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“Only connect . . .”
E. M. Forster, Howard’s End (epigraph)

To give a truthful account [. . .] is beyond the powers of the biographer or the historian. [. . .] Fiction is truer than fact.
Virginia Woolf, Orlando (ch. 4)

Three things emerge: The first is that the mother always forgives. The second is that it is often not possible to write about events until they are over or sufficiently of the past [. . .] in that twilight between the fact and the imagined. [. . .] And, thirdly, secrets, if they are revealed completely, become mere facts. Secrets, if partly kept, can be seen as relating not to some kind of imitation but to something extra to real life.
Elizabeth Jolley, The Georges’ Wife (8)

This long early passage from Elizabeth Jolley’s The Georges’ Wife—the final volume of her major work, the Vera trilogy—evokes the ethos and aesthetic of two other great modernist fiction writers: E. M. Forster whose conviction was that one should “only connect” and that friendship is the superordinate connection between people; and Virginia Woolf whose metonymic lyricism is kin to Jolley’s deployment of “sophisticated spaces” (“Habit” 124). Moreover, they function as a point de caption, a quilting point for what has been worked through in the previous two volumes of the trilogy and what will be concluded—something to do with mothers and fathers, with mothering and fathering, and with friendship. And, finally, this passage is significant for what I wish to explore here through the figure of Mr Berrington in Jolley’s writing—the way in which Jolley’s fiction
negotiates connections between life and work, and the equally significant ways in which we as readers (and biographers) experience and reproduce that connection.

As a figure in Jolley’s writing, Mr Berrington first appears in the late eighties—
that moment in her life and work when she had finished her long and hard-
fought apprenticeship as a publishable writer with two volumes of short stories
and three early novels, and then secured her position with the publication of a
third collection and five further award-winning novels. The narratives of these
eyear and middle works are located in an Australian landscape—the country to
which Jolley migrated in 1959 at age 36. It was only after this accomplishment
that she returned to the landscape and experiences of her childhood, adolescence
and young womanhood, and to an unpublished manuscript, Georges Wife and
the Feast—a manuscript written across 1950–1965 which, to borrow from Henry
James, could be called a loose and baggy monster, but which is the genesis of
Jolley’s lucid, lyrical major fiction, the Vera trilogy. And Mr Berrington is critical
to that transformation.

Mr Berrington’s entry is as the eponymous central character of “a short story”
published in The Australian in April in 1987, two years before the publication of
the first volume of the trilogy, My Father’s Moon. He proves a popular character,
for this piece is reproduced twice in 1988, once each in 1992 and 1997, and
twice again in 2000. He is also an ambiguous figure—he first appears as a fic-
tional character, but in a significant interview Jolley tells of writing “Mr Berrington”
when Geoffrey Dutton asked her to “write something about someone who had
changed my life” for The Australian newspaper:

And I thought about my mother’s friend, Mr Berrington, you know
the lover that she had—well I presume he was her lover, one doesn’t
know things like that about one’s own mother, but she was so nasty to
him when he was old I think they must have been intimate, you
couldn’t be that nasty otherwise. I wrote about him, and I felt really
fond of him when I was writing and I wrote about him as closely to
the truth as I have ever written about a real person. [...] (Reid 67)

This ambiguous figure—both fictional and “real”—also appears in a less antholo-
gised piece in 1988, “Of Butchers and Bilberry Baskets,” a sequel in time to “Mr
Berrington” where Jolley tells of her solo trip to Germany in 1939 at the very
moment World War Two erupts, and where she remembers the previous “golden
summer” of “Mr Berrington,” when at age 15 she travelled through Germany
with her mother and her mother’s “special friend.” In addition, Mr Berrington
finds his way into the trilogy, elliptically in the reiterated image from these paired
pieces of the father, white-faced, farewelling the boat train that takes his wife and
her friend and his daughter to Germany, and explicitly in the final volume, The
Georges’ Wife (19–20, 44–56, 170). Nor is this his last major appearance. For he recurs again in 2001 as Mr H, one of three protagonists in The Innocent Gentleman, where Jolley once more works through the difficult familial triangle of her adolescence, and once more makes it something “extra to real life.”

MR BERRINGTON IN LIFE

Perhaps life is a mystery not a muddle; they could not tell.
E. M. Forster, A Passage to India (ch. 24)

Who then was Mr Berrington? He was born in 1884 of a prosperous Wolverhampton family. His father was Mayor of Wolverhampton in 1904–1905, and an engineer with offices in that city and in London, who bought and developed a tract of land nearby Jolley’s girlhood home in Wells Road, Wolverhampton (northwest of Birmingham)—Jolley recalls the Berrington home as “bigger and better than those in the surrounding streets (“Mr Berrington” 32). He studied at Pembroke College, Cambridge, was admitted as a barrister to Lincoln’s Inn in 1908 when he was twenty four, practiced on the Oxford Circuit, and from 1948 was Chair of the Appeals Tribunal of the Dudley District of the Ministry of National Insurance. He was not, however, a King’s Council, except to the extent that Jolley’s mother, Grete Knight, conferred that status on him—and so her daughter represents him as such (33).

Mr Berrington met Grete Knight in the 1930s when he was her student and she was teaching German on Thursday nights in an adult education program at the Aston Technical College near Birmingham. Soon he started to visit the Knight home, for private lessons on Thursday afternoons and, later, for the Sunday midday meals where he and Wilfrid Knight would discuss the weather and the sermons at his St Paul’s Anglican Church and Knight’s Beckminster Methodist Church. Then Berrington and Grete Knight would repair to the living room for their German lesson, or perhaps to his home a mile or so away. He soon came to be known to the family as “Mr B.”

Jolley remembers him as fastidious and conservative in his dress, carrying a newspaper and umbrella, and with a raincoat folded over his arm. He belonged to the Conservative Party but was open-minded enough to serve as a sympathetic adjudicator of the arguments of conscientious objectors who appeared before him at tribunals during World War Two. Imaginably he and Wilfrid had serious conversations that tested their political/philosophical positions, and certainly he suffered diatribes from Grete Knight who challenged his pro-British point of view from her European one. Likewise, Monica Knight argued with him from her own disingenu-
ous position, described in her diary as that of “a solid British Patriot.” She wrote, “I shocked him considerably by suggesting that Germany should be allowed to invade Britain and become one big State—imagine the United States of Europe, if we so call [sic] ‘win’ we shall repeat history and be no better off, but if we could do something this time, what different results might be there in 50 or 60 years [sic] time. I can hardly wait for the years to go by to see” (23 October 1944).

Reserved, perhaps prudish, Mr Berrington could not bring himself to ask his housekeeper Mrs Bartlett to buy toilet paper for him and so he asked the more intimate person, Grete Knight, to do so (“Mr Berrington” 33). He also slept with his bedroom door closed and locked, as Wilfrid Knight and the police discovered, after he failed to visit the previous Sunday, the morning they found him dead in bed of a cerebral haemorrhage at sixty nine on Friday 10 July 1953.

Berrington’s obituary said that “his interests included music, history and astronomy, and he was a fluent linguist.” He was a wide reader too, well grounded in the classics. He enjoyed Jane Austen, telling Monica Knight that he would have liked to sit in the pew where Austen sat in church, but he disliked Shaw and his plays, and his study with Grete Knight would have given him close acquaintance with German literature since she used writers like Goethe for texts to translate in her German-language classes. Cultured and urbane, he also was generous with his time and money, playing tennis with Madelaine at his Wolverhampton Lawn Tennis Club in August of 1939 when her sister was away in Germany, and then paying her fees when she started boarding school the following year. In 1953 he bequeathed Grete Knight £63,000, leaving just £1000 to each of his only heirs, his deceased half-brother’s two daughters. And twice he took Grete Knight and her children on extended trips to the continent, the first in 1936 to Austria, the country of her birth, accompanied by Madelaine, and the second in 1938 to Germany with her older daughter Monica. Of this latter trip Jolley says, “Perhaps my first realisation that it was not usual for a family to have a Friend like Mr Berrington came during the long golden summer in 1938 (“Mr Berrington” 36–37).

**Mr Berrington in Jolley’s Life**

Why did I write? what sins to me unknown
Dipp’d me in ink, my parents’, or my own?
Alexander Pope, “Epistle to Dr Arbuthnot” (ll.125–34)

Just as Mr Berrington is an ambiguous figure in Jolley’s fiction—sometime fictional character, sometime “real person”—so too there is an ambiguity in regard
to his relationship to her mother. Only once, in the Battye interview cited above, does Jolley explicitly call him her mother’s lover, but then she quickly resiles and settles here and in the rest of her writings and conversations on the title “special friend.” When asked in the Battye interview, “Was there was any form of social approbation [sic] directed at your mother as a result of her affair with […]” she replied, “Oh yes, I think so. I think she had to weather neighbours’ remarks and so on” (Reid 18). But neighbours, family friends, and overseas guests interviewed years later expressed surprise at any suggestion of impropriety, stressing Wilfrid Knight’s religiosity and Grete Knight’s rectitude. And Madelaine Knight’s response complements theirs—“only a cad,” she remarked, “would have had an affair with Mother, and Mr Berrington was not a cad.”

Still Jolley encourages speculation regarding the triangle between her parents and Mr Berrington when she has Berrington singing while doing dishes with Grete, “‘Mann und Weib, und Weib und Man’—a line from Mozart’s Die Zauberflöte where Papageno is looking for a woman (Weib) to be his wife (Frau).” She wonders if Berrington was making “half-hidden declarations” (“Mr Berrington” 36). Then she gives the question added fillip, saying, “When they sat together over a text, even if it was only a grammar, it could be said Galeotto fu il [ l]ibro e chi lo scrisse [The book was Galleot, Galleot the complying],” but it was many years before I realised this” (34). The line is from Dante’s Inferno, where Virgil and Dante come upon Paolo and Francesca in the Fifth Circle of Hell, and they explain that they were condemned to be there because, when reading the love story of Lancelot and Guinevere, in effect the meaning became the matter and they enacted what they had been reading about. And, finally, the situation in the Knight household is echoed in An Innocent Gentleman, where Mrs Muriel Bell travels to London from Birmingham with the permission of her husband to meet Mr Hawthorne—called “Mr H”—with whom she stays overnight in a hotel after, ironically, attending the opera to hear Beethoven’s Fidelio.

This clearly is a question that cannot be decided, nor perhaps should be—perhaps the circumspect responses of daughters and neighbours reflect not just another era and its ethos, but also the kind of tacit acceptance that has always taken place in different ways when conventional monogamy proves insufficient, and accommodations are made. What is important is the fact that Mr Berrington’s presence was a source of tension in the Knight household, at least to begin with. When Grete Knight accompanied Berrington to Copthorne Road for German lessons, Jolley’s father “prowled, white-faced, up and down the hall” (“Mr Berrington” 36)—and at one stage Knight banned Berrington from the household. And when in 1939 Grete and Monica travelled from Birmingham to London for the boat trip to the continent, Knight travelled on a platform ticket on the same train, apparently unbeknownst to them, to farewell them. The final paragraphs of “Mr Berrington” recaptures the poignancy of the scene:
Mr Berrington moves his folded raincoat from one arm to the other and holds open the door of the compartment for my mother and me to climb up. Before following us he shakes hands with my father and hopes he will have a pleasant journey back to the Midlands.

As the train begins to move my father walks alongside on the platform. The train gathers speed and my father runs smiling and waving. His face, anxious and sad behind the smile, is the last thing I see. (38)

This is the climactic scene of the piece, and it echoes the girl’s earlier sense of betrayal when she arrives on the London platform with her mother and only then discovers that Mr Berrington travels with them to Europe.

The marriage of Grete Fehr and Wilfrid Knight was not an easy one. They met, as Jolley recounts it, likening the meeting to that of Goethe’s Werther and Lotte, when he was doing Quaker relief work in Austria following World War One and she was “distributing slices of bread at dusk” to young pupils in her care (“What Sins” 2)—though again family myth probably conflates facts and overwrites the more mundane likelihood that they met at one of her classes in experimental teaching methods when he was in Vienna to study. Their families of origin were different. Hers was a solidly upper-middle-class Austrian family, where music and books were important; his a working-class family, where education was important but where the short form of the vowel “a” was used. Grete Knight’s tendency to inflate the wealth and status of her family and to insist on speech and manners different to those of her working-class neighbours marked what Jolley often speculates was her disappointment in her husband’s position and family when she arrived in England as a bride in 1922. But for all that, there were commonalities in the experiences they brought to their marriage. Hers related to her mother’s early death followed by her father’s attention to two successive stepmothers, who each produced a child, and one of whom—the second stepmother—drove her out of the household to live with the father’s older sister. His was related to a father who threw him out of the house when he became refused war service and a complicit mother who favoured his sister and condemned what others might have regarded as heroic selflessness when he converted to Quakerism and endured solitary confinement as a conscientious objector. Familial sympathy and cherishing, judged on the evidence of milestones in the lives of Grete Fehr and Wilfred Knight, seemed lacking.

Grete Knight’s response to the emotional deprivations of her youth was to reassure herself by seeking attention and approval through extra-familial connection and familial self-dramatisation; Wilfred Knight’s was to seek attention and approval through service and self-effacement. Both enacted these dispositions in their teaching, just as she did so through their friendship circle and he through
his pastoral work—she baked cakes to put on the table, and he organised free school lunches and left cabbages from his garden on neighbours’ doorsteps. He tolerated her flamboyant, coercive behaviour to close friends, relatives and family; she endured his ministrations to people they didn’t even know. She repressed affection and he strove to suppress anger. And together they worked to maintain the appearance of a normal middle-class household. A measure of their success is that the many people who knew them remember them with great admiration and affection, and only a few confessed to detecting signs of conflict and distress.

Not surprisingly Kenneth Berrington played an important role in the lives of this counter-dependent couple and their children. For more than twenty years his presence functioned like the central wall in the family structure, acknowledged but not questioned for the fact that, while holding it up, it kept the family members apart. After his death, with the Knight daughters married and living away from home, Wilfrid and Grete Knight lived together as if for the first time: it is possible that they accepted their relationship, although they both knew that it was not perfect. Certainly, their daughters knew as much—thus Jolley’s description of their first meeting as being like that of Goethe’s Werther and Lotte, and her laconic conclusion: “A deeply moving scene but not a good guide to marriage” (“What Sins” 2). But that knowledge did not come before the daughters’ participation in the family constellation had contributed to the formation of their own unique mix of assumptions, beliefs and practices resulting from their trying to negotiate the triangulated coupledom of their parents’ marriage, and each parent’s comparable triangulation of the children as an ally in opposition to the other parent. In “‘What Sins to Me Unknown Dipped Me in Ink?’” Jolley wrote, “My mother was given to moods. Storms blew up unexpectedly, were savage and disappeared again as quickly. [. . .] 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” (6).

**MR BERRINGTON “EXTRA TO REAL LIFE”**

“Precisely this gift you have,” he says, “of being able to have friends, which are not perhaps of the supreme or ultimate choice, is a gift you must always use because it is a help to you and, in turn, can be of use to other people too.” He adds that he does not have this gift. He even regrets this.

Elizabeth Jolley, *The Georges’ Wife* (140)
In Helen Daniel’s memorable phrase, the Vera trilogy is composed of “memories which enclose others, all licking around an old wound” (33). That wound is everywhere and nowhere expressed in the Vera trilogy, for it pertains both to what is known but cannot easily be said, and to what is not known because never-said or belonging to the time before speech. The torque of that unspoken/unspeakable wound is no more evident than in the compulsively repeated triangular relationships of Jolley’s trilogy—*My Father’s Moon* (1989), *Cabin Fever* (1990) and *The Georges’ Wife* (1993). These seem iterations of Freud’s paradigmatic family romance, that triangle formed when the child’s new awareness of the father disrupts its intense intimacy with the mother. Always eroticised, the intimacy between mother and child is sometimes experienced as a nameless bliss—a fusion of self and other in which the child, in an reiterated phrase of Jolley’s, is both “the giver and the recipient of the whole” (*Georges’ Wife* 93); and sometimes the intimacy is experienced as the terrors of being abandoned or being overwhelmed—terrors invoked by Vera’s homelessness, by her somehow distant and always oppressive mother, by the image of a face white with pain, and by the recurrent description in Jolley’s writings of feeling “on the edge.”

The child’s perception of the advent of the father mediates the dynamic of bliss and terror with the mother, and requires that the eroticism of the child’s first intimacy with the mother be repressed. What results is a kind of holy family with an asexual parental pair aligned with one another but oriented toward the child whom they cherish (a signature word in Jolley’s vocabulary). This configuration occurs again and again in the trilogy. It is active functionally in the triangle formed by Vera and Sister and Mr Peters—the kindly owners of the nursing home where Vera has Dr Metcalf’s baby out of wedlock and stays on as a helper for the next few years. And it has a dysfunctional realisation in the relationship of Vera to Mommy and Daddy Doctor, for whom she is a live-in baby-sitter when pregnant. More complicatedly, the configuration also appears in the triangle formed by Vera, Gertrude, her shadowy husband—for here the effective absence of the husband suggests that in Gertrude Vera finds the good mother of infancy. And, finally, this last triangle is echoed in the configuration formed by Vera, the older Ramsden and the also-shadowy Nurse Pusey-Hall, with the difference that Nurse Ramsden is less like the lost nurturing mother and more like the idealised figure of the courtly romance, and so Vera’s longing for this older woman to be her friend far more clearly eroticised.

Whatever the case, in each of these triangulations, Vera finds something essential missing—Sister Peters and her husband are too ordinary, Mommy and Daddy Doctor too domestic, the nurturing Gertrude too simple, and Nurse Ramsden too unobtainable. In short, in each instance what is missing is the possibility of being “the giver and the recipient of the whole,” the possibility of the passionate intimacy that characterises the child’s relationship to the mother, and that is
especially invoked by Vera’s imagination of intimacy with Ramsden. “If I miss Mr George,” Vera reflects in the opening of The Georges’ Wife, “it is something from before which I am missing” (4)—a remark whose phrasings recur at the novel’s end (116) and forms a Leitmotif in Jolley’s first novel, Palomino (2, 9, 126).

Nor do the trilogy’s triangular configurations end here, for the triangulated relationships of the Knight household are invoked through the appearance of Mr Berrington as Vera’s mother’s special friend. His name is not disguised, as it is in An Innocent Gentleman, just as the “real life” names of Gertrude and Night Sister Bean, two other important people in Jolley’s life, are unchanged. Similarly, she reproduces the scene from life, in which the father farewells mother and child, and the mother’s “special friend.” In the context of the novel, however, this scene takes on further meanings. For here the father oddly takes up the position of the child in the family romance, in that his betrayal (like that of the girl’s when she finds out she will not be travelling alone with her mother to Europe) evokes the betrayal felt by the child when it becomes aware of the parents’ intimacy. In this moment, Vera identifies with her father, seeing him standing, like herself, on the edge of other people’s happiness; seeing him white-faced with unhappiness, like Helena who Vera abandons in one way through her restless desire for someone and something else.

Such identification with the father redoubles the original wound of the mother’s inevitable betrayal of the child. Even more, it skews the “normal” vectors of desire, whereby the child’s infant desire for the mother is displaced by an oedipal one for the father in preparation for “normal” adult heterosexuality. For here the identification with the father conjures a permutation of the romance in which the child stands in the place of the father, and so in some sense becomes (again) the mother’s beloved. This hopelessly entangled pattern of desire produces the several ménages à trois that Vera compulsively enters into across the trilogy—in the first volume with the older Dr Metcalf and his much older wife Magda; and, in the last, with the older Mr George and his much older sister (a triangle which yields the carefully placed apostrophe of the title of the last narrative); with the bohemian sister and brother Noel and Felicity; finally, with Mr George and the ageing rice-farm widow who Vera meets on board the ship that takes her and Mr George to Australia.

In The Georges’ Wife, the narrator explicitly reflects on all the triangular relationships she has experienced and on others she has observed, offering not so much an explanation as an acknowledgment of their compulsion. Thus the phrase repeats itself with gathering momentum across the three narratives: “There is something hopeless in being hopeful that one person can actually match and replace another” (My Father’s Moon 53, et passim). Nevertheless, a kind of resolution is found through the figure of the rice-farmer widow. “Straight away after meeting the rice-farm widow,” Vera thinks it is:
strange that there should be, all at once, another widow in my life making now a total of four if I count Gertrude and Magda. [. . .]
And the fourth widow, the railway-man’s widow with her pronouncements and her ability with the sewing machine. [. . .](103)

The railway-man’s widow is Mrs Pugh, the (knowing) neighbour once dismissed as vulgar by Vera’s mother who becomes her friend, “the chosen property of my mother” (103), just as the rice-farm widow, from whose vulgarity Mr George recoils, becomes Vera’s “special friend.” “[B]eing a widow,” Vera reflects, “means that you are something special, that you have been selected and publicly chosen at some time in your life. [. . .]—even if you live alone later” (105). Vera has been chosen by Mr George and has borne his child, but their relationship remains secret from his sister and the world. Following Vera’s contracting tuberculous during her affair with Noel and Felicity, she and Mr George migrate to Australia in separate cabins, their relationship still unacknowledged (and inexplicably without either their child or Vera’s child by Dr Metcalf). Vera wants Mr George, and wants to be married to him when they arrive in Australia; and they are. At the same time she asks Mr George to understand her need for friends like the rice-farm widow (114); and he does (140).

CONCLUSION

For though these are not matters on which a biographer can profitably enlarge it is plain enough to those who have done a reader’s part in making up from bare hints dropped here and there the whole boundary and circumference of a living person.
Virginia Woolf, Orlando (ch. 2)

Biography and fiction conventionally are tied to different imperatives—one warranted by fact, the other licensed by fiction. Jolley, however, like Woolf in Orlando (though less deliberately) disregards generic boundaries in the interests of imagining something “extra to real life,” something that might be helpful in real life. Similarly, we as readers inevitably draw on the autobiography as we know it from book jackets, the interviews and the essays in Central Mischief, and so also traverse generic boundaries, possibly for the same purpose. Vera’s rice-farm widow preens herself, “I like to think [. . .] that during our long voyage, I have initiated you, helped you in some way” (131). It is left to the reader to imagine what that help might be, though clearly it would seem to have something to do with mothers and fathers—and friends. On board ship Vera learns of and mourns her father’s
death, and is comforted by the rice-farm widow who tells her “your father can’t accompany you all the way in your life” (110–11). And the reader knows from early in *The Georges’ Wife* that another lesson is “that the mother always forgives.”

Jolley rethinks both lessons in later fiction, especially in the *Orchard Thieves* where the perspective becomes that of the (grand)mother for the first time, and in *An Innocent Gentleman* where the Berrington triangle is anchored firmly on the terrain of fiction. Here in the trilogy, however, these lessons from life are caught up in the rice-farm widow’s truth universally acknowledged that “The world is made for couples” (135). Jolley’s fiction tells us that, nonetheless, people are not made to be couples, however much they may long to be the special chosen one forever. The “something extra” Jolley offers against this painful truth is the conviction that to be open to having special friends is, as Mr George would say, a special gift.

**Endnotes**

1 The collections of short stories are *Five Acre Virgin* (Fremantle Arts Centre P, 1976), and *The Travelling Entertainer* (Fremantle Arts Centre P, 1979); the novels are *Palomino* (Outback P, 1980), *The Newspaper of Claremont Street* (Fremantle Arts Centre P, 1981), and *Miss Peabody’s Inheritance* (U of Queensland P, 1983)—in this last novel the terrain includes England and the continent.


3 This is the best interview with Elizabeth Jolley available. It consists of a verbatim transcript of some five hours of interview conducted in May and June of 1999 and resulting in some 100 manuscript pages—a record of Jolley’s reflections on her life and work at a key moment in her career in writing. The interview covers her early life in England, migration to Australia 1959, development as a writer since 1960s, publications to 1989, and tutoring and lecturing in creative writing. It is held in the Battye Library of West Australian History, Oral History Unit.

4 A German officer who studied English with her while held in England as a prisoner of war recalled fifty years later that she had told him Berrington was a KC as she went on to explain the difference between a solicitor and a barrister (Personal Interview, 22 June 1999). However, according to Guy Holborn, Librarian, Lincoln’s Inn Library, Mr Berrington is not listed in Sainty’s authoritative list, which is based on original patent rolls in the Public Record Office, nor did he maintain an office in London, which a KC was required to do (Personal Email Correspondence, 2 January 2004). This and
related information in this section of the paper is indebted to Professor Brian Dibble.

5 Wolverhampton Express and Star, 11 July 1953.
6 Personal Interview, 26 November 1999.
7 In Mozart, there is no und in the middle.
8 In Jolley’s text fibro is a misprint for libro. The reference to Galeotto is provocative for, as Galehaut in Lancelot du Lac, he arranged the meeting with Guinevere, his name thereafter coming to signify a panderer.
9 Personal Interview with Elizabeth Jolley, 2 June 1996.
10 Personal Interview with Madelaine Blackmore (née Knight), 17 November 1999.
11 It is probable that Nurse Ramsden’s name is also unchanged, as Elizabeth Jolley once remarked that throughout her time as a trainee nurse at Birmingham’s Queen Elizabeth Hospital, unlike Ramsden, she never had a room of her own (Personal Interview, 1999).
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