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Abstract

The present study complements Brownlee Jean Kirkpatrick’s bibliography on the New Zealand writer Katherine Mansfield, published in 1989. More than a decade has passed since its publication and criticism on Mansfield has increased substantially, creating the need to update Kirkpatrick’s material. This survey offers a careful selection of articles, book chapters, and monographic studies, also considering those published within the Spanish academic system. It starts by providing a list of the books and journals that include article collections on the writer, to make easier subsequent allusions.
1. Collections of essays

Commonwealth: Essays and Studies 4 (Katherine Mansfield and Hanif Hureishi). 1997. Special volume dedicated to Mansfield and Hureishi with articles by important critics on Mansfield studies, such as Bardolph, O’Sullivan, Stead, Wevers, Boddy-Greer, Ramat, New, Corballis and Smith.

Grindea, Miron, ed. 1972-3. Adam: International Review. Katherine Mansfield: Fifty Years After 370-5. A miscellaneous volume dedicated to Mansfield that contains a selection of Mansfield’s letters and poems, as well as articles by such critics as Grindea and Mantz.


Michel, Paulette and Michel Dupuis, eds. 1991 (1989). The Fine Instrument: Essays on Katherine Mansfield. Sydney: Dangaroo Press. Collection of essays on Mansfield that covers a wide range of topics, such as Mansfield’s position in twentieth-century literature and the role of autobiography and feminism in her work. The figures who write for this volume are Gordon, Glage, Fullbrook and Hanson, among others.


that include the insights of some critics contemporary to her, such as Middleton Murry, O’Connor and Daiches.


2. Primary sources


porates an introduction by Murry, where he develops the purifying myth about his wife.


— 1974. Undiscovered Country. The New Zealand Stories of Katherine Mansfield. Ed. Ian A. Gordon. London: Longman. In his introduction to this volume, Gordon suggests going beyond a biographical approach to Mansfield. He calls her fiction “multicellular” (not linear), and selects her New Zealand stories grouping them, not chronologically, but taking into account the protagonist family (e.g.
the Burnells, the Sheridans, etc.). He includes some not published in Murry’s official version.


resentative Mansfield’s stories with an introduction by Juani Guerra.


Scott, Margaret, ed. 1997. *The Katherine Mansfield Notebooks* (2 volumes). Canterbury, New Zealand: Lincoln University Press. Two volumes comprising all the material that Mansfield kept in her notebooks, including unfinished stories, poems and incomplete novels.


3. Biographies

Berkman, Sylvia. 1951 (1952). Katherine Mansfield: A Critical Study. London: Geoffrey Cumberlege, OUP. Critical-biographical study on Mansfield that connects the biographical elements of her life with her artistic production. There is a list of Mansfield’s literary influences (Chekhov, Joyce, Romantic poets, Russian novelists, etc.), and it goes beyond the “feminine” modernism in Mansfield, comparing her with T.S. Eliot in her thematic scope.

Clarke, Isabel C. 1935 (1944). Katherine Mansfield: A Biography. Introduction by P.A. Lawlor. Wellington: The Beltane Book Bureau. Biography of considerable importance for the time in which it was written. However, Clarke herself admitted that Mansfield’s “true life” was still to be produced. Years later, figures like Alpers, Tomalin and Meyers would provide more precise biographical studies.
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Moore, Leslie. 1971 (1972). Katherine Mansfield: The Memories of LM. New York: Taplinger. LM, Mansfield’s lifelong friend, offers in these memories details about the last part of Mansfield’s life, although some of them remain dubious.


Woods, Joanna. 2001. Katerina: The Russian World of Katherine Mansfield. Middlesex, England: Penguin. One of the most recent biographies on this writer with aspects of great value regarding her connection with Russian authors, such as Tolstoy or Chekhov.

4. Criticism on Katherine Mansfield


Aiken, Conrad. 1922 (1996). “The Short Story as Colour”. Pilditch, ed. 9-11. A harsh critic on the work of Mansfield, Aiken states that her stories are “more subjective than one is accustomed to expect a short story to be” and that they constitute “a diabolically clever masquerade” of Mansfield herself who, in his opinion, hides behind all characters. Thus, in his opinion, she does not create fictional personae, but different sides of her own personality.
Alcock, Peter. 1977. “An Aloe in the Garden: Something Essentially New Zealand in Miss Mansfield”. *The Journal of Commonwealth Literature* 11.3: 58-64. Departing from the opinion of some prestigious critics in Mansfield studies, such as Justus, O’Connor and Magalaner, Alcock questions Mansfield’s creativity as a writer and her identity as a New Zealander, and attacks her, asserting that her literary production lacks a historical perspective and is just the encapsulation of the author in her own experience.


Baldeshwiler, Eileen. 1970 (1996). “Katherine Mansfield’s Theory of Fiction” Pilditch, ed. 103-112. A defence of Mansfield’s excessive preoccupation with formal aspects, as opposed to the opinion of certain critics like Bowen that the New Zealander was merely intuitive.


as “feminine”). Bicker speaks of a “subdued feminism” in the covert
effect Mansfield’s fiction has on the reader.

and Katherine Mansfield: A Study in Literary Influence, Anxiety, and
Subversion”. Modern Language Quarterly: A Journal of Literary
History 47.1: 48-65. Discussion of the reciprocal influence in the
works of Mansfield and Lawrence. As opposed to Aiken, Blanchard
distinguishes between Mansfield the writer and her characters, as-
serting that, despite identifying herself with the mind of her hero-
ines, she transcends this identification and creates characters that
can exist on their own.

Mansfield’s Women”. New Renaissance 5.3: 104-12. A study of
Mansfield’s in-between position as a feminist: as opposed to the
open feminism of Woolf or Rhys, Mansfield develops stories of
feminine victimisation, but acknowledges the faults of women and
presents them as acquiescent figures.

Boddy-greer, Gillian. 1988. Katherine Mansfield: The Woman and the
Writer. Victoria, Australia: Penguin. Analysis of Mansfield’s position
within the realm of the short story (versus the novel) and of the im-
portance of the biographical element in her fiction.

Background Discussion on the Treatment of the Roles of Men and
Women in the Writing of Katherine Mansfield.” Michel and Dupuis,
eds. 80-94. Adopting a feminist perspective in her criticism, Boddy-
Greer highlights Mansfield’s subtle attack on patriarchal gender
roles in that she presents vulnerable women condemned to maternity, while men are normally hateful.

— 1992. “Leaving ‘All Fair’? Working Towards a New Definition of Katherine Mansfield’s Notebooks”. Ricketts, ed. 9-22. Speaking about Murry’s editorial work in his wife’s notebooks, Boddy-Greer justifies some of his omissions, but also criticises him for not clarifying when he did them.

— 1997. “Familiar Lives: Men and Women in the Writing of Katherine Mansfield”. Commonwealth: 50-61. Analysis of the relationship between men and women in Mansfield’s fiction and how, on very few occasions, there is a total communion. Consideration of the writer as a feminist sympathiser, but in a very subtle, almost imperceptible way.

Bowen, Elizabeth. 1956a (1996). “A Living Writer”. Pilditch, ed. 70-6. In favour of Mansfield’s multiplicity, Bowen affirms that her innovative character and her privileged position derive precisely from her lack of a definite “formula” or technique.


Bravo Villasante, Carmen. 1981. “Katherine Mansfield otra vez”. *Nueva Estafeta* 26: 84-6. Mansfield’s fiction is elevated to the degree of “poetic prose”, where there is no plot and trivial elements gain a special significance; some of Mansfield’s influences (Symbolism, Azorin, Chekhov, etc.) are listed; and her universal projection versus her feminist intention is recognised.

Brown, Sally. 1988. ““Hundred of Selves”: The British Library’s Katherine Mansfield Letters”. *The British Library Journal* 14.2: 154-64. Mansfield’s multi-faceted personality is illustrated through her epistolary work, where, according to Brown, it is most clearly displayed.

Burgan, Mary. 1994. *Illness, Gender, and Writing: The Case of Katherine Mansfield*. Baltimore and London: The Jones Hopkins University Press. Study of Mansfield’s work within the context of her illness, with a conclusion that the writer finally triumphs over the tragedy of her life in the realm of fiction.

Busch, Frieder. 1970. “Katherine Mansfield and Literary Impressionism in France and Germany”. *Arcadia: Zeitschrift Für Vergleichende Literaturwissenschaft* 5: 58-76. Asking for the consideration of Impressionism as an independent movement with the same status as Naturalism, Symbolism and Expressionism in the field of literature, Busch acknowledges the importance of the technique of free indirect speech within Impressionism, as well as the central role it plays in the short story genre and, particularly, in Mansfield.

traditionally considered within Mansfield studies: the literary relevance of her biography (letters and journal), the inexistence of a journal as such, the literary influences on her work and her sympathy for feminism.


Coad, David. 2000. “Lesbian Overtones in Katherine Mansfield’s Short Stories”. Literature and Homosexuality. Ed. Michael J. Meyer. Amsterdam –Atlanta, GA: Rodopi. 223-36. There are two fundamental topics in this chapter: on the one hand, the identity search that characterises female characters in Mansfield’s fiction and their difficulties due to the limitations imposed by patriarchal society at the beginning of the twentieth century; on the other hand, the homoerotism that pervades in some of Mansfield’s stories. Coad offers a negative view of homosexuality, both in those cases where it
is explicitly recognised (as in “Je Ne Parle Pas Français” or “At the Bay”), and in those where it is implicitly suggested (in ambiguous figures like Bertha in “Bliss” or Beryl in “At the Bay”). In any case, according to Coad, Mansfield presents the homosexual as a pathological figure.

Corballis, Richard. 1997. “From the New Age to The Blue Review. Katherine Mansfield’s ‘Kick-Off’ Towards Maturity, 1910-13”. Commonwealth: 18-26. Mansfield’s evolution from her period at the magazine New Age (with her cynical and satirical portraits) to The Blue Review and Rhythm, where her stories start to reflect a combination of elements from her previous work (a celebration of the child’s intuition together with a satirical portrait of adults’ reason).

Cornut-Gentille D’Arcy, Chantal. 1999. “Katherine Mansfield’s ‘Bliss’: ‘The Rare Fiddle’ As Emblem of the Political and Sexual Alienation of Woman”. Papers on Language and Literature 35.3: 244-69. Taking the story “Bliss” as an example and distinguishing two methodological levels (direct and indirect), Cornut-Gentille D’Arcy argues for the critical dimension and political transcendence of Mansfield’s fiction, as opposed to the general consideration of her stories as delicate and feminine.

as the epitome of romantic intoxication and the fly as the representation of human suffering, precisely due to the constant disjunction between reality and idealism.


Daiches, David. 1939 (1993). “Katherine Mansfield and the Search for Truth”. Nathan, ed. 166-73. Contrary to the ideal of objectivity defended by numerous modernist writers, Daiches states that Mansfield, in line with the psychoanalytic tenets of that time, considered this ideal a fallacy, which is why she trusted her own sense of truth through a “literature of vision”, lyrical and personal, yet of objective appearance.

Dale, Judith. 1989. “Performing Katherine Mansfield”. *Landfall 172*: 503-11. Assertion that Mansfield’s main objective was to expose the social construction of gender; hence, she was the creator of her own life (in her autobiographical work) and used the technique of free indirect speech to show the ambiguous position of the individual in society.

Darrohn, Christine. 1998. “‘Blown to Bits!’: Katherine Mansfield’s ‘The Garden-Party’ and The Great War”. *Modern Fiction Studies 44.3*: 513-39. With a focus on the story “The Garden-Party”, this article outlines the influence of war in Mansfield’s writing, especially after
her brother Leslie's death and, therefore, the importance of class and gender in her work, as opposed to the general opinion that Mansfield avoids socio-cultural aspects.

Di Ciolla McGowan, Nicoletta. 1999. “Through Girls’ Eyes: Young Female Perspectives in Katherine Mansfield and Elsa Morante”. *AUMLA: Journal of the Australasian Universities Language and Literature Association* 92: 97-119. Study of the privileged position of young women in Mansfield’s fiction, who display their special sensitivity to grasp the truth that hides beneath the surface of things. According to Di Ciolla McGowan, this advantaged position is due to the fact that Mansfield’s characters preserve their childish innocence, even when they have grown up. Hence, the critic does not conceive childhood as a linear or chronological state, but as a psychological and cyclical one. She uses the figure of Kezia in “Prelude” and “A Doll’s House” as a working example and presents her as a rebellious and sensitive child who occupies an in-between position between the adult and child worlds. There is also an analysis of Mansfield’s dual vision towards childhood, both positive and negative.


Dickson, Katherine Murphy. 1998. *Katherine Mansfield’s New Zealand Stories*. Lanham, New York, Oxford: University Press of America. This work is the result of Dickson’s doctoral thesis in 1958, which
has been updated and to which she has added a further chapter. She carries out a general study of the topics more thoroughly studied in connection with Mansfield: her concept of truth, the New Zealand element in her fiction, and her failed attempts to write novels.

Dowling, David. 1980. “Mansfield’s ‘Something Childish But Very Natural’”. *The Expli-cator* 38.3: 44-6. This story is presented as an example of the typical duality in Mansfield: she apparently defends the romantic impulse in her protagonists, but finally underlines the dark realism of our society with a consequent attack on romanticism.

— 1992. “‘You Taught Me To Write’: Mansfield, Orage and *The New Age*”. Ricketts, ed. 49-57. An illustration of Beatrice Hastings and A.R. Orage’s influence on Mansfield’s literary direction. The most outstanding one is her instinct for drama, which she incorporates in her stories.

Dowling, David and Wilhermina and David Drummond. 1988 (1994). “Introduction”. *Katherine Mansfield Dramatic Sketches*. Palmerston North, New Zealand: Nagare Press. 1-14. Compendium of Mansfield’s dramatic production, chronologically arranged. In the introduction, the authors set out the origin of the dramatic influence on Mansfield, as well as the most distinctive traits of this type of writing.

Dunbar, Pamela. 1997. *Radical Mansfield: Double Discourse in Katherine Mansfield’s Short Stories*. London: The Macmillan Press. Detailed study of Mansfield’s stories with special attention to the dichotomy individual/society, which is so pervasive in her fiction. Dunbar divides the book into several chapters, according to different topics: “alienation”, “isolation”, “the self”, “couples” and “the family”.

Franklin, Carol. 1992. “Katherine Mansfield and the Charge of Plagiarism”. Ricketts, ed. 75-84. A defence of Mansfield against the accusation of plagiarism that some critics find in her collection *In A German Pension*. On the contrary, Franklin states that Mansfield carries out a “dialectic parody”.


Fullbrook, Kate. 1986. *Katherine Mansfield*. Brighton, Sussex: The Harvester Press. Describing Mansfield as a true feminist and taking Simone de Beauvoir’s opinion as her point of departure, Fullbrook speaks about Mansfield’s feminist side both in her fiction and biography.

— 1991. “Katherine Mansfield: Subjection and Authority”. Michel and Dupuis, eds. 51-60. Study of the dichotomy between Mansfield’s aesthetics/fiction (with an anti-feminist position where she consid-
ers herself a writer first and a woman second) and her philosophy (where she implicitly denounces male chauvinism). She winds up considering Mansfield as a “feminist”, although not in the formal sense of the word.

Garlington, Jack. 1956. “Katherine Mansfield: The Critical Trend”. *Twentieth Century Literature: A Scholarly and Critical Journal* 2.2: 51-61. Two types of writing in Mansfield are distinguished: her short stories and her “scattered writings” (journal, letters and criticism). Speaking of a change in the tone of Mansfield’s critics after the late 1930s, Garlington carries out a very detailed analysis of the two positions in her criticism until 1956: on the one hand, those who praise her work (Aiken, Sitwell and Wagenknecht); on the other, those who discredit her (Huxley and Eliot).


Glage, Liselotte. 1991. “Bibliographies and No End: Katherine Mansfield Criticism in Search of its Subject”. Michel and Dupuis, eds. 28-48. Analysis of the most significant biographical works on Mansfield that perceives Meyers and Alpers’s studies as academic (although the first one displays some mistakes) and Tomalin’s as “non-academic”. The last work is regarded as “feminine”, not “feminist”, in
the feminine complicity between Tomalin and her subject of study (Mansfield).

Godenne, René. 1989 (1991). “Katherine Mansfield’s ‘Nouvelle-Instant’”. Michel and Dupuis, eds. 107-116. Highlighting the artistic value of her production, Godenne calls Mansfield’s stories “nouvelles-instants”, and finds in them two main traits: trivial moments that lead to some existential discovery and the minimal importance of the plot as opposed to the impact of psychological introspection.


and Heinz Kosok. Tübingen: Narr. 41-7. Explanation of the artistic affinity between Mansfield and Joyce: both developed a type of modernist narrative with introspection versus external events, in medias res beginnings and open endings, epiphanies, etc. Although Joyce’s direct influence on Mansfield is not so evident, Gottwald speaks of her as his disciple.


Grindea, Miron. 1972-3. “Only One K.M.?”. Grindea, ed.: 2-18. Enumeration and commentary on the main biographical studies on Mansfield. Not only does Grindea focus on canonical works within Mansfield criticism (i.e. Mantz, Alpers and Berkman), but also on French and German essays. This study also includes an analysis of early works by Mansfield herself with a clear autobiographical background (e.g. Juliet).


as a colonial writer and an expatriate who did, however, resort to her land, New Zealand, as the main material in her fiction. Gurr asserts that her identity as a New Zealander was never consolidated; she lacked a further confrontation with her mother land by coming back to it, versus other exiled writers like V.S. Naipaul and Ngugi Wa Thiong’O.


which there is a dialectical battle between fantasy and reality, as in “Something Childish But Very Natural”, and distinguishes four types of endings in the writer’s stories.

— 1982. “Katherine Mansfield and the Inner Life”. *Critical Essays on the New Zealand Short Story*. Cherry Hankin, ed. Auckland, New Zealand: Heinemann. 1-29. Although connecting Mansfield with the psychological trend in literature and, therefore, with the elaboration of new literary techniques, Hankin does not find a political projection in this writer as, in her opinion, she only portrays mental states. This critic divides her stories into several groups that illustrate different psychological aspects, and concludes by emphasising Mansfield’s universality versus her political or nationalistic intention.

— 1983. *Katherine Mansfield and her Confessional Stories*. London and Basing-stoke: Macmillan. A very precise critical and biographical study, including both Mansfield’s early writings (or *juvenilia*) and her more mature work.

Hanson, Clare. 1987. “Introduction”. *The Critical Writings of Katherine Mansfield*. Ed. Clare Hanson. Basingstoke and London: Macmillan. 1-20. Consideration of Mansfield as an ambiguous “feminist”, because she developed the so-called “feminine writing”, proclaimed by Richardson and other modernist writers. Hanson shows Mansfield’s innovative character, even in her job as a critic, where she seems to adopt a new persona, similar to that of her fiction.

the general perception of Mansfield as a minor modernist writer, considering her, not as a minor but as a marginal author, due to her condition as a woman and a colonial writer. Hanson revalues the feminine material produced by modernist writers, including the biographical one, and defends the radical thesis that there is not a feminine division within modernism; on the contrary, it was precisely this feminine version that gave birth to the modernist movement. She underlines Mansfield’s moderate feminism and the importance of her literary contribution to the detriment of Woolf’s.

— 1991. “Katherine Mansfield’s Life as a Work of Art”. Michel and Dupuis, eds. 61-70. Hanson explains how, at the beginning of the twentieth century, women were only allowed to enter the public sphere through biography; hence, this genre is traditionally perceived as “feminine”. She argues for the recognition of autobiography as a literary genre, and sees it as a link between the public and private spheres.

Hanson, Clare and Andrew Gurr. 1981. Katherine Mansfield. London and Basingstoke: The Macmillan Press. These critics start with the discussion of the role of autobiography in Mansfield’s fiction, highlighting her role as a precursor of a new short story form, where symbolism and lyricism are central. They consider this author’s narrative innovation and illustrate her evolution with the detailed study of her most relevant stories, which are grouped chronologically.

Hardy, Linda. 1989. “The Ghost of Katherine Mansfield”. Landfall 172: 416-32. The term “hybridization” (from Homi Bhabha) is used to refer to the cultural space where Mansfield is simultaneously present
and absent. As opposed to Shakespeare in England, Mansfield is not perceived in New Zealand as a figure of origin and literary continuity, but as an ambiguous and marginal icon.

Harmat, Andrée-Marie. 1991. “‘Is the Master Out or In?’ or Katherine Mansfield’s Twofold Vision of Self”. Michel and Dupuis, eds. 117-25. Acknowledging the symbolic and musical character of her work, Harmat qualifies Mansfield’s art as “polyphonic”, hence the impression of multiplicity not only in the contradictions of her characters, but also in the figure of Mansfield herself as a writer, whose presence is both pervasive and non-existent.

— 1997. “Bliss Versus Corruption in Katherine Mansfield’s Short Stories”. Commonwealth: 62-71. A list of the main symbols used by Mansfield in her fiction with the aim to show her range of opposed terms and the constant ambiguity of her work.

Hayman, Ronald. 1972. Literature and Living: A Consideration of Katherine Mansfield and Virginia Woolf (Only 600 copies). London: Covent Garden Press. Parallel study between Mansfield and Woolf which concludes that the former influenced the latter in her development of a new technique, and considers her as superior to Woolf in her capacity to distance herself from her fiction, while Woolf’s presence is pervasive in her novels.

pect, regarding the New Zealander unbearable in her “breathless femininity”.

Hennessy, Alice K. 1997. “Reading Katherine Mansfield as ‘Selective Cultural Archaeology’. Deep South 3.2. 4th February 2002 <http://otago.ac.nz/DeepSouth/vol3no2/alice.html>. Departing from Mansfield’s stories “The Garden-Party” and “The Woman at the Store” to comment upon the role of colonial nostalgia, Hennessy focuses on Mansfield’s universal character due to the fact that each generation interprets her stories according to the new socio-economic situation they are living in.

Henstra, Sarah. 2000. “Looking the Part: Performative Narration in Djuna Barnes’s Nightwood and Katherine Mansfield’s ‘Je Ne Parle Pas Français’”. Twentieth Century Literature 46.2: 125-49. Presentation of these texts by Mansfield and Barnes as subversive through what Henstra calls “mimesis of subjection”: they apparently follow gender conventions, but actually hide a subversive and critical attitude. She speaks of a “performative” side to these stories in that everything looks like a farse, a game of masks that betrays the artificial construction of social gender roles.


Holden ronning, Anne. 1991. “Katherine Mansfield, British or New Zealander – The Influence of Setting on Narrative and Theme”. Michel and Dupuis, eds. 126-33. This critic concedes a special value to
Mansfield’s New Zealand stories, where geographical location plays a significant part, as opposed to the European ones.

Hormasji, Nariman. 1967. *Katherine Mansfield: An Appraisal*. London: Collins. Some important issues on Mansfield are addressed, like her emotional dependence, her ambiguous identity as a woman and a writer, and Chekhov’s influence on her work. Her stories are analysed in chapter 7.

Hughes, Brian. 1998. “Lyric Compression in the Stories of Katherine Mansfield”. *Revista Alicantina de Estudios Ingleses* 1: 109-19. Going beyond biographical studies in Mansfield, this article takes into account her evolution and maturation as regards narrative technique, from *In a German Pension* to her last writings.


Kaplan, Sydney Janet. 1991. *Katherine Mansfield and the Origins of Modernist Fiction*. Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press. Survey of Mansfield’s position within modernist narrative with a meticulous analysis of the elements that led to her recognition as a credible modernist writer: covert bisexuality, taste for the artificiality of the city (reflected in her attraction to the technical aspects of the short story), and choice of the short story genre. However, Kaplan highlights Mansfield’s problematic position as a modernist in her connection with decadent writers like Pater, Symons and Wilde.


to prove how Mansfield’s exile exerts a powerful influence on her artistic vision, her characters and even the way in which she organises the stories around an existential moment of conscious or unconscious revelation. The image of the writer that arises from this study is pessimistic, marked by a search of emotional and material stability that she never managed to attain.


Kinoshita, Yukiko. 1999. *Art and Society: A Consideration of the Relations Between Aesthetic Theories and Social Commitment With Reference to Katherine Mansfield and Oscar Wilde*. Chiba, Japan: Seiji Shobo. The central thesis is to prove how a good modernist work combines an aesthetic preoccupation with a political and social intention, illustrating this idea in Mansfield and Wilde’s literary production. Kinoshita analyses Mansfield’s aesthetic and symbolist side and how both tendencies prefigure her modernist alternative. Her most representative stories are scrutinised to illustrate this point: “Prelude”, “At the Bay”, “Bliss” and “The Daughters of the Late Colonel”, and an outline of Mansfield’s similarities with Wilde is offered in chapter four.
Kirkpatrick, Brownlee Jean. 1989. *A Bibliography of Katherine Mansfield*. Oxford, England: Clarendon. One of the most canonical and complete bibliographies on Mansfield that has since become obsolete, due to the increasing interest in this writer.


Konrád, Zsuzsa. 1975. “Style and Portraiture in Katherine Mansfield’s Short Stories.” *Studies in English and American* (vol.2). Eds. Erzsébet Perényi and Tibor Frank. Budapest: Eötvös University. 121-54. Mansfield’s work in developing a new style where details are central is highlighted, as well as the link between biography and fiction.

— 1950. *The Loneliness of Katherine Mansfield* (only 250 copies). Wellington: Beltane Book Bureau. Lawlor argues that Mansfield searched vehemently for a faith that she never found, and that she never traced the ulterior “truth” that modernists longed for.

Lawrence, Berta. 1998. “Katherine Mansfield and Thomas Hardy”. *The Thomas Hardy Journal* 4.1: 32-5. Comment on Mansfield’s admiration for Hardy, whom she regarded as almost the only representative poet of her time.


Lohafer, Susan. 1996. “Why the ‘Life of Ma Parker’ is not so Simple: Preclosure in Issue-Bound Stories”. *Studies in Short Fiction* 33.4: 475-86. Lohafer is against the exclusive application of a formalist approach to the analysis of this story by Mansfield, and suggests
its combination with a biographical one. Perceiving Mansfield as a “minor” writer and commenting upon the richness of the short story genre, this critic demands an active reading to infer unsaid ideas, and carries out such a study with her own students to work out how one story can produce multiple interpretations.

Lugo Bertrán, Dorian. 1995. “Percances de ocupación en Katherine Mansfield y Violeta López Suria”. Revista de Estudios Hipánicos 22: 359-78. Presentation of Mansfield as a canonical writer within modernism and of her stories as *bildungsromans*. However, in Bertrán’s opinion, they differ from those dealing with male protagonists in that Mansfield’s women are involved in a “negative initiation”, since their freedom is limited. The story “Bliss” is taken as an example with its clever composition and the symbol of the pear tree as the lack of feminine freedom.

Magalaner, Marvin. 1971. *The Fiction of Katherine Mansfield*. Carbondale and Edwardsville: Southern Illinois University Press. Clarifying that his study is neither a critical-biographical one (like Berkman’s), nor an exhaustive analysis of Mansfield’s work (like Daly’s), Magalaner calls attention to Mansfield’s weak points: limited education, inability to distance herself from her work and artistic immaturity. He considers that Mansfield is not a great writer, despite acknowledging her innovation in the field of the short story.

— 1978. “Traces of her ‘Self’ in Katherine Mansfield’s ‘Bliss’”. *Modern Fiction Studies* 24.3: 413-22. Detection of autobiographical elements in this story to conclude that, as Mansfield approaches the
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— 1978. “The Quest for Katherine Mansfield”. *Biography: An Interdisciplinary Quarterly* 1.3: 51-64. Explanation of the reasons to choose Mansfield as the subject of this biographical study; the image that comes out is not idyllic and pure, but rebellious and cruel.

Moix, Ana María. 1999. “Introducción”. *Cuentos Completos*. Mansfield. 13-16. A list of the traits that turn Mansfield into a unique writer: her multiplicity, her marginality as an expatriate woman, her literary impressionism and the “painful silence at the end of her stories”.

Moran, Patricia. 1991. “Unholy Meanings: Maternity, Creativity, and Orality in Katherine Mansfield”. *Feminist Studies* 17.1: 105-25. Mansfield’s conflict with respect to maternity and femininity: on the one hand, her closeness to modernist writers and her apparent rejection of women authors; on the other, her defence of feminine values. Moran enhances the negativity that characterises the figure of the mother in Mansfield, even speaking of “matrophobia”.

— 1996. *Word of Mouth. Body Language in Katherine Mansfield and Virginia Woolf*. Charlottesville and London: University Press of Virginia. Discussion of Woolf and Mansfield’s ambiguous position as writers: on the one hand, both adopted a rebellious attitude against feminine devaluation within the patriarchal system; on the other, they unconsciously considered the “rotten” status of women’s bodies. Moran links this dichotomy with that of mind and body, and distinguishes a “feminine style” in their writings.

and D’Arcy Cresswell Together with Ottoline’s Essay on Katherine Mansfield. Ed. Helen Shaw. London: Century Publishing. 117-25. The opinion about Mansfield of one of her close friends, Ottoline Morrell, with an emphasis on her dual identity and a description of her as “material” and incapable of understanding the tragedy of human beings.

Morrow, Patrick D. 1990. “Katherine Mansfield and World War I”. Literature and War. Ed. David Bevan. Amsterdam and Atlanta. 39-43. Neglecting the idea that World War I coincides with the beginning of modernism, Morrow states that this movement already existed by that time and Mansfield was already well-established as a modernist writer before the war. He argues for Mansfield’s recognition as a great writer despite her exclusive dedication to the short story genre, and proposes a postmodernist approach to her work.
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