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Introduction
In November 1931, the newly celebrated Australian author Henry Handel Richardson (1870–1946), was approached by Dr. Jacob Schwartz (b.1899) of the Ulysses Bookshop,1 to publish some of her short stories in fine, limited edition booklets. In December the same year, Two Studies was published by the Ulysses Press. The following is an examination of the history of this fine print publication, and the relationship between the author and the publisher, within the context of the literary and publishing market of the late 1920s and early 1930s.

Henry Handel Richardson was in the midst of her greatest literary success following the publication of the final volume of the Richard Mahony trilogy, Ultima Thule.2 The worldwide triggers for this acclaim were reviews by Gerald Gould (Observer, 13 January, 1929) and Arnold Palmer (Spectator, 12 January, 1929), the latter describing the trilogy as, “one of the greatest novels not only of our generation but of our language.” As international accolades continued, publishers, agents, writers, reviewers, critics, translators, readers, old friends and acquaintances, collectors, and literary organisations were all vying for a piece of the famous author.

Such attention came as a surprise to Richardson. Her first novel, Maurice Guest had been published twenty-one years prior to Ultima Thule. In the intervening years, she published The Getting of Wisdom (1910), Australia Felix (1917), The Way Home (1925) and two short stories, “Death” (1911) and “The Bath: An Aquarelle” (1929). Sales of the first two volumes of the trilogy had been mediocre and Heinemann, her London publisher, determined that it would not publish the third without funds being put forward. Professor John George Robertson, Richardson’s husband, paid one hundred and sixty five pounds for the first print run of one thousand copies.

Although she desired and welcomed the success, the demands on Richardson’s time and privacy did not sit well with her:

This kind of thing doesn’t really suit me—tears me to tatters. And in one way it has come too late. When I think of the joy it wld have been to me, 20 yrs or so ago. Now I’m cynical & blasé & too much turned inwards greatly to care. One can’t be

Thank you to Professor Clive Probyn, executor of the Henry Handel Richardson Estate, for permission to quote from Richardson’s unpublished works and papers.

neglected, as I’ve been, & not carry the mark of it somewhere. Well, the main thing is, I haven’t grown bitter over it—only indifferent.³

From the outset of her career as a fiction author, Richardson sought to protect herself from public scrutiny by instituting and maintaining a pseudonym. She explained, “This Henry Handel Richardson is the man of straw I have set up for the critics to tilt at, while I sit safe & obscure behind.”⁴

The success of Ultima Thule generated a flurry of requests and demands. These included press photographs, interviews, renegotiation of the contract for Ultima Thule with Heinemann, revision and republication of Maurice Guest, fan mail to answer, requests to read or launch various novels, and a major revision of the trilogy for the omnibus edition, The Fortunes of Richard Mahony (London: Heinemann, 1930). Richardson learned that “Truly the way of the successful writer is hard!”⁵

Despite the trouble, Richardson sought to seize the advantage by having her novels republished, and her short stories placed in magazines and periodicals. Her short stories were written and edited with the same vigour that she applied to her novels, and she valued them in their own right, not merely as diversions from or adjuncts to her novel writing. She was very keen to see them in print. Furthermore, magazine publication generally paid well.⁶

In December 1929, Richardson questioned her American literary agent, Brandt & Brandt, about its progress in placing three of her stories, “Two Hanged Women,” “Life and Death of Peterle Luthy” and “Mary Christina.” She subsequently sent Brandt & Brandt “The Professor’s Experiment.” No publishers were found for these works.⁷ In the meantime, two translations of the short story “Death” were published in 1931.⁸

In October 1931, the month preceding the offer by Jacob Schwartz, a representative of Curtis Brown, Richardson’s literary agent in London, visited Richardson in her London home, requesting that she “turn out” her “bottom

---

⁴ Richardson to Carl Van Vechten, 13 October 1917, Letters, no. 353. Richardson’s given names were Ethel Florence Lindesay.
⁵ Richardson to Mary Kernot, 24 February 1932, Letters, no. 709: “Money is so tight just now.”
⁶ Richardson to Mary Kernot, 24 February 1932, Letters, no. 709: “Money is so tight just now.”
⁷ “Two Hanged Women” was first published in The End of a Childhood (London: Heinemann, 1934); “Life and Death of Peterle Luthy” was first published in Good Housekeeping (London) in June 1931 and “The Professor’s Experiment” in Good Housekeeping (London) in October 1933.
⁸ “Death” had been published in English as “Mary Christina” (English Review, October 1911). A Danish translation with an illustration was published in early 1931 (Richardson to Mary Kernot, 26 March 1931, Letters, no. 589). A Swedish translation, “Döden,” followed, accompanied by an interview with Richardson on 13 September 1931 in Nya Dagligt Allehanda. Richardson received two pounds for this version (Diary, 28 September 1931, NLA MS 133/8/104).
drawer.” Richardson obliged. A combination of factors caused Richardson to offer Schwartz previously published works only. It made financial sense for her to publish first in periodicals and magazines.\(^9\) In addition, she had already engaged Curtis Brown and Brandt & Brandt. Finally, her slow working methods (she was “not one of those who can throw off small things ‘by the way’”), meant that she was not able to produce new stories during this busy period of her life.\(^10\)

### The Great Extractor

We have no way of knowing where or how Jacob Schwartz first made contact with Henry Handel Richardson regarding her short stories. Perhaps they were introduced by a mutual acquaintance. Maybe, Richardson was a customer of the Ulysses Bookshop at 20 Bury Street, London.\(^11\) Schwartz may have been familiar with her husband, Professor John George Robertson, as they both frequented the British Museum reading room. Or perhaps, like so many others, Schwartz wrote to her via Heinemann.

Jacob Schwartz was a charismatic presence amongst the London literati, including the Bloomsbury set. He earned a reputation as a wily and somewhat dubious player in the autographed books and manuscripts market. His ability to prise works from their author, along with his earlier career as a dentist in Boston, led Samuel Beckett to dub him “The Great Extractor.”\(^12\) Under the imprint Ulysses Bookshop, and Ulysses Press for Richardson’s *Two Studies*, Schwartz

---

\(^9\) Richardson to Mary Kernot, 17 April 1932, *Letters*, no. 725.

\(^10\) Richardson wrote to Mary Kernot on 29 October 1931 (*Letters*, no. 651), and on 10 November 1931 to Nettie Palmer (*Letters*, no. 653) that Curtis Brown had a number of her as yet unpublished sketches. These would form part of the set of stories known as “Growing Pains” in *The End of a Childhood* (London: Heinemann, 1934). On 6 November 1931, Richardson also sent “Succedaneum” to Curtis Brown (Diary 1931, NLA MS 133/8/104).

\(^11\) The Ulysses Bookshop was founded in 1930 at 187 High Holburn, London. It moved to 20 Bury St. at the beginning of 1931, 40 Great Russell St. in 1932, and returned to 20 Bury St. by January 1933.

produced a number of high quality, limited edition works by authors including Edgar Allan Poe, Henry Havelock Ellis, and James Joyce.

On the evening of 10 November 1931, Jacob Schwartz visited Henry Handel Richardson in her home and they discussed the publication of two of her short stories and, separately, a German carol for which she had composed the music.13

It is tempting to visualise the sixty-one year old author poised in the formal sitting room of her Regent’s Park Road home, her eyes looking just past or through those of her visitor, as in the press photographs from this period. In contrast, the exuberant and engaging younger man sitting opposite would have offered no such restraint:

Jacob (I wish you cld see him; he might stand for the picture of an old Egyptian king, did he plait his black hair & beard instead of leaving it frizzly: he wears a blue, bright blue, shirt, high-necked, with a scarlet embroidered pullover, Chelsea hat, velvet coat: oh yes, he gives colour to London!)14

As much as Richardson hid behind her pseudonym and her quiet and unassuming demeanour, attire and environment, everything about Schwartz was colourful, theatrical, and purposeful.

Money and stories were exchanged speedily. The end of the year was approaching and they were hoping to have the stories out for Christmas. On 12 November 1931, Richardson was thanking Schwartz for the cheque made out for fifteen pounds, “being half the sum for the right to reproduce the two studies, ‘Death’ and ‘The Life and Death of Peterle Luthy’ in a signed limited edition of 500 copies.”15 In exchange, Richardson organised for her publicity agent at Heinemann to send an unpublished copy of “Death” to Schwartz, and she provided him with a copy of “Life and Death of Peterle Luthy.” On 13 November, she organised for a revised copy of “Life and Death of Peterle Luthy” to be brought to him, ready for printing. One of these versions was probably her copy of *Good Housekeeping* with handwritten expansions and corrections.16

From this first noted meeting, Richardson was thanking Schwartz for his generous gifts. As a keen observer of character, it could be assumed that Richardson understood that she was being courted for what she could offer: publishable works, autographed first editions of her books and manuscripts.

13 Richardson recorded “visit from Schwartz” (Diary, Tuesday 10 November 1931, NLA MS 133/8/104).
14 Richardson to Mary Kernot, 12 November 1931, *Letters*, no. 656.
15 Richardson agreed with Schwartz’s proposal that there should be no republication of either story in England for at least three months from the date of the Ulysses Press issue (12 November 1931, *Letters*, no. 655).
16 Mitchell Library, State Library of New South Wales MSS A2629.
On 11 November 1931, Richardson thanked Schwartz for the Eric Gill woodcut and Havelock Ellis’s book (either Concerning Jude the Obscure or The Colour-Sense in Literature). Eleven days later, Schwartz gave Richardson a little book with Eric Gill woodcuts and a photograph of his mother. He sought to flatter (or at least draw familiarity) with Richardson by asserting a likeness between her and his mother.


Richardson reciprocated with signed photographs and “manuscripts” of other stories to consider for publication. She presented him with an inscribed copy of the German translation of Maurice Guest (Berlin: S. Fischer Verlag, 1912), other novels signed, and offered him the Swedish edition of The Way Home (Stockholm: Wahlström & Widstand, 1932). Schwartz’s copies of Maurice Guest (German) and The Fortunes of Richard Mahony (London: Heinemann Colonial Library, 1917) subsequently made it into the library of the American collector, Bernard George Ulizio.

Schwartz commissioned a post-publication manuscript of “Death” which Richardson completed on 3 September 1931. He had similarly paid Samuel

---


19 Although Richardson offered manuscripts, it is most likely that she was referring to typescripts. Her working method did not produce full manuscript copies of her works: “My books are handwritten in single paragraphs, which are at once typed off and re-worked from the typescript.” (TLS Richardson to Bernard George Ulizio, Box 2, English Literary Manuscripts, Special Collections and Archives, University Libraries, Kent State University).

20 The dates of acquisition are unknown.
Beckett and William Gerhardie to rewrite published works in manuscript form.\textsuperscript{21} Richardson did have her limits. She stopped short of giving or selling Schwartz some typescripts, using her husband’s resistance as an excuse. She firmly ended her communication of this disappointing news to Schwartz with “so, if you don’t mind, we’ll just let the matter drop.”\textsuperscript{22} She knew better than to leave the door even slightly ajar.

“Mary Christina”

In later recollections of the publication of \textit{Two Studies}, Richardson wrote that Schwartz first approached her to publish “Death,” later renamed “Mary Christina”; and that the second story, “Life and Death of Peterle Luthy,” was added to make a more substantial volume.

Schwartz claimed to have remembered “Death” from its publication twenty years earlier in the \textit{English Review}.\textsuperscript{23} Associations with this publication and the personal nature of the story contributed to this new publication of “Death” being attractive to Richardson. The following year, she was again enjoying the thought that others also had a lasting memory of the \textit{English Review} publication. In response to a letter from one of her American collectors, Paul Lemperly, she wrote: “It is quite amazing to me to find how many people have remembered my little story from its first printing in the \textit{English Review}. I imagined it \textit{verschollen} [forgotten] ever since.”\textsuperscript{24}

The \textit{English Review} was regarded as a prestigious literary review. Richardson herself described it as “our only literary Review.” It boasted works from eminent international literary figures and claimed some as its own discovery, including D. H. Lawrence and Norman Douglas, both of whom appeared in the October 1911 volume containing Richardson’s story. Richardson probably received more attention for being in this particular issue of the \textit{English Review} than would normally have been expected for the struggling journal thanks to the inclusion of John Masefield’s controversial narrative poem, “The Everlasting Mercy.”

A slightly revised version of “Death” was published for private distribution by the De La More Press (London) in 1911. Richardson organised this publication after the story had been accepted by the \textit{English Review}. She wrote, “I have had some reprints made privately for my friends—to save the bulky parcel the Review

\textsuperscript{22} Richardson, 1 May 1932, \textit{Letters}, no. 732.
\textsuperscript{24} Richardson to Paul Lemperly (1858–1939), 15 January 1932, \textit{Letters}, no. 686.
would make, & also for the pleasure of seeing my work for once on better paper.”

Delays in the *English Review* publication may have meant that the De La More Press edition was, in fact, the first publication of the story.

The initial date of composition of “Death” cannot be determined. It is probably a very early piece, written as a response to the death of her mother, Mary Richardson. Richardson wrote a detailed and lengthy personal account of the final illness that led to her mother’s death on 26 November 1896. Many of the experiences recorded in the journal account are taken up in the short story with only slight variation. “Death” differs most radically from the journal account in that it is conceived from the position of the dying woman, rather than the onlooker.

Richardson gave two reasons to Jacob Schwartz for changing the title of the story from “Death” to “Mary Christina.” First, “as the word ‘death’ occurs in the titles of both studies;” and second, to alter the way in which the piece was read: “The sketch is more about ‘dying’ than Death.”

Another very important source for this story was Jens Peter Jacobsen’s Danish novel, *Niels Lyhne* (1880). Richardson translated this novel from Danish to English, and it was published as *Siren Voices* by Ethel F. L. Robertson (London: William Heinemann, 1896). The epigraph at the beginning of “Mary Christina,” “… den vanskelige død” is from the last sentence of *Niels Lyhne*. Richardson left it to Schwartz to decide whether to retain it for *Two Studies*, as she believed that “so few people read Danish that you will perhaps not think this worth while.”

It is interesting that Richardson, who was generally exacting about her writing, entrusted Schwartz to evaluate issues of content. Schwartz elected to keep the “motto.” A translation was not provided for the reader.

Richardson does not explain how she intended the epigraph, or “motto” to act on a reading of the story. Her own translation of “den vanskelige død” was “the bitter death,” yet the better known and more literal translation is “the difficult}

---

26 *The English Review* accepted “Death” in May 1911. Richardson expected publication in May. She was advised by Austin Harrison that it would probably appear in July. Finally, it appeared in October (Richardson to Paul Solanges, *Letters*, nos. 71, 107 and 109).
28 “Diary of H. H. R.’s about her mother’s last illness” (NLA MS 133/8/19).
29 Richardson to Jacob Schwartz, 22 November 1931, *Letters*, no. 666.
32 Richardson to Jacob Schwartz, 12 November 1931, *Letters*, no. 655.
33 In “Note to Printers” on the corrected page proofs, Richardson wrote: “... *den vanskelige død* is a motto, not part of the title, & should be placed on p. 13 just above the beginning of the story” (Publisher’s Proof in Ulizio Collection, Kent State University).
death.” What in fact is meant by each translation is difficult to determine. Niels Lyhne Jensen in a study of Jens Peter Jacobsen discussed the word “difficult” in this context:

The word “difficult” does not refer to the problem of overcoming the Christian tradition. It emphasizes the inexorable condition of facing death from the point of view of atheism.

Both Niels Lyhne and Mary Christina resist the impulse to call for help from above at the last desperate moment of life. The “motto” of “Mary Christina” and its sources can be used to provide a complex and ambiguous reading of the story. Richardson’s story does not simply represent death as the final point to existence. Mary Christina has died a physical death, but her relationship to herself and to God continued through acknowledgement and rejection. Religious and spiritual ideas and symbols, including “living shadows on the wall” at the end of the story, suggest an ongoing presence which may also relate to Richardson’s well known interest in Spiritualism.

“Life and Death of Peterle Luthy”

“Life and Death of Peterle Luthy” was inspired by the death of the baby of Henry Handel Richardson’s maid. Two entries in her diary of 1899 offer an unsentimental record of this short life. On 3 June: “went to see E.’s baby;” and on 25 June: “went to see dead baby.” The earliest possible reference to a story may be by Professor

36 In her Preface to her translation of Niels Lyhne (published for the first time in Probyn and Steele, eds., 2003), Richardson quoted a passage from a letter of Jacobsen to Georg Brandes: “I should like,’ he said, ‘to write a book about the defective freethinkers … people who cannot get through life without occasionally sending up petitions for aid from above. You see, the mere folding of the hands and looking up—that is the whole thing; all the rest—our whole theology—is contained in it or follows from it, and is what such freethinkers cannot desist from doing when the shoe pinches.” Richardson alluded to this passage when, in “Mary Christina,” she wrote: “But the lying down and folding of the hands is not enough; it is no such easy matter as that to die.” A rejection of hope does not cause death. Mary Christina’s death is destined to be difficult. She defies the urge to petition God. Richardson defended her use of the term “unblessed” to mean that Mary Christina was not a Catholic (Letters, no. 732). Looking to a third source for the story or, at least, the philosophy behind the writing, further sheds some light on what Richardson may have intended by the epigraph. The writing of the Danish philosopher and religious thinker Søren Kierkegaard (1813–1855), particularly, The Sickness Unto Death, informed Richardson’s treatment of death in “Mary Christina” and again in Ultima Thule. According to Kierkegaard, to die is not to end, but to live the experience of dying. Mary Christina’s “ultimate wisdom” is a rejection of faith and hope. She goes “unblessed into the darkness.”
37 For an account of Richardson’s interest in Spiritualism see Michael Ackland, Henry Handel Richardson: A Life (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004).
38 NLA MS 133/8/3.
John George Robertson to “Richard’le” in 1910. Richardson claimed that the story was written during World War I but from notes made earlier.

“Life and Death of Peterle Luthy” was to be the second of the Two Studies, being the later of the two to be written. Richardson described it as “a tale of old Strassburg, & for those who can read between the lines, treats of a subject that is not generally alluded to in polite society.”

Good Housekeeping (London) first published the story in June 1931. “Life and Death of Peterle Luthy” is the most complex of Richardson’s stories in terms of editorial and authorial modifications. Richardson was simultaneously dealing with two versions of her story: she was correcting proofs for the Twelve Best Short Stories from Good Housekeeping and, at the same time, revising a copy of the first Good Housekeeping publication for Jacob Schwartz.

This story presented many issues to be resolved before publication by Ulysses. The first of these involved the title. The typescript that Curtis Brown placed with Good Housekeeping magazine earlier in the year was entitled “Life and Death of Peterle Luthy” yet Good Housekeeping published it as “The Life and Death of Peterle Luthy.” Richardson was keen to amend this error. She wrote to Schwartz: “Peterle’s correct title … has no ‘the’ in it: ‘LIFE AND DEATH OF PETERLE LUTHY.’” Although Schwartz published the title without “The” at the beginning, it continued to find its way back. Examples include, the reviewer of Two Studies for the Times Literary Supplement, Olga Roncoroni (1893–1982), and Richardson herself in a receipt to Schwartz enclosed with the letter explaining the issue.

The subtitle was a further concern. Her own subtitle was “An Interior.” The editor at Good Housekeeping had replaced this with: “A Little Gleam of Light Between Two Eternities.” It was important to the mood of the piece that the original subtitle be reinstated: “I meant the sketch to be a kind of replica of some dark old Dutch painting.” This also alludes to Jen Peter Jacobsen’s novel Fru

39 NLA MS 133/8/3.
41 Richardson to Jacob Schwartz, 12 November 1931, Letters, no. 655.
42 Richardson to Mary Kernot, 2 November 1927, Letters, no. 407.
44 TS [1931] ML MSS A2628.
45 Richardson to Jacob Schwartz, 12 November 1931, Letters, no. 655. Richardson later explained that the name of the character is Peter and the suffix le forms a diminutive “& shd be pronounced Peterly (or with the German ‘er’ Paterly)” (25 May 1932, Letters, no. 739).
47 Richardson to Jacob Schwartz, 12 November 1931, Letters, no. 655.
Marie Grubbe (1877) with its subtitle, “Interiors from the Seventeenth Century.” Richardson wrote about this in her published article “A Danish Poet” (1897).\footnote{Ethel F. L. Robertson, “A Danish Poet,” *Cosmopolis*, 8 November 1897. Reprinted in *Southerly* 23, no. 1, (1963): 44; and Probyn and Steele, *J. P. Jacobsen Niels Lyhne*.

Of added annoyance to Richardson were the illustrations by Stephen Spurrier that *Good Housekeeping* provided. Richardson drew a line through these in her own copy. In response to Schwartz’s proposed promotional tag for the stories in the proof prospectus for *Two Studies*, “Two pictures in prose, both on the theme of death,” Richardson suggested that the simple phrase “Pictures in Prose” would be better. She wished for as little external influence on the reading of the stories as was possible in their promotion.\footnote{Richardson to Jacob Schwartz, 18 November 1931. Corrected proof prospectus Box 4/2(a), The Letters of Henry Handel Richardson, John Kinmont Moir Collection, State Library of Victoria.} Schwartz obliged and the new prospectus read, “Two Studies: Pictures in Prose.”

Of the two versions of “Life and Death of Peterle Luthy” that were in play as Richardson was preparing for *Two Studies*, the first was about eight thousand words in length, and the second was cut by about five hundred words for *Good Housekeeping*. She allowed Schwartz to decide which version he preferred. He chose to include the descriptive passages that had presumably been removed to fit the word length requirement of the magazine.

As well as correcting errors or changes made by *Good Housekeeping*, this more collaborative publication afforded Richardson the opportunity to alter her story. She was uncomfortable with the final sentence: “And before the sun went down that night, it was almost as though Peterle had never been.” She wrote to Schwartz that this sentence must be removed and that this would entail some reworking of the preceding paragraph.\footnote{Richardson to Jacob Schwartz, 12 November 1931, *Letters*, no. 655.} It is intriguing that this sentence reappeared, slightly reworked, in typescript, proofs and publications subsequent to *Two Studies*.\footnote{Typescript [1934] NLA MS 133/5/217–36; first corrected proofs for *The End of a Childhood* (London: Heinemann, 1934) NLA MS 133/14/49 and second corrected proofs for *The End of a Childhood* (London: Heinemann, 1934) NLA MS 133/14/50.

Another concern Richardson expressed to Jacob Schwartz related to the use of accents. In the Ulysses proof the printers had omitted the French accents and the German umlaut. She wrote, “Will you see that these are inserted? The omission of the two dots in ‘Madele’ would convict me of confusing the Strassburg dialect with that of Munich or Vienna.”\footnote{Richardson to Jacob Schwartz, 22 November 1931, *Letters*, no. 666.} Interestingly, Richardson’s deployment of accents on foreign words, including in the name Luthy or Lüthy, was inconsistent.\footnote{Maureen Mann handwritten notes, “*The End of a Childhood* (some notes of mine),” Henry Handel Richardson Project Archive, Monash University.}

As she closely read through the *Good Housekeeping* publication, perhaps with the aid of a typescript by her side, Richardson became upset by the changes the
editor had made to her story. She wrote to Schwartz when returning the corrected proofs:

If you find my corrections too heavy, please let me bear the expense of them. They are due to the liberties taken with my text by those wretched *Good Housekeeping* people. Their changes were most subtle & did not strike my eye till I began to go through the thing word by word.  

She also used this opportunity to correct the punctuation for the *Good Housekeeping* anthology.

The most significant, albeit subtle, change *Good Housekeeping* made to “Life and Death of Peterle Luthy” was to substitute the word “stepfather” for “father” in order to veil the incestuous nature of the relationship between Henriette and her stepfather. Richardson was most outraged by this imposition which she saw as denying an important part of the story. The points of substitution were those most likely to shed light on the relationship. She wrote to Schwartz, “The theme is as much of the family as the child: the infant covers the incest.”  

This use of the child is typical of the role of the child in seventeenth-century Dutch genre painting: “The children function as commentators for or as embodiments of adult problems, vices or concerns.”

**Two Studies**

On 22 November 1931, Henry Handel Richardson was correcting proofs of each of the stories for *Two Studies*. She requested that she see page proofs prior to publication. A set of corrected page proofs was later purchased by B. George Ulizio. In 1939, she wrote to him, “I cannot remember anything now about the corrected proof sheets, but I think it most unlikely that I saw more than one set of proofs.” A set of galley proofs signed by Richardson has also been noted.

*Two Studies* was to be marketed as follows:

The entire edition consists of 500 copies, each signed by the author. Price £1. 1s. 0d.; and an edition-de-luxe of 15 copies, on hand-made paper, bound in leather, 10 copies only for sale at £4. 4s. 0d. each, and 5 for author’s presentation.

---

54 Richardson to Jacob Schwartz, 23 November 1931, *Letters*, no. 667.  
55 Ibid.  
57 TLS, Richardson to B. G. Ulizio, 13 June 1939, Kent State University.  
The book will make approximately 80 pages in a demy octavo format, and will be elegantly printed by the Shenval Press under the personal supervision of James Shand, formerly of the University Press, Oxford.

The book was to be “Ready December 7, 1931.”

In order to have the book published within such a short time frame, Schwartz and Richardson needed to work diligently on their various tasks. Richardson would have been happy to leave most of the material concerns to Schwartz. He, however, insisted on a more collaborative effort. Richardson wrote:

[He] wrote me two letters per day for 4 weeks. Paper, binding, edging, colours, print, capitals—all had to be decided by me—as I’ve no experience in these things the bother was considerable.

For the most part, Richardson tried to hold back on making such decisions, yet she was prompted to make some contribution: “Paper and type I leave entirely to your judgement. As for colour, I am all for something plain and simple and, as you say, without decorations. Death as a subject needs rather a cold neutral shade, to my mind.”

There is one extant letter from Schwartz to Richardson. The State Library of Victoria holds fifty-three of Henry Handel Richardson's letters, receipts and postcards to Jacob Schwartz written between 11 November 1931 and 30 January 1933 in the collection of John Kinmont Moir (1893–1958).

Although Richardson found Schwartz’s persistence and determination tiring, she carefully considered the many questions he hurled at her regarding content and design. In calculating the number of pages, the Shenval Press allowed for too many. This afforded Richardson the opportunity to insert a dedication: “To my friend | MARY A. KERNOT.” She further offered the idea of a page of contents or an expanded paragraph in “Life and Death of Peterle Luthy” to make the story extend one page further. Schwartz chose the former of the ideas. She also expressed her concern with the list of her books at the end of Two Studies: “I don’t feel quite certain that this fits in with the character of the thing.” Schwartz was responsive to this, and it does not appear in the published version.

On 6 December 1931, she declared to Schwartz:

I am delighted with the Studies—it’s a charming little book. Couldn't be bettered in any way. I feel I must thank you yet once again for giving me the pleasure of seeing my work in such a form. It is indeed a change from anything I have had before.

59 Corrected proof prospectus Box 4/2(a), The Letters of Henry Handel Richardson, Moir Collection, SLV.
60 Richardson to Mary Kernot, 28 December 1931, Letters, no. 679.
61 Richardson to Jacob Schwartz, 12 November 1931, Letters, no. 655.
62 Undated ALS NLA MS 133/2/178.
63 Mary Amelia Kernot (1858–1954), school friend of Richardson at Presbyterian Ladies’ College in Melbourne.
The beauty and simplicity of the product must have been a great reward for her as she pressed on with the next task of numbering, signing and inscribing copies. The *Studies* arrived in batches for marking and returning to the Shenval Press. The standard issue was bound with green cloth over blue papered boards, with gilt lettering to the spine; and the deluxe issue was bound in decorative cloth with green leather shelfback, stamped in gold, with gilt top edges, and printed on handmade paper. Richardson’s correspondence with Schwartz contains references to slip cases and tissue wrappers. There are no listings of either in any current library or booksellers’ catalogues.

The process of signing and numbering the issues is difficult to chart through the extant correspondence. On 6 December 1931, Richardson wrote that she would sign and return the first 50 copies. She also thanked Schwartz for the personal copy and noted that she would “remember to number one of the fresh batch 4.” Richardson may have left number four out of the sequence, misnumbered it, or it may have in some way been damaged or soiled.

Five days later, she wrote, “I see that you are going to number the latter [books] for me. What numbers shall I put on my ten?” Richardson later wrote to Schwartz that the *Studies* were numbered up to 490. In an edition of 500, that would suggest that ten were put aside for a special purpose. A copy in the Henry Handel Richardson collection, Mitchell Library, State Library of New South Wales, is numbered 490. No copies bearing higher numbers have been located.

As it happens, it appears that Richardson’s ten may have included numbers 97 and 98. An anomalous copy of the standard edition is in the Henry Handel Richardson Collection in the National Library of Australia. It is described thus:

The SR copy is no. 97 and is a cut-down version (19 x 13 cm) of the same printing with narrower margins, quarter bound in dark green leather, with floral decorated paper boards, and is believed to be part of a small run HHR had specially prepared for her friends.

A copy also bearing a similar description and numbered 98 has also been located.

---

64 Richardson to Jacob Schwartz, 6 December 1931, *Letters*, no. 671. Richardson was numbering, signing and inscribing *Christkindleins Wiegenlied: An Old German Carol Set to Music* for Schwartz.
65 The Shenval Press was established in 1930.
66 Richardson to Jacob Schwartz, 6 December 1931, *Letters*, no. 671.
67 The copy of *Two Studies*, standard edition, number 4 was inscribed by Richardson to Elling Aaneståd (associate editor of W. W. Norton & Co). This copy is currently available from MW Books Ltd, New York.
68 Richardson to Jacob Schwartz, 11 and 20 December 1931, *Letters*, nos. 674 and 678.
69 SR 22, NLA.
70 This copy has a brown leather spine. (In personal collection). No other copies bearing a similar description or with numbers near 97 or 98 have been located.
On 9 December 1931, Richardson wrote that the printers had sent review copies to sign, and, as instructed, she would leave them unnumbered. She asked Schwartz whether she should write “for review.” It is most likely that Schwartz did not want to create the distinction between review copies and saleable or presentable copies of the Studies. Schwartz presented Siegfried Sassoon (1886–1967) with an unnumbered copy in which he tipped a slip intended for reviewers, and crossed out all except the name and address of the Ulysses Press: “Please accept this copy for Review | The Publishers would appreciate any editorial comment. | Ulysses Press, Ltd., | 20, Bury St, Bloomsbury, London, | W. C. 1.”

Nine days later Richardson wrote to Schwartz about 35 of the books which the printers wanted her to leave unsigned. She suggested that she would number but not sign these copies if she did not hear otherwise from Schwartz. Two days later she wrote, “The ‘Two Studies’ are numbered & signed up to 490. This leaves 35 blank, as requested by the S. Press in the enclosed letter.” It is not clear for what purpose these 35 copies were left “blank.” They are presumably not the earlier, signed “review” copies. Either way, the limited edition of 500 contained at least 490, and 35 “blank” copies, and, or including, 10 copies probably for Henry Handel Richardson, and a number of signed copies “for review.” Given Schwartz’s reputation for questionable practices, one can only speculate on his intentions in numbering at least some of the copies himself, leaving the review copies pristine save for Richardson’s signature, and leaving another batch “blank.” Some unnumbered and unsigned copies were inscribed and presented by Schwartz.

The signing and numbering of the deluxe copies was not straightforward either. The first two batches were sent to Richardson four at a time. On 17 December 1931, she returned four copies to the Shenval Press, two for presentation and two numbered. She wrote to Schwartz, “According to your instructions I inscribed the two former to Captain Arnold Gyde & Eldred F. Hitchcock.” On 14 January 1932, she was still dealing with this edition. She wrote:

I’m really distressed to hear that I made two mistakes in signing those de-luxe volumes. I can’t think how it happened, especially as I had Miss Roncornoi beside me, who has all her wits about her. It’s too annoying. Now I suggest that you let

---

71 Richardson to Jacob Schwartz, 9 December 1931, Letters, no. 673.
72 Schwartz inscribed the slip: “To Siegfried Sassoon Esq. with the complements of the publisher Jacob Schwartz I hope you like the carol” (in personal collection).
73 Richardson to Jacob Schwartz, 18 December 1931, Letters, no. 677; 20 December 1931, Letters, no. 678.
74 Wake Forest University Library has an unsigned copy. The copy in Mitchell Library for Mary Kernot is unnumbered and unsigned. At least two presentation copies from Jacob Schwartz are also unnumbered and unsigned.
75 Richardson to Jacob Schwartz, 17 December 1931, Letters, no. 676. Captain Arnold Gyde was Henry Handel Richardson’s publicity agent at Heinemann; and Sir Eldred Frederick Hitchcock (1887–1959) was a businessman and collector of Islamic art.
me give you one of the two copies you sent me the other night. It will still leave me with a couple, for you know you sent me a slightly smudged copy before I went away. Please agree to this. It will relieve my mind.

Olga Roncoroni recalled Richardson's distractibility and irritability during the task of numbering and signing copies, and suggested that her language gave the lie to her dignified public persona.\footnote{Purdie and Roncoroni, \textit{Henry Handel Richardson}, 99.} It is probable that one of the errors was in numbering two copies number 2. A copy in the Dorothy Green Collection, (ADFA special 219065) is numbered 2 and then crossed through in ink. B. G Ulizio's copy is numbered 2 of 5 copies for "author's presentation."\footnote{Main Special Collection PR6035.I35479, Kent State University.} One of Richardson's own copies is unnumbered and unsigned.\footnote{In possession of the editors of the \textit{Letters}.}

Richardson and Schwartz were each concerned to keep the American collectors up to date. Richardson asked that a prospectus be posted to Harold Kamp in California\footnote{Richardson to Jacob Schwartz, 14 January 1932, \textit{Letters}, no. 685.} and Samuel Heiman in New York.\footnote{Richardson to Jacob Schwartz, 21 February 1932, \textit{Letters}, no. 706.} She was also in contact with Paul Lemperly in Ohio about the publication.\footnote{Richardson's response to Lemperly's remarks about the change of title of "Death" to "Mary Christina," 15 January 1932, \textit{Letters}, no. 686.}

In Australia, about twelve orders were placed for \textit{Two Studies}. Richardson wrote to Nettie Palmer (1885–1964) that she thought the number satisfactory given the economic times.\footnote{Richardson to Nettie Palmer, 23 February 1932, \textit{Letters}, no. 708.}

**Reception**

Jacob Schwartz ensured that a review copy reached Stuart Gilbert (1883–1969).\footnote{The publisher's review slip could not be located in the Stuart Gilbert Papers, Harry Ransom Center, University of Texas Library. Stuart Gilbert's copy of \textit{Two Studies} is copy 1 PR 9619.3 r=R5T9 1931.} An extract from Gilbert's response to Schwartz was published in a promotional pamphlet for \textit{Two Studies}.\footnote{Richardson to Nettie Palmer, 23 February 1931, \textit{Letters}, no. 708.} It read:

Many thanks for the H. H. Richardson books; I started reading her a quarter of a century ago; there is no book previous to “Ulysses” that I have read so often and so often recommended as “Maurice Guest.” To my mind it is the best novel written in the twenty years preceding the war. The stories you publish ("Two Studies") are utterly delightful. You have certainly struck a “winner” there—unless in these days of half-baked revolutionaries good writing is a disadvantage. I hope to review the H. H. Richardson “Two Studies” in “Exchange.”
By the end of December 1931, Richardson’s press cutting agency had provided her with only two reviews of *Two Studies*, one by Henry Fraser in *Everyman* (24 December 1931), and the other by Gerald Gould in the *Observer* (27 December 1931). Gould’s good word was flattering to Richardson. She happily recalled that he “started the ball of *Ultima Thule* rolling.” She sent copies of these to Mary Kernot in Australia to be passed on to Nettie Palmer.

Schwartz informed Richardson that two complimentary reviews were not published for fear of bias:

I also hear through him, that two reviews have been written for the Daily Telegraph—by John Collier & Rebecca West respectively—but in each case so over-laudatory that the editor has suspected wire-pulling & consigned them to the waste paper basket.

It is questionable whether two such well known and respected literary voices would have been so readily dismissed.

On 22 January 1932, Richardson asked Schwartz whether he had sent a copy of *Two Studies* to Edwin Muir. She told Schwartz that he wrote for the *Yorkshire Post* and some American papers. On 16 May, she followed this up:

I wonder if you remember me asking you to let Edwin Muir have a copy of the “Two Studies”? I had a letter from him the other day, when he sent me some Poems of his, & in it he says he never received the Studies. Do you still think it worth while bestowing a copy on him? He’s a great admirer of H. H. R., & might give the booklet a mention in his correspondence with America or in the *Yorkshire Evening Post*.

Two days later she thanked Schwartz for sending Muir the book. What Richardson did not mention was her friendship with Muir. He was not only an admirer of her books, but he and his wife lived with Richardson’s sister, Lil, and her husband A. S. Neill in Dresden during the early 1920s. It appears that Edwin Muir did not review *Two Studies*. However, an unsigned review did appear in the *Yorkshire Post* on 20 April 1932.

---

85 Words of praise from Gerald Gould also appeared on the promotional pamphlet for *Two Studies*. Richardson wrote, “I believe G. G. is a very remarkable man, & what he says carries considerable weight.” (Richardson to Nettie Palmer, 23 February 1932, Letters, no. 709).
86 Richardson to Mary Kernot, 28 December 1931, Letters, no. 679.
87 Ibid.
88 Richardson to Mary Kernot, 21 January 1932, Letters, no. 691.
89 John Collier (1901–1980), British writer, especially noted for his short stories. Rebecca West (1892–1983), British author, journalist and literary critic. In 1959, she was made a DBE for her contribution to English letters. Leonard Russell (1906–74) was literary editor of the *Daily Telegraph*.
90 Richardson to Jacob Schwartz, 22 January 1932, Letters, no. 692.
91 Richardson to Jacob Schwartz, 16 May 1932, Letters, no. 734, 18 May 1932, Letters, no. 735.
92 Further reviews: *Times Literary Supplement*, 11 February 1932: 96; *South Australian Institutes’
On 24 January 1932, Richardson was pleased to hear that Arthur Ellis (1883–1963), Superintendent of the British Museum Reading Room, was championing her cause by asking Desmond MacCarthy (1877–1952), at this time the literary critic for the *Sunday Times*, to write a review. Richardson wrote, “But if he gets Desmond McCarthy [sic] to do anything, we will have accomplished a miracle. McCarthy [sic] has persistently ignored me.” Ellis had personally written a letter of praise to Richardson. No review was forthcoming.

The following day, Richardson again registered her disappointment as to reviews, “Now, fancy the Referee letting you down too! What is it about my work that mustn’t be praised?”

The appraisal of *Two Studies* which had the most impact on Henry Handel Richardson came in the form of a letter. Jacob Schwartz had sent a copy of *Two Studies* to T. E. Shaw (1888–1935) otherwise known as T. E. Lawrence, to which Shaw wrote a detailed critical response on 26 April 1932. He asked that Schwartz keep his response confidential, and not use any of it for advertising purposes. The tone of the letter was one of great praise and respect for Richardson’s short story writing, but contained within it a number of concerns regarding detail:

> It is very beautiful, and so exquisitely wrought that one can imagine such tiny blemishes as those I have picked upon above. It is only the finest stuff that shows specks. For the beauty of the whole and of its parts I have not words worth putting down. If she could write a book like this it would beat the Thule books out of court, fine and large though they were.

Richardson was initially upset by the letter, but with more consideration was grateful for the content and the time and effort Shaw dedicated to her work. She responded in sixteen numbered points to Shaw’s concerns, but asked that Schwartz keep the whole letter from him and instead quote from it as he saw fit.


93 Richardson to Mary Kernot, 21 January 1932, *Letters*, no. 691.
94 Richardson to Jacob Schwartz, 25 January 1932, *Letters*, no. 695. Richardson was referring to the *Sunday Referee*.
96 Schwartz wrote to Richardson: “I have been debating within myself if I should send along the T. E. Shaw (Colonel Lawrence) letter enclosed—I submit it to you without comments…. Please don’t show it to anybody: he dreads personal contact. I hope to get it back next Friday. T. E. Shaw is one of my semi-idols. I know of no one else in England whose good favor or attention I would desire than his.” (NLA MS 133/2/178).
97 Richardson’s diary entry for 28 April 1932 reads: “From Jacob enclosing T. E. Lawrence’s (It upset me) criticism of Death & Peterle.” (Diary 1932, NLA MS 133/8/105).
98 Richardson to Jacob Schwartz, 1 May 1932, *Letters*, no. 732.
In the 1934 typescript of “Mary Christina” for *The End of a Childhood*, Richardson incorporated changes based on Shaw’s suggestions and criticisms.\(^99\)

**After Two Studies**

During 1932, each of Richardson’s three major publishers, Heinemann, Norton and Ulysses, was exerting pressure on her to publish a collected volume of short stories. Richardson resisted each of their offers, claiming that her stories could not constitute an appropriate collection. She wrote to Schwartz, “I fear the pencil sketches are too few and too scattered to be of use to you.” Nevertheless it appears that she favoured a more refined and elegant volume by the Ulysses Press.\(^100\)

According to Schwartz, Richardson was assured a window display in Bumpus’s bookshop in Oxford Street, London, if she would publish a 7/6 volume of stories with Ulysses. This offer was tempting and Richardson did not reject it out of hand, despite her concerns about the quantity of stories and the discontinuity of theme and artistic method.\(^101\) Eventually, she wrote to Mary Kernot:

> No, I’m not letting Ulysses publish a 7/6 vol. of stories in the meantime. Heinemanns were against it. They have bothered me a lot to give the things to them. But firstly I want the stories to have “serial” (magazine) publication, & secondly I don’t consider they wld make at all a satisfactory volume. They’re too diverse.—Of course this holds good with regards to Ulysses, too.\(^102\)

It was not until November 1933 that Henry Handel Richardson finally consented to produce a collected volume of her short stories for both Heinemann and Norton.\(^103\) *The End of a Childhood* appeared in England on 3 September 1934.

At the same time that Richardson was trying to avoid a collected edition of her stories, she was discussing with Schwartz the possibility of publishing a single story in a similar format to *Two Studies*. This story was “Succedaneum”:

> The winter after (1929–30) I spent writing a long-short-story—about 18,000 words I think it ran to—which has so far not seen the light of print. But there are reasons. In the first place it’s too long for mag. publ. while not long enough for a serial, & secondly it was written in a spirit of violent rebellion against the realism of Mahony, & the Mahony books, & so evidently impresses people as unduly

---

\(^99\) NLA MS 133/5/300–10.

\(^100\) Richardson to Jacob Schwartz, 14 January 1932, *Letters*, no. 685.

\(^101\) Richardson to Mary Kernot, 21 January 1932, *Letters*, no. 691.

\(^102\) Richardson to Mary Kernot, 17 April 1932, *Letters*, no. 726.

\(^103\) In 1929 an agreement was drawn up between Heinemann and Norton to allow Norton to take over all previous Richardson titles in America, and to have first option on any subsequent titles (Richardson to Norton, 28 December 1933, Columbia University Libraries MS Norton files).
fantastic. But its day will come. Personally I think it one of the best things I’ve written in spite of its impracticability.\textsuperscript{104}

Unfortunately, Schwartz’s comments about “Succedaneum” do not survive. In the context of his interest in modern authors, it would be interesting to know his response to a story by Henry Handel Richardson which thematically and stylistically pushed the boundaries of realistic fiction. All that is known from the extant correspondence is that Schwartz told Richardson that his debts to the printers prevented him from publishing the story in the meantime.\textsuperscript{105}

The final extant letters from Henry Handel Richardson to Jacob Schwartz suggest that the relationship between the two continued until January 1933. Richardson was offering Schwartz collectable items and to catch up for a chat. It would seem that she did not anticipate this correspondence itself becoming a literary collectable.

It appears that Schwartz remained in the book trade in London for some time, joining the Antiquarian Booksellers’ Association in April 1934.\textsuperscript{106} In the 1940s he married the Irish-born Hollywood actress Anita Sharp Bolster (1895–1985). William S. Brockman found that, during the 1940s, the couple divided their time between Hollywood and Bar Harbor, Maine, where Schwartz continued his literary dealings, as well as dabbling in acting, real estate and antiques.\textsuperscript{107} He continued his travels in pursuit of literary treasures.\textsuperscript{108} He disappeared from the literary landscape in the early 1970s.

Between Two Studies and The End of a Childhood, Henry Handel Richardson published six stories in magazines and had one published as a fine, separate book. The Bath: an Aquarelle, was the first publication of P. R. Stephensen & Co. (Sydney, 1933). She completed two additional stories, “The Coat” and “Sister Ann” before her death in 1946. “The Coat” was published during her lifetime. The Young Cosima, her final novel, was published in 1939.

\textbf{Conclusion}

Richardson’s association with Schwartz was regular, generous and, at times intense during the months surrounding the publication of Two Studies.

As a literary figure, Richardson had much to gain from Schwartz. He provided her with connections to the modern literary scene through gifts, stories and

\begin{footnotesize}
\textsuperscript{104} Richardson to Mary Kernot, 20 March 1933, \textit{Letters}, no. 805.
\textsuperscript{105} Richardson to Jacob Schwartz, 3 March 1932, \textit{Letters}, no. 712.
\textsuperscript{107} Brockman, “Jacob Schwartz,” 179.
\textsuperscript{108} A note from Schwartz dated 30 September 1948 from Paris where he was hoping to “buy books to defeat the inflation” is in the Bob Brown Collection; Bob Brown wrote of a book buying trip Schwartz made to Leningrad (undated).
\end{footnotesize}
publication by the Ulysses Press. For Richardson, who is described as terribly shy, this was perhaps a way of engaging without ever having to step out from behind her “man of straw.” In addition, Schwartz promised her valuable critical recognition as a short story writer. This was realised in the critique by T. E. Lawrence. Her publication by Schwartz also enabled her inclusion in the fashionable, high-end literary market of the small press, and in consequence the libraries of some collectors of major modern literary works.

More generally, the dynamics of their relationship operates as a useful prism for a wider consideration of publishing for Richardson, and of publishing more generally, in the early 1930s.

As to Richardson, she greatly admired and appreciated fine quality paper, typography and print. In the circumstances set out above, and for the first time, Richardson was able to see her own careful craftsmanship of her short stories reflected in their presentation in a commercial context. In her own word, her stories were “redeemed” from the crude or basic serial publications. Richardson valued this; and it is clear that she would have liked more of her stories published in this style.

And yet, the 1930s heralded a period in which the fashion of producing high quality, expensive books was in decline. More specifically, the onset of the Great Depression saw the folding of many small presses, such as Ulysses and P. R. Stephensen & Co. Despite all efforts by Schwartz in England and America, and Richardson through Nettie Palmer in Australia, to push sales and reviews of Two Studies, collectors and casual buyers were reluctant to spend as they had earlier.

Richardson continued to regret the publication of her collected stories by Heinemann. Her final published words on the short stories contained her wish for another specialist publication: “I still hope that someday an enterprising publisher will extract the satiric little Growing Pains and bring them out in a separate booklet.” Unfortunately, circumstances did not provide for a passionate, charming and risk-taking figure such as Jacob Schwartz or P. R. Stephensen to come forward again.

Melbourne, Australia

109 Richardson to Mary Kernot, 12 November 1931, Letters, no. 656.