

An Atonement for Ambition and Passion: The experiences of British Victorian  
educational pioneer, Constance Louisa Maynard (1849-1935)

by  
Pauline A. Phipps, B.F.A. (Hons.), M.A.

A thesis submitted to  
the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research  
in partial fulfilment of  
the requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

Department of History  
Carleton University  
Ottawa, Ontario  
August 31, 2004  
© 2004, Pauline Phipps



Library and  
Archives Canada

Bibliothèque et  
Archives Canada

Published Heritage  
Branch

Direction du  
Patrimoine de l'édition

395 Wellington Street  
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4  
Canada

395, rue Wellington  
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4  
Canada

*Your file* *Votre référence*  
*ISBN: 0-612-97840-0*  
*Our file* *Notre référence*  
*ISBN: 0-612-97840-0*

#### NOTICE:

The author has granted a non-exclusive license allowing Library and Archives Canada to reproduce, publish, archive, preserve, conserve, communicate to the public by telecommunication or on the Internet, loan, distribute and sell theses worldwide, for commercial or non-commercial purposes, in microform, paper, electronic and/or any other formats.

The author retains copyright ownership and moral rights in this thesis. Neither the thesis nor substantial extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's permission.

#### AVIS:

L'auteur a accordé une licence non exclusive permettant à la Bibliothèque et Archives Canada de reproduire, publier, archiver, sauvegarder, conserver, transmettre au public par télécommunication ou par l'Internet, prêter, distribuer et vendre des thèses partout dans le monde, à des fins commerciales ou autres, sur support microforme, papier, électronique et/ou autres formats.

L'auteur conserve la propriété du droit d'auteur et des droits moraux qui protègent cette thèse. Ni la thèse ni des extraits substantiels de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation.

---

In compliance with the Canadian Privacy Act some supporting forms may have been removed from this thesis.

Conformément à la loi canadienne sur la protection de la vie privée, quelques formulaires secondaires ont été enlevés de cette thèse.

While these forms may be included in the document page count, their removal does not represent any loss of content from the thesis.

Bien que ces formulaires aient inclus dans la pagination, il n'y aura aucun contenu manquant.

  
**Canada**

## Abstract

This study examines the life of Constance Maynard (1849-1935), a relatively unknown but influential educational pioneer. Maynard's founding of Westfield College in 1882 is noteworthy because it afforded women new opportunities to gain Bachelor's degrees from the University of London. When Maynard retired from Westfield in 1913, women had entered professional careers like teaching and medicine. This study, based on my reading of Maynard's unpublished Green-book (1866-1935), Diary (1871-1935) and Autobiography (1915-27), together with her published texts, is a descriptive and interpretive biography of her public and private life experiences as an educational pioneer.

Scholars have made recent revelations about how religion influenced women's self-empowerment and social gains. However, little has been written about the impacts of faith and ambition on Victorian women's passion, in general, and in particular, on those who suppressed desire to embrace suffering as evidence of moral purity. This study offers a preliminary analysis of the unique way in which one Victorian woman sought to reconcile faith, passion and ambition. It traces Maynard's conflicts between ambition and religious duty, and between rationalism and religious passion. I am also interested in defining and exploring Maynard's sexuality and in connecting it to her religious belief. In so doing, I hope to offer more insight into Victorian sexuality.

Maynard's life is intriguing because her myriad texts that commonly proffered compelling but contradictory narratives, also revealed her distinct "Atonement" for transgressions in ambition and passion. During an era when science threatened faith, and when ideas about gender and sex were in flux, she struggled to conceptualize her role as a pioneer and her desires as a woman. Raised to renounce "worldliness," her beliefs countered the more popular Evangelicalism of the 1850s that stressed faith as a guide in life as well in the afterlife. Even so, as restrictive as Maynard's upbringing was, I conclude that her faith forged her subversion of gender and sex norms in her pioneering role. Her passion for men and for women became understood as God's gift, and her compulsion to resist worldliness in His name propelled her towards negotiating complex positions of power in both leadership and love.

## Acknowledgments

A number of people at Carleton University have supported my endeavours during the production of this study. Dr. Deborah Gorham encouraged me to pursue my topic, and has been most helpful in guiding me through the final stages of the study. Her support of my work, and prodding me to argue my case more directly, has been invaluable. Dr. Frances Cherry provided useful observations from a psychological perspective, and helped me in publishing my earlier work. Other faculty members took time to encourage my pursuits, but Dr. David Dean deserves mention in shaping my outlook as both a researcher and a teacher. Numerous members of faculty at the University of Windsor have supported my academic interests. Dr. Leslie Howsam supervised my M. A. thesis and continues to be a mentor, colleague and friend. Dr. Christina Simmons has also provided many interesting insights into my area of investigation. My lunches with Dr. Martha Vicinus “across the border” in Ann Arbor were also stimulating, and helped me to clarify my thoughts.

The librarians and archivists who have assisted me are too numerous to mention, but special acknowledgment is given to Anselm Nye at Queen Mary and Westfield College Archives in London, England. He assisted me over a number of years, including introducing me to Dr. Janet Sondheimer who aided in my archival research, and escorted me around the two “original” Westfield College sites in Hampstead, London. I am also indebted to archivist Kate Perry at the Girton College Archives, Cambridge, who directed me towards a number of core biographies by pioneering Girton students. I also thank the

Inter-Library Loans Department of the Leddy Library at the University of Windsor for tracking down microfilms of the unpublished diaries and autobiography of Constance Maynard. Joan White and Regina Aulinskas have been more than accommodating over the years.

Family, colleagues and friends from near and far have never ceased encouraging my pursuits, from my work as a visual artist to my graduate work in history. I wish to thank the many colleagues who “adopted me” during my two-year residency in Ottawa, and the Windsor contingent who faithfully came to visit. My parents were always proud of my academic pursuits, as are my brother Keith and my sister Sheila together with their respective family members. Words cannot express how much I owe to my husband, Alan, for not only his patience and responsibility as chief care-giver while I was at Carleton for two years, but also his unceasing patience, pride and love over our many years together. The academic pursuits of Alan, my son, Greg, and my daughter, Kelly, and their unique and special personal qualities, are in turn the sources of pride for me.

Financial support for this project was provided by the Faculty of Graduate Studies at Carleton University.

## Table of Contents

Abstract .....	ii
Acknowledgments .....	iv
Table of Contents .....	vi
Chapter 1: ' <i>I am seeking great reward from Thee</i> ' .....	1
Chapter 2: ' <i>The outer world</i> ': The Maynard family .....	52
Chapter 3: ' <i>My inner feelings</i> ': What is masochism? .....	102
Chapter 4: ' <i>A Time of Crisis, Restraint and Liberty</i> ' - 1869-1872 .....	153
Chapter 5: ' <i>Caught in the current</i> ': Girton, 1872-1875 .....	186
Chapter 6: ' <i>An Unhappy Marriage</i> ': Leadership, Longing, Lament, 1876-1880 ....	240
Chapter 7: ' <i>Was my friend a man or a woman?</i> ': Ambition versus Passion, 1880 - 1886 .....	293
Chapter 8: ' <i>Eleven years of Gloom</i> ': Amid Success, 1886-1896 .....	348
Chapter 9: ' <i>A glorious new spring of hope and love</i> ', 1896-1913 .....	410
Conclusion: .....	470
Bibliography: .....	503

## Chapter 1

### 'I am seeking great reward from Thee'

The records of Constance Louisa Maynard present an astonishing and in-depth account of one Victorian woman's life experience. In fact, it was Maynard's wish that the story of her life be known. She deliberately preserved her diaries, which were written faithfully from adolescence until her death at eighty-six; and these, alongside her journals, correspondence and various publications, engendered her autobiography, which covers the years from early childhood to the end of 1902. Although the work was left unfinished when she died, she bequeathed it alongside her myriad documents to five close friends, requesting that her life story be completed.<sup>1</sup> Her biography was written by Catherine B. Firth—the youngest of the five—and published in 1949 under the title, *Constance Louisa Maynard, Mistress of Westfield College*.<sup>2</sup>

Why did Maynard feel that her life was of interest? As Firth's text implies, and as Maynard writes at the beginning of her Autobiography, "My life is worth writing because it shews the inception and traces the course of a great national movement, 'the higher

---

<sup>1</sup> Constance Louisa Maynard, copy of Last Will and Testament, Special Collections, Queen Mary and Westfield College Archives, London. As noted in this document: "I bequeath to my friends Frances Ralph Gray, Hilda Mary Smith, Catherine B. Firth, Sarah Harriet Wisdom and Ruby Inglis, all of my Diaries and manuscripts and writings including my notebooks of lectures and letters."

<sup>2</sup> Catherine B. Firth, *Constance Louisa Maynard, Mistress of Westfield College* (London: George Allen and Unwin, 1949).



education of women.”<sup>3</sup> An advocate for this cause, which began in the mid 1800s, she helped to pave the way for middle-class women’s future social, economic and political reforms. Since the one extant biography of Maynard’s life was written over 50 years ago, a re-consideration of this relatively unknown Victorian educational pioneer is timely. Further, her records present a compelling testimony to her life-long conflict between “earthly love and divine love.” Maynard explains this in a poem, which she composed in 1885:

‘I am seeking great reward from Thee,’  
as He should say.  
Yet He claims the cost most fiercely  
stilling all our cries,  
holding out no other gain or prize  
but only, - ‘I am here, come thou to me.’  
Straight as a flame, as growing wheat is straight, -  
yes, Thou art more than the sweetest on earth, Love!  
My choice is made!

“These lines have remained with me,” she concludes. “In all subsequent troubles over love, which were many, they have helped me to reassure myself over and over that the knowledge and love of Christ was better than [any] intimacy...formed on earth.”<sup>4</sup>

Maynard’s life is noteworthy because it affords us a unique insight into how one

---

<sup>3</sup> Constance Louisa Maynard, *Unpublished Autobiography*, Part I, Chapter 1, “Childhood, 1849-1860,” 1, written April 1927 (Toronto, Ont.: University Microfilms, 1985), 1. Hereafter cited as *A*, I, 1, “1849-60,” 1. Maynard divided her autobiography into parts (I-VII) with consecutively-numbered chapters from start to finish. Although this organization makes sense, her page numbering does not, and was often confusing to this researcher. For example, when beginning her section on her life work at Westfield (part VII) she began at page one again. See footnote 4 below.

<sup>4</sup> *A*, VII, 48, “My Life Work, 1885,” 1. She includes the poem in her account of 1885 as a means of explaining her conflict between earthly love and divine love.

Victorian woman “atoned” for her transgressions in both ambition and passion. At a time when norms surrounding gender and sex were in flux, she struggled to understand her role as a pioneer and her desires as a woman. Certainly, her life story could be included in literature on educational reform or women and religion, given her commitment to interconnecting higher learning with religion. However, virtually nothing has been written about the impact of ambition and faith on Victorian female/female eroticism, especially on one who resisted pleasure to embrace suffering as evidence of moral purity. This dissertation offers a beginning analysis of the unique way in which a nineteenth-century believing woman negotiated faith, passion and work. It traces the conflict that Maynard confronted throughout her life between ambition and religious duty, and between rationalism and religious passion. It also defines and explores Maynard’s sexuality and connects it to her religious belief. By so doing, it offers more insights into sexuality in general and Victorian sexuality in particular.

Born in 1849, Constance Maynard was raised in an upper-middle-class family during the prosperous and relatively stable mid-Victorian period. The family’s wealth was largely the result of the onset of industrialization and its accompanying technological development in the 1760s, which, in turn, saw the emergence of the middle classes as distinct from the gentry and working-class.<sup>5</sup> Two generations of Maynard entrepreneurial

---

<sup>5</sup> R. K. Webb’s, *Modern England: From the Eighteenth Century to the Present* (New York: Dodd, Mead, 1968), is a classic overview, giving a general picture of industrial change. A good example of a more recent study is *The Nineteenth Century: The British Isles 1815-1901*, ed., Colin Matthew (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000). Both texts describe how industrialization, beginning in the 1760s, stemmed from improved farming techniques and an efficient credit system—based on import and export trade—which was initiated in the 1750s.

success had enabled Constance's father, Henry, to develop the family business through overseas imperialist ventures. By the time he married her genteel mother, Louisa Hillyard, in 1837, he had made his fortune in South African diamonds. The Maynards raised a large family, Louisa giving birth to Josephine (1839), Harry (1840), Gabrielle (1845), Dora (1846), Constance (1849) and George (1850) over a span of eleven years. In many ways, Maynard's upbringing reflected her class and gender. She lived in a luxurious mansion where governesses were hired on occasion.<sup>6</sup> Her brief secondary education at Belstead, a private boarding school for girls, was also typical. While she was taught the usual "accomplishments" for girls, her brothers received an in-depth Classical education from around ten until eighteen. The boys were trained for the public sphere of work (family business) and the girls were prepared for the private sphere of the home. In 1865, at age sixteen, Constance was removed from Belstead a year early to face a life of domesticity, beginning with her role as daughter-at-home and its accompanying duties such as entertaining family guests and village charity work.<sup>7</sup>

Although Maynard's upbringing reflected her class-based, elitist attitudes, in other ways her early socialization was atypical. Her father's evangelical beliefs led him to adopt a particularly dour view of human nature because of "Adam's sin." Her mother's faith was even more extreme. Of French Huguenot descent, her Puritan-based life principle led

---

<sup>6</sup> Firth, *Maynard*, 21-38.

<sup>7</sup> Mary King, "Reminiscences of the Henry Maynard family, 1837-1875," 1-24, in Maynard, *A*, I, 1. Hereafter cited as King, *Reminiscences*, 1-24. This included accomplishments like sewing and music, alongside some English, French, Scripture, history and a smattering of arithmetic.

her to more actively renounce worldliness. Neither Constance nor her siblings could participate in any activity that “aroused the senses.” Not even romantic fiction was allowed.<sup>8</sup> Barred from the social life that was normal to their class, it was virtually impossible for the Maynard sisters to meet suitable men: only Dora eventually married. Moreover, the Maynards’ moral convictions led them to actively try to suppress their daughters’ budding sexuality. Indeed, because of her parents’ perspective on the conflict between good (spirit) and evil (body) Constance felt compelled to sever the self. At twenty, she wrote of her need to repress the earthly, carnal body, in favour of the rational (divine) body.<sup>9</sup>

Maynard’s upbringing, paradoxically, forged her life as an educational pioneer. Her parents’ values fuelled her need for passion, her ambition to learn beyond her prescribed norms, and her sense of self as visionary. Constance first heard of the women’s college, Girton, when visiting her married cousins, Fanny and Lewis Campbell, in Scotland in 1872.<sup>10</sup> It is notable that higher education for middle and upper-middle-class women had only begun in 1848 with a private venture in London named Bedford College. Girton, the first college affiliated with Cambridge University, had been founded in a similar vein by Emily Davies in 1869 (colleges in Oxford would follow suit in 1879). Cambridge University had not yet formally accepted women. Nor was it granting them

---

<sup>8</sup> See *A*, I, II, “1849-60,” 3-28, 80; King, *Reminiscences*, 32; Firth, *Maynard*, 29-30.

<sup>9</sup> *A*, II, 4, “Adolescence, 1861-62,” 65.

<sup>10</sup> Firth, *Maynard*, 81-86.

Honours degrees although they could sit the official Tripos. In fact women would not be given the title of their degree at Cambridge until 1948. Nonetheless, the fact that Cambridge professors were prepared to teach students at Girton meant that a few privileged women were receiving the highest academic training available to them. Their training would prove crucial in affording them an opportunity to reconsider their roles as women by pursuing professional careers rather than domesticity.<sup>11</sup>

Maynard's infatuation with Lewis Campbell, coupled with her boredom as daughter-at-home, convinced her doubting parents to let her enrol at Girton in October, 1872. At age twenty-three, she became one of the first middle-class women who sought new challenges through higher education. From the outset, she proved both a committed and talented scholar. Her interest in human behaviour—not surprising given her upbringing—steered her towards being the first Girtonian to “try for the Moral Science Tripos,” which included the subjects physics, philosophy, ethics, logic and political economy.<sup>12</sup>

Upon successfully completing her studies in 1875 Maynard strove to pursue a teaching career. Indeed, love and ambition drove her to negotiate her career with her parents for years. The earlier years—fought out school term by school term—were

---

<sup>11</sup> See Rita McWilliams-Tullberg, *Women At Cambridge: A Men's University of a Mixed Type* (London: Victor Gollancz, 1975), 1-5; Barbara Stephen, *Girton College, 1869-1932* (London: Constable, 1927), 1-5. For writings about higher education see, for example, Joan N. Burstyn, *Victorian Education and the Ideal of Womanhood* (London: Croom Helm, 1980); and Martha Vicinus, *Independent Women: Work And Community For Single Women 1850-1920* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1985).

<sup>12</sup> See A, III, 12, “Introduction to ‘higher education,’ 1873-1875,” 230-57; Firth, *Maynard*, 109-35.

testimony to her parents' oddly progressive views and to her own determination and powers of persuasion. Such qualities would stand her in good stead as a pioneer. From 1886-7 she taught with fellow ex-Girtonian, Louisa Lumsden, at the famous Cheltenham Ladies' College, which, founded by Dorothea Beale, was considered the best genteel girls' boarding school at the time. In 1877, she opened St. Leonards school for girls' in St. Andrews in Scotland with Lumsden and another former Girtonian, Frances Dove. St. Leonards became one of the most influential girls' schools in Scotland. Its emphasis on learning and corporate spirit distinguished it from established schools like Belstead, which still focussed on feminine accomplishments. Maynard was part of its formation for three years. Her devotion to Louisa Lumsden and liking of independence led her to refuse marriage to a prominent Scottish minister, Dr. James Robertson, in 1877. She left St. Leonards in 1880 largely because her relationship with Lumsden had fallen apart.<sup>13</sup>

Maynard entered the Slade Art School in 1880 after returning to London. But her interest in art dwindled after she became involved in the founding of a women's college—Westfield—in London. In 1882 she became Westfield's first Mistress, remaining for 31 years until her retirement in 1913. Westfield was unique in that its Mistress and founding Council aimed to send out educated *Christian* women into the growing secularist world. It also stood distinct in that it was founded specifically to prepare women for University of London degrees, which, unlike the situation at Oxford and Cambridge, had been

---

<sup>13</sup> See *Ibid.*, IV, 27, "Cheltenham, 1876," 1-138. For some reason, Maynard begins this section of her Autobiography at page 1 again; see also *Ibid.*, V, 32, "My 3 Years at St. Andrews, 1877-1879," 235-88.

opened to women in 1878.<sup>14</sup> Certainly, London degrees did not have the same social standing as Oxbridge. Begun through secular initiatives by Jeremy Bentham and his followers in 1828, it had been converted into a purely examining body in 1858. Its great development would not occur until the 1900s. Nonetheless, it offered a broader curriculum than that at Oxbridge, giving middle-class men better opportunity to pursue careers like engineering; and it clearly had a more progressive view of women's higher education.<sup>15</sup> When Maynard retired in 1913, she could proudly proclaim of her venture: "Women's higher education has placed a considerable number of the professions within our reach, and doubtless has not as yet attained its full growth."<sup>16</sup> The efforts and trials of the early pioneers like herself had already gained some middle-class women entrance into new careers like medicine and university lecturing, and had also impelled moves towards political reforms like female suffrage.

Maynard's records prove powerful testimony to the struggle facing educational pioneers seeking to free middle-class women from the Victorian definitions of gender. Of most interest to this writer, however, is examining how her goals shaped, and were shaped by, other aspects of her experience. Firth's biography touches upon this. As both

---

<sup>14</sup> This did not to happen elsewhere in Britain until at least a decade later. The Scottish universities, the Royal Irish, Wales, Durham and the new provincial universities or university colleges all awarded their degrees to women by 1895. See McWilliams-Tullberg, *Women At Cambridge*, 101.

<sup>15</sup> See T. W. Heyck, *The Transformation of Intellectual Life in Victorian England* (Chicago: Lyceum Books, 1982), 74-77; also H. Bellot, *University College, London, 1826-1926* (London: Constable, 1929), on the history of University College.

<sup>16</sup> Maynard, "Green-Book," 8 October 1913, 99, (Toronto, Ont.: University Microfilms, 1985), 99. Hereafter cited as *GB*, 8 October 1913, 99; See also *A*, 1, 1, 1.

an academic and former Westfield student, she had first-hand knowledge of Westfield and women's education at large, and she went to great lengths to detail how Maynard's familial upbringing influenced her aims and gave rise to a life-long conflict between faith and scientific values. But her text does not dwell at length on Maynard's public life, and because she was a close friend, Firth did not discuss Maynard's personal relationships either. In this, Firth's text not only avoided addressing a large part of Maynard's emotional life, but neglected to examine it within the contours of her professional life.

Long before embarking upon this project, I was struck by the vibrant, interconnection of ambition and passion in Maynard's life. And I have been even more intrigued by the complex ways in which she negotiated ambition and passion within the context of the powerful religious belief implanted during her childhood. Turning first to ambition, it is perhaps inevitable that Maynard found that merging "the splendid discoveries in science" with her duty to seek "'Truth' in the Bible led [her] into a deep religious crisis" at Girton. As she explained in her Autobiography:

My diaries trace the experience of the young soul brought up on evangelical doctrine; who was satisfied about the good work such doctrine was doing in the world....I was then confronted with the flood of criticism - the battleground between faith and knowledge - knowledge being such things as literary, scientific, historical, ethical, psychological or philosophical.<sup>17</sup>

Her dilemma reflects that unique to Victorians at large. While Charles Darwin's *On the Origin of Species* (1859) particularly led Maynard to doubt, the age itself has been

---

<sup>17</sup> A, I, 1, "1849-60," 2.



described as one of increasing religious doubt.<sup>18</sup> But Firth and other recent studies have suggested that as science threatened to separate faith from knowledge, so religious vitality abounded. The 1840s saw a flurry of church building in response to Bible criticism and to secularist discourse—as seen, for example, in the British Association for the Advancement of Science’s (B. A. A. S.) dedication to the acquisition of supposedly neutral scientific facts.<sup>19</sup>

As Firth also pointed out, while many Victorians reconciled faith with science Constance Maynard could not.<sup>20</sup> During adolescence faith had formulated in her a strong sense of the visionary. Her duty as one of His prophets, she believed, was to lead others to God. This had impelled her to organize a Girton Prayer Meeting (G. P. M.) for peers at Girton in 1874, to instigate a circular “Budget” letter for “Old [Westfield] Students” in 1886, and to initiate a Divinity program at Westfield in 1901 “to evangelize the world.”<sup>21</sup>

---

<sup>18</sup> See Peter Addinall, *Philosophy and Biblical Interpretation* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991), 5-7; John Brooke, *Science and Religion: Some Historical Perspectives* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991), 55-70 and Lance Butler, *Victorian Doubt: Literacy and Cultural Discourses* (London: Harvester, 1990), 60-90.

<sup>19</sup> Firth, *Maynard*, 330. She notes that Victorians did not stop believing or attending church. Also see David Hempton, *Religion and Political Culture in Britain and Ireland* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996); and Robin Gill, *The Myth of the Empty Church* (London: McMillan, 1993). The texts challenge assumptions based upon the 1851 census, arguing that newspapers and church records imply church attendance actually *increased* until 1901.

<sup>20</sup> Firth, *Maynard*, 333. She suggests here that some Victorians declared themselves agnostic while others sought a “faith vaguer than that within the Church’s creeds.”

<sup>21</sup> As she asserts in a pamphlet entitled, *The Cultivation of the Intellect* (London: Westfield College, 1888, first edn. in 1881), 21, “any sort of cultivation carried out apart

Her creative, cross-disciplinary linking of the “antagonistic forces” (Bible and science) in her published texts reflects how Victorians struggled to integrate science with religion.<sup>22</sup>

In some ways, Maynard’s ideals left her a passive participant in the women’s movement and eager to retain the values of femininity within the context of her faith. Yet she also subverted gender, sex and faith in her fight for women’s independence. Her dedication to career, like others in her position, made marriage virtually impossible (Robertson typically had expected her to give up her career and remain at home as his wife). But her adoption of an illegitimate six-year-old named Stephane Rosabianca (Effie), although proving a disastrous decision, reveals how women in her position sought to reconcile motherhood with career when marriage was not an option.<sup>23</sup> Maynard also subverted gender, sex and faith in her relationships with Louisa Lumsden, and with Westfield students Margaret Graham Brooke and Marion Wakefield and staff member, Frances Ralph Gray. During an era when passion between women was a part of culture,

---

from religion is dangerous since it is a strong and versatile power.” Her shilling books evoke her merging theology with secular subjects she had taken at Girton like ethics, logic, history and philosophy.

<sup>22</sup> *GB*, 8 August 1905, 50. She was never truly settled on the matter, however. As she writes in 1905: “I have persisted in making Christ my whole life, to leave out no action or thought from Him... Yet each such gain seems almost impossible. Lately I think I am beginning to see the thought and value of secular things, if they are touched by God. But do I doubt, even now?”

<sup>23</sup> See Maynard, *Life of Stephane: 1888-1915*, vols. I-VI, Special Collections, Queen Mary and Westfield College Archives, London, for an in-depth account of Effie. Hereafter cited as *Stephane*. See also Firth, *Maynard*, 211-43; and Pamela J. Walker, *Pulling the Devil’s Kingdom Down: The Salvation Army in Victorian Britain* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2001), 149-63, on this mother and daughter relationship.

and considered compatible with heterosexual marriage,<sup>24</sup> the reference of Maynard and others to husband/wife role playing at college evokes how some women modified norms within a milieu in which conventional masculine and feminine roles no longer applied.

Historians generally concede that changes in sexual mores influenced close relationships between women. By the late 1800s new understandings of sex within the context of “normal” heterosexuality (within marriage) meant that all other forms of sexual behaviour like homosexuality were deemed “degenerate.” As a result, ideas surrounding romantic friendship began to modify in the early 1900s.<sup>25</sup> There is no current consensus amongst scholars on how sexual norms affected Victorian women’s sense of self, or, in fact, about the overarching depictions of romantic friendship itself. Historians like Martha Vicinus and Lisa Moore, for example, have recently argued against the innocence of romantic friendship as depicted by Carroll Smith-Rosenberg’s groundbreaking study.<sup>26</sup>

Constance Maynard’s records suggest that she carved for herself a distinct sexual

---

<sup>24</sup> See Carroll Smith-Rosenberg’s groundbreaking study on this, “The Female World of Love and Ritual: Relations between Women in Nineteenth Century America” *Signs* 1 (1975), 1-29.

<sup>25</sup> See, for example, Lucy Bland and Laura Doan, eds., *Sexology in Culture: Labelling Bodies and Desires* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1998); Kim M. Philips and Barry Reay eds., *Sexualities in History*, (London: Routledge, 2002), and Jonathon Ned Katz’s *The Invention of Heterosexuality*. Foreword by Gore Vidal and afterword by Lisa Duggan (New York: Plume Publishing, 1996). This will be discussed in more detail later in this chapter.

<sup>26</sup> See Vicinus, ““They Wonder To Which Sex I Belong:” The Historical Roots of the Modern Lesbian Identity” *Feminist Studies* 18 (1992), 467-99; Lisa Moore, ““Something More Tender Still Than Friendship:” Romantic Friendship in Early-Nineteenth-Century England” *Feminist Studies* 18 (1992), 499-521; and Smith-Rosenberg, “Female World.” The ongoing debate between these and other scholars will be discussed in more detail later in this chapter.

self-consciousness as an educational pioneer. As she writes of “love” in a Green-book entry in 1905:

I know what love can be in how it gives without counting, how it invents things to do, how it waits for a glance, how it never forgets the time, how it speeds away to get a last Goodnight kiss, how it has ever one more word to write,...how it irradiates everything til the very puddles shine...<sup>27</sup>

and of the nature of her love for college women:

My relationship with Margaret is beyond college. Last night she came after I had put out the lights and in an instant more I had my arms around her, my love, my darling. ‘I *didn’t* mean to come,’ she said, ‘but oh, I couldn’t, *couldn’t* bear it just this once....’ She says I am the greatest treasure that God could have possibly given her. Do I not return it? Her presence brings a strong fascination that *is* partly physical, and draws my love with a force almost painful. Yet she seems unsullied when she is asleep in my arms; as peaceful as a little child, yes, an incarnation of intensity, sweetness and purity.<sup>28</sup>

Powerful words indeed for a woman who had chosen career over love and marriage. Yet the above quote, which echoes many Green-book entries in the late 1800s, suggests an erotic component in Maynard’s relationships with women.<sup>29</sup> This does not mean to imply that Maynard viewed her behaviour as “lesbian.” Indeed, the term was not adopted until the 1920s. What the quote does strongly suggest, however, is Maynard’s justification of her passion within the context of faith.

The idea of physical desire as God-given was formulated during Maynard’s young

---

<sup>27</sup> GB, 8 August 1905, 50; also transcribed in A, VII, 49, “4<sup>th</sup> College Session, 1885,” 345.

<sup>28</sup> GB, 17 December 1883, 69.

<sup>29</sup> See, for example GB, 6 January 1902, 99; GB, 21 March 1904, 109; GB, 8 June 1905, 62; GB, 8 May 1907, 107.

womanhood when she found herself strongly attracted to Lewis Campbell (1872), who, as noted earlier, was married to her cousin, Fanny. From Campbell to Louisa Lumsden to Margaret Brooke, Ralph Gray and Marion Wakefield, faith was to become the sphere in which Maynard reconciled passion and ambition. Maynard's interconnection of faith, passion and ambition was, of course, inevitably accompanied by power struggles. As this study will show, her suffering under Campbell's and Lumsden's manipulations during the 1870s led her to re-enact similar measures of control when she was in a position of power as an educator—particularly at Westfield (1882-1913). Just as Campbell and Lumsden had toyed with Maynard's emotions and had tried to control her, so she would play upon Brooke's, Wakefield's and Gray's vulnerability as younger women who were infatuated with their older and purportedly wiser Mistress. Maynard's adopted daughter, Effie, would also suffer under Maynard's controlling ways.<sup>30</sup>

Faith was also the sphere in which Maynard tried to resist her need for passion and ambition. This became an equally large part of her experience as an educational pioneer, creating nuanced tensions and power struggles at work and in each of her relationships. Her upbringing created this conflict, as we have seen. Yet through her attempts to resist worldliness she could also find some justification for her failings in leadership and in love. This also condoned her sexual and emotional abuse of young women through enforced activities like fasting in order to “cleanse” their physical passion.<sup>31</sup>

---

<sup>30</sup> See, for example *GB*, 6 January 1883, 99; *GB*, 21 March 1886, 109; *GB*, 8 June 1901, 62; *GB*, 8 May 1904, 107.

<sup>31</sup> This was particularly apparent in her relationship with Wakefield. See *Ibid.*, 28 June 1902, 162; *GB*, 6 April 1903, 207; and *GB*, 21 February 1905, 14.

Through the religious narrative, Maynard struggled to negotiate her role as a pioneer and her passion as a woman during an era when ideas of gender and sex were undergoing rapid change. This, I am proposing, sets her behaviour apart from other contemporaries of her time. A single case history can hardly speak for the widely differing ways in which nineteenth-century believing women reconciled religion and their desires and ambition. Nonetheless, through Maynard's experience we can gain some new understandings of Victorian sexuality.

.....

The mass of the Maynard archives—two parallel diaries, autobiography, journals, public and private correspondence, and various published and unpublished books, “shilling books,” verses, papers, essays and pamphlets—are all housed at Queen Mary and Westfield College Archives in London.<sup>32</sup> The diaries, named by Maynard as her “Green-book” and “Diary,” have proved the most valuable sources for this study. She began her Green-book on January 1<sup>st</sup>, 1866, at age seventeen, largely as a means of documenting her progress as a Christian. But by the early 1870s she was referring to it as her “Friend”; and it became an outlet for her outpourings about love, usually analysed within the context of faith. “It is a record of everything that touched the inner life of my heart and soul,” she

---

<sup>32</sup> Since completing my research in London, Queen Mary and Westfield College has subsequently been renamed Queen Mary College, University of London. While Queen Mary's website acknowledges roots stemming from Westfield College (alongside two London medical colleges), all history of Westfield's early years has been lost in this “merging” and renaming. But perhaps Maynard would appreciate the fact that over 9,000 male and female students now attend Queen Mary; and she would likely feel proud of its firm attachment to the University of London. Another copy of Maynard's diaries on microfilm can be found at Wayne State University in Detroit, Michigan.

writes in her Autobiography (1915), "I kept it strictly private."<sup>33</sup> Interestingly, as her Green-book was evolving into her Friend, she started a parallel daily Diary on January 8<sup>th</sup>, 1871,<sup>34</sup> in which she meticulously recorded her many social and educational events, usually without comment. Although the Diary is factual rather than reflective, when compared with her Green-book, it does provide good insight into her all-round experience, and it hints at her feelings about her public and private issues. Row upon row, these small green and/or black leather-bound memoirs—the earlier written in pencil, the later in ink—span a period of 45 years. Separated yet adjoining, contradictory yet affirming, they symbolize the multi-faceted nuances of her public and private faces; and they prove an evocative depiction of the ways in which she both separated and negotiated public requirements and private wishes.

Following the diaries come the personal letters and essays which tell all about their author. Although Maynard destroyed hundreds of letters upon retiring from Westfield, many from her mother and siblings remain, ranging from descriptions of holidays and family visits to discussion of individuals such as Dr. Robertson. Texts like, *A True Mother* (1916), and essays like, "From Early Victorian Schoolroom to University" (1914), imply her early socialization and how she sought change for women.<sup>35</sup> The

---

<sup>33</sup> A, I, 1, "1849-60," 2.

<sup>34</sup> Maynard, Diary, 8 January 1871, (Toronto, Ont.: University Microfilms, 1985), 1. Hereafter cited as *D*, 8 January 1871, 1.

<sup>35</sup> Maynard, "From Early Victorian Schoolroom to University: Some Personal Experiences," *Nineteenth Century* 76 (1914), 160-73; Maynard, *A True Mother* (London: Marshall Bros., 1916).

circular Budget letters or “Ring” (1887-1899) augment this, conveying her support of her “Old Students” careers and her thoughts on topical issues like imperialism, socialism and suffrage. Clear, also, is her hope that the Ring would provide a communal spiritual network and encourage the spreading of His word.<sup>36</sup> As she asserts in her pamphlet, *The Cultivation of the Intellect* (1888), “any sort of cultivation carried out apart from religion is dangerous since it is a strong and versatile power.”<sup>37</sup> Her shilling books, like *The Threefold Revelation* (1913), *Then Shall We Know* (1913) and *The Prophet Daniel* (1914), evoke her creative attempts to achieve this through merging theology with the secular subjects she had taken at Girton. She was particularly keen to incorporate evolutionary theory with Biblical creation in order to prove God’s existence.<sup>38</sup>

The *Girton Review* and autobiographies by Louisa Lumsden and other ex-Girtonians—all located in the Girton College archives—help substantiate the unique experience of early pioneers like Maynard. As Georgina Buckler explained: “If I had to state the greatest gain of my life at Girton I would say Emancipation, the discarding of prejudices, the learning to work independently, and the realization to a slight degree of what was meant by Cosmopolitanism.”<sup>39</sup> The *Girton College Register 1869-1946* lists the

---

<sup>36</sup> Maynard, Budget Letters, 1887-1899, Special Collections, Queen Mary and Westfield College Archives, London. Hereafter cited as *Ring*, 1887.

<sup>37</sup> Maynard, *Cultivation of Intellect*, 32.

<sup>38</sup> Maynard, *Then Shall We Know* (London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge); *The Prophet Daniel & Other Essays* (London: Morgan and Scott, 1914); *The Threefold Revelation* (London: Religious Tract Society, 1913).

<sup>39</sup> See Georgina Buckler, *Diaries of Georgina Buckler 1889-91* (London: Blackwood, 1927); Louisa Lumsden, *Yellow Leaves: Memories of a Long Life* (London:



achievements of the pioneering graduates, evoking their success as educators across the country, alongside a number who participated in political movements like suffrage.<sup>40</sup> Turning to Queen Mary and Westfield College archives, the *Westfield College Alumnae, Reminiscences and Memorabilia*, the *Westfield College Register*, and the *Minutes of Council*, are similarly useful in conveying student experience at Westfield, and listing their successes as educators, missionaries and social and political reformers. While these records reflect the rules and customs of Girton, due to Maynard's years there, her religious values are also evident.<sup>41</sup> When comparing Maynard's diaries with the Council Minutes, one gets a particularly good insight into the individual struggles early pioneers faced. While both records convey the blatant, sexist disrespect with which the Council treated Maynard over the years, they also evince Maynard's attempts to subvert their "patriarchal" control. In this, her character, early socialization and college training stood her in good stead, giving her the confidence to weather storms and fight for her beliefs.

Maynard's hand-written unpublished Autobiography is of less value. Written

---

Blackwood, 1933); also Anna Lloyd, *A Memoir: With Extracts from her Letters* (London: The Cayme Press, 1928); Emily Townsend, *Memories for Friends* (London: Curwen Press 1936); *The Girton Review*. Special Collections, Girton College Archives, Cambridge. Hereafter cited as *Girton Review*.

<sup>40</sup> *Girton College Register, 1869-1946*. Special Collections, Girton College Archives, Cambridge. Hereafter cited as *Girton Register*.

<sup>41</sup> See *Westfield College Alumnae, Reminiscences and Memorabilia*. Special Collections, Queen Mary and Westfield College Archives, London. Hereafter cited as *Westfield Alumnae*; also, *Westfield College Register*. Special Collections, Queen Mary and Westfield College Archives, London. Hereafter cited as *Westfield Register*; and *Minutes of Council*. Special Collections, Queen Mary and Westfield College Archives, London. Hereafter cited as *Minutes*.

between 1915-1927, the text suffers under her selection and modification of her diaries; and she tends to analyse her past life within the context of contemporary discourses as opposed to nineteenth-century values. The work also inevitably lapses into circuitousness as she attempted to prioritize from her voluminous records—for example she kept separate, lengthy journals for travels or for sermons, and on individuals like her adopted daughter Effie. Nonetheless, the text, beginning with her transcribing of parts of her cousin, Mary King's biography, entitled, "*Reminiscences of the Henry Maynard Family, 1837-1901*", gives a crucial depiction of her early life since no diaries exist.<sup>42</sup> However meandering, biassed and at times deliberately oblique, the work is the fruit of reflection on the diaries. It evinces her two main, ongoing themes: how her upbringing shaped her emotional and intellectual life, and how her early experiences affected her life as an advocate for women's higher education.

.....

Collectively, the historical work dealing with Victorian middle and upper-middle-class culture has identified and examined several important class-based assumptions of femininity that were negotiated, disputed and subject to change during the mid-to-late nineteenth century. When examining literature on Victorian middle and upper-middle-class women and religion, a number of groundbreaking works have pointed out how religion became a powerful force for women's social gains. However, as mentioned above, little has been written on the impact of faith on their erotic lives. The following

---

<sup>42</sup> King, *Reminiscences*. King was Maynard's cousin on her father's side.

discussion illuminates the need for exploration of this fascinating aspect of Victorian women's experience in order to broaden understandings on how women sought to mediate the eclectic and changing cultural climate of the mid-to-late 1800s.

The literature on family life suggests that forging women's higher education was no small feat, given Maynard's gender-distinct cultural milieu. In *Family Fortunes* (1987), Leonore Davidoff and Catherine Hall argue how an evangelical stimulus, dating back to British anxiety over French Revolutionary events, gained momentum after the 1820s—most obviously exemplified by evangelicals, intellectual circles and groups like the utilitarians. As this study argues, "Respectability," which included morality, rationality and frugality, was key to the Maynards, and Evangelicalism seemed to play the largest part in disseminating this ideal. Faith encouraged the middle classes to move beyond gentry idleness and worker degeneracy.<sup>43</sup> But while the early domestic idyll of manhood "came dangerously close to embracing feminine qualities," from the outset, as Davidoff and Hall, and earlier works like Deborah Gorham's, *The Victorian Girl and the Feminine Ideal* (1882) reveal, a parallel, contradictory ideology of "separate spheres" was evident. Indeed, Maynard's records confirm that prescriptive literature delegated women to the "private sphere" of the home, advising them to emulate evangelically-based feminine ideals like gentleness, piety and obedience. In contrast, men were advised to be assertive

---

<sup>43</sup> Leonore Davidoff and Catherine Hall, *Family Fortunes: Men and Women of the English Middle Class 1780-1850* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1991), 107-49. An example of a comprehensive guide is Lawrence Stone's *The Family, Sex and Marriage in England: 1500-1800* (London: Weidenfeld and Nicholson, 1977), and Anthony Fletcher, *Gender, Sex and Subordination in England, 1500-1800* (London: Routledge, 1995).

in the “public sphere” and authoritative at home. Thus, while gender roles were interconnected, industrialization created a new value attached to men working for money. This emphasized gender and class differences, leaving women from the middle-classes socially, economically, and politically dependent upon men. These pioneering studies have been important in pinpointing the family as an historically formed, relational whole, and acknowledging gender and class as important categories of analysis.<sup>44</sup>

Recent studies have built upon these works, conveying how ideals of respectability interconnected with discourses like imperialism, laissez-faire and social purity, and with theories like Malthusianism and Darwinism; all of which coloured perspectives on class, gender and race, as Maynard’s diaries convey.<sup>45</sup> As Elizabeth Langland asserts in *Nobody’s Angels* (1995), “class and gender were representations, inscribed on the body through values to the extent that Victorian women produced and reproduced these representations.”<sup>46</sup> John Tosh has moved the debate beyond linking the

---

<sup>44</sup> Davidoff and Hall, *Family Fortunes*, 357-97; Deborah Gorham, *The Victorian Girl and the Feminine Ideal* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1983), 1-37, 125-87. See also Kate Millett’s “The Debate Over Women: Ruskin vs. Mill” in *Suffer and Be Still: Women in the Victorian Age*, ed., Martha Vicinus (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1972), 121-39; Joan Kelly-Gadol’s classic essay, “The Social Relation of the Sexes, *Signs* 4 (1976); and the classical collection, Bernice A. Carroll, ed., *Liberating Women’s History: Theoretical and Critical Essays* (New York: The Free Press, 1976), which have been instrumental in forging gender as a category of historical analysis.

<sup>45</sup> See, for example, *D*, 10 November 1872, 66; *D*, 8 May 1901, 99; and *D*, 12 October 1915, 43.

<sup>46</sup> Elizabeth Langland, *Nobody’s Angels: Middle-Class Women and Domestic Ideology in Victorian Culture* (New York: Cornell University Press, 1995), 61; also Yaffa Clare Draznin, *Victorian London’s Middle-Class Housewife: What She Did All Day* (Connecticut: Greenwood Press, 2001); Joan Perkin, *Victorian Women* (London: John Murray, 1993); Una A. Robertson, *The Illustrated History of the Housewife, 1650-1950*

cult of domesticity with femininity. His *A Man's Place* (1999) argues that it was also central to mid-Victorian notions of middle-class masculinity; that Victorians articulated an ideal of home life against which men's conduct was, and, still is, measured.<sup>47</sup> Key, however, is that all narratives served to justify class, race and sex/gender hierarchical norms.

The influence of separate sphere ideals has recently been elaborated by Peter Stearns, who is among a number of scholars arguing that behavioural standards shape emotions, and that "emotional culture" (in America at least) was particularly unique in its gender-distinction between 1840-1920. Fiction and advice manuals, like Lydia Sigourney's "Advice to Girls," cautioned against "unfeminine" displays of anger since girls were destined for domesticity and must learn to control their tempers. Conversely, boys' stories such as *Rollo at Play* (1860) and studies like G. Stanley Hall's "A Study of Anger" (1899) indicated to Stearns that men were expected to channel anger into the public sphere as it led to "achievements and performance of a high level."<sup>48</sup> Stearns suggests that the shifting of the expertise from moral authority to science, coupled with

---

(New York: St. Martins Press, 1997); Michael Mason, *The Making of Victorian Attitudes* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1994).

<sup>47</sup> John Tosh, *A Man's Place: Masculinity and the Middle-Class Home in Victorian England* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1999), 27-53.

<sup>48</sup> Peter Stearns, "Girls, Boys, and Emotions: Redefinitions and Historical Change," *Journal of American History* (1993), 43-45. Rollo was the hero of a Victorian-era series of boys' books by Jacob Abbott. See also Rom Harre's "Emotion and Social Change," *American Journal of Sociology* 95 (1991), 807-91; and Theodore Zeldin's "Personal History And The History Of Emotions," *Journal of Social History* 15 (1982), 341-47, who are among a number of scholars writing about the cultural influences on emotions.

women's entrance into the work force, helped to modify behavioural norms by the late 1800s. Anger was particularly perceived as negative behaviour for both genders by the 1920s.<sup>49</sup>

Although little has been written about British emotional standards (even though the literature on the family suggests gendered behavioural norms), it is not my intention to write about emotional culture in Victorian Britain based on the social behaviours of only one individual. Nonetheless, studies of the history of emotions may enlighten us about the social experiences of individuals during a transformation such as industrialization. My earlier analysis of the writing of novelist and journalist, Eliza Lynn Linton (1822-1898), suggests that anger was more acceptable behaviour for men than for women. In fact Linton appears to have suffered from low self-esteem throughout her life because she felt ostracized by her family due to her "boiling rage." The first woman journalist to draw a salary, in the 1840s she denigrated "mannish" women who rejected gendered ideals, while effusing about the "womanly woman" that she longed to become.<sup>50</sup> According to Catherine Firth's and Mary King's biographies, and Maynard's Diary, the Maynards adopted gender specific ideals. While Maynard voiced irritation over her "obedient"

---

<sup>49</sup> Stearns, "Girls, Boys, and Emotions," 54-59; Davidoff and Hall, *Family Fortunes*, 431-33.

<sup>50</sup> Pauline Phipps, "Social Construction and Essentialism in Victorian Emotional Culture: A Case Study of Eliza Lynn Linton and Beatrice Webb," M. A. Thesis, University of Windsor, 1997, 28-49; Linton's male persona in her autobiographical novel, *The Autobiography of Christopher Kirkland*, 3 vols. (London: Garland Publishing, 1885), enabled her to project her dilemma. The text at first condemned "Christopher's" anger, but then applauded it when he channeled it into his career as a writer.

stance as a Victorian girl and woman, when writing in 1925,<sup>51</sup> similarly to Linton, she negotiated between “feminine” and “masculine” ideals in her transgression of gender norms as an educational pioneer. Maynard’s determination and self-assertion, I suggest, were channelled into “achievement and performance of a high level” in the public sphere as much as Linton’s was.<sup>52</sup>

New understandings about the “widening scope of shame” challenges notions of emotions as “a unitary phenomenon.” Cultural psychologists, Susan Miller, Jack Katz and Leon Wurmster, argue that shame can include a constellation of emotions like guilt, desire and anger. Anger, for example, “can emerge as a defence mechanism aimed at obviating exposure and the consequential emotion of shame.”<sup>53</sup> These important observations help to explain the complex struggles of individuals like Maynard. She not only faced new situations as a woman, but also struggled to reconcile her austere religious beliefs with her cultural transgressions. As Katz explains it, “what is shameful is not so much the violation of religious (and I include cultural) boundaries, but the loss of control, that is, the vulnerability of reason to either sexual urges or social pressures.”<sup>54</sup> This issue will be taken up in chapter three.

---

<sup>51</sup> See *D*, 6 June 1871, 56; *D*, 10 February 1876, 74; *D*, 15 March 1879, 66; also *A*, II, 4, “1865-66, 65; Firth, *Maynard*, 17; King, *Reminiscences*, 34.

<sup>52</sup> As quoted in Stearns, “Girls, Boys, and Emotions,” 44, on definitions of masculinity.

<sup>53</sup> See Melvin R. Lansky and Andrew P. Morrison, eds., *The Widening Scope of Shame* (Hillsdale: The Analytic Press, 1997), xiv; also Susan B. Miller, *Shame in Context* (Hillsdale: The Analytic Press, 1996), 6-8.

<sup>54</sup> Jack Katz, *Seductions of Crime* (New York: Basic Books, 1988), 99.

The above of course brings to light the problems of presenting monolithic, generic conceptions of past experience, and raises the question, to what extent did behavioural prescripts actually reflect social practice? Recent post-modernist approaches to women's history have challenged separate spheres as an analytical framework for explaining past experience, arguing that few middle-class women mindlessly embraced the doctrine. Jeanne Peterson suggests that the discourses surrounding the "Angel-in-the-House" drew more support from lower-middle class women who aspired to be gentlewomen; and that genteel women negotiated norms by gaining *some* education and economic freedom. Langland similarly suggests that genteel women's management of household funds and servants enabled their emergence into professional life.<sup>55</sup> Janet Howarth points out that while magazines like *Household Words* (1850-59) were suffused with the ethos of domesticity, and manuals like Sarah Stickney Ellis' *The Mothers of England* (1843) advised women to submit to patriarchy, this could suggest that women were not submitting.<sup>56</sup>

---

<sup>55</sup> Jeanne M. Peterson, "No Angels in the House: The Victorian Myth and the Paget Women," *American Historical Review*, 89 (1984), 677-708. Langland, *Nobody's Angels*, 12-21. In *Middle-Class Housewife*, 186-87, Draznin suggests that middle-class women's support of technological development in the home sped up the process of modernization

<sup>56</sup> Janet Howarth, "Gender, domesticity, and sexual politics," in *The Nineteenth Century: The British Isles 1815-1901*, ed., Colin Matthew (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000), 174. This is implied in chapter 3 of *The Women of England: Their Social Duties and Domestic Habits* (New York: J. and H. Langley, 1843). Ellis states: "It is the privilege of the married woman to be able to show, by the most delicate attentions, how much she feels her husband's superiority to herself, not by mere personal services...but by a respectful deference to his opinion, and willingly imposed silence when he speaks. Even 'a highly gifted woman' must not exhibit the least disposition to presume such gifts for fear of raising her husband's jealousy of her importance."



The home, Tosh argues in *A Man's Place*, was, in theory, the milieu in which the masculine and feminine complemented each other. But his seven case studies attested that this could range from a rigid assertion of patriarchal control, to the husband's acceptance of his wife's preeminence in the home.<sup>57</sup> In a similar vein, James Hammerton suggests the home as site of contestation. His "Victorian Marriage and the Law of Matrimonial Cruelty" (1990) proposes that women's "negotiations" for more companionate modes of marriage at home forged evolutionary changes to the law of matrimonial cruelty.<sup>58</sup> According to Tosh, by the late-Victorian period some middle-class men were revolting against the feminization of the home. His study of the Bensons in *Manful Assertions* (1991) suggests that tensions between Mary and Edward led to their sons "flight from domesticity" due to the sharp split in gendered norms.<sup>59</sup> Vicinus has lately expanded upon Tosh's observations in "The Gift of Love': Nineteenth-Century Religion and Lesbian Passion" (2001). She proposes that the Bensons' marriage, while never happy, improved

---

<sup>57</sup> Tosh, *A Man's Place*, 53-123.

<sup>58</sup> James Hammerton, "Victorian Marriage and the Law of Matrimonial Cruelty," *Victorian Studies*, (1990), 247-261. Records suggest that from 1780-1850 there was an emphasis on bodily harm. Judges advised wives' subservience as long as her husband did not denigrate domestic norms. But women's fight for a reconsideration of bodily harm—due to disrespect of women's domestic role—was grounds for matrimonial cruelty after the 1850s. Thus, while the law indicated changing norms, the records implied that new attitudes towards marital relations pre-dated legal changes. See also his *Cruelty and Companionship: Conflict in Nineteenth-Century Married Life* (London: Routledge, 1992).

<sup>59</sup> See Tosh, "Domesticity and Manliness in the Victorian Middle-Class" in *Manful Assertions*, eds., Michael Roper and John Tosh (London: Routledge, 1990), 44-73. The sons sought alternative outlets to domesticity in homoerotic settings.

with Mary's clarification of *her* own emotional needs through homoerotic relationships.<sup>60</sup>

These case studies reveal the layers of complexity and contradictions that faced both men and women in differing ways, and the part that behavioural expectations played in forging change.

Historians like Vicinus, Gorham and Kathleen McCrone have argued strongly that the efforts of educational pioneers like Emily Davies and Constance Maynard brought the most direct change to middle-class women, however, by preparing them for new social, economical and political rights.<sup>61</sup> As they also point out, and as Maynard's records indicate, neither pioneers, nor society in general, could escape behaviour stereotyping and expectations. The position adopted in this dissertation is that while the social impact of the separate spheres doctrine is not easily traced, it was very widely diffused. Indeed, visual and text-based work on contemporary culture asserts that it still is.<sup>62</sup> In the 1800s,

---

<sup>60</sup> Vicinus argued that Mary's relationships indicate how female/female passion could contribute to the stability of an increasingly unstable institution, patriarchal marriage. See "'The Gift of Love': Nineteenth-Century Religion and Lesbian Passion" *Nineteenth-Century Contexts* 23 (2001), 242-57.

<sup>61</sup> Janet Sondheimer, *Castle Adamant In Hampstead: A History of Westfield College 1882-1982* (London: Westfield College Publication, 1983), 7-41; Gorham, *Victorian Girl*, 151-64; Vicinus, *Independent Women*, 121-211; McCrone, "Emancipation or Recreation? The Development of Women's Sport at the University of London," *International Journal of the History of Sport* 7(1990), 203-27.

<sup>62</sup> A contemporary example of the power of the doctrine is Julie Sando's photographic work, *Separate Spheres*, Art Gallery of Windsor, 2001. The work suggests the tenacity of the myths and cliches surrounding women's experience. This, Sando argues, perpetuates the conflict contemporary women feel between domestic and public roles. See my accompanying text, Phipps, Pauline. "'The Angel-in-the-House': Victorian Myth or Millennium Reality?" *Art Gallery of Windsor* (2001), 1-16, which explains this work and places it in historical context.

as now, meanings were fervently debated, which, by creating multiple and contradictory inscribed values, left open unstable boundaries that slowly shifted.<sup>63</sup>

From the mid-1800s, early educational pioneers like Emily Davies, Frances Power Cobbe, Sara Burstall and Constance Maynard wrote about the movement towards women's higher education, which shall be discussed in more detail in chapter two. They pointed out how the cause gained momentum in the 1860s largely through their own and others' efforts. Davies, for example, founded Girton College in 1869 in the hope that degree examinations would eventually be opened to women alongside men. Lady Margaret and Somerville were established in Oxford in 1879 for similar reasons. Although degrees were not granted to women at Cambridge until 1948, while Oxford fared better with degrees being granted to women in 1921, higher education afforded some women an alternative to domesticity through careers after the 1870s.<sup>64</sup>

Writings about Victorian educational reform in the 1970s, like literature on the family, sought to insert gender and class as a category of analysis. For example, Rita

---

<sup>63</sup> Most historians cited above have this outlook. See Amanda Vickery's "Golden Age to Separate Spheres? A Review of the Categories and Chronologies of English Women's History," *Historical Journal* 36 (1993), 383-414, for an interesting debate. Although she challenges what she sees as too narrow a model of femininity in Davidoff's and Hall's *Family Fortunes*, she does not dismiss the prevalence of the spheres doctrine in Victorian society.

<sup>64</sup> See Maynard, "Early Victorian Schoolroom;" Emily Davies, *Thoughts on Some Questions Relating to Women, 1860-1908* (Cambridge: Bowes and Bowes, 1910, reprint, New York: Kraus, 1971); Sara Burstall, *English High Schools for Girls* (London: Longmans, 1907) and *Retrospect and Prospect: Sixty Years of Women's Education* (London: Longmans Green, 1933), Frances Power Cobbe, *The Duties of Women: A Course of Lectures* (Boston: George Ellis, 1882). Also see Lilian M. Faithfull's *How Shall I Educate My Daughters?* (London: Victoria Press, 1863) and J.G. Fitch, "Women and the Universities," *The Contemporary Review* (1890), 220-45.

McWilliams-Tullberg's study, *Women At Cambridge* (1975), was written as a corrective to former androcentric texts, which had largely ignored women's establishments at Cambridge. She moved beyond women's detailed accounts of Girton's history in the 1930s by highlighting the controversy over women's rights to degrees alongside men.<sup>65</sup>

Maynard politely explains this in an interview for the *Daily Mirror* in 1933:

After many years of struggle and perplexity, Girton College opened its doors in October, 1869, through the indomitable courage of a small group of women. It must be remembered that the high schools had not yet begun their victorious career, that private schools were for the most part hostile to the idea of a further education for women, and students had to be collected, as it were, one by one. Degrees were in those days not granted to women, but we were examined by the kindness of the individual professors appointed for that work.<sup>66</sup>

Nonetheless, Maynard viewed her Girton days under Davies' tutelage as "being afloat a stream that had a real destination."<sup>67</sup> As Gorham, Joan Burstyn and others argue,

---

<sup>65</sup> See McWilliams-Tullberg, *Women At Cambridge*, 1975, 14; she criticized male-centered texts like D. A. Stanley, *Late Victorian Cambridge* (London: Constable, 1969); and she expanded upon earlier accounts like M., E. T. *An Interior of Girton College, Cambridge* (London: London Association of Schoolmistresses, 1876); Stephen's *Girton College* and B. Megson and J. Lindsay's *Girton College 1869-1959 An Informal History* (London: Heffers, 1960), by asserting that "the women's educational movement could be seen as rehearsals for the later contest...women faced in their campaign for the vote," see, 14. Another example of a more "feminist-based" text is V. Glendinning's *A Suppressed Cry* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1969).

<sup>66</sup> As published in *Daily Mirror* (London) 16 May 1933, under the title, "A Woman Waited 53 Years for Her M. A." Special Collections, Queen Mary and Westfield College Archives, London.

<sup>67</sup> Maynard, "Girton's Earliest Years," in *Between College Terms* (London: James Nisbet, 1910), 182-83.

opportunity depended upon social status, circumstance and individual temperament.<sup>68</sup>

Gorham's eleven case studies in *Victorian Girl*—which includes Constance Maynard as a subject of analysis—point to the differences between the educational opportunities available to early and mid-Victorians. Maynard, Gorham explains, had access to higher education through an institution, Girton, and could thus pursue a career that had a collective organization.<sup>69</sup> But as Gorham warns, while women's colleges gained women a milieu which applauded their intellectual merits, they were not so much founded to create a learned community apart from men, but because of the exclusionary policies of men's colleges. From ambitious programs of self-improvement in the home, to women's colleges, prescribed gender roles still played a part in determining views on women's education; and they persisted until the end of the century despite the fact that over 240,000 women were in "professional occupations" after having received a secondary education which was now more equal to that of men.<sup>70</sup>

Vicinus's development of the idea of women's community in "One Life to stand Beside Me': Emotional Conflicts in First-Generation College Women in England" (1982),

---

<sup>68</sup> Gorham, *Victorian Girl*, 153-79; McWilliams-Tullberg, *Women At Cambridge*; Burstyn *Victorian Education*; Carol Dyhouse, *Girls Growing Up in Victorian and Edwardian England* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1981); Felicity Hunt, ed., *Lessons for Life: The Schooling of Girls and Women, 1850-1950* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1987).

<sup>69</sup> Gorham, *Victorian Girl*, 179.

<sup>70</sup> Gorham, *Vera Brittain: A Feminist Life* (Cambridge: Blackwell Publisher, 1996), 72. See also Vicinus, *Independent Women*; Jeanne M. Peterson, *Family, Love and Work in the Lives of Victorian Gentlewomen* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1989); and David Rubenstein, *Before the Suffragettes: Women's Emancipation in the 1890s* (Brighton: Association University Press, 1986).

and in *Independent Women* (1985), touches upon this. She argues that while college women's self-(re)definitions were mediated within a nuclear family-like context, college communities enabled them to develop leadership skills, form friendship networks, and forge a power base for public work. Vicinus' central focus is examining how the social significance of institutions like Girton and Westfield affected the emotional lives of women like Constance Maynard and Louisa Lumsden, both of whom are included in her studies. Infatuations between peers or teacher and student, which Vicinus calls "raves" (they have also been termed "pashes" and "gonnages"), became "a vital and empowering ideal" for college women since they could be neither mother nor prostitute. "Celibacy, within the context of loving friendships," moved them beyond the passive, pure and self-sacrificing role of the Victorian spinster.<sup>71</sup> As implied above, Smith-Rosenberg's powerful study, entitled, "The Female World of Love and Ritual: Relations between Women in Nineteenth Century America" (1975), first brought to light romantic friendships between American middle-class women in the mid-to-late 1800s. They were not only explained away as preliminary to heterosexual courtship, Smith-Rosenberg argues, but were also fully compatible with heterosexual marriage.<sup>72</sup>

In her most recent work, "The Gift of Love," Vicinus looks more closely at connections between sexuality and religion. Her case study of Mary Benson depicts how

---

<sup>71</sup> Vicinus, *Independent Women*, 9, 186-96; "'One Life to stand Beside Me': Emotional Conflicts in First-Generation College Women in England," *Feminist Studies* 8 (1982), 603-27.

<sup>72</sup> Smith-Rosenberg, "Female World," 1-12. See also Lillian Wald's, "Smashing: Women's Relationships before the Fall," *Chrysalis* 8 (1979), 17-27.

one Victorian woman adopted faith to vindicate her homoerotic needs within the context of heterosexual marriage. But as Vicinus rightly points out, although feminist scholars have made recent gains in revealing how religion could be an enabling force for women's self-empowerment and social rights, virtually nothing has been written on the impact of religion on Victorian women's physical lives. While "a single case can hardly speak for the widely differing ways in which nineteenth-century believing women reconciled religion and their homoerotic desires, the atypical could also illuminate the typical."<sup>73</sup>

Before addressing Vicinus' claim and her sexual classification of Benson, let us first turn to studies on women and religion. Certainly, pioneering collections like Gail Malmgreen's prove useful for this study in terms of revealing how English women adopted religion as a public platform for social gains. Ann Higginbotham's chapter on Salvation Army rescue work illuminates how women like Maynard were able to adopt illegitimate children like Effie in the late 1800s, and why the situation changed a decade later.<sup>74</sup> Richard Quebedeaux's contribution in Ursula King's volume, which is among a number of studies examining women's roles in world-wide religions, traces Victorian critical methods of Biblical study—that seem not unlike Maynard's teaching at

---

<sup>73</sup> Vicinus, "The Gift of Love", 242.

<sup>74</sup> Ann R. Higginbotham, "Respectable Sinners: Salvation Army Rescue Work with Unmarried Mothers, 1884-1914," in *Religion in the Lives of English Women, 1760-1930* ed., Gail Malmgreen (Bloomington: Indiana UP, 1986), 216-34. The volume addresses English women's public expression of religion between 1760-1930 in arenas like Temperance and S. A. Rescue work. For more recent publications on the S. A. see Walker, *Devil's Kingdom*, and for women and religion see Anne Hogan and Andrew Bradstock, eds., *Women of Faith in Victorian Culture: Reassessing 'The Angel in the House'* (London: Macmillan, 1998); Julie Melnyk, ed., *Women's Theology in Nineteenth-Century Britain: Transfiguring the Faith of Their Fathers* (New York: Garland, 1998).

Westfield—through to American Evangelical feminism in the 1970s.<sup>75</sup> These works point, once again, to the value of considering gender, class and race in studies on religion—both cross-culturally and across time—to better understand women’s experience.

Pamela Walker’s and Beverly Maine Kienzle’s recent volume, *Women Preachers and Prophets through Two Millennia of Christianity* (1999), exemplifies scholarly developments in examining the connection between religion and belief systems across time. Contributors trace attitudes towards women visionaries over the centuries, outlining their negotiations in face of new meanings around religion, which, in turn, were tied to perceptions of gender and/or body image. Phyllis Mack’s chapter suggests that women in the 1700s sought to merge cultural perceptions of their role as “good” visionaries with narratives on their “evil” body—the emotionally dangerous “other” to man’s rational self. This binary, as Carolyn Walker Bynum asserts in *Fragmentation and Redemption* (1991), was evident during the medieval period with nuns seeking to interconnect their image as charity workers (active agents) with that of their blind suffering as “brides of Christ;”<sup>76</sup>

---

<sup>75</sup> Richard Quebedeaux, “We’re on our Way, Lord!: The Rise of ‘Evangelical Feminism’ in Modern American Christianity in *Women in the World’s Religions Past and Present*, ed., Ursula King (New York: Paragon House, 1987), 129-45. See also Arvind Sharma ed., *Women in World Religions, Today’s Women in World Religions, and Feminism and World Religions* (Albany State: University of New York Press, new and revised ed, 1999); and Pat Holden, ed., *Women’s Religious Experience* (London: Croom Helm, 1983), for other examples of scholars’ attempts to bring diverse cultures and belief systems together to better understand women’s experiences.

<sup>76</sup> Phyllis Mack, “In a Female Voice,” in *Women Preachers and Prophets through Two Millennia of Christianity*, eds., Beverly Maine Kienzle and Pamela J. Walker (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1999), 43-60. Women’s bodies, Mack argues, engendered volatility and irrationality, and, ultimately, fear in men. Caroline Walker Bynum, *Fragmentation and Redemption: Essays on Gender and the Human Body in Medieval Religion* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1991). See also Lynda L.



and this antithesis can also be traced to the Victorian period. Constance Maynard may well have wished to live “the Cloister” in her submission as a woman and in her resistance to worldliness, but her subversion of both secular and religious norms led to conflicting feelings in both her public and private life, as this dissertation will argue.

When looking more specifically at Victorian experience, Boyd Hilton’s *The Age of Atonement* (1988) presents an good overview of the mentality of the middle-classes during the first half of the nineteenth century, tying evangelicalism to economical discourses like laissez faire and political narratives like liberalism, although he does not link faith to sexuality or gender. Nonetheless, his study, like David Bebbington’s *Evangelicalism in Modern Britain* (1992), provides some context for Constance Maynard’s mind-set.<sup>77</sup> When consulting these texts, it is clear that her faith reflected evangelical thinking in the 1830s rather than the 1850s. As Hilton explains it: “Before 1850, especially, religious feeling, biblical terminology and *stress* on Christ’s sacrifice on the cross permeated *all* aspects of thought.”<sup>78</sup> Although these elements persisted from the

---

Croon, ed., *That Gentle Strength: Historical Perspectives on Women in Christianity* (Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 1990); R. N. Swanson, *Gender and Christian Religion* (London: Boydell, 1998).

<sup>77</sup> Boyd Hilton, *The Age of Atonement: The Influence of Evangelism on Social and Economic Thought, 1785-1865* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1988); David Bebbington, *Evangelicalism in Modern Britain: A History from the 1730s to the 1980s* (Grand Rapids: Baker Books, 1988). See also D. N. Samuel, ed., *The Evangelical Succession in the Church of England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1979), Doreen M. Roseman’s, *Evangelicals and Culture* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1984) and George A. Rawlyk and Mark A. Noll eds., *Amazing Grace: Evangelicalism in Australia, Britain, Canada and the United States* (Montreal: McGill-Queen’s University Press, 1994).

<sup>78</sup> Hilton, *Atonement*, ix.

1730s until the 1950s, Bebbington argues, they altered enormously. The goal of the Christian, according to “Atonement” thinking, was to develop a moral conscience on earth by suffering in order to enter the Kingdom of Heaven. Such belief contrasted incarnational theology, which, gaining ground after the 1850s, de-emphasized earthly struggle by stressing “the rest in faith” for all (classes) and the importance of religion as a guide to life as well as the afterlife.<sup>79</sup> It is notable that the rise of scientific discourse would oppose even more directly atonement thinking. Thus it is not surprising that Constance’s atoning for ambition and passion was of necessity both complicated and contradictory, given her life experiences and her changing cultural context.

In this, Joan Jacobs Brumberg’s *Fasting Girls* (1988), and Rudolf Bell’s *Holy Anorexia* (1985), prove formative in unveiling the complexities of belief systems in their focus on the singular act of fasting. Fasting symbolized to Maynard a denial for Him, and was inevitably interconnected to narratives surrounding faith, ambition and passion. As she wrote in her Green-book in 1902:

I told Marion that love is to be second, not first, to our search for the Saviour. We must pray for resistance, and try to fast for spiritual guidance. There is to be no more playing with talk or prayer.<sup>80</sup>

Bell and Brumberg link fasting with anorexia—a term coined in the 1870s. A person was driven by one desire to be holy, and another to be thin, but whether in the service of

---

<sup>79</sup> Bebbington, *Evangelism in Modern Britain*, 2-5; also Hilton, *Atonement*, 2-9.

<sup>80</sup> *GB*, 19 February 1902, 115.

holiness or thinness, they assert, women determinedly relished the effects of starvation.<sup>81</sup>

Neither Bell nor Brumberg discuss food refusal within the context of sexual desire, however. They propose that anorexia was tied to patriarchal structures—from the medieval religious order to the industrial world.<sup>82</sup> However, Maynard's Green-book entry suggested that she sensed that her imposed penance of physical resistance had also added to Marion Wakefield's malaise.<sup>83</sup>

As the above discussion on literature has conveyed, historians have looked at how gender and class are representations, inscribed on the body through values to the extent that past women produced them while simultaneously rejecting them. This was particularly evident in the Victorian cult of domesticity and women's corresponding fights for social and other rights; and more widely in religion with the view of women's (bodily) inferiority, which subsequently led to their striving towards a synthesis of the masculine

---

<sup>81</sup> Bell traces "anorexic" behavioural patterns from the 1200s to the present. Brumberg also suggests that "anorexia" is evident across time, but argues that we can not assume that it has the same cause or is biologically based. See Joan Jacobs Brumberg, *Fasting Girls: the Emergence of Anorexia Nervosa as a Modern Disease* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1988); Rudolf Bell, *Holy Anorexia* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1985); also Mark Micale, *Approaching Hysteria: Disease and its Interpretations* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1995); Mark Micale and Paul Lerner, eds., *Traumatic Pasts: History, Psychiatry, and Trauma in the Modern Age, 1870-1930* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001); and also Walker, *Holy Feast and Holy Fast: The Religious Significance of Food to Medieval Women* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1988); Merry E. Wiesner-Hanks, *Christianity and Sexuality in the Early Modern World: Regulating Desire, Reforming Practice* (London: Routledge, 2000).

<sup>82</sup> Bell, *Holy Anorexia*, 180-86; Brumberg, *Fasting Girls*, 270-72; although Brumberg does link it to body image, see 220-27.

<sup>83</sup> This is also reflected in her Autobiography. See *A*, VII, 70, "Egypt and The Holy Land, 1900," 468.

and feminine in face of an evolving world in which strict categories were increasingly formulated. When turning specifically to the impact of religion on Victorian female/female eroticism, we find little written. Furthermore, virtually nothing has been written about a person who traversed a binary from an unfettered to a masochistic-like passion under the guise of religion.

When examining sex within the context of religion, it is important to consider the change in sexual mores in Victorian culture. New discourses about sex gained force after the writings of sexologists in the 1860s. This was a key moment in the history of sex because sexology created an ambivalent legacy in which a wide range of practices were both recognized and detailed through medical and scientific discourses. By collating, listing, and publishing case histories of their patients, texts like Krafft-Ebing's *Psychopathia sexualis* (1886), and more particularly to Victorian Britain, Havelock Ellis' *Psychology of Sex* (1897), described the congenital roots of human erotic preferences, detailing the enormous range from heterosexuality to "perversions" like the homosexual, bisexual, sadist and masochist. The sexologists essentially created the "invert," forging the strict categories of the twentieth century: "normal" heterosexual marriage sex versus perversion(s). In short, the latter acts were no longer perceived as a sin or a crime, but the result of a physiological disease. It is also notable that conditions became gendered. The "masochistic" desire to suffer pain and be subjected to force was a pathological degeneration of the psychical peculiarities of women, Ellis and Krafft-Ebing argued. Meanwhile sadism—the act of sexual arousal produced by inflicting pain—was deemed a

pathological intensification of masculinity.<sup>84</sup>

Sigmund Freud's subsequent studies on childhood development in the late-nineteenth century and early-twentieth century has often been contrasted with the sexologists' physiological approach since Freud superseded them with his theory of sex as psycho-pathology. In his, *Three Essays on the Theory of Sexuality* (1905), Freud suggests that "normal" psychosexual development—the progressive focusing on just one subset of all possible sexual objects while repressing all others into the subconscious—evolved into male-female desire. An "arrested" development meanwhile initiated same-sex desire. By the early 1900s, his explicit use of the word heterosexual to define *desire*, as opposed to the earlier reproductive model which had focussed on *acts*, aided in the earlier constituting of different-sex eroticism as the dominant norm and curtailing other forms of eroticism like homosexuality, bisexuality and sado-masochism. Core to both sexology and Freudianism, was the belief that sexual identity constituted the truth of the self. This perspective can be seen as a link between the Victorian age and contemporary culture.<sup>85</sup>

---

<sup>84</sup> See Bland and Doan, eds., *Sexology in Culture*; Philips and Reay eds., *Sexualities in History*; and Katz's *Invention of Heterosexuality*, for good discussion on the "normalization" of heterosexuality.

<sup>85</sup> Sigmund Freud, *Three Essays on the Theory of Sexuality* trans. James Strachey (New York: Basic Books, 1962). Freud proposes that the sex instinct is initially so polymorphous that the infant can readily attach itself to *any* object giving it physical pleasure. For discussions on his ideas see Francois Meltzer ed., *The Trial(s) of Psychoanalysis* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1988); Teresa de Lauretis, "Freud, Sexuality, and Perversion," in *Discourses of Sexuality: From Aristotle to AIDS*, ed., Donna C. Stanton (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1992), 216-34; Jeffrey Weeks, *Sexuality and its Discontents: Meanings, Myths and Modern Sexualities* (New York: Routledge, 1985).

Since the 1970s, there has been a major expansion in the study of sexuality in general. Scholars have moved beyond the naturalist approaches of early sexologist assumptions of a core of natural sexuality towards viewing it as a “construct,” that is, a series of representations produced by society in complex ways. Michel Foucault’s genealogy of the Western apparatus of sexuality has been especially influential. The Victorian period particularly saw the outpouring of discussion on and classification of sex, he argues, in debates, surveys and legislation, and in the copious medical literature concerning sexual matters.<sup>86</sup> This opened up the whole field of sexuality to critical analysis and assessment, influencing studies on topics like the family, birth control, prostitution and same-sex desire by scholars like Lawrence Stone, Judith Walkowitz and George Chauncey.<sup>87</sup> In a number of studies, which include *Coming Out* (1977) and *Sex, Politics and Society* (1989), Jeffrey Weeks has written extensively on Victorian cultural history, tracing the regulation of sexuality in the 1800s through familial, social, economic, political and religious mores and structures. As he points out, these complex processes were also negotiated in various interlocking power relationships relating to gender and

---

<sup>86</sup> Michel Foucault, *The History of Sexuality, Volume 1: An Introduction*, trans. Robert Hurley (New York: Pantheon Books, 1985); also his *The History of Sexuality, Volume 2: The Use of Pleasure*, trans. Robert Hurley (New York: Vintage Books, 1990).

<sup>87</sup> Stone, *The Family*; Judith Walkowitz, *Prostitution and Victorian Society: Women, Class, and the State* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1980); George Chauncey, “From Sexual Inversion to Homosexuality: The Changing Medical Conceptualization of Female ‘Deviance,’” in *Passion and Power*, eds., Kathy Piess and Christina Simmons (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1989), 95-111. There are many other examples, like John D’Emilio and Estelle Freedman’s *Intimate Matters* (New York: Harper and Row Publishers, 1988), 302-14, and Roy Porter’s and Lesley Hall’s *The Facts of Life: the Creation of Sexual Knowledge in Victorian Britain, 1650-1950* (New Haven: Yale university Press, 1995).

class.<sup>88</sup> This is not to assume that the idea of sexuality as “innate” and/or Freudian concepts of it as an “instinctual aim” have been entirely abandoned by historians. The ongoing debate between essentialism and social construction concerning past experience will be expanded upon in chapter three.

The most comprehensive histories of sex are of same-sex attractions, and these deal disproportionately with male homosexuality. However, a number of powerful studies exist on female sexuality. Sheila Jeffreys’ *The Spinster and her Enemies* (1985) is considered an important text on the watershed period in Victorian and Edwardian women’s sexuality. She demonstrates how the sexologists’ forging of a “scientific” description of lesbianism, as implied in Ellis’ *Sexual Inversion*, interconnected with anti-feminism in the late 1890s. This classic stereotype of the “manly” women echoed the characteristics of the “New Woman,” who was fleeing the norms of prescribed femininity. Chauncey, for example, points out that a “born invert” could be identified by her enlarged clitoris or excessive body hair and her misused aggressive behaviour.<sup>89</sup> Later sex reformers like Marie Stopes struggled to distinguish romantic friendship mores of kissing from (homosexual) genital contact. This change in attitude was illustrated by an attempt to make homosexual acts between women illegal in 1921.<sup>90</sup> Later studies by Leslie Hall

---

<sup>88</sup> See, for example, Jeffrey Weeks, *Coming Out: Homosexual Politics in Britain from the Nineteenth Century to the Present* (London: Quartet, 1977); his *Sex, Politics and Society: The Regulation of Sexuality Since 1800* (London: Longman, 1981); and *Against Nature: Essays on History, Sexuality and Identity* (London: Rivers Oram Press, 1992).

<sup>89</sup> See Chauncey, “From Sexual Inversion to Homosexuality,” 90-91.

<sup>90</sup> Sheila Jeffreys, *The Spinster and her Enemies: Feminism and Sexuality 1880-1930* (London: Pandora, 1985); also see Cynthia Eagle Russett, *Sexual Science: The*

and Lucy Bland suggest that women also used sexology as a tool *against* patriarchal attitudes, and that sexology and feminism emerged from the campaign against the Contagious Diseases Acts and changes in the social roles of the sexes.<sup>91</sup>

As mentioned earlier, the idea of romantic friendship as culturally acceptable has been challenged recently. Although it is generally accepted that raves and the like became more scrutinized in the early 1900s<sup>92</sup> (they did not appear to trouble Linton's biographer in 1901 yet were termed "deviant" in D. H. Lawrence's *The Rainbow* in 1917<sup>93</sup>), scholars are not entirely convinced that romantic friendship was always "innocent." Vicinus, Moore, Terry Castle and Randolph Trumbach are among a number arguing that women's

---

*Victorian Construction of Womanhood* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1989), 128-46; Margaret Jackson, *The Real Facts of Life: Feminism and the Politics of Sexuality c1850-1940* (London: Taylor & Francis, 1994); and Lilian Faderman, *Surpassing the Love of Men: Romantic Friendship and Love between Women from the Renaissance to the Present* (New York: William Morrow, 1981), 249.

<sup>91</sup> Lesley Hall, "Suffrage, Sex and Sciences," in *The Women's Suffrage Movement: New Feminist Perspectives*, eds., Maroula Joannou and June Purvis (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1998); Lucy Bland, *Banishing the Beast: English Feminism and Sexual Morality, 1885-1914* (London: Penguin, 1997).

<sup>92</sup> Vicinus, *Independent Women*, 291; also Smith-Rosenberg, *Disorderly Conduct: Visions of Gender in Victoria America* (New York: Routledge, 1987) and Lisa Duggan's more recent, "The Trials of Alice Mitchel: Sensationalism, Sexology, and the Lesbian Subject in Turn-of-the-Century America," *Signs* 18 (1993), 791-813, which proposes that female/female eroticism was, at times, painted negatively by the American mass media in the late 1880s. Sexologists re-appropriated these "sensational" stories, which evolved into later notions of the mannish lesbian.

<sup>93</sup> George Somes Layard, *Mrs. Lynn Linton: Her Life, Letters, And Opinions* (London: Methuen, 1901), 25-56. His concerns centred around her male persona as being "uncomely" behaviour for a *woman*, as opposed to viewing it as a sign of sexual deviance. Yet Linton, like Maynard, had passion for both men and women throughout her life. See, 322-41, in D. H. Lawrence's *The Rainbow* (London: Marshall Bros., 1915, reprint, New York: Randon House, 2002), for discussion on deviance.



diaries and other primary records suggest that some women who engaged in passionate friendships could be quite aware of their sexual feelings and acts. Examinations into Anne Lister's (1791-1840) diaries, for example, have led to claims that Lister's coded language implied her "lesbian" encounters.<sup>94</sup> By discovering Sapphic references in eighteenth-century English diaries, letters and pamphlet literature, Emma Donohue has similarly shown that contemporaries could potentially conceive of "lesbian desire," although they continued to see it as sin.<sup>95</sup> These studies have advanced historians beyond conceptions of asexual romantic friendship, towards recognizing women as capable and desiring subjects. When the term, "lesbian," was normalized in the 1920s, women who desired women could better see themselves as erotically different from heterosexual women.

But this raises the question, what then of Victorian women's friendships in the mid-to-late 1800s? How do we write of their experiences today? Do we call them lesbians? Does it matter? As mentioned earlier, Maynard does seem to have engaged in what we, today, would call lesbian acts. Although the extent of her physicality with women is hazy, her Green-book and Autobiography indicate that she engaged in sexual plays like kissing on the lips or finger biting. Certainly, when examining the contours of

---

<sup>94</sup> See Helen Whitbread, ed., *I Know My Own Heart: The Diaries of Anne Lister, 1791-1840* (London: Routledge, 1988); Vicinus, "Which Sex I Belong," 467-99; Moore, "More Tender Still," 499-521; Terry Castle, *The Apparitional Lesbian* (New York: Routledge, 1993); Randolph Trumbach, "The Origins and Development of the Modern Lesbian Role in the Western Gender System: Northwestern Europe and the United States, 1750-1990," *Historical Reflections* (1994), 289. See also Elizabeth Wilson, "Forbidden Love" *Feminist Studies* 10 (1984), 213-26.

<sup>95</sup> Emma Donohue, *Passions between Women: British Lesbian Culture, 1668-1801*, (London: Routledge, 1993).

her religious-based resistance of desire—which ranged from suppressed outrage to fasting or extreme physical activity—terms like obsessive-compulsive and masochism spring to this researcher’s mind. As Vicinus points out in “‘The Gift of Love,’” we must recognise that women like Benson (and I would include Maynard here) are speaking of behaviours and “carnal intimacies that surpassed the spiritual merging that was her ideal.”<sup>96</sup> But, unlike Lister, there is no evidence in Maynard’s manuscripts to suggest that she recognised herself as lesbian and/or bisexual, or understood her behaviour as atypical as we might perhaps view it today. As she so often writes, “God has offered love to me and so I now claim the right to see human love as His great treasure.” Although Lewis Campbell was married to her cousin Fanny, and she clearly sensed “a danger in [her] personal absorption” with Margaret Brooke, Ralph Gray and Marion Wakefield, she always justified earthly passion by understanding it as an awakening to God’s love. Her denial of carnal love then, however severe and extreme, was to her part of a single and/or shared suppression in the name of a higher love.<sup>97</sup>

If we are to construct a more nuanced interpretation of past experience, then why apply term(s) that did not yet exist as a means of understanding desire? Or designate conditions that were not recognizable to women like Constance Maynard? While I believe that terms *do* help us to understand past women’s experience—“masochism,” for example,

---

<sup>96</sup> Vicinus, “‘The Gift of Love,’” 242.

<sup>97</sup> See GB, 3 May 1883, 71, and GB, 23 April 1886, 133. These are among a number of many examples, as will be seen in this dissertation. There is no evidence in any of her texts to suggest that she developed a vocabulary, like Lister did, to suggest orgasms with women (i.e., Lister adopted the word “kiss” for orgasm); see Whitbread, *I Know My Own Heart*, 145.

will be discussed at length in chapter three—it is important to remember that these women are not of our time.<sup>98</sup> Indeed, in some ways, classifying an historical subject who could never assume present-day identities not only “essentializes” *her* experience, but “essentializes” her experience to us; and this seems a precarious endeavour for the historian.<sup>99</sup>

Whether Firth viewed Maynard’s behaviour as “masochistic” or her sexual orientation as “lesbian” and/or “bisexual” is unclear. But since it seems likely, this returns us once again to questions of censorship, in this case, the “bias” of friendship. Maynard initially dismissed Firth as a “vexing person” in her Diary in 1904.<sup>100</sup> But Firth’s winning the Gilchrist scholarship and achieving a first class B. A. in History soon gained Maynard’s respect. Their friendship grew as Firth successfully received her Master of Arts and Doctor of Literature degrees. But Firth’s “conversion in 1913” was what really seemed to cement their friendship.<sup>101</sup> Firth went on to a brilliant career; she lectured in

---

<sup>98</sup> An interesting example of this debate can be seen in a comparison between Anna Clark’s, “Anne Lister’s Construction of Lesbian Identity,” in *Sexualities in History*, 247-70 with E. Ann Matter’s “Discourses of Desire: Sexuality and Christian Women’s Visionary Narratives,” in *Que(e)rying Religion: A Critical Anthology*, eds., Gary Comstock and Susan Henking (New York: Continuum, 1997), 106-16.

<sup>99</sup> For a fascinating discussion along these lines see Estelle B. Freedman, “The Prison Lesbian: Race, Class, and the Construction of the Aggressive Female Homosexual, 1915-1965” *Feminist Studies* 22, (1996), 397-423 and “‘The Burning of letters Continues’: Elusive Identities and the Historical Construction” *Journal of Women’s History* 9, (1998), 181-99.

<sup>100</sup> *D*, 20 May 1904, 89.

<sup>101</sup> See *GB* 6 October 1913, 46. Firth had just accepted her first post with the Christian Missionary Society. “With her historical instincts, mental grasp, and true devotion to religion,” Maynard writes, “here is an ability and motive that must not be lost

history at Newnham College, Cambridge between 1914-1921; she became vice principal of St. Hugh's College, Oxford in 1923; and she published a number of historical texts. According to both Green-book and Diary, she was one of the most frequent visitors at the Sundial, Maynard's retirement cottage, throughout the 1920s and early 1930s, and she clearly became one of Maynard's closest friends. It was during these twilight years of Maynard's life that she was actively publishing. Firth was also apparently Maynard's "most valued and most severe critic."<sup>102</sup> It is not surprising, given Firth's friendship, values, talents and publication record, that she was the one to write the story of Maynard's life. Maynard had far less contact with her other "Old Student" friends, Hilda Smith, Sarah Wisdom and Ruby Inglis—as named in her will. Ralph Gray, who was first given Maynard's records after her death, died before completing the biography.<sup>103</sup>

Why did Maynard want one of her proteges to write about her life? The obvious answer is that Firth and the above-mentioned ones could give a good first-hand account of Maynard's achievements as an educational pioneer. Perhaps Maynard also knew that she could count on Firth's loyalty and discretion as a friend. As mentioned earlier, Firth chose to focus on Maynard's familial milieu, her role as an educator, and her religious struggle

---

to the C. M. S....For college it is a wonderful offer." After this, they often went on "cycling tours" together. See *A*, VII, 55, "Summer Vacation, 1901," 333. For Firth's academic background see *Minutes*, 1 April 1903, 146, and also *College Register*, 22.

<sup>102</sup> *Ibid.*, 17 March 1929, 154; and *Ibid.*, 21 November 1930, 230. She wrote, "five chapters on Modernism are accepted in the 'London Quarterly' and I'm also trying for the 'Christian.' At the present I have submitted my writing to my 'little snippet' and most severe critic, C. Firth." On Firth's career and publication record, see Sondheimer, *Castle Adamant*, 56.

<sup>103</sup> Firth, *Maynard*, 5; also Maynard, Last Will and Testament.

rather than on her emotional life. Her structural “breaking up” of Maynard’s life, conveyed through separate chapters on Maynard’s adopted daughter, Effie, her travels, writing and the Divinity program, emphasize this. In fact Firth admits that she found Maynard’s outpourings about love so “startling, sometimes painful,” that she “often wished that [she] could turn away from records which, it seemed, no stranger’s eye should read.”<sup>104</sup> She alluded to her intense, romantic involvements with women like Louisa Lumsden and Ralph Gray through brief, oblique observations or, as in the case of Lewis Campbell, by simply transcribing large sections of Maynard’s Autobiography without comment. In her epilogue she cautiously notes, “Constance was not aware of the degree in which the unusual intensity of her emotions affected both her judgements and her friendships [with women].”<sup>105</sup>

Firth’s hesitancy also implies the period in which Firth herself wrote.<sup>106</sup>

Contemporary society is far more sensitive to issues surrounding conduct at the workplace. Moreover, neither lesbianism nor bisexuality had the levels of acceptance in the 1940s that they have today. Firth proposes that Maynard’s sense of loneliness as an educational pioneer “would have been decreased” had she been privy to the new study of

---

<sup>104</sup> Firth, *Maynard*, 5.

<sup>105</sup> *Ibid.*, 337.

<sup>106</sup> See Roy Pascal’s classic text, *Design and Truth in Autobiography* (New York: Macmillan, 1960), also Elizabeth Bruss, *Autobiographical Acts* (Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 1976), for good insights into the genre of autobiography. There are many others, including Carolyn G. Heilbrun’s *Writing a Woman’s Life* (London: Routledge, 1988), which points to how women began “inserting” their anger into their texts after the 1970s.

psychology at the end of the 1800s, and that the “new knowledge of the twentieth century would have provided explanation to some at least of her fightings and her fears.”<sup>107</sup>

Perhaps it would. In 1935, when Constance analysed her past under “the present light of psychology” she laments in her Green-book, “I suppose I had love within me which I could not give away”:

When I read over my autobiography written during 1915-1918 it all seems so new to me. I feel as if it is about the life of someone else. My concentrated love of L [Louisa] and the utterly sleepless nights she gave me at Cheltenham. As I read on it gets worse and worse. I was given the one post in a thousand, yes, one in a million, - and I ruined it by ‘falling in love’ - Margaret Brooke, Anne Richardson, Ralph Gray, and then, after a period of most sore desolation came Marion Wakefield. Oh! it was wrong, yes, *all* wrong! If only I could have given that love, that preoccupation of the heart, to Christ alone! I had entered the Cloister voluntarily, and I had perpetually transgressed its first rule.<sup>108</sup>

This is a summation of Maynard’s lifelong dilemma. In her own view, she had failed in her role as an educational pioneer because human love took priority over divine, even though God had given her the power of human love. Nonetheless, the main point is that she found her earlier autobiographical account disturbing in light of her reading of psychoanalytical insights into gender and sexuality. In fact she, or perhaps Ralph Gray, may have carried out her threat to destroy her Green-book since the records between 1887-1902 are missing. Although schooled in “Mental Philosophy,” she could not fully accept ideas on the “thwarted sex instinct” because she had also been schooled in a milieu that approved of the ideals and values surrounding romantic female friendships and

---

<sup>107</sup> Firth, *Maynard*, 337.

<sup>108</sup> *GB*, 8 February 1935, 255. This ongoing theme is evident in her *Autobiography*.

college raves.<sup>109</sup>

Censorship versus “truth,” discourse versus experience—recent feminist post-structuralist scholarship warns the researcher against linking a relationship between truth and linear narrative. As Bella Brodzki and Celeste Schenck argue, an assumption about an “autobiography as a transparency through which we perceive the life, unmediated and undistorted,” is as problematic as reifying a unified, transcendent self.<sup>110</sup> This raises the question whether writers may ever claim either to know the “truth” about past experience from *any* primary text, or to respond to those texts without codifying their own language to mimic them?<sup>111</sup> The answer to both is probably not. However, I believe in life writing as a valid enterprise. As Gorham writes in her introduction to *Vera Brittain: A Feminist Life* (1996), “Historical biography continues to engage readers because it offers us intimate knowledge of another personality and another period, and that knowledge allows us to know ourselves better.” Through a past woman’s texts, I “can grasp,” as Gorham and others suggest, “vicarious validation of [my] own life” as a woman. I would also conclude that the autobiographical or diary “‘I,’ however fugitive, partial and unreliable, is indeed the privileged textual double of a real person, as well as a self-evident textual

---

<sup>109</sup> See *A*, VII, 44, “1882,” 3, and for romantic friendship see Smith-Rosenberg, “Female World,” and Vicinus’, *Independent Women* and “‘One Life.’”

<sup>110</sup> Bella Brodzki and Celeste Schenck, *Life/Lines: Theorizing Women’s Autobiography* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1988). See introduction.

<sup>111</sup> See James Olney, ed., *Studies in Autobiography* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1988), and Eric Homberger, ed. *The Troubled Face of Biography* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988), for good discussion on this.

construct.”<sup>112</sup>

During an era when women’s roles were in flux, and sexual preferences were not yet classified, Maynard struggled to negotiate ambition and passion under a roof in which work and love interconnected. However, she and others conceptualized new experiences within the context of cultural norms. This is seen, for example, in their adoption of a husband’s or a wife’s role at college. Maynard’s behaviour depended upon her power base in the relationship. However, since this created identity issues in a milieu in which evolving roles and norms were complicated further by emotions surrounding ambition and passion, Maynard turned to faith to reconcile her conflicts. As this dissertation will argue, her faith became a means in which she understood her ambition as an educational pioneer and her passion as a woman. It was not that either was wrong; her transgression was in viewing both as more compelling than God. “Temptation was the testing ground where God presses on the very spots of acute feeling.”<sup>113</sup>

.....

I do not take lightly Maynard’s injunction to Firth in 1902, “Speaking (sic) the truth in love, dear, and don’t forget the love.”<sup>114</sup> Certainly, she wanted her hesitant young biographer to write about her public and private life with empathy. After all, her *Autobiography* evinces her struggle for redemption in its symbolic “Atoning” for

---

<sup>112</sup> Gorham, *Vera Brittain*, 6; also Susan Groag Bell and Marilyn Yalom, eds., *Revealing Lives: Autobiography, Biography and Gender* (Albany: New York Press, 1990), 1-9.

<sup>113</sup> See for example, *GB*, 3 June 1886, 312; *GB*, 17 November 1892, 317.

<sup>114</sup> Firth, *Maynard*, 5.



ambition and passion.<sup>115</sup> But a Green-book entry written around the same time is telling. “What I share with others must be shared and not hidden here,” she tells the reader.<sup>116</sup> If sex today has less to do with biological gender and genital manoeuvrers—since many now regard it as more concerned with self definition and self satisfaction—could the same be said for individuals who lived during the Victorian era? Indeed, can there be any consensus on the history of supposed sexual knowledge? I would like to think that Constance Maynard knew that her eloquent, compelling depiction of one woman’s unique interconnection of love, aim and religion not only raised new questions about sexuality for her own era, but also for the subsequent ones. It is her words that complement the narrative which follows.

.....

“When I first wrote my Green-book,” Constance said, “it contained only my inner feelings. Writing about the outer world seemed either negligible or an interruption to my thoughts.”<sup>117</sup> The following two chapters of this study reveal the nature and the reasons behind this division. Chapter two: “‘*The outer world*’: The Maynard family,” discusses the importance of social class and the ideologies of gender in shaping Maynard’s familial

---

<sup>115</sup> Pascal discusses this in *Design and Truth*, as do most studies on life writing and as cited above. An interesting discussion on the confessional as genre can be found in Ellen Willis’, *No More Nice Girls* (Hanover: Wesleyan University Press, 1992), 123-73. I would like to think that Maynard’s *A* was not a manipulative plea for absolution or a covert expression of anger at others for provoking guilt. The idea of the multifaceted self is seen in Sandra J. Peacock’s, *Jane Ellen Harrison, The Mask and the Self* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1988).

<sup>116</sup> *GB*, 1 January 1905, 3.

<sup>117</sup> *Ibid.*, 17 December 1911, 37.

experience, and examines her acceptance of, and resistance to, the dominant assumptions that characterized her home milieu. Chapter three: “*My inner feelings*”: What is masochism?’ analyses her complex reaction to the religiously-based split between emotion and reason that she had inculcated in childhood. I then trace how her move towards claiming a holistic self fell within the parameters of a life-long binary between desire and resistance. In Chapter four: “*A Time of Crisis, Restraint and Liberty*,” 1862-72,’ I discuss her relationship with Lewis Campbell, who unearthed both her passion and aim. Chapter five: “*Caught in the current*”: Girton 1872-1875,’ focuses on how her life as a Girton student impelled her religious crisis, and spawned her enactment of a human/divine circumferential resulting from her passion for Louisa Lumsden. “*An Unhappy Marriage*”: Leadership, Longing, Lament, 1876-1880,’ as the title of chapter six implies, portrays Maynard’s journey towards self-discovery as she struggles through her troubled partnership with Lumsden. Chapter seven: “*Was my friend a man or a woman?*”: Ambition versus Passion, 1880-1883,’ eight: “*Eleven years of Gloom: Amid Success*, 1886-1896,’ and nine: “*A glorious new spring of hope and love*,” 1897-1913,’ examine Maynard’s 31 years as Westfield’s Mistress, depicting her struggles to atone for passion and ambition in face of self-doubt. I analyse her bonds with Margaret Brooke, Anne Richardson, Ralph Gray and Marion Wakefield, and with her adopted daughter Effie, which are complicated by the contradictions surrounding desire and resistance, and/or ambition and passion. Chapter ten is a brief conclusion. I discuss Maynard’s life-long conflicts within the context of her current thoughts on her past experiences, and her reactions to the new discourses on sexual mores in the 1920s and 1930s.

## Chapter 2

### 'The outer world': The Maynard family

Constance Maynard's early poem—evoking the religiosity of her times—reflects an adolescent's ruminating over life and life's future possibilities:

O birds, who live without the shade of sadness  
dimming your happy days.  
Your life seems one continual hymn of gladness  
striking the note 'of praise.'  
The morning breezes freshly round him blowing  
the sunlight on his wings,  
and louder, yet his ceaseless song is flowing,  
as straight from earth he springs.<sup>1</sup>

At fifteen, her yearning to expand her horizons was perhaps not so dissimilar from that of an aspiring young woman of today. As an upper-middle-class Victorian girl, however, her need “to try her wings for some harder flight” seemed more extreme.<sup>2</sup> Leaving the confines of home for Belstead, a private boarding school for girls, had made her feel as if “all pressure was lifted off [her], and [she] could be [her]self.”<sup>3</sup> Her verse, written at Belstead, conveyed this sense of freedom. Her happiness was to be short-lived, however. After eighteen months of secondary education she left Belstead, because

Father didn't see why he should go on paying for an expensive school when I could do quite well at home with three sisters above me who had been educated till they were eighteen. I felt this as a kind of slight, a hint even, that I was not worth much, but I did not venture on a word of

---

<sup>1</sup> A, I, 3, “Home and Belstead, 1863-4,” 41-45. Written April, 1925.

<sup>2</sup> Maynard, “Victorian Schoolroom,” 106.

<sup>3</sup> A, I, 3, “1863-4,” 45.

remonstrance, nor even express regret.

She ended her remembrance of the incident by commenting, “The homecoming was pleasant. A bon-fire was lit in my honour.”<sup>4</sup>

Henry Maynard’s decision was no more atypical than Constance’s memory of her response to such shortchanging of women’s education. In fact their father-daughter interaction reflects the gender disparities so common in Victorian Britain in the 1860s—particularly for those from the middle classes. Although she was an eager, industrious student, society had taught her to fume in silence over such blatant disregard of her education. This chapter examines Constance Maynard’s early experiences, and outlines the circumstances surrounding her move from gender-bound silence to advocate of women’s higher education.

Born on February 19<sup>th</sup>, 1849, in Highbury in London, Constance Louisa Maynard was raised during the prosperous and relatively stable mid-Victorian period when, some might argue, Victorians truly regarded themselves as Victorian.<sup>5</sup> Urbanization and industrialization and their accompanying technological and economic developments had facilitated the emergence of a new class comprised of lower-middle, middle and upper-middle classes. The Maynards, as part of the last class, were an example of those who had

---

<sup>4</sup> Ibid; Also see Firth, *Maynard*, 53.

<sup>5</sup> For a good discussion of Victorian mentality see David Newsome, *The Victorian World Picture: Perceptions and Introspection in an Age of Change* (New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 1997), 1-12. He suggests that the Edwardian age began after 1880.

made a fortune alongside the gentry through industrial or commercial ventures.<sup>6</sup> In *Family Fortunes*, Davidoff and Hall trace how entrepreneurs like the Cadburys of Birmingham took advantage of retail change by making money in shopkeeping and food manufacturing in the 1780s, their modest capital inherited by sons who continued expanding the family business.<sup>7</sup> There is evidence that Constance's great-grandfather, Charles Maynard, made his money as a malt-distiller in the 1750s. His sons inherited his business and continued making money as merchants.

The Maynards appeared to have expanded their business abroad, since Charles was buried in Edmonton, Canada in 1757. Although little is known about his later schemes, or those of his sons,<sup>8</sup> their ventures were made possible because of the strength of import and export trade and empire building.<sup>9</sup> In 1821, Henry Maynard (1800-1888) was sent to South Africa by his father, Thomas, to become "a wealthy merchant." He

---

<sup>6</sup> See Webb, *Modern England*, and Matthew ed., *Nineteenth Century*, for an overview on industrial society; and for economic history, R. Floud and D. McClosky, eds., *The Economic History of Britain since 1700* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1994).

<sup>7</sup> Davidoff and Hall, *Family Fortunes*, 55-57. But 51% of the population still worked on the land in the 1850s.

<sup>8</sup> Firth, *Maynard*, 38-49.

<sup>9</sup> Newsome, *Victorian World* 131-32; A. N. Porter, *Religion and Empire: British Expansion in the Long 19<sup>th</sup> Century, 1780-1914* (London: Macmillan, 1991). Shipbuilding had established Britain as an imperial power by 1815. Empire building was an outstanding feature of Victorian Britain as seen in activities like white settlement colonies and missionary evangelizing. Constance was involved in the latter, training Westfield students to become missionaries overseas.

returned home in 1837 a very rich man after finding diamonds.<sup>10</sup> He was never enthusiastic about his career. But he was fortunate in that his entrepreneurial activities paralleled a period when Britain's fiscal policies, central to politics, were bitterly contested as governments adjusted to the increasingly urban and peacetime economy. Such friction eroded the conservatism of the gentry, and the Whig takeover in 1830 saw the rise of middle-class Liberalism and modern politics.<sup>11</sup>

Henry Maynard was empowered when he married Louisa Hillyard in 1837, not only because of his class and wealth, but also because he married into gentry. Louisa Hillyard (1806-1871) was of French Huguenot descent. Her mother's ancestors, the Tahourdins and d'Albaics, had fled the family estates and come to England as Protestant refugees in 1685.<sup>12</sup> Louisa was intensely devout. Her Puritan-based life principle—echoing devout Evangelicals of her time—led her to “renounce the world out of faith and love towards God.” In fact faith, not class, impelled her to refuse Henry's first proposal in 1827. She “would not accept him,” Mary King said, “until she was convinced he was

---

<sup>10</sup> Firth, *Maynard*, 50-59.

<sup>11</sup> The gentry opposed welfare while workers and entrepreneurs saw income tax repeal (1815) and the Corn Law (1816) as gentry privilege. The Reform Bill (1832) forged change by giving more middle-class male householders the opportunity to vote. See Martin Daunton, *Progress and Poverty: An Economic and Social History of Britain, 1700-1850* (London: Routledge, 1995); Floud and McClosky, eds, *Economic History*; and Webb, *Modern England*.

<sup>12</sup> Firth, *Maynard*, 11. The family estates in Civray, which were considerable, were inherited by other family members, who continuing Catholic, remained there until the mid 1700s.

Christian.”<sup>13</sup> When Henry and Louisa married on September 20<sup>th</sup>, 1837, he had promised that religion was to be the key in which they would set their lives: and indeed it was.

The Maynards started a family two years after their marriage; and, over an eleven-year period, Louisa gave birth to eight children. Josephine (Tissy), born on January 26<sup>th</sup>, 1839, was followed closely by Henry (Harry), who was born on May 13<sup>th</sup>, 1840. As the eldest son, he would take over the family business, which, unfortunately would prove disastrous. But in 1840 “the noble looking child [was] very proudly” shown to his grandparents. The next surviving child was Gabrielle (Gazy), who was born in 1845, and Dora (Do) followed quickly in 1846. Constance was born on February 19<sup>th</sup>, 1849. Like Gazy, she was a healthy and attractive child, her “unusual golden brown hair and large luminous eyes” being her particular crowning glory. The last child, George, was born on March 26<sup>th</sup>, 1850. He was always considered “delicate” because he suffered from asthma as a child and then joint and muscle pain after an accident when playing ice hockey in 1871.<sup>14</sup>

The general consensus amongst historians is that the 1850s proved a stable milieu in which to raise a family because inter-class conflict and the economy had stabilized.<sup>15</sup>

---

<sup>13</sup> King, *Reminiscences*, 5-6. King wrote here: “Henry would carry around small square-bound books of the Psalms, Gospels and Epistles, which both he and Louisa read to members of his family, including my own mother [Henry’s sister]. On these occasions neither myself nor my sister dared to interrupt.”

<sup>14</sup> *Ibid.*, 9.

<sup>15</sup> Daunton, *Progress and Poverty*, 66-90; Floud and McClosky, eds., *Economic History*, 41-78. Economic growth finally matched population growth. Workers’ movements were contained, and the move toward income tax (1842) and Corn Law repeal (1846) symbolized gentry power loss.

The Maynards also had status, since the Victorians believed their class had forged Britain's reputation as the "workshop" and banker of the world. The Great Exhibition (1851) reflected these sentiments as well as funded monuments like galleries, libraries and museums—the rebuilt British Museum's anthropological collection particularly promulgating British power over "primitive" people.<sup>16</sup> Queen Victoria's long reign (1832-1901) promoted stability while intellectual life proclaimed change—the exchange of ideas furthered through associations like the British Association for the Advancement of Science.<sup>17</sup> As mass marketing disseminated the values of the middle-class, so this middle-class morality was reflected in taxes, the classification of crime, leisure activities and Sunday as more Sabbatarian. In short, this middle-class liberalization aimed to both shape and unify a body of active, cooperating citizens.<sup>18</sup>

Constance Maynard's records evoke these values and the vibrancy of this period. When she was five years old (1854) her father's wealth moved them from Highbury to an estate in Hawkhurst, a village in Kent, where some family members would remain until

---

<sup>16</sup> See Asa Briggs, *The Age of Improvement* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1979); Porter, *Religion and Empire*, 49-60; and Newsome, *Victorian World*, 144.

<sup>17</sup> Matthew, "Public Life," 113. Workers resisted middle-class norms until the end of the century, but these values did take form in workers' organizations. See E. J. Hobsbawm and Terrence Ranger, *The Invention of Tradition* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983) on the impact of tradition on the well-being of society.

<sup>18</sup> See David Vincent, *Literacy and Popular Culture: England 1750-1914* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989), 270-91; and Heyk, *Intellectual Life*, 130-78. Both authors suggest that magazines targeted specific readership; mass-marketing promoted affordable consumption as a moral enterprise; taxes targeted products like beer and tobacco; crime classified "vice" like alcohol and prostitution; and leisure delegated activities to specific spaces.



1894. Oakfield was a thirty-year-old white stucco mansion: “Its symmetrical, dignified, discreet opulence,” Firth wrote, was accentuated “by a wide porch, supported by four ‘Greek’ pillars.”<sup>19</sup> Set in fourteen acres of land, the estate seemed idyllic indeed to Maynard:

Oakfield was where my high spirited childhood began and where my passion for nature was awakened. The field in front was yellow with buttercups, and the gardens on the front and back were filled with azaleas, lilies and scarlet geraniums. Beyond the back orchard were ponds, trees and wild shrubbery, which eventually opened up into the Kent country side. It is little wonder that the grounds made it seem a sort of paradise for playing, climbing trees, making gardens, keeping pets and riding Fairy, our pony.<sup>20</sup>

According to Constance, a highlight of each week was Thursday afternoon. Her mother set this time aside to teach her daughters in handicrafts like needlework, printing and willow plaiting. Like others in her social position, she also taught them benevolence. They gave to the poor; they made gifts for local villagers; and they helped with the autumnal village hop-picking. Key to Louisa was that they learn the value of time—her ordering of their activity and “shielding” of their space reflecting her society’s moral values.<sup>21</sup>

---

<sup>19</sup> Firth, *Maynard*, 21.

<sup>20</sup> *A*, I, 1, “1849-60,” 8; Firth, *Maynard*, 15-21. The estate had an orchard and stables. This contrasted with the former family home, which was a rented three storey terrace house. King’s recollection of Constance’s ninth birthday reveals the milieu *inside* Oakfield’s walls. “Louisa led the procession, clapping in time to music played by Dora and George. Everyone wore black except for Constance. She sat on a high elaborate ‘throne,’ by a table decorated with gifts and flowers, wearing a white flowing shawl and a large crown on her head.” See King, *Reminiscences*, 22.

<sup>21</sup> *A*, I, 1, “1849-60,” 9-31.

Besides the busy inner circle of family life, one can envision the frequent coming and going of friends and family to Oakfield's opulent setting, as well as holidays to the sea and later trips to Europe. Nonetheless, Maynard's *Autobiography* suggests that her childhood was also lacking. In some ways, this is perhaps not surprising. Genteel children saw little of their parents during their early lives. Oakfield, like other upper-middle-class homes, had delineated spaces for members of the household and staff. For example, Louisa had her own drawing room while a wing was devoted to a "nursery" and a "schoolroom" for the children. "I had the special attention of a nurse called Susy until I was about four," Constance recalled, "and then I was mostly under the care of Jebb (Pug) who made me feel peculiarly empty and forlorn." At the forefront of this "rather loveless picture," she added, were "cool and distant" parents:

Mother had no delight in babies. I cannot even remember any personal intercourse with her until I was about five years old. Father had little patience with children. He never played games with us or let us sit on his knee. Shadowy and stern, he was an ever awe-inspiring distant figure to me until I was twelve.<sup>22</sup>

Constance was forced to rely on her 'chums,' Gazy, Do and George, to compensate for her melancholy. Gazy in particular became "the centre of my life," she wrote, "because she made me feel valuable and precious. I'm not sure what I would have done without her."<sup>23</sup>

Constance's feelings of insecurity were brought to the fore by her eldest sister,

---

<sup>22</sup> *A*, I, 1, "1849-60," 5-6; Firth, *Maynard*, 19; Gorham, *Victorian Girl*, 155; and for division of domestic spaces see, also, Garnet, "Gender, domesticity," 167.

<sup>23</sup> *A*, I, 1, "1849-60," 7; Firth, *Maynard*, 20.

Tissy. In fact Tissy's "harsh criticism" frightened all siblings except Harry whom "she adored."<sup>24</sup> While George "never recovered" from the damage Tissy did,<sup>25</sup> the years between 1861-63 were very trying for Constance. Her chums were away at school and she was left with the dreaded Tissy who, at eighteen, had left Belstead and was to teach her youngest sister. Constance recalled of Tissy's manner:

There was often a slight tone of contempt, as if it were very kind of people to feed and clothe and teach anyone who was worth so little, and on my side a constant fear lest I should provoke her to mimic me, or say something disparaging.<sup>26</sup>

Besides the lack of approbation Constance felt from Tissy, her parents and Jebb, her sense of self-worth was also coloured by societal cultural norms. As noted in chapter one, middle-class prescriptions surrounding Evangelical "respectability" were set within separate spheres discourses, which, in turn, separated the genders through distinct, unequal roles and rights.<sup>27</sup> Firth's allusion to Henry's "reputation for integrity, competitiveness and pleasure in maintain[ing] his family in the comfortable, moderate opulence of Oakfield" does indeed suggest the Arnoldian definition for masculinity.<sup>28</sup> By

---

<sup>24</sup> *Ibid.*, 9; *Ibid.*, 43; Gorham, *Victorian Girl*, 156.

<sup>25</sup> King, *Reminiscences*, 25.

<sup>26</sup> Firth, *Maynard*, 43.

<sup>27</sup> See Gorham, *Victorian Girl*, 3-101, and Davidoff and Hall, *Family Fortunes*, 172-77. The Anglican evangelical mission, beginning in the 1780s, was advocated by the Clapham Sect and writers like William Wilberforce and Hannah More, who urged middle-class men and women to move beyond gentry idleness and worker degeneracy by forging a new "moral" nation.

<sup>28</sup> Firth, *Maynard*, 39; also Tosh, *Man's Place*, 189. Exponents, like the liberal Anglican Thomas Arnold, urged men to learn respectability through work, purity and

the mid-1860s, Henry's diamond business was flourishing under free trade. He had established a firm in London for South African affairs and was making frequent trips to the Cape now accompanied by both sons. In 1871 he "showed off one of the very first South African diamonds, which sold for £1,050."<sup>29</sup> Such wealth afforded him more social mobility. He added extensions to Oakfield and became a landlord, also building a village schoolroom and lecture hall where Evangelical ministers spoke to Hawkhurst villagers during the next twenty years. Henry's paternalist behaviour was not atypical. His providing for his local villagers echoed the commitment social reformers and philanthropists had to the "cultivation" of the "lower orders" of the time.<sup>30</sup>

Constance's recollection of her mother's advice, that she be humble and obedient, evokes her culture's feminine norms. Although Mary Wollstonecraft's famous *A Vindication of the Rights of Woman* (1792) argued for sex equality, her feminist manifesto was hotly protested. Over a decade later, texts like Hannah More's novel, *Coelebs in Search of a Wife* (1808), strongly supported women's subservience and complementarity to men in their feminine duties and virtues. When Constance was raised in the 1850s it was

---

self-respect.

<sup>29</sup> Firth, *Maynard*, 1-38. Henry had also invested in the new, luxurious steam-driven passenger liners which were taking industrialists, settlers and missionaries over to British colonies. On the diamond see *D*, 10 November 1871, 89; and on free trade, see Dauntton, *Progress and Poverty* and Floud and McClosky, eds., *Economic History*.

<sup>30</sup> *A*, II, 8, "My Seven Years of Waiting, 1865-72," 193. As Newsome points out in *Victorian World*, 73-74, by mid-century, the middle-class work ethic had become translated for the lower classes into Samuel Smiles' term, "Self-help," which advocated that "national progress [wa]s the sum of individual industry and uprightness, as national decay [wa]s of individual idleness, selfishness and vice."

still “normal” to view women as the inferior gender. Restricted politically, socially and economically, their limited rights left them dependent upon men within a double standard of sexual morality. Tracts, fiction, magazines and advice books prescribed womanly, submissive roles while always stressing the duties and dignity of motherhood. As Gorham points out in *Victorian Girl*, Louisa and her daughters typically seemed confined to the “private sphere” of the home where Louisa taught them such moral values as piety, purity and submission.<sup>31</sup>

There is little doubt that the discourses surrounding separate spheres informed, and were informed by education in the 1840s and 1850s. Once again, Maynard’s sense of self-worth as a female was shaped by her parents’ culturally-based attitude towards her primary and secondary education. A governess was only hired on occasion, possibly because Louisa Maynard had been raised without one herself, and she did not employ one for Constance when Gazy and Do were at Belstead. Of those who were hired, the most vivid in Constance’s memory were Miss Armstrong (Grandam) and Jette Kroger (Krogie) because each was skilled in French and German respectively. But other lessons, Constance recollected, were taught in the mechanical fashion of the times:

....So many pages of ‘Mrs. Markham’ to read aloud, a French verb to repeat (and the accent taught was excellent), ten examples of *Colenso* to be worked, six questions of *Mangnall* to answer, and two pages of *Child’s Guide* to prepare....I do not think I remember a spark of real interest being elicited, except when one governess (otherwise unsatisfactory) taught us to collect, press, and name the beautiful ferns of our neighbourhood; neither do I recollect any sort of explanation—no, not even to correct the spelling of the word Mediterranean, which had been rendered with two t’s and one

---

<sup>31</sup> Gorham, *Victorian Girl*, 3-101. See also Davidoff and Hall, *Family Fortunes*, 181-9; Howarth, “Gender, domesticity,” 168-69.

r.... Of all the arithmetic I learned, and there was a little every day for several years, I can call to mind only one single rule, and it ran thus: 'Turn the fraction upside down, and proceed as before'...<sup>32</sup>

While early education for genteel girls was neither regular nor standardized, the efforts at reforming middle-class boys' public schools had taken place since the 1830s.<sup>33</sup> The founding of University College, London (1828), followed by boys' public school examinations (1850s), gave some boys more chance of a university-based training, and entering occupations like the civil service.<sup>34</sup> It was such changes that inspired reformers like Emily Davies to campaign for similar improvements in girls' education:

If a liberal education equips boys for all walks of life why is it less suitable for young ladies? It would make them better wives and mothers as well as affording some employment opportunity... and generally speaking, the education of the daughters of the labouring classes is as carefully watched over as boys, why is the case altered when we advance a few steps higher in the social scale?<sup>35</sup>

---

<sup>32</sup> A, I, 4, "1849-60," 10; Maynard, "Victorian Schoolroom," 106-4; Firth, *Maynard*, 22.

<sup>33</sup> Heyck, *Intellectual Life*, 75. Thomas Arnold developed a reformed model at Rugby.

<sup>34</sup> *Ibid.*, 62. Oxford and Cambridge had tried to maintain a monopoly of university education, with entry for genteel Anglicans only. But, as noted earlier, the secular London University offered a broader curriculum than Oxbridge. University College was non-denominational while King's College was Anglican. In *Victorian World*, 69, Newsome asserts that by 1848 in Birmingham alone 97 schools catered to a male population of about 1,000. By the late 1800s, enrollment had tripled at Oxbridge with over 1800 new students each year.

<sup>35</sup> Quote from Davies', "On Secondary Instruction as Relating to Girls" in *Thoughts*, 64. Davies apparently read this paper at the National Association for the promotion of Social Science in 1864. It countered influential journalist, W. R. Greg's article in 1862, which proposed that "women know their place." See W. R. Greg, *Literary and Social Judgements* (London: Trubner, 1868), 56. See also Frances Power Cobbe's *Duties of Women*, and Lilian Faithfull's, *How Shall I Educate?* as other examples of

In reality, workers' daughters were not regular school attenders until education was made more available by the Education Act of 1870 and the legislation following it. The fact that voluntary co-educational schools for working-class children had *existed* since the early 1800s gave reformers more momentum. Those whose parents could not afford governesses or private schools often had to attend small scale "educational homes," which had a poorer quality of education than received by working-class girls.<sup>36</sup>

The pioneering efforts of Frances Mary Buss and Dorothea Beale are worthy of note. Buss' founding of the North London Collegiate School for Girls (1850) created the single most influential middle-class girls' secondary school. Cheltenham Ladies' College (1858), in turn, reflected Beale's genteel upbringing, and was an acclaimed boarding school.<sup>37</sup> The 1860s was the turning point in the history of middle-class girls' education in England, however. Cambridge took the lead opening up Local Examinations to girls in 1863. The Endowed Schools Act (1869) recommended that girls' day-schools charging

---

Victorian women's fight for higher education.

<sup>36</sup> See Gorham, *Victorian Girl*, 25. Beale, Buss and Davies convinced the School's Inquiry Commission (1864-67) to include girls' schools within their enquiry into middle-class education; and the Commission's survey made the case for mobilizing resources for reform. See also Dyhouse, *Girls Growing up in Late Victorian and Edwardian England*, Hunt, ed., *Lessons for Life*; Burstyn, *Victorian Education*; and for workers, and Ellen Ross, *Love and Toil: Motherhood in Outcast London, 1870-1918* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1993).

<sup>37</sup> Vicinus, *Independent Women*, 123, Gorham, *Victorian Girl*, 142-43. Beale was upper-middle-class and had been educated by governesses at home and in Paris. Buss, raised in a middle-class family, attended private school and then taught there at fourteen years old.

only moderate fees should be set up throughout the country.<sup>38</sup> In the 1870s and succeeding decades a new type of middle-class girls' school was established. Schools like those founded by the Girls' Public Day School Company (1872) led the way, along with high schools established in London.<sup>39</sup>

Notting Hill, the second school founded by the G. P. D. S. C. in 1873, sought to establish the ideals of Buss and Beale to encourage middle and upper-middle-class girls to pursue externally measurable goals through education. This, they reasoned, would distinguish their aims from schools like Belstead, which, set within a mansion-like setting, still reflected the pre-industrial era of "polite sociability" with its emphasis on feminine accomplishments.<sup>40</sup> Davies writes of this early-Victorian model:

The young girl has spent a few years at school, has learnt the rudiments of French, can play on the piano, and is tolerably skillful with the needle. She can read and write. Whether she can also spell, and work a sum correctly and quickly, is doubtful, as too many parents are more anxious for

---

<sup>38</sup> Gorham, *Victorian Girl*, 25; Vicinus, *Independent Women*, 134-40. Beale, Buss and Davies argued the need to standardize girls' education and define goals. For other accounts see Burstall, *High Schools*; Zimmern, *Renaissance*; Jane Martin, *Women and the politics of schooling in Victorian and Edwardian England* (London: Leicester University Press, 1991); and Patrick Scott and Pauline Fletcher, *Culture and Education in Victorian England* (Cranbury: Association University Press, 1990).

<sup>39</sup> Fitch, "Women," 249; and for history of the G. P. D. S. C. see Josephine Kamm, *Indicative Past: A Hundred Years of the Girls' Public Day School Trust* (London: George Allen & Unwin, 1971). Local committees formed the companies, acting either independently or in concert with a national school company in both founding and administering schools.

<sup>40</sup> For a first-hand account see Zimmern's, *Renaissance*. See also Burstall, *High Schools*, 67; Vicinus, *Independent Women*, 123; Gorham, *Victorian Girl*, 142-43. Buss, Beale and Day sought public recognition through a diploma from Queen's College, founded in London in 1848 by the Reverend F. D. Maurice and the Governesses' Benevolent Institution to provide "advanced education" for teachers and governesses.



proficiency in what are called 'accomplishments' than in these fundamentals which make no-show. She is released from the wholesome discipline of school, and thrown suddenly upon her own resources. Her mother probably expects her to help a little in household matters, which occupy her for, perhaps, two hours of the day, and the rest of her time is thrown upon her hands, to spend as she likes. Can we wonder that her days are passed in laborious trifling, and her nights in dissipation?<sup>41</sup>

Although many private schools underwent alteration to keep pace with changes in girls' education, it is notable that many that conformed to the early-Victorian model continued to exist well into the twentieth century.<sup>42</sup> Belstead was in this category. Its approach to girls' education was still preferred by genteel families like the Maynards in the 1860s. "Even in the 1900s," Constance wrote, "its curriculum was still conservative when compared to Cheltenham."<sup>43</sup>

In contrast to the Maynard daughters, the sons attended a private boarding school in Herstmonceaux in Sussex from age ten to eighteen. Each received a liberal education based on the Classics.<sup>44</sup> Since Harry was to inherit his father's business, "Father took great care over him" Constance said. In fact he was sent to Europe with a private tutor for

---

<sup>41</sup> Davies, "Letters to a Daily Paper," in *Thoughts*, 2; Stephen, *Emily Davies*, 40.

<sup>42</sup> For Belstead see Joyce Senders Pederson, "Schoolmistresses and Headmistresses," *Journal of British Studies*, 15 (1975), 148. Belstead reflected Oakfield's setting with its lodge and stables. In *Victorian Girl*, 26, 34, Gorham cites 'Queenwood, which was run out of a house in Eastbourne, as another example of this type. It still catered to genteel families and still had the 'ambience of a home' in the 1890s.

<sup>43</sup> *A*, 1, 3, "1863-4," 41.

<sup>44</sup> Firth, *Maynard*, 24. Arnold claimed that the Classics "created the gentleman who aspired to duty." Classics included subjects like Greek, Latin, German and French, English language and grammar, mathematics, geography and history. See Newsome, *Victorian World*, 67-69.

eighteen months to “inspire him to learn.”<sup>45</sup> Meanwhile, she and her sisters entered Belstead when they were fourteen years-old, and they remained there with the exception of Constance until aged eighteen. Louisa apparently approved of founder, Mrs Umphelby’s (Mamie’s), educational ideas. But “lessons were not Belstead’s strong point,” Constance asserted, “and arithmetic was particularly stupid and unexplained.” Nonetheless, she recalled the “cheerful ‘busy-ness’ over all sorts of trifling matters;” and how Belstead’s “delightful” domestic atmosphere was furthered by various house pets and the presence of Mamie’s mother.<sup>46</sup>

When Do completed her studies at Belstead in July of 1864, Constance had already gained the distinction of “First Class,” a position Do never attained. The privilege afforded to First Class students echoed private sphere ideals. While Buss and Beale were encouraging girls towards academic achievement at their schools, Mamie was advising Constance to “set an example to incoming students by keeping up a tidy room and appearance” instead. Yet for Constance, this was freeing nevertheless. As Firth pointed out, Constance was so involved that Harry’s marriage to Gertrude Langston in February, 1864, was only mentioned in passing. Thus, it was a severe blow when her father

---

<sup>45</sup> A, II, 8, “London and Lymfield, 1871,” 196. Harry never succeeded academically and neither son went on to Oxford or Cambridge. Constance wrote here that, “Harry would have been far happier at one of the newer institutes,” which had sprung up in industrial towns in the late 1830s to specialize in subjects like engineering or business. See also Davidoff and Hall, *Family Fortunes*, 238-39.

<sup>46</sup> Maynard, “Victorian Schoolroom,” 120; A, 1, 3, “1863-4,” 41; Firth, *Maynard*, 50; Pederson, “Schoolmistresses,” 137-43; See also Peter Laslett’s, *The World We Have Lost* (New York: Schocken Books, 1965), 89-99, and Geoffrey Best, *Mid-Victorian Britain, 1851-1875* (New York: Schocken Books, 1975), for more discussion on private boarding schools.

suddenly removed her from Belstead in December of 1865: “It was too early because I wasn’t even sixteen yet,” she tersely noted in her Autobiography. Destined for the private sphere, she was expected to join her sisters as a “grown-up-daughter-at-home.”<sup>47</sup> For the next seven years she remained home, her life of genteel womanhood reflecting her father’s wealth.

When reviewing Maynard’s girlhood and adolescence, Firth downplayed the gender disparities of the period, suggesting, instead, that the regular routines surrounding learning and recreation, alongside Louisa’s “gaiety of spirit” and interest in her children’s activities, created a colourful and stable home milieu.<sup>48</sup> Writing in 1910, King did not mention gender roles in *Reminiscences* either. But she did adopt a different tack from Firth—her biography evoking her disapproval of her Aunt Louisa’s structuring of her young cousins’ lives:

Her [Louisa’s] most obvious daily principle was instilling a careful exactness in everything they did, such as writing, drawing etc. Louisa hated laziness and each child had to have a ready answer to what they were doing every hour of the day....Nor was teasing or quarrelling allowed in the nursery and school room. At the time I thought this was wonderful, but now I’m not so sure. All actions were controlled so that no spontaneous action or demonstrative affection was permitted.<sup>49</sup>

Maynard’s Autobiography correlates more with King’s observations than with Firth’s. It seems that Louisa—largely absent from her children’s early lives—was “a *huge* presence...

---

<sup>47</sup> Firth, *Maynard*, 56; *A*, I, 4, “At Home, 1865-6,” 47; Gorham, *Victorian Girl*, 158-59.

<sup>48</sup> Firth, *Maynard*, 23-26.

<sup>49</sup> King, *Reminiscences*, 30-31.

from 5 until 13 before disappearing into obscurity again.” Certainly this had its advantages. “She instilled a love of knowledge for its own sake,” Constance said. “She had a passion for learning.<sup>50</sup> But Louisa’s presence had an equally negative impact. Emotionally distant yet emotionally controlling, her “strong will” evoked an anger and criticism from Constance that went far beyond King’s disapproval of her home-life:

Difficulties were caused by Mother’s strong will and the pressure was unceasing. Even the merest trifle was examined under the exponent of her fixed Principle, ‘turn from the world.’<sup>51</sup>

Louisa’s concern reflected one Victorian response to the rise of secularism, for example, with the Church’s diminishing power over education and welfare.<sup>52</sup> As noted in chapter one, the challenges to secularism at large were evident in activities like the flurry of church building; the rise in church attendance; and also in the founding of organizations like the Salvation Army.<sup>53</sup>

According to King, Louisa’s religious teaching was so extreme and complicated that “it [wa]s not easy to describe”:

---

<sup>50</sup> A, I, 3, “1849-60,” 36.

<sup>51</sup> Ibid., II, 4, “1865-6,” 65.

<sup>52</sup> This was evident in the Poor Law (1834) and the Education Acts (1870). By the end of the century the Church had evolved from a voluntary body or agent of the state chiefly into a unit of religious worship. See Webb, *Modern England*, 123-29; Newsome, *Victorian World*, 48-120; also Briggs, *Age of Improvement*, and Heyck *Intellectual Life*.

<sup>53</sup> See Firth, *Maynard*, 330; Hempton, *Religion and Political Culture*, Brooke, *Science and Religion*, Butler, *Victorian Doubt*; Gill, *Myth of Empty Church*; and H. McLeod, *Religion and Society in England 1850-1914* (London: McMillan, 1996) for challenges to assumptions on the rise of Victorian doubt in the 1800s. For the Salvation Army see Walker, *Devil’s Kingdom*.

She wanted them to understand that the moral goodness of daily life was pleasant and happy, and that they could enjoy pleasing parents, teachers and friends. But this was not good enough for *God* because He wanted everything *He* had made very good. No one was born like that, however, and so they could not really please Him until they saw the distinction between natural and spiritual life, between earthly and heavenly goodness. This belief stemmed from the puritan and Huguenot attitudes of her ancestors.<sup>54</sup>

On the one hand, Louisa's puritan-based emphasis on conscience was not entirely atypical for the times. "The 'evangelicalism' of the period did reflect puritan virtues," Hilton argues, as seen in "the end achieved by moral restraint."<sup>55</sup> Nonetheless, Louisa's values were stricter than most. In fact her children were taught an ideal of conduct that was, in many ways, antithetical to the prescribed social activities for their class. The Bible condemned worldliness, Louisa cautioned, and "turning from the world" meant shunning the "frivolous behaviour" of their society. Most social equals were condemned as "not our sort," Constance wrote. "Childhood friends were largely villagers" who were deemed "equal" in God's eyes yet "unequal" socially.<sup>56</sup> No Maynard child was allowed to attend the theatre, dances or parties, read romantic fiction, or dress fashionably. As their mother explained, sensation was "little more than an attack on the nerves." Plays and the like

---

<sup>54</sup> King, *Reminiscences*, 32.

<sup>55</sup> Hilton, *Atonement*, 23; also Bebbington, *Evangelicalism*, 15; Joseph Byrnes, *The Psychology of religion* (New York: The Free Press, 1984); and Patrick Collinson, *Godly People: Essays on English Protestantism and Puritanism* (London: Hambledon Press, 1983).

<sup>56</sup> *A*, II, 4, "1865-1866," 65-80. The only equals they played with on occasion were the Herschel children. This seems ironic given that (Sir) John, former Fellow of St. Johns in Cambridge, was an eminent scientist and astronomer who had affiliations with the B. A. A. S. See Heyck, *Intellectual Life*, 50, 60, for Herschel.

were dangerous because they “took hold of the senses and dulled the keen edge between right and wrong.”<sup>57</sup>

As young adults, “our activities continued to be strictly monitored,” Constance asserted in her Autobiography. “We read the Bible,” and the emphasis on religion extended to selections of biography, poetry and fiction, with only “Walter Scott or the odd text like Harriet Beecher Stowe’s *Uncle Tom’s Cabin*” being permitted in the latter.<sup>58</sup> Some popular sermons of the day were acclaimed, like Thomas Chalmers’ “the expulsive power of a new affection” (1861).<sup>59</sup> But according to all records, the sermons of Scottish dissenter, Edward Irving (1792-1834), reigned supreme in terms of advocating Henry’s and Louisa’s true Christian ideal.

Irving’s ministry was based upon the belief that evil tempted Christ in just the same way that it tempted humankind:

To strike terror is his delight....His aim is to come at the hearts of men through their apprehensions, and by depicting the awful attributes of the Deity, and the fallen condition of his creatures, with more or less success,

---

<sup>57</sup> *A*, II, 4, “1865-1866,” 86-89; also Maynard, *Cultivation*, 14; Firth, *Maynard*, 53-64; and Gorham, *Victorian Girl*, 158-59.

<sup>58</sup> Other texts, as noted in Maynard’s *D*, were *Paradise Lost*, *As you like it* and *Much Ado About Nothing*. See *D*, 7 May 1872, 21 and *D*, 8 October 1872, 66.

<sup>59</sup> *A*, II, 9, “1871,” 242. In her *GB*, 3 December 1869, 7, Constance wrote of Chalmers’: “I feel sure that the right thing is to take sin to Jesus, and then having it once ‘purged,’ remember it ‘no more.’” Her father also saw Paley’s *Evidences* and Butler’s *The Analogy of Religion* as “among the foundational Truths.” As Hilton notes in *Atonement*, 104-5, 170-77, Paley advocated suffering, but focussed more on the “benevolence of nature and mankind.” Butler meanwhile emphasized the evils of Conscience and perpetual trial.

to force repentance, by a sort of moral torture, into the bosom of despair.<sup>60</sup>

Although Irving's repressive stratagem had been attacked by evangelicals for its lack of pathos since the 1830s, this was exactly what drew the Maynards to it. "They concluded that the 'dry light' of the intellect...was neutral," Constance wrote. "It was when you came to the heart and the will that you found *all* the sin and corruption. They told us, 'God did not even spare the sinful nature of his own son.'"<sup>61</sup>

Irving's homily, which decreed that one should suffer with resignation, perhaps with even masochistic gratitude,<sup>62</sup> fit very well into Louisa's "life-principle." In fact it was central to Louisa that her children not be tempted to seek earthly love over heavenly love: "At five, we were told to *know* God by using our mind, not our emotions," Constance lamented in her Autobiography. "At twelve, when we received our first Bible, Mother dissuaded all expression of faith as we read her carefully selected verses aloud."<sup>63</sup> The Green-book record, begun on January 1<sup>st</sup>, 1866, opens with Louisa's "new year

---

<sup>60</sup> Fleming, *Edward Irving*, 22; also Hilton, *Atonement*, 14, 19, 285; Bebbington, *Evangelism*, 96, and Doreen Rosman, *Evangelicals and Culture* (London: McMillan, 1984), for the views of extreme evangelicals like the Maynards.

<sup>61</sup> See *GB*, 1 April 1867, 88; *GB*, 15 June 1871, 99; and *A*, 2, 9, "1871," 301 on this. Irving was deposed from the Scottish Establishment in the 1830s for his espousal of universal pardon over pre-destination. He moved to London to minister to fellow expatriates and was proclaimed a martyr by some in the 1850s for standing by his convictions. See James Fleming, *The Life and Writings of the Rev. Edward Irving* (London: Marshall, 1823), 1-12.

<sup>62</sup> On this see Gerald Parsons, ed., *Religion in Victorian England* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1997), 67; John Stachniewski, *The Prosecutory Imagination: English Puritanism and the literature of religious despair* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991) and Hilton, *Atonement*, 32.

<sup>63</sup> *A*, I, II, "1849-60," 3-28; King, *Reminiscences*, 32; Firth, *Maynard*, 29-30.

motto” to her youngest daughter: “So foolish was I, and ignorant: I was as a beast before Thee.”<sup>64</sup> A harsh maxim indeed for a seventeen year old. Yet the words set the tone for this at times, self-depreciating record. An entry in 1869 particularly reflects Constance’s struggle with her mother’s life-principle:

All through life the old nature will strive for mastery, and pain and sorrow for sin must continue. I can not find a single text of scripture that might impute Satan’s omniscience. His darts are fiery because they inflame the nature they touch. Some of them poison the intellect, producing sceptical tendencies and distrust of God. Others inflame the will, moving it to acts of ambition, passion or covetousness. The most deeply [sic] brings remorse because it drives us in shame away from Christ.<sup>65</sup>

Maynard’s struggle between will and submission was to create a conflict that became core to her experience. As the Green-book unfolds, a woman emerges from its pages who struggled to reconcile faith, love and ambition. It is through faith that Maynard revealed her violations of boundaries to herself. Yet at the same time, faith became a means of deceiving herself about the natures of her feelings as a lover and as a person of strength, intelligence and determination.

The Green-book also suggests that the Maynards’ emphasis on moral restraint naturally applied to sexual restraint. This is not surprising given their religious views and cultural notions of middle-class women’s sexual innocence. While society promoted romantic married love, it was understood that women took no pleasure in sex. Moreover, the association of “respectable womanhood” was set against an opposing unspoken ideal

---

<sup>64</sup> *GB*, 1 January 1866, 1. Apparently Louisa gave each son and daughter a new year motto, which they were expected to try and follow throughout the year.

<sup>65</sup> *Ibid.*, 30 November 1866, 21.



of male sexuality. Society tolerated a man's use of the services of working-class prostitutes mostly before marriage, despite the fact that it contradicted the moralizing imperative of a middle-class culture. The Contagious Diseases Acts of the 1860s had stretched the double standard of sexual morality to the breaking point, tapping a strong current of Evangelical morality as well as avowedly feminist sentiments. The latter illuminated the victimization of prostitutes, and was exemplified by Josephine Butler's seeking to transform men's sexual culture in the name of 'social purity' in her effort to stamp out the double standard of sexual morality.<sup>66</sup>

It seems that Henry and Louisa adopted a gendered perspective on sexuality, laced, of course, with a strong dose of religious and class-based morality. Louisa "really fretted over" Harry's living alone in London. After all, he "loved a crowd and was known to like a joke and a pretty girl." Tissy was often sent to stay with him before he married to prevent him "from lapsing into evil."<sup>67</sup> Constance's acclaim of Butler's views on gender suggested a similarly genteel feminine perspective:

---

<sup>66</sup> Social purity targeted the immorality of bachelors while feminists also sought to dignify the figure of the fallen woman, reserving their anger for the middle-class bridegroom who brought venereal disease to the marriage bed. See Judith R. Walkowitz, *Prostitution and Victorian Society: Women, Class, and the State* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1980) and *City of Dreadful Delight: Narratives of Sexual Danger in Late-Victorian London* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992), 90-93; Gorham, "The 'Maiden Tribute of Modern Babylon' re-examined: Child Prostitution and the Idea of Childhood in Late-Victorian England" *Victorian Studies* (1978), 353-79; Frank Mort, *Dangerous Sexualities: Medico-moral Politics in England since 1830* (London: Routledge, 1987); and Tosh, *Man's Place*.

<sup>67</sup> Although Constance felt that her mother interfered too much in Harry's life, her diaries imply her revulsion yet fascination for "sexual danger." This shall be discussed at more length in chapter seven. See *D*, 9 November 1871, 99; *D*, 12 October 1871, 77; also *A*, II, 4, "1865-66," 65-70; and *GB*, 13 September 1868, 13.

I went to the meeting about the state regulation of vice. Best of all was Josephine Butler's plea for rights and justice. She is 'the Angel of light.' She said that a man has sensations he does not understand, and that a woman should be careful to appeal to the mind, not only the bodies of men. She should seek the companionship, not the admiration of the man.<sup>68</sup>

Butler's adoption of the "combined role of prophet and suffering magdalen" was carefully considered, Walkowitz argues. She presented herself "as the pure but not defenceless victim, threatened by the same sexual danger as her fallen sisters," who sought to both subvert and moralize patriarchal authority."<sup>69</sup> It is notable that Maynard was to adopt a similar role. Her sense of self as prophet forged her role as an educational pioneer. Moreover, her subversion of Butler's discourse of social purity provided her with an understanding of her sexuality in later years.<sup>70</sup>

Harry's and George's marriages somewhat freed them from Louisa's tether, even though Constance lamented the daughters' plight in the 1870s, in her Autobiography, "We had no London season, no parties, no friendships, no possibilities of love affairs..."<sup>71</sup> Whether consciously or unconsciously, the Maynards' religiously-based confining of their daughters within the home circle raised them to be spinsters. Only Do eventually married, and then not until she was thirty. In fact any form of romantic liaison was condemned, as

---

<sup>68</sup> *GB*, 8 January 1883, 59 ; See also *GB*, 1 April 1883, 75.

<sup>69</sup> Walkowitz, *Dreadful Delight*, 91; also Walkowitz, *Prostitution*; Gorham, "Maiden Tribute"; Mort, *Dangerous Sexualities*; Weeks, *Sexuality and Discontents*; and Michael Mason, *The Making of Victorian Sexuality* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1994).

<sup>70</sup> This will also be discussed at more length in chapter seven. For other references to Butler see *D*, 10 February 1887, 102; *D*, 16 March 1889, 122.

<sup>71</sup> *A*, II, 4, "Many Interests, 1866-7," 65.

Constance found out when forming friendships at Belstead and Girton, and when Harry Collisson and Dr. Robertson declared their love for her.<sup>72</sup> But Louisa would have been more distraught on both a religious and social level about her daughter's feelings for the married Lewis Campbell. Moreover, if Louisa had still been alive, she would have no doubt disapproved of Constance's passionate liaisons with students and peers at Westfield.

What, then, can we conclude about Maynard's upbringing? As King viewed it, their being raised on sayings like, "walk on hostile ground as 'Pilgrim and Stranger,'" had a specific effect upon Maynard and her siblings: "As adults they were independent, industrious and trustworthy, but there was also a sense of superiority and scorn of 'wrongdoing' that made them difficult to be with."<sup>73</sup> Firth concurred:

The religious teaching of Louisa Maynard set her family apart: it was their privilege to confer not soup only but sound doctrine on others, who, through no fault, were demonstrably in the position of inferiors...All unwittingly Constance sometimes alienated those ignorant both of her personality and of social history by what they felt as condescension.<sup>74</sup>

Firth also suggested that Maynard's upbringing left her feeling socially "awkward," even inferior to others of her social class; that she hid this and her inner conflicts by "adopting a pose."<sup>75</sup> Certainly, Maynard wrote of how she resented the "pat, pat, pat, of [her]

---

<sup>72</sup> Ibid., I, 3, "1864-5," 45; Ibid., II, 5, "1869," 60; Gorham, *Victorian Girl*, 160.

<sup>73</sup> King, *Reminiscences*, 30-31. In other words, being "Pilgrim and Stranger" made a "better" Christian than most because he/she "turned from the world."

<sup>74</sup> Firth, *Maynard*, 334

<sup>75</sup> Ibid., 29-30.

mother's hands around [her] and her insistent "no, you had better not do that, no, be content..."<sup>76</sup> Yet, as Gorham points out, she felt obliged to obey her parents until her twenties, accepting their severe limitations on her as a matter of course.<sup>77</sup>

I would argue that Maynard's home milieu, together with cultural discourses, particularly those around separate spheres, created an individual torn between polar opposites. Her struggle with what we might now call low self-esteem shaped her experiences with work and love. Her penchant for strong-minded individuals, perhaps resulting from Tissy's and her mother's domineering, seemed to leave her vulnerable yet unwilling to extricate herself from a relationship or situation in which she felt unequal. This tendency seemed to irritate her the most, at least when writing her Autobiography. Yet there is also evidence to suggest that Maynard was not beyond rebellion, even as a young child. Her rhyming sermon, *A True Mother* (1916), described the conflict between a mother's will and that of a four-year-old child.<sup>78</sup> King recalled an incident when Maynard was eleven:

There was some misunderstanding about her travel arrangements. Because the only transport available was a high dog-cart, with room only for her, a driver, and her box behind, no one could travel with her. It was raining hard and we wrapped her in a large waterproof. She was to be met on the way back at Edenbridge station by her father's coachman, 'Bishop.' He was not there, and, after a long wait, she returned home [fifteen miles] in the dog-cart. It continued a miserable night. The driver had to repeatedly climb down to see his way while she bravely held onto the reins of the awful horse she had seen run away so wildly when it had been frightened

---

<sup>76</sup> A, II, 4, "1866-7," 65.

<sup>77</sup> Gorham, *Victorian Girl*, 154-61.

<sup>78</sup> Maynard, *True Mother*, 23; also Firth, *Maynard*, 27.

at the station. The whole experience really frightened her. Meanwhile, Bishop had waited all day at another station...

As King concluded, “the whole incident indicated Constance’s courage and self control.”<sup>79</sup>

Maynard’s allusion to anger-based undercurrents “beneath Oakfield’s smooth outer surface” presents another picture to the reader:

He [Henry] was considered a worthy husband, but their tastes were not similar; nervous irritability on the one side and a sort of iron inflexibility on the other made for volatile situations that caused unhappiness and lack of trust. Throughout my life I was privy to these scenes, and have never written about them and will not now.<sup>80</sup>

She never did elaborate further. But she does point out here that, their “clashes were frequent.” In fact “we all had bad tempers,” she added.<sup>81</sup> In short, the Maynard women did not always adopt submissive stances. This, as noted in chapter one, counters Stearns’ concept of a monolithic gender-distinct emotional culture between 1840-1910.<sup>82</sup>

Constance, of course, would face the extra challenge of transgressing boundaries as an educational pioneer.

According to all of the records, Maynard directed her self-assertion towards career. Ambition drove her to seek a career. Ambition also won out over uncertainty or

---

<sup>79</sup> King, *Reminiscences*, 28.

<sup>80</sup> *A*, II, 4, “1865-66,” 65; Firth, *Maynard*, 17; King, *Reminiscences*, 34.

<sup>81</sup> *A*, II, 4, “1865-66,” 65. Although unclear, it seems that both Constance’s and Gazy’s anger created a rift between them at some point which was never quite repaired.

<sup>82</sup> Stearns, “Girls, Boys, and Emotions,” 60. As he notes here, men were encouraged to channel their anger in the public sphere through activities involving competitiveness or ambition.

love. When this form of self-assertion interconnected with passion, whether consciously or not, Maynard was not beyond using her position of power to exploit others, just as she had been exploited. Completing this strange, antithetical mix, as shall be discussed in chapter three, was a deeply ingrained emotion/reason split which coloured and complicated every aspect of her public and private life.

As a young woman, Maynard clearly adopted strategies of resistance. For emotional and intellectual outlet, she turned to nature, art, poetry, philanthropy, self-study and, faith itself. Her connection to her brother, Harry, is also worthy of note. "I'm very much struck with his position with us all during this period," she remarked in her Autobiography. "He was handsome, light hearted, naturally worldly, but was very humble about himself and very self-disciplined."<sup>83</sup> In short, she "understood his struggle with worldliness and 'duty' all too well":

His pathetic, euphemistic accounts of his father's tyranny and boundless courtesy in not giving details...was his response to *her* [Louisa's] attitude as he strove to follow the path set for him. He often wished he could run away but knew he would likely be hunted down....After him came us three girls, and I got most of it."<sup>84</sup>

Whereas Maynard's observations imply that her frustrations with her own upbringing and possibly the wider culture were as intense as Harry's were, her Green-book suggested that she found solace in his candid remarks, "Our parents fail to apply their beliefs to the matters of life." According to Constance's Autobiography, Harry was important in her life because he was her only sibling who admitted to feeling the levels of resentment that she

---

<sup>83</sup> *A*, II, 4, "1865-66," 67.

<sup>84</sup> *Ibid.*, II, 7, "An Eventful Year, 1869," 158-59.

felt about their repressive upbringing.<sup>85</sup>

Firth pointed out that “politics were not discussed at Oakfield,” and this seems to be confirmed when consulting the diaries. However, this did not mean that Constance was entirely closed off from public life.<sup>86</sup> In fact Harry’s public interests, which neither parent supported, opened his youngest sister’s sphere beyond Oakfield. A letter describing his visit to a consumptive hospital, ““They are dying Conse - they are dying - your disciplined, well filled mind would be a great blessing...Oh, do come out and *do* something!’ makes *me* long for something,” she wrote. “I wish *I* could help the poor and do some good.”<sup>87</sup> An entry in 1871 reflected Harry’s attempts to involve his siblings in politics, to possibly share in his emotional release through an interest in worldly affairs :

Harry arranged a lecture on the causes of the Franco-Prussian war. All think that they are in a rare muddle as to their future government. Hal showed us some dreadful cinders made when the Prussians burnt a stack of their dead with vitriol so that the French might not know their losses.<sup>88</sup>

---

<sup>85</sup> See *GB*, 15 January 1868, 68. She wrote, “This is one of my greatest griefs too. If I had the upbringing that many Christian parents gave their children, I should be far more advanced in thought of these things. As children, our hearts were not only uninstructed but were really ‘at enmity.’” See *A*, II, 6, “Many Interests, 1868,” 100. She said here, “I can hardly believe that Gazy was content with all her beauty and talents. Perhaps her duty was so strong that she never questioned herself. She was surprised at my ‘Panther in the Cage.’”

<sup>86</sup> Firth, *Maynard*, 62. Firth argued, “The rare references to public matters are spectacular rather than political.” Certainly, this is evident in entries like, “The Prince of Wales all but died,” see *D*, 2 December 1871, 98, but other entries counter this. See, for example, *GB*, 3 May 1868, 77; *D*, 28 January 1872, 20; and *D*, 29 June 1872, 33.

<sup>87</sup> *GB*, 13 September 1868, 13. She spoke of Harry’s lament about how the cholera epidemic in London (1866) “had afflicted over 900 working-class people.”

<sup>88</sup> *D*, 25 March 1871, 29.

Constance was neither allowed to “help” Harry in London nor did she seem involved in politics beyond his teaching. But her approach to village work at Hawkhurst reflects her “long[ing] for something” more.<sup>89</sup> Indeed, it can almost be viewed as preparation for her future pioneering aims. King felt that “village work helped her to learn sympathy at a later age.”<sup>90</sup> The villagers, Hetty Lawrence, Harriet Boxall, and Eliza Thoulburn loom largest in Maynard’s Green-book from the mid-1860s to the late 1870s. “I am amazed at Hetty’s unruffled endurance of an unbelieving husband, noisy children and endless heavy housework,” she wrote in 1867; and in 1875, “I never cease to marvel at her wisdom in her extreme simplicity.”<sup>91</sup>

Maynard’s two “protegees,” Harriet and Eliza, stimulated her teaching instincts. From 1867 to 1868 she spoke of “leading” the deaf and blind Harriet “to God, to please Mother.” Yet she seemed more excited and was perhaps more successful at teaching Harriet braille in order to give her some form of “independence and self-fulfilment.”<sup>92</sup>

---

<sup>89</sup> *GB*, 13 September 1868, 13.

<sup>90</sup> King, *Reminiscences*, 31. This also seems to be the reason behind Louisa’s disapproval of it. See *A*, II, 7, “1869-70,” 160, on Maynard’s perplexity as to why her mother did not encourage village work. In her *GB*, 26 March 1868, 60, she wrote, “George is reading to Willy Bishop [villager friend] before he goes to the workhouse to die of consumption. I think what George is doing is ‘worthy’ since he will know little of the poor after going ‘out into life.’”

<sup>91</sup> *GB*, 26 March 1867, 138; *GB*, 14 March 1875, 260; and for other examples see *GB*, 6 December 1868, 57; *GB*, 2 April 1871, 138; *GB*, 6 October 1872, 123.

<sup>92</sup> See *GB*, 15 February 1867, 52; *GB*, 20 May 1868, 48. She was clearly proud about Harriet’s achievements in brail. Indeed, her ‘cause’ took over her fear of Harriet’s violent mood swings. It seems that Harriet was what we term today, bipolar. Constance lost contact with Harriet after she was removed to an asylum for attacking her mother in 1868.



Constance adopted a similar attitude towards consumptive patient, Eliza, whom she met in 1875 when taking on village work at Girton: “My heart fell when I saw her room, perfectly bare, with tiny windows shewing the dreary levels of snow. She will just lie there like that till she dies, being attended in the roughest manner by her poor common mother.”<sup>93</sup> Constance worked at converting Eliza. She also developed Eliza’s writing skills, and they corresponded after Constance left Girton. What is notable in the Green-book, however, is her interest in Eliza’s ensuing “testimony” as survivor of consumption. Indeed, she found Eliza’s words so powerful that she preserved all of Eliza’s letters in the hopes of publishing them. They confirmed, for Constance, “the power of human strength and faith in face of great adversity.”<sup>94</sup>

In terms of her own “great adversity,” Constance had resisted her mother’s asceticism since age seven. Her love of nature was followed by a passion for poetry—as exemplified by her writing the poem cited at the beginning of this chapter. Certainly, this outlet was important since all reading was monitored, duties typically regulated, and visits beyond Oakfield’s gates carefully chaperoned. Yet Louisa’s (sub-)conscious encouragement for her daughters’ creative skills could be viewed as providing an emotional outlet for them. Do and Tissy took music lessons and “drawing helped *my* sad heart,” Constance wrote.<sup>95</sup>

---

<sup>93</sup> *GB*, 6 January 1876, 213.

<sup>94</sup> *A*, III, 20, “My final year at Girton, 1875,” 620-24. See also *GB*, 12 August 1869, 190; *GB*, 8 April 1877, 14; *GB*, 6 May 1912, 102-8.

<sup>95</sup> *A*, II, 4, “1864-5,” 65; Firth, *Maynard*, 53-54. They all spent time in the workroom, which had been set up for woodblock printing and pottery. The family

Art became an important milieu in other ways too. In her Autobiography, Constance noted how she and Gazy stayed in London under Jebb's care in order to take drawing lessons after 1866.<sup>96</sup> This surely afforded them some independence from Louisa. Meanwhile, the Green-book reveals that an art class in 1868 gave Constance "freedom of interpretation" as opposed to rendering the more conventional still life. She wrote of her attempt at sketching the eight-foot tall wooden figure of the high priest, Aaron: "I decided to sketch him in virtual darkness. Because the relief on the ephod vanished in the shadow, I let it vanish, and because one of the eyes looked square in the strange light, I drew it square."<sup>97</sup> The experience proved pivotal. By understanding that art could evoke the "undescribable by capturing the elusive," she discovered that art, like nature and poetry, could facilitate one's self-expression yet reveal the multifaceted layering of "truth"—the interconnection of evidence and experience.<sup>98</sup> Art-making was an important outlet throughout her life. In fact she gave it serious consideration in 1880, enrolling briefly at the Slade School of Art to develop her talents.<sup>99</sup>

---

Christmas card was to become a ritual for over twenty years—often involving all-night printing.

<sup>96</sup> A, II, 5, "1865-66," 92.

<sup>97</sup> GB, 12 October 1868, 142. Firth, *Maynard*, 65. The wooden and plaster figure, bought by Henry years earlier, was possibly Northern Italian Renaissance. After Oakfield was let in 1894, Aaron was taken to Maynard's rooms at Westfield.

<sup>98</sup> A, II, 6, "1872," 112. Henry bought her "a life-size lay-figure from London," which her dressmaker subsequently clothed in a shirt and navy-blue serge sailor suit. Her undertaking of a landscape painting on the wall by her school-room moved her beyond the confines of paper and canvas and also symbolized new arenas of freedom.

<sup>99</sup> GB, 28 May 1870, 183.

The “brighter writing in the diaries,” Maynard asserted in her Autobiography, corresponds to “my being treated more like a grown-up after 1871.”<sup>100</sup> Louisa’s asthma-related bronchitis contributed to this since she kept more to her drawing room after 1869.<sup>101</sup> However, it is notable that Maynard was now also consulting her Diary, which she began on January 8<sup>th</sup>, 1871. The Diary is freer from the painful soul-searching of the Green-book. Indeed, through this record of social events emerges a woman of great strength, intelligence and ambition. Her sense of self, largely gleaned from gender and class values, draws from other narratives surrounding nation, faith and sexuality. While the diaries as a whole present a divided individual who was torn between ambition and religious duty, and between rationalism and religious passion, Maynard sought to unite and empower the self through modifying her belief systems. Her struggle, as this study will show, was necessarily complex and complicated in her fight for love and for ambition, and ultimately for her own and others’ independence.

The Diary depicts how travel played an important part in shaping Maynard’s values as a young woman. The family could afford to stay at new luxurious hotels that were resplendent with fine dining and entertainment. This inculcated in Constance a certain snobbery, not simply because of her class, but because of her scorn of the

---

<sup>100</sup> A, II, 8, “1871,” 236-42.

<sup>101</sup> See Firth, *Maynard*, 58. Louisa found the summer humidity particularly oppressive: “The house, kept dark and scented by large magnolia buds, reminded me of the ‘Royal Presence,’” Constance wrote, “I crept quietly around so as not to disturb her as she sat in white in the drawing room which, with north aspect and half-closed shutters, was always cool.”

‘wrongdoing’ at the hotels like dancing and drinking.<sup>102</sup> Perhaps becoming her father’s second favourite exacerbated this. “I earned his respect through my keen mind,” she recalled in her Autobiography.<sup>103</sup> The diaries, which speak of their lengthy discussions on long walks together, also suggest that Henry pampered his youngest daughter: “I liked Boulogne because without my sisters my particular wants were indulged,” she asserted in her Diary in 1871.<sup>104</sup> On the more positive side, such attention seemed to give Constance back some of the self-confidence that she had lost as a child.

Travel served other purposes too. When walking in the Lake District, the family “stumbled upon Laxey, an industrial town known for its coal, lead and silver mines.” They apparently had little sympathy for the miners who had been on strike for two months. As Constance ruthlessly noted, “They want a raise from 18 shillings to 24. Father says that ‘it is too much’ and that ‘they will be starved into submission.’”<sup>105</sup> Her visit to Glasgow in 1872 is also noteworthy. She had accompanied her father to visit their “saint’s [Edward Irving’s] tomb at the cathedral.” But the city itself disgusted her because of what

---

<sup>102</sup> See *D*, 6 September 1871, 22. As noted above, King found her cousins’ attitude “made them difficult to be with.” See King, *Reminiscences*, 30-31.

<sup>103</sup> *A*, I, 2, “Adolescence, 1861-2,” 31. Her close relationship with him had begun at age twelve upon his return from South Africa in 1861. “He gave me a warm hug and I thought, he does love me after all,” Constance noted here. In the early years she helped him with gardening. They later became walking companions, which gained her the reward of trips alone with him. After Girton, she saw far less of him, and he thus relied on Gazy for companionship. Gazy took care of him in later years after his wife died.

<sup>104</sup> *D*, 3 July 1871, 23; she wrote here: “I took drawing lessons, saw the cathedral and frescoes, and went to the Cirque to see the ‘Japanese jugglers.’”

<sup>105</sup> *Ibid.*, 16 September 1871, 28.

she thought workers and paupers symbolized—sloth, filth, disease and immorality.<sup>106</sup>

We walked down streets of factories with workers and working girls... We found the same streets were *so full* in the evening that we could *scarcely* push through the crowd; as wretched looking a crowd as *ever* I saw - miserable dissipated looking people for the most part - children, sitting on the pavement bare-footed, dirty and ragged, and factory girls, very pale and sickly looking with bare feet and nothing on their heads.<sup>107</sup>

The above reflects the Malthusian notion that welfare encouraged the poor to reproduce, which was commonly believed by middle-class people in mid-century. Maynard was also to be influenced by Darwinist-based theories, which promoted class, gender and race hierarchy in the late 1800s.<sup>108</sup> The inter-relationship of these political, economical, religious and scientific discourses are evident in the records throughout her life. She never shook her social perspective implanted in youth.

Trips to London to shop and to visit museums, cathedrals and galleries were “always special” to Constance as a child, adolescent and woman. True to middle-class

---

<sup>106</sup> See Gareth Stedman Jones, *Outcast London: A Study in the Relationship Between Classes In Victorian Society* (London: Penguin Books, 1971); Anthony Wohl, ed., *The Bitter Cry of Outcast London* (New York: Humanities Press, 1973), 193; and Walkowitz, *Dreadful Delight*. These authors point out that ‘Outcast London’ was symbolized by poverty, street crime, prostitution and disease, and was much condemned by the middle-class.

<sup>107</sup> D, 20 May 1872, 53-55.

<sup>108</sup> Mason, *Victorian Attitudes*, 79-85; Newsome, *Victorian World*, 73-74; Best, *Mid-Victorian Britain*. Malthus’ *Essay on the Principle of Population* (1798) first gained support during the economic slumps and cholera outbreaks in the 1830s. His economic gloss on original sin gained credibility as he employed statistics and mathematics to argue his case. In *On the Origin of Species* (1859), Darwin argued that the male species was more highly evolved than the female since males developed higher faculties through survival skills like “hunting.” *The Descent of Man* (1870) built upon these ideas, asserting that certain features denoted male white supremacy.

form, her Diary evinces her relish at basking in the glory of nationalism—her sense of patriotism reflecting the confidence of society at large.<sup>109</sup> Patriotism also remained with her, as seen in her thoughts on the First World War in 1915:

I have always had a kind of patriotism towards nature, and its central intensity. Today it is England, beautiful England. It is mixed and heated with human life. The enemy is here, and many dead since the battles of Hastings. Men in khaki join in the service and take communion. I look at them and think how their bodies might be maimed or killed. I feel such compassion and sympathy that it makes me think that it is not worth it, that we are not worth it! But then again I think, ‘yes, England is worth such lives.’<sup>110</sup>

Her family’s fiercely nationalist pride also included an interest in technological development. Constance was taken to see the new “spinning machinery” and “electrical experimentation with wire” at the Albert Hall. It is noteworthy that she fought to get light bulbs installed at Westfield in 1894.<sup>111</sup> It was at the Crystal Palace where she saw “the first bicycle.”<sup>112</sup> She was among the first women to own one in later years, undertaking extensive and extreme “cycling tours” covering hundreds of miles across England to see

---

<sup>109</sup> See *D*, 5 July 1871, 197; *D*, 21 May 1876, 206; *D*, 23 July 1880, 208.

<sup>110</sup> *D*, 6 June 1915, 99. She clearly had strong feelings about this since she also wrote about it in other records. See *GB*, “Patriotism,” 12 July 1915, 261; *A*, II, 5, “1867,” 92.

<sup>111</sup> See *Minutes of Council*, 7 June 1898, 285. Special collections, Queen Mary and Westfield College Archives, London. Hereafter cited as *Minutes*, 7 June 1898, 285.

<sup>112</sup> The Crystal Palace was named during the Great Exhibition of 1851, which, as mentioned above, marked a high point of celebration of British economic success. See Dauntton’s *Progress and Poverty*, 40-47 and Newsome’s *Victorian World*, 25.

family, friends and “Old Students.”<sup>113</sup>

The most telling entries in the Diary, in terms of Maynard’s ambition, speak of her commitment to self-study. In fact the Diary immediately introduces the reader to “the Bill,” which was apparently a “work time-table” instituted by Constance after leaving Belstead to study the Classics of Greek and Latin, and German and History. This is not to assume that the Green-book is devoid of any “manly” ambition. In 1867 she wrote, for example:

Waiting at the train station we spoke to a young man with consumption. I shall never forget the earnest look of the large dark eyes as he talked of the cruelty of nurses at the hospital - patients actually had to help each other...Father commented that he should have had the whole story printed. Oh! if only I was a man I should write it, and print it, that all the world might hear of such a dreadful act! But I can’t! I can’t! I suppose I must let it rest, for someone else to find out - if only *I* was a man!<sup>114</sup>

But the Diary continued as it had begun as a record not only of educational achievement, but also of social events, and the Bill reflected such a focus in the early 1870s.<sup>115</sup> A “good Bill” meant 36 hours per week for Gazy and Do. “I reached as high as 43 by getting up early and writing in shorthand to get down more information,” Constance asserted in her Autobiography. The fact that she “kept the Bill” until leaving for Girton in October of 1873 again reflects her “long[ing] for something” more.<sup>116</sup> Neither parent objected since

---

<sup>113</sup> See for example, *GB*, 12 January 1869, 45; *D*, 2 March 1871, 23; *D* 12 August 1872, 56; *D*, 13 July 1887, 78; and Firth, *Maynard*, 20-25.

<sup>114</sup> *GB*, 13 October 1867, 123.

<sup>115</sup> See, for example *D*, 4 February 1871, 6; *D*, 16 March 1871, 23, *D*, 12 April 1871, 33. The Bill is mentioned at least three times a week.

<sup>116</sup> *GB*, 13 September 1868, 13.

they monitored these texts. When Henry added a “school-room” on the west of the house his youngest daughter spent the majority of her time working there.<sup>117</sup>

Maynard’s intellectual pursuits seem quite remarkable given her life situation. She assumed that her formal education had ended. Yet she was determined not to succumb to what Davies may have called “laborious trifling and...dissipation” as a grown-up-daughter-at-home.<sup>118</sup> As noted above, a reformation of girls’ education was taking form in the wider world while she, unawares, kept her Bill in the 1860s. The campaign for higher education for middle-class women, beginning at this time, had a profound impact upon her life.

.....

Why was it that higher education changed middle-class women’s lives so much? After all, it is arguable that they were not entirely restricted before this time. Their crossing of sphere boundaries was evident in their participation in the anti-slavery movement in the 1780s, 1820s and 1830s, for example.<sup>119</sup> Later political pressure groups

---

<sup>117</sup> A, II, 4, “1864-1865,” 56; Maynard, “Victorian Schoolroom,” 106; Firth, *Maynard*, 64-65.

<sup>118</sup> Davies, “Letters to a Daily Paper, 1860” in *Thoughts*, 2; Stephen, *Davies*, 409.

<sup>119</sup> The 1820s movement—under the British Anti-Slavery Society (1823)—was moral rather than political. By the 1830s, a third of all societies were run by women. Their petitioning parliament to abolish slavery breached the convention that petitions (as distinct from the Crown) were only a men’s activity. See C. Midgley, *Women Against Slavery. The British Campaigns, 1780-1918* (London: Routledge, 1992). For working women’s demonstrations like the Peterloo Massacre (1819) and Chartism (1838, 1848) see A. Clark, *The Struggle for the Breeches: Gender and the Making of the British Working Class* (London: Routledge, 1995).



including the Anti-Corn Law League exploited women's control over household consumption in order to organize political campaigns against their opponents. By the 1840s women were demanding property rights, and they sought freedom from abusive marriages in the 1850s. In addition, the numbers engaged in teaching, writing, and religion at mid-century suggest that they already had alternatives to domesticity.<sup>120</sup> The problem with all of these activities was that they were largely viewed as extensions of women's domestic roles. The general consensus amongst historians is that higher education paved the way towards a new understanding of women's capabilities and roles; and that through higher education women gained new social, economical and political rights.<sup>121</sup>

Bedford, founded by Elizabeth Jesser Reid in 1849, was the first college to establish a curriculum for women "on the same plan as the public universities."<sup>122</sup> As

---

<sup>120</sup> In *Family Fortunes*, 175-80, Davidoff and Hall propose that 13,000 were involved in religious work while others made up the majority of the teaching force in towns like Essex. Florence Nightingale's tending of Crimean War (1854-6) victims was opening up nursing for women. See also Lee Holcombe, *Victorian Ladies at Work: Middle-Class Working Women in England and Wales, 1850-1914* (Hamden: Archon Press, 1973).

<sup>121</sup> See Gorham, *Victorian Girl*, 151-64; Vicinus, *Independent Women*, 121-211; Janet Sondheimer, *Castle Adamant In Hampstead: A History of Westfield College 1882-1982* (London: Westfield College, 1983), 41; and Sheila Fletcher, *Feminists and Bureaucrats: A Study in the Development of Girls' Education in the Nineteenth Century* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1980); Jane Martin, *Women and the Politics of Schooling in Victorian and Edwardian England* (London: Routledge, 1991); and Dale Spender, ed., *The Education Papers: Women's Quest for Equality in Britain, 1850-1912* (New York: Routledge, 1987).

<sup>122</sup> McCrone, "Emancipation or Recreation?" 206-7 and Kathleen E. McCrone, *Playing the Game: Sport and the Physical Emancipation of English Women, 1870-1914*. Lexington: University Press of Kentucky, 1988, 116-18. Jesser Reid persuaded University

Davies summarized Bedford's dilemma in the 1850s, that "at that time even the name of 'college,' as associated with women, seemed to require apology." Maynard expanded upon this in her Autobiography:

The first of our nurses were trained at Kaiserworth, and the first doctors held degrees from Brussels, Paris or Vienna, but education in arts and science in England freed women, enabling them to receive the same mental training as men....Bedford College 'made itself one of the great forces in our land.' For twenty years it was low, its teaching standard not as high as today's average high schools. Yet at the time, its courses of lectures were decidedly in advance of the age. Its committee were women who could not reap its benefit themselves, but who were still anxious to help the generation below. Such ladies were Lady Stanley, Miss Clough, Madame Bodichon, Mrs. Russell Gurney and, above all, Emily Davies.

She concluded that "the biggest barrier of all was the thought, 'but what is the use? All the expense, away from home, and what will be gained by it?'"<sup>123</sup>

Davies took the matter in hand in 1867. Encouraged by developments in girls' education in Cambridge, her decision to "open the first women's college" there stemmed from her hope that Cambridge would eventually grant degrees to women. What better than being attached "to the highest educational forces in the country?" Davies battled opposition in face of her adamant insistence that her venture reflect the formality of a *college* for women. She assured her target audience—the middle-class—that her college would be connected to the Protestant church, and that it would not:

---

college professors to give lectures in her home in 1847. In 1849, she rented larger premises in Bedford Square. Bedford struggled for years, its problems complicated by financial, organizational and educational weaknesses. But it survived, becoming the first women's college to be admitted as a School of the University of London in 1900.

<sup>123</sup> Davies, "Women in the Universities," in *Thoughts*, 159; *A*, III, 11, "1872," 338.

rub off the tender home-bloom of maidenliness. It [wa]s not directed towards changing the occupations of women, but rather towards securing what they d[id] well. Whether as mistresses of households, mothers, teachers, or as labourers in art, science, literature or the field of philanthropy, their work suffer[ed] from the want of previous training.<sup>124</sup>

Confined somewhat by cultural norms, Davies was nonetheless convinced that women could achieve academically at the same level as men. “She held meetings, she spoke her thoughts, she gathered statistics and she collected £7,000 in pledges,” Maynard proudly noted.<sup>125</sup> By 1868, the additional support from media including *The Times* helped to validate the scheme.<sup>126</sup> After Davies’ tenacity in securing Cambridge lecturers by convincing them that female students offered new avenues of research, Hitchin College opened its doors to six students in October 1869. Located in Hertfordshire, Hitchin was the first women’s college that was attached to Cambridge. It was unique because, in its early years, only up to five women were admitted each year.<sup>127</sup>

---

<sup>124</sup> Davies, “Proposed new College for women, 1868,” in *Thoughts*, 102-3; although it was promoted as Protestant, Maynard notes that students from unitarian backgrounds were also admitted.

<sup>125</sup> *A*, III, 11, “Introduction to ‘higher education’, 1872,” 338. Davies was supported by friends like Barbara Bodichon, Elizabeth Garrett and George Eliot. See also Vicinus, *Independent Women*, 125; Stephen, *Emily Davis*, 77-90; and B. Megson and J. Lindsay, *Girton College 1869-1959 An Informal History* (London: Heffer, 1960).

<sup>126</sup> Stephen, *Emily Davis*, 80. It ran thus: “It would be easy to indulge in raillery of such a scheme, but the names which have been subscribed to for the proposal for the plan demand at least serious consideration.” That same year the *Athenaeum* had printed an article noting parents’ “horror” over the idea of examinations for their daughter’s.

<sup>127</sup> *Ibid.*, 204. A mansion (Benslow House) in Hitchin—a village over twenty miles from Cambridge—was the chosen college site. Mrs. Manning, a member of the founding committee, was first Mistress. See also Vicinus, *Independent Women*, 127-62; McWilliams-Tulberg, *Women At Cambridge*, 68-9, 72; Bradbrook’s *That Infidel Place*, 79, 34; and Prudence Waterhouse, *A Victorian Monument: The Buildings of Girton*

Maynard first heard of Hitchin when she was visiting her older cousin, Fanny, and her husband Lewis Campbell, at St. Andrews in Scotland in 1871. She became determined to go. As chapter four will describe, her relationship with Lewis Campbell—and its accompanying disappointment—impelled her to gain permission from her parents to sit Hitchin’s entrance examination in June of 1872. She passed the exam, despite the disadvantages of her Belstead education, and she entered Hitchin in October. Certainly she faced serious teething problems. Davies had introduced the Little-go and the Intermediate (as a prerequisite for the Tripos) as a measure of proof that women could achieve as well as men if they followed the same curriculum and sat the same examinations.<sup>128</sup> As a result, Hitchin students “floundered about...reading hosts of unnecessary things” due to lack of supervision. This said, Maynard’s sentiments echoed most of her peers: “It was like being afloat a stream that had real destination.”<sup>129</sup> Like her trip to St. Andrews, the college (and then teaching) opened her up to the world of love.

In 1873, Hitchin moved to a new building of its own in Girton, which was about three miles from Cambridge, and was accordingly renamed Girton. It was in 1873 that Girton’s three pioneers, Sara Woodhead, Louisa Lumsden and Rachel Cook passed their

---

*College* (London: Routledge, 1990), 44.

<sup>128</sup> See Stephen, *Emily Davis*, 80; Vicinus, *Independent Women*, 140-62; McWilliams-Tulberg, *Women At Cambridge*, 94-5, 142; Bradbrook, *Infidel Place*, 99. Both the Little-go and Intermediate required passing Classical subjects like Latin, Greek, Theology, Arithmetic and History. The Tripos required studying four of the subjects in more depth. Some university members encouraged women to take degree examinations but official admission was refused.

<sup>129</sup> *A*, III, 11, “1872,” 340; Firth, *Maynard*, 114-119.

Tripes—the former in Mathematics and the latter two in Classics. Such success gained Davies more support from her main competition, Newnham College, which had opened its doors in 1871 under reforming Cambridge professor, Henry Sidgwick, and Anne Jemima Clough. Although Newnhamites were initially advised to bypass both Little-go and Intermediate, they followed Girton’s curriculum after 1873. Frances Dove and Mary Kingsland meanwhile became the first Girtonians to pass the Natural Science Tripos in 1874, while Constance was the first to gain her Moral Science Tripos in 1875. Her academic achievement, similarly to those of Lumsden, Woodhead, Cook, Dove and Kingsland, was not publicly announced.<sup>130</sup>

Constance returned home upon graduating from Girton. She soon persuaded her parents to let her assist her former Girton tutor and friend, Louisa Lumsden, who was now hired as Classics teacher at Cheltenham, by marking student papers in 1866. Maynard’s involvement in the founding of St. Leonards in St Andrews in 1877 with Lumsden and Frances Dove was also viewed as a “temporary measure” by her parents, even though her dedication to a career was becoming increasingly clear. As noted above, girls’ public high schools were developing at this time. St. Leonards offered a female equivalent to the boys’ public boarding schools in its emphasis on Classics and character-building through

---

<sup>130</sup> Ibid., 341; Ibid., 120-2; Maynard, “Early Victorian” 105-10; The Moral Science Tripos consisted of four groupings: physics and philosophy; ethics (included psychology); logic; and political economy. Its particular advantage was that it afforded women more equal opportunity with men since neither had taken the subjects previously. See also Vicinus, *Independent Women*, 139-48; McWilliams-Tulberg, *Women At Cambridge*, 60-1; Bradbrook, *Infidel Place*, 44.

activities like sports.<sup>131</sup>

Attitudes towards women's higher education in Cambridge were changing as well.

As Davies proudly noted in 1878:

After much discussion the Senate and Convocation agreed to accept from the Crown in 1878 a Supplemental Charter, making every degree, honour, and prize awarded by the University accessible to students of both sexes on perfectly equal terms. The University of London was thus the first academical body in the United Kingdom to admit women as candidates for degrees...and honours and distinctions have since been won by female students.<sup>132</sup>

Davies would have to wait until 1881 before Cambridge formally opened degree examinations to women, and until 1948 before degrees were actually granted to women. However, the fact that the situation in Oxbridge starkly contrasted with that in London proved both crucial and beneficial to Maynard's role as an educational pioneer. Indeed, the University of London's granting of degrees to women in 1878<sup>133</sup> inspired her great life work as a powerful leader in the movement to reform women's education—as chapters seven, eight and nine shall describe.

From the outset, Maynard's undertaking of Westfield stemmed from ambition.

---

<sup>131</sup> A, III, 11, "1872," 344; Firth, *Maynard*, 135-39. See also Joyce Senders Pederson, "Schoolmistresses and Headmistresses," *Journal of British Studies*, 15 (1975), 148. St. Leonards was followed by Roedean School (1885) and Wycombe Abbey (1896). For history of St. Leonards see Julia Macaulay, ed., *St. Leonards School 1877-1977* (Glasgow: Blackie and Son, 1979).

<sup>132</sup> Davies, "Women in the Universities," 174.

<sup>133</sup> See Fitch, "Women," 254; Pederson, "Schoolmistresses," 147; Vicinus, *Independent Women*, 135, 175; and Sondheimer, *Castle Adamant*, 10-24. The situation was similar at Oxford, with the first women's residences, Lady Margaret and Somerville Halls, not being built until 1879 and degrees not granted until 1921.

Her frustration with love and career, owing to her relationship with Louisa Lumsden, had caused Maynard to leave St. Leonards in 1881. Ambition took further form after she attended the Christian Women's Education Union meetings in 1881, while she was enrolled at the Slade school of Art in London at the time. Maynard's support of the C. W. E. U. stemmed from its aim to found a women's college in London on a religious basis.<sup>134</sup> But her own path towards this goal took a distinct turn after meeting a wealthy, devout spinster named Anne Dudin Brown who had similar aims. It was through Maynard's unceasing activities with public speaking and fund-raising throughout 1881 that Westfield College became a reality in October 1882.

In many ways, Westfield resembled Girton and Bedford. It originated as a private venture for five students in two, large, rented terraced houses. As "head" of her "family," Maynard, like Davies, carefully preserved feminine norms like cocoa parties or "walking out" with a chaperone. But she also stressed the importance of autonomy, leadership and corporate spirit, just as she herself had learned at Girton. By the early 1900s, the Westfield student was encouraged to lead the formal college Debate or to present a challenging lecture on a controversial topic.<sup>135</sup> However, the distinct advantage that

---

<sup>134</sup> For the goals of the C. W. E. U. (discussed in more detail in chapter seven), see Caroline Cavendish, *Aims for Women's Higher Education* (London: Simmons and Botten, 1881).

<sup>135</sup> *A*, VII, 44, "Introduction to my 31 years of Principalship, 1882," 333, written, May-June, 1926; Firth, *Maynard*, 251. See also Letter to Janet Sondheimer, 25 March 1976, from Florence Lyle in reply to her letter of enquiry 16 March 1976. Special Collections, Queen Mary and Westfield College Archives; and Irene Biss, *Reminiscences 1907- 1911* (London: Hodder, 1921). As McCrone proposes in *Playing the Game*, 1-13, sport was an important part of this. By the late 1890s there were various games clubs, and the tennis and hockey tournaments were taken seriously. This is true of Westfield.

Westfield had over Oxbridge and any other women's college in England in 1882, was its ability to prepare students for the B. A. degree. This, coupled with the fact that qualified female tutors could be hired due to the production of Girton and Newnham graduates, meant immediate success. By 1886, Maynard was proudly proclaiming her first three B. A. graduates. A decade later, at least fifteen graduates "fled down the Banquet Aisle," including those holding the B.Sc.<sup>136</sup> Maynard nurtured Westfield through its difficult early years; to its move to larger, more permanent premises in 1891; to its admission as a school of London University in 1902. When she retired in 1913, women's colleges were not only established, but women amounted to more than one in five of all full-time students in universities.<sup>137</sup>

Westfield also reflected Maynard's religious upbringing. She had suffered a religious crisis after confronting secularism at Girton. And her faith was further tested with the agnostic Lumsden at Cheltenham and St. Leonards. Thus she stressed the interrelationship between religion, intellect, and feminine independence. "Function," which was an essential feature of Westfield Sundays, evolved into an important arena for Maynard to discuss college matters and to broach missionary and allied topics. Similar to "the Church that is Girton" (Maynard's room at Girton) where the Girton Prayer Meeting

---

<sup>136</sup> *D*, 12 May 1885, 99. This was part of the yearly Banquet celebration for graduates. The students would form two lines and the graduates, donned in a white dress and wearing yellow poppies in their hair, would run down the "aisle" amid cheers and clapping.

<sup>137</sup> See *D*, 28 October 1886, 24; also *D*, 7 May 1897, 78; Zimmern, *Renaissance*, 103; Vicinus, *Independent Women*, 280-91; Sondheimer, *Castle Adamant*, 22; also Fletcher, *Feminists and Bureaucrats*; Hunt, *Lessons for Life* and Spender ed., *Education Papers*.



was formulated, Function was the forum in which ideas about the future Student Christian Movement (S. C. M.) were spawned. Its purpose was to evangelize the student world at large. In fact, regular Bible study, Function, and Divinity became symbolic of Westfield, setting it apart from colleges like Girton and Bedford, and its other main competitor, Royal Holloway College (which opened in Surrey, London in 1887). However, such goals left Westfield open to being criticized as either too “pi” (pious) or too conservative, particularly in later years. Certainly, Maynard’s aims for women were progressive during her era. Yet Westfield had targeted a more specific sector of the population than had Girton. Distinct in its degree program, and its provision of a religious milieu, it was favoured by upper-middle-class clergymen wanting a higher education for their daughters. Maynard never ceased to lament Westfield’s slow move towards secularist ideals, or the infiltration of “common” middle-class girls into her “precious baby.”<sup>138</sup>

In general, the mid-to-late 1800s saw the evolution of society at large. The Education Acts implied that neither Church nor voluntary bodies were sufficient for society’s growing needs. The rising standard of education for all classes was enabling social mobility and diminishing basic illiteracy. Thus, while the gentry were increasingly disempowered by the Reform Acts that gave the right to vote to men from the lower classes, the newly-educated workers were entering the expanding commercial professions

---

<sup>138</sup> See *GB*, 11 May 1901, 25-6; *GB*, 17 April 1904, 210; *GB*, 6 February 1907, 48; *GB*, 12 September 1910, 87 on this. Also Maynard, “Early Victorian” 105-10; Biss, *Reminiscences*, 21; Firth, *Maynard*, 240-60; Vicinus, *Independent Women*, 155-57; and Sondheimer, *Castle Adamant*, 22.

of banking, insurance, or accountancy.<sup>139</sup> Women's colleges meanwhile were flourishing due to more social acceptance. Besides Oxbridge, they had been founded in industrial cities. Victoria University comprised of Owen's College in Manchester, Yorkshire College in Leeds, and University College in Liverpool, opened their degrees to women in 1884. The ancient Scottish universities, in which hackles were raised over Sophia Jex-Blake's battles for access to medical education in Edinburgh, opened their degrees to women in the 1890s. Newer universities, like the federal University of Wales, were mostly coeducational from the start. Improved high school teaching—as noted in Alice Zimmern's book, *The Renaissance of Girls' Education* (1898)—also helped the development of colleges. Over 90 high schools had been founded under the Endowed Schools Act, and more than 30 by the Girl's Public Day Schools Company (which was to become a trust by the 1900s).<sup>140</sup>

Higher education furthered women's professionalization in careers like nursing, teaching and medicine. Traversing the public sphere had also enabled them to become better integrated into party and pressure-group politics. For example, the Campaign for

---

<sup>139</sup> See Newsome, *Victorian World*, 125-46; Vincent, *Literacy and Popular Culture*, 270-91; Heyk, *Intellectual Life*, 99; Fitch, "Women," 247, Howarth, "Gender, domesticity," 183-84. But while workers were more empowered, social distinctions remained, symbolized by the gentry's estates, emerging middle-class suburbs and urban slums.

<sup>140</sup> Zimmern, *Renaissance*, 99; also Gorham, *Victorian Girl*, 25; Vicinus, *Independent Women*, 134-40; Pederson, "Schoolmistresses," 147; Fitch, "Women"; Hunt, *Lessons for Life*; Spender, ed., *Education Papers*; Burstall, *High Schools*; Martin, *Women and the politics*, and Patrick Scott and Pauline Fletcher, *Culture and Education in Victorian England* (Cranbury: Association University Press, 1990) and Mary Price and Nonita Glenday, *Reluctant Revolutionaries: A Century of Headmistresses, 1874-1974* (London: Pitman, 1974).

the Repeal of the Contagious Diseases Acts, which criticized mandatory examinations of prostitutes for venereal disease but not of men, made public speaking easier for women.<sup>141</sup> This, in turn, was an important element in their fight against the double standard of sexual morality and repeal of the C.D. Acts (1886). Education and public speaking were important tools for the women's suffrage movement, which began in 1867 after John Stuart Mill's failure to secure an amendment to extend the franchise to women in the Reform Bills of 1867. The National Union of Women's Suffrage Societies (N. U. W. S. S.) was formed in 1897 under the leadership of Millicent Garrett Fawcett. By 1918, middle-class women over thirty years-old who owned property could vote.<sup>142</sup> Maynard never supported suffrage because of her conservative outlook. In fact she dissuaded Westfield students and staff from supporting the movement in the late 1800s. However, as she proudly proclaimed in 1925, "the seed [education] has been scattered and now it is up to the next generation to reap the harvest."<sup>143</sup> Indeed it did.

In conclusion, despite Maynard's narrow and elitist perspective, Westfield's success was due to her intellectual ability, her leadership skills, and her tenacity. These qualities were apparent in her determination to provide women the opportunity to take the B. A. and B. Sc. degrees at London. Nevertheless, her dedication to career was not

---

<sup>141</sup> See Walkowitz, *Dreadful Delight*. Also Holton, *Feminism and Democracy* and Rubenstein, *Before Suffragettes*.

<sup>142</sup> See Ray Strachey's *'The Cause': A Short History of the Woman's Movement in Great Britain* (London: H.R. Allenson, 1928, reprint, Port Washington: Kennikat Press, 1969), for a first-hand depiction of the trials and triumphs of the suffrage movement.

<sup>143</sup> *A*, III, 11, "1875," 338. See also Maynard, *We Women: A Golden Hope* (London: Morgan and Scott 1913), 23-26.

without its price. This chapter has outlined the challenges that Maynard faced as a young woman. Her understanding of faith and secularism, which intersected with her attitudes about gender, class and nation, would shape her life. Her choice of career over marriage competed with these attitudes, and so, she often felt crippled with self-doubt. Because she faced opposition from both family and society, she felt conflicted about her role, despite her great achievements as an early educational pioneer.

This chapter has also introduced Maynard's emphasis on Westfield's religious and academic milieu as reflecting not only her strict upbringing, but also the typical societal dilemmas of the time. Like many of her day, she struggled to reevaluate faith as a part of a vast field of knowledge after secularism had created an austere new phenomenon of unbelief and futility within her. Chapter three will elaborate on this theme in its examination of the impact of religious values on her behaviour and how her behaviour influenced the lives of other women. In so doing, it offers insights into how religion influenced one Victorian woman's experience, and it raises new questions about sexuality. The ensuing chapters trace the painful yet liberating path that Maynard took in her attempts to "atone" for ambition and passion. As she herself metaphorized, "It is as if I dare not enter on those years of starvation and my reckless satisfying of it, nor on the yet more solemn subjects [of religion]."<sup>144</sup>

---

<sup>144</sup> *GB*, 25 April 1927, 260.

### Chapter 3

#### 'My inner feelings': What is masochism?

In Constance Maynard's life, faith was a fundamental personal context for her romantic interests. Furthermore, her penchant for intense, erotic pleasure evolved sometimes into a corresponding form of "Atoning," which bordered on physical and psychological self-abuse. A Green-book entry concerning "the remarkable commentary in Hosea" is particularly telling:

I will hedge up thy way with thorns that will wound you if you try to turn back to the old ways, and make a wall, that she shall not find her paths. For she did not know that I gave her corn and wine and oil, and multiplied her silver and gold, and that all the things that made her so attractive were mine to give or withhold. Therefore will I return, and take away my corn in the time thereof, and will recover my wool and my flax *given* to cover her nakedness.<sup>1</sup>

"It was a *relief* to find my case typical and stated in detail in the Bible," exclaimed the heartbroken Maynard on her thirty-seventh birthday. "God has taken Ralph [Frances Gray] from me because I have loved her too well, or, rather, in too earthly a fashion. I am utterly helpless without His gifts! I *promise* to relinquish *everything* in order for Him to speak to my heart."<sup>2</sup>

What seems remarkable about the above is Maynard's adoption of faith as a means of understanding her earthly desires. It was not that she was carnal in a worldly

---

<sup>1</sup> GB, 20 February 1886, 142. Quote taken, in part, from the New English Bible; 2 Hosea 2. 6-15, 507.

<sup>2</sup> Ibid., 20 December 1885, 94.

way, although she struggled with disbelief at times. Her biggest sin, as far as she was concerned, was choosing human love over divine. Historians of women have examined how women's roles in formal church organizations and in lesser-known religions and theologies empowered them to seek important social gains.<sup>3</sup> But virtually nothing has been written about the impact of religion on Victorian women's eroticism—especially those who appear to have resisted pleasure to embrace suffering as evidence of moral purity. Writing about desire is difficult, of course, as debates surrounding social construction versus essentialism have shown. But scholars largely concede that the nature of desire encompasses varying needs at different times and circumstances, and is interconnected to values and to personal aims. Chapter two portrayed how Maynard forged independence beyond gender boundaries by justifying her motivations, in part, through faith. This chapter offers a beginning analysis of one Victorian woman's attempts to reconcile passion within the context of religion. I outline how Maynard's struggle towards this objective failed, perhaps inevitably, owing to her unresolved conflict between desire and resistance.

Maynard's religious fervour, as implied in the above quote, reflects an early Victorian evangelicalism rather than a mid-Victorian. Yet her dairies convey her struggle with this religiously-based dilemma all her life. Why was this experience different from

---

<sup>3</sup> See Malmgreen, ed., *Religion of English Women*. As the authors point out, this includes spiritualism, theosophy, the Quakers and Christian Science. See Hogan, *Women of Faith*; Melnyk, *Women's Theology*; Holden, ed., *Women's Religious Experience*; and Alex Owen, *The Darkened Room: Women, Power and Spiritualism in Late-Victorian England* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1990). Maynard's close friend, Anne Richardson, is another example of how women utilized the interrelationship between faith and politics to further careers.

that of other mid-Victorians? Why did Maynard choose to atone in this particular way for this particular sin all her life? As noted in chapter one, the earlier scheme of salvation emphasized moral conscience, in which suffering was viewed as the logical consequence of such bad behaviour as carnality.<sup>4</sup> By 1850, Evangelical thinking was reflected in middle-class values. For example, this morality conveniently favoured economic free trade while downplaying social conscience at large; and suffering was often viewed as a phase in the moral education of the poor. Some were even uneasy about charity in face of its supposedly deleterious effects on the receiver.<sup>5</sup> As we have seen, the inter-relationship of cultural, secular and religious narratives influenced Maynard's attitude in young womanhood.<sup>6</sup> As Mistress of Westfield, she emphasized to her students the importance of moral duty. They were encouraged to take on philanthropy, but with an objective of religious conversion, and not economic welfare.

---

<sup>4</sup> Hilton, *Atonement*, 6-12. Evangelicalism, which began with a middle-class reaction to French Revolutionary events and English Jacobinism, distinguished early Victorian mentality from the rationalist tradition of the eighteenth century. Since the age was also torn by social and political upheaval and by catastrophe like famine, suffering, perhaps out of necessity, was understood as part of God's plan. Popular texts included Henry Venn's *Complete Duty of Man* (1763), which warned of human depravity because of "the Fall" of Adam. See also Bebbington, *Evangelism in Modern Britain*, 75-105 and Roseman, *Evangelicals and Culture*, 45-69.

<sup>5</sup> See Hilton, *Atonement*, 17-27; also Samuel, ed., *The Evangelical Succession*, 44; Noll, Bebbington and Rawlyk, eds., *Amazing Grace*, 99; and Cheryl Walsh, "The Incarnation and the Christian Socialist Conscience in the Victorian Church of England," *Journal of British Studies* 34 (1995), 352-55. All texts suggest that the upper sectors of society did not view low pay and unhealthy working conditions as unchristian behaviour since it was considered good business.

<sup>6</sup> *A*, II, 6, "1868," 45-78. See also Mason, *Victorian Attitudes*, 79-85; Newsome, *Victorian World*, 73-74; and Best, *Mid-Victorian Britain*, 87-102, on middle-class views.

The beliefs of the Christian socialist, the Reverend Frederick Denison Maurice (1805-72), inspired a theological transformation in mid-century that also influenced class perspectives. Maurice, an Anglican theologian who taught at King's College, London, and then Cambridge, moved beyond the Atonement towards Incarnational theology to argue that Christ's sacrifice on the cross *redeemed* humankind from original sin:

The race never really ever *stood* in Adam, as it *clearly does* stand in Christ. The latter...truly felt the temptations of evil on our behalf, and had redeemed us all because he never, unlike Adam, lost trust in God or tried to stand alone.<sup>7</sup>

This new emphasis on Jesus as man, as opposed to lamb, demanded concern about the fate of all humankind—including the plight of workers—and with the condition of the secular world. As such, the Church was proclaimed a holy, but *social*, entity, in which all could celebrate the union with Christ in communion with one another. Encouraging church attendance thus became an important goal throughout the late nineteenth century.<sup>8</sup>

Although raised in the 1850s, Constance never quite freed herself from earlier evangelical thinking. As late as 1905 she wrote in her Green-book, “I believe in my vocation to teach. I have given the last of six lectures on the Atonement. I still see why

---

<sup>7</sup> Cited in Hilton's *Atonement*, 286. As James D. G. Dunn suggests in *Christology in the Making: An Inquiry into the Origins of the Doctrine of the Incarnation* (London: SCM Press, 1980), 128, the doctrine determined the character of the redeemer figure—the divine being who united humanity with God. Christ conquered where Adam failed because He died and rose again. Christ participated in a new humanity, which was God's original plan, but which now could be enjoyed through sharing in the life of the risen Christ.

<sup>8</sup> Walsh, “The Incarnation,” 351-73. Maurice was chaplain at Lincoln's Inn in the 1840s before moving on to King's College, London, and then Cambridge.



the Atonement is a vital centre of religion. It reminds us that we have something to do.”<sup>9</sup> She was taught, as many were, to honour the Sabbath, and her recollection of Sundays evoked an especially harsh reaction to Atonement thinking. After attending dreary church services, she faced an equally morose evening family ritual, which was launched by her father’s solemn ‘Saying’, “Hark, universal Nature shook and groaned, Tis the last Judgement; see the Judge enthroned.”<sup>10</sup> It was meant “to teach us that because of ‘the Fall’ our hearts were thoroughly bad,” Maynard recalled.

Redemption, we were told, was ‘something we would understand when older.’ We learnt, instead, that a seemingly innocent life - in which one felt secure in one’s faith - was more dangerous spiritually than a crime filled one.<sup>11</sup>

Given such harsh commands, one can only imagine the confusion resulting from Constance’s earnest decree when she was ten, that being “‘good’ was simply not enough for God.” Indeed, her parents’ fretting more over earthly temptation than outright wickedness left her with an overwhelming sense of personal failure about her inability to be unworldly and truly Christian. A baleful recollection of her anguish at twelve is telling in its tormented despair:

I remember...the solemn feeling coming over me that here was a whole other day gone and I had not once thought about God. People said, ‘Here is a child who *never* cries,’ but now and then I would cry bitterly in my little

---

<sup>9</sup> *GB*, 15 December 1905, 73.

<sup>10</sup> Firth, *Maynard*, 29.

<sup>11</sup> *A*, I, 1, “1849-60,” 4-11; *A*, II, 6, “1868,” 132; Firth, *Maynard*, 29-30, 82; See also Hilton, *Atonement*, 31; Bebbington, *Evangelism in Modern Britain*, 96; and Gerald Parsons, ed., *Religion in Victorian England* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1997).

bed, not for any wrong-doing, but for what looked to me to be so much worse, a general conviction of sinfulness and ignorance and discouragement.<sup>12</sup>

Maynard's childhood recollections convey how evangelicalism could contribute to, rather than detract from, a sense of anxiety, precariousness and doubt. Nonetheless, given the changing theological climate, her parents seemed overly fixated on the conflict between good and evil. Their obsessive searches to confirm the "Truth," Constance wrote, "usually meant condemning a work when tried by the central words of the Bible." Since the parents followed Edward Irving's preaching above all else, Incarnational theology was naturally dismissed as "emotional complacency."<sup>13</sup> As Maurice pointedly noted of Irving, "what could the Incarnation on his previous Calvinistic hypothesis be but the descent into a radically *evil* nature?"<sup>14</sup>

When rebelling against her mother's dry asceticism at twelve, Constance justified her "sentimental" transgressions of art, nature, and poetry by assuring herself that as "Pilgrim and Stranger" she was "a cut above most" in any case.<sup>15</sup> But upon hearing her mother's criticism of the superficiality of relatives in the summer of 1863, she seized upon what she saw as an even better resolution:

---

<sup>12</sup> *A*, II, 4, "1865-1866," 65, 69.

<sup>13</sup> *GB*, 19 May 1867, 89; Hilton, *Atonement*, 104-5, 170-77, 183-87.

<sup>14</sup> Cited in Hilton, *Atonement*, 286; see also Edward Irving's 'On the humanity of Christ,' *The Morning Watch*, 1 (1829), 421-45. He argues that, "Christ's holiness was due to the indwelling of the holy ghost in him and not inherently so. If it were not so, the doctrines of atonement, regeneration and redemption would have been void and meaningless."

<sup>15</sup> See *A*, II, 4, "1865-1866," 60-62; and also King, *Reminiscences*, 30.

When reading Isaiah 6 I was particularly struck by the words, ‘Whom shall I send, and who will go for us?’ This brought to mind the thoughtlessness of the lives of some I had seen in the summer and I suddenly thought that a real prophet was needed now, as ever it was in Isaiah’s time.<sup>16</sup>

In her Autobiography, Constance maintains that from this moment on—when she was fourteen—that she believed that God had singled her out to be a prophet, and that the “feeling had never really left her.” The idea of doing His work in such a vibrant way also helped satisfy her emotional cravings *and* appease her guilt over them. While her mother warned her against “enthusing” over conversion, since it “degenerated into romantic cravings for spiritual experience,”<sup>17</sup> Constance’s firm belief in her God-given aims took her down the very emotive path condemned to her by her mother.

Maynard’s experience at Belstead directed her towards her destined path. As she noted in her Autobiography, “Mamie had an approach different to any I had seen and my heart was soon open.”

The triumph of assurance was so utterly unlike the slow and generally mournful songs to which I was accustomed, that I could not but enjoy them. Mother had called them over-confident and irreverent, but never mind, this was Belstead and she herself had sent me there, and I would accept it whole and entire. Not a word did I hear about ‘truth,’ but the

---

<sup>16</sup> A, I, 2, “1865-7,” 28. Richard Swindburne’s, *The Existence of God* (Oxford: Clarendon press, 1979), 257, offers some insights into the idea of the prophet. He suggests that Christians, like Victorian evangelicals, generally believed that when humans abused God-given freedom to work out their own destiny God had compassion to raise up prophets or leaders. They had no supernatural powers, however, as this would take away an individual’s freedom of action.

<sup>17</sup> See A, III, 11, “My first term at Hitchin, 1872,” 374. See also Hilton, *Atonement*, 20. Evangelicals were anxious to distinguish devotion from enthusiasm, the latter being little more than the “mental inflammation expected of a bacchanalian, an actor, or a fop.” See also Stachniecowski, *Prosecutory Imagination*; and Doreen Rosman, *Evangelicals and Culture* (London: Macmillan, 1984).

stress was on devotion.<sup>18</sup>

The Green-book record, notably begun after Belstead, reflects Mamie's "devotion" and advice about Maynard's progress as Christian:

'At Belstead you know that I saw & REPROVED what was wrong & you placed dependence on me to train you. Now that you are removed from me, you have a far wiser & more loving Friend to go to, One who will never make a mistake or misunderstand you, but will train you up to the work He has in store for you....He will never fail you.' Mamie.<sup>19</sup>

Mamie's powerful statement, "He died for me," emphasized the Incarnational approach to understanding: "His love, tender compassion and pardon through the blood of the cross."

Mamie's favourite maxim, "sin shall NOT have dominion over you," was perhaps the most liberating to a fifteen-year-old who had thought, up to that point, that "sin was the worst thing that could happen to you." She had never dreamt that "religion could be so sweet, genuine and lasting."<sup>20</sup> One can but imagine the release that accompanied openly expressing feeling without guilt or pain for the first time in her life.

Early socialization is powerful, however. As "Mamie's devotion" and maxims fill the Green-book pages, so Louisa's new year mottoes and "Sayings" warned against sentiment and thoughts of His pardon: "*Happiness* consists in the denial of that self, which it is the aim of *Pleasure* to feed and gratify;" and again: "The Crucifixion means

---

<sup>18</sup> A, I, 3, "1865-66," 41.

<sup>19</sup> GB, 1 January 1866, 1.

<sup>20</sup> See *Ibid.*, 1; GB, 7 January 1866, 18; GB, 18 February 1866, 22; GB, 14 March 1866, 24.

that *He* must increase, but *we* must decrease.”<sup>21</sup> As King asserted, the Maynard children “were quietly discouraged from the religion taught at Belstead, and taught instead to be dutiful to God.”<sup>22</sup> Constance herself remarked in 1868, two years after leaving Belstead:

You may feel His sacred presence near in your weakness upon His love; and yet while it is only the luxury of sentiment, you may be treating Him like an earthly friend or lover...I believe this state of feeling to be compatible with real spiritual life but I also think it is very dangerous....It is the over excitement of a natural feeling and was, I think, the greatest danger at Belstead....It is the feelings we cannot trace that do us harm.<sup>23</sup>

Her reaction, in fact, had been extreme. Torn between Belstead and home, she had desperately ploughed through Irving, Joseph Butler, William Paley and William Law in an effort to understand her parents’ conception of “Truth” and “Reason.” Although painful, her two-year research led her privately to challenge their view of “Reason” as inseparable from blind obedience and humility. “I think that real humility is not simply knowing the Truth about God, it is knowing a true estimate of us,” she concluded in June, 1867.<sup>24</sup> This early investigation prepared her for her future intellectual challenges, and her

---

<sup>21</sup> *Ibid.*, 1 May 1866, 24; *Ibid.*, 20 November 1866, 45. This is also reflected in Louisa’s new year motto, “So foolish was I and ignorant: I was as beast before Thee.”

<sup>22</sup> King, *Reminiscences*, 24-33.

<sup>23</sup> *GB*, 16 April 1868, 192. This echoes Irving’s decree in “Humanity of Christ,” 433, “that only martyrdom, leading to ‘assurance’—that is the consciousness of the power of the Holy Spirit operating within oneself, independently of sanctification of good works—and so to ‘final perseverance,’ could suffice to vanquish the devil.”

<sup>24</sup> See *GB*, 1 April 1867, 98. Constance noted, “I think God meant Reason to be satisfied in a great degree in this world and in the world to come. This is echoed in Paul Stanford’s *William Law: A Serious Call to a Devout and Holy Life - The Spirit of Love* (Toronto: Paulist Press, 1978). For other examples, see *GB*, 2 May 1867, 112; *GB*, 12 June 1867, 120.

self-search fired her ambition and propelled her towards independence by seeking a career.

Writing in 1925, Maynard looked back upon her parents' attempts "to sever [her] mental furniture" with both sadness and anger. It evoked "all too clearly, the ultra-critical atmosphere in which I had been raised," she wrote. "While Theology could be talked about and endlessly discussed, the devotional, ethical and personal side was to be dealt with in silence."<sup>25</sup> Yet even as a child she had wondered at a much-loved governess's impassions about the "marvel of grasping the idea of God as *love*."<sup>26</sup> Mamie's religious approach furthered her blossoming, as did her brother Harry's turning from his parents' strict asceticism towards the popular evangelicalism of the day. "Trips to his home at Tunbridge Wells brought *me* into regions of real devotion," Constance said in her Autobiography. A Green-book entry in 1866 confirmed the richness such experiences gave her:

Mr Blackwood spoke of the precious blood of Christ as delivering, atoning, cleansing, life giving blood...The church was so still I could hear the birds chirping outside, and it was one of those happy times (so very, very seldom do I feel so on account of sin and weakness) when my heart felt somewhat at leisure from itself, to flow upwards to its Maker and saviour.<sup>27</sup>

Oddly enough, neither parent prevented Harry from evangelical prophesying,

---

<sup>25</sup> *A*, I, 3, "1865-66," 41; Firth, *Maynard*, 84.

<sup>26</sup> *Ibid.*, II, 5, "Drawing, Grandam, 1867," 97 (the governess was called Grandam).

<sup>27</sup> *Ibid.*, 98; *GB*, 30 March 1866, 78. As noted in chapter two, neither parent fully supported Harry's involvement in public affairs either. Constance also met other powerful evangelical preachers of the day like Mr Langston and Sir Emilius Bayley.

despite their distaste for such emotive preaching. Because of Harry, Constance was drawn to virtually every revival group of her age, from Moody and Sankey to the Salvation Army. These huge inter-class congregations united Victorians through compelling sermons, hymn singing and conversion, while evoking the testimony of faith and nationalism at large.<sup>28</sup>

King (Maynard's cousin "Mare") was perhaps the most formative in Maynard's search for a united self or "bare faith" as she called it at the time. Mare's concepts of the "devotional, ethical and personal" not only reminded her of "dear Mamie," but also compensated for "the painful want of ministry at Oakfield"<sup>29</sup>:

Mare says that 'we can act directly by our faith in Christ in prayer.' I think this is something to be very thankful for. It takes all the *effort* out of morality and makes it a simple effect of the life within, so that whatever is shown on humility and generosity is not from the outside...but from the inside.<sup>30</sup>

Just as Mamie's Sayings had filled the Green-book in the mid-1860s, so Mare's spiritual guidance is evident throughout the late 1860s and early 1870s. Maynard took great strength from admonitions like "it is love, not the act, which is precious."<sup>31</sup> But Mare's

---

<sup>28</sup> See Firth, *Maynard*, 120. For revivals see Rawlyk and Noll, ed., *Amazing Grace*, 179-82; and for the S. A. see Walker, *Devil's Kingdom* and Edward H. McKinley, *Marching to Glory: the History of the Salvation Army in the United States, 1880-1992* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995).

<sup>29</sup> *GB*, 14 April 1868, 65; Firth, *Maynard*, 120.

<sup>30</sup> *GB*, 28 November 1869, 3-5. Other examples can be seen in *GBs*, 19 February 1866, 23; 31 December 1867, 67; 15 February 1868, 77; 6 December 1868, 57; 22 July 1869, 67.

<sup>31</sup> *Ibid.*, 29 June 1866, 44.

favourite saying, “The effort is not in the fight, but to fly to the one who fights for us as He is never beaten,”<sup>32</sup> apparently remained with Maynard all her life. This concept, which allowed her to accept her own emotions, also enabled her to begin envisioning a more holistic self. She could not entirely relinquish her early beliefs. But her visualization, while conflicted, became a life-long process whereby she integrated religious truth with her passion for nature, art, secular learning and, ultimately, human love.

Belstead initiated Maynard’s penchant for, and embracing of, sex within the context of faith. Little is written in the Green-book, but Maynard wrote of her “genuine love” for fellow student, Fanny (Fan) Williams in her Autobiography:

I do not think it was a foolish affection, but it was discouraged by mother....She was so severe on my friendship with sweet Fan, and read my letters and checked them, and would not let me stay with her....<sup>33</sup>

As both Firth and Vicinus suggest, Louisa curtailed the friendship not simply because Fan was “too worldly,” but because she feared her daughter’s emotional attachment to Fan. It was not until a decade later that Fan and Constance could visit each other.<sup>34</sup> Maynard’s second Belstead love was Virginia Dalrymple. “She was the most beautiful girl I had ever seen with her long golden hair and lovely fawn-like eyes,” she recalled.<sup>35</sup> Their friendship did not last, yet it is nonetheless noteworthy. While silent about Fan, the Green-book

---

<sup>32</sup> Ibid., 28 November 1868, 3.

<sup>33</sup> A, I, 3, “1863-4,” 41. See also Firth, *Maynard*, 70.

<sup>34</sup> Vicinus, *Independent Women*, 35-36; Firth, *Maynard*, 52, 82. Constance was very angry about the fact that Dora was allowed to visit Fan while she was not.

<sup>35</sup> A, I, 3, “1863-4,” 45.



pages pour forth Maynard's attraction for Virginia. In fact an entry in 1870 almost depicts Maynard as a bashful male admirer:

Walking on the parade in the afternoon I heard, 'have you forgotten me, Consy?' and there was Virginia. I did not know what to say or do. I did not know to that minute how much I had loved her before, and I could only hold her hand and look at her, her face pale with a subdued expression. It cannot be but that she has had many struggles with herself, and with worldliness all around her and no Christian friend to lean upon - Oh! it must be hard too!<sup>36</sup>

That same year Maynard struggled to formulate her feelings for her favourite young villager friend, Hetty Lawrence:

When I saw her, it was as if we were both silently holding the end of electric chains and sparks exchanged between us - only then I knew that I was holding Him. Hetty said, 'when you young ladies come, it seems as if we know each other quite well like sisters!' I feel that we do.<sup>37</sup>

Sisterly love, spiritual connection, physical sparks: eventually Constance would recognize and accept that her feelings were as much based on physical sensation as spiritual passion. But this was certainly no thanks to her mother. Virtually no effort was made to introduce Constance or her sisters to prospective husbands. Constance may well have felt ambivalent towards Harry Collison, who proposed marriage in 1869, or Dr. James Robertson, who did so in 1877, but Louisa actively disparaged both candidates on the grounds that they were "not good enough" despite the fact that the former was the son of

---

<sup>36</sup> *GB*, 2 June 1870, 125. See also *GB*, 10 June 1866, 32; *GB*, 21 December 1868, 69; *GB*, 26 March 1869, 89. A *GB* entry on 30 January 1880, 132, is telling. She wrote, "I met Virginia. She was lovely but more matronly. I recall all those years ago when I bumped into her, and how my heart longed to see her again. I went to the station in hopes of seeing her again and cried over the disappointment. I contented myself with colouring her face and framing it for my bedroom, where it has been ever since."

<sup>37</sup> *Ibid.*, 28 November 1871, 53.

an evangelical minister and the latter was a distinguished Scots minister.

Maynard's first trip away from home alone at twenty-three is notable because it marked the beginning of her freedom to explore love apart from the lens of her mother's "fixed Principles." She noted of her desire for Lewis Campbell in 1872:

The whole thing was dangerous because of my love of approbation, and, most of all, because of the love which Lewis gave me....I must have a more personal relationship with God....'Oh wash my feet from the sin of this day and keep me Thine.'<sup>38</sup>

The fact that Lewis was married to her cousin Fanny was, needless to say, a significant social dilemma. Their intimacy ended when Maynard grew more and more uncomfortable with his advances, while he in turn withdrew by promising fidelity to his wife.

Nonetheless, as the above quote implies, the relationship became troubling to Maynard when physical feelings overcame spiritual duty. As chapter four suggests, their interconnecting narratives—his was tied to Arnoldian ideals of moral self-restraint while hers, to a theological relinquishing of worldliness—saw the beginnings of Maynard's understanding of a dichotomy between desire and resistance centering on human and divine love.

Two years later in 1874, when Constance was a student at Girton, another side of her personality emerged. She had tried to master the scientific and religious disputes of the age without losing faith, and she felt compelled as His prophet to guide fellow Girtonians' facing a similar plight. Yet, at the same time, she was finding her promise to "surrender *all* to Him...too confining." In fact she was "filled with undescrivable

---

<sup>38</sup> Ibid., 5 May 1872, 134; Ibid., 27 March 1872, 133.

longings” for the earthly love her mother so condemned. Once again she consulted texts, grasping, in particular, at the observations in Paley’s *Evidences*, which suggested that since innate desires were God’s gift they could be fully accepted.<sup>39</sup> An entry written a year later reveals the sensual undercurrents in her interactions with an adoring young fellow Girtonian, Amy Mantle:

My Amy was devoted, soothing me when out by her love - quite unwearied in her attentions. The last night was most touching of all when we sang ‘Auld Lang Syne’ with crossed hands for the last time and with the lights out. She drew me to her and I felt her heart beating so hard with the struggle to keep down the choking tears - when will anyone ever love me so much and so unweariedly?<sup>40</sup>

Throughout that year Constance had cautioned Amy to have faith in their love for each other as part of God’s plan; that “love” must be given up to the keeping of the Lord. Yet she wrestled, as had so many Christians before and since, with how to separate physical and spiritual love.<sup>41</sup>

Perhaps inevitably, Maynard turned towards understanding her God-given desire as His *reward* for her “good” public deeds. This was particularly apparent after she became Mistress of Westfield in 1882. She commented in her Autobiography, “I saw myself as God’s sentinel, chosen out of thousands of English girls to hold the most

---

<sup>39</sup> Ibid., 3 August 1873, 111; Ibid., 28 March 1874, 94.

<sup>40</sup> Ibid., 6 December 1875, 169. Maynard, anxious to convert, attracted a number of fellow students at Girton who sought to gain her affection by declaring their need to be better Christians. This was not so unusual. Vicinus points out in “‘The Gift of Love,’” 244, “George Eliot attracted numerous younger women who had lost their faith, and hoped to find spiritual sustenance in her religion of duty.”

<sup>41</sup> Other examples of this conflict are implied in *GB*, 10 May 1874, 245 and *GB*, 29 August 1874, 91.

difficult post in all the world...I was starting a college exactly like Girton but with a religious grounding.” The rising secularism at home, alongside concerns over colonial paganism overseas, was a clear call to devout evangelicals like herself. She, as prophet, felt driven to inaugurate a Divinity program at Westfield in 1901 to proclaim “His message...upon the housetops.”<sup>42</sup>

However, Maynard’s teaching students to embrace Christ intimately became complicated when human and spiritual intimacy converged. This became an important new topic of debate in the Green-book that, interestingly, had evolved into a “Friend” rather than simply a religious record since the Campbell relationship. Maynard tried telling Margaret Brooke, a student at Westfield during the college’s early years, that their mutual passion must be realized within the spiritual flame. “I felt a *longing* desire to be with her again,” she wrote in November 1882, “but I told her that I should never forgive myself if she only came to me...instead of going *there* beside her little white bed.”<sup>43</sup>

Even so, just as she had with Amy, Constance found Margaret’s intense adoration for her irresistible. “Oh! how vividly the human feeling rises! - Lord keep me steady,” she wrote in December 1882.<sup>44</sup> An entry during the following April suggested that she had acted upon her physical passion:

---

<sup>42</sup> See *A*, VI, 43, “1882,” 355, written in 1926; and *A*, VII, 62 “9<sup>th</sup> College Session, 1901,” 480. In *Castle Adamant*, 34, Sondheimer argues that the many graduates who became missionaries at home and abroad owed their vocation to Maynard’s dedication to her role.

<sup>43</sup> *GB*, 5 November 1882, 10.

<sup>44</sup> *Ibid.*, 12 December 1882, 23.

I told her [Margaret], 'I have loved others, but always felt as if it were a little wrong. But with you it is based upon everything, so I may, and can feel safe and happy in it.'

According to this Green-book entry, Margaret was a willing participant: "You are two people. I love my Mistress clearly, but I love my own Love better." The entry concluded with Maynard's justification of *her* passion through faith: "It is more important to guard against external restrictions [college dances or novel reading] rather than internal restrictions. This, I will simply set aside and believe that what forces itself unasked upon me is meant to be."<sup>45</sup> Their physical intimacy continued even after Maynard had fallen in love with a fellow teacher, Ralph Gray, in 1883.

Although the extent of Maynard's physical relationships with women is unclear,<sup>46</sup> by the end of 1884 she was writing more candidly about human love. As a thirty-four-year-old woman, who was committed to a professional career, she found herself mediating passion and ambition under Westfield's roof. While her Puritan/evangelical upbringing was still reflected in her view of human desire as a "snare," she now admitted that her "hunger for love" was something "deeply rooted in [her] and difficult to give up."<sup>47</sup> In fact Maynard never resisted love when it was offered to her. In 1901 she wrote impassioned accounts in her Green-book about her love for Marion Wakefield, a student

---

<sup>45</sup> Ibid., 1 April 1883, 70.

<sup>46</sup> She does not appear to have adopted a coded language, like Anne Lister did, for sexual acts like orgasm. See Whitbread, ed., *My Own Heart* on this; also Castle, *Apparitional Lesbian*; Trumbach, "Lesbian Role," and Donohue, *Passions between Women*, on "lesbian" acts.

<sup>47</sup> GB, 1 April 1884, 98.

of twenty-three. "When I think that I was over 50," she noted in her Autobiography, "I am ashamed. Surely by thirty-five all such emotion should be conquered." Yet even in 1927 she argued that God had blessed her love for someone who had loved her passionately in return. She recalled of her feelings in 1896, "There was that thrill, the strange momentary sinking of my heart, the actual physical sensation, and I knew I loved her....Here the deed was done and could not be undone. A sense of awe, even terror, came over me, as well as a wave of extraordinary sweetness." Maynard tried "for passion pure in snowy bloom...while Marion flung herself full length on [her]." Yet cautioning herself "to take a steady side" was impossible since *she* "had lighted M's fire...."<sup>48</sup> For seven years, both Autobiography and Green-book implied Maynard's adoption of a spiritual and physically-wise mother/lover role, while Wakefield as a younger woman in love promised to follow Him more faithfully because of her new found love.<sup>49</sup> The relationship ended when Wakefield grew tired of Maynard's oppressive intensity.

.....

The above discussion, which has outlined Maynard's journey towards conceptualizing passion, may seem unfamiliar to readers today. But we cannot conclude that her behaviour was atypical for the times. Indeed, her Green-book gives evidence to

---

<sup>48</sup> *A*, VII, "Thuringer Wald, 1899," 411-38.

<sup>49</sup> *Ibid.*, 448. For example see *GB*, 28 February 1901, 12; *GB*, 2 March 1902, 120. See above reference to Eliot in footnote 37 and also Gordon Haight's *George Eliot: A Biography* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1968), 450-55.

support what Vicinus would describe as college raves:

They could be encouraged as long as they did not risk the balance between authority and self-control that characterized girls' schools. Thus, homoerotic friendships were an important means to maturity.<sup>50</sup>

Raves usually involved an evangelical awakening to God's love through a shared earthly love, Vicinus adds. They were also "quite unselfconsciously" referred to as marriages.<sup>51</sup>

Maynard wrote of her passion for Brooke, "God has offered MGB to me, so I, as reverent husband,...now claim the right to love, protect and cherish her...."<sup>52</sup> Her inferences to the "husband and wife" relationships at Girton and Westfield—to be discussed in chapters eight and nine—imply that other college women subverted gender norms as a means of conveying their passion for one another.

Vicinus' assertion in "'One Life,'" that Maynard "justified her passionate and deeply disturbing love life as a form of spiritual searching," was groundbreaking in 1982.<sup>53</sup> As noted earlier, little else has been written on the impact of faith on Victorian women's sexual lives. Scholars have only recently begun investigating connections between faith and women's sexuality. Joanne Glasgow's study is worthy of note. She proposes that some early twentieth-century "lesbians" found solace within the erotic

---

<sup>50</sup> See Vicinus, *Independent Women*, 189. Refer back to chapter one, 27-28 for Vicinus and college raves.

<sup>51</sup> *Ibid.*, 158; see also her "Distance and Desire: English Boarding-School Friendships," *Signs* 9 (1984), 600-22.

<sup>52</sup> *GB*, 22 March 1883, 69; also *Ibid.*, 3 May 1883, 71.

<sup>53</sup> Vicinus, "'One Life,'" 609.

ritualism of the Roman Catholic service, despite growing opposition towards their activity.<sup>54</sup> Glasgow's work relates to that by Mack, Bynum Walker and others who attest that, for centuries, women have gained empowerment through faith in face of new cultural meanings around gender identity.<sup>55</sup> From this point of view, we can argue that religiously-based activity, similarly to political or social activity, may be dedicated to filling voids, calming fears, gratifying wishes, and reinforcing the beliefs and needs of the group or individual who faced new situations or opposition.<sup>56</sup>

Vicinus also suggests in "One Life" that social acceptance of women's intense friendships gave Maynard "no tools for analyzing [her] relationship[s]. She was unable to step back and judge her inner conflict, and so remained out of touch with the connections

---

<sup>54</sup> As Glasgow argues in 'What's a Nice Lesbian Like You Doing in the Church of Torquemada? Radcliffe Hall and Other Catholic Converts,' in *Lesbian Texts and Contexts: Radical Revisions*, eds., Karla Jay and Joanne Glasgow (New York: New York University Press, 1990), 241-54, regarding 20<sup>th</sup> century lesbians who converted to Catholicism, a church that defined sexuality in wholly phallic terms could not imagine, much less condemn, female homosexuality. See also Sean Gill, ed., *The Lesbian and Gay Christian Movement: Campaigning for Justice, Truth, and Love* (London: Cassell, 1998); Kathy Rudy, *Sex and the Church: Gender, Homosexuality, and the Transformation of Christian Ethics* (Boston: Beacon, 1997); and David Hilliard, "Unenglish and Unmanly: Anglo-Catholicism and Homosexuality," *Victorian Studies* 25, (1982), 190-206.

<sup>55</sup> See Mack, "In a Female Voice" in *Women Preachers*, eds., Kienzle and Walker, 43-60. As noted earlier, she argues that women in the 1700s sought to merge perceptions of their role as "good" visionaries with those concerning their engendered "volatility and irrationality." See also Bynum Walker, *Fragmentation and Redemption*; Croon, ed., *Gentle Strength*; and Swanson, *Gender and Religion*.

<sup>56</sup> Andre Godin, *The Psychological Dynamics of Religious Experience* (Birmingham: Religious Education Press, 1996), 10, 50.



within herself between power, sexuality and the emotions....”<sup>57</sup> Vicinus’ interpretation of Maynard as a woman who “domesticated” her public and private life, and one who used faith to hide her passionate feelings from herself and others, seems limiting.<sup>58</sup> Certainly, Maynard did not have today’s discourses for analyzing her same sex desires. Nonetheless, she utilized cultural norms and faith quite assertively to reconcile her feelings. A Green-book entry in January 1883, which adapted Josephine Butler’s observations on the sexes, is particularly revealing:

...when I see an ardent nature like that [Margaret] which has crept into my heart, I begin to see how difficult my task is. That nameless tribute [physical desire] is so easy to elicit from men, and it is so intoxicating to receive! I know it in every fibre of my being, and all the more strongly from its never having been indulged. Oh! to deal wisely now.<sup>59</sup>

Maynard did “indulge” her physical desire for Brooke as we have seen, and her “heterosexual language” to understand her passion for Wakefield is evident in a Green-book entry in 1903:

So starving was I, so hungry for such innocence and beauty offered me, that I gathered it by handfuls and crushed it on my lips and my heart. Oh! how hard it is for a starving man at a table to have good manners!<sup>60</sup>

“I expect one day she shall marry,” Maynard said, trying to rationalize her sensual play with Amy Mantle, and her role playing with Brooke, “when the right man comes along I

---

<sup>57</sup> Vicinus, “One Life,” 614.

<sup>58</sup> Ibid., 615; Vicinus, *Independent Women*, 161.

<sup>59</sup> GB, 12 January 1883, 46. Butler was a feminist who was particularly active in the campaign against the C. D. Acts.

<sup>60</sup> Ibid., 31 December 1903, 218.

shall be happy to let her go to him....”<sup>61</sup> But Wakefield was a different situation entirely:

I said, ‘I have been chary of any allusion to married love, but what we both feel really is of that kind.’ I then placed the ring on her finger to represent the highest love in the hand of God....After, she [M] said, ‘I belong to you,’ and then she said, ‘I take thee’ and we had one more kiss.<sup>62</sup>

This is not to suggest that Maynard found her relationships trouble free. Nor did she resolve her conflict between earthly love and divine love. Indeed, there was an erotic component to her college relationships that troubled her. She confessed to feeling “uncomfortable about Amy’s passion,” in her Autobiography.<sup>63</sup> Her Green-book conveyed similar ambivalence. “Surely it is all rather unusual. Is it exactly as the Lord meant it?”, she asked of her full-blown desire for Brooke; and of her “God-given love” for Wakefield she admitted to “something not right.”<sup>64</sup> The fact that Maynard and others alluded at times to the “wrong” of losing “all self control,” implied their ongoing wavering over what was “permitted” behaviour in their physical encounters with women.<sup>65</sup> But the point is that this did not prevent Maynard from expressing desire. The overwhelming impression remains that she tested acceptable levels of female/female passion more against faith than against

---

<sup>61</sup> Ibid., 22 August 1875, 99; Ibid., 22 March 1883, 73. See also Tess Cosslett, *Woman To Woman: Female Friendship in Victorian Fiction* (New Jersey: Humanities Press, 1988), 23-78.

<sup>62</sup> *GB*, 16 March 1904, 304-8.

<sup>63</sup> *A*, III, 25, “1875,” 387.

<sup>64</sup> See *GB*, 29 October 1882, 3; and *GB*, 12 May 1906, 123.

<sup>65</sup> Ibid., 23 April 1886, 87. As Vicinus similarly argues of Mary Benson’s passion for women in “‘Gift of Love,’” 254, “She appears to have had a wavering boundary between what might be an acceptable form of fusing and what might be dangerous.” Benson, according to Vicinus, did engage in lesbian acts with women.

gender or sex, notwithstanding her allusions to heterosexual love.

Maynard's adoption of heterosexual and religious language also suggests her position of power in these relationships, and this was an important part of her experience. This is evident in some of her other Westfield relationships as well as those with students that she taught at St. Leonards. Her role as Mistress gave her considerable authority over her pupils, which, of course, was a new position for a Victorian woman to have. Maynard also employed faith as a means of exercising control over their behaviour and emotions. In fact by today's standards she could be seen as guilty of sexual and emotional abuse in her relationships with young women.<sup>66</sup> The others who have examined her life have evaded and avoided the extent of the concealment of this.<sup>67</sup> Far from submissive, Maynard's records reveal that she could be exploitive and manipulative, while she both concealed and revealed these violations to herself over her lifetime.

Women, power, love and faith to one side, "the Church" itself certainly did not tolerate homosexuality. Weeks points to the long history of Hebraic and/or Christian condemnation of non-procreative sex, with sodomy as the gravest of sins. Sodomy was

---

<sup>66</sup> For an interesting discussion of this see Jane Gallop's, *Feminist Accused of Sexual Harassment* (Durham: Public Planet Books, 1997); and Anne Fausto-Sterling's, *Myths of Gender: Biological Theories about Women and Men* (New York: Basic Books, 1992). Fausto-Sterling argues that what seems like "normal" behaviour to men, registers in females as traumatic. Gallop meanwhile presents an alternative experience. Her view of her encounters with female students as part "of the wide range of sexual opportunities," 50, seems controversial by today's standards. Nonetheless her attempts to reconcile academic interests, mutual support and sexual charge is not unlike that which Maynard describes in her Green-book. Clearly, both women's experience suggest the complexity surrounding the professor and student relationship.

<sup>67</sup> Neither King, Firth nor Vicinus touch on this—despite the latter's focus on college women's relationships in *Independent Women* and "One Life."

first brought under the scope of statute law in 1533, and it was the basis for a number of homosexual convictions until 1885.<sup>68</sup> The two evolving categories of heterosexuality versus “degenerate” homosexual behaviour refined people’s conceptions about the latter as a sin or a crime. The latter became viewed, instead, as a biological anomaly termed “inversion.”<sup>69</sup> According to Weeks, the writings of Havelock Ellis, first, and second, Edward Carpenter, had the most influence on English culture. Ellis’ *Psychology of Sex* (1897) detailed the manifestations of sexual inversion from homosexuality to other conditions like incest, sadism, masochism and necrophilia.<sup>70</sup>

Lesbian-like acts were largely ignored by both Church and State, according to Anna Clark, because Victorian society viewed such behaviour as impossible between women.<sup>71</sup> Even so, as noted in chapter one, texts like Ellis’ *Sexual Inversion* (1897) were interconnecting scientific definitions of the “manly” woman with the abnormal “New Woman” in the late 1890s. Changing cultural attitudes were also evident in efforts to

---

<sup>68</sup> Weeks, *Coming Out*, 3-33; *Sex, Politics and Society*, 99-121.

<sup>69</sup> See Bland and Doan, eds., *Sexology in Culture*, D’Emilio and Freedman, *Intimate Matters*, 302-14; Chauncey, “From Sexual Inversion to Homosexuality,” 101, Katz, *Invention of Heterosexuality*, 41, 51-53.

<sup>70</sup> Weeks, *Coming Out*, 47-68; *Sex, Politics*, 141-52. Ellis defined the term “auto-eroticism,” the involuntary sexual energy of the individual. Also see Gilbert Herdt, “Introduction: Third Sexes and Third Genders,” in Gilbert Herdt, ed., *Third Sex, Third Gender: Beyond Sexual Dimorphism in Culture and History* (New York: Zone books, 1994), 12-81, for a good discussion of Victorian mentality surrounding the third gender, and how it became viewed as an unviable category to Victorians.

<sup>71</sup> Clark, “Construction of Lesbian Identity,” 249; also see Vicinus, ““Gift of Love””, 242. She argues here that while the Church taught that love found its fullest erotic expression only within marriage, a wide range of female/female love was tolerated until the early 1900s, because the Church did not view such behaviour as sinful or sexual.

make acts like genital contact between women illegal in 1921. In short, Darwin's work was influencing these sexologists.<sup>72</sup> Scholars like Jeffreys and Faderman believe that the new sexology disempowered women. It was anti-feminist and it changed the innocence of romantic friendship, which, Faderman argues, left women as "fledgling human beings" who were unable to counter the sexologist's language of neurosis.<sup>73</sup> In contrast, historians like Duggan and Newton propose that sexology forged the radical idea that women apart from men could have autonomous sexual feeling; and that Freud's subsequent theories on psycho-sexual development enabled women who desired women to view themselves as erotically different from heterosexual women, thereby freeing them from the asexuality of romantic friendships.<sup>74</sup>

The general opinion amongst historians is that interactions between college women gradually changed, particularly after the term lesbian was introduced in the

---

<sup>72</sup> See Bland and Doan, eds., *Sexology in Culture*; Weeks, *Sexuality and Discontents*, Jeffreys, *The Spinster*; Cynthia Eagle Russett, *Sexual Science: The Victorian Construction of Womanhood* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1989); and Margaret Jackson, *The Real Facts of Life: Feminism and the Politics of Sexuality c1850-1940* (London: Taylor and Francis, 1994).

<sup>73</sup> Jeffreys, *Spinster and Enemies*; also Faderman, *Surpassing Love of Men*, 249.

<sup>74</sup> Esther Newton, "The Mythic Mannish Lesbian: Radclyffe Hall and the New Woman," in *Hidden from History: Reclaiming the Gay and Lesbian Past*, eds., Martin Bauml Duberman, Martha Vicinus, and George Chauncey (New York: New American Library, 1989), 274-93; Duggan, "Trials of Alice Mitchel," 791-813. For Freud, see *Theory of Sexuality*. As noted earlier, he proposed that an "arrested" psychosexual development initiated same-sex desire. His linking of sex to define desire, as opposed to an act, promoted the idea of sexual preference. See also de Lauretis, "Freud, Sexuality," 216-34; and Katz, *Invention of Heterosexuality*, 66.

1920s.<sup>75</sup> In comparison, Maynard lived during a period in which ideas about the nature and role of women were in great flux. Writing about her experience is problematic too, of course. There is no real consensus regarding romantic friendship, with one side arguing for societal acceptance of Victorian female/female passion,<sup>76</sup> and another—against such “boringly asexual” depictions—calling for perhaps the need to insert the “lesbian” into history.<sup>77</sup> Nor do scholars agree on how the emerging sexual norms affected women. Maynard’s experience may be viewed as a bridge in which the historian can glean insight into how one Victorian woman either did, or could not, merge the old values and the new ones. Her records suggest that far from feeling like a fledging human being, she drew on the discourses *available* to her in the late 1800s to formulate a distinct self-awareness and sexual self-consciousness as an educational pioneer. In short, she adopted faith in

---

<sup>75</sup> For changes in women’s relationships see Vicinus, *Independent Women*, 278-91; Smith-Rosenberg’s, “Female World;” and Sahli’s, “Smashing.”

<sup>76</sup> See Smith-Rosenberg, “The Female World.” Another well-known argument for this position is Lillian Faderman’s *Surpassing the Love of Men: Romantic Friendship and Love between Women from the Renaissance to the Present* (New York: William Morrow, 1981), and her essentially unchanged position in *Odd Girls and Twilight Lovers: A History of Lesbian Life in Twentieth-Century America* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1991). See also the ways in which these generalizations have been adopted by literary critics like Cosslett in *Woman To Woman*. Looking at authors like Charlotte Bronte or George Eliot, Cosslett proposes that intense friendships operated to assimilate the heroine(s) into conventional roles like marriage.

<sup>77</sup> See Vicinus, “Introduction” in Vicinus, ed. *Lesbian Subject: A Feminist Studies Reader* (Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 1996), iv. Earlier, I noted that Vicinus, Moore, Castle and Trumbach were among those arguing that women’s primary texts suggested that some were aware of their sexual feelings and acts. See Vicinus, “They Wonder To Which;” Moore, “Something More Tender;” Castle, *Apparitional Lesbian*; Trumbach, “Modern Lesbian”; also Wilson, “Forbidden Love;” Whitbread, ed., *My Own Heart*. For discussion on this debate see Vicinus’, “Lesbian History: All Theory and No Facts or All Facts and No Theory?” *Radical History Review* 60 (1994), 57-75.

powerful ways to justify both her erotic encounters and her subversion of gendered norms within the new college milieu.

But how does one begin to explain how negotiations between self and society were expressed, felt or understood, or write about the nature of desire itself? As previously mentioned, belief systems surrounding faith, gender, class and nation will influence behaviour including the emotions. When turning to the phenomenon of desire, the scholar encounters the “essentialist” versus “social construction” debate that has been ongoing since the 1970s. Michel Foucault’s analysis of desire as an amalgamation of varying and cultural historically-distinct discourses in *The History of Sexuality* (1979) was groundbreaking.<sup>78</sup> His study challenged Freud’s insights on desire as an innate instinctual aim,<sup>79</sup> and raised new questions surrounding the study of emotions. On the one hand, historians like John Demos and Judith Brown continue to assert that the emotions of shame and “gayness” display patterns of resemblance, and that shame can be explored trans-culturally and across time. Others such as Stearns and Weeks argue for a more distinct socially-constructed “emotional culture,” in which behavioural norms give

---

<sup>78</sup> Foucault, *The History of Sexuality*, 37-49; see also his *The History of Sexuality Volume 2: The Use of Pleasure*, trans. Robert Hurley (New York: Vintage Books, 1990), for which he has been criticized for assuming that female desire in Classical Greece was assimilated to men’s desire for sex. Nonetheless, his ideas have stimulated studies on female sexuality since the 1970s.

<sup>79</sup> Freud, *Theory of Sexuality*, 34. He wrote here that he understood these innate aims to be “the psychological representative of an endosomatic, continuously flowing source of stimulation....The source of an instinct is a process of excitation occurring in an organ and the immediate aim of the instinct.”

specific meanings to human activity and gendered self-definition at different times.<sup>80</sup>

Foucault's ideas have led poststructuralist theorists like Judith Butler to interpret gender and sex as a scripted performance—subverted, at best—so that any relationship between gender and sex is “tenuous.”<sup>81</sup> However, Freudian historians like Nancy Partner argue that subjective resistance is more than a reiterative practice. She ascribes “psychic drives, internalized strictures of conscience and a complex, reality-connected conscious ego” to the individual. Further, she modifies Freud's theory on “Sublimation” by suggesting that “repressed” instinctual aims can find other outlets for sexual expression that are not necessarily perverse or psychotic.<sup>82</sup> Thus, while many scholars have found ways to criticize or develop Freud's essentializing of gender disparities (as seen with his

---

<sup>80</sup> John Demos, “Shame and Guilt in Early New England,” in *Emotion and Social Change*, eds., P. Stearns and C. Stearns (New York: Homes Meier, 1988), 69-78; Judith C. Brown, *Immodest Acts: the Life of a Lesbian Nun in Renaissance Italy* (New York: Routledge, 1986). See also John Boswell, *Christianity, Social Tolerance, and Homosexuality: Gay People in Western Europe from the Beginning of the Christian Era to the Fourteenth Century* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1981); Stearns, “Boys, Girls, and Emotions”; Weeks, *Sex, Politics and Against Nature*.

<sup>81</sup> Judith Butler, *Gender Trouble* (New York: Routledge, 1990). Her debate on drag—is “it an imitation of gender, or a dramatization of the signifying gestures through which gender itself was established” vii—led her to suggest that sex was as culturally constructed as gender. See Foucault, *Sexuality I*, 1-14. Agency thus is a performance, which, Butler proposes, is adopted by individuals to subvert heterosexual norms, see 134-141.

<sup>82</sup> Nancy Partner, “No Sex, No Gender,” *Speculum* (1993), 436-42. There has been much debate regarding Freud's theory of sublimation, which, he argues in *Sexuality*, 104, is an “alternative result of an abnormal constitutional disposition...enabl[ing] excessively strong excitations arising from particular sources of sexuality to find an outlet and use in other fields....” See also Nico H. Frijda, *The Emotions* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986).



theory on “penis envy”),<sup>83</sup> the Foucauldian paradigm has also been contested on an empirical level. For example, critics point to Foucault’s failure to include women and non-white racial groups in his studies.<sup>84</sup>

Weeks has recently argued for the “absolute necessity of inter-, multi-and cross-disciplinary approaches to studies in sexuality.”<sup>85</sup> This approach to studying behaviour has been ongoing since the early 1990s. Scholars are far more sensitive to the disparity between prescript and experience, proposing that individuals mediate between the two. Cultural psychologists like Shinobu Kitayama and Hazel Markus claim that emotions are an assortment of socially shared “scripts” made up of physiological, subjective and behavioural processes. Emotion scripts develop as individuals actively, personally and collectively, adapt, adjust and perhaps challenge their immediate sociocultural environment.<sup>86</sup> Recent interdisciplinary works on emotions also argue that an overly constructed view of behaviour limits the explanations about more spontaneous acts. As

---

<sup>83</sup> See Louise Kaplan, *Female Perversions* (New York: Doubleday Bell, 1991); and Teresa Brennan, *The Interpretation of the Flesh: Freud and Femininity* (London; Routledge, 1992).

<sup>84</sup> See Nancy Harstock, “Foucault on Power: A Theory for Women?” in *Feminism/Postmodernism*, ed., Linda Nicholson (New York: Routledge, 1990); Mariana Valverde, *Sex, Power and Pleasure* (Baltimore: New Society Publishers, 1987); Irene Diamond and Lee Quinby, eds., *Feminism and Foucault: Reflections on Resistance* (Boston: Northeastern University Press, 1988).

<sup>85</sup> Weeks, “Sexuality and History Revisited,” in *Sexualities in History*, eds., Philips and Reay, 28-29.

<sup>86</sup> Shinobu Kitayama and Hazel Markus, *Emotion and Culture* (Washington: American Psychological Association, 1994); also Carol Magai and Susan McFadden, *The Role of Emotions in Social and Personality Development* (New York: Plenum Press, 1995).

Paul Griffiths proposes:

In addition to “immediate” emotion scripts, social constructionist literature discusses a much larger range of emotions which are at least somewhat variable across cultures. This variation suggests that cultural factors play some role in the construction of these emotional responses in each person. But these are the very same emotions—guilt, vengefulness, moral outrage—about which evolutionary psychologists have speculated is an irruptive pattern of motivation that affects the higher cognitive processes...The biology/culture divide plays no role in this ‘heterogeneous construction’ of emotion. I suggest that there is at least some reason to suppose that there exists a group of irruptive motivational states that contrast in interesting ways to other forms of motivation.<sup>87</sup>

It is impossible, of course, fully to determine fully the nature of “innate” or other emotional drives. In general I agree with Weeks who argues that “Sexuality is not a given. It is a product of negotiation, struggle and human agency.”<sup>88</sup> My analysis of Maynard and my earlier examination of Eliza Lynn Linton suggest that human agency includes an individual’s mediation between public requirements and private wishes. In short, both Maynard and Linton were “socially constructed” individuals. But they also sought to construct identities in keeping with their desires.<sup>89</sup>

---

<sup>87</sup> Paul Griffiths, *What Emotions Really Are* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1997), 15. See also Victor S. Johnston, *Why We Feel: The Science of Human Emotions* (Reading: Perseus Books, 1999); Keith Oatley and Jennifer Jenkins, eds., *Understanding Emotions* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1996). Stearns still adopts a social construction approach. But in Stearns, ed., *An Emotional History of the United States* (New York: Routledge, 1998), 13, he accedes that historians “gain from a dialogue between essentialist and social construction theories when interpreting past experience.”

<sup>88</sup> Weeks, “Sexuality and History Revisited,” 29. However, he largely adopts the Foucauldian view of sex as constructed through diverse relations of power.

<sup>89</sup> See my “The Symbolic Body of the Historical Subject,” in *Literary Texts and the Arts*, eds., Corrado Federici and Esther Raventos-Pons (New York: Peter Lang, 2003), 163-74, for my position on this.

Maynard's desire will not be classified with a label in this study. One could argue that she should be viewed as bisexual since she was physically aroused by both women and men. However, because most of her relationships were with women, one could also classify her as a lesbian. If we place Maynard in historical context we may argue that "bisexuality" has been a topic of discussion since the Greek Stoics. Turning to the nineteenth century, Victorian sexologists viewed bisexuality anatomically: it consisted in male nipples, for example, or an enlarged clitoris. Freud meanwhile viewed it in a psychological sense in which the "bisexual disposition" accounted for internal conflict and consequent neurosis. A third, and most common view today, is that bisexuality consists in heterosexuality and homosexuality.<sup>90</sup>

Current debates among cultural theorists like Merl Storr, or historians like Jonathon Dollimore about what bisexuality *is*, concern the relationship between its two elements: Is it a combination of maleness and femaleness, masculinity and femininity, or heterosexuality and homosexuality? Or is it rather that each of these two are points at either end of the scale, with bisexuality situated at a third point between them? The overall thrust of bisexual epistemology has been opposed to categorization, particularly to the binary division and dualistic thought. This deconstruction approach has been adopted by queer theorists like Butler and Eve Sedgwick, each of whom has illuminated the

---

<sup>90</sup> Merl Storr, ed., *Bisexuality: A Critical Reader*, (London: Routledge, 1999), 1-9; and Marjorie Garber, *Bisexuality and the Eroticism of Everyday Life* (New York: Routledge, 2000), 12-48; and also Erwin J. Haeberle and Rolf Gindorf, ed., *Bisexualities: The Ideology and Practice of Sexual Contact with both Men and Women* (New York: Continuum, 1998), 29. Jonathon Dollimore, *Sexual Dissidence: Augustine to Wilde, Freud to Foucault* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1991); and also Weeks, *Sexuality and Discontents*; and Jeffreys, *The Spinster*.

dangers of assuming an unchanging “homosexual” essence or category.<sup>91</sup> Meanwhile, Adrienne Rich’s concept of a “lesbian continuum” (1980) for both hetero-and homosexual women has challenged and blurred sexual categories.<sup>92</sup>

All of this raises the very important question, does a heterosexual-identified individual who has same sex encounters have the same kind of investment in annihilating the hetero/homosexual binary as those who identify as bisexual or lesbian?<sup>93</sup> The question has been addressed well by historians like Chauncey and Freedman, who look towards multiple layers of meaning—intellectual, emotional, and cultural—when interpreting past behaviour.<sup>94</sup> This was also the focus of my study of Linton. Other scholars writing about Linton’s life had classified her as lesbian. Linton would not have understood her

---

<sup>91</sup> Eve Kosofsky Sedgwick, *Epistemology of the Closet* (Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1990), 44. Butler, *Gender Trouble*, 13-14; while Sedgwick suggests that “there may be no continuous defining essence of ‘homosexuality’ to be known,” Butler believes that the label, lesbian, should be “permanently unclear” to counteract identity categories which normalize (or contest) desire. In *Essentially Speaking* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1989), 103-4, Diana Fuss favours the idea of a transitory, provisional identity to understand single or multiple, brief or long-lasting affiliations, without being trapped in institutionalized sex categories. Some scholars, however, argue that the formation of categories in certain contexts is useful in terms of inclusion or legal equality. See, for example, R. Colker, *Hybrid: Bisexuals, Multiracials, and Other Misfits under American Law* (New York: New York University Press, 1996).

<sup>92</sup> Adrienne Rich, “Compulsory Heterosexuality and Lesbian Existence” *Signs* 5 (1980), 631-790. Applying Freudian psychoanalysis, she reasons that the natural sexual orientation of both men and women was towards women.

<sup>93</sup> For discussion on this see Storr, ed., *Bisexuality*, 9; Colker, *Hybrid*, 13; and Vicinus, “Theory and No Facts,” 60.

<sup>94</sup> George Chauncey, *Gay New York: Gender, Urban Culture and the Makings of the Gay Male World, 1890-1940* (New York: Basic Books, 1994); also Freedman’s “Prison Lesbian” and “Burning of letters” on the challenge of epistemology and identity.

experience as “lesbian” in the 1840s, 1850s and 1860s since the term was not yet used. Added to this, Linton writes of her love for both men and women throughout her life, just as Maynard does.<sup>95</sup> As Gorham warns us in *Vera Brittain*, “a ‘broader’ definition of lesbianism (or bisexuality here) advanced by historians...obfuscates rather than clarifies.”<sup>96</sup> Classifying an historical subject who could never have assumed that identity seems foolhardy for the historian.

The historians, Roy Porter and Lesley Hall, point out in *The Facts of Life* (1995) that English reaction to Krafft-Ebing’s *Psychopathia* was still one of scepticism in 1902, and that Freud was not discussed much beyond the medical profession and intellectual circles until a decade later. Thus, the terms of “repression” or “sublimation” did not really have an impact on the rethinking of sexual categories until after 1920.<sup>97</sup> This important observation helps both to explain and to distinguish Victorian experience from Edwardian. Despite Maynard’s justification of desire within the context of faith, her

---

<sup>95</sup> See Pauline Phipps, “Gender and Sexuality in Victorian England: an Analysis of The Autobiography of Christopher Kirkland,” *Journal of Guidance and Counselling* 17 (2002), 112-17; and also Phipps, “Symbolic Body,” 163-65. I was arguing against Nancy Fix Anderson’s, *Woman Against Women in Victorian England* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1987), and Deborah Meem’s, “Eliza Lynn Linton and the Rise of Lesbian Consciousness,” *Journal of the History of Sexuality* 7 (1997), 537-60. Both authors classified Linton as lesbian.

<sup>96</sup> Gorham, *Vera Brittain*, 63. See also Gorham, “‘The Friendships of Women’: Friendship, Feminism and Achievement in Vera Brittain’s Life and Work in the Interwar Decades,” *Journal of Women’s History*, 3 (1992), 44-69.

<sup>97</sup> Roy Porter and Lesley Hall, *The Facts of Life: the Creation of Sexual Knowledge in Victorian Britain, 1650-1950* (New Haven: Yale university Press, 1995), 178-202. Jeffreys hints at this as does Weeks in his texts, particularly the extent of Carpenter’s influence.

training in Mental and Moral Science at Girton left her profoundly interested in human behaviour. By 1926, “psychoanalysis” seems to have become a part of her vocabulary. She suddenly exclaimed in her Autobiography, “I feel compelled to examine my feelings under the light of psychology,” and she continued tersely to tell the reader:

I suppose *today* psychoanalysts would call my [past] feelings ‘a thwarted sex instinct.’ This to me is an extremely disagreeable term. All I know is that ‘I had a hunger which needed satisfying’ like the need ‘for food.’ So the record is mournful.<sup>98</sup>

A year later Maynard re-visited the subject, arguing, “If my love did stem from ‘repressed sex feelings,’ then why didn’t my thoughts ‘ever stray to a man?’”<sup>99</sup> It is unclear whether she had actually read Freud at this time. She was possibly aware of his “Repression” theory,<sup>100</sup> or perhaps her anger stemmed from her past relationships now coined “deviant” by contemporary standards. But the more pressing question is whether her new knowledge radically altered her self-perceptions. It did not appear to. According to all twentieth century records, she continued to analyse her longings within the context of faith. She concluded of this impassioned entry, “My craving and my loneliness was not the instinct toward marriage, it was the instinct toward God, which can be satisfied with

---

<sup>98</sup> *A*, VII, 44, “1882,” 3. Written August 1926.

<sup>99</sup> *Ibid.*, VII, 52, “1886, My Eleven Years of Gloom,” 172-74. Written June 1927.

<sup>100</sup> Freud, *Sexuality*, 103. He wrote, “if in the course of development some of the components...are submitted to the process of repression (which, and it must be insisted, is not equivalent to their being abolished), the excitations concerned continue to be generated as before; but they are prevented by psychological obstruction from attaining their aim and are diverted into numerous other channels till they find their way to expression as symptoms.” See also *The Standard Edition of the Complete Psychological Works of Sigmund Freud*, trans. James Strachey (New York: Hogarth Press, 1955), 45-57.

nothing less.”<sup>101</sup>

We may conclude that on some level at least Constance recognized and accepted same-sex love and its potential for sin. But her relationship with Lewis suggested that this sinfulness existed in a heterosexual relationship if earthly love was not consecrated to God. Indeed, until the end of her life, she worried that she was not “gaining entrance to the Kingdom of Heaven” because she had always longed for earthly love more than divine.<sup>102</sup> Life events led her to choose a career over marriage and to work for the rights of women. Most of her life was dedicated to women’s higher education, and as a result of her milieu, her conflict between human and divine love largely involved women. If she had been aware of Freud’s theories in the mid- to late 1800s, she might have re-considered her college relationships and/or her passion for both men and women. Perhaps the language of psychoanalysis would have led her to re-conceptualize the “wrong” of her passion sexually, as opposed to spiritually. Thus, she had no means of understanding her “bisexual” nature, or her lifestyle choice as a cover for her sexual orientation as it became for many early twentieth-century lesbians.

.....

#### What is masochism?

Maynard’s wrestling between honouring the spiritual, and experiencing through the physical, represented Atonement theology that emphasized suffering for sin. In fact,

---

<sup>101</sup> *A*, VII, 52, “4<sup>th</sup> College Session, 1886,” 172-74.

<sup>102</sup> *GB*, 24 May 1932, 55.

because of her conflict between earthly and divine love, her engagement in intense, erotic pleasure sometimes involved a corresponding form of denial that, in the extreme, bordered on intense forms of physical and psychological penance. Neither Firth nor Vicinus have touched upon this important aspect of Maynard's experience. Thus, this form of Maynard's self-expression shall be the focus of the second part of this chapter.

Constance's mother, Louisa, might have emphasized the depraved quality of *all* souls before God to her children, including their need to resist worldly and spiritual sentiments, but Constance and her sisters learned that womanly passivity and selflessness were both expected and interconnected to subservience to men. The Darwinian revolution institutionalized a reproductive paradigm of sex and gender, body and mind: sex was to nature and to female, as culture was to gender and to male.<sup>103</sup> As we have seen, sexology was also a child of the Darwinian tradition with its emphasis on gender-distinct conditions like masochism (female) and sadism (male).<sup>104</sup>

Further broadening the concept was Freud, and lesser known psychiatrists such as Wilhelm Reich, who each developed his theory within the context of the Victorian middle-class family. Freud introduced the idea of sado-masochism as two forms of the same entity, often found in the same person. Indeed, his view of masochism as a form of

---

<sup>103</sup> David Hekma, "Introduction: Third Sexes and Third Genders," in *Third Sex, Third Gender*, Herdt, ed., 5-21. He argues that sex and gender are typically dualized as nature and nurture and traced to correlates with social practices.

<sup>104</sup> Havelock Ellis, *Sexual Inversion, Studies in the Psychology of Sex Volume II*, 3d ed. (Philadelphia: F. A. Davies, 1915); Richard von Krafft-Ebing, *Psychopathia Sexualis: With Especial Reference to the Antipathetic Sexual Instinct. A Medico-Forensic Study*, 12th ed. F. J. Rebman ed. (Philadelphia: F. A. Davies, 1933), 58, 166-67. Originally published in 1886.



moral self-righteousness, as expressed in King's and Firth's criticisms of Maynard's scorn of 'wrongdoing,'<sup>105</sup> could also explain Maynard's life-long commitment to religious duty. Since masochistic satisfactions are basically self-inflicted punishment, then cruelty towards others is perfectly compatible with cruelty towards oneself.<sup>106</sup> Does this then help to explain Maynard's emotional abuse in her relationships? Freud's belief that a child's forced repression of sentiment could induce sado-masochism, is also revealing with regard to Maynard's upbringing. Reich, in a radical critique of Freud, theorized that Victorian women at large feared their sexual feelings since they had been raised to believe that they were not supposed to have them.<sup>107</sup> In this respect, the gendering of norms in the Victorian era can be viewed as part of the history of the social construction of women's masochism.

It is notable that sadism and/or masochism are still visualized as intrinsically pathological and symptomatic in individuals who have underlying personality problems. Contemporary research highlights the ways in which children can develop distinct masculine and feminine sexual psychologies through a largely subconscious process of parental intimidation. As feminist scholar Ellen Willis argues, sexual repression and

---

<sup>105</sup> See King, *Reminiscences*, 30-31; and Firth, *Maynard*, 334.

<sup>106</sup> See Christopher Badcock, *Essential Freud* (Cambridge: Blackwell, 1992), 74-76. He points out that in Freud's view, masochism is narcissistic in quality and is often played out in a vigorous attachment to duty. See also de Lauretis, "Freud, Sexuality, and Perversion," 216-34; and Weeks, *Sexuality and its Discontents*.

<sup>107</sup> Paula Caplan, *The Myth of Women's Masochism* (New York: E. P. Dutton, 1985), 23-24. Like Freud, Reich suggests that the child reacts to sexual repression with rage and revenge. See also Sandra Lipsitz Bem, *Lenses Of Gender* (New Haven: New Haven University Press, 1993), 23-27; and Bland, *Banishing the Beast*, 67-73.

sexism operate symbiotically, and cause women to feel more shame and self-blame than men.<sup>108</sup> This has led cultural psychologist, Paula Caplan, to ask, how can “masochism” be re-conceptualized? How can we move beyond well-known myths like “women are not happy unless they are being martyrs?” Can we look for other ways of understanding the behaviour in question? Caplan resolves this dilemma by asserting that so-called “female” masochism “may actually be the ability to delay gratification, earn happiness through effort, or put others’ needs ahead of one’s own.”<sup>109</sup> This proposition, I suggest, seems limited by Caplan’s own concept of so-called womanliness. In fact her observations on womanhood echo the Victorian culture that middle-class women found themselves then enmeshed within. This not only implies the tenacity of myths and cliches, but also their aid in perpetuating culturally-induced, gender-distinct anxieties.<sup>110</sup> Contemporary scholars seem unable to relinquish the stereotyping of the dominance and submission binaries surrounding gender and sex when trying to (re)conceptualize masochism.

We can not diminish the fact that various forms of sexual proclivities are and have been gendered and classified. Nor can we dismiss any kind of biologically-based theory,

---

<sup>108</sup> Ellen Willis, *No More Nice Girls* (Hanover: Wesleyan University Press, 1992), 12. She notes, “women suffer from self-disgust - I have failed. I have no choice about feeling shame. Other “mother-blaming” theories suggest that a mother’s repression of her daughter can invoke, in the daughter, even more intense forms of masochism. See Kaplan’s, *Female Perversions*, 33, in which she asserts, “this could involve into the need to seek suffering, pain or humiliation to obtain love and respect. This is also discussed in Phelan’s *Mourning Sex*, 23-40.

<sup>109</sup> Caplan largely argues this in *Myth*, 1-15, 221-28, although Lipsitz Bem disagrees in the *Lenses of Gender* (see 56). It is notable that both authors (and also Kaplan and Phelan) analyze masochism within the context of gender and sex.

<sup>110</sup> Phipps, “Victorian Myth or Millennium Reality?” 1.

as well as anger at the sexist and arguably homophobic history of psychoanalysis, since they offer insights into both past and present experience. But if we look more closely at masochism and sadism within the context of faith, we may refine the concepts of masculinity and femininity and their accompanying sexual psychologies.

It is easy, of course, to see how the conflict between celebratory and extremist evangelicalism, combined with her mother's Puritanical self-denial, led Maynard to inculcate a form of revelling in pain as though it were a mark of grace. As Freudian scholars like Wurmster explain it:

There is no incidence of 'masochism' other than that produced in the name of shame; an inner moral form of self-torment which is carried out by the conscience. At the extreme, the condition can take on a compulsive quality, in which the individual searches for tormenting partners or for situations of anguish. But at the same time, their behaviour can be understandable on the basis of the premise of power through suffering.<sup>111</sup>

Such observations offer important new insights into behaviour, enabling the historian better to conceptualize seeming contradictions: Maynard could be self-assertive while simultaneously adopting self-deprecating forms of atoning for ambition and desire. But the important point here, however, is that Maynard likely did not view her behaviour as "masochistic" since she did not understand it within that context.

At the age of eight, Maynard's need to prove that she was "a *real* Christian" was played out in her symbolic crucifixion of her flesh:

One day when I was alone at the Shaw, I thought I would pray, so I went in

---

<sup>111</sup> Leon Wurmster, *The Mask of Shame* (Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 1981), 45-46. See also Bell's *Holy Anorexia*, which argues that women's extreme forms of fasting in the 1400s not only emphasized self-punishment, but also gave them a power base.

between the hazel bushes and knelt down on last year's dead leaves. When I got up I thought, 'Now that was real prayer.' Looking down at my bare knees I saw that some of the leaves were holly and that they clung on, and I thought, 'Holly prickles and I did not feel it. Oh, it was *real*, real prayer.'<sup>112</sup>

Clearly, this symbolizes the measures she took to try to attain the level of moral standard and religious truth that she thought her parents and God expected. She felt compelled, even in childhood, to seek forms of physical and psychological self-punishment to prove her faith.

Most of Maynard's relationships, as already discussed, involved self-denial, since she believed human love was supposed to be consecrated to God. She also tended towards negotiating levels of dominance and/or subordination in each of her relationships. The loves of her life, Lewis Campbell, Louisa Lumsden, Ralph Gray and Marion Wakefield, evinced this tendency within her. Maynard's relationship with Campbell, and particularly Lumsden, forced her to adopt the submissive role. From the outset, Lumsden's compelling yet erratic personality both lured and frightened Maynard. As Lumsden's peer, and then her student at Girton, Maynard found their similarities "startling" but their differences equally so. Because she longed to convert her Madonna, she would suffer Louisa's tirades over issues like religion and teaching, and then "beg her for forgiveness, though at times [she] hardly knew what for." But, as she added in her Green-book:

[Ls] coolness was so unendurable...that I asked her forgiveness,...and at once she became so sweet and so gracious that I almost drowned in the sense of overpowering beauty of living day and night for one heart alone. Work, friends, pleasure, everything shared and then the long, long clasp of

---

<sup>112</sup> Firth, *Maynard*, 27. See Hilton, *Atonement*, 10-11, 286. He writes here, Irving viewed evil as an independent force since it tempted Christ. As to whether the Maynard's adopted this view is unclear, but it could explain Constance's fear and torment as a child.

living love that needs no explanation.<sup>113</sup>

Thus was the nature of their relationship over the next four years. When they did not quarrel Constance rejoiced in Louisa's deep affection for her. But their disagreements left Constance feeling vulnerable. "L has the ability to hurt me deeply," she wrote in 1879, "and this is how she maintains authority over me."<sup>114</sup> Working under Louisa at Cheltenham (1876) and then St. Leonards (1877-80) brought Constance pain that reached "a sort of...paralysing intensity" at times. "Feeble and passive under Ls influence," her decision to stay in such a power-based relationship never wavered because "the single argument of [her] *heart* was always L." Indeed, she found it easy to turn down Dr. Robertson as the life of domesticity *he* offered "seemed timid and colourless by comparison."<sup>115</sup> However, this emotional roller coaster eventually took a physical and mental toll on Constance. When she found the strength to leave her "unhappy marriage" to Louisa in 1880, she had still not brought her "noble leonine" to Christ.

Ralph Gray was likely the love of Constance's life; at least she strongly implies this in her Autobiography. Yet, once again, her depiction of their relationship (1883-94) implies her tendency towards self-persecution. I have argued that Maynard's autobiographical in persona revealed a dejected and tormented lover who sought understanding through atoning for her human weakness: "Even now, I feel as if I cannot

---

<sup>113</sup> *GB*, 8 May 1878, 99.

<sup>114</sup> *Ibid.*, 15 December 1879, 157.

<sup>115</sup> *Ibid.*, 24 December 1879, 124; *A*, V, 32, "My 3 years at St. Andrews, 1877," 155. See also Vicinus, "One Life," 613.

bear to approach this miserable eleven years of my life with its whistling, heartless winds," she remarked in 1926.<sup>116</sup> This ongoing theme is also reflected in her Green-book. In 1884, she was convinced that Ralph's "strong, pure, equal and unselfish love could fit into every corner of her heart."<sup>117</sup> However, another notation—"We always move back and forth, and just now we are at a distance again, oh why *must* I love her?"—is indicative of their fluctuating relationship over the next six years.<sup>118</sup> As the opening quote of this chapter implies, she explained Ralph's emotional withdrawal from her as God's punishment. He had taken Ralph from her because she had "not used this treasure rightly"<sup>119</sup> Yet she could barely accept Ralph's rejection. She never understood why He stood by in silence while she seethed with jealousy over Ralph's intimacy with fellow teacher, Anne Richardson, throughout 1886-1887, and then again in 1891-1892.

The struggle between earthly love and divine love became the basis of Maynard's last relationship. She longed for Marion Wakefield to be both a life partner and a successor, whereas she noted in 1926, "My love, given in 1897, never wearied, but what was given in 1899 was never really at rest. Our love was perfect, but our whole level and aim were spiritual." Her resolution to their transgressions centered around stringent asceticism like fasting, while ever pressing Wakefield to embrace the "missionary

---

<sup>116</sup> *A*, VII, 44, "1883," 3.

<sup>117</sup> *GB*, 20 November 1883, 145.

<sup>118</sup> *Ibid.*, 29 June 1884, 228. See also, *Ibid.*, 10 May 1886, 66; *Ibid.*, 26 April 1887, 201; *Ibid.*, 31 December 1889, 303; *A*, VII, 52 "8<sup>th</sup> College Session, 1890," 190.

<sup>119</sup> *GB*, 27 December 1885, 98.

spirit.”<sup>120</sup> On at least two occasions Wakefield went for “Rest-cures” at a private nursing home which involved “over-feeding,” Maynard wrote in her Diary. This was to help “M recover from neurasthenia caused, in part, by malnutrition.”<sup>121</sup> As Bell, Brumberg and Micale propose, the desire of an individual to be holy through fasting can be compared to a present-day woman’s desire to be thin.<sup>122</sup> Nonetheless, for Maynard, thoughts of Wakefield’s “pure body,” free from worldly indulgences, were also accompanied by a corresponding longing. Their intense stolen hours between Rest-cures or trips home were erotically painful, and according to the Green-book, Wakefield also “*ached* for the touch of her love’s hands.”<sup>123</sup>

Implied in the above are Maynard’s and Wakefield’s struggles for power. A woman may use “food refusal” as a means of gaining control in her particular patriarchal environment through controlling her body, Brumberg asserts.<sup>124</sup> Hence, Wakefield does appear to have been reacting to the hierarchic, submissive and “possessed” relationship in

---

<sup>120</sup> A, VII, 56, “15<sup>th</sup> College Session, 1897,” 142.

<sup>121</sup> See D, 12 October 1898, 66; D, 12 May 1900, 99; D, 22 March 1902, 123.

<sup>122</sup> As noted earlier, neither Bell nor Brumberg discusses food refusal within the context of sexual desire. They suggest that anorexia was tied to patriarchal structures—from the medieval religious order to the industrial world. See Bell, *Holy Anorexia*, 180-86; and Brumberg, *Fasting Girls*, 270-72, and 220-27 for body image. Micale does make some connection, however. See 291 in his *Approaching Hysteria*.

<sup>123</sup> See GB, 2 March 1902, 120; GB, 18 January 1903, 18; GB, 16 January 1901, 8; GB, 31 December 1904, 218; GB, 13 December 1903, 270-71.

<sup>124</sup> Brumberg, *Fasting Girls*, 126-30. Also Bell, *Holy Anorexia*, 54-84; Elaine Showalter, *The Female Malady: Women, Madness, and English Culture, 1830-1980* (New York: Pantheon Books, 1985); and Juliet Mitchel, *Women: The Longest Revolution* (London: Virago, 1984).

which she found herself with another woman. In other words, one woman's vying for power over another may be as damaging and repressive as a man's domination of her. This serves as another important example of how educational pioneers subverted gender when faith, ambition, and passion conjoined in the same milieu.

In her Autobiography, Maynard wavered between explaining Wakefield's plight as mentally-based, and asserting that it was a religious crisis. It was at this time that new scientific definitions about "food refusal" as pathological were emerging. Maynard's records thus offer another example of how Victorians traversed uneasily between faith and science.<sup>125</sup> However, all records suggested that Maynard sensed that her controlling ways and imposed penance of physical resistance had also caused Marion's malaise.<sup>126</sup> In the end, Wakefield was overwhelmed as she struggled under Maynard's complicated expectations of her as both daughter and wife, successor and partner, and missionary and academic. In 1905, she relinquished Maynard's hold by entering a purportedly physical relationship with a younger peer. "I am awakening Mary's spiritual growth," she apparently told a very jealous Constance. Marion withdrew farther by taking her degree at another London college, and then teaching psychology at Chichester College for Women in 1923.<sup>127</sup>

---

<sup>125</sup> *A*, VII, 63, "18<sup>th</sup> College Session, 1900," 456-58; also *D*, 7 May 1902, 89; *D*, 6 June 1902, 99; Brumberg, *Fasting Girls*, 149-63; and Micale, *Approaching Hysteria*, 123-67, for discussions of symptoms and treatment in the Victorian period.

<sup>126</sup> See *D*, 6 November 1899, 67; *A*, VII, 64, "1901," 468; and *GB*, 12 October 1899, 99.

<sup>127</sup> *A*, VII, 62, "1900," 400; *GB*, 23 December 1923, 59. Marion was about ten years older than Mary. She apparently told Constance that she was "teaching" Mary in the



In 1905, when her relationship with Marion was waning, Constance remarked in her Green-book, “Often I have talked about self denial and restraint, and though my life has a great deal of this element, it is not voluntary and I would break it if I could.”<sup>128</sup> Perhaps she no longer cared to recall—for example, in Willis’ much later words: “her reactive guilt manifested in the impulse to submit to others while embracing pain and suffering as evidence of one’s own moral purity.”<sup>129</sup>

However, can we conclude that Constance’s penchant for self-denial and suffering was a *perverse* outcome of her mediation between prescript and experience, as Ellis, Krafft-Ebing or Freud would suggest? Was it an impulse that was inevitably corrupted by social inequality and coercion? Certainly, her evangelical/puritan upbringing alongside her culture’s gender norms promoted some “abnormal” forms of asceticism.<sup>130</sup> Nonetheless, as historians Vern Bulloch and Dwight and Joan Dixon powerfully argue in “Sadism, Masochism and History, or when is Behaviour Sado-Masochistic?”, we should not underestimate the deeply embedded concepts of pain and suffering in Western Christian culture. They propose that Christology has long made the Western world prone

---

same way that Constance had helped her; this implied was their mutual physical passion, led by Marion.

<sup>128</sup> Ibid., 22 May 1905, 92.

<sup>129</sup> Willis, *No Nice Girls*, 50. She sums this on 20, “It is not clear that sex can be understood as an emotional, moral and social issue without some recourse to the idea of desire as a biological need.”

<sup>130</sup> See Stachniecoski, *Prosecutory Imagination*, 59-60 and Edwin Starbuck, *The Psychology of Religion: An Empirical Study of the Growth of Religious Consciousness* (New York: Charles Scribner and Sons, 1899).

to inculcating a wide variety of sadistic and/or masochistic-like behaviours without particular gender attachments, long before they were classified as such by Victorian sexologists. That is, since Jesus suffered martyrdom on the cross to save humankind, many Christians have undergone the same suffering, believing either that they would achieve salvation sooner or that salvation was only possible to those who had suffered. Bulloch, Dixon and Dixon suggest that scholars suspend debating definitions and/or pathologies, and begin recognizing that the behaviour is, in fact, as much a part of physiology, psychology and culture, as “normative” sex is.<sup>131</sup>

Throughout this chapter Maynard’s behaviour has been shown to be social since it involved social interaction, and the mutual definition of the meanings of acts with other individuals from her culture. European literature from at least the Middle Ages conveys the long history of adoption by individuals of one language for love, whether divine or earthly, whether ecstatic or painful, in order to explain the combination of erotic and spiritual feeling that swept through them in the presence of a beloved.<sup>132</sup> Maynard lamented in her Autobiography, “Love had treated me cruelly, and...yet what a glorious

---

<sup>131</sup> Vern Bullough, Dwight Dixon and Joan Dixon, “Sadism, Masochism and History, or when is Behaviour Sado-Masochistic?” in *Sexual Knowledge, Sexual Science*, eds., Roy Porter and Mikulas (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), 49, 63-82; for example, while some scholars argue that the behaviour ranges from mutual, gentle play-acting to assaultive behaviour, others dispute such over-generalization, asserting that it involves dominance and submission, role-playing and mutual definition. Melvin Lansky and Andrew Morrison, eds., *The Widening Scope of Shame* (Hillsdale: The Analytic Press, 1997), offers good insights into culturally-imbibed aspects of behaviour.

<sup>132</sup> See, for example, A. Butler’s *Butler’s Lives of the Saints*, new rev. ed. Herbert Thurston and Donald Attwater, 4 vols. (reprinted New York: R. J. Kennedy and Sons, 1962); also Bynum Walker’s, *Fragmentation and Redemption* and *Holy Feast*.

thing love itself was! The colours grew more brilliant as I thought of it. And all the while Christ stood beside me, offering me white, pure white...."<sup>133</sup> Fighting jealousy and rejection, she tried to accept her emotional desolation over Ralph in terms of God's righteous anger at her forgetfulness. Until she put Him first, she could not have Ralph; until she could stop thinking about Ralph, she would be denied both Ralph and His mercy. She tried to accept Marion's betrayal by assuring herself that Marion's sharing of their acts of love with another was a necessary teaching tool in conversion: "I was...upset that M handed on everything I had to give to someone else. Yet when she wanted to express love she knew no language but what I had taught her, so how could she help it?"<sup>134</sup>

Historically, ecstasy has often been associated with pain. Maynard's early childhood experience—praying unawares on the "holly prickles"—is not so dissimilar from that of the ascetic saints of the fourth and fifth centuries, or those of centuries-old cultures such as in Southern Spain. Individuals have endeavoured to become better Christians by establishing a mystical—some might call it orgasmic—response to pain and suffering in the hopes of achieving Truth or eternal salvation.<sup>135</sup> As an adult, Maynard

---

<sup>133</sup> A, VII, 57, "1897," 411.

<sup>134</sup> GB, 29 September 1906, 126.

<sup>135</sup> The ascetics sometimes went beyond mere denial by trying to outdo each other in pushing the human body to new and greater abuse. See Bullough, Dixon and Dixon, "Sadism, Masochism," 51-52. As Timothy Mitchell points out in *Passional Culture* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1990), 47, 87, 111, in Southern Spain, eloquent Roman Catholic rituals and ceremonies, which center around the passion and death of Christ and the suffering of Mary, have infused a guilt and suffering complex on that society for centuries.

found herself adopting ever more punitive measures when her attempts at “industry, meditation, courage and perseverance did not meet with the response from Heaven which [she] looked for.”<sup>136</sup>

Ultimately, Maynard was treading dangerous waters and found herself drowning in seas of “loss and waste and confusion.”<sup>137</sup> As Keith Yandell points out, “religious ‘truth,’ which is limited to what is within reach of our cognitive powers, can leave us intellectual prisoners at the best of times.”<sup>138</sup> When reading through Maynard’s records throughout the mid-to-late 1800s, one gets glimpses of the depths of her angst as she struggled to resolve faith within the context of love and work, and vice versa. This is not surprising in light of both her guilt- and suffering-complex, and her faith shaping her emotional drives. She manifested extreme forms of compensatory penance. Her conflicts caused her to sink into a devastating depression for seven years, which at times, led to thoughts of suicide. She “felt as if no-one on earth or in heaven really cared whether [she] lived or died...and did not even wish to be cured [her]self because it seemed like a permanent way to be feeling.”<sup>139</sup>

Nonetheless, while she “used to sit and hate the bondage which [she] had brought on,” she also admitted that, “I have slipped the collar on quite willingly.” She later

---

<sup>136</sup> A, VII, 55, “1892,” 307.

<sup>137</sup> Ibid., VII, 46, “1890,” 256.

<sup>138</sup> Keith Yandell, *The Epistemology of Religious Experience* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1993), 10.

<sup>139</sup> A, VII, 56, “11<sup>th</sup> College Session, 1893,” 3. See Stachniecowski, *Prosecutory Imagination*, 50-60, for a good discussion on this.

explained, “During this time I was influenced by Dante. The Purgatorio was my favourite, with the unwillingness of the victims to escape from their pain.”<sup>140</sup> This is not to imply that she suffered for the sake of suffering, even though she did evidently seek pleasure at times through a formula that had brought her pleasure and happened to involve pain. Maynard’s point in both *Autobiography* and *Green-book* is that her contemplation for hours in cold, wet fields, which brought on rheumatism, and her biking “extremely hard as if [her] sanity depended upon it,” which exacerbated her rheumatism, enabled her to ride into a “new, brighter, happier space.”<sup>141</sup>

Kathleen McCrone argues, although “the evidence is only circumstantial, sport probably brought to Victorian women what it has brought to modern ones—real mental and physical gains in the form among other things of greater self-confidence and improved health.... This probably explains why...the lure of sport was irresistible.”<sup>142</sup> Indeed, Maynard’s physical activity, albeit painful, might have been a powerful attempt to *release* herself from a great deal of emotional pain. These extreme measures of self-denial (she did this with fasting) became a necessary part of her healing process, in a form of cathartic cleansing and closing of her wounds. She eventually approached a new consciousness which she associated with a deified body—healthier and purified both

---

<sup>140</sup> See *GB*, 12 November 1887, 102; *GB*, 12 May 1888, 267; *A*, VII, 52, “Vacation in Norway, 1888,” 232.

<sup>141</sup> See *A*, VII, 55, “Long Vacation, 1893,” 307; *A*, VII, 60, “1894, Long Vacation,” 345; *A*, VII, 64, “Cycling Tour, 1895,” 361.

<sup>142</sup> McCrone, *Playing the Game*, 286.

physically and emotionally.<sup>143</sup> Her struggles with passion and ambition may never have been entirely resolved, but her 'new' body helped her move towards a new sense of self-respect and aim. Her sense of empowerment brought her "out of the depths of her quagmire of sorrow" in 1895, and by 1901, she had gained a renewed interest in her general physical and psychological well-being:

It comes to me with a clearness that I have something distinctive in which I have gone through. That it was 'worthwhile,' I doubt if I can say yet. The process...had a sadness...which did not compare with anything else, and goes almost beyond our limits, but I know that I managed to leave the tunnel.<sup>144</sup>

Religion was many things to Maynard, a shelter, an escape, a consolation, a justification, a discipline, an inspiration, an arena for rebellion against prescriptions. As Malmgreen, Hogan, Melnyk and others argue, Victorian women adopted religion as platform for many social gains.<sup>145</sup> However, faith was a powerfully erotic sphere in which Maynard experienced a love that included a form of self-denial in her attempt at total submission to God's will. Yet in this, she sought the drama of personal self-conquest in every aspect of her life as a Victorian woman. During a period when she felt obliged to

---

<sup>143</sup> A, VII, 57, "Long Vacation, 1894," 362. In "Sadism," 50, Bullough, Dixon and Dixon point out that endorphins, which are produced in the body through exercise, are both powerful painkillers and antidepressants. Caplan also points this out in *Myth*, 163, after interviewing a woman who took up long-distance running to extricate herself emotionally from what she termed, a masochistic relationship. In *Female Perversions*, 3, Kaplan asserts that extreme forms of self-punishment can "shield the individual from the worst effects of death drive."

<sup>144</sup> GB, 29 December 1901, 88.

<sup>145</sup> Malmgreen, ed., *Religion in the Lives*; Hogan and Bradstock, eds., *Women of Faith*; Melnyk, ed., *Women's Theology*.

choose between love and career, she found ways to mediate both within the context of religion. Certainly, the following chapters illustrate the deeply embedded dominance and submission binaries of her culture, played out in norms surrounding gender, sex, class, race and religion. Furthermore, Maynard's subversion of norms and faith enabled her to gain new erotic meaning and mutual definition with her partners. In sum, Western culture may be permeated with masochistic behavior, and each of us "probably has elements of this in our own psyche,"<sup>146</sup> and so the diaries of Constance Maynard teach us that the problem is not so much its existence, but its control. She warned:

Confidence alone is pure, sweet, and grave, but rather lacking in force.  
Passion alone brings tortures, jealousies, and murders, but it is strong....Could not the two be united? Here is the danger.<sup>147</sup>

---

<sup>146</sup> Bullough, Dixon and Dixon, "Sadism, Masochism," 59.

<sup>147</sup> *A*, VII, 62, "Long Vacation, 1899," 448.

## Chapter 4

### 'A Time of Crisis, Restraint and Liberty' - 1869-1872

Constance Maynard wrote of her experiences of the year 1872, "At twenty-three, I was noted for my array of well-tested opinions and for my wonderful eyes and smile. This year I got Liberty as exceedingly few girls in the '70s got it, got it in full measure. It was like learning a new language."<sup>1</sup> She had fought her conflict over trying to separate emotion from reason by learning to embrace the self more holistically, which, ironically, had gained the respect of both parents. Such forms of self-fulfilment and approbation had unearthed both her passion and ambition. She explained of her fertile ground:

It was like a well, deep and sunless, for no one had touched it....There is a force in every woman's heart that is self-immolating, overwhelming, and mine had found no expression at all....Who was going to discover the wealth of those untroubled depths?<sup>2</sup>

The excavator of the depths of her deep-seated passions was the enigmatic Lewis Campbell, a man twenty years her senior. He was also responsible for opening up to her the world of secular intellect which led to her subsequent role as an educational pioneer.

The years leading up to Maynard's fateful visit to the Campbells set the stage for her experiences there. As explained in chapters two and three, she had suffered under her mother's determination "to bring [her] to a humble, teachable and unworldly spirit"

---

<sup>1</sup> *A*, II, 9, "The year of Crisis, Restraint and Liberty, 1872," 238. Written, March, 1925.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, II, 9, "1872," 240.



throughout 1865, 1866 and 1867.<sup>3</sup> Yet at the same time, individuals like Mamie, Harry and cousin Mare had helped her to look beyond her mother's ascetic concept of "Goodness" by questioning her fragmented self. Village work, travel and self-education, meanwhile, had given her more self-confidence; and nature, poetry and especially art had led her to examine her feelings and perspective, and to express her thoughts and emotions more freely.

In her Autobiography, Maynard told readers that her adolescent awakening to her sexuality was largely understood through poetry. For example, at age twelve, when she read Tennyson's "Fatima":

Oh love! Oh fire! Once he drew  
In one long kiss my whole soul through  
My lips, as sunlight drinketh dew

she recalled asking herself, "What did this feel like? I thought I could make a good guess. I had similar sorts of attractions towards male cousins, which had been more exciting than anything else at the time."<sup>4</sup> Maynard's experience was not so atypical for her times. As Gorham notes in *Victorian Girl*, ignorance about sex was deemed the best policy—particularly for women—and sex was not really discussed in many middle-class homes. Even at the end of the century information about sexuality was believed to be inherently dangerous.<sup>5</sup>

---

<sup>3</sup> Ibid., II, 4, "1865-66," 60.

<sup>4</sup> A, I, 2, "1861- 62," 40.

<sup>5</sup> See Gorham, *Victorian Girl*, 54-55, 91-96, 160, for a good discussion on this. Also Christina Simmons' "Modern Sexuality and the Myth of Victorian Repression," in

During her teenage years, Maynard's curiosity found form in surreptitious looking over romantic fiction at railway stations; and in a Green-book entry in 1868 she noted, "My shy glances at the nudes at the Royal Academy awakens a great curiosity that I can not satisfy."<sup>6</sup> Yet while she felt that "her growing need for passion was real," such excitement, she was learning, must be curbed.<sup>7</sup> In this, as I have argued, Maynard's upbringing was both typical and atypical. Her mother had already thwarted her friendship with Belstead fellow student, Fan Williams. Louisa's views on the evil of sentiment also included heterosexual romance. In fact a particularly mortifying event at eighteen made Constance "feel as if [she] could never speak to a man again." When Tissy had noticed that she "could not take [her] eyes off" George's teenage friend, "a few vivid words" ending with her admonition, that Constance "be modest and quiet," had sent the latter "away with [her] hands clapped over her ears to howl in the garden."<sup>8</sup>

In February 1869, the "eventful year," as Maynard called it in her Autobiography,<sup>9</sup> she wrote in her Green-book, "He who searches my heart sees that I care more about my

---

*Passion and Power: Sexuality in History*, eds., Kathy Piess and Christina Simmons (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1989), 157-78, for Victorian ideas of romantic love and the move towards even more companionate forms of marriage in the 1900s.

<sup>6</sup> *GB*, 7 July 1868, 159; *A*, 1, 2, "1861-62," 43-47; *A*, II, 6, "Many Interests, 1868," 130; she noted, "I read the backs of novels at railway stations and guessed what they were about."

<sup>7</sup> *A*, II, 6, "1868," 130.

<sup>8</sup> *GB*, 7 July 1868, 159; See also Firth, *Maynard*, 63.

<sup>9</sup> *A*, II, 7, "1869," 176.

own imaginations than thinking of Him.”<sup>10</sup> Her thoughts were based upon the “new year motto” from her mother which, taken from Psalm 37.3.4., had cautioned her to:

*Trust in the Lord. Delight thyself also in the Lord, and He shall give thee desires of thine heart. Give does not mean grant the desires of thy heart, or fulfill them.*<sup>11</sup>

She concluded of this entry:

I think this is *more* satisfactory than fulfilling them. Desire is more completely answered by having vocation for it *taken away* than by having it granted fully. Youth has been quite pleasant, though not satisfactory. This next five years ought to be far happier because the fluctuation of feeling will decrease as knowledge gets firmer.<sup>12</sup>

At age twenty—when most women of her class were thinking of romance—Maynard was trying to resist it through faith. “I long for the excitement of feeling,” she exclaimed, “but I sincerely hope that my insane longing - I will call it nothing else - will quite pass away.”<sup>13</sup> Nonetheless, she deeply resented “her ignorance in love....Love and Marriage were such great things, *must* they be forever hidden away? *Never* to be touched on by speech or writing?”<sup>14</sup>

Marriage was to be a topic of conversation not once, but twice that year in fact. Although no-one saw the significance at the time, Louisa privately decided that as Tissy

---

<sup>10</sup> *GB*, 7 February 1869, 110.

<sup>11</sup> *Ibid.*, 19 February 1869, 107. Louisa selected what she saw as a fitting text for each daughter or son in the new year. Constance’s text implied her mother’s concern about “carnality.”

<sup>12</sup> *Ibid.*, 107.

<sup>13</sup> *Ibid.*, 7 July 1868, 159.

<sup>14</sup> *Ibid.*, 159; *A*, II, 6, “1868,” 130.

was nearly thirty, the age in which she herself had married, "it was time to begin to look around." This did not mean that Tissy was allowed to attend social evenings or dances. Instead, Henry dutifully brought home two eligible doctors from the National Club. The first, Constance recalled in her Autobiography, "seemed impossible" because he was unattractive, overly talkative and irreverent. The next was even less likeable because he was "a stickler for facts and was tiresome." Because "lynx-eyed Tissy saw through the little ruse de guerre and scouted it rather unmercifully," Constance commented, "there were no more guests of this nature."<sup>15</sup> For Tissy such experiences were doubtless bitter, but the incident also left a sting for her youngest sister too, as seen in her addendum:

Years later I remember a dinner party where I met a captain Montan Wilbraham-Taylor, whom I thought was splendid. I can remember thinking, 'Why did *we* never meet a man like this when we were younger?'<sup>16</sup>

Perhaps Maynard's bitterness over romance also stemmed from the events surrounding her own marriage proposal later that summer—although she was not remotely in love and the incident did gain Tissy's unexpected sympathy. In mid-July, both she and Gazy visited the widow of a "good Evangelical clergyman." It was their first stay with friends, as opposed to relatives; and it was there that Constance met Harry Collisson—the eldest of the twelve children—who was a merchant but planned on becoming a clergyman. Although their stay was cut short, Harry seized the chance to declare his love for her when they were momentarily alone at the train station. Constance kept quiet about his

---

<sup>15</sup> *A*, II, 6, "1869," 139. See also Firth, *Maynard*, 63.

<sup>16</sup> *Ibid.*, 139.

marriage proposal—a Green-book entry a month later seeming an almost lurid account of the first whispers of love with its emphasis on sin, shame and loss:

I became earthly minded, I am ashamed to say. My first flush of feeling was one of pleasure mixed with great trembling, and then an overwhelming feeling that it must not be allowed for an instant. I told him that I wished he had not said that and he said that it ‘was impossible to keep in.’ Oh! the trial of the next few days! He was in the background of every thought, yet with a sense of some irreparable loss. I was a child no longer, but a woman, and must be very careful.<sup>17</sup>

While she “rather liked him,” the thought of intimacy with “*any* human being was wholly insupportable.” Moreover, he was penniless in comparison to her wealth. Her father had just mentioned that he had “put aside £20,000 for each daughter with more to come in the future.”<sup>18</sup>

Nonetheless, Collisson’s intentions about marriage were serious. When he was offered the chance to train for the ministry in America he arranged a visit to Oakfield with her mother to “say Goodbye to friends.” Constance was leery about his planned visit yet resolute. When he came he fervently argued his case but she “gave him no hope.” He courteously accepted her refusal and then quietly left. The Green-book covered a few pages about it “all being very distressing,” but then added, “Yet when he was gone I was shocked at the rebound of feeling I experienced....I flew down the garden saying, ‘It’s all over - I’m free, quite free!’”<sup>19</sup>

However, she was not quite free. She soon learned that Tissy’s suspicions had

---

<sup>17</sup> *GB*, 17 August 1869, 87.

<sup>18</sup> *A*, II, 6, “1869,” 141.

<sup>19</sup> *GB*, 17 August 1869, 87; Firth, *Maynard*, 73.

been aroused by Collison's behaviour and she was filled with dread:

Oh, how keenly I dreaded that sharp tongue! How I imagined her saying, 'Away from home for the *first* time...and this is what comes of it - Oh! what a girl!' ....I was mistaken....She said she could tell by my 'white face and guarded manner' that I was not 'sentimentally hankering after his demonstrative outpourings.' She would not let me blame myself, and her magnanimity about the whole incident has made us friends.<sup>20</sup>

The incident did indeed bring her closer to Tissy, who became her confidante when James Robertson asked her to marry him in 1887.

Her mother was a different story, however, according to the Green-book:

'Why didn't my old darling tell me?' I said, 'Oh, you would laugh so!' Mother said cheerfully, 'And aren't you laughing too?' At one bound my heart sprang a mile away from hers, as I am afraid it pretty often does these days, and I said to myself: 'Never, never! Laugh? Would I laugh to see a poor animal in pain? This is dreadful.'<sup>21</sup>

Constance was told that her father must not know of the incident—he was in South Africa at the time—since he “would be angry.” Her mother then wrote “a very unkind letter to Collisson, calling him ‘childish, presumptuous and dishonest’ for pretending to say goodbye in order to renew his ‘secret protestations.’” Constance, mortified beyond measure, was appalled at “how vulgar [her] mother made the whole incident seem.”<sup>22</sup> But she likely had a lucky escape. After becoming ordained in America, Collisson married an American named Susan Wallace who “was reported to be charming and good.” Less than a year later, he was suffering from depression and felt so “unworthy that he drew out a

---

<sup>20</sup> Ibid., 2 September 1869, 110.

<sup>21</sup> Ibid., 110.

<sup>22</sup> Ibid., 30 September 1869, 135. See also Firth, *Maynard*, 74.

pistol and killed his wife and then himself.”<sup>23</sup>

Key to the Collisson episode was Maynard’s first-hand experience with heterosexual love and its far-ranging emotions: from his ardent desire, her responsive “flush,” towards her recognizing that while it was pleasurable she had no attraction for him. The event also unveiled her own needs. Her religiously-based mediation between desire and resistance would prove irreconcilable, as the ensuing chapters will argue. Yet her penchant for this binary makes clear that passionlessness was out of the question—as exemplified by the “lasting impression” the novel, *L’Hotel du Petit St. Jean*, had upon her:

Today I finished reading my first love story and I shall always remember it with great pleasure. It shows, almost unconsciously, the narrowness and selfishness of earthly love, even in its most intense form, ‘compared with the love our Lord sets before us to dwell and rule in our hearts.’<sup>24</sup>

Guarded as the entry was about “the pleasure” the novel gave her, in her Autobiography she remarks that *L’Hotel* “opened up the world of love to [her] as nothing else had done - and [that] all sorts of inarticulate stirrings in [her] heart were explained to [her].”<sup>25</sup> Her Green-book largely inferred her “difficulty in submitting [her] heart and every thought to complete surrender to Him.” Yet one wonders at the significance of one Green-book entry in April 1869, “only love can do it.”<sup>26</sup>

---

<sup>23</sup> *A*, II, 7, “1869,” 183.

<sup>24</sup> *GB*, 15 July 1870, 219.

<sup>25</sup> *A*, II, 9, “The year of Crisis, Restraint and Liberty, 1872,” 196.

<sup>26</sup> *GB*, 13 April 1869, 170.

The intensity of the love between “a young Christian woman and her poetic lover” in *L’ Hotel*, as depicted by Maynard in her Autobiography, seems to mirror the relationship described between herself and Lewis Campbell in her Green-book. Her Autobiography makes no connection to this. In fact the text is oblique about their relationship in its haunting, painful eloquence. It is also notable that *this* account is transcribed by Firth in a chapter entitled, “The Crucial Year.” Firth made no attempt to analyse their relationship, but simply noted, “Constance, writing in 1915, tells the story of the year 1872 herself.”<sup>27</sup> Compelling and intriguing as this is, it is through Maynard’s Green-book that we learn the extent of Campbell’s impact upon her ambition and passion, and her limitations as a Victorian upper-middle-class woman.

Since age eighteen, Constance had been invited to the Campbells by her Aunt Amelia, whom she had met at Cousin Mare’s. Although Louisa had always refused, she suddenly granted permission in 1872. After all, Constance “was nearly 23, and Amelia, Henry’s sister, now quite aged, was extremely fond of her.”<sup>28</sup> Constance was pleasantly surprised by such liberty although her parents had “loosened [their] reins” since 1870. In April 1871, Dora had been allowed a month of trial nursing at Queen’s Square Hospital in London. Tissy meanwhile was scheduled to train at Highbury Convalescent Home (for the elderly) later that summer. Each position was viewed by their parents as an extension of their domestic roles, Dora having convinced them that her training would be useful for

---

<sup>27</sup> See Firth, *Maynard*, 81.

<sup>28</sup> *A*, II, 9, “1872,” 252. Amelia spent each summer with her niece (Mare) and each winter with her daughter, Fanny Campbell.



village work. Nonetheless, both Do and Tissy would receive “professional training;” and Dora persuaded her parents to let her enter the profession seriously in 1879.<sup>29</sup> Yet despite the Maynards’ somewhat progressive attitude to women’s careers, given their cultural milieu, Louisa remained unpredictable and strict about visiting, particularly if the environment was purportedly secular. Hence Constance had amazement at setting off, on February 6<sup>th</sup>, to the worldly home of Lewis and Fanny Campbell. She would have been even more astounded if she had known that her mother’s decision meant that her life would be forever changed on both an emotional and intellectual level.

Louisa and Henry knew little about Fanny’s enigmatic husband, Lewis, except that he was from an impoverished genteel family and had “managed to succeed in life through scholarships and prizes,” including studies at Oxford. He had met their niece in 1858 at the Oxford commemoration when she was nineteen and he was twenty-six. They fell in love and Fanny had apparently taken him “in hand.” She not only “prepared him for society” but had nurtured him both “mentally and physically.” An attractive woman, she was “considered a good wife” whose support had been vital to her husband’s academic success. At forty-two, Lewis was well respected. He had a number of publications under his belt and had “held the Greek chair of St. Andrews University” for many years.<sup>30</sup>

Constance received an affectionate welcome from her cousins and was soon

---

<sup>29</sup> *GB*, 9 December 1870, 13. The convalescence home at Highbury was attached to the children’s hospital at London, which specialized in hip and joint disease. Tissy apparently did not have the same aptitude for nursing as her younger sister. Henry was asked to remove her from the home after a couple of months because “her work was not fast enough for them.”

<sup>30</sup> *A*, II, 9, “1872,” 269.

settled into a “quiet, but delightful routine” in their sumptuous home, The Scores. Mornings were always spent with Aunt Amelia but afternoon activities varied. Sometimes she walked with Lewis or attended university lectures. On other afternoons Fanny held “charming afternoon teas” which were equally stimulating. Indeed, it was at these functions that Constance became more aware of women’s rights and educational and sanitary reforms. She also heard, for the first time, the merits of women’s higher education.<sup>31</sup>

Etiquette also played a part in the Campbells’ consideration of her upbringing. “Lewis chose his words so that he would not shock me while Fanny excused any amusement that mother might find too worldly,” Constance wrote in her Autobiography. “So I missed the county ball, dinners and card-parties, remaining behind with auntie.” But because the Campbells entertained members of the upper classes, like Lewis’ well-respected peers, Dr. Shairp and Dr. Tullock, Fanny insisted on buying Constance a more fashionable dress. “It was thin book-muslin with narrow strips of embroidery and a white waist band,” Constance explained. “I loved the dress and I always adorned it with the diamond locket father had given me on my 21<sup>st</sup>.” The dress was apparently worn “at every festivity after that.”<sup>32</sup>

Not surprisingly, Constance wrote “ecstatically about life at St Andrews” to her family. She loved the “city of the scarlet gown,” and all the wonders of University talk,”

---

<sup>31</sup> See, for example, *D*, 28 February 1872, 55; *D*, 6 April 1872, 63; *D*, 3 March 1872, 67.

<sup>32</sup> *GB*, 6 March 1872, 121.

and in late February she begged her mother to let her stay longer. Louisa gave her daughter permission but her letters cautioned Constance to have more “self discipline” in her worldly environment. The latter, however, was forming her own opinions about her cousins and their life in her Green-book:

Secular it was certainly, and sometimes worldly, but the delightful brightness and warmth of intellect of which there is so large a proportion at St. Andrews seems to me to take off from the thing which oppresses the very spirit of this world. It was only on Sunday that I was really unhappy and shocked when I watched them both read novels. Or with other things like parties, acting and card playing. But perhaps they are not sins but simply the love of them. I have come (perhaps too willing) to agree to every subject of difference but one. The various schools of thought, expression, action, education, society and dress are up to individual people, but I must have a personal relationship with God.<sup>33</sup>

Despite her concern for what she saw as their “disrespect for the Sabbath,” the idea of freedom of thought and speech was clearly innovating for Constance. Moreover, she relished “feeling that people respected [her] opinion,” despite her belief that such self-seeking of “approbation was a weakness.” But most important of all, “I knew that I was seizing the opportunity to bring forth a kind of self I had recognized before by glimpses,” she recalled. “Something within me strained and strove, like a seed under the clods trying to reach the air.”<sup>34</sup>

Constance’s realization of her ambition took form in early March upon meeting Isabella Cook, the daughter of the late moral philosophy professor of St Andrews, whom Lewis had greatly admired. Isabella told Constance that her sister Rachel was attending

---

<sup>33</sup> *Ibid.*, 14 April 1872, 133; *A*, II, 9, “1872,” 269.

<sup>34</sup> *A*, II, 9, “1872,” 259.

Hitchin College, and that Rachel aimed to be among the first women to sit for the Cambridge Classical Tripos. “Learning about this whole new world [for women] is exactly what I feel I have been waiting for,” Constance wrote in her Green-book. “I won’t disobey my parents,” she added, “but I will move heaven and earth to get there!”<sup>35</sup>

When Isabella mentioned that Lewis had tutored Rachel in Greek for the Hitchin entrance examination, Constance anticipated, and received his enthusiastic support. From “the very first” Fanny had encouraged her to take walks with him since—Constance noted quite nastily in her Green-book—“*she* never went out without an object in mind like shopping.”<sup>36</sup> While she had initially found Lewis intimidating and moody, Constance soon found herself admiring his “gentle, refined and melancholy mind.” Their afternoon walks had drawn them towards each other’s “aspirations and deep compassions,” particularly their mutual passion for poetry. Meanwhile, the “loveliest part of the evening was when Lewis read texts by Plato, Electra, Iliad, and Shakespeare while [she], Fanny and auntie drew or sewed.”<sup>37</sup> Implied here, besides Maynard’s growing infatuation for Lewis, are the gender roles played out in separate spheres. The Scores may have been Fanny’s domain, but Lewis was the head of the household, the instructor of knowledge. He read, the women listened.<sup>38</sup> This form of gender hierarchy, amongst other things, was reflected in Maynard’s relationship with him over the years.

---

<sup>35</sup> *GB*, 12 March 1872, 109.

<sup>36</sup> *Ibid.*, 21 April 1872, 121.

<sup>37</sup> *A*, II, 9, “1872,” 272.

<sup>38</sup> *Ibid.*, II, 9, “1872,” 258. See also Tosh, “Domesticity,” 50.

In 1872, Maynard was mostly concerned by Campbell's religious perspective, however, and she wrote at length about it in her Green-book. He seemed interested in the subject but she surmised that he thought her "very *theological*." Thus, determined to prove that religion had "*brightened*" her life, she "introduced the inspiration of the Bible" by explaining that "millions had found it different from any other book." Although Campbell agreed that it was "a collection of...inspired writings by the *best* men of old days, it was not infallible. Christianity was the chief light...given by God," but there were many other God-given "lights," like reason, science, nature and art. He strengthened his argument by pointing out that while her "religious hero, Edward Irving, may well breathe a lofty spirit of devotion," there was "more greatness in men like Shakespeare who reached out to a wider audience...and condemned no one."<sup>39</sup>

Maynard was baffled by Campbell's powerful argument from the start. Sensing her shock and unease over his religious perspective, he would trap her by asking her to explain her ongoing condemnation of "this natural man" who was "not of the spirit." Maynard could never offer a convincing argument. Her research throughout 1867-69 had led to her *own* self-justification, that intellect *and* passion were God-given. Thus, when Campbell got her to agree that "it was *sin* then, that debased us and tied us to the earth," he could argue that her distinguishing between flesh and spirit was problematic: "I believe that what touches us deeply on any side, surely touches our inner self, our spirit. God made the whole of us, mind and flesh and all."<sup>40</sup>

---

<sup>39</sup> *GB*, 18 February 1872, 123.

<sup>40</sup> *Ibid.*, 27 March 1872, 124.

However, the Atonement doctrine of “salvation” was so embedded in Maynard’s psyche that she could never move beyond arguing “that a life with God meant that one *must* condemn the world.” Campbell, delighting in the irony of her enjoyment of his society, teasingly replied, “God condemns *sin* - the world is in our hearts.” Maynard felt intellectually “beaten,” even though she disagreed with his empowerment of the individual through his or her access “to the spirit through *understanding*. *God* gave the spirit understanding,” she concluded in her Green-book. “Lewis has no religion at all, only a noble code of ethics that has no sense of the presence of God.”<sup>41</sup>

Their religious differences notwithstanding, Constance wrote of “a sort of intimacy” growing between them. It is notable that neither Fanny nor Amelia were mentioned in either diary after mid-February, while her feelings for Lewis became an important new topic to debate in her Green-book. In late March, she exclaimed, “He is the centre of the life that I find myself in!” In fact, just like the Christian heroine in *L’Hotel*, she had fallen hopelessly in love with her “poetic, faithless lover;” fallen deeply into a “new world, filled with a force unmeasured.” When Lewis told her that their connection on both intellectual and emotional levels “fit into regions where Fanny had failed,” she responded to that knowledge. Certainly, his enactment of the “misunderstood husband” was a ploy to gain his young admirer’s sympathy. But when he began to reminisce about love she deliberately “lured him on” by waxing ignorant on the subject, knowing that her

---

<sup>41</sup> *Ibid.*, 18 February 1872, 122. See also *A*, II, 9, 1872, 283.

very “naivety” on the subject was part of her attraction to him.<sup>42</sup>

Needless to say, if Lewis had left Fanny for Constance it would have been truly scandalous for the time. Yet the above also echoes cultural standards, with their accompanying contradictions, that were so unique to Victorians. As Walkowitz and Tosh point out, the double standard of sexual morality was in place: the physiological imperative of sexual desire for men, whether married or not, versus the comparative asexual woman, which included the prostitute.<sup>43</sup> At the same time—as Karen Lystra, Steven Seidman and others argue—advice literature described how a woman fell in love with a man’s “moral wisdom” and that he was drawn to her loving nature.<sup>44</sup>

Constance would later note that Fanny accepted “Lewis’ little ‘ways.’” While he flirted with their female friends, or various young students, she formed a series of separate romantic friendships with women. Fanny’s admission to Constance after Lewis’ death in 1914, “I always liked women best,” was meant to explain and lament her neglect of Lewis in later life. It may also suggest their separate erotic interests. Constance, for her part, seemed to accept their behaviour. It appears to have helped assuage her guilt over her feelings for Lewis, but it also evinced cultural norms surrounding male sexuality and

---

<sup>42</sup> Ibid., 9 March 1872, 121; Ibid., II, 9, “1872,” 275-8.

<sup>43</sup> Walkowitz, *Dreadful Delight*, 23, 97-98; also Tosh, *Man’s Place*, 27-28.

<sup>44</sup> Karen Lystra, *Searching the Heart* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1989), 9; Steven Seidman, *Romantic Longings: Love in America 1830-1980* (New York: Routledge, 1991), 57.

romantic friendship.<sup>45</sup>

Campbell's outpourings on love, Maynard found in 1872, were tantalizingly vague and melancholic. He assured her that nothing "was more worth experiencing than...love and ambition," but that his choice of career over love had led to intense regret and disappointment. As an academic, he had found certain resolutions to this dilemma. His "duty" to students sometimes found form in an "irrepressible yearning" to help them succeed and also protect them "from pain and evil." Maynard was wise enough to suspect that this emotive outlet, masked by his role as a lecturer, condoned his attraction for young prodigies like Rachel Cook and was "somehow connected with his love for her." She appears to have found this romantically appealing.<sup>46</sup>

However, it seems clear that Campbell was, in fact, a classic academic abuser of power. By today's standards, his attitude and behaviour towards students could be viewed as boundary transgressions and sexual harassment.<sup>47</sup> Interestingly, neither Firth touched

---

<sup>45</sup> GB, 9 March 1914, 236. Constance concluded here that Fanny was always a "faithful" wife as was Lewis a faithful husband since he resisted having an affair with her. Yet she criticized Fanny's failure to involve herself in Lewis' intellectual needs. See A, II, 9, "1872," 280.

<sup>46</sup> GB, 27 March 1872, 123. Lewis had also been very attached to a male student named Herbert, who was brutally killed by the Greek brigands.

<sup>47</sup> There are many texts on this subject. See, for example, Billie Wright Dziech, *The Lecherous Professor: Sexual Harassment on Campus* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1990); Gina Fisher, *Sexual Harassment of Students in a University Setting* (Ottawa: National Library of Canada, 1989); Melissa J. Monson, *Power and the Professorship: Perceptions of Sexual Harassment* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1998); and Daphne Patai, *Heterophobia: Sexual Harassment and the Future of Feminism* (Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield, 1998). All texts outline legislation for professors' inappropriate behaviour towards students on campus, like flirtation or sexual propositioning. Meanwhile, professors are advised to act prudently, like keeping office



on this vital point, nor did Vicinus mention Campbell at all. Yet Maynard's relationship with Campbell is crucial to understanding her life. She not only remained a willing participant in his "game," but would enact it herself when in a position of power as Mistress of Westfield. Her behaviour, whether conscious or not, would leave life-long scars on those who fell under her spell, and for herself, torment, bitterness and confusion.

Maynard's fascination with Campbell's emotional life was fuelled by his positioning love and ambition as powerful opposing binaries. While acclaiming love, he also "condemned the very passion of love as a degree of weakness - a letting one's heart being out on one side." Since "to be weak was to be miserable," he said, "one should work at making the character strong" by focussing on ambition and self-control instead.<sup>48</sup> Maynard probably failed to see the ironies in his assertion. In her Green-book, she simply concluded, "Self-control *is* the main ingredient." After all, that had been the keyword during her childhood and with the Harry Collisson affair. She now surmised that "even the passion of love fell under weakness because it was letting wants out." However, she was to find that self-control was not always possible. In the evenings while she "chatted to "Auntie over [her] needlework [she] would suddenly look up to find his eyes fixed on [her], sometimes with vague regret, and sometimes with the sweetest playfulness."<sup>49</sup>

In many ways, Maynard "wanted things to go on forever like that." She rejoiced in her "intangible exquisite feelings," like the time

---

doors open when seeing students to protect themselves from any false accusation.

<sup>48</sup> *GB*, 28 March 1872, 126.

<sup>49</sup> *Ibid.*, 128; see also *A*, II, 9, "1872," 275; Firth, *Maynard*, 99.

[they] had sat upon the gate to watch the sun dip below the horizon until the sky was flooded with orange. He had almost awoken [her] from her reverie when he had suddenly jumped down and said, 'Come away Constance, I have kept you out too long,' and they had run down the hill holding hands and laughing like two children.<sup>50</sup>

According to her Autobiography, she drew back if she sensed a potentially dangerous situation. This had been apparent one afternoon when, "inadvertently" lying on the sand with her eyes closed, he had asked her "to go to sleep while he watched." She had complied, but was unprepared for his look of "deep lingering attention" when she opened them again. So "when he repeated his request, she quickly jumped up and suggested they went for a walk to look at the sea."<sup>51</sup>

There is no evidence to suggest that they engaged in more than heavy flirtation—especially when comparing her records of their intimacy in 1880. But at the same time, their interactions do evoke the rituals of Victorian romantic heterosexual love. Prescriptive literature proclaimed that love united the unequal genders, evincing a selfless, consuming love as the basis of courtship. As Frederick Saunders put it in *About Women, Love and Marriage* (1868), "Love is the richest treasure of our nature. It unites different creatures in 'a mystical and holy union,' assuring the mysterious attraction of heart for heart."<sup>52</sup> Clearly, however, society would have viewed sex before marriage as disgraceful; equally clear was that society would have been far more outraged by

---

<sup>50</sup> A, II, 9, "1872," 269.

<sup>51</sup> Ibid., II, 9, "1872," 281.

<sup>52</sup> Frederick Saunders, *About Women, Love and Marriage* (London: Hodder, 1868), 162.

Maynard's flirtations with a married man than by his with her.

At the end of her stay, Lewis and Fanny went to Blebo for the county ball.

Constance missed him very much "and counted the hours when he would return":

I ran into the hall, but Oh! - I was not prepared for such a welcome! - he literally bounded up the shallow hall steps, gave me a kiss on the forehead, held me by the shoulder, looking at me with a face blazing with joy, while he whispered 'home again' under his breath.<sup>53</sup>

Later that night when they were alone in his study "he took her hand and gave it long, long kisses." She "found it bewildering, but nothing more happened 'thank Heaven' because [he] was far too fastidious and reverent to do anything like that again." Their last walk together, on April 11<sup>th</sup>, was not alone because Mary Bethune—a new friend—came to bid farewell to Constance. "To make up for losing our walk he lured me into his study three times," she noted in her Green-book,<sup>54</sup> adding in her Autobiography, another "danger zone. Although I was followed about by dumb beseeching eyes I remember no special Good-bye....The door of The Scores closed, and it was never, never to be the same again."<sup>55</sup>

Upon her return home Maynard struggled to take up her familiar routine. She tried to show an interest in life at Oakfield, her "usual village occupations" and with her Bill, her timetable for study. But she missed life at The Scores, "the glorious old city" and the "white sand dunes covered with coarse grass;" and, most of all, she missed her "sad,

---

<sup>53</sup> *GB*, 6 April 1872, 136; *A*, II, 9, "1872," 279.

<sup>54</sup> *GB*, 6 April 1872, 136.

<sup>55</sup> *A*, II, 9, "1872," 286.

poetic lover.” For the first time in her life, she “felt a huge distance between [herself] and her family that [she] did not know how to bridge over.” She surmised they “thought her unchanged.” However, not only did her change feel profound, but she sensed it was irrevocable. As a consequence, she spent hours in her “Furlong,” hiding away from “cheerful visitors,” and pondering her feelings on love and ambition, down a winding sheltered path by the apple orchard that she had discovered ten years earlier.<sup>56</sup>

In her Green-book, Maynard implied her guilty pleasure over “the love which cousin Lewis had given [her].” After all, he *was* a married man, and she was relieved that her family could not know of the “painful and silly thoughts crowding into her head at times.” It is also notable that it was around this time that her Green-book evolved from a religious record into a “Friend,” in whom she would confide when she fell in love. This was a marked difference from her attitude at the outset of the Harry Collisson episode, in which she noted, “I do not mind writing about it. If I should die I would like my mother to know about it.”<sup>57</sup> As mentioned above, her Green-book entries regarding Collisson note her shame about liking the idea of his loving her, her determination to relinquish this “overwhelming feeling,” and her attempt to behave responsibly as a woman and simultaneously to criticize her mother’s lack of compassion. In short, as a Christian woman she had behaved with decorum.<sup>58</sup>

Thus, while Maynard’s experiences with Campbell had led to her adopting

---

<sup>56</sup> *GB*, 28 April 1872, 133.

<sup>57</sup> *Ibid.*, 17 August 1869, 87.

<sup>58</sup> See footnotes 17, 18, 19.

“secrecy,” the fact that human passion was out of control was more troubling. She begged of God, “Oh! wash my feet from the sin of this day and keep me Thine.”<sup>59</sup> She strove to follow the “acts of self denial” in *Anna*—the “cloister of self-discipline, restraint and voluntary self-denial”—in order “to break through the brilliant web of self-centred imagination.”<sup>60</sup> But any attempt at purging feeling was impossible because it was like “giving up something that [filled] up the blank spaces of every day with bright light.”<sup>61</sup>

There is an indication that Campbell had similar feelings. After a couple of “playful and kind letters,” Maynard wrote, one sent “in May spoke of his longing for an absent love.” After ending with the words, “I wish I could whisper my private gladness into your ear,” he enclosed a sonnet which he claimed he had “written in [her] honour on April 17<sup>th</sup>”:

Angel, that when like summer dust my heart  
was hot and dry within me, thou didst not fear  
to whisper comforts in a grief-dulled ear  
and pour thy balm upon a desperate heart.  
Forgive, if, blameless of dissembling art,  
too eagerly I drank when thou was't here  
the proffered benediction from thy clear  
deep eyes, strong pleaders for the holier part.  
Oh! forgive! now that thou art no more near,  
if in my desert soul some trace remain  
of all that thou didst't water with such care.  
My thirst returns. Yet milder doth appear  
the aspect of old familiar pain,

---

<sup>59</sup> *GB*, 28 April 1872, 132.

<sup>60</sup> *Ibid.*, 24 December 1913, 199.

<sup>61</sup> *D*, 5 May 1872, 134.

and happy memories linger in the air.<sup>62</sup>

At the bottom of the sonnet he wrote “I will spare your blushes....I have not shown it to anyone....I do not think you’ll see any remains of the wants that hollowed the heart in winter time.”<sup>63</sup> Implied here, once again, is his adoption of the misunderstood husband. He may well have felt sad and desperate about his personal life and been attracted to her, but he was cruelly toying with her naivety and emotions. He was exploiting his position of power in their relationship just as he had done with his students. Although Maynard sensed his rebuff, and possibly his dallying by the tone of his letter and sonnet, his promise of a visit to Oakfield later that summer left her filled with excited trepidation and with hope.<sup>64</sup>

Besides or perhaps because of her ongoing angst over Lewis, Constance’s energy was bound up with the “Hitchin question.” Indeed, Hitchin may have become the way out to her at this time. While unsure of Lewis, Gazy’s volunteer teaching at a local dame-school in 1869 had also symbolized the parting of ways to Constance. Of all her siblings, excepting George, Gazy had the most academic talent as their work together on the Bill had implied. But Gazy’s goals seemed low, especially now, and Constance had never shared either Gazy’s or Do’s enthusiasm for the “Monday cottage reading at the Four Wents or the Sunday girls’ classes,” which they had established while she was at Belstead. Oakfield duties fell more their way than hers, since she was the youngest

---

<sup>62</sup> *GB*, 17 May 1872, 159.

<sup>63</sup> *Ibid.*, 159.

<sup>64</sup> *Ibid.*

daughter-at-home, and so she had grown increasingly bored and frustrated over the recent years.<sup>65</sup> But now she felt at fever pitch—her Furlong “like the path of the poor panther as he walked restlessly up and down.” Visiting Cousin Mare at Limpsfield only exacerbated her frustrations. Neither her heart nor her head could pay heed to Mare’s warning, “love not the world nor things that are in the world.”<sup>66</sup>

Constance knew she had to secure her parents’ support, and then pass the Hitchin entrance examination, if she was to pursue her dream. Her Diary indicated a bevy of correspondence with the Cook sisters about Hitchin throughout April and early May. Both women encouraged her to pursue her goal. Rachel assured her that she would enjoy college life.<sup>67</sup> But it took until late April for Constance to raise the topic with her father:

There was a frowning and a smiling and ‘I say, Conse, this is something new,’ and then a pinch on the cheek or the ear and ‘But where’s the *use*? What’s it for?’ and a murmur or two about staying at home and being like my sisters....<sup>68</sup>

In her Autobiography Constance noted, “But I think dear Father always gave in if rightly and carefully approached.” Neither Autobiography nor diary divulges how she accomplished this, although she was her father’s favourite after Gazy. After lengthy discussions with her father—including her refusal of a new pony “if she would give it up”—he realised her determination. In early May he finally “gave in” and agreed to pay her

---

<sup>65</sup> *A*, 1, 2, “1861-62”, 35.

<sup>66</sup> *GB*, 18 August 1872, 195.

<sup>67</sup> See for example, *D*, 16 April 1872, 77; *D*, 20 April 1872, 80; *D*, 4 May 1872, 96.

<sup>68</sup> Firth, *Maynard*, 102.

college fees, which at that time were £35 per term.<sup>69</sup>

Henry told his daughter that she must get her mother's permission since she knew "more about it all" than he did. While Constance knew her mother "approved of classical learning, and respected the University," she feared she "would be against the secular atmosphere of Hitchin." Moreover, as she had learned at St. Andrews, "women's rights were just beginning and perhaps she would feel [her] aims were unfeminine and purely adventurous." But Louisa did consent, on the condition that she only enrol for a year, and that she not "take the degree" or view college as a precursor to teaching—in other words, that she ultimately "return home and live with her sisters." Constance promised "anything-everything,"<sup>70</sup> but noted in an essay for *The Girton Review* in 1926:

There was no subsequent difficulty from my parents. In fact they looked upon my astounding joy in the life that lay before me with generous eyes, and they never balked when I regaled on each promise in the on-flowing tide of life.<sup>71</sup>

This is not entirely true, however. Maynard's records speak of her parents trying to persuade her against returning to Hitchin, and working at Cheltenham, and then at St. Leonards. For each venture she had to negotiate term by term, promising to return home eventually. Nor did she see Westfield as solid until she had her father's stamp of approval

---

<sup>69</sup> A, II, 9, "1872," 290. Maynard's powers of persuasion become evident throughout her life. She convinced the doubting Lord Shaftesbury, for example, about the need of a Westfield in 1881, and she talked her Council into initiating a Divinity program at Westfield in 1901.

<sup>70</sup> Firth, *Maynard*, 102-3. Constance could not, of course, "take the degree" at this time. But as noted in chapter two, she could sit the Tripos examination, which was the same final examination that male undergraduates took to attain the degree.

<sup>71</sup> Constance Maynard, "My College Days," *The Girton Review* (1926), 7-12.



after his first visit. Yet, while conservative in many ways, and largely disapproving of her career, her parents always recognised her talents and her commitment to study. Likewise, as controlling as Louisa was, she was oddly supportive of higher education. “She encouraged us to glean in every field that was open,” Constance wrote in her Autobiography. “It was exceedingly fragmented knowledge, and yet no-one could call it a ‘smattering,’ because it was fired with the most ardent interest.”<sup>72</sup>

Not surprisingly, Constance faced much opposition from other sources. Her siblings pointed out that she could not possibly pass the entrance examination due her lack of education, particularly in mathematics, a subject she disliked. The family clergyman was also negative and he condemned Hitchin’s “broad church tone.” His fear that “the intellectual work [would] be too engrossing for [her] own good,” reflected that of scientists, like Dr. Henry Maudsley, regarding higher education for women.<sup>73</sup> Constance was upset by such remarks. Yet although she began studying as she “never had before” she felt torn. “Is it my duty to stay at home as the others do? If I go to Hitchin, *will* I like it too much?” She knew, of course, that she had to seize this opportunity while it existed. She had proved her passion for learning to herself by her faithful commitment to a “Bill” since Belstead, and, after all, Do had just returned from *her* work at Queen’s

---

<sup>72</sup> A, I, 3, “1849-60,” 36.

<sup>73</sup> Such texts like Henry Maudsley’s “Sex in Mind and Education,” *Fortnightly Review* 21 (1874), 466-83 and Arabella Kenealy’s *Feminism and Sex-Extinction* (London: T. Fisher and Unwin, 1920), warned society of the dangers of cerebral activity for women’s health.

Square and Tissy planned to go to Highgate in October.<sup>74</sup>

Preparations for Hitchin's entrance examination took a definite turn on May 6<sup>th</sup>, after Constance received some "very formidable" specimen entrance examination papers from Rachel Cook. After looking over "the dreaded fractions,...tiresome English history, and perplexing geography questions," she realised the amount of work she must do if she was to pass the examination scheduled for June 17<sup>th</sup>.<sup>75</sup> Her biggest fear was mathematics since the subject had been badly taught by both governesses and at Belstead. It was thus arranged that she would stay with her brother George at Wimbledon so that he could coach her. Although the arrangement worked well, for George was a good teacher, she went through periods of intense self-doubt. By all accounts, her mother was very supportive. She wrote to her frequently, telling her, "Do your very best darling, and don't be too anxious over the results because they will be the best for you in some way or other."<sup>76</sup>

On June 17<sup>th</sup>, Maynard travelled to London to sit the examination alongside ten other candidates. They were scheduled to write three, two-hour papers daily over a three day period, with Emily Davies invigilating. "The exam room is too hot," Maynard complained in her Diary. "I feel anxious, tired and headachey. I am thankful to pass the

---

<sup>74</sup> *GB*, 10 May 1872, 136.

<sup>75</sup> Firth, *Maynard*, 105.

<sup>76</sup> See for example, *GB*, 2 June 1872, 161; *GB*, 10 June 1872, 165.

days so well.”<sup>77</sup> By contemporary standards she does indeed seem to have survived a gruelling schedule. Thus, it is not surprising that she returned home feeling a sense of accomplishment. “I had enjoyed the challenge of trying to get all my thoughts down,” she noted in her Green-book. Standing at the threshold of the “public sphere,” she had also found the “‘now or never of the crisis of life’ fascinating and inspiring.”<sup>78</sup>

In her Autobiography, Maynard exclaimed, “The thought that I was at *last* out on the current of life where there were plenty of perils and great prizes to be won felt liberating.”<sup>79</sup> She would not have been quite as certain of this in 1872 of course. The Diary also evoked her fears about failing the examination.<sup>80</sup> But given that genteel women were usually chaperoned, “being alone on the streets of London, or choosing a shop to get coffee, [likely symbolized] the sort of presage of the liberty that would now be [hers].”<sup>81</sup>

---

<sup>77</sup> *D*, 19 June 1872, 112-13. They could not have “the large Hall as 400 surgeons were being examined at the same time.” She wrote of how she enjoyed Scripture, History, English and Drawing. “I survived the dreaded geography,” she added, “and the much feared arithmetic. Euclid would have been perfect if only I had not become stuck and gone back to the beginning.” See *D*, 22 June 1872, 115-16; also Firth, *Maynard*, 105.

<sup>78</sup> *GB*, 22 June 1872, 166.

<sup>79</sup> *A*, II, 10, “1872,” 300.

<sup>80</sup> See *D*, 26 June 1872, 111.

<sup>81</sup> *A*, II, 10, “1872,” 302. See Lynne Walker’s “Vistas of pleasure: women consumers of urban space in the West End of London 1860-1900,” in *Women in the Victorian Art World*, ed., Clarissa Campbell Orr (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1996), 70-85, for a good discussion on Victorian women’s traversing of new “public” spaces.

On June 27<sup>th</sup> Davies wrote to say she was “safely in.”<sup>82</sup> Maynard did not pass “with great honours,” but she was nonetheless delighted. She received congratulations all round; Lady Herschel being particularly supportive since she was considering to send—and did send—Connie to what by then was Girton College in 1874.<sup>83</sup>

When the Campbells visited five days later, Maynard’s anxiety arose once more. Her biggest fear was that her family would not warm to the man who “had drawn her heart to him.” Thus she voiced her relief about her parents’ almost immediate response to his “sympathising impressible character.” Harry, also taken with the vibrant Scot, had already accepted an invitation to The Scores for that September. There also was much discussion about Gazy going for an extended visit in 1883.<sup>84</sup>

Constance’s initial conversations with Lewis centred on Hitchin. He was certainly pleased about her acceptance, but vague and offhand when she questioned him about his own student experience. He summed it up as “curious and complicated,” adding that “some parts can be painful.” Although Constance dismissed his advice as “more about himself than her,” she was nevertheless filled with foreboding about the “mournful ring of

---

<sup>82</sup> *D*, 29 June 1872, 116. Her score of 78% in Scripture, 73% in History, 65% in Drawing, 65% in Composition, 57% in Geometry, 50% in Arithmetic, 46% in Greek, 46% in Geography. and 28% in Grammar, placed her in fifth place. These results reflect her earlier comments about each exam. See footnote 76.

<sup>83</sup> *GB*, 28 June 1872, 176. As noted in chapter one, footnote 56, the Herschels were the only genteel neighbours that Constance and her siblings could interact with.

<sup>84</sup> Although unclear, it seemed that Gazy also fell victim to Lewis’ ploys and to the “secular” atmosphere at The Scores. As Constance noted rather jealously in her *GB*, 16 February, 1873, 210, “Gazy is *still* reacting to her visit to St. Andrews. She says that she misses Lewis and all else! *I* cannot help her with this now, only God can.”

his words,” which was far from the encouragement she needed and had expected from him. When he directly asked her about life after college she was equally oblique. She assured him that while she “meant to be at home and not shirk from responsibility,” she would not discuss “the future because she knew it was arranged for her [by God].” This Green-book entry particularly implied her confusion about Lewis and about going to Hitchin. Lewis, admitting to picking up on the latter, told her that from now on he would “be [her] secular conscience.” He advised her to broaden her library and rely less on “religious heroes” because “real” life was “earnest and practical.”<sup>85</sup>

They discussed their personal relationship the following day, when taking a long walk together alone. Not knowing what to expect, it was a conversation that Maynard had longed for and yet feared, since receiving his sonnet in May:

He would not tell me what had made him very unhappy, because he ‘could not speak of his unhappiness all through the winter without compromising others,’ he said. Then what followed seemed almost like a parting. He thanked me most lovingly for what I had done, saying that ‘the fresh love which had come to his desolation was just all he wanted,’ ending with, ‘but now it is over. I am happy and it will not be the same again.’

“As to the sonnet,” Maynard concluded of this entry, “When I spoke to him about the first word [Angel], he said it was to mean ‘a messenger,’ and that is what I *most* want to be!”<sup>86</sup>

On their last evening together Campbell apparently reiterated his stance. “He cheerfully gave me a long kiss,” Constance wrote, and then “he suggested that keeping life uncomplicated was the best thing; that moments of emergency made one take counsel

---

<sup>85</sup> Ibid., 2 July 1872, 181.

<sup>86</sup> Ibid., 182.

with one's own, and with the Higher spirit."<sup>87</sup> She did not challenge his decision.

Constance missed him after he left but claimed that she did "not feel lonely and blank." Nor did she think "that either loving or being loved by Lewis hurt [her]." But neither of them was left unscathed. She struggled not to "fall under him in any way," adding, "He tells me, 'I am quite happy now,' but I feel otherwise." She further explained this in her "Friend":

I know, as the others do not, that his determination to work extremely hard in Greek is to stifle an unspecified love which lives on still passionate and hopeless in his heart. But enough of this. I do not want to write anything better left unsaid, nor is it of use to remember. I love to know his beautiful mind, and am grateful for his affection, and feel that my Master cannot have given it to me for nothing. I have told Him, it is enough to make me happy inside and out.<sup>88</sup>

Of note here is Maynard's further justification of her feelings and actions within the context of faith—God had a reason for giving her Lewis. The entry also implied her retreat into religious metaphor to avoid confronting her own guilt and his wrongdoing. She told herself that she respected Lewis' moral code because it curbed his "trifling with her affection," thus admitting that he had, indeed, trifled with it. Yet she was also angry at his looking at "purity and morality as *apart* from the Saviour," as she believed that it held him back from God-given virtues like passion.<sup>89</sup> Here we see the beginnings of her mediation between seduction and resistance. She would adopt religion to help her to resist passion or to explain rejection in her future primary relationships. But at the same time,

---

<sup>87</sup> Ibid., 12 August 1872, 195.

<sup>88</sup> Ibid., 196.

<sup>89</sup> Ibid., 7 July 1872, 186.

she employed faith to condone her passion, particularly if they were mutual. This is not to assume that she would have entered into a physical relationship with Lewis in 1872, if she had the opportunity. But the fact that she never discovered “what had made him change” is curious in its never ceasing to baffle her.<sup>90</sup>

Writing of this time in 1925, in an age somewhat more liberal towards sex and divorce, an older and wiser Constance took a more pragmatic, defensive stance on their relationship:

Was it that he felt himself unsympathetically married? That I could give him something he could not otherwise have? Fanny lived in her busy world and played in his. He also lived in his own world, silent and alone, and came out to play in her world. She was very content but *he* was not. He tried to be, but he was quite lonely in many ways.<sup>91</sup>

All in all, “the parting was good,” she concluded in her Autobiography. “For the next eight years I saw a great deal of him, but it was not the same.”<sup>92</sup> Certainly, she grew increasingly disenchanted with him—viewing their professional disagreements and his emotional distance as betrayals of sorts. But their feelings for each other did not cease. As chapter five will reveal, she came dangerously close to having an affair with him in 1880, shortly after her four-year relationship with Louisa Lumsden had ended.

Lewis Campbell had a profound effect on Constance Maynard’s life, both professionally and emotionally. As she wrote upon his death in 1908:

He was the only man who came close to me. He directed me towards

---

<sup>90</sup> *A*, II, 9, “1872,” 181.

<sup>91</sup> *Ibid.*, II, 10, “1872,” 286.

<sup>92</sup> *Ibid.*, 286.

Girton, and my debt to him is immense....He also opened me up to the gate of love. We were both very good at self-restraint, but there it was....At the time I was ashamed to write about it, but I don't mind doing so now.<sup>93</sup>

Love was a degree of weakness - the weakness of love was irresistible: such was the distinctive desire/resistance dichotomy which bound them. His was driven by the male evangelical discourse of moral purity, integrity, self-restraint and ambition. Hers was set against the puritan/evangelical relinquishing of worldliness. This was to become elemental to her future relationships, which were all with women. It was through Lewis that she came to learn that passion and ambition could be interconnected. This led her in a direction which relegated him to the background as an awkward, peripheral figure. He eventually disappeared from view as she traversed farther along her new public path, catching in her arms the women who could share in the contradictions and nuances of her public and private worlds.

---

<sup>93</sup> *GB*, 30 October 1908, 23; see also *GB*, 9 March 1914, 217.



## Chapter 5

### 'Caught in the current': Girton 1872-1875

How often I had stood with the others in the hall,...and given the last shouts and the last blown kisses, as Harry or George turned out into the world, and the carriage went grinding down the pebble drive and out at the gate, and now it was all for me, for me!<sup>1</sup>

The recalling of her momentous departure for Hitchin, on October 14<sup>th</sup>, 1872, still evoked emotion-filled pride for Maynard in 1915. This is not surprising. During a period when women neither considered nor concerned themselves with higher education, for her, it had not only become a reality, but would also be a means of opportunity for self and for others. The symbolic “dead pig” had gone, and the carriage stood by, waiting for her father to drive her to catch the London express “in honour of the occasion,” as he told her.<sup>2</sup> “My infamous St. Andrews visit had opened me up to the idea that my life could be different,” Maynard said, tellingly, in her Green-book, in 1872.<sup>3</sup> It was only later that she could note how “work, Louisa Lumsden, and all the other counter influence, [at Girton], produced a sense of restraint that became [even more] intolerable.”<sup>4</sup>

It was earlier in May that Maynard had first seen the college that she had dreamed

---

<sup>1</sup> *A*, II, 10, “1872, Journey to Hitchin,” 294.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, 295; Firth, *Maynard*, 107. The “dead pig” was a sewn-up sacking containing cushions, curtains, Indian matting, a skin rug and a folding chair for her rooms at Hitchin.

<sup>3</sup> *GB*, 28 March 1872, 88.

<sup>4</sup> *A*, III, 19, “1874, The October Term,” 624. Written in January-June 1925.

so much about since her fateful visit to St. Andrews. In some ways it had been disappointing. The red brick villa had looked more “like a gentleman’s country home;” the library was also the lecture room and the common room; and the dining room was a “dark, dank sort of billiard room in the basement” with food to match:

Luncheon was a big loaf of bread, boiled beef and single dish of Kadjeree. This was repellent in comparison to the variety of food at home. The barred windows, the bare discoloured walls and the plates lined up in a row, made the dining room seen like a workhouse.<sup>5</sup>

Maynard had felt quite dubious about Hitchin after her visit. It did not seem at all suitable for a young upper-middle-class woman of polite sociability and grooming. She feared that her mother would declare the students “not our sort” since they were either commonplace or eccentric. “I thought, three years of this kind of life is probably as much as I can stand,” she noted in her Autobiography. “But I also knew that I longed to take a degree.”<sup>6</sup> She supported Davies’ cause and she aimed to be among the brave young pioneers who were determined to bring it to fruition.

As mentioned in chapter two, Davies had fought to gain middle-class support for women’s higher education. While asserting that Hitchin was not “a new variety of girls’ school,” she had warned her pioneers not to advertise themselves through overt behaviour and “flamboyant clothing” or even *go* to Cambridge. Since they travelled in closed flies when attending lectures, they did indeed seem invisible when compared to Newnham

---

<sup>5</sup> *A*, II, 10, “1872,” 294. See also Stephen, *Emily Davies*, 66-80; and Waterhouse, *Victorian Monument*, 44. Hitchin, formally known as Benslow House, was leased from owner, Mr Ransom.

<sup>6</sup> *A*, II, 10, “1872,” 298.

students, who, set up in boarding houses in Cambridge itself, were distinguished by their “olive green and mustard serge, trimmed with ecru lace.”<sup>7</sup>

Davies’ views had been respected by Girton Mistresses, Mrs Manning (1869-70) and Miss Austin (1870-71), and by her gifted pioneering students Louisa Lumsden, Sarah Woodhead, Rachel Cook, Emily Townsend, Isabel Gibson and Anna Lloyd. Although all differed dramatically in attainment, they were quiet and studious. Of the group, it was the genteel Louisa Lumsden, the daughter of an affluent Scottish lawyer, who stood out. She was the oldest student at twenty-eight years of age and had already received higher education at private schools in Belgium and London. Thus she expected, and gained, solicitousness from both peers and authority figures.<sup>8</sup>

Besides her age, experience and attitude, Lumsden’s captivating looks and personality enabled her to exert a powerful influence from the onset. As Emily Townsend recalled, Lumsden soon instigated “College ‘rules,’” like formal dress for dinner; the use of surnames when addressing each other; and recreational activities like cricket, tennis, dancing and “Charades.” Nor were “we afraid to rebel, like the time we refused to all face

---

<sup>7</sup> See Davies, “Instruction Relating to Girls,” 60-63; Stephen, *Emily Davies*, 204; Maynard, “Early Victorian Schoolroom,” 1066. In *Women at Cambridge*, 68, McWilliams-Tullberg explains the differences between both schools. “Girton had a reputation as a woman’s rights foundation and was regarded with suspicion by many Cambridge people. Newnham was more in tune with liberal Cambridge ways. The ‘cause’ was kept in the background...” See also *That Infidel Place*, chapter II.

<sup>8</sup> *A*, II, 10, “1872,” 299. See also Maynard, “My Girton Days,” *Girton Review*, May 1926, 7-12.

the ‘High,’ Townsend added.<sup>9</sup> But learning was of utmost importance to Lumsden. When her peers complained of feeling overwhelmed by course work she was quick to initiate a weekly “College Five” to discuss academic problems. She later organized a debating society and a lecture series to give students the opportunity to speak “publicly” amongst themselves.<sup>10</sup>

Of big concern, in 1869, was the Little-go, which, as mentioned in chapter two, was a prerequisite at Hitchin to the Additional and Tripos examinations. The pioneers felt that the system was problematic. This was partially owing to lecturers only being able to teach from 3:00 p.m. to 6:00 p.m., due to university commitments and the train timetable. Another factor was what the pioneers saw as a superfluous curriculum, complicated by poor tutoring. As they could do little about the former, they “beseeched more essential teaching” and demanded the “shunting of some troublesome lecturers.” The Girton Council angrily assented but accused us of “taking things far too seriously,” Lumsden noted in her autobiography. “We were only required to pass the ‘women’s examination.’”<sup>11</sup> In other words, they could sit the Tripos, which was the official degree

---

<sup>9</sup> Emily Townsend, née Gibson, “A Girtonian of the 1870s,” *Girton Review*, May 1925, 2-11. She said here, “We did not all want to face Davies at the ‘High’ table as we could not have good conversation in a row.”

<sup>10</sup> Lumsden, *Yellow Leaves*, 1-15; also Constance Lubbock, née Herschel, “My recollection of my Girton days,” *Girton Review*, May 1877, 12-17. The debates, which began with Shakespeare readings, evolved into more varied topics. Constance was applauded for her lecture on the human face, in which she employed diagrams to indicate “the placement of the organs.” See *GB*, 30 January 1873, 28.

<sup>11</sup> Lumsden, *Yellow Leaves*, 11-20; and Davies, ‘Women in the Universities,’ 174. As noted in chapters one and two, the Tripos was equivalent to the men’s degree but not yet officially recognized as such for women. Degrees were not actually *granted* to women

examination, but they were not yet granted the degree.

The situation had much improved by 1871. The pioneers had taken the Little-go and the Additional, which most had successfully passed, and the student enrollment for that year looked far more promising. Davies, who had now installed herself as Mistress,<sup>12</sup> admitted Elizabeth Welsh, Rose Aitken, Frances Dove and Mary Kingsland. The former two planned to sit the Classical Tripos while the latter were the first Natural Science Tripos candidates.<sup>13</sup> However, despite such successes, Davies was informed in 1872 that the Little-go, Additional and Tripos could still not be regarded as “an official university exam” as they were for men.

The pioneers had resented this ruling. Yet as their Tripos fast approached, they felt desperately ill-equipped after their three years of hard work. This was not surprising since they had received far less schooling than men in mathematical subjects like trigonometry, or in Classical subjects like Latin and Greek.<sup>14</sup> Anna Lloyd left in her second year due to

---

until 1948. See also Fitch, “Women,” 248-49; Bradbrook *Infidel Place*, 67; and Spender, ed., *Education Papers*, 46-78.

<sup>12</sup> This was because Austin, who proved incompetent, had resigned due to ill-health. Davies remained as Mistress until A. F. Bernard was hired in 1874. See Lumsden, *Yellow Leaves*, 15-18; Stephen, *Emily Davies*, 99; Davies, “Women in the Universities,” 178; and Vicinus, *Independent Women*, 134.

<sup>13</sup> Lumsden, *Yellow Leaves*, 21-27. This contrasted with the 1870 academic year, which had seen the entrance of five “General” students admitted as a “stop-gap” to fill empty rooms. A Miss Hoskins was an example of another prevailing attitude. She was “sent to Hitchin to be out of the way of her guardians for a couple of years.” See A, II, 10, “1872,” 298.

<sup>14</sup> Lumsden, “The Ancient History of Girton College,” *Girton Review*, April 1902, 13-21. She noted here that men took at least six more years of Greek and Latin. Women also struggled with “the problem of verse.” See Burstall’s *High Schools for Girls*, and her

fatigue and family pressures. The gifted Isabel Gibson and Emily Townsend also lost momentum and, fearing failure, left shortly before sitting their Tripos in June of 1872. Louisa Lumsden, also hoping to take the Mathematical Tripos, had been forced to opt for Classics when she found the Additional's too difficult. Louisa, Rachel Cook and Sarah Woodhead did pass their Tripos. But "Rachel nearly threw the whole thing up," Louisa noted, and "I found the work an almost insuperable barrier."<sup>15</sup>

This was the situation facing Constance when she entered Hitchin College in 1872. However, Davies, with characteristic optimism, immediately took her in hand, organizing the subjects she needed for the Little-go, which was scheduled for December 1873. Constance was soon settled into a routine studying Latin, Greek, Euclid, Theology and Arithmetic. She found herself relying, as others had done, on peers to explain texts like Goethe's *Faust* or Paley's *Evidences* if she "became stuck."<sup>16</sup> Early afternoon breaks before lectures were always welcome. The weekly "swim" at the Hitchin's public baths was as much of an experience<sup>17</sup> as cricket or tennis in the garden; and if it rained, Louisa

---

*Retrospect and Prospect*, Power Cobbe, *Duties of women*; Faithfull, *How Shall I Educate?*, 23; Stephen, *Emily Davies*, 200-22; Fitch, "Women," 254; Mc Williams-Tullberg, *Women At Cambridge*, 209; Vicinus, *Independent Women*, 125-29, for discussion of women's difficulties at this time.

<sup>15</sup> Lumsden, *Yellow Leaves*, 53-8. She was disadvantaged by her lack of knowledge in geometry, calculus and dynamics. See also Lloyd, *Memoir with Extracts*, 68-72.

<sup>16</sup> See *D*, 28 October 1872, 56-9; Firth, *Maynard*, 118-24.

<sup>17</sup> *D*, 10 November 1872, 99. Swimming was free to woman once a week. As Constance noted, "most students could not swim and so we all held hands in a line and jumped up and down to keep warm. Isabel was particularly fearful so I tied a rope around both our waists."

organized footstool or “leaping and wrestling” in the library. After tea came perhaps a “scamper in the moonlight or musical activities,” but most evenings were “given to reading or the writing of papers,” Constance noted. “I studied 44 hours each week, but I often spent ten hours on ‘extra’ reading because I felt this was necessary.” This schedule persisted until her role as “senior student” distracted her somewhat. Despite such a timetable, alongside the fact that she was relegated to the “iron room” in the garden—which was “cold in winter and scorching in summer—each morning [she] awoke with a sort of *sting* of delight thinking, a whole other day in this lovely college!”<sup>18</sup>

However, the program at Hitchin remained a problem because of the lack of tutorial supervision, and Maynard was soon “ignorantly plunged” into “overwork” at an “inhuman pace”:

The walking was fast, meals were hurried, and the games in the garden quite violent so I would get too hot and then get very cold sitting at lectures. I was so tired at night that I would often fall asleep with a book in my hand and wake up stiff and cold before stumbling into bed.<sup>19</sup>

The problem was partially resolved by the hiring of resident lecturers after 1872. But as the college trained and hired its own staff, like Louisa Lumsden (Classical lecturer, 1872), and Mary Kingsland (Science and Math lecturer, 1875), both lecturer and student continued to “flounder about among books connected with [the subject], reading hosts of

---

<sup>18</sup>A, III, 11, “1872,” 300-34. The temporary wooden roofed, iron building was built on the grounds in 1872 as the villa only accommodated five students, and five were already living in nearby rented cottages. See also Gibson, “A Girtonian of 1870s,” 9.

<sup>19</sup> A, III, 11, “1872,” 346.

unnecessary things.”<sup>20</sup>

Maynard’s busy curriculum also caused the onset of what became a life-long struggle about what she thought were misguided priorities. It had soon become clear that the “serious” peers, Louisa Lumsden, Rachel Cook and Sarah Woodhead, placed study foremost since they all “seemed to be unbelievers.”<sup>21</sup> Yet Maynard herself was finding the “triumphant yet unsettling” sphere of academia irresistible. While she tried to “seek God *first*, prayer was becoming an interruption.” After all, she told her “‘Friend,’ the pleasure of life here depends a *lot* on one’s feelings and study, and both are very attractive for consciousness and progress *aren’t* they?”<sup>22</sup>

Her Diary meanwhile recorded her unequivocal excitement when Woodhead, “the first out of the thicket,” gained the honour of “senior Optime” for her Mathematical Tripos. She was “not placed [on the official university list], but it was heartening to hear, ‘three cheers for the Lady!’ at the conferring of the degrees” in January of 1873.<sup>23</sup> Also heartening was Lumsden’s and Cook’s Tripos success that March. Indeed, the fact that Cook “beat the three best men” was a double triumph in face of the verdict that, “as a woman, she was sure to fail Aristotle.”<sup>24</sup> The “big celebratory teas,” followed by composed “Odes” and a triumphant round of “Auld Lang Syne” sung in a circle with

---

<sup>20</sup> Firth, *Maynard*, 115.

<sup>21</sup> *GB*, 20 October 1872, 255.

<sup>22</sup> *Ibid.*, 23 December 1872, 260.

<sup>23</sup> *D*, 18 January 1873, 78; *D*, 24 March 1873, 116.

<sup>24</sup> *GB*, 6 March 1872, 96.



crossed hands, set in place a Hitchin ritual that Maynard was to initiate at Westfield. As she recalled in her Autobiography:

These were special times when everything was fresh and a new form of collective conscious left us shouting to be heard! We ran around the college waving flags in triumph. Towards sunset we made so much noise...ringing the great fire bell on the roof that Miss Davies asked us to desist in case the fire men heard.<sup>25</sup>

However, Maynard's conflict between rationalism and religious passion tormented her throughout her college days, as Firth detailed in her chapter entitled, "Mental and Moral Science."<sup>26</sup> Maynard's struggle took form in two ongoing counter-narratives in her parallel diaries, which not only projected her self-doubt, but her anger over that doubt. In her Green-book, her debate often ran thus:

I have thrown myself into amusements with a fondness I never felt before. This reaction has come quietly and it is very pleasant. I do not now feel afraid of enjoying myself too much, as I did, because I do not now think it is because my sense of right or wrong has become less sensitive.<sup>27</sup>

But in her Diary and Autobiography, trying to pray or read the Bible:

was difficult because it all seems so meaningless....I *brace* myself for 'nice talks' with my young friends. I *speak* of my feelings of conviction and happiness. But from my first waking, to the evening, I am eluding the Cloister—although I never shrink from thinking of Girton as Satan's seat as I feel that I must represent Christ to those who did not know him.<sup>28</sup>

---

<sup>25</sup> *A*, III, 11, "1872," 392.

<sup>26</sup> See Firth, *Maynard*, 109-34.

<sup>27</sup> See for example, *GB*, 16 March 1874, 46; *GB*, 5 February 1875, 88 and *GB*, 6 June 1875, 150.

<sup>28</sup> See *D*, 23 October 1874, 99; *D*, 17 May 1875, 593; *A*, III, 13, "October Term, 1875," 790.

Sunday caused Maynard to feel the most “desolate,” particularly in the earlier years. She always attended church, but the remainder of the day was spent alone in her room and she *dreaded* the evening routine “with its political discussion or analysis of some new novel. College etiquette required [they] mingle and [she] kept [her] mouth shut.” However, she had been raised to treat Sunday as the Sabbath and often longed to turn the “conversation to the Lord Jesus.” It was during a Sunday in November 1872 when they gathered around the fire, that “the inception of Westfield formed in her mind.” In fact, she felt so overcome by her desire to found a “college exactly like Girton, but with a religious grounding,” that she had to excuse herself and take a walk. “From this time on,” she wrote in her Autobiography, “I fully believed that I was a sentinel, chosen out of thousands of English girls to hold the most difficult post in all the world.”<sup>29</sup> Through this role she could also resolve her conflict by interconnecting faith with ambition.

The post was difficult in that Maynard never ceased to feel an intense and unrelenting pressure to convert those that she liked, who, as it turned out, proved to be her most powerful adversaries. She had hopes about Elizabeth Welsh since she could discuss religion with her vivacious Irish friend on an intellectual level.<sup>30</sup> But when she suggested they “both take a stand together” by raising religion as a topic for discussion on Sunday evenings, Elizabeth had firmly refused, saying in her strong accent, “I pity ye -

---

<sup>29</sup> A, III, 11, “1872,” 355.

<sup>30</sup> Ibid., 360. This often centred around “the difficulties about the lack of evidence.” But at least “she needs to *feel* God’s presence in her life,” Constance noted here.

that I do. Bless ye!" Thus Constance, "starved for Christian companionship," found herself willing to cross social barriers to "sit with local tailors" named the Thompsons on Sunday afternoons.<sup>31</sup>

However, neither the Thompsons nor Elizabeth could satisfy Constance's visionary cravings and, ultimately, her emotional needs. Out of all the individuals that she had met, Rachel Cook held the most interest for her at this time. She was intrigued, indeed, jealous, of the beautiful, rather bohemian young woman who had caught the eye of Lewis Campbell. This woman seemed so far "*beyond* [herself] in every gift that [she did] not feel at all fitted to begin setting her right." Rachel did indeed prove a challenge. Rachel strongly resisted while Constance hotly pursued her, begging her to accept "the importance of the Bible in understanding the Truth" as it would benefit her "life and aims." From Rachel, to the sweet, gentle Isabel Gamble, and on to the vibrant Amy Bully, Constance faced rebuttal, as she was disarmed once again after locking heads with strong assertive minds. She fell under Amy's powerful humanitarian argument based upon Seeley's *Ecce Homo*; she recoiled from Isabel's fierce rejection of her friendship; and even the empathic Elizabeth kept "counselling [her] to keep quiet."<sup>32</sup>

However, Rachel's wounds proved the most fatal. Constance received "her first lesson in unbelief" when Rachel, tiring of her incessant proselytizing, angrily accused her of "creat[ing] her beliefs and then act[ing] upon them. I suddenly saw what I had never

---

<sup>31</sup> Ibid., 436, 353.

<sup>32</sup> See for example, *GB*, 2 November 1872, 242; *GB*, 10 February 1873, 199; *GB*, 8 July 1874, 62.

realized before,” Constance sadly wrote, “that our desires and aspirations were in the world unseen, almost like building up the very things that *we* want.”<sup>33</sup> Stunned by the thought of her fallibility as Christian, as she noted in all records, “I never recovered from Rachel’s words.”<sup>34</sup> This event did indeed spawn the seeds of doubt that were to plague her for the rest of her life.

In terms of realising ambition, the determining moment came in Maynard’s second term, as Firth pointed out. She had signed up for Physiology alongside Natural Science Tripos candidates Frances Dove and Mary Kingsland. However, upon learning of a class in Elementary Logic, being held at the same time, she chose Logic. This one act propelled her towards taking the Moral Science Tripos. She passed her Little-go with a First Class in December 1873. She persuaded her parents to let her remain at college to pursue the Additional—at which she gained another First Class in June of 1874. She finally convinced her father to let her “have the gold,” although he viewed it as “useless” since she was a woman, by allowing her to sit her Tripos in November of 1875.<sup>35</sup>

The Moral Science Tripos curriculum consisted of four groupings of subjects; Physics and History of Philosophy; Ethics which included Psychology; Logic; and Political Economy. Its particular advantage, in comparison to Classics and Natural

---

<sup>33</sup> *GB*, 27 October 1872, 240; also see *GB*, 17 November 1872, 247; *GB*, 24 November 1872, 252, for the same lament.

<sup>34</sup> See *GB*, 31 December 1905, 78; *D*, 1 May 1910, 99; *A*, III, 11, “1872,” 360.

<sup>35</sup> Firth, *Maynard*, 110-15; also *D*, 7 December 1873, 180; *GB*, 22 June 1874, 60; and *A*, III, 11, “1872,” 360-67. Being raised in an atmosphere of science, Maynard’s diaries reveal her continued hankering after science. She often went to the lab during her lunch hour to watch dissections of livers and kidneys of sheep.

Sciences, was that it gave women more of an equal opportunity with men since neither had taken the subjects previously.<sup>36</sup> As Maynard explained it:

Psychology, then into its infancy, lay at the background to both Mental Science and Ethics. Both Metaphysics and the History of Philosophy were incorporated into the 'Mental' papers, just as the growth of democracy, the history of banks, or emigration was considered Political Economy.<sup>37</sup>

It is not surprising that Maynard felt drawn towards "human thought and conduct" given "the search after the criteria of truth" that was so fundamental to her parents. She tackled familiar texts like Butler's "Sermons on Human Nature" with as much zeal as new readings like Immanuel Kant's essay on "Right and Wrong," Herbert Spencer's *First Principles* (1862) and John Stuart's Mill's *System of Logic* (1843). The latter was decreed "epoch-making" in both Diary and Autobiography, probably since it reflected her own ongoing personal struggle.<sup>38</sup> She was drawn to Mill's incorporation of Comte's Positivism with Darwinism to explain the universe through social evolution: "Human perfection (progress) is possible through unceasing search towards seemingly unknowable 'truth.'" She also "loved" his Coleridgean ideas on "feeling." In fact it is likely that Mill's ideas on reforming the world through intellectual proselytizing reinforced her envisioned

---

<sup>36</sup> A, III, 19, "October Term, 1874," 280; Maynard, "Between College Terms," 31; McWilliams-Tullberg, *Women At Cambridge*, 60-63.

<sup>37</sup> A, III, 19, "1874," 287. See also Alma Brown, "Girton in the 1880s," *Girton Review*, March 1882, 13.

<sup>38</sup> See, for example, D, 13 October 1874, 67; D, 20 May 1875, 78; GB, 10 November 1874, 88; GB, 23 March 1875, 102; and A, III, 19, "1874," 290.

role as an educator.<sup>39</sup>

One advantage of “the gold” (Tripos) for Maynard, as Firth also pointed out, was taking Philosophy with the “formidable” Henry Sidgwick. Although his “mild looks were more intimidating than harsh criticism,” Maynard was quite attracted to him, and she never ceased to admire “the supreme lecturer.” After all, he was a powerful supporter of women’s education. He even lived within Newnham’s walls when his wife became second principal. Within Hitchin’s walls remained the enigmatic Louisa Lumsden, who was hired to teach Classics in May 1873, after passing her Tripos. As far as Maynard was concerned, “Getting to know ‘L’ was the supreme event of [her] term.”<sup>40</sup> Curiously, Firth did not discuss Maynard’s relationship with Lumsden. Yet Lumsden not only contributed to Maynard’s conflict between rationalism and faith, but was to become a central figure in Maynard’s life for four years. Their relationship is crucial in its conveyance of the difficulties that pioneers faced in their subversion of norms, and in illuminating Maynard’s complex mediation between ambition, passion and faith.

Like her peers, Maynard had always both admired and feared the “aloof and

---

<sup>39</sup> *D*, 20 February 1874, 54; *A*, III, 15, “Lent Term, 1874,” 536-39. She liked Spencer because he mirrored Mill’s utilitarianism. Kant’s unknowable God also appealed since it echoed Butler’s philosophy, which her father so admired. Mill’s influence seems clear in her goals for Divinity—to incorporate critical thinking in Biblical teaching. See Quebedeaux, “We’re on our Way,” 130-39 on this, and Newsome, *Victorian World*, 50-60; and Heyck *Transformation of Intellectual Life*, 190-95, for good discussions on intellectual thought at this time.

<sup>40</sup> *A*, III, 11, “Lent term, 1874,” 540-52. It is notable that Maynard was initially attracted to both Sidgwick and Lumsden. However, her Green-book implied that she soon found Sidgwick too intimidating, and then realised that Lumsden was far more attracted to her than he was. See *GB*, 25 May 1873, 424, 27. On Girton and the Tripos see Firth, *Maynard*, 117-19; Stephen, *Emily Davies*, 250-56; Vicinus, *Independent Women*, 125-26.

dignified 'L' who stood at the head of college." Therefore, at a time when raves were an important part of college women's lives, gaining her tall, fair-haired Latin tutor's admiration was thrilling. As she excitedly and, tellingly, noted in her 'Friend,' "at *last* L wanted to see me and we arranged for Sunday afternoon. It was a beautiful day and I was happy as we lay on the grass in a fairly secluded spot. But I also felt afraid." She knew that Louisa would "test" her about religion; and she had already failed *that* test with her most beloved friends:

We initially spoke about nature, and then L confided in me by explaining that she had been brought up on Scottish Calvinism and had rebelled against it. She had read Edward Irving and yet had pushed away....She *thought* she believed in God, but thought Christianity over rated....<sup>41</sup>

Then came the "test" with Louisa's question, "Do you believe in Christ or only in God?" L likely anticipated Constance's answer, "Christ our Lord is God to me."<sup>42</sup> Constance would only later learn the depths of Louisa's revulsion at "the idea of a mediator between God and man." It's just a "story," she would snort at Constance in disgust. But in 1873 the naive Constance eagerly tried to convert her "noble friend":

If God is like the pure light as it comes from the sun, Christ is exactly like the very same light [only] refracted by the atmosphere of the earth. They tell us, as you know very well, that we could not see at all in empty space; it would appear perfectly dark to our eyes, though it really is there.<sup>43</sup>

---

<sup>41</sup> *GB*, 15 May 1873, 74. See also D. S. Bussy's *Olivia* (London: The Hogarth Press, 1949) and Brenda F. List's *Girton, My Friend and other Matters in Prose and Verse* (Cambridge: W. Heffer, 1908), for examples of close friendships between women at this time.

<sup>42</sup> *GB*, 15 May 1873, 74.

<sup>43</sup> *GB*, 25 May 1873, 424; *A*, III, 12, "Lent Term, 1873," 423.

Louisa, for her part, never ceased to admire Constance's creative attempts to explain Christ's existence, although she consistently spoke of her unwillingness to trust in God.

The end of term saw a marked change in their relationship. While Constance deliberately sought Louisa's advice over the "disarming Sidgwick"—their long talks often leaving them "locked out" of college at night—Louisa had made it clear that Constance was her chosen one. "I alone, can go to her room at any hour," she said in her Green-book, "and now and then, *even* in public, I stroke the lion's mane."<sup>44</sup> Implied is their growing physical intimacy, which I assume involved caressing and gazing into each others' eyes.

Clear is Maynard's hope that she would lead the woman that she adored to Christ:

I pray and fast for her, yet there she is noble, selfish, upright, all that I most admire and love, but not accepting the still dearer Saviour. She saddens and perplexes. She seems good and honest but yet pushes things from her, and when I say that *I* struggle a lot [with faith] she finds herself distrusting it, *naturally*.<sup>45</sup>

Since discourses on sex did not yet include the "lesbian," and Lumsden's "endless longings to be a man were not to be abated by Christianity," as Maynard noted, they were left to analyse their relationship within the context of the nuclear family. Lumsden, who expected deferential treatment and deplored her social limitations as woman, naturally adopted the "male" role. After all, she had already made her feelings on "womanly" convention clear—her gender bending when organizing charades and masculine activity

---

<sup>44</sup> Ibid., 7 June 1873, 81.

<sup>45</sup> Ibid., 14 December 1873, 180; Ibid., 7 June 1874, 81. Unfortunately, no records give any indication of the exact nature of their physical passion at this time.



like football creating many a “strained relation” between herself and Davies.<sup>46</sup> She would later refer to Constance as “her wife,” who, for her part, had already inculcated a stereotypical Victorian feminine stance:

As always, I did not answer her because I felt mute and could *not* answer. And the fact that I said ‘yes’ during our conversations—unless I felt strong opposition—led me into difficulties. Yes meant yes, I understand, as opposed to yes, I agree. I tended to do this with L.<sup>47</sup>

While basking in the thrills of passion, Constance could never relax around Louisa, as the above has implied. “She is very perceptive and unsparing,” she noted, “and I have to be careful about everything I say.”<sup>48</sup> She knew that Louisa, alongside others like Elizabeth Welsh, hotly defended the notion of “progress through the discoveries of natural science.” Thus she struggled through Darwin’s *On the Origin of Species* and *Descent of Man*. Darwin’s work was not entirely new to her. Listening to a clergyman’s attempts to “disprove Mr. Darwin” in 1871 had been as “strange and unsettling.”<sup>49</sup> At this time, she had read the work of Scottish geologist, Hugh Miller, who similarly to others of the era, linked his own formulated “evolutionary cycles” with creation:

Read Miller’s lecture, “Two Records, Mosaic and Geological.” He traces

---

<sup>46</sup> Lumsden, *Yellow Leaves*, 51; Bradbrook, *Infidel Place*, 43. When Constance entered Hitchin, male-like personas in charades were not uncommon. “Miss A, in a long beard, was besieged to sign the paper on Women’s Rights. Miss C, the spokeswoman in spectacles, rough hair and general untidiness, looked fearfully ‘strong minded.’” See, *D*, 11 November 1872, 6.

<sup>47</sup> *A*, III, 12, “1873,” 428. For other discussions of Louisa’s and Constance’s mediation of roles see Vicinus, *Independent Women*, 291 and “‘One Life,’” 610-15.

<sup>48</sup> *GB*, 20 June 1873, 85.

<sup>49</sup> *D*, 4 June 1871, 84.

three divisions. 1<sup>st</sup> is vegetative life; 2<sup>nd</sup> is creeping things; and 3<sup>rd</sup> is mammals, including man....Such 'days' encompassed thousands of years. .... We see this in Smyrna, Rev. 2.8.<sup>50</sup>

In 1873, Maynard sought advice from a local minister, who also spoke of evolution as that “guided by His hand but gave man *choice* to seek holiness through discerning good over evil.”<sup>51</sup> The idea of “evolution as enabling an understanding of the puzzles of theology, ethics, history and science” was to be painfully complex as Maynard fought waves of unbelief throughout her life.<sup>52</sup> At this time, she concluded, “The moral tone is low in the early part of the Bible, so everything seems to point to the fact that the world is slowly improving. One could argue that this will continue until the Divine becomes victorious.”<sup>53</sup>

Nonetheless, college had a profound impact upon Maynard. She noted in her Autobiography about her mind-set in June 1873:

The end of term signified the last of several things as the whole college was moving to Girton for the October term. Yet by moving only a few

---

<sup>50</sup> GB, 5 July 1871, 197; also GB, 21 July 1871, 206; GB, 23 July 1871, 208. Robert Chamber's *Vestiges of the Natural History of Creation* (1844) was symptomatic of how critics tried to incorporate geology and biology into an argument for progressive transmutation by “God's” natural laws in face of secularist challenges. Moreover, the middle-of-the-road *Athenaeum* review of *Origin* alongside a treatise on *Ancient and Modern Wild-Fowling*, a history of the British and Foreign Bible society, and fiction, implied that opinion was far from monolithic. See Kate Flint, “Literature, music and the theatre,” in Matthew ed., *Nineteenth Century*, 239.

<sup>51</sup> GB, 10 October 1873, 145. See also Swindburne, *Existence of God*, 257, which argues that Victorian evangelicals generally believed that God gave individuals freedom to work out their own destiny.

<sup>52</sup> A, VII, 66, “Lent Term, 1905,” 367.

<sup>53</sup> GB, 23 July 1871, 208; GB, 20 June 1873, 85. See Hilton, *Atonement*, 23.

yards, I had been caught in the current and was being locked and buffeted this way and that. Rules of right and wrong were discarded, and everything was growth, self expansion, and experiment....I realized that the particular thought which had been the basis of my belief, duties, aspirations and action were not as strong as I had supposed. Religion was changing from certainty to a high degree of probability, and the effects of conduct that I so infinitely valued could have other courses than the ones I had attributed to them.<sup>54</sup>

From recreation on Sundays, to accepting that texts like *Origin* or *The Senses and the Intellect* “afforded [her] new ideas and insights,” Maynard had walked towards the door to the world.<sup>55</sup> In her Diary, she symbolized her decision to traverse through it by “gathering up [her] hair and plac[ing] it on the back of [her] head” in the “modern style, like Lumsden did,” while her new “dark red cashmere dress” was an exact replica of one that Cook had worn.<sup>56</sup>

This is not to say that she had closed Oakfield’s door behind her completely. Indeed, home would always “feel familiar; almost as if [she] had never been away.” She would hear about such things as Tissy’s life at “the Children’s Hospital, where she did everything but the grate;” hear about Do’s ongoing negotiating about a career in nursing

---

<sup>54</sup> A, III, 12, “1873, May Term,” 447.

<sup>55</sup> GB, 16 February 1873, 187. She noted here that Alexander Baines *Senses* was the first “materialist” book she had ever read.

<sup>56</sup> As noted in chapter two, she had been raised to scorn fashion. Yet there is no mention in any diary of her mother’s disapproval of her new appearance. But Constance was clearly caught up with “looks,” describing, in detail, how Rachel “epitomized the aesthetic movement (1869-73) with her slim body, graceful pose and slightly slow speech.” See D, 18 June 1873, 88.

with her parents;<sup>57</sup> and hear about Gazy's various classes, which were declared "more organized than those taught at the Flimwell school room." Yet, as she lay in her bedroom, that summer of 1873, she sensed an "irrevocable change." While she could speak about her life at college, her family could not share her unique experience, and she felt an uncomfortable barrier between her and them. Her discomfort was, perhaps, accentuated by Gazy's admission, after visiting Hitchin in October, "I *might* have had all this too." There was something "pathetic about that visit," Constance admitted in her Autobiography, "because Gazy had true instincts for learning." In truth, Constance had grown to view "college not only as work but also an escape," an escape which poor Gazy would never have.<sup>58</sup>

Constance anticipated that Lewis Campbell, scheduled to visit that summer, would have empathy for her situation. Lumsden had generated feelings of ambivalence towards him, certainly, which had been exacerbated after hearing of his scorn of her parents' theology—"it was as fruitful as farmers into Hindoo lore!"<sup>59</sup> Nonetheless, he would surely share her feelings "now that Hitchin had enlightened [her] in terms of his school of thought." But he disappointed her. He was "pleased" that Hitchin had given her "a good

---

<sup>57</sup> *D*, 19 October 1871, 26. The grate was the fireplace, *D*, 25 June 1873, 66; Do had entered as a pupil of the hospital for women in Soho but had failed to tell her parents of the extent of the "fearful diseases and operations." Henry had "immediately removed her" and they were looking for a "safer hospital to take her."

<sup>58</sup> *GB*, 20 October 1872, 234; *A*, III, 11, "1873," 374.

<sup>59</sup> *GB*, 14 September 1872, 201. Lewis had challenged Harry when he had visited St. Andrews, declaring his parents' theological research "as a pleasant past-time more than logically sound."

shaking.” But when she assured him “that all that was true only stood the firmer,” she sensed his scepticism. Moreover, his defence of Rachel’s “unbelief” left her seething with jealousy: “Rachel, Rachel, she is his first and always recurring thought - the excuses he makes for her are almost beyond patience!” She confided to her “‘Friend’, the ‘exciting element’ *is fading away.*”<sup>60</sup> Future encounters with him were as disappointing. As she traversed her long and troubled relationship with Louisa, she was to find him equally frustrating. His company, once thrilling and stimulating, mostly left her either angry or lamenting their deterioration into superficial conversations. She could never quite forget him, but she grew farther from him.

In the summer of 1873, it was Fan Williams (from Belstead days) who helped shape Constance’s life, although not in the way that Fan would have hoped. Constance was delighted when her mother suddenly agreed to let Fan visit Oakfield. Fan, like Cousin Mare, strongly urged Constance to keep “counselling” students about the importance of Christianity since it was her “duty.” As Firth asserts, Constance did undertake “deliberate evangelistic work among her fellow-students” in her second and third year, which strengthened her visionary aims at Girton and at her future venture, Westfield.<sup>61</sup> However, Fan’s plea that she “fully surrender and find perfect life,” which Firth ignored, is of note here. The idea of “bringing into captivity *every thought*” to Him was abhorrent to Constance. “It *confines* freedom and happiness,” she admitted in her Green-book, adding,

---

<sup>60</sup> Ibid., 27 July 1873, 104.

<sup>61</sup> Firth, *Maynard*, 125; *GB*, 3 August 1873, 111.

“I was strangely ready to part with her.”<sup>62</sup> Five weeks later she confessed to her ‘Friend’ that the love she craved was more earthly than Divine:

I am filled with undescribable longings to do, or be, or feel something different - better, wider, fuller. These seem very unworthy when I think of my Saviour, who not only has stored my life to an unusual degree, but even opened His very heart of love itself. It is *love* that I want, not more nor less. I want a full love ‘that will take me as I am and rather die than leave me’ ...I do know the dear Saviour, but I have *not* love like that.<sup>63</sup>

Rachel would no doubt affirm this, Constance ended wryly, “so *now* do you not suppose that your sensations begin and end with yourself?” Even a year earlier, when she “had been in a stronger position than now,” she had been unable to give any answer other than “an illogical, ‘Oh, I *know* it is not so!’”<sup>64</sup>

.....

Maynard’s second and third years at Girton saw the continuation and the utilization of her earlier experiences at Hitchin. That she was a committed scholar, Firth pointed out, was obvious from the record of long hours of reading in vacation and term. Maynard explained this in her Autobiography:

The accumulative result of this learning was very powerful. It led me to weigh evidence, search for the foundation of truths, and see the far-reaching value of ultimate principles that became the springs of action.<sup>65</sup>

---

<sup>62</sup> *GB*, 3 August 1873, 111.

<sup>63</sup> *Ibid.*, 16 September 1873, 144.

<sup>64</sup> *Ibid.*, 149.

<sup>65</sup> *A*, III, 19, “October Term, 1874,” 748. See also Firth, *Maynard*, 118.

Besides her promising academic career, her initiation of a Bible study group at Girton enabled a support network for peers threatened by the growth of secularism at college. The fact that her room, known as the “Church that is Girton,” became a “refuge for the disappointed and weary” testifies to her ability at leadership.<sup>66</sup> In terms of love, she also embraced the challenge, and in no short measure. Work, faith and love, while vital and challenging, created complex nuances in her life by the very virtue of their interconnection, and their inconstancy.

The most immediate challenge facing Maynard, in October of 1873, was settling into her dishevelled new surroundings. The inside of Girton was incomplete while the muddy quagmire outside was a “dumping ground for broken bricks and mortar.”<sup>67</sup> She also noted, Girton’s closer proximity to Cambridge impelled a modification of the “family-like life of Hitchin.” This had its advantages: students could more easily attend university lectures, teas and “even” evening parties; they could share their unique experience with other female students from Merton and Newnham Halls; they could visit institutes like the Museum of Physiology; and access to all this became easier when the wagonette was made available to all Girtonians for a small fee.<sup>68</sup>

---

<sup>66</sup> *GB*, 17 May 1874, 222.

<sup>67</sup> *A*, III, 19, “1874,” 751. As noted earlier, Hitchin College moved to the village of Girton in 1873 and changed its name to Girton College.

<sup>68</sup> *GB*, 17 October 1873, 50. She recalled a “very grand dinner at Professor and Mrs. Clarke Maxwell’s” and Davies—likely acting as chaperone—introducing her to Mr Bryce, author of *The Holy Roman Empire*. She also met Mr. Ellis, a fellow of Sidney Sussex College, who was apparently romantically interested in her, but it was not reciprocal. See *A*, III, 15, “Lent Term, 1874,” 533.

Girton's location gained it more notice, despite the fact that its distance from Cambridge was meant to protect Girtonians from the temptations of the town. On the positive side, Davies could entice out powerful guest speakers like J. R. Seeley, the author of *Ecce Homo*. Maynard—named the “show student with [her] courteous manner and nice room”—met other important visiting guests like Dr. Elizabeth Blackwell, Madam Bodichon, Dr. Elizabeth Garrett-Anderson, Miss Buss, Miss Beale and Lady Stanley, who were major players in the early movement for women's rights.<sup>69</sup> However, being more on the public map created certain new problems. Convention decreed no male visitors in students' rooms, and “convention” unfortunately did not cease there. Since there “was no gate, no lodge, and no front door, male undergraduates could enter the building unannounced.” They “took great delight one day in taking running leaps across the long narrow dining tables, despite the fact that places had been set for dinner.” Girtonians tolerated their annoying attitudes, sometimes with private relish:

We could hear their conversations in the corridor through the ventilators in our rooms. We took great amusement in one conversation which ended up with them saying, ‘but what is the point of everything?’ followed by the housekeeper's prim response, ‘it is for educational purposes Sir.’<sup>70</sup>

But they sometimes felt irritation, such as the time when they learned how college women had been mocked through cartooning in *Punch* magazine.

---

<sup>69</sup> *D*, 24 May 1873, 66. Constance loved her sitting room with her “bust of Locke standing on his brackets, [her] lovely pole screen made out of a Bittern with lifted wings. [She] always had fresh flowers and always looked healthy, according to Elizabeth Welsh. L remarked that [she] was one of the few who could be trusted to stand up and speak.”

<sup>70</sup> *A*, III, 14, “Start of the GPM, 1874,” 488-515. See also List, *Girton, My Friend* and M.E. T's *An Interior of Girton College, Cambridge* (London: London Association of Schoolmistresses, 1876), for discussion on life inside Girton's walls.



Most of her work with Lumsden had ceased but Maynard still saw much of her. Their long, intense debates on subjects like poetry, fiction, philosophy or religion appear to have been as stimulating as ever. Indeed, Maynard truly adored 'L.' But a number of diary entries evoke new, unhealthy aspects to their relationship. Louisa's cruel taunting of her during their lectures on Utilitarianism particularly troubled Maynard. As Newsome explains in *Victorian World*, intellectuals hotly debated exactly what "useful knowledge" was. "Could *any* Christian view the menacing influence of Utilitarianism with equanimity?" he asks.<sup>71</sup> Maynard "hated" Jeremy Bentham's utilitarian-based, "'chilly' disregard of religion," which argued that "man" obeyed out of fear of earthly punishment rather than religious conviction.<sup>72</sup> But her main angst, according to all records, was over Lumsden's intense criticism of religion. This ranged from her rage about "overly emotive" evangelicalism, the veracity of the Bible and "hysterics" of prayer, to rage over God's "unconcern" about victims of senseless tragedy. "I dare not speak in case she sees the chill of doubt I feel creeping over me," Maynard noted. As with any science versus faith attack, she sought resolve by compartmentalizing learning, just as she had tried to split emotion and asceticism in her youth.<sup>73</sup>

---

<sup>71</sup> Newsome, *Victorian World*, 50-62, emphasis mine.

<sup>72</sup> *A*, III, 13, "October Term, 1873," 552. Nonetheless, she also noted, "some of Bentham's views on morality are similar to that of Mill's." Bentham's concept of utilitarianism (1823), which advocated 'the Greatest Happiness of the Greatest Number,' would have been viewed as too worldly a view for Maynard. See Daunton *Progress and Poverty*, 99, on Bentham and Hilton's observations in *Atonement*, 31-32. Hilton suggests that Benthamism contained a puritanical emphasis on self-denial.

<sup>73</sup> *GB*, 30 December 1874, 56; also *D*, 16 March 1874, 75 and *A*, III, 15, "Lent Term and Easter Vacation, 1874," 545.

However, Maynard could no more do this than split love from the world and faith. As a result, the strain caused by Lumsden took its toll. “The more I love her the more power she has to grieve me,” she sadly noted in her Green-book. “I try to be cheerful at a tea party or at musical evenings after talking with L, whose every sentence severs my soul and deepens the wound in my heart.” Lumsden wanted sympathy and understanding for her striving to understand a world filled with senseless tragedies and gender inequality. But Maynard found that she had no language except religion to explain worldliness. Deflecting her difficulties with Lumsden to problems of belief, she realized that each had come to demand a certainty from the other that neither could give.<sup>74</sup> Yet Maynard could not seem able to extricate herself from their unequal and at times abusive relationship.

Constance found third-year Natural Science Tripos candidate, Frances Dove, a solace of sorts. Frances was the daughter of an upper-class Broad Church clergyman, who had been raised in relative isolation in a village parish in Northumberland. Known by her peers as somewhat cold and introverted, she had endeavoured to befriend Constance because she also loved L and she was “anxious” to meet her “rival.” But by all accounts, Frances’ love for Louisa was unrequited. Her acts of devotion, like “drawing L’s curtains, or making her fire,” only served to diminish Louisa’s respect for her. As Constance remarked in her Autobiography, “I don’t know what happened but I remember L telling me with a kind of disgust, ‘of course I thought it was the servants - do you know it has

---

<sup>74</sup> *GB*, 29 November 1873, 164; also *A*, III, 16 “May Term, 1874,” 555; and *Vicinus*, ““One Life,”” 610-11.

been going on fully *two years?*”<sup>75</sup> Constance’s thought on the matter, that Frances “endured L’s unkindness because she was self-deprecating,” seems ironic given her own relationship with Louisa.<sup>76</sup> She consistently seeks to distinguish between their relationships with Louisa through comments like, “Frances accepted L’s respect for me.”<sup>77</sup> But in truth, they became co-dependent victims of Louisa’s power-driven cruelty and they grew to dislike each other because of it.

Little did Constance know that their love for Louisa would involve all three in a four-year relationship centring on passion and ambition, or that Frances would set the ball in motion when she accepted Beale’s offer of a post at Cheltenham Ladies’ College shortly after passing her Tripos in November of 1874. Constance “felt for” Frances at this time, with Frances’ angst over the future clearly echoing her own fears about the unknowns surrounding love and aim.<sup>78</sup> She herself would join both Frances and Louisa at Cheltenham in 1875. All three were then involved in the Campbells’ founding of St. Leonards in St. Andrews in 1877 where Constance remained for three years, working with Frances under Louisa as Mistress.

In 1874, Frances proved that there was hope for a career after completing the Cambridge Tripos. Emily Davies “was completely surprised but very much pleased” upon learning that Dorothea Beale had offered Frances £60 for teaching mathematics and

---

<sup>75</sup> *A*, III, 19, “1874,” 773.

<sup>76</sup> *GB*, 8 February 1874, 205-7.

<sup>77</sup> *Ibid.*, 15 November 1874, 159.

<sup>78</sup> *Ibid.*, 14 December 1874, 248.

physiology half days with or without the Tripos. She was equally amazed when Frances Mary Buss hired another Tripos candidate to teach Classics at her school, the North London Collegiate.<sup>79</sup> Yet such success reflected Davies' unceasing efforts to promote her cause. Earlier that year, for example, she had raised £1,050 for Girton after delivering a speech in Liverpool.<sup>80</sup> She then organized a "Girton evening party" in honour of "the kindness shown by University members" towards women's higher education. Although it evolved into a lavish yearly affair,<sup>81</sup> the first Girton party was purely business. A number of university personages and "various curious guests" eagerly "cross-questioned [Girtonians] about college life."<sup>82</sup> The Campbells' attendance at the 1874 party likely inspired their enterprise, St. Leonards, which points to the important role promotion played in developing women's education. Davies sent Constance "to Belstead on a missionary enterprise for Girton's sake each summer; and [she] was invited to Collingwood twice in 1873 as college life was being considered for Connie [Herschel]"

---

<sup>79</sup> See *Ibid.*, 9 November 1874, 150; *Ibid.*, 27 November 1874, 164.

<sup>80</sup> *D*, 25 January 1874, 74.

<sup>81</sup> June Grey née Collins, (untitled) *Girton Review*, October 1927. One gets a sense here of how the Party gave wealthy students an opportunity to wear "satin and diamonds," and others the chance for romance. Collins noted of the 1878 event, "'The looking glass figure' involved a 'girl' sitting in the middle of the room with a looking-glass. Gentlemen were brought to her, and as she saw their faces in the glass she wiped them out til the man came with whom she chose to dance."

<sup>82</sup> *A*, III, 15, "1874," 542. The Girton party usually began at 7:15 p.m. and finished at 10:15 p.m.

who would enroll as a Natural Science Tripos candidate in October 1874.<sup>83</sup>

Davies' energetic approach to women's higher education augmented a community spirit, which was reflected in sports. In fact the students saw sports as vital to college life, as indeed it was in terms of introducing a corporate, communal spirit. Maynard was a strong athlete and was designated a captain with Lumsden for games like "Elevens" and cricket in her first year.<sup>84</sup> But organizing games at Girton proved a challenge. Plans for the gymnasium were at a standstill due to the death of the donor. The "horrendous mud" meanwhile stopped the outside games, which had been so commonplace at Hitchin. When they could "pitch wickets" on the new lawn, they often abandoned their cricket games as male undergraduates "watched" them. So they settled for indoor dances, gymnastics, wrestling, fencing and "Fives." In 1874, they bought and erected "an old black barn," which became their gymnasium. Although the gymnasium corners had sunk by the following year, Maynard "loved it because [she] could exercise without the strong winds and mud....After lunch [she] would often change into [her] bright blue athletic costume, and [find] at least three more to play Fives with [her]"<sup>85</sup>

---

<sup>83</sup> *D*, 26 April 1874, 82; *D*, 8 April 1874, 73; *GB*, 15 April 1873, 62. As mentioned in chapter two, in footnote 56, the Herschels were the only genteel family that the Maynard children could occasionally play with in the 1860s, which was ironic since Sir John was an eminent scientist.

<sup>84</sup> *D*, 6 June 1873, 46. She noted, "we each had four men under us and we play for half an hour after dinner in the summer evenings. I love running around bare footed on the grass and then rewarding my teammates with drink out of raspberry vinegar and effervescing powders." See also McCrone, *Playing the Game*, 25-34. The gymnasium was finally built in 1877, and women's inter-university sports—between Oxford and Cambridge—were inaugurated in 1883.

<sup>85</sup> *A*, III, 14, "1873," 428; *A*, III, 13, "1873," 567; *D*, 6 November 1874, 54.

As Girton's public spirit developed and its enrollment grew, the interpersonal relationships became more complicated. Pioneers vied for power or love in their new public arena, and this became an important new topic of debate in Maynard's Green-book. It is notable that she had "never been classified with [her] own year" even though "etiquette stated that freshmen keep their place" on the lowest rung of the hierarchical ladder. Her "exemption from this rule," which was likely introduced by Louisa, had largely stemmed from her connection with Rachel through Lewis, and her intimacy with Louisa had afforded her more "privilege." However, her diaries suggest that she herself had snubbed lower middle-class peers like Mary Kingsland, or "non-serious" students like Ellie Baker. But she "felt desolate" now that Louisa was becoming so troubling. Thus, she reached out to the talented Mary and "amiable" Ellie. Although both were flattered by her attentions she found neither compelling—but accepting "their invitations to look at portfolios at least provided opportunity for serious 'conversations'" about religion. Just as she had admired Rachel, now *she* basked in approbation from peers and it was relatively easy to gain their warm response to her proselytising. As Mare and Fan would point out, she was fulfilling her "duty."<sup>86</sup>

The six new students who entered Girton in October of 1873 had meanwhile created another new dynamic. Amy Mantle, Annie Wallis, Lizzie Burgess and Alice Betham were typical of the younger "school-girl like" generation of students who would enter Girton in future years. By comparison, the genteel Malvena Borchhardt (Matty) and Henrietta Muller (Hetty) threatened Maynard because they were older and more

---

<sup>86</sup> *GB*, 23 February 1873, 37.

experienced. She smarted over the fact that Matty had gained Louisa's immediate respect because of her talent in mathematics and Latin and because of her "nonreligious, materialist" views. Hetty, although quieter, was even more "chilling" to Constance with her "exotic and sensuous" ways that, Constance surmised, were deliberately "contrived to lead the weaker students."<sup>87</sup>

Maynard had tasted power both through her privileged position at Girton, and with her hold over Mary and Ellie, and she aimed to retain it. Although she did not admit to it in her diaries or Autobiography, Matty's and Hetty's "considerable influence" probably impelled her move from one-on-one conversion to starting a 'private' weekly Bible gathering as a means of blocking their control. The idea of open "discussion about theology" had been raised in early 1873. The proposal was vetoed, as only Constance and Louisa were interested. But Louisa's nasty backhanded support, that the "free 'rational' mind" could "well test" religion, had actually incensed Constance more than her outright disapproval would have done. It implied that Louisa believed herself a cut above those like herself who still clung to His word, and even at this time Louisa's sting had led her to vow, "the unbelievers will *not* have everything their own way!"<sup>88</sup>

Maynard's first Bible classes, which began in November 1873, only included Mary Kingsland, Elizabeth Welsh and Ellie Baker. But invitations were soon extended to controllable new students like Amy Mantle, Annie Wallis and Lizzie Burgess. "It is slow

---

<sup>87</sup> Ibid., 2 November 1873, 161. She never ceased to think that this was how Louisa viewed her in general, and this, and L's agnosticism, caused a rift between them.

<sup>88</sup> Firth, *Maynard*, 114.

work,” Maynard noted in her Green-book, “and I have to endure L’s open repugnance; but I go bravely on...because they like to come and are learning.”<sup>89</sup> Her growing self-assurance, revealed by her Green-book of 1874 and 1875, seemed to shield her from the caustic nature of her relationship with Lumsden. Her comment, “I can never entice anyone to say more than yes,” evokes her wielding of her theological knowledge while she also sought “good helpers” to augment her power base. A year later she wrote, “Our first little Bible reading began with four of us - and *here* we are at eight!” Mary was a “strong advocate” of the readings while Ellie, embracing her nurturing role, was “happy that God sent her one person after another to pour out their troubles.”<sup>90</sup>

Nonetheless, it also is noteworthy that Constance sincerely believed that the meetings provided “a strong bond of union,” which enabled students to “get to know each other in a way otherwise impossible.” The support system was also vital to younger students who suffered acutely from overwork and gruelling exams:

Annie became hysterical after cramming on Homer, Ellie had violent pains and aches and needed hot wrung out flannels, and Amy had a persistent cough which was like the beginning of consumption.<sup>91</sup>

For Constance, adopting a nurturer/leader/proselytizer role had its own rewards:

Affection I had in plenty, sometimes devoured with kisses, sometimes finding my vases filled with flowers, sometimes discovering little three

---

<sup>89</sup> *GB*, 3 November 1873, 78. She noted a week later in the *GB*, 16 November 1873, 171, “when I first got ready I felt as if I would give *anything* to be waiting for L, and actually it *must* be so before I leave.” But L never attended her Bible readings.

<sup>90</sup> *GB*, 5 November 1874, 265; also *GB*, 2 March 1875, 278; *GB*, 6 June 1875, 298.

<sup>91</sup> *A*, III, 16, “May Term, 1874,” 578.



cornered notes laid on my desk asking for prayer, and always treated as the 'final appeal' in matters of the soul."<sup>92</sup>

As Mary Kingsland admitted to Constance while reading her an entry from her own Green-book that Constance had encouraged her to keep:

I began to love her [Constance], and then I tried my best to make her love me, but I couldn't do it. There seemed to be a kind of secret always behind her, and I found it was no use shewing that I loved her unless I loved her Lord too.<sup>93</sup>

As the above suggests, for "raves" like Mary, human and divine passion were interconnected in her efforts to gain her adored one's favour.<sup>94</sup> What of Constance? From Coleridge to Paley, she had endeavoured to unite a self which had been threatened by her mother's admonition, that she repress all sentiment. Her experiences with Lewis had opened her up to life's possibilities and to the complexities surrounding passion and aim. She had since been "swept down [Girton's] stream" of inspiration, grasping at interconnections between theory and religion.<sup>95</sup> As for love and desire, she still believed in Paley's premise, that "if [she took] all [her] pleasures from God's hands it [could not]

---

<sup>92</sup> Ibid., 593.

<sup>93</sup> Ibid., 556. There is no other information regarding Mary's GB in Constance's records. But it is curious that her GB, like Constance's own, interconnected Divine love with human.

<sup>94</sup> For raves, see Vicinus' *Independent Women* and "'One Life'"; Nancy Sahli, "Smashing," and Elizabeth Wilson, "Forbidden Love," *Feminist Studies* 10 (1984).

<sup>95</sup> For example, her 'mechanics' class led her to understand that, "perpetual motion (God) was possible, but not in practice (we could not prove His existence.)" *GB*, 7 March 1874, 90.

hurt [her].<sup>96</sup> In short, religion was becoming a process by which to vindicate her private needs. However, she was not physically drawn to Mary. “It is the pretty, delicate, Amy [Mantle] who needs to touch me, kiss me, and cling to me,” she wrote in her Green-book. “I am lonely beyond more than I can bear with L’s chill; and Amy’s sweet blue eyes and resolute lips - that bespeak of passionate loving - send an irresistible appeal to my heart and all my reason gives way.”<sup>97</sup>

Constance’s intense, sensual interactions with Amy cover scores of Green-book pages. While Louisa’s agnosticism pushed her away, so Amy’s passion and response to her proselyting drew her in. “Amy lost her mother at birth and has been raised by a very uncongenial aunt,” Constance wrote, “and then a young cousin she had been wildly in love with drowned at sea. So this is why she craves love so much.”<sup>98</sup> Constance happily mediated the mother/lover roles in her attempt to lead Amy to God and to understand the nature of their relationship.<sup>99</sup> The extent of their passion is not clear—beyond references to long passionate kisses and caresses. But the point is that both seemed to gain self-definition and satisfaction from their encounters. Constance pandered to Amy’s “passionate, intense thirst for [her] love,” finding herself both titillated yet horrified by

---

<sup>96</sup> Ibid., 28 March 1874, 78.

<sup>97</sup> Ibid., 4 November 1874, 88; see also Ibid., 29 August 1874, 91.

<sup>98</sup> Ibid., 10 May 1874, 245.

<sup>99</sup> See Ibid., 29 August 1874, 91. Sexual undercurrents seem at play even in the mother role, “She leant back against me, and stretching out her arms, whispered ‘mother.’ This word has never passed her lips before, though often I have called her ‘baby.’”

Amy's frank discussions about her heterosexual feelings.<sup>100</sup>

While empowering and pleasurable, Maynard's new friendships raised issues around social class. Elizabeth Welsh, Frances Dove and Louisa Lumsden had criticized her friendship with Kingsland from its outset, sneering at Mary's "commonness" as the daughter of a tradesman. Maynard had countered their attacks by pointing out that their "views were ignorant. All were equal in His eyes, and [she] was gathering Christians at Girton." But in truth she felt ashamed of her friendship with such an

uncultivated being of whom [she] would not *think* of knowing in other circumstances. Educated at grammar school, she had been pushed forward to gain success through hard work. She was a good example of the lower refinement of women's colleges, and her sort was inevitable.<sup>101</sup>

This implies that even in 1925, her class-based bias persisted despite changing attitudes. Since the early 1870s, the establishment of girls' high schools had made clear that secondary education was not only affordable to middle-class girls, but that it could be "public" in nature.<sup>102</sup> By the end of the century most members of the lower middle-class were receiving secondary education and pursuing social advancement in trades such as

---

<sup>100</sup> Ibid., 10 May 1884, 245. She does not elaborate here, but Amy seemingly spoke of sex quite openly, which would seem averse to Maynard's moral upbringing.

<sup>101</sup> A, III, 19, "1874," 750.

<sup>102</sup> Fitch, "Women," 249. As noted in chapter two, Miss Shirreff and her sister Mrs. Grey had sought to improve the lot of the middle-class girl, whose education "was in a worse plight than her poorer sister," by founding the Girls' Public Day School Company. See also Gorham, *Victorian Girl*, 25. Hunt, *Lessons for Life*, Dyhouse, *Girls Growing up in Late Victorian* and Burstyn, *Victorian Education*.

banking, insurance, or accountancy.<sup>103</sup> Maynard's perspective, as this study will show, remained shaped by the more conservative discourses around class and gender.

Louisa's outrage upon discovering that Amy Mantle was the illegitimate daughter of a wealthy shop-keeper was a "huge blow" for Constance, in May 1874. She had assumed that Amy was her equal, class-wise, and "this was a line of demarcation that was too strong to step over. To think I have let her touch me and kiss me! I do not know how to behave for fear of grieving her, and I have vowed to take her on in both body and soul," she wrote in her Green-book.<sup>104</sup> Struggling between her ideals surrounding class and religion, and her interest in Amy, Constance could not be completely honest with Amy or with herself. When Amy heard about her reaction to her upbringing from another student five months later she accused Constance of betraying her.<sup>105</sup>

Lumsden's own issues with class re-surfaced when she suddenly learned that Kingsland had been invited by Davies and Girton's committee members to become resident Science lecturer, starting in January 1875. "It is insulting to be socially linked with such a plodding, commonplace little person who will lower and degrade Girton," she apparently raged to Maynard, who politely added here, "I think Mary is a *good* influence

---

<sup>103</sup> Howarth, "Gender, domesticity," 183-4. The Reform Acts of 1867 and 1884 had empowered more mid-and working-class men. Class distinctions remained as symbolized by the estates of the gentry versus the emerging middle-class suburbs and urban slums.

<sup>104</sup> *GB*, 14 May 1884, 247.

<sup>105</sup> *Ibid.*, 21 October 1884, 277-81. Their argument centred around human and divine passion, of course. Amy apparently told Constance that she could not understand her "betrayal," given her faith and their relationship, and that she was "deeply offended" by Constance's attitude.

at college, but I sympathize with L because I understand that the subtle differences in their lives envelope more than the intellectual.”<sup>106</sup> In *Yellow Leaves*, Lumsden downplayed her in arguably reprehensible views:

....I confess that the two years of my tutorship at Girton were not altogether happy ones....It was not to the committee to whom I felt loyal, it was the college. The college I cared for, and for the college I was willing to serve. As friendly as some of the members of the committee were...[others] treated me as if I was a mere stranger.<sup>107</sup>

However, Lumsden was an insufferable snob who demanded preferential treatment. Moreover, it was now evident to both staff and students that her volatile nature could evince an intense, unchecked wrath. This unfortunately would always create problems in her professional life. Maynard had seen the extent of this in early 1873, when Lumsden’s Tripos presentation was cancelled by the Girton committee due to the lack of quorum. She had returned fuming when, after “sitting in a bare room” for over an hour, a mere *servant* was sent to inform her. Her angry pride had prevented her from returning to London five days later to attend the re-scheduled ceremony.<sup>108</sup> Her Classical tutorship had appeased her, but her relations with Davies and the committee had remained strained.

Louisa was certainly a difficult individual, but overwork and exhaustion also seemed to be causes of her short temper. As enrollment had grown, so had her

---

<sup>106</sup> Ibid., 25 October 1874, 762.

<sup>107</sup> Lumsden, *Yellow Leaves*, 57.

<sup>108</sup> *A*, III, 13, “1873,” 438. She added here, “The years of gruelling work, coupled with her noble name and lineage, fuelled the flame....This was a shame because it was quite a dignified occasion....The certificate itself was a big parchment, properly embossed with large red seals.” Compare with Lumsden, *Yellow Leaves*, 59. Lumsden wrote that she “was too deeply hurt to take any notice of the second invitation.”

responsibilities as tutor, and then official “nurse”, since none were hired at this time.<sup>109</sup>

Constance wrote of the trials of a typical term during the wintry months:

Annie Wallis had bad headaches and her head had to be bathed every night. Amy had a bad cough and her face became swollen with toothache. Lizzie had fainting spells. Then there was a flu outbreak and L was up most nights for a week.<sup>110</sup>

Gender and love further complicated their roles. When Louisa advised Amy to drop to a “General Student” because of poor work, Amy “worked herself into a state.” Louisa likely against her better judgment gave in to Constance’s plea—perhaps obstinate assertion—that “Amy says that she has come to take the degree and will *not* give it up!” Mary had had similar troubles with Lizzie Burgess, who had neither the aptitude nor ambition for work. Amy never got past Little-go and Lizzie failed it three times. Like others before and after, they left Girton feeling resentful and disappointed about their new experiences. Their tutors meanwhile felt incompetent and guilty.<sup>111</sup>

Both tutors and students struggled to navigate the new milieus of cause versus individual, and professionalism versus femininity, within a society that tied women to domesticity. While Mary managed to overcome such contradictions Louisa could not. Feeling misunderstood and underappreciated at large, she believed herself a mere “cog in

---

<sup>109</sup> Lumsden, *Yellow Leaves*, 55. She said here, “life was lonely and monotonous; and on top of feeling overwhelmed by teaching, I often had to take care of ill students.” See also McWilliams-Tullberg, *Women At Cambridge*, 65-67.

<sup>110</sup> *D*, 29 November 1874, 90; also 6 March 1875, 7; 8 October 1875, 99.

<sup>111</sup> *GB*, 20 November 1874, 66. Mary “felt miserable having to write down, ‘perfect rubbish!’ for Euclid and algebra, which had come from the mouth of her own pupil.” See *GB*, 26 December 1874, 98.

the wheel of Davies' great scheme...who counted for little."<sup>112</sup> By November 1874, she was suffering from stress related insomnia. Angry and tired, "she was so edgy that I kept wondering what she would do next," Constance recalled.<sup>113</sup> The situation erupted in February 1875, when Louisa voiced her "regret about coming back" for the Lent Term.<sup>114</sup> Her threat was taken at face value by Davies and the Girton Committee who offered her post to Elizabeth Welsh who was due to take her Classical Tripos in March. Elizabeth, also being sought after by Miss Day, the headmistress of the Manchester High School for Girls, would have preferred tutoring at Girton but rejected Davies' offer out of courtesy to Louisa. The latter, meanwhile, was incensed by their lack of decorum, and resigned immediately. As Constance wrote in her Autobiography:

There was no discussion, no questions - just a brief curt acknowledgement of her letter of resignation, and then nothing. L had clearly made the committee afraid of her. She had always been seen as an enigma with her pride and demand for etiquette and they probably wanted to be rid of her.<sup>115</sup>

After weeks of silence, the Council invited Lumsden to return in October. They advised her to take a leave for the May Term, but "without any apology for the past," Maynard pointedly noted in her Autobiography. "L decided to consider their offer, but she withdrew over the Lent, much to *my* relief. I pitied her, but I shrank from her fixed

---

<sup>112</sup> Quoted in Bradbrook's, *That Infidel Place*, 31.

<sup>113</sup> A, III, 19, "1874," 769.

<sup>114</sup> D, 7 February 1875, 78.

<sup>115</sup> Ibid., 18 March 1875, 67; see also A, III, 13, "1873," 478.

face.”<sup>116</sup> However, at the time, Maynard confessed that she felt “really miserable”:

She has been an important part of the college for over five years, supporting and shaping its ideals; and although we differ opinion-wise, our tastes are similar and I know that I will miss her terribly.<sup>117</sup>

While Maynard’s Green-book entries about Amy Mantle were sensuous, they always lacked the intensity of her tortuous, passion-filled narrations about L. Lumsden held what seemed to Maynard to be a “farewell supper” in which she “brought in dainties from Edinburgh and spoke passionately about her days at Hitchin and Girton.” She did resign over Easter,<sup>118</sup> and Maynard’s intense relationship with her took a hiatus for a year.

It is notable that the spring of 1875 marked not only an end to Lumsden’s connection with Girton, but also a big change for Maynard. She had undertaken proselytizing in her second year, as Firth pointed out. However, it was during the summer of 1875 that the Green-book spoke of her warm response to her familial religious milieu. Harry’s new-found admiration of Moody and Sankey particularly fuelled her visionary aims. “Their missionary work is vital because it...reaches huge audiences,” he assured her. Constance herself was won over after attending a meeting held at the Agricultural Hall in London. She recalled, “the S.A. [Salvation Army] was not yet in existence, and I had

---

<sup>116</sup> *A*, III, 19, “1874,” 769. According to McWilliams-Tullberg, *Women At Cambridge*, 65-67, Davies’ attitude was condescending towards both staff and students at times.

<sup>117</sup> *GB*, 25 March 1875, 47.

<sup>118</sup> *D*, 26 March 1875, 96; *A*, III, 20, “Lent Term, 1875,” 834-40. At the time, she told L “to take a break—perhaps travel—and then return refreshed to college in October.”



never come across a large gathering such as this before.”<sup>119</sup>

I felt overwhelmed by the wave of emotion which urged so many to stand up during the sermon as if they really wished to be saved. They [Moody and Sankey] are trying to accomplish God’s work, which, after all, isn’t so much different from my own work, or the one I long to have. We both have the same Truth and aim, and both have tools from the same Bible...The external difference lies in the number of people that can be helped simultaneously - their lower education meaning a slightly different method of teaching.<sup>120</sup>

Maynard returned to Girton with a renewed “longing over the souls of others,” but she found that she could not put this into practice because of her new, empowered position as “the *senior* student, the observed one by all.” These observers included A. F. Bernard who had been appointed as Girton’s Mistress in 1874. A well-mannered rather conservative woman, Bernard suited Maynard’s needs very well. She afforded Maynard privileges; she asked her advice on college matters; and she did not interfere with her religious aims.<sup>121</sup> Added to this, Maynard’s “two overseers,” Lumsden and Elizabeth Welsh had left, and Mary Kingsland, “the sole survivor of the powerful years preceding [hers] was on the staff. This is a unique opportunity,” she noted in her Green-book. “I can

---

<sup>119</sup> *A*, III, 20, “1875,” 830-33.

<sup>120</sup> *GB*, 4 April 1875, 57.

<sup>121</sup> According to the *A*, III, 20, “1875,” 840-43, Bernard relied quite heavily on Maynard. Bernard was not particularly popular during her nine years at Girton. Her distant manner alienated many students. Some wished for a more motherly leader while others wanted a more dynamic feminist. See Vicinus, *Independent Women*, 134-5. Constance liked her conservatism and the fact that she could wield some power over her. It is notable, however, that Bernard did not encourage Maynard to apply for the teaching post in Classics at Girton after completing her Tripos. She supported Welsh instead.

follow my own plans without having to consult anyone. I am free!”<sup>122</sup>

By early May Constance believed herself the key player, both religiously and secularly: “I was the one sought after for both advice and encouragement. It was *my* room, known as ‘the Church that is Girton,’ that was now the refuge for the disappointed and weary. I could never do any work for my Tripos after 9 p.m. because I was always so busy.”<sup>123</sup> Parts of days were spent organizing sports for the twenty-two students now enrolled at Girton, and she was always on the look-out for suitable candidates “to join [her] select Bible reading,” which had gained a stronger foothold with at least ten regular attenders. The meetings were “still difficult.” But Maynard countered this by encouraging others “to choose the subject,” while she gladly relinquished some power to Mary who “was willing to do any amount of evangelical work.”<sup>124</sup> These leadership skills would help Maynard through her Westfield days.

“Teaching the poor in Girton village” had become an important offshoot of the Bible meetings. Village work had always been a part of Oakfield life and of other genteel households. But when Maynard learned that the rector had “stopped the schismatic meetings” taught by male undergraduates, she saw it more as an opportunity. She could prove herself by having “*her* little flock” run the meetings while simultaneously “showing

---

<sup>122</sup> *GB*, 25 April 1875, 85. Welsh had taken the post at Manchester under Day.

<sup>123</sup> *Ibid.*, 17 May 1875, 222.

<sup>124</sup> *A*, III, 14, “1874,” 554.

them what conversion did.”<sup>125</sup> Holding the Bible meetings led her to consumptive patient, Eliza Thoulburn, who was to remain her special protegee even after leaving Girton. Thoulburn proved a wonderful example of how faith enriched one’s life, however poor that life was. She survived consumption, with her correspondence with Maynard possibly getting her through what must have been desolate days.

In hindsight, Constance admitted to treating Eliza as a showpiece of sorts. “I even took students outside our Bible group to see her as a special treat,” she explained. “It was good to show them what conversion did. I’m not sure whether this was good for Eliza.” One might have thought how Lizzie Burgess’ scrubbing an aged villager’s “splintered kitchen floor with a worn out scrubbing brush, inky black water and a sippy old rag,” would have affected Constance, as she certainly noted her amazement at Lizzie’s forbearance.<sup>126</sup> Yet Constance herself did little other than talk with the villagers. Her inculcation of the Atonement doctrine had led her to view teaching “sinners” to develop a moral conscience as her most important task. Proclaiming Eliza’s turn to “grace” was *evidence* of the power of conversion and “test of faith,” as far as Constance was concerned.<sup>127</sup> This attitude was also evident later in her behaviour towards her adopted

---

<sup>125</sup> *GB*, 13 June 1874, 67; *A*, III, 15, “1874,” 518-20. Around 20 attended the weekly meeting held in a large kitchen. The rector had banned them after receiving a letter complaining of the friction they created. According to Constance, “the village had rebelled” against his decision.

<sup>126</sup> *A*, III, 20, “1875,” 620-24.

<sup>127</sup> Hilton, *Atonement*, 17-27. As noted in chapter two, he argues that suffering was viewed as a phase in the poor’s moral education, and that some saw charity work as an interference with this. *GB*, 8 April 1877, 14.

daughter, Effie. Her help for the poor meant “converting,” not charity work, and she had a similar preference in motherhood, particularly since Effie was from the middle-class as opposed to the upper-middle-class.

Conversion was to remain paramount to Maynard for the rest of her life. Besides Eliza Thoulburn, she was also caught up with the half hour “Prayer Meeting” that she had instituted the previous November with Kingsland and Ellie Baker, which involved sitting “by the fire and pray[ing] for the others.” She had also recently organized a “Five Meeting” over the summer, in which each had promised “to pray for the others to be Faithful every Sunday afternoon at 4:30 p.m.”<sup>128</sup> This small, informal gathering was actually the beginning of the famous Girton Prayer Meeting (G. P. M.). For over twenty years Maynard’s regular attendance at the yearly “Old Students” (O. S.) meetings was driven by her desire to promote the G. P. M., and to ensure that its elected “Chaplain” was fulfilling her important obligations. G. P. M. members, old and new, automatically became members of “The Budget,” a package of circular letters introduced by Maynard in 1887 as a means of keeping Westfield graduates “True,” and in contact with each other. The G. P. M. meanwhile flourished until 1897, at which point it merged with what became known as the Students’ Christian Movement (S. C. M.), under the direction of Robert Wilder.<sup>129</sup>

Not surprisingly, as Maynard’s religiously-based power had grown at Girton she found herself increasingly under severe attack. This gained force particularly after

---

<sup>128</sup> *GB*, 8 November 1874, 78; *GB*, 12 May 1875, 151.

<sup>129</sup> *A*, III, 15, “Lent Term, 1874,” 501. See also Stephen, *Emily Davies*, 56.

Lumsden's "stately presence" was removed. As leader of one "camp," Maynard was respected for her academic, athletic and creative talents. Her position as senior student meant that she was favoured by Bernard, Girton's Mistress. Maynard was also afforded certain social privileges. She could go "into Cambridge for both tea *and* dinner." She could take "splendid long [horse] rides" with tutor and friend, John Venn, the prominent Evangelical clergyman who taught her both Logic and Political Economy. However, "as a disciple of sorts," she was the "scorn of the 'Free-thought' camp," as Matty Borchhardt and Hetty Muller had begun to call themselves. Whereas Constance resented their "corrupt" power at Girton, Lizzie's comment, "those who like you, *do*, and those who don't, *don't*," implied the opposition towards her coercive, ego-based proselytizing.<sup>130</sup>

The core of the issue for Maynard was evinced by her stances in her Green-book and Autobiography. In a Green-book entry on May 31<sup>st</sup> 1875, she noted, "the college is divided right in two and I feel sad because it is all my doing. Hetty suggests that the 'camps' be separated by a corridor so 'we can be happy.'"<sup>131</sup> In her Autobiography, she took a more defensive stance. "I knew my clique was of a peculiarly objectionable sort, separating 'the good' from 'the bad,' but I knew that I could not go back."<sup>132</sup> She then

---

<sup>130</sup> *GB*, 15 October 1874, 223. Of note is that Connie Herschel, her old playmate and neighbour, had rejected her Bible classes in favour of the Free-thought group. In fact Connie spurned Constance's friendship by avoiding "in depth conversation on any subject." As Constance jealously noted, "Her name, respected for nearly a hundred years, made her popular at college and with Cambridge society."

<sup>131</sup> *GB*, 31 May 1875, 160.

<sup>132</sup> *A*, III, 20, "1875," 605. This is revealed in a *GB* entry on 20 May 1875, 45. She wrote here, "New students behave humbly during our Bible meetings and then go to Matty's room to make fun of us. One encouraged Lizzie to pray in Matty's room which

pointed out that her little flock's attempts at proselytizing were so ridiculed by the free-thought group that guarding them from the latter's scientific views was an ongoing battle.<sup>133</sup> She concluded by emphasizing that she had to fight against such "tainted" control. "I informed my tutors that we were absconding from the debates because of the new interest in discussing 'controversial' topics like, 'is flirting wrong?' or 'should truth and beauty be aimed at in fiction and in art?'"<sup>134</sup>

The free-thought group had taken revenge for what they saw as her "narrow minded elitism and deficiency of public spirit" by mocking religion during an end-of-term game of Consequences:

Last night a dreadful thing happened. We were playing Consequences and Amy was passed the note which she tore again and again in tiny pieces. The situation was uncomfortable after that - forced laughter and then we dispersed....Amy came in later to say that she had read the note, and that it had been written by Henrietta. It was a conversation between two people. One said, 'how do you do?' And the other answered in a verse about 'I see the flames of hell, I feel the gnawing worm.'<sup>135</sup>

This reveals, once again, the intensity and complications facing these early pioneers in their mediation of their micro public setting that was always in flux.

---

had led to the latter's triumphant comment, 'it is great to see that there are a good many idiots in the family of heaven.'"

<sup>133</sup> Ibid., 610. They would flatter members of her flock, and then invite them to their rooms to try and turn them from religion through Bible criticism. See *GB*, 2 June 1874, 162 and *GB*, 16 October 1874, 202.

<sup>134</sup> Ibid., 625. See also Ibid., 31 May 1875, 160. Both topics were suggested by Matty but Hetty approached a tutor about the matter, who then suggested to Constance that her group "join in again." She told him that although she felt "they should contribute," she still refused to go.

<sup>135</sup> Ibid., 6 June 1875, 176.

Struggles for new-found power were a part of this. For Constance, who found the Free-thoughts' behaviour sacrilegious, there was added angst. But her records suggest that her torment lay with herself. While her Autobiography continued hotly to justify her moral and religious position, her Green-book voiced how "humiliated and hopeless" she felt at the time. She admired Matty's "hearty public spirit and brilliance." She envied Connie Herschel, "who was like a queen bristling with science." Her "shame over [her] little flock's ignorance [in proselytizing]" symbolized her own sense of failure on both public and personal levels. Faith created impossible demands in an environment that embraced science, in which *she* had embraced science. Moreover, the norms of class and etiquette, alongside a complex faith and power-driven sense of responsibility, prevented her from admitting her deeply embedded conflict to either friend or foe. Indeed, she could no longer distinguish between them.<sup>136</sup>

The stress from Maynard's strife over rationalism and faith was connected to her struggles with ambition, passion and faith, and in the end, it took its toll. Her Diary particularly revealed her struggle with "trying to give the best she had" during her last year especially in Sidgwick's Philosophy classes.<sup>137</sup> Shortly before her Tripos, she wrote:

He [Sidgwick] said that 'with endless sympathy, I try to follow system after system and believe it all; but as a result I seem to have no opinions of my own because I am not sufficiently independent of thought. I must

---

<sup>136</sup> See *Ibid.*, 14 June 1875, 182; *Ibid.*, 25 October 1875, 227. She noted here, "I thought about Lizzie's bullying of Alma, Ellie's insensitivity towards K, and Amy's exploitation of Alice. They had all made mistakes except for Mary...and as a consequence of these mistakes, any superciliousness tended to fall on the weakest of us."

<sup>137</sup> For example, she had needed to rewrite essays on Kant and Locke because of the "inaccuracies" in her arguments. See *D*, 4 April 1874, 69; *D*, 18 May 1875, 70.

centre my thoughts and avoid guesswork,' he said, 'and should not be disappointed if I get a second in all the Tripos.'<sup>138</sup>

She concluded of their conversation, "I felt pleased considering they came from the great man, the pessimistic philosopher of Cambridge." But in her Autobiography she confessed that she "disliked his cold, negative approach to [her] work." In truth, his observations had vexed her. She had hoped to excel as much in work as in other areas of her life. However, it seems that her conflict and the problems arising from it had distracted her from her studies, especially towards the end.<sup>139</sup>

The Tripos papers were first distributed at Cambridge University, and then were sent out to Girton twice daily. The exam began on November 29<sup>th</sup> 1875, and Maynard wrote six hours daily over six consecutive days in Bernard's rooms with Bernard as invigilator. After two nights of little sleep—she came "unstuck" in two Philosophy exams and had felt obliged to join in the Debate and charade each night—she took control over her situation by declining invitations to activities at night. She also became more familiar with the process of the examination, writing "with assurance on what [she] knew, leaving out what [she] did not know well or, if [she] had the time, making a bold dash at

---

<sup>138</sup> Ibid., 18 November 1875, 7. He had just complained about her work on Cicero's position in Ethics and Metaphysics which, he said, "was so entirely 'unintelligent' that had he not known some of the previous papers [she] had written, he should have thought it was 'quite hopeless to teach so difficult a subject to such a mind as was there presented.'" See, *D*, 9 October 1875, 5.

<sup>139</sup> Ibid., 73. In fact one gets the distinct feeling that she almost "gave up" on her studies at the end—although her good study habits throughout her college days had prepared her for her Tripos. She also had a good memory for facts. See also *A*, III, 20, "1875," 552.



invention.”<sup>140</sup> After her last exam ended on Saturday December 4<sup>th</sup>:

Miss Bernard rose and said, ‘Miss Maynard, the Tripos is over. I do congratulate you!’ She seized both my hands she gave me a kiss. Now could be heard a tumult outside the door.....I went out, and we flew indiscriminately into each other’s arms. Done, done! Whatever the result may be, the whole thing is done! Some gave me a chair-ride down the corridor and there was a fine row, which culminated in three ringing cheers as Miss Bernard led me into the Dining Hall. Then came singing and stamping, and everyone without exception was so warm and kind.<sup>141</sup>

In her Autobiography Maynard noted, “I held out pretty well and quite enjoyed my challenge. I fought off hysterics after the papers, which others like Louisa, Elizabeth and Frances had exhausted themselves in doing.” For this, Maynard claimed, she gained new respect from the free-thought group.<sup>142</sup> Since hysteria, at this time, was viewed by physicians as “the predominance of the emotional ‘subforce’ over the intellect or the will, Maynard would likely have seen her battle as triumphant on both secular and religious levels.<sup>143</sup>

---

<sup>140</sup> While not commenting on Mental Philosophy in her diaries, she noted feeling “rewarded by a lovely question on Cairns about the ethics and logic surrounding crime and punishment,” and how much she enjoyed her final political economy exam in which she was asked to write “an imaginary speech about the Repeal of the Corn Laws with arguments for and against.” See *D*, 29 November 1875, 88; *D*, 4 December 1875, 63.

<sup>141</sup> *GB*, 5 December 1875, 167.

<sup>142</sup> *A*, III, 25, “My Last Term, 1875,” 758-60. Matty had thrilled her by addressing her as “*Our* Questionist,” while another member had thoughtfully placed big placards at crucial points on the stairway and corridors stating, “*Silence* - remember our Questionist.” As Constance noted, “Girton’s remarkable corridors always invited the clattering of heels along its wide, shiny surface.” This is true today!

<sup>143</sup> See Brumberg, *Fasting Girls*, 76, for discussion on the emerging discourses about hysteria in the late 1800s, which, physicians were proposing, “created gross and senseless delusion in women and in weak minded men.” As shall be discussed in chapter nine, Maynard was clearly relieved when Marion Wakefield’s malaise was not diagnosed

On December 8<sup>th</sup> the results came in, which Maynard learned rather crudely through Hetty who “loudly announced to someone down the corridor, ‘yes, second class.’” To learn that she had placed second in her class, slightly below one man, and slightly above Mary Kennedy who was the first from Newnham to sit the Tripos, was acutely disappointing. She had dreamed of being the first Girtonian to win a First Class and it was difficult to conceal these feelings. At the time, her discontent came to an abrupt halt. Two days after her results a telegram arrived informing her that Do had contracted typhoid fever and she was packed and home by nightfall. It was not until a week later, after Do began to recover, that she mused over her last college days. “I was happy that every kind of difficulty was smoothed over at the end,” she wrote. “The Free-thought actually *sought* my advice on issues like the nomination of the new ‘show student.’”<sup>144</sup> But in terms of her Tripos, she remained upset, as seen in a letter from Lumsden on December 14<sup>th</sup>:

I am *so pleased* about your Second. *Don't* say you are ‘contented!’ That is not half enough....Evidently the First Class in your Tripos is meant to be reserved for an exceedingly select few—very great swells—as you say.<sup>145</sup>

Maynard’s years at Girton set in place what became a life-long conflict between rationalism and religion—her compartmentalization of the self evinced in her two separate diaries. As we have seen, her tendency towards self-doubt was countered by a strong will

---

as hysteria—religiously-based “over excitability”—in 1896.

<sup>144</sup> Ibid., 760. Lizzie won the election.

<sup>145</sup> Louisa Lumsden to Constance Maynard, 14 December 1875, Special Collections, Queen Mary and Westfield College Archives, London. Two male students from Cambridge were expected to achieve a First Class that year, and apparently they did.

to succeed. The reiterated “not our sort,” taught during her childhood, was not then without its added touch of arrogance. In terms of ambition, her conflicts created a dissatisfaction within her that perhaps led to unrealistic goals. She believed herself incapable of *any* first-class work simply because she never mastered Philosophy. Firth agreed, arguing that being raised “to seek what truth was,” and to then accept it “for all time,” meant that Maynard tended to reproduce learnt knowledge without analysis.<sup>146</sup> This seems a limited view. As Maynard herself wrote in 1875, “I did well in my Tripos given the amount of work I had covered in the allotted time.” Girton did not see a first class until 1880, when Constance Jones gained such distinction in her Moral Science Tripos.<sup>147</sup> One has to assume, given Girton’s success rate at large, that methods of preparation for degrees had vastly improved by then.

In addition to doubts and conflicts surrounding ambition, Maynard would remain torn by its impact upon her faith. “I cared for the total cause more than the individuals themselves,” she noted in her Autobiography. She obliquely admitted how her need for power in the name of religion had driven her both to woo and to condemn fellow students, and that this had created friction due to their dislike of her motives. The lens of class prejudice meanwhile had prevented her from seeing her “shoppy peers” as social equals. None had challenged her intellectually, like Louisa Lumsden, Rachel Cook and Elizabeth Welsh had done, despite the fact that she tended towards submissiveness in face of strong

---

<sup>146</sup> *A*, III, 19, “1875,” 769; Firth, *Maynard*, 122.

<sup>147</sup> *GB*, 12 December 1875, 99; *A*, III, 19, “1875,” 769; McWilliams-Tullberg, *Women At Cambridge*, 72.

personalities like Lumsden.<sup>148</sup> Nonetheless, while her conflict between ambition and faith would persist, her influences on students and other people were profound, as the ensuing chapters will reveal. Moreover, Girton had afforded Maynard the opportunity to test her leadership skills and to learn from her mistakes. For example, when Mistress of Westfield, she emphasized to her students their need to keep strictly to the curriculum required for a particular honour's degree. She would certainly repeat mistakes made at Girton by creating friction through her complex, elitist views. However, the college experience gave her the strength to wage her battles as an educational pioneer, as she negotiated ambition and religious duty within the rigid yet fluctuating discourses surrounding faith, science, gender and class.

Following chapter three, this chapter has also traced how Girton became a milieu for Maynard to explore her sensual nature. Certainly, her passion and those of others mirrored the raves in women's colleges, as understood within the context of faith and heterosexual courtship. Of interest in Maynard's Green-book, however, is how faith led her to negotiate her physical encounters that included the beginnings of a powerful seduction and resistance ritual. In September 1875, shortly before her Tripos, she noted:

For the past three years I have felt more conflict than ever before. I have *taken out all feeling*, all that makes Religion so lovable. I come to Thee with *bare intellect*, knowing that I am but a half-creature without Thee, useless, miserable, incomplete, and knowing that in Thee is just that which fits into me to complete and satisfy my being. Now, this afternoon, I begin again this coming to Thee, and mean to go on at it, leaving absolutely

---

<sup>148</sup> This had also been evident in her dealings with the Free-thought. For example, in her *GB*, 24 October 1875, 138, she noted, "I responded to Matty's observations with my usual misleading, 'Yes,' that I always used in the face of opposition."

everything else to Thee.<sup>149</sup>

Just like the young girl who had knelt upon the holly leaves, the older Constance felt compelled to prove her faith. Rationalism had made her doubt. Love had filled her with earthly desire. She thus cautioned her sweet Amy Mantle “have faith in their love for each other as a part of God’s plan.”<sup>150</sup> An entry written a month later speaks of Amy’s trying to “turn her heart from [Constance] to the Saviour unbearable. She loved [Constance] too much to do that,” she complained. Jealous of Constance’s attentions towards others, Amy resented her love’s struggle between succumbing to their mutual passion and hesitating due to faith and class difference.<sup>151</sup> Passion won in the end, and its expression after weeks of resistance was orgiastic-like as described by Constance during their last night together:

She [Amy] told me that ‘she did not notice me til the love was so strong - all of a sudden - that it was as much as she could manage.’ That night she gave me all that I suppose one mortal can give away to another, and holding her close to me I knew I *should* give her up to the keeping of my Lord....Farewell my Amy - love and pain and suffering you have cost, as well as brought me the greatest of joys....<sup>152</sup>

In her Autobiography, Maynard added after speaking of this incident, “there was almost something uncomfortable about Amy’s passion. I told her very kindly that I could

---

<sup>149</sup> *GB*, 19 September 1875, 98.

<sup>150</sup> *Ibid.*, 22 September 1875, 100.

<sup>151</sup> *Ibid.*, 17 October 1875, 128. She noted here, “Although I know I love her as much as ever, I have felt the difference in our position and culture too strongly to admit any close tie. I do so fear that even spiritually I have treated her with a sort of petting and indulgence that was sure to weaken, and has now brought her to this sorrow.”

<sup>152</sup> *Ibid.*, 29 December 1875, 198.

not ‘respond to the private exclusive side that seemed to give her satisfaction.’”<sup>153</sup> When she wrote these words in 1915, the ideas about sexuality had begun to change from the past. She frequently let old students—even old loves—read her *Autobiography*. One wonders if they enlightened her about the new discourses on sexuality. As mentioned in chapters one and three, she stated her abhorrence of Freud-like ideas on “Repression” in 1926 and 1927, since such theory implied that her same-sex relationships were the result of her “thwarted sex instinct.”<sup>154</sup> It is also notable that her former love, Marion Wakefield, was studying psychoanalysis at a London college at this time. Nonetheless, always caught up in her need to “seek Him first,” Maynard continued to interpret passion within the context of faith rather than gender or sexuality until the end of her life. “Friendship,” she sums of lessons learned at Girton, “should be based on mutual admiration and passion as well as the bonds of ‘one Lord, one faith, one baptism.’”<sup>155</sup>

---

<sup>153</sup> *A*, I, 2, “1849-60,” 52.

<sup>154</sup> *Ibid.*, VII, 52, “1886,” 172-74.

<sup>155</sup> *GB*, 6 January 1876, 99.

## Chapter 6

### 'An Unhappy Marriage': Leadership, Longing, Lament, 1876-1880

When writing of her four-year relationship with Louisa Lumsden in 1919, Maynard noted, "It is obvious to me that I was cut out to be always second and never first - and truly through these four long years I did try to be a real and perfect wife to Louisa. But it was a thoroughly 'unhappy marriage.'"<sup>1</sup> Certainly, as this chapter suggests, passion left her victim to Lumsden's intense mood swings at Cheltenham (1876) and at St. Leonards (1877-80). However, ambition was also the reason that their relationship fell apart. Maynard no more wished to be "wife" to Lumsden than she did to Dr. James Robertson, who was to propose marriage in 1877. Leadership, longing, lament: this particular binary between ambition and passion, set within the context of faith, was to engulf Maynard during these "reckless and complicated" years of her life as a recent Girton graduate.<sup>2</sup>

Upon leaving college in 1875, Maynard's parents immediately called her to account for the "certain stipulations" to which she had agreed. "First, [she] would not teach, and, second, [she] would come back to [her] sisters and live at home 'as though nothing had happened.'"<sup>3</sup> As an early pioneer, her plight was not atypical of that of her

---

<sup>1</sup> *A*, V, 33, "St. Leonards School, 1878," 340. Written in 1919.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, 341.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, IV, 27, "At home and at Cheltenham, 1876," 228. It is notable that Maynard began Part IV of her autobiography, which covered her year at Cheltenham, at page one again.

contemporaries. Lizzie Burgess and Amy Mantle also returned home where they would remain until they married. Others, meanwhile, worked to support themselves before marriage. Sarah Woodhead, Mary Kingsland, Connie Herschel and Ellie Baker taught, while Rachel Cook, who worked as a reviewer for the *Manchester Guardian*, met and married the editor, Charles Scott.<sup>4</sup>

This is not to imply that those who chose to marry felt comfortable in their separate sphere or even settled for conventionality. It is notable that Emily Townsend, the first Girtonian to marry, wrote most apologetically of her marriage and grew to regret leaving Hitchin without her Tripos.<sup>5</sup> Rachel Cook continued to write for the *Guardian* whilst raising five children. Her eloquence at public speaking helped women to gain admittance to the degree program at Manchester University in 1883. She remained politically active until the end of her life, fighting for women's suffrage and improved elementary education.<sup>6</sup> Mary Kingsland, meanwhile, preached "to crowded female congregations" for over twenty years after marriage. Her later dedication to working women's rights in factories was perhaps her subversive way of reconciling her own

---

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, 720-81. Sarah taught maths at various Yorkshire colleges, Emily taught at Cheltenham, Ellie at a private girls' school in London, and Connie at Girton.

<sup>5</sup> *D*, 15 November 1873, 70. She married Chambrey Gibson, Isabel's brother, in 1873. She noted of her marriage, "I knew my peers would be angry, and indeed they were." See Emily Gibson, *Some Memories for her Friends* (London: Hodder, 1903), 46-59.

<sup>6</sup> *Girton Register*, 2.



entrapment in a marriage to a physically abusive husband.<sup>7</sup>

However, some early Girtonians sought independence from domestic norms from the outset. Anna Lloyd and Isabel Gibson published a number of texts. The former wrote a book on poetry and a number of travel books. The latter was noted for her insights into Fabianism and Fascism.<sup>8</sup> Constance Maynard, Louisa Lumsden, Frances Dove, Elizabeth Welsh and Amy Bulley were among those who devoted their lives to pioneering middle-class women's higher education. Amy and Louisa later became advocates for women's suffrage alongside their independently wealthy ex-Girtonian contemporaries, Hetty Muller and Matty Borchhardt. Emily Gibson was among the brave suffragettes who went to prison for fourteen days for the cause. When widowed in 1903, Emily also became heavily involved in the National Guilds League, after being told that she was "too old" to train as a factory inspector. Amy Bulley is likewise notable in that she went on to become one of England's first female justices of the peace in 1901.<sup>9</sup>

The impact of Girton on these women's lives is clear. Maynard remarked about *her* mind-set in December 1875, in her Autobiography, "I saw something helpless in my

---

<sup>7</sup> Mary told Constance about this in 1885, explaining that faith had helped her to reconcile and accept her husband's disrespect for her as well as his physical beatings. It is interesting that she fought for working women's rights to respect in the factory milieu, including other rights, like better pay. See *GB*, 9 May 1885, 90-96.

<sup>8</sup> *A*, IV, 27, "1876," 230; *Ibid.*, 103. Isabel painted in Rome for a time and was close to notables like Robert Lewis Stevenson and William Morris. Anna published many of her travel diaries, short poems and a few books. See Lloyd, *A Memoir*, 77; also *Girton Register*, 4.

<sup>9</sup> *Girton Register*, 5-10. She also fought for women's higher education in north-west England as well as for suffrage and trade unionism. See, *A*, IV, 27, "1876," 270-81.

role in my quiet English home. I had managed to gain more years to attend college but the second stipulation remained fixed. I grimly faced my fate as daughter-at-home hoping to ignore past experiences.” She also faced “disturbing storm clouds” on the horizon, hearing “the first rumblings about problems with the South African properties” although gold had been found on her father’s land the previous summer. Thunderbolts struck later that summer when Harry’s inept business dealings threatened bankruptcy. Henry was forced to resign his position as director of the bank, and Harry faced the prospect of having to work for decades to pay off his liabilities.<sup>10</sup>

It was also evident that Constance’s mother was very ill. She had suffered from asthma and digestion related problems since 1868. But now she struggled to eat, and as a result, had grown extremely thin and lethargic, shutting herself away more and more in her rooms.<sup>11</sup> Home for the first time in years, her twenty-sixth birthday proved a lonely and depressing one for Constance. Her father and brothers were in South Africa; Gazy and Tissy were staying at Winchester; and Do was recuperating from typhoid fever at Cannes with Fan Williams, who had just been diagnosed with consumption which would prove fatal. As a result, all home duties and village work fell on Constance’s shoulders. Although these responsibilities were temporary, thoughts of “the monotonous ease of

---

<sup>10</sup> *GB*, 14 May 1876, 37. She noted here that although South Africa was “in a wretched condition,” and the firm was losing money, Harry’s new business partner, Mr. Walker, had lost Maynard Bros. thousands over a six month period. Harry was chagrined to think that “the very house [he] live[d] in [wa]s more [his] father’s than [his] own.”

<sup>11</sup> *A*, IV, 27, “1876,” 228. Christmas had been very difficult because her father had been irritable about business and her mother accordingly moody. Dora had also had “violent delirium” episodes, which taxed Constance since they shared the same bedroom.

home going on and on for years was unbearable.” Her Diary is notably scant over these months while her Green-book speaks of her “bitter tears” over the “helplessness about [her] situation.” She seems to have fallen into a deep malaise as a consequence.<sup>12</sup>

Nonetheless, Maynard never ceased trying to escape her situation. Indeed, she had thought about career possibilities for over a year, albeit knowing that her parents would not let her teach for pay. In July 1874 she visited Cheltenham. Frances Dove was teaching there and was apparently keen “to snag her” as a future teacher. Beale had offered her a post teaching history, literature and “general supervision” there, but she had left “undecided” since it meant “countering her family’s wishes.”<sup>13</sup> That same summer, she had also “looked over” the Manchester High School where both Elizabeth Welsh and Sara Woodhead taught under Day. While pressured by Welsh to join the staff, she once again “demurred” when Day offered her a post.<sup>14</sup>

Although both diaries are vague on the matter, Maynard made a point of arriving early for the first Old Student (O. S.) Girton meeting in March 1876 in order to promote herself as a candidate for Lumsden’s replacement. Bernard, however, was set on

---

<sup>12</sup> *GB*, 22 January 1876, 174. See also *GB* 12 March 1876, 190; *GB* 9 April 1876, 18.

<sup>13</sup> *Ibid.*, 3 July 1874, 29. She sardonically noted, after introducing Beale to the Campbells at the Girton Party, Beale “no doubt learned of *their* opinions on the matter.” Lewis at this time had applied for both the “Full Greek Chair” at Glasgow and the Public Orator’s post at Cambridge. He did not get either post, and remained at St. Andrews for twenty more years.

<sup>14</sup> *Ibid.*, 17 July 1874, 49. Part of her dilemma here was about going to Manchester. The north western part of England was not deemed as desirable as London or the south. To a certain extent, this perspective remains to this day.

Elizabeth Welsh. She told Maynard that she was not “considered satisfactory” because of her religious agenda. Elizabeth was more open minded and would therefore cause less conflict as a staff member. “I did not want the position anyway,” Maynard asserted in her Green-book. Nonetheless, her chagrin over Bernard’s comments did appear to set the tone for the remainder of her stay:

As I listened to all the voices of my first term at Hitchin I felt completely out of cinque [sic]. The three years of work and steady rise were blotted out, and I was a newcomer, not venturing to speak a word among the others, a black sheep in the flock, a heart completely out of tune, and therefore, though in a crowd, smitten with perpetual loneliness.<sup>15</sup>

She took comfort in the Girton Prayer Meeting. The “quiet faces of Ellie [Baker] and Amy [Mantle]” symbolized her former powerful role at Girton, and Eliza Thurlbourn’s delight at seeing her was a pleasant reminder of her village work. Yet Maynard hankered after those with whom she felt out of tune. A black sheep in one flock, she felt herself “far superior” both intellectually and socially to the other little flock. “I need to move on and stop wasting time with them,” she wrote in her Green-book.<sup>16</sup> Power, once gained from religious motivation, was now seen as part of secular-based ambition. Similarly to her faith, it was inextricably tied to self-worth and to discourses surrounding class and gender.

When Constance was told that Oakfield, the land at Flimwell, and the Hall at

---

<sup>15</sup> Ibid., 18 April 1876, 14. Quite possibly Bernard’s rejection of her as a potential instructor further strengthened her resolve to start her own Christian school.

<sup>16</sup> Ibid., 29 May 1876, 28. See also Ibid., 1 June 1876, 92. Her comment, “I found the GPM ‘satisfactory.’ I feel they exaggerate their importance at college and shirk from religious reading,” seems ironic given her own motives at Girton.

Hawkhurst could well be sold that July, “the thought of sparing and saving” was frightening to her. Yet it was also an opportunity for escape. “At least Do and I can support ourselves financially if need be,” she wrote.<sup>17</sup> But nothing was sold at this time, and life continued as before. At the end of July she accompanied George for his treatments at “the hydropathic at Crieff in Perth without any money worries.” Always nurturer to her younger brother, she had persuaded her father to pay for his “course of baths and massage” at Mannedorf in 1874 to relieve his knee joint pain after an injury playing ice hockey in 1871.<sup>18</sup> This time, however, her desire to help George was also driven by self-motivation. She hoped that the trip to Scotland would enable her to see Louisa Lumsden, who lived on the west coast of Scotland at Arran. It seems that her purpose in seeing Louisa was career oriented, since she knew that she had just accepted a teaching post in Classics at Cheltenham for October.

After contacting Lumsden, Maynard was immediately invited to her home, Glenbogie, which was situated near a town also called Lumsden. Lumsden had “approved” of Louisa Maynard’s gentility when the latter had made her one visit to Girton in 1874, and Constance sensed and approved of the refined and elegant ambience in which Lumsden had been raised, although Glenbogie itself “was not grand.”<sup>19</sup> Their

---

<sup>17</sup> Ibid., 2 July 1876, 57.

<sup>18</sup> Ibid., 20 July 1876, 66. They stayed at a luxury hotel. George’s treatments consisted of being wrapped in wet hot or cold sheets for periods of time. Unfortunately, neither treatment had long-term benefits. See also, Ibid., 16 August 1874, 86.

<sup>19</sup> Ibid., 23 July 1876, 69. Constance respected Mrs. Lumsden, who “was a Forbes of Forbes castle,” with her Presbyterian background and liking of poetry.

long discussions together “were often painful” as Maynard needed to work at bridging the abyss between them since Lumsden’s stormy exit from Girton. However, her toleration of Lumsden’s harsh criticism of her elitism, choice of friends, and the G. P. M. gained her the reward she sought: “I won back her trust after two days and we spent our remaining three on the glorious lonely uplands with L’s head resting on my lap.”<sup>20</sup>

When Lumsden made overtures about her teaching Classics at Cheltenham, which Maynard must have anticipated, she immediately implied her interest by explaining about her family’s difficulties. She had misgivings when Lumsden “expressed the thought of having her for her ‘wife’” of course, because it conjured up images of their bittersweet relationship at Girton: “L, sensing [her] thoughts, had said flatly, ‘perhaps you are right - I should grieve you so often.’”<sup>21</sup> Yet Maynard never wavered from passion and ambition. When Fanny asked her to be Lewis’ secretary a month later, her “heart said no” because it no longer belonged to Lewis. As she had exclaimed after staying with her captivating friend, “Oh! to know her, *is* to love her! *Anything* else is impossible.”<sup>22</sup>

It is unclear whether some kind of plot regarding Cheltenham was hatched when Maynard was at Glenbogie. It seems likely, however, given: Maynard’s notation in her Green-book, “Oh! *when* will it all end;” Mary Kingsland’s remark when visiting Oakfield, “outwardly you seem satisfied, but deep down inside you are restless,

---

<sup>20</sup> Ibid., 25 July 1876, 71-72.

<sup>21</sup> Ibid., 75. L accused her of not speaking enough, on her behalf at Girton *and* of condescending interfering—of which Constance admitted had truth. She clung to L’s assertion, “You must see that I’m *not* irreligious or purely materialist in thinking.”

<sup>22</sup> Ibid., 20 August 1876, 88.

dissatisfied and almost wretched;”<sup>23</sup> and, in early October, “the answer” in the form of a letter from Frances Dove “implo[ri]ng [her] to go to Cheltenham and help in a private capacity.” Louisa was finding correcting elementary Latin tedious. Would Constance “please come and help out of kindness as a true friend?”<sup>24</sup> Cleverly worded indeed. Constance anticipated her parents’ consent “given the conditions.” As a “genteel woman” she would simply “help” a friend until Christmas and receive no salary. However, she likely sensed that her parents’ agreement over Dora resuming nursing at Winchester hospital could be used as further ammunition for her own desire to pursue a career.<sup>25</sup>

Maynard went to Cheltenham on October 13<sup>th</sup>, 1876, four years to the day since she had entered Hitchin. Thus began her four-year “marital” relationship with Lumsden, “My entrance into a fool’s Paradise,” she noted in her Autobiography. It was “a paradise I would fall into a thousand times over, in the wooing and winning before an unhappy marriage.”<sup>26</sup>

In a chapter headed, “Waiting Again,” followed by another chapter called “Prelude,” Firth covered these years in her biography. But as her titles suggest, they serve to foreshadow Maynard’s work at Westfield. Firth’s avoidance of Maynard’s relationship with Lumsden was, I believe, a means of extricating herself from any analysis of her

---

<sup>23</sup> See *Ibid.*, 25 July 1876, 82; and *Ibid.*, 9 August 1876, 95.

<sup>24</sup> *Ibid.*, 8 October 1876, 105. She noted here, “L had hoped to teach advanced work with enough payment to keep her.”

<sup>25</sup> *D*, 9 October 1876, 89. Dora was now fully recovered from Typhoid fever.

<sup>26</sup> *A*, IV, 27, “1876,” 230.

friend's same-sex liaison. Her brief comment about "the power of Louisa Lumsden to make or mar the happiness of Constance; are not these things written (and at length) in the Green-books and the Diaries?" is tantalizing in its request that the reader form *his* or *her* own conclusions about the nature of the relationship.<sup>27</sup> However, the unfortunate result is that Firth's chapters give little insight into Maynard's life at Cheltenham or St. Leonards. Indeed, "Prelude" emphasizes Maynard's courtship with Robertson. This further illuminates Firth's continued silence on Maynard's love for Lumsden,<sup>28</sup> despite the fact that it covers far more Green-book pages than the Robertson episode does. Maynard's entrance into "a fool's Paradise" shall be the focus of this chapter. I wish both to illuminate the nuances surrounding this important relationship in Maynard's life, and to reveal the impact that Lumsden had on Maynard's journey in search of passion and ambition.

Initially, life with Louisa as "her chief love and duty" was blissful. "Duty" involved correcting around eighty five Latin books per week for Louisa. When Beale offered Constance a small salary to teach an infant arithmetic class and a junior Latin class, she accepted. She also volunteered to teach Logic to the staff and could attend any classes herself in her free time. "*Never happier with L's tender consideration,*" she had soon secured her father's permission to remain until July. Louisa, also in love, declared that "it was beyond her wildest dreams to have [Constance] all to herself. Gazing into

---

<sup>27</sup> Firth, *Maynard*, 155.

<sup>28</sup> *Ibid.*, 135-67. As noted in chapter five, Firth did not discuss Maynard's relationship with Lumsden at Girton either.



[her] eyes,” she would often say, “I am truly happy because my work, my home and my wife are all good.”<sup>29</sup>

Maynard embraced her ascribed role of “wifehood.” Flowers, billet-doux, and countless caresses and kisses marked their courtship and “marriage,” as Vicinus points out, in ““One Life.””<sup>30</sup> In her Green-book, Maynard spoke of her delight in having their “own house to invite friends” like Elizabeth Welsh and Ellie Baker. She rejoiced in a life that centred on work and the home, “thinking always and only of each other.”<sup>31</sup> Of course such singular devotion had some drawbacks. Maynard avoided developing friendships with two fellow Christian teachers because she sensed Lumsden’s jealousy. When Lumsden told Maynard that she wanted to “throw off the long-pressing claims of Frances Dove’s affection,” which had been going on since Girton, Maynard had no qualms about seeing Dove to “sort things out.” Even after listening to Dove’s heartbreaking lament, “Oh! my love just burns me up. Oh, I cannot, cannot bear this constant keeping me in check. I care for no one else, I belong to no one else, and it is slowly killing me,”<sup>32</sup> she coldly informed Dove, “you are no longer welcome at our home.” She claimed to have “smoothed everything over in the end,” but she surely must have known that Dove would

---

<sup>29</sup> *GB*, 12 October 1876, 117.

<sup>30</sup> Vicinus, ““One Life,”” 612-13.

<sup>31</sup> See *GB*, 19 November 1876, 127; *GB*, 25 November 1876, 132. See also Lillian Faithfull’s, *You And I: Saturday Talks At Cheltenham* (London: Chatto And Windus, 1927), for the intensity of Cheltenham friendships.

<sup>32</sup> *GB*, 24 December 1876, 126. As noted in chapter five, Lumsden had felt a certain disgust for Dove after discovering that Dove had demonstrated her affection for her through menial tasks like making up her bed at Girton.

be left seething with pain, bitterness and jealousy.<sup>33</sup>

However, Maynard's own relationship with Lumsden had its troubles. "We are compatible in a manner that is almost startling," she noted in her Green-book in December. "Yet I see, and, feel, the barrier as ever strong between us." Shortly after arriving in October, she "had proposed that they read a few Bible verses every night." Lumsden had firmly declined, saying "she was too tired at night and so it was impossible." Although Maynard had hoped this would change, it had not. In fact her persistent proselytizing appears to have irritated Lumsden. In December Maynard noted their growing tension in her Green-book. "It is the same old weary disagreements of past, which usually leads to my crying bitterly when alone in my bedroom at night."<sup>34</sup>

Maynard's biggest concern was Lumsden's need for amusements on Sundays—her angst provoked, as usual, by her own "irreligious" feelings. "I was thinking that historical evidence indicated that much of the Bible was not true," she admitted later. "Many said that the Old Testament was constructed by the human mind, and in truth, I thought this until 1880."<sup>35</sup> This remark evokes the science versus religion debates that were permeating Victorian culture in the 1870s.<sup>36</sup> Tormented by her own disbelief, Maynard longed for, indeed, felt, that she *needed* her loved one's "Christian awakening" to fulfill

---

<sup>33</sup> Ibid., 127.

<sup>34</sup> Ibid., 28.

<sup>35</sup> *A*, IV, 27, "1876," 222.

<sup>36</sup> See Brooke, *Science and Religion*, 55-57; Hempton, *Religion and Political*, 66; Butler, *Victorian Doubt*, 99; and Gerald Parsons, *Religion in Victorian England* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1997), 87-90.

her emotional needs:

How does the dawn rise? How does the night begin? Is it not with thee, friend, companion of mine? I watch, I wait, I pray, but no light gladdens my eyes...But hope is still with me, hope on the word of [God]...Oh! my friend with deep and violent heart, is there not something of change? not a sign, or confession of weakness? Not even the longing for life with passionate endeavours? Yet betrayed by a look, by gentle and softened demeanor; and by patient considerate love to me, the prejudiced Christian....<sup>37</sup>

She concluded, "One of three things will happen: we will part, we will live together with no common aims, or we will live together as one - with one heart, one faith and one Lord." She fervently hoped it would be the last.<sup>38</sup>

The workplace was also creating conflict for Maynard. She had initially been content to "serve under L and Frances," in fact declaring herself "ready to lay down [her] very life [for] two of the best teachers in England."<sup>39</sup> Yet feeling "intellectually unequal" to them had become vexing. She was irritated when Lumsden asserted that her Logic lectures to the staff were confusing. But this paled in comparison to Beale's "contention that [her] Latin class was out of control and that her students seemed useless" in the subject.<sup>40</sup> Being viewed as less of a disciplinarian than either Lumsden or Dove implied her inferiority in another way. Yet her aim was to inspire "work from love of the subject," and not to enforce learning as they did through threats of extra work or of failure. Girton

---

<sup>37</sup> *GB*, 5 November 1876, 113.

<sup>38</sup> *Ibid.*, 31 December 1876, 127.

<sup>39</sup> *Ibid.*, 29 October 1876, 113.

<sup>40</sup> *D*, 12 November 1876, 99.

had taught her “that there must be equality between friends.” Cheltenham, meanwhile, was setting in place her teaching approach, whether right or wrong. She felt hurt and irritated that both friend and superior thought her insufficient in both areas.<sup>41</sup>

Clearly, Maynard’s ambitions were as high as Lumsden’s. This was particularly evident in two counter narratives in her Autobiography and Diary about an event in November. In her Autobiography, she noted that Fanny Campbell wrote a letter stating her wish to found a girls’ school at St. Andrews. “It was cautiously worded, implying that *if* the school was to exist it was to be very good; 12 staff, all well paid, and well built.” Fanny wanted Constance to become one of its founding teachers, and she asked her “to consult Louisa about the need for such a school....Of *course* L had no doubt at all because she had complained about the number of Scottish girls at Cheltenham.” After Constance had responded favourably to Fanny, “another letter came inviting Louisa to come too.” Louisa was interested, but made it clear that she “wanted the headship.” The record ended with Maynard’s emphasis on her worry about entering a secular institution, followed by an addendum voicing her “surprise” that this event—the “greatest point” of the term—“was not recorded” in any of her diaries.<sup>42</sup>

However, Maynard did comment about the event in her Diary. While her entry is scant, and makes little sense without her autobiographical account, it is clear that her concern at the time was not simply about religion. It was also about the fact that the committee, which included the Campbells, had not even considered her for the headship.

---

<sup>41</sup> *GB*, 10 December 1876, 120-27.

<sup>42</sup> *A*, IV, 27, “1876,” 162-64.

“L may see her ‘wildest dreams’ as ‘fulfilled’ as she is to be 1<sup>st</sup> teacher!” she noted. “But I feel bitterly disappointed not to have got the position.” It must have been galling to think that she was “simply expected to help L,” as she was doing at Cheltenham.<sup>43</sup>

Nonetheless, any thought of going home again was “unendurable,” Maynard explained in her Autobiography:

St. Andrews gave me thrills of happiness by comparison. I gained my parents consent, but I sensed their disappointment despite that it was St. Andrews. It was too far from Kent; they disapproved of my receiving a salary [£150 ]; and they disliked L’s intent to make it a secular school.<sup>44</sup>

Her Green-book entries about St. Andrews, which begin in December, evince her own misgivings:

How can I throw my heart into a direct contradiction of all I hold the most essential to education? What is the meaning of my training at Girton, of my long love of her, and of this strange coming to Cheltenham and warm invitation from a committee who already must know my opinions? Should I walk away from what will possibly be one of the best schools in the United Kingdom?<sup>45</sup>

Here again, we see evidence of Maynard’s ongoing struggle with ambition, passion and faith, as played out in her different records. Her Green-book revealed her attempts at resolving her religious dilemma by asserting her position of power. Aware that the committee “would not take L apart from [her],” she would only agree to teach at St. Leonards school, as it was to be named, when she was assured that religious

---

<sup>43</sup> *D*, 19 November 1876, 78.

<sup>44</sup> *A*, IV, 27, “1876,” 165-68

<sup>45</sup> *GB*, 31 December 1876, 127.

instruction would “be placed in [her] hands, with L as overseer.”<sup>46</sup> Nonetheless, the ensuing discussions with Lumsden reveal not only their serious differences about religion, but also the problems that faith created for Maynard when interconnected with ambition and passion. Lumsden was leery of her stark Atonement views and about her insistence on teaching from the Bible, which, L likely guessed, would ultimately lead to Maynard’s criticism of worldliness. L’s impassioned decree, “I do not want the girls to be made anxious about their souls. I will not endure it!” left Maynard recoiling from her vehemence and seeming distrust. She exclaimed, “L had to bring down all her love upon me, so sweet, so strong, so clinging, before I was appeased.” Even so, she “agreed to teach from the ‘secular’ text that Lumsden recommended.”<sup>47</sup>

Lumsden’s goal for St. Leonards clearly had a socio-economic basis. In *Yellow Leaves* she wrote:

There were difficulties facing Public Schools for girls in Scotland as the Scottish universities were closed to women. My intent was to change this and also undertake a crusade against the fashionable so-called finishing schools. Before compulsory education became established more in Scotland, one of the few women who headed schools declared, ‘the headmistress is going to be as extinct as the dodo.’ My aim, on the

---

<sup>46</sup> Ibid., 128. Upon arriving home from Cheltenham there was another letter from Fanny stating that she must be part of the St. Leonards package. As to whether she would have refused to go unless she was given Scripture is unclear. But she said that she “did not want to spoil L’s life” by not going.

<sup>47</sup> See Ibid., 25 January 1877, 154-57; and Ibid., 25 March 1877, 16. She refused to “tone down” her plans for teaching the Atonement three times. Louisa also wanted teaching taken from “the simple gospel’s” (probably published religious texts for young adults) and not from the Bible itself, as Constance wished. She also cautioned Constance against ethereal topics like revelation.

contrary, was to see women equal in granting with men as teachers.<sup>48</sup>

Probably to secure her power base, she invited Frances Dove to join them as a founding teacher in January. Maynard was clearly jealous of and very upset about this manoeuvre, and fumed over learning that Dove and others were to teach upper levels while she was designated elementary geography and arithmetic, “not subjects she cared about like Greek or science.”<sup>49</sup> Nor could she even teach Scripture to the upper levels, for Lumsden, probably to clip Maynard’s wings further, had invited another Cheltenham teacher, Kate Kinnear, to do this. Yet the venture was firmly in place, since all of St. Leonards shares were taken. Maynard set off with Lumsden and Dove for Scotland in late April as planned, to “look over the ‘Schoolhouse’ and settle each room use.” She found herself revelling in “the society,” despite herself:

I enjoyed the nightly grand dinner parties in which I was in great demand - and being courted and made much of by the small world there....I looked on with joy to see L - my love and my pride - appreciated and honoured at last. She was like a stately queen, and yet had the attributes of a man. Frances was making her presence felt as a powerful underwing organising the music curriculum.<sup>50</sup>

However, while her Diary voiced her “thrill” over the venture, and her Greenbook proclaimed, “I have made the right decision,”<sup>51</sup> the latter record still conveyed her concern with ambition and religion. She wrote of her irritation at being “somewhat

---

<sup>48</sup> Lumsden, *Yellow Leaves*, 61.

<sup>49</sup> *D*, 9 February 1877, 102.

<sup>50</sup> *GB*, 15 April 1877, 171.

<sup>51</sup> See, for example, *D*, 20 April 1877, 98; *D*, 30 April 1877, 100; *D*, 12 May 1877 105, and *GB*, 25 April 1877, 180.

manipulated” by Fanny, who, completely taken with Louisa, “designated any spade work [her] way.”<sup>52</sup> Religion created even more intense waves of “insecurity over [her] decision.” Cousin Mare’s counsel about this was apparently futile, and her sisters all gave her different advice—although all three encouraged her to teach from the Bible. Her parents, now aware of her conflict, also demanded “to know *why* she wanted to go. What was so urgent?” Constance did not really have an answer for anyone, since she herself verged between socio-economic and faith-based aims. “I fully believe in the need for good schools like [St. Leonards],” she noted, “and can think of nothing better than teaching children. Surely I can lead some of the girls to God?”<sup>53</sup>

Dora got closest to the heart of the situation. “I can not help feeling anxious about you altogether,” she wrote to Constance. “It is obvious that you are very much smitten with Miss. L, and it is so very like ‘marrying unbelief’ that it can be dangerous ground.”<sup>54</sup> Dora was possibly aware of her sister’s romantic attachment to Louisa, but her concern was probably more about Louisa’s agnosticism than anything else. Religious issues aside, life with Louisa had become emotionally trying for Constance all around. She was exhausted by the effort of comforting the capricious L over the “serious difficulties” of Elizabeth Welsh’s Girton appointment, Beale’s forcing a teacher’s resignation, and

---

<sup>52</sup> *GB*, 13 April 1877, 170. She did not elaborate on this except to point out how Fanny expected her, *not* Louisa, to promote the venture to difficult individuals like Mrs. Marsh, “whose approbation would be the very making of the school.”

<sup>53</sup> *Ibid.*, 9 - 12 April 1877, 159-61.

<sup>54</sup> *Ibid.*, 19 February 1877, 158.



“getting the girls through the ‘Group D’ examinations.”<sup>55</sup> However, when Louisa projected her frustration onto Constance through intense debate on topics like politics, she not only felt upset but also “outclassed in terms of intellect.” In fact most conversations about even minor work-related issues ended up causing controversy between them.<sup>56</sup>

A further and clearly troubling emotional problem for Constance was that Louisa had insisted upon their sharing the same bed after they had moved lodgings in November. One assumes that Louisa wanted more physical intimacy although she does not speak of this in *Yellow Leaves*, and Maynard’s Diary is silent and the Green-book vague about the matter. Firth’s brief coverage on Cheltenham also omitted this important detail, asserting instead that “the drudgery of corrections and elementary teaching” caused Constance’s largest frustration at Cheltenham.<sup>57</sup>

However, her sharing Louisa’s bed appears to have made Constance far more frustrated, as she “never felt off duty.” By July she felt so tense from such seemingly-incongruent intimacy owing to their religious differences, that she sought Frances’ advice, and Frances unfortunately seized upon Constance’s plight as an opportunity for revenge.

---

<sup>55</sup> Ibid., 25 March 1877, 173. The teacher was forced to resign after an argument with Beale. After Beale had held a meeting about the situation she received “rapturous letters of allegiance by all the teachers, except five,” including Constance, Louisa and Frances.

<sup>56</sup> Ibid., 20 April 1877, 78; Ibid 13 May 1877, 189.

<sup>57</sup> Firth, *Maynard*, 150. It is unclear as to whether their new lodgings only had one bedroom, or whether Louisa simply wanted them to sleep together. The fact that they shared a bed is not entirely unusual. Constance slept with Dora until she left for Girton, and friends staying at Oakfield usually shared a bed with either Constance or her sisters.

She repeated their conversation to Louisa, suggesting that Constance's religious-based confidences with 'unequals' like Ellie and Amy at Girton had far surpassed her present intimacy with Louisa.

Adding salt to the other wound, Frances told Lumsden about her own "anxiety over the religious teaching at St. Leonards in [Constance's] hands." The anger, tears and laments which followed, as conveyed in Maynard's Green-book, reveal the fragility yet intensity of this relationship:

I felt that the showering of caresses which followed were being given out of kindness - and this made them harder to bear than anything. It is no use *telling* me when the sun is shining on me. I have felt it, and *know* when it is. I can not stop crying wherever I am. It is not only for the love slipping away, but also from a sense of wrong and failure which is caused by my lack of courage and doubt of conviction. This is a hateful wrong and it is stifling me.<sup>58</sup>

In fact their relationship was creating such anxiety for Constance that she felt driven to consult her family physician. "He asked many questions," she wrote, "but I blamed overwork for my tiredness because I could not admit that L was draining life from me." Dr. Ker warned her "that the disease had spread throughout her whole constitution" and advised her get more sleep and not to over exert herself.<sup>59</sup>

It seems likely that the conflicts surrounding work, love and faith had brought Maynard dangerously close to what Victorians called neurasthenia by the late 1800s. Maynard was actually diagnosed with this shortly before retiring from Westfield in 1913 after suffering an outbreak of shingles. In *Fasting Girls*, Brumberg suggests that

---

<sup>58</sup> *GB*, 15 June 1877, 199-200.

<sup>59</sup> *Ibid.*, 6 May 1887, 176; *Ibid.*, 10 June 1887, 230.

neurasthenia incorporated so many symptoms “that it was useful as a catchall diagnosis” for middle-class conditions like general fatigue or anxiety.<sup>60</sup> Nonetheless, Maynard was always keen to distinguish neurasthenia from hysteria. As Showalter argues in *Female Malady* (1985) and Mark Micale in *Approaching Hysteria* (1995), neurasthenia was viewed as a more genteel, manageable female illness than hysteria. The latter was linked to madness and to degeneration, and therefore required more vigilant monitoring. While all these conditions were interconnected with class, hysteria, in particular, was firmly linked to gender norms and to the different natures of man and woman.<sup>61</sup>

In *The History of Sexuality*, Foucault emphasizes how the first half of the nineteenth-century brought the “hysterization” of women.<sup>62</sup> Thus, conditions like neurasthenia, hysteria and anorexia nervosa, Showalter, Micale and others argue, were seen to impact sexual behaviour after the development of sexology. The realisation that women, like men, had sexual desires, meant that women’s behaviour became increasingly scrutinized and classified. Distinctions were made between “abnormal” or “excessive”

---

<sup>60</sup> Brumberg, *Fasting Girls*, 320; also Porter and Hall, *Facts of Life*, 77; and Mason, *Victorian Attitudes*, 78.

<sup>61</sup> Showalter, *Female Malady*, 1-20, 51-57; Micale, *Approaching Hysteria*, 70-77. See also Janet Oppenheim, *Shattered Nerves: Doctors, Patients, and Depression in Victorian England* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1991) and Edward Shorter, *From Paralysis to Fatigue: A History of Psychosomatic Illness in the Modern Era* (New York: Free Press, 1994). For historical links to women, the body and irrationality see Bynum, *Holy Feast* and Mack, *Visionary Women*.

<sup>62</sup> Foucault, *History of Sexuality*, 3-36. See also Michael Mason, *The Making of Victorian Sexuality* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1994), and John Maynard, *Victorian Discourses on Sexuality and Religion* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993).

sexual urges as sexologists sought to spell out the more physiological aspects of sexuality.<sup>63</sup> In fact sexuality became so suspect, Doan suggests in *Sexology in Culture*, “that a term like invert could refer to *any* sort of sexual act between females, without regard to the fine distinctions advanced by sexologists like Havelock Ellis.”<sup>64</sup> However, it is important to remember that even in the 1920s, when Freud’s ideas about psychosexual development were taking hold, female sexual inversion as a coherent sexological construction still did not exist within legal discourse.

Maynard’s diaries suggest the complications surrounding Victorian gender and sex. In June 1877, she wrote in her Green-book:

When folded close I can not respond to her [Louisa’s] ongoing endearment, ‘now I am satisfied, now I am quite happy.’ The nearer she expresses the full grandeur of her woman’s nature, the more fearfully I feel the blank and the dissatisfaction. I pretend to sleep, and lie awake for hours without strength for prayer in a dumb conflict of feeling.<sup>65</sup>

Maynard believed, according to her Autobiography written in 1925, that her struggle had stemmed from Lumsden’s “overpowering personality,” coupled with her own suppressed longing to lead Lumsden to God, and that her resultant broken sleep “laid the foundation

---

<sup>63</sup> John Haller and Robin Haller, *The Physician and Sexuality in Victorian America* (Illinois: Urbana, 1974), 39. Showalter, *Female Malady*, 120-24; Micale, *Approaching Hysteria*, 3-19. See also Oppenheim, *Shattered Nerves* and Jackson, *Real Facts of Life*.

<sup>64</sup> Bland and Doan, eds., *Sexology in Culture*, 211. See also Fletcher, *Gender, Sex and Subordination*, and Frank Mort, *Dangerous Sexualities: Medico-moral Politics in England since 1830* (London: Routledge, 1987).

<sup>65</sup> GB, 3 June 1877, 195.

of the insomnia that persisted throughout her life.”<sup>66</sup> Certainly, her angst was caused by her self-enforced passivity under Lumsden. However, another Green-book entry written in 1877 implied that her insomnia also stemmed from her repression of physical desire:

If I slept with her, if I touched her the least bit, I was kept awake, as by an electric thrill, all through the short summer night, catching only the slightest snatches of sleep til the red sunlight lay in streaks on the wall.<sup>67</sup>

Did Maynard, then, view her physically-based desire as wrong in 1877? Did the entry imply her tension following from a lover’s quarrel? Or was she resisting Lumsden emotionally because Lumsden pushed God away? It seems likely that it was a combination of all three. Ambition versus passion as they were set within the context of faith had converged within a single, uneasy relationship for Maynard owing to her love’s nature and beliefs. Even a decade later she had no language with which to understand her deep emotional struggles: “L’s physical power over me was so painful that I think she could have kept me awake til I died of it, so intense so unsparing was it.”<sup>68</sup>

Chauncey has written, “We must be careful not to attribute inordinate power to ideology as an autonomous social force.”<sup>69</sup> To this I would add that we should not label our past subjects with our own sexual definitions. When lamenting Louisa’s “attempts to destroy [her] faltering faith,” Maynard also told the reader in her Autobiography, “but my decision about my future never *really* wavered because the single argument of my heart

---

<sup>66</sup> A, IV, 27, “1876,” 225-26.

<sup>67</sup> GB, 31 December 1877, 217.

<sup>68</sup> Ibid., 3 May 1883, 70.

<sup>69</sup> Chauncey, “From Sexual Inversion,” 112.

was L”:

She [L], in a voice, which, to me, was unending music, sometimes read them [Scottish love ballads] to me in an evening. There were tales of maidens who risked life and reputation to follow their lords in a page’s dress; and there were others who held fast to their loves through dire transformations. As she read I felt that was the way I laboured for her, and was content to do it. If the blessing is given, I can think of nothing sweeter than our living together amid our children.<sup>70</sup>

Maynard’s utilization of the Scottish love ballad as analogous to her love for Lumsden is interesting here. It not only implies her subversion of gender, but also, I would suggest, reflects how she creatively put together the fragmentary cultural materials available to her in order to understand her feelings for Lumsden as best she could.<sup>71</sup>

When Lumsden took it upon herself to leave Cheltenham before the end of term Maynard could not but help follow, despite feeling guilty about leaving the rest of the staff “toiling through a whole fortnight longer.”<sup>72</sup> When Elizabeth Welsh “prognosticated strife for St. Leonards because of their different characters,” Maynard refused to listen even though Welsh pointed out the success of girls’ schools under Christian headmistresses like Buss, Metcalfe, Hadland and Umphelby. In September, she set off for the beautiful St. Andrews in great hope of embracing “the white clear air, the glorious

---

<sup>70</sup> A, IV, 27, “1876,” 181.

<sup>71</sup> In *The Practice of Love: Lesbian Sexuality and Perverse Desire* (London: Bloomington, 1994), 308, Teresa de Lauretis explains that individuals absorb “external representations” and then “rework the fantasy in their internal world” of the self.

<sup>72</sup> D, 8 July 1877, 189. L left because “she felt grumpy thinking about nothing except the examinations.” Constance seemed to try and appease her guilt here by pointing out that although they spent an exciting afternoon in London choosing “high art furniture” for their rooms, she also spent £100 of her teaching salary from Cheltenham on school supplies for St. Leonards like boards, easels, paper and pencils.

blue and the lonely coast and ridges of dark Hills” with the second of her poetic, worldly lovers.<sup>73</sup>

.....

Maynard’s first year at St. Leonards was tinged by problems similar to those at Cheltenham. She was pleased to oversee art and gymnastics for the entire school but still felt “put upon” at having to teach elementary geography and arithmetic simply because Lumsden and Dove “wished it,” and “no other mistress would take them.” She also felt frustrated at having to read scripturally-based “story books of a secular character” to the lower forms.<sup>74</sup> In short, it was difficult “to swallow [her] pride and take [her] position in third place.” Yet all in all, her professional life was relatively trouble free and she was caught up in the excitement of the new venture:

Carpenters were still working but the ‘Schoolhouse’ was fresh and pretty and everyone was bursting with energy. I was asked to do the printing as no-one else knew the technique. I made copies of the timetable, which Frances had made, and I printed names on pegs and boot-boxes for the students.<sup>75</sup>

The other members of staff, Madame Bondet, Miss Comyns, Fraulein Frieda, Miss Young and Kate Kinnear seemed “pleasant” although none is mentioned at length over these years. She received a particularly warm welcoming from the Campbells, who do not

---

<sup>73</sup> *A*, V, 32, “My 3 years at St. Andrews, 1877-80,” 239; *GB*, 28 July 1877, 175.

<sup>74</sup> *GB*, 7 October 1877; *GB* 14 October 1877, 239-42. Constance argued that such texts had “no real approach to the Bible.”

<sup>75</sup> *Ibid.*, 27 October 1877, 235. She used “an electric pen, which made frantic buzzing.”

really feature in her diaries either. It is noteworthy that she rarely mentioned Lewis.

Lumsden began with what became the “calling over” of the forty-nine students including ten boarders, who wrote examination papers in order to be “classified.” This was difficult in the early years with students’ differing attainments, and their ages ranging from about ten to seventeen. The “settling in,” which involved planning lessons, walks, games and drills, was also difficult. “We struggled to appear organized even although we weren’t,” Maynard noted in her Diary. But by the end of October a routine had been established. They rose at 6:30 a.m. for breakfast and hymns followed at 7:30 a.m. School began for all students at 9:00 a.m. and broke for lunch between 12:00 p.m. - 1:00 p.m. Classes ended at 3:30 p.m. Tea at 5:30 p.m. and supper at 8:30 p.m. was provided for the boarders.<sup>76</sup>

Constance lived in the Schoolhouse with Louisa, Frances and Kate. As Louisa had explained, this would be the arrangement until enrollment grew and boarding houses were established. But it was understood that “L would take the first House.” One assumes that the professional milieu, coupled with Louisa’s new position, caused the modification of her former domestic arrangement with Constance since they now slept separately. Constance claimed that much as she missed having “all of L’s wonderful love to [her]self,” she “felt healthier now that [they] were more apart.”<sup>77</sup> She also comforted herself by asserting that “L indulged [her] in comparison to Frances, who was vital to the school and yet underappreciated”:

---

<sup>76</sup> *D*, 12 October 1887, 99.

<sup>77</sup> *GB*, 25 May 1877, 260; *D*, 30 October 1877, 189; *D*, 21 June 1877, 67.



L tells me that she can not do without me, yet it is Frances who is everything to L. She superintends the work in every department. I don't begrudge Frances this because she has invested herself in the school in a way that I have not, and so she deserves the reward.<sup>78</sup>

Constance referred to herself positively at first, and then negatively, as the "school ornament" who was afforded the privileges of staying overnight at The Scores, or taking the boarders for sunset walks. Although her classes were gruelling, her Bible classes proved as rewarding as the G. P. M. letters. But far beyond everything were the stolen moments with "L, like her nightly goodnight kiss, which made everything worthwhile."<sup>79</sup>

Largely satisfied with her professional and personal life, Maynard's first year was marked by two events outside St. Leonards: Dr. James Robertson's marriage proposal and the death of her mother. Both *Autobiography* and *Green-book* tell how the former, a Scottish minister, came into her life. She first met him at a dinner party at the Campbells in April 1877. They had spoken at length and she had enjoyed talking to him about her aims and successes like the Girton Prayer Meeting. After she had returned to London he wrote her a letter indicating his interest in her: "I did not know that the world contained any creature to make me thrill with alternative respect and sense of womanly charm. You are indeed my ideal; so bright, warm and living."<sup>80</sup> However, Maynard sensed that he saw her more as "a splendid accession" for the private sphere as opposed to an equal.<sup>81</sup> He

---

<sup>78</sup> *GB*, 9 January 1878, 7-10.

<sup>79</sup> *Ibid.*, 6 January 1877, 2-5.

<sup>80</sup> *A*, V, "1877," 240-241; *GB*, 11 April 1877, 182-185.

<sup>81</sup> Separate sphere ideals were discussed in chapters one and two. See, for example, Gorham, *The Victorian Girl*, 1-37 and Tosh, *Man's Place*, 56-78; also Barbara

dwelled at length on her benefit to *him* as his wife, and did not appear to have any interest in her pursuit of a career.<sup>82</sup> Added to that, she was not attracted to him. So she quickly sent a reply stating:

From my heart I respect you; but these feelings, however strongly admitted, will not stand in place of love, and I cannot with truth say that I return your affection in the way you desire....If I have caused you any pain it will grieve my very heart; and I shall find it hard to forgive myself for [anything] I have unwittingly done. I hope to be your friend and should we ever meet in St. Andrews...<sup>83</sup>

Robertson responded by saying that her reply “was very much what he would have guessed,” and he ended by asking if “he could write to her in the future, as many things in her letter interested him.”<sup>84</sup>

When Constance told her father about the incident, he commented that “a man like that is rare indeed.” However her mother felt very differently. Firmly against the relationship, she “drew pictures of poverty in a manse, loss in position, distance from her and an unsuitable life in general.” Gazy, on the other hand, advised Constance to give Robertson’s offer some consideration: “From what I have seen so far, he is the one man I

---

Caine, *Destined To Be Wives* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1986). See Patricia Anderson, *When Passion Reigns* (New York: Basic Books, 1995), and Stearns “Boys, Girls, and Emotions,” 50, for discussion on Victorian romantic love.

<sup>82</sup> *GB*, 18 May 1877, 192. She transcribed most of Robertson’s letters in her Green-book, and also the letters from family like Do and Tissy regarding her relationship with him. Robertson does appear to have concentrated on his own needs rather than hers. He spoke of his life in great detail, mentioning such things as his small income, his manse, his friends and aging neighbourhood. See also Firth, *Maynard*, 152-54.

<sup>83</sup> *GB*, 23 April 1877, 178-79.

<sup>84</sup> *Ibid.*, 3 May 1877, 187.

have heard of more than anyone else. It could be years before you meet someone like him again.” Constance, however, did not think of Robertson as an optional escape route from a possibly “lonely and weary future.” Her family had “missed the central point.” She did not think that she loved him. Moreover, if she married, she knew that she would only come to “feel regret over having cast away a treasure more precious than [her] own life.” As her husband, he would not encourage her personal goals. She would be forced into a life of domesticity with its accompanying gendered norms.<sup>85</sup>

Of course Louisa also played a part in Constance’s decision. The latter’s fervent, “Don’t let anyone take me from you unless I want to go with all my heart,” had evinced the response from Louisa that she wanted. While she had “surmised that [Constance] probably saw being married to a minister as honourable,” her impassioned outburst about her “pain and suffering,” ending with her plea, “What *shall* I do without you?” made clear to Constance that Louisa feared losing “the woman she loved.” Robertson continued to pursue her, writing letters about his feelings of “emptiness, conflict or sadness.” Although her mind seemed set, the fact that she heeded to Gazy’s advice, and did not rigorously dissuade him, implied not only her own uncertainty about her future, but perhaps also the pervading power of the separate spheres doctrine.<sup>86</sup>

However, Constance was more concerned during the winter months of 1877 and 1878 about her mother’s health. Since late November Constance had been receiving

---

<sup>85</sup> Ibid., 6 May 1877, 188.

<sup>86</sup> Ibid., 27 May 1877, 194-95. In fact she continued to write to him on a fairly regular basis. See Firth, *Maynard*, 155-56. See also Vickery, “Golden Age,” 390-414 and Howarth, “Gender, domesticity,” 174, on the tenacity of the spheres doctrine.

“upsetting letters from home” stating that Louisa was seriously ill. Upon returning home for Christmas, she was shocked to see how much weaker her mother had become. Dora had taken a leave of absence, “setting in for a winter of it with our patient yet odd, difficult mother,” Constance wrote. Nonetheless, Louisa, with telling foresight, was trying to consider her daughters’ future. While initially refusing Gazy’s wish to counsel soldiers in a nursing home in Aldershot, “she suddenly changed her mind.” She also encouraged Constance to return to St. Andrews. Constance’s decision to leave was determined after Connie Herschel, who had now graduated from Girton, refused to take over her work at St. Leonards.<sup>87</sup>

The following weeks proved stressful. A letter from Robertson spoke of his intended visit St. Andrews to preach, and this was followed by one from Tissy stating, “there is little hope now. Mother has developed new problems in her lungs.” Constance was “summoned home” by her father on January 19<sup>th</sup> to face a traumatic home milieu. During “bad times [her] mother was quite delusional, ranting remorse that no-one knew about or understood.”<sup>88</sup> Thus, during one of her “good periods” Constance quickly secured her consent about any future decisions regarding marriage or career, and then escaped the dreary, tense atmosphere by using a batch of “woeful” letters from both

---

<sup>87</sup> *GB*, 25 November 1877, 220; *GB*, 19 December 1877, 259. Aldershot was near London. Gazy adopted a philanthropy role, caring for wounds and offering religious advice. Her parents had refused her request in 1876 because they “had wanted her to lead a pleasant life.”

<sup>88</sup> See *Ibid.*, 9 February 1878, 8. She explained here that her mother was convinced that God was going to take her at midnight that day (Sunday). She insisted that they all “gather around her bed for a last goodbye.” The family gathered but her mother did not die at this time, but hung on in painful suffering for another three weeks.

students and Fanny Campbell as an excuse.<sup>89</sup> Her exit from Oakfield proved untimely. Her mother died a week later on February 27<sup>th</sup>, and she found herself once again heading back home, this time for the funeral. Her mother was buried on March 2<sup>nd</sup>:

Her wish was to be carried...by her six man servants...along the church path in a little hand hearse - like the poor; and to be followed by father and Tissy, Gertie and Harry, Gazy and Do, George and myself, and then all of the servants. Most of the villagers came to the service given by Mr. Howlett [the close family friend.] Then everyone assembled in the churchyard to sing 'the strife is o'er' around the open grave. The day ended with us all holding each other and weeping at home.<sup>90</sup>

So ended Constance's relationship with her strange and complicated mother. Yet just as guilt over leaving always haunted her, so her mother's fixed Principle remained within her consciousness. Watching her mother's suffering had also led Constance to contemplate her own mortality and the futility of life without love. "It is nothing, nothing, except the most empty of miserable forms," she wrote in her Green-book.<sup>91</sup> Henceforth, she would follow her heart, whether in passion or in aim, and whatever the consequences.

Maynard attempted to enact her ideals shortly after returning to St. Leonards.

Robertson had arrived as planned on March 19<sup>th</sup>, and requested that they meet immediately. As usual, the topic of conversation centered on him and his feelings for her:

...at 41, he looked quite pale and older than last spring. He was quiet and gentle, and everything he said only added to my respect and sorrow. Yet I could not give him anymore. I covered my face with my hands while he

---

<sup>89</sup> Ibid., 10 February 1878, 32; Ibid., 17 February 1878, 35. Louisa was able to write letters, "divide up her jewels," and set aside "little portions of money for the poor."

<sup>90</sup> Ibid., 2 March 1878, 48.

<sup>91</sup> Ibid., 29 February 1878, 45.

spoke of his love, value and respect for me. He was upset and leant against L's desk covering his face in silent prayer. I did the same. I almost wished I could love him, and yet when I put my hands on my knee and he touched one of them, I quickly placed them behind my back.<sup>92</sup>

"I know that I can not submit because a voice just says 'no,'" she asserted in her Green-book. "When he wrote a few days later, speaking of his 'ardent love of me,' I answered immediately and decisively. 'I deeply honour and truly sympathize with you but I can not accept you on this ground as I will do you a great wrong.'" Yet *still* not wishing to burn her domestic bridges, she ended by explaining that she was not saying that she "could *never* love him, but was reacting on present guidance."<sup>93</sup>

Louisa and Tissy were her main confidantes on the matter, but Constance did not record their conversations. However, her notation about Louisa's teasing remark, "I believe if I were he I could win you yet!" signified, once again, the crux of the matter for Constance. "Let him speak and look as *L* does, and every disadvantage would be outweighed, and I would be his forever." Her heart belonged to 'L', and as long as *she* wanted her "by her side" no man could ever lure her away. Her contemplation of this, which she believed had impelled her to chose between work and marriage, made her feel "free somehow."<sup>94</sup>

When Louisa invited her to Glenbogie during Easter, Constance joyously

---

<sup>92</sup> Ibid., 19 March 1878, 55.

<sup>93</sup> Ibid., 24 March 1878, 60-63.

<sup>94</sup> Ibid., 20 March 1878, 57.

accepted.<sup>95</sup> This trip is of note, according to the Green-book at least, because it signified the height of their passion. In fact this was probably the closest that both women came to discussing their emotional commitment towards each other and the depth and nature of their relationship:

We spent hours together during the day, taking long walks or pony riding. L is at her very best on these expeditions. She loves to hear me speak on subjects like geology - of which *she* knows nothing. But I like the nights better when we fold close, Ah! so close. Such times are sweetness beyond words; and I feel she feels it too. Last night she said, 'why am I still happy when we feud? In several ways we do not suit, but I am so happy!'"<sup>96</sup>

Louisa apparently admitted to Constance, "You make me happier than anyone else I know. I do not want to analyse my feelings. I only wish I was a man."<sup>97</sup> As noted in chapters one, three and five, Victorian discourses left them to conceptualize their feelings within the construct of a traditional family and romantic friendship. The term "lesbian" did not yet exist as a sexual category, and according to the Green-book, Louisa refused to understand their mutual desire within the context of faith. Gender, as such, probably had more to do with cultural values than with biology, even though Louisa may have been

---

<sup>95</sup> Frances claimed that Louisa had initially invited *her*. Her sad lament, "You get given to you - without asking - what I may never get!" had low impact. Constance left with Louisa as planned. She may have felt guilty, but she explained it away "as a misunderstanding" in her Green-book. Louisa claimed to have "invited Frances weeks ago [when Constance was away] but was refused." See *GB*, 27 March 1878, 67.

<sup>96</sup> *Ibid.*, 21 April 1878, 75; *A*, V, 34, "My third and fourth terms, 1878," 314. The implication here is that they shared the same bed at night. This, once again, suggests that it was a culturally acceptable activity. One assumes that Louisa's mother did not object to their behaviour, despite the fact that there were likely spare bedrooms.

<sup>97</sup> *GB*, 22 April 1878, 78. Again, Lumsden does not mention this aspect of her personality in *Yellow Leaves*, 74. But when speaking of her life at St. Leonards and beyond she does state, "Friendships were an extremely important thing in my life."

referring to male anatomy here. On some level they both seemed to understand their desire as same-sex, and both appeared to gain some level of self-definition and self-satisfaction from subverting gender-based norms. Anthony Giddens's commentary on human relationships in his *Transformation of Intimacy* is helpful here:

What we have is a strong tendency towards relationships based upon emotional communication rather than institutionally given gender roles - in relations between men and women, between same sex partners, and also between parents and children.<sup>98</sup>

Constance prayed that Arran promised a future relationship of intimate bliss and equality, set within a perfect balance of aim and faith.

However, their stay at Arran marked not only the height of their relationship, but also the beginning of its decline. Maynard noted in her Autobiography, "Staying there was pleasurable because it was like the better days of Cheltenham, but the old difficulties resumed once we returned to St. Leonards." She met Lumsden's withdrawal and denigration when she "failed; but all this was rectified when [she] did good work."<sup>99</sup> The battle within this kaleidoscope of emotions proved impossible for both women. Their ongoing disagreements over teaching methods and religion, as well as Maynard's growing intolerance of Lumsden's stress-related mood swings, led each to withdraw from their tumultuous relationship.

The fact that Maynard acceded to Lumsden did not mean that she was comfortable with the self-effacing "feminine" role that Lumsden expected her to adopt. As noted, the

---

<sup>98</sup> Anthony Giddens, *The Transformation of Intimacy* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 1992), 99.

<sup>99</sup> *A*, V, 34 "1877," 342.



refusal of Robertson symbolized to Maynard her refusal of domesticity. She would later refer to the incident as her “escape from bondage.”<sup>100</sup> As Fanny Campbell pointed out:

I hardly think you realize the importance that you have in the school. You must know that there is no-one that can take your place in the house, however good a teacher we could find, and over and over again I hear from many different quarters how people are longing for your influence back.<sup>101</sup>

Constance felt “this was true. My heart had overflowed when L praised my nice rapport with the girls,” she wrote, adding, “because both she and Frances were insufficient in that skill, I was needed to counsel the girls and sort out their disputes.” However, Constance also admitted that Louisa had warned her that her being “a friend” to students meant that she “had made herself essentially one of them....[She] did not have enough control in the gym; and [her] physical geography classes were too loud and disruptive.”<sup>102</sup> Constance would eventually formulate a technique for discipline when Mistress of Westfield. However, she never overcame her reluctance to use authority openly and this remained a problem for her at St. Leonards and at Westfield.

Nonetheless, Maynard remained convinced that her aim for “liberty within” based upon her artistic nature influencing her professional teaching, reaped more gains than Lumsden’s and Dove’s assertive, hierarchical approach. “I do not want to stand on high and call others to come to me,” she angrily wrote in her Green-book. “I would rather go down exactly to where each one is to give them help of a step or two at least. *L never sees*

---

<sup>100</sup> Ibid., 343.

<sup>101</sup> *GB*, 22 April 1878, 80.

<sup>102</sup> Ibid., 10 January 1878, 6; *A*, V, 32, “1877,” 294-97; Constance apparently helped to avert a potentially volatile disagreement between two school girls.

the true nature of the girls as I do because of her character and position.”<sup>103</sup> One sees evidence of Maynard’s success at motivating her students’ talents in an advanced drawing class. She inspired the gifted Ethel Andrews who, in turn, “helped raise the level of the whole class.” Maynard was then able to introduce more advanced techniques like “painting in Chinese white on blue linen” or still life, which involved “persuad[ing] local people to donate flowers from the Conservatory.”<sup>104</sup>

Despite professional differences among Lumsden, Maynard and Dove, St. Leonards’ enrollment steadily grew under all three women’s capable and creative hands. Conceived as model societies, these new girls’ public schools moved beyond familial metaphors towards public sphere analogues that emphasized “loyalty and public spirit” in lieu of godliness and gentility through character-building. As Vicinus points out in *Independent Women*, St. Leonards was modelled more closely on the boys’ public system than the houses at Cheltenham. Educators like Lumsden, Maynard and Dove adopted the roles of both father and mother. For example, while Lumsden did not intend to ignore feminine accomplishments like music and art, she was also committed to introducing her students to demanding academic subjects like Latin and Greek, and to regular examinations. Even so, while embodying the leadership qualities formally belonging to a man, Lumsden and more particularly Maynard became the wise, nurturing mother in their “House”. The division between the public and private was retained, while it also was

---

<sup>103</sup> *GB*, 14 October 1878, 242.

<sup>104</sup> See *D*, 10 May 1877, 78; and *D*, 12 October 1877, 89.

altered.<sup>105</sup> As Sara Burstall explained it, “Parents have to realise that the [female] teacher is an expert professional and is entitled therefore to the deference shown to the skilled professional opinion of the doctor, lawyer or architect.”<sup>106</sup>

By October 1878, the ‘Schoolhouse’ had already undergone powerful new modifications under Frances’ adept administration. From allocation of space, to rules and duties, each member of the St. Leonards community knew her role from teaching and playground duty to overseeing “K,” the room allocated as the girls’ sitting-room for evening social activities like cocoa parties.<sup>107</sup> When examining Maynard’s Diary, one gets an impression of her growing capabilities in her professional life. By 1879, she had been allocated upper level forms V and VI for physics, geography and geology. Excited about inaugurating the last, she had researched the subject thoroughly, seeking the advice of scholars like Drs. Mactier and Nicholson about local rocks and stones. She “began a stone collection,” taking interested students on long walks to find mica, shale and different kinds of granite. She organized interesting projects, which included the making of crystals

---

<sup>105</sup> Vicinus, *Independent Women*, 169, 187-88. See also McCrone, *Playing the Game*, 70-73; Pederson, “Schoolmistresses and Headmistresses,” 149; Zimmern, *Renaissance*, 156, Hunt, *Lessons for Life*, 99; and Price and Glenday, *Reluctant Revolutionaries*, 23.

<sup>106</sup> Burstall, *Retrospect and Prospect*, 161. See also her *High Schools for Girls*.

<sup>107</sup> See GB, 16 October 1878, 233-34; and Zimmern, *Renaissance*, 157. Other information about St. Leonards development derived from Lumsden, *Yellow Leaves*, 76-81; Jane Frances Dove, *Work and Play in Girls’ Schools* (London: Hodder, 1901); Julia M. Grant, Katherine McCutcheon and Ethel Saunders, eds., *St. Leonards School 1877-1927* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1927) and Macaulay, ed., *St. Leonards School*, 78-90. For more discussion on the new girls’ public schools see Pederson, “Schoolmistresses and Headmistresses,” 149; Price and Glenday, *Reluctant Revolutionaries*, 34; Burstall, *Retrospect* and Faithfull, *How Shall I Educate*.

as she had learned long before from her esteemed neighbour, John Herschel. By the time she left St. Leonards, she could look back with pride on some of the end-of-term exam papers written by her geography students.<sup>108</sup>

Although Maynard's gymnastics classes were sometimes "out of control," they were largely successful because of her own athletic ability. Her students soon donned official gym uniforms, and her interest in sports inspired her to introduce extra curricular activities like rackets, tennis and cricket. In fact during the summer months the hours spent out on the playground organizing matches and games left her "little time to go to The Scores or anywhere else." Bathing in the North Sea also came under her charge after Lumsden discovered that no other staff member could swim. A huge responsibility given the rough seas, she often tied rope around students' waists to ensure they would not drown, even though one nearly did. Despite this, swimming became as important as other sports in terms of self-achievement.<sup>109</sup> As McCrone argues, college women's seriousness about sports symbolized their moves towards liberation. Their appropriation of "male" models of competitive sports was another means of transforming attitudes towards women's capabilities.<sup>110</sup> Maynard organized St. Leonards' first athletic sports day in July

---

<sup>108</sup> *D*, 30 March 1878, 99; *D*, 5 October 1879, 120. She made a strong solution out of alum, sulphur, copper, ferro, cyanide of potassium, and set it on thin saucers to evaporate. The little crystals formed and were turned over with a darning needle every day. Although she found it "painstaking work, the girls were charmed with a present of these odd diamonds."

<sup>109</sup> *Ibid.*, 19 July 1878, 134; *Ibid.*, 7 October 1878, 167; also Dove, *Work and Play*, 78; Lumsden, *Yellow Leaves*, 67.

<sup>110</sup> McCrone, "Emancipation or Recreation?", 225.

1879. A “little tent was set up in the playground for ices and cakes, and at 3 p.m., the entire school watched races, high jump, long jump, and bar exercises.”<sup>111</sup>

Maynard’s artistic talent perhaps gained her the most attention. In 1878, she modified advanced drawing by setting up the large “array of large easels” in the Hall as opposed to a smaller classroom. She also introduced “perspective” drawing to her advanced class. Students were taken on field trips to draw landscapes or cathedral ruins to improve their understanding of perspective and negative space, similarly to what the younger Constance had done when she had sketched the figure of “Aaron” at Oakfield. By 1879, she was drawing flowers and animals alongside her advanced students, and she gave demonstrations on the figure in clay.<sup>112</sup> Her end-of-term exhibition that year gained her the recognition that she craved. She decorated the Hall with plants, and hung over seventy pencil drawings including her own. She was pleased that the reception was well attended:

The evening began at 6:00 and went on with great spirit until 9 p.m. There were 70 girls dancing and I finally got the courage to try as well. I danced with a good many of the girls who were all so pleasant and happy.<sup>113</sup>

She was even more thrilled by Louisa’s pride, and by Peter Guthrie Tait’s public commendation of her talent as both artist and educator.<sup>114</sup>

---

<sup>111</sup> *D*, 9 June 1879, 269.

<sup>112</sup> *Ibid.*, 17 May 1879, 178. Tait, Chair of St. Leonards’ founding committee, was Professor of Philosophy at Edinburgh and author of *The Unseen Universe*.

<sup>113</sup> *Ibid.*, 29 July 1879, 149.

<sup>114</sup> *Ibid.*, 150.

When schedule changes freed up her afternoons Constance could attend some university lectures. While she continued her love/hate interest in secular subjects like Utilitarianism, she took great pains to keep updated on the latest writing and approach to teaching subjects like geography. Another advantage of living in a university town was the accessibility of individuals like Arch Forbes, the war correspondent of the *Daily News*, who spoke about the Zulu War. Much to Constance's delight, of course, "the girls came back in raptures about military ardour and patriotism." While old values held fast, she tried to relinquish others by allowing herself to become "as intoxicated" with romance novels and drama "as *anyone*." She initiated the first school play, Shakespeare's *Twelfth Night*, and she "invited everyone" to the opening night:

What is to be done with pleasure if one cannot go near it without feeling its spell. Curiously enough, this time it does not seem to be in any way weakening. The careful training that opens our eyes for ever to the whole world of acting, the openness that must help to rid me of this miserable self consciousness. This seems to me to be a real gain.<sup>115</sup>

Becoming less afraid to become involved in St. Leonards social evenings, like the "Fancy Ball," she "was as excited as the girls about choosing" fancy dress and joining in the dancing and other activities of the "noisy happy evenings."<sup>116</sup>

However, although Maynard's Diary evokes her embracing of a busy social and academic life in her later years at St. Leonards, her Green-book alludes to her underlying uncertainty and pain, which as ever were caused by Lumsden. Her off and on criticism of

---

<sup>115</sup> See *GB*, 18 March 1879, 98; *GB*, 14 March 1879, 253; and *D*, 19 January 1879, 89; *D*, 1 February 1879, 99.

<sup>116</sup> *D*, 27 March 1879, 100. Apparently, a routine had been established whereby the teachers would dress up and be cheered by students as they entered the room.

Maynard's teaching approach, with vague accusations about her "carelessness," like "letting the fires go out," left Maynard vulnerable and in frequent tears over what she interpreted as "L's set look of disapproval."<sup>117</sup> Moreover, Lumsden's temper tantrums, according to Maynard, were becoming both intolerable and embarrassing. L's behaviour during a serious diphtheria outbreak in November of 1879 was a case in point:

My own throat was bad, but I was assured by Dr. Moir that it was not the real thing and so I continued to teach although talking was painful. L had similar symptoms and yet she stayed in bed for about 20 days, leaving us to get through. So we gave a holiday and encouraged the Edinburgh girls to go home and got through as best as we could. We did manage, but when L came down she seemed annoyed with us all; and for the first time, I felt angry at her injustice. She turned on the Staff, doctors, the Council, the parents, declaring us all inadequate, foolish and meddling. She even abused Fanny [Campbell], her unshakeable friend.<sup>118</sup>

Since 1878, Maynard had gone through torturous indecisions about whether she should stay or leave St. Leonards. She knew she was unhappy because of what we would call today an unequal, abusive relationship, and she was tiring of Lumsden's moodiness. However, as mentioned above, Lumsden only had to tell her that she "*wanted* her to remain," and Maynard was more than willing to reject Robertson and, more importantly, to ignore the constant "murmuring" from her family that included negotiating term by term. While she could justify her work in any case, she would never admit that her wish to remain largely centred on Lumsden: "Why does she [L] have such power over me? I don't feel about anybody else the way I feel about her, yet it accompanies a fear at times

---

<sup>117</sup> See *GB*, 6 May 1878, 56; *D*, 23 March 1879, 55; *A*, V, 35, "1880," 294-97.

<sup>118</sup> *GB*, 5 October 1879, 155; *A*, V, 34, "1879," 250. Written in 1919.

which reaches a sort of power of paralysing intensity.”<sup>119</sup>

Nonetheless, her knowledge that Lumsden wanted her at St. Leonards did not ultimately satisfy Maynard’s emotional needs. “I *finally* told her about my loneliness,” she noted in her Green-book in October of 1878, “and she suggested that I invite two or three girls to my room in the evenings. Their bright young faces round my hearth were quite enough....”<sup>120</sup> Such times, while pleasant, were not nearly enough. Even though she asserted in her Green-book that she felt “better and happier *by far* without L,”<sup>121</sup> she admitted in her Autobiography, “my heart was lonely and hungry beyond words. L had really failed me.” Besides treating Maynard cruelly at times, Lumsden had apparently developed a social life beyond her. They were seldom together. Since “there was no-one on the Staff to whom [Maynard] was attracted,” she turned, perhaps not surprisingly, to her students to meet her needs:

It was here that I thought I found a little quiet outlet of which I need tell no one. After all, even as Edward Irving has said: ‘Unless we obey instantly in every way, we never get those minute insights, such as a guidance to turn our life from grey uniformity into an inexpressible sweetness.’<sup>122</sup>

Notwithstanding, this dubious justification steeped in religious metaphor is an example of how Maynard was continuing to exonerate desire within the context of faith.

The first “girl” Maynard “fell in love with” was eighteen-year-old Katherine

---

<sup>119</sup> *GB*, 31 December 1878, 67.

<sup>120</sup> *Ibid.*, 27 October 1878, 145.

<sup>121</sup> See *Ibid.*, 30 November 1878, 33; *Ibid.*, 3 March 1879, 47.

<sup>122</sup> *A*, V, 34, “1878,” 315. Besides Fanny, it is unclear with whom Louisa socialized.



Milligan. Her records imply their mild flirtations that, one assumes, echoed the culturally accepted raves. Her love for Mary Guthrie Tait, the sixteen-year-old daughter of John Guthrie Tait, was “not quite as wholesome” according to the Autobiography.<sup>123</sup> As Maynard’s Scripture pupil, and head House girl, they were in close contact from the outset of the October Term of 1879. Maynard soon found herself responding to Tait’s intelligence and “sensuality.” Similarly to Katherine, she felt “that touch of excitement that ma[de her] know intuitively when Mary was in the room.” However, her “innocent feelings soon changed.”<sup>124</sup> She does not elaborate any further on this, beyond implications of a sexual tension between them. It appears that Mary used faith as an excuse to visit Constance alone at night. Much like her experience with Amy Mantle at Girton, Constance responded to Mary’s need “to find God,” and this likely involved intense trysts in His name. An older and wiser Constance wondered “what L would say about all this.” After all, she was now in a position of authority as Mary’s teacher, and one may infer that their carnal intimacies surpassed the spiritual and earthly merging that was her ideal.<sup>125</sup>

In hindsight, Maynard admitted to her weakness. “My poor starving heart fastened upon her advances,” she wrote, “and there was the added thrill that was bad for both sides.”<sup>126</sup> In her Green-book, there is evidence to suggest that she tried to resolve the

---

<sup>123</sup> Ibid., 318-19.

<sup>124</sup> Ibid., 320.

<sup>125</sup> She made a point of distinguishing between the two. “My affection never harmed [Katherine] as I never saw her alone.” See *GB*, 30 October 1879, 170.

<sup>126</sup> *A*, V, 33, “1879,” 342.

problem by encouraging Tait to “reflect” on the texts that she gave her to read rather than discuss. Tait apparently complained, arguing that the readings on the Atonement were “conjur[ing] up horrible imaginations.” Underlying this was Maynard’s coaxing of Tait to engage in a seduction and resistance ritual, like that she had experienced with Amy at Girton. She noted her “thrill, yet concern, over Mary’s sadness,” which, while unclear, seems likely a result of Mary’s repressing of her emotions.<sup>127</sup> When it became clear that Constance expected faith to be a large component of their relationship, that earthly love was ultimately to be consecrated to God, Mary reacted violently. She threw tantrums at home, she became defiant at school, and she even threatened suicide. Her final retaliation was to show indifference, and even contempt for Constance. She surrounded herself with a circle of “flippant and insubordinate” friends who taunted Constance in class, leaving the latter to “spend many a night in [her] little room in a rage.”<sup>128</sup>

In her Autobiography, Maynard lamented, “*Mary* was the one who conquered, not I.”<sup>129</sup> Even so, both women suffered in this complicated power struggle around sex. By July 1879, the situation was so intolerable that Maynard was forced to tell Lumsden about Tait. “I softened things,” she wrote tellingly in her Green-book, “and L was distressed, but I feel she stands by me. I vowed that I would never repeat my mistake, nor have

---

<sup>127</sup> *GB*, 6 February 1880, 21; Mary was demanding more time with her, claiming that texts like *Daily Light* disturbed her. But Constance would tell her, “keep trying and then we can meet.” See *A*, V, 35, “1879,” 355-56.

<sup>128</sup> *GB*, 8 March 1880, 32. Constance became alarmed after Mary threatened to “send a rude letter home, and intimated that she had thought of drowning herself by falling into the frozen/thaw lake.

<sup>129</sup> *A*, V, 33, “1879,” 350.

favourites among the girls again.”<sup>130</sup> It seems that Lumsden and Tait each saw something “wrong” in Maynard’s conduct as an educator, although neither could conceptualize it as a form of sexual harassment, as we could today.<sup>131</sup> Unfortunately, Maynard’s emotional needs always got the better of her. The power-based relationships that she had found herself in with both Campbell and Lumsden had an impact on her future relationships with students. In the extreme, Maynard’s toying with these young women led to their emotional breakdowns, as in the case of Marion Wakefield.

Another factor which marked Maynard’s struggle with leadership and longing was her turning thirty in 1879. As a “middle-aged” woman, her life situation seemed only too predictable, particularly in light of Dora’s wedding that April. Dora had met Frank Moillet, who was a missionary, the previous summer when nursing his mother through typhoid fever at the McAll Mission in Paris. She had initially refused his marriage offer despite his unworldliness, as “she did not care for him.” Thus, Constance was surprised to hear of her change of heart in November.<sup>132</sup> Throughout her years at St. Leonards, Constance received frequent letters from Tissy and Gazy who begged her return to Oakfield. However, it was particularly disquieting to receive one from Gazy that year asking, “Can you survive without the protective love you might have if you choose career over

---

<sup>130</sup> GB, 20 July 1880, 127.

<sup>131</sup> See Dziech, *Lecherous Professor*; Fisher, *Sexual Harassment of Students*; Monson, *Power and the Professorship*; and Patai, *Sexual Harassment*.

<sup>132</sup> See *Ibid.*, 16 August 1879; *Ibid.*, 13 October 1879, 138. It is unclear how Dora knew Mrs. Moillet, or “Angel,” as she fondly referred to her. Tissy apparently wrote saying that “Dora had been sad” because she had regretted her hasty decision. When Frank wrote again she saw it as “God’s doing” and immediately accepted him.

marriage or a life at home?" Even so, a letter from Robertson that April declaring his undying love, had virtually no impact when compared to Louisa's sudden threat to leave a month later. *This* had resounded in her ears "like a thunder clap." Louisa changed her mind,<sup>133</sup> but the event reaffirmed for Constance the depth of her feelings as guided, of course, by His metaphorical hand:

I will act on faith only, if it is right; but I am a woman whose one strength is the capacity for loving;...and I will act like this until He gives me something else because, when released, as far as love is concerned, everything else fades.<sup>134</sup>

Lumsden's criticism and sequestering of her Scripture class was ultimately the final blow for Maynard. Always wary of Lumsden's lack of trust in her since their values and teaching approach were directly opposed, Maynard's fears re-surfaced when Lumsden began complaining about her religious teaching in March 1879. She disliked Maynard's encouraging students to keep Green-books that "promoted a form of weak and sentimental religion."<sup>135</sup> But Maynard was little prepared for "L's surprise appearance during [her] scripture with the Lower III. I felt so nervous," she wrote, "that I asked questions as opposed to speaking, and was relieved that the girls answered well." There is little mention of their subsequent discussion in the Green-book other than "we have

---

<sup>133</sup> See *Ibid.*, 2 March 1879, 38; *Ibid.* 12 April 1879, 52. L had implied her discontent since in January, saying she felt "confined in the dull routine of St, Leonards."

<sup>134</sup> *Ibid.*, 6 May 1879, 69.

<sup>135</sup> *Ibid.*, 27 March 1879, 67. Ironically, this is likely what Constance's mother would have disapproved of too. For Constance, asking students to record their spiritual feelings and write religious poetry made sense because this was what she had done herself at Belstead with Mamie.

discussed it since and L has been kind.”<sup>136</sup> Scripture began to worry her far more than her other classes, and this became the dominant topic in her Green-book. As it turned out she had good cause for concern. In June, L began “needling” her about wanting to sit in on her classes. This convinced Maynard that

the time of ‘trial and sifting’ had finally come. I felt edgy. I pictured the possible scenario, that L would call me a weak sermonizer and would take the whole thing over herself. This, I knew, would be intolerable.<sup>137</sup>

In hindsight—and the emphasis *is* on hindsight—Louisa’s concerns “seemed reasonable” to Constance. “Ever since the Mary Tait affair, I had felt awkward about teaching the seniors Scripture anyway,” she confessed in her Autobiography. “I felt such dislike from some that I wanted to be out of the Schoolhouse.”<sup>138</sup> She thus acknowledged her mis-treatment of Mary, and her great discomfort in recognizing that others were judging her behaviour.

At the time, according to the Green-book, she focussed on or, perhaps, hid behind her problems with Louisa. “Intense loneliness over the full state of my position returned to me in full force,” she lamented.<sup>139</sup> Louisa had never seen her as more than a school ornament, and she still smarted from Louisa’s accusation in late 1878 that *she* “left Frances with too much school work.” She tried to forgive what she saw as Louisa’s own guilt projected through anger at her. It was only later that she would fully understand

---

<sup>136</sup> Ibid., 1 March 1879, 160-67; Ibid., 8 March 1879, 169.

<sup>137</sup> Ibid., 23 June 1879, 1879, 173.

<sup>138</sup> A, V, 35, “1880,” 356-65

<sup>139</sup> GB, 12 May 1879, 78.

Louisa's struggle with relinquishing control to subordinates such as Frances who effectively ran the school. Low self-assurance, coupled with envy of Frances' "indispensab[ility]," plagued Constance again when Frances was chosen to "take the first [boarding] House" in January 1879, although she had felt relieved that "Frances' jarring presence had been removed from the Schoolhouse."<sup>140</sup>

When Lumsden seized control of Scripture in November 1879, as she had threatened to do in July, her reassignment of the lower forms, and teaching of the senior classes, released Maynard from the vicious emotional cycle to which she had been tethered. She refused to discuss her decision with Maynard, whose outraged lament in her Green-book, "This is what *I* came to St. Leonards for!", tells all.<sup>141</sup> By December, it was clear to Maynard that their grievances were irreconcilable and that her "time was up":

How can I be happy when the very wish of my life has failed me? Instead of understanding me better the estrangement grows....I gave her everything I could to support her while she has had the power to torture me and she has done it. I fear her like no other, and I believe she could make me tell all, or kill myself or anything.<sup>142</sup>

Strong words indeed. Perhaps Constance's emergence from this emotional quagmire impelled her towards deliberate, insensitive decisions during the early months of 1880.

---

<sup>140</sup> Ibid., 18 May 1879, 84; *A*, V, 35, "1880," 367-40.

<sup>141</sup> See *GB*, 1 November 1879, 148; *GB*, 15 December 1879, 157-59.

<sup>142</sup> Ibid., 31 December 1879, 187. From a Green-book entry on 19 February 1880, 249, one gets insight into Louisa's manipulative charm. As Constance, perhaps jealously, wrote, "L's nastiness to Kate [the housekeeper] had caused Kate so much upset that she wanted to leave. But a few kind words and one kiss, and Kate was left believing it was all her own fault. L with her usual charm, cleared things so that Kate's miserable week was blotted out."

After toying with Robertson for over two years, she had no qualms about requesting that he stop all contact with her. In some ways this was difficult. He did offer an avenue of escape, and had won Mamie's, Fanny's and Adeline's favour. But his lament "that everything at Whittingham had been purchased with...a view to her taste," implied once again another potentially controlling personal relationship that was different, yet similar.<sup>143</sup>

After closing off her marriage option once and for all, Maynard informed a member of the recently formed organization, the Higher Christian Education of Women, of her possible life change in early May.<sup>144</sup> She was rewarded by learning of their "scheme for a women's college in London," and by being offered the Principalship in May. Interest turned to disappointment when she found out that the college under the directorship of Major Charles Malan and Caroline Cavendish, was to echo American college schemes in its emphasis on training missionaries. "This was to be God's work purely, so no business, no method, and no standard - social or intellectual," she wrote in

---

<sup>143</sup> *Ibid.*, 18 December 1879, 120. She learned that Mamie had sent Robertson to stay with Adeline so that Constance could meet him—which she did. But she firmly refused to see him again. Fanny later accused her of "being gloomy, but [she] rebelled" by making her position clear. When Robertson recorded his anger at being turned down, she used it as an excuse to criticize his lack of sensitivity over her feelings or her aims. See *Ibid.*, 11 January 1880, 122.

<sup>144</sup> *A*, III, 15, "1875," 65. Maynard had met Mrs. Charles, who was heavily involved with the organization, five years earlier when visiting Madame Bodichon. She initially disliked Charles, but grew to admire her for her support of women's higher education and for her many life experiences, like surviving the siege of Paris in 1870.

disgust in her Green-book.<sup>145</sup>

Lumsden's threat to resign due to "despair of success, access and climate," also left Maynard pondering her future. Adeline was begging her to remain by dangling a House carrot under her eager nose.<sup>146</sup> But when Maynard found out that the Council had offered the Principalship to Dove if Lumsden left,<sup>147</sup> and then had "worked hard to smooth things over" with Lumsden because of this, her position on St. Leonards' hierarchical ladder seemed clear.<sup>148</sup> That is, Maynard knew that she would not even be offered a Houseship—though both diaries are vague on this matter. This was enough to tip her particular scales. She formally resigned at the end of June although she had no definite future prospects.<sup>149</sup>

As she "stood in No. 6...kissing many tearful faces," Maynard thought of all the trauma that she had endured at St. Leonards, but she could not help but feel "a huge

---

<sup>145</sup> *GB*, 2 June 1880, 99. Malan wanted Cavendish to take a small house with four students. The three years of training, which was not so dissimilar to that at girls' high schools, would prepare "the graduate for teaching or mission work at home or away," and also "prepare women for domestic training for practical duties of life [since] each pupil would do a certain amount of household work."

<sup>146</sup> *D*, 30 May 1880, 95.

<sup>147</sup> *GB*, 6 June 1880, 6. She noted of Frances, "I did not want to transfer my allegiance to one so cold, so rough, and to one with whom my relationship has from the first been a sore point, and does not improve with time."

<sup>148</sup> *Ibid.*, 7. Maynard faced Lumsden's wrath when Lumsden discovered that Maynard knew of the Council's offer to Dove, but had failed to tell her. Maynard noted with some ambivalence here, "The Council showed themselves to be models of forbearance and courtesy. They knew that L was the making of the school....She had also brought in good clans, such as Douglas, Dundas, Farquharson and Scott-Moncrief."

<sup>149</sup> *D*, 6 June 1880, 78.



release.” Her saying goodbye to Lumsden was very painful nonetheless. “She held me to her breast hard as she, only she, does. Then she burst into tears, saying ‘How will I go on here when the joy of my life is leaving?’”<sup>150</sup> Later, when alone, Maynard recalled, “I cried as if my own heart was breaking. Oh! my darling, I would have given my life for thee!”<sup>151</sup> At the end of her life she still wondered about their relationship, and still could “not understand the matter.” But she *could* say that

L never had the same ascendancy again. Not *once* did I long for her personal presence, nor did I greatly value her letters. In the past, especially at Cheltenham, I would say ‘O Lord bless us both. I don’t want blessing if she is to be left out in the cold, for she is worth more than I am;’ but then I ceased praying for her, thinking, ‘she had her chance.’<sup>152</sup>

Maynard never regretted her decision “whether right or wrong,” and Lumsden did appear to “be swept” from her life.<sup>153</sup> There is little mention of her in any record and they rarely saw each other afterwards. According to Maynard, Lumsden left St. Andrews in 1882 because the Council were weary of her tirades and asked her to resign. Dove took over the Principalship, remaining in St. Leonards until she became the first Principal of Wycombe Abbey school in 1896.<sup>154</sup> Lumsden moved to London upon leaving St.

---

<sup>150</sup> *GB*, 1 August 1880, 39.

<sup>151</sup> *Ibid.*, 40.

<sup>152</sup> *A*, V, 35, “1880,” 355-58.

<sup>153</sup> *Ibid.*, 462.

<sup>154</sup> *Ibid.*, 490. In *Yellow Leaves*, 66, Louisa presented a different picture. She wrote, “after five years hard work and illness, and worry about mother, I resigned my post and recommended that the Council appoint Frances Dove as my successor. She was appointed. I was sorry to leave the school and friends in St. Andrews.”

Leonards, notably after Maynard had become Mistress of Westfield. When Lumsden hinted about teaching at Westfield, thoughts of their history led Maynard to refuse her.<sup>155</sup>

Maynard's last traumatic interaction with Lumsden took place in 1884, when both Lumsden and Elizabeth Welsh "stood for Girton's" Mistress-ship owing to Bernard's retirement. When Maynard refused to vote after claiming friendship with both candidates, she faced Lumsden's anger as Welsh was voted in.<sup>156</sup> Little is mentioned of Lumsden again until 1889, when she became principal of the hostel for female students at St. Andrews, and where she remained until retiring in 1898. After 1910, Lumsden was a regular guest speaker at Westfield until Maynard herself retired in 1913. It is not clear whether they ever spoke about their relationship, but according to the diaries, they did discuss their religious differences and Lumsden's failings as Principal of St. Leonards.<sup>157</sup> In 1916, at age eighty-five, Lumsden was made Dame, as was Dove in 1918. Maynard's adverse reaction to both implies the continuation of jealousies among these early pioneers.<sup>158</sup>

Life with Louisa had taught Constance the impossibility of combining ambition, passion and faith when the emotions, values and beliefs surrounding each were inextricably tied to "an unhappy marriage." She noted in her Green-book in 1880:

---

<sup>155</sup> *GB*, 12 November 1882, 222. Maynard told Lumsden that Westfield's Council would disapprove of her secularist attitude.

<sup>156</sup> *D*, 26 July 1884, 102.

<sup>157</sup> See *GB*, 12 May 1911, 89; *GB*, 7 May 1912, 109 and *D*, 8 June 1913, 2.

<sup>158</sup> *A*, V, 35, "1880," 463.

I am sick of concealment, sick to the heart, and long, with a painful longing, for [another] world, one where I can stand shoulder to shoulder with an open friend, battling face-to-face with an open enemy.<sup>159</sup>

However, the “enemy” Maynard wanted to battle was not simply secularism and rationalism. She continued to demur in face of Malan’s plea that “it was her duty to” oversee his new venture, since his focus remained on missionary work as opposed to women’s rights to higher education and independence. In fact, she was relieved when the scheme fell through in 1881 due to a lack of funds and public interest. All in all, “St. Andrews and my dealings with Major Malan had been a good preparation,” she noted in her Autobiography. “It made me realize the need for women to claim the London B. A. degree.”<sup>160</sup> At the time she asked, “so why not the foundation of Christian college, manned from the G. P.M.?”<sup>161</sup> Little did she know that the incident would propel her towards being a part of the founding of Westfield College. Little did she know that the emotions surrounding leadership, longing, and lament that had tied her to Louisa, would evolve into similar binaries between desire and resistance that, centring on her mediation of ambition, faith and passion, set the stage for her future primary relationships.

---

<sup>159</sup> *GB*, 21 June 1880, 29.

<sup>160</sup> *A*, V, 35, “1880,” 463.

<sup>161</sup> *GB*, 3 July 1880, 34.

## Chapter 7

### 'Was my friend a man or a woman?': Ambition versus Passion, 1880-1886

In May of 1879, during the height of her quandary over ambition and passion, Maynard's recalling of two recurring dreams symbolized her dilemma. The first dream, which "lasted throughout 1872," perplexed her.<sup>1</sup> But she connects it to her relationship with Louisa Lumsden at Girton. It is also notable that 1872 was the year in which she met and fell in love with Lewis Campbell:

I have no idea what originated this dream. I was living alone in London as a penniless painter and printer, and the work was shown in a gallery. One day I met a girl and she remained with me for many days. She never left the room but awaited my return each night, and she gently received the love of Christ. When she was with me, she was the beauty and love of my life. This came true although I never realized until Girton was over. She was my Magdalen, taking all I gave without an idea of the cost to me; and there too was the awakening of her devotion.<sup>2</sup>

The second dream, lasting throughout 1876, was more "intangible":

All I remember is the glory and joy of standing together with someone in unbroken love. Was my friend a man or a woman? I cannot tell as I never saw the face or heard the voice. There was a perfect understanding of love to let me to think it was a woman, yet at times there was a sense of being protected and of admiration...that made me think it was a man.<sup>3</sup>

As the dreams imply, and as this dissertation suggests, Maynard's experiences as a Victorian woman stemmed from her negotiations between prescript and private need.

---

<sup>1</sup> *GB*, 16 May 1879, 77.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, 77.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, 78.

Because of faith, her acknowledgment of prescribed gendered or class “attributes” did not always feature in her understanding of aim and passion. Yet her dilemma, as implied in her question, “Was my friend a man or a woman?”, was her sense that her friends in her dreams—and she was referring to Louisa and Lewis here—were always “a little above [her] in everything.”<sup>4</sup> Her “true dream,” she had come to realize, was to share her life with someone to whom she felt equal, someone with whom she could share her aims, faith and passionate nature. “I do *so* want a kind arm around me,” she wrote, “and a ‘Come! *we* will share it *all!*’ from a voice I can trust.”<sup>5</sup> This chapter traces Maynard’s path towards that self-realization. It pinpoints how certain life choices led to her merging of “feminine” passion with “manly” ambition, which, in turn, impelled her towards the gender of her “friend.”

Two events, which Maynard downplayed and Firth ignored, are notable for their impact on Maynard’s journey towards self-discovery, her re-kindled passion for Lewis Campbell in the summer of 1880, and her enrolling at the Slade School of Art that fall. Given Firth’s treatment of Maynard’s relationship with Campbell in 1872, her concealment of this event is not surprising. As mentioned in chapters one and four, Firth avoided any analysis by simply transcribing Maynard’s autobiographical account without comment. Moreover, since Maynard’s and Campbell’s interactions brought them dangerously close to an affair in 1880, Firth’s silence in order to protect her much adored

---

<sup>4</sup> Ibid., 17 May 1879, 85. She viewed this as one of her failings in her selection of friends and loves. As she wrote of Louisa here, “I really think a few years more with her would have brought me to death.”

<sup>5</sup> Ibid., 86.

Mistress and friend from scandal is perhaps understandable. After all, even by contemporary standards Maynard's and Campbell's conduct can be viewed as underhanded and taboo. In her Autobiography, Maynard dismissed the event by simply commenting, "In the summary of the year [1880] I only have a bare mention of Italy and none told about the strange passing incident of October 20<sup>th</sup>."<sup>6</sup> But her implication that the incident did not really affect her, is not really true. In fact her Green-book suggested that Campbell's continued toying with her emotions did indeed have an impact upon her. Their encounter that summer also raises some interesting questions about sexuality.

Certainly, Maynard had felt "less drawn" to Lewis Campbell in recent years. Her diaries only mention him in passing when she was at St. Andrews, and she had found his "helpless silence" during her mother's illness and death particularly disappointing. Yet the fact that he still had a certain "distinction that placed him above any man [she] knew" indicates that Robertson must have appeared a poor substitute by comparison.<sup>7</sup> Nor is it surprising that Maynard's passion for him sparked when she and Gazy accompanied him and his wife to Rome in August 1880, shortly after she had left St. Leonards. After all, hurt and confused by Lumsden, she was more vulnerable to his attentions and possibly, on a subconscious level, strove to purge Lumsden from her thoughts.

Maynard's Green-book implied that she initially avoided Campbell, which is not surprising given their history and the societal norms regarding sex. However, the record

---

<sup>6</sup> *A*, VI, 38, "Tour in Italy, Slade School, 1880," 39. Similarly to Part V, Maynard begins Part VI of her autobiography at page one.

<sup>7</sup> *GB*, 17 May 1879, 81; also *GB*, 18 January 1878, 7; and *GB*, 6 March 1879, 90.

then suggested that she began to relax her position, and even exploited the sultry, heated atmosphere of Rome. She had no qualms about “letting his hand steal secretly into hers.” The fact that they did this even “when Gazy and Fanny were present” points to their blatant disloyalty towards Fanny, who remains a hazy figure against this vibrant record of desire.<sup>8</sup>

There is also evidence that they sought time together alone. One Green-book entry describing her “lying beneath his caresses all panting as he gently stroked [her] face and arm,” revealed the growing intensity of their physical attraction.<sup>9</sup> By the end of the vacation the sexual tension between them was clearly at a peak. But when it was released through a passionate “kiss in the twilight,” Constance drew away, despite feeling “intense rapture, because the slip into love was inevitable. When I saw his face,” she explained in her ‘Friend,’ “there was love there - not a passing flash - but still and blazing.” They seem to have spoken about the possibility of their entering a sexual relationship, with Constance adding for emphasis:

I said, ‘Lewis, gradually I have let you take a position that no man has ever or can have. You must be aware of this.’ He said, ‘I know it. I am weaker than you think. I know that on some level I have crossed the line.’<sup>10</sup>

Lewis, it seems, suggested that they continue only as “friends.” He assured her that he would “never repeat his actions; and [he] promised (once again) to go back [to Fanny] and

---

<sup>8</sup> Compare *GB*, 8 August 1880, 39 with *GB*, 14 August 1889, 45.

<sup>9</sup> *Ibid.*, 20 August 1880, 50.

<sup>10</sup> *Ibid.*, 6 October 1880, 69. Upon their return, Lewis had apparently made the pretense of wanting her to show him the schoolroom at Oakfield. She added, “in a moment he had gathered me to him...till I felt as if my soul would slip away.”

be happy and loyal.”<sup>11</sup>

There is no indication of what Maynard really expected from Campbell since her Green-book is tantalizingly vague on the matter. Perhaps her assertion that he had taken “a position that no man ha[d] ever or c[ould] have” with her, suggests her passion for women was stronger. However, another admission, “I am saved from a love that might wreck my whole life,” suggests otherwise.<sup>12</sup> The entry also seems astounding, given her cultural norms and upbringing. Certainly, the double standard of sexual morality collided with the moralizing values surrounding romantic married love. As also noted, the definition of respectable womanhood was linked to ideas about women’s purity, asexuality and romantic friendships.<sup>13</sup> Maynard’s entry in defiance of her class-based gender norms, suggested her physically-based feelings for Lewis. Had he been willing, she might have entered into a sexual relationship with him. Clearly, this would have “wrecked” her reputation and any hopes of a career. “I am yet allowed to go a little near it,” she concluded of this entry, “and experience a faint shadow of what such a life might be, so now a long shadow remains.”<sup>14</sup>

It is perhaps inevitable that Maynard grew to resent Campbell’s rejection of her. Their disagreement over Lumsden’s hiring of a Unitarian, Alice Wood, at St. Leonards

---

<sup>11</sup> *Ibid.*, 70.

<sup>12</sup> *Ibid.*, 7 October 1880, 77.

<sup>13</sup> See Walkowitz, *Prostitution and Victorian Society and Dreadful Delight*, 90-93; Gorham, “Maiden Tribute,” 353-79; and Mort, *Dangerous Sexualities*, 66-90.

<sup>14</sup> *GB*, 9 October 1880, 80.



certainly augmented her sense of his “betrayal.”<sup>15</sup> Her fury over his letters to her that condemned her religiously-based thoughts on the matter, was fuelled by his overtures once “his side had won” and Alice was allowed to remain. Lewis’ behaviour ended their relationship as far as she was concerned, although she noted, “I am being harsh with him.”<sup>16</sup> While one could argue that she could have swallowed her pride, his attitude towards her echoed Louisa’s cruel, power-based control, and perhaps her own sense of being jilted, whether it be right or wrong.

According to Maynard’s records, Campbell appeared to slip from her life at this point. Possibly his behaviour turned her once again towards career. She became involved with Westfield while he remained at St. Andrews. Nonetheless, her experience with him at this time raises some interesting questions. Do we assume, given her more explicit allusion to their encounters as sexual–panting, intense rapture etc.–that she viewed sex as heterosexually based? If so, what does this say about her conceptualization of her passion for women?

In lengthy Green-book entries in 1914, written shortly after Lewis’ death, Maynard debated, rather guiltily, as to whether Fanny knew of their relationship:

She [Fanny] was collecting Lewis’ sonnets and verses together and suddenly there lay the sonnet he had sent to me on the table between us,

---

<sup>15</sup> Ibid., 20 November 1880, 83. She was likely irritated by Lewis’ assertion, that “L’s leaving would destroy the school. He wrote me dreadful, rude letters,” she added, “demanding that I use my influence with Adeline,” who opposed L’s hiring of Wood.

<sup>16</sup> Ibid., 28 November 1880, 91. She was angry when he accused her of narrow mindedness. She also disagreed with his view that “Unitarianism was non-judgmental and did not promote proselytizing.” When Woods could remain, he slipped “back into affectionate interest in my affairs,” she noted. “This evoked contempt for him in me.”

undisguised. A pang went through me....Had she just discovered it? Or did she know of it over 40 years ago? I tried to pay more attention to one of the other papers, but her attention remained on the mysterious poem. ‘What is it about?’ she asked impatiently. ‘Is it a happy poem or is it miserable? It seems a very happy friendship with love, and then the storm comes and love goes pale and dead. Do you think it could be about Rachel?’ she said gently and reflectively. I seized on this as a loophole of escape, for he had loved Rachel before he loved me. ‘Perhaps it is,’ I said, and then asked, ‘did they quarrel?’ She answered, slowly, ‘well, not exactly *quarrel*...’<sup>17</sup>

Maynard’s thought, “Fanny looked upon Lewis’ little ‘ways’ with amusement,” implied her own justification and the continued acceptance of the double standard of sexual morality.

Maynard did not appear to condemn Fanny’s admission of her emotional attachments to women either. She continued, “Fanny then said, ‘I left him [Lewis] alone for hours while Brownie and I went for long drives....I did not sympathize the way I should.’ She went on wistfully, ‘I never cared for men at all, I always liked women best.’”<sup>18</sup> While Fanny’s female ties seemed to transcend those with Lewis, Constance did not believe that they precluded her “faithfulness as a wife.”<sup>19</sup> Thus, once again, we see the nuances surrounding sex/gender interconnections during this period.

For Maynard, cultural norms were further deconstructed when set within the context of faith. As she cried to her ‘Friend,’ of her passion for Lewis and Louisa:

Why, oh *why*, am I forced to love them? Why am I forced to throw a slender bridge of sweet human affection across a dark unknown abyss of

---

<sup>17</sup> Ibid., 9 March 1914, 216. He died of pneumonia while he and Fanny were on a holiday in Milan.

<sup>18</sup> Ibid., 17 April 1914, 236.

<sup>19</sup> Ibid., 18. She also noted this in her *A* as well. See *A*, VI, 39, “1880,” 24.

differences and misunderstandings? I might almost say, mutual antipathies?<sup>20</sup>

It was not so much about sex or gender for Constance, although their discourses of power were clearly in play in her struggle. Her quandary lay more in her recognition that her penchant for loving strong-minded, secularist individuals had left her vulnerable to their control over her, and that this was exactly what had drawn her to them in the first place.

Aware that both Lumsden and Campbell were deeply scornful of Malan's plans for a woman's missionary college in London, and doubtful of it herself, Maynard was relieved when "all plans came to a standstill" in October 1880.<sup>21</sup> Interestingly—although she made no connection herself—she sought to follow the whims of her first recurring dream, which had featured her as an artist who exhibited in London. She asked her father's permission to enrol at the Slade Art School so that she could "learn the foundations after teaching drawing for years." While the Slade was an avenue of escape for her, the fact that she would live with her brother George in London was a decisive factor for her father. It proved a good decision all round. She enjoyed her course; her faith was revived; she grew closer to both brothers; and she met new friends, some of whom were key in her future. In fact her new ventures restored her self-confidence and her health, and gave her the wherewithal to flee Oakfield for good. While she never achieved artistically, her experience gave her the fortitude to take on her life's work at Westfield. "I plunged into the future with the daring of youth, taking with me my hard-learned lessons,"

---

<sup>20</sup> *GB*, 28 October 1880, 92.

<sup>21</sup> *Ibid.*, 26 May 1880, 90. Malan died of lung cancer seven months later.

she noted in her Autobiography.<sup>22</sup> However, rather like the alter ego of her dream, her pattern of falling for strong minded individuals would continue. Her longing to convert her loves would always result in pain and disillusionment.

Maynard's time at the Slade was relatively free from such angst, however. In fact her eighteen months as an art student were probably one of the most carefree times of her life, according to both Diary and Green-book. The latter is noticeably free from its usual lament over her lack of faith and dilemma over love and ambition. Typically, given her dedication as a student, she worked hard at mastering the Slade's notorious distinctive style of "shading." When classes were cancelled on foggy days she made a point of going in to study a skeleton. But she found that her learning as an adolescent—drawing what she *saw* as opposed to what she knew—proved the most beneficial. As noted in chapter four, by utilizing art-making to evoke the "undescribable by capturing the elusive," her imagery proved both creative and expressive. After ten days she was rewarded for her skills by being accepted into the life school. This was indeed a privilege as most students only entered advanced drawing after a term of fundamental drawing.<sup>23</sup>

The twenty female students had separate critical discussion (crits) from the forty men. But it is noteworthy that they sat side by side to draw the figure who was often "a

---

<sup>22</sup> *D*, 1 October 1880, 120. Her fees were £20. See also *A*, VI, 39, "Slade School, freedom and happiness, 1880," 24.

<sup>23</sup> See *A*, II, 6, "1867," 112; also *D*, 1 November 1880, 122; *D*, 29 November 1880, 126. She adopted the "criss-cross" shading style of the Slade, "which marked it as 'superior' to the Royal Academy." The studio spaces consisted of walls of windows. Thus the 'fog' from the Thames would fill the rooms on damp and misty days. See *A*, VI, 39, "1880," 29.

handsome lad or pretty girl clad in the minimum of drapery.” This set up, which countered the etiquette of middle-class norms, was qualified at least by Maynard by the subject matter being taken from the Bible or Classics, and students were “expected to set the figure in the appropriate landscape.” Maynard had great talent for depicting a figure like “Moses, striking the Rock.” But she quickly found that she lacked confidence with composition (improvisation), and she was in awe of those who placed “Moses” in a convincing landscape or among “a spirited herd of cattle.”<sup>24</sup> Moreover, she realised that she was, after all, in a male-centred milieu. Because of her fear of welding, she was cut off from any future as a sculptor since she could not enter the competition for “metal design as the most talented [male] students were expected to do.” She spoke of her womanly contentment “to sit at her easel” and draw. But, frustrated and angry, she saw her low grades as symbolic of her gender and of her lack of success as an artist.<sup>25</sup>

In her Autobiography, Maynard was quick to dismiss her talent as an artist, as was Firth in her biography.<sup>26</sup> However, the discipline itself had more to do with her fate. If she had been encouraged to self-express more than to improvise, as most art programs teach

---

<sup>24</sup> *GB*, 14 November 1880, 85; *A*, VI, 39, “1880,” 55-64. Monsieur Legros was her exacting tutor. Since he spoke to his students in French, Maynard would transcribe most of his comments to her in French. He apparently criticized her about her tendency to make secondary figures and the scene as central to her drawing instead of the key subject like Moses. He also accused her of being “fearful” of her canvas.

<sup>25</sup> *A*, VI, 39, “1880,” 31-33. Ever the competitor, she was not only peeved by her low marks in composition and design, but was most piqued to come in third place for figure drawing, despite the fact that she had entered the program early.

<sup>26</sup> *Ibid*; also Firth, *Maynard*, 172.

today, she might have developed her talent, particularly as a conceptual artist.<sup>27</sup> As implied above, she had learnt in adolescence that art, like religion and nature, could facilitate one's self-expression yet reveal the multifaceted layering of "truth," the interconnection of evidence and experience.<sup>28</sup> Her Slade experience augmented this, and also built upon her teaching approach begun at St. Leonards, as a basis for her inspiring from within rather than forcing through "outer" threats. Finally, as noted in chapters one, two and four, her creative talents enabled her to incorporate a multi-disciplinary approach to teaching, as seen in her interconnection of science with religion at Westfield.

As Maynard's disenchantment with her skills as an artist grew, she became more involved with educational, religious and social commitments outside the Slade. Visits to the Crystal Palace and the Royal Academy brought back happier childhood memories.<sup>29</sup> She briefly tried her hand at rescue work, hoping to convert working-class prostitutes and unwed mothers staying at lock hospitals or Mission houses respectively. Her diaries do not dwell on these experiences. Nevertheless they convey her revulsion yet fascination for these "fallen women," about whom discourses ranged from their plight as deceived

---

<sup>27</sup> For example, art form in the 1970s—conceptual, minimal and performance art—situated itself between or outside traditional divisions, not defining itself by any medium or traditional context. See Jeanne Siegel, ed., *Art Talk: The Early 80s* (New York: Da Capo Press, 1988), 11-12; and H. H. Arnason, *History of Modern Art* (New York: Abrams, 1979), 1-9.

<sup>28</sup> *A*, II, 6, "1867," 112.

<sup>29</sup> *D*, 6 January 1881, 78. Here she noted her interest in the electric exhibition at Crystal Palace. In fact, she was so taken with the light bulbs that she persuaded Westfield Council to put in electrical wiring. They finally agreed after a candle had caused a bad fire in 1884.

victims, to their being a part of the “panoply of shame on the capital of the civilized world.”<sup>30</sup> Though she asserted, “I am doing God’s work,” in her Green-book, I suggest that these women also symbolized Maynard’s own recent sexual struggles. She was so shaken when a “girl in a tattered coat and dirty face” rejected her attempts at conversion with, “don’t *you* touch me, You!”, that she refused to return to the Mission.<sup>31</sup> Possibly it conjured up memories of Mary Tait, or her sexual struggles with Louisa Lumsden. Or perhaps she viewed her behaviour with Lewis Campbell as “dirtier” than the girl’s if the girl was a “cruelly deceived” victim of unwanted male sex.

It is notable that Maynard felt more comfortable speaking with prostitutes, who, Walkowitz interestingly suggests, were seen “to embody the animal passions that the...‘angel in the house’ had suppressed.”<sup>32</sup> Were they, one wonders, a means by which she could justify her own passion for both men and women? Were they a measure alongside her society’s depiction of prostitutes as “inevitable as...are sewers, sinks and cesspools”?<sup>33</sup> Maynard was persuaded against working at a lock hospital on the grounds

---

<sup>30</sup> See *GB*, 13 November 1880, 90. For “Outcast London” see Jones, *Outcast London*; Wohl, ed., *Bitter Cry*. As noted earlier, these authors point out that “Outcast London” was symbolized by poverty, street crime, prostitution and disease, and was much condemned by the middle-class. For examples of women’s plight see Ross, *Love and Toil*; Walkowitz, *Dreadful Delight*; Higgenbotham, “Respectable Sinners;” and Gorham, “The Maiden Tribute.” For children’s lives see Davin, *Growing Up Poor*.

<sup>31</sup> *D*, 12 February 1881, 85.

<sup>32</sup> Walkowitz, *Dreadful Delight*, 21. Although as she noted, Josephine Butler elevated the status of the prostitute, pointing out that their suffering ennobled them in comparison to the outcasts of the workhouses, see 88-92.

<sup>33</sup> These are the words of Victorian social critic, Dr. G. Richolet, cited in Lynda Nead, *Myths of Sexuality: Representations of Women in Victorian Britain* (Oxford:

of respectable womanhood. "It will give me a bad reputation," she wrote.<sup>34</sup> But while she viewed herself as more refined, more educated, and more Christian than these fallen women, if she had become Campbell's mistress she would have become another fallen woman, despite her class and faith. In the end, she reconciled herself vicariously by hearing of Harry's experiences with his Hope Café, which gave working-class men an opportunity to discuss social issues and be converted through open testimony.<sup>35</sup>

Underneath Maynard's traversing of meanings around sex, class and gender, as both artist and Victorian upper-middle-class woman, lay a commitment to her role as an educator. Alongside her numerous social engagements, she regularly stopped overnight at Belstead, or Addlestone, a "criminal children's home" run by Caroline Cavendish, to teach Scripture and drawing to the girls and Political Economy to the teachers. Because she strove to maintain her interest in Girton, she was elected Old Student representative as she was willing to attend meetings in both London and Cambridge. The college had changed vastly since her student days. Its new additions left the "corridors three times their original length" while the new gardens had altered the external facade. She always

---

Blackwell, 1988), 121.

<sup>34</sup> *GB*, 12 December 1880, 126. Susan Bernard, sister of Girton's Mistress, ran the Mission for fallen girls. Apparently, when Maynard told Bernard of her plans to work at a lock hospital, she was advised against it because helping prostitutes would be more damaging to her career than helping "deceived fallen women." See Edward J. Bristow, *Vice and Vigilance: Purity Movements in Britain since 1700* (Dublin: Gill and Macmillan, 1972), on Victorian attitudes towards lock hospitals.

<sup>35</sup> *GB*, 12 December 1880, 128; *GB*, 20 December 1880, 132. Harry's Hope Café echoed the Homes of Hope for fallen women. See Higginbotham, "Respectable Sinners," 217.



appreciated its potent social milieu, which “was as grand as ever” with its dinners, plays and dances. Her visits also enabled her to re-connect with friends like Elizabeth Welsh and Connie Herschel, the latter a Science lecturer, and to oversee the development of her “baby,” the Girton Prayer Meeting. She usually felt its members “careless and blundering,” but she always left still wanting to help them.<sup>36</sup>

Another profound turning point at this time was Maynard’s intense “revival of [her] Christianity.” Her interest in the Church Missionary Society (C. M. S.), the Bible Society, the Young Men’s Christian Association (Y. M. C. A.) and most particularly, the Salvation Army (S. A.), were key in this respect. The Salvation Army movement, founded in 1865 by William and Catherine Booth, targeted the working-class and drew in thousands to its organization. Its aim, “to carry ‘the fire of the Holy Ghost’ into all its work,” was evident in its visible presence through contemporary advertising and revivalism.<sup>37</sup> Some scholars have presented Salvationists as deluded fanatics or perhaps socially ambitious individuals. But Walker argues in *Pulling the Devil’s Kingdom Down* (2001):

Every aspect of Salvationists’ activity and belief—including ecstatic conversions, the conviction that women had a right to preach, and the

---

<sup>36</sup> GB, 9 May 1879, 34. She noted here, “As we stood all linked together - I thought of all the intellectual and social difficulties in its path. But I encouraged them to seek God, stressing that finding the right path was worth their labours.” See also GB, 27 April 1880, 54.

<sup>37</sup> See Bebbington, *Evangelicalism*, 165; Noll, Bebbington and Rawlyk, eds., *Amazing Grace*, 179-82. For more in-depth studies on the influence of the S. A. on British society see Walker, *Devil’s Kingdom*; McKinley, *Marching to Glory*. Robert Sandall’s, *The History of the Salvation Army*, vols. 1-3 (London: Salvation Army, 1964), presents a detailed account of the S. A.

willingness to face attacks from clergy and street gangs—expressed deeply felt religious convictions...Th[is] experience, or belief, was shaped by the exchange between the Salvationist theology and the cultural world in which Salvationists evangelized.<sup>38</sup>

The Salvation Army's success lay in its ability to utilize working-class culture for its own ends. This is exactly what pulled Maynard towards it like a magnet. She noted in her Green-book review of 1881, "after my uncertainty at Girton and St. Andrews, the S. A. helped me immensely. It exhibited a higher type of spiritual life that had not been seen for a century at least."<sup>39</sup> The Salvation Army fuelled Maynard's aims as prophet. Its deconstruction and refashioning of working-class gender relations—evidenced in Hallelujah Lasses gaining rights to preach—augmented her own dedication towards interconnecting religion with higher education to further *her* class and gender.

Another large draw of growing organizations like the Salvation Army was their echoing of the emotive spirit of Moody and Sankey, and in this they gained support from Maynard and from all ranks of society. Wealthy benefactors like Lord Shaftesbury, a powerful social reformer with ties to the Bible Society, and the staunch evangelist F. A. Denny, contributed towards the thousands spent on the purchasing and refurbishing of Exeter Hall for the Y. M. C. A. headquarters and Clapton Hall for the S. A.'s. "Everything

---

<sup>38</sup> Walker, *Devil's Kingdom*, 6. Walker is countering texts like Deborah Valenze's, *Prophetic Sons and Daughters: Female Preaching and Popular Religion in Industrial England* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1985), and texts which tend to detail as opposed to analysis, like Richard Collier's, *The General Next to God* (London: Collins, 1965).

<sup>39</sup> *GB*, 30 December 1879, 27. The Y. M. C. A. had been established for about 50 years. It had seen the rise of the Bible society and C. M. S. and celebrated the abolition of slavery.

was conducted on a huge scale and with great enthusiasm," Maynard wrote, after attending the opening of Clapton Hall in May:

There were 1,000 Officers gathered from everywhere and an audience of 4,000. The collection of the day amounted to over £7,000. I was drawn to the living transforming power of testimony - displayed by the many who walked to the platform to declare their new-found commitment to God.<sup>40</sup>

Embracing the emotive milieu, Maynard also became engulfed in the wave of nationalism both organizations evoked. "I even bought an SA bonnet to walk down the streets to the Marble Arch...amid the jumping red jerseys and the 'war cry,'" she commented in her Autobiography.<sup>41</sup> But while she supported an organization with imperial aims, and one which afforded women the same ranks as men (also seen in their roles as S. A. Officers),<sup>42</sup> class remained an issue. Societal unity seemed so potent through her class lens, that "it was almost as if the mid-and-upper-class could conquer all of England, beginning with the poor and most wicked."<sup>43</sup>

Maynard fully believed that her "flight back to conversion was the very root of genuine [atonement] evangelicalism." While many Salvationists or reformers, like her

---

<sup>40</sup> *GB*, 16 May 1882, 90. The re-opening of Exeter Hall was particularly potent. As Maynard noted here, "Lord Shaftesbury sat on the platform with the Archbishop of Canterbury and Lord Mayor of London, while the six donors stood behind. 1,000s joined in hymns. The sound was so glorious that it remained with me although the speeches were good." See also *GB*, 5 March 1882, 61.

<sup>41</sup> *A*, VI, 40, "A new start, 1881," 66.

<sup>42</sup> See Higginbotham, "Respectable Sinners," 220; Walker, *Devil's Kingdom*, 130-34; and Walkowitz, *Dreadful Delight*, 41. Walkowitz notes that during the 1870s and 1880s, "British women of all ranks repeatedly spilled over and out of their ascribed roles, bounded roles,...and engaged in missions of their own."

<sup>43</sup> See *GB*, 9 May 1881, 90-96.

brother Harry, sought to rehabilitate workers through religious missions, housing reform or massive surveys,<sup>44</sup> for Maynard, “consciousness of sin” evolved into concern for upper-middle-class women. Her new-found energy reinforced her commitment to her G. P. M. “Ring” letter that, inaugurated the previous October, aimed to inspire both old and new Girtonians’ spiritual development. It would also evolve into a vital support network for Constance. Amy Mantle was particularly generous in her financial support of Westfield for over twenty years. The addition of Ring’s II, III and IV to accommodate Westfield graduates widened this powerful sphere, making Constance’s dream of initiating a Divinity program at Westfield a reality in 1901.<sup>45</sup>

The milieu of “simplicity, unity and kindness which I find myself in,” Constance exclaimed in her Green-book in early 1881, “promises a future filled with hope, energy and a sense of adventure! At 32, *I am so* fortunate to have this...I almost pity domestic bondage.”<sup>46</sup> She was referring here to Do, who after recently giving birth to her second child, was bitterly complaining about the “years of care and anxiety” as both mother and wife. She would later note her empathy for Connie Herschel’s and Mary Kingsland’s suffering at the hands of physically abusive husbands, notwithstanding her inference that

---

<sup>44</sup> See McKinley’s *Marching to Glory*; Sandall’s, *Salvation Army*, and Walker, *Devil’s Kingdom*, on this.

<sup>45</sup> *A*, VI, 40, “1881,” 68-69. The Ring echoed that used in Methodist meetings. Each member wrote a letter which Constance then placed in a little pouch and circulated around. When each member received the Ring (every four months) she replaced her ‘old’ letter with a new one.

<sup>46</sup> *GB*, 19 February 1881, 77.

the latter's "commonness" actually caused this.<sup>47</sup>

However, Constance was keenly aware that her own future threatened "uncertainty and loneliness." To resolve the latter, she turned towards her Slade peers. Love was still understood within the context of religion, as seen in her comment, "I thought of the possibilities of doing good." She was drawn to the genteel Mabel Prideaux, whose passion for art and emotive expression matched her own. Mabel was also willing to be converted, and happily accompanied her to Y. M. C. A. and S. A. meetings. The Green-book is filled with their debates about art and faith. Tension arose when Mabel declared her love for Constance because the latter could not reciprocate.<sup>48</sup> But Mabel's encouraging her towards forming the Slade Bible study in 1881 is notable.<sup>49</sup> Although the meetings ended in 1882, their success or failure was not an issue. As Constance noted, "In comparison to all my miseries with L, and my disappointment in Lewis, *this* is real pleasure."<sup>50</sup> Her new life was opening up potential avenues that would steer her away from Louisa's and Lewis'

---

<sup>47</sup> Connie left her post at Girton in 1881 to marry the future Sir Neville Lubbock, a widower with seven children. It is notable that Maynard was silent about Lubbock's behaviour but viewed Mary's class as a trigger for her upper-middle-class husband's violence. In this, she was almost condoning his physically abusive behaviour. See *GB*, 19 February 1881, 44; *GB*, 28 August 1884, 246; and *A*, VI, 40, "1880," 70.

<sup>48</sup> *GB*, 4 December 1881, 1. When Mabel confessed that her interest in religion was out of love Constance answered, "I can not respond to you as memories of L still crowd in so vividly." Mabel left the Slade shortly after as "she was needed at home." But her departure from the Slade seemed more likely due to Mabel's mother's concern about Constance's influence on her daughter.

<sup>49</sup> The meetings were held each Wednesday in a dreary basement largely used as a storage room for lumber. See *D*, 8 November 1880, 98; *GB*, 17 May 1880, 92.

<sup>50</sup> *GB*, 14 December 1881, 1.

holds, and lead her towards the dream that she had envisioned at Girton on that fateful Sunday in 1872, when listening sadly to her peers discuss secular texts.

Maynard's friendship with Caroline Cavendish was central to this dream. Besides running Addlestone, in 1880 Caroline had recently founded the Christian Women's Education Union (C. W. E. U.) The C. W. E. U. had four goals—to permeate existing schools with Christian teaching; to promote Christian teaching in homes; and to promote Christian education world-wide. The organization also had the goal of establishing a middle-class women's college with a Christian basis. Maynard was completely enamoured of this cause, and she strongly urged Cavendish to plan a conference in January 1881 to garner support for a women's college based in London. Around twenty-five attended, including family, friends, members of the G. P. M. and prominent schoolmistresses like M. E. Pope and Fanny Metcalfe.<sup>51</sup>

The conference was a huge success as far as Constance was concerned, because it had illuminated the need “to link education with the will of God.”

It almost seems as if religion and culture openly oppose each other....The main difficulty is that there tends to be two sets of schools - those with a low religious tone, but thorough intellectually; and those with a teaching deficient in aim and method, but the Christian teaching is genuine.<sup>52</sup>

It had been determined that:

A Christian college could be established to reflect the foremost elements of college life - its freedom of choice and collision with those of a different

---

<sup>51</sup> As Sondheimer notes in *Castle Adamant*, 14-16, after Malan's deflection Cavendish still had enough support to justify the formation of the C. W. E. U. in December, 1880. See also Cavendish, *Aims for Higher Education*, 5.

<sup>52</sup> *GB*, 8 February 1881, 21; also Cavendish, *Aims for Higher Education*, 7.

stamp. The thoroughness of work would attract a wide sphere of girls and announce that Christians sought a higher education as well as others.<sup>53</sup>

The point was, Maynard asserted, that “no distinct [women’s] college existed for London degrees (B. A. and B. Sc.), and these were the only degrees, except medical, that had been legally opened to women in England.” She was backed by Lettice Bernard, one of the first women to take medicine at London, who said that “both degrees *could* be taught by those holding the corresponding Cambridge Tripos, as long as tutors ‘worked up’ the material. It was resolved that a London college was needed to prepare students over eighteen years-old for degrees from the University of London.”<sup>54</sup>

Thoughts of the proposed college left Maynard even less absorbed in her work at the Slade, and this was exacerbated by her new quandary about the act of art-making as a valid activity for “*true* Christians”:

We spoke again about the relationship and antagonism between art and Christianity. Miss Cooper said art satisfied her, and that throughout her life would be the beauty of God by her productions. Mabel said, ‘if the world was not as it was, then this would be a noble cause.’ I do believe art reveals the works of God in a way that nature does not, but as the way things stand, there is a difference. Miss Cooper asked to change the subject.<sup>55</sup>

As noted earlier, Maynard had romanticized life as an artist, which had included showing her work in a gallery. Now she was surmising that art-making in an increasingly secularist world “could become the one driving motive in one’s life...that could not be

---

<sup>53</sup> *A*, VI, 40, “1881,” 73; and Cavendish, *Aims for Higher Education*, 10.

<sup>54</sup> See Cavendish, *Aims for Higher Education*, 13; also *GB*, 23 November 1881, 283.

<sup>55</sup> *GB*, 26 November 1880, 277.

reconciled with the 'seek ye first' of the Kingdom of Heaven."<sup>56</sup> Possibly, her disappointment in the Slade led her to conclude this since her Autobiography declared, "but I never doubted that experiencing something this sweet and tender *is* His gift."<sup>57</sup> While she was speaking of art here, as we have seen, it mirrored her views on desire. Art, like desire, would always remain intangible to her.

In 1880, however, the interconnecting of religion with higher education seemed more plausible and *far* more important to Maynard. After all, she had believed that this was her calling as prophet since attending Girton, and the Salvation Army had helped to re-kindle her dream. Moreover, she likely viewed it as another avenue of escape from Oakfield. As a result, her attendance at the Slade dropped to two days weekly, "interspersed between endless meetings" with Caroline Cavendish and Fanny Metcalfe. The latter, who was the headmistress of Highfield, a well respected girls school, was to become an important figure in the formation of Westfield alongside Maynard.

Royal Holloway College, under construction at the time, seemed a possible venue for such fusing. Fanny strongly encouraged Constance to approach the founder, Thomas Holloway, who was a wealthy patent medicine manufacturer, and "offer [her]self without pay for the Principalship." She visited the huge structure in Egham, Surrey, and was tempted by its lavish, unfinished interior. However, upon discovering that "there was no

---

<sup>56</sup> *Ibid.*, 3 December 1881, 287.

<sup>57</sup> *A*, VI, 41, "Summer and one term at the Slade, 1881," 89. See also Partner, "No Sex, No Gender," 436-42; Frijda, *The Emotions*, 32; Magai and McFadden, *Role of Emotions*, 12-16; Griffiths, *Emotions Really Are*, 45-49 Johnston, *Why We Feel*, 2-91, and Oatley and Jenkins, *Understanding Emotions*, 17-32 for discussion about the intrinsic nature of desire.



chapel [or] religious test for the staff” she concluded that it “was not for [her].” Despite Fanny’s subsequent assertion, “that any opposition to Holloway was self-defeating,” Constance was convinced of the growing impetus towards university education for women.<sup>58</sup> She energetically promoted her idea of a women’s college throughout 1881, during a period when public speaking by women was still considered a daring activity. Both diaries indicated that she gave over eighty speeches, at venues from the London School of Medicine for Women, Belstead and the North London Collegiate, to an industrial school for girls in the Midlands.<sup>59</sup>

In September 1881, Maynard wrote what became one of her most influential publications, *The Cultivation of the Intellect*. The pamphlet developed the arguments raised at the C. W. E. U., insisting that literature, science *and* religion should be a part of women’s knowledge:

Society has been content with a superficial cultivation, and Christian parents already lament the secularising tendency of the best schools and shrink from them....The common belief that women do not need cultivation is erroneous. We meet women whose powers have been drawn out, whose ideas have been awakened, who, in short, have been and *are* ‘cultured’.... Attention must be given to places of instruction for girls - in whose hands the future of the womanhood of England lies.<sup>60</sup>

---

<sup>58</sup> *A*, VI, 41, “1881,” 90-92. She noted here, “the founding of colleges gained momentum between 1869-1889.” Holloway became the third most prestigious women’s foundation after Bedford and Westfield, opening its doors to 28 students in 1887. See McCrone, “Emancipation or Recreation?,” 213-14.

<sup>59</sup> See Vicinus, *Independent Women*, 58. Also, Firth, *Maynard*, 180; Sondheimer, *Castle Adamant*, 20; and *D*, 14 March 1881, 19. In her *GB*, 26 May 1881, 90, Maynard asserted, “public speaking taught me to express what I know.”

<sup>60</sup> Maynard, *Cultivation*, 7, 18, 26. Another reason for the neglect of women’s education, she argued, was the mid- and-upper-class focus on social reform of the poor.

*Cultivation* was positively received at the C. W. E. U. during the following January, together with presentations on social purity and the plight of workhouse children.<sup>61</sup> It was here that Maynard met Mary Petrie, who was among the first women taking the B. A. degree at University College, London. Their shared commitment to women's higher education not only cemented their friendship, but Mary also facilitated Constance's meeting a family friend named Ann Dudin Brown, an elderly wealthy spinster, who knew of Malan's scheme and wished to establish a similar college in London. As Constance recalled of this pivotal event, which took on February 8<sup>th</sup>, 1882:

I was at the Slade when I was suddenly summoned to meet a rather timid elderly lady [Dudin Brown]....I had no idea why she had come, or that she had £20,000 to contribute towards a college. The next day she sent me a formal note saying that she was calling some friends together to discuss the establishment of a college on Christian basis....I wrote back immediately saying that if I could be useful I would be delighted to attend.<sup>62</sup>

Maynard attended the meeting in which she met Dudin Brown's friends, Col. Martin Petrie, the Rev. James Fleming, Dr. Thomas Boulton Bee and Dr. William Barlow.<sup>63</sup> Although she respected the interest of these prominent evangelicals in inter-connecting

---

<sup>61</sup> *GB*, 25 September 1881, 254. Maynard's paper was not actually a part of the curriculum, but she persuaded the chairperson to let her speak for ten minutes.

<sup>62</sup> *A*, VI, 42, "Dawn of Westfield, 1882," 106. Written May 1926. See also Firth, *Maynard*, 182-83; Sondheimer, *Castle Adamant*, 17-18. Dudin-Brown gave liberally to many religious-based charities. She met the Petries—who knew of Malan's and Cavendish's work—at the C. M. S. in 1879 and they became friends. The Petries likely steered Dudin Brown in a more academic direction than she had originally intended.

<sup>63</sup> Petrie was Mary's father; Fleming was a powerful Vicar who presided over the wealthy St. Michael's parish in Chester Square; Boulton Bee was the Principal of St. John's, which was a training ministry in Highbury; and Barlow was the Principal of a C. M. S. institution in Clapham. See Sondheimer, *Castle Adamant*, 18.

women's higher education with religion, she was disappointed by their lack of knowledge of, and ambivalence towards, a religious version of Girton. Their idea of a college seemed "no more than a training ground" to prepare women missionaries. In fact Dudin Brown expected "the students to do most of the house work; and she assumed that they would sleep in dormitories paying only £40 a year for board and tuition."<sup>64</sup>

However, since Petrie had read and had liked *Cultivation*, they wanted Maynard's opinion. She persuaded them against a missionary college by arguing that "the newly opened degrees to women at the University of London indicated support for women's higher education." Moreover, the fact that the university "granted degrees to women on *equal* terms with men" would distinguish a London-based college from those at Cambridge or Oxford. In order to establish a college of suitable calibre, she asserted, they must raise both the fees, and the age of admission from sixteen, suggested by Dudin Brown, to eighteen, with scholarships initiated to offset the former. She concluded by stressing that their college must also provide a milieu to "reach Christians." She left the meeting much encouraged. There had been "very little divergence of thought and the plans seemed more promising than anything of the kind yet." Key, was the interest she felt when Dudin Brown turned to her and said, "what would you be to it?"<sup>65</sup>

Fanny and Caroline encouraged Constance's interest in the scheme, advising her to

---

<sup>64</sup> *Ibid.*, 18-19. Dudin Brown did acknowledge the "usefulness" of training women to become teachers and social workers. But "the word 'College' suggested no definite thought of a degree and no one knew much "about universities beyond the male dominated Oxford and Cambridge."

<sup>65</sup> *GB*, 12 February 1882, 41.

accept the position of Honorary Secretary made to her at the following meeting on March 4<sup>th</sup>. While not offered the position of Mistress at this time, Constance assumed it a given since “the first initial steps had been taken.” From that time onward she willingly put all her energy into the proposed college; she discussed economic affairs like staffing and equipment with Fanny; she began looking at old houses as potential candidates for the future college; and by mid-March she had prepared an in-depth proposal on the running of a college for ten students.<sup>66</sup> Boulton suggested that they formalize matters by going public and instituting both a Council, and a “scheme” to add more funds to Miss Brown’s £10,000 investment.<sup>67</sup>

The “first *grand* meeting” about the college, held on April 3<sup>rd</sup>, included several well connected leaders of the educational community like Sir William Muir, Denny and Shaftesbury.<sup>68</sup> The proceedings began well. Boulton spoke eloquently of their aims and it was resolved that there was “ample room for such a college, as Oxford and Cambridge were already producing mistresses for girls’ schools.” A Council was then formed, consisting of Dudin Brown, Boulton, Barlow, Fleming, Petrie and Fanny Metcalfe—the

---

<sup>66</sup> *Minutes*, 4 March 1882, 3. She estimated that the Mistress’s rooms, the assistant lecturer’s rooms and six students’ rooms would cost £30 each; kitchen £40; library £70; and dining room and drawing-room £50 each. Teaching (around 12 hours per week) would cost £230 per annum; house expenses £210 per annum and domestics around £250 per annum. She suggested a fee of £100 per student per annum to cover staffing, rent, domestic expenses and equipment.

<sup>67</sup> *Ibid.*, 16. The scheme would take the form of “trenching,” i.e., the writing of promissory notes to each other or a promise on a bank loan.

<sup>68</sup> Sondheimer, *Castle Adamant*, 22. Muir was a civil servant with strong India connections. Maynard had sought donations from each man and from the G. P. M. “I said, ‘could not the same sort of thing be much better large-scale?’” *GB*, 5 March 1882, 61.

latter deemed important since she had been involved in the formation of Girton. Maynard was voted in as Honorary Secretary.<sup>69</sup> But then “things became discouraging,” she noted in both diaries. Boulton and Fleming voiced their doubt about the venture because of “its public condemnation.” Dudin Brown, strongly influenced by both men, spoke of her own “inclination to give the whole plan up.”<sup>70</sup>

Maynard was further upset when Shaftesbury and Denny also voiced concern. She was particularly disappointed in the former as he had apparently implied his support in an earlier conversation with her. As noted above, the wealthy Shaftesbury had ties to education, the Bible society and the Salvation Army. Known as a key reformer of his age, he was to “labour on behalf of the poor and suffering” throughout his life.<sup>71</sup> On this occasion, however, “He said that genteel women should not receive *too* much education,” Maynard lamented in her Green-book. “He said the saddest part of his work was not among the poor and ignorant but with fallen refined ladies.” The meeting “broke under a cloud” as everyone knew that Shaftesbury had the power to jeopardize the scheme if he criticized it publicly.<sup>72</sup>

---

<sup>69</sup> Sondheimer, *Castle Adamant*, 33; *Minutes*, 3 April 1882, 32-33. Fleming argued, “our college will be reassuring to Christian parents as the secularising influence(s) of scientific study will find their true safeguard in the true Christian life.”

<sup>70</sup> See *D*, 9 April 1882, 176 and *GB*, 12 April 1882, 76.

<sup>71</sup> For the life and work of Shaftesbury see Edwin Hodder, *The Seventh Earl of Shaftesbury, K. G., as Social Reformer* (Chicago: Fleming H. Revell, 1886) and his *The Life and Work of the Seventh Earl of Shaftesbury, K.G.*, vols. 1-3 (Shannon: Irish University Press, 1886).

<sup>72</sup> *GB*, 12 April 1882, 76.

Besides this linking of respectable womanhood to social evil, an attack against university-educated women had also been recently launched by two eminent physicians, Dr. Edward Clarke and Dr. Henry Maudsley, who had declared that university life was “out of harmony with the rhythmical periodicity of the female organization.”<sup>73</sup> Perhaps these views had influenced Shaftesbury, even though there is no evidence beyond Maynard’s dairies to suggest that he actually condemned the venture at the meeting.<sup>74</sup> Nevertheless, it does appear that some damage had been done. From this time on, the Council resisted appealing to a wider public, and this prohibited the college from becoming better known. Lack of wider support also meant a lack of funding. Thus, Dudin Brown was in a controlling position that left Westfield’s future more precarious and more susceptible to her conservative views about women’s higher education.<sup>75</sup>

In 1883, however, Maynard was clearly afraid that the venture would not actually even be launched. “I approached him [Shaftesbury] after the meeting,” she asserted in her Green-book, “to persuade him from speaking out against the college.” Her persuasion as she described it, implied that mild flirting was included as a part of her plea:

---

<sup>73</sup> Maudsley, “Sex in Mind and in Education,” *Fortnightly Review* 15 (1874), 466-68; Edward Clarke, *Sex in Education* (Boston: James Osgood, 1873), 66

<sup>74</sup> According to Sondheimer, in *Castle Adamant*, 26, Shaftesbury’s unpublished diary does not mention his criticism of the venture. “He wrote that ‘he took the chair at ‘Miss Dudin Brown’s meeting’ but made no comment.’” It is also curious that a diary entry in 1828, as cited in Hodder, *Earl of Shaftesbury*, 187, “Am happy to have had the means of spending £5 in a good cause—nothing less than a subscription to a fund which may educate a young girl,” evokes Shaftesbury’s support of education, which he maintained for over sixty years.

<sup>75</sup> See *Minutes*, 3 April 1882, 32-3; *Minutes*, 10 May 1883, 202; *Minutes*, 23 June 1884, 321; and Sondheimer, *Castle Adamant*, 23.

I gently laid my hand on his knee to tell him that he really must not go speaking against; that we were on the same side as he, and were as determined to heal some of the miseries of the world.<sup>76</sup>

His response as she reported it, “never mind what I or anyone else says. Real enthusiasm can accomplish *anything*, so you will succeed!” contained no direct promise,<sup>77</sup> but it confirmed an impression that she believed she had made. Personally reassured, her perseverance in “undoing the bad impression” was rewarded. On May 7<sup>th</sup>, 1882, a simple Diary notation, “The College, I believe, is to go on,” implies both her tenacity and skill in persuading her doubtful Council. On May 8<sup>th</sup> she was offered the position of Mistress, and she accepted the formal written offer a week later.<sup>78</sup> Her determination coupled with Dudin Brown’s financial support, made “her” college a reality five years before Holloway opened its doors.

.....

Maynard began her role as Mistress as she meant to continue, presenting a thorough, detailed list of her duties to the Council. This included nominating lecturers; hiring domestic staff; overseeing all monetary and household matters; advising students; arranging lectures at Westfield and the University of London; teaching Bible classes; overseeing the library and science apparatus; maintaining college rules regarding

---

<sup>76</sup> *GB*, 16 April 1882, 82.

<sup>77</sup> *Ibid.*, 82. See also Sondheimer, *Castle Adamant*, 23-26.

<sup>78</sup> *GB*, 7 May 1882, 85. She apparently spent hours writing letters of reassurance to Council members about the scheme. See also *GB*, 16 May 1882, 87.

behaviour, hospitality and travel; and issuing a Report to the Council at the end of each term. Although she felt the first of many “murmurs of difference” from Fanny Metcalfe, who at this time questioned her staunch evangelical approach, her list was accepted by the Council. They also agreed to her domestic arrangements which, reflecting those at Girton, suggested that students be allocated a connecting bedroom and sitting room. The meeting ended on a pleasant note. Maynard was cordially invited to attend future council meetings and “meet with the Council on any point she may desire.”<sup>79</sup>

The Council was equally cordial about the college prospectus. Printed under the heading, *Proposed College for Women for the Preparation of Students for the London University Degrees*, it largely echoed the recommendations forged at the Christian Women’s Education Union conferences. Although only advertized in *The Record* and the more secular *Journal of Education*, Maynard sent copies to friends, relatives and educators. Interestingly, she “shrank from sending” them to the Campbells, Lumsden and Davies. After a period of silence, Davies sent a letter of support, “I do not begrudge success to a common cause;” and she included “£5 as a token of goodwill.”<sup>80</sup> But the fact that neither the Campbells nor Lumsden responded implies their lack of support. Nor did

---

<sup>79</sup> Ibid., 17 May 1882, 91-33. She assured them that religious teaching would be in accordance with the Protestant Church of England to deflect Fanny’s open accusation. See also *Minutes*, 30 June 1882, 41-49

<sup>80</sup> *GB*, 6 July 1882, 120; also Firth, *Maynard*, 29-30. Maynard’s visionary sense never ceased to convince her that *her* calling was “higher” than that of most seeking to improve women’s education. As mentioned in chapters two and three, being raised “as Pilgrim and Stranger” had led her to feel awkward in yet superior to a society which countered her ideals. She tended towards self-depreciation, certainly, but she also had remarkable determination.



Girton's committee respond enthusiastically despite Davies' support. In fact Lady Stanley, whose opinion was powerful, openly harangued Maynard for her Evangelicalism.<sup>81</sup>

Constance sadly wrote, "this will always be the verdict of the strong bright daring world as it goes on in its course of venture and success." However, it is notable that her aims were to become a marker by which to justify her behaviour in face of those who challenged her values, or a shield against those who hurt her personally.

Opposition or support aside, Constance knew her energy had to be focussed on securing a building, students and staff if the venture was to be launched. The Council had demonstrated their faith in her abilities by setting the opening of the College that October, which was an astonishingly early date for such a venture. She was expected, as the prospectus indicated, to hire women trained at London or Cambridge as resident tutors. Angry over "only being allowed" one resident lecturer, she was equally upset when Mary Petrie "failed her;" and she worried over whom the Council "would send" her.<sup>82</sup> Implicit here is her fear of their securing either a strong-minded individual or, at the other extreme, one who would be weak and ineffective. "Then I remembered Katie Tristram!" she exclaimed in her Green-book, "an industrious and clever [Cheltenham] student who had excelled in Latin." Katie's age and lack of Matriculation was a distinct disadvantage. Moreover, she was seriously considering an offer from Frances Dove, who was now Mistress at St. Leonards. Nonetheless, her Christian background, intelligence, and the fact

---

<sup>81</sup> Stanley made a point of telling her this publically, at the annual Girton Committee meeting. See *GB*, 18 June 1882, 112.

<sup>82</sup> *A*, VI, 42, "1882," 90. Mary Petrie devoted her life to writing and publishing.

that she was pliable, made her the best candidate as far as Constance was concerned. After weeks of concentrated wooing she triumphantly recorded, "Katie has turned down St. Andrews and her employment is formerly confirmed by my Council."<sup>83</sup>

After securing her resident lecturer Maynard began her search for a college site.

Her Council had stipulated that

it should resemble the aspects of the country house, with all its numerous advantages, such as could in no way be gained by residing in London; yet we desire a property in which students could work together...within the order and energy of a true corporate life.<sup>84</sup>

The achievement of this proved more arduous than finding a lecturer. She searched through dozens of advertisements in *The Times* and local agencies, focussing on houses on the outskirts of London in areas like Hampstead, Highgate, Hendon, Acton and Ealing. It was not until August that both she and Boulton discovered two semi-detached, three-storey red-brick terraced houses (nos. 2 and 3) for rent on Maresfield Gardens in Hampstead. The location seemed ideal. There was access to London by train even though Hampstead itself was still a rural village containing several large estates. The Council signed a seven-year lease and "The College for Ladies at Westfield" became a reality. The final name, Westfield College, was chosen in 1887. In 1888, two adjoining terraced houses were leased to accommodate the increasing enrollment. Westfield moved to its

---

<sup>83</sup> See *GB*, 30 June 1882, 41-49; also *Minutes*, 2 July 1882, 128. Katie's father, a Canon of Durham, was active in the C. M. S. Since his wife regularly attended the annual Mildmay conference Constance had a good opportunity to win her over.

<sup>84</sup> *Minutes*, 17 July 1882, 23.

larger, permanent residence nearby in 1891.<sup>85</sup>

On September 10<sup>th</sup>, 1882, Maynard officially moved her belongings into Westfield for her “5<sup>th</sup>,” and as she rightly predicted, “last start in life!”<sup>86</sup> A week later, five candidates, Frances Synge, Margaret Graham Brooke, Emily Thompson, Annie Tristram and Alicia Bleby, presented themselves for the entrance examination, though all had already been admitted for October.<sup>87</sup> The examination, the Council had decided, must necessarily be of a lower standard than the London Matriculation. This, alongside the fact that the students were either friends of Maynard or another Council member was also predictable within the cultural climate. Demand for women’s university education was still limited. At best, a candidate would only come armed with a certificate from one of the Local Examination Boards. Moreover, as noted earlier, degrees from the University of London were deemed inferior to Oxbridge, since it was purely an examining body at this

---

<sup>85</sup> *A*, VII, 44, “My Life’s Work, 1882,” 4. Maynard began Part VII, her final Part of her autobiography, yet again at page one. See also Vickery, *Bluestockings*, 56, Sondheimer, *Castle Adamant*, 28, 44; and Eleanor Carus-Wilson, ed., *Westfield College, University of London, 1882-1932* (London: Favil Press, 1932), 22-7. The original name choice, in 1882, was St. Hilda’s, named after the English educational pioneer. Maynard noted in her *A*, “I put the name on the gate post and on writing paper.” But since a nearby girl’s school already held the title—and threatened legal action—the name was changed. Westfield College, chosen because the college faced west, began appearing in the title of the Annual Report in 1887.

<sup>86</sup> *D*, 10 September 1882, 61. She wrote here, “I dismantled my room [at Oakfield] completely. I took down all my pictures and packed the drawers of my writing table with my crockery.”

<sup>87</sup> *Ibid.*, 62; *Minutes*, 15 August 1882, 41-49. Mary Petrie corrected English Grammar, composition and English history; Constance did Scripture and physical geography; Colonel Petrie did Arithmetic, algebra and geometry; and Elizabeth Welsh corrected Latin and Greek.

time, and degrees were granted without much regard to the course of study.<sup>88</sup>

It is perhaps understandable, then, that on the eve of Westfield's opening, October 2<sup>nd</sup>, 1882, Maynard exclaimed in her Green-book, "I have a sort of foretaste of college life and it is not very congenial." While proud of her courage in the face of hostility, she felt "anxious about the degree, students, and of household matters of which [she] knew nothing." She tellingly added, "love has left me with a sad quiet, and a soberness about life." However, her sense of not being "allowed to make any mistakes" by her Council, the metaphorical public, seemed the most "insurmountable burden."<sup>89</sup>

Both insecurity and depression would haunt Maynard throughout her Westfield days. However, she never wavered from believing that Westfield was her life's work, despite the initial doubts surrounding the venture, and her ongoing haggles with her Council over Westfield's intellectual and religious aims.<sup>90</sup> Perhaps the fact that her first term proved self-fulfilling in a variety of ways helped in this respect. Certainly there were nasty teething problems like smoky chimneys and leaky windows. She also suffered through "inefficient" domestics and the multitude of "confusing bills which passed through her hands."<sup>91</sup> Though overwhelmed by her workload, she nonetheless found "the

---

<sup>88</sup> Sondheimer, *Castle Adamant*, 31. See also Carus-Wilson, ed., *Westfield College*, 3-4.

<sup>89</sup> See *GB*, 24 September 1882, 145; *GB*, 1 October 1882, 167.

<sup>90</sup> *Ibid.*, 28 May 1882, 90.

<sup>91</sup> *D*, 22 October 1882, 78. Rain poured in at every window and Constance's fire smoked to the extent that she had to evacuate her room. She was ill-prepared for household matters certainly, but lazy maids and cooks were a problem in institutions. Her accounting struggles were also compounded by the fact that she had to get each cheque

college homogeneous and most congenial to [her] ways.” She liked Jane Goldsmith, who remained her loyal housekeeper for the duration of her thirty-one years as Mistress. Staff member Kate Tristram meanwhile was industrious and biddable and was thus proving “to be the perfect second-in-command; and [her] five students, who were all clergymen’s daughters,<sup>92</sup> respected [her] values and were eager to learn.”

Maynard’s first task was to prepare her students for the London Matriculation examination by “working up” the subjects of English, History, Geography, Mathematics, Natural Philosophy (Physics), Chemistry, Scripture, Greek, Latin and German, from the elementary to the advanced levels. Her Council deemed the Matriculation necessary for distinguishing between those fit to go on for the Intermediate and B. A. degree, and those who would be “General students.” This was to be Westfield’s particular academic standard for many years. The Intermediate required taking the Classics of Latin and Greek, and English and History, alongside Mathematics and a modern language. The student then selected three subjects out of the five for the degree. In total, the degree program was expected to take three years to complete.<sup>93</sup>

Although all students had passed Westfield’s entrance exam, Constance found that

---

from the treasurer.

<sup>92</sup> *GB*, 8 October 1882, 147. See also *Westfield College Alumnae*, 1. Margaret Brooke’s and Frances Synge’s fathers were Church of England clergymen, Alicia Bleby’s father was a Wesleyan minister, and Emily Thompson’s father was a Congregational minister. It is notable that most students entering during Maynard’s rule were clergymen’s daughters.

<sup>93</sup> Details of the examination requirements are given in the *University of London Calendar*. See also *Minutes*, 10 May 1899, 294.

their educational levels, similarly to students at St. Leonards, differed dramatically. Annie, who was Katie's younger sister, probably had the least education.<sup>94</sup> Frances and Margaret followed as Belstead graduates. Frances had also briefly attended Blackheath High School, which was one of the girls' high schools founded by the Girls' Public Day School Company in the early 1870s.<sup>95</sup> Emily and Alicia, who had won the Amy Mantle scholarship (£50) and Dudin Brown scholarship (£40), respectively, seemed to have fared the best with private tuition. Alicia, who was the oldest by about six years, also had the advantage of having spent time in America. Constance began with introductory lectures on subjects like German and Physical Geography. But elementary Greek took up most of her five lecturing hours per week. Katie, meanwhile, spent seventeen hours teaching elementary Latin and Mathematics. The latter included geometry, algebra and arithmetic at both the elementary and advanced levels to students as needed. All students were escorted to Gower Street, where they took Physics and Chemistry at University College, twice weekly as Westfield had no laboratory facilities, and neither Constance nor Katie could teach the subjects at the Matriculation level.<sup>96</sup>

By November, a teaching routine had been established that, while somewhat

---

<sup>94</sup> *GB*, 4 June 1882, 105. Annie was probably admitted out of deference to the Tristrams wishes. Constance never discussed her nor is she listed in the *Westfield Alumnae* or a book containing the list of students' names as presented to Maynard when she retired in 1913.

<sup>95</sup> As noted in chapter two, the Girls' Public Day School Company promoted the building of public high schools across the country. These schools were more accessible to middle-class girls. See Fitch, "Women," 249; and Stephen, *Emily Davies*, 409.

<sup>96</sup> See *A*, VII, 44, "1882," 38-42; Firth, *Maynard*, 187-90.

piecemeal, served the needs of a small college building up its academic work. Margaret, Frances and Annie took elementary Mechanics from Kate, as they were “not sufficiently advanced to attend the University College Physics course.” At the same time, Constance had “changed the Physics lecture [at University College] twice as Alicia and Emily found it too easy.” In fact, Alicia was so far advanced of her peers that Constance had to send her “away from college twice until they caught up to her.” Meanwhile, Constance faced many “futile expeditions” to the University searching out suitable lectures for present and incoming students.<sup>97</sup>

The four new students in the Lent Term and two in the May Term brought the total for the year to eleven. This pattern, or something close to it, was repeated year by year. But as students rarely finished the course, the search for recruits was a preoccupation and worry for Maynard. The Council’s admission of three students who had failed the entrance exam—which was *not* “a precedent for the future”—typified the situation until suitably qualified entrants increased in the early 1890s. The lowering of the teaching standard compounded the problems during these early years. It meant the influx of the “indifferent” breed of student who produced “slip shod work,” Maynard pointed out. She was relieved when difficult students often left without any qualifications, but she also

---

<sup>97</sup> Students left for various reasons. Some married, others found the work too difficult, and sometimes parents refused to continue paying fees. See *A*, VII, 44, “1882,” 45-46; *Report of the Mistress*, in Minutes, November 1882, 60. Hereafter cited as *Report*, November 1882, 60. Katie, keen to read for the B. A. degree, joined Alicia and Emily for Physics, Chemistry, Latin and German. See also Anne W. Richardson, “Notes on the History of Westfield College up to 1913,” Special Collections, Queen Mary and Westfield College Archives, London, 18.

“felt a sense of failure.”<sup>98</sup>

Of the original five, only Alicia Bleby and Emily Thompson took their degrees, the former with Honours in Classics. Even so, in light of the ideas about women’s education, the majority of students who left with only Matriculation or Intermediate in hand in the early 1880s should not be seen as failures. Maynard’s trials after the admission of a “nervous invalid,” Evelyn Buxton, highlights how some parents saw higher education as an opportunity to get a difficult daughter off their hands. While the family did pay extra for private teaching, and Buxton did have aptitude, Maynard felt guilty when two other students had to defer their Matriculation. They were not prepared because she had been distracted by Buxton’s heavy demands.<sup>99</sup>

The inauguration of what Maynard termed, “the much dreaded Thursday ‘at Home’” that evolved into the immense and lavish yearly Garden-Party, helped to buoy her much needed confidence at this time.<sup>100</sup> Whether her guests were family like George, friends like Amy Mantle, feared critics like Davies, or complete strangers, she “was always encouraged.” However, one of the biggest hurdles, as far as she was concerned, was gaining her father’s approval. Although he had already shown his support by donating £1,000 towards furnishings for Westfield, she worried that he would condemn her college

---

<sup>98</sup> See *A*, VII, 45, “1883,” 33; *Minutes*, 12 December 1882, 63-65; and Sondheimer, *Castle Adamant*, 30-32.

<sup>99</sup> *GB*, 6 November 1882, 190-96; *D*, 20 November 1882, 106; also *A*, VII, 45, “1883,” 43; Sondheimer, *Castle Adamant*, 35.

<sup>100</sup> These were held about once a month in Westfield’s first year and were undoubtedly a lot of work. Maynard usually invited a mix of friends, family and educators in her effort to promote the college as much as possible. This seemed to work.



when he actually saw it, and perhaps even demand that she return home again. Rather, as she remarked after his visit in November, “his appreciation of the whole enterprise has cleared my last shadow of doubt away.”<sup>101</sup>

Maynard’s first Council meeting also went well. Her Council approved her lecture arrangements, and college rules, with the latter reflecting her cultural norms, her Girton experience and her own upbringing. “When I told them that I encourage corporate behaviour they were delighted,” she noted. “But I made sure that they knew that special permission was needed to travel in the city alone, to stay overnight from Westfield, and to return after 9:30 p.m.; and that all male visitors excepting relatives were entertained in the library or the Mistress’s rooms.” They also agreed to her more stringent, personalized college rules against dancing, theatre and novel reading. “I was so pleased that I left in a state of quiet content and gratitude,” Maynard recalled in her Autobiography. “I felt as if my first formidable barrier had been surmounted.”<sup>102</sup>

Maynard’s outward satisfaction was also influenced by her happiness and ease with her spiritual life. Divinity, the closest Church of England church to Westfield, suited her spiritual needs. Henry Sharpe’s emotive sermons echoed those she had heard at the

---

<sup>101</sup> *GB*, 9 November 1882, 200; also *A*, VII, 44, “1882,” 50; and Carus-Wilson, ed. *Westfield College*, 1-13.

<sup>102</sup> *A*, VII, 44, “1882,” 22. She was fearful about explaining that the total expenditure for the term (£373) left a deficit of £198. However, if they “got 15 students,” she had asserted, “the college would be self-supporting. See also *Report*, 11 November 1882, 56-58. Total layout cost was around £760. University college fees and salaries were £112 per term, while rent and taxes were £133. Maynard stressed that Westfield was “a college and not a school;” they must use surnames; refrain from public intimacy like kissing; include all newcomers; and male friends were considered guests of the Mistress.

Salvation Army meetings, “You will not mind walking alone through the dreary and bad streets with the Lord Jesus.” Sharpe’s exhortations, as reminders about “Outcast London” and her mother’s “fixed Principle,” reinforced Maynard’s belief in her chosen life. Her first Bible class, based upon her much loved “Parable of the Sower,” cautioned her students that, “[M]uch of the good seed scattered is wasted if hearts are hard, shallow and already occupied. *Good* means not having these defects.”<sup>103</sup> “The Sower” became Westfield’s “motto,” setting in place her expectation of each school year. According to the Green-book record, her teachings on “The Sower” evolved to become interwoven with philosophical and historical discourses. Kant’s “famous categorical imperative, ‘I ought, I can, I will,’” was particularly useful to her in helping to emphasize an individual’s need to maintain “high moral standards.”<sup>104</sup> She continued to make a special effort to incorporate or modify secularism with religion if she sensed that “simple Religious teaching” was falling flat with her students, or if she felt the need to stress that “the inner life be in greater proportion to the outer life.”<sup>105</sup>

However, contentment in both spiritual and academic life could not satisfy Maynard’s day-to-day cravings for human affection and companionship. Ever aware of her painful mistakes at Girton and St. Leonards, she had determined “to keep [her] place

---

<sup>103</sup> See *GB*, 8 October 1882, 149. As she explained it, “On the hard soil it only ‘patters’ on the outside. If the root is strong, though the tree may appear small, it will be strong and fruitful. “The Sower” is also alluded to in *Cultivation*, 29.

<sup>104</sup> See *GB*, 29 October 1884, 3; *GB*, 22 November 1890, 78; *GB*, 20 October 1903, 43. Also Firth, *Maynard*, 200-04.

<sup>105</sup> *GB*, 21 December 1884, 56. Also see *GB*, 16 October 1891, 88; *GB*, 1 November 1899, 99; *GB*, 20 October 1904, 3; and Firth, *Maynard*, 205-08.

among her staff and students as opposed to being a friend. After all,” she added, “a ‘deference’ needs to be demonstrated towards me publicly given my role. I asked to be addressed as ‘Miss.’”<sup>106</sup> But her feeling cool and confident was not easy. She found handling responsibility alone overwhelming, and Katie Tristram’s “fun with such a merry, noisy bunch” heightened her sense of solitariness. Thus, when the students “began instituting informal evening talks with [her]” she happily encouraged them. Indeed, their quiet “assembling outside [her] door” soon metamorphosed into a nightly “personally-conducted Pie.” As she gathered them “around [her] armchair in the firelight, or kiss[ed] each face in succession after [her] Bible class, [she] fe[lt] that [she was] in the right place at last.” She had no regrets about “the strong bond of affection” that she had with them.<sup>107</sup>

Clearly, Maynard struggled with her new, public role. Like many educational pioneers of her time, she sought to differentiate between appropriate work behaviour and personal emotions. But adopting “male” traits like cool assertiveness likely felt at odds with prescribed femininity, particularly within Westfield’s familial-like setting. Thus, her pining for the emotional ties of the traditional Victorian family was predictable. However, her adoption of maternal-like rituals to offset her “weakness” was interconnected with another, more powerful desire. Campbell had opened her up to the intensity of love. With Lumsden, she had hoped to connect passion with ambition and faith. As she had noted after falling in love with the latter at Girton:

---

<sup>106</sup> *GB*, 12 November 1882, 15.

<sup>107</sup> *Ibid.*, 29 October 1882, 3; Margaret instituted the name “Pie,” which meant that they could discuss anything with “Miss.” See also Carus-Wilson, ed., *Westfield College*, 13-25.

...I have got only one thing to give, - a heart that could lose itself in another, and think *no* trouble too much....I have *not* love like that for the Saviour....To *love* is *not* like that. When the heart has a flash of recognition the idea presented always is, 'we belong to each other!'<sup>108</sup>

Although Lumsden, Campbell and others had failed to meet her needs, Maynard still romanticized about finding that special "someone in whose arms [she] could feel love and trust." Gender, it seems, was no longer really an issue.<sup>109</sup> Since her life from this point was devoted to Westfield, despite her best intentions and her laments, Maynard could never resist turning to peers or students to satisfy her intellectual and emotional needs. As a result, her physical longings became women-centred. Consequently, her passion, ambition and faith became troubling in distinct, new ways.

Throughout much of the 1882/1883 school year Constance saw Margaret Brooke (MGB) as "the choice of [her] life." She was drawn to the pretty, industrious, pious nineteen-year-old from the outset. By late October, her (true to form) Green-book implied their mutual attraction and her debate over desire. One entry, "But oh! how vividly the human feeling rises! - Lord keep me steady," implies both her surprise and fear at the intensity of her feelings. She was apparently even more "awe-struck" when, during a Pie discussion on resisting worldly pleasures,

this seemingly sweet, demure and gentle mannered girl...leaned hard against [her] in the dark and whispered: But Oh! *with love*, I shall never,

---

<sup>108</sup> *GB*, 16 September 1873, 148.

<sup>109</sup> *Ibid.*, 17 May 1882, 92. She asserted here that it was certain *attributes* that she sought, rather than gender. However, even at Girton, she seemed to assume that seeking a career meant that she would probably be with a woman. This does not suggest that her desire was female-focused. As noted in chapter 5, she was quite attracted to Henry Sidgwick. Had he been interested in her, she may spent her life with him as a pioneer.

never, want such things. I have been longing for this my whole life. You fit right down into every corner til no part is empty and hungry - Oh, how I have wanted you!<sup>110</sup>

Constance was drawn to Margaret's passionate outburst, while at the same time, she "felt almost ill with the responsibility" owing to her age, values and role. She explained in her Green-book, "I had to have a 'straight out' talk" with her later that night, explaining

that I must expect the utmost self control from her for...all students must be alike to me. Then coming nearer yet, I told her how self control was not needed for the sake of appearances only, but for our own true self. Love, 'the best thing in all the world,' could be a terribly weakening power by standing in the way of 'I ought, I can, I will;' and that I should never forgive myself if she only came to me for help instead of going *there* beside her little white bed....She saw all this fully. We agreed that a denial such as this was part of our nature, and a sort of satisfaction to another part - the love of order and justice, of doing something great and public.<sup>111</sup>

Here we see the enactment of the desire versus resistance "ritual" that Maynard had encouraged with Amy Mantle and probably Mary Tait. Religious "duty," set within the contours of the Atonement, was realized through wrestling between honouring the spiritual and experiencing through the physical. Brooke, like Mantle and Tait, disliked her love's conditions and her manipulative restrictions. "She declares herself out of control whenever I touch her," Maynard exclaimed. "This noble consciousness of attraction is not lost on me as the scar caused by L is ever in my heart. My position makes me silent, but I speak of having also loved across that terrible chasm, and we pray to keep our

---

<sup>110</sup> Ibid., 5 November 1882, 10. See also Ibid., 28 October 1882, 5.

<sup>111</sup> Ibid., 5 November 1882, 11.

hearts...sheltered in His hand.”<sup>112</sup>

During the ensuing months Constance struggled with her passion. In “the day, in public, nothing could be more controlled, more helpful and respectful in [their] manner” towards each other. But their nights together alone were different:

She knows my step and stands with outstretched arms as I enter with the almost painful longing expression that love must bring when it comes in force....She says her world was empty before she met me; that she had often fallen in love before but *that* was hollow and worthless. She says I am the greatest treasure that God could have possibly given her.<sup>113</sup>

Maynard’s desire was also “drawn with a force that [was] almost painful.” She teasingly acceded to Brookes’s subversion of her gender. “I become her dearest, strongest, most reverent husband in the whole world,” she noted. “As I gather my wife to myself so yielding, I ask, ‘why is the man’s love stronger and fiercer than that of the women?’ - So I feel to thee, my own, my love, my heart’s darling...mine, only mine!”<sup>114</sup> Yet at the same time she questioned her adopted role and the nature of their relationship, “Is all this right? Is it taking the truly highest path? Surely it is all rather unusual, is it exactly as the Lord meant it?”<sup>115</sup> She apparently told Brooke, “I will never let you give more than you ought.” While Brooke “would sweep this aside and say the marriage vows,” or silence her doubt “with impatient” exhortations like, “I am truly your wife,” Maynard still felt guilty about

---

<sup>112</sup> Ibid., 12.

<sup>113</sup> Ibid., 22 March 1883, 69. She noted here, “at 19, she [MGB] seemed to have had a more passionate past than most women of her age, but had been satisfied with nothing.”

<sup>114</sup> Ibid., 69.

<sup>115</sup> Ibid., 71.

usurping the feelings that, perhaps, Brooke should be giving to a man.<sup>116</sup>

Clearly, Maynard was troubled by the depth of their carnal intimacies.

Nevertheless, she had no means of understanding her passion for a woman beyond that which she had experienced at Girton and St. Leonards, in which the rave or husband/wife roles, as such, had been enacted or reverted. Her turning towards the discourse of social purity is similarly interesting. As noted in chapter three, she modified Josephine Butler's observations on gender in an effort to understand her desire:

She said, 'the man leans to the physical side, and exercise is the way to keep him right. The girl falls in love with the man....It is the impulse toward maternity implanted by God, showing itself in the attraction of the other sex....The girl should especially be profound, and appeal to the mind and not just bodies of men and their feelings.' *I know how hard this is. Margaret's passion has crept into my heart. I begin to see how difficult my task is because passion is so very, very, intoxicating to receive. I have felt it in every fibre of my being, and I know that I must deal wisely with His gift. Oh! to deal wisely now.*<sup>117</sup>

Inevitably, Maynard's failure to completely justify her desire within her cultural context steered her towards religion, once again, as a tool of further understanding. As the quote suggested, her relationship with Brooke had made her "aware, as never before," of how much she needed passion in her life. She yearned for the "giving away of oneself - heart and body - every inch," after perhaps having already experienced it. Lumsden had had the same "physical power" over her when they were together, but that relationship

---

<sup>116</sup> Ibid., 7 May 1883, 84. Margaret apparently wanted Constance to say her "part of the vows. But I could not," Constance added, "because I was afraid my words might feel like a restraint on her one-day." She also justified this within the context of the rave, "if the right man comes along, I shall be happy to let her go to him." See also Ibid., 19 August 1883, 117, for another example of their husband and wife role playing.

<sup>117</sup> Ibid., 12 January 1883, 46.

now seemed “a painful exercise” in comparison to “*this* one, which, though as strong, [wa]s all gentleness and peace.” Maynard surmised that the crucial difference was God’s Blessing. Her aims at Westfield symbolized her commitment to doing His work, and Brooke had been converted. He was rewarding her emotional needs through religious enlightened empowerment:

He has made her to my heart to heal that terrible scar, to give me the excitement and the wings of love without that self destructive keen edge of discord....I have never seen quite so sweet a heart and life as this that is now poured on me so lavishly.<sup>118</sup>

Maynard’s turn to the language of religious love to exonerate her desire moved her beyond its justification in cultural terms:

God has offered MGB to me so I now claim the right to love, protect and cherish her to her life’s end. I shall put away my last fear, and while guarding the external restrictions, set aside the internal restrictions and believe that what forces itself unasked upon me is meant to be.<sup>119</sup>

In short, she condoned her passion by claiming that it was more important to guard against worldliness at college with novel reading or dancing, than to debate His gift of love.<sup>120</sup>

Her understanding of eroticism as God’s reward for “good” *public* deeds was emotionally freeing for Maynard. In many ways, if she had replicated her first term, she quite possibly could have run a small Christian-based college with a loving female partner

<sup>118</sup> Ibid., 3 May 1883, 71-73.

<sup>119</sup> Ibid., 73. See also Ibid., 30 December 1883, 27.

<sup>120</sup> Ibid., 5 November 1882, 8. When Frances raised the question of dancing Constance had thought “why not? the bright young creatures would really enjoy it!” But she “was saved just in time” by Margaret, who remarked that it was “better to make the line rigid or one [didn’t] know when to stop; that it [was]n’t dancing so much as playing cards or going to the theatre.”



for the remainder of her working days. This is evidenced in 1901 when she tried to found a Divinity college with Marion Wakefield at her side. However, “ambition” pulled Maynard in another direction, driving her to seek a successful academic institution. Thus, her concealment of an erotic private milieu with a public front could not shield her from the resulting power struggles. In 1883, she was perplexed by Frances Synge’s and Katie Tristram’s increasing moodiness, failing to recognize that it paralleled her passion for Margaret. Although Frances claimed her religious upbringing caused her rebellion, her retaliation actually stemmed from being usurped as “No. 1 student” by Margaret.<sup>121</sup> While Katie’s desire for Constance was not revealed until April 1884, at this time she also employed religion to explain her “aching heart” as evinced in her impassioned, “don’t touch me!” when Constance tried to talk to her about her behaviour. “I do not feel like a Christian,” Katie explained of her rebuff, “I am deceiving you by helping to do Christian work.”<sup>122</sup>

The problems surrounding jealousy and envy were complicated by growing enrollment. Even so, the interpersonal relationships were out of hand during Maynard’s first year. She faced for the only time in her thirty-one years as Mistress, the nervous breakdowns of two students. In one case she wrote of her fear for everyone’s safety. She

---

<sup>121</sup> Ibid., 16 December 1882, 21. Constance knew Frances the best and always sought her advice until she fell in love with Margaret. Frances retaliated by disrupting religious discussion. Yet Constance blamed Mamie, founder of Belstead, for this. “Religious words had lost their meaning for Frances at Belstead,” she asserted here.

<sup>122</sup> Ibid., 19 November 1882, 14. “I spoke to her wisely,” Constance wrote perhaps naively of this incident. “I told her God’s hands could bring joy, but that she must do His work in the dark.”

“was forced to submit to lying in [Emma Maunder’s] arms all night listening to her incoherent mutterings...about [their] *marriage* making [them] a part of each other forever.”<sup>123</sup> Maynard’s assertion, that Maunder’s “unhealthy affection for [her]” evolved into “a desperation like madness,” reflected the distinction she made between Brooke’s and Maunder’s passions for her. She was clearly more attracted to the former.

However, Maynard’s concern about Maunder also reflected the discourses on hysteria in the nineteenth-century. As noted in chapter six, the equation between nervous disorders and gender stemmed from centuries old discourses on the different natures of men and women. Women were bodily and therefore subject to the irrational and emotive. Men, in comparison, were rational, intellectual and cultured.<sup>124</sup> In 1866, one physician recorded his observations of the “hysterical” woman:

She shifts erratically from an outburst of laughter to one of tears. She becomes enthusiastic with ardour and passion for the person she wants to possess at any cost; she stops at nothing, at no sacrifice to achieve her goal....She affects feminine airs...while in secret abandons herself to the most shameful scenes in which she makes crude and sometimes obscene remarks and engages in the most disruptive acts....<sup>125</sup>

Little wonder, then, that Maunder’s intense mood swings, “prowl[ing] about like a cat at night” and then holding Maynard as a sexual hostage, were seen as a mental breakdown as

---

<sup>123</sup> Ibid., 14 January 1883, 44. It must have been a stressful situation for Maynard. She noted, “At night she would...inevitably end up cold and miserable in my bed, where she would cling to me with a desperation like madness.”

<sup>124</sup> For discussion on the long history concerning the “different nature” of men and women see Bynum Walker, *Holy Feast* and Mack, *Visionary Women* and “In a Female Voice.”

<sup>125</sup> Citation taken from physician, Jules Falret, in Micalé’s *Approaching Hysteria*, 229.

it would be today. When Maunder was taken off to an asylum Maynard was relieved to be freed from responsibility for her.<sup>126</sup>

Nevertheless, Showalter points out, it is important to remember that when Victorian women began seeking social freedoms such as higher education, neurasthenia, anorexia nervosa and hysteria became epidemic. Since women were believed to be more vulnerable to insanity than men, and experienced it in specifically feminine ways, it was assumed that the “disorder” could surface from the way that women conducted their lives. As noted above, Victorian physicians were criticising a university education for women at this time. For example, in “Sex in Mind and Education” (1874), Maudsley argued that while learning brought out the best in men, it could upset the more unstable nerve centres of women and leave them seriously deranged.<sup>127</sup>

Here we see the problems facing educational pioneers. If we are to take Maynard’s Green-book at face value, Maunder does appear to have been mentally unstable before entering Westfield, as she was only there for ten days. Yet Maynard’s anguish over the doctor’s decision to remove Maunder likely stemmed from knowing that the incident would fuel criticism of Westfield in these early years, despite the achievements of other students.<sup>128</sup> By the same token, Maynard was relieved when her love, Marion Wakefield,

---

<sup>126</sup> *GB*, 14 January 1883, 45. She noted here, “I hear she is on the verge of mania.”

<sup>127</sup> Maudsley, “Sex in Mind,” 466-68. See also Clarke, *Sex in Education*; and Allan White’s collection of writings on hysteria in *Carnival, Hysteria and Writing: Collected Essays and Autobiography* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993).

<sup>128</sup> *Report*, Lent Term, 1883, 69-71. She asserted here, “After 10 days of continuous nervous breakdown Miss Maunder had to leave.” But it is notable that she felt conflicted by her “diagnosis.” In her *GB*, 18 January 1883, 45, she admitted, “I think I

was diagnosed as suffering from neurasthenia and *not* hysteria in 1902. Marion's problems were the direct result of college life. Her stress was caused by the academic, personal and spiritual pressures that Maynard had placed upon her.

The second and final Westfield student to leave due to acute mental problems was Minna Colville. A talented and hard-working student, Colville appears to have made herself ill trying to over achieve. She set herself strict time schedules for taking both the Matriculation and the Intermediate; and she would have been the first student to pass the B. A. degree if she had continued. However, although Maynard's diaries are vague on the matter, Colville was also disgusted by the stifling, religious atmosphere instilled by Maynard giving credibility to what she viewed as inappropriate behaviour.

According to the Green-book, Colville's violent outbursts frightened Maynard even more than Maunder's had done. Colville's accusations that Maynard "was a hypocrite and whiten [sic] sepulchre, amongst other things," touched upon what Minna likely saw as a biased milieu. It is notable that Maynard used her position of power to discredit Colville. When the latter accused her of inappropriate behaviour, Maynard retaliated by ridiculing Colville in public. Time taught Maynard to modify her stringent religious-based expectations, and to curb her penchant for erotic-based favouritism, but her new-found power always left her reluctant to curb either. Her struggle between her admiration for secularism and her need for religion created an uneasy balance in her role.

---

made too much of it, calling it hysterical mania. The next day she seemed calmer, but by 5:00 p.m. I got the doctor's verdict and she was driven off with her nurse. Two days later she noted, "after hearing she was much better, I now hear she has broken down again and is once more on the verge of mania." See *GB*, 20 January 1883, 47.

Her failures with a vulnerable Emma Maunders and a talented Minna Colville would always leave a sting.<sup>129</sup>

Maynard's struggle with her role was further complicated by her own tendency to over achieve. She not only supervised lectures, taught Bible classes, and struggled to keep abreast of correspondence, household matters and innumerable visitors; but she also continued to teach the Slade Bible lessons and attend the S. A., C. W. E. U. and Girton meetings. She further added her interest in Butler's and W. T. Stead's "plea for rights and justice" in their fight against the C. D. Acts, which as noted in chapter two, tapped a strong current of Evangelical morality at this time.<sup>130</sup> Since Maynard would find this pace impossible in future years, it is not surprising that she found herself suffering from stress-related anxiety by May 1883.

Anxiety led to frequent headaches that, in turn, led to bouts of insomnia. As a result, Maynard found herself seeking advice and consolation in Brooke's arms. However, this "mere indulgence" apparently made matters worse because their relationship was faltering. While Maynard adored Brooke's femininity, courage and piety, she no longer viewed them as equals. In fact she was growing resentful of "her sweet child's" increasing criticism of her rule. Brooke's blaming her for some college conflicts, including the

---

<sup>129</sup> *GB*, 13 October 1884. Minna was among the first to study mathematics.

<sup>130</sup> *D*, 23 January 1883, 99. Maynard wrote here, "Some 500 women full of courage stood up to suggest and support plans." She was likely referring to feminist sentiments regarding prostitution and mens' sexual culture. Stead's famous newspaper article exposed youth prostitution, which, alongside Butler's aims, shifted the public discourse on sexuality, and incited political movements. See Walkowitz, *Prostitution*, 66; *Dreadful Delight*, 11, 90-93; and Gorham, "The Maiden Tribute" on this.

Colville affair, had been especially hurtful as they had a ring of truth. At the end of the day, she had “tears of loneliness” despite career and love. “Work is good,” she wrote in her Green-book, “but it is not one’s whole being, and love might be sweet, but it leaves a sad craving.”<sup>131</sup> In short, her relationship with Brooke, and perhaps her inter-personal troubles at Westfield, had illuminated her need for “a strong masterful woman upon whom [she] could lean”—or so Maynard wrote in her Autobiography.<sup>132</sup>

It is notable that such a woman had already entered Maynard’s life. In February, 1882, she had received a “stiff, precise note” from a second year Newnhamite, named Anne W. Richardson (Nannie). The latter had explained that she enjoyed reading *Culture* and wanted to meet the author, especially as the text had been written by a supposedly secular-minded Girtonian.<sup>133</sup> They arranged to meet the following June at Cambridge, when Maynard was trying to secure a resident lecturer for Westfield. She recorded:

It was the great annual tennis match between Girton and Newnham and 120 students were cheering their respective sides. She was one of the champions. I watched her slim, alert figure in dark blue from afar. When the game finished she came towards me. Her cheeks were flushed with running and her thick brown hair was plaited. She was swinging her racquet by the top and saying cheerfully ‘the play was altogether too strong for us!’<sup>134</sup>

---

<sup>131</sup> *GB*, 10 June 1883, 90. She resented MGB’s comment, that she did “not take care in her dress,” and was “irritated” to be told that she was “too opinionated.” See *GB*, 19 August 1883, 114.

<sup>132</sup> *A*, VII, 44, “1882,” 42.

<sup>133</sup> Firth, *Maynard*, 176. Firth suggested that Nannie’s governess—attending the Liverpool C. W. E. U. conference—had liked Constance’s paper so much that she had sent Nannie a copy.

<sup>134</sup> *GB*, 8 June 1882, 122; *A*, VI, 44, “1882,” 128.

Although there was little time for in-depth conversation, Maynard was immediately taken with the compelling twenty-three-year-old who had been raised in an aristocratic Quaker home in Moyallon in Ireland. Nannie was similarly drawn. In fact Maynard was pleasantly surprised when she called on her in London two weeks later, and she noted her delight at finding “fellow sympathy and support” for her college.<sup>135</sup>

Richardson was one of Westfield’s first visitors in October 1882, stopping en route to Newnham with a gift of six small study lamps for each student’s room. “That visit was the beginning of our lifelong friendship,” Maynard recorded in her Autobiography.

When I realized that we were both aiming for the same work for God I felt we might be friends. We spoke about Girton, Newnham and Westfield, and her life at Moyallon and mine at Oakfield. We also spoke about my contact with unbelief and my beginning of the GPM. She was amazed that I had managed to accomplish this in such a difficult atmosphere.<sup>136</sup>

In fact listening to Richardson’s pain over an “unbeliever’s rage” evoked such memories “of L that I spoke about my doubts in a way I have seldom spoken before,” Maynard wrote at the time. “As we knelt together and prayed for the girls of the upper classes, our equals, our fellows, I felt as if I had been waiting for this friend all my life.”<sup>137</sup> Thus, while seeking emotional comfort from Brooke, she frequently wrote to Richardson throughout the year, relying on her “strong masculine intellect” for academic advice. Here, at last, was someone who not only shared her class-based views and aspirations, but was also a

---

<sup>135</sup> *GB*, 21 June 1882, 132.

<sup>136</sup> *Ibid.*, 16 October 1882, 151.

<sup>137</sup> *Ibid.*; *A*, VII, 44, “1882,” 8.

Christian.<sup>138</sup> Nannie became a key figure in her life for many years.

When the Council agreed to the hiring of another resident tutor after congratulating Constance on her all-around achievements as Mistress,<sup>139</sup> she wanted Nannie “as [her] new helper.” However, Nannie, not yet qualified, was expected to oversee her father’s linen mill after finishing college.<sup>140</sup> Ultimately, she persuaded her father to let her teach at Westfield. Her thirty-eight years service as lecturer and vice-principal, beginning in 1887, interconnected her with Constance in complex ways.

Equally noteworthy was Nannie’s guidance of Constance towards the fateful hiring of Nannie’s close Newnham friend, Frances Ralph Gray in 1883. Frances (Ralph) seemed the perfect candidate. Raised in an upper-middle-class home in Tipperary in Ireland, she was “a sincere Christian” who was gifted and expected to excel in her upcoming Classical Tripos. After meeting Ralph, Constance was clearly smitten with the beautiful, tall, blue-eyed brunette. “Her gentle face and low replies gave me a feeling of steady reliable force,” she recorded in her Green-book, “and so, as young as she was, I felt my search had ended.”<sup>141</sup> In fact, Maynard’s professional and personal “searchings” were both ending

---

<sup>138</sup> See *GB*, 6 January 1883, 209; *GB*, 12 March 1883, 256; *GB*, 16 June 1883, 302.

<sup>139</sup> *Ibid.*, 17 May 1883, 80. See also *Report*, 19 March 1883, 72-75. The year had seen economical success in that there was a surplus of £32 after household expenses, tuition, rates and taxes. Emily and Alicia had passed their Matriculation, and a number of student names were down for October. Mantle had “also promised £1,000 to the college.”

<sup>140</sup> *A*, VII, 45, “1882,” 44.

<sup>141</sup> *Minutes*, 24 May 1883, 72-75. Ralph was born a Wesleyan Methodist but chose to attend the evangelical Church of England. She “passed the Cambridge Higher Local with distinctions in both English and Divinity. See also *GB*, 20 May 1883, 85.



and, at the same time, merely beginning.

Ambition versus passion in the form of a merging of the “feminine” and the “masculine” was the important process for Maynard in the early 1880s, as this chapter has argued. This involved a distinct and complicated questioning of gender, class and sex, culminating in Maynard’s synthesis of it into a singular aim of passion, ambition and faith. If she had known that this uneasy synthesis would create “eleven years of desolation and emptiness,” she might have heeded her misgivings when Nannie brought Ralph to view Westfield in June 1883. She knew, even at this time, that they saw her nurturing demonstrative approach, steeped in religious values, as somewhat lacking in public spirit and authoritativeness.<sup>142</sup>

Nonetheless, Maynard’s determination and ambition helped forge Westfield’s success. Moreover, her new-found position of power as Mistress, I suggest, facilitated what would sometimes become her sexual and emotional abuse of young women. This is implied in the way that she conducted herself in the nightly Pie, and it seems evident in the different ways that she (sub-)consciously toyed with Frances Synge, Katie Tristram, Margaret Brooke and, perhaps, Emma Maunder and Minna Colville. In fact I propose that Maynard’s behaviour mirrors that of Campbell’s in 1872 and 1880. Just as he had guilefully played on her naivety and her emotions, so she would inflict schemes of manipulation upon those to whom she was attracted. Just as she had adopted religious metaphor to avoid confronting her own guilt and confusion, and Campbell’s wrongdoing,

---

<sup>142</sup> *GB*, 17 June 1883, 91. She was too busy with exams to spend much time with either Nannie or Ralph. But she sensed their disapproval with some of her “rules.” See also *A*, VII, 45, “1883,” 38.

so faith became a means to justify her own wrongdoing.

Thus, even though her family home was and would be relaxing throughout her Westfield years, she now knew that she could never go back. Tissy and Gazy might feel obligated to village work, nursing their father, or assisting Do with her second pregnancy, but *her* “heart always seemed to fly back to the work [she had] left behind.” In other words, while family remained of concern, and she felt guilty regret about her sisters’ wasted talents, she “had a real vocation which [she] needed to fulfill.” Her “college must come first.”<sup>143</sup> In sum, her priorities in love, duty and faith were college based, and not in the domestic sphere. Her “family,” regardless of how “publicly troubled” or “emotionally wronged” it was, resided within the walls of her college, as an analogy of the situation of many other women living together then.

---

<sup>143</sup> *Ibid.*, 16 September 1883, 123. She noted here, “Dora’s second child, Theodore, was born in August. Yet distributing copies of Westfield’s first annual report at the crowded Mildmay conference seemed more important and rewarding to me.”

## Chapter 8

### 'Eleven years of Gloom': Amid Success, 1886-1896

1886 marked the onset of what Maynard referred to as, "Eleven years of Gloom."

The story is an old one. The one I loved with the element of undisguised passion, failed me. The good and steady friend who might have brought relief from the loss transformed her affection to others, for my prolonged grief became to her wholly uninteresting. This state was not continuous otherwise I probably would have lost my mind....Perhaps I'm overstating my unhappiness....<sup>1</sup>

While Maynard's troubles with her Council and her role as Mistress caused much of her stress, the root of her on and off depression stemmed from her torment over love. "Just as I dislike some people at first sight," she wrote in her Green-book in 1884, "I knew I loved Ralph from the first moment I saw her." Indeed, Ralph Gray promised the "total love" she had craved since her Girton days.<sup>2</sup> But as love became unravelled, so Maynard sought to "Atone" for passion.

Firth's account of Maynard's long reign as Mistress of Westfield only hinted at this struggle. Similarly to her treatment of Maynard's relationships with Campbell and with Lumsden, Firth failed either to discuss or analyse her passion for Gray. Firth's few references to Gray were taken from Gray's biography, *Gladly, Gladly* (1923) that, similarly to Lumsden's *Yellow Leaves*, focussed on Gray's life-long commitment as an

---

<sup>1</sup> *A*, VII, 44, "1883," 3. Written, May-June, 1926.

<sup>2</sup> *GB*, 31 December 1884, 199.

educational pioneer.<sup>3</sup> As noted in chapter one, an important aspect of this study is its portrayal of the vital, unique ways in which Maynard's emotional life potentially interconnected with her professional life. As also argued, Firth's friendship with Maynard left her reluctant about connecting the two. This is a serious deficiency in Firth's study since Maynard's relationship with Gray is core to understanding her experience during these years of her life.

Although Firth has some interesting things to say about Westfield, she did not discuss the college at great length, despite the fact that she was a student in history there herself from 1901-1905. As Westfield tutor Eleanor McDougall pointed out in her review of Firth's book in 1949, "Those to whom Miss Maynard was 'the Mistress' would probably have preferred to have less minute detail about her family life and...[Effie] whom she adopted, and to hear more about the actual College."<sup>4</sup> Firth's lengthy chapter on Effie does have prominence, positioned as a separate chapter between Westfield's early and late years. "It seems to be of intrinsic interest and I have therefore treated it at

---

<sup>3</sup> Frances Ralph Gray, *Gladly, Gladly* (London: Hodder, 1923), 12-50. The narrative, which frankly is quite dull, traces Gray's work at Westfield to the running of St. Paul's School for Girls. In terms of Westfield, she speaks of her struggles with social convention, like the time she sat on the top of an omnibus during a period when women were expected to sit below. She had joined a student who complained of a headache and wanted "to sit on top to get fresh air." Gray speaks quite kindly of Maynard and of her support of Maynard's ideals, although she did challenge some of her rules. However, she does not discuss their personal relationship at all.

<sup>4</sup> Eleanor McDougall, review of *Constance Louisa Maynard, Mistress of Westfield College*, by Catherine Firth, *Westfield College Magazine* (1949), 15. McDougall was a tutor at Westfield from 1902-1912.

disproportionate length, as a study within a study,” Firth explained.<sup>5</sup> However, while Effie was important in Maynard’s life, according to her records, she was no more so than either individuals like Nannie or Ralph, or the running of Westfield. It seems more prudent to place Effie within the wider context of Maynard’s life. Maynard’s role at Westfield and her passion for Ralph clearly influenced her relationship with Effie, and vice versa. This chapter, then, explores how Maynard’s seeking of a particularly stringent Atoning for passion and ambition shaped her experiences and those of those close to her during these important years of her life.

What may we say of Westfield under Maynard’s long Mistress-ship? Looking through her Diary, we might argue that the “pleasant social customs” that were in place until her retirement, evoked her attempts at merging a “masculine” authoritarian role with her prescribed female one. Moreover, her style of running Westfield like a large family, while hierarchical and claustrophobic, might have been appropriate in her pioneering role. Westfield’s “rules” reflected those at Girton and the gendered values at large. Firth’s recollection of her student days described some “social customs” initiated at Girton:

The Mistress sat at the High Table and its places were filled by students whose names had earlier been written on a china menu stand. At the head of each small table sat a lecturer. It was an unwritten law that no student went twice consecutively to the same table.<sup>6</sup>

Others were distinct to Westfield:

At half past eight a gong rang. You put your small black kettle on the fire (I can see mine now—with a high handle and sharply curving spout—a

---

<sup>5</sup> Firth, *Maynard*, 5.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.*, 251.

pattern, likely enough, chosen by the Mistress herself ); you toasted your bread, and then you made your way, tin tray and all, to some other student's room where she, as hostess, welcomed you with cakes and jam.<sup>7</sup>

Other Old Students also spoke of the maternal-like upper-middle-class atmosphere. This was likely an appropriate milieu for students who were the daughters of either clergymen or the gentry.<sup>8</sup> The college was, in many ways, viewed as the extended family. Indeed, there was an element of trust between parent and Mistress that was distinct to this college era:

[T]he open fireplace in each student's room; the maid bringing the bowl of hot water every morning; breakfast and lunch served in hot dishes on the service table; tea taken in the hall; formal dress for dinner, with hymns played on organ and piano; the sending out of all laundry; the ritual of marmalade making; the yearly strawberry party - only one (Bible) lapse was allowed if one was to attend; always walking out with a companion until 1905, when we could walk down Finchley Road alone!<sup>9</sup>

Vicinus points out in *Independent Women* that the shift towards professionalism at colleges did not take place until the 1890s, when teaching was improving in high schools. As indicated above, in the 1880s, domestic rituals at colleges were intended to reassure parents and the public. For college inhabitants, however, the merging of the feminine with the masculine proved trying. A teacher at Royal Holloway implied her discomfort

---

<sup>7</sup> Ibid., 252.

<sup>8</sup> One exception was Agnes Abernathy, whose father was an engineer. She proved to be a very talented student, gaining a B. A. pass first division in Mental and Moral Science. See *College Register*, 1-23.

<sup>9</sup> Letter to Janet Sondheimer, 25 March 1976, from Florence Lyle in reply to her letter of enquiry 16 March 1976, Ms. 317, Special Collections, Queen Mary and Westfield College Archives, London; Biss, *Reminiscences 1907-1911* (London: Hodder, 1921).

over telling two students, who had chatted over coffee in her room for two hours, to leave at 10:00 p.m. so that she could prepare for class. The following day one of the students apologized that, as a second year, she could not leave before the shy third year “as it wasn’t done.”<sup>10</sup>

Maynard, Gray and Richardson faced similar trials with overwork and “domestic” tending. For example, Gray’s pulling back from student, Marie Pechinet, who demanded much of her time, was exacerbated by her criticism of Pechinet’s essay. In fact Pechinet felt so betrayed by Gray’s rejection and professional stance that she refused to re-write the paper.<sup>11</sup> The uneasy balance between public and private spheres held fast, even into the 1890s. As Agnes Maitland, principle of Somerville College, Oxford, said in her address to the National Union of Women Workers in 1894:

Women’s experiences in college teach them to understand what life in a corporate body must of necessity be....They learn what true union is, how absolutely we are members one of another....Personal unselfishness, individual rather than communistic, is a plant that often flourishes

---

<sup>10</sup> Vicinus, *Independent Women*, 143-52. Anxiety that too much learning would unsex a woman was widespread, promoted, for example, by Social Darwinists’ concern about the decline of the species. See Joan N. Burstyn’s “Education and Sex: The Medical Case against Higher Education for Women in England, 1870-1900,” *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society* 117 (April 1973), 78-89, and Sara Delamont’s “The Contradictions in Ladies’ Education,” in *The Nineteenth-Century Woman: Her Cultural and Physical World*, eds., Sara Delamont and Lorna Duffin (London: Croom Helm, 1978), 134-63. Also Maudsley’s “Sex in Mind,” 468-74 and Anderson’s “A Reply,” 582-94, for other examples of the medical debate in the 1870s.

<sup>11</sup> According to Maynard, Marie Pechinet adored Gray and was thus unable to handle rejection, which included “professional” criticism of her work. She never forgave Gray who, for her part, refused to carry on as her tutor. See *GB*, 12 January 1884, 204.

exceedingly in college life.<sup>12</sup>

The point is that Maitland's emphasis on community, social service *and* prescribed feminine ideals was what appealed to middle-class women and society, even at this time. Maynard justified maintaining these social mores at college, considering them "the best possible shelter for the new aspirations."<sup>13</sup> It was not until a generation later that women more clearly sought college entry as a gateway to independence. However, it is important to remember that these early beginnings laid the groundwork for later major reforms.<sup>14</sup>

Westfield remained distinct from other women's colleges in its interconnection of religion and higher learning, however. Richardson explained this in "Notes on the history of Westfield College up to 1913." Maynard was "convinced of the importance of mission in helping the minds of women to the culture and training without which breadth of outlook and power of achievement must be for the most part lacking."<sup>15</sup>

These aims were particularly apparent in "Function," which was a compulsory Sunday evening meeting for all students in a modification of the "personally-conducted

---

<sup>12</sup> Agnes Maitland, "The Student Life of Women in Halls of Residence" in *National Union of Women Worker's Report for 1894* (London: National Union of Women Workers, 1894), 100.

<sup>13</sup> Maynard, "Girton's Earliest Years," 189.

<sup>14</sup> See Vicinus, *Independent Women*, 124; McCrone, *Playing the Game*, 228; Sondheimer, *Castle Adamant*, 22; Gorham, *Victorian Girl*, 26-46; Sheila Fletcher, *Feminists and Bureaucrats: A Study in the Development of Girls' Education in the Nineteenth Century* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1980), and Zimmern, *Renaissance*, 103.

<sup>15</sup> See Richardson, "History of Westfield College up to 1913," 19, Special Collections, Queen Mary and Westfield Archives; also Sondheimer, *Castle Adamant*, 12.



Pie” of early Westfield days.<sup>16</sup> After a Bible class—the first Function always featuring “The Sower”—discussion turned to college matters; the general progress of students; the volunteer missionary work; or perhaps a tennis match with the London School of Medicine. In later years, Function was to become a stronger platform for promoting mission work, both at home and overseas. Most notable was Maynard’s effort to organize a college expedition to Canada (planned in 1907 for 1910). Although the “Westfield Expedition” to Canada did not occur, Maynard obtained a leave of absence for five months and went by herself in 1910. Saskatchewan and Vancouver were among the provinces she explored. There she met “religious workers” and gave Bible classes herself, later sharing her rich experiences through extensive notes taken throughout the trip.<sup>17</sup>

The annual At Home had also evolved from a small “Thursday At Home” gathering, into a lavish affair resplendent with fine food and entertainment. The annual banquets for graduates were equally splendid, and Constance wrote glowingly about these:

They never cease to please. This time the whole was as pretty a sight as ever I saw, all dressed with yellow poppies, and beautifully laid out. The white dresses, the happy faces, the shiny heads of flaxen and brown.... We had two new odes and all the old favourites. After it two students stood... and shouted in unison, “we want Miss Piper” and all the rest of the names....It was simply compelling. The long avenue looked charming as one B. A. after another fled down the white lane in her blade gown.<sup>18</sup>

---

<sup>16</sup> *GB*, 29 October 1885, 3. As mentioned earlier, Brooke had instituted the name “Pie,” which, she said, meant that they could discuss anything with “Miss.”

<sup>17</sup> Firth, *Maynard*, 296-97.

<sup>18</sup> *D*, 2 May 1909, 99.

Maynard's reference to the "white lane" and "white blade gown" once again implied her interconnection of religion and feminine independence. The graduate as a pure, virtuous woman—a "bride of Christ?"—was also the triumphant contestant in the public sphere. Yet the symbolic power of the white blade is curious in its evoking of the "male" combatant, who, while victorious in battle, was nonetheless drawn towards the white light of Christ.

In terms of academic achievement, the Diary and Westfield Council Minutes reveal that the October Term of 1883 portended Westfield's promising years to come under Maynard's Mistress-ship. Two of the seven new students, Marie Pechinet and Mabel Beloe, showed academic promise,<sup>19</sup> and Anne Richardson showed similar promise when she transferred from Newnham for the Lent Term of 1884.<sup>20</sup> There were some bleak years of course. In 1885, for example, ten out of an enrolment of sixteen were "General Students" who did not intend to take the B. A. degree.<sup>21</sup> But by October 1886, Westfield's three pioneers, Richardson, Marie Pechinet and Emily Thompson were among the 36 women who sat alongside 130 men for the B. A. examination.<sup>22</sup> Nannie had excelled in taking a First Class in Classics. Marie meanwhile was Westfield's first B. A. graduate to secure a lecturing post (at Newnham) in 1886. Nannie was hired to teach at Westfield in

---

<sup>19</sup> *Report*, October Term, 1883, 88; *D*, 16 October 1883, 70.

<sup>20</sup> *D*, 13 February 1884, 102. See also Sondheimer, *Castle Adamant*, 28-48.

<sup>21</sup> *Ibid.*, 6 June 1885, p 88; and also *Minutes*, 12 October 1885, 142.

<sup>22</sup> *A*, VII, 49, "4<sup>th</sup> College Session, 1887," 177; and *D*, 24 October 1886, 60. She wrote here, "I noticed that there were four women sitting the B. Sc. alongside over twenty-five men." See also Burstall, *Retrospect and Prospect*, 56-59; Fitch, "Women, 340;" and Price and Glenday, *Reluctant Revolutionaries*, 66-69, for discussion on women and the universities.

May 1887, and Mabel followed suit in October 1888.<sup>23</sup> By 1888, the Council Minutes indicated a clear improvement in student calibre. Over one-half of nineteen enrolled aimed for degrees, since the B. A. was in place and the inauguration of the B. Sc., begun in 1885, underway.<sup>24</sup> By the 1890s, the success rate had doubled:

Westfield sent in five B. A.s and one B. Sc. It was very exciting. I sat surrounded by my six caps and gowns. Dinner took over two and a half hours. We had about twenty speeches and three cheers for the staff. We then sang many college songs such as “The new B. A. to her School has gone.” We finally sang “Auld Lang Syne” with crossed hands....<sup>25</sup>

By the time that Maynard retired in 1913, up to ten B. A.s and six B. Sc.s “were sent in” for “Capping Day,” the graduation ceremony during each May and November.

When Ralph Gray began teaching in October of 1883, it soon became clear that this second resident lecturer in place had distinct advantages. Because Katie Tristram taught all elementary science—a lab had been installed in the basement that summer—and Ralph oversaw elementary Classics, outside teaching was drastically reduced. “Teaching only cost the college £18 as against the £72 spent last term,” Maynard proclaimed in her October *Report* of 1883.<sup>26</sup> The May *Report* of 1887 conveyed the progress on this score:

The cost per student head is £10 lower than it has been since 1884 when

---

<sup>23</sup> See *D*, 12 October 1886, 66; *D*, 12 March 1887, 109; *Minutes*, 10 May 1887, 166; *Minutes*, 8 October 1888, 178.

<sup>24</sup> See *Report*, October Term, 1887, 227; *Minutes*, 2 November 1888, 40.

<sup>25</sup> *D*, 6 May 1893, 102.

<sup>26</sup> *Report*, October Term, 1883, 91. This was feasible because Alicia was taking a Leave, and all other students were preparing for Matriculation sciences: physics, chemistry, algebra, Euclid, arithmetic and mechanics. It had cost £18 to set up the lab for nine students.

the first B. A. work began. Matriculation costs Westfield little now as it is taught by resident lecturers. It is the small numbers of science students that makes them a heavy expense because they cost about £19 per head per term for tuition. Girton was the same size that Westfield is now during my time there as a student, and at that time the expenses were enormous. Now they have 100 students in residence and it is far cheaper. Increased enrollments and more resident lecturers will likely reduce B. A. and B. Sc. costs.<sup>27</sup>

Clear here is the meaning that Girton had for Maynard. Her keeping up-to-date on its progress through the Old Student meetings and friends like Mary Kingsland gave her important information and ammunition with which she could pacify her doubting Council. Despite the obvious disparity in “gendered” salaries, Maynard’s predictions did prove correct. Higher enrollment and the hiring of more resident staff throughout the 1880s and 1890s reduced tuition costs drastically. It is notable that the hiring of Josephine Willoughy in 1885 particularly cut down B. Sc. costs. Until the early 1900s, when all laboratory work was taught at Westfield, teaching costs for the B. Sc. remained relatively high.<sup>28</sup>

Turning specifically to Maynard’s Green-book over these years, it is also clear that the October Term of 1883 forewarned the conflicts stemming from her interconnection of ambition and passion. From the outset, Gray gave Maynard the emotional support that she so desperately needed. She respected her academic and religious ideals even though she sometimes thought the latter too “lofty,”<sup>29</sup> she carried her

---

<sup>27</sup> *Minutes*, 8 July 1887, 26. She had consulted with Elizabeth Welsh, who was now Mistress of Girton, about tuition expenses.

<sup>28</sup> See *Minutes*, 16 June 1894, 15; *Minutes*, 2 January 1895, 48.

<sup>29</sup> See *GB*, 29 June 1884, 228; *GB*, 28 October 1883, 137.

through student difficulties;<sup>30</sup> she boosted her confidence by asserting Westfield's "superiority" over colleges like Newnham;<sup>31</sup> and she buffered Constance's onslaughts from her Council with reassurances like, "Well, they can't touch the *inside* of Westfield." In fact Ralph seemed almost "*too noble*" to the adoring Constance. Completely taken with her Madonna, she yearned for a more intimate relationship but seemed afraid to approach Ralph: "My love is none-the-worse for its silence and self-containment as yet. I am content with the sight of her radiant hair in the morning sunshine as beauty, itself, can go no further."<sup>32</sup>

Facing coolness, and perhaps rejection was a new experience for Maynard.<sup>33</sup> Her loves to this point had at least indicated their desire for her, even though her self-seeking caused pain for the unfortunates entangled within her emotional swath. Margaret Brooke was one casualty of love. As Maynard noted of their "ardent passion" during the October term, despite her growing love for Ralph :

Last week I loved [MGB] with such thrills of strong excitement that I was taken by surprise. I tried to dismiss them as they seemed as much physical as mental. Yet this week over I gave way. I feel that I have reached such a

---

<sup>30</sup> Ibid., 31 December 1884, 303. Constance noted here, Ralph "often came to my room after the students had left to give me a warm, comforting hug."

<sup>31</sup> A, VII, 45, "May Term, 1884," 74-76. For example, she told Constance that her students "were good" when compared to Newnhamites, who "were giving Miss Gladstone much difficulty by coming home late in hansom cabs."

<sup>32</sup> GB, 13 March 1885, 235. As mentioned above, Gray never refers to her personal relationship with Maynard in *Gladly*. Thus there is no evidence of their relationship beyond Maynard's records.

<sup>33</sup> Ibid., 20 December 1884, 93-94. She noted here, "Ralph is sweet and kind, but there is a hard part to her character that is so cruel that I shrink before it, amazed."

height that it can only go downwards after such happiness as this.<sup>34</sup>

Again in her Green-book review of 1883, she noted: “Human love is very, very precious, and my natural passion for it has carried me away - I know this - and yet I have looked for it, and leaned on it and craved for more....”<sup>35</sup>

As implied in these entries, Maynard’s interactions with Brooke had become more physical. However, her shifting between seduction and resistance, while titillating, was troubling to her because “resistance” threatened to succumb to “seduction.” More pressing than the perils of physical attraction, I suggest, was Maynard’s need to distinguish between passion and love. She had experienced this at Girton, as shown in her differing attitudes towards Mantle and Lumsden. Her Green-book indicated that her adoration for Gray confirmed, even more clearly, how unsuitable Brooke was as “the choice of [her] life.” Her feelings were not lost on Brooke whose unhappiness over love was to cause Maynard much guilt over the ensuing two years.<sup>36</sup>

In addition to these increasing tensions with Margaret, Constance noted her surprise when Nannie, whom she had persuaded to enrol as student in April 1884, discovered the cause of tutor Katie Tristram’s malaise that term. Her “extreme dejection,” Katie told Nannie, stemmed from her suppression of love for Constance. Not only was her heart broken over Constance’s “undisguised passion” for Ralph, but her deference towards Ralph also left her feeling inadequate as a lecturer. Constance had spoken little of

---

<sup>34</sup> Ibid., 4 November 1883, 138.

<sup>35</sup> Ibid., 23 December 1883, 149.

<sup>36</sup> Ibid., 9 August 1884, 255. See also Ibid 12 November 1884, 300.

Katie over the years. A brief Diary entry in October 1883 that, “Katie had a bad toothache so I laid down in the dark with her and ‘charmed’ it better,” suggest some eroticism between them.<sup>37</sup> But such intimate moments, while seemingly potent for Katie, meant less to Constance from her lengthy Green-book overtures about Margaret and Ralph.<sup>38</sup>

Nannie’s intuition also elicited Constance’s own outpourings about her love for Ralph, though probably also envious of Nannie’s closeness to Ralph.<sup>39</sup> She painfully recorded their “talk about love, marriage and the troubles of life” in April of 1884:

She [Nannie] suddenly touched my arm and my heart gave a momentary sting, for this last month I have looked it all steadily in the face. Ralph does not love me, but I love her.... ‘She has a deep and unbreakable nature controlled and formed by duty, and a tendency to disregard the love of others,’ [Nannie] said steadily. She then continued to say that a great deal lay in my hands. Like a high-bred horse, Ralph answered to the bit steadily, and that she needed a fearless hand over her. I quietly said, ‘I will.’<sup>40</sup>

This is another example of how women sought to merge separate sphere ideals within their new college domains. Apparently, Nannie tried to re-direct Constance’s passion, or at least discuss it within an evangelical, “feminine” version of Arnold’s concept of middle-class masculinity, namely, ambition, hard-work, purity and self-respect.

---

<sup>37</sup> *D*, 28 October 1883, 90.

<sup>38</sup> Katie had asked the Council if she could take a full leave of absence for two years. See *Minutes*, 3 June 1884, 156. Katie’s family, aware of her pain, hoped that she would leave Westfield. They were “satisfied,” according to Constance, when Katie told them that “she did not want to leave after all.” See *GB*, 17 May 1884, 205.

<sup>39</sup> *GB*, 23 December 1883, 149. She was very jealous of their relationship. She wrote here, when Nannie was visiting Westfield, “they are together, so happy and so quietly satisfied while I, in my room, am so near yet so far.”

<sup>40</sup> *Ibid.*, 15 April 1884, 197.

Constance, however, found “it [more] comforting to spend time in Nannie’s arms and condemn the conventional, hurried world in praise of the rarity of finding so true, pure, strong and tender a heart as Ralph’s.”<sup>41</sup>

Maynard was also oddly consoled by commiserating with Tristram over the “physical snare of love.” After all, her “brilliant and erratic L had weakened [her] aim and made [her] vulnerable.” She turned Tristram’s sights towards the B. A., and Katie did pursue a life-long career in missionary work in India after gaining her degree in 1887. In 1884, Constance believed that Katie’s dilemma had illuminated her own “mistake with Margaret, and how it had also dimmed [her] position with Ralph.” As she explained it to Nannie:

There is something so *satisfying* in feeling oneself loved, that I fear lest it should stop effort and aspiration half-way. I mean that our love should climb up to meet the love of Christ alone....It would feel rather splendid to be robbed of it all, and live in a desert and have only Him to look to, wouldn’t it?<sup>42</sup>

Nonetheless, while Maynard declared that human love was a “snare,” her Greenbook also admitted that her “hunger for love” was something “deeply rooted in [her] and difficult to give up.”<sup>43</sup> Her relationship with Brooke had enabled her to re-consider her success or failure with Lumsden, and to awaken further her deep, passionate nature. Her review of 1884 implied that other Westfield women faced similar negotiations:

I think I have learned a great deal about love this year. I have seen

---

<sup>41</sup> Ibid., 198.

<sup>42</sup> Ibid., 27 April 1884, 201; *A*, VII, 46, “Autumn Term, 1884,” 75-78.

<sup>43</sup> *GB*, 20 November 1883, 67; *GB*, 6 March 1884, 98.



Margaret generously moving away from me. I have hurt Katie who says that she will not allow herself to love again so easily. I have seen Alice [student] helping Katie and loving her and yet K is unable, like me, to like A better. I have seen Ralph stirred by passion, yet she thinks that love degrades. So what does this mean? That the lesson is now learnt and I will never hurt anyone else like this again.<sup>44</sup>

We should not under-estimate the levels of intensity of the raves that took place within a milieu in which work and love interconnected. Vicinus rightly points out in “One Life,” no matter “how exaggerated their griefs and loves, as described by Maynard, women of the late nineteenth and twentieth centuries gave each other...immensely positive support” in the face of a male dominated society.<sup>45</sup> This is certainly true. Although the students, Margaret Brooke and Amy Mantle, eventually did marry, other bonds made at college were never broken. Westfield students, Katherine Porter and Maria Parry, bought a cottage together living, as Maynard noted, “as man and wife.” Parry worked while Porter stayed “home and kept house.” Whether they had sexual relations is unclear, but the point is that they remained emotionally committed to each other over the years.<sup>46</sup> I would also argue, however, that college women had emotionally damaging relationships with each other. The implications of this seem clear in Maynard’s

---

<sup>44</sup> Ibid., 31 December 1884, 305. See also Alice Stronach’s *A Newnham Friendship* (London: Blackie and Son, 1901), Rosamond Lehmann’s *Dusty Answer* (New York: Grosset & Dunlap, 1927) and Bussy’s *Olivia*, for other examples of close relationships between college women. Janice Raymond’s *A Passion for Friends: Toward a Philosophy of Female Affection* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1986), provides an interesting discussion on contemporary women’s intimate affection for each other.

<sup>45</sup> Vicinus, “One Life,” 625. See also her *Independent Women*, 158-65

<sup>46</sup> Maynard, *Sundial Diary*, 19 February 1915, 78, Special Collections, Queen Mary and Westfield College Archives, London. Hereafter cited as *Sundial*, 19 February 1915, 78.

relationship with Lumsden. They were also evident in Maynard's relationships with Gray and Marion Wakefield. In fact, contrary to what Vicinus suggests, Maynard's records conveyed how Victorian women's relationships could become tragically negative in the face of a male dominated society.

In late 1883, such a thought was far from Maynard's mind. In fact she had convinced herself that Gray's attributes promised the "total love" she craved. This love would replicate her one with Lumsden, but with more intellectual equality, and a religious and erotically-based passion that she had explored with Brooke.<sup>47</sup> According to the Green-book, their relationship deepened after she wrote a love poem to Gray in May 1884, admitting her love but promising "to avoid 'the wrong parts, the weak parts.'"<sup>48</sup> By the close of 1884 Gray seemed indispensable to her, meeting both her emotional and academic needs. Her review of the year shared this intimacy:

Her [Ralph's] perceptions are acute and thus more helpful than anyone else at the college. She spends most evenings on my sofa which has given me the opportunity to get to know her better. A warm point was when I asked her if she loved me. She said she wanted to be sure before she said the words but she could say them now. We stayed in a long, close embrace while she told me, and she made me so very happy. I hope that she will seek Him more now.<sup>49</sup>

However, Maynard's romanticization of "one heart to pour its fullness into [hers]" proved too idealistic. She had deferred to Dove and Lumsden as leaders when she was at Cheltenham and St. Leonards. At the same time, she disliked feeling subordinate to them.

---

<sup>47</sup> *GB*, 1 December 1883, 75.

<sup>48</sup> *Ibid.*, 10 May 1884, 210; *A*, VII, 49, "Lent Term - A Crisis, 1886," 140.

<sup>49</sup> *GB*, 10 December 1884, 78.

In the end, ambition had been part of her reason for disengaging from passion. Her role as Westfield's Mistress had augmented her belief that *her* calling as prophet was "higher" than that of most seeking to improve women's education. But no such excuse existed with Gray. "She is so much stronger and cleverer than I am, *and* she is a true Christian," Maynard exclaimed. Indispensable, yes, but Gray's "perfection" inevitably left an adoring Maynard feeling vulnerable and insecure:

I feel as if Westfield is slipping from my hands. Her [Ralph's] embodiment of youth, beauty, energy and force of mind...has fostered an independent, reckless spirit. I think of old-times, the first year before she came in and changed rules from a happy confiding family to a college.<sup>50</sup>

Because of these problems, the interconnection of her public academic spirit with her religious duty had also become a struggle for Constance. "My main objective - Christ in education - is still in place," she asserted in her Green-book. "But the *means* I propose to take seems to waver and fade before R's luminous, steady eyes, as though my weaker mind must bow to hers." Their ongoing dispute about novels was a case in point.

Constance not only sobbed after their disagreements—Ralph brought her "to tears with the *least* provocation"—but was left thinking that her "ideals were too severe."<sup>51</sup> The January *Report* (1884) was another example. She asked Ralph to rewrite it after struggling with it for weeks. While she had been dismayed at Ralph's (re)focus on academia over religion,

---

<sup>50</sup> Ibid., 31 December 1884, 88. See also *GB*, 13 July 1884, 231, for her concerns on this.

<sup>51</sup> See Ibid., 16 October 1883, 149; and Ibid., 8 February 1885, 15. She noted here, "we held a Debate 'On the Effect of Fiction' to settle the whole question even tho' Ralph said that it would cause upset." Afterwards Maynard triumphantly noted, "there were more against novels than for." But she remained upset because of Ralph's views.

she had sent it in to the Council “without comment.”<sup>52</sup>

Richardson fuelled the fire as far as Maynard was concerned. Certainly, she proved a “bright spot” as a student (1884), adding sparkle to debates, games and charades. In addition, their friendship was to be strengthened by George’s romance with Nannie’s younger sister, Jeannie, beginning in 1884.<sup>53</sup> However, Constance resented her reliance upon Nannie. While she appreciated her advice, Nannie’s “‘latitudinarian’ manner of expressing her convictions” meant that they often disagreed.<sup>54</sup> However, if Nannie sided with Ralph she felt the most distraught. Her sense that they criticized her leadership, or attacked her values by instigating Bible criticism, was soul destroying. “I have allowed myself irritation over damages in the Bible,” she lamented. “But I avoid creating unsettling doubts among them [the students].”<sup>55</sup>

Maynard’s struggle with faith, love and leadership reduced Richardson and Gray to negotiating the roles of advisor, friend, or dutiful subordinate themselves. Richardson

---

<sup>52</sup> *GB*, 20 January 1884, 163. Ralph apparently only mentioned religion in passing, concentrating instead on Westfield’s course work for degrees and the fees.

<sup>53</sup> *Ibid.*, 27 January 1884, 163-66. George had met Jeannie through Constance’s friendship with Nannie. Constance told Jeannie of George’s feelings and then arranged some “unchaperoned” meetings in the hopes that George could woo her successfully. Jeannie initially turned him down, but they continued to see each other. Jeannie eventually changed her mind, and they married in 1891.

<sup>54</sup> *Ibid.*, 31 December 1884, 296. Nannie’s dismissal of “the conflict between culture and Christianity”—as argued in Maynard’s *Cultivation*—was particularly vexing and hurtful to Maynard since she struggled so much with her conflict between faith and science. She noted here, “Nannie says that every life has some test and that mine may be here.” See *Cultivation*, 21.

<sup>55</sup> See *GB*, 27 January 1884, 163; *GB*, 13 July 1884, 231.

disliked Maynard's teetering between being "overbearing" and indecisive. But her teasing comment about Maynard's former stance in 1884, "so, you are *not* going to be allowed to continue like that," indicated that as a student she considered herself in a position of power.<sup>56</sup> Even so, she would resort to girlish recants after attacking Maynard even when vice-Mistress, "Oh! *I* should not speak to you like that. *I* have no right. You do have a good relationship with the students, you *do*. They say that your rule is gentle and sweet." Gray's problems with Maynard were somewhat similar. She would angrily accuse Maynard of underappreciating her or overworking her at times. Her vehement apology for one outburst in 1886—"Your *perfect* magnanimity after I spoke like that. Oh, it is lovely, it is *most* Christian. I love you, *truly*. Yes, I *do*!"—was typical of her penitent beseeching over the years. Maynard, for her part, interpreted their unhappiness in personal terms since passion was a part of ambition. This left her feeling such a failure at times that no guilt-ridden, affectionate apology could appease her.<sup>57</sup>

In her Autobiography, Maynard asserted that she never ceased to pine for the maternal atmosphere so emblematic of Westfield's first term. She was aware that "as Westfield grew, this rule must diminish to be replaced by an equally valuable public spirit."<sup>58</sup> Yet she never liked the "masculine," impersonal methods of running a college, much preferring intimate one-on-one talks with students, particularly if they proceeded to

---

<sup>56</sup> *Ibid.*, 2 October 1884, 265. Nannie told Constance here, "your power last year could make you overbearing and unsympathetic."

<sup>57</sup> *Ibid.*, 17 June 1883, 91. See also *A*, VII, 44, "1884," 270-76.

<sup>58</sup> *A*, VII, 44, "1884," 280-81.

conversion. Thus while she spoke of her difficulty in managing accounts, college duties and staff, as Vicinus points out, her approach left her reluctant to use her authority openly and to avoid administrative duties.<sup>59</sup>

However, on the other hand, Maynard's "feminine" intimacy with students would be viewed as "boundary violations" in terms of present day standards.<sup>60</sup> The problems with interpersonal relationships during her first year as Mistress certainly implied this.<sup>61</sup> Her intimacy with Margaret Brooke aside, her Green-book suggests that the religious-based pressure that she placed upon other students would be considered inappropriate behaviour for one in her position today. She described her one-on-one interactions with Maria Parry, for example:

May looked so ill today. She said that she had felt sad and lonely last night when she stood at my door. I said, 'why didn't you come in?' and she said, 'I *did*, but you were reading something interesting that you wanted to finish.' This cut me to the heart and I felt bad. May says that she is not happy because she does not feel that she is a Christian. This is troubling.<sup>62</sup>

A week later she noted:

May came in today to tell me that she had been converted. She was so glowing and so flushed with excitement about everything that I made her lie down, and I sat and listened while her heart poured itself out in

---

<sup>59</sup> Ibid., VII, 42, "1884," 220-25; Vicinus, "'One Life,'" 615-66, and, *Independent Women*, 158-65.

<sup>60</sup> On this see Dziech, *Lecherous Professor*; Fisher, *Sexual Harassment of Students*; Monson, *Power and the Professorship*; and Patai, *Sexual Harassment*.

<sup>61</sup> As noted earlier, Maynard quite possibly crossed the line with Emma Maunders and Minna Colville. Her emotional abuse of Mary Tait at St. Leonards was even more evident.

<sup>62</sup> Ibid., 25 February 1884, 59.

passionate love. I'm not sure that I'm doing the right thing. Yet it is leading her closer to God, it really *is*, and surely this should be the test.<sup>63</sup>

Not every student responded favourably to Maynard's subversive, coercive approach:

In a conversation with Margaret we discussed Evelyn Moore. When I confessed to being repelled by E's coldness M argued that E was strong, and that *she* liked her the best of all. I said nothing. Margaret went on to say, most approvingly, how E hated demonstrative affection. She said that the way some students behaved with me was disgusting and looked foolish. E told Margaret that she knew it was because we were Christians, but that this one point spoiled everything. I said nothing and then M left the room. I was very upset. Is E right and we wrong in our demonstration of Christianity? Is she right in thinking us X'tians - 'a set of fools?'<sup>64</sup>

In this instance, Brooke was retaliating against Maynard's rejection of her in favour of Gray. But Moore's comments, similarly to Minna Colville's in 1882, revealed her disapproval of Maynard's intimacy and, perhaps, emotional and sexual exploitation of students in the name of faith. Unfortunately, Maynard's position of power always left her reluctant to curb her behaviour because her emotional longings were so great. Faith, it seems, allowed her to deceive herself about her feelings and actions.

Maynard's behaviour and unease in her role as Mistress was to create conflict with both staff and Council. But her relationship with her Council is particularly worthy of note. It gives insight into Victorian cultural values in general, and those unique to Westfield in particular, and provides an interesting example of Maynard's determination in face of what she saw as her Council's blatant, sexist disrespect of her over the years. "I

---

<sup>63</sup> Ibid., 6 March 1884, 64.

<sup>64</sup> Ibid., 12 August 1884, 110.

had prided myself for keeping well in with my Council,” she wrote in her Autobiography, “because of L’s awful experience at St. Leonards. I had assumed their support of my request for a housekeeper in December, 1883, because of my stress from overwork, lazy domestics and dishonest tradespeople.”<sup>65</sup> But after denying her request, her Council went on to admonish her about household expenses, and for the first time she “felt disillusioned” with them.

There was not one word of recognition regarding my slaving over the funds for the past 14 months. I did not want to remind them that my father had given 1000s for the furnishings, and that I had worked for no salary at all. I had only asked for £50 in the October Term because my dress allowance from home did not cover expenses. I kept silent and my heart sighed.<sup>66</sup>

While no evidence of the above interaction exists beyond Maynard’s records, her inward “sighs” do evince the gender-distinct disparities of Victorian culture which proclaimed women as subordinate to men. She had assumed some of those values when she was willing to work for no pay, and so, she was left vulnerable to their attitude and frequent disrespect for her as an individual.

Nonetheless, Maynard was ambitious enough to resent her position. She came to believe that her Council’s tactics over the following years were deliberate attempts to disempower her. Although their decision to depose her as Honorary Secretary in January 1884 was possibly meant to relieve her burden after her recent request for help, she

---

<sup>65</sup> *A*, VII, 43, “Autumn Term - E Rawlinson, 1883,” 60. Her friend, Effie Rawlinson, had offered to work as a house-keeper for no pay, only room and board.

<sup>66</sup> *Ibid.* She noted here, “it was an effort to keep my promised appointments with the cloth workers and Professor Morley [from the University] to plead for future Westfield scholarships.”



smarted over her name being “struck off without any recognition for [her] two years of work.”<sup>67</sup> Her relations with them flared a month later at the February Council Meeting when she was driven to verbal rage in face of what she saw as Council member, Fanny Metcalfe’s air of “irritating, lordly self-satisfaction” about her poor book-keeping. On the one hand, Dudin Brown’s “fit of ‘pique’” over such incorrigible feminine behaviour nearly caused her to withdraw her endowment. On the other hand, Maynard felt “so uneasy about [her] disgrace” that she wrote her Council a letter of apology.

However, in the Council’s view, Maynard crossed the line. She was formally asked to relinquish her seat on the Council. “You were never really on the Council, as ‘Honorary Secretary,’” they argued. Maynard felt obliged to accept their position, yet chided herself about this in her Autobiography. “This was a great pity. I should have expressed my opinions more.”<sup>68</sup> Her loss of power was indeed a bitter pill to swallow: she lost voting rights; she was banned from Council meetings; and she raged at being “ruled without protection by those who knew so very little of what they were ruling.” Their treatment seemed both unfair and humiliating after all her hard work. Bernard sat on Girton’s Council as did Frances Dove on St. Leonard’s. So “now [she] was the sole exception.”<sup>69</sup>

---

<sup>67</sup> See *GB*, 31 December 1884, 302; also *GB*, 23 January 1884, 165.

<sup>68</sup> *A*, VII, 46, “1884,” 61-69. As Stearns argues in “Girls, Boys, and Emotions,” 54-59, anger was considered “unfeminine” behaviour until the 1920s. See also Gorham, *Victorian Girl*, 1-37; Davidoff and Hall, *Family Fortunes*; Caine, *To Be Wives*; Vicinus, ed. *Widening Sphere*; Perkin, *Victorian Women*; and Mason, *Victorian Attitudes*, for discussion on appropriate gender behaviour.

<sup>69</sup> *GB*, 26 March 1884, 187.

These were difficult years for Maynard. As she noted in her Autobiography, “I was repressed by my Council in so many ways.”<sup>70</sup> The Minutes and Diary confirm that Mistress and Council wrangled over numerous issues throughout 1885 and 1886. While Maynard understood “that science was to be one of Westfield’s foremost subjects, they passed the B. Sc. in June [1885] after much demurring.” After suggesting the hiring of Josephine Willoughby, a Newnham graduate, to develop the B. Sc. (and also give Katie Tristram more time to pursue her B. A.), they only agreed on the condition that both become part-time lecturers without pay for the October Term.<sup>71</sup> Maynard had to fight to institute salaries for both women in the ensuing terms.

The ongoing tensions about the B. Sc., staff salaries, and recruitment of suitable students, together with Metcalfe’s ongoing criticism about Maynard’s “negligence in housekeeping, and laxness” as Mistress, led to the Council’s institution of sub-committees for household management, college promotion, student admission and faculty hiring. In this, the Council likely wanted to help. The records imply that Maynard was not simply overworked, but that she was a poor manager. She avoided settling accounts; she avoided reprimanding lazy domestics; she avoided speaking to students about noisy behaviour; and her bias towards enrolling daughters of friends compounded her problems. Thus, although she struggled with leadership, she interpreted her Council’s actions as a

---

<sup>70</sup> *A*, VII, 49, “1886,” 133-9.

<sup>71</sup> See *D*, 12 May 1885, 102; *D*, 3 June 1885, 120; and *Minutes*, 3 June 1885, 156. The Council refused Katie full leave thus Constance requested that they hire Josephine (Natural Science Tripos) to teach 12 hours. The Council agreed. They also decided that both could share a salary of £80 per term, but then, for some reason, recanted.

sign of their growing distrust in her. Mostly, however, she resented her growing loss of control.<sup>72</sup>

Not surprisingly, Maynard's ongoing conflicts surrounding ambition and passion affected those close to her. It seems that pressure at the workplace, with its accompanying complex emotionalism, proved too much for Gray. In March 1885, when Maynard was in the throes of the B. Sc. program, and Lumsden's losing the Girton Mistress-ship,<sup>73</sup> Gray suddenly announced her intention to live with her father and her sister, Sara, who were moving to London for Sara to pursue medicine in January 1886. Reading between Ralph's words, however, Maynard suspected that *she* was the cause of Ralph's flight. Her impassioned Green-book outcries on the heels of Ralph's flight from residence were:

What do Gentiles seek? Beauty. Golden hair, loving eyes, sweet smile and shy dignity....Go, Helen, Go! You fetter me and you joke me. In my folly I led you to my side and drank in your beauty. I did not know that your hands would keep me down from my work, and paralyse my will in seeking it.<sup>74</sup>

---

<sup>72</sup> See *D*, 12 May 1885, 99 and *D*, 6 March 1886, 122, for Maynard's perspective. For the Council's, see *Minutes*, 4 May 1885, 74, and 6 April 1886, 120.

<sup>73</sup> See *GB*, 7 October 1884 135, and *GB*, 13 January 1885, 165. When Louisa and Elizabeth Welsh were short-listed out of the sixty candidates, Constance refused to vote, claiming her personal friendship with both candidates. After Elizabeth won the vote, she felt awful, "feeling as if [she] had robbed [her] L of her desire."

<sup>74</sup> *Ibid.*, 25 March 1885, 35. Here we see an interesting combination of Christianity and Mythology. In the New English Bible, Acts 14.27, 623, Gentiles are described as "those who were not Hebrews. Paul preached the Christian message to the Gentiles and 'opened the door of faith to them.'" Helen of Troy, who represents Ralph, was a character from Greek Mythology over whom a ten year war was fought. In her *GB*, 30 December 1923, 262, Maynard explained this. "For Ralph, it was love. It was the old, old story of Troy, besieged for ten years,...yet content as long as Helen was within its walls."

and again in her review of 1885:

Oh! My Ralph! too far, too high. Your long sweet kiss is on my lips still, your head resting on my knee in the firelight, your voice singing in my ears. Because I have loved you far too well, or, in too earthly a fashion, you are taken from me. He has taken you from me.<sup>75</sup>

These entries reveal, once again, how Maynard adopted faith to understand her physical desire. Yet, at the same time, her use of Greek mythology to depict her feelings for Gray presents her as the tormented male lover who had fallen victim, as many others had, to the lovely Helen. Her wrong, she concluded, was choosing human love over divine. She “promise[d] to relinquish *everything* in order for Him to speak to [her] heart.”<sup>76</sup> Of course it was the last thing she wanted or was able to do.

With Ralph Gray gone, Brooke hoped to rekindle her relationship with Maynard. When her attempts failed, an already heartbroken Maynard suffered under Brooke’s verbal lashing and “misery” over their relationship.<sup>77</sup> “Margaret left without her degree in January [1886] and I wrote pages of self reproach about how I had ruined our love,” Constance sadly noted in her Autobiography.<sup>78</sup> “Yet *nothing*,” not Council, not Westfield, nor Margaret, “makes any impression,” she lamented in her Green-book in April 1886.<sup>79</sup> While her Diary evoked her busyness with college life, the latter record admitted, “Since

---

<sup>75</sup> *Ibid.*, 20 December 1885, 94.

<sup>76</sup> *Ibid.*, 95.

<sup>77</sup> *Ibid.*, 31 January 1886, 88.

<sup>78</sup> *A*, VII, 49, “1886,” 133-39.

<sup>79</sup> *GB*, 11 April 1886, 130.

[Ralph] has left she never comes to see me, and *I long* for our sweet intimacy.”<sup>80</sup>

The “final blow” came at the end of the Lent Term when Ralph angrily accused her of overworking her and not paying her enough. Constance fell completely apart, seeing her failing as a superior as another cause for the failure of their relationship.<sup>81</sup> She told Nannie:

Ralph knows how deeply I love her yet she has slapped me in the face. This has broken me so much that no one else can touch me. I really believe that Ralph’s resistance is due to her want of love for Him. I don’t want to seem to excuse myself, but I only want you to know how it seems to me.<sup>82</sup>

Nannie, however, appeared to question Constance’s understanding of Ralph’s behaviour within the context of a religiously-based desire versus resistance ritual. According to the Green-book account, she advised Constance to view *all* “temptation and trial as God’s testing ground,” and then proffered her own opinions about Ralph’s motives on the basis of her own observations about the romantic liaisons at Westfield at large over the past two years.

‘I have seen with you [Constance], Margaret, Katie, and even perhaps myself, a waywardness. Has there not been something wrong? I should

---

<sup>80</sup> For example, in her *D*, 20 March 1886, 30, she noted her pride over Katie’s winning the Gilchrist Scholarship, awarded by the university to the woman who placed second in the Intermediate. Her *GB* of 20 March 1886, 120, meanwhile bespeaks of her ongoing pain and frustration over Ralph’s becoming a “ghost of a friend.” See also *D*, 3 January 1886, 10; *D*, 28 February 1886, 30 and *GB*, 2 February 1886, 90.

<sup>81</sup> *Ibid.*, 11 April 1886, 130. She noted here, “Ralph took her check, and ignoring me, said to Nannie, ‘and *I have* worked hard for it, haven’t I?’ I felt that she despised me....Later, I told her that I had missed her very badly this term and yet she refused all my invitations. I opened out my arms and she put them down instantly and said, very coldly, ‘I am glad you have missed me. Maybe it will make you treat me with more respect.’”

<sup>82</sup> *Ibid.*, 30 April 1885, 137.

have spoken a year ago, but I felt unfit to do it; and now again Ralph by *quite* different path has come to feel that in personal absorption there is a danger and a wrong that she can scarcely express, but *feels* intensely.’<sup>83</sup>

Ralph apparently affirmed Nannie’s comments, for as Maynard wrote in her Green-book:

She [Ralph] said that it was a long time before she really loved me...,but that she did at last, deeply, very deeply. Yet she saw there were two sides to me - one independent, practical, hard-working, wholly devoted to the College, and this she loved, the other ‘something wrong.’ Yet *this* was the side ‘I seemed nearly always to be in contact with...I know it was cruel and wrong but I assumed that you would know I cared for you.’<sup>84</sup>

Did Maynard realise the *sexual* implications in Gray’s and Richardson’s view of her emotional demands of them? That *this* was what was wrong about her love for them? Quite possibly. As suggested, she felt somewhat ambivalent about her bodily “hunger for love,” preferring to understand it within the context of religion and the rave. One wonders about her admission in her Green-book at this time, that her desire for Louisa had been deeper than that for Lewis.<sup>85</sup>

Equally curious is Maynard’s guilt over her Council’s inference of the reason behind Gray’s leaving the residence. Her comment—“it was almost as if I could read their nasty thoughts, but I felt quite sure that they were wrong”—may well imply her struggle over understanding her needs as a sexual wrong.<sup>86</sup> But, in her Green-book at least, she

---

<sup>83</sup> Ibid., 23 April 1886, 127.

<sup>84</sup> Ibid., 30 April 1886, 138.

<sup>85</sup> Ibid., 3 May 1883, 73.

<sup>86</sup> Ibid., 11 October 1885, 79.

continued to employ faith to exonerate human passion:

We discussed what we would do and I advised Ralph to continue as she had done before. Ralph asked, 'and you?' I replied, 'I will leave you alone, and just *see*. I have had a lesson I could not have twice.' She wanted me to explain, but I mentioned only a small part of it. I said, 'when anyone is called to the kind of work I do, it is very lonely, but one should only satisfy that loneliness through God's permission. One should not hanker and catch after love, but wait and take what He gives.'<sup>87</sup>

In the end, if "God gave" her love she would accept it. Thus, as with Campbell and, to a lesser extent, Brooke, she appears to have retreated into a religious metaphor to avoid confirming her own guilt. Gray's parting words, "I do not think either of us will be left to starve," gave her "hope and comfort."<sup>88</sup>

However, when Ralph remained "'the ghost' of the friend she was" over the May term, leaving Constance feeling "very hungry," she lost all hope.<sup>89</sup> For the first time since beginning her Green-book in 1866 her entries virtually cease. On December 31<sup>st</sup>, 1886, she briefly noted, "I have no wish to give an account of the year. The first six months explain the last six, which I do not wish to discuss."<sup>90</sup> Her Diary continued on with bright, short accounts of her "public" life at Westfield and her interest in the cultural issues of Stead's rescue work, or socialism.<sup>91</sup> But her "Friend," in whom she had confided for years

---

<sup>87</sup> *Ibid.*, 12 December 1886, 199.

<sup>88</sup> *Ibid.*, 199.

<sup>89</sup> *Ibid.*, 6 May 1886, 146.

<sup>90</sup> *Ibid.*, 31 December 1886, 142.

<sup>91</sup> See for example, *D*, 1 October 1886, 66; *D*, 4 May 1886, 68; *D*, 21 November 1886, 70.

about her conflicts surrounding faith, passion and ambition, remained uncharacteristically silent. Two sentences in February 1887, spoke of her joy in converting Harry's eldest son, Henry. A brief notation in August mentions a trip to Mannedorf in Germany.<sup>92</sup> All entries after this are missing until January 1<sup>st</sup>, 1901, when Maynard was in the throes of passion with her new love, Marion Wakefield. Thus for over a decade, the reader is left to piece together Maynard's life through the brief, factual account of the Diary and her Autobiography. Gone, therefore, are the rich, multi-faceted narratives of her "public" and "private" faces that had provided such a rich, full account of her experiences as a lover and a person of strength, intelligence and ambition.

Did Maynard tear out the interim pages of her Green-book, as she threatened to do in both Green-book and Autobiography towards the end of her life?<sup>93</sup> It remains unclear. But it is notable that the record resuming in 1901 begins at page one. Was this simply a coincidence? Or did Maynard start the record over with a new book? As noted in chapter one, she bequeathed her myriad documents to five close Westfield friends, requesting that her life story be completed. Since Gray had first access to the records after her death she could have destroyed the Green-book entries herself if she disliked the implications in them, sexual or otherwise. Perhaps Gray took Maynard at her word, using her threat as an excuse to destroy records that she found uncomfortable. Gray, like Maynard, died before finishing the biography. Firth, the second to receive the records, claimed in her biography

---

<sup>92</sup> *GB*, 2 January 1887, 14; *GB*, 6 February 1887, 26; *GB*, 12 May 1887, 2.

<sup>93</sup> See *A*, VII, 49, "1886," 160; *GB*, 6 September 1886, 150. Another example is *GB*, 19 February 1910, 347. She said here, "As for several volumes of this book, I feel inclined to burn them."



that the entries between 1887 and 1901 were missing by the time that she was given them.<sup>94</sup>

Maynard's self-personification in her Autobiography over these years is largely one of the tormented lover, who sought understanding through Atonement for her sin of human love.<sup>95</sup> Her transcribing of her Green-book entry on her thirty-eighth birthday conveyed her ongoing lament:

Oh, for one single hour, to be the loved and not the lover! I am like a sort of half-creature, stripped and maimed all down one side of me. I love and love, I long and long. Christian people go on *saying* there is love in God, they *say* it is strong, true and exceedingly tender, they *say* it satisfies, really satisfies...but what is the true picture of me? - A shut door, cold, darkness, loneliness....<sup>96</sup>

She angrily noted Rachel Cook's fateful words, "You make your faith and believe it," and then added, "It is *not* God, but Ralph I need to lift me off my feet and say, 'There, I love you, I will never leave you!' If only she would put her arms around me I would be ready to meet the whole world."<sup>97</sup> But Ralph would not, and Maynard may have succumbed to a deep depression as a consequence. She wrote of her lack of care about her appearance, her

---

<sup>94</sup> Firth, *Maynard*, 250.

<sup>95</sup> As Foucault points out in *History of Sexuality*, 60, "The obligation to confess...is so powerfully ingrained in us, that we no longer perceive it as the effect of a power that constrains us; on the contrary, it seems, the truth, lodged in our most secret nature, 'demands' only to surface." In short, self disclosure becomes equated with liberation. See Willis, *No Nice Girls*, and Pascal, *Design and Truth*, for discussion on the genre of life writing as confessional. As noted in chapter 1, I would like to think that Maynard's *A* was not a manipulative plea for absolution or a covert expression of anger.

<sup>96</sup> *A*, VII, 49, "1886," 177.

<sup>97</sup> *Ibid.*, 50, "5<sup>th</sup> College Session, 1887," 182.

sense of “experienc[ing] some form of ‘amputation’ symbolized by her adorning of a lace cap.” The cap told the world “that her youth was over”, and to those who cared to dig deeper, that she “loved Ralph so much that [she] could have died for her.”<sup>98</sup>

After debating in her Autobiography why she remained at Westfield—she apparently came close to resigning in April 1887—Maynard simply stated, “I did remain.”<sup>99</sup> There was good reason for this. Her sense of purpose was fuelled by Westfield’s representation at “Capping Day” for the first time that May. “I can now proclaim to girls’ public high schools that Westfield students stand apart from most other colleges as they were gaining the B. A.,” she proudly wrote in her May Report.<sup>100</sup>

When reading through her Diary over these years, one is struck by her remarkable energy for and investment in upcoming graduates:

Professor Walker of Stellenbosch came in the afternoon to talk about Alicia Bleby. A talk with Katharine Nisbet who has been accepted as a probationer at St. Barts. Then with Helen Sturge who hopes to go to Croydon as math Mistress in January. Five days later sent E. M. W. Edwards off to Rochester to see the Headmistress of the grammar school who wants a B. Sc. some time soon. Went to St. John’s after this to speak with Mr. Ramsey all afternoon about the possibility of them hiring Agnes Abernathy. Then had long, long talks with Sarah White and with Priscilla Wood about their possible prospects.<sup>101</sup>

Nisbet became a qualified nurse in 1900. Bleby and Abernathy meanwhile passed their B.

---

<sup>98</sup> *Ibid.*, 200.

<sup>99</sup> *Ibid.*, 188.

<sup>100</sup> *Minutes*, 8 July 1887, 26.

<sup>101</sup> *D*, 2 November 1890, 100.

A.s. The former became the principal of a girls' high school in Cape Town, remaining until her death in 1911. The latter went to St. Leonards where she taught Classics for over thirty years. Maynard's "long, long talks" with the talented White and Wood also paid off. Wood was the first Westfield graduate to receive an M. A. in Classics in 1896. She taught Classics at various colleges until the 1930s. White was the first to achieve her B. Sc. degree. She then received an M. D. from London in 1896, after which she ran a private practice in Belfast.

It is also noteworthy here that another talented student, Mary Cornford, broke off her B. Sc. in 1888 in order to transfer to medicine at London. Several who followed her example later worked as medical missionaries, and perhaps owed to Westfield not only their grounding in the basic sciences but also their vocation. At the same time, the Westfield College Register implied that Cornford was among the gradually increasing numbers of students who came from middle-class professional families. This was a stark contrast to the earlier predominance of daughters of clergymen or the gentility.<sup>102</sup> While Maynard admired their intellectual ability, and some were converted, she always preferred the company of students who came from the upper-middle and gentry classes.

There were also those who faced failure and yet surmounted it. As Constance recorded in her Diary the week the degree results came out in November 1889, "A day of writing - my family not all rigged out with places yet. Letters pouring in about the poor

---

<sup>102</sup> Ibid., 102. Cornford's father was an engineer. See *Westfield Register*, 16; and also Sondheimer, *Castle Adamant*, 34

failed dears [E. M. W. and Helen]. But we hope Croydon and Rochester are safe.”<sup>103</sup>

Helen and E. M. W. got teaching posts, thanks to Nannie’s and Constance’s recommendations. Both gained their respective B. A. and B. Sc. the following year. Helen went on to become Headmistress of the Mount School in York, while E. M. W. remained at Cheltenham until she married geologist, Clement Reid, in 1897. She researched alongside her husband, continuing on with their work after his death in 1960.<sup>104</sup>

In January 1888, Maynard was formally invited back to Council meetings twice yearly, after she had begged them to do this since 1886. It had become clear that she was an effective Mistress, and for this she had regained her Council’s respect. Attending meetings gave her important new leverage to dissuade her Council from “unwise” decisions like increasing B. Sc. tuition or installing an entrance exam fee.<sup>105</sup> Her gain in self-confidence allowed her to stand up to her Council more. This was particularly evident in her ongoing defence of “high” B. Sc. tuition (the Council threatened to close the program because of this), and in her demand for higher salaries and fewer teaching hours for her staff. Indeed, her “unconstitutional” instigation of a sixteen-hour teaching schedule, in face of the agreed upon eighteen, could almost be seen as an act of

---

<sup>103</sup> *D*, 10 November 1890, 78.

<sup>104</sup> *Ibid.*, 80. Nannie went to Croydon on behalf of Helen while Constance saw Beale on behalf of E. M. W. After marrying, she traced the history of flora in the British Isles and climatic change with her husband. After his death she did research in geology for the British Museum.

<sup>105</sup> See *Minutes*, 7 April 1886, 208; *Report*, Lent Term, 1888, 78; *Report*, May Term, 1888, 118.

defiance.<sup>106</sup>

When Council Chairman, the Rev. James Fleming, announced in January 1888 that, “the College should not be dropped, but must continue on with vigorous effort,” Maynard felt the biggest battle had been won.<sup>107</sup> By October Westfield had taken over two adjacent houses (8 and 10) as a temporary measure, thanks to founder Dudin Brown’s donation of £500, which enabled an intake of twenty-nine students. The Council had also committed to planning the purchase of a large estate as the future home for Westfield. Maynard’s strong ties to Old Students through the Ring, meanwhile, helped garner invaluable support for Westfield, both financial and promotional.

The O. S. have always spread the knowledge of Westfield among their friends with great industry, and in consequence there has been a growing number of inquiries about it. Some are now offering assistance in scholarships as tokens of appreciation and financial aid for their sisters.<sup>108</sup>

1888 proved opportune for women in other ways. It saw the inaugural meetings of the Women’s University Club, the Southwark University Settlement for women, the Y. W. C. A. and the Students’ Christian Education Union—the latter, as mentioned in chapter five, an offshoot of the G. P. M. The London Association of Schoolmistresses was

---

<sup>106</sup> *D*, 24 March 1890, 78. She later admitted this was wrong since the Council had decided to defer her request until the next meeting. It is notable that at the time headmistresses were discussing better working hours and rates of pay. See Price and Glenday, *Reluctant Revolutionaries*, 66-69; Hunt, ed., *Lessons for Life*; Vicinus, *Independent Women*, 163-88, Spender, ed., *Education Papers*, 74-87; and Jane Martin, *Women and the Politics of Schooling in Victorian and Edwardian England* (London: Leicester University Press, 1991), 76-90.

<sup>107</sup> *D*, 30 November 1887, 66.

<sup>108</sup> *Report*, May Term 1887, 78.

meanwhile becoming a powerful network for disseminating information, and would keep educators informed of change and new rights.<sup>109</sup>

Nevertheless, underlying “my professional success,” Maynard reminded the reader in her Autobiography, was “my silent outcry.” She had convinced the Council to hire Anne Richardson as resident Classical lecturer after her graduation in May 1887, and she proved an asset in many ways. She was an able helper; she was a good lecturer; her ability to teach ethics saved Westfield money;<sup>110</sup> and on a few occasions “she was an oasis for [Maynard’s] barren desert.”

I had gone to bed when I heard a knock on the door. Nannie came in and without a word came and lay down beside me. To feel her so close and hear her words of love was as if all the frost melted into summer. I lay in the darkness fully content, my starving ended. We did not speak much, but love filled the silence. It was with utter relief that I fell asleep, and the next day had a new strength with which to face life.<sup>111</sup>

These fleeting, intimate visits, however, always left Constance “thirsting for

---

<sup>109</sup> *D*, 7 October 1888, 99. Attending an early Association of Schoolmistresses meeting, she noted “I met 50 of my profession like Miss Buckland, Miss Manning, Miss Douglas and Miss Ward. Miss Manning brought Frau Schrader, a German teacher. She was delighted, saying that we really were in advance of Germany.”

<sup>110</sup> *Minutes*, 4 March 1887, 1-5. She had argued that Nannie was needed due to the increasing number of students wanting to take University examinations. The Council had agreed, although they had quibbled over her salary and the fact she was a Quaker. Nannie’s appointment saved Westfield over £2 per week in tuition.

<sup>111</sup> *A*, VII, 49, “1887,” 188. See also *A*, VII, 51, “7<sup>th</sup> College Session, 1889,” 182; *A*, VII, 52, “8<sup>th</sup> College Session, 1890,” 200; *A*, VII, 55, “10<sup>th</sup> College Session, 1892,” 300. Here she said, “I went up to my room with no more hope than usual. But for once, she was there, saying fondly, ‘My own love, here I am! My heart loves you, my mind admires you, my soul respects you, isn’t that a fine state to be in?’ Then she spoke about all the wonderful things she thought I gave the students. I felt so wonderful.”

more.”<sup>112</sup> Richardson was not only disappointing as a friend and potential love, but even worse, had become very close to Gray. The onset of their intimacy—and her distance from Maynard—had been symbolized by their trip to Athens in April 1888. Maynard’s loneliness was exacerbated by Tristram’s sudden decision to teach in Japan for the C. M. S. in October 1888. Tristram’s replacement, Mabel Beloe, was cold, moody and eccentric in comparison with the adoration Tristram had shown her. She grew to resent what she saw as Nannie’s pampering of Beloe during the latter’s thirteen years as lecturer at Westfield.<sup>113</sup>

Self-suppression turned to anger in Maynard, according to her Autobiography. As tormented lover, barely able to accept Ralph’s rejection, she told herself that God was chastening her for a higher purpose. “I belong to *Him* now,” she recalled of her thoughts in 1888, “I had slipped the collar on willingly.” To substantiate the nature of her atoning she told the reader, “During this time I was influenced by Dante. The Purgatorio was my favourite with the unwillingness of victims to escape from their pain.”<sup>114</sup> In her Diary in June 1895, she still noted her enjoyment of Dante.<sup>115</sup> Yet this form of self-prosecutory penance only seemed to make her emotional life more dissatisfying. God never seemed to

---

<sup>112</sup> *Ibid.*, VII, 56, “1893,” 325. Here we see the sensuality between them. Constance noted, “She stood before me in all her youth and beauty. I caught her hand and looked at her as though I would fasten the vision in my mind forever. She said gently, ‘good night my beloved,’ and then those Lethe-bringing lips were laid on mine, and she was gone.”

<sup>113</sup> *D*, 18 March 1888, 99.

<sup>114</sup> *A*, VII, 49, “1888,” 232.

<sup>115</sup> *D*, 7 June 1895, 45.

hear her “insistence for peace in His love.

My outer face of cheerfulness belied my raging storms within. Almost every night I cried from sheer hunger, yet I would not say a word to recall her [Ralph]. I felt scornful in religious settings such as Trinity....The beautiful words of faith evoked such rage, anger and despair.<sup>116</sup>

Controlling her emotions left Maynard feeling “vulnerable” and exhausted. While she felt “hurt and irritated at least a dozen times” during the day, she had “to restrain [her]self from tearing up all the papers that surrounded [her] on her desk” at night.<sup>117</sup>

Perhaps it is understandable that Maynard’s “loss and emptiness” drove her to adopt a child at the end of 1888. The idea of adoption had become popular in the 1860s, after a number of London charities, largely associated with the Church of England, had begun to offer help to unwed mothers. By 1881 the Women’s Social Services as an offshoot of Salvation Army rescue work, was the largest and most effective rescue organization in Britain. It provided pre-natal care for women who would otherwise be destitute, since many, including those from the upper classes, were often cast out from their families after becoming pregnant out of wedlock. After childbirth the W. S. S. sought to find positions for those who could not return to their families. However, since most became domestic servants they could not raise their children while living in an employer’s home. The W. S. S. thus made substantive efforts to find adoptive *Christian*

---

<sup>116</sup> *A*, VII, 49, “1887,” 174. See also Stachniecowski, *Prosecutory Imagination*, 67-80; Hilton, *Atonement*, 89; Bebbington, *Evangelism in Modern Britain*, 90; Roseman, *Evangelicals and Culture*, 66-69; Stanford, *William Law*; and D. N. Samuel, ed. *The Evangelical Succession in the Church of England* (Cambridge; Cambridge University Press, 1979), for the levels of penance that Evangelicals inculcated to atone for sin.

<sup>117</sup> *A*, VII, 53, “1891,” 184-86.



parents for their illegitimate children. Notably at this time, however, a biological parent could not legally sever their ties from a child, and nobody else could make a permanent legal claim to a child.<sup>118</sup>

Maynard was aware of the work of the W. S. S. because she had kept in touch with ex-Girtonian, Ellen Pash, who worked for the S. A. in Paris, through the Ring.<sup>119</sup> She had romanticized about motherhood for a while, “want[ing] a daughter just like Gaylie was to Dora.” Her father’s sudden death from a heart attack in the summer of 1888 led her to think about family bonds and mortality, and her urge for motherhood strongly increased. She spoke to her sisters about life changes and “endings,” and the discussion of adoption was raised at that point. But when she was advised against taking such a step she promised “not to, unless ‘a child was thrown at [her] head.’”<sup>120</sup>

It seems that Maynard did pursue her fantasy despite her promise, although there is no direct evidence of this. In October she noted in her Autobiography, “Ellen Pash

---

<sup>118</sup> Higginbotham, “Respectable Sinners,” 218-24. The W. S. S. was established by Florence Booth, daughter-in-law of General Booth of the S. A. Few women who entered the S. A. maternity home returned to family. Most found work as domestic servants because a “fallen woman” could not demand the same wages “as a servant of unblemished reputation.” See F. K. Prochaska, *Women and Philanthropy in Nineteenth-Century England* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1980), 98-123; G. K. Behlmer, *Friends of the Family: The English Home and its Guardians, 1850-1940* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1998), chapter 6; and Jo Manton, *Mary Carpenter and the Children of the Streets* (London: Heinemann, 1976), 122, on the law and rescue work.

<sup>119</sup> See *GB*, 16 November 1874, 99; and *Ring*, 28 October 1885.

<sup>120</sup> *A*, VII, 50, “6<sup>th</sup> College Session, 1888,” 167. She rarely mentioned her father in her records after the 1880s, although she was always fond of him. Here she simply noted, “He was 88 and strong. He walked two miles on the day he died, Sunday September 9<sup>th</sup>. He was just and a good man, but he never conquered his temper.”

suddenly wrote offering me a six-year-old girl named Stephane Rosabianca from one of their orphanages.”<sup>121</sup> Effie, as she was nicknamed, was the illegitimate daughter of a young middle-class Italian woman named Rosabianca Fazulo, who was disowned by her family after becoming pregnant by the family pastor. After giving birth, Rosabianca, like other “fallen women” in her position, was left to beg on the streets until she was rescued by an S. A. officer. The S. A. found work for her in a London hospital and set her up in lodgings. Effie was meanwhile taken to a Paris orphanage. She was given her mother’s first name as her surname, as this was the usual practice with illegitimate children.<sup>122</sup>

The reason why Pash “suddenly wrote” to Maynard remains unclear. I suspect that Maynard actually contacted Pash about her wish to adopt a child since they had never been particularly friendly or kept in personal touch beyond the Ring letter.<sup>123</sup> In her Autobiography, Maynard characteristically noted, “I saw Ellen’s letter as a sign from heaven.” It must be His gift, given the ache in her heart. Moreover, she had apparently asked her sisters if they would be interested in taking Effie and they had all refused. “I saw plainly that there was no help to be had in my family,” she asserted. While initially repulsed by Effie’s physical appearance of her “crossed black eyes, white face and pale

---

<sup>121</sup> *A*, VII, 50, “1888,” 160.

<sup>122</sup> *Ibid.*, 167. She noted here, “the pastor was also driven from his position with all disgrace.” See also Firth, *Maynard*, 211-17. Rosabianca lived with distant relatives in Naples until she gave birth. She begged on the streets in southern France for about two years until the S. A. officer discovered her. See also Higginbotham, “Respectable Sinners,” 224-27; and Prochaska, *Women and Philanthropy*, on the role of the S. A.

<sup>123</sup> In fact Maynard had disliked Pash at Girton because the latter did not agree with her religious views. See *GB*, 6 May 1874, 91.

swollen lips,” she was attracted to her intelligence because “brains her daughter must have.” Added to this, Effie evinced “a brisk independent nature, rather than a clinging one,” indicating that she could tolerate living “with strangers.”<sup>124</sup> Of note here, is that Maynard expected a child to fit in with *her* life as Mistress, not vice versa.

When Reverend Moore and his wife, who were good friends of Harry’s, agreed to take Effie, Maynard saw it as a second sign. “Here was a home that could be entirely approved” by the W. S. S. Thus, despite not being allowed any trial period after Ellen Pash refused on the grounds that another party wanted to take Effie immediately, and despite being warned of the expense of raising a child, her daughter officially became registered as Stephane Anthon to prevent any future discovery of her illegitimacy. Maynard was legally bound to pay 5 shillings per week towards her support. Interestingly, she downplays the fact that she signed a proviso for reneging on her obligation with six months’ notice in the event of unforeseen circumstances. Instead, she informed the reader that she “signed the deed of adoption on November 16<sup>th</sup>.” This is also interesting because English law before 1927 made no provision for legal adoption of a child whose mother was alive.<sup>125</sup> Maynard’s stance implied that she felt some level of guilt about her commitment as a mother when writing her Autobiography.

Six note-books tell the story of Effie, together with entries in Maynard’s Diary, Green-book and Autobiography—and it is largely a story of tragedy. This was due not only

---

<sup>124</sup> A, VII, 50, “1888,” 167; Firth, *Maynard*, 212-3.

<sup>125</sup> *Ibid.*, 167; *Ibid.*, 211-17. Assuming a different surname in cases like this was quite common to avoid the stigma of illegitimacy. See Higginbotham, “Respectable Sinners,” 224, and Behlmer, *Friends of the Family*, chapter 6, on the English law.

to their clash of temperament, but also to Maynard's biased perspectives on class, race and sexuality. As noted earlier in this study, Maynard's values had left her viewing the lower classes, including the mid- and lower-middle class, as inferior beings to herself, in spite of her religious view "that all were equal in His eyes."<sup>126</sup> Added to this, her ideals about "respectable womanhood," together with her embracing of nationalist imperialism, left her thinking in even more class-based ways.<sup>127</sup> For Maynard, then, class, race and sex were inextricably interconnected. Although Firth hinted at this, she largely depicted Effie as a difficult child and applauded Maynard for her perseverance over the years.

However, as Maynard's records revealed, and as Walker suggests in her chapter on Effie in *Devil's Kingdom*, Maynard never really conceptualized Effie as her daughter—as an upper-middle-class child—because she saw her as inferior both in class and race.<sup>128</sup> This is inferred from her instruction to Effie to address her, in turn, as Godmother, Auntie and Miss Maynard. Furthermore, instead of being enrolled in a private upper-middle-class boarding school, as Dora had done with her daughter Gaylie, Effie largely lived in lower-middle-class lodgings and even attended a Board School at one time,

---

<sup>126</sup> See *GB*, 12 April 1867, 88.

<sup>127</sup> As mentioned earlier, middle-class femininity was linked to ideas about women's purity, asexuality and romantic friendships; and Maynard's ideals were heightened by evolutionary theory—the science that she loved to hate. See Walkowitz's, *Prostitution and Victorian Society; Dreadful Delight*, 90-93, Gorham's, "Maiden Tribute," 353-79, and Mort's, *Dangerous Sexualities*, 66-90, on "respectable womanhood."

<sup>128</sup> Compare Firth, *Maynard*, 215-17 with *D*, 12 December 1888, 97, and with Maynard's notebooks on Effie (*Stephane 1888-1915*, vols. I - VI). See also Walker, *Devil's Kingdom*, 149-63, for perspectives on this relationship.

where she was educated alongside working-class children.<sup>129</sup>

In the beginning, their relationship had some potential, as Maynard at least believed that her “love for Effie was very strong.” Nonetheless, as with Maynard’s protégée from her Girton days, Eliza Thoulburn, Effie was almost like a showpiece, a project of sorts. “She expanded under my affection and care,” Maynard asserted in her Autobiography, “transformed through regular bathing and a new wardrobe - and I thought her pretty with her rosy cheeks, nice oval face and animated expression. I bought her glasses to help her squint.”<sup>130</sup> Her Diary also mentioned Effie’s development, her own joy in shopping for her, and how much she missed her when she was at Westfield. “When Effie demonstrates her affection by throwing her arms around my neck, and rubs her soft cheek against mine, I feel satisfaction in my empty heart.”<sup>131</sup> Vacations took on a whole new meaning:

Whether at Eastbourne with Dora, or home, or Westfield, there was no lying awake now, no tears. Effie would climb into my bed every day and we would read Scripture together. How I longed to transform her. I would take her outside and make her listen to the bees, smell the fragrance of flowers and look at the sky. I wanted to show her beauty and I did not like being away from her.<sup>132</sup>

It is also notable that while Maynard’s Autobiography was silent on the matter, her Diary implied another underlying, far deeper joy, which seemed to take up more of

---

<sup>129</sup> See *D*, 12 December 1888, 97; *D*, 20 May 1889, 112; Firth, *Maynard*, 219; and Walker, *Devil’s Kingdom*, 163.

<sup>130</sup> *A*, VII, 50, “1888,” 235- 47; also Firth, *Maynard*, 223-34.

<sup>131</sup> *D*, 7 November 1888, 57.

<sup>132</sup> *A*, VII, 50, “1888,” 235- 47. See also *D*, 3 February 1889, 66.

her energy and emotions, namely, her reconciliation with Ralph. Her rekindled relationship with Ralph and her appreciation of Effie may have gone hand in hand, although detail concerning this is scant since the Diary largely focussed on public events. There also seems to have been a distance between Nannie and Ralph and between Nannie and Constance by April 1889. The reasons for these rifts are also unclear, but jealousy and ambition may have been among the reasons. Nannie was frequently absent from Westfield because she was delivering public addresses on temperance and Union politics in Ireland. Her ability to debate these issues was gaining her prestige across England as a female public speaker.

When Nannie spoke of taking the Mistress-ship of the Mount School in York in October 1889, Constance seemed unconcerned. "In some ways would be a relief," she wrote, "she actually dwarfs me at times." Moreover, she was hoping that Nannie's departure would bring Ralph back into residence.<sup>133</sup> Nannie did not leave, however, although she was discontent and restless.<sup>134</sup> Even George's engagement (1890) and subsequent marriage to Jeannie (1891) did not appear to bring Constance and Nannie any closer. In fact Constance seemed largely disinterested in the marriage, while Nannie was completely absorbed by it.<sup>135</sup>

---

<sup>133</sup> *D*, 7 April 1889, 59. She noted here, "Nannie sat on committees where she was the only woman; she attended great Ulster demonstrations in the Albert Hall; and she addressed hundreds very well and was truly effective."

<sup>134</sup> *Ibid.*, 16 May 1889, 66.

<sup>135</sup> *A*, VII, 50, "1888," 233. Nannie was possibly concerned about her sister, Jeannie, since Constance implied, in her autobiography, that it was a troubled relationship from the outset. Jeannie could apparently be selfish, while George, like Constance, had

Ralph, meanwhile, was at Westfield to the extent that Constance felt she “*really* had her back after four years.”<sup>136</sup> Ralph officially moved back into residence in January 1890, one may surmise, to renew her relationship with Constance. We know through the Green-book of 1885 that they kissed at length on the lips and lay in each other’s arms. But, as mentioned, we only have access to Constance’s later experiences with Ralph through her Diary and Autobiography. The Diary of 1890 and 1891, while scant in detail, clearly implied Constance’s pleasure in their renewed intimacy. She spoke of “delightful” nights or “*good* nights with *R*,” and of Ralph’s tender ministering when she felt unwell. She appeared to allow herself, once again, to fall under her spell.<sup>137</sup> The eroticism between them during these years is mentioned in her Autobiography in the form of a transcription of a Green-book entry written on April 14<sup>th</sup>, 1891:

[Ralph] was not well, and I went to see that she was rightly attended to. As I left she said with gentle hesitation, ‘You never bite my fingers now, as you used to do.’ ‘Oh no, never,’ I replied lightly. ‘And you never snarl and growl like a jaguar when you can’t express yourself. I never heard anyone growl as well as you.’ ‘No,’ I said, ‘it’s useless. I’ve been cured of that.’ The sweet voice went on, ‘And you never rock me in your arms and call me your baby.’ ‘No,’ I said in the same even tone, ‘I’ve been cured of that.’ ‘Oh!’ she said, with quite new meaning, ‘oh, I see.’ Here was a spot too painful to be touched. I said, ‘Goodbye, dear,’ and left the room. I will not go into the desolation I felt when alone again. I was like a pot-bound root all curled in on itself, like an iron-bound bud that has lost the spring, and now no rain and no sunshine can open it.<sup>138</sup>

---

his father’s bad temper and was prone to his mother’s melancholic nature. In fact at one time Jeannie wanted to break off her betrothal because she found George so difficult.

<sup>136</sup> See *D*, 20 September 1889, 60; *D*, 26 October 1889, 67.

<sup>137</sup> See *D*, 12 January 1890, 56; *D*, 2 March 1890, 73; *D*, 19 May 1890, 4.

<sup>138</sup> *A*, VII, 53, “9<sup>th</sup> College Session, 1891,” 286. Taken from *GB*, 14 April 1891, 66.

Similarly to her relationships with Campbell and, more particularly, Lumsden and Brooke, Maynard's explorations of passion with Gray were expressed through sexual play and role playing. As Bullough, Dixon and Dixon point out in "Sadism, Masochism," biting and growling were subject matters in the ancient sex manuals from India and China. Such practices continue in modern times. For example, Alfred Kinsey and others note that scratching and biting are often part of the precoital play in conventional sex.<sup>139</sup>

In light of this, one wonders if this is why the Green-books are missing for this period. Was this single entry left behind as an oversight? Were other entries more sexually explicit? Was this perhaps "deviant" behaviour to readers in the early 1900s? If Maynard destroyed the records, as she threatened, why then did she risk copying this one into her Autobiography in 1927? The answer remains unclear because we can not know who destroyed the Green-books. However, when comparing this entry to others describing her physical intimacies, it does not seem inconsistent, and admittedly more sexually explicit than her entries about her sexual plays with Brooke. Unfortunately missing are the Green-book entries that richly supplement Maynard's writing of love and physical passion in her Autobiography.

What also seems clear is Maynard's wish that the entry be viewed as a part of her "Atoning" for passion and ambition over these years. When turning once again to the context in which we find this quote, Maynard's rejection of Gray's overtures stemmed not

---

<sup>139</sup> Bullough, Dixon and Dixon, "Sadism, Masochism," 51; Alfred Kinsey, W. B. Pomeroy, C. E. Martin and Paul H. Gebhard, *Sexual Behaviour in the Human Female* (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1951). Both texts argue that this points to the physiological; that morphine receptors in the brain can generate feelings from anticipation to fear which can be channelled into sexual feelings.



from her discomfort over their sexual activities, but from professional jealousy and her dilemma about faith.

At the time (1891), Westfield had just moved to its permanent home, Kidderpore, a large white stucco mansion with newly-built wing, located in a two-acre estate about a mile from the former college. It was not a moment too soon. The college was “over-filled” with an enrollment of thirty, and potential students were being turned away.<sup>140</sup> Maynard, however, felt ambivalent about a venture “in which she had no part.” Maynard was even more “upset” after the Council decided to send some students and one staff member to Kidderpore in January 1891, with the full move to take place over Easter after renovations were more complete.<sup>141</sup> Certainly, the term would prove stressful, for example, with transporting hot meals daily to Kidderpore among her problems. A terse Diary entry following her Council’s decision, “And *that*, I suppose, will mean R’s going [to Kidderpore],” indicated, however, her more worrying concern.<sup>142</sup> Gray indeed seized on this opportunity to further her career as a House Mistress. Even though Maynard’s Diary is vague on the matter, her Ring letter for 1891 evoked her resentment about the

---

<sup>140</sup> *Minutes*, 28 October 1889, 221. The Council considered the asking price of £12,000 for the home and immediate garden (two acres) reasonable. Dudin Brown gave £5,000 towards the purchase. The “building fund was already at £2,000, thanks to the kindness of Alexandra Brown, [Dudin Brown’s niece] and Mrs. Stevens’ donation of £500.” The Council sold their Northern Railway Stock for £3,000 to boost the building fund and get repairs and construction underway. See *Minutes*, 3 December 1890, 15.

<sup>141</sup> *A*, VII, 53, “1891,” 263. She was rightly angry and upset. She was not invited to be a member of the selection committee, despite the fact that she had asked repeatedly. She was left with no say in any decisions regarding location etc.

<sup>142</sup> *D*, 20 November 1890, 67.

situation:

...This term we are physically rather uncomfortable for the Council... allowed us to be cut off like an island....Nine students are with Miss Gray at Kidderpore and are unbearably proud of it. With their thick walls, double windows and wide fireplaces, they are forever boasting of the heat and comfort, and look with a pity, which is akin to scorn, on us whose steps are slippery and whose fires smoke....They are moreover eaten up with vanity over the gay omnibus which every morning, floored with footwarmers and replete with rugs, conveys them here by 9:20 a.m....They have a sort of high tea at 7:00 p.m., and I have to send them over everything nearly ready cooked. I just warn you, my good friends, against endeavouring to keep house nicely for 13 hungry folks at the distance of a mile and a quarter. It's not to be lightly done, I can tell you.<sup>143</sup>

Maynard's professionally-based jealousy was compounded by hurt and disappointment. She sorely missed Gray. Yet Gray seemed completely caught up in her new position. Thus, while Maynard enthused about the "grand entertainment" at Kidderpore," it seems that she was jealous of the "cheerfulness and independence of the Kidderpore party" under Gray's capable supervision.<sup>144</sup> Although her records are vague on the matter, she chastised herself in her Autobiography for being so "blind, so miserably blind" after mentioning her difficulty with overseeing the split college. Gray, furious about the "interfering" with her administration of Kidderpore, gained permission from the Council for an extended Easter vacation. She left shortly before the end of term, leaving Constance to face a disorganized move over to Kidderpore without any help from staff or

---

<sup>143</sup> *Ring*, 23 January 1891. There was tension around this following a petition from the students asking to have their evening meal at Kidderpore instead of Westfield.

<sup>144</sup> *D*, 23 February 1891, 89.

Council.<sup>145</sup>

Humiliation, coupled with her dislike of the new Westfield's evoking "an institution that was *not*, even by the widest stretch, the family," left Maynard questioning both aim and self. The move had left her vulnerable to Fanny Metcalfe's insinuations about her inability "to rule."<sup>146</sup> Her failure at defending students' volunteer missionary work to her Council symbolized her faltering aims.<sup>147</sup> She struggled to cope with the changes of a growing institution, venting her frustrations on students and staff. She could not reconcile the fact that she had allowed her vulnerability in her love for Gray to override her rule by allowing the infiltration of the very secular activities that threatened her aims:

Whether in novels, songs, dress, dancing, acting, expressions and tastes....I had left my own standard and conceded here and there, till I seemed to have no voice in the matter. I looked on in vague dissatisfaction...at the whirling couples and the rouge on 'Juliet's' sweet face. Oh! how unlike all I meant when I took the college! I had consulted the wishes of my Staff too

---

<sup>145</sup> *A*, VII, 53, "1891," 283. Only four students helped with the move, and, unfortunately, the students at large had not packed well. When Constance herself went home, leaving the workmen and servants "to finish up," Fanny accused her of "more poor judgement." She demanded her "immediate return from Oakfield and then proceeded to berate [her] for leaving everything in such confusion."

<sup>146</sup> *Ibid.*, 284. Fanny apparently told students that Constance "was very weak; students could coax [her] into anything; the servants were free and noisy; the move was disgraceful; [she] had not one idea how to rule; and that the liberty [she] permitted was but license and disorder."

<sup>147</sup> *Minutes*, 1 April 1891, 146. Regarding volunteer missionary work, the Council stipulated that she get their permission; that it must be within a mile from Westfield; that it must be under the direction of the local clergyman; and that the work did not involve the students being out after dark. This meant giving up work at local factories, Board Schools and hospitals. In fact the only activities possible were reading once a week to girls at two small factories nearby.

much. They did not know, how should they? It was mine to control.<sup>148</sup>

Following this entry Maynard wrote, “No one noticed any change except Ralph who is very sharp about such matters.” Gray, as would any individual close to another, likely sensed the root of Maynard’s frustration and hoped to reconcile their differences. But Maynard, angry and hurt by the whole Kidderpore episode, her diminishing power, and her faltering religious values, appears to have retaliated by informing the piqued Gray that she was cut off from their former intimacy, and that she was “cured” of their erotic play like “finger bit[ing] and growl[ing].”<sup>149</sup>

Whether they resumed relations remains unclear. Maynard simply noted in her Autobiography after this evocative entry:

I have failed 500 times, here I will try again. But then followed much misery, partly repentant and partly obstinate. I seemed to get unutterably tired of myself with ever-crying hunger for love going on within, and there were sleepless nights and wet pillows....There were more things also, but I will go no further.<sup>150</sup>

It seems that Ralph alternated between being teasingly close to Constance and then to Nannie. For example, she was close to Nannie from 1888-89; Constance between 1889-91; and she grew close to Nannie again in April 1892, according to the Diary.<sup>151</sup> Although Constance was drawn, or perhaps tied to her own seduction/resistance ritual, she abhorred Ralph’s shifting between intimacy and distance. “I was shut out from the joy of domestic

---

<sup>148</sup> *A*, VII, 53, “1891,” 286. Taken from *GB*, 14 April 1891.

<sup>149</sup> *Ibid.*, 286.

<sup>150</sup> *Ibid.*, 288.

<sup>151</sup> See *D*, 8 April 1892, 89. Here they had just returned from a holiday at Eastbourne together. They took several trips together after this.

life that was going on around me,” she raged in her Autobiography (one presumes she meant raves here). “I felt like a prisoner in an empty cell.”<sup>152</sup> Heartbreak had led to anger, once again, at His silence.

Even more provocative is another comment in her Autobiography, “His [General Booth S. A.] strange words, such a tender man, half a woman! somehow explained my loneliness due to the pollution of sin.”<sup>153</sup> As Weeks points out, Edward Carpenter’s work, *The Intermediate Sex* (1908), had the most significant impact on the early twentieth-century sex reformers. There is no evidence to suggest that Maynard had read his work when writing in 1926. However, her re-telling of this incident from 1892 is curious in its echoing of Carpenter’s idea of a “third sex,” which he suggested bore the characteristics of one sex and emotional characteristics of the other.<sup>154</sup> Yet, as Maynard passionately concluded, “I thought, I give up N! I give up R! I want Thee only. How can I fear?”<sup>155</sup> Her struggle was not simply understanding and writing about her desire within the context of changing norms surrounding gender, but also avoiding it within the context of faith.

The other heartache for Maynard at this time was Effie. Once again, one wonders

---

<sup>152</sup> *A*, VII, 53, “1891,” 317.

<sup>153</sup> *Ibid.*, 320. See also Smith-Rosenberg, “The New Woman as Androgyne: Social Disorder and Gender Crisis, 1870-1936,” in *Disorderly Conduct: Visions of Gender in Victorian America*, ed. Carroll Smith-Rosenberg (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1985), 245-95, for discussion on this phenomenon.

<sup>154</sup> See Weeks, *Coming Out*, 47-68; his *Sex, Politics*, 141-52; *Sexuality and Its Discontents*, 123-32, and *Against Nature*, 32-50. See also Jeffreys, *The Spinster*, 44-47 and Herdt, “Third Sexes and Third Genders,” 12-81. Carpenter was strongly influenced by Ellis, but broke away from his biological model. He argued for a new evolutionary type, the bisexual.

<sup>155</sup> *A*, VII, 53, “1891,” 320.

about any connection, such as whether Maynard's disappointment with Gray affected her attitude towards Effie. Was Effie herself causing problems? Or had her patience and, perhaps, *use* for Effie run its course? It was probably a combination of all of these.

Maynard confessed in her Green-book in 1903:

Effie lasted through the very worst stress and strain, a sort of hope, and yet all the while my heart could have died mentally and physically. It was a drastic measure to take her... yet, looking back, perhaps it was the only safeguard against the inaction and despair... While A and R chattered cheerfully over the fire, I closed my door softly, and went alone seek the door of heaven that gave me no response.<sup>156</sup>

While this suggested Maynard's exploitation of Effie to bolster her through an emotionally difficult time, her Autobiography presented an entirely different perspective. She explained how Nannie and Ralph had warned her, for quite some time, about Effie's tendency to manipulate her through contrived, demonstrative affection. Their observations had apparently been confirmed by Tissy, Gazy and Do, who criticized Effie's bullying and selfishness. "She loves as long as loving is pleasant, and becomes heartless when it brings with it any effort or trouble." Even so, it was not simply Effie's "bare, heartless deceit" that upset Constance, it was her "certain coarseness that [she] shrank from." Dora had pointed this out, declaring that she no longer wanted Effie around to "corrupt her innocent children with her immodest, dirty mind, and her making up tales about wicked women."

Constance herself had noticed that:

when Dora's children came, or when [she] took [Effie] to Eastbourne and watched her with the other girls, she seemed to change. There was a

---

<sup>156</sup> *GB*, 5 June 1903, 199.

teasing and vulgar tone in her voice and in every look and action.”<sup>157</sup>

In later years, Maynard discovered that Effie had been “a runner” at one of her earlier lodgings. Effie’s freedom to run messages had given her the opportunity to see exactly those working-class vices of prostitution and petty theft that Maynard so disapproved of and could not understand. It also apparently led to Effie’s first sexual experience at thirteen. Thus, it is not surprising that Effie’s behaviour was not only at odds with Constance’s moral values, but highly offensive to her dignity and taste. Indeed, given her upbringing, and norms surrounding class, gender and race, it is little wonder that she keenly felt the “disgrace” Effie brought her. The girl could never be a daughter to her like Gaylie was to Do, and she “felt so ashamed knowing that [her] child should never be left alone with others.” In fact she wanted to relinquish all responsibility for her:

Human love is a terribly strong thing, and here it broke under my feet and sawed me in two. As she slept, she looked so ‘un-English’ yet very young and innocent, but she wasn’t the pure snowdrop. What have I got hold of here?...Is it the terrible Opium poppy?<sup>158</sup>

Disgust and shame, coupled with Maynard’s lack of interest, spawned her avoidance of Effie. Indeed, the fact that Effie usually stayed with family seems most presumptuous on Maynard’s part. She clearly had no tolerance for Effie herself. “I find her a drag - a day seems like seven on account of my being with her all day long!”<sup>159</sup> Her

---

<sup>157</sup> *A*, VII, 53, “1891,” 264; also Firth, *Maynard*, 229.

<sup>158</sup> *Ibid.*, 227-9. See also Firth, *Maynard*, 254-67, and *Stephane*, vol. IV, 67. As Walker points out in *Devil’s Kingdom*, 152, Maynard half believed that Effie suffered from a “moral idiocy” that came to her from her ethnic taint.

<sup>159</sup> *D*, 6 January 1892, 104.

increasing disappointment led to a corresponding nonchalance towards the demands of raising a child, although it is debatable as to whether Maynard had *ever* really tried to understand what this actually entailed. She did not care to understand the disruption that the continual uprooting from lodgings must have created for Effie. Certainly, Effie was problematic. Maynard was forced to move her three times because of “lies and bad behaviour.” But the fact she was mostly lodged with “a simple cottage mother and workman father” is telling.<sup>160</sup>

Also telling is that when Ellen Pash learned of Maynard’s attitude, she accused her of lacking in “mother love.” This event is notably downplayed in Firth’s account,<sup>161</sup> and although Maynard smarted under what she felt “was an injustice,” she admitted that Pash had a point.<sup>162</sup> She attempted to make more of an effort, and her Diary at least spoke of her enjoyment of Effie’s cuddles or pleasure when she sang to her. “After much trouble,” apparently, she moved Effie to Highgate “under the care of two pious and exacting [middle-class] teachers, the Miss Corytons.”<sup>163</sup>

Maynard’s attitude, and her inability to curb her disfavour of Effie, left her unable to analyse her own conduct as a mother. She wished to teach Effie to seek holiness, as this would lead her to become more humble and less self-centred. Perhaps then Effie could attend Westfield, and possibly join her in a professional capacity. She failed to see that

---

<sup>160</sup> See *D*, 6 May 1890, 99; and *D*, 20 September 1890, 122.

<sup>161</sup> See Firth, *Maynard*, 232. Firth simply noted here, “the attitude of Ellen was not without effect.”

<sup>162</sup> *A*, VII, 55, “10<sup>th</sup> College Session, 1892,” 360.

<sup>163</sup> *Ibid.*, 226; *Stephane* vol. IV, 77-90.



humiliating Effie was not the way to achieve these goals. Just as she punished Effie's bad behaviour, such as by having her spend one Easter as a servant, so Effie retaliated with temper tantrums and rude behaviour. "I could not help feeling the pain of genuine contempt for so feeble and vain a character, Maynard confessed in her *Autobiography*.<sup>164</sup> This vicious comment evinced, once again, Maynard's failure to understand the demands of child-rearing. It also differentiated her expectations from those of the Salvationists. The latter were far more concerned with an orphan's redemption than judging her class or career prospects.<sup>165</sup>

When Effie was expelled by the Corytons in June 1892 for "rudeness, deceit and bad conduct with other children," Constance felt she "had gone beyond [her] last point of endurance." She spoke to a lawyer about her wish to act on the proviso to discontinue her custody, and she began looking at various orphanages. On June 28<sup>th</sup> she wrote, "This day the exchange is completed. Effie sleeps tonight in Miss Sharman's orphanage as one of her large family." Interestingly, by this time, Victorian rescue workers were becoming more opposed to finding homes for illegitimate children. They argued that it removed the burden of child support as a reminder for an unmarried mother of her sin. The Women's Social Services apparently accepted this view. They only pursued cases where the mother had died or had married a man who was unwilling to accept the child. Instead they had

---

<sup>164</sup> *A*, VII, 52, "1890," 269.

<sup>165</sup> See Walker, *Devil's Kingdom*, 152-4; also Madge Unsworth, *Maiden Tribute: A Study in Voluntary Social Service* (London: Salvationist Publishing, 1949); and Louisa A. Jackson, "'Singing Birds as Well as Soap Suds': The Salvation Army's Work with Sexually Abused Girls in Edwardian England," *Gender and History* 12 (2000), 107-26, on Salvationist's aims.

opened up a home for babies where illegitimate children could be cared for under the direction of the W. S. S. staff, while older children remained in Salvation Army orphanages.<sup>166</sup>

Maynard wrote to Effie's mother to inform her of her actions. Rosabianca did not reclaim her rights as a mother, even though she could do so under the proviso until Effie was seventeen. She was now remarried and lived in South Africa. Effie remained at the S. A. orphanage and hoped at one point to become an S. A. Officer. But apparently the S. A. would not accept her owing to her ongoing behavioural problems. This, together with Effie's contracting consumption, resulted in Maynard financially supporting Effie until her death at thirty in 1915. As far as Maynard was concerned, "Effie was a disappointment to the end."<sup>167</sup> Although we do not have Effie's voice, we know about her later behaviour, and thus with good reason, she must have felt just as disappointed in her "God-mother."

Effie's situation notwithstanding, nothing could have prepared Constance for the "chief event" of the Lent term of 1894. She noted in her Autobiography:

There was a movement to make a Junior school for the great St. Leonards in St. Andrews and Ralph stood for the Headship. She won the election and held the post for many years. This sounds simple enough, and I wrote a heartfelt testimonial and spoke brightly of all that could be done.<sup>168</sup>

This event was anything but "simple." Constance was devastated at the thought of

---

<sup>166</sup> Higginbotham, "Respectable Sinners," 224.

<sup>167</sup> *A*, VII, 55, "1892," 364; *Stephane*, vol. V, 89-102.

<sup>168</sup> *A*, VII, 57, "12<sup>th</sup> College Session, 1894," 339.

Ralph's departure. She was further upset to learn that Nannie was trying to get Ralph confirmed into the Church of England in order to qualify for the post. Constance justified her anger in terms of faith:

I said to N, 'we talk about waiting for the lead of God, and then say to ourselves, she *shall* get it! Well, I won't stir another step!' Nannie responded at once, 'I *do* get rather led away by the pleasures of pursuit, I know, darling. I've gone to the limits. I won't do anything else. I won't write to the Bishop. I'll stop.' She did stop but I was still left sad.<sup>169</sup>

A brief Diary entry on February 27<sup>th</sup> 1894, "Ralph's telegram arrived, appointed," apparently concealed the rage within her. According to her Autobiography, she plunged headlong into depression again, which left her exhausted and at times suicidal.<sup>170</sup>

Tormented lover versus successful Mistress; these competing roles forged the conflict between ambition, passion and faith during these poignant years in Maynard's life. Nonetheless, her strength of will again got her through, and a trip to Norway in July 1894 was the beginning of this. Just like the young girl seeking emotive release through nature, so an older and wiser Maynard "spent hours contemplating its beauty in cold fields. It was the physical re-making of [her] body, and violent exercise became crucial for [her] health."<sup>171</sup> Most notable is her intensive bicycle riding. In fact she was probably

---

<sup>169</sup> *Ibid.*, 340. The problem centred on the fact that Ralph was a Methodist. It seems that Nannie's efforts paid off. Constance noted, "The question of Ralph joining the Church of England was soon settled and she was privately confirmed by the Bishop of Wakefield."

<sup>170</sup> *D*, 27 February 1894, 67; *A*, VII, 56, "11<sup>th</sup> College Session, 1893," 323. She said, here, "I did not care if I lived or died, nor even wish to be cured because it seemed like a permanent way to be feeling."

<sup>171</sup> *D*, 8 July 1894, 99. See also *A*, VII, 57, "Norway, 1894," 344. She wrote, "I have 37 closely written little pages, all minutely descriptive. The banks of snow, the vast

among the early women to own a bicycle. Her “cycling tours” or “biking cures,” as Effie called them, could take up to three weeks covering over twenty miles a day. According to her Autobiography, throughout her slow road to recovery, she never ceased to view her depression “as physical,” which she believed could only be cured through exercise.<sup>172</sup>

Firth suggested that if Maynard had known “the study of psychology at the stage which it had reached by the end of the nineteenth century,” she would at least have better understood her “suffering” and loneliness as an educational pioneer.<sup>173</sup> As noted in chapter one, sexologists from the late 1860s on were citing a wide range of practices—from heterosexuality to “perversions” like homosexuality, bisexuality and masochism—which they detailed through scientific discourses. This important change meant that acts were now viewed as the result of a physiological disease as opposed to a sin or crime.<sup>174</sup> Freud’s subsequent theories on childhood psychosexual development introduced the idea of “normal” heterosexual development versus “arrested” development, which, he argued, could initiate same-sex desire. The notion of “desire,” as opposed to sex as merely an act, aided in the earlier constituting of different-sex eroticism

---

beds of reindeer moss, the little lakes lying like sapphires amid the rich brown bog-land, nothing escapes me.”

<sup>172</sup> *A*, VII, 57, “12<sup>th</sup> College Session, 1894,” 346. For bicycle riding see McCrone, *Playing the Game*, 177-85; David Rubinstein’s “Cycling in the 1890s,” *Victorian Studies* 21 (1977), 47-71 and his “Cycling 80 Years Ago,” *History Today* 28 (1978), 544-47, and also Helen Meller’s *Leisure and the Changing City, 1870-1914* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1976), 227.

<sup>173</sup> Firth, *Maynard*, 337.

<sup>174</sup> See Bland and Doan, eds., *Sexology in Culture*; Philips and Reay, eds., *Sexualities in History*; Katz, *Invention of Heterosexuality*; Jeffreys, *The Spinster*; and Weeks, *Sexuality and Its Discontents*, and *Against Nature*, on the work of sexologists.

as the dominant norm. All other forms of eroticism, including intimacy between women, began to be curtailed in the early 1900s. Thus, central to the development of both sexology and Freudianism in the late 1800s, was the new understanding that sexual identity constituted the essence of the self. This powerful new perspective, Weeks argues, can be seen as a link between the Victorian age and contemporary culture.<sup>175</sup>

When Maynard wrote of her relationship with Gray in 1926, her questioning reflected her attempt to understand the new ideas about the inner self. She asked:

Why did I not speak out or consult someone? When I examine my feelings under the present light of psychology I suppose I had love within me which I could not give away. Someone has called this loneliness 'sex feeling,' but I can honestly say that my thoughts never strayed to a man.<sup>176</sup>

As noted in chapters one and three, when she re-visited the subject a year later, she moved beyond gender to analyse her "thwarted sex instinct" within the context of faith:

My craving was not the instinct toward marriage, *surely* not, it was the instinct toward God, which can be satisfied with nothing less. Religiously I had run dry and prayer did not help. It was like being fastened to a house and told to drag it along, for there was not one moment of real success.<sup>177</sup>

The point here is that Maynard could never understand her struggle in purely cultural terms, and certainly not within the context of psychology or the sexual

---

<sup>175</sup> See de Lauretis, "Freud, Sexuality, and Perversion"; Meltzer, ed., *The Trial(s) of Psychoanalysis*; Christopher Badcock, *Essential Freud* (Cambridge: Blackwell, 1992); Malcolm Macmillan, ed. *Freud Evaluated: The Completed Arc* (Cambridge: M.I.T. Press, 1997); Jonathon Dollimore, *Sexual Dissidence: Augustine to Wilde, Freud to Foucault* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1991), on the work of Freud, and also Freud's, *Theory of Sexuality*.

<sup>176</sup> *A*, VII, 52, "1888," 172.

<sup>177</sup> *Ibid.*, 174.

classifications of the early twentieth century, as this study has consistently argued. In this, Janice Raymond's view of romantic friendship in *A Passion for Friends* is worthy of note:

Female friendship is not an uninterrupted chronicle of wondrous happenings, nor is it a tale of failure and disruption,...it is formed on the *cultural* commitments that women have made to themselves and to each other in the face of repeated assaults of hetero-reality to be 'essentially' and 'by nature' for men.<sup>178</sup>

Raymond struggles between "wanting to affirm" that female/female passion is lesbian and her "gnawing intuition" that this view morally "shortchanges women who are Lesbians and patronizes women who are not Lesbians." Her conclusion that there is a distinction between "Gyn/affection and Lesbian Be-ing" today,<sup>179</sup> affirms how scholars struggle to label sexuality today. It also exemplifies the difficulty in defining passion during an era when cultural norms about sex and desire were in even more flux.<sup>180</sup>

I also suggest that Maynard sought—as many individuals before and since—ways of achieving "psychological" strength through both spiritual and physical strength by banishing emotional pain through forms of ritualistic deification. She knew that her turning to Dante's "'Purgatorio' was a deliberate refusal to escape her pain." But was it

---

<sup>178</sup> Raymond, *Passion for Friends*, 21. Italics, mine.

<sup>179</sup> Ibid., 227. See also, for example, Rich's, "Compulsory Heterosexuality," 650; Smith-Rosenberg's, "The Female World of Love," 32; Faderman's, *Surpassing Love of Men*, 95; Sahli's, "Smashing," 17-20, Blanche Wiesen Cook's, "Female Support Networks and Political Activism: Lilian Wald, Crystal Eastman, Emma Goldman," *Chrysalis* 3 (1978), 48; and Leila J. Rupp's, "Imagine My Surprise: Women's Relationships in Historical Perspective," *Frontiers* 5 (1980), 65, on this debate.

<sup>180</sup> See Bussy's *Olivia*; Faithfull's *You And I*; Lehmann's *Dusty Answer*; List's *My Friend*, Stronach's *Newnham Friendship* and Townsend's *Memories for Friends*. It is notable that none of these Victorian and Edwardian authors refer to their intimacy with women as "lesbian," or speak with shame about their love for their female friends.

not also a means of understanding her pain? After all, she herself argued, “Atoning for suffering and pain helped my mental salvation.”<sup>181</sup> Contemporary psychologists like Caplan and Brennan assert that some women utilize physical pain as a powerful means of *releasing* themselves from intense emotional pain.<sup>182</sup> In a somewhat similar vein, in *Playing the Game*, McCrone suggests that Victorian women, particularly those seeking social change, likely gained greater self-confidence and improved mental and physical health through sport, just as modern women do, and that “this probably explains why its lure was irresistible.”<sup>183</sup>

Maynard truly believed that cycling “extremely hard” enabled her to ride into a “new and brighter happier space” in 1894.<sup>184</sup> Her extreme physical exercise probably became a part of her healing process. Her pain and conflict were never entirely resolved, but she did emerge from “the depths of her quagmire of sorrow.” She wrote of her “sudden dismay” at her appearance. Her dresses were dowdy, her hair looked lifeless, and the lace cap she had worn since 1888 aged her. She “decided not to let things slip again.”<sup>185</sup> She remained healthy through regular exercise for the rest of her life. On “good

---

<sup>181</sup> *A*, VII, 60, “15<sup>th</sup> College Session, 1897,” 412.

<sup>182</sup> Brennan, *Interpretation of Flesh*, 78-88; Caplan, *Myth*, 163. Caplan interviewed a woman who spoke of undertaking extreme physical exercise to extricate herself emotionally from a masochistic relationship. See also Bell, *Holy Anorexia*, 111.

<sup>183</sup> McCrone, *Playing the Game*, 286.

<sup>184</sup> *A*, VII, 58, “13<sup>th</sup> College Session, 1895,” 371. She wrote here, “I see that in the whole vacation I cycled 722 miles.” See also Bullough, Dixon and Dixon, “Sadism, Masochism,” 50; the authors point out that endorphins, produced through physical activity, are both powerful painkillers and antidepressants.

<sup>185</sup> *A*, VII, 57, “1894,” 362; also *D*, 8 June 1894, 124.

days” she could appreciate all the gains she had made as Mistress.<sup>186</sup> As this chapter has shown, her energy and commitment to women’s higher education had enabled her to triumph in face of great adversity—a good deal of it in her own making.

Maynard also fought her pain over love by seeking closure. In August she visited St. Andrews ostensibly to help Gray unpack, although nothing is written about the trip. But her comment, when Gray visited Westfield the following April, that “Ralph improves each day she stays here,” implied that tensions remained between them.<sup>187</sup> Maynard, likely as a result of this, went “on a cycling tour” which ended at St. Andrews that July. She left Scotland inferring that Gray did not appear to regret her decision. She spoke warmly of her staff “and she seemed perfectly happy” with her new life.<sup>188</sup> As Vicinus points out, “we cannot know what Ralph lost by narrowing her personal life” in order to pursue public duty.<sup>189</sup> Nonetheless, Frances Dove’s poignant lament to Maynard that summer, “I put all my eggs into one basket [Lumsden] and they broke,” bespoke the longing and loneliness particular to educational pioneers.<sup>190</sup> Perhaps the visit helped to facilitate Maynard’s own process of emotional disengagement. She and Gray may well have new common interests now that Gray had met the Campbells and Dove. Ralph, though perhaps Maynard’s greatest love, would be discarded as Lewis and Louisa were previously.

---

<sup>186</sup> *Ibid.*, 366-67.

<sup>187</sup> *D*, 20 April 1895, 88. See also *D*, 30 April 1896, 90.

<sup>188</sup> *Ibid.*, 10 July 1895, 99.

<sup>189</sup> Vicinus, “One Life,” 618.

<sup>190</sup> *GB*, 15 April 1892, 197.



## Chapter 9

### 'A glorious new spring of hope and love', 1896-1913

'Come follow me. Leave all, and follow me.'  
He who speaks, knows all that therein lies,  
of endless leaving, endless sacrifice.  
And yet He claims the cost most fiercely.  
'Is this enough?' murmurs the heart afraid,  
as bending left or right she leans her weight  
upon the sweetest of earths glories, love.  
'Content! It *is* enough.'<sup>1</sup>

As we have seen, love's "force unmeasured" carried Maynard from the heights of bliss to the depths of sorrow with Campbell, Lumsden, Brooke, Gray and Richardson, as she struggled to reconcile passion, ambition and faith. Love was to soar again in 1897, salvaging her desolate heart and impelling her aims. Marion Wakefield "penetrated [her] winter, loosening the deadly bond of compression." She also inspired Maynard's founding of a Divinity program at Westfield in 1901, which enabled Maynard to proclaim publicly "what [she] had whispered about for years," the interconnection of women's independence and religion.<sup>2</sup> These were amongst the happiest years of Maynard's life, since Marion (M) was also a willing participant in the desire and resistance dichotomy to which she herself felt so bound. But the price, while fulfilling, was too high. In 1905 Maynard angrily wrote,

When this gift of the 'perfect' is allowed in every life, may we not

---

<sup>1</sup> *A*, VII, 48, "3<sup>rd</sup> College Session, 1885," 122.

<sup>2</sup> *GB*, 21 February 1901, 14.

naturally suppose that it is a reproduction, in small, of the divine love which might capture and control every human heart? Yet why is the first dawning approach of the divine so unlike the human? Why is it filled with neglect and starvation, and miserable relapses, and hollow pretenses?<sup>3</sup>

Bitter over her failing relationship and her troubles with Divinity, Maynard once again clung to the thought that His love was enough. It was—when she could mediate passion, ambition and religious duty. But when desire, aim and faith were thwarted, the battle was gruelling. Unable to counteract the march of time, she grimly faced her defeats as the new century dawned.

In 1896, however, “the sky was clear.” Her Council were “kinder” than they had been in the past; she had been allocated both a housekeeper and a secretary;<sup>4</sup> and the vacancies in Classics and science (left by Ralph and Josie Willoughby) were filled by a well qualified rising generation of university women.<sup>5</sup> It was also another “successful Capping year” with nine victories, including Westfield’s first M. A., the talented Priscilla Wood, who gained her graduate degree in Classics.<sup>6</sup> Indeed, it is little wonder that Maynard’s contribution to the Ring letter of 1896 evinced the new-found pride and

---

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, 8 August 1905, 59.

<sup>4</sup> *A*, VII, 60, “15<sup>th</sup> College Session, 1897,” 398.

<sup>5</sup> Lilian Whitby is worthy of note. Hired as temporary resident science tutor, her talents gained her a permanent position in 1896. She also undertook administrative tasks when Nannie was on Leave, which Maynard really came to rely upon her for. See *Minutes*, 4 December 1895, 99; *Minutes*, 2 December 1894, 77.

<sup>6</sup> In 1895, out of the twelve B. A. candidates only two failed. Seven of these achieved a First Class while B. Sc. candidate, Lucy Hall, won the Tuffuall scholarship for her achievement in Intermediate chemistry. This afforded her the not insubstantial amount of £100 a year for two years. See *D*, 17 October 1895, 69.

confidence that she felt:

Now we are at work again and college looks much the same, still the crowd round the letter table in the morning sit, still the lion roaring as we rise from the table, still the packing into the small lecture halls. Indeed, they still wear the flannel blouses, much the same as you did yourselves, only their faces are different. Both fire brigade and hockey club going well and always energetic and cheerful. The one spare room is all that is left, so I have to be most careful about my invitations.<sup>7</sup>

Less workplace stress had helped “me to banish the devastating waves of depression,” Maynard asserted in her Autobiography. “I still had spells, but they were neither as violent nor as frequent.”<sup>8</sup> Her reference to depression in 1927 reveals the changing perceptions regarding illness. Although Freud had linked conditions like anxiety with depression in the 1890s, Victorians did not cast the unhappy as depressed. They focussed more on the physical cure as opposed to etiology<sup>9</sup> (as shall be seen with Wakefield when she was diagnosed with neurasthenia and its accompanying anorexia nervosa). By the 1920s, however, physicians were beginning to accept that emotional states like anxiety and unhappiness could cause inner malaise. Freud’s theory that behaviours like anorexia or depression could also be related to repressed sexuality, was starting to be discussed.<sup>10</sup> As mentioned, Maynard struggled with these new ideas. She

---

<sup>7</sup> Ring, 19 October 1896.

<sup>8</sup> A, VII, 58, “1895,” 348.

<sup>9</sup> See Brumberg, *Fasting Girls*, 143, 157, 214; Micale, *Approaching Hysteria*, 3-19; Showalter, *Malady*, 23-57 and Edward Shorter, *From Paralysis to Fatigue: A History of Psychosomatic Illness in the Modern Era* (New York: Free Press, 1994), 56-59, for discussion on these changes.

<sup>10</sup> In “Psychiatrists, Soldiers, and Officers in Italy During the Great War,” in Mark Micale and Paul Lerner, eds., *Traumatic Pasts: History, Psychiatry, and Trauma in the*

did not want to accept that her past emotional conflicts, particularly her love for Ralph Gray, could be the result of a thwarted sex instinct.

Nor could Maynard accept that depression was another possible symptom of her emotional conflict. In fact her “resolve to see it as more physical than mental” revealed how Victorians sought to merge old values with new. Whether she was accompanied by students (Firth joined her in 1904) or whether she rode alone, covering hundreds of miles through rain or mud, she saw cycling as a vital “form of freedom.” Her “mental salvation” through exercise also symbolized a spiritual cleansing of sorts. Just like her physical longings, mental salvation came through faith. “It is the idea of making oneself clean inside and out,” she explained to the reader, “like when one pours a bath. All our sins are taken away by the defiled water.”<sup>11</sup> For the first time in years, she felt as if she had ventured from “the dark tunnel” towards the light of life:

When I was crossing the dining hall with a plate of soup a wave of joy passed over. The squares of dazzling sunshine on the floor, the laughter and chatter of the students, all this was mine, *mine*....I had known nothing like it for eight years, and though it was over by the time I reached my seat, quiet contentment remained with me, and I felt I had known a counter-balance to those flashes of the very blackness that invaded the steady gloom of depression, and made life not worth calling ‘life’ at all.<sup>12</sup>

Her improved senses of self and purpose made her more relaxed around students, of

---

*Modern Age, 1870-1930* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001), 147, Bruna Bianchi argues that ideas about depression were accompanied by a new form of shame. Depression, especially in men, was viewed with disdain by society. For links to Freud see Badcock, *Essential Freud*, Dollimore, *Sexual Dissidence*, Mort, *Dangerous Sexualities*, De Lauretis, “Freud, Sexuality, and Perversion,” and Freud’s own *Theory of Sexuality*.

<sup>11</sup> *A*, VII, 60, “1897,” 403-12.

<sup>12</sup> *Ibid.*, VII, 58, “1895,” 356.

whom forty now lived in residence at a given time. As a result, they felt more confident about consulting her on various matters, and this improved the “public college spirit” by creating more congeniality, trust and understanding.<sup>13</sup>

Flourishing bodies like the Association of Headmistresses and the International Congress of Women Workers (I. C. W. W.) expressed both the optimism and commitment of pioneers at large, and their advancement towards professional recognition. The former drew “hundreds of representatives from colleges, universities, high schools, public schools and board schools” to its yearly conference, Maynard wrote in her Diary.<sup>14</sup> Lively debates centred on issues like the “Question of Registration” and “Salaries.” Maynard remained ambivalent about the move towards “the training” to be a “Recognized Teacher” after an undergraduate degree, just as her more conservative male counterparts had been.<sup>15</sup> In contrast, a lecture on the “keeping up of salaries was most useful.” It gave her leverage for her future fights with her Council over staff rights. Indeed, her success in reducing teaching hours from eighteen to sixteen hours per week

---

<sup>13</sup> Ibid., VII, 57, “1894,” 351-55. She noted here, “Instead of pacing in my room like a tiger in a cage, and eating my heart out when anything went wrong, I now consulted the elder at once to ask their help.” See also *Ring*, 23 January 1894.

<sup>14</sup> *D*, 23 October 1896, 99. See Burstall, *Retrospect*, 45-78; Pederson, “Schoolmistresses,” 149-52, and Sondheimer, *Castle Adamant*, 97, and Zimmern, *Renaissance*, 157 on the Association of Headmistresses.

<sup>15</sup> See Sondheimer, *Castle Adamant*, 58. The training to become Recognized as Teachers under new statutes stemmed from the formation of an Association for promoting a Teaching University for London in 1884. This sought to standardize levels of education by improving the quality of teaching itself. Thus, attaining the certificate implied that the educator was better qualified to prepare students for the London degree. See also Fitch, “Women,” 342; and Dale, ed., *Education Papers*.

was a real victory in 1897 after four years of conflict.<sup>16</sup>

Maynard had little contact with the International Congress of Women Workers until 1899, when she was asked to be “governor of the educational section.” She summed up the event, “it [wa]s magnificent. The crowd [wa]s very great, many nations represented and 3,000 tickets taken.” Topics like co-education reflected the ongoing concerns of the era, and each of her old loves, Lumsden and Gray, gave good presentations on the “advantages of women’s higher education.”<sup>17</sup>

Like many educational pioneers at the time, Maynard advocated the widening of access to education. As discussed in chapter two, girls’ public high schools were being built through the Girls’ Public Day School Company (1873).<sup>18</sup> Maynard was a board member of the Church Schools Company (1895), which had been founded with a religious emphasis in mind. Her Diary record depicted the flourishing of schools in towns like Streatham, Wigan, Brighton and Bournemouth between 1897 and 1898. Maynard’s difficulty in selecting three out of the eighty-eight teacher applicants, many of whom held “degrees and had good work experience,” was a result of the number of women who were

---

<sup>16</sup> *D*, 20 November 1897, 89. See “Girls Schools with Special Regard to Salaries of Head Mistresses as Recommended by the Endowed Schools Commission,” *Journal of the Women’s Education Union IV* (1876), 96, for the lists of possible minimum and maximum salaries. Also Pederson, “Schoolmistresses,” 149; Burstall, *Retrospect*, 161; Price and Glenday, *Reluctant Revolutionaries*, 23; and Hunt, *Lessons for Life*, 99.

<sup>17</sup> *A*, VII, 60, “1897,” 412-19; *D*, 25 June 1899, 200. She was Chair of the education section. See also Price and Glenday, *Reluctant Revolutionaries*, 23-27, Fitch, “Women,” 245; and Spender, ed., *Education Papers*, 45.

<sup>18</sup> See Fitch, “Women,” 245; Fletcher, *Feminists and Bureaucrats*, 46, Sondheimer, *Castle Adamant*, 11, Spender, ed., *Education Papers*, 45; and Zimmern, *Renaissance*, 78.

attaining higher education at this time.<sup>19</sup>

Maynard also served on the committees of the Women's Grosvenor Institute and Penny Bank. She pronounced that the training for working-class occupations like cooking, carpentry and dress-making, was "good work, which had a promising future."<sup>20</sup> This, of course, was another class-biased observation, similar to her attitude towards her "shoppy" peers at Girton; towards Effie; and towards admitting "terrible students" from the lower-middle-classes to Westfield in the early 1900s. Her condemnation of an ex-Girtonian's commitment to Southwark<sup>21</sup> was also evidenced in her Ring letter of 1898:

Southwark is not working. There is no way of saving the really lowest class. They have no tastes...to which we can appeal to raise them. They do not want to be more tidy,...or even more comfortable....No lever is strong enough to lift the really drunken man and reform him, or elevate the coster-monger woman who sells in the streets...[but] they go on...trying to do various kind little things that, together, form hard work for them.<sup>22</sup>

Here Maynard was making a distinction between what she saw as the

---

<sup>19</sup> See *D*, 13 March 1898, 190; *D*, 13 October 1898, 230.

<sup>20</sup> *Ibid.*, 13 November 1897, 66; *Ibid.*, 6 October 1898, 78. See Clara Collet, *Educated Working Women: Essays on the Economic Position of Women Workers in the Middle-Classes* (London: P.S. King, 1902), Geoffrey Crossick, ed., *The Lower Middle Class in Britain 1870-1914* (London: Croom Helm, 1977); Joan Scott, "The Woman Worker," in Louise Tilly, ed., *Women, Work and Family* (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1978), 401-22; Mason, *Victorian Attitudes*; and Meller, *Leisure and Changing City* on class distinction and middle-class attitudes towards occupations.

<sup>21</sup> Southwark was a Settlement House, which had been renovated and was rented out to the poor. The founders also provided some instruction, which aimed to elevate the working-class, both intellectually and spiritually. They also provided such things as holidays for the children each summer. See *D*, 8 June 1898, 70.

<sup>22</sup> *Ring*, 28 May 1898. While biased, Maynard's predictions did prove correct. Southwark eventually fell into bankruptcy because the workers failed to pay their rent.

“respectable” (those employed in low trade) and the “unrespectable” (paupers and the destitute) working-class. The East End of London was particularly notorious for homeless immigrants, paupers and the destitute. It was viewed by the middle-classes as an alien place with beings who spread evil through vice and disease.<sup>23</sup> Since the 1870s, professions like banking, shop-keeping, nursing, clerical work and teaching had provided upward social mobility for some working men and women. Even so, the majority of working women were still destined for either domestic service or the textile industry.<sup>24</sup> Meanwhile, the “very impressive” girls’ boarding school, Wycombe Abbey, which opened under Frances Dove’s Mistress-ship in 1896, offered to upper-middle-class girls, a better educational focus similar to that for men through its curriculum and sports like lacrosse and hockey, just as St. Leonards had done.<sup>25</sup>

Turning from the Diary record, which spoke of Maynard’s public life, what evidence do we have of her emotional life at this time? Of love? Of passion? Since her

---

<sup>23</sup> See Jones, *Outcast London*; Walkowitz *Dreadful Delight*; and Wohl, ed., *The Bitter Cry*; Davin, *Growing Up Poor*; Ross, *Love and Toil*; Daunton, *Progress and Poverty*; Manton, *Children of Streets*; and Vincent, *Literacy*, for more discussion on the lowest class. Benjamin Seebohm Rowntree’s, *Poverty and the Welfare state: a third social survey of York dealing only with economic questions* (London: Longmans Green, 1951), provides statistical analysis on occupation and poverty levels beyond London.

<sup>24</sup> As Joan Scott points out in “The Woman Worker,” 421, and Howarth argues in “Gender, domesticity,” 185, of the 4.5 million women (out of 13 million women) in work in Britain in 1891, 2 million were in domestic service, 1.5 million in textiles, 264, 000 in the professions, and 80,000 in agriculture.

<sup>25</sup> *D*, 31 October 1897, 66. This certainly distinguished Wycombe Abbey. In *Playing the Game*, 32, 128-29, McCrone proposes that women’s hockey did not evolve until the mid-1890s. Dove had organized lacrosse at St. Leonards and the game was introduced at Girton in 1899 by students who had attended St. Leonards.



Green-books are missing until 1901, we only have access to this aspect of her life through her Autobiography. In this record she wrote of her feelings in 1896:

I look back on my fierce hunger for love, and my passionate loneliness, with a sort of surprise. Tho' everything is now gentle, unexciting and full of hard work, I am not deceived. Nannie returned for a few hours travelling between Ireland and Mentone....She was amused that I was happy to wear an old dress that she would have criticized had she been there. She came and went like a flash, and then I had the one sleepless night of the whole term. Strange but so it was.<sup>26</sup>

With Ralph Gray gone, and no one else on staff of romantic interest, Maynard's emotional energy was directed towards Anne Richardson, her long-term colleague and friend. As a result, Nannie had an immense impact upon her well-being between 1894-97, but this, of course, left her vulnerable on both a professional and personal level.

"When I read over my diaries," Constance told the reader, "Through all, Nannie is my yoke-fellow, strong and unwearied....Yet I could rule better with her gone. Without her I was someone who did not wither under her views and criticism."<sup>27</sup> As mentioned in chapter eight, Constance, Nannie and Ralph struggled with their conflicting roles as a leader, a friend and a subordinate. Maynard's Autobiography implied that her reliance upon Nannie at this time had culminated in a vicious circle of competitive angst and grasping need. This conflict, Firth argued, was fuelled by Maynard's self-exaggerated grievances. Her tendency to "dramatize herself" led her to "invest the trivial with significance beyond its due."<sup>28</sup> Vicinus similarly asserts that "trivial slights were blown

---

<sup>26</sup> *A*, VII, 59, "1896," 377. Cited from *GB*, 12 February 1896.

<sup>27</sup> *Ibid.*, 337.

<sup>28</sup> Firth, *Maynard*, 337.

out of proportion, and feelings were exaggerated.”<sup>29</sup> Certainly this is true. Nonetheless, events following Nannie’s return after a May 1896 also show how Maynard’s ongoing attempts to reconcile and to obscure her ambition, passion, and faith created a deep emotional struggle within her.

Maynard appreciated Richardson’s advice, like the time she steered her away from “emphasizing conversion, over hard work and earnestness, in the testimony on Westfield’s aims.” She added, however, “Yet I feel quite at despair over succumbing to N’s face and listening to her voice. If I could just reach a level where N’s arrows could not hit. That would be real independence. Oh! to be rid of this carping, miserable self!”<sup>30</sup> Notwithstanding, Richardson’s cruel remarks that were made perhaps out of ambitious rivalry, did threaten Maynard’s self-esteem. She recalled of one particular incident in 1896:

I had felt elated after hearing that Holloway lacked Westfield’s cultivating spirit. When I told N she knocked me flat. I had thought that all was well last term but she says that, ‘things were said about me behind my back of which I had not the least idea.’ The old, sad, timid, shrinking impression of my own inefficiency closed around me again, and my hands hung by my side. I left the room quickly so I could privately release my tears.<sup>31</sup>

Maynard’s ensuing discussion with Richardson about religion added more salt to the wound:

When I listened to her say that she had never thought the Atonement meant anything; that she had never had a conviction of real guilt or felt the

---

<sup>29</sup> Vicinus, “‘One Life,’” 615.

<sup>30</sup> *A*, VII, 59, “1896,” 338.

<sup>31</sup> *Ibid.*, 339.

need of pardon, and *now*, suddenly, she wanted conversion, I burst out, 'Anne you *didn't* help me! All this 14 years I have been labouring alone!'<sup>32</sup>

The pain, for Maynard, lay in Richardson's motivation. Since Richardson was a Quaker, her conversion as "a vigorous Protestant" was vital if she was to assume the Mistress-ship after Maynard retired, based upon the wording of the Trust Deed.<sup>33</sup> Richardson's prospects looked good because the Council had already demonstrated their faith in her capabilities by promoting her to senior lecturer.

Richardson's self-questioning led her down a different path, however. Invited to present her views at the "Yearly Friends Meeting," she found herself focussing on the "foundation and abilities of the society" instead. As a result, she remained a committed Quaker that precluded her from the Mistress-ship, but it gained her the freedom to "continue successfully as a public speaker" and to lecture for twenty-eight more years. Maynard meanwhile fumed over what she saw as Richardson's exploitation of what she herself had sacrificed so much for in following the Cloister. "Why is it that my one chosen friend and helper should have this effect on me?" she concluded of this lengthy entry. "It is a strange and painful arrangement, is it not? Is this my life, my marriage, my future, my all?"<sup>34</sup>

---

<sup>32</sup> Ibid., 337-39.

<sup>33</sup> See Sondheimer, *Castle Adamant*, 21. The Trust Deed had made the intention of founders, Dudin Brown, Barlow, Fleming and Boulton clear. It stated the need to link Westfield with the most "conspicuously Protestant side of the Church of England." The Mistress, therefore, must be a Protestant. As Sondheimer rightly points out, this "tied the hands of their successors more firmly than they perhaps realised, or even wanted."

<sup>34</sup> *A*, VII, 59, "1896," 337.

Reading between the lines, Nannie's avoidance of emotional entanglement with Constance seems to have caused the latter the most hurt, even though she knew from the outset of their relationship that Nannie would never meet her emotional needs. While she romanticized about loving Nannie, if only Nannie would love her, Nannie apparently distanced herself farther through new friends. But it was through Nannie that she met someone who *did* respond to her passionate overtures, and with whom she fell deeply in love. She metamorphosed "from feeling ugly, desolate, unloved and unsuccessful, with youth and hope behind," into "a glorious new spring of hope and love."<sup>35</sup>

Constance met Marion Wakefield (M) in April 1897, when she planned an Easter retreat to Berka in Holland with some favourite students. Because her leader of recreational and spiritual activities could not attend, Nannie proposed her young cousin, Marion for the position. She described Marion "as a pleasant, hearty, country girl, who was a dynamic spiritual influence in the local cottage meetings around her home, which lay in the desolate bog-land of Portadown in Ireland."<sup>36</sup> Constance could not write about Marion in her Green-book for a year, according to her Autobiography, but when she did she wrote over twenty pages. As she "compresses [her Green-book account] into two or three incidents" in her Autobiography, much of the detail is lost. Nonetheless, her analogy of love implied the unbridled intensity of her passion, and of her attempt at resistance:

Life made an appeal to me like a glorious scale of colour, a language not of thought but of emotion and unanalysed happiness. Love had treated me cruelly, and I had a desperate foreshadowing of fear that I might love

---

<sup>35</sup> Ibid., 377-82.

<sup>36</sup> Ibid., 382.

Marion, and yet what a glorious thing love was! The colours grew more brilliant as I thought of it. Meanwhile Christ stood beside me, offering me white, pure white. I must choose white, and I will, I dread love....M had come to us so confident, so recklessly happy, and now there were tears on her cheeks, and again and again she pleaded with me. I had asked this child out for a holiday, and here I am tearing her soul to pieces. Am I a Minotaur that I must eat a maiden's heart? I hate myself for having brought her to this....<sup>37</sup>

After years of longing and repression, at last Maynard had found someone with whom she could enact her religiously-based ritual of desire versus resistance.

At forty-nine years of age, Maynard was fully aware of her sexual dallying with a twenty-three year old. But she found Wakefield irresistible with her "tall slender frame, creamy skin, cloudless blue eyes, splendid blonde hair, full red lips and white teeth." There was that "thrill, the actual physical sensation of the sinking of [her] heart." She was in love. She was not going to walk away. "God was near" and she felt "a wave of extraordinary sweetness and peace. Before May was out [she] no longer suffered from intense loneliness and desire."<sup>38</sup> Her records imply that her need of Richardson dramatically decreased. As to whether they argued about Wakefield remains unclear. Maynard claimed that it was only in later years that she learned the depths of Richardson's disapproval of her relationship with Wakefield.

Constance hoped that Marion could enrol immediately as a student at Westfield, but since she did not gain permission from home until May 1898, Constance sought solace through their correspondence, brief visits, professional activities and a cycling tour

---

<sup>37</sup> Ibid., 411.

<sup>38</sup> Ibid., 338. She also points this out in her *GB*, 18 September 1916, 78.

across England and Scotland. Besides health reasons, it is notable here that her cycling tours over recent years were also associated with changes at Oakfield that had begun the year that Ralph left. Financial difficulties had culminated in the renting of Oakfield and the selling of the Flimwell properties in the late 1800s, causing much bitterness in the family. George accused Harry of being “a wretched partner” because he had brought the family financial ruin.<sup>39</sup> As noted earlier, Harry was always aware of his lack of talent and interest in business. In 1871, he had begged his father in vain to allow him to relinquish his familial obligations so that he could enter the ministry.<sup>40</sup> Unfortunately, his father’s refusal proved a costly mistake. In 1876, the London firm had rescued Harry’s South Africa firm from insolvency. In so doing, the London firm had crippled its resources for any future operations. The financial embarrassments, and the difficulties involved in the sorting out their father’s estate and will, had created the beginnings of what became a life-long misunderstanding between the brothers.

Tissy and Gazy had resented “stepping down,” Constance recorded in her Autobiography, “from the luxury [of Oakfield] to the comparative poverty” of a small house in Hawkhurst, The Cottage. Life had not been the same for her either. Ironically, she had come to view Oakfield as an escape from the stress of Westfield. Thus, in some ways, she suffered as badly as her sisters from the uprooting. More troubling to her was her recognition of her sisters’ culturally inflicted plight as upper-middle-class women:

They were ignorant of money matters, accepting their income as a child

---

<sup>39</sup> *GB*, 17 August 1902, 152.

<sup>40</sup> *Ibid.*, 30 April 1871, 150.

accepts food without any thought...They had never had a bank account of their own, and when Jeannie instituted one and showed them how to use it, Tissy took out the whole sum and kept it in the locked drawer which was the custom. They made mistakes about selling the horses and carriages that were quite grotesque. They used coal lavishly and then complained about the bill later. Although I thought them pathetic, I could understand because I had been raised in the same way.<sup>41</sup>

She helped her sisters financially until Tissy died in 1907 and bequeathed most of her assets to Gazy.<sup>42</sup> The Cottage was never home to Constance. She avoided visiting her sisters, perhaps because they symbolized what she strove to flee, but could not escape, as a single Victorian woman.

Maynard also avoided Effie during these years. Little is mentioned of her in either Diary or Autobiography, except for the occasional comment on either her hopes for, or anger over, Effie's behaviour. When Effie was twelve (1894) she had been expelled from a school that trained orphan girls to be servants, hospital matrons, and teachers. A teacher had apparently found Effie in bed with other girls teaching them "filthy and disgusting tricks. The tyranny of this sin," masturbation, had fuelled Maynard's disgust with Effie and confirmed her inferior status.<sup>43</sup> It was commonly believed that stooping to this particular vice affected one's physical, moral and spiritual progress, and would in the end contribute to the national degeneration.<sup>44</sup> Thus while voicing concern about Effie's

---

<sup>41</sup> *A*, VII, 56, "1893," 315-21. Written December, 1927.

<sup>42</sup> *Ibid.*, VII, 50, "1888," 212-23.

<sup>43</sup> *D*, 20 January 1894, 70.

<sup>44</sup> See Mason, *Making of Victorian Sexuality*, 205-15; Maynard, *Victorian Sexuality And Religion*, 123-29; and Bland, *Banishing the Beast*, 214-19, on attitudes towards sex acts.

education, Maynard did not object when Effie was sent to work as a domestic at twelve. After all, it was a fitting occupation for a respectable lower-class girl.<sup>45</sup>

Likewise, Maynard did not intervene a year later when Effie's second job of running errands and cleaning introduced her to "Outcast London." However, she never forgave Effie for entering into a sexual relationship with a lodger where she worked.<sup>46</sup> When Effie was cast out of this position for stealing, Maynard persuaded the S. A. home, The Clock House, at Walthamstow, London, to take Effie after "paying them well." She was impressed by the religious work the S. A. had accomplished. She supported their commitment to redeem fallen working women through "respectable work" and conversion. Surely they could raise Effie who, at thirteen, was "defiled, worse than murdered," she wrote. "The 'outcasts' are their prize. They will keep my E., through anything and everything. Here she is, liar, thief and of intolerable insolence, and so unclean in mind..."<sup>47</sup> The S. A. could both take Effie, and ease Maynard's conscience.

Firth argued that the records imply the "faithfulness" and the "unremitting effort on the part of Maynard in letters, gifts and visits" during these years.<sup>48</sup> However, there is

---

<sup>45</sup> As noted above, most working women were destined to work in domestic service. See Scott, "Woman Worker," 421; and Howarth "Gender, domesticity," 185.

<sup>46</sup> *D*, 10 January 1894, 66; *A*, VII, 57, "1894," 338. As Walker argues in *Devil's Kingdom*, 163, at thirteen, Effie could not have legally consented to sexual relations because the Criminal Law Amendment Act raised the age of consent to sixteen. Yet the guilt was firmly Effie's and she was expected to seek forgiveness.

<sup>47</sup> *D*, 10 January 1894, 66. See Jackson, "Singing Birds as Well as Soap Suds," 107-26, on the S. A.'s work with fallen women.

<sup>48</sup> Firth, *Maynard*, 243.



no indication that she expended much energy on Effie after the Salvation Army took her in. Indeed, as Walker points out, Maynard had ceased bringing Effie to Westfield when her “vice” had been discovered in 1894.<sup>49</sup> Firth’s statement almost served as “an avoidance” to discuss Maynard’s behaviour, since by today’s standards, she could actually be accused of child neglect. In her Diary, Maynard only mentioned her “attempt to spend a day” with Effie twice between 1894 and 1896. She fell off her bicycle on one occasion (May 1895), missed her train on the other (April 1896), and returned to Westfield without seeing Effie either time.<sup>50</sup> Over the Christmas period of 1897, when Effie was fifteen, she “spent [her] promised two nights” with her, taking her shopping during the day and discussing her possibilities as an S. A. Officer at night.

What of Effie’s life at The Clock House? In her Autobiography, Maynard wrote:

It is as if [the girls] were only expected to last 2 or 3 hours till the next service, and for this they pray and for this they give thanks; the words and thoughts are prompted, and they are led along this simple but entirely personal and practical path, without one word of explanation of what lies beside the mark....*This* is the influence at work upon Effie and it is exactly what she needs. The work on her soul has indeed begun.<sup>51</sup>

Implied here is Maynard’s sense of the S. A.’s limitations, Firth argued. Nonetheless, this approach was good enough for Effie since she was not removed from The Clock House.

Effie, however, was not content. She found the strict supervision, the hard work, and

---

<sup>49</sup> Walker, *Devil’s Kingdom*, 153.

<sup>50</sup> Compare *D*, 8 May 1895, 99; and 6 April 1896, 12, with Firth, *Maynard*, 232-39.

<sup>51</sup> *A*, VII, 57, “1994,” 332-40; Firth, *Maynard*, 227. See also Madge Unsworth’s, *Maiden Tribute: A Study in Voluntary Social Service* (London: Salvationist Publishing, 1949), chapters 2 and 3, on the aims of the Clock House.

endless services soul destroying. She “ran away from the S. A. home” the following June, and Maynard had to beg the Salvation Army to take her back.<sup>52</sup> Effie certainly rebuffed what others in her predicament might have adjusted to. However, by age seventeen, she was to inform Constance of her wish to become an S. A. Officer. Her acts of deceit, defiance and “vice” would never end, but she could escape neither the milieu to which Constance had consigned her, nor her fate determined by it.

To a large extent Marion fell victim to a similar situation, even though her privileged class prevented her from facing some of the problems that Effie did. According to the Green-book of 1923, she accused Constance of “stealing” ten years of her life (1897-1907). “Because of your own desperate need at the time,” she told Constance, “you did not see the harm you were doing me. When you overwhelmed me lavishly, and thought you were opening doors to my mind, you were actually repressing me.”<sup>53</sup> Maynard’s records suggest that she struggled between conceptualizing Marion as a daughter and wife. She particularly compared Marion and Effie as her two “daughters” in her Autobiography and Green-book in the 1920s. Her records also implied that she attempted to mould Marion just as she had done Effie, and that Marion was as upset as Effie was in trying to attain the standard set for her by Constance.

Firth did not mention Marion at all within the otherwise corresponding text in her biography. This is not surprising in light of her avoidance of discussion about Lewis, Louisa, Ralph and Nannie. However, Marion, as Firth finally put it at the end of her

---

<sup>52</sup> See *D*, 12 June 1898, 78; *D*, 19 June 1898, 79; Firth, *Maynard*, 232.

<sup>53</sup> *GB*, 30 December 1923, 260.

book, “was one of the four women who at different times had caused [Constance] pain by withdrawing from an emotional relationship that she eagerly desired.”<sup>54</sup> Throughout 1898 and most of 1899, however, Marion was not only unaware of such peril, but also naively embraced the blossoming of the passion of love, according to Maynard:

By this time she was a student and I could reach out to her whenever I wanted to, and she responded with a full heart. It was too much, far too much....For over a year she had been silent, but now her heart had caught fire. It was endless, ‘Oh Mistress, my friend, my heart’s choicest treasure, I love you, I love you!’ What about me? It is from this time on that I should hide my face in shame because I was also passionately in love with her.<sup>55</sup>

The shame for Maynard was not that she loved a woman, but that at fifty her emotions were completely out of control. In a relationship in which she should take the religious lead, her “heart [had] plunged itself into the heart of another almost recklessly. When I look through my Green-book,” she wrote, “her name is written over and over.”<sup>56</sup> Inseparable during college terms, they spent vacations in each other’s company. A trip to the Pyrenees in April 1899 was descriptive of their intimate, secluded world of love:

It was beautiful and the air was pure. We went on many expeditions to the surrounding villages, sometimes on bicycles, sometimes on mules. Sometimes M bathed, a snow white Naiad in her native land, while I kept watch above. When she was dressed we would lie together on the warm turf and read. Then we left for Porte de Venasque, where we stayed for four days. Outside it was snowing heavily and inside we had fire logs....<sup>57</sup>

Although Maynard’s Autobiography is vague on the matter, this trip to the

---

<sup>54</sup> Firth, *Maynard*, 274,

<sup>55</sup> *A*, VII, 61, “16<sup>th</sup> College Session, 1898,” 444.

<sup>56</sup> *Ibid.*, 448.

<sup>57</sup> *Ibid.*, 433. Copied from *GB*, 22 April 1899.

Pyrenees seemed to fuel Wakefield's passion, which in turn placed tremendous pressure on her. Caught up in the intensity of their relationship, she tried to meet Maynard's high expectations:

She worked too hard for the Matriculation and then she became sick. Yet she came to me again and again as her one comfort. In her long grey dressing-gown, with her fair hair in one thick Marguerite plait, she would steal in and seek shelter in my arms.<sup>58</sup>

Maynard was not only referring to Wakefield's academic anxiety here. It seems that she was also coaxing Wakefield to resist sexual desire, and to understand passion within the spiritual flame, just as she had advised Brooke in her early Westfield days:

I spoke of the dangers of love, that the opening of the heart could potentially let in wrong. I told her we must pray for strength in the face of this overwhelming force. She held me close in a sort of impassioned longing and I felt responsible for her. I felt that I had coloured the white rose, that it was too late.<sup>59</sup>

Marion tried to resist passion. But she seemed to find her love's prescript for "Atoning" for desire virtually impossible. "She reacted violently," Constance noted, "telling me, 'I have always felt selfish and I hate suffering, so I have *played* at self-denial and self-renunciation and kindness. Yet I do not *want* to believe in the death of the self with its will and desires. This is impossible.'" It was clearly impossible for Constance too. She noted after this entry:

Oh! but love - L'amour tout simple - is a dreadful thing, a knife without a handle cuts the owner more than it does the opposed....Here is the danger. We calmly say the Cloister is a great mistake, but would millions of people make the same mistake century after century if there were not some

---

<sup>58</sup> Ibid., 440.

<sup>59</sup> Ibid., 444.

truth in it? I am supposed to take the steady side since it is *I* who has lighted M's fire. Oh! let us try for 'Passion pure in snowy bloom through all the years of April blood!<sup>60</sup>

Desire versus resistance, in the end Constance was like a moth to Marion's flame, while Marion flew from their heated passion and its troubling binary. She left with her family for Europe in June 1889, claiming that she needed two months of rest from the pressures at Westfield.

If Maynard had known that her separation from Wakefield would span eighteen months, as opposed to their planned two, she probably would have been distraught. "If I counted every day during this time, I was only 33 days with her!", she exclaimed in her Autobiography. "This was a test. I loved her strongly all the time. In truth, I loved her for about 14 years."<sup>61</sup> The test of love proved costly in other ways. While her Autobiography is silent on the matter, the hostility between herself and the Westfield Council throughout 1898 and 1899 loomed large when reading her Diary and the Council Minutes. It serves to remind us of the trials facing educational pioneers within their social context, and their immense struggles in mediating work and love under the same roof.

The Trust Deed prescribed no fixed term for office, and so Council members like Fanny Metcalfe, William Barlow, Sydney Gedge and Emma Power had remained for many years.<sup>62</sup> Familiarity, as far as Maynard was concerned, had bred contempt from

---

<sup>60</sup> Ibid., 450. For similar comments see *GB*, 16 May 1869, 99 and *GB*, 8 August 1905, 50. As this study has shown, she was not able to resist the "will and its desires."

<sup>61</sup> *A*, VII, 61, "1898," 430.

<sup>62</sup> Sondheimer, *Castle Adamant*, 38-40. Power, Gedge and Round joined the Council in the mid-1880s, remaining until 1916. The last two were solicitors and

those who knew little of college matters. While she had a point, as discussed in chapter eight, her Council's grievances with her at this time also had merit. Educationally-based issues had resurfaced in 1897 when Council member, Lady Chapman (the former Council secretary) had urged "the importance...of obtaining the recognition of Westfield as one of the schools of the University," as Holloway and Bedford were seeking to do, by applying to become "one of its bodies."<sup>63</sup> This had initiated fresh scrutiny of Westfield that gained further momentum after the Council's concern about the high rate of B. A. failures in 1897—disappointing indeed after the successes of 1895 and 1896. They instituted an "education sub-committee to investigate" which reported that

[N]o blame was to be attached to unfortunate situations [Maynard had explained that students needed more preparation for Logic], or for changes in teachers...,but that it should be made plain that the Council take a responsible part in the selection of all teachers....The opinion of the Mistress, would, of course, be asked.<sup>64</sup>

They also advised a modification of the curriculum to allow more time for studying the challenging subjects of Logic and German, and to offer a broader variety of subjects including history, so that those who preferred taking these subjects had a better chance of success.

---

politically involved, and each also had a close connection with C. M. S. Sondheimer points out that although all were knowledgeable in Church matters, they were new to the responsibility of running a women's college.

<sup>63</sup> *Minutes*, 20 October 1897, 226. In *Castle Adamant*, 57, Sondheimer points out that twenty-one institutions were preparing students for London degrees at this time; and that the University of London Act of 1898 was to state that all schools of the University must work with established standards set by the Royal Commissions.

<sup>64</sup> *Minutes*, 10 November 1897, 237.

Were Council members justified in their stipulations and concerns? Was Maynard's distraction over Wakefield causing her neglect as Mistress? Were the academic problems simply the result of poor quality students over these years? Or was the standard in women's education rising? According to the Minutes and to Maynard's records, it was a combination of all. In April 1898, when Maynard was deeply distracted by Wakefield, she had to account for more failure in the Matriculation and the Intermediate. She was to learn that her Council members were not convinced by her explanation that "ten students had to be excused because of illness." Their ensuing list of grievances was a product of both a communication breakdown and, quite possibly, Maynard's acts of insubordination against their rule. She had not kept her account book updated; she had been absent during term-time without their consent; she had not only failed to attend the meeting about house-keeper problems but had tried to hire a replacement without their consultation; and she had appointed two non-resident lecturers without consulting the education committee, which had been established for that purpose.<sup>65</sup>

Maynard's problems with Wakefield seem to have had a negative impact upon her work performance at this time. This, together with developments in women's education, created new problems for her. Her interconnection of passion and ambition with faith not only exacerbated her conflict, but left her more resistant to change. This said, Maynard's

---

<sup>65</sup> *Minutes*, 8 November 1897, 265. She had acted out of rage because they would not dismiss the current one—whose arthritis apparently left her incapacitated—yet had rejected her choice out of hand "as only an older woman was suitable." See *D*, 13 October 1897, 77.

acts of defiance towards her Council might have been justified, with the installation of electric lighting in 1895 perhaps best symbolizing this. The incident illustrated not only their ignorance about college matters, but also their culturally-based attitudes towards her. Certainly, electric lighting could have improved living conditions at Westfield. However, the Council took on the expenditure sooner than planned after a gas lamp had caused serious burns to a student in 1894, and then they ignored some serious startup setbacks even though they had the funds to resolve them. It took Constance two years to rescind “switching off the electric current” at 10:30 p.m.; four years to install higher wattage bulbs in students’ rooms (they had fallen back on candle light to read by); five years to get electric lighting in her own rooms; and in 1900 she felt obliged to offer “£40 [of her own money] towards putting a second light bulb in every room because [she] *still* received complaints about the lack of light.”<sup>66</sup> One has to wonder if her Council would have moved faster on these changes if she had been a man demanding them. Would she have been taken more seriously? Would they have made more effort to investigate problems?

Despite the differences between Council and Mistress, both were concerned about the number of examination failures in 1897. Once again, Maynard’s failure—probably resulting from her fear—to consult her staff about the Council’s decision to have outside expertise on their marking for Matriculation caused outrage amongst the staff. Nannie, Lilian Whitby and Mabel Beloe had received the training to become Recognized as Teachers under the new statutes. The training aimed both to improve and standardize

---

<sup>66</sup> See *Minutes*, 7 June 1898, 285; *Minutes*, 19 September 1900, 42. Italics mine.



higher learning, and thus enable better preparation for the London degree.<sup>67</sup> Nannie, the staff's spokesperson argued, "We do not mind consulting with experts about the curriculum, but we strongly resent any *examination* of our work. It is not consistent with the dignity of our position."<sup>68</sup> Once again, one wonders if the Council would have requested this of qualified male lecturers. Fortunately, Nannie's courage in speaking out resolved the conflict to everyone's benefit. The Council apologised; students benefited from extra Matriculation coaching; Constance was "automatically put on every subcommittee" but without the vote; and she (or another staff member in her absence) was given "power of suggestion on all educational matters...and was to be consulted on any decisions respecting educational work."<sup>69</sup>

Although such conflicts had abated by the end of 1899 coinciding with the conclusion of Westfield's academic struggles, Maynard's ongoing crises in work, faith and love had taken their toll on her health. She took a leave until September 1900, visiting the Holy Land for faith, and Switzerland for love. However, her pursuit of her love in Switzerland did not produce Marion's return to Westfield as she had hoped:

Her [M's] image had been in the background all the while, and now it blazed out so that I could see almost nothing else. Only a day or two she was with me, and no promise was made, but I gave her the watch I had carried all round. On the dial I had engraved in minute letters, 'Occupy till

---

<sup>67</sup> See Sondheimer, *Castle Adamant*, 58. The certificate was not restricted to teachers serving in Schools of the University of London. See also Fitch, "Women," 342; and Dale, ed., *Education Papers*.

<sup>68</sup> *Minutes*, 7 June 1899, 312.

<sup>69</sup> *Ibid.*, 12 August 1899, 322; also *D*, 11 June 1899, 78.

I come,' and she received it with solid joy, as a trust, a command.<sup>70</sup>

Notwithstanding her disappointment in love, Maynard returned with renewed energy as Mistress. Her Diary speaks of her determination to remain healthy, just as she had promised herself in 1894 at the apex of her torment over Ralph:

I have woken at 5:30 a.m. for years, but now I arise and work til breakfast. This gives me time for a brisk walk around the garden at 11:00 a.m. before more writing until 1:00 p.m. I take a two hour nap before my valuable hours of study before dinner at 7:00 p.m. I work after and then do physical exercises for about 10 minutes before retiring to bed at around 9:45 p.m.<sup>71</sup>

Of life as a student in the early 1900s, Catherine Firth remarks:

Eight hours a day, the Mistress told us all, should be given to academic work, but this should not absorb our energies. College, she said, was a place mainly, but not only, for getting: she would like each of us to undertake some form of work for others—teach in a Sunday school or visit someone poor or lonely....This, and the routine of every day, suggested something not, in principle, unlike the happy busy-ness of Oakfield....<sup>72</sup>

The maternal-like upper-class etiquette, set in place in Westfield's early days, continued under Maynard's Mistress-ship until she retired. There were the social customs of sitting at the "High," attending the nightly cocoa parties, entertaining male visitors in the mistresses' rooms, and "walking out" with a chaperone. Students were quick to point out how "approachable, kind, and understanding" Maynard was, and how they appreciated the "various ways in which she tried to get close to [them]" through evening games like "Snatch" (scrabble) or gardening. Indeed, the tone was accentuated by

---

<sup>70</sup> A, VII, 64, "Switzerland, 1901," 460.

<sup>71</sup> D, 7 October 1900, 89.

<sup>72</sup> Firth, *Maynard*, 251-52. See also Carus-Wilson, ed., *Westfield College*, 13-25.

“Westfield’s lovely garden,” Old Student, Helen Cadbury recalled. “The smooth lawns were surrounded by hedges of rhododendrons and rose gardens with paths, where one met lead statues.”<sup>73</sup>

Westfield’s milieu was emphasized by the annual Garden Party (formerly the At Home), and this was now a huge event, entertaining 700 guests in any given year. It was lavish, in terms of refreshments and decor. Sofas and plants were rented and either a soloist or quartet would accentuate the refined tone. It was at the 1897 Garden-party that Maynard was “interviewed” by Alice Zimmern, who published her powerful *Renaissance of Girls’ Education* the following year. Meanwhile, the “2,665 [women] in for Matriculation [that year]- which went in such a procession with many hansoms - broke the record.”<sup>74</sup>

However, Westfield’s “feminized” milieu, fuelled by Maynard’s religiously-based aims, also had a negative impact. “Educationalists were dubious about [Westfield’s] intellectual standards,” Vicinus argues. Its lack of recognition as a School of the University left it somewhat inferior in status when compared to women’s colleges at Oxbridge, since they were at least recognized as institutions of higher learning.<sup>75</sup>

---

<sup>73</sup> Beatrice Boeke née Cadbury to Janet Sondheimer, April 1974, Ms. 213. See Maitland’s, “Student Life;” Faithfull’s *You And I*; List’s *Girton, My Friend*; Bradbrook’s *Infidel Place*; Burstall’s, *High Schools for Girls* and her *Retrospect*, for customs instigated at women’s colleges. For Westfield, see Gray, *Gladly*, 22- 39; Richardson, “Westfield College,” 16; Biss, *Reminiscences*, 12; Firth, *Maynard*, 251-52; Carus-Wilson, ed., *Westfield*, 13-25; and Vicinus, *Independent Women*, 157-62.

<sup>74</sup> *D*, 7 May 1897, 78. See also *D*, 7 August 1900, 99; *D*, 10 May 1903, 200.

<sup>75</sup> Vicinus, *Independent Women*, 157.

Unfortunately, Maynard failed to “recognize that new needs were soon to demand new methods,” according to Sondheimer.<sup>76</sup> Firth concurred. “For some years [Westfield] stood firm on [Maynard’s] principles and practices,” she said. Then, “like the mature independent daughter it had become, it began to quietly move away.”<sup>77</sup> This was to become evident when Maynard fought to install a Divinity program at Westfield in 1901.

Maynard’s conservative views also appear to have influenced those inside Westfield’s walls. For example, in 1905, she remarked, “Miss Davies came and gave a lecture on women’s suffrage. We liked it, but it did not make much impression.” Apparently, these views held fast. Former student, June Moy-Evans, remembered the reaction to her request to join in a suffragette march in 1911. “A staff member told me, very politely, ‘Miss Moy-Evans you look so very young. You would add nothing to the dignity of the occasion!’”<sup>78</sup> While some feminists simply wanted equality with men, one would have thought that Maynard would have agreed with those who believed that suffrage itself “tapped those deep reservoirs of spiritual devotion and consecrated selflessness.”<sup>79</sup> As Vicinus suggests, support for women’s independence was strongest

---

<sup>76</sup> Sondheimer, *Castle Adamant*, 55-59. She points out here that new lecturers like Caroline Skeel, who joined Westfield in 1897, moved Westfield towards more secular pastures.

<sup>77</sup> Firth, *Maynard*, 268.

<sup>78</sup> See *D*, 11 June 1911, 99. Maynard noted here, “at least 50,000 marched. I was tempted, but I did not go.” In her *D*, 12 October 1915, 45, she said, “I still see no hurry for it [suffrage].” See also, June Moy-Evans to Janet Sondheimer, 3 February 1976, Ms. 215, Special Collections Queen Mary and Westfield College Archives, London.

<sup>79</sup> This quote taken from Elizabeth Robbins, *In Defence of the Militants* (London: Women’s Social and Political Union, 1912). See also Strachey’s first-hand account, ‘*The*

when “femininity” did not threaten the status quo.<sup>80</sup> Perhaps Maynard’s concern lay in not wishing to rock the boat of higher education on the sea of public acceptance. This said, it is clear that her stance also stemmed from her class-based elitist values.

The topics included for the formal college Debate were consistent with Maynard’s values. “Debate on independence of the colonies,” she noted in 1894. “Imperial Federation won by a great majority!”<sup>81</sup> In 1899 she invited Old Student, Alicia Bleby, whom she called “a real live imperialist,” to speak about the Second South Africa War.<sup>82</sup> In fact, while her views on public issues like imperialism and suffrage remained old-fashioned, Old Student Irene Biss’ recollection of an experience in 1907 suggested that Maynard’s views were not now those of the majority:

I was persuaded to speak on how the present government policy would pauperise the working-classes. Lloyd George, liberal, was trying to put through a bill allowing 5 shillings weekly to poor people out of work. I’m

---

*Cause*, on suffrage; and also Holton, *Suffrage* and Sophia A. Wingerton, *The Women’s Suffrage Movement in Britain, 1866-1928* (New York: St. Martin Press, 1999).

<sup>80</sup> Vicinus, *Independent Women*, 281-82. Nonetheless, she argues that suffrage brought women into public visibility in a unique way. See also Rubenstein, *Before Suffragettes*, and Stanley Holton, *Feminism and Democracy*.

<sup>81</sup> See *D*, 23 February 1895, 43; *D*, 9 November 1895, 55. As seen, she never shed her familial ties to imperialism. The Imperial Federation League (1884) aimed at imperial political consolidation. At the heart of its vision of empire as the key to Britain’s future in a world of ever larger states were the white settler colonies. See Porter, *British Empire*, 159.

<sup>82</sup> *D*, 25 October 1899, 99. Bleby was one of Westfield’s first students in 1882. She became the principal of a girls’ high school in Cape Town. As Porter points out in *British Empire*, 160, “at this time British leaders were defending imperial interests in South Africa, to the point of engaging in the Transvaal in the last, and by far the greatest, colonial war of the century. The war exposed Britain’s weakness in preparation for war.”

*glad* to say that the votes were in favour of Lloyd George.<sup>83</sup>

Biss was likely unaware that Maynard had helped a student prepare for a debate on Fabianism in 1894. Her Diary entry, “A real socialist also spoke. Motion lost, of *course*,” was telling.

Nonetheless, Maynard’s commitment towards preparing her Westfield “babes” for the public sphere deserves praise. Despite her values, there was a steady improvement in their teaching, course work, and degree success. And the Debate, as biased as it appears to have been, did have underlying strategic aims. “The dignity of [Maynard’s] appearance,” Firth wrote, “which matched her grave courteous argument, was intimidating to the bravest student whose heart thumped so loudly as she rose to put her argument forward....” Firth recognized that Maynard aimed to encourage students to overcome their socially-induced timidity:

She sharpened our wits and trained our manners intellectually and socially....The president of the debate sat on a dais....The effort was so great that to this day I know the spot where I first stood to speak ‘in public?’<sup>84</sup>

Interestingly, male students were invited to the Debates in 1910, but “the Mistress felt that these men dominated the discussions,” Biss recalled, “and so they were soon debarred.”<sup>85</sup>

Perhaps Function, the weekly college meeting, best evinced Maynard’s unique

---

<sup>83</sup> Biss, *Reminiscences*, 1-18.

<sup>84</sup> Firth, *Maynard*, 255.

<sup>85</sup> Biss, *Reminiscences*, 45; also see Sondheimer, *Castle Adamant*, 23.

exemplification of feminine independence and religious values. While her various Bible classes were not compulsory, Function was an essential feature of Westfield Sundays until she retired. As Firth recollected of her own experience of the event:

We were expected (not ordered, but the obligation was distinctly felt) to assemble in the Mistress's room. The seniors sat in armchairs in a semi-circle facing her while the rest sat mostly on the floor...The dignified, strange, gilt figure of Aaron which she had once drawn in her father's study looked down on the dimly lit room from the corner.<sup>86</sup>

Self-expression, evidence and Truth. The setting and the aims evoked Maynard's lifelong goals, and those that she aimed at for her students. Meanwhile, the intimacy of the firelit room, and the "hooded candle at her side," symbolized the "strong bond of affection" that she sought in her public and private life.

Function also evolved into an important arena for Maynard to broach missionary and allied topics. Similarly to "the Church that is Girton," namely, Maynard's room at Girton where the Girton Prayer Meeting was formulated, Function was a forum in which ideas about the future Student Christian Movement (S. C. M.) were spawned with the aim to evangelize the student world at large. Formally constituted in 1905, the S. C. M represented the convergence of the Student Voluntary Missionary Union (S. V. M. U.) and the British Colleges Christian Union (B. C. C. U.). The B. C. C. U. had been established at Westfield in 1896, and was regularly host to the combined annual meeting of all London branches for women students and the summer camps (and later S. C. M.) in

---

<sup>86</sup> See Firth, *Maynard*, 261. In Carus-Wilson ed., *Westfield*, 22, Ralph Gray wrote of Maynard, "she was always accessible, always ready to respond"; and Mary Butts, *The Crystal Cabinet* (London: Hodder, 1937), 252, depicted Maynard's special qualities as "sunny" and "affectionate."

Derbyshire. The S. V. M. U. had the more specific purpose of enrolling students as future missionaries. S. V. M. U. secretaries were regular guest speakers at Westfield, and many students attended its quadrennial conferences between 1886 and 1912.<sup>87</sup>

Sports remained an integral part of college life as a echo of Westfield's social values. By the early 1900s, there were "games clubs of all kinds except football," Biss recalled, and the yearly tennis and hockey tournaments were taken very seriously:

We heard that a tale was going around that Westfield was 'pi' (Pius). The morning that Mary Naish was playing in the hockey finals, at the early morning SCM prayer meeting, a friend prayed for us to play so that everyone would realize that Christians are not "soft," and that whether we won or lost, we should behave with courtesy and good humour. We won by a big score and I *hope* that we behaved properly.<sup>88</sup>

"Pi" or not, Westfield was the first women's college at least in London "to have a college boat" in 1911. A rowing team was formed that year, and it practised on the lake in Regent's Park. Another Westfield tradition, the annual "boating picnic," was established the following year.<sup>89</sup> Such are the reports of life at Westfield in the late 1880s and early 1900s. As Firth pointed out, "the lack of the Green-book records [aside, what]...was distinctive in the Mistress's college was a spirit, hard to convey to those who did not

---

<sup>87</sup> See *D*, 6 January 1900, 54; *D*, 4 May 1902, 99; *D*, 9 October 1904, 231; Sondheimer, *Castle Adamant*, 66-68. In her *A*, VII, 61, "1898," 389, Maynard wrote of the inaugural meeting, "I invited all the Christian Union Students from Bedford, the Slade, University College, School of Medicine and Bushey. It was not a large meeting but it gave a good sense of unity. We had 50 Mistresses from various Schools."

<sup>88</sup> Biss, *Reminiscences*, 12.

<sup>89</sup> Sondheimer, *Castle Adamant*, 50-5.



know it in experience.”<sup>90</sup>

But what *of* Maynard’s Green-book as testimony to college life, and the academic world and beyond? On January 31<sup>st</sup>, 1901, the year before a pause in the writing of her Autobiography, the Green-book record resumed in full force:

This is a new century! Thinkers are not only occupied with reviewing the past, but have hopes and ideas beyond their own immediate circle. The peace of nations, social reform, abolition of drink, missionary conquests, universal education, the discoveries of science and medicine; so this century should bring as much advancement as the last. These pages don’t dwell on this topic. They follow an individual life ‘amid the vast web’....I need two things this year if I am to go on with college; one is Health, and the other is Marion. *May* I have them?<sup>91</sup>

As ever, the Green-book pages contrasted those in the Diary, with the succinct public facade in the former, versus the in-depth emotive ruminations in the latter. Thus, once again, each record unfolded the rich nuances of Maynard’s experience. As a package, the diaries depicted her continuing need both to reveal and to conceal her violations of boundaries, as a lover, and as a person of strength, intelligence and ambition.

Maynard’s most obvious contradiction, similarly to previously, was revealed through Green-book entries about her conflict between faith, passion and ambition. In this instance, she complained about her “hopes, fears, doubts and longings about [her] relationship with Marion. Our separation for over a year has made me miserable.” Furthermore, “Marion’s unfitness for a degree is serious. She can never be a staff member at Westfield which is what I want for her, so plans have to be changed to

---

<sup>90</sup> Firth, *Maynard*, 250.

<sup>91</sup> *GB*, 1 Jan 1901, 1. As noted earlier, is this coincidence, one wonders, or did Constance begin at page 1 after destroying the earlier records.

accommodate this.” Wakefield, however, was hesitating over Maynard’s request that she work at Westfield as her private secretary, and so Maynard was left to cling to their brief, passionate encounters.<sup>92</sup>

Uncertain about Wakefield in her Green-book, Maynard’s re-focus of her concerns in her Autobiography implied, once again, her attempt to justify love, or its rejection, within the context of faith. “It was real love,” she wrote, “innocent enough, but misleading, and a sort of block to the nobler things I desired.” Certainly, she wanted Westfield to be recognized as a School of London University in the Faculty of Arts, and she sent in the application in May 1901. Even so, she pointedly told the reader, “I also told my Council that the subject of more systemic training in Scripture was becoming very important in the educational world.”<sup>93</sup>

In her Green-book, Maynard noted that when she had learned of the founding of an American Bible college in February 1901, she had thought of “how few of her 200 Old Students were missionaries for the world of education”:

Academic success was important, yet this was negligible in comparison to my dawning realization that *I* was qualified to run a theological college. The Evangelical Church, as I knew it, was practically non-existent. There was the C. M. S. abroad, with its supporters at home, but Evangelicalism did not touch educated minds, and here, I seemed to stand alone.<sup>94</sup>

---

<sup>92</sup> *GB*, 16 January 1901, 8. According to Marion, her doctor had remarked, “you do not seem to want to be a student, and it is impossible for you to be [Maynard’s] secretary as you still suffer from depression.” See also *GB*, 22 April 1901, 22.

<sup>93</sup> See *A*, VII, 63, “17<sup>th</sup> College Session, 1900,” 366-7; also *Minutes*, 11 December 1901, 106; *Minutes*, 10 July 1902, 80; *Minutes*, 14 May 1904; and Firth, *Maynard*, 259.

<sup>94</sup> *GB*, 21 February 1901, 14. According to Maynard, the founder of the American Bible college, the Reverend White, only aimed to focus on Scripture.

Here was a noble aim indeed, and she wondered:

Why did I not think of this years ago? Sitting over a fire with Marion as my scribe, and ten good students working in their room. The less work, the being ridded of the whole range of secular routines, the leisure to give mind and heart to the upper levels of my interests...is attractive to me beyond what I can say. It will be like the old time, before Ralph came and changed the rules from a happy confiding family to a college, and be the call of God to my life.<sup>95</sup>

Her role was clear. She, as prophet, was to be “the new evangelical.” With modern learning on one hand, and the Bible on the other, she had the tools to accomplish His work by leading the upper-classes towards Truth and, ultimately, the Kingdom of Heaven. For this, He would give her love never-ending, surely.<sup>96</sup>

As “a kind of sign that the plan was needed,” Maynard contacted friends, knowing full well that her faithful Amy Mantle would financially support her. The difficulty in finding her successor, since Nannie was disqualified by the trustee deed, persuaded both the Council and Maynard against any idea of her resignation, and so her plan for a “St. Gabriel’s” remained simply a dream. On July 12<sup>th</sup>, 1901, “after a stormy Council meeting,” Maynard triumphantly exclaimed, “Theology exists!”<sup>97</sup>

In her biography, Firth had her discussion of the Divinity program in a single chapter, similarly to the ones on Effie, and on Maynard’s “holidays” in a chapter

---

<sup>95</sup> *Ibid.*, 15

<sup>96</sup> *A*, VII, 63, “1900,” 340-44.

<sup>97</sup> *GB*, 11 May 1901, 25-26. She received £1,100 in donations from friends and the Council allocated her £42 per term to pay for tutors. Divinity students—there could be six residents and ten out-students—had to be at least twenty-three and serious about “teaching the Bible to the more educated classes.” Most students were friends of Maynard who had little or no qualifications.

following Divinity. In both chapters she hinted at links with Maynard's public and private experiences. To a certain extent this was justifiable. Firth suggested that trips, similarly to art and exercise, were important outlets for Maynard throughout her life, as I have also pointed out in chapter eight and elsewhere. However, while Firth's chapter on Divinity highlights the distinctive "private" world that Maynard entered in her latter years as Mistress,<sup>98</sup> it is also important to consider each aspect of her life within her larger context. As I argued at the beginning of, and throughout this study, Firth's failure to analyse Maynard's emotional life also meant that she never considered it within the contours of her professional life.

Maynard's extended leave to the Holy Land in 1901 is another example of Firth's neglect. While Maynard herself dismissed it as "dreary" because she got bronchitis, it was in the Holy Land that she met the Reverend Fawkes, who had published in scholarly journals like the *Spectator* and *North British Review*. I suggest that their intense discussions "on the evils of worldliness" re-kindled her belief in self as visionary. It probably inspired the Divinity program since Fawkes helped her to set up her Divinity curriculum.<sup>99</sup> In the end I would argue that Divinity portrayed, conclusively, how Maynard's aims were out-of-date as judged by both Council and staff. This was quite possibly why she was forced to retire earlier than she wished. Incorporating Divinity with Maynard's "larger" life also serves to further exemplify the impact of faith on her emotional life.

---

<sup>98</sup> Firth, *Maynard*, 269-89.

<sup>99</sup> *A*, VII, 64, "Egypt and the Holy Land, 1900," 454.

In light of this, it is notable that the “stormy Council meeting” about Divinity actually arose from the Council’s upset over the University Commissioner’s recent verdict. The Commissioner had reported that “certain deficiencies” held Westfield back from becoming “a School of the University.”<sup>100</sup> The Council’s subsequent focus on upgrading Westfield, versus Maynard’s concentration on a Divinity curriculum, clearly signified the beginnings of a serious divergence of interest between Council and Mistress. Nevertheless, Maynard seemed too caught up in getting their approval for her syllabus, and securing twelve Divinity students, to notice this important change.<sup>101</sup> Convinced that she was carrying out “a message from the divine spirit” when the program opened in October 1901, she felt “so happy that it almost like the very early days.” She had Westfield, she had Divinity, and “best of all, she had love.” After months of recanted promises, Marion had suddenly walked into Westfield on October 1<sup>st</sup>:

She took me into my darkened room so that we could hold each other, and then she said, ‘I am to live with my mother and come here as your secretary.’ I am overjoyed. I feel ten years younger, I am at peace....My little bed, which has seen extremes of agony I do not wish to think of, now sees hours of calm and content....It is like going from black midnight to a

---

<sup>100</sup> *Minutes*, 12 August 1901, 74. Divinity was mentioned, but there was more concern about the laboratory only being equipped for courses in Intermediate science; German and French being taught by staff who were not “Recognized Teachers’ under the new Statutes”; and the need to invest £1,000 to upgrade Westfield’s “poor, scanty little library.”

<sup>101</sup> See Firth, *Maynard*, 267-68; and Sondheimer, *Castle Adamant*, 55-59. She noted here, Westfield’s success in gaining recognition as a School of the University was due “in part to the Council,...but still more to...staff members’, Lilian Whitby’s, Anne Richardson’s and [new staff member] Caroline Skeel’s...commitment to safeguarding Westfield’s future as an academic institution.” Skeel had joined Westfield in 1897, after taking a First Class in Classics from Girton. She was noted for her skills in history.

new dawn...Can anything be better?<sup>102</sup>

As Maynard recalled of this time in her Autobiography, “I had health, love, the ever-expanding work and presage of success; it was wonderful, *wonderful!*” While the “difficult and exacting” Mabel Beloe had left after thirteen years,<sup>103</sup> her now “kindly and united staff” oversaw Westfield, leaving her to joyfully “arrange [her] life and not stumble along.” She delivered seven Divinity classes per week (two for Divinity, four for Westfield, and one for the London School of Medicine for Women).<sup>104</sup> Her lectures aimed to equip her students with weapons to fight “the enemies” that she had faced at Girton. These, she told the reader, centred on “the problem of evil in the world, and the fact of Christ.” She then introduced her carefully worked out “evolution” in the Spring term, and this pinpointed “the unfriendly relations of science and religion in the past.”

There have been three battles royal, and in every case science has won and religion has retreated....The first, the *Triumph of Space*. With the Copernican theory all was changed,...but we see now that not one really important fact of faith was touched....The second, the *Triumph of Time*. At the beginning of the last century we thought that the earth was created in six days about six thousand years ago....It does not matter to our religious beliefs how many hundreds of years we allow for the building up of the earth as we see it today....The third, the *Triumph of Method*. Scarcely was the truth concerning time accepted by the Church when the trumpet

---

<sup>102</sup> *GB*, 12 October 1901, 67.

<sup>103</sup> Mabel left to become headmistress of Denbigh High School. Constance rarely mentioned her over the years. It seems that she was a difficult individual, however, since her staff at Denbigh wrote to the Council about her domineering behaviour. See *GB*, 22 November 1901, 71; also Firth, *Maynard*, 287-309.

<sup>104</sup> As noted earlier, Maynard’s connections with the London School of Medicine for Women had begun in 1881 when she had endeavoured to promote Westfield by delivering speeches at various educational facilities for girls and women. Maynard’s aim here was to encourage medical missionaries overseas.

sounded and war began again. Science brought forward the theory of evolution... We are living in the interval between acceptance of this truth which is past, and definite teaching of it which is still in the future.<sup>105</sup>

Maynard chose lecturers noted for their outstanding scholarship. The Reverend Scott, Principal of Westminster College, Cambridge, gave “a very good criticism on the Old Testament.” The Reverend Schneider spoke on The Early Church, and Vernon Storr of Westminster spoke “brilliantly” on the perils of the “evil” that was secularism. While Maynard fussed over her Divinity tutors and her delicate, insulated clergymen’s daughters, her staff thrust Westfield towards the public. The gifted Caroline Skeel, Eleanor McDougall and Marion Delf, hired in 1897, 1902 and 1905 respectively, particularly helped to forge both Classics and Science at Westfield.<sup>106</sup>

In her retrospective of the year, Constance wrote in her Green-book, “her name [Marion] is not written across the year as it was two years ago, and there I leave the record, except to say that this year she was given not only to my heart but to my arms.” But while enthusing about a life that was “full and rich, as the best of all earthly treasures

---

<sup>105</sup> A, VII, 65, “19<sup>th</sup> College Session, 1901,” 390-92. See also Maynard’s *The Four Aristocracies and Other Papers* (London: Marshall Bros., 1915) and *Then Shall We Know* (London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge), and Firth, *Maynard*, 287-309, on Maynard’s teaching approach.

<sup>106</sup> *Minutes*, 9 July 1897, 288, Skeel was hired for her expertise in History; *Minutes*, 12 June 1901, 680, the Council felt that Delf’s knowledge in Botany would be an asset to the science department; *Minutes*, 12 May 1906, 330, McDougall’s knowledge in Archeology was also viewed as an asset for Westfield. At this meeting we see more Council support. Nannie’s request to teach part-time to pursue public speaking was sanctioned as was Skeel’s, in lieu of gaining a D. Litt. at the London School of Economics (1912).

were [hers],”<sup>107</sup> it was “not the perfect subjection and union” that she had “asked for and had expected since September 19<sup>th</sup>, 1886,” when she had felt so “hungry” for Ralph:

It is a coming down from the highest ideal. They say that bringing into captivity *every* thought to the obedience of Christ is literally an impossible aim. To all this my heart starts up in answer and says, ‘No! it is not’ - though, even if I die in the account, the whole, poor, unravelled, unfinished attempt, I must still hold on as my very life.<sup>108</sup>

Obedience to Christ, Maynard still believed, centred around fears and narrow escapes, awful warnings and reproofs, and a sense of chronic anxiety. Here we see the echoes of Edward Irving’s sermons, which she had read as a young woman: “Fallen creatures should repent by a sort of moral self-torture, into the bosom of despair.”<sup>109</sup> Such views would have seemed extremist to members of society at this time, notwithstanding the growth of secularism. Even the staunch Reverend Fawkes, who had agreed “that the ‘best’ people avoided the world, pleasures and excitements,” had warned Maynard that her “Puritan ways, and view of the Cloister, were somewhat medieval.”<sup>110</sup> While Maynard herself was aware that most Christians now “condemned the Atonement doctrine” in favour of the more celebratory Incarnational thinking that emphasized Christ as redeemer

---

<sup>107</sup> *GB*, 31 December 1901, 98.

<sup>108</sup> *Ibid.*, 7 July 1901, 35 (she had noted this in *GB*, 6 May 1886, 146).

<sup>109</sup> *Ibid.*, 35; also *Ibid.*, 6 April 1871, 78. See also Fleming, *The Life*, 12, and Noll et al., *Evangelicalism*, 352. The authors argue that Irving had an intense devotion to Jesus, and in the unquestioning acceptance of the authority of the Bible. He aimed to convert the world.

<sup>110</sup> *A*, VII, 63, “1900,” 456-58. She noted here, “I told him that I thought the Principle was right. I found him far more lenient; but when I said, ‘yet the words remain, Forsake all and follow me,’ he said that, ‘although that was true, we must each do as our conscious bade us.’”



of humankind, she seemed unable to relinquish the idea of one's need to suffer to gain entrance to the Kingdom of Heaven. Her mother's admonition, "Forsake *all* and follow Him," still held fast.<sup>111</sup>

Maynard's sense of the "inefficiency of [her] soul" when she was likely tormented by her craving for her passionate encounters with Wakefield, convinced herself that she "needed spiritual more than physical health." She thus told Wakefield on February 19<sup>th</sup>, 1902, the day of her fifty-third birthday, "Love is to be second, not first, to our search for the Saviour. We must pray for resistance, and try to fast for spiritual guidance. There is to be no more playing with talk or prayer."<sup>112</sup> In other words, Wakefield could not be "a messenger of God" as Maynard saw it. Indeed, Wakefield's feeling pressure about "living the Cloister" and becoming successor to Westfield and Divinity caused the onset of acute anxiety and depression. "She has evolved from being a light hearted, good secretary, into a morose individual, who tends towards indolence in everything," Maynard angrily wrote in her Green-book a month later.

Wakefield eventually sought a physician's advice, who, alarmed at her melancholia as evidenced in her low pulse and low weight, "diagnosed malnutrition as the cause of her neurasthenia." The fact that Wakefield's "neurasthenia was not complicated by hysteria," was crucial for Maynard.<sup>113</sup> As noted in chapters six and seven,

---

<sup>111</sup> GB, 17 April 1904, 210. See Hilton, *Atonement*, 8; Fleming, *The Life*, 20; and Noll et al., *Evangelicalism*, 340.

<sup>112</sup> GB, 19 February 1902, 140.

<sup>113</sup> Ibid., 19 February 1902, 109-15.

neurasthenics were viewed as more refined, more co-operative and less likely to lose control than the unpredictable and insane “hysterical” women.<sup>114</sup> Wakefield’s doctor proposed that she undergo a “six-week Cure of bed-rest and overfeeding” that would cost Maynard a term’s work (£83 and eight shillings)—but place her delicate “Chela-bird in a ‘Cage’” to save her from harm she must. When Wakefield left shortly before the end-of-term, a doctor informed the impatient and angst-ridden Maynard, “No! you cannot call on her nor can she write you letters, but letters to her are welcome.”<sup>115</sup>

Was Maynard aware of the detrimental effect that she had on Wakefield? Did she feel guilt about the psychological pressure that she placed upon her? As Brumberg, Showalter, Micale and others point out, neurasthenia, anorexia and hysteria were in fact powerfully prescriptive of social and moral values. These “female” conditions, while class and gender based, also served to highlight the physiological differences between men and women. Victorians’ struggles were further complicated by faith. Nineteenth-century commentators often cited neurasthenia as the result of an individual’s battle between faith and science, as was true in Wakefield’s case. Even when neurasthenia or anorexia became viewed as a health problem rather than a spiritual crisis in the late 1880s, physicians were still not considering motivation or etiology, but were focussing instead on the

---

<sup>114</sup> See Showalter, *Female Malady*, 134; and also Janet Oppenheim’s *Shattered Nerves: Doctors, Patients, and Depression in Victorian England* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1991), for discussion on the medical discourses regarding these conditions.

<sup>115</sup> *GB*, 19 February 1902, 109-15.

physiological cure.<sup>116</sup>

Apparently not all Victorians felt reassured by such methods of cure. As Maynard exclaimed in her Diary:

She *is* better, and distinctly stouter, exactly eight pounds heavier than when she came. It was all right as long as she was in bed, but now it is enough. She must leave. Dinner was a pitiful sight with the consumption patients forcing themselves to eat large portions of meat...The atmosphere of 'Cheer up! You're getting on famously!' is not for Marion at all.<sup>117</sup>

The physician's task was to "add flesh to the emaciated frame of the food refuser," Brumberg proposes. Hence, Maynard, horrified by the extremes of the treatment, was pleased when Wakefield was pronounced "cured" and sent home. But her Diary continued to speak of her vexation and confusion about Wakefield's continuing apathy and her mother's ongoing laments of finding "Marion blue with cold under her blankets."<sup>118</sup>

Maynard's Green-book also hinted at her guilt. "I am quite desperate because I know I am no better myself in terms of perfect subjection to Him," she lamented. Blaming Divine love was likely easier than accepting her own human failing and her emotional and

---

<sup>116</sup> See Brumberg, *Fasting Girls*, 5; Showalter, *Female Malady*, 134-37; Micale, *Approaching Hysteria*, 72, 247, 299. Also see Oppenheim's *Shattered Nerves* and Shorter's *Paralysis to Fatigue*.

<sup>117</sup> *D*, 7 May 1902, 89.

<sup>118</sup> *Ibid.*, 8 July 1902, 102. As Brumberg argues in *Fasting Girls*, 5, another bad symptom of neurasthenia was temperature loss. See also Shorter, *Paralysis to Fatigue*; and Sander L. Gilman, Helen King, Roy Porter, George Rousseau and Elaine Showalter, eds., *Hysteria beyond Freud* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1993), on the many symptoms of this disease, and for discussion on its treatment in the Victorian period and beyond.

sexual manipulation of Wakefield.<sup>119</sup> Once again, she appears to have deceived herself about her actions as an individual who held such a dominant position of power over another in both love and work. Louisa Lumsden would have been intrigued by her old love's lengthy entry on "the needless suffering of man and animal," as this mirrored her own complaint to Maynard so long ago at Girton. One can but imagine Lumsden's response to Maynard's impassioned, "Is this really God's will? Can He do no better?"<sup>120</sup> God, Maynard believed, had let her down once again in love and ambition.

In her Autobiography, Maynard tried to downplay her guilt. By the 1920s, neurasthenia, anorexia nervosa and hysteria were becoming established as female psychological or neurotic disorders, and the value of psychotherapy was being stressed. But Maynard asserted that her payment for Wakefield's *physiological* cure in the Cage "saved M from a real nervous breakdown." She also made a point of telling the reader that Marion had told her that "her whole family was under some kind of curse; and that Marion did not know how it would all end." Although psychiatrists after Freud were suggesting links to psychosexual dysfunction, Maynard was referencing an "'evil' devil-like curse" rather than a familial one. In short, Wakefield's physiological condition was

---

<sup>119</sup> Maynard does appear to be guilty of emotional and sexual abuse by today's standards. See Kevin K. Hamberger and Claire M. Renzetti, *Domestic Partner Abuse* (New York: Springer Publications, 1996). The authors trace a variety of heterosexual and homosexual relationships, attesting that psychological pressure can affect relationships in similar ways. See also Claire Renzetti, *Violent Betrayal: Partner Abuse in Lesbian Relationships* (California: Sage Publishing, 1992); and Guy A. Larkins, *Teacher Enthusiasm: A Critical Review* (Hampton: University of Southern Mississippi, 1985).

<sup>120</sup> GB, 17 April 1902, 115. See also A, VII, 65, "20<sup>th</sup> College Session, 1902," 486.

the result of a spiritual crisis, not a mental one.<sup>121</sup>

Nevertheless, a Green-book notation written around the same time (1927) is telling, “It is as if I dare not look back on my reckless satisfying of passion, nor on the yet more solemn subject of faith.” The entry suggested that Maynard was attempting to incorporate psychoanalysis with faith to understand her need of passion.<sup>122</sup> Thus, while her Autobiography argued that evil had caused Wakefield’s malaise, she was also trying to justify writings on the thwarted sex instinct in terms of faith at this time.

During her account of the spring of 1902, Maynard’s Autobiography ends on an abrupt, disgruntled note about the trial of work, love and faith. Her Green-book, meanwhile, focussed on the “wrangle” between her two brothers, which “culminated into keen bitterness [that] summer.” Designating herself peacemaker, she had apparently been scanning every letter that they had been writing to each other over the past few years. However, her attempt to shield Harry from George’s “defensive irritability and vulnerability to monomania,” which she understood only too well, did not protect her from their emotional toll on her during these years.<sup>123</sup> Although she wrote with hope about

---

<sup>121</sup> A, VII, 65, “1902,” 488. See Showalter, *Female Malady*, 236-39; Micale, *Approaching Hysteria*, 299-334; Oppenheim, *Shattered Nerves*, 102-34. For links to Freud, see Willis, *No Nice Girls*, 23, and Caplan, *Myth*, 78 and Kaplan, *Female Perversions*, 102.

<sup>122</sup> GB, 5 April 1927, 260. See also GB, 20 July 1917, 99; and GB, 20 October 1930, 170, for similar discussion on abusing “God-given human passion.”

<sup>123</sup> Ibid., 2 March 1902, 107; also Ibid., 31 December 1906, 137-52. Tissy backed Harry because “she disliked George’s spirit in handling everything,” while Do supported George. Constance felt able to be ‘peacemaker’ as she had ‘learned political economy at Girton’ and felt more informed than her ‘bewildered sisters.’ But she passionately loved both brothers. George was a wonderful friend when she had attended the Slade, and she

work, love and faith, she was not to know that the events over the May term and summer were a presentiment of the future. George and Harry remained estranged; Divinity struggled; Westfield chomped at the bit; and “hard tugs at Marion’s heart called her elsewhere.”

According to Maynard’s Green-book, she wooed Wakefield intensely for the next two years (1902-04) in order to persuade her to return to Westfield. In “One Life,” Vicinus argues that their “relationship seemed most satisfactory when it remained analogous to a mother and daughter,”<sup>124</sup> but the quote cited by that author from the Green-book in 1901 does not entirely substantiate this claim:

I looked to Anne for years for what she would never, never give; I would *not* look elsewhere....Then Marion was given to me, and I found all, yes, more than I had ever dreamed of, put into my hands....The husband and wife are constant, and the child added to the mother’s heart, with the almost intoxicating joy it brings, does not detract from His share but allows the content to be full.<sup>125</sup>

I infer, rather, that Maynard tried to deceive herself about her own actions and feelings. Moreover, by adopting “maternal” love to justify earthly passion to God, as a good and nurturing “mother,” she *should* be intoxicated with love. At the same time, neither Green-book nor Autobiography indicates that she ever really saw her love for Marion as motherly. In fact on their seventh anniversary, she gave Marion an opal “wedding” ring as a token of her understanding of, and commitment, to their relationship:

---

admired Harry’s generous spirit. His “happy party” at Wimbledon had helped evaporate her years of trials of Westfield, if only temporarily.

<sup>124</sup> Vicinus, “One Life,” 620.

<sup>125</sup> *GB*, 20 August 1901, 46.

I told her that seven years love like ours was a wonderful thing and that of its kind it had been perfect; that though we had our little upsets in the friction of life, never for a moment had a shade dimmed our love; and she said 'no, never, never.' I reminded her how often I had called her my daughter, as I had been very chary of the least allusion to married love, but that what we both felt really was of that kind; and again she nestled in even nearer. That for years past her life had been interwoven with mine, and I could never plan a future apart from her; that was impossible. It was no longer 'I' but 'we'....Then I put the ring on her finger and we prayed together.<sup>126</sup>

Marion promised to return to Westfield as her secretary for the October Term of 1904.

They would try for the third time.

However, the ring proved ill-fated. Maynard was soon criticizing Wakefield's "carelessness" and there were other changes too. "Without a word, she resolutely shuts her door at night," Maynard lamented. Marion's action clearly symbolized to Constance that Marion was no longer physically and emotionally available to her. In late November Marion confessed that she had fallen in love with a new student, Mary Armitage, "in a way that was a whole new experience, and that Mary felt the same way."<sup>127</sup> Driven to despair and jealousy since Marion had given her no warning of this, Constance fell back on analysing Marion's "expression of love" within the context of faith:

I had expected this someday and I had encouraged it, telling her that she must have children and really love them...I am not jealous of Mary, but upset that M has handed on everything I have given her to someone else.... I felt I had placed trust in a child who did not understand the sacred bond as I understood it. Because I was over 50, and she was first experiencing love, to her it was only 'the presage to a victorious region she was just

---

<sup>126</sup> Ibid., 16 March 1904, 308.

<sup>127</sup> Ibid., 22 October 1904, 267. Mary was the granddaughter of Canon Gibbon. A wealthy orphan, she had enrolled at Westfield because neither she nor her guardians knew "what else to do. She soon changed her mind, saying she wanted to stay for years."

entering.' Can I expect her to do otherwise? When she wanted to express love she knew no language but what I had taught her....She did not know that it was a treasure, and that she would never see anything like it again.<sup>128</sup>

Marion left Westfield with Mary shortly afterwards, telling Constance, "I am needed immediately at home."

In truth, however, both sides were drifting apart. Maynard wrote about how she felt "paralysed at the thought of losing Marion," and how her heart wrenched each time Marion called at Westfield en route from Europe to Ireland with Mary hanging on her arm. Even so, she also admitted that Marion could never be a competent secretary or her successor at Westfield—although she continued to "hope despite [her] judgment" for the next three years as Marion's relationship with Mary slowly fell apart.<sup>129</sup>

Concurrently, hope had also evolved into "a sense of failure" and upset over Effie. Once again, one wonders at the connection. Did Maynard's angst with Wakefield, like Gray, affect her attitude towards Effie? In 1901, when her passion for Wakefield was at its height, she spoke with new hope about Effie in both her Green-book and Diary, "She was a complete wreck of a girl five years ago, but she has changed and is now good and seems more refined. She is energetic and is willing to learn and sympathize. She is great!"<sup>130</sup> A year later she wrote, "Today Anne Richardson persuaded me to make my will. The decision about my money is simple, it will go to Marion and Effie."<sup>131</sup>

---

<sup>128</sup> Ibid., 29 September 1906, 126.

<sup>129</sup> Ibid., 127; see also Ibid., 14 December 1907, 172; Ibid., 25 March 1908, 10.

<sup>130</sup> See Ibid., 14 December 1901, 74.

<sup>131</sup> See *D*, 30 November 1902, 169.



However, in 1905, when her relationship with Marion was in trouble, she exclaimed:

I feel a sense of failure around me, real failure, in things where I have spent my *very* best. The very centre and blossom of my life have been given to a few people, just a few, and they have failed me, all failed! Effie, in all her unfaithfulness, has been found out in sin again and dismissed from the Salvation Army. All my joy for her has gone. She has had many opportunities, and one by one, she has thrown them all away.<sup>132</sup>

Certainly, Constance was angered by Effie's failure with the Salvation Army, and during at least the past three years, Effie had disappointed her with acts of deceit, theft and her fall again "under the enemy [masturbation] that at one time trampled her life."<sup>133</sup> It is notable that after 1905, she disengaged herself further and further from Effie.

Unfortunately, shortly after Effie's dismissal from training as a Cadet in the S. A., she was diagnosed with tuberculosis. Despite three operations, the disease would prove fatal. In her Green-book, Maynard continued with her lament about Effie. In fact her disease gave Maynard more fuel for her wrath since the S. A. authorities told her that Effie's vice had brought on her illness. "Effie is a wreck, a ruin, diseased, unclean, untrue," she raged, "She unleashes the most terrible thoughts and hates within me which will not be suppressed."<sup>134</sup> Certainly, Maynard felt financial responsibility and, at times, extreme guilt in spite of Effie's ongoing deceit—or at least she said she did in her *Life of Stephane* and Green-book. Interestingly, Effie continued to work in domestic service after

---

<sup>132</sup> *GB*, 4 June 1905, 38.

<sup>133</sup> *D*, 12 October 1903, 232.

<sup>134</sup> *Ibid.*, 20 August 1905, 77.

her diagnosis.

Also, as Walker points out, Maynard's telling Effie about her biological mother, and then persuading Effie against contacting her, likely compounded Effie's sense of loss and abandonment.<sup>135</sup> Effie's hysterical attempts, as described in both *Diary* and *Stephane*, "She writes of 'piercing agony,' and of how 'she goes all rigid' and her face 'gets blue and cold,'" reiterate Effie's longing for love and sympathy that apparently repeatedly were mentioned in letters to Maynard. However, Maynard's scorn for Effie's "self-pitying, grasping, commonplaceness" remained coloured by class and race.<sup>136</sup> Her view of Effie as unrespectable was also shaped by her religious belief and cultural attitudes. These narratives, I would argue, became devices which enabled Maynard to hide from her own reprehensible behaviour.

In January 1908, Maynard wrote in her Green-book, "The failure and the loss of both of my daughters is inextricably bitter to me." Nonetheless, while Marion was depicted as the other wayward child in possibly another ploy to conceal Maynard's own wrong, she never ceased viewing Marion as a love she had lost. "No-one can look at her lips in their heavy fullness and not be almost frightened by their weight of feeling," she wrote sorrowfully in 1910.<sup>137</sup> In 1908, however, her irritation with both turned her into an

---

<sup>135</sup> Walker, *Devil's Kingdom*, 158-63. At four, Effie was told by the S. A. that her mother was dead. It is unclear as to what Effie's mother was told. Maynard told Effie the truth in 1903—that her mother was alive and remarried with a son—but emphasized that any knowledge of Effie's existence would bring her mother shame.

<sup>136</sup> *Stephane*, vol. V, 166-90.

<sup>137</sup> *GB*, 30 December 1910, 364.

angry, righteous mother. She sent Effie, now twenty-four, “a list of the opportunities she had wasted since the age of ten.”<sup>138</sup> On their “eleventh anniversary,” she told Marion about her academic disappointment in her. She then sent her a letter conveying the remainder of her thoughts. “Love is not what it was. You have no life of your own and none with me either. I feel such a loss...I will never forget the gratitude I owe to you, my white rose, my sweet, unconscious, love inspiring child.” Marion wrote back, admitting that she saw Maynard’s letter as “a milestone, opening up a new life before [her].”<sup>139</sup>

The fact that Marion immediately enrolled at East London College, and successfully gained her B. A. in 1912, speaks volumes,<sup>140</sup> as does a Green-book entry written around the same time about Effie:

I feel disgust at her lies and ingratitude, but seeing her dressed as a servant-maid raises a storm of feeling....She is the sinner, suffering bitterly, and I am the Pharisee, living far away in comfort, condemning her. I see us in heaven, with Effie above me, looking down with pardon in her eyes.<sup>141</sup>

Maynard’s sense that Marion saw her “as old-fashioned, intolerant, unsympathetic and remembering the past to the point of being utterly hopeless” in 1908 is also telling.<sup>142</sup>

Maynard’s anger at both Marion and Effie—which I think she grew to regret—seems more of a projection of her own wrong doing in faith, love and duty.

---

<sup>138</sup> Firth, *Maynard*, 243.

<sup>139</sup> Maynard transcribed both letters in her *GB*, 22 April 1908, 221.

<sup>140</sup> See *GB*, 31 December 1915, 24.

<sup>141</sup> *Ibid.*, 27 October 1912, 113-14.

<sup>142</sup> *Ibid.*, 22 April 1908, 224.

By 1904 it was clear that Divinity was failing. It had few students, it was bankrupt, and the Council had “already dismissed it” by informing her that it could continue only at her own expense.<sup>143</sup> Notwithstanding, in some ways, Maynard’s aim to be the “the new evangelical” was forward thinking, as Firth argued. Richard Quebedeaux’s “We’re on our Way, Lord!” also suggests that Victorian methods of Biblical criticism may be *loosely* linked to American Evangelical feminism in the 1970s. Victorian women’s insistence upon the authority of the Bible opened up the issue of women’s place in society, he suggests.<sup>144</sup> Quebedeaux raises new questions on religious teaching. Maynard’s wish to provide a milieu for critical thinking through her multi-disciplinary approach to Divinity was a means of furthering women’s higher learning. It is clear that she wanted her Divinity students to be well equipped in all aspects of learning.

This is not to imply that Maynard had no other motives. Indeed, as implied above, Divinity was founded to further her own grandiose schemes for converting the world, with herself at the helm as prophet, and her genteel disciples spreading Her word. Unfortunately, her metaphorical standing “wonderfully alone” was not to be the far reaching enlightened proselytizing that she hoped to achieve. Richardson, who had “ignored” Divinity to that point, began to “criticize various points....; and if there is one person who can make one feel one is living in a fool’s paradise, it is Nannie,” wrote

---

<sup>143</sup> She worked at securing students. For example, in her *D*, 18 June 1902, 78, she noted, “wrote about 75 letters to Mildmay, CMS, evangelical clergy, the BCCU, and to Matlock and the Girls’ Camps; and again in *D*, 12 January 1903, 88, “Very disappointing. Harry did such a diligent search, and each took such work before she ‘was landed,’ but then no one came from Wimbledon.”

<sup>144</sup> See Firth, *Maynard*, 289; and Quebedeaux, “We’re on our Way,” 129-45.

Maynard sadly, also recoiling from Richardson's double blow of including Wakefield as part of these "empty visions." When her Council attacked her once again on the value of the Divinity program Maynard felt beaten. "Divinity has faded into obscurity," she wrote, "leaving me to shrink back into helping Westfield."<sup>145</sup>

Ironically, this "shrink[ing] back into helping Westfield" appropriately described her *diminishing* influence on college life. As mentioned, the seeds were sown when the Council had planned for Westfield to become a School of the University, which was achieved in 1902. By 1905, the donations largely from Westfield's founder, Ann Dudin Brown, had seen the construction of the (Skeel) library, and "the new wing" that was renamed Dudin Brown Wing. This had enabled Westfield to evolve from a body of around forty students in the late 1890s, to being "over full, with sixty in residence and at least five pining to live in" by 1910.<sup>146</sup>

Becoming a School of the University meant that Westfield was bound by a "Scheme of Provision" for course work and regulations for admission procedures and fees. While tedious and labour intensive, this had benefited Westfield especially in terms of B. Sc. success and salaries.<sup>147</sup> Meanwhile, Rosalind Boyd received the Gilchrist

---

<sup>145</sup> See *GB*, 31 December 1908, 253; *Minutes*, 8 October 1908, 68.

<sup>146</sup> Firth, *Maynard*, 259-65; *Minutes*, 15 April 1903, 166. Dudin Brown donated £5,000 towards completing the addition. The new wing was built on land given earlier by her niece, Mrs. Alexandra Brown.

<sup>147</sup> *D*, 7 February 1909, 69. She noted here, "when Bedford, Holloway and East London sent in their scales of pay, I could argue that Westfield sadly lagged behind other schools, in order to get the collective salaries raised by £200." See also *Minutes*, 8 July 1903, 182.

Scholarship in 1902, and Firth gained it for her brilliance in History in 1904. After 1905, at least one student per year would receive an M. A. This academic success, in turn, elicited more scholarships from Council members, local businesses and Old Students.<sup>148</sup>

However, Maynard lamented Westfield's "merging into the main life of the university" because it had affected Westfield's "cultivating spirit" which had been its core to her. This concern was obviously important to her since she wrote about it in both the *Diary* and *Green-book* from 1905 until her retirement in 1913. Her comment, "It is difficult to maintain 'real gentle-women' [at Westfield] because the classes below have needs and must be accepted," evinced how class was a part of this equation. As noted in chapters seven and eight, she never ceased to pine for the maternal-like upper-middle-class milieu of Westfield's early years.<sup>149</sup> She grew to resent the "terrible city girls" who were daughters of middle-class professional men, but who came better prepared from the high schools to win the entrance scholarships over the "very nice ones." She never tired of the cocoa parties, the "Sayings," the graduating "Bird's of Paradise" and Function, "when, in [her] stiff black dress [she] preach[ed] the gospel in [her] own way." While she immersed herself in this "family" milieu that quite possibly no longer existed outside of herself, her staff's participation in the University's inter-collegiate course program

---

<sup>148</sup> See *D*, 11 May 1904, 89; *D*, 26 June 1905, 79. Scholarship support came from members of Council like Alexandra Brown, local businesses like the Draper's Company, and Old Students like Marie Pechinet and Alicia Bleby. See *GB*, 17 December 1911, 37; *Minutes*, 10 April 1907, 355; and Firth, *Maynard*, 217-45.

<sup>149</sup> See *College Register*, 1-73, for class distinction. Throughout the 1880s most of the students were either the daughters of clergy or gentry. But by the 1890s, and especially 1900s, the daughters of middle-class professionals were becoming the majority.

prepared for the future on a bigger collegiate map. Referred less to as “Miss Maynard’s college,” Westfield had fled her domestic meadows for the more public pastures of professionalism.<sup>150</sup>

Perhaps Maynard’s empathy for the Dean of Peterborough’s resignation from the Council in 1908 presaged her own sense of superfluousness, as Mistress.<sup>151</sup> Since 1905, she had planned to retire in 1917, at sixty-eight. Her resignation in 1913 was not by choice. She was made to feel that she *must* retire since it was the wish of both staff and Council. Richardson placed the most pressure upon her. While Maynard had been deeply distracted by Wakefield and Divinity in the early 1900s, Richardson had formed an intense relationship with Eleanor McDougall. McDougall, who joined the faculty in 1902, was a vibrant and talented woman whose expertise in archeology proved an asset to Westfield. When Maynard’s relationship with Wakefield ended she had “half imagined [her]self in love with Eleanor.”<sup>152</sup> But Nannie, and probably Eleanor, had made it clear that Eleanor was off limits.

When Maynard built a retirement cottage at Little Bookham in Surrey in 1911, Nannie began prodding her to retire so that Eleanor could become Mistress. As implied in

---

<sup>150</sup> *D*, 2 May 1912, 8; *GB*, 3 May 1913, 4; Sondheimer, *Castle Adamant*, 23.

<sup>151</sup> *Minutes*, 13 May 1908, 36. The Revd. William Barlow had taken over the Chair in 1904. As last survivor of Dudin Brown’s original trio of clerical advisors, he had seen the entering of the new type of Council member, like the notable Oxford scholar, Dr. Carlyle, Lord Alverstone, Chief Justice of England, and Dr Henry Wace, former Principal of King’s College. Barlow stormed from a meeting when his colleagues voted in the admission of a Unitarian, which, he declared, was “abandoning loyalty to Christ.”

<sup>152</sup> *GB*, 31 December 1908, 253. See also Sondheimer, *Castle Adamant*, 60-66, on the abilities of Eleanor McDougall.

the last chapter, Nannie seemed to prefer a Victorian woman's method of ruling behind the scenes while grasping the reins of power. Maynard, who felt "propped up on one side by El's [Eleanor's] academic knowledge, and on the other side by A's inventiveness," resented the old formulaic, ever at play:

11 years of R, 11 years of El, and over 30 of A. They have been good, *good* for college, and I would do it again, yes, indeed I would. But oh, *how* the weaker nature suffers! Strong enough to have aspiration, weak enough to be suppressed by small personal, everyday matters. That is real suffering.<sup>153</sup>

Even so, Maynard had always chosen her path and her role. She had succumbed to passion and, at times, to adopting the position of second-in-command. Ultimately, this had always left her resenting her weaknesses in love and ambition.

Matters came to a head in May 1912. Without warning, Richardson suddenly informed Maynard that she "'had found out' that El was inevitable as [her] successor, but that she would leave if [Maynard] wait[ed] four more years to retire." Maynard, deeply affronted, found herself "staggering under the shock about being kept in darkness, and then actually being *told* [by the few Council members that she trusted] that [she] was no longer wanted."<sup>154</sup> She judged that she had no other choice than "resigning her position as Mistress at the end of May Term, 1913." The experience, as she described it in her Greenbook, epitomized her struggle with her Council over the years, and her sense of their

---

<sup>153</sup> *GB*, 6 February 1913, 142.

<sup>154</sup> *Ibid.*, 8 May 1912, 73. Lady Chapman apparently said, "You are right in thinking the time is right to seek a new Mistress." Alverstone and Hulbert seemed kinder, remarking, "I cannot question your decision because after all these years you are entitled to less responsibility."



wrong-doing:

To think that for nearly 30 years I have not worked with my Council, but *despite* them. Every meeting I came back flattened from the want of enterprise, the personal criticisms, and the total lack of appreciation. Very little regarding my resignation. Lord Alverstone absent, and only about nine of Council present. Old Mr. Gedge thought the new regime would begin in January, and there was much discussion about the successor too. The only words of *real* feeling came from Mrs. Woodhouse, who spoke of solidity and the noble aims of college in a way I greatly liked.<sup>155</sup>

However, neither Constance, Nannie or Eleanor could have predicted the turn of events. Agnes de Selincourt, who was highly regarded by some Council members for both her scholarship and missionary work, was voted the most qualified candidate. Eleanor immediately resigned and took a job in India,<sup>156</sup> leaving Nannie to have the first of a series of breakdowns. In fact, the combined loss of power and love left her reacting violently if she even heard the new principal's name. Maynard also disapproved of de Selincourt, and judged Richardson's plight as "a retribution of sorts,"<sup>157</sup> but her feeling revenge only left her bitter. For this, alongside irritation over her brothers' wrangle and her upset over Wakefield and Effie, she was to pay a toll. An onset of neuralgia in the form of shingles that nearly blinded her in one eye, denied her most of her final term at Westfield. She

---

<sup>155</sup> Ibid., 10 October 1912, 109-112; *Minutes*, 9 October 1912, 186.

<sup>156</sup> *GB*, 21 May 1912, 118. De Selincourt was a Girton graduate in Classics. She had helped to found the Bombay Missionary Settlement for University Women, and had served as first Principal of the Lady Muir Memorial College, Allahabad. Sickness in 1909 had brought her back to England where she had taken a senior position in the S. C. M. See Sondheimer, *Castle Adamant*, 69.

<sup>157</sup> *GB*, 22 June 1913, 159. She noted here, "Nannie has made others suffer so bitterly, for months and years at a time, and now she herself is shut up, shut away....It is difficult to see her like this. Her power of judgment and decision making are all gone. Yet 'the judgments of the Lord are true and righteous altogether.'"

managed to attend her farewell party and receive her generous parting gift of £800 from the Council. The latter she immediately requested “be kept as a special fund” for the benefit of needy students. She gave her last Function, taking the subject delivered at her very first Westfield Bible class, the “Parable of the Sower.”<sup>158</sup>

When Constance Maynard retired she took with her a unique interconnection of the three causes, namely, vital religion, intellectual endeavour and feminine independence, to which she had dedicated her thirty years at Westfield. As argued in this dissertation, all of her aims were related to the Evangelical beliefs and Puritanical ways implanted during her childhood, and to a counteracting need for intellectual freedom which had impelled her to break loose. The fruitful balance of these three forces was complex and so delicate that outsiders tended to dismiss Westfield as “all cant and prayer meetings.”

According to Maynard, both staff and Council soon revealed their lack of support for application of “Higher Criticism” to the study of the Bible:

Grace is said in Latin, and prayers are altered. Function now in a blaze of light. Scripture classes, which were cozy and informal around my fire, are held in morning hours in the ordinary lecture room and the board is used. A dozen of the servants have given notice and left and D Brown is in despair and says ‘that interest in Westfield is gone.’<sup>159</sup>

Certainly, as implied by Dudin Brown’s reaction, and as both Firth and Sondheimer argue, Westfield produced more missionaries in proportion to its number of students

---

<sup>158</sup> Ibid., 24 May 1913, 151; *Minutes*, 10 December 1913, 234.

<sup>159</sup> GB, 31 December 1913, 202. See also Firth, *Maynard*, 259-67; Sondheimer, *Castle Adamant*, 66-69. Sondheimer particularly suggests that Westfield was wronged by being described as “all cant” given graduates’ pursuits.

during the first thirty years of its existence than any other college of comparable standing. Of over 500 graduates, at least 50 served in countries like India, Japan, China, Africa and Canada as teachers in the medical field. The expectations of Dudin Brown were thus fulfilled. Maynard was equally supportive of those taking up social work in settlements or children's homes, and of those entering the teaching profession. By 1913, at least a dozen were Mistresses, while hundreds of others taught in private schools, schools of religious foundation like the Mount, and girls' high schools. Less than half stayed home to raise children. No matter what her graduating student's decision, as long as she spread His word, Maynard wholeheartedly supported her life choices.<sup>160</sup>

Soon gone from Westfield was the domestic intimacy that Maynard endeavoured to mediate within her three aims. Perhaps this was necessary for the evolutions of Westfield and women's colleges at large. "The room where [she] had suffered so much" was rid of its memories by her symbolic "destruction of old letters," from missionaries like Katie Tristram, from Richardson which "covered the history of Westfield," and "passionate outpourings" from Lumsden, Robertson, Brooke and Wakefield. The mistakes surrounding faith, aim and love would not be forgotten, however. "All of A's, R's and M's, and the hundreds with poor Effie," would haunt her for the rest of her days.<sup>161</sup>

Maynard's excessive demands have their sources not only in her particular

---

<sup>160</sup> She attended many weddings over the years. Of note was Connie Herschel's (1881) to the future Sir Neville Lubbock, a widower with seven children. See *GB*, 18 September 1881, 247.

<sup>161</sup> *Ibid.*, 31 December 1913, 202.

upbringing, but also in the strain under which her generation worked, and her dependence upon women in face of public animosity and indifference to her work. Neither male- nor female-centred passion was ever easy or simple for Maynard. Her love for Lewis Campbell was complicated by his marriage to Fanny. Her erotically-based entanglements with women, which perhaps surpassed those with men, also left her struggling with the idea of “something wrong,”<sup>162</sup> even though they were freed from a “deviancy” label in the late 1800s. Throughout her life, Maynard concealed her boundary violations through her struggle between accepting love as God-given and chastising herself for preferring human love over divine.

---

<sup>162</sup> Ibid., 23 April 1886, 127. As noted in chapter eight, Richardson had questioned the nature of the raves at Westfield, asking Maynard, “Has there not been something wrong?...a waywardness?...Ralph has [also] come to feel that in personal absorption there is a danger and a wrong that she can scarcely express, but *feels* intensely.”

## Conclusion

I am now free. Yet the sense of the great shadow of 'outer darkness' lying close to me can never be forgotten. They say that after a stress of great physical pain, the mere absence of it is positive joy, and that you can lie...and feel enwrapped in bliss, - well, it is something like that in the outer life and I'm content. But within I still long with a great and sore longing. I can never *quite* find it. I want someone who is far in front of me, along the same lines. The uneducated will not serve, neither will saints. Is love a fair parable of the relations between God and Man?<sup>1</sup>

This dissertation ends as it began with Maynard's lament about her struggle with passion, ambition and faith, a struggle that influenced her public and private life in unique ways. Her interconnection of ambition and faith forged her role as an educational pioneer during an era when most women faced a life of domesticity instead. Further, the idea that desire was God's gift enabled her to transgress social norms in her passion for Lewis Campbell, Louisa Lumsden, Margaret Brooke, Ralph Gray and Marion Wakefield.

At the same time, faith and science co-existed as uneasily for Maynard as faith and desire did. This, I argue, shaped her experience in other important ways. Most obviously, her conflict was played out in her attempts to reconcile ambition and religious duty, and rationalism and religious passion. At the extreme, her struggle to "Atone" for worldliness took form in a dichotomy between desire and resistance, which not only threatened her own health but that of others. Even so, in a strange and contradictory way, Maynard's stringent asceticism afforded her the tools to combat the immense hurdles facing her as an educational pioneer—from acceptance as a professional to the certain

---

<sup>1</sup> GB, 31 December 1927, 56.

loneliness such acceptance engendered.

As complicated as Maynard's interconnection of passion, ambition and faith was throughout her life, this was an empowering force. Just as faith forged her goals, and fuelled her longings, so it justified her failings in leadership and love. Maynard's interconnection of faith, ambition and passion, then, involved complex, multi-faceted power struggles both at the work place and with love. It was evident in her friendships with her peers such as Anne Richardson, her suitors such as James Robertson, and her "family" including Effie. In terms of love, Maynard's submissive stance with Lewis Campbell and Louisa Lumsden evolved into her adoption of a more dominant role in her later relationships. The eventually frightful result of this was her apparent emotional and sexual abuse of such students as Mary Tait, Margaret Brooke and Marion Wakefield, and interestingly, others have not written about these actions. Nonetheless, whether contrived or not, these actions became important aspects of Maynard's experience as a Victorian educational pioneer.

What may we say about Maynard's interconnection of ambition, passion and faith during her retirement years? It seems that her ambition largely took form in writing. "I have found the power to write, a gift. This is THE REAL CENTRE of life," she exclaimed in 1923.<sup>2</sup> This of course had been true for many decades, but upon retiring from Westfield, it was with her pen, she believed, that she could reach out and convert others: "I *have* a message to give. I *am* a prophet, though hardly anyone in the world

---

<sup>2</sup> Ibid., 31 December 1923, 112. She wrote here, "Lots of interesting things. Have been writing for the press and most mornings devoted to this end. The result is many publications. Seven in total and two more in the press."

recognizes it.”<sup>3</sup>

Maynard’s “message” is most evident in her little pamphlets of sermons which evoke her exhortation in the living of a Christian life. Some including *The Carpenter’s Tools* (1915), are based on parable or analogy, whereas others including *The Perfect Law of Liberty* (1913), link faith with morals like sincerity and courage, and those like *The Prophet Daniel* (1914) focus on principles of conduct like self-control. The fact that all are full of Biblical illustrations and direct quotation reveal the biblicism that marked Victorian Evangelicalism throughout the 1800s.<sup>4</sup> The texts also reflect Maynard’s religious upbringing. While she was to struggle with her conflict between rationalism and faith for the rest of her life, her views on the Truth never changed. “No one will make me believe that the ethical struggle is the *real* value in God’s eyes,” she asserted in 1925. “It is *no* effort of Will. The Atonement reminds us that we have something to do.”<sup>5</sup>

Maynard’s lengthiest published volumes, *We Women: A Golden Hope* (1913), *Between College Terms* (1910) and *The Life of Dora Greenwell* (1926), probably best illustrate her unique interweaving of ambition, passion and faith. *We Women* is a powerful portrayal of her life-long dedication to educational emancipation for middle-

---

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, 25 December 1925, 76.

<sup>4</sup> Maynard, *The Carpenter’s Tools* (London: Morgan and Scott, 1915); *Perfect Law of Liberty*; *The Prophet Daniel & Other Essays* (London: Morgan and Scott, 1914). These pamphlets were also published in religious periodicals. For biblicism and Evangelicalism see Bebbington, *Evangelism*, 75-105; Roseman, *Evangelicals*, 45-69; Hilton, *Atonement*, 17-27; Samuel, ed., *Evangelical Succession*, 44; Noll, Bebbington and Rawlyk, eds., *Amazing Grace*, 99. These authors argue that biblicism remained an important aspect of evangelical religion into the mid-1900s.

<sup>5</sup> *GB*, 31 December 1925, 23.

class women, taking into account her views on faith and the influence of science on culture:

Man has honoured us, accounting us (taken singly) as the supreme prize of life. Man, as a race, has used us very badly, accounting us (taken collectively) as hopelessly inferior to himself. So serious are these indictments that we hesitate to acknowledge them, for it seems like an admission that we have thoroughly deserved our fate....The debt I owe to the pioneers cannot be paid except by heartfelt, lifelong gratitude. The principal admitted - that everything we can do in the world of learning we may do - has led us toward all the privileges we can justly claim....We have natural powers of both reason and conscience. But beyond this again there is another source of knowledge that we call revelation, a guiding line given us from on High.<sup>6</sup>

“There is no longer ‘man’ and ‘woman,’” Maynard emphatically concluded. “The ‘perfect man’ is both Adam and Eve. The two halves complete a whole that need to no longer be separated, even in thought, as they are brought together by God.”<sup>7</sup> This last powerful statement encompasses not only Maynard’s progressive views on gender and culture at large, but also her reconciliation of them within her secular and religious concerns. Even so, at the same time, her conflict between rationalism and faith left her oddly conservative about gender. In 1925, she proclaimed the “seeds” of women’s higher education “scattered,” and she admonished, “Now it is up to the next generation to reap the harvest.”<sup>8</sup> Notwithstanding, one is also reminded of the lines in her much loved “Parable of the Sower” that cautioned, “Much of the good seed scattered is wasted if hearts are

---

<sup>6</sup> Maynard, *We Women*, 6-8.

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.*, 130-132. As Maynard told us, this quote was taken (although modified) from the New English Bible. See Gal. III: 28, 657.

<sup>8</sup> *A*, VII, 11, “1882,” 338. See also her *Cultivation*, 23; and *We Woman*, 23-26.



hard, shallow and already occupied. *Good* means not having these defects.”<sup>9</sup>

For Maynard, the seeds of *good* change included retaining certain feminine values that, echoing her Christian views, were steeped in domestic and religious metaphor. As she exclaimed in *We Women*, “The total church is the bride” and “The mother is the true centre of the home, and sister of Jesus.”<sup>10</sup> Her prescriptions for middle-class femininity in this text were also expressed in her views on suffrage:

By the vote we can suppress the evils of vice; by the vote we can secure good housing, sanitation, and national education, both general and technical; by the vote we can make idleness and cheating difficult, honest labour attractive, and can secure adequate scope for every child among us....Do not neglect your vote, my sisters, but use it for these ends ”<sup>11</sup>

The moral undertones in the above reflect Maynard’s class-based elitism as always colouring her socio-political concerns. Her views did not change. She had unwavering praise for nationalism and the missionary (imperialist) motive. In contrast, women’s support of the labour movement was another matter entirely. “The government doles are the source of much of our misery,” she tersely noted in 1923. “The women’s vote is one of the great sources of evil. It has really doubled the labour vote.”<sup>12</sup>

---

<sup>9</sup> *GB*, 8 October 1882, 149. As she explained it, “On the hard soil it only ‘patters’ on the outside. If the root is strong, though the tree may appear small, it will be strong and fruitful. See also, *Cultivation*, 29.

<sup>10</sup> Maynard, *We Women*, 109. For other examples of this, see *GB*, 8 October 1890, 214; and *GB*, 8 October 1923, 163.

<sup>11</sup> Maynard, *We Women*, 136-39.

<sup>12</sup> *GB*, 9 December 1923, 251. Some feminists, like the Fabians, reflected Marxist ideals in their fight for a society based on class equality. They used the vote as a means of ending the exploitation of the working-class—as seen in their support of rights through strikes. See Stanley Holton, *Suffrage*; Wingerton, *Suffrage Movement*; and Newsome,

The public and the private, the feminine and the masculine, Maynard straddled old and new ideals in her goals for women. On the one hand, she never ceased to be proud of Westfield's steady growth and academic success, while on the other hand, she resented its maturing secularism and professionalism as the ways to achieve this:

For 12 places next October there are over 100 applicants. 40 students live out in lodging as well as about 90 residents. Since the 40 years I gathered them round me, things have changed so much one might be on another planet. They have one Divinity lecture weekly and no one seems to care about their individual souls. Students have more power, more freedom, and more choice in selecting subjects. It is now become a machine of sorts, and is one college among the many. I am glad to be gone. Westfield is now run under a very different scheme to the one in which I gave my life.<sup>13</sup>

The Westfield of the mid-1920s seemed far removed from her early nurturing milieu that had catered to the daughters of genteel clergymen. "It is no use pressing on modern young people a sense of sin they ought to feel and do not," Maynard complained in *Then Shall We Know* (1926).<sup>14</sup>

Nonetheless, Maynard's reticence about spreading His word at Girton's annual Banquet in 1927 revealed her own struggle with the changing times:

I was called upon for a few moments as I was the oldest student present. When I stood on the platform with over 300 intelligent faces unknown to me, it was the opportunity of a lifetime. But how difficult is the testimony of Christ? It is not exactly cowardice, but before so many agnostics was it wise? I dealt as vividly as I could on the happiness of my sudden freedom, and touched lightly on the extreme difference of thought between home

---

*Victorian World*, on this. Also Strachey's first-hand account, *The Cause*.

<sup>13</sup> *GB*, 25 April 1924, 21; see also *GB*, 25 December 1921, 154.

<sup>14</sup> Maynard, *Shall We Know*, 99.

and college. Now I feel the stress of not speaking Christ's name more.<sup>15</sup>

It happened again at Westfield in 1934:

The beginning was okay. I told them how Character was more important than either Ability or Attainment, valuable as these were, and I gave them the main ingredients. The next necessity was Religion, to speak of how the outer shell was of no account.... Yet I could not deal with what true Religion really *was*. It was as if hands were laid over my mouth. I forgot everything.<sup>16</sup>

Silenced by fear, and by her own continuing self-doubt, Maynard keenly felt her loss of power. Her Girton Prayer Meeting had dwindled as had her beloved Ring.<sup>17</sup> The failure of Divinity still left a sting.<sup>18</sup>

As narrow minded, conservative, and possibly self-serving as Maynard might have been, it is important to remember that her merging of a private milieu with a public front was vital to the evolution of change for women. Pioneers of her generation may neither have escaped from the stereotyping of behaviour and expectations, nor Maynard, from her religious upbringing. Even so, it was through their careful negotiation of values that women's colleges and the idea of higher education for middle-class women were

---

<sup>15</sup> *GB*, 10 January 1926, 79.

<sup>16</sup> *Ibid.*, 6 May 1934, 265-66.

<sup>17</sup> See for example *Ring*, 17 October 1898, in which she wrote, "well, we must be resigned then to having the Ring once a year that is it." In 1899, Maynard wrote in her Ring letter, dated 6 June, "I feel a lack of Christianity from your letters. Here is a little sermon which has been much on my mind lately from Heb. 11; 1, choice that others may think strange; 2, difference in what is really valuable; 3, independence of man - not fearing the 'wrath of the Kingdom of God.'" The Ring letter appears to have ceased shortly after this.

<sup>18</sup> See *D*, 12 November 1915, 102; *GB*, 6 May 1927, 45; and *GB*, 12 October 1932, 162, for her continuing lament about Divinity.

established. They paved the way for the next generation of pioneers who were empowered to demand further reforms in all aspects of public and private life after exposing the existences of wife and child abuse, the double standard of sexual morality, poor working conditions, inadequate health care, and disenfranchisement.<sup>19</sup>

We will conclude that ambition drove Maynard to achieve great heights as an early educational pioneer. The founding and ensuing success of Westfield was due to her intellectual ability, her leadership skills, and her tenacity. These qualities were apparent in her determination to provide women with the opportunity to take the B. A. and B. Sc. degrees at London. Her commitment to this goal stood her in good stead against the blatant, sexist disregard of women's education at large that was even latent during her battles with her Council. Although brought to desperation at times, she endeavoured to gain voice through perseverance and strength rather than retaliation. Her achievements afforded her success as Mistress of Westfield and dignity as an individual, despite the gender disparities of her culture.

*The Life of Dora Greenwell* is fascinating in its reflection of Maynard's inner struggle with passion, ambition and faith that she subverted within the context of the biography. The text, oddly enough, is about a drug-addicted Victorian theologian, Greenwell, and features her life-long search for Truth. "Her re-editing of ancient books, historical inaccuracies and scientific contradictions were, in the end, negligible," Maynard asserted. "She always wove her varied treasures into a crown for the head of the

---

<sup>19</sup> See, for example, Vicinus, *Independent Women*, 280-91; Sondheimer, *Castle Adamant*, 22; Fletcher, *Feminists and Bureaucrats*; Hunt, *Lessons for Life* and Scott and Fletcher, *Culture and Education*, on this.

suffering Redeemer.”<sup>20</sup> For Maynard, of course, the varied “treasures” for the suffering Redeemer included suffering oneself.

In a chapter entitled, “Two Loves,” Maynard cited “a very curious poem” by Greenwell. According to Maynard, this poem attested to “Greenwell’s firm belief that the whole of human nature, ‘natural man’ as well as ‘spiritual man,’ will finally be redeemed by Christ.”<sup>21</sup> Firth argued that these “conflicting spirits” were actually “clearer to Maynard than to Greenwell.”<sup>22</sup> As Maynard herself lamented in a Green-book entry in 1927, “In a passionate nature there are instinctive elements which make it impossible to choose the Cloister.”<sup>23</sup> It was at this time that she was voicing indignation in her Autobiography about her passion for women now being deemed abnormal because love “had been blocked from the normal outlet [marriage].”<sup>24</sup> Thus, in light of the changes in culture stemming from sexology and psychosexual theories, Greenwell’s ideas may have proved a balm for the deeply conflicted Maynard, reaffirming her justification of passion within the context of faith. Notably, she worked on *Dora Greenwell* for over twenty

---

<sup>20</sup> Maynard, *The Life of Dora Greenwell* (London: H. R. Allenson, 1926), 34, 66.

<sup>21</sup> Ibid., 212. See Bland and Doan eds., *Sexology in Culture*; Weeks, *Sexuality and Discontents*, Jeffreys, *The Spinster*; Eagle Russet, *Sexual Science*; Jackson, *Real Facts of Life*, for discussion on the development of discourses on sex.

<sup>22</sup> Firth, *Maynard*, 303.

<sup>23</sup> *GB*, 19 February 1927, 104.

<sup>24</sup> *A*, VII, 52, “1884,” 172-74.

years.<sup>25</sup>

While *We Women* and *Dora Greenwell* conveys Maynard's message and her private struggles as a Victorian woman, *Between College Terms* reveals another remarkable and compelling aspect of her personality—her ability to find creative outlets for her conflicts. “These intervals, these parentheses,” as Constance referred to her travels in *Between Terms*, evokes how nature, similarly to art, exercise and writing, was synonymous with the grey space between thought and action, and this was a void into which she could experientially flee, and reconsider her ambition, passion and faith. From her “physical re-making” in Norway [healing from Ralph],” to embracing “a land [Holy Land] that drinketh of the rain of heaven [formation of Divinity],” travel punctuated her life course. Ambition, passion, and faith were in Constance's metaphoric expressive self as the artist, cyclist, and writer were in her public persona, and she always reaffirmed her need to interconnect all three.<sup>26</sup>

Turning to Maynard's private records written during the 1920s and early 1930s, it is perhaps not surprising that they appear more retrospective in tone. As I have argued, her Autobiography not only voiced her pride about her success as an educational pioneer, but also became a powerful means of censuring as well as justifying her past behaviour.

---

<sup>25</sup> Firth, *Maynard*, 302. Firth noted here, Maynard “went about England [in 1906] endeavouring to gather up the personal recollections of those who had known her.”

<sup>26</sup> Maynard, *Between College Terms* 78, 99, 157. See also *A*, VII, 57, “1894,” 344-47; and Firth, *Maynard*, 300. As noted earlier, this counters Firth's tendency to separate Maynard's life into separate chapters, ie., Westfield, Effie, Holidays.

Her “upbringing caused [her] repression;”<sup>27</sup> Lewis was unhappily married “so [she] c[ould] talk about it now;”<sup>28</sup> Louisa was a “faithless tyrant who bound [her] to an unhappy marriage;”<sup>29</sup> Margaret “took the blame [for passion] that was [Margaret’s];”<sup>30</sup> Ralph rejected her “love due to R’s want of love for Him;”<sup>31</sup> Effie “was a disappointment to the end;” and she “saved Marion from a real mental breakdown.”<sup>32</sup>

Shame and regret also enveloped Maynard’s recollections of her romantic life. Within the space of the autobiographical “confessional,” she became the tormented lover who must atone for ambition, for passion, and for faith. In the extreme as in her passion for Gray, her struggle took the form of a dangerous level of self-torture that was consistent with the consciousness in which she claimed that she embraced “the Purgatoria” in her unwillingness to escape from pain.<sup>33</sup> “I have difficulty in writing down the history of the next years of my life,” she noted before discussing her “Eleven years of Gloom” with Gray. “The tale is not only disappointing, but there is an inner turmoil of feeling of which I am very ashamed. The temptress [Gray] was too near and Heaven too far,” and when she moved on to discuss her relationship with Wakefield, “Experience has

---

<sup>27</sup> *A*, I, 5, “1860,” 67.

<sup>28</sup> *Ibid.*, II, 10, “1872,” 286.

<sup>29</sup> *Ibid.*, VI, 33, “1878,” 340.

<sup>30</sup> *Ibid.*, VI, 47, “1884,” 92.

<sup>31</sup> *Ibid.*, VI, 52, “1888,” 232.

<sup>32</sup> *Ibid.*, VII, 70, “1902,” 486.

<sup>33</sup> *Ibid.*, VI, 52, “1888,” 232. See also *GB*, 12 November 1887, 102.

now taught me that love can cause heartbreak and disillusionment.”<sup>34</sup> Just as the young Maynard had retreated into religious metaphor to avoid confronting her guilt and confusion about Campbell in 1872,<sup>35</sup> so it became a tool to self-chastise or “exonerate” her love for individuals like Gray and Wakefield when writing her Autobiography in the 1900s.

Her Green-book, her Friend, evinced most of Maynard’s thoughts on her current life during her later years, since her Autobiography was only written up until the year, 1902, and her Diary remained virtually silent. The record spoke of the loneliness and trials of old age, such as bad teeth, gout, rheumatism, weak heart: “The time which suggests arm-chairs, Shetland shawls and avoidance of all conflicts of life.”<sup>36</sup> It also spoke of loss; from the passing of friends like Elizabeth Welsh (1921); Old Students like Alicia Bleby (1911)<sup>37</sup>; family like Tissy (1907) and Gazy (1925); and to the ongoing strife between her brothers, George and Harry:

The Harry and George affair is serious. We hoped that the South African property would end all strife, but it has done the reverse and made any reconciliation beyond hope. Harry has signed a declaration, that from now on he will only communicate with George through W. Heath [solicitor].<sup>38</sup>

---

<sup>34</sup> See *A*, VII, 49, “1885,” 134; and *A*, VII, 52, “1890,” 257.

<sup>35</sup> *GB*, 2 July 1872, 181.

<sup>36</sup> *Ibid.*, 19 February 1919, 203.

<sup>37</sup> *Sundial*, 234-50. As noted earlier, Elizabeth Welsh was Maynard’s old Girton friend. She took over as Mistress of Girton in 1884. Alicia Bleby was one of Westfield’s first students. After initially going out to south Africa as a missionary, she eventually became Principal of a girls’ High School in South Africa. She died in 1911.

<sup>38</sup> *GB*, 12 July 1918, 153.



Their differences were not resolved before Harry's death in 1918. George never ceased to "vilify Harry for his financial mistakes," Maynard wrote, "yet he continued with 18 more experiments when other failures of this nature were apparent. Why did *he* not pull accredited investments?"<sup>39</sup> For Constance, who managed quite comfortably financially, "Gazy's death was the real solid block removed from life." She lamented, "my 70 years of Hawkhurst life is now closed and gone forever."<sup>40</sup> Towards the end of her life, she became more and more estranged from George, seeing only Dora and close friends like Catherine Firth on a regular basis.

But despite these endings accompanying the passage of time, Maynard's Greenbook revealed her continued embracing of life. She published, she attended conferences, she gave lectures, she visited friends, she travelled, and she cycled across England and Scotland until her early seventies. She explained of her approach to life in a lecture at Westfield in 1929, "My subject is always 'life is interesting.' I deal with education, England, colonies and the world (that is, the awakening of India and China)..."<sup>41</sup> Her

---

<sup>39</sup> *Ibid.*, 17 January 1920, 7; also *Ibid.*, 31 December 1925, 76. She wrote here, "We hear of how Harry had left him [George] alone in the ever losing office while he tried to make money in companies and directorships outside. We heard about the firms, Maynard Brothers, Maynard and Walker, and so on, and the enormous loss of £3,000."

<sup>40</sup> This was evident in her response to Tissy's and Gazy's death. "I did not know she was even ill," she writes of Tissy's death from a sudden heart attack in her *GB*, 15 January 1907, 66. For Gazy, who died from bronchitis, she exclaimed, "She will be so much missed. She leaves *such* a gap in my life." See *GB*, 8 June 1925, 98. Dora died in 1937; and the "delicate" George in 1942, at the ripe old age of ninety-two. See Firth, *Maynard*, 329.

<sup>41</sup> *GB*, 20 December 1920, 45. She also spoke quite regularly at Belstead and Girton.

unceasing interest in knowledge, technology, and places manifest itself in her buying the latest tricycle, publishing passionate poems about World War I, and acknowledging “the great waves of thought” surging from the *Zeitgeist* or from Christian Science.<sup>42</sup>

Ambitious to the end, she sought the letters, M. A., after her name, “just to make people tend to [her] words.”<sup>43</sup> Her wish was finally granted by the University of London in 1928.

In an interview for the *Daily Mirror* entitled, “A Woman Waited 53 Years for Her M. A.,” Maynard’s words spoke loud and clear:

After the University preserved a silence with regard to us students for some 53 years, which was as deep as the sea, suddenly, in 1928, we were informed that we might write the letters M. A. after our names, and wear the appropriate gown and hood.<sup>44</sup>

Little wonder then that Maynard wished that the story of her life be known. Little wonder that she wanted her “brilliant” Catherine Firth, to write it.<sup>45</sup>

In 1915, at the age of sixty-six, Maynard exclaimed in her Green-book, “I have fallen in love!” She had fallen for a local eighteen-year-old, named Jim Gillett, whom she was tutoring with his two sisters as a favour to his middle-class parents:

He is 52 years younger than I, so not a son but a grandson....My lips are

---

<sup>42</sup> *Ibid.*, 12 July 1917, 96. She noted here, “If we believe that God is governing the world, we must accept the *Zeitgeist*. If seed and harvest come from him, so must the great waves of thought. Each seed represents some kind of advance towards a perfect end. But I cannot accept any view which makes faith in the world too easy. It takes away sin and atonement.” She did not appear to move from this position for the rest of her life.

<sup>43</sup> *Ibid.*, 31 December 1925, 76. She asserted here, “I think that I deserve it.”

<sup>44</sup> “A Woman Waited 53 Years for Her M. A.,” *Daily Mirror* (London), 16 October 1933, 4.

<sup>45</sup> See *GB*, 17 March 1929, 154; *GB*, 21 November 1930, 230.

clean, but when his in their pure youthfulness seek mine, - a flame not allowed very often, - my whole being thrills. I am a little ashamed to write down things that surely I ought to have forsaken a good 19 years ago when Jim was born.... Yet may not the heart be kept young, quite unutterably young?<sup>46</sup>

Obviously, the incestuous undertone of this relationship again raises the question about why Maynard sought what we would view today as aberrant relationships. After all, Campbell was married, and her female loves were either peers or students. Before turning to that, it is important to note that Maynard's desire for Jim Gillett suggests, once again, her physical attraction for both men and women. In other words, similarly to her passion for Campbell, she understood her desire for Gillett as heterosexual:

I always preserve that slight barrier to exist between man and women, but he knows how to love. He says nothing, but his kisses are to me an incredible sweetness, and like nothing else that I possess in the whole world. He is in some ways uninformed, and in others well beyond his years.<sup>47</sup>

Maynard's infatuation with Gillett impelled her to mould him into the Wakefield who had failed, while notably she had no interest in either of his sisters for this role. "I hope that he is training to be a prophet," she wrote in 1922. "His curiously strong sense of loneliness seems to point in that direction."<sup>48</sup> Here, she believed, was another hopeful who could be taught the importance of interconnecting ambition and faith. This seemed to help her to justify her physical passion, just as she had done with Campbell, Lumsden,

---

<sup>46</sup> Ibid., 4 August 1915, 77.

<sup>47</sup> Ibid., 23 April 1921, 114.

<sup>48</sup> Ibid., 23 November 1922, 134. Her hopes for his future as a prophet frequently appeared in her Green-book at this time. See, for example, Ibid., 6 June 1919, 190; Ibid., 2 May 1920, 134; Ibid., 22 January 1921, 108; Ibid., 12 October 1923, 132.

Brooke, Gray and Wakefield. Desire was not entirely about gender or sex, or even about age. Gillett was His gift.

In 1923, Maynard happily agreed to pay for Gillett's education at Oxford. But she grew increasingly disappointed and resentful of his focus on academia over faith, and interest in peers over herself.<sup>49</sup> He drew further and further from her, his lack of correspondence and excuses not to visit when home hurting her deeply. "Among my 500 daughters [Old Students] I had longed for a son," she lamented. "I gave him my very best, but just when my love was ready to grow and become a genuine lifelong friendship, his slackened off."<sup>50</sup>

Once again, Maynard struggled to conceptualize her feelings for Gillett as she had done with Wakefield. Certainly, her struggle was culturally based. As implied above, she had never simply viewed her love for Jim as that of a kindly mother or grandmother. Even so, she also adopted faith to justify her longings and failings in her relationship with Gillett. "When I found the courage to speak to him about my feelings," she noted in 1926, "he said, 'I have never felt love as much as you have.'" A sorely disappointed yet worldly-wise Maynard added, "and somehow, I felt content with that."<sup>51</sup> She likely knew that she had become caught up in over-romanticizing their relationship.

It is notable that Maynard's comment about Gillett was written after Wakefield's

---

<sup>49</sup> See *Ibid.*, 30 July 1923, 228-31. She was also paying for Dora's sons' education at Oxford.

<sup>50</sup> *Ibid.*, 14 April 1924, 18.

<sup>51</sup> *Ibid.*, 15 July 1926, 92.

angry outburst regarding *their* past relationship: “She [Wakefield] said, ‘You did not see the harm you were doing me. When you thought that you were opening doors to my mind, you were actually repressing me.’”<sup>52</sup> I suspect that Maynard knew, on some level, that she had emotionally abused Gillett, just as she had done to Brooke, Wakefield and others. While she had a less dominant physical position in their relationship, she had a more dominant one in her persistent psychological bullying of Gillett to resist “the world” and to become both leader and prophet.<sup>53</sup> She might have better understood Gillett’s rejection after her rude awakening from Wakefield’s accusation. While Gillett disappeared from her life from this point on, she did continue to pay for his education.

It is also notable that the Green-book record evinced a more contemplative tone after the Gillett and Wakefield episodes in the mid-1920s. Certainly, one gets a more direct sense of pain, loss, sorrow and shame from its pages, in comparison with the Autobiography. Notwithstanding, since her record was biased towards censuring or justifying behaviour, both her past and her present “confessions” as they were, became tantalizingly oblique and fleeting. When they did appear, however, they spoke volumes.

As noted in chapter seven, Maynard was deeply embarrassed when Fanny

---

<sup>52</sup> Ibid., 30 December 1923, 260.

<sup>53</sup> See Ibid., 18 July 1926, 95 on her admission of this. See above footnote, 48, and also Ibid., 4 August 1915, 77; Ibid., 23 April 1920, 112; and Ibid 30 October 1923, 256, on her persistent “encouraging” him to follow God and become His prophet. As noted earlier, there are a number of contemporary texts regarding the varying forms of harassment in relations of power. In this instance, see Tina Stephens, *Bullying and Sexual Harassment* (London: Institute of Personnel and Development, 2003); and also, Russell A. Sabella, *Confronting Sexual Harassment: Learning Activities for Teens* (Minneapolis: Educational Media Corporation, 1995).

discovered a copy of the sonnet that Lewis Campbell had sent to her in 1872. At that time, she had turned to culture and to faith to avoid confronting her guilt and confusion,<sup>54</sup> while adopting the double standard of sexual morality to condone his “sort of imaginative love” for her.<sup>55</sup> Nonetheless, Maynard felt very guilty about the event. She made great efforts to excuse her own and Lewis’ behaviour in 1872 and in 1880, by accusing Fanny of failing to meet his emotional and intellectual needs. Nonetheless, her Green-book also admitted that “Fanny knew the full meaning of the sonnet.” Maynard did not elaborate on this statement, but Fanny may have been far more “faithful” with her acceptance of Lewis’ “little ways” than Constance was.<sup>56</sup>

Maynard’s ruminations about Louisa Lumsden reflected the intensity of their relationship that had centred on passion, ambition and faith. Although no records mention Lumsden at length during the 1880s and 1890s, her visits as guest speaker to Westfield in 1912 and 1913 apparently rekindled old flames. For example, after listening to Lumsden’s “really fierce lecture on Homer,” her old love exclaimed, “The magnificent intonation with which she read her extracts I can hardly describe!”<sup>57</sup> Lumsden’s visit also

---

<sup>54</sup> Ibid., 12 May 1871, 78.

<sup>55</sup> Ibid. She also noted this in her *A* as well. See *A*, VI, 39, “1880,” 24, written in 1921. See also Smith-Rosenberg’s “The Female World;” Faderman’s *Surpassing Love of Men* and her *Odd Girls*; and Sahli’s “Smashing,” on married women’s romantic friendship.

<sup>56</sup> Ibid., 17 April 1914, 224-25. See Gorham, *Victorian Girl*, 23-40; Tosh, *Man’s Place*, 66-78; Walkowitz, *Prostitution and Victorian Society*; and Mort, *Dangerous Sexualities*, 66-90 on Victorian sex discourses.

<sup>57</sup> *GB*, 22 November 1910, 161.

enabled Maynard to confront her about past issues:

She [L] spoke of how a friendship like ours had endured for forty years, and shall stand to the end. But her wrong can be seen in the mistakes she made at St. Leonards as Headmistress. I told her that she had never called staff meetings, had never consulted us, and never been anything but a tyrant. The sad part was that she didn't realize any of this injustice as I or her other friends did.<sup>58</sup>

Their disagreements over religion had surfaced the following year. Maynard had questioned her own beliefs and values when her relationships with Gray and Wakefield fell apart, but she was not about to admit this to Lumsden:

She told me that my views on sentiment were ridiculous. 'What does attending the theatre have to do with faith?' she said. I said, 'I always did believe in the Cloister, and I still do. I don't mean mortar and bricks, but the Cloister of self-discipline and restraint, and of voluntary self-denial.'<sup>59</sup>

Ambition versus passion versus faith. Power issues continued to underlie Maynard's remembrance of the past, and powerfully coloured her feelings for Lumsden. Maynard saw little of her after 1913. But an entry in 1935, written shortly before Maynard's death, is telling: "That she [Louisa] loved me sincerely there is no doubt. Yet she remains the most *pathetic* figure my life contains because there is no hope for her religiously. I left her 45 years ago!"<sup>60</sup>

The entries concerning Maynard's interactions with Anne Richardson also ponder

---

<sup>58</sup> Ibid., 24 December 1912, 99.

<sup>59</sup> Ibid., 16 October 1913, 161.

<sup>60</sup> She mentioned Lumsden's visit twice to the Sundial in the early 1920s, noting each time that "L seemed gentler than of past." See *Sundial*, 8 June 1922, 66; and Ibid., 23 March 1925, 78. In her *GB*, 8 February 1935, 255, she noted: "She is still alive at 92, but I know almost nothing of her this past 45 years."

their long and complicated relationship. Upon retiring from Westfield in 1913 Maynard had noted:

It is over. Whatever she may do, 'there is none like her, none.' Her approbation is so noble, her criticism so crushing, her love so sweet. For 30 years my life has been saturated with her, as these books shew, and now this is the end, the very end.<sup>61</sup>

At the time, Richardson was too consumed with Eleanor McDougall's loss of the Mistress-ship to pay Maynard much heed. She subsequently was soon besotted with Westfield's new Mistress, Agnes de Selincourt. Agnes' untimely death in 1917 left Nannie once again "suffering with grief" over the loss of a love and leader. Her impassioned outburst to Constance, "Agnes was just beginning to reap some fruit from her *magnificent* years of work for college," needless to say, caused outrage and jealousy for the latter.<sup>62</sup>

Richardson became "Acting Principal" (1917-19) until Bertha Phillipots' reign (1919-21). Gray's chilling admonition to Maynard in 1917, "You can do nothing. It is better that *Anne* takes control for now," was designed to stop her from even thinking of interfering.<sup>63</sup> Richardson supported Westfield's "moving with the times" under, first,

---

<sup>61</sup> *GB*, 22 June 1913, 89. She wrote here, "Nannie thrust a little note into my hand which said, 'my beloved Constance, you'll know something of all I should love to say - and can't! The bonds between us can never be broken. Yours always A'."

<sup>62</sup> *Ibid.*, 4 September 1917, 70. Maynard continually criticized "Agnes' society ways" and seemed jealous of what she called "Nannie's misplaced love for Agnes." See also *Ibid.*, 6 March 1914, 92 and *Ibid.*, 20 November 1916, 123.

<sup>63</sup> *Ibid.*, 4 September 1917, 75.



Phillipots' and, second, Eleanor Lodge's (1921-1931) more secularist approaches.<sup>64</sup> On the one hand, Richardson's progressive attitude had made her "a most successful" pioneer, Maynard believed. On the other hand, her being "more 'hardened'" than pioneers like herself also left Richardson brutally insensitive, as far as Maynard was concerned.

I went to Westfield's first commemorative day. I find it strange that the history of the college, exactly 40 years, had no mention of me at all. There was ovation for Miss Phillipots, and another to Miss Lodge, who has one year. Yet I, who had 31 years, sat there unnoticed among the audience. This is Anne's doing and I have to accept that her judgment is right....All I can do is hide any pain she gives me, but like a physical blow, she goes on hurting me until I feel quite weary of feeling bruised and sore.<sup>65</sup>

This slight may or may not have been Richardson's actual doing, but its attribution revealed her continued impact upon Maynard on both a professional and personal level.

Nonetheless, behind Richardson's effectiveness as leader and, according to Maynard, her callousness, lay the influence of culture. Indeed, her formula for success was arguably as "femininely" specific as Maynard's was, since it depended upon her ruling backstage for her adored one. This left her as equally vulnerable, and perhaps even more so. Nannie was never close to Lodge, and so when passion and ambition fell apart, she headed towards her third and most devastating breakdown, and was forced to retire in 1925.<sup>66</sup> Certainly, Richardson was remembered by colleagues and students "as a fine

---

<sup>64</sup> Ibid., 25 April 1924, 2; Ibid., 23 June 1929, 160. See also Sondheimer, *Castle Adamant*, 76-92 on Nannie's important role; and Carus-Wilson, ed., *Westfield College*, 43.

<sup>65</sup> *GB*, 17 June 1922, 187.

<sup>66</sup> *GB*, 8 February 1924, 123; also Vicinus, "One Life," 621. As Constance noted quite nastily of Richardson's plight five years later in her *GB*, 15 December 1930, 182, "There is strong Anne, under whose influence I lived, and under whom I had to

lecturer and vice principal who had a good presence at Westfield.”<sup>67</sup> Even so, like Maynard, she appeared to suffer from immense personal conflicts in her negotiation between the public and private spheres.

Ambition, passion and faith remained core to Maynard’s understanding of her relationship with Ralph Gray. In 1901, Gray returned from St. Andrews to take over what became a very successful girls’ school in London named St. Paul’s. Similarly to Holloway, St. Paul’s was a grand venture with its “marble floors, lofty rooms, solid oak doors, electric fans and lights, and fire escapes.” By 1907, “everything was ‘turning to gold’ in Ralph’s hands” with over 200 students enrolled. Rather like Gray’s short reign as House Mistress at Kidderpore in 1891, the atmosphere at St. Paul’s under her leadership was relaxed yet “lavish,” and seemingly a point of envy for Maynard.<sup>68</sup> She never ceased to support Gray, however, and Gray’s appreciation of Maynard’s loyalty appears to have drawn them closer in later years. She helped Constance to select her retirement cottage site in Little Bookham in 1910; she requested “that the original part of Westfield be named ‘the Maynard wing’” out of respect for Maynard’s long reign;<sup>69</sup> and she was an

---

accommodate my emotional artistic nature, - there she is, more than six years past, - the hopeless mental invalid, sane and yet with her judgment gone and power of thought.”

<sup>67</sup> See Biss, *Reminiscences*, 32; Moy-Evans to Janet Sondheimer, 3 February 1976; Sondheimer, *Castle Adamant*, 102; *Westfield Register*, 66; *College Alumnae, Reminiscences*, and *Minutes*, 9 October 1925, 465.

<sup>68</sup> *D*, 4 November 1901, 98; also *GB*, 15 July 1907, 92; and for Gray’s own account see, *Gladly*.

<sup>69</sup> According to the *GB*, 23 June 1929, 160, Ralph told Constance: “I have only known few people in my life who are quite magnanimous, and you are one of them.” Firth concurred with this, pointing out how “those who had caused [Constance] hurt,

occasional guest at the Sundial throughout the 1920s and 1930s. “She is the only one I ask to come down by herself from Friday to Monday,” Constance wrote.<sup>70</sup>

However, Ralph maintained an emotional distance from the adoring Constance, to whom *she* remained “nothing short of beautiful”:

For Ralph it was real love, for my soul was thirsty. It was the old, old story of Troy, besieged for ten years, betrayed, sacked, burned, enduring the very worst, yet content as long as Helen was within its walls. Some of it I suppose was actual sin, but mostly it was immaturity, ignorance, blunder. Fool that I was, I was irresponsible and hurt nobody but myself. I look on myself with the most profound compassion.<sup>71</sup>

Again in 1934:

Ralph and her sister came to see me. I think for the first time I felt how utterly and entirely lost were those years of love long ago. I looked into her dear calm face with equal calmness, and it was as though all the heart breaking longing I had bestowed on her had happened to someone else. What a strange thing is life! All gone, all over and done.<sup>72</sup>

But it was never “quite done” for either Constance or Ralph. “Ralph doesn’t want my verses!” Constance exclaimed in her Diary, ten days before her death. The verses she was referring to included love poems that were probably written for Ralph.<sup>73</sup> Until the end, it seemed, Gray was quick to reject any of Maynard’s overtures of love.

When comparing all of Maynard’s relationships with each other, Green-book

---

could, if they wished, turn back to her with a perfect confidence.” See Firth, *Maynard*, 342.

<sup>70</sup> *D*, 28 August 1924, 88.

<sup>71</sup> *GB*, 30 December 1923, 260-61.

<sup>72</sup> *Ibid.*, 30 January 1934, 255.

<sup>73</sup> *D*, 4 February 1935, 123.

entries concerning Marion and Effie evinced the most shame, sadness and loss. As noted in chapters eight and nine, by the early 1900s Maynard was losing patience with Effie. Her attitude, though derived from her disappointment about Effie's ongoing deceit, remained coloured by her class-based values and religious ideals. After 1910, according to the Green-book and Diary, she only saw Effie about once a year.<sup>74</sup> This did not appear to change in 1914 when it became clear that Effie was terminally ill with tuberculosis. Maynard, true to form, wavered between feeling revulsion and pity for Effie's "prolonged physical suffering." Her comment, "I always send Effie thirty shillings each month despite her rudeness and inconsideration," confirmed the estrangement between them. Effie, evidently, took Maynard's financial help but kept her uninformed about her life.<sup>75</sup> Was any blame for this arguably more on Maynard's side, with her ongoing poor treatment of Effie?

In 1915, Maynard noted, "Two most kind ladies are paying for Effie's care at a Home for Incurables due to lies she has been telling them about being financially destitute."<sup>76</sup> Whether Maynard offered to pay for Effie's medical care, or even spend more time with her, is unclear, but it seems doubtful. In September Effie became too ill for private care and was moved to an infirmary. Maynard mentioned a visit to Effie on

---

<sup>74</sup> See *GB*, 12 February 1910, 76; *D*, 7 March 1913, 109; *D*, 12 June 1914, 32. Firth also seemed to draw this conclusion, although she did not directly speak about it. See Firth, *Maynard*, 243-45; also, Walker, *Devil's Kingdom*, 145-53.

<sup>75</sup> In her *D*, 12 October 1912, 26, she lamented, "all I ever get is a few scrambled words of its [the money] safe arrival." See also Firth, *Maynard*, 244.

<sup>76</sup> *GB*, 13 September 1915, 99.

November 12<sup>th</sup> after “being told that she was much worse”:

I went through two wards, and then entered a smaller one with only five beds, and there, in a good quiet place against the wall behind the door, was Effie. Should I have known her? I think not. For 45 minutes I was alone with her. She did not look at me or speak.<sup>77</sup>

A Green-book entry written three days after Effie’s death on November 15<sup>th</sup> is telling:

“Forgive me Effie, forgive me, darling. I gave you much, much, but I withheld what you wanted, real intimate undying love. I do not wonder that you sought it elsewhere.”<sup>78</sup> This was a sad end to a tragic relationship, indeed.

Marion’s particular journey through life was equally disappointing for Constance, creating an added sense of loss, sadness and guilt. In 1910, when Wakefield enrolled at East London College, Maynard was critical of her decision.

I fear she is in a worldly, frivolous atmosphere. She only spoke about dress, men and marriage. My poor child, I know that the usual feelings were missed out of her life and given to me, and no one can look at her lips in their heavy fulness and not be almost frightened by their weight of feeling, and this abstinence is now revenging itself. Her evangelical instincts are quite lost.<sup>79</sup>

Their mutual desire, Maynard now seemed to admit, had diverted Wakefield from heterosexual passion and, ultimately, from faith. Through this relationship, according to her Green-book at least, she struggled to understand her passion for women within the new twentieth-century discourses. In 1917 she wrote:

Marion left yesterday. When I think of what we had, I feel humiliated. I

---

<sup>77</sup> See Firth, *Maynard*, 245.

<sup>78</sup> *GB*, 18 November 1915, 315.

<sup>79</sup> *Ibid.*, 30 December 1910, 364.

misused passion, I made the white roses sent to me flush with threads in the heart.... Yet if Marion was still the same I would still love her; the skin, the tall frame, the splendid thick hair, the full lips and the white teeth -, all are only grievance landmarks of what is lost. I believe that the 'real bond' *was* spiritual. I always give thanks for what she once *was*, but she can't do that. She says that someday she'll have to tell me what her recent work really means to her, despite the fact that it would hurt me, and may not even succeed in getting her point of view across.<sup>80</sup>

While Constance clung to faith as a means of avoiding her guilt and confusion, Marion had turned instead towards the new studies in psychoanalysis. She became a Nietzschean, apparently telling a devastated Constance, "I have lived all my life under repression and tyranny, and so the charms of freedom and self-confidence are endless."<sup>81</sup> An "atoning" conscience was at the core of Nietzsche's rejection: "Dead are all Gods: Now we want, that the superman live—this should be, at the time of the great noon, *our* ultimate Will."<sup>82</sup> Thus, "the charms of freedom" for Marion meant the understanding of the self through culture rather than through faith. As Vicinus points out in "One Life," Marion could "have found no better way to hurt [Constance] than to deny her religion."<sup>83</sup> To this, I would add, she had found no better way than to deny the "purity" of their passion.

Did Wakefield share her thoughts at length with Maynard? Did Maynard question others about the new insights into the subconscious? Or did she take up the studies

---

<sup>80</sup> Ibid., 18 September 1917, 80.

<sup>81</sup> Ibid., 30 December 1920, 20.

<sup>82</sup> Translation taken from Leon Wurmster's "Nietzsche's War against Shame and Resentment," in *Scope of Shame*, eds., Lansky and Morrison, 181. Italics mine.

<sup>83</sup> Vicinus, "One Life," 620.

herself? As I have argued, this remains unclear. However, when comparing Maynard's autobiographical account written in 1915 with those written in 1925 and 1927, her language concerning same-sex passion appeared to have changed. In 1915, her depiction of her passion for her Belstead friend, Fanny Williams, was analysed more within the context of her mother's condemnation of sentiment: "I do not think it was a foolish affection, but it was discouraged by mother...."<sup>84</sup> However, when writing her Autobiography in 1925 she more strongly admitted to feeling "something uncomfortable about Amy's [Mantle's] passion" for her at Girton.<sup>85</sup>

In 1927, when Maynard was debating her "craving and loneliness" for Gray in her Autobiography, she was simultaneously re-considering the nature of her love for Wakefield in her Green-book:

Yesterday Marion came. The memories she wakes are overwhelming. For only a moment the door was opened between us, for the sight was too painful. I said, 'I suppose I missed my vocation, for I really was *too* lonely. It was a blank starvation for love. Oh, Marion, forgive!' She threw herself upon me, saying, 'how *can* you say that? Look at the good!' And then she looked up at me with tears on her cheeks. That was all. It was as if I dare not enter on those years of starvation and my reckless satisfying of it, nor on the yet more solemn subjects [of religion].<sup>86</sup>

In other words, while Maynard still alluded to the wrong of her passion in terms of faith, she was recognizing her desire as same-sex. However, we must not forget that she was writing of her "love" for Jim Gillett in her Green-book at this time. Raised in an era that

---

<sup>84</sup> *A*, I, 3, "1863-4," 41. See also Firth, *Maynard*, 70.

<sup>85</sup> *Ibid.*, III, 25, "1875," 387.

<sup>86</sup> *GB*, 25 April 1927, 102.

approved of college raves, Maynard viewed transgression largely in religious terms. She failed when human love took priority over divine. While she might justify her deeply passionate nature by telling herself that God had given her the power of human love, this binary held fast culturally for even a “deviant” relationship.

In some ways, Maynard’s training in Mental Philosophy at Girton had opened her up to ideas about the self and society. As she explained this in her Autobiography:

I still believe that besides the Intellect and Feeling, there is in me a mere unanalysable point. It is a thread slight indeed, and yet just of sufficient strength to urge the Will on over the dark empty spaces that intervene.<sup>87</sup>

This interesting comment reveals how Maynard, not unlike recent post-structuralist theorists, found ways to conceptualize how the self navigates culture.<sup>88</sup> In short, her views on behaviour lend more insight into her complex concept of desire as His will. Not surprisingly, perhaps, her understanding of desire and its perils did not leave her open to the new ideas surrounding psychosexual development.

Nonetheless, as we have seen, the new theories did appear to have connoted a psychopathology that did not resonate easily with her experience of loving women (or

---

<sup>87</sup> See A, III, 24, “1874,” 345. One can see the influence of her upbringing in her reasoning through ideas about the “will.” She wrote here, “Read Mill - triumph of reason over consciousness. Then I was led by Kant’s, ‘I am, I ought, I can, I will,’ - world as subject to strict Causation. But what determines the Will? It *cannot* start off without some ground, the reasonable basis of faith and obedience. Yet as we force it to out run Feeling, so can we also force it to out run Intellect, and act on a sort of conviction of truth in the past, or on evidence of present instances, combined with a hope that both Intellect and Feeling may yet again become present and personal and living.”

<sup>88</sup> See Butler, *Gender Trouble*, 13-14; Sedgwick, *Epistemology of Closet*, 44; Fuss, *Essentially Speaking*, 103-4; Rich, “Compulsory Heterosexuality,” 631-790; and Colker, *Hybrid and Other Misfits*.



Gillet, I suggest). Contemporary scholars continue to adopt and to refine Freud's biology-based theory in spite of its sexist and arguably homophobic history of psychoanalysis, and so, it must still offer important insight into both past and present experiences.<sup>89</sup>

Maynard's struggle, therefore, was understandable.

In 1935, shortly before her death on March 26<sup>th</sup>, Maynard turned Green-book upon Autobiography as a means of self-chastisement. Once again, we glean insight into the influence that changing ideas about sex were continuing to have upon her:

I have taken my autobiography written between 1915 and 1927, and carefully read most of it. Some of it is very striking with its spiritual adventures. Then I look at page after page of sadness....How can you feel satisfied when you are walking across a rope of doubt? I look at myself with sincerest pity. I entered the Cloister voluntarily...,but my heart would not follow. Yet God himself has written, 'it is not good a man should be alone.' I do not understand why this actual starving for human love should lead to negligence and sin, but it did so lead me, and as I pursue the track, I see lost and waste and confusion around me. I failed in prayer, I sinned in secret, and I can but ask for pardon from beginning to end.<sup>90</sup>

As noted in chapter one, her earlier autobiographical account, including that written in 1927, disturbed Maynard in the wake of the infiltration of discourses on the subconscious in British society in the 1930s.<sup>91</sup> In another Green-book entry, which Maynard wrote around the same time, she claimed that she had "ruined" her important role as an educator

---

<sup>89</sup> On this see Willis, *No Nice Girls*, 12; Kaplan, *Female Perversions*, 33; Phelan, *Mourning Sex*, 23-40; de Lauretis, "Freud, Sexuality;" Meltzer, ed., *Trial(s) of Psychoanalysis Also Weeks'*, *Coming Out and Against Nature*; Jeffreys, *Spinster and Enemies*; Eagle Russet, *Sexual Science*.

<sup>90</sup> GB, 18 March 1935, 268.

<sup>91</sup> As noted in chapter three, in *Facts of Life*, Porter and Hall argue that British reaction to Krafft-Ebing's *Psychopathia* was still one of scepticism in 1902. Nor was Freud discussed much beyond medical and intellectual circles until at least a decade later.

and prophet by “falling in love.” This “was wrong, yes, *all* wrong,” she exclaimed.<sup>92</sup>

Certainly, Constance had genuflected about her passion for college women from the 1870s onwards in her Green-book. While she had justified her desire within the context of faith, the record also suggested that she was troubled by carnal intimacies that had surpassed the spiritual merging that was her ideal. Nevertheless, she continued to engage in physical relationships with women, at the same time as having a brief encounter with Lewis Campbell in 1881. She then wrote about being cautioned by Nannie and others against the “something wrong” in her passionate relationships at Westfield in 1884. However, she also viewed her physical needs as something “deeply rooted in her and difficult to resist,”<sup>93</sup> and so she continued to explore and to express her physical passion with peers and students until she retired.

While obviously troubled by the language of psychoanalysis in the 1920s and 1930s, Maynard did not embrace the modern sexual terms even at the end of her life. Would she have offered Gray her love poems if she felt that they had a lesbian context? It seems doubtful in light of her upbringing and cultural context. She had no means of understanding her lifestyle choice as a cover for her sexual orientation, as it became for twentieth-century lesbian women. We will thus conclude that her understanding of her sexuality was uniquely different from that of the following generation, and that her complex binary permitted her to behave in special ways with her passion for both men

---

<sup>92</sup> *GB* 8 February 1935, 255. See footnote 106, chapter one, for more detail on this.

<sup>93</sup> *Ibid.*, 1 April 1884, 98

and women, despite her guilt and confusion.

In her Autobiography, Maynard implied that she had come to view her evangelical/puritan upbringing as having created “abnormal” forms of asceticism within her.<sup>94</sup> Did the new studies on psychosexual development alter her views of faith? Did she associate her acts of atoning for worldliness with Freud’s or others’ view of sadomasochism as a form of moral self-righteousness? Or did she view her impulses as corrupted by social inequality and religious-based coercion?<sup>95</sup> Her comment, “Often I have talked about self denial...It is not voluntary, I would break it if I could,”<sup>96</sup> suggests that on some level she did. Nonetheless, Maynard’s either exaggerated, or overly imagined, or even privately relished concepts of pain and suffering were not so atypical in terms of early Victorian evangelical thought, in particular, or of historical Western Christian culture, in general. As Constance herself warned us at the end of her Autobiography, the danger lies in allowing the behaviour to get out of control: “I could spend hours of resentment and tears recalling ‘pain’s most cruel sawing.’ I felt it to the

---

<sup>94</sup> *A*, I, 3, “1863-4,” 41. See also Stachniecowski, *Prosecutory Imagination*, 59-60 and Starbuck, *Psychology of Religion*, on this.

<sup>95</sup> See Sigmund Freud, *Works of Freud*, trans., James Strachey (London: Hogarth Press, 1978); also Badcock, *Essential Freud*, 74-76; and de Lauretis, “Freud, Sexuality,” 216-34. As noted earlier, Freud introduced the idea of sado-masochism as two forms of the same entity. I also argue that Freud’s view of masochism as a form of moral self-righteousness could explain Maynard’s life-long commitment to religious duty, which influenced her relationships.

<sup>96</sup> *GB*, 22 May 1905, 92.

extreme and let it ruin my life for years.”<sup>97</sup>

I suspect that Maynard yearned for a world that was ceasing to exist, one in which neither labels nor stigma surrounded women’s passionate relationships. For Maynard, romantic love was about emotional communication and the specialness of the other, and carried with it the hope of intimacy. It was a moral and emotional conjunction, and perhaps she wished to give us a glimpse of that world. After all, as she asserted in her Green-book, “What I share with other’s must be shared and not hidden here.”<sup>98</sup> The pages of that record have indeed revealed the intensity of her relationships, as this study has shown. To contemporary feminists, who value our own historically-constructed ideal of openly sexual categories, Maynard’s retreat into faith to explain desire perhaps now seems unprogressive. However, if we are serious about the scholarly enterprise of recognizing women’s historical agency, we have to be willing to try to understand the beliefs and behaviours outside the so-called “progressive” narrative that prescribes the categories of sexual orientation or supposed sadomasochistic tendencies.

For complex reasons then, I think that historians must be careful not to utilize a modern identity to categorize a historical one, and possibly even worse, to classify a

---

<sup>97</sup> *A*, VII, 62, “1899,” 367. Also Bullough, Dixon and Dixon, “Sadism, Masochism,” 49, 63-82. As noted in chapter three, the authors propose that Christology has long made the Western world prone to inculcating a wide variety of sadistic and masochistic-like behaviours long before they were classified by Victorian sexologists. Because Jesus suffered on the cross, many Christians believed that through suffering they would achieve salvation sooner, or salvation itself.

<sup>98</sup> *GB*, 1 January 1905, 1.

woman as lesbian when she had physical attractions for both men and women.<sup>99</sup> The Green-book, Diary and Autobiography of Constance Louisa Maynard present the unique ways in which a genteel Victorian woman sought to construct an identity in keeping with her desires. Her search for love with an “equal” partner had a promise for her of equalities in their emotions, intellect, values and class, but within the complex of her partly contradictory ideals, each of her relationships ultimately materialized with one inequality or another in these.<sup>100</sup> A single case study does not reveal the differing ways in which Victorian women reconciled passion and ambition within the context of faith. However, Maynard’s life-story certainly raises new issues about power, faith and ambition, and new questions about Victorian sexuality.

---

<sup>99</sup> See Phipps, “Symbolic Body,” 163-74. As noted in chapter three, this has been the case with Eliza Lynn Linton—I argued against Fix Anderson’s, *Woman Against Women* and Meem’s, “Linton and Rise of Lesbian Consciousness.” I can not but help wonder if Maynard would be similarly classified as lesbian, if others were to write about her life.

<sup>100</sup> On the complexity of intimacy see Giddens, *Transformation of Intimacy*. He argues that most individuals, past and present, are subject to the rule of patriarchy in complex ways, and that this gives rise to inequality in most relationships.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

### Unpublished Primary Sources:

Boeke née Cadbury, Beatrice, to Janet Sondheimer, April 1974, Ms. 213. Special Collections, Queen Mary and Westfield College Archives, London.

*Girton College Register, 1869-1946*. Special Collections, Girton College Archives, Cambridge.

*Girton Review, 1875-1881*. Special Collections, Girton College Archives, Cambridge.

King, Mary. "Reminiscences of the Henry Maynard family, 1837-1901," in Maynard, ed., *Unpublished Autobiography*. Special Collections, Queen Mary and Westfield College Archives, London: 24-33.

Maynard, Constance Louisa. *Green Books, 1866-1935*. Special Collections, Queen Mary and Westfield College Archives, London; (copies of Maynard's unpublished personal documents are also available on microfilm at Wayne State University, Detroit, Michigan and the University of Toronto, Toronto, Ontario).

----- Dairy, 1886-1935. Special Collections, Queen Mary and Westfield College Archives, London.

----- Sundial Dairy, 1913-1935. Special Collections, Queen Mary and Westfield College Archives, London.

----- Unpublished Autobiography, 1915-1927. Special Collections, Queen Mary and Westfield College Archives, London.

----- Life of Stephane: 1888-1915, vols. I-VI. Special Collections, Queen Mary and Westfield College Archives, London.

----- Last Will and Testament, 1910. Special Collections, Queen Mary and Westfield College Archives, London.

----- "The Inception of Westfield College." Special Collections, Queen Mary and Westfield College Archives, London, 1881.

----- Budget Letters, 1887-1899. Special Collections, Queen Mary and Westfield College Archives, London.

- Lumsden Louisa, to Constance Maynard, 14 December 1875, Ms. 312. Special Collections, Queen Mary and Westfield College Archives.
- Moy-Evans, June, to Janet Sondheimer, 3 February 1976, Ms. 215. Special Collections, Queen Mary and Westfield College Archives, London.
- Minutes of Council*. Special Collections, Queen Mary and Westfield College Archives, London.
- Richardson, Anne W. "Notes on the history of Westfield College up to 1913." Special Collections, Queen Mary and Westfield College Archives, London: 1-23.
- Westfield College Register*. Special Collections, Queen Mary and Westfield College Archives, London.
- Westfield College Alumnae, Reminiscences and Memorabilia*. Special Collections, Queen Mary and Westfield College Archives, London.

**Primary Sources:**

- Abbott, Jacob. *The Mother at Home: Or the Principle of Maternal Duty*. London: Longmans Green, 1935.
- Bateson, Margaret. *Professional Women Upon Their Professions*. London: Horax Cox, 1895.
- Biss, Irene. *Reminiscences 1907- 1911*. London: Hodder, 1921.
- Bremner, C. S. *The Education of Girls and Women in Great Britain*. London: Swan Sonnenschein, 1897.
- Buckler, Georgina. *Diaries of Georgina Buckler 1889-91*. London: Blackwood, 1927.
- Burstall, Sara. *Retrospect and Prospect: Sixty Years of Women's Education*. London: Longmans Green, 1933.
- , *English High Schools for Girls*. London: Longmans Green, 1907.
- Bussy, D. S. *Olivia*. London: The Hogarth Press, 1949.
- Butler, Joseph. *Fifteen Sermons: Preached at the Rolls Chapel and a Dissertation Upon the Nature of Virtue*. London: Morgan and Scott, 1914. Reprint, London: Bell, 1958.

- Butler, A. *Butler's Lives of the Saints*, ed., revised and supplemented by Herbert Thurston and Donald Attwater, 4 vols. Montreal: Palm Publishers, 1956. Reprint, New York: R. J. Kennedy and Sons, 1962.
- Butts, Mary. *The Crystal Cabinet*. London: Hodder, 1937.
- Cavendish, Caroline. *Aims for Women's Higher Education*. London: Simmons and Botten, 1881.
- Clarke, Edward. *Sex in Education*. Boston: James Osgood, 1873.
- Cobbe, Frances Power. *The Duties of Women: A Course of Lectures*. Boston: George Ellis, 1882.
- Collet, Clara E. *Educated Working Women: Essays on the Economic Position of Women Workers in the Middle Classes*. London: P. S. King, 1902.
- Craik, Dinah Mulock. *A Woman's Thoughts About Women*. London: Hurst and Blackett, 1858.
- Davies, Emily. *Thoughts on Some Questions Relating to Women, 1860-1908*. Cambridge: Bowes and Bowes, 1910. Reprint, New York: Kraus, 1971.
- Dove, Jane Frances. *Work and Play in Girls' Schools*. London: Hodder, 1901.
- Ellis, Havelock. *Sexual Inversion, Studies in the Psychology of Sex Volume II*, 3rd ed. Philadelphia: F. A. Davies, 1915.
- Ellis Mrs. [Sarah Stickney]. *The Daughters of England. Their Position in Society, Character and Responsibilities*. London: Fisher, 1843.
- , *The Women of England: Their Social Duties and Domestic Habits*. New York: J. and H. Langley, 1843.
- Faithfull, Lillian. *How Shall I Educate My Daughters?* London: Victoria Press, 1863.
- , *You And I: Saturday Talks At Cheltenham*. London: Chatto and Windus, 1927.
- Fleming, James. *The Life and Writings of the Rev. Edward Irving*. London: Marshall, 1823.
- Emily Gibson. *Some Memories for her Friends*. London: Hodder, 1903.



- Gray, Frances Ralph. *Gladly, Gladly*. London: Hodder, 1923.
- Greg, W. R. *Literary and Social Judgements*. London: Trubner, 1868.
- Hodder, Edwin. *The Seventh Earl of Shaftesbury, K. G., as Social Reformer*. Chicago: Fleming H. Revell, 1886.
- *The Life and Work of the Seventh Earl of Shaftesbury, K. G.*, vols. 1-3. Shannon: Irish University Press, 1886.
- Krafft-Ebing, Richard von. *Psychopathia Sexualis: With Especial Reference to the Antipathetic Sexual Instinct. A Medico-Forensic Study*, 12th ed. Translated by F. J. Rebman. Philadelphia: F. A. Davies, 1933.
- Law, William. *A Serious Call to a Devout and Holy Life: The Spirit of Love*. New York: Paulist Press, 1878.
- Lawrence, D. H. *The Rainbow*. London: Marshall Bros., 1915. Reprint, London: Penguin Books, 1987.
- Layard, George Somes. *Mrs. Lynn Linton: Her Life, Letters, and Opinions*. London: Methuen, 1901.
- Lehmann, Rosamond. *Dusty Answer*. New York: Grosset and Dunlap, 1927.
- Linton, Eliza Lynn. *The Autobiography of Christopher Kirkland*. 3 vols. London: Hodder, 1885. Reprint, London: Garland, 1976.
- List, Brenda F. *Girton, My Friend and other Matters in Prose and Verse*. Cambridge: W. Heffer, 1908.
- Lloyd, Anna. *A Memoir: With Extracts from her Letters*. London: The Cayme Press Ltd, 1928.
- Lumsden, Louisa Innes. *Yellow Leaves: Memories of a Long Life*. Edinburgh: William Blackwood, 1933.
- M. E. T. *An Interior of Girton College, Cambridge*. London: London Association of Schoolmistresses, 1876.
- Maynard, Constance Louisa. *Between College Terms*. London: James Nisbet, 1910.
- *An Alpine Meadow*. London: Oliphant, Anderson and Ferrin, 1912.

- . *The Perfect Law of Liberty*. London: Religious Tract Society, 1913.
- . *We Women: A Golden Hope*. London: Morgan and Scott, 1913.
- . *The Threefold Revelation*. London: Religious Tract Society, 1913.
- . *The Prophet Daniel & Other Essays*. London: Morgan and Scott, 1914.
- . *The Cultivation of the Intellect*. London: Westfield College, 1888.
- . *The Four Aristocracies & Other Papers*. London: Marshall Bros., 1915
- . *The Carpenters Tools*. London: Marshall Bros., 1915.
- . *A True Mother*. London: Marshall Bros., 1916.
- . *Then Shall We Know*. London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1926.
- . *The Life of Dora Greenwell*. London: H. R. Allenson, 1926.
- Mill, John Stuart. *The Subjection of Women*. London: Fisher, 1869. Reprint, Cambridge: MIT Press, 1970.
- Paley, William. *Evidences of Christianity*. New York: King, 1824.
- Robbins, Elizabeth. *In Defence of the Militants*. London: Women's Social and Political Union, 1912.
- Roe, Mrs. *A Woman's Thoughts on the Education of Girls*. London: Fisher, 1866.
- Rowntree, Benjamin Seebohm. *Poverty and the Welfare State: A third social survey of York dealing only with economic questions*. London: Hodder, 1901. Reprint, London: Longmans Green, 1951.
- Saunders, Frederick. *About Women, Love and Marriage*. London: Hodder, 1868.
- Sewell, Elizabeth. *Principles of Education, Drawn from Nature and Revelation, and Applied to Female Education in the Upper Classes*. New York: D. Appleton, 1871.
- Soulsby, L. H. M. *Stray Thoughts for Mothers and Teachers*. London: Longmans Green, 1897.
- Starbuck, Edwin. *The Psychology of Religion: An Empirical Study of the Growth of*

*Religious Consciousness*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1899.

Strachey, Ray. *'The Cause': A Short History of the Woman's Movement in Great Britain*. London: H. R. Allenson, 1928. Reprint, Port Washington: Kennikat Press, 1969.

Stronach, Alice. *A Newnham Friendship*. London: Blackie and Son, 1901.

Townsend, Emily. *Memories for Friends*. London: Curwen Press, 1936.

Zimmern, Alice. *The Renaissance of Girls' Education in England: A Record of Fifty Years' Progress*. London: A. D. Innes, 1898.

### **Primary Sources: Selected Articles**

Anderson, Elizabeth Garrett. "Sex in Mind and Education: A Reply." *Fortnightly Review* 21 (1874): 582-94.

Fitch, J. G. "Women and the Universities." *Contemporary Review* 58 (1890): 333-54.

"Girls Schools with Special Regard to Salaries of Head Mistresses as Recommended by the Endowed Schools Commission," *Journal of the Women's Education Union* IV (1876): 96.

Hall, G. Stanley. "A Study of Anger." *American Journal of Psychology* 10 (April 1899): 560-79.

Irving, Edward. "On the humanity of Christ." *Morning Watch*, 1 (1829): 421-45.

Linton, Eliza Lynn. "The Girl of the Period." *Saturday Review* (1868): 2-24.

Maitland, Agnes, "The Student Life of Women in Halls of Residence" in *National Union of Women Workers Report for 1894*. London: National Union of Women Workers, (1894): 100.

Maudsley, Henry. "Sex in Mind and in Education." *Fortnightly Review* 15 (1874): 466-83.

Maynard, Constance. "From Early Victorian Schoolroom to University: Some Personal Experiences." *Nineteenth Century* 76 (1914): 106-89.

Simcox Edith. "The Capacity of Women." *Nineteenth Century* 22 (1887): 391-402.

**Secondary Sources:**

Abrams, Dominic and Michael Hoss. *Social Identity Theory: Constructing Critical Advances*. New York: Springer-Verlag, 1990.

Adamson, J. H. *English Education: 1789-1902*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1964.

Addinall, Peter. *Philosophy and Biblical Interpretation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991.

Anderson, Patricia. *When Passion Reigned*. New York: Basic Books, 1995.

Anderson Fix, Nancy. *Woman Against Women in Victorian England*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1987.

Andre, Godin. *The Psychological Dynamics of Religious Experience*. Birmingham: Religious Education Press, 1996.

Arnason, H. H. *History of Modern Art*. New York: Abrams, 1979.

Badcock, Christopher. *Essential Freud*. Cambridge: Blackwell, 1992.

Bebbington, D. W. *Evangelicalism in Modern Britain: A History from the 1730s to the 1980s*. Grand Rapids: Baker Books, 1989.

Behlmer, George K. *Friends of the Family: The English Home and Its Guardians, 1850-1940*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1998.

Bell, Rudolf. *Holy Anorexia*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1985.

Bell, Susan Groag and Marilyn Yalom, eds. *Revealing Lives: Autobiography, Biography and Gender*. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1990.

Bellot, H. *University College, London, 1826-1926*. London: Constable, 1929.

Best, Geoffrey. *Mid-Victorian Britain, 1851-1875*. New York: Schocken Books, 1975.

Bland, Lucy. *Banishing the Beast: English Feminism and Sexual Morality, 1885-1914*. London: Penguin, 1997.

Bland, Lucy and Laura Doan, eds. *Sexology in Culture: Labelling Bodies and Desires*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1998.

- Boswell, John. *Christianity, Social Tolerance and Homosexuality*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1980.
- Boutilier, Beverly and Alison Prentice, eds. *Creating Historical Memory: English-Canadian Women and the Work of History*. Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, 1997.
- Bowerman, Elsie. *Stands There a School: Memories of Dame Francis Dove, Founder of Wycombe Abbey School*. Brighton: Wycombe Abbey School Seniors, 1965.
- Bradbrook, M.C. *That Infidel Place*. London: Chatto and Windus, 1969.
- Bray, Alan. *Homosexuality in Renaissance England*. London: Routledge, 1982.
- Brennan, Teresa. *The Interpretation of the Flesh: Freud and Femininity*. London: Routledge, 1992.
- Briggs, Asa. *The Age of Improvement*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1979.
- Bristow, Edward J. *Vice and Vigilance: Purity Movements in Britain since 1700*. Dublin: Gill and Macmillan, 1972.
- Brodozki, Bella and Celeste Schenck. *Life/Lines Theorizing Women's Autobiography*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1988.
- Brooke, John Hedley. *Science and Religion: Some Historical Perspectives*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991.
- Brown, Judith C. *Immodest Acts: The Life of a Lesbian Nun in Renaissance Italy*. New York: Routledge, 1986.
- Brumberg, Joan Jacobs. *Fasting Girls: The Emergence of Anorexia Nervosa as a Modern Disease*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1988.
- Bruss, Elizabeth. *Autobiographical Acts*. Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 1976.
- Bullough, Vern L. and Bonnie Bullough. *Cross Dressing, Sex, and Gender*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1993.
- Burstyn, Joan N. *Victorian Education and the Ideal of Womanhood*. London: Croom Helm, 1980.

- Butler, Lance St. John. *Victorian Doubt: Literacy and Cultural Discourses*. London: Harvester Wheatsheaf, 1990.
- Butler, Judith. *Gender Trouble*. New York: Routledge, Chapman and Hall, 1990.
- Bynum, Caroline Walker. *Holy Feast and Holy Fast: The Religious Significance of Food to Medieval Women*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1988.
- , *Fragmentation and Redemption: Essays on Gender and the Human Body in Medieval Religion*. New York: Zone Books, 1991.
- Byrnes, Joseph. *The Psychology of Religion*. New York: The Free Press, 1984.
- Caine, Barbara. *Destined To Be Wives*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1986.
- Caplan, Paula J. *The Myth of Women's Masochism*. New York: E. P. Dutton, 1985.
- Carroll, Bernice A., ed. *Liberating Women's History: Theoretical and Critical Essays*. New York: The Free Press, 1976.
- Carus-Wilson, Eleanor, ed. *Westfield College, University of London, 1882-1932*. London: Faval Press, 1932.
- Castle, Terry. *The Apparitional Lesbian*. New York: Routledge, 1993.
- Chauncey, George. *Gay New York: Gender, Urban Culture and the Makings of the Gay Male World, 1890-1940*. New York: Basic Books, 1994.
- Clark, Anna. *The Struggle for the Breeches: Gender and the Making of the British Working Class*. London: Routledge, 1995.
- Colby, Vineta. *Women Novelists of the Nineteenth Century*. New York: New York University Press, 1970.
- Colker, R. *Hybrid: Bisexuals, Multiracials, and Other Misfits under American Law*. New York: New York University Press, 1996.
- Collet, Clara. *Educated Working Women: Essays on the Economic Position of Women Workers in the Middle-Classes*. London: P. S. King, 1902.
- Collier, Richard. *The General Next to God*. London: Collins, 1965.
- Collinson, Patrick. *Godly People: Essays on English Protestantism and Puritanism*.

- London: Hambeldon Press, 1983.
- Cosslett, Tess. *Woman To Woman*. New Jersey: Humanities Press, 1988.
- Croon, Lynda L., ed. *That Gentle Strength: Historical Perspectives on Women in Christianity*. Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 1990.
- D'Emilio, John and Estelle Freedman. *Intimate Matters*. New York: Harper and Row Publishers, 1988.
- Dale, Peter Allen. *In Pursuit of Scientific Culture: Science, Art, and Society in the Victorian Age*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1989.
- Davidoff, Leonore and Catharine Hall. *Family Fortunes: Men and Women of the English Middle Class, 1780-1850*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1991.
- Davin, Anna. *Growing Up Poor: Home, School and Street in London 1870-1914*. London: Faber and Faber, 1996.
- Davis, Charles. *Body as Spirit*. New York: The Seabury Press, 1976.
- Daunton, Martin. *Progress and Poverty: An Economic and Social History of Britain, 1700-1850*. London: Routledge, 1995.
- De Lauretis, Teresa. *The Practice of Love: Lesbian Sexuality and Perverse Desire*. London: Macmillan, 1994.
- Diamond, Irene and Lee Quinby, eds. *Feminism and Foucault: Reflections on Resistance*. Boston: Northeastern University Press, 1988.
- Dollimore, Jonathon. *Sexual Dissidence: Augustine to Wilde, Freud to Foucault*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1991.
- Donogue, Emma. *Passions Between Women*. London: Harper Collins, 1993.
- Draznin, Yaffa Clare. *Victorian London's Middle-Class Housewife: What She Did All Day*. Connecticut: Greenwood Press, 2001.
- Duberman, Martin, Martha Vicinus and George Chauncey, eds. *Hidden From History: Reclaiming the Gay and Lesbian Past*. New York: Penguin, 1990.
- Dunn, James D. G. *Christology in the Making: An Inquiry into the Origins of the Doctrine of the Incarnation*. London: SCM Press, 1989.

- Dyhouse, Carol. *Girls Growing Up in Late Victorian and Edwardian England*. Boston: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1981.
- Dziech, Billie Wright. *The Lecherous Professor: Sexual Harassment on Campus*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1990.
- Eagle Russet, Cynthia. *Sexual Science: The Victorian Construction of Womanhood*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1989.
- Faderman, Lillian. *Surpassing the Love of Men: Romantic Friendship and Love between Women from the Renaissance to the Present*. New York: William Morrow, 1981.
- , *Odd Girls and Twilight Lovers: A History of Lesbian Life in Twentieth-Century America*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1991.
- Fausto-Sterling, Anne. *Myths of Gender: Biological Theories about Women and Men*. New York: Basic Books, 1992.
- Firth, Catherine B. *Constance Louisa Maynard: Mistress of Westfield College*. London: George Allen and Unwin, 1949.
- Fisher, Gina. *Sexual Harassment of Students in a University Setting*. Ottawa: National Library of Canada, 1989.
- Fletcher, Anthony. *Gender, Sex and Subordination in England, 1500-1800*. London: Routledge, 1995.
- Fletcher, Sheila. *Feminists and Bureaucrats: A Study in the Development of Girls' Education in the Nineteenth Century*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1980.
- Floud, R. and D. McClosky, eds. *The Economic History of Britain since 1700*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1994.
- Foucault, Michel. *The History of Sexuality, Volume 1: An Introduction*. Translated by Robert Hurley. New York: Pantheon Books, 1985.
- , *The History of Sexuality, Volume 2: The Use of Pleasure*. Translated by Robert Hurley. New York: Vintage Books, 1990.
- Franklin, Stephen T. *Speaking from the Depths*. Grand Rapids: William B. Erdman, 1990.
- Freud, Sigmund. *Works of Freud*. Translated by James Strachey. London: Hogarth Press,



1978.

----- . *The Standard Edition of the Complete Psychological Works of Sigmund Freud*. Translated by Alan Tyson. London: Hogarth Press, 1955.

----- . *Three Essays on the theory of Sexuality*. Translated by James Strachey. New York: Basic Books, 1962.

Frijda, Nico H. *The Emotions*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986.

Fuss, Diana. *Essentially Speaking*. New York: Routledge, 1989.

Gallop, Jane. *Feminist Accused of Sexual Harassment*. Durham: Public Planet Books, 1997.

Garber, Marjorie. *Bisexuality and the Eroticism of Everyday Life*. New York: Routledge, 2000.

Gay, Peter. *The Education of the Senses*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1984.

----- . *The Bourgeois Experience, Victoria to Freud*, vols. 1 and 2. New York: Oxford University Press, 1984.

Giddens, Anthony. *The Transformation of Intimacy*. Cambridge: Polity Press, 1992.

Gill, Robin. *The Myth of the Empty Church*. London: Macmillan, 1993.

Gill, Sean, ed. *The Lesbian and Gay Christian Movement: Campaigning for Justice, Truth, and Love*. London: Cassall, 1998.

Gilman, Sander L., Helen King, Roy Porter, George Rousseau and Elaine Showalter, eds. *Hysteria beyond Freud*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1993.

Glendinning, V. *A Suppressed Cry*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1969.

Godin, Andre. *The Psychological Dynamics of Religious Experience*. Birmingham: Religious Education Press, 1985.

Gorham, Deborah. *The Victorian Girl and the Feminine Ideal*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1982.

----- . *Vera Brittain: A Feminist Life*. Cambridge: Blackwell Publishing, 1996.

Grant, Julia M., Katherine H. McCutcheon, and Ethel F. Sanders. *St. Leonards School, 1877-1927*. London: Oxford University Press, 1927.

Griffiths, Paul. *What Emotions Really Are*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1997.

Haerberle, Erwin J. and Rolf Gindorf, eds. *Bisexualities: The Ideology and Practice of Sexual Contact with both Men and Women*. New York: Continuum, 1998.

Haight, Gordon. *George Eliot: A Biography*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1968.

Haller, John and Robin Haller. *The Physician and Sexuality in Victorian America*, Champaign-Urbana: The University of Illinois Press, 1974.

Halperin, David. *One Hundred Years of Homosexuality*. New York: Routledge, 1990.

Hamberger, Kevin K. and Claire M. Renzetti. *Domestic Partner Abuse*. New York: Springer Publications, 1996.

Hammerton, James. *Cruelty and Companionship: Conflict in Nineteenth-Century Married Life*. London: Routledge, 1992.

Hempton, David. *Religion and Political Culture in Britain and Ireland*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.

Heyck, T. W. *The Transformation of Intellectual Life in Victorian England*. Chicago: Lyceum Books, 1982.

Hilton, Boyd. *The Age of Atonement: The Influence of Evangelism on Social and Economic Thought, 1785-1865*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1988.

Hobsbawm, E. J. and Terrence Ranger. *The Invention of Tradition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983.

Hogan, Anne and Andrew Bradstock, eds. *Women of Faith in Victorian Culture: Reassessing "The Angel in the House."* London: Macmillan, 1998.

Holcombe, Lee. *Victorian Ladies at Work: Middle-Class Working Women in England and Wales, 1850-1914*. Hamden: Archon Press, 1973.

Holden, Pat, ed. *Women's Religious Experience*. London: Croom Helm, 1983.

Holton, Sandra Stanley. *Women's Suffrage and Reform Politics in Britain, 1900-1918*.

- New York: St. Martin's Press, 1987.
- , *Feminism and Democracy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986.
- Hunt, Felicity, ed. *Lessons for Life: The Schooling of Girls and Women, 1850-1950*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1987.
- Jackson, Margaret. *The Real Facts of Life: Feminism and the Politics of Sexuality c1850-1940*. London: Taylor and Francis, 1994.
- Jeffreys, Sheila. *The Spinster and her Enemies: Feminism and Sexuality 1880-1930*, London: Pandora, 1985.
- Johnston, Victor S. *Why We Feel: The Science of Human Emotions*. Reading: Perseus Books, 1999.
- Jones, Gareth Stedman. *Outcast London: A Study in the Relationship Between Classes in Victorian Society*. London: Penguin Books, 1971.
- Kamm, Josephine. *Indicative Past: A Hundred Years of the Girls' Public Day School Trust*. London: George Allen and Unwin, 1971.
- Kaplan, Louise. *Female Perversions*. New York: Doubleday Dell Publishing, 1991.
- Katz, Jack. *Seductions of Crime*. New York: Basic Books, 1988.
- Katz, Jonathon Ned. *The Invention of Heterosexuality*. Foreword by Gore Vidal and afterword by Lisa Duggan. New York: Plume Publishing, 1996.
- Kinsey, Alfred and W. B. Pomeroy, C. E. Martin and Paul H. Gebhard. *Sexual Behaviour in the Human Female*. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1951.
- Kitayama, Shinobu and Hazel Markus. *Emotion and Culture*. Washington: American Psychological Association, 1994.
- Langland, Elizabeth. *Nobody's Angels: Middle-Class Women and Domestic Ideology in Victorian Culture*. New York: Cornell University Press, 1995.
- Lansky, Melvin R. and Andrew P. Morrison, eds. *The Widening Scope of Shame*. Hillsdale: The Analytic Press, 1997.
- Larkins, Guy A. *Teacher Enthusiasm: A Critical Review*. Hampton: University of Southern Mississippi, 1985.

- Laslett, Peter. *The World We Have Lost*. New York: Schocken Books, 1965.
- Lipsitz Bem, Sandra. *The Lenses of Gender*. New Haven: New Haven University Press, 1993.
- Lystra, Karen. *Searching the Heart*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1989.
- Macaulay, Julia S. A., ed. *St. Leonards School 1877-1977*. Glasgow: Blackie and Son, 1979.
- Mack, Phyllis. *Visionary Women: Ecstatic Prophecy in Seventeenth-Century England*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1992.
- McLeod, H. *Religion and Society in England 1850-1914*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1996.
- Macmillan, Malcolm, ed. *Freud Evaluated: The Completed Arc*. Cambridge: M.I.T. Press, 1997.
- Magai, Carol and Susan McFadden. *The Role of Emotions in Social and Personality Development*. New York: Plenum Press, 1995.
- Manton, Jo. *Mary Carpenter and the Children of the Streets*. London: Heinemann, 1976.
- Martin, Jane. *Women and the Politics of Schooling in Victorian and Edwardian England*. London: Leicester University Press, 1991.
- Mason, Michael. *The Making of Victorian Attitudes*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1994.
- , *The Making of Victorian Sexuality*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1994.
- Maynard, John. *Victorian Discourses on Sexuality and Religion*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993.
- McCrone, Kathleen E. *Playing the Game: Sport and the Physical Emancipation of English Women, 1870-1914*. Lexington: University Press of Kentucky, 1988.
- McKinley, Edward H. *Marching to Glory: The History of the Salvation Army in the United States, 1880-1992*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995.
- McWilliams-Tullberg, Rita. *Women at Cambridge: A Men's University-Though of a Mixed Type*. London: Victor Gollancz, 1975.

- Megson, B. and J. Lindsay. *Girton College 1869-1959 An Informal History*. London: Heffers, 1960.
- Meller, Helen. *Leisure and the Changing City, 1870-1914*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1976.
- Melnyk, Julie, ed. *Women's Theology in Nineteenth-Century Britain: Transfiguring the Faith of Their Fathers*. New York: Garland, 1998.
- Meltzer, Franco, ed. *The Trial(s) of Psychoanalysis*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1988.
- Micale, Mark. *Approaching Hysteria: Disease and its Interpretations*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1995.
- Micale, Mark and Paul Lerner, eds. *Traumatic Pasts: History, Psychiatry, and Trauma in the Modern Age, 1870-1930*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001.
- Midgley, C. *Women Against Slavery. The British Campaigns, 1780-1918*. London: Routledge, 1992.
- Miller, Susan B. *Shame in Context*. Hillsdale: The Analytic Press, 1996.
- Mitchel, Juliet. *Women: The Longest Revolution*. London: Virago, 1984.
- Monson, Melissa J. *Power and the Professorship: Perceptions of Sexual Harassment*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1998.
- Mort, Frank. *Dangerous Sexualities: Medico-moral Politics in England since 1830*, London: Routledge, 1987.
- Nead, Lynda. *Myths of Sexuality: Representations of Women in Victorian Britain*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1988.
- Newsome, David. *The Victorian World Picture: Perceptions and Introspection in an Age of Change*. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 1997.
- Oldfield, Sybil. *Spinsters of this Parish*. London: Taylor and Francis, 1984.
- Olney, James, ed. *Studies in Autobiography*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1988.
- Oppenheim, Janet. *Shattered Nerves: Doctors, Patients, and Depression in Victorian England*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1991

- Owen, Alex. *The Darkened Room: Women, Power and Spiritualism in Late-Victorian England*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1990.
- Parsons, Gerald, ed. *Religion in Victorian England*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1997.
- Patai, Daphne. *Heterophobia: Sexual Harassment and the Future of Feminism*. Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield, 1998.
- Peacock, Sandra J. *Jane Ellen Harrison, The Mask and the Self*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1988.
- Perkin, Joan. *Victorian Women*. London: John Murray, 1993.
- Peterson, Jeanne M. *Family, Love and Work in the Lives of Victorian Gentlewomen*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1989.
- Phelan, Peggy. *Mourning Sex: Performing Public Ceremonies*. London: Routledge, 1997.
- Philips, Kim M. and Barry Reay, eds. *Sexualities in History*. London: Routledge, 2002.
- Phipps, Pauline. "Social Construction and Essentialism in Victorian Emotional Culture" A Case Study of Eliza Lynn Linton and Beatrice Webb." M. A. Thesis, University of Windsor, 1997.
- , *The "Angel-in-the-House": Victorian Myth or Millennium Reality?* Winsdor: Art Gallery of Windsor, 2001.
- Porter, Roy and Lesley Hall, eds. *The Facts of Life: The Creation of Sexual Knowledge in Victorian Britain, 1650-1950*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1995.
- Porter, A. N. *Religion and Empire: British Expansion in the Long 19<sup>th</sup> Century, 1780-1914*. London: Macmillan, 1991.
- Price, Mary and Nonita Glenday. *Reluctant Revolutionaries: A Century of Headmistresses, 1874-1974*. London: Pitman, 1974.
- Prochaska, F. K. *Women and Philanthropy in Nineteenth-Century England*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1980.
- Raymond, Janice. *A Passion for Friends: Toward a Philosophy of Female Affection*. Boston: Beacon Press, 1986.

- Renzetti, Claire M. *Violent Betrayal: Partner Abuse in Lesbian Relationships*. California: Sage Publishing, 1992.
- Robertson, Una A. *The Illustrated History of the Housewife, 1650-1950*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1997.
- Roper, Lyndal. *Oedipus and the Devil: Witchcraft, Sexuality and Religion in Early Modern Europe*. New York: Routledge, 1994.
- Rose, June. *Marie Stopes and The Sexual Revolution*. London: Faber and Faber, 1992.
- Rosman, Doreen. *Evangelicals and Culture*. London: Macmillan, 1984.
- Ross, Ellen. *Love and Toil: Motherhood in Outcast London, 1870-1918*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1993.
- Rubenstein, David. *Before the Suffragettes: Women's Emancipation in the 1890s*. Brighton: Association University Press, 1986.
- Rudy, Kathy. *Sex and the Church: Gender, Homosexuality, and the Transformation of Christian Ethics*. Boston: Beacon, 1997.
- Sabella, Russell A. *Confronting Sexual Harassment: Learning Activities for Teens*. Minneapolis: Educational Media Corporation, 1995.
- Samual, D. N., ed. *The Evangelical Succession in the Church of England*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1979.
- Sanders, Valerie. *Reason Over Passion*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1986.
- Sandall, Robert. *The History of the Salvation Army*, vols. 1-3. London: Salvation Army, 1964.
- Scott, Patrick and Pauline Fletcher. *Culture and Education in Victorian England*. Cranbury: Association University Press, 1990.
- Sedgwick, Eve Kosofsky. *Epistemology of the Closet*. Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1990.
- Seidman, Steven. *Romantic Longings: Love in America*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1991.
- Sharma, Arvind, ed. *Women in World Religions, Today's Women in World Religions, and*

- Feminism and World Religions*. New and Revised Edition, Albany: State University of New York Press, 1999.
- Shorter, Edward. *From Paralysis to Fatigue: A History of Psychosomatic Illness in the Modern Era*. New York: Free Press, 1994.
- Showalter, Elaine. *The Female Malady: Women, Madness, and English Culture, 1830-1980*. New York: Pantheon Books, 1985.
- Siegel, Jeanne, ed., *Art Talk: The Early 80s*. New York: Da Capo Press, 1988.
- Smith-Rosenberg, Carroll. *Disorderly Conduct: Visions of Gender in Victorian America*. New York: Routledge, 1987.
- Sondheim, Janet. *Castle Adamant in Hampstead: A History of Westfield College 1882-1982*. London: Westfield College, 1983.
- Spender, Dale, ed. *The Education Papers: Women's Quest for Equality in Britain, 1850-1912*. New York: Routledge, 1987.
- Stachniewski, John. *The Prosecutory Imagination: English Puritanism and the Literature of Religious Despair*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991.
- Stanford, Paul. *William Law: A Serious Call to a Devout and Holy Life - The Spirit of Love*. Toronto: Paulist Press, 1978.
- Stanley, D. A. *Late Victorian Cambridge*. London: Constable, 1969.
- Stearns, Carol and Peter Stearns. *Emotion and Social Change*. New York: Holmes and Meier Publishers, 1988.
- Stearns, Peter. *An Emotional History of the United States*. New York: New York University Press, 1998.
- Stephen, Barbara. *Emily Davies and Girton College*. London: Constable, 1927.
- Stephens, Tina. *Bullying and Sexual Harassment*. London: Institute of Personnel and Development, 2003.
- Stone, Lawrence. *The Family, Sex and Marriage in England: 1500-1800*. London: Weidenfeld and Nicholson, 1977.
- Storr, Merl, ed. *Bisexuality: A Critical Reader*. London: Routledge, 1999.



- Swanson, R. N. *Gender and Christian Religion*. London: Boydell, 1998.
- Swindburne, Richard. *The Existence of God*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1979.
- Tosh, John. *A Man's Place: Masculinity and the Middle-Class Home in Victorian England*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1999.
- Unsworth, Madge. *Maiden Tribute: A Study in Voluntary Social Service*. London: Salvationist Publishing, 1949.
- Valenze, Deborah. *Prophetic Sons and Daughters: Female Preaching and Popular Religion in Industrial England*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1985.
- Valverde, Mariana. *Sex, Power and Pleasure*. Baltimore: New Society Publishers, 1987.
- Vicinus, Martha, ed. *A Widening Sphere: Changing Roles of Victorian Women*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1977.
- , *Independent Women: Work and Community for Single Women 1850-1920*. London: Virago Press, 1985.
- Vincent, David. *Literacy and Popular Culture: England 1750-1914*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989.
- Walker, Pamela J. *Pulling the Devil's Kingdom Down: The Salvation Army in Victorian Britain*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2001.
- Walkowitz, Judith. *Prostitution and Victorian Society: Women, Class, and the State*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1980.
- , *City of Dreadful Delight*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1992.
- Waterhouse, Prudence. *A Victorian Monument: The Buildings of Girton College*. London: Routledge, 1990.
- Webb, R. K. *Modern England: From the Eighteenth Century to the Present*. New York: Dodd, Mead, 1968.
- Weeks, Jeffrey. *Coming Out: Homosexual Politics in Britain from the Nineteenth Century to the Present*. London: Quartet, 1977.
- , *The Regulation of Sexuality since 1800*. London: Longman, 1981.

- , *Sex, Politics And Society*. New York: Longman Group, 1981.
- , *Sexuality and its Discontents: Meanings, Myths and Modern Sexualities*. New York: Routledge, 1985.
- , *Against Nature: Essays on History, Sexuality and Identity*. London: Rivers Oram Press, 1992.
- Whitbread, Helen, ed. *I Know My Own Heart: The Dairies of Anne Lister, 1791-1840*. London: Routledge, 1988.
- White, Allan. *Carnival, Hysteria and Writing: Collected Essays and Autobiography*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993.
- Wiesner-Hanks, Merry E. *Christianity and Sexuality in the Early Modern World: Regulating Desire, Reforming Practice*. London: Routledge, 2000.
- Willis, Ellen. *No More Nice Girls*. Hanover: Wesleyan University Press, 1992.
- Wingerton, Sophia A. *The Women's Suffrage Movement in Britain, 1866-1928*. New York: St. Martin Press, 1999.
- Wurmster, Leon. *The Mask of Shame*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1981.
- Yandell, Keith. *The Epistemology of Religious Experience*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993.
- Zeldin, Theodore. *An Intimate History of Humanity*. New York: HarperCollins, 1996.

#### **Chapters in Books:**

- Bianchi, Bruna. "Psychiatrists, Soldiers, and Officers in Italy During the Great War," in *Traumatic Pasts: History, Psychiatry, and Trauma in the Modern Age, 1870-1930*, eds. Mark Micale, and Paul Lerner (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001): 222-53.
- Bullough, Vern; Dixon, Dwight; Dixon, Joan. "Sadism, Masochism and History, or When is Behaviour Sado-Masochistic?," in *Sexual Knowledge, Sexual Science*, eds. Roy Porter and Mikulas (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994): 63-82.
- Cannadine, David. "The Context, Performance and Meaning of Ritual: The British Monarchy and the 'Invention of Tradition', 1820-1977," in *The Invention of Tradition*, eds. Eric Hobsbawm and Terence Ranger (Cambridge: Cambridge

University Press, 1983): 101-64.

Chauncey, George. "From Sexual Inversion to Homosexuality: The Changing Medical Conceptualization of Female 'Deviance,'" in *Passion and Power: Sexuality in History*, eds. Kathy Piess and Christina Simmons (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1989): 87-118.

Clark, Anna. "Anne Lister's Construction of Lesbian Identity," in *Sexualities in History*, eds. Kim M. Philips and Barry Reay (London: Routledge, 2002): 247-70.

Crossick, Geoffrey. "The Emergence of the Lower Middle Class in Britain: A Discussion," in Geoffrey Crossick ed. *The Lower Middle Class in Britain 1870-1914* (London: Croom Helm, 1977): 11-61.

De Lauretis, Teresa. "Freud, Sexuality, and Perversion," in *Discourses of Sexuality: From Aristotle to AIDS*, ed. Donna C. Stanton (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1992): 216-34.

Delamont, Sara. "The Contradictions in Ladies' Education," in *The Nineteenth-Century Woman: Her Cultural and Physical World*, eds. Sara Delamont and Lorna Duffin (London: Croom Helm, 1978): 134-63.

Demos, John. "Shame and Guilt in Early New England," in *Emotion and Social Change*, eds. Peter Stearns and Carol Stearns (New York: Holmes and Meier, 1988): 69-78.

Glasgow, Joanne. "What's a Nice Lesbian Like You Doing in the Church of Torquemada? Radcliffe Hall and Other Catholic Converts," in *Lesbian Texts and Contexts: Radical Revisions*, eds. Karla Jay and Joanne Glasgow (New York: New York University Press, 1990): 241-54.

Harstock, Nancy. "Foucault on Power: A Theory for Women?" in *Feminism/Postmodernism*, ed. Linda J. Nicholson (New York: Routledge, 1990): 212-58.

Hekma, David. "'A Female Soul in a Male Body': Sexual Inversion as Gender Inversion in Nineteenth-Century Sexology," in *Third Sex, Third Gender: Beyond Sexual Dimorphism in Culture and History*, ed. Gilbert Heerdt (New York: Zone Books, 1994): 213-39.

Herdt, Gilbert. "Introduction: Third Sexes and Third Genders," in *Third Sex, Third Gender: Beyond Sexual Dimorphism in Culture and History*, ed. Gilbert Heerdt (New York: Zone Books, 1994): 12-81.

- Higginbotham, Ann, R. "Respectable Sinners: Salvation Army Rescue Work with Unmarried Mothers, 1884-1914," in *Religion in the Lives of English Women, 1760-1930*, ed. Gail Malmgreen (Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 1986): 216-34.
- Howarth, Janet. "Gender, domesticity, and sexual politics, in *The Nineteenth Century: The British Isles 1815-1901*, ed. Colin Matthew (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000): 163-93.
- Kennedy, Elizabeth Lapovsky and Madeline Davis. "The Reproduction of Butch-Fem Roles: A Social Constructionist," in *Passion and Power: Sexuality in History*, eds. Kathy Piess and Christina Simmons (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1989): 241-59.
- Mack, Phyllis. "In a Female Voice," in *Women Preachers and Prophets through Two Millennia of Christianity*, eds. Beverly Maine Kienzle and Pamela J. Walker (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1999): 43-60.
- Malmgreen, Gail. "Introduction," in *Religion in the Lives of English Women, 1760-1930*, ed. Gail Malmgreen (Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 1986): 1-11.
- Matter, Ann E. "Discourses of Desire: Sexuality and Christian Women's Visionary Narratives," in *Que(e)rying Religion: A Critical Anthology*, eds. Gary Comstock and Susan Henking (New York: Continuum, 1997): 106-16.
- Matthew, Colin. "Public Life And Politics," in *The Nineteenth Century: The British Isles 1815-1902*, ed. Colin Matthew (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000): 85-132.
- Millet, Kate. "The Debate Over Women: Ruskin vs. Mill" in *Suffer and Be Still: Women in the Victorian Age*, ed. Martha Vicinus (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1972): 121-39.
- Newton, Esther. "The Mythic Mannish Lesbian: Radcliffe Hall and the New Woman," in *Hidden from History: Reclaiming the Gay and Lesbian Past*, eds. Martin Bauml Duberman, Martha Vicinus, and George Chauncey (New York: New American Library, 1989): 274-93.
- Philips, Kim M. and Barry Reay, eds. "Introduction" in *Sexualities in History*, eds. Kim M. Philips and Barry Reay (London: Routledge, 2002): 1-24.
- Phipps, Pauline. "The Symbolic Body of the Historical Subject," in *Literary Texts and the Arts*, eds. Corrado Federici and Esther Raventos-Pons (New York: Peter Lang, 2003): 163-74.

- Quebedeaux, Richard. "We're on our Way, Lord!: The Rise of 'Evangelical Feminism' in Modern American Christianity," in *Women in the World's Religions Past and Present*, ed. Ursula King (New York: Paragon House, 1987): 129-45.
- Rennie, Ian S. "Fundamentalism and the Varieties of the North Atlantic Evangelism" in *Evangelicalism: Comparative Studies of Popular Protestantism in North America, the British Isles, and Beyond, 1700-1990*," eds. Mark A. Noll, David W. Bebington and George A. Rawlyk (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1994): 333-51.
- Scott, Joan. "The Woman Worker," in *Women, Work and Family*, ed. Louise Tilly (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1978): 401-22.
- Simmons, Christina. "Modern Sexuality and the Myth of Victorian Repression," in *Passion and Power: Sexuality in History*, eds. Kathy Piess and Christina Simmons (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1989): 157-178.
- Smith-Rosenberg, Carroll. "The New Woman as Androgyne: Social Disorder and Gender Crisis, 1870-1936," in *Disorderly Conduct: Visions of Gender in Victorian America*, ed. Carroll Smith-Rosenberg (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1985): 245-95.
- Tosh, John. "Domesticity and Manliness in the Victorian Middle-Class" in *Manful Assertions*, eds. Michael Roper and John Tosh (London: Routledge, 1990): 44-73.
- Trumbach, Randolph. "London's Sapphists: From Three Sexes to Four Genders in the Making of Modern Culture," in *Third Sex, Third Gender: Beyond Sexual Dimorphism in Culture and History*, ed. Gilbert Heerdt (New York: Zone Books, 1994): 111-36.
- Vicinus, Martha. "Introduction" in *Lesbian Subject: A Feminist Studies Reader*, ed. Martha Vicinus (Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 1996): 1-15.
- Walker, Lynne. "Vistas of Pleasure: Women Consumers of Urban Space in the West End of London 1860-1900," in *Women in the Victorian Art World*, ed. Clarissa Campbell Orr (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1996): 70-85.
- Weeks, Jeffrey. "Sexuality and History Revisited," in *Sexualities in History*, eds. Kim M. Philips and Barry Reay (London: Routledge, 2002): 1-24.
- Wolffe, John. "Anti-Catholicism and Evangelical Identity in Britain and the United States, 1830-1860" in *Evangelicalism: Comparative Studies of Popular Protestantism in North America, the British Isles, and Beyond, 1700-1990*, eds. Mark A. Noll, David W. Bebington and George A. Rawlyk (Oxford: Oxford

University Press, 1994): 179-98.

**Articles:**

- Burstyn, Joan N. "Education and Sex: The Medical Case Against Higher Education for Women in England, 1870-1900." *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society* 117 (1973): 78-89.
- Cook, Blanche Wiesen. "Female Support Networks and Political Activism: Lilian Wald, Crystal Eastman, Emma Goldman." *Chrysalis* 3 (1978): 30-64.
- Diggs, Marlene. "'Romantic Friends or a Different Race of Creatures'? The Representation Of Lesbian Pathology In Nineteenth-Century America." *Feminist Studies* 21 (1995): 317-40.
- Duggan, Lisa. "The Trials of Alice Mitchel: Sensationalism, Sexology and the Lesbian Subject in Turn-of-the-Century America." *Signs* 18 (1993): 791-813.
- Faderman, Lilian. "The Morbidification of Love between Women by 19<sup>th</sup>-Century Sexologists." *Journal of Homosexuality* 4 (1978): 73-90.
- Freedman, Estelle B. "The Prison Lesbian: Race, Class, and the Construction of the Aggressive Female Homosexual, 1915-1965." *Feminist Studies* 22 (1996): 397-423.
- , "The Burning of letters Continues': Elusive Identities and the Historical Construction." *Journal of Women's History* 9 (1998): 181-99.
- Gorham, Deborah. "The 'Maiden Tribute of Modern Babylon' re-examined: Child Prostitution and the Idea of Childhood in Late-Victorian England." *Victorian Studies* (1978): 353-79.
- , "'The Friendships of Women': Friendship, Feminism and Achievement in Vera Brittain's Life and Work in the Interwar Decades." *Journal of Women's History* 3 (1992): 44-69.
- Haig, A. G. L. "The Church, The Universities and Learning in Later Victorian England." *Historical Journal* 29 (1986): 187-201.
- Hammerton, James A. "Victorian Marriage and the Law of Matrimonial Cruelty." *Victorian Studies* 34 (1990): 269-92.
- Harre, Rom. "Emotion and Social Change." *American Journal of Sociology* 95 (1991): 807-91.

- Hilliard, David. "Unenglish and Unmanly: Anglo-Catholicism And Homosexuality." *Victorian Studies* 25 (1982): 181-210.
- Jackson, Louisa A. "'Singing Birds as Well as Soap Suds': The Salvation Army's Work with Sexually Abused Girls in Edwardian England." *Gender and History* 12 (2000): 107-26.
- Katz, Jonathon. "The Invention of Heterosexuality." *Socialist Review* 20 (1990): 7-34.
- Kelly-Gadol, Joan. "The Social Relation of the Sexes." *Signs* 1 (1975): 1-23.
- Levine, George. "Dying to Know." *Victorian Newsletter* 79 (1991): 1-4.
- MacKinnon, Catharine. "Feminism, Marxism, Method and the State: An Agenda for Theory." *Signs* 7 (1982): 515-44.
- McCrone, Kathleen E. "Emancipation or Recreation? The Development of Women's Sport at the University of London." *International Journal of the History of Sport* 7 (1990): 203-27.
- McDougall, Eleanor. Review of "Constance Louisa Maynard, Mistress of Westfield College," by Catherine B. Firth. *Westfield College Magazine* (1949): 15-16.
- Meem, Deborah. "Eliza Lynn Linton and the Rise of Lesbian Consciousness." *Journal of the History of Sexuality* 7 (1997): 537-60.
- Moore, Lisa. "'Something More Tender Still Than Friendship': Romantic Friendship in Early-Nineteenth-Century England." *Feminist Studies* 18 (1992): 499-521.
- Partner, Nancy. "No Sex, No Gender." *Speculum* 68 (1993): 419-44.
- Pederson, Joyce Senders. "Schoolmistresses and Headmistresses: Elites and Education in Nineteenth-Century England." *Journal of British Studies* 15 (1975): 135-62.
- Peterson, Jeanne M. "No Angels in the House: The Victorian Myth and the Paget Women." *American Historical Review* 89 (1984): 677-708.
- Phipps, Pauline. "'The Angel-in-the-House': Victorian Myth or Millennium Reality?" *Art Gallery of Windsor* (2001): 1-16.
- , "Gender and Sexuality in Victorian England: an Analysis of the Autobiography of Christopher Kirkland." *Journal of Guidance and Counselling* 17 (2002): 112-17.

- Rich, Adrienne. "Compulsory Heterosexuality and Lesbian Existence." *Signs* 5 (1980): 631-790.
- Rubinstein, David. "Cycling in the 1890s." *Victorian Studies* 21 (1977): 47-71.
- "Cycling 80 Years Ago." *History Today* 28 (1978): 544-47.
- Rupp, Leila J. "Imagine My Surprise: Women's Relationships in Historical Perspective." *Frontiers* 5 (1980): 61-70.
- Sahli, Nancy. "Smashing: Women's Relationships before the Fall." *Chrysalis* 8 (1979): 17-27.
- Smith-Rosenberg, Carroll. "The Female World of Love and Ritual: Relations between Women in Nineteenth Century America." *Signs* 1 (1975): 1-29.
- Stearns, Peter. "Social History Update: Sociology of Emotion." *Journal of Social History* 22 (1989): 592-99.
- "Girls, Boys, and Emotions: Redefinitions and Historical Change." *Journal of American History* 26 (1993): 36-73.
- Trumbach, Randolph. "London's Sodomites: Homosexual Behaviour and Western Culture in the Eighteenth Century." *Journal of Social History* 11 (1977): 1-33.
- "Sex, Gender and Sexual Identity in Modern Culture: Male Sodomy and Female Prostitution in Enlightenment London." *Journal of the History of Sexuality* 2 (1991): 186-203.
- "The Origins and Development of the Modern Lesbian Role in the Western Gender System: Northwestern Europe and the United States, 1750-1990." *Historical Reflections* 20 (1994): 231-56.
- Vicinus, Martha. "'One Life to Stand Beside Me': Emotional Conflicts in First-Generation College Women in England." *Feminist Studies* 8 (1982): 603-27.
- "Distance and Desire: English Boarding-School Friendships." *Signs* 9 (1984): 600-22.
- "Lesbian History: All Theory and No Facts or All Facts and No Theory?" *Radical History Review* 60 (1994): 57-75.
- "'They Wonder To Which Sex I Belong': The Historical Roots of the Modern



- Lesbian Identity." *Feminist Studies* 18 (1992): 467-99.
- , "The Gift of Love: Nineteenth-Century Religion and Lesbian Passion." *Nineteenth-Century Contexts* 23 (2001): 241-64
- Vickery, Amanda. "Golden Age to Separate Spheres? A Review of the Categories and Chronologies of English Women's History." *Historical Journal* 36 (1993): 383-414.
- Wald, Lillian. "Smashing: Women's Relationships Before the Fall." *Chrysalis* 8 (1979): 17-27.
- Walsh, Cheryl. "The Incarnation and the Christian Socialist Conscience in the Victorian Church of England." *Journal of British Studies* 34 (1995): 352-55.
- Wilson, Elizabeth. "Forbidden Love." *Feminist Studies* 10 (1984): 213-26.
- Zeldin, Theodore. "Personal History and the History of Emotions." *Journal of Social History* 15 (1982): 341-47.