Lytton Strachey and other Cultural Influences on Keynes’s Communication of Economic Ideas in Economic Consequences of the Peace
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When Economic Consequences of the Peace appeared during December 1919 it was an immediate publishing success, although Keynes’s argument that the book was a serious work of economics met with a controversial response that continues to the present day. While most critics’ focus on the book’s economic arguments, there has, to date, been limited analysis of the reasons for the success Keynes enjoyed in communicating his ideas to a wider audience.

By applying the tools of literary criticism to the book it is possible to uncover a number of implicit and explicit influences, which help explain how Keynes developed a unique way of reaching out to a wide range of readers. These influences began when Keynes was a young man at Eton, where he came under the sway of the school’s anti-Benthamite sentiment, and which never left him. When he went up to Cambridge he came under the influence of the philosopher G. E. Moore, whose message of friendship and community profoundly affected his activities in the Cambridge Apostles and his later association with Bloomsbury. His close friendship with the fellow Apostle Lytton Strachey, and their shared views on homosexuality, was particularly important, as was Bloomsbury’s Virginia Woolf and her written mode of psychological realism. Combined, these influences help us understand why the unique styles of each writer was so successful in communicating to such large and diverse audiences.
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1. Introduction

Collini’s analysis of public intellectuals and the phrase “cultural authority” implies they belong in a cultural environment both as influencers and as individuals who are influenced (Collini, 2006, p. 452). Despite this view, some economists do not see a relationship between culture and economics as important. They take a narrow view and divorce reason, and by implication economics, from a definition of culture (Eagleton, 2000). But for others the relationship is tightly coupled and they see
economics as embedded in culture, although scholars sharing this view often find themselves defending the notion that economics can be understood in cultural terms.

For example, Jones argues that economists do not give the subject of culture much thought (Jones, 2006). However, this is difficult to accept given the prominent role scholars of information dissemination give to it. Mokyr (2002), Crémer (1993), North (1990), Barnard (1958), and Casson (1997) represent a handful of those who give a pre-eminent place to the role of culture in explaining how ideas are communicated. Bigelow (2003) and Klaver (2003) argue that culture is central to our understanding of economics, its influence is pervasive and it cannot be separated from the subject. An examination of a number of cultural influences that surrounded Keynes provides strong support for these views.

His schooling at Eton, involvement with the Cambridge Apostles and later friendships within Bloomsbury, were all important influences on Keynes, his economic views and how he communicated those views. Two of the most significant influences were his friendship with Lytton Strachey and his association with Virginia Woolf. For example, Economic Consequences of the Peace (1919) closely maps aspects of both Strachey’s and Woolf’s own writing styles. A comparison of Strachey’s Eminent Victorians (1918) and Economic Consequences shows how both men often used triplets to construct words, sentences and phrases, a literary tradition reaching back to ancient Greece and Rome. Both Strachey and Keynes owed a great deal to these conventions. Nevertheless they were not bound by the past and both pioneered innovative new ways of writing biography and economics respectively. Their use of elaboration and exaggeration could, in the hands of lesser talents easily have become tedious but as skilled rhetoricians both men charted new ways of writing. In looking for explanations, some critics argue their homosexuality partly accounts for their unique styles. This is a controversial argument and does not enjoy widespread support, but at a time when some aspects of sexual orientation were criminalised, a sense of rebellion and elaboration permeates literary styles in ways that often are not found in writers whose sexuality is not suppressed or hidden in some way. Both men enjoyed entertaining their readers and they both took pleasure from shocking their readers so it is not surprising they believed their point of difference was that they were “rebellious immoralists.”
The second important influence on Keynes’s style was Virginia Woolf and her interest in psychoanalysis. Applied to the literary characters she developed some scholars refer to her technique as ‘psychological realism’. Woolf was also an innovator and she developed the inner psychology and complex personalities of her characters in ways previously not done. This also coincided with a period when there was great interest by fellow Bloomsberries in the developing discipline of psychology. A comparison of Woolf’s, Strachey’s and Keynes’s development of their characters shows a similarity of style when dealing with the inner psychology of their subjects.

Such comparison lacks explicit verification but an examination of the archives reveals how each author took an interest in the other’s writing. For example Keynes and Strachey regularly swapped books and manuscripts, also corresponding and commenting on each other’s views. Woolf also wrote to Keynes on at least one occasion commenting on his reading out a portion of his unpublished manuscript of *Economic Consequences* to a group of Bloomsberries. Letters also reveal Keynes and Strachey discussed and compared their respective works in progress so that by implicit methods we can judge how each writer influenced the other.
2. Keynes and his Cultural Environment

Prior to Holroyd’s first two-part biography *Lytton Strachey*, published in 1976, few paid much attention to Keynes’s cultural environment. Holroyd discussed in some detail his education at Eton and his friendships in the Cambridge Apostles and Bloomsbury, and since then a number of researchers have emphasised the importance of these earlier influences on his economic ideas. For example, biographies by Skidelskey (1983, 1992 and 2001) and Moggridge (1992) both explained a number of Keynes’s economic ideas and activities in the context of cultural influences. Other works by Mini (1991) and Taddeo (2002) deal with cultural influences in considerable detail.

One of the most important early influences on Keynes was the views of G. E. Moore, which Keynes acknowledged in *Two Memoirs* (Keynes, 1949, p. 81). It was Moore who impressed on Keynes and his fellow Apostles that the focus of inquiry should be method rather than outcome and when Keynes applied this to economic problems it led him to take apart the basic components of the classical system of economics to which most of his contemporaries subscribed. Mini argues that far from being impressed, Keynes found the structure of the classical system illogical, self-contradictory, and superficial (Mini, 1991). One example is the classical relationship between savings and investment. Known as ‘Say’s Law’ the classical economists regarded as practically synonymous the notion that to save was to invest. In part, this view of the classicists comes from the writings of David Ricardo and John Stuart Mill who rigidly defined the terms of supply and demand in a way that supported the definition of Say’s Law as simply ‘supply creates its own demand’ (Sowell, 2008, p. 1). However, Ricardo and Mills were just two economists during the nineteenth century who were part of an evolutionary process when the basic terms of economics were being debated and continually redefined. While their position may now be judged as simplistic, Say’s Law is a good example of a term that has a long history of controversy and ‘sheds light on the enormous difficulties involved when even intelligent thinkers with honesty and goodwill try to understand each other’s theories without clearly defined terms and without a clear sense of the conceptual framework of the opposing views’ (Sowell, 2008, p. 3).
Keynes’s contribution to the debate was to take apart the simplistic conclusion of the classicists, uncovering a world of neglected mechanisms in the process. First, he found an increase in savings reduces consumption. From this line of thought Keynes determined that a fall in consumption reduces incomes, which has a negative effect on business outlook, sales prospects, and hence on the marginal efficiency of capital. Thus, if anything, an increase in savings means a decrease in investment. What to classicists seemed a straightforward flowing of non-consumption (savings) into business consumption (investment), is shown by Keynes to hide a world of complex linkages that must be analysed and, ‘not taken for granted’ (Mini, 1991, p. 71).

Mini argues that we can only understand Keynes’s economics by understanding the early influences of his youth, first from his education at Eton with its anti-Benthamite sentiment and second, his activities with the Cambridge Apostles and the influence Moore’s philosophy had on the group. A third significant influence was his association with Bloomsbury, while a fourth was the emerging discipline of psychoanalysis.

Those in Keynes’s circle rejected the harsh utilitarian views of Bentham, Keynes stating in his memoir that ‘we were amongst the first of our generation, perhaps alone amongst our generation, to escape the Benthamite tradition’ (Keynes, 1949, p. 96). Keynes and his circle of friends turned rather to Coleridge’s, and others’, more humanistic views. Similarly, Moore’s philosophical views held sway over the young Keynes. He wrote that:

I went up to Cambridge at Michaelmas in 1902, and Moore’s *Principia Ethica* came out at the end of my first year. I have never heard of the present generation having read it. But, of course, its effect on us, and the talk which preceded and followed it, dominated, and perhaps still dominates, everything else … For us, those who were active in 1903 … the influence was not only overwhelming … it was exciting, exhilarating, the beginning of a renaissance, the opening of a new heaven on a new earth, we were the forerunners of a new dispensation, we were not afraid of anything (Keynes, 1949, p. 82).
Keynes and his fellow Apostles took Moore’s ethics as the philosophical basis for their deep friendship and community. Through his association with the Apostles the bonds of community and friendship took precedence over most other values. The closest of Keynes’s Apostle friendships was with Lytton Strachey. Both were homosexual and both regarded themselves as rebels whose devotion to Plato was part of their larger opposition to Victorianism. This generation, proclaimed Strachey, ‘renounced religion and politics, proclaimed the death of God, and declared “love is the only reality”’ (Taddeo, 1997, p. 167).¹ What this also meant was that it was likely the Apostles would stay in touch with one another. Furthermore, Moore’s ‘highest good’ proved strong enough to withstand the requirements of making a ‘regular’ living and many of the Apostles of Keynes’s generation settled in London in close proximity to each other. From the original ‘at homes’ of some of them a new association eventually sprang up, looser than the Society, but one that, in time, would be a very important force in the cultural life of Britain. Those individuals who became the core of what is now known as Bloomsbury, were the third significant influence on Keynes, which wanted to change the cultural values of the nation away from utilitarianism and towards Moorean ethics. They were in the anti-Benthamite tradition of writers who viewed themselves as having a mission to teach higher values to the masses, and especially to prevent them being swallowed up by the crassness of a commercial civilization. In time a number of the Bloomsberries would conquer one field after another, giving new directions to art and art appreciation, to the novel, to history and biography and to political economy.

In addition to his rejection of Benthamite utilitarianism, a commitment to Moorean ethics of community and friendship, and rebellion against Victorian mores and conventions, a fourth influence on Keynes was the application of a psychological way of developing literary characters. While the acknowledged father of psychology was Wilhelm Wundt (1832-1920) the individual who most influenced a number of the Bloomsbury set was Sigmund Freud (1856-1939) (Geering, 1980, p. 211). Freud referred to his pioneering work as psychoanalysis as it grew out of the clinical practice of psychiatry rather than the growing science of psychology, although psychology was revolutionised as a result of Freud’s work (Geering, 1980, p. 213). The importance of Freud is that ‘he dealt a lethal blow to man’s perhaps greatest illusion – that of being master of his thoughts and actions’ (Misiak, 1966, p. 378).
Psychoanalysis basically represents the discovery of a whole new area of man’s psychic life of which we were previously unaware and now simply refer to as the ‘unconscious’ or the ‘subconscious’. This Freudian influence was to have an effect on the way Keynes and his Bloomsbury friends wrote about others.

Together, these influences of anti-Benthamite sentiments, Moore’s philosophical views, the anti-Victorian rebellion of Keynes and his friends and their interest in psychoanalysis provided a cultural environment different from the scholarly surroundings of Cambridge, and the public policy work of the Treasury, in ways that help explain why Keynes believed economics was more than a science.
3. **Lytton Strachey and *Eminent Victorians***

Most scholars acknowledge that the most important influence on Keynes’s writing style in *Economic Consequences* was Lytton Strachey and his book *Eminent Victorians*. Up to the time of the publication of both books, within a year of one another, Keynes’s and Strachey’s friendship had been particularly close. David Garnett argues that Strachey’s book ‘was to influence the style of *Economic Consequences of the Peace* …. persuading Keynes to be more indiscreet than he was by nature and to have the courage to print what he would have said in conversation’ (Garnett, 1979, p. 140). Holroyd accepts Garnett’s argument but provides little material to enable judgment on the degree to which Strachey’s style in *Eminent Victorians* influenced Keynes’s style in *Economic Consequences* (Holroyd, 1995, p. 428). Rosenbaum also has no doubt there is a strong correlation between both men’s styles and argues that to date this correlation has been poorly researched. Furthermore, those associated with the Bloomsbury set, and literary works produced by Bloomsberries, have a close reciprocal relationship (Rosenbaum, 1981, p. 330). Rosenbaum also argues that ‘the basic premise of a literary history of the Bloomsbury Group is that their writings are historically interrelated in ways important if not essential to their interpretation’ (Rosenbaum, 1981, p. 331). In commenting specifically on Keynes’s *Economic Consequences* and Strachey’s *Eminent Victorians*, Rosenbaum claims the entire texts of both works are related to each other and adds that ‘Bloomsbury’s writings display … similarity [in such a way that] … literary history [calls for a description of] … this resemblance’ (Rosenbaum, 1981, p. 338).

In this section a number of explicit and implicit influences are examined. First, an examination is undertaken of the way in which both men’s use of triplets defined the style of their books. This style of writing had been adopted from Edward Gibbon (1737-1794), especially his magnum opus, *The History of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*. Strachey makes explicit reference to this influence in correspondence with friends and family and Keynes purchased a number of books from Gibbon’s library, although it is most likely that Keynes was influenced as much by Strachey’s book as Gibbon’s. The use of triplets has a mixed history with writers from the time of Cicero through to Ascham during the middle ages, Johnson and Gibbon in the
Restoration period and Strachey in the Modernist era bringing its use back into fashion for what they believed helped add clarity and elaboration to their written styles. Others, such as Dryden in the Restoration period, have been equally dismissive in the use of triplets and argue that it adds little to a writer’s style. For present day writers it is rarely used nor remembered as a useful literary device. But, despite the fashionability of its use, in the hands of master craftsmen such as Cicero, Johnson, Gibbon, Strachey and Keynes, it has been a highly effective technique as the ongoing publishing success of each writer bears witness.

The second influence examined is the ways in which Keynes’s and Strachey’s sexuality affected their writing. This is a controversial argument but both men were homosexual during an era when it was a crime to be so and both lived under the shadow of the Oscar Wilde trial. According to some scholars this had an important influence on the ways in which both men developed their written styles. A third influence is the way in which Keynes and Strachey as writers of the Modernist period (turn of the twentieth century to mid-1920s) pioneered new ways of writing about their subjects, Keynes in Economics and Strachey, the Biography. This third point owes much to a fourth influence, which was the process of innovation underpinning their written styles as both men relied on the past as they experimented with new ways of writing about their subjects. Despite this reliance both considered themselves “rebellious immoralists” who believed it their duty to reject the Victorianism of their forebears and this directly influenced the ways in which they explicitly sought to shock and entertain their readers.

3.1. Triplets and Style

Spurr notes that in Strachey’s book there is a persistent use of triplets in words, sentences and phrases, something that literary critics of Economic Consequences have also noticed in Keynes’s book. Furthermore, there is a pattern of both writers using a triplet of words, followed by a set of phrases in triplet, and finally three sentences that taken together form a triplet. Spurr refers to this characteristic of Strachey’s style as his ‘elaboration of phraseology’ and that his use of triplets of words, phrases, and sentences ‘in an immense variety of guises is the most extraordinary manifestation of this preoccupation’ (Spurr, 1990, p. 36). Strachey’s and Keynes’s use of triplets is unusual for writers of the ‘modernist’ period although it does enjoy a rich history of
usage, especially from the medieval English and Restoration periods, when writers looked back to a Latin tradition for rhetorical inspiration.

This Latinate influence has not always enjoyed scholarly support. For example, Burnley points out it has only been since the late 1970s that literary critics have increasingly come to support the view that the use of triplets in prose writing owes more to Latin influences than French-Anglo writing (Burnley, 1986). Furthermore, Burnley argues that the curial style of prose used in England from the time of Chaucer ‘with its Latinate constructions, extensive clausal qualifiers, lexical doublets and triplets, and anaphoric cohesive devices’ (Burnley, 1986, p. 593), supports the view that triplets were used as rhetorical devices as far back as ancient Roman times, with a renaissance in their use taking place during the medieval English period. Research by Politzer, whose work predates that of Bornstein by sixteen years supports the view that triplets can be traced to ‘learned Latin rhetoric’ and the use of the device ‘mushroomed’ in the early Middle Ages (Politzer, 1961, p. 484). Vos’s study of Ascham’s prose style (c. 1515 – 1568) supports the view that the use of triplets became popular during the Middle Ages, and also notes the important influence of Cicero’s (Latin) style on Ascham.

From around the time of the Restoration period to the late 1700s use of the triplet style was increasingly criticised. For example, Dryden (1631 – 1700) was vehement in his objections. Adler argues, ‘about … triple rimes the critics were apparently unanimous. Nobody liked them for serious non-dramatic compositions’ (Adler, 1961, p. 225). Ironically this is the period that some argue was the time in which use of the triplet flourished in the writing of poetry (Balliet, 1965, p. 528). While there is a ‘scarcity of triplets’ in the works of Alexander Pope (1688 – 1744), Samuel Johnson (1709 – 1784) was still using triplets throughout his prose in the mid-to late-1700s, something a number of his critics complained about (Adler, 1961, p. 226). Archibald Campbell (c. 1726 – 1780) in his booklet Lexiphanes (1774) attacked Johnson’s style (with some success it should be noted) as ‘consisting of a mass of polysyllables and triplets, mostly tautological.’ Campbell accused Johnson of ‘contaminating the English tongue; that his words were hard, his phraseology absurd, and his style affected’ (Reynolds, 1935, p. 146). Robert Walpole (1676 – 1745) described Johnson’s use of the triplet as ‘triple tautology, or the fault of repeating the same sense in three different phrases’ (Reynolds, 1935, p. 151).
Nathan Drake (1766 – 1836, English essayist and physician) undertook an exhaustive analysis of Johnson’s style and published his views in a number of contemporary periodicals. His arguments are at strong variance with most of Johnson’s critics and he stated, ‘Johnson first presented to the public those peculiarities and prominent beauties of style which immediately distinguished him, in so striking a manner, from all preceding writers and which have made so durable an impression upon our language. … Johnson had no equal in harmony, propriety and energy’ (Reynolds, 1935, p. 159). What is striking about Drake’s analysis is that while he gives no opinion, as such, about the use of the triplet in Johnson’s prose, in the hands of a master stylist the triplet is as effective as any other device used by Johnson. Drake argues, the reason is Johnson’s attention to precision in his writing, with ‘his long words, “abstract, and of classic derivation,” formed on native analogies, and despite their heavy effect, they are so clear in their meaning, and so appropriate to their respective ideas that they express the author’s meaning with complete accuracy’ (Reynolds, 1935, p. 159).

3.2. Triplets – Clarity and Elaboration

This brief historical synopsis helps explain why rhetorical writers since ancient Greek and Roman times have chosen the triplet style. For some it is a way of being more precise. Politzer argues that this is why the triplet style has its origins in legal documents, which need to be as accurate as possible. He argues ‘there is little doubt that the legal nature of these documents is responsible for much … synonymic repetition. The desire to be exact leads to a style in which series of expressions … are used extensively.’ Furthermore, the increasing use of synonymic repetition (doublets and triplets) ‘laid the foundation’ as a stylistic device. The use of ‘Romance’ Latin words in conjunction with ‘classical’ Latin words was not only a stylistic device, but has also [been] useful [in] making phrase more generally comprehensible’ (Politzer, 1961, pp. 486-487). Vos also argues that the desire for ‘neatness’ and accuracy explains why Roger Ascham favoured Cicero’s use of the triplet style (Vos, 1974, p. 364). Burnley in his examination of the curial prose style agrees that clarity and precision were desired objectives in legal documents (Burnley, 1986, p. 596).

Burnley provides a further explanation for why triplets became popular. He examined the Rolls of Parliament from the fourteenth century and argues, ‘in this
period the history of the curial style illustrates a general tendency towards elaboration at the expense of clarity’ (Burnley, 1986, p. 596). In making this argument it would be a mistake to think the one (elaboration) takes the place of the other (clarity). As studies of Cicero’s style have shown, there was a careful and balanced concern for both objectives in using triplets. For example, in Orator, (p. 140) Cicero states that the ornate (ornatus) use of words is the aspiration of the perfect orator and ‘springs from the writer’s aspiration to the praise which is the reward of all perfect oratical art.’ Furthermore, this ornate use of words can be created in one of two ways, ‘through using single words, and through using words as they are arranged or joined together (Orator, p. 80),’ … and that ‘units of threes are best’ (Vos, 1974, p. 349 and 362). In the development of his own style, Roger Ascham adopted the view, ‘knowledge without eloquence is of no value’ (Vos, 1974, p. 364). Balliet, in his examination of the use of the triplet, also found the triplet developed from a rather simple device ‘to a complex poetic form within a form, that could add intensity, emphasis, and variety to the limited and sometimes monotonous pentameter couplet’ (Balliet, 1965, p. 533).

A desire for clarity and elaboration are then important for a writer who uses triplets. Keynes’s frequent use of triplets should be seen in this context. For example, when Keynes writes ‘the Supreme Economic Council received almost hourly the reports of the misery, disorder, and decaying organisation of all Central and Eastern Europe,’ he wants the reader to clearly grasp the magnitude of the problem, that is to say, while people are living in misery because of the destruction from the war, this misery is being added to because of the disorder among the countries of Europe and, furthermore the corruption at the heart of the governing and capitalist institutions not only has a decaying effect but piles more misery onto the peoples of Europe (Keynes, 1919, p. 5).

In another example Keynes paints a picture of how the average Englishman, at least of his own class, ‘regarded his state of affairs’ before the war. The average Englishman of the day took for granted he lived in an era where goods of all variety could be easily sourced from any part of the globe and should he want to, ‘could secure forthwith, if he wished it, cheap and comfortable means of transit to any country or climate without passport or other formality.’ But most importantly, ‘he
regarded this state of affairs as normal, certain, and permanent, except in the direction of further improvement, and any deviation from it as aberrant, scandalous, and avoidable’ (Keynes, 1919, p. 10).

In addition to using triplets for purposes of clarity Keynes also used triplets to elaborate on his arguments. Strachey was also fond of using triplets for clarity and elaboration. For example he uses three words to describe Cardinal Manning’s demeanour on his appointment to Westminster: “kindness, gentleness, and conciliation.” Strachey follows this up with a triplet of phrases: ‘The new archbishop poured forth upon every side, all the tact, all the courtesy, all the dignified graces of a Christian magnanimity’ and we have an example of how Strachey sought to elaborate on the description already given of Manning as kind, gentle, and conciliatory. (Strachey, 1986, p. 80). There are numerous examples in Eminent Victorians of such uses of triplets and phrases linking triplets together, just as there are in Economic Consequences. For example, when Keynes describes Clemenceau at the Conference he uses a triplet of phrases: ‘he closed his eyes often’ and ‘sat back in his chair with an impassive face of parchment,’ with ‘his grey gloved hands clasped in front of him.’ This phrased elaboration follows a triplet of words to describe that Clemenceau’s ‘walk, his hand, and his voice’ were vigorous (Keynes, 1919, p. 27). In describing Wilson’s performance, Keynes again uses a triplet of phrases to elaborate his point that ‘the President would be maneuvered off his ground,’ and ‘would miss the moment for digging his toes in,’ then ‘before he knew where he had been got to, it was too late’ (Keynes, 1919, p. 40).

3.3. The Influence of Keynes’s and Strachey’s Sexuality

What is striking about the elaborative styles of both men’s writing is the explicit way in which they described their subjects. Yet this is in contrast to the indirect way both men promoted some of their radical views on religion and sexuality. Some commentators attribute this contradiction to both men’s homosexuality. Strachey and Keynes lived under the shadow of the 1885 Criminal Law Amendment Act that criminalised homosexuality. The “depressing” memory of Oscar Wilde’s trial and rumours of ruined reputations of public school masters haunted their daily lives. Yet both men avoided the company of those whose reputations were dubious. In a letter to Keynes, Strachey described one such incident involving a homosexual: ‘I was
dreadfully afraid of his clinging to us (after your accounts) and I fear I may have been rude’ (Strachey to Keynes, ?, 1908, King’s College Archives, JMK/PP/45/316/4).

Keynes reminded Strachey ‘how damned careful one has to be … in this respect one is so hopelessly in the hands of others’ (Keynes to Strachey, 10 April, 1907, King’s College Archives, JMK/PP/45/316/3). Spurr argues there is a direct link between Strachey’s repressed sexuality and his literary style and that ‘[there was] the artistic resolution of the sexual contradiction that bedevilled Strachey’ (Spurr, 1990, p. 32).

Spurr argues that Strachey’s homosexuality did shape his literary style and in this he believes that Cyril Connolly’s reflection that, ‘homosexuality is not a factor of importance in the assessment of a writer’s style’ is completely erroneous. However, while Strachey’s sexuality did make a difference to his literary style it did not do so in any “bold,” “new,” or “fresh” way we might expect from someone who had made claims to be a “rebellious immoralist.” It is, he argues, ‘distinctive, an indirect technique that is polished and authoritative, in the style of the confident avatars of orthodoxy, but it is animated by a world view and directed to conclusions that are markedly heterodox’ (Spurr, 1995, p. 34). It humorously exaggerates the orthodox while pursuing the artificial and the theatricalisation of experience. Sontag identifies these as essential components of the homosexual sensibility (Sontag, 1964). Spurr argues that ‘in his prose style, Strachey reveals his convoluted sexuality, though cautiously and covertly – achieving a consummation in art which life so frustratingly denied him’ (Spurr, 1995, p. 124).

Those who have examined the links between sexuality and literary style sometimes argue that the writings of Strachey belong to a literary history of homosexuality, ‘a story of indirection, subterfuge, disguise or outright suppression’ (Adams, 1970, p. 7). Jeffry Meyers identifies ‘cautious and covert qualities’ in the prose of several authors of Strachey’s generation (Meyers, 1987). He argues that context is important because the emancipation of the homosexual has led paradoxically to the decline of his art. Spurr argues this is an indisputable reality and that homosexual oppression, whatever its other effects, has produced literary artistry of a high order in the works of Proust, Forster and others, including Strachey. However, today, following the post-war, post-Kinsey sexual revolution, the “Stracheyian procedure” is deemed unnecessary, even reprehensible. The contemporary homosexual author is expected to be direct and “unblushingly
pornographic.” Spurr believes ‘this gain in frankness … is at the expense of art’ (Spurr, 1995, p. 123).

3.4. Innovation in Keynes’s and Strachey’s Prose

It has been argued that both Strachey and Keynes’s literary style owe much to their conventional pasts. However, it would be a mistake to see either man’s style as somehow “outdated” or divorced from more popular modernist styles. After all, both Eminent Victorians and Economic Consequences were significant publishing successes in the modernist era and both attracted a diversity of critical comment, much of which continues to the present day. Spurr argues that the answers to this literary success can be found in an individual and ‘subtle transformation of conventional procedures.’ In other words, while both Strachey and Keynes drew inspiration from their literary forebears they nonetheless provided an entirely individual and new “pitch.” Commenting on Strachey Spurr argues that in his writing he seemed to

vocalise the many contradictions of his mind and sensibility; its passion and detachment, humour and sadness, cynicism and hope, solitariness and desire for love. Introducing the vocabulary and cadence of Mandarin¹⁰, Strachey proceeds subtly and wittily to pervert and violate its conventions, manipulating the solemnity of the Ciceronian, Gibbonian dialect … it is as much in the manner of Strachey’s prose as in its matter that we discern the fascinating and complex personality behind it. (Spurr, 1995, pp. 31-32).

A good example of this “new” and individual twist on conventional literary style is Strachey’s use of elaboration and exaggeration. Spurr argues that Strachey’s persistent use of this style could render his work predictable and tedious but in the hands of someone as accomplished as Strachey the style is successfully subjected to a series of variations (Spurr, 1995, p. 36). Similarly, and already discussed, when critics of Samuel Johnson condemned his persistent use of triplets others were quick to jump to his defence. What might have seemed tedious in other writers was transformed in the hands of a craftsman such as Johnson and Strachey. For example, when Strachey vents his anger at the political injustice of the abuses of the French judicial system in the eighteenth century – ‘the scandal of arbitrary imprisonment, the futile barbarism of torture, the medieval abominations of the penal code’ (Strachey, 1948, p. 96), he
exaggerates imprisonment, torture and the penal code with arbitrary, futile barbarism and medieval abominations. Or in his treatment of Bishop Mandell Creighton, Strachey says, ‘he believed in the Real Presence. He was opposed to Home Rule. He read with grave attention the novels of Mrs. Humphrey Ward’ (Strachey, 1980, p. 114). By descending from humour into pathos Strachey summarises Creighton’s denominational allegiance: the nonsense of its theology, the scourge of its erastianism and the Victorianism of its morality ‘to subordinate demerits in the course of celebration’ (Spurr, 1995, p. 37).

This “flourish” Strachey used to describe his subjects can be mapped closely to Keynes’s own “elaboration of phraseology” as he expressed his frustration with the politicians whom he blamed for the Carthaginian Peace. In comparing Wilson’s performance to Lloyd George he asks the reader, ‘What chance could such a man have against Mr. Lloyd George’s unerring, almost medium-like, sensibility to every one immediately around him?’ Having asked the question Keynes uses triplets to answer his own question. The British Prime Minister, states Keynes, possesses ‘six or seven senses not available to ordinary men … judging character, motive, and subconscious impulse.’ On the one hand Keynes exaggerates Lloyd George’s senses beyond the normal to six or seven, making them unique to Lloyd George, which allowed him to anticipate what Wilson was going to say next and in turn allowed Lloyd George to frame his appeal or argument ‘best suited to the vanity, weakness, or self-interest of his immediate auditor.’ This meant the “poor” President would be playing ‘blind man’s buff in that party.’ Just as Strachey moved from words, to phrases, and on to sentences in triplets, so did Keynes. From the sentences and phrases used above Keynes rounds out his discussion with a triplet of sentences:

Never could a man have stepped into the parlour a more perfect and predestined victim to the finished accomplishment of the Prime Minister. The Old World was tough in wickedness anyhow; the Old World’s heart of stone might blunt the sharpest blade of the bravest knight-errant. But this blind and deaf Don Quixote was entering a cavern where the swift and glittering blade was in the hands of the adversary (Keynes, 1919, pp. 37-38).

Spurr argues that for both Strachey and Keynes, the use of triplets to highlight political and “polemical” injustices is just as effectively used ‘in the bathos of
deflation.’ An example of using triplets anti-climatically can be found in Strachey’s summary and dismissal of Addison – ‘that charming, polished, empty personality’ (Strachey, 1933, p. 17). The third epithet laughs at the reader who might have supposed that charm and polish were tending to praise. Another example is Strachey’s view of the ‘holiness of the Middle Ages … which embodied itself in prayer, asceticism, and dirt’ (Strachey, 1933, p. 123). Keynes also drew on bathos, when, for example he says of Wilson ‘his head and features were finely cut and exactly like his photographs, and the muscles of his neck and the carriage of his head were distinguished. But, like Odysseus, the President looked wiser when he was seated’ (Keynes, 1919, p. 37).

The use of such words and phrases were intended by Strachey and Keynes to harness the humour from a situation, although Keynes never took it to the extremes Strachey so enjoyed doing. Commenting on Strachey’s use of humour Spurr argues, ‘ranging from sarcasm and facetiousness, where laughter is cheaply bought, to the elegance of the epigram, Strachey’s manner is a compact comic medium’ (Spurr, 1995, p. 38). Epigrammatic succinctness and resonance satisfied Strachey intellectually, aesthetically and emotionally. This was the perfect verbal medium for Strachey’s desire to justify his separation from a hostile world that had decreed that he was immoral, illegal and dangerous to know, views that both Strachey and Keynes shared in their most intimate of documented exchanges.13 Their own personal sufferings, both considered themselves unattractive, and, at times, bitterness, find expression in their epigrammatic humour, a tradition that, some scholars argue, belongs to ‘high camp.’14 Examples of exaggerated ‘camp’ language are not difficult to find in Strachey’s works although less so in Keynes’s writings. Strachey in “Two Frenchmen” quips; ‘the greatest misfortune that can happen to a witty man is to be born out of France’ (Strachey, 1933, p. 71). In his opening to Eminent Victorians he also quips, ‘the history of the Victorian Age will never be written; we know too much about it. For ignorance is the first requisite of the historian’ (Strachey, 1986, p. 17). Spurr argues that in these two examples we are bowled over by the audacity of the statements and we must continue reading in order to discover whether the observations are true because ‘the method is as captivating as the message’ (Spurr, 1995, p. 39). When we examine Keynes’s writing we find the same epigrammatic humour that wills the reader to determine if the statement is as preposterous as it
seems. For example, when comparing Lloyd George’s and Wilson’s intellects, Keynes states: ‘Never could a man have stepped into the parlour a more perfect and predestined victim to the finished accomplishments of the Prime Minister’ (Keynes, 1919, p. 38). On the Fourteen Points that had been blatantly manipulated in the framing of the final Treaty; ‘he [Wilson] could have preached a sermon on any one of them or have addressed a stately prayer to the Almighty for their fulfilment; but he could not frame their concrete application to the actual state of Europe’ (Keynes, 1919, p. 39).

In contrast to the originality of the epigrams Strachey and Keynes used, there is, in places, the recourse to deliberate cliché and colloquialism. Clichés such as ‘Albert was in the habit of playing second fiddle’ (Strachey, 1921, p. 97), (to his wife Queen Victoria) and ‘Voltaire kept the ball rolling,’ (in his correspondence with Frederick the Great) (Strachey, 1980, p. 55), are used by Strachey for amusement. In *Eminent Victorians* he describes the Church of England, prior to the Oxford Movement, as having slept ‘the sleep of the … comfortable,’ the inference being that to all intents and purposes, the church was dead (Strachey, 1986, p. 30). Similarly we find Keynes used deliberate clichés such as, ‘on this sandy and false foundation,’ to describe the economic state of Europe prior to and immediately following World War One (Keynes, 1919, p. 1). He described the “Devil” of Malthusian population growth outstripping the world’s ability to feed it as ‘for the next half century he was chained up and out of sight,’ but as a result of the conflict that had engulfed Europe ‘now perhaps we have loosed him again’ (Keynes, 1919, p. 8). And in describing the tensions that had come upon Europe prior to the war, the rivalries, militarism and imperialism ‘were to play the serpent to this paradise’ (Keynes, 1919, p. 10).

3.5. **Other Influences on Keynes’s Prose Style**

In addition to the use of triplets for purposes of clarification and elaboration, Spurr’s analysis of Strachey’s style reveals a number of other ways in which he enhanced his prose style and we can assume that Strachey’s influence on Keynes was such Spurr’s findings have a strong correlation to Keynes. First, Strachey had a conscious desire to entertain, ‘whether in biography or literary criticism, in the historical essay or private correspondence’ and the idiosyncrasies’ evident in Strachey’s works [that] are a direct reflection of the man himself (Spurr, 1990, p. 32). Rather, and this is Spurr’s second
point, the individuality of Strachey’s technique owes more to the adaptation of ‘Augustan and Victorian styles albeit for unconventional purposes, than to any stylistic innovation.’ Others have also argued that what is striking about Strachey’s and Keynes’s stated rebelliousness and ideological opposition to Victorianism is, while they claimed to be “immoralists” they ‘advocated a version of male love that further emphasised class privilege, gender difference, and male superiority’ (Taddeo, 1997, p. 198). While Strachey and Keynes thought of themselves as liberals and rebels, in practice they struggled to break free from the mores and conventions of their Victorian forebears and their own upbringing. While they repudiated entirely customary ‘morals, conventions and traditional wisdom,’ they were concerned about being found out by a society whose values reached back to the early 1800’s and the ascension of “Victorianism.”

One of the best indicators for claiming Strachey’s style owed more to his Victorian past than his modernist present was the special ‘aesthetic affinity [Strachey had] with the writings of Edward Gibbon (1737 – 1794)’ (Spurr, 1990, p. 32). Strachey continually placed primacy on the importance of historical and biographical prose writers of the past in the development of his own literary skills. Foremost amongst these are the combination of Strachey’s control over his material and the influence of his personality since ‘one seeks the discipline of art, the other enlivens communication of information and deference to the conventions of prose composition with the intimacy of individuality’ (Spurr, 1995, p. 79). As Strachey grew older and matured he strove to develop his own unique style, even attempting to break free of these historical influences, with an idiosyncratic prose, which would win the attention he always craved and elicit support for the principles he espoused. Spurr argues:

Yet the individuality of Strachey’s technique owes as much to the adaption of conventional styles, Augustan and Victorian, to his unconventional purposes as to innovation. Favouring a Latinate vocabulary and an elegant cadence, exploiting the intricacies of etymology and observing the disciplines of order and balance, Strachey expresses an aesthetic affinity with Augustan procedures and especially the writings of Edward Gibbon (Spurr, 1995, p. 119).

Strachey had begun reading Gibbon at school and for literary inspiration was to return to *The Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire* many more times in the years
ahead. So taken was Strachey on the first reading of Gibbon that he composed a parody of Gibbonian rhetoric called “The Decline and Fall of Little Red Riding Hood,” written in 1896. Strachey’s desire to entertain had begun early, something that studying Gibbon allowed him greater ability to do by imitating a style he found amusing. In preparing himself for the Christ Church scholarship to enable the furthering of his studies at University he chose as his special subject the Early Roman Empire. He wrote to his mother at this time, ‘I have been reading the Great Gibbon lately and have just finished the two chapters on Christianity. They are the height of amusement – his attitude throughout so unimpeachably decorous.’ When writing Eminent Victorians Strachey would read aloud sections from Gibbon to Carrington (Holroyd, 1995, p. 397). In 1929 he wrote to Roger Stenhouse (his lover at the time), ‘I’ve now relapsed into my beautiful new Gibbon’ (September 9 1929) and four days later, ‘My laziness is becoming more scandalous than ever. I do nothing but read Gibbon – first in the quarto – then in Bury’s edition.’

As with Eminent Victorians and Economic Consequences Gibbon’s magnum opus was a publishing success and remains in print some two hundred years after its initial publication. Craddock argues that while this continuing interest is due to the work’s narrative style, its world-view and implicit commentary on its own age, the success of The Decline and Fall is due to the demands Gibbon placed on treating history in a fresh way, a direct result of the influence of the fifteenth century Renaissance (Craddock, 1988, p. 570). When applying research techniques, using general rules for testing evidence, and taking care with annotations, Gibbon followed the Renaissance authors in treating history as a craft rather than an art. On the care Gibbon exercised Craddock comments:

Unlike some of his contemporaries Gibbon identified the source(s) of every statement he presented as a datum rather than a conclusion or interpretation, and he qualified, developed, or provided complex contexts for many of his textual statements in his notes. Even when the notes were banished to the end of the volume, literally hundreds of note numbers warned the reader that the apparent self-sufficiency of the text was only temporary (Craddock, 1988, p. 571).
For Keynes, as with all historians since Gibbon, attention to craft is important. For example, Keynes carefully kept a record of the many sources and supporting information he used by way of notes in *Economic Consequences*.

Of just as much interest to Strachey and Keynes as Gibbon’s craft, was the ‘Gibbonian method,’ which means narrative is not merely data and abstractions, but people and events. These events, however, are not ‘isolated, inexplicable, random, hypothetical, or invented; they are mutually determined, related to psychological and political patterns, and subject to our moral and intellectual evaluation’ (Craddock, 1988, p. 577). Furthermore, Gibbon acted on his own belief that the historian must be detailed, accurate, balanced, conscious of psychological probability, and desirous of discovering reliable and widespread patterns among historical occurrences, ‘for the benefit of his own and future ages’ (Craddock, 1988, p. 586). Finally, we can see the lasting influence of Gibbon on Strachey and Keynes because of Gibbon’s contribution to the writing of history in a ‘modern’ way. Gibbon was among the first ‘historical’ writers to realise it is impossible to write objective history. When Walter Bagehot quipped that Gibbon ‘did not know the difference between himself and the Roman Empire,’ it was the recognition that Gibbon knew all too well that honest historians cannot write themselves out of their histories (Bagehot, 1858, p. 104). For Gibbon ‘it was the very intervention in the selection and ordering of their material, their subtle splitting of the ‘splendid and brittle mass’ (Bagehot, 1858, p. 736) of their sources, and, above all, their very participation in the construction of a ‘candid and rational inquiry,’ (Bagehot, 1858, p. 446) which makes the past alive and – most importantly for their readers – inescapably part of the present’ (Kelly, 1997, p. 54). Similarly both Strachey and Keynes brought alive the characters they wrote about because they wrote as if they were often participants in the scenes they described.

There were of course influences other than Gibbon that affected Strachey’s and Keynes’s styles. These included such nineteenth-century sages as Carlyle and Arnold who were more important than the artistic literary experimentations practiced by others of the Bloomsbury Group and the Modernists. So, while Strachey and Keynes believed they belonged to a generation that renounced ‘religion and politics, proclaimed the death of God, and declared that “love is the only reality,” in practice they struggled to break free from the mores and conventions of their upbringing (Taddeo, 1997, p. 198). For example, when Strachey wrote of Cardinal Manning’s
doubts: Where was he? Manning asked himself. What had he accomplished? Had any of it been worthwhile? Strachey imposed his own rebellion against religion and God into the mouth of Manning. In similar vein Keynes sought to impose his own dislike of politics onto the minds of his readers by demeaning the politicians themselves. For example, when he describes Clemenceau as only having France’s interests in mind, he describes Clemenceau as feeling about France as Pericles felt of Athens – ‘unique value in her, nothing else mattered; but his theory of politics was Bismarck’s. He had one illusion – France; and one disillusion – mankind’ (Keynes, 1919, p. 29).

Statements such as this shocked many of Keynes’s readers. Where was the verifiable evidence that Clemenceau disliked mankind more than he liked France, and France more than the French themselves? This style of prose provided Keynes’s critics with the ammunition they wanted. Did this not prove what they were saying of Keynes, that he was pro-German and vindictive as well?

Keynes’s reaction to critics of Economic Consequences was to accuse them of misrepresenting his intentions. But, what really annoyed his critics was the prose style he chose to use, as Strachey had done before him, although it is a more conservative prose style that Strachey’s. But, despite this, both men sought to be ironical and ‘delectably humorous’ at the same time (Spurr, 1995, p. 33). For example, when Strachey wrote of Florence Nightingale that ‘her conception of God was certainly not orthodox. She felt towards Him as she might have felt towards a glorified sanitary engineer; and in some of her speculations she seems hardly to distinguish between the Deity and the Drains,’ Strachey provided his friends and admirers with something to laugh about (Strachey, 1986, p. 158). After all, in an age where “cleanliness was close to godliness” such a witty turn of phrase no doubt was one of those ‘delectably humorous’ lines that caused Bertrand Russell to laugh out loud when he first read Eminent Victorians in Brixton Goal (Levy, 2005, p. 397). But, it equally played into the hands of Strachey’s critics, such as the Master of Balliol who has pilloried Strachey as ‘that contemptible sniggerer’ (Kenny, 1986, p. 15) and the reviewer of The Daily Telegraph who says of Strachey’s most famous work, it consists of nothing more than ‘sniggering little hatchet jobs’ (Chamberlain, 1982, p. 15).

While Keynes did not fully replicate the deliberately humorous manner of writing Strachey so enjoyed, he nonetheless used language in ways that mirrored Strachey’s irreverence and often met with similar hostility to that received by
Strachey. For example, when Keynes used references to Wilson as, ‘his temperament was not primarily that of the student or the scholar’ (Keynes, 1919, p. 37), ‘the poor President would be playing blind man’s buff in that party’ (Keynes, 1919, pp. 37-38), ‘this blind and deaf Don Quixote’ (Keynes, 1919, p. 38), ‘he was by no means a businessman’ (Keynes, 1919, p. 38), ‘the President was like a Nonconformist minister, perhaps a Presbyterian’ (Keynes, 1919, p. 38), ‘his temperament was essentially theological and not intellectual’ (Keynes, 1919, p. 38), and ‘the President’s dullness’ (Keynes, 1919, p. 41), Keynes was surprised at the reaction he received and remained insensitive to the deep offence he caused by using graphic descriptions of the then serving US head of state. Moggridge in *Collected Works* summarises:

Keynes marvelled at the bitterness of the American press. … he had handed the opponents of the President Wilson some red-hot political ammunition. Although he had written a longer version of the preface for Economic Consequences in November 1919, which contained a second paragraph acknowledging the mitigating circumstances of the President’s illness and emphasizing his basic sincerity he had not made use of it (Keynes, *CW XVII*, p. 42).

Furthermore, the French never forgave Keynes his portrayal of Clemenceau nor what they perceived as his pro-German and anti-French sentiments (Keynes, *CW XVII*, pp. 164-165).

Keynes’s astonishment at some of the reactions to his book may have, to a degree, been justified as others clearly felt similarly as he did about the leaders at Versailles. For example, Nicolson, who attended Versailles wrote:

That spiritual arrogance which seems inseparable from the harder forms of religion had eaten deep into his [Wilson’s] soul. It had been confirmed in the course of many battles with the Faculty of Princeton. His vision had been narrowed by the intensive ethical nurture which he had received: he possessed, as he himself admitted, ‘a one-track mind.’ This intellectual disability rendered him blindly impervious, not merely to human character, but also shades of difference. He possessed no gift for differentiation, no capacity for adjustment to circumstances. It was his spiritual and mental rigidity which proved his undoing. It rendered him as incapable of withstanding criticism as of absorbing advice. It rendered him blind to all realities which did not accord with his
pre-conceived theory, even to the realities of his own decisions (Nicolson, 1945, p. 163).

Hansen, who attended the Conference as a journalist wrote of Wilson:

President Wilson is the great tragic figure of the Peace Conference. … he demonstrated anew that the fortunes of people in the mass are affected by the limitations of the individuals who lead them. … Woodrow Wilson had tenacity, but also stubbornness; vision, but also myopia; a sense of personal responsibility for the general welfare and a deviant conviction that his judgment was accurate. This made him the architect of the League of Nations; this in turn lost him his American support, and the peace (Hansen, 1949, p. 27).

3.6. Summary – Lytton Strachey’s *Eminent Victorians*

A comparison of *Eminent Victorians* and *Economic Consequences* suggests Strachey’s style had a significant influence on Keynes’s writing style. The first important clue to this influence is the way in which both men used triplets. Despite triplets falling in and out of favour with writers, both men liked the ways in which they could describe their characters with greater clarity in addition to being more elaborative with language. They found it even better when beginning with word triplets and could move onto phrases of triplets and finally conclude with a triplet of sentences.

Another way in which we see influence at work is the way both men enjoyed shocking their readers, Strachey more overtly but both took pleasure in the effect it had. After all both men considered themselves “rebellious immoralists,” although as has been argued this view of themselves was, in practice, somewhat restrained. Some believe this is best explained by their suppressed homosexuality at a time when it was a crime to be homosexual. But, taken together both men ultimately gave the world new and unique forms of literary expression that differed from their parent’s generation.

However, it is not surprising more conventional influences were also at work. In one endearing example from Keynes’s personal papers he had sent his mother a draft of one of the early manuscript copies of *Economic Consequences* to which his mother wrote back:
My Darling Son, I have made many marks on these first 50 pages – many of them small points, but some in the interest of cleanliness of expression, and some as matters of discretion. It would be unfortunate to subject yourself to criticism for expressions which do not affect the argument, and that might put you out of court with some people. The points to which I want specially to call your attention are the following – probably you have already modified the most important.

p. 4. – omit the “showman” section

p. 38 – top paragraph as at present, it seems to me to give unnecessary offence to both Wilson and Lloyd George – and mixes up blind man’s buff, the spider, the fly, and Don Quixote

p. 41 – I don’t like calling the President ignorant even if he is!

p. 46 – The Artful Dodger has doubtless disappeared. We couldn’t keep him in.

p. 47 – I don’t like orgy – it is not a nice word and anyhow you can’t clothe yourself in it.

p. 50 – last sentence but one. It isn’t needed and spoils the effect – do make away with it.”

In the next manuscript draft Keynes had made every change suggested by his Mother (ECP Correspondence Archives, Undated, King’s College Archives, JMK/EC/1/2)!
4. Virginia Woolf and Psychological Realism

Keynes’s and Strachey’s friendship was forged at Cambridge when both were undergraduates and de facto leaders of the Apostles. Both followed the other’s writing careers with interest, regularly asking the other to review drafts of texts they were working on. Their subsequent involvement with Bloomsbury meant further and different influences on their writing styles, especially from their association with Virginia Woolf. Apart from the acknowledged influence Bloomsbury had on early twentieth-century intellectual life in Britain, Strachey, Keynes, and Woolf were responsible for fundamentally changing the way their own genres of literature are viewed and with it introducing a new sense of psychological realism into the characters they wrote about. Because Woolf was the first to write about her characters in this way, it would seem to follow that both Strachey and Keynes took a lead from her when they also injected this same kind of realism into their characters.

Before publication of Eminent Victorians Virginia Woolf had published her first novel, The Voyage Out (1915) and by the time Economic Consequences had appeared she had also written and published Night and Day (1919). In The Voyage Out the main character Rachel Vinrace embarks for South America on her father’s ship and is launched on a voyage of self-discovery. The mismatched group of passengers provided Woolf with an opportunity to satirise Edwardian life. She also introduced Clarissa Dalloway who became the central character in her later, and best-selling novel, Mrs. Dalloway (1925). In Night and Day Woolf contrasts the daily lives of Katherine Hilbery and Mary Datchet and examines the relationship between love, marriage, happiness and success.

Researchers often comment on how Woolf develops the inner psychology and complex personalities of her characters in ways not previously attempted by novelists. Most see this treatment as a reflection of the time period when psychology was an emerging discipline. Johnson argues that in her works Woolf reflected this modernist trend:

Virginia Woolf was the most adamant of the modernists in her claim that “we are sharply cut off from our predecessors” (Essays III, 357). However, she also believed in the continuity of culture,
Rosenbaum claims Woolf’s ‘writing was shaped by a series of intellectual assumptions about reality, perception, morality, government, and art’ (Rosenbaum, 1983, p. 11). However, he says little about human psychology, which Johnson argues needs to be included because it was an important intellectual element in her writing (Johnson, 1994, p. 139). He argues that Woolf was influenced by the psychologists’ working hypotheses about personality, ‘and her extraordinary sensitive antennae picked up psychological ideas in the air’ (Johnson, 1994, p. 139). In a draft paper of “Character in Fiction” (1924) given before the Cambridge Heretics Society she wrote:

No generation since the world began has known quite so much about character as our generation … the average man or woman today thinks more about character than his or her grandparents; character interests them more; they get closer, they dive deeper in to the real emotions and motives of their fellow creatures. There are scientific reasons why this should be so. If you read Freud you know in ten minutes some facts – or at least some possibilities – which our parents could not have guessed for themselves … There is a … vaguer force at work – a force which is sometimes called the Spirit of the Age or the Tendency of the Age. This mysterious power is taking us by the hand, I think, and making us look much more closely into the reasons why people do and say and think things. (Essays III, 504) (Johnson, 1994, p. 140).

It has been noted that Woolf had a problematic attitude with Freud and she only read anything of substance from Freud after the outbreak of World War Two (Lee, 1997, p. 722). However, despite her own claim that she knew psychoanalysis ‘only in the way of ordinary conversation’ (December 7, 1931) this, argues Johnson, represents a severe understatement on Woolf’s part. The conversations she had about psychoanalysis were ‘far from ordinary’ since they took place with those who were at the forefront of the psychoanalytic movement in Britain (Johnson, 1994, p. 140). Furthermore, she was raised in an environment in which current psychological, as well as philosophical ideas were regularly discussed. The earliest influence was Cambridge thought and according to Johnson:
[Moore’s presence at Cambridge] has obscured other Cambridge influences on Bloomsbury. When it was realised that Moore’s teachers included the most distinguished psychical researcher of the day, Henry Sidgwick; an idealist, John McTaggart; and two of the most eminent English psychologists of the day, G. F. Stout and James Ward, one cannot help wondering to what degree the currents of thought expounded by them permeated the Cambridge atmosphere.

Woolf certainly felt the impact to varying degrees of all these thinkers, mainly second-hand, through the friends and relations who attended Cambridge and with whom she held numerous discussions as a member of the Bloomsbury group (Johnson, 1994, p. 145).

Her own husband Leonard also took a strong interest in Freud from an early stage and James Strachey, brother of Lytton, both of who were in turn influenced by Henry Sidgwick, Past President of the Society of Psychical Research, had read works by Freud as early as 1904. By 1924 Freud had a high profile as a psychoanalyst, and his ideas were discussed regularly by the Bloomsbury group (Johnson, 1994, p. 140).

An examination of a selected group of character sketches from Keynes, Strachey and Woolf helps illustrate how the influence of psychological realism helped each writer develop their characters. While these are small and implicitly derived examples, they are not isolated. All three writers demonstrate an interest in the psychological motives of their characters rather than merely providing descriptions of them and their actions.
Table 1: Extracts from the writing of Virginia Woolf, Lytton Strachey, and Maynard Keynes from a Psychological Realism perspective.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Virginia Woolf</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Voyage Out (<a href="http://www.gutenberg.org/files/144/144.txt">www.gutenberg.org/files/144/144.txt</a>)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Chapter One**

“It was only by scorning all she met that she kept herself from tears, and the friction of people brushing past her was evidently painful.”

“Mr. Ambrose attempted consolation; he patted her shoulder; but she showed no signs of admitting him, and feeling it awkward to stand beside a grief that was greater than his, he crossed his arms behind him, and took a turn along the pavement.”

“Yes, how clear it was that she would be vacillating, emotional, and when you said something to her it would make no more lasting impression than the stroke of a stick upon water.”

**Chapter Two**

“Mrs. Chailey folded her sheets, but her expression testified to flatness within. The world no longer cared about her, and the ship was not a home.”

“Lying in the hot sun her mind was fixed up on the characters of her aunts, their views, and the way they lived. Why did they do the things they did, and what did they feel, and what was it all about?”

*Night and Day ([www.gutenberg.org/files/1245/1245.txt](http://www.gutenberg.org/files/1245/1245.txt)).*

**Chapter One**

“It suddenly came into Katherine’s mind that if someone opened the door at this moment he would think that they were enjoying themselves.”

**Chapter Two**

“His thought was so absorbing that when it became necessary to verify the name of a street, he looked at it for a time before he read it; when he came to a crossing, he seemed to have to reassure himself by two or three taps, such as a blind man gives, upon the curb.”

**Chapter Three**

“The quality of her birth oozed into Katherine’s consciousness from a dozen different sources as soon as she was able to perceive anything.”
### Lytton Strachey

*Eminent Victorians*

**Cardinal Manning**

“All that was weakest in him hurried him onward, and all that was strongest in him too. **His curious and vaulting imagination began to construct vast philosophical fabrics** out of the writings of ancient monks, and to dally with visions of angelic visitations and the efficacy of the oil of St Walburga; his emotional nature became absorbed in the partisan passions of a University clique; and his subtle intellect concerned itself more and more exclusively with the dialectical splitting of dogmatical hairs” (Strachey, 1986, p. 33).

**Florence Nightingale**

“Yet the want, absurd, impracticable as it was, not only remained fixed immovably in her heart, but grew in intensity day by day. **Her wretchedness deepened into a morbid melancholy.** Everything about her was vile, and she herself, it was clear, to have deserved such misery, was even viler than her surroundings” (Strachey, 1986, p. 119).

**Dr. Arnold**

“His prayer was answered: Dr. Arnold was never in any danger of losing his sense of moral evil. If the landscapes of Italy only served to remind him of it, how could he forget it among the boys at Rugby School? **The daily sight of so many young creatures in the hands of the Evil One filled him with agitated grief.** ‘When the spring and activity of youth,’ he wrote, ‘is altogether unsanctified by anything pure and elevated in its desires, it becomes a spectacle that is as dizzying and almost more morally distressing than the shouts and gambols of a set of lunatics.’ **One thing struck him as particularly strange:** ‘it is very startling,’ he said, ‘to see so much sin combined with so little sorrow.’ The naughtiest boys positively seemed to enjoy themselves most” (Strachey, 1986, p. 185).

### The End of General Gordon

“In his solitude, he ruminated upon the mysteries of the universe; and those religious tendencies, which had already shown themselves, now became a fixed and dominating factor in his life. His reading was confined almost entirely to the Bible; but the Bible he read and reread with an untiring, an unending, assiduity” (Strachey, 1986, p. 204).
Maynard Keynes

*The Economic Consequences of the Peace*

Chapter Three - Clemenceau

“… and Clemenceau, silent and aloof on the outskirts – for nothing which touched the security of France was forward – throned, in his grey gloves, on the brocade chair, dry in soul and empty of hope, very old and tired, but *surveying the scene with a cynical and almost impish air*; and when at last silence was restored and the company had returned to their places, it was to discover that he had disappeared.

He felt about France what Pericles felt of Athens – *unique value in her, nothing else mattered*; but his theory of politics was Bismarck’s. He had one illusion – France; and one disillusion – mankind, including Frenchmen, and his colleagues not least” (Keynes, 1919, pp. 28-29).

Chapter Three – Wilson

“Yet the causes were very ordinary and human. The President was not a hero or prophet; he was not even a philosopher; **but a generously intentioned man**, with many of the weaknesses of other human beings, and **lacking that dominant intellectual equipment** which would have been necessary to cope with the subtle and dangerous spellbinders whom a tremendous clash of personalities had brought to the top as triumphant master in the swift game of give and take. …. His temperament was not primarily that of the student or the scholar, but that he had not much even of that culture of the world which marks M. Clemenceau and Mr. Balfour” (Keynes, 1919, pp. 36-37).

Chapter Three – Lloyd George

“Mr. Lloyd George’s unerring, almost medium-like, sensibility to every one immediately around him? To see the British Prime Minister watching the company, with **six or seven senses not available to ordinary men**, judging character, motive, and sub-conscious impulse, perceiving what each was thinking and even what each was going to say next, and compounding with telepathic instinct the argument or appeal best suited to the vanity, weakness, or self-interest of his immediate auditor” (Keynes, 1919, p. 37).
These examples show how each writer speculated on their character’s psychological states of mind. Skidelsky argues that although the influences on each other are not explicit, ‘something had to have changed in people’s attitude to themselves and to the world for such [books] to have been conceived and written’ (Skidelsky, 1992, p. 406). The change was transitional, occurring as it did, during the rise of the twin movements of modernism and collectivism (Skidelsky, 1992, p. 406). Holroyd argues that Strachey had successfully used G. E. Moore’s refutation of idealism to write a different style of biography that in turn was a criticism of Victorian ideals and, as has been argued, was to influence the style of The Economic Consequences of the Peace. According to Mini these texts almost certainly sharpened Keynes’s belief – to which his own personal, Moore-inspired experiences were also leading him – that logic plays a limited role in human affairs (Mini, 1991).

Virginia Woolf was also influenced by Moore and arrived at the same conclusion that she too was trying to escape from customary modes of expression, which heralded her new mode of expression of ‘psychological realism.’ In her novels and essays she finds consciousness is a very elusive element to discover and expose and argues: ‘It is no use trying to sum people up. One must follow hints, not exactly what is said, not yet entirely what is done.’ People are organic and complex unities and ‘of all futile occupations this of cataloguing features is the worst.’ There is no essence of character, no unity, no ‘basic flaw’: everything is uncertainty and inconsistency. Everything is also unstable, the apparent calm may be shattered at any moment. Time is discontinuous, not homogeneous, and the controlled psychic state of Monday may give way to the horror and sudden crash of Tuesday. Keynes shared this ‘catastrophic-view’ of time, of its essential discontinuity and near-unintelligibility. A sudden ‘outer’ occurrence, that is, one ‘exogenous’ to the psyche of the character, a mark on the wall, is what jolts the mind into self-consciousness. According to Mini, these changing outer events in Woolf find their equivalent in the unexamined events of The General Theory, (Keynes’s later magnum opus) such as a political speech, an unexpected bankruptcy, a rumour that sets off an irrational flight into liquidity, that cause the descent into depression by shaking the fragile psychological foundations of economic relations (Mini, 1991).
5. The Influence of Friends and Family

Although the surviving archives are silent on exactly how each writer influenced the other, what we know is that friendships were close, forged from regular contact with other Bloomsberries. We also know that among the literary set material and manuscripts were freely shared and circulated, each person seeking and incorporating feedback into their own works. For example, when Keynes was preparing for his follow up to *Economic Consequences, A Revision of the Treaty*, he had read sections to his friends, as he seemed to do quite often when preparing a manuscript. Virginia Woolf wrote to him:

Dear Maynard

Would you let us have your manuscript in order that we may read what we missed last night? It will be kept private and returned instantly. We think it just magnificent, and I can’t say how much I envy you for describing characters in the way you do (Virginia Woolf to Keynes, 3 February, 1921, King’s College Archives, JMK/PP/45/353/3).

Leonard Woolf also wrote to Keynes later in the same year:

Dear Maynard

I think this first rate and most amusing. I expect your psychological analysis of Wilson is absolutely correct. It explains everything. I hope you’re doing Lloyd George (Leonard Woolf to Keynes, 21 August, 1921, King’s College Archives, JMK/PP/45/352/3).

Keynes had written up a psychological profile of Lloyd George for *Economic Consequences* but had decided to omit it from the final publication. Only with his later publication of *Essays in Biography* (1933) did he provide a full character sketch of Lloyd George. It was worth the wait as Keynes painted the following picture:

How can I convey to the reader, who does not know him, any just impression of this extraordinary figure of our time, this syren, this goat-footed bard, this half-human visitor to our age from the hag-ridden magic and enchanted woods of Celtic antiquity? One catches in his company that flavour of final purposelessness, inner irresponsibility, existence outside or away from our Saxon good and evil, mixed with cunning, remorselessness, love of
power, that lend fascination, enthrallment, and terror to the fair-
seeming magicians of North European folklore (Keynes, CW X,
1971, p. 23).

Family opinion was also important and perhaps it was once again feedback from his
mother that led to his decision not to include the fully prepared character sketch in
Economic Consequences. In reviewing one of his draft manuscripts she had written:

My dearest John

Here is the remainder – on p. 188 your references to Sir S. L.
won’t do – it is rude. And on pp. 203,4, your remarks on Lord
Summer approach libel – don’t they? You really must be more
careful. In looking back, I cannot feel quite sure that I
eliminated all the nasty bits about Lloyd George – I hope I did,
or that you will. You owe some loyalty to your Chief, even if
you don’t agree with him, and I am sure you will be happier
afterwards if you keep within the bounds. Also spare the
President where you can – I wish I could see the chapter again.
Don’t call him “poor” – and I am doubtful about the taste of the
Nonconformist Minister comparison. Broadly speaking it is
really important to be careful about international susceptibilities
– so don’t call the French preposterous – or call any “great” man
wicked or wanton. The work will gain – not lose – by restraint
(FGK to Keynes, Undated, King’s College Archives,
JMK/EC/1/9).

Although this advice did not stop Keynes publishing his character sketches his
mother’s advice once again had the effect of his toning down the more ‘nasty bits.’

But, as important as the feedback was from friends and family the one friend
who exercised the greatest influence on Keynes was Strachey. This had begun from
the time of Keynes first serious work on Probability and continued to time of
Strachey’s death in 1931. In 1907 Strachey wrote to Keynes on his work on
Probability:

I’m glad Probability is progressing. It certainly will be of
immense importance when it is done. I talked about your theory
of “self evidence” to Horon and became rather perplexed. He
denied there was any such thing. Your simile of Berkley;
dungheap really doesn’t quite do because even you admit that
when the mind isn’t there some sort of a dungheap still exists,
which I don’t think Berkley would allow (Strachey to Keynes, 17
Both men reciprocated the habit of reading selected portions from manuscripts and sending each other drafts of books intended for publication and on matters related to literature in general. For example, Keynes wrote to Strachey in 1920: ‘My experiences with a variety of translators have given me some reflections on English style I should like to talk about’ (Keynes to Strachey, 17 May, 1920, King’s College Archives, JMK/45/316/5). They also followed and commented to one another on critical reviews of each other’s works. Following the publication of Economic Consequences Strachey wrote to Keynes: ‘I saw the translation of the Wilson part of your book in the Lowell Review. Not so bad, but the poor good man got it quite wrong once or twice. And how tame it is! Is that because it’s in French, or because it’s a translation’ (Strachey to Keynes, 12 May, 1920, King’s College Archives, JMK/45/316/5)?

Then there was the habit of sending a copy of each other’s texts as soon as they were being readied for general publication. On receiving an advance copy of Treatise on Probability, Strachey wrote to Keynes:

I am delighted to get the Treatise on Probability, which I have perused, minus the symbols, with a pleasure apparently independent of comprehension. I thought it full of interest – and so much of the incidental kind that really I believe even the absolutely “general reader” would enjoy it and be all the better for it. So far as I can judge the main conceptions are true and important; but my judgment is of a curiously theoretical one – I have “thoughts of things, which my thoughts but tenderly touch.” I was pleased to see Karl Pearson severely lauded. Also it is gratifying to know that a formula reduces the argument from Design to ashes: an absurd thing I always thought it. Perhaps you might have referred en passant to Pascal’s argument that it is worthwhile to believe in God because there is always a chance of exiting, as you do mention some analogous theories. The note on Lord Lister’s treatment a priori and the “inevitable assumption about the wages” made me laugh. Dear me! The assumption is indeed all too inevitable. I note 4 misprints which may have escaped you … I presume that 1000 years hence the manuals on English Literature will point out that it is important to distinguish between the two entirely distinct authors of the same name, one
of whom wrote the *Economic Consequences of the Peace*, and the other a *Treatise on Probability* (Strachey to Keynes, 25 August, 1921, King’s College Archives, JMK/45/316/5).

Four months later Keynes had also sent Strachey a copy of the *Revision of the Treaty*, sections of which Keynes had read out loud to his friends. Strachey wrote:

Dearest Maynard

I ought to have written days ago to thank you for the *Revision of the Treaty*. It is a great pleasure to have it, and it seems to me a second reading quite as good as I thought it when you read it aloud. It came out at a very opportune time!! But to judge from George’s dreadful remarks about Reparations it doesn’t seem to have produced an immediate effect! Or perhaps it has – perhaps he regards it as an encouragement to him to continue in his wicked ways.

I gather, rather indirectly, that you’re going to India pretty soon. I hope this will reach you before you depart, as I want to ask whether you think it would be suitable for me to dedicate my next production (such as it is) to you? I should like to, and will, unless you forbid it. I enclose a little work of the South Sea Bubble, also a note from Carrington (Strachey to Keynes, 24 January, 1922, King’s College Archives, JMK/45/316/5).

Keynes replied three days later to say he would be ‘honoured and delighted by the dedication,’ also informing Strachey his trip to India had been cancelled. Keynes never did make it to India, despite having worked in the India Office at the beginning of his career.
6. Conclusion

Friendships forged during the Apostle years and in Bloomsbury acted as a life-long influences on Keynes. These friends kept up a continual cycle of sharing their work before and after it was published, inviting feedback and taking note of the respective success of each other’s ventures. It should be no surprise, then, that aspects of each other’s literary styles would have influenced the other. As far as the influence on Keynes and *Economic Consequences* was concerned there were to be important implications for how his book was received. For example, Keynes would have already taken note of how Strachey’s use of triplets in his prose lent a degree of elaboration his book may not have otherwise had. Their friends and intellectual peers also undoubtedly influenced both men by the way in which psychology as a science and emerging discipline was being embraced. That Virginia Woolf had successfully pioneered a form of psychological realism in describing the characters in her novels seems to have had a direct influence on the ways in which both Strachey and Keynes wrote about the characters in their books. Ultimately, all three enjoyed publishing success and all three are considered as pioneers of original and new ways of writing in their respective genres: Woolf; the novel, Strachey; biography, and Keynes; in the field of social science generally and economics specifically.


2. For a period of time Strachey and Keynes were the ‘effective’ leaders of the Cambridge Apostles and their correspondence during this time is voluminous, rich in detail, at times very personal and at other times, engaging in gossip that only close friends would exchange. Following graduation from Cambridge Strachey and Keynes remained close friends through their association with the Bloomsbury set that continued, albeit not as intensely during the Apostle days, up until the mid-1920s.

3. Some scholars have looked closely at the prose styles of individuals within Bloomsbury. For example Barry Spurr has written a book and journal articles dealing specifically with Strachey’s prose style. Refer: (Spurr, 1990), and (Spurr, 1995). However there is little in the way of comparative analysis between the Bloomsbury friends and the degree of influence each other’s writing styles had on the others.

4. Rosenbaum uses Leonard Woolf as the ‘most detailed and reliable historian of the group’ to establish the original members of the Memoir Club (Bloomsbury core members) as Leonard and Virginia Woolf, Vanessa and Clive Bell, Lytton Strachey, Maynard Keynes, Duncan Grant, Roger Fry, Mary and Desmond MacCarthy, E. M. Forster, Saxon Sydney-Turner, and Adrian Stephen.

5. The King’s College archives have the record of the books Keynes purchased from Gibbon’s library between 1934 and 1935. Refer JMK/PP/67.

6. (Burnley, 1986, p. 593) from (Diane Bornstein, 1977), “French Influence on Fifteenth-Century English Prose as Exemplified by the Translation of Christine de Pisan’s Livre du Corps de Policie,” Mediaeval Studies, 39, pp. 369-386; and (1978), “Chaucer’s Tale of Melibee as an example of the Style Clerigial,” Chaucer Review, 12, pp. 236-254 as evidence that Chaucer had used the curial prose style some 100 years before William Caxton. Until then it had been assumed that Caxton pioneered the style and had learned it from French courtly models. However, evidence of Chaucer’s use of the style supports the view that it has Latin roots and Latin influence. Curial style in English at the time of Chaucer’s death, argues Burnley, was perceived essentially as a technical style. Texts which depended upon a fully developed curial style in English can be found in legal documents from the early 1380s; English letters modeled on the style of the French appear towards the end of the century; and Chaucer in 1391 exploited the style in a technical manual. In more discursive literary prose, curial features occur not as a structural foundation but as an occasional connective convenience or a stylistic colouring, supported by other rhetorical devices of ordering (Burnley, 1986, p. 610).

7. Although most interest in rhetoric focuses on Cicero, the most well-known triplet is credited to Julius Caesar who wrote back to the Senate on conquering the Gaul’s, ‘I came, I saw, I conquered.’

8. Bornstein’s research was published in 1977, Politzer’s in 1961.

9. (Balliet, 1965, p. 528) argues that the use of triplets in poetry, like some other literary forms, had an origin, a period of growth, a maturity, (of around 100 years) and then an end. The triplet, he argues, was an offspring of the pentameter couplet, but developed in its own way at its own rate. When the couplet was loose, open, and unpolished, there was little need for further variety, and poets wrote few triplets. When the couplet became tight, closed, and highly polished, as it did with Pope, the triplet was considered a violation of the rules. Interestingly, Balliet also argues that while the couplet owes it origins to French and Latin poetry, there is nothing in Latin equivalent to the triplet. The triplet (as used in poetry) is an English phenomenon whose history has not been written yet (at least not in 1965). If this were correct then the use of the triplets by Cicero would have been restricted to prose writing only.

10. Ottoline Morrell had written to Strachey to tell him how much Russell had enjoyed the book, despite her own feelings of offence at Strachey’s satire of religion. Strachey wrote back to Morrell on 26th May 1918 to ‘say that I think it a great honour that my book should have made the author of Principia Mathematica laugh out loud in Brixton Goal.’ (Strachey to Morrell, letters held in the Humanities Research Center, University of Texas at Austin.)
11. Mary Augusta Ward (1851-1920) wrote under the pseudonym of Mrs. Humphrey Ward. Her uncle was the poet Matthew Arnold and her grandfather was Thomas Arnold, the famous headmaster of Rugby School. As a young woman she married Humphrey Thomas Ward, a writer and editor. She began her career writing articles for magazines while working on a book for children that was published under the title *Milly and Olly*. She wrote a number of novels, which contained strong religious subjects matter relevant to Victorian values she herself practiced. Her novels enjoyed publishing success in both Great Britain and the United States. In 1903 the *New York Times* rated her *Lady Rose's Daughter* the best-selling novel in the United States. Source: Sutherland, (ODNB, 2004, 36736).

12. In his description of Wilson Keynes uses with skill and variety triplets to enhance his rhetoric. In the very next paragraph following this one, for example, Keynes explores what sort of person Wilson really was and suggests on the one hand that he was a man of force, personality and importance and in arguing that Wilson's temperament was theological rather than intellectual qualifies his view with the words 'with all the strength and the weakness of that manner of thought, feeling, and expression.'

13. Some examples include:
1. Strachey to Keynes, “One plants one’s penis in so many peculiar spots! – at least, I do! And really, it’s not much good you pretending, at this time of day, that you don’t too.” Strachey to Keynes, 1 July, 1907, Lancaster Gate, King’s College Archives, JMK/PP/45/316/3/81
2. Strachey to Keynes: “I had a very pleasant evening at Fitzroy Square on Thursday, and, as usual, all but buggered Clive. He was divine – a soft shirt and hair and complexion that lifted me and my penis to the heights of heaven. Oh! Oh! Oh!” Strachey to Keynes, 21 October, 1907, Belsize Gardens, King’s College Archives, JMK/PP/45/316/3/149.
3. Keynes to Strachey: “To-night I dined for the second time at their High Talk. The food is excellent, but, my God, one feels a don. I play the part admirably, perhaps it belongs to me, but I should like to rape an undergraduate in the Confirmation Room, just to make them see things a little more in their true light. Not that rape of an undergraduate is very typical of real life, alas.” Keynes to Strachey, 21 March, 1909, 6 Harvey Road, Cambridge, King’s College Archives, JMK/PP/45/136/4/136.
4. Strachey to Keynes: “I have also been examining some antique family letters – temp. Warren Hastings. During one of the risings letters were carried in quills, rolled up very small. This was known – I’ve now discovered that the quills were put up the black’s arses who carried them. The letters were called ‘fundamental chits’ and they usually arrived, my grandfather observes, “safe, but not sweet.” Do I have to put this culturally piece of information into my great work? Would it shock the ladies?” Strachey to Keynes, 7 July, 1910, Belsize Gardens, King’s College Archives, JMK/PP/45/316/4/163.
5. Keynes to Strachey: “May God blight and blast you! May your penis become an asparagus and your balls an artichoke!” Keynes to Strachey, 11 March, 1906, King’s College, King’s College Archives, JMK/PP/45/316/2/155.

14. In one letter from Keynes to Strachey he wrote, “My dear, I have always suffered. I suppose I always will from a most detestable obsession that I am so physically repulsive that I’ve no business to launch my body onto someone else’s.” Keynes to Strachey, 11 March, 1906, King’s College Archives, JMK/PP/45/316/2/155.

15. Skabarnicki, Anne, “Strachey, Lytton British, 1880-1932,” http://www.custom-essay.net/essay-encyclopedia/Lytton-Strachey-Essay.htm explains the full term “Camp Mandarin” as an idiom Spurr first dubs as a witty parody of an elite mode, used to undermine the conventional views of the mandarins through incongruity and exaggeration. Mandarin was part of an elite group and were high-ranking officials in the ancient Chinese Empire with extensive powers and high status in intellectual and cultural circles.

16. Soon after James married Alix in 1920 they moved to Vienna, where James, an admirer of Freud, began psychoanalysis with the great man. Freud asked the couple to translate some of his works into English, and this became their lives' work. Both became psychoanalysts themselves, and as well as Freud's works they also translated works by a number of other European psychoanalysts. Their translation of Freud's works, in twenty-four volumes, remains the standard edition of Freud's works to this day.