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Notes to Introduction

1. Elizabeth Bruss’s 1976 *Autobiographical Acts* explores the intersections between gender and generic systems; she argues that gender systems are created and sustained in culture and that “outside of social and literary conventions that create and maintain it, autobiography has no features” (6), thus noting the arbitrary definitions of both gender and autobiography. Judith Kegan Gardiner and Irma McClaurin add in a 1998 “Preface” to *Feminist Studies* that “the issue of female resistance to patriarchy has been a continuing feminist theme but until recently scholars have paid less attention to men’s experiences as both resisters and reinforces of patriarchy and to their socialization as specifically masculine subjects.” Sherif Hetata notes in a 2003 *PMLA* article the ways in which “men in a patriarchal society divided by class are accustomed to exercising power, to controlling, to constructing, to bringing order to chaos, to concealing weaknesses or replacing it with strength and to mold things to their will. The self is a construction, an image that must be maintained,” suggesting that “perhaps women will help men write real autobiography—that is, if literature and art and other beautiful things survive . . .” (125).

2. Simons sees diaries as “a license of uncensored expression” (18) as well as acknowledging a potential readership. She addresses this paradox, saying, “The dividing line between degrees of privacy is a delicate one, and the nature of the implied audience inevitably determines the tone and content of the text” (7). Obviously for Duchess de Praslin, her privacy was breached with disastrous results.

3. I use the term “husband” loosely. Woolf was the only one of the three who was married in a traditional sense. Mansfield lived with John Middleton Murry for more than six years before they finally married in 1918. Whether Violet Hunt and Ford Madox Ford ever did marry is still a matter of dispute, though their affair lasted for almost ten years and they lived together as man and wife much of that time, causing scandal and legal action against them.

4. The terms *diary, journal,* and *notebook* are used interchangeably in this study. Though there are distinctions that can be made between them (the journal generally held to be more complete and organized than diaries or daily notebooks), the texts by Woolf, Mansfield, Hunt, and Lessing’s Anna *Wulf* all share similar characteristics in terms of regular recordings of events, thoughts, and feelings.
5. Barbara Belford found many other Hunt diaries in researching her excellent 1990 biography, *Violet: The Story of the Irrepressible Violet Hunt and Her Circle of Lovers and Friends—Ford Madox Ford, H. G. Wells, Somerset Maugham, and Henry James*. I was able to draw on her published materials. Also of note is Joan Hardwick’s 1990 biography, *An Immodest Violet: The Life of Violet Hunt*. Hardwick focuses on Hunt’s fiction, which is particularly helpful since so many of Hunt’s novels are out of print and difficult to find.

6. I resist a rigid essentialist and gendered reading of diaries, noting that men, too, may write diaries that both conform to and resist patriarchal standards in the presence of audience. John Paul Eakin, for example, argues that men’s and women’s autobiographical texts share and differ in degrees, not in whole categories. However, cultural power relations that value “subjects” and “selves” differently ideologically and socially dictate that some groups work from within those relations, whereas some struggle against them. Thus, this study emphasizes that “difference” in gendered constructions while acknowledging there are other groups outside the hegemonic power structures that suffer equally, if not more so, from patriarchal devaluation.

7. Domna Stanton in *Autogynography* says, “It will surely come as no surprise that beyond their tacit agreement to exclude women’s texts, critics disagreed about the specific nature and substance of autobiography” (1998, 134). Judy Lensink Temple also argues that the diary is “resisted because in both form and content it comes closest to a female version of autobiography . . . emerging as a female text” (1987, 40). Their studies and others in the late 1980s and early 1990s added much to the beginnings of a refiguring of autobiography and diary criticism through a woman’s experience: Shari Benstock and her editing of *The Private Self*, Bella Brodski and Celeste Schenck’s *Life/Lines: Theorizing Women’s Autobiography*, and Mary G. Mason’s influential “The Other Voice—Autobiographies of Women Writers.” I note especially Sidonie Smith’s work, beginning with her *Poetics of Women’s Autobiography* and continuing with her several books. These early critical incursions into patriarchal autobiography authority, in addition to poststructural explosions of the canonical, laid additional groundwork for productive and interesting critical queer theory and postcolonial “authorizing” of selves in patriarchal culture. For a more complete reading of the history of diary criticism, see Elizabeth Podniesk’s “Blurring Boundaries: Mapping the Diary as Autobiography and Fiction” in *Daily Modernism* (2000, 13–45).

8. The diarists discussed in this study are products of turn-of-the-century British middle- and upper-middle-class cultures. Their personal experiences and geographical place within that culture varied greatly, however, with Virginia Woolf and Violet Hunt primarily urban and independently wealthy—in varying degrees. Both Hunt and Woolf found they had to earn money writing to supple-
ment their income. Katherine Mansfield hailed from a very wealthy New Zealand background but chose a struggling middle-class existence with her literary editor/husband. She too felt the need to write for the salary she would earn. Similar institutions, cultural pressures, and codes of behavior exerted pressures on each. See Representing Femininity: Middle Class Subjectivity in Victorian and Edwardian Autobiographies by Mary Jean Corbett (1992).

9. Many critics of autobiography are divided on the importance of audience on the writing, particularly when it comes to diaries. Sidonie Smith, George Gusdorf, and the Personal Narrative Group maintain that the diary is essentially private. Judy Simons holds that women who write diaries often are "secret exhibitionists," though only one chapter, "The Fear of Discovery: The Journals of Fanny Burney," touches on the imposition of a real rather than a fictive audience and its influence on the writer's work (1990, 1). Nancy K. Walker's "Wider than the Sky" does acknowledge the "public presence" (1988, 272) in the diaries of diary writers, specifically Woolf, Emily Dickinson, and Alice James. Shari Benstock and Elizabeth Podnieks share an interest in the ways in which the idea of audience shapes texts. Lynn Z. Bloom creates categories of diary writers: those writing with an audience in mind and those who do not. I concur with Lawrence Rosenwald that "All our utterances are mediated through our sophisticated or imperfect sense of some public, externally given form" (Podnieks 24). I suggest that all diarists know—or find out—that their diaries can be open to scrutiny and are interested in specific audiences of husbands and literary communities as audiences—not in the generalized "idea" of audience.

10. Writing diaries under any oppressive and authoritarian regime, whether domestic or political, can be "downright dangerous," according to Margaret Ziolkowski in her study of Russian diaries (1987, 199).

11. Judy Nolte Lensink Temple uses the artist's metaphor, which I appropriated: "[D]iary writers tell their truth and create female design" (1987, 41).

12. "Modernism" is a term perhaps overly definitive for the tradition-shedding fragmentation of literary genre written at the turn of the century. The modernist author's sense of alienation and rejection of traditional values may parallel many women writer's depictions of themselves in culture; in practice, however, modernism itself limits readings of "modernist" works and authors and, although useful, should be regarded skeptically.

13. Perhaps because of childhood experiences or fear of what Gail Godwin calls "a snooper" (in Lifshin 1982, 17), diaries are often cautious documents. As Maxine Kumin writes to Lifshin, "[V]ery little of my interior is showing... I am too much living a life of mother and wife now to unfold. It is all... in the pleats" (ibid.).

14. Thomas Mallon groups Woolf in the category of "Creators" in his book on diaries, and Mary Jane Moffat and Charlotte Painter's Revelations categorizes
Woolf’s diaries as “Work” diaries. Judy Simons notes the diary “formed a cornerstone for her total artistic undertaking” (1990, 170). H. Porter Abbott provides a close reading of the way Woolf’s diary prefigured Night and Day. Podnieks's more complete study positions Woolf solidly within the modernist tradition, providing an excellent analysis of Woolf’s stylistic method—both in language and diary formats.

15. Hassam invites speculation on the reader’s motivation in reading diaries. He argues that although we can no longer sustain the illusion of authenticity with regard to subjectivity, we read “published diaries as if they had not been published, as if we were not authorized readers” (1987, 442). He suggests that readers join in the fiction of their privacy. Gail Godwin seems to agree when she says, “Diarists: that shrewdly innocent breed, those secret exhibitionists and incomparable purveyors of sequential, self-conscious life; how they fascinate me and endear themselves to me by what they say and do not say” (in Halpern 1988, 9).


Notes to Chapter 1


3. Virginia Woolf’s biographers vary in their opinion of Leonard Woolf and the Woolf marriage. Hermione Lee’s Virginia Woolf analyzes astutely, concluding that Leonard was a “guardian” and the “marriage made a frame and a space for the work, which was life to her” (1997, 314). DeSalvo (1989) argues that Virginia as an incest survivor invited Leonard’s power over her; Mitchell Leaska’s Granite and Rainbow: The Hidden Life of Virginia Woolf (1998) analyzes the incest narrative differently, seeing Leonard as a “father figure.” Roger Poole calls him “despotic” in his The Unknown Virginia Woolf (1978) as does Lyndall Gordon, whose Virginia Woolf (1984) is critical of the “Master” Leonard. Jeffrey Meyers writes in his Married to Genius that Leonard’s “code of duty, faith in her
art...sustain and even cure her” (1977, 112), a view shared by George Spater and Ian Parsons in *A Marriage of True Minds* (1977). Natania Rosenfeld’s *Outsiders Together: Virginia and Leonard Woolf* (2001) sees the two sharing an “outsider” status, a commitment to justice, and a contribution to modernism.

4. “Bunny” is David Garnett, writer and literary editor of the *New Statesman* and *Nation* from 1932 to 1935. He later married Woolf’s niece Angelica Bell, though her Aunt Virginia was critical of their relationship. “Duncan” is Duncan Grant, who lived with Woolf’s sister, Vanessa, from the year 1915 and fathered Angelica.

5. Male modernist jealousies concerning women writers are discussed at length in Sandra Gilbert and Susan Gubar’s *No Man’s Land: The Place of the Woman Writer in the Twentieth Century* (1988) and Mary Lynn Broe and Angela Ingram’s *Women’s Writing in Exile* (1989, 19–41).

6. Rowena Fowler’s “Moments and Metamorphoses: Virginia Woolf’s Greece” discusses Woolf’s use of the “Greek chorus” of collective, anonymous voices in her work (1999). See also Allen McLaurin’s “Consciousness and Group Consciousness in Virginia Woolf.”

7. Jacques Lacan’s phrase “presence in absence” refers to the whole play of Desire; I refer merely to that which we read between the lines, the tensions in Woolf’s silences.

8. Woolf’s sexuality, or supposed “lack” of sexuality, is seriously discussed by all of her biographers, drawing radically different conclusions. Jane Marcus calls these discussions “a custody battle over her reputation” (1987, xi).


11. Max Beerbohm’s *And Even Now* (1920); Aldous Huxley’s “The Farcical History of Richard Greenow,” a story in his book *Limbo* (1920); and Wyndham Lewis’s *The Roaring Queen* (1973) all satirize Woolf’s position in the literary modernist world, depicting her power as somehow sexually dominant and emasculating.


14. See Elaine Showalter’s *The Female Malady: Women, Madness, and English Culture, 1830–1980*: “It remained to Virginia Woolf, however, to connect the
shell-shocked veteran with the repressed woman of the man-governed world through their common enemy, the nerve specialist” (1987, 192).

15. In *Three Guineas* Woolf redefines the word *feminist* by her hypothesis to rid the world of the word in order to reclaim for everyone the equality and “rights of all” (1936, 102).

**Notes to Chapter 2**

1. Boddy 1988, 149.

2. Judy Simons in her study *Diaries and Journals of Literary Women from Fanny Burney to Virginia Woolf* addresses the question of Katherine Mansfield’s “naming” of herself: “The very name ‘Katherine Mansfield’ is a mark of the uncertainties that dogged her. She was born Kathleen Mansfield Beauchamp...but throughout her life she was known by different names to her different friends, ‘Kathleen,’ ‘Katherine,’ ‘Katie,’ ‘Tig,’ ‘Kassienska,’ ‘K.M.,’ each one indicting her shift of identity in any particular relationship and her own enjoyment of role-playing” (1990, 152).

3. The complete *Notebooks* “includes everything; even isolated words and sentences...the huge, amorphous, nearly illegible mass of material...—the whole raft of it—is so rich in reflections of, connections with, roots of, hints at, variations of her best work that to explicate it all would take...lifetimes” (Scott 2002, xiv–xv).

4. Mark Gertler, a painter from The Slade, was much a part of Bloomsbury in his relationships with Lady Ottoline Morrell, Dora Carrington, and Virginia Woolf. As Tomalin says of his relationship with Mansfield, “Gertler decided that he liked Katherine, and wanted to know her better. Her journal is discreetly silent about it” (1988, 132).

5. Even after her death D. H. Lawrence had little to say about Mansfield’s talent as a writer. He writes to Murry: “Poor Katherine, she is delicate and touching—but not Great! Why say great?” (Tomalin 1988, 239). Gilbert and Gubar take Lawrence and other male modernists to task for their arrogance: “[They] were...attempting to end the idea of poetry for ladies, and they were often attempting to do so specifically by castigating what they defined as the incoherence or destructiveness of the female language” (1988, 236).

6. Tillie Olsen’s seminal work *Silences* delineates what silences women: “[C]ensorship silences:...deletions, omissions, abandonment of the medium.” They result from “publisher’s censorship” or “self-censorship” (1965, 9). Sara Kofman’s *The Enigma of Woman* (36–97) draws on Freud’s “Three Essays,” where she notes his belief that women’s “erotic life...partly owing to the stunting effect of civilized conditions and partly owing to their conventional secretiveness and insincerity—is still veiled in an impenetrable obscurity” (1985, 151).
7. Recent research on women’s diaries (including my own) owes much to earlier theories about the “unspoken’ of femininity” (DeLauretis 1984, 95), the idea that the unspoken in self-narrative marks the text as significantly as the spoken.

8. Mansfield’s references to her sexual relationship with Murry were “baldly matter of fact” (Boddy 1988, 42): “Jack & I lay in bed, deeply in love, strangely in love. . . . We have each other our freedom in a strange way” (67). This reticence expresses a repression of sexual language, long a taboo for women. Murry’s letters, on the other hand, express a masculine openness and eroticism: “Even now that I begin to imagine our caresses, my hand snuggling against your wonderful breasts, my lips feeling slowly over them till I kiss—it is all so true” (J.M. Murry to K.M., March 29, 1915). These comparisons and many others are in Boddy’s Katherine Mansfield (1988).

9. Mansfield writes Ida Baker, L.M., expressing a jealousy not to be guessed from the Journal: “You’re the greatest flirt, I ever have met, a real flirt. I do wish you weren’t. With all my heart I do. It seems so utterly indecent at our age to be still all aflutter at every possible glance . . . I am not going to flirt back, Miss, and say how I want you as part of my life and can’t really imagine being without you . . . read as much love as you like into this letter. You won’t read more than is there” (K.M. to L.M., 1921; The Letters of John Middleton Murry to Katherine Mansfield, vol. II, 1983, 172).

10. One side effect of pulmonary tuberculosis, which Mansfield may have contracted from D. H. Lawrence in the winter of 1916, is violent mood swings. Mansfield's mood swings make her unpredictable at best. Lawrence suffered from a similar moodiness that critics say bordered on madness.

**Notes to Chapter 3**

1. When White Rose of Weary Leaf was published in 1908, Hunt received much acclaim. H. G. Wells wrote her: “[I]f you go on you will be a credit to the Fabian Society”; Galsworthy thanked her for writing as “you have let us into many workings of the woman’s mind . . .” (Secor and Secor 1983, 15). D. H. Lawrence argued for Hunt “as a novelist, saying that she wasn’t at all appreciated” (Secor and Secor 1987, 17). Marie Secor’s “Violet Hunt, Novelist” (English Literature in Transition 19 [1976]: 25–34) analyzes her literary worth.

2. Until 1918 Ford Madox Ford used his baptismal name, Ford Hermann Hueffer. He called himself Joseph Leopold Hueffer after his German Catholic baptismal name while in Germany. He decided on Ford Madox Ford after World War I. I call him Ford throughout, though I sometimes refer to him as “Joseph Leopold” during the German excursion because Hunt did.

4. Douglas Goldring decries the fact that “ladies on whom Ford bestowed his affections, and who subsequently nourished grievances against him, were not restrained by these considerations from pursuing their quarrels in public” (1943, 75). Patricia Searles and Janet Mickish counter: “The woman . . . is expected to understand her man’s point of view and to accommodate herself to his desires. She is expected to be able to do this in silence” (1984, 269).

5. Ford’s German patriot musings in the chapter “Subject Races” can be read with painful retrospective irony after Britain’s two world wars with Germany, especially in light of Ford’s fighting for Britain in World War I. British colonialism certainly influences Alien as the two authors work to praise German aggression while keeping the British Empire intact—rhetorically at least.

6. “Ayenbite of Inwit,” a medieval philosophical phrase, describes the poignancy of anxiety coupled with regret.

7. Hunt codes as “H—” or “G—” the small towns and villages whose inhabitants Hunt often describes in much detail and sometimes satirizes. Hunt must have meant to protect the people of the towns and her own legal position.

8. Violet contracted syphilis in an early affair with Oswald Crawfurd, a married man. Just when she discovered it is not clear, but her doctor told Ford of the illness in 1915.

9. In “Marriage and Sex in the Novels of Ford Madox Ford” (Modern Fiction Studies 23.4 [1977–1978]), Igor Watt states, “in Ford’s novels the love relationship occurs invariably outside marriage, while the marital relationship is experienced as destructive and deathly” (587).

10. In 1914 Ford had an affair with Brigit Patmore, a friend of Hunt’s. By 1917 Hunt was still worried about it, writing, “I could love B[rigit]—I suppose if I believed in F & his statements I could not. So—.-. . . F’s letter came. I made her read it” (Secor and Secor 1978, 58).

Notes to Chapter 4

1. Elizabeth Podnieks argues that diary writers such as the ones in this study write with a literary, modernist consciousness of form; if aware of an audience either real or potential (which I hold is nearly always the case) writers are also “concerned with the aesthetic potential of the diary” (2000, 351). Such attention to technique and reception seems to hold regardless of the period in which they write. See Harriet Blodgett’s Centuries of Female Days (1988).

2. Lessing accuses a myriad of critics of assuming The Golden Notebook embodies “The Confessions of Doris Lessing” (Newquist interview 1974, 51). She says in an interview with Florence Howe that the novel “was a detached book” representing what “she took . . . absolutely for granted,” the “despicable game” between men and women where “any sort of loaded point sucks in anger or fear” (ibid., 81).
3. Anna mentions the notebook’s inclusion of hundreds of newspaper clippings and letters as part of the notebooks, but they are not actually part of this text. In Anna’s editing process, she deletes as well as joins materials to create her golden notebook.

4. Patrocinio Schweickart says, “the reader is a visitor and . . . must observe the necessary courtesies. She must avoid unwarranted intrusions—she must be careful not to appropriate what belongs to her host, not to impose herself on the other woman” (1997, 623).

5. By shifting the reader’s gaze from the woman writer to the process and effect of writing, Lessing places the discourse, the “structure” as Lessing would have it, at the center of the reader’s production of meaning.

6. Anna’s “crossed out material” has significance, but “Lessing, Anna’s creator, chose not to pursue in her subsequent fiction direct visual presentation of raw worked-over, interpolated, or discarded materials” (Sprague 1987, 81).

7. In Walking in the Shade, the second volume of Lessing’s autobiography, she writes: “Far from being like George Sand . . . I never put writing before love, or before Jack; . . . [I] was like Jane Austen, writing . . . well, if not under the cover of a blotter, then only when he was not around or expected” (1997, 146).

8. In her interview Against Utopia with Suzie Linfield, Lessing admits to writing a diary “now” (she is eighty-one), but when asked if it will be published she says, “Not immediately. Not until the children are all dead. I think the children of well-known people have a terrible time . . . persecuted by journalists” (2001, 69).

9. In this section Anna refuses to give Saul her notebook; this act of refusal empowers Anna sufficiently to give Saul the first line of his novel. It is then that Saul returns her notebook that he has appropriated. Only in refusing to give way to Saul does Anna remain “author, reader, reviewer, parodist, and critic of her own texts” (Franko 1995, 255, 264).

10. In The Summer before Dark Lessing writes: “[S]he knew now that . . . all her life she had been held upright by an invisible fluid, the notice of other people” (1983, 176).