly in their writing style, in their ‘casual use of the same metaphors and phrases’, that Smith says the reader can hear the ‘unconscious echoes of one in the other’s psyche’.⁵ Smith contends that in *To the Lighthouse* (1927) and *Mrs Dalloway* (1925) are the echoes of Mansfield’s short stories ‘At the Bay’ (1921) and ‘The Garden Party’ (1921). The critic Ronald Hayman notes that, although Woolf, along with James Joyce and Dorothy Richardson, were credited for introducing the ‘stream of consciousness’ technique to writing, Mansfield was using this technique quite some time before Woolf.⁶

Mansfield’s choice of the short story as her field of work may have been the reason why she has been generally disregarded in studies of modernism.⁷ In comparison, Woolf’s essays, literary criticism, novels and short stories, produced over a thirty year career span, are a far more sizeable oeuvre. But as Hayman further notes, ‘It is odd that [...] so little attention has
been paid to the links and affinities between them’.\(^8\) Is it, as Pamela Dunbar suggests, because Mansfield ‘frequently dealt in the dangerous, or taboo subjects’?\(^9\) Was she simply too subversive and offensive to male criticism in the way that Woolf was not? Nora Sellei quotes critic and essayist Frank O’Connor who says of Mansfield, ‘[m]ost of her work seems to me that of a clever, spoilt, malicious woman’.\(^10\) And of Woolf, Sellei quotes the poet and feminist Adrienne Rich who says that even when ‘Woolf is addressing an audience of women [...] she is acutely conscious - as she always was - of being overheard by men: by Morgan and Lytton and Maynard Keynes and for that matter her father, Leslie Stephens’.\(^11\) Whatever the reasons, there is sufficient evidence to prove that Mansfield and Woolf had a complex professional relationship as well as a rivalry that, for Woolf, continued long after Mansfield’s death: ‘[i]f she’d lived, she’d have written on, & people would have seen that I was the more gifted - that wd [sic] only have become more & more apparent’.\(^12\)

Rivalry aside, the focus of this essay is to see whether it is possible to glean from certain texts what similarities and differences exist between the writing styles of Katherine Mansfield and Virginia Woolf and whether quantitative analysis tools used in digital humanities to data mine literary texts may be used to identify these. To do this I have chosen to examine five short stories from each author. Admittedly this results in a very small corpora, but I hope that there would be sufficient content to elucidate similar linguistic features in their literary styles.

As previously stated, Mansfield’s chosen genre was the short story whereas Woolf wrote both short stories and novels and is best known for her novels. I’ve tried to select stories that were written roughly the same time and are some of the best from both writers. For Katherine Mansfield I chose ‘Prelude’ (1917), ‘Bliss’ (1918), ‘The Garden Party’ (1920), ‘An Ideal Family’ (1921) and ‘The Voyage’ (1921). For Virginia Woolf, ‘The Mark on the
Wall’ (1917), ‘Kew Gardens’ (1919), ‘A Society’ (1921), ‘Monday or Tuesday’ (1921) and ‘The String Quartet’ (1921). The total word count for the Mansfield stories is 32,789 words compared to Woolf’s 13,055. The unevenness in word count may skew the results of this experiment. If so, this could be something to take into account for future experiments.

In Intelligent Archive (IA) I ran word frequencies for both sets of texts in word blocks - BlockBigLast - of 500; I wanted to ascertain the top 20 words used by both authors. The reason for doing this was so I could compare their words with the list of the 20 frequently used words across both spoken and written texts identified by James W. Pennebaker in his

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Word</th>
<th>Percentage of all Words</th>
<th>Word Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>pronoun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>the</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>article</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>conjunction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>to</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>preposition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>article</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>of</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>preposition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>that</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>conjunction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>in</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>preposition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>it</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>pronoun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>my</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>pronoun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>is</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>aux verb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>you</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>pronoun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>was</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>aux verb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>for</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>preposition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>have</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>aux verb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>with</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>preposition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>he</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>pronoun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>me</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>pronoun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>on</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>preposition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>but</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>conjunction</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1 Most Frequently Used Words - James W. Pennebaker
The words in the above table account for nearly 30 percent of all words we hear, read and use across both written and spoken texts. These are made up exclusively of function or style words that are so ubiquitous in the English language as to be almost invisible. According to Pennebaker, function words make up 55 percent of all words used in the English language. The rest of the words are Content words, or words that have a meaning, action or label that is culturally shared. ‘Style (or function) words are words that connect, shape and organise [these] content words’. Not only that, Pennebaker postulates that how a person uses style words tells us a lot about a person’s ‘personality, attitudes and social worlds’. If this is so, then by examining how both Mansfield’s and Woolf’s use of style words in their short stories should also tell us a little about them as individuals and their writing style in particular.

The above chart compares Woolf’s and Mansfield’s frequency of use of Pennebaker’s 20 most frequently used words with Pennebaker’s percentages, shown by the yellow line. It could be said that both women mirror each other except for their uses of the prepositions of
and the verb was. It is interesting to note that Woolf used is more frequently than Mansfield who had a higher frequency of was in comparison. Also interesting is the use of the which both authors have as their most frequently used word. I would be hesitant to suggest a reason other than to suppose that it is because these are short stories and not personal writings. Woolf’s high use of the preposition of, and of propositions in general, may indicate that she categorises and hierarchically organises information in more concrete ways than Mansfield. Woolf’s top 2 word n-gram clusters are in the (349) and of the (316), further attesting to an almost masculine need to categorise and order things in such spatial ways.²¹
Discussion

The development of Stylometry from its origins in 1850 was given a boost in the early 1960s when Frederick Mosteller and David L. Wallace, building on the works of Alvar Ellegard, used frequencies of occurrences of ‘function words such as prepositions, conjunctions and articles’ to aid determination of the disputed authorship of a twelve of the eighty-five papers making up the Federalist Papers written to support the ratification of the American constitution. While the authorship of Mansfield’s and Woolf’s short stories is not in dispute, this exercise is supported by the experiments of John Burrows who found that how an author uses common function words is indeed distinctive. Burrows theorised that how people use function words is ‘unconscious’ and therefore is a more quantifiably effective method than previous methods when analysing style according to descriptive measures. This seems to support Pennebaker’s theory that people bring their unconscious feelings, beliefs and word views to their writing.

In Pennebaker’s top 20 words there are 6 pronouns. These are I, it, my, you, he and me. Katherine Mansfield favoured 7 pronouns adding she, her, and they and dropping me and my, whereas Virginia Woolf’s top 6 pronouns included we and perhaps the use of one as a pronoun. She also dropped me, you, my and he from her top 20. From this initial experiment, what can be generally said is that Mansfield’s pronouns tell us that her stories are about other people: she, her, he, they, you. Her stories are so densely populated by living things it is almost possible to hear them speak. It is not so easy to say the same about Woolf without drilling further into her texts. Woolf use’s I more often that Mansfield, and the absence of you from this list could mean that she favours the more formal use of we and one instead. It could be suggested that Woolf is perhaps a great deal more selfconscious and class conscious. Smith contends that the ‘edgy hostility’ between the two women was part professional jealousy and part class consciousness, with Woolf calling Mansfield’s friends ‘the underworld’ and Mansfield referring Woolf and her Bloomsbury set as the ‘smelly’
‘Woolves’ [sic] and the ‘Blooms Berries’.

At times the rivalry between Mansfield and Woolf could be savage. In her review of Woolf’s novel *Night and Day* in 1919, Mansfield writes, ‘[i]t is extremely cultivated, distinguished and brilliant, but above all - deliberate. There is not a chapter where one is unconscious of the writer, of her personality, her point of view, and her control of the situation’. But privately, as she says to John Middleton Murry, in a letter, ‘I don’t like it, Boge. My private opinion is that it is a lie in the soul’. Note Mansfield’s repetitive use of the third-person pronoun *her*. Pennebaker states that, when angry, people tend to focus on others and also to talk and think in the present tense as well as use high rates of second-person and third-person pronouns.

Woolf, in a letter to Vita Sackville-West, complained about Mansfield’s smell and that her stories ‘enabled her to “permeate one with her quality; and if one felt this cheap scent in it, it reeked in one’s nostrils”’. Here it is interesting to note Woolf’s use of the pronoun *one* in what could be regarded as a private conversation. It would seem that Woolf not only wished to distance herself from Mansfield, but to vicariously draw Sackville-West to her way of thinking.

![Figure 5 Comparison of Pennebaker’s 20 most frequently used words to those of four modernist women writers.](image)

To better see how Woolf’s and Mansfield’s style may be similar or different to other modernist women writing at the same time, I conducted word frequency experiments on two novels: Dorothy Richardson’s *The Long Day* (1905) and *Three Lives* (1909) by Gertrude Stein.
The decision to use their novels rather than short stories was for no other reason than expedience: these were available on Project Gutenberg and could be downloaded in their entirety in a format I could use in IA. For this exercise I have labelled Pennebaker’s figures as Universal for a better word. What is obvious in the above chart is that, while all four writers use *I* to a lesser extent than Universal, there is a marked difference between the American Stein and the three English writers. While Stein’s use of articles is markedly lower than the others, it is evident that she favours *and, to, you* and *was* above other function words. In contrast, Woolf and Richardson share similarities in their use of articles and prepositions. In Richardson’s case, her use of *I* and *my* is also comparatively distinctive. Of the four, Mansfield is the most unremarkable. In order to gain a better perspective, I compiled the top 30 words used by all four authors. Because of differences in their styles the word list comprises 46 words in total.

Stein adds significantly to this combined list with her exclusive use of *always, good, him, never, now, so* and *very*; Mansfield *little, there, said and up: be, one, or* and *what* from Woolf; and *have* and *my* from Richardson. These are predominantly adverbs and adjectives, the exceptions being Woolf’s additions of a conjunction and pronoun. Using a statistical method called Factor Analysis, Pennebaker claims that how people combine various classes of function words points to three distinctive writing styles: formal, analytic and narrative. This is true across all genres of
writing. That being the case, it could be argued that both Mansfield and Stein sit more comfortably in the class of narrative thinkers and, as natural storytellers, tend to use more third person pronouns, past tense verbs and conjunctions such as *with, and,* and so on. They also have one adjective in their top 30. On the other hand Woolf and Richardson exhibit higher use of articles and prepositions, most notably *of,* a part of speech that is used more often to express relationships and associations between entities. Of the four, these two authors can be classed as formal writers. People, things and places are spatially and hierarchically organised in their world views. Of course it is impossible, especially in this essay, to make generalisations and it could be argued that each of these authors would exhibit all three writing styles depending on what they are writing. I also hesitate to make any generalisations about personality and proclivity based on this surface view. As Hugh Craig points out ‘[t]he leap from frequencies to meanings must always be a risky one [...] [and] [t]he interpreter who is tempted to speculate [...] presents an easy target for dismissive critique.’ My observations of this chart is that there is an observable difference between Gertrude Stein and the three English authors in the former’s comparatively low use of articles and prepositions. Whereas the similarities between Woolf and Mansfield seemed more obvious in Fig. 1. With the addition of Richardson their similarities are less obvious here.

Returning to Woolf and Mansfield, of interest to me is Mansfield high frequency use of the adjective *little,* and of Woolfs uses of *we* and *one.* These appear in their top 30 frequently used words. When a Google Ngram search was done for *little* I found that its use across the English corpus peaked in 1900 and has steadily declined without any sign of an increased use of compensatory words such as small, tiny, diminutive, insignificant or trivial for instance. It does seem that *little* had significant preference over *small* until the mid 1970s when the two words seem to be used interchangeably. When Mansfield was writing, the use of the word had already started its decline. This word seems quite particular to Mansfield, almost a signature word, if
you like. In order to see how she used it I conducted a concordance\textsuperscript{34} experiment of collates sorted by frequency. This table shows the top twenty collates. In total there were 64 left collated words and 124 right collated words.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Left Collate (of 64)</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Right Collate (of 124)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>girl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>the</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>of</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>girls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>poor</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>cottages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>her</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>were</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>on</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>that</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>old</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>two</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>nose</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Whether Mansfield had intended some of her descriptions to be diminutively appealing is hard to know, but many of her stories are drawn from childhood memories. Children and family scenes dominate her stories, perhaps increasingly so as her illness progressed from diagnosis in 1917 to her death in 1923, and she was forced to spend life away from her husband and their home in England. In ‘The Garden Party’ she writes with wistful affection:

> It was the heavy piano being moved on its stiff castors. But the air! If you stopped to notice, was the air always like this? Little faint winds were playing chase, in at the tops of the windows, out at the doors. And there were two tiny spots of sun, one on the inkpot, one on a silver photograph frame, playing too. Darling little spots. Especially the one on the inkpot lid. It was quite warm. A warm little silver star.

Here we have the adjectives heavy, stiff and little. In the space of two sentences the reader is
picked up out of density and floated away to play with sunlight and wind. The images and resulting emotions that arrive through reading the above passage is not prescribed by Mansfield. Her mind remains ‘perfectly transparent’. Mansfield’s mastery of both direct and indirect interior monologue is why she is now considered a leading figure in the development of British women’s modernism. This paragraph is a good example of her use of both techniques:

The wind, the wind. It’s frightening to be here in her room by herself. The bed, the mirror, the white jug and basin gleam like the sky outside. It’s the bed that is frightening. There it lies, sound asleep. . . . Does Mother imagine for one moment that she is going to darn all those stockings knotted up on the quilt like a coil of snakes? She’s not. No, Mother. I do not see why I should . . . The wind-the wind! There’s a funny smell of soot blowing down the chimney. Hasn’t anyone written poems to the wind? . . . ‘I bring fresh flowers to the leaves and showers’. . . . What nonsense.

Indirect interior monologue ‘allows the narrator and reader to be simultaneously out and inside the character’. The character’s thoughts are not translated by the narrator. We imagine that we can hear the character’s thoughts directly. ‘[H]ere in her room by herself’. The distance between reader and character shrinks with the change of tense. It is the character who says ‘here’, not the narrator. In the same paragraph Mansfield dissolves the boundary between reader and character when, through direct interior monologue, we hear the character’s thoughts ourselves. The narrator ceases to exists and so too does distance. Vincent O’Sullivan notes how in that rapid transition of tenses and time levels, the future not simply anticipated but narratively held within the present, that present itself already contained in the past. It’s a method Mansfield became aware of through hitting on the very simple fact that the technique of film could be applied to the short story.

The immediacy of Mansfield’s writings, the sense of urgency and emotional thrall her collection of short stories imparts must have seemed experimental one hundred years ago. Had she not been so debilitated and ill, and had not succumbed at such a young age, one wonders what her body of work could have been. That her writings were experimental is obvious. Patricia Moran contends that Mansfield’s influences can be credited for key shifts in Virginia Woolf’s writing beginning with ‘Kew Gardens’ and culminating in praiseworthy
works such as *Mrs. Dalloway, To the Lighthouse* as well as an enormous body of essays, reviews and other works.\(^{41}\) Of Woolf’s writing Ronald Hayman says, ‘[s]he describes meticulously and beautifully, involving herself with great intensity in the minutest visual particulars of the scene. But she remains involved, stuck to it. We cannot see it without seeing her’.\(^{42}\) If Mansfield’s mind was transparent, ‘Virginia Woolf never allows us to see through her in this way’.\(^{43}\)

In Woolf’s top 30 most frequently used words are *we* and *one*. On performing a concordance search for *we* on her five short stories it became quite obvious that the results of the word frequency count in IA has been fatally skewed by ‘A Society’ which had 106 of the 128 uses of *we*. Perhaps the title alone explains why. The story is a parody of the thoughts and actions of a group of six or seven women as told from the point of view of one narrator: ‘*We* have gone on all these ages supposing that men were equally industrious and that their works were of equal merit. While *we* have borne the children, they, *we* suppose, have borne the books and the pictures. *We* have populated the world’.\(^{17}\)

Woolf’s frequent use of the word in this story serves to reinforce the sense of a society or group. However, for the purposes of this essay, it demonstrates that I should have been more diligent in choosing texts for these experiments, of being more familiar with the stories perhaps. It certainly proves the soundness of having a large body of texts instead of a select few. Scientific rigor would demand a larger corpus and perhaps test sets as well.

Of *one*, Woolf used this word eighty-two times in this collection. I wanted to see whether she used it as a pronoun or a number. The concordance search demonstrates that Woolf used the word frequently as a pronoun as in this quotation from ‘Mark on the Wall’: ‘Why, if *one* wants to compare life to anything, *one* must liken it to being blown through the Tube at fifty miles an hour - landing at the other end without a single hairpin in *one’s* hair!’\(^{44}\)

A manual count showed that roughly half of the time Woolf used this word as a
pronoun. The use of *we*, and *one* as a third person singular, can impart a stilted and formal quality to writing, and according to Pennebaker, some uses of *we* imparts barriers and is used more often by those of higher social status.\textsuperscript{45}

**Conclusion**

Researching this essay and running numerous experiments has been a steep learning curve. But I was lost in Franco Moretti’s alternate universe of ‘swarms of hybrids and oddities, for which the categories of literary taxonomy offer very little help’.\textsuperscript{46} What has been enlightening is the study of function words and how much their use in writing and in conversations tell us about ourselves and one another. My decision to compare five short stories to see whether Distant Reading can determine the influence of one author on another has shown that word frequencies of function words alone is far from enough. Stylometry alone does not explain style and will not determine influence. David L. Hoover suggests that analysing texts word clusters and the ‘frequencies of frequent word sequences’ could offer better ways to characterise authorial style’.\textsuperscript{47} In examining Woolf’s use of *we* I discovered that there was a flaw in my method that skewed the results. When I performed the same word frequency search on Woolf’s entire collection of short stories a different result emerged. This confirms that a far greater corpus was required that should necessarily include both personal and critical writings. Both authors were prolific letter writers who also kept volumes of diaries and journals and contributed essays and criticisms by way of literature reviews.

The experiments I have conducted on the works of Virginia Woolf, Katherine Mansfield, Dorothy Richardson and Gertrude Stein, demonstrate marked differences and also similarities between word choice. To really appreciate the literature of these writers requires engagement and close reading. Critics warn the humanities against becoming too excited with the novelty of ‘this self-declared identification with new scientific methods’ and the ‘rhetorical
shift towards scientific methods centred on big data’. Distant Reading has provoked a ‘dystopian rhetoric’ with warnings that could limit the proper development of the reading brain through reduced ‘attentional, inferential, and reflective capacities’. This is indeed a narrow view but one that has a place in the larger debates around the medium (print vs digital) and the information. But computer assisted reading of texts may just do what critics theorise that it would not, that is, to provide deeper and richer insights into people or characters through new and improved methodologies such as stylistics. For those willing to step out and join Moretti’s ‘fascinating universe’ and ‘to feel so lost in a universe one didn’t even know exist[ed]’ there is everything to discover and nothing to lose.
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‘Cast Aside’ – An Extra in the Pictures: Mansfield’s Modernist Representation of the Marginal

Anthony Stepniak

Introduction

Katherine Mansfield’s short stories ‘Pictures’ and ‘Miss Brill’ can be interpreted as representing the marginal figure in an unorthodox fashion. This unorthodox representation is achieved through Mansfield’s use of modernist literary techniques such as the epiphanic moment and free indirect discourse in the short story form. Marginal figures live on the sidelines, decentred and ‘othered’. Nicola Allen explains the margins from which they originate thus: “the margin” refers to a space occupied and peopled by communities who live on the fringes of society and describes those who are not permitted for some reason to express their authentic voice within mainstream discourse’.¹

Taking this definition further, the marginal can be aligned with any persons perceived to be in an oppositional position to mainstream culture (in the West this would be patriarchal culture). Thus women, and in particular middle-aged women, fit into the definition of the marginal as they are not fully represented by youth-focalised patriarchal culture, another convention of the marginal figure highlighted by Allen: ‘The marginal is thus often described in terms of groups whose cultural practises are not represented or supported by the state’.²

Alongside my interpretation of the marginal through Allen, which I apply to both Mansfield stories, I also engage with the performativity model known as dramaturgy, theorised by Irving Goffman. Goffman defines peoples’ everyday existence as series of performances, enabled by a number of ‘props’, which in turn help us to adapt our performance depending on the context or ‘stage’ that we find ourselves on and the ‘audience’ we find ourselves in front of. Blumberg and Hare summarise Goffman’s approach: ‘Goffman, and others following his lead, have focused
on the ways in which an individual presents an image of self to others.

[...] Throughout the self presentation each individual must also be director, critic, and audience member as well as an actor in order to monitor and adjust the performance’.  

Goffman identifies two main types of performer, both of which are pertinent to my close readings of ‘Pictures’ and ‘Miss Brill’. In his first performer type, he notes: ‘At one extreme, one finds that the performer can be fully taken in by his own act; he can be sincerely convinced that the impression of reality which he stages is the real reality’.  

Goffman then complements this with his second performer type: ‘At the other extreme, we find that the performer may not be taken in at all by his own routine. This possibility is understandable, since no one is in quite as good an observational position to see through the act as the person who puts it on’.  

Both of these performer types are useful in identifying and exposing Mansfield’s representation of the marginal in ‘Pictures’ and ‘Miss Brill’.

‘Pictures’

In the aptly titled ‘Pictures’, protagonist Miss Ada Moss is a singer-turned-actress who is struggling to earn a living from her profession. Ada can be interpreted as a marginal figure due to her status as an unmarried and middle-aged woman. Heather Murray identifies the connection between Ada’s ever-increasing age and its detrimental effect on her profession as an actress: ‘Ada Moss tries to shape the pattern of her own life and support herself by acting on the stage, but as she ages, her chance of doing this recedes’.  

This connection between Ada’s ageing and her success as an actress demonstrates how, with no income, she is unable to support herself. This situation, for a woman, results in further marginality from society since she now has no profession, home, money and thus status.

As a result, Ada is literally cast aside, in both her profession and her life in general. However, despite an inability to act on the stage anymore, ‘Pictures’ portrays Ada’s greatest
performances in Goffman’s terms, as we witness her attempt to convince others that she is still a ‘star’ and not an ‘extra’ in her own production.

The reader perceives Ada attempting to convince those around her that her situation is better than reality. At the start of the story Ada has no money to pay her landlady so attempts a performance to earn herself more time in her accommodation. She does this by indicating that a rejection letter is in fact an acceptance calling her for an audition: “Well, Mrs Pine, I think you’ll be sorry for what you said. This is from a manager, asking me to be there with evening dress at ten o’clock next Saturday morning” (179). However, Ada’s attempt to fool Mrs Pine fails: she is mentally and physically too quick for Ada - snatching the letter from her and seeing through her performance. In this example, just like the second performer type that Goffman theorises, Ada is unconvincing in her own act.

Another example of Ada attempting a performance which fails, is when she tries to extract information from a younger actress about a part, while attempting to conceal her desperation for the work: “Oh dear, that was hard lines” said Miss Moss trying to appear indifferent. “What was it - if I may ask?” (182). Despite this performance, just as with Mrs Pine, the younger actress sees through Ada’s act: ‘But the dark mournful girl saw through her and a gleam of spite came into her heavy eyes. “Oh, no good to you, my dear”, said she. “He wanted someone young, you know - a dark Spanish type....”’ (182). In her uncovering of Ada’s act, the younger actress targets some of Ada’s attributes that marginalise her - her age and appearance. When the actress states ‘you know’, it is possible that Ada does know that despite her attempts to resist it, she has been ‘cast aside’.

These examples of failed performances from Ada serve as epiphanic moments in the story for the reader, as they discover the truth of Ada’s marginalised position in society. They are a convention of Mansfield’s stories, as Gerri Kimber notes: ‘Epiphanic moments in Mansfield’s fiction seem, then, to consist of manifestations which go on to produce a profound
realisation, perceived by the reader, though not necessarily by the characters themselves’. In the cases of Ada’s failed performances, they alert the reader to the profound realisation of her marginal position.

Another reason for the failure of Ada’s performances is the poor condition of the ‘props’ (in Goffman’s terms), used to enable them. Such an example is Ada’s powder-puff. Its description as lifeless and aged symbolises its inability to function correctly: ‘Miss Moss, taking out an old dead powder puff’ (181). This lack of functionality which the powder-puff possesses, affects Ada’s appearance, and, as we learn from her encounter with the younger actress, in acting appearance is everything. A connection can also be drawn between the powder-puff and Ada, as both are ageing and unable to perform their roles successfully anymore.

Conforming to Goffman’s second performer type, Ada’s failed performances are evidence that she has an awareness of her marginalised and ‘cast aside’ position. Throughout the story, Ada attempts to conceal from others what she already knows - that she is no longer a star but has been ‘cast aside’ and marginalised, both literarily and metaphorically in both her profession and life. Murray notes Ada’s acting to help herself and its failure: ‘Ada Moss seems to act to help herself, but the opposite is the case: whatever independence she had kept is now lost irrevocably’. In both the professional and in Goffman’s sense of the term, it is clear how Ada has awareness of her marginalisation and attempts to act to help herself out of her position but fails.

Ada’s awareness of her position is evident, as when Kimber talks of Ada’s ability to ignore her situation: ‘Miss Moss deceives the reader by being so constantly cheerful and optimistic that we forget, or rather ignore, as she does, her true plight’. Kimber’s highlighting of Ada’s deception of the reader underpins Goffman’s second performer theory where characters’ performances fail because they do not believe in them. Ada’s deception indicates
that she is already aware she is not what she is performing. Furthermore, when Kimber states Ada ignores her situation, this suggests further awareness - for to ignore something one must, on some level, have awareness of its presence in the first place.

Ada’s awareness of her situation is further highlighted when the reader perceives her telling herself she is ‘up against it’: “Well, old girl”, she murmured, “you’re up against it this time, and no mistake” (180). Ada is aware of the struggle she faces and the true depth of the situation she is in. In keeping with Goffman’s second performer type, comments like the one above reveal that Ada does not believe the performance she is about to undertake. It is a combination of her lack of belief and the poor quality of ‘props’ she uses, that result in her performances failing.

After a series of failed performances, Ada comes to accept her ‘cast aside’ and marginalised status. This is evident in the conclusion of the story where it is indicated that Ada works as a prostitute: “Well, am I goin’ your way, or are you comin’ mine?” he asked. “I’ll come with you, if it’s all the same,” said Miss Moss’ (185). Ada finally has to accept defeat and adopt a performance more suitable to the marginal role society has forced her to occupy - that is, prostitution. Moreover, the shift in performances Ada undertakes is symbolised in the new pulsating feeling she experiences as she goes from her actress role to that of a prostitute: ‘Miss Moss blushed until a pulse at the top of her head that she never had felt before pounded away’ (184).

‘Miss Brill’

Just like Ada Moss, Miss Brill, from the story of the same title, is also a marginal figure. Miss Brill is female, unmarried, middle-aged and is, in patriarchal culture, marginal. Her older, unmarried status is identified by Sylvia Berkman: ‘In ‘Miss Brill’ Miss Mansfield presents an elderly spinster who ekes out a narrow living in Paris by genteel, in-consequential
work’. Berkman’s reference to Miss Brill’s ‘narrow living’ can be interpreted as a living on the margins - a result of her marginal status due to her gender, age and marital status.

Murray shares my situation of Miss Brill on the margins of society: ‘Miss Brill lives on the periphery; she has no security or resource other than her own resilience’. Although sharing Ada’s marginal status, unlike Ada, Miss Brill is unaware of it - she does not think she has been ‘cast aside’. Miss Brill is convinced that she is a star and even refers to being on stage: ‘They were all on stage’ (253). Miss Brill interprets the park and all the others there to being part of a play: ‘It was like a play. It was exactly like a play’ (253). Finally, Miss Brill looks for assurance that she is part of this ‘play’ - this performance: ‘she was part of the performance after all’ (253).

In her belief that the world around her is a play and she part of it, Miss Brill literalises Goffman’s Dramaturgy theory. Furthermore, unlike Ada, Miss Brill’s belief in her performance places her in alignment with Goffman’s first performer type - one who believes in their own performance. Berkman supports Miss Brill’s disillusionment regarding her position through her identification of the character as ‘intensely absorbed in the limited happenings which make up her life’. These ‘limited happenings’ further support her lifestyle as marginal and her ‘intense absorption’ in it only adding to this end and suggesting her lack of awareness of it. Miss Brill is ‘part of the performance’, but as an extra, not the star, she thinks she is.

Whereas in ‘Pictures’ we witness a series of failed performances that eventually reveal to the reader Ada’s marginalised status, in ‘Miss Brill’ we witness a series of failed performances, but it is Miss Brill who learns of her marginalisation from them. Just as with Ada’s powder-puff, Miss Brill’s fox fur wrap is the prop that enables the performance in Goffman’s terms: ‘She had taken it out of its box that afternoon, shaken out the moth- powder, given it a good brush, and rubbed the life back into the dim little eyes’ (251). The fact that Miss Brill has to literally rub the life back into the fur indicates its lifelessness; her ‘rubbing the life’
into it is a performance which does not convince the reader.

Just as in ‘Pictures’, it is through epiphanic moments in the story that Miss Brill finally realises her marginal position and her failed performance. The most decisive of these epiphanies is Miss Brill’s encounter with the young lovers on the bench: “‘No, not now’ said the girl. ‘Not here, I can’t’. ‘But why? Because of that stupid old thing at the end there?’ asked the boy. ‘Why does she come here at all - who wants her? Why doesn’t she keep her silly old mug at home?’” (254). Just as with the younger actress in ‘Pictures’, the young couple here attack all the attributes of Miss Brill that marginalise her - her age, appearance and gender. In this epiphanic moment the young couple reveal the ‘play’ that Miss Brill believed she was a part of; however in their own version she is merely an extra - and, moreover, a hindrance to the performance of their own parts.

The encounter with the young couple serves as an epiphanic moment for Miss Brill as she is forced to come to terms with her marginality. This is evident when she fails to conform to her usual routine of stopping for a cake, but instead rushes home and quickly pack the fur away: ‘She unclasped the necklet quickly; quickly, without looking, laid it inside’ (254). Since the fur is one of the props enabling her (failed) performance it makes sense that Miss Brill now packs it away. It no longer can be worn, as in accepting her new marginalised status and accompanying role, the fur is no longer a suitable or relevant prop. It is the fur, as an enabling force for the former performance and role, that is now rejected by a newly aware Miss Brill, and which can be heard crying. The crying is a symbolic act of Miss Brill’s marginalised status and new found awareness of it: ‘But when she put the lid on she thought she heard something crying’ (254). It is significant that the fur and not Miss Brill cries; Miss Brill in packing away the fur is accepting her new marginalised role and thus does not mourn what she can no longer be.

Both of these representations of the marginal are enabled through modernist literary
techniques employed by Mansfield. Examples of these techniques are listed by Barry in his
description of modernist literature, in which he claims there is ‘a rejection of traditional realism
(chronological plots, continuous narratives relayed by omniscient narrators, “closed
endings”’).  

Another modernist literary technique is free indirect discourse, which Mansfield
employs freely in her stories - as for example when we learn that Miss Brill thinks the activities
in the park are seemingly part of a play performance: ‘Oh how fascinating it was! How she
enjoyed it! How she loved sitting here, watching it all! It was like a play. It was exactly like a
play’ (253). Here, the reader is taken straight into the mind of Miss Brill without the
problematic use of an omniscient narrator. Miriam Mandel comments upon the use of free
indirect discourse and its effect of enabling the reader to achieve Miss Brill’s perspective: ‘We
not only see what Miss Brill sees, but how she sees what she sees, as it is reported in her own
language (free indirect discourse)’.  

Through the use of free indirect discourse Mansfield achieves an unorthodox
representation of the marginal. This is because the reader is taken into the mind of the marginal
to hear their opinions/thoughts/feelings without their marginal status questioned as a result. For
Allen, ‘[a]s soon as that voice [one from the margins] gains even a little representation in the
novel form its claim to being truly marginal would seem to become strained’. Mansfield
overcomes this problem that Allen highlights through a combination of the modernist
convention of free indirect discourse with its effect of resisting problematic omniscient
narration, in order to allow the reader into the marginal mind as well as the form of her fiction -
the short story. In writing in the short story form Mansfield overrides the issue Allen identifies,
which is more an issue connected to the realist novel.

Through a combination of modernist literary techniques and the use of the short story
form, Mansfield is able to give the marginal - Ada Moss and Miss Brill - starring roles, without
undermining their status as such in the process. Mansfield makes two different marginalised performers, in Goffman’s terms, stars for being marginalised, by accessing the perspective of the extra or ‘cast aside’.

**Notes**

5. Goffman, p. 28.

Back row from left:
Claude Duncan Beauchamp (1877 - 1950), Cradock’s son
Ethel Maude Beauchamp (1867 - 1946), Cradock’s daughter (Mrs Grimsdale Anderson)
Margaret Annette Beauchamp (Nettie), (1869 - 1946), Cradock’s daughter (Mrs John Duncan)
Stanley Beauchamp (1872 - 1959), Arthur’s son Arthur Beauchamp (1827 - 1910)

Middle row from left:
Reginald de Charms Beauchamp (1872 - 1916), Cradock’s son
Harriet Augusta Beauchamp, née Broughton (1847 - 1908), Cradock’s wife
Cradock Beauchamp (1830 - 1906)
Front row from left:
Helen Mary Beauchamp (1871 - 1939), Cradocks’s daughter (Mrs Stuart Greensill)
A Broughton cousin, unnamed
Laura Elizabeth Gwendoline Beauchamp (1873 - 1939), Cradock’s daughter (Mrs de Barclay)
Clement John Broughton Beauchamp (1880 - 1959), Cradock’s son
(two other sons of Cradock, Herbert Arthur (1865 - 1916) and Henry William Granville (1875 - 1943) are not in this photograph).

Note by JW: the date of the photograph is given as c.1892. Judging from the ages of the subjects, it could be several years later than this. The married names of the daughters are given for information purposes; they were not necessarily married at the time the photograph was taken. Some additional information on the identities of the subjects (dates etc) has been given.

Much of the following information on the history of the Beauchamp family has been extracted from A Colourful Tapestry - Tales of the Beauchamps and the Elliots¹ by Elizabeth Beauchamp Naylor. This article has used research details from other sources in order to clarify and supplement the original.

Elizabeth Beauchamp Naylor is descended from John Beauchamp the silversmith through his son, Henry Herron Beauchamp. Henry Herron’s son, the eminent physician Sir Sydney Beauchamp (1861 - 1921), was her grandfather. Her father, Richard Beauchamp, was Sir Sydney’s youngest son.

Introduction

Beauchamp Naylor’s book tells us much about Beauchamp family origins and the colonial background of Katherine Mansfield and Elizabeth von Arnim. By tracing the lives of their Beauchamp forebears and relations, we begin to see characteristic patterns emerging: an ability to prosper in desperately difficult circumstances; a continuing need for culture, education and creative expression; and above all, a restless desire for travel. We can see how Mansfield draws upon her family history to name characters in her stories, and understand more of what the Beauchamp connection might have meant to her. The presence of some notably strong female characters in von Arnim’s Scottish ancestry gives us a fresh clue about the origins of her character.

¹ I am grateful to Elizabeth Beauchamp Naylor for her kind permission to use material from her book, and to a family member for supplying me with a copy.
The main characters

This synopsis provides a guide to those characters who played major roles in this story:

Beauchamp family

John Beauchamp (1781 - 1852), and his sisters Elizabeth, Jane and Charlotte

Four of the sons of John Beauchamp: Henry Herron (father of Elizabeth von Arnim), Horatio, Arthur (grandfather of Katherine Mansfield) and Cradock

Their cousin Walter Powell (son of John Beauchamp’s sister Elizabeth and John Powell), who married Ann Elizabeth Bell, daughter of Joseph Bell (friend of John Beauchamp)

Harold Beauchamp (son of Arthur Beauchamp and father of Katherine Mansfield)

Elliot family

Margaret Elliot (1734 - 1813)

Grand-daughters of Margaret Elliot: Elizabeth and Kezia Bedford

Elizabeth Bedford and her children from two marriages: Georgina Ford (later Georgina Bell) and from Elizabeth’s second marriage: Frederick Waite, Annie Mary and Elizabeth (Louey) Lassetter. (Note: Annie Mary married Horatio Beauchamp and Louey Lassetter married Henry Heron Beauchamp).

Kezia Bedford (Kezia Iredale after her marriage to Lancelot Iredale)

Frederick Waite Lassetter who married his cousin, Kezia Bedford’s daughter Charlotte (Chaddie) Hannah Iredale.

Beauchamp background

There is an intriguing family legend that the Beauchamps came to Britain from Normandy with William the Conqueror. After the conquest, Hugo de Beauchamp, whose name is on the list of William’s knights in the Hastings church, received large estates in Hertford, Buckinghamshire and Bedfordshire. The de Beauchamp family’s prosperity and status grew, until William de Beauchamp (1237 - 1298) inherited the title of ninth Earl of
Warwick. This illustrious line ended when Anne, the fifteenth Countess of Warwick, died in 1449.

The ancestors of the Elliots were the de Alights, who also came across from Normandy but settled as a warrior clan in the border country of Scotland. Their line in this narrative is traced through a female descendant, Margaret Elliot. This clan was noted for their powerful and independent female characters, a trait which continues to this day.

**The Beauchamps and their wandering descendants 1700 - 1850s**

Records of the Beauchamps in London begin with a pawnbroker, Robert Beauchamp, born in 1717. Married to Elizabeth Stretton, he was a member of the Broderer's Company. Their oldest son, a pawnbroker and silversmith, was Edward Beauchamp (1751 - 1813) who married Sarah Stokes in 1778. There were nine children:

Edward (b 1779), John (1781 - 1852), Sarah (b1782), Elizabeth (1783 - 1838), Robert (b1785), Sarah (b 1787), Mary (b1789) Jane (1792 - 1871), and Charlotte (1793 - 1877).

On 8th June 1802, the oldest surviving son, John Beauchamp, was bound apprentice to his father. He inherited a successful business and in 1815 married Ann Stone (1796 - 1859), one of the six daughters of Samuel and Mary Stone.

In her biography of Elizabeth von Arnim, Leslie de Charms\(^3\) writes of John Beauchamp:

> Early in the nineteenth century there lived in Hornsey Lane, in the north-west of London, a silversmith, John Beauchamp.

> His business, a flourishing one in the hands of his forebears from 1660 at least onwards, ceased to prosper under his management, though he invented the process for turning out imitation silver originally known as British Plate. This he failed to exploit and it eventually got into the hands of German manufacturers...

> [he]enjoyed what could best be found in London, the company of intellectuals, writers and artists.
These last he had particular opportunities to meet, for John Constable and Charles Robert Leslie, noted painters, lived close by in St John's Wood and in Hampstead, and Leslie had married Harriet Stone, sister of John Beauchamp’s own wife Ann. They were known as the ‘Six Precious Stones’ because of their charm and beauty. John Beauchamp’s interest in poetry and ability to recite verses (particularly those of Coleridge and Byron) earned him the nickname ‘the poet of Hornsey Lane’. He became known in the family as the original ‘Pa-man’ whose dominant but benevolent nature and forthright manner of expression was inherited by several of his sons.

The first child of the marriage, Annette (b 1815), died in infancy. Four sons followed: John Rutland (1817 - 1848), Frederick (1818 - 1861), George Western (b 1820 and died in infancy), Samuel (1822 - 1856); of these sons, only Frederick had children. Another daughter, Ann Charlotte (b 1823) also died in infancy.

Then followed the four sons who are of particular interest to this narrative: Henry Herron (1824 - 1907), Horatio Nelson (1826 - 1896), Arthur (1827 - 1910), Cradock (1830 - 1906). Henry Herron Beauchamp was to be the father of Mary Annette Beauchamp, Elizabeth von Arnim, and Arthur Beauchamp became the father of Harold Beauchamp and grandfather to Kathleen Beauchamp (Katherine Mansfield). The youngest of the brothers of Hornsey Lane was Ralph (1834 - 1855).

Sisters of John Beauchamp: Elizabeth Beauchamp (1783 - 1838), Jane (1792 - 1871), Charlotte (1793 - 1877)

Several of John Beauchamps sisters had a crucial influence on the lives of succeeding generations, especially the Beauchamp nephews. Of particular importance was Elizabeth, who married John Powell in 1810. Thirteen years later, she became the first of the Beauchamp family to emigrate when she, her husband and children went to Van Dieman’s Land (called Tasmania after 1853). The story of the Powells and their son Walter is continued later.

Jane was of independent character, and sought employment rather than follow the
usual path of marriage. She became a companion and assistant to her wealthy Anglo-Irish friend, Lady Laura Tollemache at Ham House by the river Thames. On the death of Lady Laura, Jane Beauchamp was given £2000 plus extra annuities for the continuing care of the pets. Her younger sister, Charlotte, was widowed soon after, and the two women, both in their late thirties, left Ham House and settled in Worcester.

Jane Beauchamp knew Edward Gibbon Wakefield, a reformer who, having had personal experience of prison life, devised schemes to make emigration attractive to the educated classes rather than a punishment for miscreants. From 1837, he was the driving force behind the New Zealand Company, sending settlers to Port Nicholas (Wellington) and nearby areas. The Company offered 4000 shares at £100 each.

Jane, with members of the Tollemache family, bought shares in the Company when they became available in 1839, including several land grants in Wellington. Jane hoped some of her Beauchamp nephews would go to New Zealand and benefit from her shares. This happened in the early 1850s, when Arthur and Cradock Beauchamp, by then in Australia, took possession of some of these land grants in Wellington City.

Margaret Elliot (1734 - 1813) and her descendants

As we follow the parallel stories of the migrant descendants of Margaret Elliot, we see how they played a major role in the destinies of Beauchamp family members.

Margaret Elliot, whose strong and independent character was to be inherited by her descendants, was one of the twin daughters of Gilbert Elliot (1751 - 1813, third Baronet) and Anna Maria Amy. She married Thomas Barratt and their daughter, Kezia Mary Barratt (1772-1804), married Thomas Bedford. Thomas and Kezia Mary Bedford had four surviving daughters: Susannah (b 1793), Elizabeth Ann (b 1795), Charlotte (b 1797) and Kezia (b 1801).
Elizabeth Bedford (1795 - 1844) and Kezia Bedford (1801 - 1863)

Susannah Bedford was first married to a young soldier at the age of 16; Charlotte died at the age of 12. Their grandmother, Margaret Elliot, cared for the remaining two daughters after the deaths of their parents, but died following an accident, slipping on the ice in the winter of 1813, aged 83.

This left Elizabeth Bedford, aged 18, and Kezia, aged 12, to fend for themselves. Susannah’s second husband, Frederick Waite, took care of his step-niece Elizabeth’s education, enabling her to become a governess. In 1817, Elizabeth married George Ford, an illustrator for the Encyclopaedia Britannica, but he died of consumption in 1821, aged 25. There were two surviving daughters, Georgina (1818 -1902), and Jessica (b c 1821/2).

Elizabeth, Georgina and the baby, Jessica, returned to live with Susannah and her husband. Elizabeth became a governess in Brighton and the Waites adopted Jessica. Eventually, Elizabeth was joined by her daughter Georgina and her younger sister, Kezia. Around 1825, Elizabeth married Matthew Lassetter, who ran a small Methodist school in Somerset. Their son, Frederick Matthias Waite Lassetter, was born in 1828.

The pioneer Elliot migrants: Elizabeth and Kezia Bedford

Soon after Elizabeth’s marriage, Kezia Bedford left England for New Zealand, becoming the first of this family to emigrate. She took the unusual step of joining a group of Wesleyan missionaries at the Whangaroa Mission, near the tip of North Island. After many adventures in New Zealand, she arrived in Sydney, Australia. There, in 1829, she married the widower Lancelot Iredale, a Wesleyan ex-convict working as a blacksmith and iron merchant.

As the couple were doing well in Sydney, Kezia wrote to her sister Elizabeth,
urging her to emigrate to Australia with her family. So, in 1832, Matthew Lassetter, Elizabeth and her children: Georgina (Ford) and Frederick Matthais Waite Lassetter sailed for Sydney on the ‘Governor Halket’.

Five children were born to the Lassetters after their emigration, but only three survived: Annie Mary (1834 - 1916), and Elizabeth Weiss (Louey) (1836 - 1919), and in 1839, and a son, Charles Henry, (b 1839 but he died in 1844).

Lancelot and Kezia had five surviving children (the first two died in infancy). These were: Alice (b 1834), Charlotte Hannah (b 1836), Emily Susannah (b 1837), Kezia Louisa (b 1841) and Lancelot Frederick (b 1844). They lived just outside Sydney where Lancelot also paid for a chapel to be built; Kezia was active in teaching at the Sunday school. Their ironmongery shop became widely known as the Iredale Store and as it prospered, Lancelot became a wealthy and highly respected citizen of the colony. Later, he joined the committee of Sydney College, which was to become Australia’s first university, founded in 1850.

As the fortunes of the Iredales rose in Sydney, the fortunes of the Lassetters declined after their arrival. There was increasing tension in the relationship between Lancelot Iredale and Matthew Lassetter, which led to the removal, in 1837, of the whole Lassetter family from Sydney to Van Dieman’s Land.

**Van Dieman’s Land**

Around this time, Matthew Lassetter applied to become a Wesleyan lay-preacher; permission was granted but he was never ordained. Despite this, he became known as the Reverend Matthew Lassetter for the rest of his life. The two daughters, Annie Mary and Louey Lassetter were initially brought up in Longford, a small farming community close to Launceston.
Matthew Lassetter followed his new role as a lay preacher but did little towards supporting his family, which suffered considerable hardship. In the end, he and Elizabeth opened a school in Launceston (a ‘School for Young Ladies’), which became a focal point for the growing Wesleyan community. Thus they became acquainted with other migrant families, including the Bells and the Powells.

The tough years of hardship in the colony took their toll on Elizabeth, and in 1844 she died, leaving the children destitute. However, only after the death of Lancelot Iredale in 1848, four years later, did Kezia feel able to help her sister’s children. Her actions were eventually to bring the Lassetter children into contact with two of the Beauchamp sons from Hornsey Lane, and also ensured the prosperous future of her daughter, Charlotte, as the wife of Frederick Waite Lassetter.

Elizabeth Powell (nee Beauchamp): pioneer migrant in Van Dieman’s Land

The tale of John Beauchamp’s sister Elizabeth, her husband John Powell and their son Walter can now be resumed.

John Powell was spurred on to emigrate by a grant of 1200 acres of land close to Launceston, Van Dieman’s Land. Their emigration, in 1823, brought them to a makeshift home, constructed of mud, which they named ‘Fairfield’ (clearly a translation of Elizabeth’s maiden name). However, despite their initial high hopes, the family suffered considerable misfortune, especially when John Powell’s health was undermined by fever not long after their arrival.

Elizabeth Powell had much to contend with, but nevertheless was responsible for setting up a small school in the colony. Walter Powell and his four older siblings benefitted from his mother’s conscientious instruction and strict grounding in morality. She managed to maintain the school despite giving birth to three more daughters,
including the twins Laura Jane and Charlotte Ellen in 1826.

Unsurprisingly, the Powell parents had difficulty surviving in this unforgiving environment, and died within a year of each other, just ten years after the birth of the twin girls. Laura and Charlotte were taken back to England to be adopted by Elizabeth’s wealthy sisters, Jane and Charlotte in Worcester. This may be the reason why the Beauchamps would often refer to their mothers as ‘Jane’, or ‘Little Jane’.

Van Dieman’s Land: the Bells, the Lassetters and the Powells

The Powell’s son, Walter Powell (1822-1868), was to be an influential figure in his family’s history as well as in the history of Melbourne. Because of his family’s impoverished circumstances, he was obliged to leave school at the age of twelve and went to earn his living as an auctioneer’s clerk. After the deaths of his parents, he went to live with a family friend and second employer and ardent Wesleyan, Joseph Bell (1792 -1874).

Before his emigration, Bell had lived in London where he had worked as an auctioneer and become friendly with the John Beauchamp and his family. In 1831, after his wife died, he took his two small children, Ann Elizabeth (4) and William (3) to Van Dieman’s Land and set up an auctioneering business in Launceston. There, in 1837, knowing the Beauchamp family connections, he employed the 15-year-old Walter Powell. In 1843, the Lassetter family became connected with the Bells when Joseph was married for the second time, to Elizabeth’s daughter Georgina. Walter was treated as a member of the family, and in 1845 became Bell’s son-in-law on his marriage to Ann Elizabeth Bell (usually called by her second name, Elizabeth).
Melbourne

Hoping for a life in more favourable circumstances, the Bell and Powell families left Van Dieman’s Land for Melbourne in September 1845. Joseph Bell was 51 years old, his wife Georgina was 25. Walter Powell was 23, and his wife (pregnant at the time) was 18. William Bell, Joseph’s oldest son by his former marriage, was also with them.

The girls, Annie Mary and Louey Lassetter, were left behind in Launceston, in the sole charge of their rather absent-minded father. Later, their half-sister Georgina (Bell) returned to take them back with her to Melbourne. (Eventually Matthew Lassetter remarried, went off to the Californian goldfields, and then in 1850 returned to Tasmania. In 1870, he joined Henry Heron Beauchamp’s family on the ship *La Hogue*, travelling back to London).

The Beauchamp Family and their cousin, Walter Powell

We now return to the story of the sons of John and Ann Beauchamp in Hornsey Lane, London. In 1848, Walter Powell accepted an invitation from his wealthy English aunt, Jane Beauchamp, to visit her in England; on this occasion he also visited the Beauchamps in Hornsey Lane. There he discovered that of the Beauchamp brothers, only Henry Herron had left home to start his career. Arthur was apprenticed to a silk merchant, but none of the other sons was employed. Powell was a man noted for his energy, honest business dealings, generosity and commitment to the Wesleyan religion. Disturbed to see their lives being wasted for lack of employment, Powell offered them assistance and support if they would emigrate to Australia.

Horatio and Arthur were the first to emigrate; they arrived in Melbourne in October 1848. Cradock followed them to Melbourne and later went on with Arthur to New Zealand.
Samuel suffered from tuberculosis; his emigration proved too much for his health, and he died at sea, shortly after leaving Sydney in 1856. Ralf also went to Melbourne and lived alternately with Arthur and Horatio. But Ralf suffered from mental instability and met an unfortunate end when he died in 1855 after falling into the harbour. Frederick stayed in London to help his father and mother. After his mother’s death, he married the mother of his four children, Ann Fox, and migrated to Sydney, where he died not long after their arrival in 1861. John Beauchamp died in September 1852; Ann died on 28th March 1859. Neither saw their emigrant sons again.

**Henry Herron Beauchamp (1824-1907), (married to Louey (nee Elizabeth Lassetter, 1836-1919))**

Henry Herron’s work for Philpotts & Co began when he was thirteen years old. After ten years with the company, he was sent to work in Mauritius, but after a couple of years he decided to set up his own business as a shipping merchant. This led him to Sydney, Australia, where he arrived in 1850. There he met Frederick Lassetter and his pretty younger sister, Louey, who was staying with her aunt Kezia (Iredale). The Lassetters, Iredales and Beauchamp families became closely connected when, in 1852, Georgina’s half-brother Frederick Lassetter married Charlotte Iredale, one of Kezia’s daughters. Henry Herron and Louey (Elizabeth Weiss Lassetter) were married in 1855.

Henry Herron’s business thrived, making him a wealthy man. By the 1863, the family had moved to one of the most prestigious addresses in Sydney, Kirribilli point. The Beauchamp children were all born in Sydney: Ralph (1857), Charlotte (1858), Sydney (1861), Walter (1862) Henry (known as Harry) in 1864 and finally on 31 August 1866, the future Elizabeth von Arnim, Mary Annette.

But in 1870, Henry Herron took the momentous decision to follow the Lassetter
family back to England (see later) and, with his adopted niece, Emma Beauchamp (see below), the family travelled to London on La Hogue in 1870. After their arrival in London, the Beauchamps and the Lassetters remained in close contact. They went together to live in Lausanne, Switzerland for a few years (1872-75). After this, they settled in London, where the Beauchamp children were able to take advantage of educational opportunities available, leading to distinguished careers for the sons, especially Sydney (later Sir Sydney) and Henry. This move to Europe was crucial also for the education and writing career of his youngest daughter, Mary Annette (Elizabeth von Arnim).

**Horatio Beauchamp (1826 - 1896), married to Annie Mary (nee Lassetter) (1834 - 1916)**

Horatio Nelson Beauchamp was the eighth child of John and Ann Beauchamp. At the suggestion of Walter Powell on his visit to London in 1848, Horatio emigrated with his brother Arthur, to Melbourne. At first, they could find no work there and went to work on a sheep station, but later Horatio returned to Melbourne with enough capital to set up business as a partner in ‘Palmer and Beauchamp Timber Merchants’. In 1853, another marriage had brought the Beauchamps and Elliot descendants together when he married Annie Mary Lassetter. Two of their eight children, Stanley and Leslie, died young, but six survived. For a time, Horatio joined Joseph Bell in his business, but later left in order to start his own highly successful auctioneering business. Horatio, influenced by his wife and also by Walter Powell, became an ardent Wesleyan. He used to preach against the evils of alcohol and became president of the Melbourne Total Abstainers Society. Like Walter Powell, he also took an active role in philanthropic and educational projects as the town developed.
His oldest brother Frederick Beauchamp (1818 - 1861) arrived in Sydney in the early 1860s with his wife Ann and four children, but died soon after arriving. At this point, the Beauchamp brothers (Horatio and Henry) stepped in to help, funding the return passage of Ann and the youngest child (also called Ann) to England. Horatio and Annie, who already had three small children, adopted Frederick’s eldest two, Frederick George and Clare. Emma Beauchamp was adopted by Henry Herron and Louey and later travelled back to London with the family on *La Hogue* in 1870.

**Walter and Ann Elizabeth Powell in Melbourne and London**

For nearly ten years, Walter Powell stayed in Melbourne where he entered a partnership with two other Wesleyans to form a hardware company. With the aid of the gold rush (1851), this became a prosperous concern. His success enabled him to give generous donations to many public charities, and take an active role in establishing the Wesley College in Melbourne where he is remembered to this day with the awards of the Walter Powell Scholarship. A talented musician, he became organist and choir master at the church in St Kilda.

In 1860, Walter and Ann Elizabeth Powell and their daughter Laura sailed back to London. From there he still actively pursued his business and charitable interests in Melbourne. He was also able to made amends for the lack of education he received in his youth, following a strict programme of academic self-improvement, studying music, mathematics, history, literature and languages.

Following an accident in his youth, Walter Powell had never been in good health, but he nevertheless travelled widely and worked tirelessly. His rigorous pursuit of business affairs, devotion to religious and charitable causes and the demanding
programme of self-education undermined his fragile constitution; he died at the young age of forty-six in Bayswater, London, in 1868.

We can note, however, that his widow, Ann Elizabeth, was also with Henry Herron and his family on the ship *La Hogue* in 1870; possibly she had been in Australia after his death to see to his affairs there. After this, Elizabeth Powell and her daughter Laura (their only surviving child) lived at 79 Lancaster Gate where Henry Herron was a frequent visitor.

**The Beauchamps, the Iredales and the Lassetters in Sydney and London**

On the death in Sydney of Lancelot Iredale, his widow Kezia Iredale arranged for Frederick Lasserter to come to Sydney to work for a friend, an auctioneer called George Lloyd. There, Frederick stayed with the Iredale family and in 1852 married Kezia’s daughter, Charlotte (known as Chaddie). Frederick was by this time a partner in the Iredale Firm; his career prospered until, in 1863, he was able to open the famous stores, F Lassetter & Co, in Sydney.89

Frederick and his young wife were able to afford a splendid house (Wotonga) on Kirribilli Point. Henry Herron and Louey Beauchamp also bought a large house there, with wonderful grounds stretching down to the bay. There, in 1866, the last of their children, Mary Annette was born. Both the families were very well established, so it is surprising that in 1869, the Lassetters decided to return to London. A year later, the Beauchamps followed them and remained in Europe. The children benefitted from their education in England, becoming distinguished in the fields of music and medicine. Mary Annette married the Count von Arnim and became famous as the author ‘Elizabeth’.

Eventually, Frederick returned to live in Sydney; the Lassets’s store remained a thriving business, and in 1910 celebrated its diamond jubilee. Frederick died in Sydney a
year later on 5 September 1911, aged 83.

**Connie Beauchamp in Melbourne, London and France**

Constance (b 1858), was the eldest daughter of Horatio and Annie Mary Beauchamp. When she was eighteen, her parents decided to encourage her to return to England with her uncle, Henry Herron, who was on the second of his long excursions from Europe to the southern hemisphere. They hoped she would be educated in Europe and make an advantageous marriage.

However, after her arrival in Europe, the rebellious Connie Beauchamp refused to attend her finishing school in Paris and also left a finishing school in Lausanne after just over a year. She returned to Henry Herron’s family in London until 1878, when her parents arrived with their three youngest children and took charge of the situation and ensured their daughters were educated in Lausanne.

Eventually, Connie Beauchamp lived in London with a young woman called Jenny Fullerton, a Roman Catholic who dressed as a man, in pin-striped suits, a tie, and wore her hair short. Connie was converted to Catholicism and the two women were able to start a small private hospital. Their success led to the purchase of the *Villa Flora*, just outside Menton in the South of France, where they retired.

There, just after the First World War, they were able to care for Connie’s desperately ill young cousin, Kathleen Beauchamp (Katherine Mansfield). Later, the two women bought a large house called the Villa Louise, further towards the Italian border; Katherine moved into a smaller house, the Villa Isola Bella, at the bottom of their garden.¹⁰

The close contact at this vital stage in her life between Katherine Mansfield and
her older family member brought her in touch with many family memories. Connie had known her Great Uncle, Henry Herron, and stayed with his family. Connie’s father was brother to Katherine’s grandfather, Arthur. All the family history and names of her relations would no doubt have been mentioned in conversation.

**The New Zealand: Cradock Beauchamp (1830 - 1906)**

Cradock was eighteen years old when Walter Powell made his visit to Hornsey Lane. By joining the merchant fleet as a cadet, he was able to join his brothers Horatio and Arthur in Melbourne. He went briefly to the gold fields, but then worked in Melbourne with Horatio.

Around 1862, Cradock sailed to New Zealand and sold his share of Aunt Jane’s lands near Wellington. In 1864, he married Harriet Broughton, an educated lady from England and they settled in Anakiwa bay, Queen Charlotte Sound. Henry Herron visited them on his trip in 1876, and records that they had eight children. All were involved in the hard labour of running the homestead; to Henry Herron’s dismay, he notes in his journal that there was little spare time or energy for cultural pursuits. Harriet took on the responsibility of her children’s education when she started a small school, Grove School, across the bay.

Harold Beauchamp, son of Arthur and future father of Kathleen Beauchamp, was Cradock’s god-child. He often spent holidays with his uncle and aunt at Anakiwa, and later his two eldest daughters stayed there while his wife Annie was having her fourth child. Kathleen visited the place several times.

When he was older and had more leisure, Cradock was able once again to enjoy reading and writing poetry. He died at Anakiwa in 1906. Harriet had wished to return to
England, but also died there two years later, in 1908. Life at the homestead is recorded in a book by his daughter, Ethel Beauchamp Hazelwood.\textsuperscript{11}

**The New Zealand: Arthur Beauchamp (1828-1920)**

Arthur was the ninth child of John and Ann Beauchamp. In her book, his niece Ethel Beauchamp records that he was “always considered the smart, brainy show boy of the family, with his ready wit, wonderful memory and sentiment and pathos. His Aunts [the Stone sisters] rather spoilt him by always praising his efforts too largely, which our grandfather [Cradock] was always trying to knock out of him to keep him humble”.

Arthur, earning only seven shillings a week while working at his Uncle de Charms’s silk merchandising firm, was keen to accept Walter Powell’s offer to help set him up in Australia. Towards the end of 1848, he, together with his cousin Robert Beauchamp, went to join Walter Powell and Horatio in Melbourne. Robert was the son of John Beauchamp’s brother Robert; an elder son, also called John Beauchamp, was already in Melbourne. Some of his descendants later also went on to New Zealand.

Leaving Robert Beauchamp in Melbourne, Arthur and Horatio at first tried sheep farming, but Horatio returned to Melbourne and Arthur went to work with Henry Herron in Sydney. Not satisfied with this arrangement, Arthur decided to go to New Zealand and take possession of the land left to him by his Aunt Jane Beauchamp. A ship was chartered and filled with saleable merchandise, which he sold in Wellington, Canterbury and Otago.

He then returned to Sydney to buy more goods for sale. However, this was 1851 and news of the gold-rush in Victoria had reached him. His destination was now Ararat, the goldfield near Melbourne. There he went into partnership to establish a store, but still unsettled, he soon left for Port Fairy. There he met Mary Elizabeth Stanley, the capable
and well-educated daughter of a Lancaster silversmith. Orphaned at sixteen she had gone to Australia as a governess to Governor Younghusband’s family; she was eighteen and Arthur twenty-six when they married in June 1854. Their first two children died soon after birth. The third son, Harold, was born in Ararat in 1858.

Further children followed: Arthur de Charms (1860 - 1940), Florence (1862 - 1893), Winifred (1864 - 1877), Walter Powell Beauchamp (1867 - 1888), Charles (1869 - 1892), Stanley (1872 - 1959) and Henry Lomax (1876 -1939). Conditions were tough and not many survived to old age.

Back once again in Melbourne, Arthur joined Horatio in his auctioneering business. With his facility with words and ready wit, Arthur proved an excellent auctioneer. After three years, early in 1861, Arthur decided to take his family to his lands in New Zealand. His family’s health was suffering in Melbourne, where infections spread rapidly in the heat. Once again, he invested his capital in goods and chartered a ship. With him were his wife, three-year-old Harold, baby Arthur de Charms, and also his cousin Robert Beauchamp and family.

Once in Wellington, he, like Cradock, sold the six Wellington sections for land in Picton, the capital of the Marlborough Province, where Cradock was now based. Then, with a business friend he established himself as a merchant and auctioneer. Picton was a thriving port and the discovery of gold at nearby Wakamarina in 1864 greatly increased its prosperity. There, Arthur prospered and was elected to the Marlborough Provincial Council in 1865. He is well remembered for his ten hour speech, blocking a proposal to move the council to Blenheim. He later became an MP for Picton and attended parliament in Wellington, where he held the liberal view that the Maori Wars could be terminated by a more just and honest land policy.
Arthur now had a large and comfortable home, ‘Fernhill’, on a fine section of Wellington Street. But the end of the gold at Wakamarina and more discoveries further along the West Coast prompted him to sell his business. Leaving his family behind in Picton, he headed for Westport to set up business there as a merchant, auctioneer and wharf owner. Two years later, he returned, intending to invest in farming.

The family left their home and started their farm on a property at Beatrix Bay near Havelock. Life now became a physically tough for the family, as they lived on fish, birds and mutton while they struggled to clear the bush. In 1869, Arthur, together with his second son Arthur and cousin Robert Beauchamp, headed north to Wanganui, where there were new opportunities to make money after the end of the Maori wars. His wife and the other children joined him there as he once more became successful as a merchant, auctioneer, stock and station agent and ship owner. The older boys attended Wanganui College. Here, on one of his world tours, Henry Herron found the family in 1876, and met the 17 year old Harold. He was greatly impressed with the young man; a friendship between nephew and uncle was forged at this time.

Arthur’s wanderings continued until eventually, having stayed with Cradock at Anakiwa, he decided to farm at Crail Bay near Nopera. There, his son Stanley continued to farm while Arthur went off to develop orchards at Keneperu. By 1902 his energy was failing. He visited London in 1902, where he stayed with Henry Herron and his family. Henry Herron’s son Sydney, a well-known physician, described him as a broken down old man with a bad heart. Nevertheless, Henry took him to see many of the Beauchamp relations in England. Back in New Zealand, he continued to farm at Keneperu where he and Mary celebrated their golden wedding anniversary. In 1907 they returned to Picton where Arthur died in 1910, aged 82. Mary stayed on there until her death in 1917.
New Zealand: Harold Beauchamp (1858 - 1938) and his family

Harold had a tough childhood with few advantages. He left school at fourteen to work for his father’s merchant and auctioneering business; he did well, and his later prosperity enabled him to provide his family with a lifestyle he could never have experienced in his youth.

He married Annie Burnell Dyer (1864 - 1915) in 1884. Three daughters, Vera, Charlotte, and Kathleen were born, followed by a son, Leslie, in 1894. Another daughter, Jeanne, was born in 1892. Annie was in delicate health, and found motherhood difficult. The main support in the household was provided by his widowed mother-in-law, Margaret Isabella Dyer.

The family’s first home was at Thorndon, Wellington, and it was there that Kathleen (Katherine Mansfield) was born in 1888. A year later, Harold became a partner in his father’s business and they were able to afford a much larger property on the outskirts of the city, Chesney Wold, in Karori. Later, the family moved back to Tinakori Road but owned a holiday ‘bach’ at Day’s Bay. The girls were brought up as young ladies and were accustomed to having servants who would perform all household duties.

In 1898, Harold was appointed to the board of the Bank of New Zealand and eventually became chairman of the bank. He was now a wealthy and ambitious man who wanted his daughters to marry well. His Uncle Henry Herron, whom he greatly admired, had taken his family to England where they were now prospering after a good education. Henry Herron’s daughter Mary was married to a German Count; for Harold; the idea of an English education for his family was very attractive.

So in 1903, he took his family to London, where his three older daughters attended Queen’s College. Annie’s sister Belle went with the family and remained in
London to oversee the welfare of her nieces. The girls spent their Christmas holidays with Henry Herron and Louey Beauchamp in Bexley. In 1906, Harold returned to London to fetch his daughters. He was received by King Edward VII and attended the Sixth Congress of the Federation of Chambers of Commerce of the British Empire. This was a high point in his career.

However, Harold discovered that his daughters loved London so much they did not wish to return to New Zealand. Kathleen, in particular, was showing signs of rebellion and desperately wanted to be allowed to stay behind. Belle did not return; she was to marry a ship-owner. The seeds of the conflicts between Kathleen and her parents, between the life they wished and envisaged for her and the life she needed to lead, were already sown. Kathleen was now dreading the thought of her future life back ‘home’.

In Wellington, the family moved to a luxurious house at 47 Fitzherbert Avenue. Harold Beauchamp tried his best to further his daughter’s literary career by supporting her submissions to a Melbourne literary magazine. But Kathleen could not be contained in New Zealand. In 1908 she sailed back, alone, for London.

Harold Beauchamp’s life continued to be outwardly successful, but on a personal level it contained great sadness. He could never understand the behaviour of his daughter Kathleen; his only son was killed in the war in October 1915. His wife Annie’s health declined and she died in 1918. In 1920 he was married for the second time to Laura Kate Bright. He was appointed a Knight Bachelor in the 1923 New Years Honours, and in 1935 he was awarded the King George V Silver Jubilee Medal.

In his later years he continued to travel frequently between Wellington and London, and died in Wellington in 1938. He left a legacy of funds to the National Art Gallery. If he died a satisfied man, history has not judged him kindly. In the light of his
family background, perhaps we can better understand his attitude to the life and career of Katherine Mansfield. And perhaps we can reflect that she, like her father and her father’s father, was born with the determination to cross the oceans to achieve her dreams; after all, she was born a Beauchamp.

The story of the Beauchamps and the Elliots gives us a glimpse into the past; the struggle to survive, the extraordinary success of some, the tragedies endured. Without close family support, most would have fallen by the way. It is hardly surprising that, towards the end of her life in far away Switzerland, Katherine Mansfield thought more and more of her family background in New Zealand. But it is strange to realise that, if Walter Powell had not visited Hornsey Lane in 1848, she would probably never have been born at all.

Notes

2 http://www.elliottclan.com/history/ accessed 29/08/14

See also:
Henry Herron Beauchamp Papers, The Huntington Library, San Marino, California, Call numbers: mss HM 77555 - 77664
Katherine Mansfield: Fifty Years After

Moira Taylor

‘Characteristically, she was a chameleon, being all things to all people and, like a divining rod, sensitive to every aspect of friend or stranger.’ ¹ - Anne Estelle Rice

In 1973, renewed interest in Mansfield was stimulated in Britain by the forthcoming fiftieth anniversary of her death and a BBC series featuring Vanessa Redgrave and Jeremy Brett as Katherine Mansfield and her husband John Middleton Murry. They enacted scenes from her life while other actors - at least two were New Zealanders - dramatized her short stories for the viewing public. As a reporter with the New Zealand Press Association I visited the film set in Hastings. A series of meetings and coincidences led me into a number of articles and interviews resulting in a radio documentary of reminiscences by three of her intimates - Ida Baker, her companion, Jeanne Renshaw, her youngest sister and Richard Murry, her brother-in-law. I recollect here the special anniversary issue of Adam, the literary magazine which devoted itself to her memory, its brilliant, domineering but fascinating editor Miron Grindea, my own memories of meeting the close associates of Mansfield I interviewed and also Vanessa Redgrave, who was ‘Katherine’ in the BBC series of her life and work: A Picture of Katherine Mansfield.

At the time the only biographies available were New Zealander Anthony Alpers’ excellent first edition written in 1953 - he published an expanded edition in 1980 - and the biography by Ruth Mantz (1933), a Stanford graduate. The Mantz biography raised the issue of the Mansfield myth perpetuated by John Middleton Murry’s editions of her work which came in a steady stream after her death in 1923.
This heroic myth of a tragic, tubercular writer struggling to complete her life’s work before
death overwhelmed her crowded out other more lively aspects of her personality: the cynic, the
mystic, the performer, the flirt, the merciless critic of Ida Baker revealed in the Letters and
Journal. At the time the ongoing researches of New Zealanders Margaret Scott and later
Vincent O’Sullivan, scholars with unfettered access to the Mansfield papers in the Alexander
Turnbull Library, were excitement yet to see the light of day. They produced a collected five-
volume edition of her letters in the 1990s which corrected the Murry editorialising while
recognising the immense effort involved for him, not least in translating her handwriting.
Margaret Scott also published in 1997 a two-volume edition of the manuscripts left behind by
Katherine Mansfield, much of which appeared originally in the Journal published by her
husband in 1927. There have since been three more biographies.

Another major event in 1973 marked this commemorative year, the Mansfield edition of
Adam, the English/French literary quarterly, which included 43 unpublished letters by
Katherine to Virginia Woolf, Bertrand Russell and Richard Murry, and posed the provocative
thesis that so far there had been no definitive biography. Copyright on the published manuscripts had expired and there were new works in the pipeline.

The *Adam* issue was praised by both Richard Murry and Ida Baker. It had a major scoop in publishing some of Katherine’s letters to the young philosopher Bertrand Russell with whom she dined on the 13 November 1916, writing to him afterwards in a state of such heady excitement, he admitted, anyone would think they were embarked on a passionate affair. But they were not. ‘My feelings towards her were ambivalent’, he said. ‘I admired her passionately, but was repelled by her dark hatreds.’

She wrote on 13 November 1916 from 3 Gower Street:

*Adam 50th anniversary issue cover, annotated by Richard Murry, Christmas 1973. Cover reproduced by kind permission of Nadia Lasserson, daughter of Miron Grindea.*
Yes, it was a wonderful evening. The thrill of it stayed with me all night. Even after I had fallen asleep I dreamed that we were sitting at the same table, talking and smoking, but all the mirrors of the cafe were windows and through them I could see big waves breaking as though we were far out at sea. I shall read your book tonight ...  

Russell’s letters to Katherine are lost but he did write to his friend Ottoline Morrell on the 5 December 1916, ‘Katherine ... interests me mentally very much indeed. I think she has a very good mind, and I like her boundless curiosity. I do not feel sure she has much heart.’ A year later, after trashing Katherine’s Prelude as worthless and full of trivial description he described her as ‘envious, dark, and full of alarming penetration in discovering what [people] least wished
The BBC series, *A Picture of Katherine Mansfield*, comprised six 50-minute programmes combining the dramatisation of two short stories with biographical detail of her life in each programme. Hastings on the Sussex coast was chosen for the location with New Zealand actors and native plants thrown into the mix. The NZ actors Bridget Armstrong and Ralph Bates were outstanding in *The Man Without a Temperament*, about which Richard Murry was thrilled. Filming in New Zealand was considered but since Mansfield had spent most of her short life in England and Europe where she produced most of her published work, this is where the series was made. Stories filmed included *Something Childish but Very Natural*, filmed in the summer, *Psychology, The Man Without a Temperament* (which dramatized the Murry’s own marriage, recognised by John), *Germans at Meat, Je Ne Parle Pas Français, Daughters of the Late Colonel* (with its Ida Baker figure acknowledged by Katherine), *Bliss*, and *Sun and Moon*. The BBC series is now available as a DVD and can be ordered on Amazon.
Vanessa Redgrave was cast as Katherine in the biographical parts, despite being tall and fair when Katherine was petite and dark and Annette Crosbie, who was of medium height, was cast as the tall Ida Baker, named ‘the Mountain’ by Ottoline Morrell because of her overshadowing height. Richard Murry (brother to John) wrote to the Radio Times objecting to the casting of Katherine and Ida. ‘This central distortion upset things so profoundly that one hardly blenched at apparitions supposed to represent D.H. Lawrence and Lady Ottoline Morrell ... if only Annette Crosbie and Vanessa Redgrave could have exchanged roles, something truer to life and far more dramatic would have been realised’.

Later Jeanne Renshaw, Katherine’s sister, voiced what many thought, that Vanessa - already a great actress - had been chosen to boost the popularity of the series internationally. The neurotic, self-obsessed figure was certainly not her sister, said Jeanne. Well aware of the reverse in physical stature, the producer, Rosemary Hill, was seeking to find the right emotional quality in the two women, an impossible task where family and friends was concerned. Ida Baker thought the biographical sections of the series were ‘pure fantasy’.

The series was filmed in 1972 and shown in 1973. I had interviewed Vanessa Redgrave for New Zealand Press Association. She was politically active, lobbying a parliamentarian on the day I saw her. She had read deeply for the role in the journal, letters and stories - even researching Bergson’s philosophy to understand Murry - but was careful about expressing how she saw Katherine.

In an interview one can’t explain the kind of affinity you have for someone who is dead and only perceived through words, any more than you can explain the affinity you have with a live person. I feel a tremendous affinity for her. I’m excited by her work and feel tender towards her as a person, but it’s not necessary to feel tender towards her to play her. It interests me to notice how much you can tell about her from her stories ... the peace and integration found in the work unrealised in the private life.

Discussing Mansfield’s husband, the writer, editor and critic, John Middleton Murry, she said:

Murry did help a great deal as a person in as much as he loved her and she needed his love. I can see that they were two very frightened people who felt less frightened when
they were together. To me the world they tried to create for each other, to me is much more important than any judgement people tend to come up with, that he was too donnish, or too dry.¹⁰

London in 1973, fifty years after Mansfield’s death, was a bleak place. The IRA was causing havoc with bomb threats weekly and the unions had brought the country to a standstill. Terrorism had also erupted in Europe in the Black September killings at the Olympic Games in Munich. As a NZ journalist I decided to interview Miron Grindea, the editor of Adam, in his house in Hove. I’d heard he was publishing a commemorative edition devoted to some unpublished letters of Mansfield.

The house was fascinating, filled with memorabilia of encounters with the great - sketches given by Picasso and Jean Cocteau, and letters from TS Eliot, who when awarded the Nobel Prize in 1948 had given Adam a cheque for £25, then a quarter of a century’s subscription. Grindea, a Rumanian, who had arrived in London with his wife Carola just before the
announcement of war, was in 1971 awarded the prestigious *Légion d’honneur* by the French government for services to French literature. *Adam* embraced both French and English contributions and included editions on Dylan Thomas, the Belgian crime writer Simenon (Grindea thought him ‘the greatest storyteller since Balzac’),\(^{11}\) Proust and H.G. Wells, its first contributor. An earlier edition of the journal (*Adam 300*, 1963-5) had published 46 KM letters to friends Anne Estelle Rice, Sydney and Violet Schiff and memoirs from Rice and Dorothy Brett.

The task of keeping *Adam* oxygenated was relentless and required ceaseless work. Grindea was on issue 500 when he died in November 1995. I discovered later he had many assistants, in his obituary described as ‘people who later became novelists, poets, therapists, musicians, publishers, dons or layabouts’.\(^{12}\) Good company.
Publishing another edition of *Adam* was like leaping from one literary precipice to another. His edition on Proust took three years. He started from nothing then provoked himself with a hypothesis, creating as many difficulties as possible and forcing himself to cope with them until eventually going to press. He had material in his files for three more editions like the commemorative one, he told me. It has been confirmed over the last year that there was indeed unpublished Mansfield material in the *Adam* files, as reported by Christopher Mourant, a PhD student writing a thesis on the journal, who found an unpublished Mansfield story. Grindea had considerable access to Ida Baker in the 1960s.

Grindea thought Katherine Mansfield a no-end subject. Had she not been eaten by tuberculosis she might have been more stable. He spoke of her as a chain-smoker, a *horizontale*, a restless traveller, a habitual liar, possibly a bi-sexual. He thought some of her love letters to John Middleton Murry, particularly those describing her erotic longing, were some of the most haunting in modern literature. He told me that Richard Murry, Katherine’s brother-in-law was...
working near to me in Queen’s Square as the Secretary of the Art Worker’s Guild - he was also a portrait painter - and Jeanne Renshaw, her younger sister, was still alive in the Cotswolds. In return for these leads, I promised to write an article on Adam to boost its circulation in New Zealand. This article appeared in the New Zealand Listener on 29 December 1973 and began: ‘Is there no end to the fascination of Katherine Mansfield?’ and said: ‘For after all, who is Katherine Mansfield? Even she didn’t really know and if her husband John Middleton Murry had not waived her instruction to destroy as many of her private papers as possible and publish as little as he could, we might be still in the dark today.’ It ends with the words, ‘As Adam says “we are still at the beginning”’. No longer. Forty years later, discovered as an early modernist writer, Mansfield is the subject of international conferences and flourishing scholarship. The latest biography is Gerri Kimber’s The Young Katherine Mansfield, published in 2017.

I was stunned by the encounter with Adam and keen to follow up the idea of doing more with the subject. I began to read every piece of Mansfield material I could lay my hands on - the Alpers biography (first edition), her letters, her journal, critical articles, the stories. To relieve the intensity I signed up for a class in printmaking. The teacher was a friend of Peter Day, as yet unknown to me, a reader for the publisher Michael Joseph and later Gollanz, who had, it turned out, become the amanuensis or muse for Katherine’s companion, Ida Baker or Leslie Moore (L.M) as Katherine re­named her - persuading her to publish her memoir of life with Katherine and then helping to edit and polish it. Ida wanted to correct the misconceptions of other biographical writers that she was abused and made a slave to Katherine’s needs, both physical and emotional. I recently learnt from the researcher Christopher Mourant that Miron Grindea had also contributed by proofreading Ida’s memoir.

I decided that in some way the synchronicity of all these events - meeting Grindea, discovering the whereabouts of Mansfield’s three intimates - was compelling me to record their memories before it was too late. Ida and Jeanne were in their eighties, Richard was 71. I signed
up for a class in radio interviewing, egged on by Miron Grindea (‘put the tape recorder under
the baby’s blanket!’) and enlisted the help of a BBC recordist, Diane Bailey, who hired me
equipment and attended the interviews to monitor sound levels. The resulting documentary, Her
Bright Image: Impressions of Katherine Mansfield, was produced in New Zealand from these
taped interviews and my written linking narrative with extracts read by New Zealand actors.\textsuperscript{15} It
has lain in the Radio NZ archives since 1974 more or less until its recent unearthing at the
prompting of Gerri Kimber when it was remastered to CD.

Richard Murry was charming and sympathetic and his view of Katherine was fairly
idealistic. He clearly adored her and suffered for her and his brother. He had known Katherine
since the age of 13 but had more contact when he started going to the Slade in London, at 17,
when Murry and Katherine were living in Church Street, Chelsea. After her brother Lesley’s
death in 1915 he became a substitute for ‘Chummie’. He had attended some of the Garsington
parties hosted by Ottoline and Phillip Morrell. A young art student, he worked for the Morrells
as a farm labourer. As her brother-in-law he was in a position to know how Katherine behaved
socially. He had attended two of the parties at the house named ‘The Elephant’ by Mansfield
and Murry in Hampstead, but was not at the Garsington parties when Katherine was there. He
wrote to me before the interview:

\begin{quote}
What I would really like to try and do would be to make profound apologies to the
spirit of Katherine for inflicting adolescent growing pains on her when she was really
ill. It doesn’t bear thinking about.\textsuperscript{16}
\end{quote}

Richard was seen as very much part of Katherine’s life in the happier Bandol years in 1918—
19 when she was establishing the mythical, escapist ‘Heron’ household of the future with John
Middleton Murry, knowing she would never have children as a result of her earlier sexual
escapades. She wrote in a letter to John on 4-5 March 1918 from Hotel Beau Rivage, Bandol:

\begin{quote}
Arthur [renamed Richard] is very real to me, by the way and a part of our life. He is
going to ‘fit’ isn’t he? I want us to have him and to give him a rich true life right from
the start with no false alarms.\textsuperscript{17}
\end{quote}
Richard and John established the Heron Press in 1919 from which the long New Zealand-inspired story *Prelude* was first published. He took Katherine out to music halls - Vesta Victoria, Marie Lloyd and Raquel Mellor were all favourites - to theatre and ballet and to the Tate and National Galleries. London at the time was alive with ideas spawned by new developments in painting on the Continent, the first wave of jazz from America and the brilliant exoticism and new colours of the visiting Russian Ballet.\(^{18}\)

Richard was very pleased with Miron Grindea’s introduction to the memorial edition of *Adam* which he found ‘rich and interesting’. He thought Grindea was particularly persuasive in his thinking about a definitive biography of Katherine: ‘There can be no last word’, \(^{19}\) he said.

He was delighted to see the unpublished letters to him in print in one batch because, as he wrote to me,

> some of their effect will be lost when they are fitted in order in the complete edition of the Letters. This is because Katherine was writing many letters to friends on the same day, and, say, some of the pictorial effects produced to please her art-student brother-in-law would be used again to ‘other people’... I am told that at the same time as she was saying quite genuinely, how pleased she was to hear from Jack that my skill was improving, she was railing at him for wasting ‘His-and-Her’ time talking about my drawings at all!\(^{20}\)

Katherine was very tender towards her young brother-in-law and often painted a verbal picture for him to stimulate his art. Here she writes to him from Isola Bella in Menton, 1920:

> Dear little Bruvver
> I occurs to me that a more reasonable ‘kick off would have been to send you a tres late Christmas present. I therefore enclose a small cheque. *Spend it.* That’s all I ask. Don’t save it. Enjoy yourself, Richard dear. Buy yourself a book you want or take Mam’selle out to dinner or - do what you like. That’s all the bes’.
> And never think any money I send you deprives Jack of anything. As you know we keep our money affairs entirely separate. He doesn’t give me a penny and never has. So feel as free as air.
> I decided this morning to make my will in case I should go off suddin like. I don’t suppose I shall leave more than 4d. but after mature consideration I’ve pitched on ce jeune peintre Richard Murry to be my heir.
> *Addio, caro mio*
> *Catterina* \(^{21}\)
Richard commented to me about these somewhat self-pitying references to money - ‘Jack never gives me a penny’; ‘I shall only leave 4d’; ‘what’s left for me’, ‘something small’. He said: ‘There is an important point to be made here that Jack was lower middle-class, semi-working-class while KM and Ida were bourgeois. I remember a most interesting conversation between Katherine and Jack on Dickens. K said: “Why does Dickens always talk about money?” Jack said: “If you have really been poor the fear of poverty never leaves you.” For example the Micawbers in David Copperfield is our (the Murrys’) background. And incidentally this explains Bloomsbury snobbery towards Katherine, the provincial, and Jack’s easy relationship with the working-class.’

In late 1921 from the Chalet des Sapins, Montana-sur-Sierre, Mansfield wrote to Richard that the new year is going to be a good one. Better than the ones that went before. There is a kind of stirring when one thinks of it, the feeling that one has on a late March night when the wind is West. Does that seem nonsense to you? I want it to be good for all of us - of course, so that this time next year here we are - rich in happiness, fat in blessings. Jack shall have a crown, you a small sceptre - What’s left for me? There is sure to be something small going. Happy Xmas, dear old boy - a Happy New Year. With much love from Katherine.
Two years later she was dead.

I asked Richard whether there was any aspect of Katherine’s character that had hitherto been neglected - I was thinking here of the remark he had made about impending character studies in the BBC series: ‘Which is going to capture the joy of the Tiger’s pounce?’ 24 He answered: ‘the speed of her attack!’ When asked if he would discuss his view of Katherine, he replied that the most life-like description was given by her friend the painter Dorothy Brett and published in the commemorative edition of Adam:

Her features were small and delicate, the eyes dark in a pale clear skin, beautiful even white teeth, and her polished black hair rolled on the top of her head in a fan-shape ... She had daring, courage and a tremendous sense of humour. She was like a sparkling brook - like quicksilver. Her changes of mood were rapid and disconcerting: a laughing joyous moment would suddenly turn through some inadequate remark into biting anger ... Katherine had a tongue like a knife, she could cut the very heart out of some one with it, and repent of her brilliant cruelty the next moment ... She had no tolerance of the stupid or slow. Her mind was so quick, so clear, so ahead of the thoughts and conversations of others ... 25

Another view of the Tigers, a name given to the Murrys by Gilbert Cannan, a Rhythm writer, came from the American painter Ann Estelle Rice who painted the Fauvist painting of Katherine now in the New Zealand National Collection. ‘The Tigers [Katherine and Murry] used to go down the Strand in cowboy shirts and a swaggreing gait pour epater les bourgeois,’ 26 she says in her memoir in Adam 300, an expression meaning ‘to shock the middle classes’ and used by the French decadent poets. Anne met Katherine in 1906 in Paris when she was working there as an illustrator. She also recounts Katherine (‘Tig’) creeping up behind New Zealand soldiers in London and letting out a Maori war cry.

When I went to see him Richard Murry spoke of the occult in relation to Katherine. Ida saw a manifestation of Katherine when she was transcribing and typing the KM material with Murry after Katherine’s death which she described in Her Bright Image; Murry talks of a manifestation of Katherine in chapter one of his book, God, ‘although he went out of his way to avoid the occult; but there are extraordinary manifestations to be collated and considered,’
according to Richard. In his own life, he told me, in times of fear and crisis ‘Katherine was there as a presence’.\textsuperscript{27} No doubt a psychoanalyst or psychiatrist would have rational arguments to explain these manifestations. Mansfield herself describes her mother in the room with her in a journal entry after her mother’s death and records coming in the door and finding someone there. ‘It’s a game I like to play to walk and talk with the dead who smile and are silent, and free, quite finally free’,\textsuperscript{28} she wrote.

Mansfield hated being alone. She was prone to night terrors which are described by Ida Baker in the recorded interview particularly in relation to the early days in London in Gray’s Inn Road, and by Richard Murry in conversation with me. In the light of this insecurity and terror and her long history of medical illness - gonorrhoea (perhaps), pleurisy, tuberculosis, a failing heart, Ida's constancy and presence was essential when Murry was absent in England, working, while she was seeking an improvement in her health in France or Italy.

Richard also discussed the existing biographical gaps. The possible love affair with the illustrator Edith ['Edie'] Bendall in Wellington (the letters Katherine wrote to her daily over six months were destroyed, according to Edith’s daughter, probably just before her marriage). We have little account of the Francis Carco affair, where Katherine travelled to the front line in France during the first world war to keep an assignation with her lover. The story of this affair, \textit{An Indiscreet Journey}, is quite cheerful but Richard Murry remembered Jack saying Katherine was incensed by his using a photo of her in a fur-collared coat. Neither of us could understand why, he said; Jack thought it was because she had the photo taken for Carco [another \textit{Rhythm} contributor and author] and hated to be reminded of him. The feeling was apparently mutual. In her memoir of Katherine recorded in \textit{Adam 300}, Anne Estelle Rice recounts meeting Carco years later at a house party in France where he denied knowing Katherine.

Richard was reluctant to discuss Mansfield’s relationship with Ida Baker. His brother’s point of view can be read about in his book, \textit{Between Two Worlds}: He said: ‘Jack and I felt the
relationship was marred by Katherine’s resentment. We both liked Ida but then the relationship of course wasn’t dynamic to us! Ida worked with John Middleton Murry after Katherine’s death, transcribing and typing many of the letters and stories for his editions of Katherine’s letters, journal and stories. She describes a ‘visitation’ by Katherine when they were together at this time in her interview with me (made more interesting now we know her remains were languishing in a pauper’s grave in Avon through a muddle over an unpaid bill by Murry, or Ida who possibly thought the family were covering costs).

My next encounter was with Jeanne Renshaw, Katherine’s petite and energetic younger sister, said to be very similar to Katherine in appearance. She was then 85 and instantly struck up a correspondence with me. Her first reply to a request for an interview came instantly:

Your letter of January 2 came today. When you arrive in Cirencester, phone me, and I will dash into town and collect you. We who are born in NZ are never defeated - our pioneer blood sees to that. We must have a long talk so please stay the night - no hurry to leave. This little valley where time has stood still is out of this world. “Peace which passes understanding.” We have a little white Saxon-Norman shine to worship in! Sincerely yours, Jeanne Renshaw.

The church was beside a graveyard where Cromwellian soldiers are buried. Inside a tiny organ is dedicated by the three Beauchamp sisters, Vera, Chaddie and Jeanne, to the memory of Katherine. Jeanne showed us her property. From my notes at the time I wrote:

Standing beside the church she looks into the valley beyond and paints a verbal picture of the annual hunt which tears across her property. The field comes to life with brilliant pink-jacketed men and the policeman of Cirencester staggering around in the fracas looking for his helmet. On the way back to the house she remembers a gate is unshut and before we can move she is running back, a tiny hunched figure in a leopard-skin coat. Before the day was out I was to see her running up and down stairs in exactly the same bunched up way. One can believe her when she says she is looking forward to her 100th birthday.
devoted child to Katherine’s black sheep. When together they reminisced about the
good times (‘Shall we go back and talk about the old times?’) because Katherine ‘was
very secretive about her life’ to Jeanne. Jeanne thought ‘she would have made a superb
actress’ and .. ’she had all this maternal love. She was magic where children were
concerned.’

Jeanne was aggrieved that her father, a director of the Bank of New Zealand and a powerful
political figure at the time, had been perceived as mean by Mansfield writers. But he had
provided an allowance to Katherine on which she lived and supplemented with reviewing.
Beginning at £100 a year it had tripled by the time of her death. He did have a large family of
six to educate, his own parents to look after and his mother-in-law and her family. The sisters
were probably not shown Katherine’s letters, they knew nothing. Her erratic behaviour in early
London life becoming pregnant, miscarrying at a late stage, then marrying an unsuitable man
and leaving him had left her reputation battered within the family. Her mother cut her out of her
will after the Bavaria episode when she had taken the pregnant Katherine there and left her to
lose the baby.

Jeanne adored her father and resented the way he’d been represented by Mansfield
writers. She felt so strongly that in 1976 she went out to NZ to put the record straight, giving newspaper interviews. Beauchamp himself had annotated Katherine’s letter to him written from Switzerland in November 1921 in which she says her relatives Connie and Jinnie ‘made me realise that for you to give me £300 a year was an extreme concession and that as a matter of fact my husband was the one who ought to provide for me’, with the words ‘Quite untrue’. He never begrudged any of his children their allowances, he wrote on the letter, according to Vincent O’ Sullivan’s notation in the Collected Letters. On his last visit to the tubercular Katherine in Italy he left her five cigarettes. She was unable to write to him after that last visit and the incident of Beauchamp requesting her bank book from his agent in London, Mr Kay. But she was touched to see him and appeared to want to be received back into the bosom of the family before she died, and she was dying.

From Cirencester and Jeanne Renshaw, I went on to visit Ida Baker and Peter Day, in Ida’s dark cottage in the New Forest. Ida was ambivalent about granting another interview and told me ‘These are my last words on the subject.’ She felt ‘squeezed dry like an orange’ after completing her memoir. Tall, stooped, frail, nearly blind and quite deaf, she spoke in a soft sweet voice with total conviction in what she was saying. It was necessary to give her prompts which can be heard in the recording. Some of my questions about the nature of her friendship with Katherine simply dissolved in her presence. She was implacable in her continued discretion and devotion. It was nearly fifty years after Katherine’s death before she published her own memoir in 1971 having frustrated biographers along the way, particularly Antony Alpers and Jeffrey Meyers.

She had supported Katherine in England, France and Italy with money, attendance to domestic duties and moral support, enabling her to realise a writer’s life despite being an invalid. Ida was particularly valuable in the last five years of Katherine’s life, the time of her most brilliant productivity. To Ida their relationship was ‘like marriage: complete, eternal and
Mansfield’s more recent biographer, Kathleen Jones, says that the New Forest cottage was on loan to Ida from the writer Elizabeth von Armin, Katherine’s cousin. Elizabeth must have felt, as a friend and family member, Ida’s tremendous contribution to Katherine’s life. She had also loaned Katherine £100 in the last year of her life.

The New Forest Cottage where Ida was living when I interviewed her for Her Bright Image

Peter Day, who was instrumental in helping Ida publish her memoir, was illuminating. He believed that Ida had not read the published Journal of Katherine Mansfield until she began work on her own memoir (intended originally by Ida for the British Museum KM archive). Because Ida was not Murry, the husband Katherine wished to have at her side, she had to endure Katherine’s depression and frustration at the approach of death, her vile temper and bitter despair. Katherine even contemplated shooting Ida in 1922. Other people had later shielded Ida from the most extreme Journal disclosures about her but it is clear from an entry Katherine made in the Journal that Ida was aware of the difficulty of the relationship. ‘What is hate? Why do I feel it for her? She [Ida] says: It is because I am nothing, I have suppressed all my desires to such an extent that now I have none. I don’t think, I don’t feel.’

The ambivalence towards the helpmeet Katherine variously described to others as ‘The
Mountain’, ‘The Albatross’, ‘The Faithful One’ came from the co-dependency which was mutual. Ida’s relationship with Peter Day was similar. He described her dependence on him and her need for constant contact as very like her relationship with Katherine, and ‘just as oppressive.’

Ida appears to be an innocent and a product of her time. She had lost her mother in her early teens and developed an almost religious devotion to Katherine from their earliest school days. She was shocked at the notion of even using the word ‘pregnancy’ in her memoir of life with Katherine according to Day. She herself had no first-hand sexual experience with a male, as she made clear to the Mansfield editor, Margaret Scott (‘I’ve never been kissed’) though she had been privy to Katherine’s love life, retiring behind a curtain to read and rest when Mansfield was entertaining guests in the studio she shared with Ida in Putney in the early days in London. Ida would return from her job in an aeroplane factory at 9 pm so Katherine could entertain Murry and others before that time. If they were late ‘I would go up to the little gallery curtained off for my room, and rest, sleep or read. As far as the guest knew they were alone with KM. If I overhead the conversation it mattered nothing.’

There are plenty of examples in the Journal offering affection (some of it semi-erotic) when Katherine wanted to appease Ida or ensure her continued devotion or support but the record of their relationship in letters was destroyed by Ida in a bonfire at Mansfield’s instruction. When Ida herself received guests, as she mentions in her account of life with Katherine - two soldiers on leave in Hampstead - the Murrys monopolised the conversation completely and they left without having any real connection with Ida. Her head remained firmly below the parapet, as a housekeeper and moral and financial supporter. But her conviction of what she meant to Katherine was imperturbable: ‘She had her line with Murry, her line with everyone else: my line went rather further down and deeper.’

The escape into otherworldliness by Ida apparent in the interview with her I interpret as
psychological compensation for loss of the primary person in her life, Katherine.

Notes


13. Conversation in Queen’s Square, London, with Miron Grindea, December 1973 (he was probably visiting Richard Murry; I was taking my baby Sam for a walk - I lived nearby at the time). He was keen for me to become his editorial assistant.
15. Richard Murry, ‘Draft Notes on Adam: International Review. Editor: Miron Grindea, vol. 38, Nos 370-5, Katherine Mansfield: 50 years after’, sent to Moira Taylor before the interview with him and accompanied by a marked proof copy of the commemorative Adam. RM had proofread this edition of Adam but had not sent these corrections to Grindea since he was not requested to do the job. He sent them to me instead as a Christmas present (see photo).
17. Taylor, ‘It’ll be all right, it’ll be all right’, New Zealand Listener, 11 May 1974. Last of three articles on Katherine Mansfield’s contemporaries.
20. Katherine Mansfield to Richard Murry, day and month omitted, Villa Isola Bella,


23. Richard Murry to Moira Taylor, 3 November 1973 re the ‘joy of the Tiger’s pounce’ [‘Tig’ was a name Murry used for Katherine]. R. Murry linked the expression to Mansfield writer Ruth Mantz, saying: ‘From this point of view Ruth Mantz’s chapter 15 [I presumed in The Life of Katherine Mansfield, Ruth Elvish Mantz (1933)] cannot be judged; Katherine was desperately ill by then’. He also said to me in these notes: ‘Ruth Mantz (like other writers on K.M.) speaks almost as though further facts should not be looked for. For example she is quite emphatic that it would be impossible to unscramble the Journal as published. To my mind this is defeatist. She has not got the measure of the researches of Anthony Alpers and Margaret Scott. No others are in the position to do what they are doing; let alone match their application.’ Alpers second biography was published in 1980; Margaret Scott was later joined by Vincent O’Sullivan to publish The Collected Letters of Katherine Mansfield (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1984-2008).


27. Katherine Mansfield, ‘It’s a game I like to play to walk and talk with the dead who smile and are silent, and free, quite finally free’.

28. Richard Murry’s annotations on Moira Taylor’s preliminary questions to him (9 January 1974) before the recorded interview in Her Bright Image.


32. Taylor, Her Bright Image.


36. Taylor ‘The marvel is.’, p. 18.


42. Taylor, Her Bright Image, 1974.

44. Ibid.
‘Complementary Cousins: Constructing the Maternal in the Writing of Elizabeth von Arnim and Katherine Mansfield’

Isobel Maddison

I

It is well known that the novelist, Elizabeth von Arnim, was the elder cousin of Katherine Mansfield. Critics, including Claire Tylee in *The Great War and Women’s Consciousness* (1990), observe, for instance, that ‘Mansfield seems to have been inspired by the example of her aunt, the successful author’. Recently, Jenny McDonnell points out, in *Katherine Mansfield and the Modernist Market Place* (2010), that Mansfield’s first collection of stories, *In a German Pension* (1911), echoes the genteel title of von Arnim’s first novel, *Elizabeth and her German Garden* (1898). Kathleen Jones also notes in her biography, *Katherine Mansfield: The Story-Teller* (2010), that Elizabeth was Katherine’s ‘role model’, adding that by 1906 Elizabeth was something of a literary ‘celebrity’ who, like Katherine, was ‘gifted in both music and literature’. And, as Jones rightly speculates, von Arnim’s writing ‘may have had a considerable influence’ on Mansfield’s ‘early work’.

These welcome comments help establish significant familial and artistic associations that have been largely unacknowledged. The intention of the discussion here is not to trace the influence of one writer on another, however, as I do in *Elizabeth von Arnim: Beyond the German Garden* (2013), but to bring into clearer focus the connections that existed between von Arnim and Mansfield on the topic of motherhood. Certainly, narrowed literary classifications have tended to obscure the links between the writing of these cousins. Von Arnim, for instance, has sometimes been considered a ‘middlebrow’ author, or at least not ‘modern’, while Mansfield is often regarded as an *avant-garde* writer, a modernist immersed in the artistic ideals of the *fin-de-siecle* aesthetes, her work frequently appearing in experimental journals. And,
while the significance placed by critics on literary ‘movement’ is important, this can also render opaque those thematic and textual similarities that are the most illuminating and unexpected. This is particularly the case for von Arnim and Mansfield, especially in their shared representation of motherhood in Mansfield’s, *In a German Pension* (1911), and in von Arnim’s novel, *The Pastor’s Wife* (1914), both of which were written as the Great War approached.

Taking account of the biographical connections between these women, as Jennifer Walker does in her recent biography of von Arnim, augments the unexpected similarities displayed in their writing. More importantly, reading contextually demonstrates that, irrespective of genre and stylistic considerations, von Arnim and Mansfield challenge the prevailing mood of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries with their increasing emphasis on the social value of ‘the mother’. Both writers frequently enlist irony and reject sentiment when discussing pregnancy, for example, concentrating instead on portraying female suffering and bodily distortion. Von Arnim and Mansfield are also startlingly candid for the time since their work associates motherhood with mindless drudgery and alienation. In addition, both writers contrast the British and German perceptions of maternity at the beginning of the twentieth century, situating motherhood, loosely, within the discourse of British anti-invasion literature by constructing caricatured oppositions depicting entrenched (and, retrospectively, uncomfortable) national types that frequently obscure the shared reality of mothers living in Britain and Germany at the time.

It is the anonymous reviewer in the *New York Nation* in December 1900 who first discusses von Arnim’s ‘unmaternal attitude’ toward the babies in her earliest book, describing this as ‘a blot’ on an otherwise entertaining novel. In truth, this was only the beginning. When she published *The Pastor’s Wife* fourteen years later, her depiction of maternity and her portrait of motherhood had steadily reached its ambivalent height. Reading some of the stories from
Mansfield’s *In a German Pension* through this particular lens prompts a curious sense of *deja vu* that consolidates the shared thematic preoccupations that existed between these complementary cousins.

**II**

Von Arnim was mother to five children, writing a book, *The April Baby’s Book of Tunes*, for them in 1900. Mansfield was never a mother although several of the stories from her first collection are preoccupied with maternity. Like von Arnim’s early novels, the stories that make up *In a German Pension* (first published singly in *The New Age* under the title ‘Pension Sketches’) have a strong autobiographical component. They are the product of an enforced stay in a Bavarian spa town, Bad Worishofen, where Mansfield was sent following a series of unacceptable episodes through which she came to be regarded as psychologically and sexually wayward. These episodes included a number of intense relationships with women. Some of these were sexual (most notably her relationship with Edie Bendall in 1907 in Wellington, New Zealand), and, possibly, with Ida Baker whom she met at Queen’s College and who became her lifelong companion, as well as, incidentally, becoming von Arnim’s housekeeper after Mansfield’s premature death.

When Mansfield’s mother sent her daughter to Bavaria to reflect on her sexual ‘transgressions’, Katherine was pregnant with a child conceived out of wedlock, but legitimised by a one-day marriage to George Bowden who was not the child’s father. At the spa close to the *Pension Muller* to where Mansfield had decamped, she was subjected to the nature-cure. This meant eating a vegetarian diet, walking barefoot in the dew and being hosed down by icy water — a procedure that sounds like a concerted effort to abort. The intention was to restore Mansfield to mental and physical health, but it is believed she miscarried, if this is, as Kathleen Jones notes, the correct term for a child born at more than six months, too early to be recorded in the German register of still births.
Mansfield’s experience of maternity and motherhood was, then, far less positive than that of von Arnim, whose correspondence with her children in later life reveals her affection for them, even if each of her confinements was accompanied with anxiety and depression. It is nonetheless particularly striking to find that Mansfield and von Arnim share a similarly negative perspective on the topic of maternity in their early fiction, constructing their work as a challenge to the wider conceptual ideas about motherhood that were circulating in both Britain and Germany at the time. For instance, we know that the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries were marked by increasingly prescriptive notions about motherhood, while propaganda advocating the benefits of maternity and mothering circulated widely. Almost certainly this was a response to the changing, and threatening, shift in the status of women in society; an attempt to construct motherhood as the ultimate female purpose at a time when anxieties about the disintegration of the family were escalating. Or, as von Arnim writes in *The Pastor’s Wife*, distancing herself from the ideas expressed through irony and the use of indirect speech, ‘Herr Dremmel said that family life had always been praised [...] for its necessity as the foundation of the State’.

In Britain, this relationship between the state and the family appears to have gained currency from the late 1870s onwards when external pressures (including the continuing impact of the industrial revolution) were such that married middle-class women largely withdrew from paid employment. As Harries notes, this meant a new emphasis on domestic work, a rising commitment to domestic efficiency, coupled with the idea that the ‘home’ was a centre of leisure and conspicuous consumption. Increasingly, wives became ‘the stage managers of one of the most important venues of social life, a venue, moreover, that was constantly lauded and promoted in sermons, speeches and popular literature’.

As early as the 1860s, there was an outpouring of publications about household management aimed at promoting domestic effectiveness, while new ideas about children’s play,
child discipline and sex education, which appeared only sporadically in the 1870s, surged into the mainstream in the 1890s and beyond. These texts included J. P. O’Hea’s *The Rearing of Children* (1910)\(^{24}\) and T. N. Kelynack’s *Childhood* (1910).\(^{25}\) Theories of child development emerged, too, and these included James Sully’s *Studies of Childhood* (1895)\(^{26}\), and W. B. Drummond’s *An Introduction to Child-Study* (1907).\(^{27}\) The advice of the American, Margaret E. Sangster (in *The Little Kingdom of Home* (1906)\(^{28}\) and *The Queenly Mother* (1907)\(^{29}\) was read widely and these works are amongst the best-known books on this subject in this period.

Moreover, in Britain, the child-study movement became immensely popular as thousands of mothers kept detailed diaries of their children’s behaviour in an attempt to understand and codify the value of their daily activities. Indeed, as Harris points out, by the early 1900s, mothering was increasingly regarded as an activity of moral, intellectual, and technical complexity. Furthermore, it became allied to notions of civic duty, and bad mothering was no longer perceived as a private matter, but as ‘subversive of community, nation, Empire and race’.\(^{30}\)

In Germany, as Ann Taylor Allen argues, the period 1890-1914 was a time similarly ‘defined by a dominant discourse on family, child-rearing and the state’.\(^{31}\) Of particular influence were ideas such as those of the neurologist Paul Mobius outlined in *Über den physiologischen Schwachsinn des Weibes* (‘On the Physiological Feeble-Mindedness of Women’). Published in 1900, by 1906 this study had been reprinted in eight editions. As Taylor Allen explains, Mobius contended that women’s intellectual inferiority was due directly to the maternal role to which the ineluctable laws of evolution had destined them. Rather than lauding motherhood as a source of moral and cultural authority, he dismissed women’s ethical insights as weak-minded sentimentality and, even before widespread concerns about declining German birth rates added another dimension to these ideas, his argument about women’s inferiority was often used to oppose advances in women’s educational opportunities and to advocate women’s
confinement to the house. In essence, women were considered unsuited to roles of responsibility in the public sphere while the value of mothering was simultaneously undermined. The introduction of the new Civil Code of the German Empire, following the unification of Germany in 1871, amplified these ideas. First made public in 1887 and discussed at the Reichstag in 1895 before being passed in 1896, the Civil Code superseded the marriage and family laws of the various states with a uniform policy. The most basic law affecting the rights of mothers and children in this new code was the definition of ‘parental rights’ which effectively nullified the parental rights of mothers during the lifetime of the father. Mothers were allotted only the ‘personal care’ of the child; the control of the child’s financial affairs, education, choice of profession, and (if under-age) choice of marriage partner was assigned to the father. Even in matters relating to the personal care of the child, the father’s will prevailed if the parents disagreed.

As we can see, the role of ‘the mother’ was subject to systematic policing while the circumscription of the female body as a site of reproduction was a cross-cultural preoccupation. As the historian Julia Mostov so pertinently puts it, ‘the perceived wellbeing and status of the nation,’ whether British or German, ‘whether strong or weak, depended upon the male protection of women’s reproductive ability’ — which, we might add, was articulated through the public denigration of women’s wider capacities and, in Britain, the lauding of motherhood through essentialist rhetoric.

This is, then, the context from which von Arnim’s and Mansfield’s early writings about maternity and motherhood emerged. And though neither could be accused of writing texts that construct simplistic portraits of ‘bad’ mothers, the frank representation of pregnancy as ‘a scarlet spear of terror’, the fear of birth as a state of being ‘loose and unheld [...] in an enormous awful world’ and the estranging effects of motherhood could not be more at odds with the prevailing ideal. Of course, these authors were not alone in expressing their concerns.
Many, like the writer Dorothy Richardson, spoke out in their polemic against the proliferation of these ideals. Richardson argued, for instance, in *The Dental Record* (1916), that the voice underpinning the Sixth Annual Report of the Women’s Imperial Health Association in Britain was that of ‘the terrified [male] gynaecologist’ who had consistently asserted that the daughters of the Empire were ‘made in the first place for motherhood’. So, while Richardson used an unlikely publication like the *Dental Record* as a platform to raise her objections, von Arnim and Mansfield preferred to address the rising tide of propaganda lauding motherhood through their fiction. In particular, and writing from a British perspective, they located motherhood within the discourse of war-time anti-invasion, their work keenly alert to the Anglo-German tensions that characterised the period following the unification of Germany in 1871. In von Arnim’s *The Pastor’s Wife*, for example, pregnancy and motherhood are presented, from an English perspective, as wholly negative and caught up in the discussions of territorial assault exemplified by the anti-invasion literature of the time that set Britain against an apparently rapacious and militaristic Germany. In von Arnim’s novel the English female body becomes a site of national conflict, open to German invasion: Herr Dremmel ‘fumed at the thought of an untractable [sic], undutiful wife’ who had ‘decree[d], this woman who had nothing to decree, that there were to be no more Dremmels’. Mansfield’s ‘Frau Brechenmacher attends a Wedding’ similarly closes with the line, ‘She lay down on the bed and put her arm across her face like a child who expected to be hurt as Herr Brechenmacher lurched in’; a more serious and obvious allusion to marital rape. In both texts the female body becomes the site of invasion so that impregnation can be read as a metaphor for territorial assault at a time of increasing national aggression. Similarly, in ‘Germans at Meat’ the discourse of motherhood is enlisted as an expression of Anglo-German hostility, communicated through dialogue with overt references to the idea of a ‘thousand premeditated invasions’. In Mansfield’s ‘At Lehmann’s’ the experience of birth, set in a German context, is contrasted
with the depiction of emerging sexual experience to become a cautionary tale centred on the
perils of female sexual desire where the spectre of maternity looms as the ultimate deterrent.
This notion is implicit in von Arnim’s *The Pastor’s Wife*, and in Mansfield’s depiction of the
self-absorbed German father, Andreas Binzer, in ‘A Birthday’. While both von Arnim and
Mansfield acknowledge that motherhood is, of course, a biological role for women, each author
systematically qualifies this by highlighting the attendant realities, complications and
limitations of motherhood for independent female development, augmenting these ideas
through references to national antagonisms that were very much part of the cultural context in
which they were publishing these texts.

III

By 1920 von Arnim considered *The Pastor’s Wife* ‘the least bad’ of her books. In 1914,
however, when the novel first appeared it is fair to say that, on the whole, the critics applauded.
The anonymous reviewer of *The Spectator* (1914) regarded the novel as von Arnim’s ‘most
notable’ and, retrospectively in 1929, the writer George Moore declared in a letter to von
Arnim: ‘you wrote the Pastors [sic] Wife at the height of your genius’, suggesting that the
portrait of unrestrained motherhood at its centre was as fine as any work von Arnim had ever
produced. Moore considered the book one ‘of surpassing beauty’, and when it ‘reach[ed] East
Prussia of equally, surpassing truth.’

In fact, the idea for the book began as early as January 1896, following Elizabeth’s
marriage to Count Henning von Arnim. As such it predates Mansfield’s first collection of
German stories. As Usborne points out in her biography of von Arnim, Elizabeth rewrote and
published *The Pastor’s Wife* only after her husband’s death in 1910, probably because the
anti-German sentiment could no longer provoke marital offence. Even so, the war with
Germany is not addressed directly in *The Pastor’s Wife*. Instead, the novel explores von
Arnim’s evident frustration with entrenched and cross-cultural gendered ideals. The tensions
played out between the English wife and German husband at the centre of the novel are
nevertheless inescapably resonant, overlaid by the wartime context, the national oppositions
inflated so they trigger a wider, subliminal, and more textured understanding of the everyday
events presented with simplicity in the book. And so *The Pastor’s Wife* is centrally concerned
with Ingeborg, the young, dutiful daughter of an earnest and controlling English Bishop who
has trained his daughter in ‘acquiescence and distrust of herself’. The novel follows Ingeborg
as she sets out on two adventures, the first being an impulsive, secret journey to Lucerne,
prompted by an advertisement for a tour with fellow ‘excursionists’. The second culminates in
her passive agreement to an almost accidental and hilariously depicted betrothal and marriage to
the German Herr Dremmel, a single-minded, Lutheran pastor.

Transported from the confines of an English Bishop’s palace to ‘a puny’ married life in the
isolated German town of Kokensee, Ingeborg initially finds ‘Space, freedom, quiet’, qualities she
believes are found only in these ‘God-forsaken’ places. The illusion of freedom soon palls, however, as her life gradually becomes one of unrelenting maternal toil when the protagonist becomes her husband’s fertility project. It is not accidental that in this novel Herr Dremmel is obsessed with seed. His studies into experimental agriculture (based on von Arnim’s similar experiences with her first husband, Henning) are perpetual and completely absorbing: “in the little laboratory I have constructed I shut in with me all life, all science, every possibility”. Not only this, once Dremmel’s initial passion for Ingeborg has cooled he forgets everything except his “research” until Ingeborg becomes pregnant. On this day, the omniscient narrator explains, Ingeborg ‘outstripped the fertilizers in interest, and the laboratory was a place forgotten’. Not really forgotten; simply relocated. Ingeborg’s body becomes the site of Dremmel’s scientific enquiry, though this is couched in terms that equate maternity with woman’s ‘Higher Duty’, while the rhetoric of motherhood is enlisted repeatedly until mothering appears to be the sole available occupation for “every true woman”.
Despite the apparent bleakness of the plot, *The Pastor’s Wife* is actually very funny, and its biting satire characteristic of von Arnim’s wider work. Dremmel is not portrayed (as is Ingeborg’s father) as an insecure, fearful bully relying on a woman to support a fragile, egoistic identity. Dremmel is simply self-regarding. His neglectfulness as a husband and his blinkered approach to life is depicted less as malicious, than as typically male. Von Arnim creates not so much a sympathetic character, but one who symbolises an aspect of normative masculinity presented as frustrating and unacceptable, but also treated with levity. Nonetheless, it is von Arnim’s portrayal of Ingeborg’s repeated pregnancies that help structure the novel into three clearly defined sections. The first is the amusing journey away from home to Germany and marriage, the last is ironic and traces the complex plottings of a serial philanderer (based on H.G. Wells\(^{64}\)) as he attempts to seduce (the implausibly naive) Ingeborg. The central section of the novel charts the experience of a series of disorientating and life-threatening pregnancies, birth as a negative event, post-partum illness and motherhood as disaffection. Without a doubt in this prolonged episode von Arnim is serious. Ingeborg knows, for instance, that prior to pregnancy she ‘had never thought of her body’.\(^{65}\) While pregnant, it simply ‘mastered her.’\(^{66}\) Ingeborg’s ‘body became fastidious,’\(^{67}\) ‘heavy’\(^{68}\). Suddenly she felt old; even ‘her will’ grew ‘flabby’.\(^{69}\) Wretched, ‘exhausted,’\(^{70}\) she considers herself ‘awkward’\(^{71}\) ‘ridiculous,’\(^{72}\) and ‘distorted’.\(^{73}\) There is nothing to recommend pregnancy here and, even if von Arnim chooses authorial omniscience and dialogue to portray these physical alterations, the communication of a fundamental psychological estrangement from the body is unmistakable.

In Mansfield’s ‘At Lehmann’s’ the emphasis on the pregnant body is similarly negative, although communicated through the perspective of an observant and sexually inexperienced young girl, Sabina, who monitors closely the ‘confinement’ of her employer, Frau Lehmann. Just as von Arnim’s Ingeborg is depicted as physically and psychologically ‘deformed’ and made miserable by pregnancy, so in Mansfield’s tale Frau Lehmann is characterised by her
rampant swellings and by her isolation. Unlike von Arnim’s Ingeborg whose personal experience of birth is communicated in detail, however, Frau Lehmann is largely voiceless; she is the subject of speculation and located firmly in the margins of Mansfield’s story. We are told, therefore, that Frau Lehmann is so unsightly (“Ugly-ugly-ugly”74) that her husband has consigned her to the room upstairs, fearing her ‘unappetising’75 appearance will drive away custom from his cafe. Sabina may be portrayed as having no idea what birth is, or why, it seems, one cannot have a baby ‘without a husband’76, but omniscient explanations are unnecessary since Mansfield’s frequent use of focalisation in ‘At Lehmann’s’ underscores the female naivety that both she and her cousin are keen to overturn, heightening this effect through the judicious use of narrative irony. Sabina knows, for instance, that all Frau Lehmann can do is wait, rather as von Arnim’s Ingeborg walks repetitively ‘up and down’77 the same path every day, living ‘in preparation’78 for a maternal reality prompted by the all-pervading rhetoric of motherhood to which she has been subjected and to which she has conceded.

It is the case that the longer form of the novel allows the pregnancies at the centre of von Arnim’s book to be depicted in grim, and discomforting, detail. In addition, the omniscient narrator interjects with appropriate reflections along the way so the reader is guided to a particular and inexorable understanding of the realities of birth. For, as von Arnim writes in a letter of 1926, literary ‘outpouring[s]’79 by women authors describing sentimental portraits of birth made her so ‘furioso’80 she wished ‘to write a counterblast’, called ‘As it is’81 — briefly, it seems, forgetting the candid portrait she had already created in The Pastor’s Wife twelve years earlier. For Mansfield, however, working with the episodic structure of the short story means that pregnancy and birth must be constructed largely through allusion and implication. As the story draws to a close, therefore, events are carefully narrowed and brought sharply into focus through the perception of her central character, Sabina, who hears ‘the thin wailing of a baby’82 upstairs and, crucially, the evocative ‘frightful, tearing shriek’83 of Frau Lehmann — before
Sabina runs from the clutches of a young man keen to initiate her into sexual activity.

Clearly, in both texts the attitude towards maternity and birth is one of unremitting pessimism, and at least part of this effect is brought about by the interplay between the private and public perceptions of this state. While, in von Arnim’s novel, the stale and deluding rhetoric of motherhood circulates endlessly in a hermetic loop through continual references to its benefits, the disorientation caused by pregnancy and the private fear of birth are carefully set against it. Furthermore, and in differing ways, von Arnim and Mansfield choose to present pregnancy as akin to a freak show; a public, physical spectacle that may be biologically explicable, but that has lost none of its power to shock the naive or to generate hostility. In Mansfield’s ‘At Lehmann’s’, for instance, the use of Sabina’s youthful perception creates an entirely plausible portrait of defamiliarised pregnancy narrated through a visual lexis that communicates the event from the ‘outside’, as it were. In The Pastor’s Wife wider, predominantly German, speculation is enlisted to similar effect when Ingeborg is subject to varying degrees of public scorn. When, for example, she visits the provincial town of Meuk to organise the copious amounts of ‘swaddling’ necessary for a new baby, she becomes symbolic of successful sexual, German invasion. On the streets, Ingeborg is a stranger, ‘a foreigner, an astonishment. Men and women stopped, children loitered, half-grown youths whistled, calling out comments her slow German is, fortunately, unable to follow. In Mansfield’s ‘Frau Fischer’, too, the English female body is similarly open to German speculation, particularly when the young unnamed English woman at the German pension is subject to the interrogations of Frau Fischer. “When I meet new people I squeeze them dry like a sponge” she boasts, Mansfield deliberately withholding redeeming features from this portrait in line with the discourse of anti-invasion. Just as von Arnim’s Ingeborg is characterised by her ‘self-effacement’ when subjected to the prevailing rhetoric of motherhood that circulates amongst all classes of German women in Kokensee (the atmosphere was ‘thick with babies’ von Arnim
writes), so Frau Fischer finds it strange that the English “do not [...] enjoy discussing the functions of the body”.90 Clearly, she hopes to prompt a confession from the young woman about an ongoing pregnancy, even if this is thinly masked by an interest in English digestion. Stray remarks about English ‘free love’ and the supposed promiscuity of English girls spice the narrative, too, until the young woman finds it necessary to conjure a fictitious husband in an attempt to halt these probings. The motif of motherhood nevertheless surfaces overtly when Frau Fischer conspiratorially discusses the infidelity of husbands and holds up motherhood as “the strongest tie of all”.91 In an echo of von Arnim’s The Pastor’s Wife, Mansfield’s German woman is sure that to sustain a marriage “Handfuls of babies”92 are necessary, and the differences between competing English and German notions of motherhood as they have been constructed by these authors are brought into stark binary collision.

Nowhere is this polarised structure more obvious than in von Arnim’s The Pastor’s Wife. The novel is largely constructed through caricatured, and retrospectively uncomfortable, national types resonant with wider contextual significance. For example, Ingeborg’s midwife, Frau Dosch, is a stern and neglectful nurse, ‘a hoary person of unseemly conversation’93, who considers Ingeborg a thin-skinned (for which we read cowardly) English woman. Ingeborg’s own English mother is depicted as self-absorbed, ineffectual and supine, having retired from her duties as wife and mother to safety ‘on the sofa’94, from where she reads ‘those mild novels her [own] mother read, sandwiched between the biographies of [...] bishops and [...] books of comfort with crosses on them’.95 Even so, her husband, a Bishop, lectures often on ‘the consequences of maternal neglect’.96 Such is Ingeborg’s maternal inheritance and ignorance of the processes of birth, Herr Dremmel’s employer, Baroness Glambeck, can only speculate as Ingeborg’s pregnancy reaches full term: ‘Did English mothers [...] all keep their daughters in such darkness on the one great subject for a woman?’97

Indeed, while a German Baroness can speak of little else but the realities of painful birth
and the wonders of mothering, English mothers are depicted as distracted, heedless of the development of their daughters, weighed down by marital demands. Even if, however, Ingeborg’s pregnancy is conducted under the watchful eye of Baroness Glambeck, female cooperation across national boundaries is severely qualified in this novel. It is fair to say that any gender cohesion that is initiated in the early stages of the book is ultimately dismantled by national considerations. Ingeborg, as a pregnant Englishwoman, is, therefore, frequently the target of female (and usually German) spite, even if the author prefers to call this ‘something [...] a little like pleasure’. National hostilities resurface as Dremmel’s German mother (along with Ilse, the nurse) are dismissive of Ingeborg’s concerns about childbirth, regarding this simply as valueless English sensitivity. Von Arnim’s tone, like that in Mansfield’s stories, is acerbic. Apparently (the narrator of The Pastor’s Wife suggests) German women are stoical and take the stages of pregnancy far less seriously than the English. For German women motherhood is the corner stone of civic duty as it is in Britain, though it is not unusual for German women to have fourteen children and with each child the process simply becomes easier. In von Arnim’s novel Baroness Glambeck is the hierarchical standard to which all the local German women aspire since she boasts of her ability to produce successive children as Christmas gifts for her husband. Like Mansfield’s young woman in ‘Frau Fischer’ and Sabina in ‘At Lehmann’s’, none of these attitudes alters Ingeborg’s understanding of maternity or tempers her fear. In fact, none of the problems of childbirth are allayed by the evidence of happy reproduction.

By inflating and juxtaposing these fictional representations of competing English and German attitudes towards motherhood in this way, Mansfield and von Arnim draw attention to the cultural rift that had emerged between these countries in the early twentieth century as the Great War approached. Moreover, both exploit the satiric potential of this situation at a time when the majority of those reading their work in England were anxious about the possibility, or
reality, of conflict. Von Arnim had, of course, written elsewhere about Anglo-German tensions in her fiction\textsuperscript{100}, though motherhood had not previously been so thoroughly enlisted as a means of articulating the discourse of anti-invasion. Nevertheless, and in spite of the fact that the war is not mentioned directly in the novel, there were some who understood the inevitable resonance. As a review in the \textit{Spectator} pointed out in October 1914, for example, lessons could ‘be learnt from Pastor Dremmel’:\begin{quote} It may be useful not to forget that the destruction of England is the ultimate object of the whole people of Germany, military and intellectual, and this object will be pursued with the enthusiasm and determination of Robert Dremmel.\textsuperscript{101}\end{quote}Given this wider context, a secondary meaning arises from Dremmel’s decision that no chloroform should be available to Ingeborg during childbirth; this judgment subtly exposes underlying national hostilities. Dremmel’s decision is, of course, also the height of hypocrisy.\textsuperscript{102} He believes that birth should be ‘natural’ and, though this novel is neither stylistically ‘experimental’ nor notable for its use of oblique allusion or elliptical plotting, the author need not state anything further; the reader is made to be fully aware that Dremmel’s belief in ‘natural’ childbirth is an attitude singularly lacking in his own scientific experiments into agricultural production.

For both von Arnim and Mansfield auxiliary meanings and careful inference are crucial in communicating ideas beyond the textual surface. Mansfield may be acknowledged for her indirect narrative style and ‘writerly’ implications, whilst we assume that texts like that of von Arnim provide unchallenging ‘readerly’ ease. In the case of these cousins and these particular texts, however, the literary construction of maternity, allied with pressing national considerations in the period before and during the Great War, is one intensified by similarities of approach and of tone. In truth, it becomes increasingly difficult to consider the writing of Mansfield and von Arnim as entirely separate in this case.
IV

There is an additional story from Mansfield’s *In a German Pension* that crystallises the thematic and attitudinal connections between these cousins on the topic of maternity.

Mansfield’s ‘A Birthday’ and von Arnim’s *The Pastor’s Wife* are strikingly similar in their characterisations of German fathers and, though it is difficult to establish in which direction the familial influence runs and the transposition occurs, ‘A Birthday’ appears to owe much to von Arnim’s early literary portraits of men. ‘A Birthday’ focuses on Andreas Binzer, an expectant father who is hoping for a son: ‘it was bound to be a boy this time’, ‘a man needed a son’. Whilst his wife, Anna, struggles with birth in the margins of the story, Andreas believes it is he who is suffering. Often he feels simply accused, and it is illuminating to access ideas about pregnancy and birth through this singular mediating consciousness, especially since it is clear that Mansfield is being both provocative and playful. Just as von Arnim employs euphemism in *The Pastor’s Wife* to suggest the maternal consequences of sex, so Mansfield enlists this approach. Von Arnim’s Ingeborg is, for instance, repeatedly told “when one has said A [...] one must say B” , while in ‘A Birthday’, Mansfield invokes a sexual equation where the physical joys of Saturday evening are followed, disturbingly, by Sunday morning filth. Enlisting interior monologue and the pathetic fallacy to communicate Andreas’s concerns about the “frightful business” of birth, Andreas sees only ‘the gutters [...] choked with the leavings of Saturday night’. Furthermore, his morbid attention is drawn to two dogs fighting. Their play over, they are symbolically at vicious odds, ‘sprawled in the middle of the road, scuffling and biting’ — a less than romantic animalistic register of the human pleasures of Saturday night.

Trapped in a cycle of spiralling tension (suspended, metaphorically, like the ‘suspension bridge’ above his filthy world), Andreas perceives only the accumulation of dirty, ‘empty’ ‘tins’ in the streets outside. These now represent his emptied state, his disgust at female physicality and, probably, a general male post-coital rejection of the female body. The servant girl consequently becomes subject to his malice. She is a “Slut of a girl!” and a source of
contagion, ‘Breathing’ into his food, spitting onto his boot as she cleans it until he fears she is the source of an ‘infectious disease’. The messy business of birth continues upstairs in spite of Andreas’s irrational ravings about female cleanliness. The young servant refuses to be brow-beaten, however. Even Andreas is aware that she has ‘no false notions of the respect due to the master of the house’, the idea skilfully underscored here through the use of free indirect speech, tying together a sense of diminishing male status and the masculine standard through which it has been spatially constructed. Like Sabina in ‘At Lehmann’s’, the servant girl in ‘A Birthday’ understands that, though the situation is increasingly uncomfortable, she is ‘learning the secrets of life with every breath’ she takes and, in the ‘full loathing of menkind,’ Mansfield makes sure this young woman vows ‘herself to sterility’.

Sterility is, of course, never an option for Ingeborg in von Arnim’s The Pastor’s Wife, because she is Dremmel’s fertility project. Nonetheless, Ingeborg’s reactions to this situation are complex. As she prepares for childbirth, and even though she is “frightened”, she apes heroism to please Robert Dremmel. Once labour begins, however, Ingeborg, ‘left off pretending’, and ‘stoicism’ became merely a ‘drawingroom’ game. Close to death, labour reduces her to ‘a writhing animal’, ‘a squirming thing without a soul’ — effectively to her ‘terrible, awful body’ — and von Arnim’s blithe narrative voice is abandoned entirely.

There are other points of comparison between these texts, too, and these also have serious import. For instance, just as Mansfield’s Andreas in ‘A Birthday’ concentrates on the photograph of his wife in an attempt to recover a sense of her identity prior to pregnancy, so von Arnim’s Dremmel is nostalgic for the happy married days before Ingeborg’s confinement. Neither male character understands the physical and psychological impact of birth on women either, though both ultimately give birth to the sons desired by their husbands. Noticeably, their reactions to the event of birth are portrayed as almost identical. Mansfield’s Andreas, for instance, is immediately forgetful of Anna — his suffering has been terrible — while von
Arnim’s Dremmel is ‘puzzled’\(^{123}\) by Ingeborg’s subsequent disintegration into post-natal illness. Von Arnim writes, Dremmel ‘had been patient for nine months, supported during their interminableness by the thought that what he bore would be amply made up to him [...] by a delighted young wife restored to him in her slenderness and health’\(^{124}\).

Mansfield closes her short story with birth and Andreas’s self-absorption, while the form of the novel allows von Arnim to continue her investigation of motherhood, exploring Ingeborg’s relationship with her children as, largely, a negative one. The first word her son, Robertlet, speaks, for example, is ‘no’. In fact, von Arnim is unrelenting in her negative depiction of German nationals, but the idea is extended unexpectedly. Von Arnim portrays Ingeborg’s surviving children as utterly German. They have the replicated features of their silent and disapproving German grandmother and the stereotypical German mentality that von Arnim has carefully instigated in this book. Ultimately, and even though she wishes to be a good and loving mother, Ingeborg cannot wholly overcome these national characteristics.

Ingeborg’s indifference to her first children does not stop Dremmel, however. In the schematic of this text German men, in particular, desire many children and multiple births validate the lives of their women — as they do in Mansfield’s *In a German Pension*. Von Arnim’s narrator tells us that ‘In seven years Ingeborg had six children’.\(^{125}\) She is ‘uninterruptedly fruitful’\(^{126}\), although four of her children die — as Ingeborg almost does with each consecutive birth. Mansfield’s Anna in ‘A Birthday’ also has “three children in four years thrown in with the dusting, so to speak!”\(^{127}\) Predictably, both women lose the spontaneity and ‘desirable’ shape that preceded motherhood to become exhausted drudges; both Andreas and Dremmel are quick to bemoan these particular facts.

On one level, then, these men are depicted as one and the same and Mansfield and von Arnim assume a satiric authorial stance towards each of them. The fact that both men are
portrayed as supremely and stubbornly distracted, tirelessly pedantic and exploitative means, of course, that neither is acquitted by their authors. Rather, Mansfield’s Andreas is completely isolated, consigned to the ‘narrow bed’\(^\text{128}\) in ‘the wretched spare room’\(^\text{129}\) while Anna gives birth surrounded by a small community of women. Similarly, in von Arnim’s novel, Ingeborg removes herself from Dremmel’s bed to sleep in the attic with her children. In both texts it is also notable that it is the doctor who delivers the final reprimand to each father. In Mansfield’s ‘A Birthday’ Doctor Erb furiously declares to Andreas that Anna has “twice the nerve of you and me rolled into one”\(^\text{130}\), whilst in The Pastor’s Wife the doctor approves Ingeborg’s decision to take control of her own fertility, and it is he that communicates this to Dremmel.

These episodes from von Arnim’s The Pastor’s Wife and Mansfield’s ‘A Birthday’, are not, however, merely comparable in terms of their authorial tone, the characterisation of the central male characters, the physical and temperamental similarities of the pregnant women, or in the invocation of the doctor to draw perpetual maternity to a close. In von Arnim’s The Pastor’s Wife (as in Mansfield’s ‘A Birthday’, ‘At Lehmann’s’, ‘Frau Fischer’, ‘Germans at Meat’ and ‘Frau Brechenmacher Attends a Wedding’), these authors construct a trajectory in which maternity is closely allied with territorial and national considerations. In addition, the use of a shared satiric approach masks the seriousness of von Arnim’s and Mansfield’s critique of Germany at a time of national hostility while simultaneously highlighting a single ‘women’s issue’, demonstrating that these thematic strands are, in the case of these authors, symbiotic. The significance that emerges from this combination of broad ‘political’ discussion may appear to be rooted in thematic interests alone, but the effect also qualifies the blunt literary categories (the ‘modernist’ and the ‘middlebrow’) that tend to obscure the complications and conversions that arise from writing that is so evidently coupled as well as being complementary. And, as far as the construction of motherhood is concerned, some ideas are quite simply shared, as the exasperated retort of Mansfield’s English girl in
‘Frau Fischer’ confirms: “I consider child-bearing the most ignominious of all professions”.131

Von Arnim’s Ingeborg in The Pastor’s Wife concurs, though with a mother’s qualification: “unbridled motherhood” is a “wild career”132, ‘a miserable career’. It is, she explains, a ‘terrible, maimed thing’.133
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A Second Flowering
Isobel Maddison

When Julian Fellowes included a reference to Elizabeth von Arnim’s book *Elizabeth and Her German Garden* (1898) in an episode of the ITV television drama *Downton Abbey* in 2011, questions were raised in the press. Who was this writer, evidently so popular at the beginning of the twentieth century? What was the significance of the book’s inclusion as a potential love token from Matthew Crawley’s butler, Joseph Molesley, to head housemaid, Anna Smith? We might add a few more questions to this list. Was the novel really the ‘potboiler’ suggested by Sarah O’Brien, Lady Grantham’s maid? And if so, did the choice of book suggest an unsuspected, and *risque*, aspect to the personality of the previously timorous Molesley? Was the progress of *Downton Abbey* mapped somehow on to the narrative of von Arnim’s first book?

The scope for speculation was wide and, for those of us who have long had a literary passion for von Arnim’s comedic writing (I have located various editions of her novels on the London Library shelves), there was delight that her fiction was again impinging on the popular imagination. It was rather disappointing, therefore, when Fellowes explained in the *Independent* in November 2011, that the fleeting inclusion of von Arnim’s novel in *Downton* was not to establish a literary resonance with his own country house drama, but because he knew of the book’s huge popularity at the turn of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries.

Rather than a potboiler, *Elizabeth and her German Garden* is a light-hearted and stylish social satire written by the antipodean, Mary Annette Beauchamp (1866-1941), under the *nom-du-plume* ‘Elizabeth’. The elder cousin of Katherine Mansfield, von Arnim had become a German countess in 1891 when she married Count Henning von Arnim-Schlagenthin. Later, she became a society wit and a member of the British literary intelligentsia (to use the term loosely). Her friends included Augustine Birrell, George Bernard Shaw, Ethel Smyth, Vernon
Lee and Max Beerbohm. She was the sometime lover of H.G. Wells (as were many literary
women) and, after Henning died, she became the wife of Francis, Earl Russell, the elder brother
of the philosopher, Bertrand. By the time of von Arnim’s death in 1941, she had written more
than 22 books, 2 of which have subsequently been adapted for film: *Mr Skeffington* (1940),
starring Bette Davis, in 1944, and *The Enchanted April* (1922), starring Joan Plowright and

Von Arnim had no intimation of her impending literary fame when she sent the
manuscript of *Elizabeth and her German Garden* from Nassenheide, Pomerania, to Macmillan
publishers in March 1898. In fact, she feared the book might be worthless and was adamant
that, if it were published, the author must remain anonymous, especially since her husband,
Henning (who appears in the novel as the ‘Man of Wrath’), would possibly have found it
intolerable for it to be known that his wife was writing commercial fiction. This was not
because the financial benefits were unwelcome - especially since Henning’s agricultural
experiments on the Nassenheide estate were costly - but because public acknowledgement of
his wife’s success was inconceivable for a man of his class at such a time. So, having rejected
several pseudonyms, von Arnim’s first book appeared under the simple title *Elizabeth and her
German Garden*, and it was phenomenally successful. Eleven editions were printed before the
end of 1898; it earned over £10,000 in its first year of publication and had been reprinted 21
times by May 1899.

The book prompted fan mail and started a trend for writing on similar themes, described
in 1900 by Mrs Stephen Batson, in the *Nineteenth Century*, as the ‘Vogue of the Garden Book’.
*Our Lady of the Beeches*, published in 1907 by Baroness von Hutten, was one of these, as was
Anna Lea Merritt’s *An Artist’s Garden* (1908). Von Arnim’s female narrator in her book may
have declared, in an uncomfortable pun, that ‘a garden is by no means ... a fruitful topic’ for
conversation, but the reading public clearly thought otherwise. And while several critics
applauded, Rebecca West, Vice-President of the London Library from 1967 to 1983, retrospectively regarded von Arnim’s first novel with ‘alarm’, a judgment probably complicated by the fact that West and von Arnim became simultaneous rivals for the affections of H.G. Wells in the early 1900s. West argued in 1921, in the New Statesman, that von Arnim’s first novel had ‘set ... tiresome women . smirking coyly about their gardens as if they were having a remarkably satisfying affair with their delphiniums’.

Von Arnim’s book opens with the narrator’s statement, ‘I love my garden’, and is a first- person, free-associative tale written as a daily journal in an amusing and nonchalant style. The novel relies on the vivid pictorial descriptions of the glorious, and largely uninhabited, Prussian countryside for its effects, and its central focus is the romantic engagement of the narrator, Elizabeth - an avid reader of Henry David Thoreau and William Wordsworth - with a garden set amid perfumed pine forests, where sleigh rides to the frozen Baltic provide opportunities for adventure. The newly created (trial and error) garden is a source of intense pleasure, so much so that Elizabeth dates the beginning of her ‘real life’ to the point when she arrives in this, her personal Pomeranian ‘kingdom’.

The beauty of this isolated place is heightened for Elizabeth by her previously interminable experiences in a flat in ‘town’ (for which we read Berlin), where persistent ill health meant doctors became ‘bad habits’ that the family found it increasingly difficult to shake off. In addition, the ‘horrors’ of city life were exacerbated by the necessity of carrying out social duties ‘wreathed in the orthodox smiles’ of a supportive wife. Consequently, the German garden becomes a refuge from wider social intrusion while simultaneously providing the opportunity to think and write in relative isolation. Throughout the book Elizabeth is portrayed as a nostalgic romantic, defining herself in artistic and languorous opposition to the brisk German women who are her nearest neighbours. Capable of spending days, and even an entire ‘solitary summer’, in contemplation, Elizabeth repeatedly takes up ‘a volume of poetry’,
wanders ‘out to where the king cups grow’ and forgets the ‘existence of everything’ but the natural world and her journal. Not for Elizabeth the energetic, organized life of the perplexing German *hausfrau* who (as the local ‘pattern’ of the perfect German country lady) is a recognised, hands-on, authority on the ‘mysteries of sausage-making, the care of calves and the slaughtering of swine’.

There are nevertheless occasional frustrations to be overcome, however creative and languid the narrator. For one thing, Elizabeth’s aristocratic status and gender mean she is never allowed to dig the garden, even if she spends her ‘pin money’ on ‘artificial manure’, a pastime eccentric enough to bewilder the servants. Gardeners, therefore, become essential to Elizabeth’s happiness, though most eventually fall from favour. Marked by their inexperience, some make elementary errors when stubbornly refusing to take orders from a woman. One goes ‘mad’ and is sent to an asylum, although the inclusion of his insanity is a literary device on the part of von Arnim, since all the doctors ‘had against him’, her narrator explains, was that ‘he would write books’. Whatever the idiosyncrasies of her fictional gardeners, von Arnim’s Elizabeth remains undeterred in transforming the neglected German garden, even if this is achieved vicariously. Gathering a cosmopolitan collection of gardening books, she searches endlessly through a whole series of manuals whilst looking for a sympathetic gardener who can recreate the informal English design (typified by Gertrude Jekyll, Norah Lindsay and William Robinson) that she desires. Most of the botanical knowledge in the book springs from von Arnim’s own experience; as Katherine Mansfield pointed out, her ‘Cousin Elizabeth’ had a genuine ‘love of flowers’ and this was her ‘great charm’. But von Arnim’s first book is not simple autobiography.

In fact, to those who would dismiss *Elizabeth and her German Garden* on this basis, we have the evidence of E.M. Forster who, in 1904, preceded Hugh Walpole as tutor to von Arnim’s children. In Forster’s impressions of Nassenheide, published in 1959 in the *Listener,*
he remarks: ‘The German Garden itself ... did not make much impression.’ In truth, he couldn’t find it. The house, he argues, ‘appeared to be surrounded by paddocks and shrubberies’ while ‘in the summer’, he notes, ‘some flowers - mainly pansies, tulips, roses [appeared] ... and there were endless lupins ... the Count was drilling for agricultural purposes’. But, Forster adds, ‘there was nothing of a show’. Essentially, von Arnim’s depiction of the lush garden is, at best, highly fabricated, and this book is more akin to convincing fiction than to autobiography. Even so, Gertrude Jekyll was so persuaded by von Arnim’s horticultural representation that in her book *Children and Gardens* (1908), she mentioned von Arnim. Including a photograph of a woman in front of a thatched cottage, Jekyll added a caption that read: ‘The pretty lady in this picture is a German Princess. She has brought out her work to the old play-house.’ This ‘pretty lady’ was Elizabeth von Arnim, and Ellen Willmott, an influential member of the Royal Horticultural Society and the recipient of the first Victoria Medal of Honour, had travelled to Pomerania to meet Elizabeth and take her photograph.

As we can see, von Arnim’s first book had far more influence than its author ever expected, and this was because the book was both deceptive and timely. For example, *Elizabeth and her German Garden* includes a subtle portrait of Anglo-German tensions as they arose in the wake of German unification in 1871 when the arms race began. The book explores this context through the minutiae of everyday experience and small-scale personal encounters, while succeeding as a witty, irreverent work that carries its message in an accessible and unthreatening manner.

*Elizabeth and her German Garden* is also alert to the preoccupations of an emerging group of professional women gardeners at the turn of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. Its publication coincided, for instance, with the foundation of the first agricultural school for women in Reading in 1898, and also with the first issue of the *English Women’s Agricultural Times*. Moreover, the book typifies a world of privilege and aesthetic aspiration, and reflects
ideas that were represented at the time in newly emerging magazines, including *Country Life*, which first appeared in 1897 under the guidance of Edward Hudson. Not that von Arnim’s book simply replicates and augments these aesthetic preoccupations in a jolly country house novel that happens to be set in rural Prussia. Rather, *Elizabeth and her German Garden* deliberately challenges a series of political and gendered assumptions that qualify the notion of an idealised late Victorian world and the position of an upper-class woman within it. In this sense, at least, von Arnim’s novel is an interesting counterpoint to *Downton Abbey*.

The book set the tone for von Arnim’s later work and, as her fiction became ever more accomplished, even Rebecca West was able to be positive about it. In 1921, for example, she argued that von Arnim’s novel, *Vera*, was ‘distinctly a triumph’, and ‘one of the most successful attempts at the macabre in English’. Barbara Pym explained, in 1978, that she had particularly ‘enjoyed the works’ of von Arnim while reading English as an undergraduate at Oxford in the 1930s. Her novels, including *Elizabeth and her German Garden*, had been ‘a revelation in their wit and delicate irony’, Pym declared in the 2011 Virago edition of her book, *Civil to Strangers and Other Writings* (1987), suggesting that Elizabeth’s novels were ‘models’ for her own richly comic fiction.

In the 1980s Virago began reprinting several of von Arnim’s novels as ‘modern classics’. In 2011 *The Enchanted April* appeared as a Virago limited edition with a cover featuring Angie Lewin’s textile design for Liberty. The London Library holds early copies of von Arnim’s work, too, including her novels that have yet to be republished. For those who love humour and gardens, *Elizabeth and her German Garden* and its sequel, *The Solitary Summer* (1899), are essential reading.

Hugh Walpole rightly pointed out, in his obituary of von Arnim in the *Daily Sketch* in 1941, that ‘English Literature is not so crammed with wits that it can spare Elizabeth’. Now, at last, we’re recognising that such a wit can no longer remain lost.