

Mothers, Daughters and Elizabeth Jolley's Ethic of Hope

BRIAN DIBBLE, CURTIN UNIVERSITY OF TECHNOLOGY

Ceres was scornful and asked the mother if she imagined that children could become immortal if they were not tempered in the heat of the fire.

Who can turn away a son or daughter? The child is always the child of the mother.

Elizabeth Jolley, *The Orchard Thieves* (17, 107)

Elizabeth Jolley and her mother had the same birth date in common, 4 June. For her mother's eighty-first-birthday in 1977, Jolley sent her a copy of her first book, *Five Acre Virgin*, and in return the mother sent Jolley a tape-recorded message which began with talk about life and death, her own and her daughter's:

I was eighty-one last Saturday, and to be honest I don't wish you [Monica Knight/Elizabeth Jolley] to live to be eighty-one. Well, it is dreadful to notice first year by year, then month by month, week by week and day by day to deteriorate. The memory goes bad, one is clumsy, and life seems to be full of difficulties of which one had no idea that they existed when one was younger. The only consolation is that I can hear music although I cannot always follow a conversation or a play on the radio. The doctor says that Daddy ought to buy a better radio but Daddy insists that the radio is all right. But when I ask him what it says he always answers, "Oh, I couldn't get it," and so I am as clever as before.¹

While sympathising with time's unkindness to Grete Knight, we cannot overlook her insensitivity to whatever might have been her daughter's thoughts and wishes about how long *she* might want to live, nor can we disregard Grete Knight's numerous complaints about her eighty-seven-year-old husband, Wilfred Knight,

who sat beside her—in addition to blaming him about the radio, she complained about having to bully him into installing a heater and about his habit of interrupting her kitchen routine by asking for his meals at inappropriate hours. He spoke little and reluctantly on the tape, primarily about his countryside excursions with their friend Bill Cotterell, for which he thanked him several times.

Grete Knight went on to say that one of her Austrian kindergarten pupils from sixty years ago would be visiting soon. After Jolley wrote back to say that she remembered her, Grete Knight replied on 17 July, saying, “You cannot possibly remember Gigi as you have never seen her.” Jolley erupted when she received that letter, scrawling on it: “Mother I’d like to tell you that you cannot tell me what I remember only I can know what I remember. I know that I never want to see you again because if I did I would lose my temper. You have not changed. I feel very differently about poor dear Dad.” She carefully dated her underscored response 25 July 1977.²

Whether or not Jolley told her mother directly how she felt cannot be known because Grete Knight destroyed all the family letters before she died, but it is unlikely that she did. For one thing, Jolley kept all of her parents’ letters to her and there is no reference to the exchange in them. For another, Grete Knight was incapable of the self-analysis required for her to begin to imagine that she had wrongly hurt someone else’s feelings. Margarethe Johanna Carolina Fehr Knight rarely felt the need to apologise to anyone.

Her uncritical self-absorption derived from a troubled childhood in which her mother died when Grete Fehr was four, and her first stepmother when she was eight. Her second stepmother, whom her father Walter Fehr married in 1910 when Grete was fourteen, disliked her, a feeling that caused or revealed a mutual dislike exhibited when Grete vomited on the altar during the wedding ceremony. This third and final mother disciplined Grete with a hair brush, ultimately sending her off to study at a convent school and to board with the father’s older sister Johanna. She also divorced Walter Fehr the same year they married, according to one record, or, according to another, a year after he died in 1928, neither date a sign of a happy family.³ Her father’s marriages produced three other children, a brother Walter six months before Grete’s mother died, a stepbrother Günther a year after the second marriage, and a stepsister Johanna from the third. In Oedipal terms, she was progressively displaced from the centre of her father’s affections, not only by two stepmothers of the wicked variety, but also by their children.

As a result, in adult life Grete Knight had difficulty sharing her household with women and always sought to command the attention of men. One exchange on the birthday tape she sent her daughter is instructive:

Bill Cotterell: You don't like women [radio] announcers, do you?

Grete Knight: Well, I'm not very fond of women altogether. And I always liked, in all my life, I always liked men better than women.

Bill Cotterell: But what about Elizabeth?

Grete Knight: Pardon?

Bill Cotterell: What about Bunti herself?

Grete Knight: Oh well, they're children.

The mother–daughter contretemps over their birthday greetings and presents suggests why Elizabeth Jolley was fond of quoting the opening line of Tolstoy's *Anna Karenina*: “All happy families resemble one another but each unhappy family is unhappy in its own way.”⁴

MOTHERS AND DAUGHTERS

From Jolley's point of view, the unhappiness in her family of origin—Wilfrid and Grete Knight and their daughters Monica “Bunti” Elizabeth (1923–) and Madelaine “Baba” Winifred (1924–)—derived from her relationship with her mother, which was difficult and complex from childhood onward. An early example would be the noble experiment of home schooling her school-teacher father instituted when Jolley was nine and Madelaine was eight, as a result of his belief that “school spoiled childhood innocence” (“What Sins to Me Unknown Dipped Me in Ink” 5). It was an idea doomed from the outset because the mother, not Wilfrid Knight, was to run the program and neither she nor the girls thought it was a good idea. Worse, it increased the tension between Grete Knight and her daughters, especially Monica who became more and more disrespectful and defiant of her, answering back and even striking back when slapped. So the parents sent her off to study at a boarding school near the Cotswolds in 1934 (keeping Madelaine at home for another four years, after which she too was allowed to attend the Sibford Quaker school). For the rest of her life, Jolley maintained a powerful ambivalence toward Grete Knight, a feeling based on an identification/disidentification with her. It was a chafing bond that continually worried and often insinuated itself into her fiction.

The identification is suggested in a fanciful autobiographical blurb Jolley drafted for herself in 1967, claiming that in the 1930s she worked with her mother in a chain factory (ML MSS 4880/29, Item 2). The image of a daughter close to the working mother implies the kind of relationship represented in the Morgan stories of Jolley's *Five Acre Virgin*, a relationship Jolley had with her new-born first daughter when she was a live-in domestic in Birmingham, and with her other daughter when she worked as a Flying Domestic in Perth in the 1970s. Moreover,

such closeness between mother and daughter symbolically existed in the 1940s between Jolley and a confidante her parents' age, Gertrude Whele, leading her to idealise Whele in *My Father's Moon* ("Gertrude's Place" [101–17]) and in *Cabin Fever* (3–5 and 192–93)—Whele told of her own close relationship with her parents who were chain makers.⁵

But disidentification is implied by a second draft of the blurb in the same notes which says, "The bitter realities of a blue brick yard in the Black Country of the Industrial Midlands were little alleviated [for the mother] by the rapid appearance of 2 baby girls unplanned and unwanted" (*Feast of Life*, n.p.)—in fact, Grete Knight told her younger daughter that Madelaine's birth was unplanned and unwelcome and that, if she had to have another child, she would have preferred a boy. Jolley's distancing herself from the mother had much to do with the strain in the Knight household from the 1930s into the 1950s that resulted from Grete Knight's maintaining a relationship with a "special friend" whose status remained ill-defined. He was Kenneth Berrington, in his early fifties when Grete was in her late thirties, an educated and erudite bachelor and barrister, possibly a lover and certainly an admirer, who on his death in 1953 left her £63,000 pounds in his will. No doubt Jolley's conflicted feeling toward her mother was giving added animus because of the disrespect Grete Knight's relationship with Berrington showed toward Wilfrid Knight, the daughter's much-beloved father, a feeling compounded by the fact that Jolley revered Kenneth Berrington as well, as revealed in her essay "Mr Berrington."

Then in the early 1940s Jolley herself became involved in a comparable *ménage à trois* with a married couple, the complete details of which are not all known but find echoes in Jolley's Vera Trilogy, *My Father's Moon*, *Cabin Fever*, and *The Georges' Wife*. However, what is known is that it resulted in the two women having daughters within six weeks of each other in 1946. Jolley told her mother that the father was a TB patient in the Queen Elizabeth Hospital where she was training in Birmingham from 1943, and that he had died; but Grete Knight did not believe her and disapproved of the man she correctly suspected. That man was an older, educated and erudite librarian, Leonard Jolley, whom Jolley first met in 1940 when she was a seventeen-year-old trainee and he was a twenty-six-year-old patient in the St Nicholas and St Martin's Orthopaedic Hospital in Pyrford. Jolley's pregnancy in 1945 led to her quitting the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, changing her name by deed poll to Monica Fielding (after the novelist she admired), having the child, becoming a live-in domestic in Birmingham for several years before leaving to take up a position as Matron in a progressive school in Hertfordshire in 1950 (a situation represented in *My Father's Moon*)—five years that were hard on both the single mother and her daughter. (It was Leonard Jolley who persuaded her to use the name Elizabeth instead of Monica.)

Put another way, in Elizabeth Jolley's adult life the *identification* with her mother was entangled with her *disidentification* with her: each of them entered a triangular relationship, causing pain to the third person involved; and for Jolley the grip of the identification was unshakeable because she often felt that, like Grete Knight, she was a less-than-perfect mother as a result of her own affaire. In addition, since Elizabeth Jolley was a self-defined placator and Grete Knight was a demanding woman whose need for attention consumed most of the emotional air in the household, the bond between the two was one of powerful co-dependence: the mother demanded, and the daughter responded.

It was the first of many responsive roles Jolley performed in the service of others' needs. In addition to the role of daughter, they included: hospital nurse, lover, unwed mother, and live-in domestic in the 1940s; matron, wife and married mother from the 1950s on; cleaning lady and nursing-home helper in the 1960s; and adult education teacher and university professor from the 1970s through the 1990s—all roles reflected in her stories and novels. Indeed, the great passion of her life—her love affaire with, and marriage to, Leonard Jolley—involved serving as lover/mother/nurse *cum* general factotum to an invalid who embraced helplessness as a lifestyle. From her teens and twenties onward, Elizabeth Jolley's attention was devoted to placating many people, most often Grete Knight, Leonard Jolley, or both. Jolley observed that, as a result of her mother's moods, "I became by nature and circumstance a placator and learned to read every change in the eye, every crease in the brow. I am still a placator" ("What Sins to Me Unknown Dipped Me in Ink" 6).

Jolley's fiction often draws on details from her life and family relationships. Her scrawl across her mother's air letter clearly indicates that in the 1970s she still had not forgiven her mother for real or imagined slights and sins, but her fiction could point in other directions, as evidenced in a short story she wrote in the 1980s, "Paper Children," and a novel she wrote in the 1990s, *The Orchard Thieves*. In those works her family details serve meditative purposes rather than autobiographical ones: she uses her fiction as a space in which to ruminate on her experience, seeking perspective on it, looking for meanings in it that might sustain living in difficult circumstances, that is, might sustain an ethic of hope.

"PAPER CHILDREN"

"Paper Children" is a challenging story that relies entirely on a sequence of nine dreams, the dream sequence being a technique that Jolley used in the 1970s in her story "Shepherd on the Roof" and in her 1985 novel *Foxybaby*. Collectively,

the dreams tell of Clara Schultz whose extreme devotion to others through her work as a medical doctor leads her to neglect her family during the occupation of Austria by the Germans during the 1940s. Only the suicide of her husband provokes Schultz to send their two-year-old daughter Lisa to a safe place, while she continues to work, caring and curing and teaching, heedless of World War Two as it rages about her.⁶ Decades later, elderly and in fear of going blind and deaf, Schultz resolves to visit the daughter and her former son-in-law in Australia, people she calls her “paper children” because she has come to think of them as existing mainly through the letters they send backwards and forwards.

There are many autobiographical echoes in “Paper Children”: Jolley’s life-long fantasy about being a medical doctor, a fantasy given an added fillip by her mother’s disappointment that Jolley studied to be a nurse;⁷ the overlapping forenames of the story’s protagonist, Clara Margarethe Carolina Schultz, and Jolley’s mother, Margarethe Johanna Carolina Knight; Schultz’s calling her daughter Lisa “Lieserl,” the term of endearment also used for Monica Knight; and the name of Schultz’s friend Irma Rosen that resonates with the name of Grete Knight’s friend Irma Roitman. Another is Jolley’s describing Schultz as the daughter of a baroness (154), which Grete Knight claimed to have been in Vienna, a claim Jolley repeats on one of her own book covers. The explanation for the improbable double vision of the tale relates to the fact that Grete Knight’s friend Irma Roitman visited the Jolleys in Australia in the 1970s, a visit that was traumatic for Jolley at the time but eventually instructive to her.

Roitman had been in a situation not unlike that of the Jewish Schultz family in Vienna in the 1930s: her husband, anticipating harm, said they must flee Austria, and so she sent her older son to India and her daughter to Holland while she fled with her younger son Paul to England where Jolley’s mother helped them as refugees. It was one of Grete Knight’s rare moments of euphoric selflessness when her dislike of women and Jews was counterbalanced by her fellow feeling for an Austrian compatriot who had suffered in wartime like Knight had in World War One. It might even have been a moment of projective identification whereby she saw herself in Roitman’s plight and thus was not just being charitable to another but also feeding her own need to be attended to. As soon as the older, formidable Roitman found a job and another place to stay, she refused to be dominated by the implacable Grete Knight, later gossiping to her daughter that Grete Fehr said she disliked England and had an unhappy marriage.

En route to visit her son Paul in Melbourne, Roitman arrived in Perth in early April 1972. For Jolley, it was *déjà vu* because Roitman was so much like her own mother Grete in age and accent as well as in her emotional neediness, an experi-

ence the more draining for the fact that Leonard Jolley would up his demand for his wife's attention in direct proportion to others' claims upon it. If Jolley had been inclined to re-evaluate her attitude toward her mother, Roitman's visit foreclosed the possibility of that. Jolley was furious when Roitman left a scented bar of soap as a parting gift, imagining that Roitman was criticising her hygiene, just as her mother was once outraged by one of her ex-kindergarten students from Vienna who visited her after the war—when the well meaning Hilde Vorwinkl went out and bought sausages as a gift for the table, Grete Knight roared at her “I buy the food in this family!”⁸

Jolley's ambivalence toward Grete Knight is reflected in her construction of the mother and the daughter in “Paper Children.” Doctor Schultz's wartime medical work mimics both Grete Knight's World War Two caring for displaced refugees and Elizabeth Jolley's hospital work with war-torn soldiers. By contrast, Schultz first likens her son-in-law and then her daughter to a ruthless Gauleiter, like the Gestapo official who exposed Schultz's husband as a Jew: the first constructs Schultz's daughter Lisa as a powerless child and the second as an all-powerful mother, since her husband is “a man much younger than herself” (149) and Gauleiter-Lisa treats him as if helpless and defenceless. Bizarrely, Lisa endorses the rule of survival of the fittest, when “Only the strongest and the intelligent shall live.” She goes on, “I tell my husband to dig the pit. . . . Perhaps it will be for him, we shall see” (159). In this connection, it is relevant to note that Grete Knight was anti-Semitic in principle, if not always in practice (as Roitman's example shows), for example, specifically instructing her daughters that “Neither of you may marry a Jew” (letter of 4 March 1940). She also admired Hitler at the beginning of World War Two but switched her approval to Churchill as it went on.

The early dreams in “Paper Children” tell of Schultz's excitement and apprehension about meeting her daughter, while the sixth dream tells of comparably mixed feelings from Lisa's point of view—as her husband Peter says while they drive two hundred miles through the night to meet the mother at the airport, “It's because you don't know her” (164). The story then takes three breath-taking turns. In one of the dreams Clara Schultz arrives in Australia to find that the daughter and her husband have been killed in a car crash while driving to meet her, but that the daughter *in utero* has been saved. In the penultimate dream, returned to Vienna, she meets Irma and tells her that her daughter has had a baby whom she—Clara—will bring back to Austria and name Lisa. And in the final dream Lisa and her husband arrive at the hotel expecting to meet the mother/grandmother Clara Shultz but are instead greeted by her Viennese neighbour Irma Rosen who has come to say that Schultz died outside Rosen's apartment door as she set out for Australia. Rosen then tries unsuccessfully to explain how it was that Schultz “must

have been crying and laughing when she died" (170)—a mysterious oxymoronic image that in the context of this story suggests the fraught relations between mothers and daughters.

It does not take a Freud to see that Jolley's story "Paper Children" portrays powerful ambivalence indicative of more than common approach/avoidance anxiety. It is more like love and hatred—of the self and of the other—on the part of the mother regarding the daughter, and conversely. Ordinarily, only one of those perspectives would be available to the dreamer but in this case, although most of the story is focussed through Schultz's eyes, the narrative sensibility is Lisa's and, by extension, Jolley's. Her odd, engrossing tale is a complex meditation that poses more problems about mothers and daughters than it resolves.

THE ORCHARD THIEVES

The impasse between mothers and daughters in "Paper Children" is revisited and reconceived a decade later in Jolley's *Orchard Thieves*, an unusual book for at least two reasons. One is that its characters are not named but rather described by the roles they play, namely, the grandmother, her three daughters and her four grandchildren. The other is its reliance on, and foregrounding of, biblical themes and Greco-Roman myths. For example, the grandmother recounts to her grandsons the story of Demeter/Ceres who searches for her lost daughter Persephone/Proserpina, in the process coming across a baby prince who will not thrive. She ministers to him, revives him, and then covers him with embers, to the alarm of the upset mother who rescues him from the coals (15–17).

The Orchard Thieves reads like a formal meditation on Jolley's constant theme, the family and its dynamics. Its thesis might well be found in Tolstoy's "What Men Live By," that "It was not given to the mother to know what her children needed for their life," a maxim she recurred to in her writings from the 1970s and 1980s.⁹ And its addendum to Tolstoy's thesis might be Jolley's insight that, like most knowledge, if it comes to mothers at all it usually comes late, when they are grandmothers. The situation in the novel is one of crisis regarding the daughters and chaos regarding the grandchildren. The grandmother is concerned not so much to resolve the former and to control the latter as to understand how both are inevitable and thus natural. Crises and chaos can even be regarded as necessary to the on-going health of the family and the growth of its members if some way can be found for the family to survive and to thrive through its conflicts.

The grandmother lives with her oldest daughter who is called the aunt since the middle sister in England has a daughter and the younger sister in Australia has three sons. Those boys are called rogues and thieves (57 ff) because of their unruly behaviour as they go about calling everything “crap” (5 ff), behaviour usual for their stage of development. The grandmother incongruously calls them “innocent” and likens their early-morning chatter in the bushes to birdsong: “Hey, craphead! Hey, idiot, dickhead!” (88). As the title of the book suggests—and as Melville suggested when he first used the phrase in *Moby Dick* (6)¹⁰—such boys are sons of Adam, their behaviour preordained. They only lack an Eve, and she is provided by Jolley through the arrival of the middle sister with her young daughter in whose “little limmes”¹¹ the boys take an inordinate interest: when she is introduced to them in the bath, they look up at her “with her legs apart and her arms held up like a dancer about to take some graceful and complicated steps”; and the illusionless grandmother thinks of the little girl as “the entailer of affliction” (81). Earlier she had anticipated “bringing the innocent little cousin straight into the loveable iniquitous world of the grandsons” (60), and before that, “The grandmother, whenever she looked along her little gallery of rogues and thieves, knew at once that they would, during their lives, do something perfect and noble and wonderful and something absolutely appalling” (50).

The return from England of the middle sister and her little girl destabilises what is already a delicate balance in the grandmother’s household. She is concerned about the older daughter, not so much because the aunt is unmarried, nor because she might be interested in women rather than men, but because she is alone, without friends and without prospects as another birthday rolls around. The aunt’s main emotional investment is in her nephews whom she loves tenderly (10), for their mother/her sister is not much company to her, being busy with the children and otherwise without opinions of her own. The return of the middle sister precipitates the central conflict when she announces to the aunt in the opening lines of the book, “if you have the house you’ll have to pay us each one-third of the current market price. One-third each of the value of the place” (Preface, n.p. 1). This is the daughter with too many friends and prospects in London—the threatened aunt calls her a lesbian, and the loving if apprehensive mother speculates hopefully that she has a caring “special friend” of whatever gender. This is also the daughter who wants to sell off the “paddock,” as she calls the family home on a large block of prime land with river views in an expensive suburb: this, too, is Eve who would sell off the garden and split the proceeds equally, which might be a reasonable suggestion if the mother were dead and if Eve’s motive were equity rather than selfishness. Unbeknown to everyone at first, this is also the daughter who is pregnant.

The resolution to the conflict echoes the ending of two of the last dreams in Jolley's "Paper Children" and also *Foxybaby* in that it relates to the birth of a child—"The grandmother, groaning and singing, it was only childbirth after all, delivered the middle sister," the narrator says. "Everything comes right in the family, the grandmother told the aunt, when there is a new baby" (109). This birth accomplishes two significant things. Symbolically, it re-enacts the originary event that creates a family—the birth of a child—even if the father is unknown, as in this case. And rhetorically it demonstrates the rearrangement of the ordinate positions within the family that result from the birth of a child: daughters becoming mothers, mothers becoming grandmothers. Thus the conditions for the insight are set in place.

In fact, *The Orchard Thieves* can be regarded as centrally preoccupied with that rearrangement, and particularly with imagining the hopeful psychological changes it can precipitate with good luck coupled with imagination and trust: daughters acquiring better perspective as they become mothers, and mothers acquiring wisdom as they become grandmothers, learning, in light of their own experience, to view the family with more detachment. The point is underscored in the scene where the normally anxious grandmother acts calmly rather than panicking when the middle daughter does something absolutely appalling, threatening to kill her newborn son by dropping him into a steaming bath. The grandmother suddenly recalls the myth of Ceres and her baby, realising that "within the action was a metaphor for trust. That was it. Imagination and trust" (121).

That optimistic epiphany is simultaneously challenged by the grandmother's shock at realising that "it was possible for the child, the grown-up daughter, to hate the mother" (121). In response, she wants to tell the middle daughter that "there was only one way and that way was to take and accept all that happens in your life and simply to push on with living in the face of accusation, misunderstanding, or whatever it is with whatever subsequent unhappiness. A person is never unhappy forever she wanted to explain . . ." (122). She wanted, in other words, to explain her ethic of hope in difficult circumstances, family life being the most difficult of all circumstances. Whatever else begins in the family, suffering begins there, and through suffering we develop into social beings. Instead of saying that, however, the mother says, "You must trust me," repeating it as a lullaby, despite her croaking voice, until it has the hoped-for effect: the sister leans more and more forward until the grandmother reaches with both hands and effectively saves both, her daughter and her daughter's child (123).

That night, with the older and younger sisters away, she is alone with the middle sister and wondering, "Were the sisters trying to force her to sell the land or to

force some sort of catastrophe in order to bring about a dramatic change?" "Finally she came to a conclusion," she tells the aunt:

She thought not. The behaviour was simply family behaviour, when people in the family do not know what to do next. There was no plan of any sort. Simply a mother and three sisters floundering. During her life, she explained, she had often floundered. Hopelessly. She was sure the aunt must have noticed. (126)

This is a mother's confession, from a grandmother's realisation that forgiveness is the wellspring of stoic hope.

CONCLUSION

A decade before her blow-up with her mother, Jolley's always-wise and always-suffering father had written in reference to Jolley's concerns about her relationship with her older daughter, "Estrangement from the parent can only be ended when the child FORGIVES the parents, and to this end the parents must confess the wrong committed. Most children have something to forgive and would forgive, if the parents were open and frank" (27 July 1968). Whether or not Jolley confessed to her own daughter, Grete Knight never confessed to Jolley and, like the middle daughter in *The Orchard Thieves*, Jolley was not able at that time to process her father's wisdom about mothers and daughters to the extent of imagining that her mother's hurtful behaviour might have derived from her Fehr family-of-origin experience. However, if Jolley did not forgive Grete Knight in fact, through the mediations in her fiction she found a way to contemplate the redemption of family trauma through a mother's confession and a daughter's forgiveness. That is the sense in which her fiction points to the possibility of the family happiness.

Her father also wrote, "My love for my children makes me realize how much my father and mother loved me. I didn't realize it when I was younger" (9 April 1967), a statement revised in *The Orchard Thieves* to read, "it was not until she was a grandmother that she, because of her own love for her grandsons, realised how much she, as a small child, had been loved" (17). Jolley's meditation in *The Orchard Thieves* leads the mother-turned-grandmother to forgive herself and, by implication, her own mother.

The voice of Wilfrid Knight, always a placator, informed Elizabeth Jolley's insight into mothers in *The Orchard Thieves*, a prelude leading to Jolley's meditations in the next decade on the circumstances of her parents' marriage and her own, first in *An Accommodating Spouse* and then, more openly and frankly, in her last work, *An Innocent Gentleman*.

ENDNOTES

- 1 The cassette recording of Charles Wilfrid Knight (1890–1977) and Margarethe Fehr Knight (1896–1978) was made by their friend and ex-neighbour Bill Cotterell on Thursday 9 June 1977. The above message is on Side A. The tape is in Jolley's possession.
- 2 These two letters and subsequently quoted ones are in Jolley's possession.
- 3 Respectively, the three women were Anna Margaretha Krammer (1874–1901), Susanna Segfried (1875–1904), and Aloisia Maria Otilie Noster (1881–?).
- 4 For example, in "The Changing Family—Who Cares?" (82).
- 5 Gertrude Wehle (1890–1957) provided the family with vegetables, eggs and poultry from her small farm during the Depression and the war. After Monica Knight became increasingly entangled with Leonard and Joyce Jolley from 1943, she regularly bicycled to Gertrude's place in Seisdon, where Wehle at first counselled her to be cautious and later to break off the relationship, distrusting the Jolleys' motives. Gertrude's chain-making story appears in Jolley's unpublished novel *Feast of Life* [sic], where Jolley also writes lyrically and movingly of Wehle's funeral, an event she imagines because did not travel from Glasgow to Birmingham to attend it.
- 6 It is not clear whether or not the safe place is Australia: Schultz transferred money to Switzerland and thereby "arranged for her two-year-old baby daughter to be taken to safety while she remained to do her work" (155).
- 7 She imagined studying medicine when her husband was appointed Librarian for the University of Western Australia, writing in her diary that "[i]f I am really going (later on) to study to be a Doctor I shall have to discipline myself now into writing and study because I shall have to fight off my tiredness" (15 July 1959). Schultz's being a medical doctor and Director of the Clinic for Women recalls a number of other doctors who figure prominently in Jolley's work: Hodgetts in "Five Acre Virgin," Abrahams in "The Fellow Passenger," Metcalf in *My Father's Moon*, and Dr Esmé Gollanberg, the elderly gynaecologist in Jolley's 1980 novel, *Palomino* where an Irma (Roitman?) and Hilde (Vorwinkl?) also figure as "the vegetarian ladies" (13 [when Roitman's son Paul became a vegetarian, Irma did a course in Switzerland to learn to cook for him]) and Dr Cecelia Page in *The Sugar Mother*; and the scars from the surgery to correct pyloric stenosis used to identify Lisa's body at the end of the story invoke the pyloric stenosis Jolley's sister Madelaine was born with.
- 8 In Jolley's *Sugar Mother* a woman named Vorwinkl is the lover of the doctor-wife Cecilia Page when Page is conferencing overseas—see pages 196 and 198–200. While at Niagara Falls they are joined by a Frau Doktor von Eppell whom Vorwinkl has invited to join them. Cecilia tells her husband Edwin that "they call her Strudell," perhaps implying that von Eppell, Vorwinkl and Cecilia Page are a sexual threesome (72–3).

- 9 Respectively, "The Wedding of the Painted Doll" (28) and "Mr Berrington" (37).
- 10 In "Loomings," the first chapter, Ishmael says, "The act of paying is perhaps the most uncomfortable infliction of the two orchard thieves entailed upon us." Leonard Jolley loaned her a copy of *Moby Dick* that, according to her diary, she started reading it 20 June 1944.
- 11 From Traherne's "The Jewel in the Lotus" that Jolley uses to open Part One of the book. It begins "These little Limmes / These Eyes and Hands which here I find, / These rosie Cheeks wherewith my Life begins, / Where have ye been?"

WORKS CITED

- Jolley, Elizabeth. *An Accommodating Spouse*. Camberwell, Vic.: Penguin, 1999.
- . *An Innocent Gentleman*. Camberwell, Vic.: Penguin, 2001.
- . *Cabin Fever*. Ringwood, Vic.: Penguin, 1990.
- . *Central Mischief: Elizabeth Jolley on Writing, Her Past and Herself*. Ed. Caroline Lurie. Ringwood, Vic.: Penguin, 1992.
- . "The Changing Family—Who Cares?" *Central Mischief* 80–92.
- . *Feast of Life* (and *George's Wife* [sic]). Elizabeth Jolley manuscript of two novels in the Mitchell Library (State Library of New South Wales): ML MSS 4880/29.
- . *Fellow Passengers: Collected Stories, Elizabeth Jolley*. Ed. Barbara Milech. Ringwood, Vic.: Penguin, 1997.
- . "The Fellow Passenger." *Fellow Passengers* 149–70.
- . *Five Acre Virgin and Other Stories*. Fremantle: Fremantle Arts Centre P, 1976.
- . "Five Acre Virgin." *Five Acre Virgin and Other Stories* 7–12.
- . *Foxybaby*. St. Lucia, Qld.: U Queensland P, 1985.
- . *The Georges' Wife*. Ringwood, Vic.: Penguin, 1993.
- . ML MSS 4880/29, Item 2. Notes from the 1960s and 1970s, after the Jolleys moved to Western Australia. In unprocessed Jolley materials held in the Mitchell Library, NSW.
- . "Mr Berrington." *Central Mischief* 31–38.
- . *My Father's Moon*. Ringwood, Vic.: Penguin, 1989.
- . "Paper Children." *Fellow Passengers* 48–62.
- . *Palomino*. Collingwood, Vic.: Outback P, 1980.
- . *The Orchard Thieves*. Ringwood, Vic.: Viking, 1995.
- . "The Shepherd on the Roof." *Five Acre Virgin* 46–55.
- . *The Sugar Mother*. Ringwood, Vic.: Penguin, 1989.
- . "The Wedding of the Painted Doll." *Five Acre Virgin* 18–30.
- . "What Sins to Me Unknown Dipped Me in Ink?" *Central Mischief* 1–12.

Melville, Herman. *Moby-Dick or, The Whale*. 1851. Camberwell, Vic.: Penguin, 2003.