

Weird and Wonderful Partnership  
Mary Paley and Alfred Marshall 1877-1924  
Peter D. Groenewegen  
*History of Economic Ideas*, vol.1, n°1, 1993  
(Extrait)



### III

When Alfred Marshall and Mary Paley married in August 1877 they were already four years removed from their initial

teacher and student relationship, and had become fellow workers in the field of economics, co-authors of a book from the time of their engagement, and, for the whole of their active academic life, lecturers in their subject at the three universities in which Alfred Marshall had sought and found employment. The last aspect, as indicated earlier, is already a remarkable feature of their relationship from the perspective of the Victorian era which embraced the greater part of their long lives. What fruits can be ascribed to this intellectual side of their partnership, or more widely, in what sense can their marriage be called an intellectual partnership? The starting point for such discussion must be the saga of their joint book, which was virtually four years in the making, enjoyed a successful run in the market place until what has been called its "suppression" in 1892. However, many traces of the joint work can be found in the book which made the historical reputation of the dominant male partner of this economist couple. Mary Paley's role in her husband's major books can then be pursued, together with her other intellectual contributions to her husband's labours over more than four decades.

Mary Paley at the end of her life recalled the association between the *Economics of Industry* and her marriage with Alfred Marshall:

When I returned to Newnham in October [1876], she [Miss Anne Clough] gave us [Mary and Alfred Marshall] a sitting-room [at Newnham] where we made the first outlines of the *Economics of Industry*, which Professor Stuart wanted as a textbook for the Extension Lectures and which with too light a heart I had undertaken to write. It was published in our joint names in 1879. Alfred insisted on this, though as time went on I realised that it had to be really his book, the latter half being almost entirely his and containing the germs of much what appeared later in the *Principles*. He never liked the little book for it offended against his belief that "every dogma that is short and simple is false", and he said about it, 'you can't afford to tell the truth for half-a-crown'<sup>58</sup>.

Mary Paley's recollections about the book have been challenged on several occasions. In his memoir of Marshall, Keynes<sup>59</sup>

58. MARY PALEY MARSHALL, *What I Remember*, p. 22.

59. J.M. KEYNES, 'Alfred Marshall', p. 201.

wrote, "In later years, Marshall grew very unfriendly to the little book. After the publication of the *Principles*, he suppressed it and replaced it in 1892 with an almost wholly different book under the same title which was mainly an abridgement of the *Principles*...". Keynes explained Marshall's growing dislike of the book in terms of the "brief and imperfect manner" in which it had treated the theory of value, thereby involving Marshall in unnecessary controversies in the pages of the *Quarterly Journal of Economics*<sup>60</sup>. More in harmony with Mary Paley's sentiments, Keynes added that Marshall's growing realisation of the complexity of economics meant that it was not "possible to combine simplicity with scientific accuracy", as its authors had originally hoped to do in the book. Keynes concluded,

Yet these sentiments do a real injustice to the book. It won high praise from competent judges and was, during the whole of its life, much the best little textbook available. (... 15,000 copies had been sold before it was suppressed). If we are to have an elementary textbook at all, this one was probably, in relation to its contemporaries and predecessors, the best thing of the kind ever done — much better than the primers of Mrs. Fawcett or Jevons or any of its many successors. Moreover, the latter part of Book III, on Trade Combinations, Trade Unions, Trade Disputes, and Cooperation was the first satisfactory treatment on modern lines of these important topics<sup>61</sup>.

When twenty years later, Keynes wrote the obituary of Mrs. Marshall, he returned to the theme. After quoting an extract of Mary Paley's own recollections, he defended the little book once again, adding in this defence the views of his father, who had known the book well.

It was, in fact, an extremely good book; nothing more serviceable

60. *Ibid.*, p. 201. The controversies were by Laughlin, Walker and Macvane and appeared in the first two volumes of the *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, Volume I, 1887, pp. 359, 477; volume II, 1888, p. 218. They dealt with the theory of value in the broader sense, since the first of these items dealt with costs in relation to value, the second with business profits and the third with the relationship of wages and profits.

61. J.M. KEYNES, 'Alfred Marshall', p. 202.

for its purpose was produced for many years, if ever. I know that my father always felt that there was something ungenerous in Marshall's distaste for this book, which was originally hers, but was allowed to go out of print without a murmur of complaint from her when there was still a strong demand for it. The book which replaced it in 1892, under a similar title and over his sole name, was of quite a different character, being mainly an abridgement of the *Principles*. The 1879 volume, so great an advance when it came out on what had gone before, is the little book in green covers, not the thicker one in blue Macmillan cloth<sup>62</sup>.

In 1972, Rita McWilliams-Tullberg shed further light on the fate of the little book<sup>63</sup>. She reproduced a draft letter by Marshall to a Japanese person, who had translated the book in 1910 without the authors' permission. The whole letter is worth quoting, especially the two pages crossed out on second thoughts:

Balliol Croft. 2.5.10.

p. 1. Dear Sir,

Your courteous and high minded letter convinces me that you would not have proposed to translate a book which its authors had deliberately suppressed if you had been aware of the fact. I am so much impressed by your noble sentiments and by the trouble and expense to which you have gone that, I give my consent to the publication of matter of which I am not proud.

p. 2. (The new *Economics of Industry* was made rapidly chiefly by scissors and paste out of my *Principles* and it is less attractive to a beginner who wants to talk about economics with the least possible exertion. But the new volume maintains a much larger circulation than the old one:

62. J.M. KEYNES, 'Mary Paley Marshall', p. 239. Keynes's father, John Neville Keynes, had been among Alfred Marshall's early students, had completed the Moral Sciences Tripos in 1875 (being "Senior Moralist"), the year after Mary Paley had completed hers, and had used the book (as a text useful for the Tripos) in his economics teaching in the period 1877-1885 when the Marshalls were absent from Cambridge.

63. RITA MCWILLIAMS-TULLBERG, 'Economics of Industry', *History of Economic Thought Newsletter* No. 9, Autumn 1972, pp. 14-17.

and as I am more anxious to clear away misunderstanding than to provide light literature, I prefer it.

Yours sincerely,  
 Alfred Marshall  
 Mary P. Marshall

p. 3 (... On serious difficulties than to provide light instruction. Those who suggested that an educational work on economics should be written by a young student (who had obtained only a very elementary knowledge of it and did) [heavily crossed through] were not economists and did not know that the task of combining simplicity with thoroughness is more difficult in this than in almost any other subject. Several scores of books have been written in the hope of doing this; but they have perished quickly. My wife and I began by trying to make the book simple) (p2 and p3 are both crossed through)<sup>64</sup>.

The crossed out reference to "a young student" with only an "elementary knowledge" of the subject invited to write an educational work is an interesting indication of Marshall's attitude to his wife's skills as an economist. In addition, Rita McWilliams-Tullberg<sup>65</sup> has presented much evidence on the meaning of "suppression" which had been used in the context of the book by Marshall, a suppression in which he implicated his wife and co-author. The book is not in the Cambridge University Library, nor on the open shelves of the Marshall Library (though copies are preserved in the Marshall Archive), nor is it easily found in (male) college libraries. John's College Library, for example, does not have it. There are three copies in Newnham Library (suggesting that Mary Paley was an unwilling "suppressor") and one at Girton. Moreover, a third edition had been contemplated as late as 1885 (in which

64. *Ibid.*, p. 15. Keynes must have seen this letter when he wrote the Marshall memoir, since he refers to the unauthorised Japanese translation, and quotes from the draft.

65. RITA McWILLIAMS-TULLBERG, 'Economics of Industry', pp. 15-17. David Collard, then editor of the *Newsletter*, adds that Bristol University Library has a first edition of the book presented by the Principal of Bristol University College, who was of course one of its authors.

among others, J.N. Keynes was involved) while a Russian translation was permitted as late as 1886. It can be added that the book was popular with Marshall's students until 1890, and that, on the evidence of Marshall's notes on students, it was read in 1898 by a Girton student and in 1904-05 (paradoxically) by an economics tripos student from Marshall's own college. His own product, however, effectively supplanted it during the 1890s<sup>66</sup>.

Marshall's suppression of the book in 1892 has been defended on doctrinal grounds by Becattini and Whitaker. Becattini, using Keynes's simile from the *General Theory*, describes the decade after the 1879 volume, when Marshall was busily constructing his own *Principles of Economics*, as a period when very gradually, "like a snake, he freed himself from his old skins. He surpassed the "ethical trap", he laid more stress on evolutionary aspects, he exorcised the spectre of communism". In short, the major work of the *Principles* replaces the earlier, and immature, *Economics of Industry*<sup>67</sup>. Whitaker likewise advances doctrinal reasons for the suppression of the earlier volume. Although the book had much of the character of a first draft of the *Principles* because it foreshad-

66. See my 'Alfred Marshall and the Establishment of the Cambridge Economics Tripos', pp. 661, 664; it may be noted that John Maynard Keynes had not read the book by 1905 (*ibid.*, p. 667). It was not popular with all students, however. As Foxwell wrote to J.N. Keynes on 10 June 1881, "I can understand ... that Marshall's book may be difficult and unattractive to beginners. The Special men don't like it; their favourite book is Adam Smith ..." (Marshall Archive, Keynes 1:22). Alon Kadish has suggested the growing popularity of the *Elements of Economics of Industry* in 1892 arose from the fact it matched the syllabus from the reformed Tripos of 1889 to a T, allowing it to resemble a "textbook course". See *Historians, Economists and Economic History*, London, Routledge, 1989, p. 160.

67. G. BECATTINI, *Invito a una rilettura di Marshall*, pp. ci-cxi, the translated quotation comes from p. cix. Becattini adds that when he communicated with C.W. Guillebaud on the Italian translation of the *Economics of Industry*, for which the material quoted is an introduction, Guillebaud immediately observed "that Marshall would not have been pleased" (*ibid.*, p. cviii n. 86). Guillebaud also recalled that when his father (Marshall's brother-in-law) was sent a copy of the first edition of the *Principles* in 1890, he had to return his copy of *Economics of Industry* for "destruction". See *Principles of Economics*, variorum edition, 1961, Vol. 2, p. 12 n.c.

owed so many of the qualities of the later book, its treatment of the distinction between normal and market value differed substantially from the treatment in the *Principles* while there were also significant differences in the theory of distribution presented in the two books. More important for the purpose of this paper is the view Whitaker expresses on the improbability "that Mrs. Marshall contributed much, outside the opening and closing chapters, apart from literary advice and drafting" and that, in a similar sense the *Principles* can be regarded as "a joint product" because Marshall acknowledged in its first edition, "My wife has aided and advised me at every stage of the MSS and of the proofs, and it owes a very great deal to her suggestions, her care and her judgement"<sup>68</sup>. The role of Mary Paley in the work needs therefore to be further investigated.

To assist such an examination, an outline of *Economics of Industry* as it eventually appeared is helpful. It was divided into three parts (books) of which the first dealt with land, labour and capital, the second with normal value, and the third with market value. Book I contained two introductory chapters: the first, definitional on economics or political economy, wealth, productive and unproductive, while the second introduced agents of production where the efficiency of man's work is seen as aided by machinery, designed to control and harness nature, and dependent on physical vigour, knowledge and mental ability and moral character. Chapters on capital, diminishing returns, population and poor laws, saving and accumulation, the historical development of industrial organisation, division of labour and increasing returns follow and the book concludes with a chapter on land tenure. Book II opens with a definition identifying normal value with the effects of competition. It then, in its first two chapters, deals with the law of utility and demand, the laws of costs and expenses of production and supply. Rent in itself and in relation to value are then discussed and this is followed by a brief reexamination of

68. J.K. WHITAKER, introduction to *The Early Economic Writings of Alfred Marshall 1867-1890*, London, Macmillan, for the Royal Economic Society, 1975, volume I pp. 67-83, and cf. p. 47; the quotations in the text come from p. 67 and n. 3.

demand in relation to value. The second half of Book II is devoted to distribution, treated as a problem of wages and profits. Subsequent chapters deal with labour supply (skilled and unskilled), business power, before treating interest, wages and earnings of management. A final chapter reiterates and summarises the theory of normal value as a necessary introduction to explaining and understanding market value, the subject of the final Book III. Its first four chapters are devoted to explanations of major deviations from normal value: changes in the purchasing power of money and crises, sudden market fluctuations from uncertainties in supply, unanticipated changes in demand and peculiarities of production; regional deviations and those explicable in terms of custom; as well as combinations and monopoly. The last topic introduces three chapters on trade unions, a chapter on arbitration and conciliation while the book as a whole concludes with a discussion of the desirability of cooperation in production, credit and exchange. Questions of trade and finance were postponed to a projected companion volume (which was never attempted), difficult passages were placed in square brackets for easy omission by beginners, and technical terms and definitions were given emphasis by bold print.

As Mary Paley recollected at the end of her life, the book was a joint production from the beginning, because its outline had been worked out together in the Newnham sitting room after their engagement in mid-1876. However, John Neville Keynes recorded in his diary for 2 December 1876 that "Miss Paley is writing a book on Political Economy for the extension lectures"; only six months later did he acknowledge Marshall's contribution to the project when he noted "I have rather scandalised Miss Bond by saying that [given] Marshall's matter and her own style, Miss Paley's book will probably be a great success". However, by 10 July 1877, he noted that Marshall had abandoned his own writing for the time-being and "is now chiefly engaged on the other book. He always says "we" in talking of it and he seems to have given a very large amount of his time to it"<sup>69</sup>.

69. JOHN NEVILLE KEYNES, *Diaries*, entries for 2 December 1876, 15 June



During their honeymoon in Cornwall in late August 1877 they worked on the book, but yet by April 1878 Marshall still had to write to Foxwell that they hoped to devote every spare minute till October to get Part I of the book in shape. By September, however, proofs of that part were ready for circulation to Foxwell and Sidgwick, whose criticism involved considerable recasting of the original drafts. Correspondence from Marshall to Foxwell in late 1878 and early 1879 suggests Marshall's major problems arose from the distinction between normal and market value, and with aspects of the theory of distribution in terms of explaining the division of national dividend (produce) into wages and profit (Jevons' problem)<sup>70</sup>. In early October 1879, the book was finally published and self-criticism by the authors began to appear in their letters to Foxwell. In the context of real authorship, it may, however, be noted that surviving correspondence on technical points on value and distribution is exclusively by Alfred Marshall and that his ex post criticisms of the book were largely directed at Book I. On 25 October 1879, Marshall confessed he would like to remove the excessive quotations from Bastiat and Mill from the first part and suggested that its first three chapters required substantial re-writing and amplification; In addition, this letter ascribes the 'worse' style of Book I to the fact that writing came more easily and "we suppose better as we went on". More important, in the context of his later complaints as recorded by Mary Paley, is his comment about the difficulty in writing *small* books: "The smallness of this book has given us so much trouble that we don't want to promise to write another *small* book.... we are distinctly against potting a *little* of the history of economic theory in a book of this kind ... we have, however, another plan to write an

1877, 10 July 1877. Cambridge University Library, Add. MSS 7827-7867. It is interesting to note that John Neville Keynes in his entry for 17 July 1877 commented on Alfred Marshall's style (he had been reading Marshall's international trade manuscript): "Marshall's style of composition is bad, or rather he has no style at all."

70. Alfred Marshall to Foxwell, 17 and 19 May 1878 (Freeman collection 44/155, 38/155); Mary Paley Marshall to Foxwell, 22 September 1878 (Freeman collection 48/155).

outline of economic history as a third companion volume [the trade and finance volume being the second one]". However, in 1879, small was not beautiful for Marshall. A week later Marshall expressed regret that in view of the difficulties of Parts II and III, "we might have pitched the key a little higher in the first chapters of Book I"<sup>71</sup>. Ultimately, the most devastatingly sarcastic criticism came from Mary Paley Marshall: "We are not proud of the book. We don't feel that we solved the great problem of the use of commas and we haven't been consistent in their use. But as to quotations, we think we have a theory, but perhaps it isn't the right one...". The strong sarcastic tone of the letter is heightened by the signature. This reads: "yours, on behalf of the firm Alfred Marshall and Mary Paley Marshall (unlimited)", the closest either of the two ever came to depicting their married life as a business partnership<sup>72</sup>.

The evidence from John Neville Keynes's diaries for 1876 and 1877, together with that from subsequent years from the Marshall's correspondence with Foxwell suggests a well-intentioned take-over by Alfred Marshall, increasingly necessitated by the way he transformed the level of difficulty in the parts of the book for which he took prime responsibility. As a result, the book, popular though it was, fell between two stools. It neither served the beginners nor the advanced market satisfactorily, and the final comment by Mary Paley to Foxwell on its publication, together with the ambiguity of the phrase "I realised it had to be really his book" implies that there was at least *some* resentment on her part at this outcome. After all, as J.N. Keynes had predicted, her ability to write would have meant the book would have reached the audience for which it was actually designed, something Marshall was incapable of achieving stylistically. His insistence on joint au-

71. Alfred Marshall to Foxwell, 25 October 1879, 2 November 1879, (Freeman collection, 9/9, 8/9). Marshall wrote to Seligman in April 1900, "My work [in writing] was then broken off ... by my being drawn into writing a hollow Economics of Industry, in which truth was economized for the benefit of feeble minds." Seligman Collection, New York.

72. Mary Paley Marshall to Foxwell, October 1879 (Freeman collection, 16/9).

thorship is also capable of more than one interpretation. It may be recalled that Marshall's first article 'The future of the Working Classes' commenced with his recognition that Mill's chapter which provided its inspiration had been the joint product of Mill and his wife. This, Marshall argued, should "awaken" us "to the question whether the quick insight of woman may not be trained so as to give material assistance to man in ordering public as well as private affairs". Six years later, Marshall may well have decided *Economics of Industry* paralleled Mill's Book IV chapter VIII; his wife's idea and his execution, with her assistance and guidance all along the way: a Millian and not a Webb partnership<sup>73</sup>.

The collaboration on the *Principles* and other economic work in the subsequent decades follows the Millian pattern albeit to a lesser extent. Marshall's acknowledgement to her in the first edition of the *Principles* was the most generous: "My wife has aided and advised me at every stage of the MSS. and of the proofs, and it owes a very great deal to her suggestions, her care and her judgment". For the second edition, her contribution was reduced to the "help and assistance from many persons" among the six of whom she was mentioned first. For the third edition, her assistance, described as "very great" is once again separated from the others: "first obligations" are likewise attributed to her in the fourth edition, while for the substantive changes of the fifth edition, special tribute was paid: "My wife has aided and advised me at every stage of successive editions of this volume, and of none more than the present. Throughout each edition a very great deal has been owed to her suggestions, her care, and her judgment". With only trivial editorial changes this remained the form of acknowledgement for the final three editions<sup>74</sup>.

73. ALFRED MARSHALL, 'The Future of the Working Class' (1873) in *Memoirs of Alfred Marshall*, ed. A.C. Pigou, Macmillan, London, 1925, pp. 101-102. Interestingly, at the end of the long quotation from Book III Ch. I, of *Economics of Industry* in his 1886 evidence to the Commission on Depression of Trade, he implies authorship in the statement, "I should say very much the same now in 1886 as I did in 1879" (ALFRED MARSHALL, *Official Papers*, Macmillan, London, 1926, pp. 7-9).

74. ALFRED MARSHALL, *Principles of Economics* (variorum edition ed. C.W. Guillebaud), Macmillan, London, 1969, Vol. 2, pp. 37, 41, 43, 44, 54, 60.

No thanks to Mary Paley Marshall on specific points were ever recorded in the footnotes of the *Principles*. The evidence suggests in fact that Mary Paley's contribution to this work was more humble. In his reminiscences as Deputy Librarian, C.R. Fay records how "the name 'Mary' lives, for me, on a treasured postcard acknowledging some verbal errors in the *Principles* collected by Edwin Cannan and myself — «thanks for the *errata*. I have handed them to Mary. The mistakes are her department. Yours. A.M.»"<sup>75</sup>. Sir Austin Robinson reported that Alfred Marshall treated his wife as his 'foolometer' in the writing of his *Principles*, any passages she could not understand were to be deleted as too difficult for the general reader<sup>76</sup>. Not directly connected with her assistance on the *Principles*, Keynes recollected that cataloguing of journals by author and subject, when they had been broken up to make the special volumes Marshall prepared for his students, was "for time out of memory, the special task of Mrs. Marshall"<sup>77</sup>. More substantial contributions to the writing of the *Principles* by Mary Paley Marshall have not been recorded for posterity.

Similar acknowledgements to his wife were recorded in the prefaces of the *Elements of the Economics of Industry* in 1892 and the second major volume, *Industry and Trade*, first published in 1919. In 1892, "My wife had aided and advised at every stage of the MSS and the proofs of my *Principles* and also of the present volume; which is thus indebted twice over to her suggestions, her judgement and her care"<sup>78</sup>. By 1919 acknowledgement was more generous: "Of this volume as of my *Principles* but even more than of that, I may say that my wife has aided and advised me at every stage; and that everywhere much of whatever is good is owing to her suggestions, her care and her judgement: the index is entirely

75. C.R. FAY, "Reminiscences of a Deputy Librarian", p. 87.

76. SIR AUSTIN ROBINSON, review of *What I Remember*, p. 123. The word 'fool-ometer' was invented by Sidney Smith. See L. A. TOLEMACHE, *Benjamin Jowett*, Edward Arnold, London, second edition, 1896, p. 47.

77. J. M. KEYNES, "Mary Paley Marshall", p. 248.

78. A. MARSHALL, *Elements of the Economics of Industry*, Macmillan, London, 1920, reprint, p. vii.

her work"<sup>79</sup>. Ironically, there are no acknowledgements to her or anyone else in the volume of 1923, *Money, Credit and Commerce*; ironically, since it is certain that without Mary Paley's assistance the volume would never have been completed. As Mary Paley told Keynes: After it [*Industry and Trade*] came out [in 1919] his health began to fail, though he did not know it. On this account, I did all I could to hasten the appearance of MOCC [*Money, Credit and Commerce*], especially as Dr. Bowen told me in 1921 that his working life was over and that he was incapable of constructive work ..."<sup>80</sup>. It seems more than likely that his last volume's publication is largely owing to her assistance in the paste and scissor work which characterises its contents, a fact acknowledged in the preface which was drafted by Marshall but not published.

One further, not unimportant possible contribution to her husband's work by Mary Paley should be noted. In her reminiscences, Mary Paley records how in her youth she learnt German from the age of nine, through a German governess who gave her and her sister regular lessons, knowledge consolidated through the regular practice she gained from the fact that "the family talked German at meals"<sup>81</sup>. This enabled her to prepare for her husband, whose German was probably less fluent, resumes of German books and articles for use in his writing<sup>82</sup>. Generally speaking, therefore, her intellectual role, with few exceptions, was secretarial and supportive with respect to her husband's work<sup>83</sup>.

79. A. MARSHALL, *Industry and Trade*, Macmillan, London, 1919, p. xi.

80. M. PALEY MARSHALL, "Biographical Notes for Keynes", Keynes Marshall File, King's College, Cambridge. Cfr. this with a draft preface to a proposed final volume on progress and ideals, dated 19 March 1923, and reproduced in *Memorials of Alfred Marshall*, p. 368. This emphasised Marshall's awareness of the contribution Mary had made to his final work: "She refuses to allow her name to appear on the title page, but that is its proper place".

81. M. PALEY MARSHALL, *What I Remember*, p. 6.

82. G. BECATTINI, *Invito a una rilettura di Marshall*, p. xxiii.

83. Cfr. *ibid.* p. xxiii.

## IV

This then was their weird and wonderful partnership. Weird, it certainly was but how wonderful can it be said to have been given the nature of the tensions which marred the relationship over so many years of the marriage and the lack of genuine intellectual collaboration between what, after all, were two economists? That lack of collaboration can be explained on two grounds on the evidence here presented. First, and this applies most strongly to their actual collaborations on the book, the then uneven nature of the partnership with respect to economic knowledge and theoretical skills in the end made it *his* book and not hers. Secondly, Marshall's growing belief as he got older of the intellectual inferiority of women to men, which came out in his advice to Beatrice Webb and which he jotted down in various manuscript fragments preserved in the Marshall Library<sup>84</sup>, prevented a genuine partnership in economics at a later stage, if indeed it had ever been possible. By then, the will and interest in such a partnership on Mary Paley's part may have already evaporated, and she may have preferred the subordinate but more peaceful role of secretarial-cum-research assistant she actually played in the construction of Marshall's works. By then she had also developed her own interests in Newnham, with her ladies dining club and was willing, without abandoning her responsibilities as a professor's wife in entertaining and like activities, to make as peaceful a coexistence as possible with her cantankerous husband<sup>85</sup>.

The failure of the partnership in this way is more difficult to explain. Becattini mentions physical and psychological breakdowns (*crisi*) in the marriage, which she, in particular, had to overcome<sup>86</sup>. Some suggestions on the possible nature of such

84. B. WEBB, *My Apprenticeship*, Pelican edition, 1938, vol. II, p. 398; manuscript fragment on higher education for women, Marshall Archive Box 8 (2). A detailed discussion of this point is in Chapter 14 of my biography of Alfred Marshall nearing completion.

85. M. PALEY MARSHALL, *What I Remember*, pp. 43-46.

86. G. BECATTINI, *Invito a una rilettura di Marshall*, p. xxiii.

crises have already been given, both in terms of presumptions on its possible sexual failures on Marshall's part, and the other traumatic factors which enveloped the marriage in the early years of Bristol, and from which separate compartmentalisation of their activities without the difficulties of actual separation seem to have been the outcome. Their division of labour in activities at Palermo provides a striking example of this co-existence: he writing on the roof, she painting, sightseeing and walking alone or with her friend. The 1884 march in Oxford, in which she participated while he stayed at home, is another, lesser instance. Whether this was by formal arrangement, in the manner they had contracted out of the obedience clause when they got married, is more problematical.

Psychological factors of relevance to this can also be found in the roots of Marshall's family life. Mary Paley wrote to Walter Scott, that "He loved his mother, his sister Mabel and his Aunt Louisa. I don't think that as time went on, he really cared very much for anyone else, except some of his former pupils ..."<sup>87</sup>. This excessive reliance on women in the formative years of his life – his mother, who saved him from the disciplinary excesses of his father; his Aunt Louisa, whose welcome and regular summer holidays in the Devon countryside saved his life as an overworked schoolboy, his sister Mabel who was his cricket companion because his older brother worked early and the younger brother was perhaps too delicate – was suddenly replaced by the male society of college life at Cambridge following on the equally male dominated society at school. Did they induce what has been called a 'Madonna complex', a reverence for women which placed them on a pedestal for distant worship<sup>88</sup>? If this was the role assigned to Mary, who, on the evidence, seems to have courted him rather than the other way round, an explanation for early sexual failure on his part can be found, and the peculiarities of this marriage are

87. M. PALEY MARSHALL, "Notes for walter Scott", Marshall Archive, Large Brown Box Item 26.

88. See ANNE PARSONS, "Is the Oedipus Complex Universal? The Jones-Malinowski Debate Revisited and South Italian 'Nuclear Complex'", in *Man and his Culture*, ed. Walter Muensterberger, New York, Taplinger Publishing Company, 1969, pp. 331-89, esp. 341-350 for the 'Madonna Complex'.

more easily comprehended. At the same time, aspects of Mary's character were in conflict with the 'Madonna image' Marshall may have construed on the basis of the dominant role played by female relatives in youth, thereby providing further room for conflict in their relationship. Such matters are not easily resolved, and in any case are more of biographical than doctrinal historical interest<sup>89</sup>.

To conclude this already lengthy discussion – a mere footnote in the history of economic partnership – the last word may be given to Sidney Webb. In a letter to Beatrice Webb, dated 24 September 1891, he tells a pretty anecdote about Marshall he had heard from Dr. Seligman, a mutual acquaintance.

I had dinner last night with Dr. Seligman, the economics professor at Columbia College, New York, and Editor of the *Political Science Quarterly*. He has been in Austria where he met Marshall (at some watering place). One pretty anecdote he had. Marshall wrote him several brief notes making arrangements etc. Opening one of these he found it addressed 'my own dear darling' and concluding 'Your affectionate Alfred'.

Marshall had accidentally sent him a letter to his wife! (Dearest, I hope we may be on such terms twenty years hence, but I hope and believe that this can happen without any absorption of the life of one of us into that of the other). But it is a revelation of a pretty, affectionate sentiment which I am glad to hear of in Marshall<sup>90</sup>.

89. A more detailed discussion awaits publication of my biography of Marshall, especially its chapters 8 and 14, to which frequent reference has already been made.

90. *The letters of Sydney and Beatrice Webb*, edited Norman McKenzie, vol. I, 1873-1892, Cambridge University press, 1978, p. 310.