

“Her letters cut are generally nothing of interest”:¹The Heterotopic Persona of Olive Schreiner and the Alterity-Persona of Cronwright-Schreiner

Liz Stanley and Andrea Salter

The writings of feminist writer and social theorist Olive Schreiner (1855-1920), author of *The Story of an African Farm*, *Dreams*, *From Man to Man*, *Closer Union*, *Woman and Labour* and *Thoughts on South Africa* among other works, are usually encountered through these publications, supplemented by the secondary literature on her life and works, rather than archival materials such as the remaining manuscript writings and unpublished letters. Some components of this secondary literature have over time taken on almost primary status: specifically, the biographies by Schreiner’s (estranged) husband Samuel ‘Cron’ Cronwright-Schreiner (*The Life*) and more recently by Ruth First and Ann Scott, Karel Schoeman (*Only An Anguish*), and the edited collections of her letters by Cronwright-Schreiner (*The Letters*), Richard Rive and Yaffa Claire Draznin. Regarding the edited letters, it is not going too far to say that collectively they have come to be treated as though a primary source, in spite of – except in Draznin’s exemplary case – their acknowledged deficiencies, and are often quoted from as though providing full and complete versions of Schreiner’s letters.² The Olive Schreiner Letters Project is in the process of analysing and publishing transcriptions of the Olive Schreiner letters, with the research underpinning this article being part of the project’s work.³

When Olive Schreiner left South Africa for Europe in 1913, she asked many of her correspondents to destroy her letters because she disapproved of ‘biographising’ and wanted to prevent them being sold after her death.

However, because her letters were treasured, most people kept them. After her death, Cronwright-Schreiner (SCCS) requested and obtained thousands of letters from their recipients. After using them in preparing *The Life of Olive Schreiner* and *The Letters of Olive Schreiner*, he then destroyed the large majority.⁴ *The Letters* contains extracts from a relatively small number of letters (c900) from the probably around twenty thousand SCCS obtained after Schreiner's death.⁵ It entirely omits many important correspondents, and otherwise reduces hundreds of lengthy letters to often inconsequential short extracts.

The omissions, inaccuracies and bowdlerisations of SCCS's edition are now known because the originals of some letters provided him in typescript have subsequently come into the public domain and can be compared against his edited versions (as have others to which he never had access).⁶ However, SCCS's *The Life* and *The Letters* has importantly set the parameters of what kind of a person Olive Schreiner is seen to be, as well as what kind of letter-writer, often without later commentators being aware that some supposed 'facts' about Schreiner are actually artefacts of the editing processes SCCS engaged in (see Stanley, *Auto/Biographical I*.) In this article, SCCS's editorial practices are discussed in relation to a previously unresearched set of extracts from the letters at his disposal after Olive Schreiner's death, which he marked as 'not published.'⁷ These are extracts from Olive Schreiner's letters to SCCS himself, and they have been thrice edited: first, by making the extracts and writing passages linking them; secondly, by striking through passages within this; and thirdly, by blue-pencil excising parts of the extracted and linking material.⁸ There has been no previous published work on these edited extracts and their implications for understanding SCCS's editing of *The Letters*, thus our detailed examination of them here.

The different layers of SCCS's extracting and editing process will be explored through analysing this "Olive Schreiner: Extracts of Letters to Cronwright-Schreiner" and the ways in which it fashions a biographical persona for Olive Schreiner. In doing so, we use an analytical framework drawn from Foucault's discussion of heterotopia, a concept giving expression to the importance of space and time in texts as 'other' realms; from persona theory, developed around exploring 'the persona of the philosopher' and having wide applicability in interrogating the textual construction of biographical persona more generally; and from Lejeune's ideas about 'autobiography in the third person,' which we have reworked to apply to the editing of someone else's first-person writings.

Heterotopic Persona: The Textual Production of Public Biographical Selves

Originating in Foucault's analysis of textual space (see "Utopie," *Order*, "Des espace," "Different Spaces"), heterotopias are external and disturbing kinds of space/place that seek to draw people out of themselves and to challenge the 'real life' spaces from which reading is done. Textual space is an exterior emplacement that meddles with our sense of interiority because, through reading, texts traverse and interpolate interiority and exteriority. Heterotopic texts are both exterior and interior to the reading self, both real and unreal, both in and out of time; and, by provoking consideration of such border crossings, they engage and draw readers out of the everyday and into the textual. Foucault's discussion is equally pertinent regarding compositional features of biographical texts, with the mediation between exteriority and interiority in these creating 'the life' in a way which explicitly or implicitly claims to mirror and/or to interpret and summarise the subject's life as lived.

Heterotopic texts semi-detach readers from themselves through their immersion in this other realm of experience. And while the empathetic moves involved – through reading about people's lives and the events occurring in them – are crucial to biographical as well as fictional heterotopias, this is not to presume that readers 'identify' in any direct way with biographical subjects, relationships and life trajectories, but rather that these need to be recognisable and identifiable by readers as *possible* or *likely* types of persons, relationships, lives, of their kind. Moreover, heterotopic texts constitute a particular kind of time out of time, one in which, in the case of biography, 'the lifetime' of another person is represented and its meanings interpreted for readers by the biographer. The authorial promise here, at least by implication, is to provide readers with summative insights into the character and motivations of the text's subject. Relatedly, heterotopic texts accumulate time in two different but mutually enhancing ways: in amassing, representing and interpreting 'the lifetime' of the subject; and in permitting diverse temporal engagements by readers, who can read straight through, or episodically, or by suspending a reading, with 'the life in the text' held still at any particular temporal juncture at which a reading stops. Heterotopic texts also fashion and re-make interiority, subjectivities and prevailing ideas about what it is to be a (biographical) self, by shaping and interpreting 'the life' and 'the person' who lived it. At the same time, there is a paradox here because depictions of interiority and subjectivity in heterotopic texts consist

in the chimera-like surfaces of the textual, while it is the practices which compose reading that actually provide interiority for the subject of such texts by this being read through their surfaces.

There are interesting connections here with persona theory, an analytical framework for thinking about biographical character and public self. The idea of biographical persona was initially formulated around theorising “the persona of the philosopher” (see Schuster; “The Persona of the Philosopher in Eighteenth Century Europe”; Condren et al.; Stanley, “David Hume”) and then developed around recognising that such persona are often the (explicit or implicit) by-product of other forms of writing and representation, not just of biography or autobiography. Persona are public representations of what it is to be this particular kind or type of person, for instance, a philosopher or pop star. Consequently, persona theory has explored the rhetorical methods used in producing these, and the (explicit or implicit) articulation of a particular style or voice in such representations. These ideas helpfully illuminate the making and re-making of heterotopic selves or character more generally in biographical heterotopias, with the persona understood as the publicly represented face of a subject constructed around understandings of distinct kinds of social self.

Persona theory sees a persona as the product of how textual and other representational heterotopias are crafted, then. And rather than focusing on the self in the sense of interiority, attention is instead on the manner and mode of its public representations, including the canonical assumptions and expectations that provide the framework within which such things are articulated. Heterotopic texts draw on these ideas to present and make sense of their subjects for readers (and perhaps their author too). That is, canonical ideas indicate the appropriate attributes and behaviours which need to be signalled for a ‘proper’ or bona fide philosopher, writer, pop star, monarch and so on.

These ideas about heterotopias and persona provide interesting methodological tools for examining the practices engaged in by SCCS in editorially fashioning (or, authoring) a biographical persona for the writer of the letters he extracts, Olive Schreiner. In using these tools, we shall examine in some detail the compositional, rhetorical and other textual aspects of the “Extracts of Letters,” and explore the complications of authorship and the split ‘I’ of the editor and letter-writer, finishing with a consideration of the light this sheds on the process of editing letters generally.

Cronwright-Schreiner's Editorial Practices

The seemingly mundane practices involved in how SCCS edited the "Extracts of Letters" are now examined in detail. No matter how low-key, editing still marks and changes an originating text and has consequences for how readers understand it. However, in some cases editing can be very proactive, not only significantly changing a text from its original form but also constraining readers to interpret it in ways they would not be likely to, were they to read the unedited version. This is how we understand SCCS's practices in extracting and editing the letters to him from Schreiner. In addition to analysing these editorial practices, we shall discuss how they shape the resulting persona of Olive Schreiner and provide an alterity-persona for SCCS himself.

We start with the archive collection referenced as "Olive Schreiner: Extracts of Letters to Cronwright-Schreiner" and what it consists of, for this is by no means self-evident. It is a manuscript of 147 pages, partly typed, partly hand-written, and partly containing some interpolated 'actual letters.' It covers the period from January 1896 to December 1920, but the distribution of its c530 extracts⁹ is not equally spread across these years, with the bulk (c490) covering just 1902 to 1908. However, the "Extracts of Letters" is not 147 pages of verbatim quotations from Schreiner's letters and is best described as a compendium that includes quoted extracts from her letters, telegrams and so on, non-verbatim extracts which are part-quotation and part-SCCS's linking notes, many summaries and commentaries by SCCS, and also five 'actual letters' by Olive Schreiner, which are partly inserted (they contain some excisions and also attached comments). Further, many items in the "Extracts," all dated, are actually *composite* entries containing material from a number of letters of different dates. Realising the complicated compendium character of the "Extracts" is important, for its contents are *not* 'Olive Schreiner's letters' but an editorial construction, and appreciating this affects the status accorded it. That is, these "Extracts" are not 'quotations from Schreiner's letters to Cronwright' in any straightforward fashion and tell the reader as much about SCCS and his editorial practices as about Schreiner and her letter-writing.

When reading this compendium, what comes across is that SCCS worked in the way he did partly to 'diarise' his past life as well as Schreiner's, partly to temporally overview her letters to him, partly to draw together quotations and his notations in preparation for writing *The Life* and *The Letters*. Indeed,

his diarising – with examples being “B’West 29.5.03. About my health & about the mierkats,” “Hanover, 1.2.04,” and ~~“M’fontein, 15.10.06,”~~ all which he extracted from these particular letters – structures the “Extracts.” The composite entries he provides seem to be an extended version of this procedure. For instance, the entry dated 23 and 25 October 1906 is composed of material partly from Schreiner’s letters, but not in quotation marks, and partly from bracketed comments from SCCS which explain who the people named are; and is then concluded with his summary of a telegram sent on 24 October about a new stove she wanted him to send her. Although crosscut by longer passages in quotation marks and interpolated by a few ‘actual letters,’ the pattern set by diarising and composite entries frames the entire “Extracts of Letters.”

An overview of SCCS’s editorial practices in one of his averagely lengthy and complicated extracts will help set the scene. One example starts with an imprecise date of October 98 and diarises both his and Schreiner’s movements with, for instance, “I drove Olive into Kimberley” and “she posted a letter to me at Kroonstad.” There are then some sentences partly in quotation marks and partly consisting of SCCS’s linking commentary about Schreiner’s health. The first precisely dated part of the extract comes about a fifth of the way through and involves SCCS summarising two letters of 7 and 13 October 1898. A letter from Dr Rogers is then mentioned, followed by a long verbatim quotation about Schreiner’s visit to Johannesburg, but from a letter which Mr Lloyd, a friend of hers, had written to SCCS and not to Schreiner herself. Thereafter, SCCS summarises another two letters around comments in which Schreiner praises and writes loving endearments to him.

All the above is blue-pencil excised. SCCS’s extensive use of blue pencil in marking and crossing through whole paragraphs or pages is his second level of excision, while the temporally-first involved him striking through with a pen particular words or sentences.¹⁰ The remaining unexcised material starts with short Schreiner quotations from two letters of 15 and 16 October concerning artists and their creative powers, with the continuation of this in a summary dated 18 October struck through. The next component, a quotation, is perhaps the verbatim version of Schreiner’s comments on artistry that SCCS had previously summarised, and which he arbitrates as “a great ~~et~~ claim but it is a just claim.” However, rather than having the import his last comment gives it, the editing he has done has reduced her longer discussion to a short would-be pearl of wisdom that reads as rather platitudinous. Also excised in blue pencil is a further diarising note from SCCS about his movements after 20 October. This is then followed by a

passage – unexcised but contained in brackets – with a 19 October date; its contents are in quotation marks and concern Schreiner’s willingness to live wherever SCCS could obtain employment. The entire entry is concluded by an excised comment marked with a capital X: “But why not quote in full the letter that contains ‘much on her art’.” Indeed.

Do these details matter, other than as a means of conveying that SCCS’s editorial practices were complicated? This question is best addressed by looking at the effects of such practices for readers. The excisions from the extract dated ‘Oct 98’ remove most of the Schreiners’ ordinary life at that time, for example SCCS’s struggle to find employment and Schreiner’s worsening asthma; they also remove the diarising and linking comments which underpin SCCS’s other editorial practices. Such practices result in a paring down of details that presents a particular interpretation of what matters which, cumulatively, is extremely consequential for how readers understand Schreiner’s life and indeed her as a person. Knowing the details of his editorial practices makes visible the highly active shaping character of SCCS’s routine activities and their contribution to the construction of the persona of Olive Schreiner. Some further examples will show just how consequential these editorial practices are.

Two of SCCS’s editorial practices that have already been noted are the production of dated extracts which, on closer examination, turn out to be compendium entries, and the reduction of lengthy extracts to short supposed pearls of wisdom. Regarding the years after the extract dated ‘Oct 98,’ compendium entries are still routinely made by SCCS. For instance, an extract dated 29 and 30 August 1906 provides material from 28 August and, while the extract dated 16, 17 and 18 April 1907 contains two separate quotations, there is no information about which of these three letters they come from. Concerning SCCS’s paring down of excerpts to produce supposed pearls of wisdom, the following reduction from the lengthy extract dated 22 March 1907 is noteworthy: “The older I grow the more intensely it seems to me that there’s nothing worth living for but love and tenderness between human beings.” This is a mildly interesting comment regarding the importance Schreiner gave to human fellow-feeling, but without the supporting context of her longer discussion and its grounded detail, it seems rather commonplace.

Also, SCCS routinely provides what are at first sight direct quotations from Schreiner’s letters but which on closer investigation turn out to be rather different. For example, a 30 August 1900 extract starts with SCCS’s note combined with a quotation and concludes as follows: “Except that note ~~from her~~ from (her) mother attacking me, I haven’t had a word or note from

a member of her family for three months.” Here SCCS seemingly begins with direct quotation, but does so in the third person of his own authorial voice, and then corrects this. Although what follows is seemingly quotation, he again slips into the authorial voice: “I haven’t had a word [. . .] from a member of *her* [rather than ‘my] family. [. . .]” (our emphasis). A closely connected editorial practice is SCCS’s tendency to provide extracts without using any quotation marks, as with the excerpt dated 15 February 1905: “Had been calling & had been met by a very friendly spirit all round. The weather was very cold! Mierkats all sleeping round the stove!” In such cases, the reader simply cannot be certain if this is quotation, notation or both combined.

SCCS’s next routine practice, probably a by-product of his diarising activities, is mentioning the length of Schreiner’s letters but reducing them to brief summarising comments. For example, an extract dated 5 December 1906 states, “Fourteen pages about my projected newspaper. When anything was to do she became distressed & very distressing, ~~& of no help~~. Much more in subsequent letters.” Not only is this long letter reduced to a rather angry gloss, but the subsequent letters are not extracted: readers, accordingly, cannot become aware that the venture in question was part of Olive Schreiner’s political strategising to ensure that some South African newspapers were outside of monopolistic control and to promote SCCS when his political career was shaky.¹¹ Further examples of this practice may be found in an extract dated 5 August 1908 concerning “A long letter about the Women’s Suffrage ~~meeting~~ movement & a big meeting just held,” which is all that the “Extracts” contains about Schreiner’s lengthy active involvement in suffrage matters; and in another, dated 21 January 1909, which states: “Great heat. Writes a good deal about Denzulu’s [sic] trial & the hatred the Dutch have for the Bantos.” This is the only reference in the “Extracts” to Schreiner’s keen interest in this important political trial, all the more surprising given that her brother Will was the legal counsel acting for Dinizulu and his colleagues and that elsewhere her letters extensively comment about it.¹²

Earlier in this article, the interpolation of five of Schreiner’s ‘actual letters’ within the “Extracts” was noted. SCCS’s comment, “(Interesting ^to be inserted^),” prior to inserting the actual letter of 1 December 1906, implies that this was the criterion for including all these interpolations, although in fact only one whole and one part letter was actually published in *The Letters* (18 December 1906 and 1 December 1906; *The Letters*: 259-62, 257-58). In the “Extracts of Letters,” the interpolated letter of 18 December 1906 is described as “About that crying occurrence in the veld,” while in

fact the actual letter starts with a lengthy comment from Schreiner on the weather in Matjiesfontein, and ends with a lengthy discussion of their Hanover house and the doings of their meerkats and various friends. However, these parts of Schreiner's actual letter are blue-pencil excised, leaving only the account (about half) of her experience of being overtaken by a longing for her youth which led her to cry out, and it is this alone which appears in *The Letters* (257-58). The original letter normalises the experience as an extraordinary part of the everyday fabric of Schreiner's life. Cumulatively, the effect of SCCS's excision of all the 'fabric of life' aspects and retention of just the 'crying occurrence' is to make Schreiner, rather than the specific experience, seem extraordinary. Similar editorial focusing on the odd or extraordinary occurs in the extracts, not just the interpolations. For example, the extract dated 27 August 1904 starts with quotation-marked detail about Schreiner and her sister Ettie's journey from Balfour, where they had exhumed their father's body so it could be reinterred in Cape Town where their mother had been buried, and concludes with many comments and endearments to SCCS himself. However, only the 'extraordinary' moment of the exhumation remains, with the rest blue-pencil excised.

As these examples indicate, SCCS's editing process removes the context in which events occurred, leaving something 'interesting' which, however, can come across as either platitudinous or odd. The routine way in which this occurs is evident in an extract concerning Schreiner's asthma. This illness was the reason she sometimes had to move quickly from accommodation after something had triggered an attack. SCCS's first extract of 16 April 1907, for example, reviews their visit to Port Elizabeth, during which they moved from their initial accommodation because "the house *did not suit Olive's chest* & we got rooms – with great difficulty – at King Edward Mansion [. . .]" (our emphasis). He then immediately rewrote this in a way that omitted the reason being Schreiner's 'chest,' that is, her incapacitating asthma. Also dated 16 April 1907, the revision reads as follows: "the house however *did not suit Olive* & we left the next morning & only with great difficulty got a room at King Edward's Mansion [. . .]" (our emphasis), with the changed version implying that Schreiner was being difficult rather than ill.

Another of SCCS's routine practices was to identify themes in Schreiner's letters, like illness, his work, political matters, and then extract material from which all other detail is edited out so that the excerpts in question appear to deal exclusively with one such theme. An interesting example concerns a series of extracts dated from 21 January to 19 February

1907 about the comings and goings of servants which, read together, imply that the servants did not like working for Schreiner. However, the actual reason for the staff turnover has been removed: that is, her support for the Boer cause during the South African War, 1899-1902. Most African peoples in the Hanover area had supported the British intervention and post-war many had saved enough money through cash-crop farming for the British forces to be selective about who they would work for. Thus, in 1904, what she elsewhere in her letters refers to as a boycott led her to go to Cape Town to recruit a young boy, Chomanie, from a reformatory to work for them. (After repeatedly stealing to buy dagga [29 April 1906],¹³ Chomanie left in 1906.)

A related practice frequently deployed by SCCS is to focus an extract in such a way that Schreiner's embeddedness in a network of family, friends and acquaintances is removed. Regarding the visit to Port Elizabeth that triggered Schreiner's asthma attack (16 April 1907), for instance, the edited extract does not mention the close friends being visited, Betty Molteno and Alice Greene, nor that the alternative accommodation was arranged by them.¹⁴ Other examples are that the "Extracts" only occasionally mentions the Purcells as a couple, rather than the close friendship between Schreiner and Anna Purcell; seldom mentions Schreiner's close relationship with her brother Will, his wife and family; and while it contains a few citations of Jan Smuts, these concern Smuts writing *to* SCCS about Schreiner, rather than his friendly relationship with Olive Schreiner herself and their many exchanges of letters.¹⁵ The appearance of Schreiner's isolation, then, is a product of SCCS's editorial practices rather than a feature of the 'lived life,' as evidenced by Schreiner's many long-term friendships and correspondences over her lifetime.

The editorial arbitration of what is and is not fact, correct and so forth in Schreiner's letters is another of SCCS's routine practices. One such instance, dated 4 March 1907, reads as follows: "I have painted my baby's little inner coffin, the shell, a beautiful pure white with Aspal's Enamel & written on it for her birthday on the ^30th April^ ~~30 April. [This is the wrong date].~~" The terse insistence of the comment struck through suggests that SCCS thought Schreiner wrong about their baby's birth and death date and excised what she had written, but then realised the mistake was his and re-inserted the date. Another example of SCCS 'correcting' Schreiner concerns a lengthy entry, dated 21 December 1908, regarding a letter she had addressed to Smuts. He comments, "I find this letter to General Smuts, which no doubt she had sent down to me to put into better 'Afrikaans' ^Dutch^ before posting it." In fact, Schreiner had dated and posted almost

exactly this letter to Smuts on the same date, 21 December 1908, so clearly this is *a copy* sent to SCCS, not for him to ‘correct’ but probably so he could enjoy her ribbing Smuts in her joking comment, “Dear ~~ne~~ Cousin Jan, [. . .] I send you an article, that I have written. Read it. Think about it. God has let your old little Auntie see some things,” in which she eschews addressing Smuts with the usual honorific ‘Oom’ or Uncle, equalises their relationship by using ‘Cousin,’ then asserts herself in the honorific ‘Auntie’ or Tante.¹⁶

A variant of ‘editor as arbitrator’ involves SCCS’s practice of characterising Schreiner’s activities in a diminutive way. For instance, the extract dated December 1908 states that “Her ‘article’ appeared in the Cape Times apparently,” with the quotation marks here treating it as something lesser, not really an article; also, the ‘apparently’ suggests his uncertainty about what she was writing at that time, for SCCS has confused an earlier piece on the *taal* which appeared in this newspaper, and her 1908 one on closer union published elsewhere.¹⁷ The negative stance underpinning his arbitrations comes across very clearly in the extract dated 2 May 1907. This starts with a warm endearment from Schreiner – “I have an infinite love and tenderness for you” – that he then very dismissively characterises as “one of her strange, wrong headed letters, which she sometimes wrote in a morbid kind of agony – very wrong as to realities.” In that it follows loving remarks from Schreiner, what SCCS writes here is startling and indicates considerable negative feeling on his part.

We shall now explore the consequences of these interlinked editorial practices for the kind of persona for Olive Schreiner that SCCS’s “Extracts of Letters” adds up to or, perhaps, *subtracts* to. As we will show, the editorial fashioning of this persona is inextricably linked to the self-fashioning of an ‘alterity-persona’ for SCCS himself.

The Persona of Olive Schreiner and the Alterity-Persona of SCCS

Standing back from the details of its editing, the persona of the letter-writer fashioned in SCCS’s “Extracts of Letters” has a number of interconnected elements. The core of the editorially produced persona ‘Olive Schreiner’ is composed by: Schreiner’s proposed emotional dependence on and love for SCCS as the husband and addressee of the original letters; the positioning of SCCS as the central presence and subject in many of the extracts; Schreiner’s seeming social isolation and dependence on him; her claimed unworldliness in not understanding political and business matters; and her illnesses which are implied or stated to be a product of her purported ‘mental state.’ We discuss these in turn.

Many extracts are either completely concerned with Schreiner's love for SCCS or are edited to make this aspect of the extract stand out by excising its other components. For instance, the entry dated 6 July 1896 states: "I love you, my dear one. When I think of you my heart runs all out in little ripples of love to you;" and an extract dated 4 October 1910, nearly fifteen years later, reads "Oh my love, my darling. I love you so. You will always know that I have loved you like nothing else on earth." These are such private expressions of love for SCCS that it is rather startling that he not only selected and extracted them, but also that both were published in *The Letters* (221-22). Furthermore, Schreiner's love is specifically characterised in terms of dependence, as with the extract dated 8, 10 and 11 December 1892, which was edited down to "I never missed you as I did this afternoon. Such a terrible depression came over me when you went," and that dated 27 August 1903, "It's such a bitter disappointment to me. I thought you would soon be back [. . .]. One feels a bit lonely & lost here."

There is a figure/ground effect to these editorial practices. The emphasis on Schreiner's love for and dependence on SCCS positions him as both central to her life *and* within the "Extracts," with the result that they become as much about him as her, producing what we discuss later as the alterity-persona of SCCS. An example here is the extract dated 11 January 1904, which starts with a general comment about the value of gifts given by rich people, but is edited down to Schreiner's comment that "all the people like you, my dear one, I was sure they would." This has the effect of not only centring the extract on SCCS, but doing so by using another 'private' comment of Schreiner's. Yet, once SCCS's excision is restored, his 'original' extract in fact indicates that she is boosting his confidence in the way that supportive partners do. Another example of this is a lengthy extract dated '13 or 14 May 1906,' in which Schreiner comments on a very happy day and on her powerful response to landscape. In this passage, her comforting remark – "Your speech is just fine. I shall be glad to see your Beaufort speech" – is actually an in-passing half-line in a long entry, but all the rest has been blue-pencil excised.

Earlier, we noted that SCCS's editorial practices strip out many references to Schreiner's friends and acquaintances, thereby presenting the persona 'Olive Schreiner' as not only dependent on SCCS but also socially isolated. A blue-pencil excised extract dated 1 November 1903 indicates how close and warm were the family and friendship networks that Schreiner maintained. In visiting her sister Ettie in Cape Town, "There was a big gathering in my honour. Will, Fan & all their children, Charley and Emma Earp & their 5 children, Will Stuart & of course Effie & Arthur Brown, & we had a big supper [. . .]. We sat down 21 to table with old John

Purglove.” No further mentions of most of these people appear in the “Extracts,” while there are hundreds of extant Schreiner letters to them in archival sources.

Another key aspect of the persona ‘Olive Schreiner’ is what is presented as her inability to understand the political and business dealings which SCCS represents himself as master of, leading him to characterise her in the extract dated 25 January 1904 as “a very helpless, ~~with~~ shy person & could never be left long alone.” An example discussed earlier is SCCS’s dismissal of Schreiner’s detailed comments on his possible newspaper editorship: “When anything was to do she became distressed & very distressing, ~~& of no help.~~” (5 December 1906). A related instance concerns an extract dated 9 August 1903 about his office troubles: “I do hope you will find all well with your business in Hanover. You could not stand much more worry [. . .]. (I had found that Pepler was a thief & a safe-breaker!!).” The implication is that Schreiner had not understood the gravity of the situation, although her extant letters show this was not so. In fact, SCCS’s comments mask a series of financial disasters he had brought about, and Schreiner’s comment is better understood as restrained and not blaming him for this (see Stanley, “Shadows”).

The persona ‘Olive Schreiner’ is closely connected with editorial practices that characterise Schreiner’s illnesses as the product of her imagination. As commented earlier, at numerous points in the “Extracts,” SCCS selects and follows a theme, which then guides a subset of excisions and editings. Further examples of this practice are the extracts dated 24 to 29 August 1903, which concern Schreiner’s chest pains, and the extracts dated 4 to 23 January 1904, which concern an illness she thought might be typhoid that had swept through the village of Hanover. With reference to an extract dated 7 January 1904, SCCS firmly comments that “Olive was not ill; she made herself quite ill about the typhoid.” He also insists more generally that the illness in Hanover was not so serious but a ‘scare’ which her imagination had exaggerated, as in the extract dated 25 January 1904: “she was alone all day, stayed in bed & dosed herself with tar-water, this & then typhoid scare & her powerful imagination account for everything.” Nevertheless, the ‘scare’ later became real for SCCS, with his extract dated 31 January 1904 commenting, “I got the Col. Sec to send an expert ~~mental~~ Health officer up, who found the source of typhoid contamination, & the epidemic was thus stopped,” and with that dated 13 December 1904 emphasising “my part in checking the epidemic.” As SCCS’s remark about Schreiner’s powerful imagination will have suggested, her illnesses are dismissed around what he summarises in an extract dated 30 March 1907 as “really her mental state, one [due] to loneliness, affecting her health.” SCCS’s comment in an extract

dated 28 November 1906 that “It wasn’t work ^alone^ so much that tired me: it was also the strain Olive was,” indicates his more general emphasis across the “Extracts” on her weaknesses and dependency and the effects of this on him.

Ultimately, then, the persona ‘Olive Schreiner’ fashioned in the “Extracts” adds up to a well-known type, that of the difficult, over-imaginative, childlike genius who is dependent on others for real-life needs. We now briefly consider what this persona omits, exploring this around what SCCS’s excisions remove from his original extractions and thus the initial portrait that his extractions created. There is a pattern to these excisions. First, many of them remove Schreiner’s ordinary loving kindnesses to SCCS, in which she comforts and looks after him and exerts herself to help him in various practical ways regarding his employment, business and political troubles. For instance, in the extract dated 23 August 1902, written while Schreiner was dealing with their house in Johannesburg which had been dynamited during the South African War (1899-1902), she is more concerned with his tiredness and worries than with telling him about what must have been a horrendous experience for her. Secondly, at numerous excised points she pokes gentle and sometimes not so gentle fun at his sternness and assumption of mastery, as in an extract dated 6 July 1896 regarding his “naughtiness” in threatening someone with violence. Thirdly, Schreiner routinely babies SCCS and indicates that he was considerably dependent on her domestic capabilities and, for example, could not cook or bake even with a servant’s help, as in the extract dated 11 November 1902: “What has my darling got to eat? Nothing?” And fourthly, extracts that show Schreiner’s considerable practical competence are completely excised. Apart from her dealing with their ruined house and possessions in Johannesburg (23 to 26 August 1902), such excisions include her making the arrangements to have their baby’s coffin removed from Johannesburg to Hanover (3 April 1903), her meetings with the Cape Governor to try to persuade him to grant a pardon for some Hanover men who had been executed for treason during the South African War (29 June 1903), and her being a witness at the trial of Jan van der Burg for possible perjury when he had given the evidence which had convicted the executed men (13 May 1903).

Clearly, the array of editorial strategies detailed here not only fashion the persona ‘Olive Schreiner,’ but have the additional effect of self-fashioning, of creating another persona which we term the ‘alterity-persona’ of SCCS. By this we mean a persona that is represented through its alterity from rather than mimesis of a persona it is linked to. In SCCS’s case, the alterity-persona is produced around three components.

The first aspect of the alterity-persona of SCCS stems from the construction of the persona of Schreiner as emotionally dependent, needy and unable to cope with everyday life. Through many diarisings, comments and summarising glosses, SCCS is self-fashioned in alterity form around his constancy in caring for and providing Schreiner with practical support in spite of the strain on him, paying for her expensive visits to health resorts, never missing writing to her and generally keeping her going.

The second aspect of the alterity-persona of SCCS is a mirror reversal of the shaping of the persona of Schreiner as socially-isolated and unable to comprehend the public world of business and politics. Again through many diarisings, comments and summarising glosses, the alterity-persona of SCCS is self-fashioned around converse traits, such as running a successful business, being elected to Parliament, being immersed in constituency networks and possibly becoming a newspaper editor.

In the “Extracts of Letters,” Schreiner’s writing is nearly always reduced to glossing statements, with even mentions of the word only infrequently quoted. A prototypical example is the extract dated 13 November 1906, in which, after an inconsequential quoted sentence about Dr Brown, SCCS has written in brackets and then blue-pencil excised “(Going to get her MS. out & work).” Olive Schreiner’s persona across the “Extracts” is fashioned with writing as a tangential and rather unimportant activity in her life, as literally as well as textually ‘in brackets.’ The third aspect of the alterity-persona of SCCS relates to this ‘vanishing’ of Schreiner’s writing and, indeed, strong sense of herself as a writer. Accordingly, the writer Olive Schreiner, who is the authorial ‘I’ who wrote her actual letters, is continually excised or bracketed, while the editor selects, excises, arbitrates, corrects, summarises and also explicitly represents. In this sense, the self who writes the Schreiner letters is *not* Olive Schreiner in the ‘then’ of their original composition and dispatch, but instead *SCCS* in the ‘now’ of their extraction and editing. A visible sign of editorial-centrality involves rewriting something which was first written (by Schreiner) ‘back then.’ In the temporally fascinating extract, “Hanover, 30th April ~~1923~~ ^1907^,” the temporal disruptions introduced by SCCS’s editorial activity are signalled by his (Freudian) slip in misdating and then correcting in the editorial ‘here now.’

The “Extracts of Letters” as a Textual Heterotopia

At this point we turn to consider in a more direct way heterotopic features of the “Extracts.” We do so by examining a series of extracts concerning Schreiner’s visit with various family members to the Zambesi Falls, and with

shorter references to other aspects that point up some of the complications of editorship. The Zambesi Falls extracts are dated 2, 5, 6 and 7 June 1911, and include “Olive left De Aar on 2nd June 1911 [. . .]. On the 5th she wrote [. . .]. They arrived that morning [. . .]. ‘We got here [. . .] the journey was delightful [. . .]. Falls surpass all dreams [. . .]. We [. . .] are now starting in a steam launch to go to Kandahar. [. . .] the motor broke down & we began drifting to the Falls. [. . .] We went to see a hippopotamus [. . .]’. She wired from Kimberley on the return journey on the 12th.” Most unusually, SCCS’s introductory and concluding remarks are his only additions to these fairly lengthy extracts. As Walters and Fogg have pointed out concerning Schreiner’s niece Lyndall Greg’s account of this trip, the journey to the Falls included the whole party going to the hanging tree in Bulawayo – which features so prominently in Schreiner’s *Trooper Peter Halket of Mashonaland*, a fictionalised critique of the imperialist massacres and executions that had earlier occurred there – and also describes Schreiner remaining resolutely calm during a nearly disastrous misadventure on the river, when their boat’s engine failed.

A key feature of heterotopias is that they disturb the usual or everyday by constituting a different kind of space/time with its own codes and conventions. This is an exterior realm, but, in order to engage with it, the reader or other kind of participant has to traverse the interiority/exteriority border. In the case of textual heterotopias, this occurs through a process that both immerses readers in this ‘other’ realm and also requires them to ingest it into their minds and thoughts. The Zambesi Falls extracts are the most story-like sequence in the “Extracts” and have a beginning, middle and end in that order. They are written in the present and future tenses, not the past tense. Also, and unusually, a strong use of the authorial ‘I’ on the part of Schreiner as the letter-writer has been preserved in their selection. As a consequence, these features engage the reader in, as it were, reading the unfolding and about-to-happen events by reading through the ‘I’ voice of the letter-writer. Equally unusually, these extracts, while selected (there were more letters and events than he includes, as indicated above), are entirely unedited by SCCS, and they also contain no editorial glosses or linking commentaries, so his only presence is to indicate the start of the journey and its end. These features too reinforce the reader’s sense of being directly engaged in Schreiner’s unfolding account, because in a literal as well as symbolic sense the reader is reading in the place of the addressee that Schreiner’s ‘I’ is writing to, with no editorial intermediary summarising what this is all about for him or her.

The heterotopic workings of interiority/exteriority borders take distinctive form in relation to the Zambesi Falls extracts. In particular, while

the latter do not disturb the persona being portrayed, this is only as the result of omission. That is, had extracts been included about the joyful planning of the trip, travelling en route via the Bulawayo hanging tree, Schreiner's staunch behaviour in the face of near-death (all covered in other letters by Schreiner and the family members she was with), they would certainly have challenged if not overturned the view of Schreiner built up elsewhere in the "Extracts." During the Zambesi trip, Schreiner actually wrote letters every day she was away, supplemented by telegrams and postcards, as SCCS notes. So the impression of sequence conveyed by these extracts is actually an artefact of selection – as already noted, there were other stories that have been omitted. Thus, while the editing of these extracts implies that they mirror real-world time, they are actually formulated around heterotopic time, the time devised by the editor of the "Extracts" and used to structure his text. One indication of this is the omission of going to the Bulawayo hanging tree, because certainly Schreiner's revulsion about the massacres and executions had been shared by SCCS and there can be little doubt she would have written to him fully about this. Nonetheless, there are more complex reworkings of temporality here too. This sequence of extracts is part of a more general shaping of the lifetime of Olive Schreiner, achieved in large part by providing elements of a time-line, an unfolding date-by-date sequence that imposes a seemingly fully coherent order on the life. In an example discussed earlier, that dated 'Oct 98,' the real-time aspects of the sequence include the seeming appearance of series and chronological order, although actually some dates are missing and what is included is at two points interspersed with 'out of time' editorial comments that are bracketed off from the quoted text. Real-time and heterotopic time co-exist, then, but are separated out into different and mutually-exclusive temporal realms within the text of the "Extracts" by SCCS's editorial bracketing and excisions.

Of course, we do not assume readers will necessarily identify with a biographical subject, or take for granted the unfolding time-line of the life which is represented as 'real life,' or accept the heterotopic time that is editorially-interwoven as actual time. However, the appearance of temporal coherence is undoubtedly seductive because making sense of lives and the persons who live them is predicated upon patterns and coherences being recognised – that they are identifiable persons of a particular kind, living lives of a particular kind. The persona here acts in a teleological way: such patterns are looked for by readers endeavouring to make sense; they are used by biographers and editors of letters in selecting and representing 'the person' around what they deem to be the essence of the life and the character; and as persona theory emphasises, people frequently publicly

present themselves and their ‘works’ around such patterns too. Providing the appearance of temporal coherence is thus an important aspect of the unfolding persona. Yet, this is artefactual and a product of editing, as is clearly shown by SCCS’s comment about an excised entry for 7 May 1907, which concludes a set of dated extracts of 9, 8 and also 7 May 1907: “[The order of these days must be reversed].”

Textual heterotopias consist of words on a page, with the paradox here being that interiority is inscribed entirely on the surfaces of these pages and it is their reader who actually produces interiority by actively reading through the textual surface to make the connections and linkages that provide depth and interiority. Overall, in the “Extracts of Letters,” the interiority effect of reading is directed editorially around the persona of Olive Schreiner and its components, with the reader connecting up illnesses and ‘odd’ behaviours as the depth that provides both demonstration and proof of the persona being attributed. The interiority effect of reading these extracts is created by the fact that what is included, rather than what is omitted, enables readers to accumulate a coherent sense of the persona of the editor who produces and comments on the extracts. Three different elements of SCCS’s editorial knowledgeability and competence are thereby produced.

Within a lengthy extract, dated 8 June 1898, on the nature of intuition, there is the following editorial comment: “(Note by S.C.C.S. I had the same certainty instantaneously and quite independently, but I do not call this an ~~an~~ ‘intuition;’ with me it was a logical deduction, a swift inference, that admitted of no reasonable doubt. End of note.)” This editorial intervention concerns the authoritativeness of the editor, who reworks what Schreiner had written in order to provide a commanding statement of what intuition really is and which also implies her misapprehension of it. The second element concerns hindsight knowledge, an important aspect of the editorial armoury, as is shown in SCCS’s comment on the extract dated 26 October 1906: “My eyes seem to make everything faint before me sometimes. Perhaps I wrote too much of my book [. . .] [. . .] (Man to Man, no doubt.)” Many editorial comments in the “Extracts” assume that when ‘book’ is mentioned, the reference must be to Schreiner’s novel, which SCCS published posthumously as *From Man to Man*. However, not only did Schreiner refer to this manuscript using various titles, but a manuscript being worked on in 1906 could well have been what became *Woman and Labour*, which Schreiner was also working on at this time. The third element of editorial competence concerns first-hand knowledge, as in the aforementioned extract dated 21 December 1908: “(21.12.08. I find this letter to General Smuts, which no doubt she had sent down to me to put into better ‘Afrikaans’ ^Dutch^ before posting it. [. . .]” This note presents the editor both as having

been a knowledgeable and proficient translator at the time and as being able to draw on direct personal information about the circumstances and personnel of Schreiner's correspondences. It thereby conjoins the real-world chronological time of the original letter-writing and the heterotopic time of the editorial interventions on the manuscript pages of the "Extracts."

Textual heterotopias combine textuality and temporality in distinctive 'time out of time' ways, then. But even if the "Extracts" is presented as a completed 'product' in a temporal sense through both the dated extracts that compose it and its editorial description and instruction, restoring text to context opens up the temporal complexities here. One example is its title page, which makes a number of temporal claims:

Extracts & supplementary notes in my own handwriting and contain matters not published in the letters

Balance of letters / O.S. to C.S.
(not to be typed.) 20/3/24

Others send to Miss Woolford.
~~20.3.24~~

The first statement here implicitly makes the temporal claim that these extracts are not in *The Letters*, which was published after August 1924. The second and third statements make explicit dated claims that these extracts are not to be typed, while unspecified other extracts are to be sent to Miss Woolford, presumptively a typist. Yet, around a hundred of the extracts *are* in fact published in *The Letters*, albeit to lesser or greater degrees different from the extracted versions. Moreover, some of the manuscript of the "Extracts" is in fact in typescript, interspersed in the greater number of hand-written pages, and a folder of Miss Woolford's typewritten work has been archived, with these typescripts containing many of the unexcised SCCS extracts.¹⁸

The temporal life of the "Extracts of Letters," then, was by no means finalised on 20 March 1924, although its front cover editorially states this, with the manuscript or a version of it having subsequently had a complicated afterlife. The heterotopic time of the manuscript has its own rhythms and ordering, both in and out of the text narrowly conceived. The units of measurement – days, months, years – in which time is expressed are real-world temporal ones whose accuracy is editorially emphasised by SCCS. However, as we have shown, there are different orders of time and sequencing represented by commission and omission throughout the "Extracts."

Biography in the First Person: In Conclusion

In this conclusion, we shall comment on some aspects of SCCS's editorial production of 'biography in the first person,' and then make some brief points about the editorship of collections of letters more generally.

Standing back from the detail, SCCS is present in the "Extracts" in the form of three different selves or rather dispositions. To extend in modified form Eakin's interesting discussion of self in autobiographical writing to editing letters as a biographical form, there is: the *self who was*, the addressee of the original letters who was Olive Schreiner's husband in the 'then' in which these were written and sent, the *self who writes*, the editor at work in selecting, noting and commenting, and the *self who is*, the estranged husband rereading Schreiner's letters and reflecting on their meaning in the 'now' of rereading in order to edit them. More specifically, the *self who is*, the estranged husband, through SCCS's diarising and other interventions, seems to be attempting to recover or self-fashion the past that had been the present for him when he was the addressee, that is, the *self who was*. In this process, the medium of exchange between 'is' and 'was,' and 'then' and 'now,' is the *self who writes*, that is, SCCS as editor. However, only two of these dispositions are visibly present in the text: the addressee, the *self who was*, and the editor, the *self who writes*. The *self who is* is 'present' only through the *self who writes* and is not a visible 'I' or 'you' in the text, with the editorial presence making no reference at all to this absent-presence. These dispositions are ordinarily a feature of editorship of collections of letters, of course, but the point we are making is that in the case of SCCS and the "Extracts," the *self who was* is one and the same but at temporal remove from the *self who is*, and this creates issues concerning the particular knowledge and emotion that was drawn into the editorial process by the *self who writes*.

An interesting example of such complexities regarding temporality and the relationship between SCCS as the editorial 'I' and as the original addressee of the letter is provided by his puzzling-out kind of comment which ends the extract dated 16 July 1903: "(i.e., as I read it, that I will make out for her ~~what~~ in my own mind what she means to express.)." In this statement, the editorial *self who writes* does so in the present tense when referring to Schreiner's 1903 comment, which SCCS construes in terms of her inability adequately to express herself. Here the *self who writes* in the present time of 'now' is puzzling about what he, as the *self who was*, had been being asked to do back 'then.' The 'I' here includes both the editor and the two other dispositions at the same time, but it does so through SCCS

collapsing a distinction that some editors at least might want to preserve: that between himself as editor, the *self who writes* ‘now,’ and himself as he was ‘then,’ the *self that was*. These issues about the relationship between the *self who is* and the *self who writes* face editors of letters more generally, but ordinarily most editors would seek to preserve the distinction, while SCCS seemingly sought to remove it but in a concealed way.

There are further complexities in the “Extracts” related to the temporal interconnections between the husband who was the addressee and the estranged husband who is the reader and which in a sense guide the self who writes as editor. Thus, unexcised from the “Extracts,” and also appearing in the published *The Letters*, are two lengthy extracts wherein Schreiner comments that SCCS had changed as a person. The first, dated 4 July 1903 (*The Letters*: 237), pinpoints this as follows: “I wonder sometimes if since you went to Johannesburg & especially since that terrible visit to England, you have been in something [of] that condition [. . .] when there seemed nothing but a blind chance ruling life & no right & no wrong & no ideal ruling life.” The second, dated 2 August 1903 (*The Letters* 239), observes, “You have not looked young & had that bright light in your eyes once, even for a day, since you returned from England.” After 1903, such comments cease in the “Extracts,” but in fact the change in SCCS continues to be intimated in Schreiner’s letters to her closest friend over many years, Betty Molteno (see Stanley, “Shadows”). They also contain comments to the effect that SCCS needed looking after because he repeatedly got into public and very expensive ‘troubles,’ which included provoking two libel cases and failing to make legal arrangements Schreiner had advised about his business, with expensive consequences when his partner defaulted.

Overall, what we are proposing here is that edited collections of letters in general, not just SCCS’s “Extracts” specifically, have embedded in them complicated combinations of authorial – editorial functions. The editorial ‘I’ is not a passive or removed entity, even when written in the removed voice, but is strongly present throughout as a kind of semi-submerged authorial ‘I’ within all collections of letters. In effect, there are two authorial ‘Is,’ that of the letter-writer and that of the editor, that co-exist in edited letter collections. While the authorial ‘I’ of the editor is sometimes acknowledged and articulated in the first person, it is most often expressed in the removed voice or else is seemingly absent. Yet, as we have shown, it is the *editorial* – authorial practices rather than the *epistolary* – authorial activities that actually control the resultant heterotopic text. Since letter-writers have rarely had the authorial intent to edit and publish their letters, there is a need, when thinking analytically about the heterotopic ‘I’ in collections of letters, to

recognise the absent-presence of the editor, just as much as the present-absence of the letter-writer. Such collections produce a public persona for the editor as well as for the writer.

We conclude, indeed, that there is not simply a splitting of the authorial 'I' but a stronger process of editorial-authoring involved in producing all edited collections of letters. This is what we mean by the idea of 'biography in the first person,' drawing here on Lejeune's interesting discussion of autobiography in the third person. Lejeune examines instances where autobiographers step out of role and the first person, and objectify themselves as though they are another person on whose lives they are reporting and commenting. What is happening in "Extracts of Letters" is that the editor, SCCS, steps into role and the (removed or disguised) editorial first person; then, as a by-product of selecting, editing and commenting on the persona of his subject, he self-fashions through an accumulation of editorial practices a heterotopic alterity, which we have termed an alterity-persona. This editorial activity not only produces the split or double 'I' of the letter-writer, but also a subterranean gap between reading the temporal progression of the epistolary 'I' and reading the unfolding editorial activity of interpreting and fashioning this progression. However, while we are proposing that there is *always* an alterity-persona represented in the heterotopias that are edited collections of letters, its dimensions will obviously vary from case to case. In general, the presentation of such a persona works in ways that are considerably subtler, less controlling and less personally motivated than that which characterises the Cronwright-Schreiner variant.

NOTES

1. SAL MSC 26, 2.16, "Olive Schreiner: Extracts of Letters," extract dated 12 Jan. 1909.

2. Heilmann's otherwise excellent discussion of Schreiner's 'new women strategies,' for instance, references specific passages rather unproblematically and positions the persona of Schreiner largely within the framework of illness and unhappiness that *The Letters* implies.

3. The main project is funded by the ESRC (RES-062-23-1286), while the British Academy has funded related research concerned with Schreiner's remaining manuscripts. The support of the ESRC and the British Academy is gratefully acknowledged. See <www.oliveschreinerletters.ed.ac.uk/>.

4. NELM Cronwright-Schreiner 30 1b, SCCS diary 15 Dec. 1921–30 Sept. 1923.

5. There are c7000 now extant Schreiner letters and other epistolary matter in archival locations in South Africa, the USA and Europe.

6. For comments on these problems, see First and Scott, Rive, Draznin, and Stanley (*Imperialism*).

7. SAL MSC 26, 2.16, "Olive Schreiner: Extracts of Letters to Cronwright-Schreiner. Extracts & supplementary notes in my own handwriting and contain matters not published in the letters." However, these extracts in fact have a complicated relationship to SCCS's *Letters* and are actually not entirely distinct from what was published, as is discussed later. Additionally, our analysis draws on a further set of Cronwright-Schreiner's extractions, which he made from the letters Schreiner wrote to John and Mary Brown, now archived in the US. SCCS's approach therein is very similar to that marking the "Extracts," and this includes the ways in which his selections centre him (see HRC University of Texas at Austin, "Olive Schreiner Letters: Extracts from letters to Mrs John Brown," as compared with the actual letters, to be found in SAL MSC 26, 2.2).

8. Since these extracts (and those in the HRC Texas) have dates and places included (and so help to date and place those of Schreiner's letters which lack this information), they have been transcribed as part of the Olive Schreiner Letter Project's work.

9. It is difficult to be completely precise because of the many compendium entries discussed later.

10. The use of pen to strike out has in many instances visibly been overlain by blue-pencil excisions.

11. OS to Betty Molteno, letters of many dates, UCT BC16.

12. OS to Will Schreiner, many letters in this year, UCT BC 16.

13. OS to Betty Molteno, letters of many dates, UCT BC16.

14. OS to Betty Molteno, letters during April 1907, UCT BC16.

15. OS to Jan Smuts, Pretoria Smuts A1.

16. OS to Smuts, 21 December 1908, Smuts Pretoria A1. In the actual letter she posted to Smuts, Schreiner explicitly addresses Smuts as nephew, making the point even more strongly.

17. See OS to Fan Schreiner and Will Schreiner, various dates in 1908, UCT BC 16. The piece appeared in the *Transvaal Leader* on 22 December 1908 and was later expanded into a book.

18. SAL MSC 26, 2.17.

WORKS CITED

- Condren, Conal, Stephen Gaukroger and Ian Hunter, eds. *The Philosopher in Early Modern Europe: The Nature of a Contested Identity*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2006.
- Cronwright-Schreiner, Samuel, ed. *The Letters of Olive Schreiner 1876-1920*. London: Fisher Unwin, 1924.
- . *The Life of Olive Schreiner*. London: Fisher Unwin, 1924.
- Draznin, Claire. *My Other Self: The Letters of Olive Schreiner and Havelock Ellis 1884-1920*. New York: Peter Lang, 1992.
- Eakin, Paul John. *Fictions in Autobiography*. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton UP, 1985.
- First, Ruth and Ann Scott. *Olive Schreiner: A Biography*. London: Andre Deutsch, 1980.

- Foucault, Michel. "Des espace autres." *Architecture, Mouvement, Continuité* 5 (1984): 46-49.
- . "Different Spaces." *Michel Foucault: Ethics, Subjectivity and Truth – The Essential Works of Michel Foucault, 1954-1984*. Vol. 2. Ed. Paul Rabinow. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1998. 175-85.
- . *The Order of Things*. 1966. London: Tavistock, 1970.
- . "Utopie et littérature." 1966. 12 Sept. 2008
<<http://foucault.info/documents/heteroTopia/>>.
- Heilmann, Ann. *New Woman Strategies*. Manchester: Manchester UP, 2004.
- Lejeune, Philippe. *On Autobiography*. Minneapolis: U of Minnesota P, 1989.
- The Persona of the Philosopher in Eighteenth Century Europe. 2006. "The Persona of the Philosopher in Eighteenth Century Europe." 14 Aug. 2008
<<http://www.ched.uq.edu.au/index.html?page=49367&pid=49368>>.
- Rive, Richard, ed. *Olive Schreiner Letters: Volume I, 1871-1899*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1987.
- Schoeman, Karel. *Olive Schreiner: A Woman in South Africa, 1855-1881*. Johannesburg: Jonathan Ball, 1991.
- . *Only An Anguish To Live Here: Olive Schreiner and the Anglo-Boer War, 1899-1902*. Cape Town: Human and Rousseau, 1992.
- Schuster, Shlomit. *The Philosopher's Autobiography*. Westport, Connecticut: Praeger, 2003.
- Stanley, Liz. *The Auto/Biographical I*. Manchester: Manchester UP, 1992.
- . *Imperialism, Labour and the New Woman: Olive Schreiner's Social Theory*. Durham, UK: sociologypress, 2002.
- . "'Shadows Lying Across her Pages': Epistolary Aspects of Reading 'the Eventful I' in Olive Schreiner's Letters 1889-1913." *Journal of European Studies* 32 (2002): 251-66.
- . "The Writing of David Hume's *My Own Life*: The Persona of the Philosopher and the Philosopher Manqué." *Auto/Biography* 14 (2006): 320-38.
- Walters, Paul and Jeremy Fogg. "Olive Schreiner in Rhodesia: An Episode in Biography." *English in Africa* 34.2 (2007): 93-109.

Copyright of *English in Africa* is the property of Institute for Study English in Africa and its content may not be copied or emailed to multiple sites or posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's express written permission. However, users may print, download, or email articles for individual use.