Meeting of the Traditional and the Modern: Jane Austen's *Emma* and Katherine Mansfield's "A Cup of Tea"

Janka Kaščáková

Abstract
By the time Katherine Mansfield started writing her stories, it had become almost a fashion to look down on Jane Austen and consider her work as dull or at the best outmoded. Yet the gap between Jane Austen and early 20th century writers is not always as very wide as it might seem – one can find Modernists who not only admired Austen but found in her work inspiration for their own art. One of these is arguably the New Zealand short story writer Katherine Mansfield. This paper will focus on some general similarities in Mansfield's and Austen's approaches, discuss affinities in their uses of free indirect discourse and provide a comparative analysis of Austen's novel Emma *and Mansfield's short story "A Cup of Tea." Not only in the use of free indirect discourse, but in terms of characters, plot, and structure do these two works contain major commonalities.*

Keywords
Jane Austen, Katherine Mansfield, *Emma*, "A Cup of Tea", free indirect discourse, modernism

At first sight Jane Austen and Katherine Mansfield do not have much in common. One, a respectable person and greatly esteemed writer of traditional novels; the other, a once marginalized "intruder" into English literature from New Zealand, writer of highly innovative short stories, and quite a scandalous figure. The societies they each depict in their works, although only some hundred years apart, could not have been more different. What is more, Jane Austen's reputation among Modernists was very ambivalent: at best admiration for her accomplishments was tempered by the view that her themes and style were outmoded and not fit for the new reality of modern times.[1]

Jane Austen lived a traditional 18th century English life, spending her days in the gentrified English countryside. She engaged in the pursuits of her country-women, not differing from them in anything with the exception of her writing. Katherine Mansfield, on the other hand, was a genuine Modernist, keen to "try all sorts of lives"[2] and to use her experience in her writing and to find the new ways of expression she believed necessary for the new literature of the day. Just as Modernism is sometimes mistakenly simplified as a breach with certain traditions, so the achievements and "modernity" of previous generations of writers are sometimes sidelined. The influence that earlier

1 Virginia Woolf considered Mansfield a "great novelist;" she commented on Mansfield's wit and taste, pointing out that "if fiction had remained what it was to Jane Austen and Trollope, fiction would by this time be dead." Virginia Woolf. *Common Reader 2.* "The Novels of George Meredith." Accessed July 1, 2010. http://ebooks.adelaide.edu.au/w/woolf/virginia/w91c2/chapter19.html. While E.M. Forster was a self-professed Janeite, D.H. Lawrence, wholly in line with his usual waspishness, concluded that "this old maid typifies 'personality' instead of character, the sharp knowing in apartness instead of knowing in togetherness, and she is, to my feeling, thoroughly unpleasant, English in the bad, mean, snobbish sense of the word, just as Fielding is English in the good generous sense." D.H. Lawrence, *Lady Chatterley's Lover and A Propos of 'Lady Chatterley's Lover,'* ed. Michael Squires (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), 333.

2 Vincent O'Sullivan and Margaret Scott, eds., *The Collected Letters of Katherine Mansfield, Volume I: 1903 1917* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1984), 19.

writers had in the shaping of Modernist works has often been undervalued or completely disregarded.

Yet Jane Austen and Katherine Mansfield do have much in common. Both were remarkable observers, able to recreate their observations in their works with vividness and accuracy; they understood and used the power of detail to the highest advantage; both share a sly sense of humour, often presented in their works in the form of irony. Austen and Mansfield each seem not to have acknowledged the great events of their eras, and rather depicted "small" domestic matters, for which they were often criticized and their importance belittled.[3] Yet even from such seemingly slight material they were able to extract the maximum, both displaying what Richard Jenkyns referring to Austen characterized as the "power to imbue the full flow of everyday, foolish or uneducated speech with an odd poetry."[4]

In this paper I will focus on three closely related issues: firstly I will aim at demonstrating the general similarities in Austen's and Mansfield's use of the discursive strategy of free indirect discourse. Next I will compare Austen's *Emma* and Mansfield's short story "A Cup of Tea," maintaining that not only in the use of free indirect discourse but in characters, plot and structure these two works display major common features. I will suggest that Austen's *Emma* was a direct inspiration for Mansfield's "A Cup of Tea." Thirdly, by examining the dissimilarities between these two works, I will point out how Mansfield managed to transfer an 18th century story into the beginning of the 0th century, both in terms of content and form, using those elements that fitted her purpose, modifying those that did not. Here I will also suggest that most of the dissimilarities spring from Austen's and Mansfield's different understanding of the purpose of art.

While in this first part I use examples from several Mansfield's stories, in the case of Austen I will only deal with *Emma* for a very simple reason. While in Austen's earlier works plot and characters are presented in a traditional way, in *Emma* the single narrator and her presence have practically disappeared; the narration is carried out through free indirect discourse, bringing it very close to Mansfield's own "floating" narrator, hardly discernible from the characters as it drifts in and out of their consciousnesses without obvious notice.

The question of free indirect discourse has often been discussed in relation to Austen as well as in Mansfield scholarship, yet no one seems to have compared the affinities in their uses of this technique. It is used to represent one or more characters' speech or their thoughts. The narrative is permeated with the opinions of nobody in particular, that is to say, of a community, a group of people in which it is difficult to discern particular voices or the source of information. In this way this aspect of free indirect discourse can be likened to gossip.[5]

Representing characters' speech through indirect discourse is very common in *Emma* though quite rare in Mansfield's stories. *Emma* is a novel written with the particular purpose of presenting the story through the eyes of the heroine,[6] and in many

3 This argument is quite common in Austen criticism; in the case of Katherine Mansfield one example out of several may suffice: "She has handled perfectly the minimum material – it is what I believe would be called feminine." T.S. Eliot, *After Strange Gods* (New York: Harcourt, Brace, 1934), 38.

4 Richard Jenkyns, *A Fine Brush on Ivory* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2007), 59.

5 For a detailed analysis of the role of gossip and its connection with free indirect discourse see: Casey Finch and Peter Bowen, "The Tittle-Tattle of Highbury: Gossip and the Free Indirect Style in Emma," *Representations* 31, Special Issue: The Margins of Identity in Nineteenth-Century England (Summer 1990): 1-18.

6 For a discussion about the importance of the control of the point of view in *Emma* see: Wayne C. Booth, "Point of View and the Control of Distance in *Emma*," *Nineteenth-Century Fiction* 16, 2 (Sept. 1961): 95-116.

cases Austen wants the reader not only to know what is being said, but also how it is perceived and manipulated by Emma's consciousness. Mansfield seems to prefer direct quotations of actual speech, giving her readers opportunity to create their own opinion about what is being said by a character.

As to free indirect discourse representing the "general opinion" of a group of people, here too the occurrence in *Emma* is more frequent than in Mansfield's writing. Although its title suggests that the story is about one person, in fact *Emma* is very much about a community and the impact it has on individuals, and the ever-present and influential opinion of "every body".[7] The behaviour of people has to be adjusted to the opinion and rules of society, no matter how absurd or repulsive. Austen also deals with the paradox of solitude, for many a luxury, though at the same time certain characters find themselves absolutely alone in the middle of a crowd. Many of Mansfield's people live in a society which has lost most of its traditional values, and the characters are usually presented in more private circumstances. Very often they are on the margins of a society or utterly alone. There is, however, the exception of the New Zealand stories, where the characters still form part of their society and Mansfield uses free indirect speech to create a sense of community. In these stories it is possible to find instances of the "voice of the public" very similar to those found in *Emma*:

> The women at the Bay thought she was very, very fast. Her lack of vanity, her slang, the way she treated men as though she was one of them, and the fact that she didn't care twopence about her house and called the servant Gladys 'Glad-eyes' was disgraceful. … It was an absolute scandal! True, she had no children, and her husband. … Here the voices were always raised; they became fervent. How can he have married her? How can he, how can he? It must have been money, of course, but even then![8]

Austen's and Mansfield's styles most resemble one another when they reproduce the thoughts of their characters through free indirect discourse. Characters hesitate, ask themselves questions and correct themselves; their syntax becomes less and less fluent as their insecurity, fear or agitation grows. In the passage in which Emma contemplates her attitude towards Jane Fairfax, her uneasy attempts to justify her behaviour and her implied guilt clearly show in the broken and hasty sentences:

> But 'she could never get acquainted with her: she did not know how it was, but there was such coldness and reserve – such apparent indifference whether she pleased or not – and then, her aunt was such an eternal talker! – and she was made such a fuss by every body! – and it had been always imagined that they were to be so intimate – because their ages were the same, every body

7 In her introduction to *Emma*, Adela Pinch gives an interesting analysis of the meaning and role of "every body" in this novel. Pinch, introduction to *Emma*, by Jane Austen (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003), xv-xvi.

8 Katherine Mansfield, *Selected Stories*, ed. Angela Smith (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002), 292. All subsequent quotations from Mansfield's stories are from this edition with page numbers indicated in the text.

had supposed they must be so fond of each other.' These were her reasons – she had no better.[9]

Mansfield also provides a similar example in the combination of the consciousnesses of the two daughters of the late colonel, similarly confused and as if thinking in unison:

> What! In the drawing-room by themselves – with no – no altar or anything! The piano would be much too high, thought Constantia, and Mr. Farolles [the priest] could not possibly lean over it with the chalice. And Kate would be sure to come bursting in and interrupt them, thought Josephine. And supposing the bell rang in the middle? It might be somebody important – about their mourning. Would they get up reverently and go out, or would they have to wait … in torture? (235)

Moreover, neither Austen nor Mansfield is satisfied with merely the presentation of the separate consciousnesses of their characters. For Mansfield the use of indirect discourse is quite complex; this is also the case for Austen in *Emma*. Uniquely in this novel Austen seems to be passing through different consciousnesses in order to present the reader more than Emma knows. As Wayne Booth has it,

> "there are many breaks in the point of view, because Emma's beclouded mind cannot do the whole job. In *Persuasion,* where the heroine's viewpoint is faulty only in her ignorance of Captain Wentworth's love, there are very few. Ann Elliot's consciousness is sufficient, as Emma's is not, for most of the needs of the novel which she dominates."[10]

Both authors use complex combinations of different usages of free indirect discourse in order to create illusions of reality. Thus shifts appear not only within one paragraph, but sometimes even within one sentence. In Mansfield's "At the Bay", Beryl thinks about the possibility of not finding a suitable husband: "But Beryl dismissed it. She couldn't be left. Other people, perhaps, but not she. It wasn't possible to think that Beryl Fairfield never married, that lovely, fascinating girl" (312). This presents not only a shift from one person to another, but also from reality to the world of dreams, since the people whose speech is represented ("that lovely fascinating girl") exist only in Beryl's dreams. Even if real, they not likely to act the way Beryl imagines.

Emma is closer to her reality when she anticipates the reaction of people to her behaviour at Box Hill, yet her thoughts are accessed in a very similar way:

> To amuse her, and be agreeable in her eyes, seemed all that he cared for -- and Emma, glad to be enlivened, not sorry to be flattered, was gay and easy too, and gave him all the friendly encouragement, the admission to be gallant, which she had ever given in the first and most animating period of their acquaintance;

9 Jane Austen, *Emma* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003), 130-1. All subsequent quotations from *Emma* are from this edition with page numbers indicated in the text.

10 Booth, 102.

> but which now, in her own estimation meant nothing, though in the judgment of most people looking on it must have had such an appearance as no English word but flirtation could describe. "Mr. Frank Churchill and Miss Woodhouse flirted together excessively." They were laying themselves open to that very phrase-and to having it sent off in a letter to Maple Grove by one lady, to Ireland by another. (289)

Emma may be compared to one of Mansfield's last stories "A Cup of Tea." The story was written during the long winter – Mansfield's last but one – of 1921-22. Mansfield was Switzerland, in one of her last desperate attempts to find a cure for her tuberculosis. As her letters to Lady Ottoline Morell and to Elizabeth, Countess Russell, prove, she spent a significant amount of time that winter reading and re-reading Austen's novels with her husband John Middleton Murry.[11] Among other things, these letters show that Mansfield's favourite novel was *Emma*, which might have given her an idea to recreate it in one of her short stories. *Emma* and "A Cup of Tea" display similarities in technique and content, yet also highlight the disparity between traditional and modernist writing.

Both works begin with the third-person introduction of the main character.

> Emma Woodhouse, handsome, clever, and rich, with a comfortable home and happy disposition, seemed to unite some of the best blessings of existence; and had lived nearly twenty-one years in the world with very little to distress or vex her. …
> The real evils indeed of Emma's situation were the power of having rather too much her own way, and a disposition to think a little too well of herself; these were the disadvantages which threatened alloy to her many enjoyments. The danger, however, was at present so unperceived, that they did not by any means rank as misfortunes with her. (5)

Here the reader gets basic information crucial for understanding the rest of the novel. One learns about Emma's appearance, intelligence, wealth and social position, age and disposition. She is also a bit too egotistical and stubborn. All these things in combination will be the cause of everything that will happen to Emma in the course of he narrative. These introductory lines could easily be taken for the opinion of an omniscient narrator, but one word changes the whole perspective: Emma "*seemed* to unite some of the best blessings of existence." (emphasis added) Thus the narrator is not reproducing her own opinion, but voicing the general view of the about Emma. One might suggest that Mr. Knightley's influential judgment is behind this. Even though there does not seem to be any disagreement about these statements in the community, and the sentences are decisive and fluent, but it is clear that the gap between what is professed and what is believed can be wide. So even before the arrival of Mrs. Elton,

11 "M. and I are reading Jane Austen in the evenings. With delight! 'Emma' is really a perfect book – don't you feel? I enjoy every page. I can't have enough of Miss Bates or Mr Woodhouse's gruel or that charming Mr. Knightley." Vincent O'Sullivan and Margaret Scott, eds., *The Collected Letters of Katherine Mansfield, Volume 4: 1920- 1921* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996), 344. There are altogether 4 letters referring to Jane Austen, two to Ottoline Morrell, two to Elizabeth, Countess Russell, all dated December 1921.
"A Cup of Tea" was written on 11 January 1922. Margaret Scott, ed., *The Katherine Mansfield Notebooks*. 2 Volumes (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2002), 315.

there are people in Highbury who would disagree with at least a part of what is claimed in the introduction. Emma, for one, would definitely reject the idea "of having rather too much her own way, and a disposition to think a little too well of herself" (most likely Mr. Knightley's general opinion). Perhaps Jane Fairfax, Miss Bates or Mrs Elton would privately differ that Emma had a "happy disposition".

"A Cup of Tea" has a very similar beginning:

> Rosemary Fell was not exactly beautiful. No, you couldn't have called her beautiful. Pretty? Well, of you took her to pieces. … But why be so cruel as to take anyone to pieces? She was young, brilliant, extremely modern, exquisitely well-dressed, amazingly well read in the newest of the new books, and her parties were the most delicious mixture of the really important people and … artists – quaint creatures, discoveries of hers, some of them too terrifying for words, but others quite presentable and amusing. (362)

Again, as in *Emma*, the reader learns that the heroine is young, brilliant, rich, and she too lacks only one thing. Yet in this case this is not a flaw of her character, but the fact that she is not pretty. The differences between Emma and Rosemary are obvious - they live in completely different eras and circumstances: one in the Regency period and the other at the beginning of the 20th century. Rosemary is called modern and gives parties for artists of the kind that could never have any place in Emma's world. The other difference, that Emma is handsome and Rosemary is not, will prove important towards the end of the story, and will be the crucial difference that will distinguish Emma's final fate from Rosemary's.

The assessment of Rosemary in free indirect discourse is very similar to that of Emma; yet there are differences caused by the very person whose mind is being reproduced. In this case the reader is introduced to the thoughts and ideas of Rosemary herself, and to her preoccupation with the fact that she is not pretty.[12] One immediately gets an image of Rosemary Fell in front of her mirror, quarrelling with herself about her appearance. Even a short paragraph shows an unusual number of exaggerated words – "beautiful", "brilliant", "extremely modern", "exquisitely", "amazingly", "delicious", "too terrifying for words" – which mimic Rosemary's affected and superficial style of speaking to and about her fashionable friends.

The beginning of *Emma* is a well proportioned evaluation of the title character, not only because it is not she who is evaluating, but because it is the opinion of a person or group created over a longer period of time. The assessment of Rosemary is highly subjective, focusing on what she (unconsciously?) considers most important. Since from the story it is obvious that she usually gets what she wants, her rumination turns on that one thing she *cannot* obtain by wealth or social prestige – good looks. Rosemary is similar to another of Mansfield's "modern women", Bertha Young from "Bliss", in her insistence on suggesting that she has a perfect life, although circumstances indicate this is not exactly the case. People that both these women call "friends" do not seem or act as such. Rosemary's remark, "Pretty? Well, if you took her to pieces. … But why be so

12 It is probable that if the free indirect discourse at the beginning of "A Cup of Tea" represented the acquaintance's view of Rosemary, the main negative feature would be different, and the syntax more coherent. It is plausible to suppose that Emma would, in the same circumstances, assess herself differently than how she is seen by her Highbury friends.

cruel as to take anyone to pieces?" is interesting in this respect. One reading may be that since many of Rosemary's friends are artists and frequently discuss the latest fashions in art, she might be echoing their disgust at cubist painting, which they perceived as cruel, since it *was* actually taking people (and things) to pieces, breaking them, analyzing them from different points of view and reassembling them into abstract forms. The other possibility is that Rosemary's "taking into pieces" refers to gossiping: she is either being ironic and hinting at her being aware of her friends' gossip about her, or she is naďve and the irony is Mansfield's, presenting us with a heroine who is surrounded by gossips and is a gossip herself, yet unaware of being a target as well. Meeting people and gossiping has an important place in both Rosemary's and Emma's lives. To complete the picture, it is necessary to add another occupation they share – shopping; but while gatherings and gossiping are more Emma's hobby, Rosemary is presented as very keen on shopping and rather obsessed with expensive and generally useless things.

The incident which is central for both stories is the help for a girl from a different social class. Harriet Smith might seem completely different from the unnamed beggar in Mansfield's story at first sight, yet closer scrutiny will reveal many similarities. Harriet Smith[13] is merely "the natural daughter of somebody" (19), which for the society in that period, as we see from the reaction of Mr. Knightley, was indeed a degradation. When Mr. Knightley gets to know her better, he is liberal enough to acknowledge her good qualities and even admit the superiority of behaviour over the socially preferred Mrs. Elton. The reader learns literally nothing about the unknown beggar, but in either case it does not really matter what qualities they have or lack, because they are not "befriended" on this basis, but quite for egotistical reasons. Both Emma and Rosemary receive them into their respective houses because of their own selves, not because of the girls'; each acts in accordance with her character, education and era, but both dream about their own, rather than the girls' welfares. Emma Woodhouse's thought, presented through free indirect discourse, is significant:

> *She* would notice her; she would improve her; she would detach her from her bad acquaintance, and introduce her into good society; she would form her opinions and her manners. It would be interesting, and certainly a very kind undertaking; highly becoming her own situation in life, her leisure, and powers. (emphasis in original 19-20)

The repetition of personal pronouns as well as Emma's snobbish assumptions clearly illustrate that the opinion presented in the introduction was accurate, albeit slightly more favourable than earlier expected. Rosemary's thoughts reveal more, the fact that she is consciously acting on the basis of her reading (Dostoyevsky) and the political

13 Even the choice of her name suggests that she is of little consequence, as we can see from the reaction of Sir Walter Eliot, in *Persuasion*, referring to Anne's friend Mrs. Smith: "A Mrs Smith. A widow Mrs Smith; and who was her husband? One of five thousand Mr Smiths whose names are to be met with everywhere." Jane Austen, *Persuasion* (Ware: Wordsworth Editions Limited, 2000), 111. See also Sheehan 2006. Sheehan suggests that Harriet Smith's name might not be her real one (she might have been sent to school incognito) and that some names and incidents in *Emma* are allusions to the life and behaviour of the Prince Regent. Colleen A. Sheehan, "Jane Austen's 'Tribute' to the Prince Regent: A Gentleman Riddled with Difficulty." (2006) Accessed July 1, 2010, available from Jane Austen Society of North America at http://www.jasna.org/persuasions/on-line/vol27no1/sheehan.htm

atmosphere of the era ("women *were* sisters"). Rosemary is aware of this being an experiment, or rather the rendering of fairy tales or plays into real life.[14]

> And suddenly it seemed to Rosemary such an adventure. It was like something out of a novel by Dostoevsky, this meeting in the dusk. Supposing she took the girl home? Supposing she did do one of those things she was always reading about or seeing on the stage, what would happen? It would be thrilling. And she heard herself saying afterwards to the amazement of her friends: 'I simply took her home with me,' as she stepped forward and said to that dim person beside her: 'Come home to tea with me.'… She was going to prove to this girl that – wonderful things did happen in life, that – fairy godmothers were real, that – rich people had hearts, and that women *were* sisters. She turned impulsively, saying: 'Don't be frightened. After all, why shouldn't you come back with me? We're both women. If I'm the fortunate, you ought to expect….' (emphasis in original 364)

For both of them, this is a welcome adventure in life and both act with the reaction of their society well in mind. These reactions, real in *Emma* and only anticipated in "A Cup of Tea", significantly contribute to their decision to "notice" their victims, as ictims they must be called here. So the more unfortunate girls are ushered into the respective lives of the protagonists and, at the beginning at least, provide ample amusement because they are easily manipulated (Harriet because of the situation, the beggar from hunger), and also because they can admire with nad've eyes what no one from the heroines' circle is willing or has any reason to admire. Rosemary's pleasure is presented by analogy with the childish joy of being able to show off in front of one's less fortunate friends: "She was like the rich little girl in her nursery with all the cupboards to open, all the boxes to unpack" (365).

Emma too is flattered by Harriet's admiration and by what she sees as proper behaviour.

> Emma was not struck by any thing remarkably clever in Miss Smith's conversation, but she found her altogether very engaging - not inconveniently shy, not unwilling to talk - and yet so far from pushing, shewing so proper and becoming a deference, and so artlessly impressed by the appearance of every thing in so superior a style to what she had been used to, that she must have good sense and deserve encouragement. Encouragement should be given. Those soft blue eyes, and all those natural graces, should not be wasted on the inferior society of Highbury. (19)

Although to a lesser degree than her father (and sister, for that matter), Emma is childish and immature; yet Austen offers her a solution which Rosemary cannot hope

14 Yet as Mary Lascelles points out even if Emma does not acknowledge to herself the reason why such an idea came to her mind, "the bookish origin of such follies does not need to be stated explicitly. Such a young woman as Emma, so constituted and circumstanced, could have become acquainted with illegitimacy as an interesting situation, infidelity as a comic incident, only in her reading." Mary Lascelles, *Jane Austen and Her Art* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1939), 69

for. Emma realizes her mistakes and, as she is going to marry Mr. Knightley, she might "grow up" under his influence and become a mature woman.

Here lies the crucial difference between Austen's and Mansfield's vision of the function of literature. While Austen offers solutions and leads characters and the reader towards a conclusion in which everything is resolved, misunderstandings are explained and single people suitably matched, Mansfield never offers the consolation of security and the feeling of completion. Quite the contrary, such a thing can hardly exist in her modern world. In a reaction to a letter by Chekhov published in the *Athenaeum* on 18 April 1919, Mansfield expressed her opinion that the duty of the artist is to "*put* the 'question' – not to solve it" and for her this is "one of the most valuable things […] It opens – it discovers rather, a new world."[15] At the end of Mansfield stories, she leaves the reader to ponder the questions and their possible answers.

Emma and Rosemary in due time realize that the "scripts" of their intended plays are not going according to their wishes and that things have moved from their hands. Emma is seriously threatened by the idea that she has been the means of the possible union of Harriet and Mr. Knightley; jealousy opens her eyes and she understands her love for him. When the crisis is over and after a series of disasters she realizes that she was "doomed to blindness" (334), she still has to dispose of the toy which stands in the way of her happiness. Emma helps Harriet become what Harriet has always wanted to be, the wife of farmer Martin.

Rosemary is already married. The moment of crisis she undergoes changes neither her life, nor her attitudes or behaviour. She acts as she does because she is married to a man whose affection and admiration she is not sure of. For Mr. Knightley, Emma is above all the women in Hartfield (or anywhere else), so much so that he stays unmarried (although apparently without being aware of the reason) until she "grows up." In spite of all her mistakes, we have reason to believe that, as he says, she will always be his earest Emma: "for dearest you will always be, whatever the event of this hour's conversation" (337) and that she will never have any substantiated reason to doubt him.

Rosemary too has a fit of jealousy when her husband remarks on the beauty of their guest; yet Rosemary's is not the relief of "perfect understanding between the parties,"[16] which is so important in Austen's novels. The beggar here too gets what she originally wanted (money for food) and leaves the scene, but her departure does not by any means not bring relief. Rosemary wheedles an new toy out of her husband, an expensive box, but even this does not make her live "happily ever after." She is and will probably always be gnawed away at by her own self-doubt and her insecurity about her husband's fidelity and affections. She asks her husband whether he thinks she is pretty and, although the story ends before his answer, it does not really matter what he says. Rosemary's question and the circumstances leading to it reveal all that it is important to know.

A comparison of the similar discursive methods of these two works presents parallels between two different worlds and literary traditions. Mansfield managed to transform a story from Regency England into her world and thus show the "new mold" she thought necessary for the modern era. To paraphrase T.S. Eliot's famous essay "Tradition and the Individual Talent,"[17] Mansfield understood both, the pastness of the

15 Vincent O'Sullivan and Margaret Scott, eds., *The Collected Letters of Katherine Mansfield, Volume 2: 1918-September 1919* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1987), 324.

16 Jane Austen, *Pride and Prejudice* (Ware: Wordsworth Editions Limited, 1992), 153.

17 T.S. Eliot, "Tradition and the Individual Talent" (1922). Accessed July 1, 2010. http://bartelby.net/200/sw4.html

past and its presence; writing not only with her own generation in her bones, but with the best of the tradition of English literature on her mind, feeling its simultaneous existence and communicating with it.

Bibliography:

Austen, Jane. *Emma.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003.
--------- *Persuasion.* Ware: Wordsworth Editions Limited, 2000.
--------- *Pride and Prejudice*. Ware: Wordsworth Editions Limited, 1992.
Booth, Wayne C. "Point of View and the Control of Distance in *Emma*." *Nineteenth-Century Fiction* 16, 2 (Sept. 1961): 95-116.
Eliot,T.S. "Tradition and the Individual Talent" (1922). Accessed July 1, 2010. http://bartelby.net/200/sw4.html
---------- *After Strange Gods.* New York: Harcourt, Brace, 1934.
Finch, Casey, and Peter Bowen. "The Tittle-Tattle of Highbury: Gossip and the Free Indirect Style in Emma." *Representations*, 31, Special Issue: The Margins of Identity in Nineteenth-Century England. (Summer 1990): 1-18.
Jenkyns, Richard. *A Fine Brush on Ivory.* New York: Oxford University Press, 2007.
Lascelles, Mary. *Jane Austen and Her Art*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1939.
Lawrence, D.H. *Lady Chatterley's Lover and A Propos of 'Lady Chatterley's Lover.'* Edited by Michael Squires. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.
Mansfield, Katherine. *Selected Stories*. Edited by Angela Smith. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002.
Scott, Margaret, ed. *The Katherine Mansfield Notebooks*. 2 Volumes. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2002.
O'Sullivan Vincent, and Margaret Scott, eds. *The Collected Letters of Katherine Mansfield, Volume I: 1903-1917*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1984.
---------- *The Collected Letters of Katherine Mansfield, Volume 2: 1918-September 1919.* Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1987.
---------- *The Collected Letters of Katherine Mansfield, Volume 4: 1920- 1921.* Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996.
Sheehan, Colleen A. "Jane Austen's 'Tribute' to the Prince Regent: A Gentleman Riddled ith Difficulty." (2006) Accessed July 1, 2010, available from Jane Austen Society of North America at http://www.jasna.org/persuasions/on-line/vol27no1/sheehan.htm
Woolf, Virginia. *Common Reader 2*. Accessed July 1, 2010.
http://etext.library.adelaide.edu.au/w/woolf/virginia/w91c/

Janka Kaščáková is an assistant professor at the Department of English Language and Literature at Catholic University in Ružomberok, Slovakia. She received her Ph.D. in English literature from Comenius University in Bratislava in 2007. Her research interests include 19th and early 20th century English literature, especially the works of Katherine Mansfield.