

Copyright by
Ralph Herman Ruedy

1976

23

FORD MADOX FORD
AND THE ENGLISH REVIEW

by

Ralph Herman Ruedy

Department of English
Duke University

Date: November 3, 1976

Approved:

Grover Smith
Grover Smith, Supervisor

Dale B. F. Randall

Elgin W. Melham

Samuel D. Hughes

Gerard Mansma

Dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for the degree of Doctor
of Philosophy in the Department of
English in the Graduate School
of Duke University

1976

ABSTRACT

(English)

FORD MADDOX FORD
AND THE ENGLISH REVIEW

by

Ralph Herman Ruedy
Department of English
Duke University

Date: _____

Approved:

Grover Smith, Supervisor

An abstract of a dissertation submitted in partial
fulfillment of the requirements for the degree
of Doctor of Philosophy in the Department of
English in the Graduate School of
Duke University

1976

ABSTRACT

Ford Madox Ford's English Review of 1908 and 1909 is considered among the most brilliant literary magazines ever published. This dissertation recounts the historical circumstances of Ford's editorship, analyzes the contents of the magazine to discover overall critical principles, relates these principles to major intellectual and artistic currents, and evaluates the impact of the journal on subsequent literary developments.

Ford founded the monthly because he believed existing periodicals did not sufficiently uphold literary standards. Beginning in December, 1908, he published important writers of three generations: Victorians (Meredith, Rossetti, Watts-Dunton, and Hardy); established contemporaries (James, Conrad, Yeats, Wells, Bennett, Galsworthy, Granville Barker, and Ford himself); and promising unknowns (Norman Douglas, Wyndham Lewis, Pound, and Lawrence). Artistically, the venture was successful, but commercially it was a failure and Ford had to sell out in December, 1909. Under Austin Harrison, his successor, the review retained some literary importance, but in

1923 it became a Conservative Party political organ and when it ceased publication in 1937 it had no artistic importance.

The work by Victorian writers Ford published has scant literary interest but demonstrates an important aspect of his editorial policy, concern for tradition, and the piety the magazine expressed toward literary forebears encouraged a sense of continuity in English letters. The review also emphasized the social importance of art, and so helped restore self-confidence and purpose to literature. Ford believed good art could cleanse the public mind of cant, a view he expressed in his editorials. These appeared, along with other essays on public issues, in a section of the magazine called "The Month." "The Month" had a Liberal Party political bias, but ultimately Ford and his circle believed in the deeply conservative ideal of a stable, non-industrial society in which a natural aristocracy governed unselfishly for the common good. There was little pure literary criticism in "The Month," either by Ford or others.

The belles lettres section of the magazine consisted primarily of fiction, but there were also well-written autobiographical and travel essays. Most major Edwardian authors contributed. Ford's announced belief that art ought to comment on (in his phrase) "the way we live now" led him to demand literary realism. The imaginative prose tends to fall

into two categories, social criticism which reflects the political orientation of the magazine, and technically sophisticated pieces which reflect Ford's interest in French artistic techniques. The former is typified by Wells's work, the latter by James's. Ford showed a tendency to favor technical sophistication, and the review helped turn realism away from social criticism and toward conscious artistry.

The little poetry that appeared is undistinguished and shows no critical coherence. However, the magazine influenced poetics, for Ford stressed intimacy, sincerity, and natural diction to the writers who gathered around him during his editorship. His theories are embodied in two poems he published under a pseudonym in February, 1910. These have apparently not before been attributed to Ford, but there is overwhelming evidence for his authorship. One of the major successes of the review was the "discovery" of unknown talent. Pound came to the magazine enthusiastic but artistically somewhat naïve, and his relationship with Ford was important in shaping his literary theories. Through Pound, the artistic doctrines that guided Ford were injected into "modernism" as it developed after 1910. Douglas and Lewis became known in literary circles because their work was published in the magazine. Lawrence's rapid rise to prominence is attributable to

his review appearances and Ford's vigorous promotion of his work.

The English Review stimulated the little magazine movement. Ford and his circle believed that the public would respond to a magazine which devoted itself uncompromisingly to art. This response did not come, for although the magazine was widely praised and highly regarded, it seldom sold more than one thousand copies per number. This seemed to demonstrate that serious art and a large public were incompatible, and literature retreated to little magazines, which began by assuming they could not be popular. The review also had an impact on Ford himself and helped produce the attitudes which made his mature work possible.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	viii
Chapter	
One. INTRODUCTION: THE MAN AND THE MAGAZINE . .	1
Two. THE FOUNDING OF THE <u>ENGLISH REVIEW</u>	20
Three. "ANCIENT LIGHTS": VICTORIANS IN THE <u>ENGLISH REVIEW</u>	70
Four. "THE MONTH": COMMENTARY AND CRITICISM . .	90
Five. BELLES LETTRES	135
Six. POETRY	185
Seven. THE <u>ENGLISH REVIEW</u> "DISCOVERIES"	207
Eight. FORD LOSES THE REVIEW	260
Nine. THE REVIEW AFTER FORD	301
Ten. CONCLUSION: THE <u>ENGLISH REVIEW</u> LEGACY . .	329
.	
SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY	348

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I wish to express my gratitude to Professor Grover Smith, who directed this study. He has been generous with both his time and ideas, and his tough-minded criticism and quick sense of humor have provided not only guidance but inspiration as well. I desire also to acknowledge my debt to Professors Clarence Gohdes and Bernard Duffey, in whose classes many of my ideas had their genesis, and to other members of my doctoral committee for their careful reading of my manuscript.

Thanks are also in order to the staff of Perkins Library, whose helpfulness and efficiency continue to make the library a congenial place in which to work.

To my parents, who have encouraged my educational endeavor, I express my gratitude upon the completion of this phase of it.

Finally, I am pleased to offer my appreciation to my wife, Shirley. Some time ago, in a dissertation of her own, she referred to "my greatest inspiration and gentlest critic." It is largely through her support that I am able here to repay that compliment.

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION: THE MAN AND THE MAGAZINE

The man who did the work for English writing was Ford Madox Hueffer (now Ford). . . . The old crusted lice and advocates of corpse language knew that the English Review existed. You ought for sake of perspective to read through the whole of the Eng. Rev. files for the first two years. I mean for as long as Ford had it. Until you have done that, you will be prey to superstition. You won't know what was, and you will consider that Hulme or any of the chaps of my generation invented the moon and preceded Galileo's use of the telescope.

Ezra Pound, 1937¹

Ezra Pound was not given to praising the literary generation immediately preceding his own, as Hugh Selwyn Mauberly clearly attests, and his well-known advice to "make it new" implies a bitter indictment of "the advocates of

¹ Ezra Pound to Michael Roberts, July 1937, in The Letters of Ezra Pound, 1907-1941, ed. D. D. Paige (New York: Harcourt, Brace, 1950), p. 296. Pound's letter was written in response to an inquiry by Roberts, who was then writing his book T. E. Hulme. Several other of Pound's responses to Roberts's queries appear in A. R. Jones's "Notes Toward a History of Imagism," South Atlantic Quarterly 60 (Summer 1961): 262-285. Jones's article contains a number of biases and should be considered in light of Frank MacShane's "'To Establish the Facts': A Communication on Mr. A. R. Jones and Ford Madox Ford," South Atlantic Quarterly 61 (Spring 1962): 260-265.

corpse language" who, in his view, dominated literature in pre-World War I London. Yet Pound frankly admitted that his generation owed a debt to the Edwardians, and later and more staid literary critics have agreed. Some, like Pound, have singled out the English Review of 1908-1909, when it was edited by Ford Madox Ford,¹ as a particularly important and provocative element on the Edwardian literary scene. F. W. Bateson, for example, advises students that "much the best introduction to modern literature is via the literary journals," and proceeds to list the English Review first among "those especially meriting exploration."²

Yet, while book-length studies of other British literary periodicals have appeared,³ the English Review has been

¹Ford Madox Hueffer in 1908. Ford was christened "Ford Hermann Hueffer" but exchanged "Hermann" for "Madox" and, in 1919, altered his surname to "Ford" by deed-poll. After baptism as a Roman Catholic at the age of 18, he briefly took on the names "Joseph Leopold." He also wrote under a number of pseudonyms, including "Fenil Haig," "Daniel Chaucer," "Francis M. Hurd," and, with Conrad, "Baron Ignatz von Aschendorff."

²F. W. Bateson, A Guide to English Literature, 2nd ed. (Garden City, New York: Doubleday, 1968), p. 155.

³Among them are: William Beach Thomas, The Story of the Spectator 1828-1928 (London: Methuen, 1928); Katherine Lyon Mix, A Study in Yellow: The Yellow Book and Its Contributors (Lawrence, Kansas: University of Kansas Press, 1960); Reginald Pound, The Strand Magazine 1891-1950 (London: Heinemann, 1966); Leslie Marchand, The Athenaeum (Chapel Hill, N. C.: University of North Carolina Press, 1941); and Wallace

largely neglected by scholars. Malcolm Bradbury, in an eleven-page article which appeared in the August, 1958, London Magazine,¹ and Frank MacShane, in a somewhat shorter piece in the Summer, 1961, South Atlantic Quarterly,² have attempted to trace the central events in Ford's editorship and to generalize on its importance, but both articles are brief overviews and neither examines in detail the magazine's contents or its place in literary history. Arthur Mizener's The Saddest Story,³ the copiously detailed standard biography of Ford, documents Ford's connection with the journal (and in the process corrects the earlier accounts on several points), but Mizener's focus is on Ford himself and not on the magazine. The work of these three scholars suggests, however, that an extended

Martin, The New Age Under Oriage, Chapters in English Cultural History (Manchester, England: Manchester University Press, 1967). Ford's one other major editorial undertaking (in 1924) is also the subject of a full-length study: Bernard J. Poli, Ford Madox Ford and the Transatlantic Review (Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 1967).

¹Malcolm Bradbury, "The English Review," London Magazine 5 (August 1958):46-57.

²Frank MacShane, "The English Review," South Atlantic Quarterly 60 (Summer 1961):311-320. Most of this article appears as Chapter 5 ("The English Review") of MacShane's biography of Ford, The Life and Work of Ford Madox Ford (New York: Horizon Press, 1965).

³Arthur Mizener, The Saddest Story (New York: World, 1971).

examination of the English Review would be useful in achieving a fuller understanding not only of the Edwardian literary scene but of the "modernism" that succeeded it.

Ford founded the review in 1908 in order to provide a forum for serious writers of all types, a forum which he believed the other periodicals of the day did not offer. The magazine continued for nearly thirty years, but Ford was involved with only a dozen or so issues. He was forced to sell the journal for financial reasons in December, 1909, and the new owner relieved him as editor, although by invitation Ford assisted the new staff in a brief transitional period. Austin Harrison replaced Ford, and under him (and, until 1916, his able assistant, Norman Douglas) the magazine retained some literary importance. After the early twenties, however, its quality declined markedly, and when it ceased publication in 1937 it was of no literary significance. The review thus had a long life, but its real brilliance lasted for only the year or so that Ford was connected with it. Compton Mackenzie's claim that by 1912 it had sunk "to the bottom of mediocrity"¹ is overstated (between 1912 and 1923 it still published such authors as Conrad, Wells, Lawrence, Yeats, and Katherine

¹Compton Mackenzie, Literature in My Time (London: Rich and Cowan, 1933), p. 182.

Mansfield), but it is true that by that year the real excitement of the publication had passed. The subject of this study is therefore the period of Ford's editorship when, in Professor MacShane's words, the review was "one of the most extraordinary literary magazines ever to be published in England."¹

A student examining the issues over which Ford presided will be dazzled by the procession of famous names in their tables of contents. Thomas Hardy, Henry James, Joseph Conrad, John Galsworthy, W. H. Hudson, Leo Tolstoy, and H. G. Wells were all in the first number, and later issues included, besides these seven, Anatole France, W. B. Yeats, Gerhart Hauptmann, Walter de la Mare, Granville Barker, Arnold Bennett, Norman Douglas, Rupert Brooke, G. K. Chesterton, Laurence Binyon, and Hilaire Belloc. In fact, most important Edwardian writers and several from the Continent published in the first year's volumes. There were also pieces by writers Ford called "Ancient Lights," prominent figures of the Victorian period: Theodore Watts-Dunton, Dante Gabriel Rossetti, and George Meredith. Perhaps most important, the English Review attracted writers whose reputations are tied to the literary trends and movements of a succeeding generation, for there were contri-

¹MacShane, "The English Review," p. 311.

butions by Ezra Pound, Wyndham Lewis, F. S. Flint, D. H. Lawrence, and E. M. Forster.

Besides imaginative literature, Ford published important book reviews and literary criticism. Joseph Conrad examined Anatole France's L'Île des Pingouins in the first number, and later issues included reviews of George Saintsbury's A History of English Prosody, C. F. G. Masterman's The Condition of England, William James's A Pluralistic Universe, and W. B. Yeats's Collected Poems of 1908. Perhaps the most provocative and influential of the criticism was Ford's own, namely his two series of essays on "The Function of the Arts in the Republic" and "The Critical Attitude."¹

There were also commentaries on leading social and political issues by Ford and other writers including Sidney Webb, Hilaire Belloc, G. K. Chesterton, and William Howard Taft, then President of the United States. Ford later denigrated this aspect of the review: "Into any remaining cracks . . . we dropped the dreary imbecilities that pass for seriousness . . . all the lugubrious pomposities which stuffed, like highly desiccated wadding, the brain of the unfortunate

¹ Much of this criticism was later published in book form as Ford's The Critical Attitude (London: Duckworth, 1911).

English reader of reviews."¹ At the time, however, Ford took political and social subjects very seriously, and it would be a mistake to overlook these articles, for they confirm that the English Review was remarkably in touch with its time: "It's It this year," H. G. Wells said in 1908.²

The aim of the magazine was no less than to start a revolution in English letters. Violet Hunt, who began as a contributor and ended as the editor's mistress, later wrote, "The English Review was of the nature of a dynastic venture, a Forlorn Hope led for the supremacy of the Kingdom of Literature gone derelict, and the crown tossing about somewhere in Fleet Street for him who would to take it."³ Ford and his colleagues meant to reassert a clear delineation between serious writing and popular Fleet Street journalism by establishing and strictly maintaining literary standards. Salient passages from the editorial manifesto which was proclaimed as a guiding principle are worth quoting:

¹Ford, in a foreword to The English Review Book of Short Stories, ed. Horace Shipp (London: Sampson Low, Marston, 1932), p. viii.

²Reported by Violet Hunt, I Have This To Say (New York: Boni and Liveright, 1926), p. 11. The English edition of this book is entitled The Flurried Years (London: Hurst and Blackett, 1926), and varies slightly from the American edition.

³Hunt, I Have This To Say, pp. 17-18.

The only qualification for admission to the pages of the Review will be--in the view of the Editors--either distinction of individuality or force of conviction, either literary gifts or earnestness of purpose, whatever the purpose may be--the criterion of inclusion being the clarity of diction, the force or the illuminative value of the views expressed. What will be avoided will be superficiality of the specially modern kind which is the inevitable consequence when nothing but brevity of statement is aimed at. The English Review will treat its readers, not as spoiled children who must be amused with a variety of games, but with the respectful consideration due to grown-up minds whose leisure can be interested by something else than the crispness and glitter of a popular statement.¹

The review, in short, recognized art as the serious business of serious people, and it meant to reawaken its readers to an appreciation of good writing.

An innate respect for artistic ability and originality came naturally to Ford, who grew up in an environment where art was valued above all else. He was the eldest son of Franz Hueffer, a German-born scholar, music critic, and devotee of Schopenhauer; and Catherine Brown, daughter of the pre-Raphaelite painter Ford Madox Brown. William Michael Rossetti, who had married Brown's elder daughter, Lucy, was his uncle by marriage, and Ford's boyhood was spent in the coterie world of the Pre-Raphaelite Brotherhood, where art was regarded as

¹Ibid., p. 18. This is also reported by Douglas Goldring, South Lodge (London: Constable, 1943), p. 24. Goldring was the review's sub-editor under Ford.

the highest human achievement and artistic talent was not so much encouraged as expected. Ford was immensely proud of this heritage--he kept reminding people of it--but he also recognized aspects of the pre-Raphaelite movement which, to his mind, had disastrous consequences for literature. In Ancient Lights, one of several volumes of reminiscences, Ford singled out "a legacy of pre-Raphaelism--the worst legacy that any movement ever left behind it," and identified the legacy as the coterie notion that great art can never be popular: "Literature, these people say, is of necessity abstrusive, esoteric, far-fetched, and unreadable."¹ Ford disliked the tendency of the pre-Raphaelites and their successors in the aesthetic movement to separate themselves from the concerns of society at large, but he admired their sense of mutual responsibility in the cause of art. The notion of a community of artists occupying a position in society and fulfilling an important social role was always dear to Ford, and lay behind his conception of the English Review's role in contemporary affairs.

Ford's belief in an artistic community, so important to pre-Raphaelism, was also an outgrowth of his own convivial

¹ Ford, Ancient Lights (London: Chapman and Hall, 1911), p. 249.

and gregarious nature. As Mizener's biography makes clear, Ford craved human association, and the respect and affection of others were vital to his own well-being. He could be extremely engaging and affable, and throughout his literary career was in close personal touch with many fellow writers. This was particularly true just before and during his editorship of the English Review, and the fact that Ford was so extraordinarily well-connected in literary circles was important to the success of the magazine. Ford actively solicited manuscripts from colleagues whose ability he respected, and personally met and encouraged young unknowns who were introduced by these colleagues or who sent him material which showed promise.

If Ford's artistic commitment and literary association helped insure that the review would be successful, there were also sides to him which guaranteed the venture would be chaotic as well. No other aspect of Ford has captured the critical imagination as much as his disregard for what passes to most people as objective fact. "I have for facts a most profound contempt,"¹ he declared not long after his association with the review ceased, and to some this apparently flippant dis-

¹Ibid., p. xv.

regard for verifiable truth warrants calling him a liar. Others see him as intuitively committed to the Schopenhauerean notion that the world of phenomena is untrustworthy and illusory, and that the only reality is the subjective reality of impressions. In order to preserve "the accuracy of impressions," Ford altered "facts" as necessary.¹

During his editorship, it was Ford's impression that he was a high-minded gentleman with a hereditary obligation to the arts, unselfishly devoting his leisure and fortune to the advancement of English letters. He felt, therefore, that he had a right to the respect and gratitude of others as a matter of course, and it apparently never occurred to him that others might regard him as a condescending snob. Some people understood Ford's attitude and learned to live with it, but others were less inclined to be charitable. In the course of Ford's editorship, even a long-standing friend like Joseph Conrad at one point was driven to complain bitterly:

His [Ford's] conduct is impossible. . . . He's a megalomaniac who imagines that he is managing the Universe and that everybody treats him with the blackest ingratitude. A fierce and exasperated vanity is hidden under his calm manner which misleads people. . . . I do not hesitate to say that there are cases, not quite as bad, under medical treatment.²

¹Ibid., p. xv.

²Joseph Conrad to J. B. Pinker, 1909, quoted by Jocelyn

Ford's impression of his position and motives meant to him that when others differed with him they were motivated by greed, spite, or, worse, a blackguardly contempt for art. Naturally, this view led to quarrels and bitterness.

His utter lack of business sense also caused constant problems; Violet Hunt reported he "seemed like a babe unborn in the guiding of mere worldly matters."¹ Enormous sums from a variety of sources were poured into the review, but Ford was incredibly inept in managing money, a failing which he cheerfully admitted and in which, in fact, he actually took pride. To his mind, money was a fiction, a measure of worth agreed upon by an age dominated by trade and materialism. He was always incredulous when he found that contributors were concerned with the money they were to receive or that printers demanded payment for their services. By late 1909, when he simply had no money left to spend, Ford had to sell the magazine.

It would be incorrect, however, to consider Ford a charming but somewhat demented Don Quixote who inhabited a dream world of his own. Mizener evaluates him:

Baines, Joseph Conrad (London: Weidenfeld and Nicholson, 1960), pp. 350-351.

¹Hunt, I Have This To Say, p. 56.

Part of him believed in the honorable and simple life of the Tory gentleman and gifted poet of his dream and believed in it so intensely that he could not imagine it was unachievable, and part of him was the skeptical observer who was reduced to hopeless inaction by his common-sense recognition that it was.¹

The "skeptical observer" in Ford caused him constantly to doubt his own ability and made him utterly dependent on the approval and emotional support of others. Without such reassurance he lapsed into hopeless indecision and, at several points in his life, severe emotional collapse. The stresses and pressures to which he was subjected as editor brought him very near such a collapse in 1910.

Yet Ford's success in bringing together in one magazine many of the best writers of three generations--figures as diverse as George Meredith and Wyndham Lewis--is truly amazing, and as Pound, Bateson, and others have suggested, the English Review had lasting importance. This importance did not stem from unwavering observance of a coherent set of critical principles or esthetic criteria. Ford was in the nature of a literary promoter, an impresario. He did not have the sort of penetrating critical intellect which provided him a clear notion of what literature had been or what he wanted it to become. Some of what he chose to publish

¹Mizener, The Saddest Story, pp. xv-xvi.

obviously belonged to the eighteen-nineties in theme and technique, and none of it could be called particularly avant-garde. Sometimes he was taken with the political or social views expressed by a contributor; at other times, one suspects that his personal relationship with the author weighed heavily in his decision to publish a piece. In short, the material in the review bears the unmistakable imprint of the editor's enthusiastic and eccentric personality.

However, the English Review had a lasting significance which may be judged in four aspects, the traditional, the social, the artistic, and the innovative. These four aspects will be treated in relation to the material Ford chose for publication, but a few initial comments on each are in order.

Ford's policy of publishing writers from different literary generations tended to remind artists of their common relationship to a literary tradition. As Pound noted,¹ writers from three distinct generations contributed: there were Victorians, Edwardians, and the young men of what one recent critic has insisted on calling "The Pound Era."² To bring these different groups together into one journal was no small

¹Pound to Ronald Duncan, 27 Jan. 1937, in The Letters of Ezra Pound, ed. Paige, p. 287.

²Hugh Kenner, The Pound Era (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1971).

accomplishment, since after the collapse of the esthetic movement in the mid-nineties and the bitter controversy surrounding the Boer War, writers were alienated from one another as well as from their public. In his editorials and in his editorial policy, Ford tried to remind them of the literary heritage they all held in common. Thus, Ford's efforts enabled writers generally to define themselves in terms of their common past and tended to restore a sense of coherence and continuity to English letters.

Similarly, the English Review sought to restore to literature a sense of self-confidence and purpose because it emphasized the writer's role in society. The members of the literary cliques of the nineties, whatever their merits, left their successors at an impasse. The untidy lives led by fin de siècle artists discredited art in the minds of the public and thus divided writers from a large portion of their readership. Also, many thoughtful Edwardians saw their society as hopelessly bogged down in complacent bourgeois materialism, a view which, to them, England's South Africa policy and the Boer War confirmed. Art which emphasized self-gratification had little appeal for these people. The young artists among them sought a sense of direction; they wanted to maintain a sense of artistic integrity, but they felt a need to influence the events of their time as well. Ford avoided advocating

that artists propagandize against causes they considered unjust,¹ but in his editorial series, "On the Function of the Arts in the Republic," he reminded writers that they had a valid role, indeed, a responsibility, in guiding society to the right path. Art, said Ford, serves a purifying function: it cleanses the minds of the populace of popular clichés and exposes "the superficiality of the specially modern kind" as the cant it is. In the English Review, Ford sought to create a literary journal which had a broad relevance to the major issues of the day, and his success helped inspire young writers with a renewed confidence in the importance of their calling. This notion of the purifying role of good art became a guiding principle for the generation of young men and women who, after the catastrophe of World War I, were determined to sweep away the clichés of what Pound called "an old bitch gone in the teeth . . . a botched civilization."²

Ford's constant editorializing about "The Critical Attitude" and his dislike of "superficiality" in writing

¹ Ford did not discount the role of the artist as propagandist. In the first year of World War I he produced two books of anti-German propaganda for a secret British government agency set up to propagandize for the Allied cause, particularly in the United States.

² Pound, "Hugh Selwyn Mauberly," Selected Poems of Ezra Pound (New York: James Laughlin, 1957), p. 64.

tended to promote the notion of art as the result of careful and deliberate effort, not the product of a spurious "inspiration." Ford, Conrad, and Henry James had discussed this concept for over a decade (they had lived within walking distance of one another in Kent and Sussex), and all three looked toward French models, particularly Flaubert, as examples of workmanlike attention to technique. This concern for craftsmanship is displayed in the items Ford chose to publish in the review, and was another of the journal's legacies.

The catholic taste which the review advocated helped open literature to young writers and encouraged them to innovate and experiment. Ford sought throughout his career to aid aspiring writers and he saw the English Review as a forum in which young unknowns could appear in a prestigious setting, next to the acknowledged greats, and so achieve the recognition they themselves deserved. The aspiring young were encouraged not to imitate their more distinguished elder colleagues. Ford's manifesto declared: "The only qualification for admission to the pages of the Review will be--in the view of the editors--either distinction of individuality or force of conviction, either literary gifts or earnestness of purpose, whatever the purpose may be." By advocating such broad, though rigorous, standards for Good Literature, Ford helped give young writers a broader sense of what was possible.

The English Review's discovery and encouragement of young talent thus comprises another aspect of its importance.

The review had an impact out of proportion to its circulation, for seldom, under Ford's editorship, were more than 1,000 copies distributed per month.¹ Yet it did reach "grown-up minds whose leisure can be interested by something else than the crispness and glitter of popular statement." If Ford as editor often irritated his colleagues, the magazine itself earned almost universal praise from both established writers and the talented young who would succeed them. Jessie Chambers, D. H. Lawrence's early sweetheart (fictionalized as "Miriam" in Sons and Lovers), later recalled:

The coming of the English Review into our lives was an event, one of the few really first-rate things that happen now and again in a lifetime. I remember what a joy it was to get the solid, handsome journal from our local newsagent, and feel it was a link with the world of literature.²

The "event" that proved so important to Lawrence was scarcely less important for literature generally, for "the coming of the English Review" signalled the beginning of a new era.

¹ Mizener, The Saddest Story, p. 160. See also MacShane, Ford Madox Ford, p. 87.

² Jessie Chambers [E. T.], D. H. Lawrence, A Personal Record (London: Jonathan Cape, 1935), p. 156.

The magazine was a matrix in which existing attitudes were given new shape and coherence, and melded with the concepts that would, in the next decades, significantly alter the form and subject of literature.

CHAPTER TWO

THE FOUNDING OF THE ENGLISH REVIEW

Scholars have long emphasized that Edwardian England was not a land of complacent prosperity as some in later generations have nostalgically tended to believe, and an awareness of the political and social climate which characterized Edward VII's reign (1901-1910) is important to understanding the English Review. R. C. K. Ensor, in a standard history of the period, has written:

Men think of the decade as one of calm and contentment, of pomp and luxury, of assured wealth and unchallenged order. Court splendours apart, it was none of these things. It was an era of growth and strain, of idealism and reaction, of swelling changes and of seething unrest. At home, politics had never been so bitter; and abroad, the clouds were massing for Armageddon.¹

The change and accompanying unrest which had characterized the Victorian period continued during the Edwardian, and on a number of issues--imperialism, national defense, Irish home

¹R. C. K. Ensor, England 1870-1914 (London: Oxford University Press, 1936), p. 421.

rule, women's suffrage, government social welfare programs, distribution of wealth, the power of the House of Lords vs. Commons--there was fierce debate, carried out not in a spirit of compromise but with bitterness and outright rancor. Both the substance and the spirit of these debates were reflected in the English Review.

The Boer War, already over a year old when Queen Victoria died on January 22, 1901, was a major source of controversy in the first years of her son's reign. Many, including a substantial number of writers and intellectuals, opposed what they regarded as an immoral attempt to make South Africa safe for exploitation by British businessmen. Supporters of the war were shocked when the seemingly simple colonial action dragged on for three years, involving a quarter million British regulars and provoking anti-British feeling around the world.¹ Thoughtful people on both sides of the South Africa issue were troubled by the jingoistic atmosphere in which the question was debated. News accounts of the fighting were often sensationalized and fiercely patriotic;²

¹Ibid., p. 347. According to Ensor, over 25,000 English soldiers died in battle or of disease.

²Emotion reached its height when word of the relief of the siege of Mafeking reached Britain and the nation erupted into virtually a country-wide carnival. For Ford's recollection of the event, see Ancient Lights, pp. 245-247.

the press offered dramatic descriptions of the action, but tended to neglect British military shortcomings or the government's motives for going to war in the first place. Among intelligent Englishmen, the Boer War raised questions not only about the durability of the empire but also over the possibility of rational decision-making in a society where public opinion was ruled by emotion.

The tendency to oversimplify and sensationalize, which characterized the Boer War debate, affected other foreign policy discussions during the decade. In 1901 a complicated controversy took place in the Cabinet and Admiralty over ship construction in the face of the German naval buildup. An elaborate compromise was reached, but the agreement was scuttled when a public outcry, encouraged by the press, forced adoption of a more ambitious shipbuilding program than leaders on either side had contemplated.¹

Over domestic issues, controversy was similarly volatile. Emmeline Pankhurst's Women's Social and Political Union campaigned vigorously for women's suffrage, and as WSPU tactics escalated to include outright violence, opinions became

¹P. K. Kemp, "The Royal Navy," Edwardian England 1901-1914, ed. Simon Nowell-Smith (London: Oxford University Press, 1964), pp. 513-514.

polarized. The perennial Irish question remained unresolved; Home Rule was favored by most Liberals, but Conservative Unionists opposed all measures leading to what they saw as the dissolution of the United Kingdom. The Liberals won a large majority in the House of Commons in the 1906 election, and regarded their victory as a mandate for social welfare programs. Diehards in the Lords acted to block such "abominable revolutions,"¹ and by 1909 the two houses were set against each other, with the Liberals in Commons demanding that the hereditary Lords be stripped of power.

Unequal distribution of wealth in Britain was regarded by some Liberals as a national scandal, and they sought laws to improve the living and working conditions of the urban poor. The poor themselves were increasingly militant. Labor unions gained strength, and the new Labour Party sent fifty-three members to Parliament in the 1906 elections.² The 1908 economic slump and resulting unemployment brought a ten-year high in work stoppages that year, and labor unrest increased steadily afterwards. Clearly, as the distinguished historian

¹The phrase was used by Balfour, the Conservative leader and former Prime Minister. See Donald Read, "History: Political and Diplomatic," The Twentieth Century Mind, ed. C. B. Cox and A. E. Dyson (London: Oxford University Press, 1972), p. 20.

²Ensor, England 1870-1914, p. 437.

G. M. Trevelyan has pointed out, ". . . a tendency to violence had already invaded the mind of the new century."¹

Trevelyan goes on to cite "the new type of newspaper [which] lived on sensation"² as a factor in the pervasive atmosphere of anger and confrontation, and the rise of the "half-penny press" is an important element in the history of the period and a major factor in the founding of the English Review. The trend toward the new journalism began in 1881 with George Newnes's Tit-Bits, a weekly journal of fascinating but trivial items intended to appeal to the lower middle classes which had become literate in the wake of the 1870 Education Act. By 1890, Tit-Bits was earning Newnes 30,000 pounds per year,³ and Tit-Bits journalism quickly attracted other entrepreneurs, including Alfred Harmsworth, who was to become the giant of Edwardian journalism. Harmsworth, himself of lower middle class background and, according to one historian, "ignorant of history, indifferent to English political tradition,"⁴ founded the Daily Mail in 1896. The paper's

¹G. M. Trevelyan, A Shortened History of England (Baltimore: Penguin Books, 1942), p. 532.

²Ibid., p. 532.

³Pound, The Strand Magazine 1891-1950, p. 25.

⁴Ensor, England 1870-1914, p. 446.

sensationalized accounts of the South African fighting brought its circulation to over a half million during the Boer War, double that of any other paper,¹ and the Daily Mail became the nucleus of a press empire. In general, Harmsworth's papers and their imitators avoided lengthy reports and analysis and instead took advantage of improved communications and transportation to cover fast-breaking news. Stories were made as interesting and appealing as possible in order to attract large numbers of readers. The popularity of the new journals drove many of the traditional papers out of business, and in a decade British journalism was irrevocably altered. Harmsworth himself was made a peer in the Conservatives' last month in office in 1905. The Prime Minister, the story went, put his arm around the new Lord Northcliffe and told him, "I am very proud of you."² Northcliffe went on to other triumphs, climaxed by the acquisition of the respected Times of London in 1908. He attempted to maintain the Times at its traditional level, but many cultivated Englishmen saw Northcliffe's success as symptomatic of a growing vulgarization of British life.

¹T. L. Jarman, A Short History of Twentieth-Century England (New York: Mentor, 1963), p. 95.

²Briggs, "The Political Scene," Edwardian England 1901-1914, ed., Nowell-Smith, p. 49.

Those who saw evidence of declining tastes in the press had their fears confirmed by trends in book publishing. Fiction was the dominant literary form, and the "six shilling novel" was a leading source of popular entertainment. The industry was thriving; between 1901 and 1913 the number of new publications doubled.¹ Yet, as one observer has pointed out, "works of real literary or artistic merit remained in a small minority."² Hall Caine, Marie Corelli, Anthony Hope, and other popular writers could expect their novels to sell 80,000 to 150,000 copies,³ while writers who would later be regarded as the literary giants of the era sold poorly.

Faced with frustrating military efforts abroad, wrenching bitterness at home, and what seemed to be a widespread vulgarization of taste, a feeling developed among Edwardians that Britain had seen her best days. Fear of decline had similarly haunted some late Victorians--Kipling's "Recessional" in 1897 had reminded Englishmen of the self-sacrifice which empire demanded, "Lest we forget"--but now

¹Marjorie Plant, The English Book Trade (London: George Allen and Unwin, 1939), p. 447. 6,044 titles were published in 1901, and the figure for 1913 was 12,379.

²Derek Hudson, "Reading," Edwardian England 1901-1914, ed. Nowell-Smith, p. 308.

³"The Novels of Sir Arthur Conan Doyle," Quarterly Review 200 (July 1894):158.

the feeling became widespread among thoughtful people of both political parties. Periodicals of the day asked, "Will England Last the Century?"¹ and "Is Great Britain Falling into Economic Decay?"² and one highly publicized pamphlet listed the following among the causes of decline: "The Growth of Refinement and Luxury," "Gradual Decline of Physique and Health of the English People," "The Decline of Literary and Dramatic Taste," "The Decline of intellectual and religious life among the English."³ A mass of "invasion literature" appeared, particularly between 1906 and 1909, warning of the military defeat which would follow decline. Among writers including Kipling, Galsworthy, Wells, and Forster the subject of decay became a theme and, as the literary historians Samuel Chew and Richard Altick point out, "A pervasive sense of social disintegration . . . was already a 'note' in modern literature before the outbreak of the Great War."⁴

¹Calchas [pseud.], "Will England Last the Century?" Fortnightly Review 69, n.s. (January 1901):20-34.

²H. Morgan-Browne, "Is Great Britain Falling into Economic Decay?" Contemporary Review 80 (October 1901): 492-502.

³[Elliot E. Mills], The Decline and Fall of the British Empire (Oxford: Alden and Co., n.d. [1905]), quoted by Samuel Hynes, The Edwardian Turn of Mind (Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1968), pp. 24-25. Hynes's first chapter, "The Decline and Fall of Tory England," is an excellent discussion of the prevailing pessimism.

⁴Samuel Chew and Richard Altick, "The Nineteenth Century and After," in A Literary History of England, ed. Albert

An understanding of such social and political issues and attitudes is vital to a consideration of the English Review. Ford and many of his associates had strong opinions on the controversies of the day and, as we shall see, those opinions found expression in the magazine. Even more important than their attitudes toward specific issues was their general view of contemporary society. Ford, Wells (who was closely associated with Ford in the founding of the review), and a significant number of their literary contemporaries shared in the opinion that British life was becoming vulgarized, and they blamed the trend on the rise of powerful monied interests. Public policy was subject to manipulation by these interests, they believed, and the attitude frequently found expression in their writings of the period. Ford's second novel, The Inheritors (1901), a collaboration with Conrad, concerns the efforts of Granger of Etchingham, the novel's protagonist and first person narrator, to foil a dissolute nobleman's scheme to exploit overseas territories in the name of patriotism ("all the traditional ideals of honour, glory, conscience . . . committed to the upholding of a gigantic and atrocious fraud").¹ The Inheritors is not a great

C. Baugh (2nd ed.; New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1967), p. 1454.

¹ Joseph Conrad and Ford Madox Ford, The Inheritors (London: Heinemann, 1901; reprint ed., Garden City, New York:

novel, but its theme is one which runs throughout Ford's fiction: the generous, high-minded and self-effacing hero confronts unscrupulous people who manipulate events in order to gain their own depraved ends. The central character in Ford's first major work of fiction, Katherine Howard of The Fifth Queen (1906), is such a heroine: Katherine defends "the Old Faith in the Old Way"¹ against scheming pragmatists led by Thomas Cromwell. The theme eventually finds its fullest expression in Ford's masterpiece, the Parade's End tetralogy (1924-1928), where Tietjens of Groby, like Granger of Etchingham of The Inheritors, defends civilized values in a world where his idealism is out of place. Ford's early non-fiction deals with similar concerns. The Soul of London (1905) is a somber picture of contemporary urban life, and charges that tradesmen have learned "the lesson of Napoleon. . . to apply yourself to gain the affection of the immense crowd," and so achieve power and wealth through mass manipulation. The villains include "Napoleons . . . of the Press . . . Lower Finance . . . Pharmacy . . . the Tea Trade . . . Grocery."²

Doubleday, Page, 1925), p. 185. The novel was published as a collaboration, but it is almost exclusively Ford's work. See Mizener, The Saddest Story, p. 51.

¹Ford, The Fifth Queen (London: Alston Rivers, 1906; reprint ed., New York: Vanguard Press, 1962), p. 54.

²Ford, The Soul of London (London: Alston Rivers, 1905), pp. 79-80.

The protagonists of Wells's Edwardian novels also face omnipresent venality. Wells's Lewisham and Kipps are "personalities thwarted and crippled by the defects of our contemporary life,"¹ and Chaffery of Love and Mr. Lewisham (1896) and Coote and Chitterlow of Kipps (1905) are prototypes of manipulators who develop "mean plans meanly executed for mean ends."² The two novels clearly foreshadow the fullest of Wells's treatments of contemporary public morality, Tono-Bungay (1909), which was serialized in the first four numbers of the English Review.

Conrad's central concerns lay elsewhere, but a distaste for contemporary affairs is often present in his fiction. In Heart of Darkness (1902), for example, Marlow is involved in a scheme for colonial exploitation, and by the end of the story he recognizes that events in London's counting houses may be as symbolically dark as anything in Kurtz's jungle clearing. Conrad and Ford both intensely admired the literary techniques of the French novelist Flaubert, and they found his attitude toward the commercial classes equally

¹H. G. Wells, Works, quoted by Gordon N. Ray, "H. G. Wells Tries to be a Novelist," Edwardians and Late Victorians, ed. Richard Ellmann (New York: Columbia University Press, 1960), p. 121.

²H. G. Wells, Kipps (New York: Scribner's, 1909 [originally published 1905]), p. 398.

congenial. In The Sentimental Education (1869) Flaubert portrays men who "would have betrayed France, or the human race, in order to protect their property, to avoid discomforts or difficulty, or simply out of pure baseness, an instinctive worship of power."¹ Conrad later recalled "the crudely materialistic atmosphere of the time . . . when the English Review was founded."²

Other writers, among them, Bennett, Galsworthy, and Forster, were also troubled by the lack of responsibility among the wealthy and powerful, but the attitude was most eloquently expressed by Yeats. The Green Helmet and Other Poems (1910) and Responsibilities (1914) display contempt for the wealthy men who lack taste and fail to recognize "responsibilities" to truth and art.

It is significant that three of Yeats's first poems expressing this attitude appeared in the English Review,³ for

¹Gustave Flaubert, The Sentimental Education, trans. Perdita Burlingame (New York: New American Library, 1972 [originally published 1869]), p. 234.

²Joseph Conrad, preface to The Nature of a Crime by Conrad and Ford Madox Ford (London: Duckworth, 1924), p. 6.

³They are "On a Recent Government Appointment in Ireland" (later titled "An Appointment"), "Galway Races," (later "At Galway Races"), and "Distraction" (later "All Things Can Tempt Me"). See The Variorum Edition of the Poems of W. B. Yeats, ed. Peter Allt and Russell K. Alspach (New York: Macmillan, 1957), pp. 317-318, 266, and 267, respectively.

Ford intended that the magazine be an antidote to the materialism that he, Yeats, and the others saw around them. Ford, with his self-image of high-minded gentleman devoted to traditional values, regarded the jingoism and impassioned debate he saw all around him as symptoms of mass hysteria which cynics manipulated to their own ends. In his writings, including The Inheritors and The Soul of London, he identified the manipulators in a general way. They included, certainly, the journalist Lord Northcliffe; the "Rand Lords" who made fortunes in South Africa; tradesmen such as Thomas Lipton, who controlled major segments of the grocery business; factory owners and industrialists; and Conservative Lords who used their places in Parliament to defend selfish interests. The list cuts across party lines, and Ford's notion of who the villains were begins to explain the apparent paradox of Ford, the self-styled Tory, editing a magazine which vigorously supported Liberal Party causes. Ford conceived of "Toryism" as an eighteenth century noblesse oblige implying a neo-classical reverence for order, proportion, dignity, cultivated taste, and personal honor. In Conservative Party politics, Ford saw entrenched interests defending the status quo, while some of the Liberals, on the other hand, recognized responsibility for alleviating conditions among the urban poor and

conducting foreign policy with regard for the well-being of peoples in other lands and not only for the advantages of British commerce. The subject of the English Review's political orientation belongs more properly to a subsequent discussion of the editorials and non-fiction which appeared, but it is important to note that Ford did not intend the magazine as a political organ. Ford's commitment was to "civilization," and in the context of his work from beginning to end, the term implied an orderly society in which decent men think critically, consider issues objectively, and reach wise and reasonable decisions.

Ford thus had a notion of what the English Review was to stand for, but he was less clear about the audience he hoped to reach. Twenty years after losing the magazine, he wrote, "To imagine that a magazine devoted to imaginative literature . . . would find more than a hundred readers in the United Kingdoms [sic] was a delusion that I in no way had,"¹ and he said that his oft-repeated proverb, "It would be hypocrisy to seek for the person of the Sacred Emperor in a low tea house," meant, among other things, that "it would be hypocrisy to expect a taste for the Finer Letters in a

¹Ford, Return to Yesterday (New York: Horace Liveright, 1932), p. 363.

large public."¹ In other contexts, however, he insisted that good literature would gain acceptance if given a chance, and criticized the pre-Raphaelites for their coterie notion that great art can not be popular. Ford projected in his imagination simple households of workers and cottagers in which the arts were appreciated,² and in general he avoided elitist notions about literature. The trouble, as Ford saw it, was not so much with the general public as with the editors, publishers, and writers who concerned themselves not with what was good but with what would sell.

Ford was therefore contemptuous of established literary periodicals, even though he wrote for several immediately before founding his own.³ Those available ranged from 6-8 page weeklies to 300-page quarterlies, and a brief survey of con-

¹Ford, Thus to Revisit (London: Chapman and Hall, 1921), p. 180.

²In Return to Yesterday, pp. 376-377, Ford idealized the home of young D. H. Lawrence as one in which the coal-miner father returned home to discuss Nietzsche, Flaubert, and the French Impressionists with his children. The description is of course completely imaginary. At several times in his life Ford himself lived in a simple cottage as a "small producer," equally attentive to his agricultural pursuits and his literary interests. The fullest projection of Ford's ideal society of craftsmen, artisans, and agricultural workers, all of whom love art, is in Great Trade Route (New York: Oxford University Press, 1937). See Ancient Lights, pp. 248-250 for Ford's criticism of the pre-Raphaelite coterie view of art.

³See "'Let Us Take A Walk Down Fleet Street!'" Return to Yesterday, pp. 235-260.

temporary literary journalism will be helpful in defining the place which the review was to fill.¹

Among the weeklies, St. Loe Strachey's Spectator with a circulation around 20,000 was the most widely read.² Billing itself on its masthead as "A Weekly Review of Politics, Literature, Theology, and Art," it was more in the nature of a political weekly than a purely literary review. Its usual 36 folio-sized pages included 8-12 pages of general news, 4-5 pages of letters to the editor, 6-8 pages of anonymous book reviews and articles on literary topics, and 8-10 pages of advertising. There was no fiction, but each issue included two or three poems. In the nineteenth century, the Spectator published Leigh Hunt, Swinburne and William Rossetti, but in

¹There is a paucity of reliable surveys and analyses of Edwardian literary periodicals, indeed, of English journalism generally. Walter Graham begins his foreword to English Literary Periodicals (New York: Thomas Nelson, 1930), with the following statement: "This, the first general survey of English literary periodicals that has ever been written, makes no claim to exhaustiveness or finality" (p. 11). The gap has not been filled, however, and English scholarship still awaits a study of the scope and historical insight of Frank L. Mott's monumental five-volume A History of American Magazines. The discussion of the Edwardian literary periodical scene which follows is based primarily on an examination of a number of journals for the period 1900-1910, supplemented by information from Graham, from the several histories of individual magazines which have appeared, and from bibliographical check-lists and tables.

²William Beach Thomas, The Story of the 'Spectator' 1828-1928, p. 102.

the Edwardian era the paper deserved its reputation for conventionalism in literary taste and Unionist conservatism in politics. Both tendencies are shown in a stanza from "The Little Englander," which appeared in 1902:

They stand deriding, while the sowers sow--
 Fain would they scatter tares the field to blight--
 Yet when the reapers down the furrows go,
 They share the harvest in their own despite.¹

The Spectator's chief literary competitors were Lord Alfred Douglass's Academy and Vernon Rendall's Athenaeum. These weeklies also enjoyed good reputations based on the Victorian period when they published leading writers and scholars, but in the first decade of the twentieth century neither was particularly exciting. Both appeared in folio-sized newspaper format of 25-35 pages (although the Athenaeum sometimes ran to 40 pages) and consisted of articles on literary topics, anonymous book reviews, and a few poems. Neither paid much attention to fiction; no original fiction appeared, and reviews of new novels (short, and usually not very perceptive) filled only a few pages.

Several of the major newspapers published weekly literary supplements which were similar in format and content to the Academy and the Athenaeum. The best known was the Times

¹J. Saxon Mills, "The Little Englander," Spectator 88 (18 January 1902):86.

Literary Supplement, begun January, 1902, and issued every Friday (beginning September 26, 1907, every Thursday) with the Times. It was usually 8 pages long and had unsigned reviews and an occasional poem, but no original fiction. The Liberal Westminster Gazette's Saturday Westminster was a similar weekly literary supplement, and Northcliffe's Daily Mail also offered one briefly.

One other weekly must be mentioned: A. R. Orage's New Age. Like the New Statesman and the New Witness, which it in some degree resembled, the New Age was primarily a political paper. Orage's enthusiasm for socialism was nearly equalled by his interest in literature, however, and under his editorship beginning in 1907 the New Age became an exciting literary forum. Like other political weeklies, it published little original fiction, however, and literary causes remained subordinate to political ones.¹

The literary weeklies, whether independent or supplements to large daily papers, were similar in many respects. None published original fiction, and the poetry which appeared was limited to short pieces of monotonous predictability

¹See Martin, The New Age Under Orage, for a discussion of this interesting journal.

("When the summer twilight closes / O'er the river, round the roses").¹ Reviewers paid little attention to original fiction, and their reviews, almost always anonymous, were seldom perceptive. Attention was usually limited to issues and books currently in fashion, and seldom was there an awareness of literary or artistic tradition.

On the other end of the spectrum from the weeklies were the ponderous quarterlies, notably the Quarterly Review and the Edinburgh Review. Whatever the distinguished traditions of these journals, neither was exciting during the Edwardian period. In format they were much the same: three hundred or so pages, in which several books on a subject formed the basis for a lengthy article which was more an essay on the subject than a review of the books. There was no poetry or fiction. Articles were generally, although not always, anonymous, and both journals were staunchly conservative. For example, the Quarterly found things to praise about Wells's literary techniques in April, 1908, but most of a review of his work was an attack on his socialist politics.² The Edinburgh, like the Quarterly, preferred political subjects

¹St. John Lucas, "Fear," Academy 72 (20 April 1907): 381.

²"The Ideas of Mr. H. G. Wells," Quarterly Review 208 (April 1908):472-490.

to literary ones, and discussions of contemporary fiction tended to be out of touch with the current concerns. An unsigned 1908 essay, "Ugliness in Fiction," attacked, among others, Hardy, Galsworthy, and Conrad, and a "review" of Conrad's The Secret Agent (1907) consisted of a plot summary and the comment that "if any embellishment of art, or service to society, is done by the concoction of such a story, clever as it may be, we confess that we fail to detect either."¹

Numerous monthly magazines were available and it is to the monthly miscellanies that one must look for the English Review's immediate antecedents. The most popular of them was the Strand, the magazine that gave the world Sherlock Holmes. Founded in 1891 by Alfred Newnes (of Tit-Bits fame), the Strand's circulation stood at a half million over most of the decade.² Nearly half its 150 pages was original fiction, and besides A. C. Doyle the magazine published Kipling, Maugham, Wells, and Bennett. The Strand was never really important from a literary standpoint, however. Newnes's formula was entertainment for the masses, and his magazine "preferred action to introspection, adventure to analysis, doing to thinking."³

¹"On Ugliness in Fiction," Edinburgh Review 207 (April 1908):440-464. The quotation is on p. 459.

²Pound, The Strand Magazine 1881-1950, p. 32.

³Ibid., p. 75.

With the exception of a few authors (and then not at their best work), contributors were "pedestrian writers . . .

[who] remained content with the surer profits to be earned by toiling on the lower slopes [of Parnassus]."¹ The Strand's imitators, Pearson's and Windsor, were no better. In format they were similar: 150 or so pages, profusely illustrated, about half stories or serialized novels. Neither attracted important writers, save for a few pieces by Kipling, who seems to have been every editor's passport to middlebrow respectability.

Of the miscellanies, the Cornhill, the magazine of Thackeray and Leslie Stephen, had the greatest claim to literary reputation, but that claim was based more on its Victorian past than its Edwardian present. Edited by Reginald John Smith throughout the decade, it advertised itself as follows: "Cornhill Magazine has a restful trustworthiness about it which is particularly pleasing in these changeful times of ours."² It was not illustrated (save for a few full-page portraits late in the decade) so it avoided the rakish look of the Strand, and its 120-140 pages always included a

¹Ibid., p. 105.

²Advertisement for the Cornhill, Athenaeum, n.v. (7 January 1905):32.

serialized novel, several short stories, and one or two poems. Non-fiction, however, predominated. Many important writers found their way into the Cornhill, among them James, Hardy, Yeats, Bennett, and even Ford himself, but in general the Edwardian Cornhill was safe and unexciting.

Its chief competitors among the "quality" monthlies were the Fortnightly Review (a monthly despite its title) and Blackwood's Magazine. The Fortnightly, under W. L. Courtney from 1894 to 1928, carried an increasing amount of fiction and poetry, though never as much as the Cornhill, and contributors included Maugham, Yeats, Wells, Galsworthy, James, and Ford. Most of their pieces were reviews and criticism, however, and fiction got short shrift. Blackwood's serialized Conrad's Lord Jim (entitled Lord Jim: A Sketch, perhaps to forestall criticism that the work abandoned traditional novel form) in 1900, and a serial, one or two short stories, and a few poems were a regular feature of "Maga," as Blackwood's was familiarly known. Contributors besides Conrad were Jack London and Alfred Noyes. Maga's obsession was colonial affairs, and its outlook was Big England. In 1901, the regular "Musing Without Method" column hoped, "Great Britain would be no more insulted by that vice of cannibalism which persuades

the Pro-Boers to outrage their country's flag,"¹ and articles in subsequent issues demanded a hard line from Ireland to Yaghistan.²

Edwardian literary periodicals were not an exciting lot, and before the English Review, periodical journalism was not a really important aspect of the literary scene. Even in the monthly miscellanies, fiction took second place, and with a few exceptions the material which appeared was not innovative or exciting. Most editors steered a safely conservative path on public issues and reinforced rather than challenged their readers' prejudices. Church, empire, laissez-faire, and conventional morality were seldom questioned, and the best writers of the period, many of whom at least flirted with socialism, suffrage, Little Englandism, and literary realism, could scarcely be expected to feel at home in their pages. Bennett wrote in 1908:

I have no hesitation in saying that our monthly periodicals are, as a whole, the most stupid and infantile of any 'World-Power', the United States not excepted. The British Public reads the Fortnightly because the Fortnightly is a good habit inherited from an earlier age; it keeps the Nineteenth Century and After on its drawing-room table

¹"Musings Without Method," Blackwood's Magazine 169 (April 1901):571.

²"The Irreconcilables of Yaghistan," Blackwood's Magazine 183 (March 1908):423-430. Yaghistan is on the north-west frontier of India.

because the list of contributors is ornamental. . . . Don't tell me that I have forgotten the Cornhill. In my view, the Cornhill stands for all that is worst in the British temperament. It has the smoothness and vacuity of a minor official retired from the Foreign Office. Look through a number; in the whole there is not a split infinitive nor an idea.¹

A historian viewing Edwardian literary journalism through the perspective of time is similarly unkind: Ensor despairs "of the monthly and quarterly reviews, whose prosperity and influence after about 1904 went fast downhill."² Clearly, in 1908 the field was open for something better.

Ford, thirty-five years old in 1908, was uniquely suited to be the central figure in a new journalistic venture. Affable, gregarious, and passionately concerned about contemporary life and literature, he was something of a social lion and literary man-about-town. Things had not always been so well for him; during much of 1904 he was undergoing treatment for nervous collapse. What doctors had not accomplished, however, London critics had, for when his book The Soul of London was enthusiastically received by literary circles and the book-buying public, Ford quickly improved and there followed the long period of literary achievement which was climaxed by his editorship of the English Review.

¹ Arnold Bennett, The New Age 2 (25 April 1908):513, quoted by Martin, The New Age Under Orage, p. 12.

² Ensor, England 1870-1914, p. 536.

Besides The Soul of London, he published two other books in 1905; there were three in 1906, and in 1907 no fewer than six.¹ He was a frequent contributor to magazines before 1904, but published nothing in periodicals between March of that year and March, 1905. Then came a number of poems, stories, essays, and book reviews--at least fourteen between March, 1905, and December, 1906, in periodicals including Country Life, Bookman, the Academy, and the Tribune.² He found time in late summer of 1906 for a brief visit to America with his wife Elsie, the first of many visits, and upon returning to England in late September, he decided to establish a permanent residence in London (he and his family had previously divided their time between Aldington, Kent, and Winchelsea, Sussex). He took a flat, first in Sloane Square and, later, at 84 Holland Park Avenue. The maisonette on Holland Park Avenue, the second and third stories of a building housing a poulterer's and fishmonger's shop on the ground floor, would

¹David Dow Harvey, Ford Madox Ford 1873-1939, A Bibliography of Works and Criticism (Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1962), p. xxi.

²Ibid., pp. 144-146. Mizener is correct in saying "Ford published no journalism at all between March, 1904, and February, 1906" (The Saddest Story, p. 96), but from March, 1905, to February, 1906, he published at least five poems, some of which appeared in more than one periodical. Thus he was no longer in total eclipse, as he had been the year before.

become the headquarters of the English Review.¹

Once settled in London, Ford's activities in journalism began in earnest. From the spring of 1907 until December, 1908, when the English Review began demanding nearly all his time, he appeared at least weekly in one newspaper or another.² In 1907 his "Literary Portraits" became a regular feature of the Books supplement to Northcliffe's Daily Mail, and fifteen of them, not all signed, appeared between April and July.³ When Books ceased publication, Ford transferred his "Literary Portraits" to the Tribune where twenty-seven, all signed, appeared between July, 1907, and January, 1908. The essays reflected Ford's feelings about the state of English literature, and the ideas expressed clearly foreshadowed the editorial stance he would take as editor of the English Review. He alleged, for example, that there was a "huge need for these imaginative writers whose function it is to spread a power of

¹For a humorous description of the flat, see Douglas Goldring, Reputations (Port Washington, New York: Kennikat Press, 1968 [first published 1920]). There Goldring (the English Review's sub-editor under Ford) says, "Sometimes gobs of blood, oozing from the suspended carcasses of rabbits, made the threshold positively unsafe" (p. 217). See also Goldring's South Lodge, p. 16.

²Harvey, Ford, A Bibliography, pp. 147-161. See also Mizener, The Saddest Story, p. 123.

³Harvey, Ford, A Bibliography, pp. 147-150.

rationalized appreciation which is called culture" (October 5, 1907), that "technique is the science of appeal" (January 4, 1908), and that "I take an extremely gloomy view of Literature in England at the present day (September 14, 1907).¹ In the fall of 1908, Ford began yet another series, this for the Daily News. Thirteen historico-fictional sketches appeared between September and November.² Ford's name was thus constantly before the reading public, and he began to think of himself, not unjustifiably, as a literary arbiter and trend-setter.

During the two years that these pieces were appearing, Ford himself was a familiar figure in editorial offices, literary salons, and artists' gatherings. Douglas Goldring first met him in the early summer of 1908:

My first impressions of Ford are of a tall thin man with fair hair and a blonde moustache which imperfectly concealed defective front teeth. He wore a grey-blue swallow-tail coat of uncertain cut, carried a leather despatch case of the kind the French call a serviette and had an "important" manner, which in some ways suggested an Under-Secretary of State.³

¹ Ibid., pp. 150-160. The quotations are from Harvey's synopses of each of the articles.

² Ibid., p. 161. These stories were reprinted in Ford and Violet Hunt, Zeppelin Nights (London: John Lane, 1916).

³ Goldring, South Lodge, p. 15. A virtually identical description appears in Goldring's Odd Man Out (London: Chapman and Hall, 1935), p. 94.

One of Ford's close friends actually was an Under-Secretary of State, and because of his association with C. F. G. Masterman and other members of the National Liberal Club, Ford apparently fancied himself a behind-the-scenes participant in Liberal party politics. Members of the Liberal Club besides Ford and Masterman were Wells and the book publishers René Byles and T. Fisher Unwin.¹ Ford was also associated with the Square Club, whose membership included the most distinguished of London's literary men: Walter de la Mare, John Masefield, H. W. Nevinson, and G. K. Chesterton.² A luncheon group which Ford met almost daily at the Mont Blanc restaurant in Soho included Edward Garnett, W. H. Hudson, and (on his infrequent trips to London) Conrad.³ Thus, Ford was on close personal terms with many important literary men of the day, and as English Review editor he would draw upon these associates. Pound later observed that "the quality of the Eng. Rev. then depended, I think, very largely on the sort of personal touch between the office and the writers." In that analysis,

¹ Goldring, The Last Pre-Raphaelite (London: MacDonald, 1948), pp. 131-132.

² Ibid., p. 133.

³ Goldring, South Lodge, p. 51. See also R. A. Scott-James, "Ford Madox Ford When He Was Hueffer," South Atlantic Quarterly 57 (Spring 1958):241, and Ford, Return to Yesterday, p. 314.

Pound certainly was correct.¹

Ford's books, articles, and conversations only partly satisfied his urge to discuss literary topics, however. The stultifying atmosphere in the existing periodicals bothered him, and he later recalled: "From the beginning of the period of which I am talking--from 1907 to 1914--I worried myself with the idea that I ought to have a periodical of my own."² Similar thoughts had occurred to him earlier; he wrote to Edward Garnett in 1901:

The idea, I say, keeps booming in my head--why couldn't one make some sort of nucleus, just some little attempt at forming a small heap on which people could stand & get a point of view with their heads a few inches above the moral atmosphere of these Islands.³

Six years later, fancying himself one of England's leading men of letters, he felt something of an obligation to see that such a forum was provided and cast about for the means of establishing one.⁴

¹ Pound to H. L. Mencken, 2 May 1915, in Letters of Ezra Pound, ed. Paige, p. 60.

² Ford, Return to Yesterday, p. 362.

³ Ford to Edward Garnett, 1901[?], Letters of Ford Madox Ford, ed. Richard M. Ludwig (Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1965), p. 15.

⁴ Ford could look to the example of his father in this regard, since Francis Hueffer was also prone to start intellectually serious but financially disastrous magazines. His New Quarterly Review was established to boost Schopenhauer

It is difficult to know how much credibility to attach to Ford's statements that he and the American journalist S. S. McClure once discussed a "programme for a journal that should consist as to half of pure literature and criticism and as to half of muck raking,"¹ but it is true that Northcliffe, an equally pragmatic and businesslike journalist, in 1906 toyed briefly with the idea of acquiring the Academy and installing Ford as editor. It is doubtful, however, that Ford could have been successful in a hard-nosed commercial enterprise and, not surprisingly, neither the McClure nor the Northcliffe venture ever got very far.²

Then in January, 1908, Ford's conversations with Wells began what would become, by December of that year, the English Review. The idea was apparently related to Wells's efforts at publishing Tono-Bungay. Both writers recognized that it was superb--certainly Wells's best work to date--and Wells was afraid that if he turned it over to a commercial publisher he would receive neither the recognition nor the money he deserved. Probably Ford brought up his long-cherished idea of

while the Musical World was intended to introduce Wagner in England. See Mizener, The Saddest Story, p. 4, and Ford, Ancient Lights, pp. 43-44.

¹Ford, Return to Yesterday, p. 362.

²Mizener, The Saddest Story, pp. 120-121.

a literary review and, no doubt at his urging (Ford could be extremely persuasive, even when he was advocating the most impractical of schemes), they determined that serialized segments of Tono-Bungay could be the nucleus of a new monthly. A basic plan emerged: they would share equally in the editing, each would bear half the initial cost, Wells would receive a fifth of the profits in return for Tono-Bungay, and the first issue would appear early that summer.

Once the initial enthusiasm had passed, Wells, the more practical of the two, began to have second thoughts. The project would make excessive demands on his time and resources, and probably he was skeptical about entering into such an open-ended partnership with someone as impractical as Ford. At any rate, he told Ford that he would be unable to share in the work of editing, though, according to Ford, "he felt like a worm for deserting me." Then, a short time later, he reported that he would be unable to contribute to the cost, though "once more he felt like a worm."¹ Wells did not participate in the editing, but never dissociated himself from the venture by refusing Tono-Bungay, and the novel appeared in the review between December, 1908, and March, 1909. Terms of the seri-

¹ Ford to Mrs. H. G. Wells, 29 January 1909, Letters of Ford Madox Ford, ed. Lugwig, p. 31.

alization, however, were a source of constant controversy and finally precipitated the quarrel which ended their friendship.¹

Ford remained committed to the plan despite Wells's withdrawal but there were formidable obstacles to overcome: there was no editorial staff, no financial backing, and no editorial office. Ford, however, was perfectly capable of ignoring such obstacles, and, on the other hand, there were reasons to believe the plan had merit. Serious writers were frustrated by the existing magazines, and Ford, with his personal contacts in the world of publishing and literature and his well-known commitment to artistic standards, seemed a good choice (his lack of business acumen aside) to edit an alternative journal. In the spring of 1908, therefore, the proposal was seriously discussed in Ford's Mont Blanc circle and among his other friends.

¹ The exact details of the negotiations, if such they may be called, between Ford and Wells in 1908 are not easily established. Exactly when Wells withdrew from the project is unknown; probably he disengaged himself gradually although he continued to wish Ford well in obtaining other backing. The two remained on reasonably good terms until that fall, when Wells began to sense that the English Review could not pay him what he felt Tono-Bungay was worth. Ford's letters and reminiscences recount their conversations but it is difficult to know how far these may be relied upon. See Ford's letters to Mrs. Wells, 29 January and 1 February 1909, in Letters of Ford Madox Ford, ed. Ludwig, pp. 31-35. Ford's account in Return to Yesterday, pp. 363-371, is further improved. See also below, pp. 268-271.

Talk continued through the summer but little progress was made in translating the proposal into action. Some of Ford's friends, knowing his uncommercial outlook, were perhaps skeptical of his chances for success but, as Goldring has pointed out, they were nevertheless co-operative:

Whatever may have been the secret misgivings of Ford's inner circle, their belief in his ability, as well as the advantages to themselves which might accrue if the project materialised, combined to assure him of their moral support, at least to the extent of agreeing to contribute to the new venture.¹

Goldring was engaged as an editorial assistant early that summer. His opinion that plans for the review were "already far advanced"² at that time was probably based more on Ford's enthusiastic descriptions than on actual facts, because he did not hear from his employer again until several months later.

The reason for the impasse was a lack of money, and that summer Ford cast around for backers. He sought to draw upon the resources of wealthy relatives,³ but this took time,

¹ Goldring, The Last Pre-Raphaelite, p. 139.

² Goldring, South Lodge, p. 15.

³ His father's family, the Hueffers (spelled with a u-umlaut in Germany), were prosperous West German journalists who owned the Aschendorff Press, a printing establishment in Münster, and the Westphalische Zeitung. Two of Ford's uncles were wealthy men, one in Rome and the other in New York and

and partly out of a lack of ready cash and partly out of his vision of the review as the joint enterprise of the entire British literary community, Ford evolved what he called a plan to run the review as a "socialist undertaking": he would obtain contributions from among his friends, not paying for them directly, but offering them a share of the review's profits. He defended the scheme to Edward Garnett in a letter in the fall of 1908:

. . . I quite realize what you say as to the awkwardness of the profit-sharing idea, but the only people who come into it are very intimate friends of mine and I have put the matter perfectly plainly to every contributor--"Will you take \$2 a 1000 words or will you take a sporting risk which might be estimated as a two to one chance against you, as a shareholder?"--and in order to avoid their incurring any liability I have added in a form of words to please Galsworthy "I do not undertake legally to pay you anything at all, but this is my private intention."

I know that inevitably there will be quarrels and recriminations, but in some things I am an idealist and my ideal is to run the "English Review" as far as possible as a socialistic undertaking. The kicks I shall get will be the price I shall pay for indulging my idealism and these I trust to bear with equanimity.¹

The project still demanded cash, however, and until some could be found there could be no magazine.

Paris. See Mizener, The Saddest Story, p. 3, and MacShane, Ford Madox Ford, pp. 2-3. Ford sometimes used variations of the name "Aschendorff" as a literary pseudonym.

¹Ford to Edward Garnett, 17 October 1908, in Letters of Ford Madox Ford, ed. Ludwig, pp. 27-28. See also below, pp. 264-266.

Conrad was deeply involved throughout that summer and fall. He was living at the time in Bedfordshire, but between August and December made frequent trips to Aldington, Kent, where Ford usually spent weekends with his family.¹ Wells and James lived nearby and there were frequent discussions among the four as to the nature of the new journal and the revolution it would work in English letters. In the course of these discussions, another south-county resident, Arthur Marwood, was drawn into the scheme. Ford had come to know Marwood in Winchelsea, Sussex, in 1906, and there had introduced him to Conrad.² Both writers came to regard him almost with reverence:

But I wish to be allowed to break off once again to pay a tribute to the memory of the late Arthur Marwood [Ford wrote in 1921]. He was too unambitious to be a writer but, large, fair, clumsy, and gentle, he had the deepest and widest intelligence of all the men I have ever met. He had the largest general, the largest encyclopedic, knowledge that, I imagine, it would be possible for any one man's skull to hold. . . . He

¹Jocelyn Baines, Joseph Conrad, p. 347.

²Ford, Return to Yesterday, p. 359. Jessie Conrad in Joseph Conrad and His Circle, 2nd ed. (Port Washington, New York: Kennikat Press, 1964), p. 116, recalled that Ford introduced Marwood to Conrad "barely a month before my second boy was born (John Conrad was born 2 August 1906). Jocelyn Baines, in conjecturing that the two first met in 1908 (Baines, Joseph Conrad, p. 347), was apparently unaware of Jessie Conrad's comment. The point is worth making because the long-standing relationship among the three explains their easy familiarity.

had no personal ambitions, being a Yorkshire Tory Squire, a distinguished mathematician and the Fellow of some Cambridge College--Trinity, I think.¹

The quiet, aristocratic, and fiercely independent Marwood personified what Ford and Conrad regarded as the virtues of the old English country squirearchy, and an offer from him that August brought Ford's dream to fruition.

Ford later described the circumstances:

. . . It was a Sunday. Marwood was suddenly on the terrace. He was pale with indignation and brandished a crumpled newspaper. He panted:

"You've got to carry on that review."

I had never seen him agitated before--and I never did again. He must have got up at four that morning to catch the train from Winchelsea to Aldington.

The newspaper announced that the Cornhill Magazine had refused to print, on the score of immorality, a poem of Thomas Hardy called A Sunday Morning Tragedy. All the other heavy and semi-heavy monthlies, all the weeklies, all the daily papers in England had similarly refused. Marwood said:

"You must print it. We can't have the country made a laughing stock." . . . Of course he found the money that hadn't been found by my other friend.²

Ford has obviously dramatized the scene, but there is enough truth in his description to give at least some factual basis to his celebrated and oft-repeated claim that he and Marwood founded the English Review in order to publish Hardy's poem. Apparently it really was the rumor that "A Sunday Morning

¹Ford, Thus to Revisit, p. 59. See Mizener, The Saddest Story, pp. 61 and 156-157, for a discussion of Marwood.

²Ford, Return to Yesterday, p. 370.

Tragedy" had been suppressed that caused Marwood to agree to underwrite the review's cost. Ford wrote to Hardy, and the sixty-eight-year-old distinguished poet responded by sending the poem.¹

With Marwood's offer of money and Hardy's contribution of "A Sunday Morning Tragedy," serious new activity began and 84 Holland Park Avenue quickly assumed its new identity as the headquarters of the English Review. Letters soliciting contributions were sent to Galsworthy and Bennett in early October,² and Conrad, for whom writing was always painful, finally produced the first installment of Some Reminiscences.³ Edward Garnett had long been close to both Ford and Conrad, and through him and his wife Constance, the distinguished translator of the Russian classics, Tolstoi's

¹See Mizener, The Saddest Story, pp. 155-156. Ford had previously asked Hardy for a contribution to the new magazine, but Hardy had replied that he had nothing to send. "A Sunday Morning Tragedy" had actually been rejected by only one magazine and Hardy already had alternate plans for publishing it when Ford's second request came but, as Mizener observes, "he had had enough trouble with pecksniffery to appreciate Ford's sympathy."

²Ibid., p. 155. See also Bennett to Ford, 9 October 1908, Letters of Arnold Bennett, ed. James Hepburn, vol. 2, 1889-1915 (London: Oxford University Press, 1968), p. 227.

³Mizener, The Saddest Story, p. 166.

"The Raid" was obtained for the first number. Ford wrote Garnett that he had obtained a story by Anatole France which he hoped either Conrad or Mrs. Garnett would translate; neither did, and it appeared in French in the January number.¹ Two letters were sent to James, who responded with "The Jolly Corner," a complex and tightly controlled tale that probably delighted Ford as much as it would have puzzled readers of commercial monthlies.² Thus, the contents for the first numbers of the English Review were gradually drawn together.

Ford began in late September and early October to assemble an editorial staff. Goldring, appointed sub-editor some months before, was at last summoned to 84 Holland Park Avenue. Then twenty-one years old, he was at the time reading proofs for Country Life and dreaming of becoming a writer. He eagerly joined Ford's venture although he was to serve without pay and do his work in the evening, after his working day at Country Life was finished.³ One of Goldring's first tasks was to find Ford a secretary. He had the good fortune

¹Ford to Edward Garnett, 17 October 1908, Letters of Ford Madox Ford, ed. Ludwig, p. 27.

²Mizener, The Saddest Story, p. 155.

³Goldring, Reputations, p. 215.

to hire "the extremely decorative and highly efficient"¹ Miss Thomas, who according to Ford, was "the pearl of all secretaries."² Other people remarked on her efficiency and organizational ability, and she was a major factor in maintaining what order there was in the editorial office.

Unfortunately, Ford was not so lucky in finding a business manager. He cabled his publisher René Byles, co-founder and former managing director of Alston Rivers, asking him to take the job, but Byles refused.³ Then in late November he appointed Stephen Reynolds, a young novelist who had just published A Poor Man's House. Reynolds lasted less than two months; by January, 1909, he retreated to his fisherman's life in Devonshire.⁴ No one ever really took his place, and the review's business affairs under Ford's editorship remained a muddle from first to last.

Sometime during the fall, Duckworth was engaged as publisher, and by early November the moment of parturition

¹ Goldring, South Lodge, p. 22.

² Ford, Return to Yesterday, p. 389. See also Violet Hunt, I Have This to Say, p. 14.

³ Ford, Return to Yesterday, p. 364.

⁴ See Reynolds's letter to his literary agent, J. B. Pinker, 10 January 1909, in Letters of Stephen Reynolds, quoted by Harvey, Ford, a Bibliography, pp. 586-587.

had almost arrived: type and format had been agreed upon, and the principle contents were in proof.

Then came a letter from Conrad inviting Ford, accompanied by sub-editor and secretary, to Bedfordshire to complete whatever details remained. Conrad recalled the evening session that followed in a letter he wrote to Ford some years later:

Do you care to be reminded that the editing of the first number was finished in that farmhouse we occupied near Luton? You arrived one evening with your amiable myrmidions and parcels of copy. I shall never forget the cold of that night, the black grates, the guttering candles, the dimmed lamps--and the desperate stillness of that house, where women and children were innocently sleeping, when you sought me out at 2 A.M. in my dismal study to make me concentrate suddenly on a two page notice of the Île des Pingouins. A marvellously successful instance of the editorial tyranny! I suppose you were justified. The number one of the E. R. could not have come out with two blank pages in it. It would have been too sensational. I have forgiven long ago.¹

The night was given more to impassioned discussions on the techniques of writing and what the review must stand for than editing, but the job was accomplished, and a few weeks later--with contributions by Hardy, James, Hudson, Wells, Galsworthy,

¹Conrad to Ford, 23 October 1923, in G. Jean-Aubry, Joseph Conrad: Life and Letters, vol. 2 (Garden City, New York: Doubleday, Page, 1927), p. 323.

"A. M." (Arthur Marwood), Ford, and Conrad (including the hard-won review of Anatole France's L'Île des Pingouins)--the English Review at last appeared.

The name "English Review" was chosen at the suggestion of Conrad, who "felt a certain sardonic pleasure in the [sic] choosing so national a name for a periodical that promised to be singularly international in tone,"¹ but it had been used by a short-lived periodical three years before. The former editors of the dead magazine brought suit for damages. Whether they ever received compensation is doubtful, and the whole incident seems absurd, but it troubled Ford immensely. Ford had an almost morbid fear of scenes or confrontations and he recalled later that "my telephone became a constant worry because those two gentlemen rang me up at all hours of the night."²

In outward aspect the English Review which was placed on the bookstalls in late November, 1908, was not much different

¹Ford, Return to Yesterday, p. 365.

²The British Union-Catalogue of Periodicals, ed. James D. Stewart, vol. 2 (New York: Academic Press, 1956), p. 126, indicates the magazine lasted from 21 October 1905 to 11 February 1906, when it was merged with the Academy. The editors also moved over to the Academy, and their unhappiness over the name issue is doubtless behind the Academy's harsh criticism of Ford's magazine. For a summary of their comments, see Harvey, Ford, A Bibliography, pp. 295-299. See also Ford, Return to Yesterday, pp. 365-366.

from the Cornhill, the Fortnightly, Blackwood's, or the other "quality" monthlies. The plain blue cover listing the magazine's contents gave it a dignified look, and in page size, typography, and layout it was as staid as they were. It was somewhat heftier than other monthlies--192 pages, compared to their 125-175. There were no illustrations (although a few later numbers carried manuscript facsimiles or caricature drawings by Max Beerbohm), so there was no confusing it with the Strand or other "popular" miscellanies. It sold for 2/6, somewhat more than most other monthlies but considerably less than the quarterlies which it rivalled in bulk.

A closer examination of the English Review reveals, however, some sharp differences between it and the Cornhill and other magazines. Unlike them, it separated offerings into distinct sections: first came a few pages of poetry (Hardy's "A Sunday Morning Tragedy" in the first number), then appeared a long section of belles lettres, and at the end in a separate department called "The Month" were reviews, criticism, and miscellaneous items. The belles lettres section occupied about three-fourths of the magazine, and fiction received the most emphasis: over half the December issue was fiction. Conrad's "Some Reminiscences" and Hudson's "Stonehenge," though non-fiction, were considered worthy to stand

alongside James's "The Jolly Corner," Tolstoi's "The Raid," and the first installment of Wells's Tono-Bungay in the center section, but items like discussions of Balkan politics, unemployment, or even the function of the arts, were relegated to "The Month." No other contemporary magazine carried such a large proportion of belles lettres, particularly fiction, and nowhere else was it accorded a special status differentiating it from more prosaic essays and commentary.

There was thus a major difference between the English Review and most other magazines, and therefore one must perhaps go back over a decade for the review's real antecedents. In the 1890's the Yellow Book and its more exotic offspring, the Savoy, both gave primary attention to belles lettres. Ford and those closest to him in the review's founding had reason to be familiar with both. The Yellow Book had published Wells and James, and Ford and Conrad had appeared in the Savoy. Arthur Symons's Savoy credo, announced in the magazine's first number, was not so different from Ford's English Review manifesto:

We have no formulas, and we desire no false unity of form or matter. We have not invented a new point of view. We are not Realists, or Romanticists, or Decadents. For us, all art is good which is good art. . . . We intend to print no verse which has not some close relationship with poetry, no fiction which has not a certain sense of what is finest in

living fact, no criticism which has not some knowledge, discernment, and sincerity in its judgment.¹

But Symons's 1890's exoticism was thoroughly discredited by 1908, and despite a proclaimed catholic taste, the Savoy became the ultimate in coterie journalism: Symons wrote the whole last issue himself. Another nineties magazine which was closer to the English Review was the New Review, edited from 1895 to 1897 by W. E. Henley. Henley published the best work of some of the best writers of the day: Yeats, Wells, Symons, James, Kipling, Conrad, and Robert Louis Stevenson all appeared before the magazine ceased publication at the end of 1897. There was nothing like it until the English Review itself.

The English Review did not change much in appearance or format during Ford's editorship. Never did it go under 180 pages, and at times it stretched to well over 200. The three-segment division was retained from first to last, and beginning in February, 1909, the poetry section carried the title, "Modern Poetry." The adjective "modern" was appropriate for a department in which Yeats, Pound, F. S. Flint, and Lawrence appeared. "Modern Poetry" usually occupied 5 to 10 pages. Late in 1909, "The Month" section swelled to over

¹[Arthur Symons], "Editorial Note," Savoy 1 (January 1896):5.

a third of the review's total bulk when various financial contributors insisted that they be allowed to air their political views, but criticism, reviews, and commentary were not allowed to invade the large center segment reserved for belles lettres. This remained by far the largest portion of the magazine. There was always a serialized novel, complete in one volume of four numbers instead of in six or more issues as in most other monthlies, and other items also extended over more than one issue. In this too the review differed from the other magazines, which seldom accepted contributions whose length fell between that of a short story and a full-fledged novel. Ford's manifesto had promised to avoid "superficiality of the specially modern kind which is the inevitable consequence when nothing but brevity of statement is aimed at,"¹ and in the English Review, James, Conrad, Granville Barker, and others were given the space they required for medium-length essays and fiction.

Thirty-seven different writers were identified by name as contributors to the first four numbers, and they were a distinguished group indeed. Over half were well known enough at the time to appear in the 1909 Who's Who,² and a

¹See above, p. 8.

²Who's Who 1909 (London: A. and C. Black, 1909).

like number (usually, but not always, the same individuals) gained sufficient lasting literary importance to rate inclusion in the Oxford Companion to English Literature.¹ Yet despite the large total of contributors, the initial volume (December, 1908, to March, 1909) was largely the work of a small coterie. That group was Ford's circle of close friends from Kent and Sussex, most of whom had been involved in the magazine's founding: Conrad, James, Wells, Marwood, and Hudson. Among them they wrote well over half the volume. This coterie cast disappears from later volumes, however. In the year of Ford's editorship, well over one hundred persons contributed. Over half rated mention in the 1909 Who's Who, while nearly a third achieved the measure of literary immortality required for listing in the Oxford Companion.

Perhaps Ford cannot be completely absolved from the charge of directing a coterie publication, however, since most of the major contributors were his friends. However, Ford knew a great many people and, as we shall see, in the course of his editorship the circle of his closest friends changed drastically. Thus, the English Review "coterie" was a very large one or, to be more accurate, there was more

¹Sir Paul Harvey, The Oxford Companion to English Literature, 4th ed. (London: Oxford University Press, 1967).

than one.

The reception which the publication received was largely favorable, and there was considerable praise and fanfare. Reviewers had the following comments:¹

In Mr. Ford Madox Hueffer the new review has a taster, commander-in-chief, and connoisseur of extraordinary range, flexibility and variety. . . . Mr. Hueffer's knowledge and receptivity alike fit him to become the impresario of a review in which all the great guns and big trumpets of modern literature are going to detonate and reverberate in a truly amazing manner. (Reader's Review, November, 1908)

It would hardly be possible to make a list more representative within the limits of one issue of a periodical of the best in current English literature. . . . Mr. Ford Madox Hueffer . . . is to be congratulated on the way he has led off his review. (Evening Standard, November 25, 1908)

. . . surpasses expectation. There are here 192 solid pages of literature--literature, be it noted, not literary matter. (Daily News, November 27, 1908)

The English Review--or, at any rate, the first number of it--is very good. (Daily Mail, November 28, 1908)

The English Review . . . requires no guarantee as to its literary character. The names embossed upon the cover speak for themselves, and the merest glance at the pages within will convince the curious that they are inspecting an enterprise of high merits and promise. (Pall Mall Gazette, December 3, 1908)

¹The reviews in which these comments appear are contained in a press cutting collection privately held by Mrs. Julia Lowe, Ford's daughter by Stella Bowen. Excerpts are published in Harvey, Ford, A Bibliography, pp. 295-300, from which these comments are taken. It should be added that Ford probably worked hard to insure that favorable reviews appeared in the maximum number of places. He set great store by log-rolling, and he had friends in many editorial offices.

The most important event in the domain of periodical publication . . . really a high-class magazine.
(Country Life, December 5, 1908)

The projectors of the English Review are to be heartily congratulated on the success of their first number.
(Nation [London], December 12, 1908)

The first issue . . . contains an overwhelming number of the best things. (Sunday Times, December 26, 1908)

Although they praised the review lavishly, some of these reviewers went on to hint at doubts about the support it could expect. The Evening Standard mused, "as for the intelligent reader--well, he has an opportunity of showing how and to what extent he can appreciate a genuine literary monthly" (November 25, 1908). The reviewer for Country Life, after his kind words, went on to say, "It will naturally be asked what room there is for a publication of this kind."

Other reviewers were even more cool. The Athenaeum said in its brief notice, "This first number gives us more stories than views on art and letters. . . . The editorial notes are somewhat wordy."¹ The Spectator's comments over several months were characterized by phrases like "meaningless except for its profanity," "squalid writing," and "strange medley,"² while the editor of the Academy said that "anybody

¹"Our Library Table," Athenaeum (5 December 1908), p. 720.

²Reported by Frank MacShane, Ford Madox Ford, p. 81.

with a cheque-book could have done what Mr. Hueffer has done."¹

In general, however, the review was counted a great success.²

As the Christmas holidays approached, Ford's L-shaped sitting room-editorial office over Mr. Chandler's poultry shop at 84 Holland Park Avenue was the scene of much celebration.

Violet Hunt recalled the gaiety:

And to celebrate the birth of the Review, I suppose, there was a Yuletide festival lasting nearly a week, according to the manner of the ancients, at Holland Park Avenue--plum pudding, Yule logs, chestnut roasting and snap-dragon; orgies of stickiness, and Father Christmas's beard getting entangled in the candle sconces. . . . There was no one to curb the editor and his German instinct for games. Wonderful paper frogs that raced, and other mechanical toys that seemed, but were not, perhaps, unworthy of a great mind unbending, and the Review was launched.³

¹See Harvey, Ford, A Bibliography, p. 295.

²MacShane's contention, stated in "The English Review" (p. 319) and reaffirmed in Ford Madox Ford (pp. 81-82), that "men of power and influence in the literary life of London" clubbed together to "cry down" Ford and the English Review is hard to sustain. The review was in fact received favorably in most quarters. Only the Spectator and the Academy (whose vendetta is explained by the fact that its editors were suing Ford over rights to the name "English Review") appear to have had consistently adverse comments. MacShane also states, "The Times Literary Supplement and the Athenaeum pretended the English Review did not exist" (Ford Madox Ford, p. 81), but the Athenaeum did contain a brief mention, noted above. The Times Literary Supplement limited itself to book reviews and it would have been out of character for it to discuss a magazine. It did, however, carry four advertisements for the English Review between 26 November 1908 and 6 May 1909. See also below, p. 297.

³Hunt, I Have This to Say, pp. 54-55.

During the next year Ford's magazine would make literary history, but Ford himself would be subjected to such tremendous personal, professional, and financial strain that he would lose the review, most of his old friends, and (very nearly) his emotional health as well.

CHAPTER THREE

"ANCIENT LIGHTS": VICTORIANS

IN THE ENGLISH REVIEW

The English Review, as Pound explained, "had really three generations--stratified groups,"¹ but Ford's lavish rhetoric about the eldest of the three, the Victorians, perhaps obscured the fact that their contribution to the magazine was actually very slight. Ford made extensive efforts to obtain previously unpublished materials by "Ancient Lights," English writers born before the mid-nineteenth century who had grown up among Tennyson, Browning, Dickens, Thackeray, Arnold, Ruskin, and the other great Victorians.² He obtained

¹Pound to Ronald Duncan, 27 January 1937, in Letters of Ezra Pound, ed. Paige, p. 287.

²See Ford's letter to Edward Garnett, 17 October 1908, in Letters of Ford Madox Ford, ed. Ludwig, p. 27. See also Goldring, Reputations, pp. 219-224. See Ford, Ancient Lights, for his treatment of his Victorian boyhood. Ford derived his title from a practice associated with the London building code, which regulated the erection of new high-rise buildings that blocked light from the windows of older buildings. Ford's inscription on a presentation copy of the book describes what he had in mind:

only a few such pieces, but they are properly the subject of a separate discussion, not only because they constitute a clearly defined group of contributions but also because Ford's motives in obtaining them demonstrate his attitude toward tradition and the role of the literary man (and, by extension, the literary review) in society.

Ford's attitude toward tradition is at once the most important and most complex aspect of his art and his life. Virtually all his novels turn on the conflict between old and new values, and his biographers agree that the "Toryism" which ruled his imagination governed his actions, sometimes to the point that his friends were convinced he had lost touch with reality. Ford also had a limitless admiration for the creative artist inculcated during his pre-Raphaelite upbringing. Respect for the past and admiration for the creative artist combined to produce an elaborate piety toward his literary forebears. Ford did not value all past writing equally, as

"In London when an old house is threatened by a new building's being erected near its windows then a man hangs out a sign bearing the words Ancient Lights-- meaning that he claims all the light falling from an angle of 45' above his windows. New York might do worse! FMF"

Thus, the metaphorical richness of the title as it applied to the Victorian Great Figures is obvious. See Harvey, Ford, A Bibliography, pp. 32-33. For a description of an actual legal case involving the "ancient lights" principle, see "Ancient Lights," Times [London], 30 March 1908, p. 16.

The March of Literature (1938),¹ the opinionated and impressionistic literary history he produced late in life, attests, but he believed all writers shared in the "civilization" which the literary heritage of the past represented. They had shaped and passed on the Grand Tradition, and thus, Ford thought, they were to be regarded with awe and pious humility.

That attitude toward the past was by no means widespread in 1908 when the beginning of the new century and the death of the old queen had combined to promote a feeling of discontinuity. People recognized that an era had ended and a new one had begun and, while there was some nostalgia for the past, there was also the affected and self-conscious "modernism" captured by Victoria Sackville-West in her novel The Edwardians (1930).² People who prided themselves on being up-to-date referred to themselves as "Edwardians" and it became fashionable to ridicule the earnestness of the old century. Ford diagnosed the attitude in Ancient Lights:

We have grown harder, we have grown more rapid in our movements, we have grown more avid of sensation, we

¹Ford, The March of Literature (New York: Dial Press, 1938).

²Victoria Sackville-West, The Edwardians (New York: Literary Guild of America, 1930). See also Amy Cruse, After the Victorians (London: George Allen & Unwin, 1938), pp. 227-230, for a discussion of the rejection of Victorianism and Victorian literature among some Edwardians.

have grown more contemptuous of public opinion, we have become the last word.¹

Ford the traditionalist disliked the trendiness that sought "the last word," and hence, in his and Conrad's English Review manifesto, the denunciation of "superficiality of the specially modern kind" and "the crispness and glitter of a popular statement."²

Ford sought to counter trendiness by including among his contributors writers who had been involved in Victorian literary movements. He was able to get only a few pieces, however. Three of them, a poem by Rossetti, an essay by Watts-Dunton, and a letter by Meredith, were printed in the January, 1909, number. The most important, Rossetti's "The Ballad of Jan Van Hunks,"³ is a long, humorous poem in modified ballad form (44 six-line stanzas, rhymed abcbdb) which tells the story of a miserly old burgher who is so arrogant that he agrees to a pipe-puffing contest with the devil. The poem has considerable charm and occasionally rises to the rich word-painting of which Rossetti was capable:

¹Ford, Ancient Lights, p. 259.

²See above, p. 8.

³Dante Gabriel Rossetti, "The Ballad of Jan Van Hunks," ER 1 (January 1909):193-200. The stanza quoted is on p. 199.

And now the stranger stood astride,
 And taller he seemed to grow,
 The pipe sat firm in his sneering lips,
 And with victorious glow
 Like dancing figures around its bowl
 Did the smoke-wreathes come and go.

The humorous subject, however, does not permit emotional intensity, and the poem cannot be considered among Rossetti's major work. A facsimile of the manuscript of the last three verses appeared opposite the first page of the poem, and a comparison of it with the transcription shows four minor word changes were made in the three stanzas. Perhaps Ford was not above "improving" Rossetti's verse.

Ford got the poem from Watts-Dunton, who reminisced in "Rossettiana: A Glimpse of Rossetti and Morris at Kelmscott,"¹ about the Rossetti circle and explained how he came to have the "Jan Van Hunks" manuscript. It was, he explained, finished in 1882, too late for Ballads and Sonnets (1881), and was intended for a "projected joint miscellany" by Rossetti and himself. The miscellany was never completed, and the poem remained with Watts-Dunton. If the explanation is correct, "Jan Van Hunks" is probably one of the last poems Rossetti wrote.

¹Theodore Watts-Dunton, "Rossettiana: A Glimpse of Rossetti and Morris at Kelmscott," ER 1 (January 1909):323-332.

The short letter which Ford solicited from Meredith, "A Note on Cheyne Walk,"¹ is of no great importance. In it the eighty-year-old author, recalling events of nearly fifty years before, when he lived briefly in the Rossetti household, explained that he did not move out because of his host's "ominous" habit of eating a large breakfast. The English Review also reproduced a line caricature of Rossetti by Ford Madox Brown, dated August, 1879, and depicting the poet stretched out on a sofa, his feet elevated.²

Ford wanted to publish something by Swinburne,³ but the contribution which he finally obtained came too late to appear during his own editorship. The article, a review of "The Earlier Plays of Beaumont and Fletcher," was printed in May, 1910, several months after Ford lost the magazine.⁴ It was both scholarly and sensitive, praising the playwrights and seeking for them their proper place in literary history.

¹George Meredith, "A Note on Cheyne Walk," ER 1 (January 1909):333.

²Ford Madox Brown, "Caricature of Dante Gabriel Rossetti," ER 1 (January 1909):opposite 323.

³See Goldring, South Lodge, pp. 51-52.

⁴A. C. Swinburne, "The Earlier Plays of Beaumont and Fletcher," ER 5 (May 1910):202-216.

The careers of Meredith, Rossetti, Watts-Dunton, and Swinburne all obviously belong to Victorian literature, but another of the writers Ford counted among the great figures was Hardy,¹ whom academics today sometimes see with Conrad, Ford, Bennett, James, and Wells as a transitional figure between Victorianism and modernism.² Hardy was sixty-eight years old in 1908, however, and an author of over twenty-five years' standing whose first novels had appeared while Tennyson, Browning, Arnold, and Trollope were still actively writing. Ford was in awe of Hardy, whom he considered "Victorian" in both outlook and technique. (Hudson and James, the other two major English Review contributors born before 1850, were only one and three years Hardy's junior, respectively, but Ford considered them both "impressionists" like Conrad and himself. Also, both were foreign-born and had not grown up in Victorian England.)³ The strenuous

¹See Ford [E. R.], "The Critical Attitude: The Passing of the Great Figure," ER 4 (December 1909):103.

²See Helmut E. Gerber, "The Nineties: Beginning, End, or Transition?" Edwardians and Late Victorians, ed. Ellmann, pp. 50-79. The academic quarterly edited by Professor Gerber, English Literature in Transition, regards Hardy as a "transitional" figure.

³Several of the other foreign writers whom Ford published were also born in the first half of the previous century. They were Tolstoy (1828), Dostoyevsky (1821), and Anatole France (1844).

efforts Ford made to obtain contributions from the reluctant Hardy have already been described, and the editor saw to it that the three poems which were finally forthcoming occupied a prominent place in the magazine.

"A Sunday Morning Tragedy,"¹ today perhaps remembered mainly for its role in starting the review, is an interesting ballad. In simple and direct language, the persona of the poem, a Wessex mother, laments her unmarried daughter's death during an induced abortion. The poem lapses into sentimentality, however, and its conclusion stretches Hardy's typical irony beyond credible limits: the girl's lover, who had refused to offer marriage, has a change of heart, but when he calls at the girl's home on Sunday morning after church services it is too late and the girl is dead. The poem was daring in 1908, but Ford saw Hardy's treatment of the subject of pre-marital pregnancy and abortion as in the best tradition of the Victorian great figure, forcing his audience to confront social issues.

Hardy's other contribution was "London Nights," a set of two poems, "The Two Rosalinds" and "Reminiscences of a

¹Thomas Hardy, "A Sunday Morning Tragedy," ER 1 (December 1908):1-4.

Dancing Man."¹ The first is especially interesting in its use of widely varying line lengths and irregular metrical patterns, and both evoke the mood of nostalgic regret for time and change which is often present in Hardy.

The items by Meredith, Rossetti, Watts-Dunton, Swinburne, and Hardy are interesting, but even the best of them, Rossetti's "Jan Van Hunks" and Hardy's "A Sunday Morning Tragedy," are not among the writers' important works. The former tends toward triviality, the latter toward mawkishness. However, it is immaterial that the pieces by late Victorians which Ford published are not of major literary significance, for he did not value the Victorians for the quality of their writing but rather for their role as literary men. He rejected virtually all Victorian writers as inartistic; the novelists, he said, paid no attention to technique, and in their carelessness constantly destroyed the illusion of truth which the novelist must seek by introducing improbable or irrelevant character or events or, worse, by intruding into their story with authorial comments,² and

¹ Thomas Hardy, "London Nights," ER 2 (April 1909):1-5.

² Ford frequently expressed this opinion in his reminiscences and writings about literature. See especially The March of Literature, pp. 785-790.

the poets (with a few exceptions, notably Browning, Hardy, and Christina Rossetti) relied, he said, upon "inspiration" rather than genuine feeling. Because of this lack of personal involvement with their subjects, they were guilty, in Ford's critical opinion, of sloppy diction and empty verbal or pictorial effects. He included the pre-Raphaelites among the offenders:

"The art of writing in English received the numbing blow of a sandbag when Rossetti wrote . . . The Blessed Damozel. . . . In the mind of the English writer [was the idea] that writing was a matter of digging for obsolete words with which to express ideas for ever dead and gone."¹

Yet, while dismissing practically everything they wrote, Ford lavishly admired the Victorian literary figures, and it is to the English Review essays on the "Ancient Lights" that one must go for an understanding of the Victorians' significance to the magazine. The most important were Ford's eulogies for Swinburne² and Meredith³ and his essay, "The Passing of the Great Figure."⁴ The latter was subsequently

¹Ford, Ancient Lights, p. 53.

²[Ford], "Algernon Charles Swinburne," ER 2 (May 1909): 193-194.

³Ford [E. R.], "George Meredith, O.M.," ER 2 (June 1909): 409-410.

⁴Ford [E. R.], "The Critical Attitude: The Passing of the Great Figure," 101-110.

included with minor changes in The Critical Attitude (1911), and the general tenor of all the essays was more fully developed in the first volume of his reminiscences, Ancient Lights (1911).

Ford cited Tennyson, Browning, Carlyle, Ruskin, Gladstone, Disraeli, Darwin, and John Stewart Mill as "great figures [who] gained [a] prodigious hold upon the hearts of the people,"¹ and the fact that he listed literary men together with political figures indicated that he admired the writers for their public roles. They were, in the phrase of Lionel Trilling, "opposing selves"² who called contemporary values into question by exploring the implications of industrialism, materialism, urbanization, and other forces which were changing English life. Ford saw them "very much in the position of schoolmaster[s] endowed with great moral prestige," and he was especially cognizant that people listened to them: "Almost every house of the City merchant or of the Lancashire employer of labour during the latter years of [the] last century would be found to contain a copy of the

¹ Ibid., 103.

² Lionel Trilling, The Opposing Self (New York: Viking Press, 1955). The concept of original literature springing from an opposition between the artist and his culture is central to most of Trilling's criticism. The view is, of course, Arnoldian: literature is seen as a "criticism of life." Ford, despite his esthetic concerns, usually tended to see literature in these terms.

later works of Browning or of Ruskin. . . ." ¹ Instead of dismissing the Victorians and ridiculing their earnestness as many post World War I writers were to do, Ford admired and even envied them their positions as arbiters of contemporary values.

Ford's feeling for the pre-Raphaelite circle in which he grew up was somewhat different. His disapproval of their conviction that great art cannot be popular has already been noted, but Ford admired the group's emphasis on originality, their devotion to art, and their willingness to assist one another. Respect for these principles runs through Ancient Lights, and the anecdotes he relates in the book (as, for example, of Ford Madox Brown's practice of sewing his own address label inside Swinburne's coat, so that when the poet was insensibly drunk, cabmen would deliver him to the Brown household, where he could be revived) ² were calculated to illustrate one or another of these points.

Two events, Ford thought, contributed to the passing of the literary Great Figure: the collapse of the esthetic movement in the mid 1890's, and the Boer War of 1899-1902.

¹ Ford [E. R.], "The Passing of the Great Figure," 107.

² Ford, Ancient Lights, pp. 11-13. Ford repeated the anecdote in many other places.

He wrote in The March of Literature, "They [the writers] died of the trial of Oscar Wilde and were swept off the carpet for good by the South African War."¹ The notoriety which the esthetes gained discredited art in the minds of those who had respected the earlier writers. Yeats's description of the movement is well-known: "My father gave these young men their right name. . . . He said 'they are the Hamlets of our age'. Some of these Hamlets went mad, some drank, drinking not as happy men drink but in solitude, all had courage, all suffered public opprobrium . . ."² The extreme of opprobrium was reached at the celebrated Wilde trial in 1895. Ford said, "Wilde I can never forgive" and regretted that "for the sake of sheer vanity" Wilde caused a spectacle which discredited writers in general.³ Ford satirized the esthetes in The Simple Life Limited (1911), where Brandson, the poet, chants romantic lyrics of girls with "grey eyes and milk-white feet . . . snowy forehead[s] and shell-like

¹Ford, The March of Literature, p. 827.

²W. B. Yeats, preface to The Oxford Book of Modern Verse, 1892-1935, ed. W. B. Yeats (New York: Oxford University Press, 1937), p. x.

³Ford, Return to Yesterday, p. 46.

breasts," to associates in the movement who are either absurd idealists or selfish cynics.¹ Ford recognized also that the pre-Raphaelites were immediate ancestors of the esthetes and decadents. Ancient Lights contends that pre-Raphaelism "degenerated into a sort [sic] Aestheticism, and Aestheticism into a sort of mawkish flap-doodle,"² and Tietjens, the stolid, long-suffering hero of Parade's End and the embodiment of Ford's Tory values, deflates the elaborate praise which the social-climbing Macmaster has for Rossetti: "Pre-Raphaelite horrors . . . that obese, oily man who never took a bath, in a grease-spotted dressing gown and the underclothes he's slept in, standing beside a five-shilling model with crimped hair."³ Ford recognized that the esthetes' behavior, publicly flaunted, had antagonized the masses, a reaction he considered tragic.

The Boer War, Ford thought, completed the process of alienation. He wrote in the review that respect for literature "seemed to die with the war in South Africa. . . . For it was the struggle with the Boers that made the fortune of the

¹Ford [Daniel Chaucer], The Simple Life Limited (London: John Lane, 1911), p. 144.

²Ford, Ancient Lights, p. 175.

³Ford, Parade's End, vol. 1: Some Do Not (London: Duckworth, 1924; reprint ed., New York: Signet, 1964), pp. 22-24.

more frivolous Press."¹ The "frivolous Press," as we have seen, sensationalized events, and the emotionalism which it stimulated made rational debate impossible. Many literary men, including Ford, were opposed to the war, but in the general roar voices in opposition were not heard. The press reports were the antithesis of the moral questioning of the Great Figures, and Ford saw the Boer War as a serious setback to the notion that writers and poets could have a public role.

The English Review tried to regain this role and so return public and self respect to literature; hence, Ford's concern to publish Victorian writers, even though he rejected Victorian writing almost entirely. The items he obtained were intended to draw attention to the past, and therefore they were prominently placed. Ford's own pieces about the Ancient Lights were similarly placed on the first pages of the magazine or at the head of "The Month" section, and they were elaborate in their praise. Of Swinburne, he wrote, "To hear him speak was to be in touch with an old and assuredly a very fine tradition,"² and Meredith was called "a great poet," although "the earnestness which he certainly felt he

¹Ford [E. R.], "The Passing of the Great Figure," 108.

²[Ford], "Swinburne," p. 193.

less persistently [than his contemporaries] pushed into the foreground." In the latter eulogy, Ford added, "And, like Mr. Swinburne, Mr. Meredith has not been buried in the Abbey. That, perhaps, is just as well since, because it honours no great men in these days, Westminster Abbey must become the resting place of mediocrities."¹ Pieces about the Victorians by writers other than Ford also appeared. A review of Swinburne's The Age of Shakespeare was less an examination of the book than a tribute to its author: "If his [Swinburne's] judgment . . . falls short of the mark, it remains notwithstanding of the highest value because it serves to explain a literary personality so interesting as Mr. Swinburne."² "The Family Stories of a Public Servant" was a collection of anecdotes about Thackeray, Trollope, and Tennyson similar in tone to Ford's own reminiscences.³

The articles by and about the late Victorians in the review were not the only, nor perhaps even the most important,

¹Ford [E. R.], "Meredith," 409-410.

²L. Levin Schücking, "The Age of Shakespeare by Algernon Charles Swinburne," ER 1 (December 1908):192. Schücking was a German professor whom Ford met in Germany in 1904.

³[M.], "The Family Stories of a Public Servant," ER 1 (March 1909):681-689. Though in some ways similar to Ford's reminiscences, the style of this piece is quite different from Ford's and there seems no possibility that Ford wrote it.

aspects of Ford's emphasis, as editor, on the literary life of that earlier period. He frequently entertained in his flat-editorial office, and his rooms were practically a museum of his pre-Raphaelite boyhood. Ford Madox Brown's 1877 painting "Tell's Son" hung over the fireplace, and Ford constantly reminded his guests that he had been his grandfather's model in the painting. There were many other pictures and paintings, and the furniture in the flat also supposedly had historical and symbolic significance. The Chippendale bureau which served as an editorial desk, for example, had, according to Ford, been a gift from Carlyle to Ford's father, and Christina Rossetti had written her best poems upon it.¹ At his frequent parties, Ford wore an old brown coat which, he said, had once belonged to Dante Gabriel Rossetti. Ford used all these artifacts as beginnings for long anecdotes or conversations about the literary men of the previous era.² There is no reason to believe that either the desk or the jacket was authentic or that all the anecdotes were true. Indeed, when the stories were published in Ancient

¹ Ford, Return to Yesterday, p. 389. See also Hunt, I Have This to Say, p. 12.

² Many people who were associated with the review have commented on this practice in various reminiscences and memoirs. See especially Jessie Chambers [E. T.], D. H. Lawrence, A Personal Record, pp. 169-172.

Lights there were immediate protests that most were fabrications (as Ford admitted in his preface). It would be wrong, however, to dismiss Ford's claim to intimacy with eminent Victorians as mere bragging, for here, as in other cases, Ford's mendacity was consciously intended to communicate an attitude or, in Ford's phrase, an "impression." As a study of Ford has pointed out, he was not an unprincipled liar; quite the contrary, he was a liar on principle.¹ In this instance, he wanted to communicate his conviction that the review should be a haven for artists and a means for intelligent men of letters to present their views to a concerned public. What could be more fitting than that he wore Rossetti's old jacket during the congenial parties that brought literary people together at 84 Holland Park Avenue, or that he wrote his editorials on the desk on which Carlyle had written critiques of English life?

Yet, despite his admiration for the Victorian Great Figures' stature, Ford recognized that the past could not be recreated, nor that it should be. He saw the dangers inherent in the absolute dominance the earlier writers had exercised

¹ Grover Smith, Ford Madox Ford, Columbia Essays on Modern Writers (New York: Columbia University Press, 1972), p. 5.

over the art of their era, and that their immense authority had stifled creativity. Thus, in the preface dedicating Ancient Lights to his daughters, he cautioned, "Do not desire to be Ancient Lights . . . Nowadays we have no great figures and I thank Heaven for it, because you and I can breathe freely."¹ He did not, however, ridicule the eminent Victorians for their prudery or moral earnestness, even in the post World War I period when it became fashionable to do so. Throughout his life, he admired a time when "there were Strong Men" who brought prestige and authority to art.²

Given Ford's elaborate emphasis on the Victorians, it is not surprising that Pound considered them one of the generations involved with the English Review, even though only a small number of contributions by them appeared in the magazine. These pieces, together with essays about the Victorians by Ford and others, are an important segment of the magazine. Ford did not expect the review to be a platform for future Carlyles and Ruskins, but he did intend it to be

¹Ford, Ancient Lights, p. xi.

²Ford used the phrase as the title for a chapter on the Victorians in a critical book published not long before he died: Portraits From Life (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1937). The view of the Victorians he expressed in the book is essentially identical to that which he had expressed in the review nearly three decades earlier.

a forum in which sincere men could bring serious subjects to public attention, and in which art could define and clarify public issues. Furthermore, the magazine could draw artists together for their mutual benefit. Such had once been the case, and Ford's efforts at publishing material by and about the earlier generation was intended to reawaken a concept which, in Ford's view, was in danger of passing away.

CHAPTER FOUR

"THE MONTH": COMMENTARY AND CRITICISM

"The Month," the section of the English Review containing criticism, reviews, and commentary on domestic and foreign policy, occupied the last fifty or so pages of each number, and an examination of the section reveals the journal's attitude toward contemporary affairs, its artistic credo, and the relationship that existed between the two. Thus, the section provides a sense of the criteria which Ford used to select poetry and belles lettres for the magazine, even though many of the articles in it are about events and controversies now forgotten.

More than fifty writers wrote for "The Month" during Ford's editorship. Ford himself contributed far more than any of the others, and at least one or two pieces by him, always unsigned or under a pseudonym, appeared in each number. There were some other unsigned articles, but the English Review, unlike most of its competitors, usually attributed the authorship of its reviews and political commentary.

Besides Ford, only J. A. Hobson, a writer and lecturer on Liberal Party causes and a member of the National Liberal Club, and Hilaire Belloc, author and Liberal M.P. elected in 1906, published more than two or three items. Other contributors included several of the people closely associated with Ford during and immediately after the review's founding (Conrad, Marwood, David Garnett, Reynolds) and writers and politicians he had come to know in the busy London years just prior to his editorship (G. K. Chesterton, regarded in 1909 as a leading critic and reform advocate; Sir Charles Dilke and G. P. Gooch, both Liberal M.P.'s and National Liberal Club members, and H. W. Nevinson, another Club member and a leading journalist with a traveller's knowledge of Africa, Russia, and the Balkans). Practically all the other contributors were also known to Ford personally, including Sidney Webb, the Fabian socialist, whom Ford met during his brief period as a Fabian in 1906. Two exceptions were President Taft and the Ali Khan, international figures from whom Ford obtained articles. Although the list of contributors to "The Month" includes some well-known names, most writers who appeared, unlike most who contributed belles lettres, are not readily recognized today. Nearly a third were sufficiently well-known in 1909, however, to be listed in the year's Who's Who,

primarily as writers, journalists, or politicians associated with reform causes of the Liberal Party.

The articles in "The Month" divide themselves naturally into two groups, those on social and political matters and those on literature and the arts. Ford's pieces often combine the two, however, and in discussing the contents of the section it will be convenient to begin with a brief survey of the social and political pieces, to move from these to an examination of Ford's commentary and criticism, and to conclude with a discussion of remaining criticism and reviews.

Of the political pieces by writers other than Ford, articles on foreign affairs were most numerous. Most were thoughtful and well-informed, and through them ran a consistent concern for liberalism and democracy abroad. There were, for example, three articles on Russia,¹ three on Spain,² two on

¹David Soskice [D. S.], "Russia," ER 1 (January 1909): 339-350; Soskice [D. S.], "The Russian Spy System," ER 1 (March 1909):816-832; Leo Mechelin, "Les Intérêts de la Russie," ER 4 (December 1909):132-137.

²R. B. Cunninghame-Graham, "Spain's Future is in Spain," ER 3 (September 1909):335-342; W. T. Goode, "Today in Madrid," ER 3 (September 1909):343-348; Goode, "The Present Moment in Spain," ER 3 (October 1909):525-542.

Persia,¹ and one each on Turkey,² Finland,³ and Poland,⁴ and in each the author set out to show that established regimes were repressive, corrupt, and inept, and that liberal movements offered hope for the future. The conclusions reached in "The Counter-revolution in Turkey" were typical:

To support the Young Turks . . . is perhaps to make for this immense Empire a bright future, and for Europe peace. To desert them, to oppose them, is to consign Turkey to ruin and to prepare for Europe War.⁵

The writer attempted to demonstrate the pragmatism of supporting the liberals, but emphasized their moral claim to leadership. In arguing that a general concern for human welfare and world peace ought to take precedence over narrow economic concerns and the maneuvers of power politics, the article on Turkey was representative of the foreign policy stance of the magazine.

¹Eustache de Lorey, "Persia," ER 1 (January 1909):351-360. Edward G. Browne, "The Persian Crisis," ER 3 (August 1909):173-181.

²H. N. Brailsford, "The Counter-Revolution in Turkey," ER 2 (May 1909):368-380.

³J. N. Reuter, "The Rights of Finland at Stake," ER 4 (December 1909):138-145.

⁴G. W., "The Rise of the Pan Polish Party," ER 2 (May 1909):381-384.

⁵Brailsford, "The Counter-Revolution in Turkey," p. 380.

This concern for liberalism abroad was probably promoted by David Soskice, the husband of Ford's younger sister, who was himself deeply involved in Russian politics. Soskice fled the Czar's police in the nineties,¹ and in England quickly became active in the large Russian exile community. He entered Ford's circle through the introduction of Constance Garnett, who was then engaged in translating the Russian novelists and on personal terms with many exiled Russian intellectuals. Soskice edited Free Russia, an expatriate periodical, and in 1906 returned briefly with Ford's sister to St. Petersburg where he was rearrested, but soon released.² Soskice wrote two English Review articles which attacked the Czar's regime and urged support for the liberals' attempts to overthrow it, and he and his fellow revolutionaries-in-exile were frequent visitors at 84 Holland Park Avenue. Ford's reminiscences refer to the spies, counterspies, and assorted secret agents he had to contend with as editor.³ In the summer of 1909, when the review was in desperate financial straits,

¹ Mizener, The Saddest Story, p. 38.

² Ibid., p. 116.

³ See especially Return to Yesterday, p. 136. Ford's statement that he was offered "the diary of the late Tsar" for publication is not corroborated.

Soskice and his friends were a major source of support. Ford later reported that they insisted on using the magazine as an ideological forum,¹ and an examination of the review's tables of contents supports this contention to some degree. "The Month" occupied a somewhat larger portion of the magazine in the fall of 1909, when Soskice's financial support and influence were at their height, than it did during previous periods, but the general nature of the views expressed was consistent throughout Ford's editorship.

In imperial matters, the English Review did not question England's right to the empire, but stressed the responsibility for the well-being of other peoples which, as a wealthy, powerful, and civilized state, she bore. Marwood in the third number saw British rule as the only alternative to chaos and civil war on the Indian sub-continent, but warned that the government's colonial policy ought not to be made for the benefit of British investors.² The Ali Khan's "The Present Discontent in India"³ suggested that educational

¹Ibid., pp. 391-392.

²Arthur Marwood[A. M.], "British India," ER 1 (February 1909):569-575.

³Syed Sirdar Ali Khan, "The Present Discontent in India," ER 1 (February 1909):576-583.

opportunities for Indians be greatly improved, and that qualified natives be included at the highest levels of colonial government. In November, a program to promote "spiritual contact" between England and India was proposed,¹ and in another issue, J. A. Hobson argued for "spiritual contact" between the white and native populations of South Africa:

There can be no enduring peace, no steady progress and prosperity in a South Africa where the vast bulk of the work of industry is done by men who are denied all opportunity to participate . . . in the government of the country which is morally theirs. . . . South African Union as is now established will be a close replica . . . of the Southern States of the American Commonwealth, where the races subsist side by side in the same land in no organic spiritual contact with one another, each race suffering the moral, intellectual, and industrial penalty of this disunion.²

On Irish Home Rule, the review took no clear stand. The two articles which appeared on the issue³ recognized that self-government was inevitable (" . . . until the majority of the people feel that they have in a measure a shaping hand

¹Vidván, "India in England," ER 3 (November 1909): 707-715.

²J. A. Hobson, "South Africa as an Imperial Asset," ER 3 (September 1909):324-334. The quotation is on 333. Hobson was objecting to the laws establishing the Union of South Africa, which placated whites in the former Boer states but disenfranchised natives in the British Cape Colony.

³[Britannicus], "The Dominance of the Irish Question," ER 2 (June 1909):590-599; R. D. H., "The Proposal of Britannicus," ER 2 (July 1909):819-821. The quotation is from the former article, 597.

in their own government . . . the country will never be contented"), but the issue was seen tied to other controversies and therefore hostage to partisan political maneuvering.

The danger of war in Europe was recognized in several articles. Nevinson's well-informed study of the Balkans in the first number described the volatile mixture of local nationalism and big power politics that existed in that area,¹ while Brailsford's "The Hush in Europe" a few months later pointed out the perils inherent in Anglo-German rivalry.² In another number Sir Charles Dilke analyzed the danger of European political maneuvering and proposed the establishment of a Parliamentary standing committee to monitor foreign policy.³ All of these articles avoided anti-German bellicosity, but stressed that Britain must keep up defenses and supported the alliance with France.

William Howard Taft's "An Answer to the Panama Canal Critics"⁴ did not bear upon British policy, but treated a

¹H. W. Nevinson, "A Note on the Balkans," ER 1 (December 1908):182-187.

²H. N. Brailsford, "The Hush in Europe," ER 2 (July 1909):779-793.

³Sir Charles W. Dilke, "Foreign Affairs," ER 3 (October 1909):495-500.

⁴William Howard Taft, "An Answer to the Panama Canal Critics," ER 2 (May 1909):394-408.

topic which was of great interest in England and around the world. As Roosevelt's Secretary of War, Taft had directed Canal construction before his inauguration as President in March, 1909, and his article defended the building of a lock-type canal instead of the sea-level canal which critics advocated. The English Review did not say so, but the article had been prepared for McClure's Magazine in America, where it appeared with numerous illustrations in May, the same month in which Ford published it.¹ There is no evidence to suggest, however, that the review frequently carried material which appeared elsewhere.

¹McClure's 33 (May 1909):3-14. McClure's comes up a number of times in connection with the English Review. Ford called on S. S. McClure during his visit to America in 1906, and later there was talk of his financing a British magazine under Ford's editorship (see above, p. 49). There is no evidence that McClure was ever involved in the English Review (although, when Ford was in desperate financial straits late in 1909 he hoped to get money from the American publisher). The editorial office of the U.S. magazine was obviously in contact with Ford. David Soskice's article "The Russian Spy System," which Ford used in March 1909, turned up nearly a year later in a slightly expanded form in McClure's: "The Story of Eugene Azeff: An Unmasking of Russia's Secret Police System," McClure's 34 (January 1910):282-299. McClure's did not mention that the piece had appeared elsewhere. Arnold Bennett's play "What the Public Wants" (see below, p.163), issued as a separate "special supplement" to the July 1909 number of the English Review, was also reprinted in the American magazine, again with no indication of previous periodical publication: Bennett, "What the Public Wants," McClure's 34 (January February March 1909):301-315, 419-429, 499-517.

As this survey of foreign policy articles indicates, Ford attempted to keep readers informed of events around the world by publishing analytical articles on topics of interest. A thoughtful tone prevailed throughout, but almost all contributors insisted that British policy encourage enlightened government abroad. Britain's moral responsibilities as the world's leading power were stressed, while the commercial advantages of power were de-emphasized.

This foreign policy position is hardly startling, but on domestic issues the magazine published articles that were more idiosyncratic. These were less numerous than those on foreign policy, but they revealed the attitudes of Ford and his circle. The general thrust of opinion was evident from the first number. In it, R. B. Cunninghame Graham compared contemporary society to the late Roman Empire when "everything was breaking down, and though intelligent people saw that this was the case, no one could propose a remedy."¹ He recognized that widespread unemployment caused by the 1908 economic slump had brought "a spirit . . . unknown since the days of the Chartists" and proposed a massive program of

¹R. B. Cunninghame Graham, "Aspects of the Social Question," ER 1 (December 1908):165-168. The quotation is on 165.

government-sponsored public works to reduce unemployment.

In the long run, however, he envisioned egalitarian socialism replacing the commercial system with its "worship of wealth and success."

W. H. Davies, known to Edwardians as "the tramp poet," saw another aspect to high unemployment, and in "How it Feels to be Unemployed"¹ suggested that workers, freed of day-to-day drudgery in factories and mills, would refuse industrial jobs once they had "properly filled their lungs with the air of freedom" during their jobless period. The number also had the first installment of Marwood's "A Complete Actuarial Scheme for Insuring John Doe Against all the Vicissitudes of Life,"² which outlined an elaborate plan for compulsory insurance to protect workers against unemployment, illness, and poverty in old age. Marwood worked up the scheme out of a sense of duty, Ford later said, for "as a Tory of the land-owning class, he had a special distrust of all employers of

¹W. H. Davies, "How it Feels to be Out of Work," ER 1 (December 1908):168-171. In the index to the volume, the title is listed as "How it Feels to be Unemployed." Davies came to Ford's attention through Edward Garnett, who had noted and admired his first published poems and encouraged him to write his autobiography.

²Arthur Marwood [A. M.], "A Complete Actuarial Scheme for Insuring John Doe against all the Vicissitudes of Life," ER 1 (December 1908, January 1909):171-175, 363-369.

labour and a special affection for the workingman as individual--if not for the working classes in the mass."¹

The second installment appeared in the January number, which also contained two pieces on "small-producers," self-employed farmers, fishermen, and artisans independent of the factory system. "The Marketing of Small Produce"² made the point that city dwellers who went to the country for a healthy and idyllic life of market gardening often failed miserably. The author never explained why, but hinted that the intricacies of the marketing system denied small farmers a fair return on their labor. Stephen Reynolds's article on the marketing of fish made a similar point: the longshore fishermen of Devon, he said, were being driven out of business because of discrimination against them by the marketing system, and so "the nation will lose one of its best and most prolific breeds of men and the Navy its best recruiting ground."³ Concern for independent producers was also the subject of "Balance-sheet of a Twenty-five-acre Holding"⁴ which detailed a year's

¹Ford, Return to Yesterday, p. 380.

²G., "Marketing of Small Produce," ER 1 (January 1909):377-379.

³Stephen Reynolds, "Marketing of Small Produce," ER 1 (January 1909):380-384. The quotation is on 384.

⁴F. E. Green, "Balance-sheet of a Twenty-five-acre Holding," ER 1 (January 1909):605-608.

operation of a small farm in Surrey.

G. K. Chesterton, in "The Homelessness of Jones,"¹ made the point that few English workers owned their houses. Maldistribution of property came to England, he said, with anti-Catholicism, when aristocrats received large free-holds from the Crown in return for support against the Church. The situation was unfortunate, he went on, but it was not likely to change, since "Socialism and the Manchester School are very much the same. . . . Both imagine that the mass of the people must be submissive wage-earners." Beside this article was one by Hilaire Belloc, who shared Chesterton's attitude to neo-medievalism and anti-industrialism.² Belloc's "The Source of Information"³ made a striking appearance; long passages were blacked out because, as a footnote explained, the editor was "mindful of the law of libel." The article charged that the media of information, particularly the newspapers, were controlled by a few people who out of caution, ineptitude, or conspiracy prevented the public from being adequately informed. Belloc's article, Ford later said, "contained the

¹G. K. Chesterton, "The Homelessness of Jones," ER 1 (March 1909):809-815.

²See especially Hynes, "The Chesterbelloc," Edwardian Occasions (New York: Oxford University Press, 1972), pp. 80-90.

³Hilaire Belloc, "The Source of Information," ER 1 (March 1909):799-808.

ultimatums the powers accepted the Dual Monarchy's action. Ford spoke against the settlement: "We heaved sighs of relief, and at the same time we felt as if we had seen a rabbit slaughtered by a burly poacher."¹ The crisis had revealed the lack of coherent plans symptomatic of a failure of the critical attitude:

What is needed in the nation is a sense of responsibility, and a sense of responsibility, too, is what is needed in the Oligarchies that from time to time rule us. . . . Let us, in the name of peace, make quite certain how our house stands. . . . Let us proclaim . . . that we are quietly confident in our strength. Then let us be quiet about it.²

The Balkan Crisis was still on Ford's mind two months later: "We have proved ourselves craven, we have proved our alliance is worthless to an ally," he charged, and added that English tradition should have led the nation to oppose the annexation and to support liberal risings in Persia and Turkey.³ In each instance, however, "a certain glow of humanitarian faith, a certain visionary quality"⁴ had lacked in the Liberal government's leadership.

¹Ibid., 355.

²Ibid., 360.

³Ford [E. R.], "The Critical Attitude: Splendid Isolations," ER 2 (July 1909):761-766. The quotation is on 765.

⁴Ibid., 763.

Most of the articles on domestic policies dealt with social and economic or economically-related issues, but other areas of concern were discussed as well. Nevinson's witty and perceptive piece on women's suffrage¹ held that the vote for women would end hypocrisy based on the Victorians' elaborately exalted view of women. There were also items advocating reform of the divorce law² and proposing innovation in education.³

Thus, the English Review supported most of the standard Liberal causes of the day--increases in social welfare programs, elimination of the Lords' veto power, a foreign policy which did not stifle the growth of liberal democracy abroad--but there were some interesting variations on standard Liberal themes. There was a general suspicion of industrialism and an accompanying conviction that a rural community of artisans, farmers, and fishermen was preferable to an urban and industrial society, since the factory system destroyed human values and dignity. There was the feeling that

¹H. W. Nevinson, "Women's Vote and Men," ER 3 (November 1909):687-696.

²E. S. P. Haynes, "Divorce Law Reform" ER 3 (November 1909):724-729.

³M. E. Robinson, "Youth for Teachers," ER 3 (September 1909):349-356.

in a properly ordered society responsible leadership would insure the public welfare by initiating whatever measures were required to alleviate poverty, disease, and ignorance. Finally, there was an undercurrent of belief that reform was thwarted because selfish interests controlled not only the means of production and distribution but the media of information as well, and that through an unspoken conspiracy the proper evolution of society was blocked.

These attitudes were central to the twenty-two separate articles which Ford himself wrote for "The Month."¹ In them, he offered opinions on current affairs and emphasized the role creative artists could have in reorienting society from what he saw as its current decline. Somewhat surprisingly, he gave comparatively little attention to the technical aspects of writing, although they had dominated his decade-long collaboration with Conrad, barely complete in 1908 when

¹Three of these appeared in January and February, 1910, after Ford had been removed as editor. They are considered here, however, because they obviously belong with the articles that appeared during his editorship since they deal with the same concerns. After February, 1910, no reviews or criticism by Ford appeared in the magazine for nearly two years, although the new editor accepted a short story for publication in the April, 1911, issue. Ford did not sign his name to any of his commentaries, but Harvey's Ford, A Bibliography, pp. 161-166, identifies those he wrote. Harvey's authoritative judgments have been followed, except in a few instances which are indicated.

the review was founded. The terms which the two had argued over--"impressionism," le mot juste, "getting an atmosphere," "rendering," "time shift," progression d'effet--were seldom mentioned in the review, where editorial attention focused on "The Functions of the Arts in the Republic" and "The Critical Attitude." It is important to add that Ford had by no means forgotten technical considerations, nor had he abandoned esthetic concerns for didacticism. Both he and most of his contemporaries believed that literature could at once imaginatively delight and practically enlighten. In fact, the assumption that literature not only could but ought to do both was the central principle governing editorial decisions.

Ford began the first of his critical editorials, "The Functions of the Arts in the Republic: I. Literature," by alluding to this twin purpose.¹ The new magazine, he announced, "devoted as it is to the arts and to letters, is devoted in addition to ideas." Literature he divided into three categories. The "merely inventive" had a "nearly negligible" interest for intelligent men because it was essentially trivial; the "factual" was lifeless and so missed

¹[Ford], "The Functions of the Arts in the Republic: I. Literature," ER 1 (December 1908):157-160.

the human truth that lay behind statistics or sequences of events; only the "imaginative" rendered life in all its complexity, and by assessing "where we stand," fulfilled a vital function:

. . . what we so very much need today is a picture of the life we live. It is only the imaginative writer who can supply this, because no collection of facts and no tabulation of figures can give us any sense of proportion. . . . England, less than any of the nations, knows where it stands, or to what it trends.¹

Imaginative literature, said Ford, should be an "expression of [the writer's] view of life as it is, not as he would like it to be," and he cited Henry James as the living writer whose work met this standard.

Today's student of the novel, accustomed to seeing James as "The Master" who gave uncompromising attention to the esthetics of form, may find Ford's praise strange, for it assumes that James was not only a realist but a didacticist as well. Ford saw no incompatibility, however, and the view of James expressed in the first number of the review dominated his subsequent book-length monograph, Henry James (1913).²

¹Ibid., 160.

²Ford, Henry James (London: Martin Secker, 1913). The date is as given, although Harvey reports actual publication took place in 1914. See Harvey, Ford, A Bibliography, pp. 42-43.

There he praised James as a master craftsman, while emphasizing that "his greatness . . . is that of the historian."¹ The imaginative writer-historian, he continued, provided "an unbiased picture of the world we live in"² and so performed a vital service:

It remains therefore for the novelist--and particularly for the realist among novelists--to give us the very matter upon which we shall build the theories of the new body politic.³

Evidently Ford had a clear opinion of the writer's role: he should be an honest, intelligent, sensitive examiner of all aspects of day-to-day life.

This view clearly belonged to the mainstream of Victorian criticism, echoing as it did Carlyle, Ruskin, and especially Arnold, with his conception of art as a "criticism of life" and his injunction to "see life steadily and to see it whole." As we have seen, Ford acknowledged the Victorian heritage of his magazine by paying suitable homage to a past when, he believed, artists were seen as wise and humane contributors to public life.

Ford's analysis of "The Functions of the Arts in the Republic," begun in the first number with literature, continued in subsequent issues with examinations of drama, music,

¹Ibid., p. 22. ²Ibid., p. 46. ³Ibid., p. 48.

and the plastic arts. Unfortunately, these were much less provocative and informed than the first essay. The one on drama modestly complimented Shaw and Barrie as playwrights who "do render some service to the Republic [because] the one quickens our emotions [Barrie], the other our thoughts [Shaw],"¹ but in general Ford found little to praise on the Edwardian stage and declared instead, "It is to the music halls that we must go nowadays for any form of pulse-stirring."² Music halls attracted huge crowds to nightly variety shows of popular songs, dances, acrobatics, comedy, and skits which were based on events and personalities in the news. Many cultural historians regard them as examples of Edwardian gaudy superficiality, but Ford felt that some of the "turns" offered a "picture of the life we live now" that was not available on the more conventional stage. This assessment seems unfair,

¹[Ford], "The Functions of the Arts in the Republic: II. The Drama," ER 1 (January 1909):319-322. The quotation appeared on p. 322.

²Ibid., 320. Ford loved the music halls and during his editorship frequently attended the Shepherd's Bush Empire, located near his editorial office and flat. He usually took his sub-editor and during the duller turns the two worked on the magazine, with Ford reading manuscripts or dictating letters. See Goldring, Reputations, pp. 217-218. Ford expressed his admiration for the music halls in a letter to his literary agent in Spring, 1909, and proposed a series of articles on popular stars. The project was never carried out. See Ford's letter to J. B. Pinker, 24 March 1909, in Letters of Ford Madox Ford, ed. Ludwig, pp. 38-39.

for, as numerous literary historians have pointed out, the stage was in fact in the midst of an exciting revival in the pre-war decades, and offered controversial drama both from England and abroad.¹

Ford's analysis of music was likewise uninformed. His father had been an important music critic, but Ford was obviously out of his depth in attempting to assess the musical scene.² In words that were occasionally pompous, he speculated vaguely that English folk ballads might offer the germ for a new national music and stated that he was "on the lookout for a rising star." The name of Elgar, who in 1900 had written The Dream of Gerontius and who had been praised by Richard Strauss as "the first English progressivist musician,"³ was never mentioned.

The plastic arts were scrutinized in the last of the "Functions of the Arts" series. While not particularly

¹ See especially Hynes, "The Theater and the Lord Chamberlain," in The Edwardian Turn of Mind, pp. 212-253, for a discussion of the controversy generated by the new drama.

² [Ford], "The Functions of the Arts in the Republic: III. Music," ER 1 (February 1909):565-568.

³ Frank Howes, "Music," Edwardian England 1901-1914, ed. Nowell-Smith, p. 414. Ford's reference in It Was the Nightingale (Philadelphia: Lippincott, 1933), pp. 161-162 to perhaps having met Elgar at Henry James's Lamb House is metaphorical.

perceptive, the essay was remarkable for its uniquely pragmatic justification of art museums.¹ When the article appeared, "modern" art was already being talked about in London, and Roger Fry's Post-Impressionist show was only a little over a year away, but Ford seemed unaware of what was in the wind. Instead, he justified the national art collection as a capital investment, and calculated that art-loving tourists brought exactly £ 44,400,000 to England per year; therefore, "it should be the ideal of a State directed upon soundly commercial lines to become the Art centre of the world. It pays."²

Many of the rest of Ford's articles had little to do with the arts and focused instead on contemporary politics. "The Personality of the German Emperor" has not heretofore been attributed to Ford, but both style and pseudonym leave little doubt that he wrote it.³ Like other foreign policy

¹Ford [E. R.], "The Functions of the Arts in the Republic: IV. The Plastic Arts," ER 1 (March 1909):795-798.

²Ibid., 796.

³Ford [A-D.], "The Personality of the German Emperor," trans. by I.v.A., ER 1 (December 1908):176-182. The signature "A-D." was derived from "Aschendorff," the name of the publishing firm Ford's German relatives operated in Münster. Ford used the name as a literary pseudonym, sometimes making it "Aschendrof," which lent itself to backward spelling. Ford used an English variation of "Aschendorff" as the name for one of his most memorable characters, Edward Ashburnham of The Good Soldier (the English "ham" as a suffix designating a place or location is equivalent to the German "dorf"), thus indi-

commentators, Ford saw Germany as a probable future enemy.

Part of the trouble, he said, was that the Kaiser was a fuzzy thinker who had "no very exact sense of the meaning of words,"¹ probably because he paid insufficient attention to imaginative writing. Ford published another foreign policy item in the second number, this a puzzling study of succession to the throne of the Netherlands.² The article reviewed the relevant

cating that he based the fictional character on himself, or at least one aspect of himself. "The Nature of a Crime," a product of the Ford/Conrad collaboration, appeared in the review in April and May 1909, under the pseudonym "Baron Ignatz von Aschendorf"; the Polish name "Ignatz" stood for Conrad. "I.v.A." was the way the "translator" of the article on the Kaiser signed himself. Thus, both the initials of the "author" and the "translator" point to Ford as the real writer.

If further proof is necessary, the piece itself provides it. The style is vintage Ford: authoritative and even bombastic, serious, but at the same time with a slightly comic edge. In characterizing the Kaiser as an imprecise romantic, Ford was expressing a view of the German temperament that was to become increasingly important to his thought. Ford's view of Germany is a complex subject; his father was German and Ford was close to his German relatives. Before the war he visited Germany frequently and in 1910-1911 he tried (for personal rather than philosophical reasons) to gain German citizenship. He came, however, to associate the "Nordic" culture with zealotry, schismatic puritanism, and fuzzy-headed romanticism, while the "Mediterranean" culture represented tolerance, reverence for tradition, and love of art. The view reached its greatest expression in Provence (Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott, 1935) and Great Trade Route. It is also the philosophical basis for The March of Literature, Ford's highly impressionistic literary history. The concept was present in seminal form in this article on the Kaiser.

¹Ibid., 179.

²Ford, [E. Roterodamus], "The House of Orange," ER 1 (January 1909):360-362. Ford was again having fun with names. Erasmus's views on women made the use of his name ironic in

statutes of the Dutch constitution, and then noted that law had given way to practicality, because a queen occupied the throne despite legal provisions that succession must follow the male line. What Ford intended by the article remains unclear.

Ford also treated foreign affairs in three of his ten essays on "The Critical Attitude." In the first of the series, he commented on the 1909 Dreadnought controversy, recognizing the German naval threat and advocating not only laying down eight battleships but establishing a national army as well.¹ He disapproved, however, of the way the debate over military armament was being conducted; thus, the debate rather than the issue itself was the focus of his concern. He attacked the Northcliffe press for sensationalism, charged that the government had adopted the press's methods, and concluded:

What we need above everything is calmness--what
we need above everything is the critical attitude. . . .
But it is lamentable that this desirable end

this context, and the initials were convenient, since Ford signed many of his review editorials "E. R." (for English Review).

¹Ford [F.], "The Critical Attitude: Blue Water and the Thin Red Line," ER 2 (April 1909):135-144. See Ford, Return to Yesterday, p. 393, for Ford's account of how the article "shook out my Left-Centre supporters."

[strengthening the fleet] should not be attainable by other means than those of sensationalism.¹

By "critical attitude," Ford meant a rational, clear-headed approach that began with an honest assessment of the situation, stated attainable and mutually consistent goals, and chose among alternative plans of action to achieve these goals.

The attitude, Ford thought, was absent in England:

For the man on the street is essentially the uncritical man. . . . He has information, but its sources are tainted by the interests of the men who supply it.²

Ford considered the goals of the battleship advocates admirable but their means unfortunate and even dangerous, because a public which was swayed in one direction by emotion could as easily be swayed in another. If democratic decision-making were to proceed on this basis, he thought, Britain was in serious trouble.

The next of "The Critical Attitude" essays likewise addressed a foreign policy question, this the 1908 annexation of Bosnia and Herzegovina by the Austro-Hungarian Empire.³ The action and the big power maneuvering which it prompted nearly caused war, but after a flurry of ultimatums and counter-

¹Ibid., 137.

²Ibid., 141.

³Ford [F.], "The Critical Attitude: Little States and Great Nations," ER 2 (May 1909):355-364.

ultimatums the powers accepted the Dual Monarchy's action. Ford spoke against the settlement: "We heaved sighs of relief, and at the same time we felt as if we had seen a rabbit slaughtered by a burly poacher."¹ The crisis had revealed the lack of coherent plans symptomatic of a failure of the critical attitude:

What is needed in the nation is a sense of responsibility, and a sense of responsibility, too, is what is needed in the Oligarchies that from time to time rule us. . . . Let us, in the name of peace, make quite certain how our house stands. . . . Let us proclaim . . . that we are quietly confident in our strength. Then let us be quiet about it.²

The Balkan Crisis was still on Ford's mind two months later: "We have proved ourselves craven, we have proved our alliance is worthless to an ally," he charged, and added that English tradition should have led the nation to oppose the annexation and to support liberal risings in Persia and Turkey.³ In each instance, however, "a certain glow of humanitarian faith, a certain visionary quality"⁴ had lacked in the Liberal government's leadership.

¹Ibid., 355.

²Ibid., 360.

³Ford [E. R.], "The Critical Attitude: Splendid Isolations," ER 2 (July 1909):761-766. The quotation is on 765.

⁴Ibid., 763.

Ford's foreign policy commentaries were consistent with the Liberal idealistic stance of the magazine's other foreign affairs articles. They also showed Ford's conviction that policy, too, often sprang from short-sighted cynicism, and that few in the government or in the press knew "where it [the nation] stands or to what it tends." Lacking "critical attitude," policy was illogical and inconsistent.

The same attitude ruled Ford's statements on domestic policy. In the first issue he addressed the unemployment and labor unrest of the 1908 recession while reviewing Stephen Reynolds's novel, A Poor Man's House (1908): ". . . the poor are breaking in on us everywhere. . . . If the winter is very hard . . . they may sack West London."¹ Most educated Englishmen, the book review said, knew almost nothing about these people because "it is astonishing how little literature has to show us of the life of the poor."² Reynolds's novel of life among the fishermen of Devon was, according to Ford, an antidote to ignorance and so fulfilled "the functions of the arts." Ford reviewed C. F. G. Masterman's The Condition of

¹[Ford], "The Unemployed" (review of Stephen Reynolds's A Poor Man's House), ER 1 (December 1908):161-164. The quotation is on 161-162.

²Ibid., 162-163.

England (1909) in a later issue and considered it useful but inferior to Reynolds's fiction:

Mr. Masterman has done this [explaining the situation of the poor] very well, but he has done it a little statistically, a little coldly. For ourselves, we wish that . . . he had given us a more emotional, a more keenly analytical picture of the great people.¹

The novelist and the non-fiction writer, Ford believed, performed the same function, but the novelist was more effective.

The June "Critical Attitude" essay attacked both Lloyd George's 1909 budget and the Conservatives that opposed it. Ford criticized the budget as a series of dreary compromises.² Although it tended toward socialism, the Liberals had stopped short of "definitely throwing down the glove to the landed interests." Then, he said, "we should have known where we stood." Ford's argument became disorganized and confused: he charged that increased taxes on the extremely wealthy would destroy work incentives among the very poor who aspired to wealth; then, after attacking the budget for taxing the rich unfairly, he reversed his argument and said various of the

¹Ford [E. R.], "Review" (of C. F. G. Masterman's The Condition of England), ER 3 (August 1909):182-184. The quotation is from 183.

²[Ford], "The Critical Attitude: Finance," ER 2 (June 1909):581-586.

proposed new taxes bore unfairly on the poor. Obviously, Ford's quarrel with the budget was not for what it said but for the passions it aroused. His "analysis" was really a "plague-on-both-your-houses" abdication in which all sides were charged with selfishness, shortsightedness, and demagoguery. His examination of the women's suffrage question was in the same vein. There he announced general support for votes for women, but disgust at the passion and partisan political feeling that the question prompted.¹

Ford's view of contemporary politics was completely and most bitterly expressed in three articles written at the end of his editorship. The failure of the review confirmed what he felt was wrong in society, and the three pieces were a Parthian shot at the entire political establishment. The first began:

Could anything be more depressing than the present state of public affairs? . . . They have been at work for so many centuries these two parties and where do they stand? On the lowest rung of the ladder! . . . And from both sides come perpetual cries of "Grab."²

The article went on to attack a favorite target, the Northcliffe press, "with its perpetual yelping about Socialism." The

¹Ford [E. R.], "The Critical Attitude: Militants Here in Earth," ER 3 (August 1909):137-142.

²[Ford], "The Critical Attitude: Women's Suffrage, The Circulating Libraries, The Drama, Fine Arts, Etc.," ER 4 (January 1910):329-346.

Conservatives had "lost all claim to respect" for their scare tactics, but the ruling Liberals were no better: they jailed suffragettes while professing to favor suffrage, sold out liberal movements abroad while pretending to champion international morality, and exiled Indian leaders who criticized British colonial policy. The last of the "Critical Attitude" essays declared the cause lost: "Nothing will make the Englishmen adopt a critical attitude."¹ Ford compared the critic in England to a slug in a beehive: either stung to death or quietly isolated in a thick wax capsule from which "escape neither groans nor foul odours." The article offered the fullest definition yet of the "critical attitude." It was, Ford wrote, an unflinching honesty which exposed cant and hypocrisy, intolerable because it might "demonstrate to ourselves the hollowness of our beliefs . . . [and] put into our hearts the doubt not only of ourselves but of our leaders."²

The last of Ford's English Review editorials was the clearest expression of the "Toryism" that ruled his imagination

¹Ford [E. R.], "The Critical Attitude: On the Objection to the Critical Attitude," ER 4 (February 1910):531-542.

²Ibid., 535.

to appear in the magazine.¹ Ford adopted his "Jove-abdicated-in-disgust"² manner in the piece, speaking through a persona, who "for the last twelve years possessed from three to four votes," but never used them because neither party offered a decent program. The article vigorously damned virtually every side of every issue, saying that lies, innuendo, cynicism, and selfishness dominated English political debate. Ford cast himself as a sensitive, concerned individual who would not stoop to such tactics and so was out of place in contemporary life. The tone of the article was no doubt attributable to Ford's loss of the magazine, but it was completely consistent with the self-styled Toryism already present in his imagination by 1909, as a number of his early novels demonstrate. The Inheritors (1901), The Benefactor (1905), the Fifth Queen trilogy (1906, 1907, 1908), and An English Girl (1907) all had as protagonists generous, well-born, self-effacing heroes who became martyrs to their sense of noblesse oblige. The conception reached fullest expression in the Parade's End tetralogy (1924, 1925, 1926, 1928) but it was already well

¹Ford [Didymus], "A Declaration of Faith," ER 4 (February 1910):543-551.

²The phrase was first used by D. H. Lawrence. See Goldring, South Lodge, p. 98.

developed in the English Review days, influencing not only Ford's fiction but also his personality.

This observation begs the question how the editor's Toryism can be reconciled to the magazine's Liberalism. Toryism for Ford was a timeless idealism which had little in common with the Conservative Party, and, similarly, the review's Liberalism was Liberalism-with-a-difference; although Liberal Party causes frequently coincided with the review's own, the magazine was not a party organ. It could agree with the Liberals' foreign affairs principles, if not always with their actions, and, like them, it vigorously advocated programs to alleviate conditions among the working poor. The review added, however, a large dose of anti-industrialism, anti-urbanism, and anti-laissez-faire economics, along with a general suspicion of democracy. On the one hand, as we have seen, Ford cherished the conviction that good art would naturally be popular and so drive out bad ideas, but his observations sometimes did not square with this abstract principle. Consequently, he simultaneously suspected the mob, with its emotional excesses and its susceptibility to manipulation. In his optimistic moods, he was convinced that if enlightened leadership were present, all would be well, while in pessimistic periods (as when he lost the magazine) he tended to think the cause

hopeless. Thus, the review was Liberal, but industrialism, urbanization, democratization, economic imperialism, and various other concepts tied to what Yeats called "Whiggery" were philosophically alien to it. The review instead had a loose kinship with Ruskin's social and artistic theories, Morris's medievalism, the Catholicism of Belloc and Chesterton, and the other schools of thought of the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries (including pre-Raphaelism) that found the legacy of eighteenth-century rationalism fundamentally unsatisfying.

While most of Ford's articles related literature and current affairs, there were some that dealt with literary trends and techniques. The first was a review of Volumes I and II of Saintsbury's A History of English Prosody (1906, 1908), a work which has been cited as seminal in English criticism because it is among the first systematic studies of poetics. Ford the technician praised the book highly and found it timely because "there was never a day when the technical side of the Art of Letters was more neglected or so jeered at."¹ He called on writers to experiment more with technique:

¹Ford [E. R.] , "Review" (of George Saintsbury's A History of English Prosody, vols. 1 and 2), ER 1 (January 1909):374-376.

The literature of to-day is a poor thing, because we have no trained writers who, bursting the bonds of the conventions which have trained them, have achieved an ease of phrase, a mastery of form.¹

Concern for literary technique likewise dominated Ford's review of the work of W. H. Hudson:

[We] consider him the most valuable figure that we have in the world of writers to-day--the most valuable in that we can learn of him that lesson that most of all we need--the lesson that "style" is a matter of research, not for the striking, the telling, or the obsolescent word, but for the word most fitted to express ourselves to ourselves.²

Ford did not say so, but in the statement he defined exactly what he and Conrad had called le mot juste.

In one of the "Critical Attitude" essays, Ford attempted to survey contemporary reading habits.³ The article became an ill-tempered attack on book publishers, whom Ford accused of pandering to public taste by publishing "Mr. Hall Caine, Miss Marie Corelli, and the other writers of that stamp." He concluded by speculating on "the purple blush of shame that will come at the thought of having poured innumerable

¹ Ibid., 374.

² Ford [E. R.], "The Work of W. H. Hudson," ER 2 (April 1909):157-164. The quotation is from 162.

³ Ford [E. R.], "The Critical Attitude: The Two-Shilling Novel," ER 3 (September 1909):317-323.

copies of Mr. Caine's work upon the world."¹ The examination of contemporary writers continued the following month, when Ford restated many of the points he had made in the first issue about the functions of literature.² As usual, he dismissed those who burdened their work with facts and details, but insisted that literature be concerned with contemporary reality. One of the illustrations offered was calculated to provoke comment: Shakespeare, he said, "if he had more frequently lapsed into the sense of the realities . . . would have been as great an artist as Tourgenieff."³ This concern for realism continued in the last of the essays surveying "English Literature of To-day."⁴ There he declared Conrad and James the most important living writers (he no doubt got pleasure out of naming two foreigners) and praised both for "an extreme literary conscientiousness." He said of Conrad:

For him every one of the situations of a book must be rendered inevitable. The actual situations thus

¹Ibid., p. 323.

²[Ford], "The Critical Attitude: English Literature of To-day," ER 3 (October 1909):481-494.

³Ibid., 483.

⁴Ford [E. R.], "The Critical Attitude: English Literature of To-day, II," ER 3 (November 1909):655-672.

set up he is less careful to define. In that way he is an impressionist.¹

Ford thus offered definitions of a few of his and Conrad's concepts--"rendering," progression d'effet, and "impressionism"--but rather than focusing on artistic technique, Ford emphasized James's and Conrad's realism:

They are, . . . in the strictest sense, realists, whether they treat of the romantic and the far away or of the everyday and the here.²

"Realism" has already been discussed in the context of Ford's ideas about the functions of art, but the term deserves further comment, since it recurs more frequently than any other in the review's criticism. Graham Hough, in an excellent short survey of English criticism in the first two decades of the twentieth century, has called the period "a time of absorption" and has identified Symbolism and Realism as the "two great continental movements . . . [that] were beginning to be absorbed into the general literary consciousness."³ Of the two, Symbolism appears to have interested Ford practically not at all, while Realism was a central concern, something which perhaps seems incongruous in view of his well-

¹ Ibid., 660.

² Ibid., 662.

³ Graham Hough, "English Criticism," The Twentieth-Century Mind 1900-1918, ed. Cox and Dyson, p. 476.

known contempt for rationalism, science, and objective fact. Ford, perhaps due to his father's study of Schopenhauer, was apparently convinced that the metaphysical realm of ultimate reality, if it existed, was inaccessible. Unlike some of his contemporaries, notably Yeats, Ford was not attracted to séances and metaphysical speculations. The contemporary interest in psychic phenomena became, in fact, an object of his satire in Mr. Apollo (1908), where the Krakoffs, two Russian occultists, are portrayed as charlatans.¹ Ford disliked romantic poetry with its attempts to make contact with the Platonic world of ultimate reality which animated the superficial world of the everyday, and his well-known Roman Catholicism was a willed act of imagination rather than a devout belief in a Supreme Being that controlled human affairs and offered a life beyond space and time. Ford admired the ordered hierarchy of the universal church and responded emotionally to the supreme artistry through which it made its imaginative appeal (Jesus was called "the supreme artist" in one of his review editorials).² There was thus nothing specious or insincere about Ford's religion, although he called religion "credibility

¹ Ford, Mr. Apollo (London: Methuen, 1908).

² Ford, "The Critical Attitude: English Literature of To-day," 482.

supported by loving-kindness" and reported that once, when he had expressed doctrinal doubts to a priest, he had received the excellent advice "believe as much as you can and be a good boy."¹

If Ford rejected the Symbolist belief that ultimate reality lay in a metaphysical world, he was equally firm in rejecting the notion that science and rationalism were useful in defining reality in the physical world. Science, he was convinced, lacked humanity, and for Ford "reality" consisted of phenomena as they were illuminated by the individual human imagination. Imagination, he believed, gave form and coherence to an otherwise shapeless physical world; hence, his contention that objective "facts" were of no use and that truth lay in subjective "impressions." In his fiction, it is the imaginative, humane characters who are admirable, while the literalists are unfavorably portrayed. Among the early novels, the point was made particularly clearly in Mr. Apollo where the unimaginative Todd, Clarges, and Alfred Milnes were rejected, while the imaginative Mrs. Todd and Frances Milnes were defended. Mr. Apollo spoke for Ford at the end of the book when he declared: "It is by the worshipping of Gods that men attain

¹For Ford's discussion of his religious beliefs, see Return to Yesterday, pp. 291-292.

to happiness."¹ It is the act of worshipping, however, not the result of that worship, that is important.

Ford's "realism" therefore did not imply a slavish concern for facts. It did, however, require the honest treatment of contemporary life, illuminated by the writer's imagination and rendered through his artistic skill. Thus, it was perfectly possible for literature to be simultaneously artistic and useful. "Realism," as Ford understood the term, was the single most important critical principle at work in the English Review, for not only was it the concern of much of the criticism, it shaped the selection of the magazine's belles lettres.

This is not to say that the principle was either particularly profound or that it was unique to Ford. The dichotomy which later criticism has tended to make between didacticism and estheticism and, ultimately, between art and life did not exist for most of the writers in Ford's circle. Even James, concerned as he was for the esthetics of form in the

¹Ford, Mr. Apollo, p. 309. The circular argument which Apollo offers for God's existence on the same page could have come from an existential advocate of the "leap of faith": "If you will have God with you, you must serve God; and if you serve God, God will be always with you."

novel, could write, "The only reason for the existence of a novel is that it does attempt to represent life."¹ Similarly, Bennett, Wells, Conrad, and others were concerned with presenting reality but presenting it in an artistic and original way.²

Realism was the major issue of Ford's English Review criticism, but a few other generalizations on his contributions are in order. In the review, as elsewhere, his criticism was not balanced and scholarly; rather it was provocative, sometimes bombastic, and occasionally contradictory. He was, for example, capable of justifying the visual arts on a pounds-shillings-pence basis one month and blasting book publishers for their commercialism the next. He was free with superlatives: in one essay, he declared Conrad and James "far above any other imaginative writers of today,"³ praising them for their technical skill, and two paragraphs later pronounced with equal authority, "The technical excellencies of Mr. [George] Moore are probably unsurpassed in the world at the

¹Henry James, quoted by Hough, "Criticism," The Twentieth Century Mind, 1900-1918, ed. Cox and Dyson, p. 480.

²See Henry James and H. G. Wells, ed. Leon Edel and Gordon N. Ray (Urbana, Illinois: University of Illinois Press, 1958) for a record of their debate on the art of fiction.

³Ford [E. R.], "The Critical Attitude: English Literature of To-day," 660.

present time."¹ (A few months before, it was W. H. Hudson who was "the most valuable figure that we have,"² also because of his style.) Ford's sweeping generalizations were tailored to the point he was trying to make, and he could declare current literature "a poor thing"³ or "on a higher plane than it has attained to for many centuries,"⁴ depending upon the context of the observation. These were, after all, "impressions" which were subject to alteration so that the "reality" of a given topic could be properly rendered.

Ford was not a profound literary theorist, a fact over which there seems to be no argument. Samuel Hynes says, not disparagingly, that his ideas "could be presented without distortion on half a page,"⁵ and Frank MacShane, who over a fifteen-year period has published more on Ford than practically anyone else, admits that he "was not a critic in the first

¹ Ibid., 662.

² Ford [E. R.], "The Work of W. H. Hudson," 162.

³ Ford [E. R.], "Review" (of Saintsbury's A History of English Prosody), 374.

⁴ Ford [E. R.], "The Critical Attitude: English Literature of To-day, II," 671.

⁵ Hynes, "Conrad and Ford: Two Rye Revolutionists," Edwardian Occasions, p. 52.

instance."¹ The English Review essays, however, for all their bombast and inconsistencies, achieved the effect of emphasizing the technical skill involved in literary creation and assigned the artist an important role in society at large.

Although Ford's was by far the most important criticism in the review, a few other items, primarily book reviews, deserve mention. The piece which Conrad wrote on Anatole France's L'Île des Pingouins (1908) at Ford's insistence during the late-night editorial session when the first number was readied for the press was favorable, although not particularly insightful. France was called a "historian," "magician," and "sage," but Conrad offered no detailed reasons for these opinions.² Chesterton's Orthodoxy (1909) was reviewed in February, and the religion Chesterton described bewildered the reviewer who did, however, declare the book a useful "protest against false culture and cant . . . [and] the incessant, arduous effort to seek truth with the help of the intellect."³ Edward Garnett's review of Yeats's Collected

¹MacShane, ed., The Critical Writings of Ford Madox Ford (Lincoln, Nebraska: University of Nebraska Press, 1964), p. xiii.

²Conrad, "Review" (of Anatole France's L'Île des Pingouins), ER 1 (December 1908):188-190.

³R. A. Scott-James, "Review" (of G. K. Chesterton's Orthodoxy), ER 1 (February 1909):594-599. The quotation is on 598-599.

Works (1908) was lavish but conventional in its praise, seeing the poet in the then-current view as the mystic Celtic bard.¹ Pound's Personae (1909) was, on the whole, judged favorably in the June number; although it "lacked grace," it had "directness and simplicity."² There was also a long, mixed (and somewhat confusing) review of William James's A Pluralistic Universe (1909) which attempted to summarize James's argument and then charged that his pluralism was "itself also the unity which his system admits."³

Besides these book reviews, the magazine published general surveys of both German and French literature,⁴ demonstrating the cosmopolitan concern to which Conrad had alluded when he remarked on the irony of the name "English Review" for a magazine so "singularly international in tone."⁵

¹ Edward Garnett, "The Work of W. B. Yeats," ER 2 (April 1909):148-152.

² Edward Thomas, "Two Poets," ER 2 (May 1909):627-632.

³ Joseph H. Wickstead, "William James and Pluralism," ER 3 (September 1909):357-368. The quotation is on 359.

⁴ Levin Ludwig Schücking, "Some Notes on Present-Day German Literature," ER 2 (April 1909):165-171; Camille Mauclair, "Le Roman français contemporain," ER 2 (June-July 1909):614-626, 806-818.

⁵ Reported by Ford, Return to Yesterday, p. 365.

American literature, it should be added, was not similarly examined.¹ There were several reviews of current drama, and one article on the leading controversy in the 1909 theater, the Lord Chamberlain's censorship of what were considered unduly frank or irreverent treatments of sex, religion, and politics. Not surprisingly, the review vigorously defended frankness, charging that "the wholesome play . . . is not a quickener of thought; it is not a thrower of genuine light upon life."² J. A. Hobson similarly argued for frankness a few months later in "The Task of Realism."³ He declared that

¹The fact that the review did not comment at all on the state of American literature seems surprising, especially since Ford had been in the U.S. in 1906 and was personally acquainted with a number of American writers. American subjects were rare in the magazine. Besides President Taft's article, "The Month" section had only one other item on the U.S.: Sidney Brooks, "Tammany," ER 3 (November 1909):716-723, which described political corruption. The three-part "Letters from America" series in the belles lettres section (see below, p. 153) likewise emphasized corruption and the lack of culture. Ford had a low opinion of America in 1908-1909, since the novel he wrote based on his visit depicts the country as materialistic and vulgar: An English Girl (London: Methuen, 1907). Thus, he may have felt that all American writers of merit came to England, as Crane, James, and Pound had done. Ford's opinion improved in the 1920's and 30's, however, when he spent much time in the U.S. and was on close terms with many leading American literary figures.

²C. E. Montague, "The Wholesome Play," ER 3 (August 1909):146-161. The quotation is on 152.

³J. A. Hobson, "The Task of Realism," ER 3 (October 1909):543-554.

drama and literature must be free to treat any topic of human interest, but for Hobson, as for Ford, "realism" related to much more than the author's choice of subject; it implied a whole way of looking at things which was free of cant or dogma.

Thus, as we have seen, a set of fairly coherent and inter-related political and literary principles emerged from the pages of "The Month." There were clear opinions on a number of public issues, a conviction that art could bear on these issues, an insistence on "realism" in art, and a concurrent belief that writers must conscientiously pay attention to form and the techniques of their craft. These generalizations provide a basis for examining what is obviously the really important portion of the English Review, the fiction and non-fiction of the belles-lettres section. That segment, containing as it does practically all the best Edwardian writers, is remarkable indeed.

CHAPTER FIVE

BELLES LETTRES

The English Review's long section of belles lettres was and is a feast of the best of Edwardian prose. The section usually occupied at least two-thirds of the magazine, and during Ford's editorship over sixty novels, plays, stories, essays, and sketches by more than forty different authors were published.¹ Most major English prose writers and several important foreigners were represented: James, Conrad, Galsworthy, Hudson, Tolstoi, and Wells all wrote for the first number, and subsequent issues had Anatole France, Norman Douglas, Forster, Granville Barker, Bennett, Dostoevsky, Wyndham Lewis, and Ford himself.² Well-read Edwardians already knew most of the

¹This includes the first thirteen numbers of the magazine, through the December 1909 issue.

²Kipling, Shaw, and George Moore were three major figures who were not represented. Ford later said, "Mr. Kipling was omitted because we could not pay his prices" (see Thus to Revisit, p. 58), but his political and social views were not compatible with those of Ford's circle. Shaw had quarreled bitterly over Fabian Socialism in 1906 with Wells, who was at the outset one of the review's insiders. Ford had sided with Wells, and thus Shaw would hardly have found the

names, for over half the writers were in the 1909 Who's Who. Wells, Conrad, James, and Tolstoi, among others, were highly regarded among discriminating readers, but there were also some who were unknown or just beginning to make reputations, including Lewis, Forster, and Douglas. Ford wanted to publish great literature rather than flaunt famous names, and most of the items in the section are memorable. A number deserve to be counted as minor masterpieces, notably Wells's Tono-Bungay, James's "The Jolly Corner," "The Velvet Glove," and "Mora Montravers," Hudson's "Stonehenge," Bennett's "The Matador of the Five Towns," Douglas's "The Island of Typhoeus," and Forster's "Other Kingdom." Clearly, Ford's success in bringing together within a relatively short time so much of the best writing by the day's best authors remains a remarkable and unprecedented accomplishment.

The variety and high quality which make the belles lettres exciting, even more than six decades after publication, also present formidable problems to anyone seeking to generalize about the contents. How is one to classify succinctly and analyze so large and diverse a body of literature,

review a congenial forum. Ford admired Moore's work and apparently attempted to get him to contribute. He did not, perhaps, as Ford later said, because "Mr.--afterwards Sir Edmund--Gosse had advised him not to give me anything" (see It Was the Nightingale, pp. 34-35).

and make generalizations that are both meaningful and fair to works so different as Tono-Bungay, "Stonehenge," and "The Jolly Corner"? This study will attempt to meet the problem by examining the material in light of the concerns, both political and artistic, expressed by Ford and others in "The Month."¹ As we have seen, the large variety of articles in that section, considered together, present a fairly clear and coherent set of interrelated political and literary principles. These principles provide a basis for discussing and generalizing on the imaginative prose which assures the English Review its place in literary history.

In his first editorial in "The Month," Ford praised "realism" which stimulated a "critical attitude," and he cited Flaubert as the ideal artist. "Had the French really read his 'Education Sentimentale'," Ford said, "France would have avoided the horrors of the D  b  cle."² Flaubert's novel analyses French public and private life, and one major characteristic of the imaginative prose in the English Review is

¹Only Ford, Conrad, and Cunninghame Graham appeared in both "The Month" and in the imaginative prose section.

²[Ford], "The Functions of the Arts in the Republic: I. Literature," 160. Ford usually attributed the statement to Flaubert himself, and agreed with it. Ford repeated the statement frequently, and it appears in criticism written nearly three decades after the English Review period. See Portraits from Life, p. 217.

that it strives to portray contemporary society. Social analysis, to be sure, characterizes Edwardian writing generally,¹ a fact roundly criticized by Virginia Woolf in her famous essay "Mr. Bennett and Mrs. Brown." There, the "Edwardians" (Wells, Bennett, and Galsworthy) are ranged against the "Georgians" (she mentions Forster, Lawrence, Strachey, Joyce, and Eliot), and the books of the former are found wanting:

What odd books they are! Sometimes I wonder if we are right to call them books at all. For they leave one with so strange a feeling of incompleteness and dissatisfaction. In order to complete them it seems necessary to do something--to join a society, or, more desperately, to write a cheque.²

Woolf's comments have some validity for the English Review, for Ford wanted the "critical attitude" which art developed to be applicable to all aspects of public and private life. However, Ford was not satisfied with flat description of character and surroundings; he demanded originality and craftsmanship. The contributions he selected had to be interesting

¹Lionel Stevenson in The English Novel: A Panorama (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1960), discusses the period 1895-1915 under the chapter title, "The Anatomy of Society." See pp. 425-455.

²Virginia Woolf, "Mr. Bennett and Mrs. Brown," The Captain's Death Bed and Other Essays (New York: Harcourt, Brace, 1950), p. 105. A footnote reports the essay was first read as a paper in 1924.

from an artistic point of view, and variety and virtuosity of literary technique are the other major characteristics of the prose in the belles lettres section of the magazine.

In discussing the pieces, it will be useful to deal with fiction and non-fiction separately. The former occupies by far the most pages, primarily because many of the stories are long, but nearly half of all the items are non-fiction. The two categories are often almost indistinguishable. Hudson's "Stonehenge," for example, vividly renders the emotion of a melancholy visit to Salisbury Plain, while Bennett's "The Matador of the Five Towns" is a London academician's first-person account of a visit to Staffordshire, where he observes an ordinary Sunday in the Potteries. Bennett's piece is a short story, but it differs little from Hudson's in style and form. Thus, the reason for separating fiction and non-fiction is not the necessity for judging the two by different criteria, nor the convenience of dividing the large body of material into two clearly defined and manageable segments. Instead, the non-fiction offers an opportunity to observe conscious artistic technique which lifts prose above mere reporting, while much of the fiction shows the attention to detail which provides the verisimilitude that is the realist's goal; as Ford maintained, "he [the writer] must not narrate; he must

present his impressions of his imaginary affairs as if he had been present at them. . . . His goal is above all, to make you see."¹

By far the longest work of non-fiction is Conrad's "Some Reminiscences," serialized in the first through the seventh numbers.² Ford himself was instrumental in getting the memoirs written, "constantly jogging Conrad's memory against Conrad's despair that he had nothing to say."³ As editor, Ford wanted a substantial contribution from his friend and collaborator for two reasons: first, he regarded Conrad as one of the best living prose stylists, and second, he wanted to provide his friend with substantial and much-needed income.⁴ The reminiscences have been a boon to Conrad scholars,

¹Ford, The March of Literature, p. 841. "Above all, to make you see," one of the catch-phrases of Fordian criticism, came from Conrad, who also used it frequently. It appeared originally in Conrad's famous preface to The Nigger of the 'Narcissus', serialized in Henley's New Review in 1897. There, it was an "Author's Note" at the end of the work. See The New Review 17 (December 1897):630.

²Joseph Conrad, "Some Reminiscences," ER 1 & 2 (December 1908-June 1909):36-51, 234-247, 432-446, 650-664, 59-69, 231-245, 500-507. The memoir later appeared in book form: Some Reminiscences (London: Nash, 1912). In subsequent republication, the title became A Personal Record.

³John A. Meixner, "Ford and Conrad," Conradiana 6 (1974):160.

⁴Ibid., 160. See also Ford, Return to Yesterday, p. 191. Ford did not anticipate that the magazine would have financial problems.

who have mined them for biographical information on incidents which Conrad's imagination transformed into fiction.¹ As an individual work, however, "Some Reminiscences" is interesting but unsatisfying. Conrad recalls the beginning of his career as a writer, and refers frequently to the manuscript of Almayer's Folly (1895) which, he says, he carried over much of the world during its composition, from the Congo River to the plains of Poland. The years covered are 1889-1894, when Almayer's Folly was written, but the "time shift" is used to move between the "present" (1908-1909, when Conrad wrote the reminiscences), the "past" under discussion (1889-1894), and the "previous past" of Conrad's formative years in Poland and at sea (1857-1889). There are some memorable segments: for example the long reminiscence (in 1909) of a recollection which he had (in 1890 or thereabouts), of a story he heard as a child (approximately 1865) about a distinguished great-great-uncle's experience as an officer of Napoleon's Grand Army during the retreat from Moscow (1812). The language throughout is eloquent, with an edge of regret and cynicism.

¹ See especially Edward W. Said, Joseph Conrad and the Fiction of Autobiography (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1966).

The mature Conrad (1909) casts himself as a Marlow-figure and subjects his romantic youth to wise scrutiny.

This autobiographical non-fiction is bold and experimental, particularly in its use of the time shift to show how the past is an impressionistic creation by the present. The book lacks an organizing core, however, and there is no central incident (such as Jim's desertion of the Patna in Lord Jim [1900]) around which the reader can arrange the various impressions, and so they remain a collection of brilliantly rendered vignettes. This difficulty no doubt results from the method of the memoir's composition, for it was produced in fits and starts as Ford's prodding stimulated Conrad to write. When the last section appeared in June, the tale was not over; Conrad stopped contributing for personal reasons and not because he had finished his story.¹ Presumably, it could have gone on forever.

Although formless, "Some Reminiscences" is important artistically because it applies the techniques of fiction--impressionism, time shift, le mot juste--to autobiography.

¹Ford had expected to publish an installment in the July number, but when none was available printed the following notice: "We regret that owing to the serious illness of Mr. Joseph Conrad we are compelled to postpone the publication of the next installment of his Reminiscences." See ER 2 (July 1909):824. The note angered Conrad. For a brief account of their complex quarrel, see below, pp. 283-296.

Conrad tells his story, but it is as inconclusive as some of his fiction. Like Marlow, he attempts to put the past together and make it meaningful, but like him he must conclude that events never quite declare themselves and that the account is never really complete. The "story" thus exists in the telling of events rather than in the events themselves.

Hudson, another of Ford's close friends and fellow impressionists, contributed two non-fiction pieces: "Stonehenge"¹ and "Goldfinches at Ryme Intrinsica."² In "The Month" Ford praised Hudson's prose style:

There is about his writing something formal and austere. . . . Having a clear and precise mind, he has expressed himself with clearness and precision, using simple words that are sometimes quaint, but never affected.³

Hudson, he said elsewhere, wrote "as simply as the grass grows,"⁴ and both sketches display direct and unobtrusive diction. Of the two, "Stonehenge" is the more memorable.

¹W. H. Hudson, "Stonehenge," ER 1 (December 1908):60-68.

²Hudson, "Goldfinches at Ryme Intrinsica," ER 2 (May 1909):246-254.

³Ford [E. R.], "The Work of W. H. Hudson," 161.

⁴Ford, Thus to Revisit, p. 52. Ford often used the phrase to praise Hudson's work, and frequently attributed it to Conrad, who also admired Hudson. See Ford, "W. H. Hudson," Portraits From Life, pp. 38-56.

The events described occurred, a headnote indicates, on June 21, 1908, but Hudson allows his memory to play over recollections of seeing pictures of Stonehenge as a child and visiting it as a young man:

As a child I had stood in imagination before it, gazing up awestruck on those stupendous stones or climbing and crawling like a small beetle on them. And what at last did I see with my physical eyes walking over the downs, miscalled a plain, anticipating something tremendous? . . . Was this Stonehenge--this cluster of poor little grey stones, looking in the distance like a small flock of sheep or goats grazing on that immense down!¹

He goes on to describe the 1908 visit, when he found the site crowded with Londoners who had come to witness the first sunrise of summer. The crowd is boisterous, and Hudson's description of their thoughtless cruelty is perceptive and poignant: as motorcars come with new arrivals, the crowd cheers each one as he disembarks, bewildering and embarrassing him so that he flees into the crowd. Finally dawn breaks through clouds and the crowd disperses, Hudson going to a local church where he meditates on the irreverence of the modern age.

"Goldfinches at Ryme Intrinsica" also shows Hudson's deep affection for the countryside of southern England. Like "Stonehenge," it is a familiar essay. Hudson's observations

¹Hudson, "Stonehenge," 62.

The events described occurred, a headnote indicates, on June 21, 1908, but Hudson allows his memory to play over recollections of seeing pictures of Stonehenge as a child and visiting it as a young man:

As a child I had stood in imagination before it, gazing up awestruck on those stupendous stones or climbing and crawling like a small beetle on them. And what at last did I see with my physical eyes walking over the downs, miscalled a plain, anticipating something tremendous? . . . Was this Stonehenge--this cluster of poor little grey stones, looking in the distance like a small flock of sheep or goats grazing on that immense down!¹

He goes on to describe the 1908 visit, when he found the site crowded with Londoners who had come to witness the first sunrise of summer. The crowd is boisterous, and Hudson's description of their thoughtless cruelty is perceptive and poignant: as motorcars come with new arrivals, the crowd cheers each one as he disembarks, bewildering and embarrassing him so that he flees into the crowd. Finally dawn breaks through clouds and the crowd disperses, Hudson going to a local church where he meditates on the irreverence of the modern age.

"Goldfinches at Ryme Intrinsica" also shows Hudson's deep affection for the countryside of southern England. Like "Stonehenge," it is a familiar essay. Hudson's observations

¹Hudson, "Stonehenge," 62.

of goldfinches near a Dorset village prompt a reverie in which the scene observed blends with recollections and opinions, and the piece is both a charming personal essay and an eloquent plea for protecting wild birds from commercial sale as caged pets. It lacks, however, the structure which makes "Stonehenge" not only a good essay but also a powerful short story. In that piece, the narrative builds slowly from a quiet beginning (recollections of childhood and youth) to an obvious climax (the 1908 summer sunrise) by gradually speeding up and intensifying the impressions so that at the conclusion the reader identifies his feelings with those of the narrator. All details are consistent, and the conclusion is inevitable. This is, of course, progression d'effet, and this technique of impressionistic fiction elevates the piece from charming essay to modest masterpiece.

Both of Hudson's contributions can be classified generally as "travel" pieces, and there was usually at least one travel essay in each number of the magazine. The place which "Stonehenge" held in the first issue was occupied by R. B. Cunninghame Graham's "Andorra" in the second.¹ The author was a friend of Ford and Conrad, with a reputation as a

¹R. B. Cunninghame Graham, "Andorra," ER 1 (January 1909):205-222.

romantic adventurer who had ridden with the gauchos in Argentina and served in Parliament in Westminster. The essay stresses the exotic isolation of the wild mountain country, where life is easy and uncomplicated, a William Morris dream "of what England might have been without machinery."¹

Norman Douglas's "Island of Typhoeus"² was the travel piece in the third number, and his "Sirens"³ and "Tiberius"⁴ appeared subsequently. Douglas, like Pound, Lawrence, and Lewis, was one of the unknowns that the English Review brought to public attention, and he is discussed in a subsequent chapter on the review's "discoveries." In this context, however, it is significant to note that his essays deal with romantic faraway places and people untouched by the problems of urban life, concentrated wealth, or the machine age.

Thus, the dislike of industrialism evident in much of the review's social and political commentary finds expression in the imaginative literature Ford selected. The attitude

¹ Ibid., p. 206.

² Norman Douglas, "The Island of Typhoeus," ER 1 (February 1909):398-419.

³ Douglas, "Sirens," ER 2 (May 1909):202-214.

⁴ Douglas, "Tiberius," ER 3 (August 1909):14-26.

comes sharply into focus in "The Back of Beyond,"¹ the travel essay in the March number. Described is a day's tramp in the Midlands, beginning across wild moorland and into a bracing wind, but after a few miles descending into the "everlasting abyss" of a colliery town which lies in a valley between the moors:

On each side was a row of houses of grey sandstone, of a dismal natural colour, begrimed and neglected. Broken windows, heaps of rubbish in filthy little yards, not a green thing growing, not a flower-pot. But for the number of people walking in the roadway and lounging in the yards, the houses might have been thought derelict. The people were as dirty as their dwellings. Clothes, hands and faces, no less than the houses, were begrimed with coal-dust. Singularly beautiful and extraordinarily dirty children played by dozens in the road. Now and again we caught a reek of smoke or of oil. And between the houses we had glimpses of scarred mountain-sides, blackened and desolate, heaped with coal-tips and dotted with smoking chimneys.²

The hikers finally leave the town and go back up to the moors pondering: "Think of Humanity . . . as a single Being--an intelligent Being. Why does it make places like this to live in?"³

"The Back of Beyond" is ostensibly a factual first-person account, but it could as easily be a short story. Descriptive details are selected for emotional effect, and the

¹J. W. Allen, "The Back of Beyond," ER 1 (March 1909): 618-624.

²*Ibid.*, 620.

³*Ibid.*, 621.

sketch has a sense of movement and progression, as the scene shifts from nature to city and back to nature. It lacks artistic subtlety, however, and is too obviously a story with a message. The message is the same as that frequently expressed in "The Month," and repeated in the Hudson, Cunningham Graham, and Douglas pieces: industrialism is vulgar and unsatisfying, and modern urban society is incompatible with humane values. Thus, the travel pieces relate directly to the picture of "the way we live now" which Ford said art ought to provide.

Ford complained in "The Month" that contemporary literature said almost nothing about the life of the poor, and among the non-fiction essays, H. M. Tomlinson's "A Shipping Parish"¹ is the most direct portrayal of life in the urban

¹H. M. Tomlinson, "A Shipping Parish," ER 3 (September 1909):200-213. Tomlinson had grown up in poor circumstances in the East End, where his father was a foreman on the East India Company dock. He was a London journalist of no public reputation when his work was published in the English Review. Ford had come to know him in 1906-1907, when both were frequent guests at Edward Garnett's Tuesday luncheons for literary and publishing figures at the Mont Blanc restaurant. Publication in the review gave Tomlinson a start as an author, and he went on to write travel books and in the 1920's won a place as a novelist.

He thus may be counted among the English Review's "discoveries," although he did not go on to gain the fame and importance which Lawrence, Pound, Lewis, and Douglas achieved. See Mizener, The Saddest Story, p. 107, and Frank Swinnerton, The Georgian Scene (New York: Farrar & Rinehart, 1934), pp. 156-161.

slums. The essay describes London's East End, "where wealth is merely made, so different from those [places] where wealth is spent," and includes a call for social justice. Primarily, however, Tomlinson depicts the slum dwellers as salt-of-the-earth Englishmen who for generations have played nameless but significant roles in the romance of ocean commerce. The prose style shows the poetic language which later earned Tomlinson a reputation as a prose stylist:

From my high window in central Dockland, as from a watchtower, I look out over a disrupted tableland of roofs and chimneys, the world of the sparrows, a volcanic desert of numberless reeking fumaroles. . . . Yet often, when the sunrise over the roofs is specially glorious, as though such light portended the veritable day-spring for which we look, and the gods were arriving, I have watched for that crust beneath me, which seals the sleepers under, to heave and roll, to burst, and for released humanity to pour through the fractures out of the dark to be renewed in the fires of the morning.¹

Tomlinson has imaginatively "rendered" the scene, and the piece is remarkable for its prose style rather than for its depiction of slum life or its call for social justice.

"The Fog,"² Tomlinson's other contribution, describes being fog-bound aboard a ship on the Thames just outside London. The first-person narrator, a mariner who has spent

¹Tomlinson, "A Shipping Parish," 202.

²Tomlinson, "The Fog," ER 2 (June 1909):508-511.

anxious days on the crowded river, builds suspense as he relates how his vessel moved among hundreds of others, all invisible. The sketch, like many others, has all the characteristics of a short story, and the style and nautical subject of "The Fog" bring Conrad to mind.¹

"The Month" had called for "spiritual contact" between Englishmen and peoples of the Empire, and two non-fiction pieces employ imaginative prose to bring about such contact. "Afrikander Memories"² is a well-written memoir of South African life before the Boer War. The Boers are portrayed as hardy and self-reliant provincials whose views are shaped by their isolated existence, the English in South Africa as tough-minded entrepreneurs, and the Africans as downtrodden victims of both. The author obviously aims to render the Boers' attitudes and to show why they and the English inevitably came into conflict. "Two Indian Sketches"³ has for subjects a wedding and a religious rite. The author seeks an imaginative rendering rather than flat description, but he

¹ See Chew and Altick, "The Nineteenth Century and After," in A Literary History of England, ed. Baugh, p. 1568.

² Perceval Gibbon, "Afrikander Memories," ER 2 (May 1909):266-278.

³ M. N., "Two Indian Sketches," ER 2 (July 1909): 643-650.

sometimes falls into hackneyed expressions and empty adjectives: "Above, the Indian sky, brilliant with sunlight, stretches a blue canopy over the festive scene. The hot, dry air is filled with the excited buzz of conversation." Phrases like "blue canopy" of sky, "festive scene," and "excited buzz of conversation" obviously miss le mot juste because they lack originality and do little to let the reader see the scene. The writer has, however, attempted to employ imaginative prose to make Indian life accessible to English readers.

Wyndham Lewis's contributions were his first published works and, like Douglas's, are imaginative non-fiction.¹ Lewis, with Douglas and the other discoveries, will be discussed below. His three contributions all fit the description of "travel literature," since they describe characters he had met in provincial France. Among the other important works of non-fiction is Cunninghame Graham's "A Sailor, Old Style,"² a character sketch. It is a first-person account of "the admiral," an old sea captain whom the narrator had

¹Wyndham Lewis, "The 'Pole'," ER 2 (May 1909):255-265; "Some Inn Keepers and Bestre," ER 2 (June 1909):471-484; "Les Saltimbanques," ER 3 (August 1909):76-87.

²R. B. Cunninghame Graham, "A Sailor (Old Style)," ER 2 (April 1909):50-58.

known in youth, and the sailor's self-reliance and generosity are praised. The sketch is sentimental but vivid, and implies that the values which the sailor exemplified--honesty, directness, courage--would make him an anachronism in the modern age.

Ford also published two contributions by his wife,¹ from whom he was becoming estranged when the articles appeared in the late summer of 1909. Like many of the other essays, they celebrate the simple life as opposed to the hectic pace of the modern city. One other non-fiction contribution had a particular personal significance for Ford, Oswald Crawford's "A Law in Literary Expression," in the September issue.² Crawford had died the previous January, after a long career as gentleman-diplomat, author, and rake. Among his many conquests was Violet Hunt, who by September was Ford's mistress.³

¹ Elsie [Elisabeth] Martindale, "The Art of Dining," ER 3 (August 1909):88-92; "Two Essays: The Art of Manners and the Art of Contentment," ER 3 (October 1909):426-436.

² Oswald Crawford, "A Law in Literary Expression," ER 3 (September 1909):254-265.

³ Violet and Crawford became lovers in 1892, and the affair continued until 1898. He was married at the time, but when his wife died in 1899, Violet had high hopes he would return to her with an offer of marriage. Instead, he married one of her friends. She never forgot him, however, and was distraught upon hearing of his death. Mizener, the first scholar to have access to the Violet Hunt papers, considers it probable that it was Crawford's death that made Violet so

Ford apparently never met Crawford, and it is likely that the article was accepted at Violet's urging. The "law" which is proposed--"the length of the phrase . . . must be measured by the breathpause"--is interesting, particularly in light of the poetry which the review published, but it is hardly profound, and the thoroughly prosaic way in which it is discussed makes the piece out of place in the belles lettres section.

Of the remaining non-fiction items only one other requires mention, G. Lowes Dickinson's "Letters From America," which ran serially for three months.¹ Dickinson, a Cambridge don, had lectured in the U.S. and he depicts the country as materialistic and culturally barren. His prose is spare and literate, but he is capable of finding le mot juste and turning memorable phrases, as when he describes billboards which clutter American roadsides: "huge wooden cows cut out in

anxious to marry Ford. Goldring acknowledges the Crawford-Hunt affair in South Lodge, although Crawford is not named, and reports, "He also did her an appalling injury." Mizener has discovered that the "appalling injury" was venereal disease. See Goldring, South Lodge, p. 80; Hunt, I Have This To Say, pp. 63-64; and Mizener, The Saddest Story, pp. 147-150.

¹G. Lowes Dickinson, "Letters From America," ER 3 (November 1909):574-586; 4 (December 1909-January 1910):33-46; 198-207. Dickinson was later the subject of a biography by E. M. Forster.

profile and offering from dry udders a fibrous milk."¹ In America, he relates, the process of vulgarization at work in England is far advanced:

[The] process of deterioration of the Press is proceeding rapidly in England, with the advent of the half-penny newspaper. It has not gone as far as in America . . . where among the thousands of papers . . . it would be possible, I believe, to name ten . . . which an intelligent man might care to peruse.²

America thus comes off rather badly in the magazine, probably as a result of the impressions which Ford himself had gained during his 1906 visit.³

The non-fiction in the belles lettres section of the English Review shows both a desire to portray contemporary life and a concern that the portrayal be imaginative and artistic. The view of society articulated in "The Month" is reflected, and the picture of "the way we live now" that emerges from the non-fiction depicts modern life--with its industrialization, urbanization, vulgarization, and all the rest--as transforming England, to her detriment. It is impossible to conclude, however, that the picture is the unflinching, tough-minded, brutally honest one demanded by the

¹ Ibid., 41. ² Ibid., 36-37.

³ See above, p. 133.

"critical attitude." In fact, an element of nostalgia and even sentimentality is present in many of the pieces. The writers look back on simpler times or idealize the faraway. Many of the contributors, including Conrad, Hudson, Cunningham Graham, Douglas, and Lewis, address "where we stand" only tangentially, and their works do not deal directly with the day-to-day concerns of most of their readers.

The imaginative non-fiction in the magazine thus does not completely satisfy the criteria Ford outlines in his essays on "the functions of the arts in the republic." Many of the pieces, however, are remarkable artistically, suggesting that although Ford talked a great deal about the social purpose of literature he actually tended to base decisions on what to publish on technical and artistic considerations. The critical vocabulary he and Conrad had developed--"impressionism," le mot juste, "getting an atmosphere," "rendering," "time shift," progression d'effet--was seldom used in Ford's English Review criticism, but the concepts obviously came into play when he selected manuscripts for publication. If he saw "social analysis" and "artistry" as two sides of the coin of "realism," it is nevertheless evident which side turned up most consistently.

This tendency to give technical considerations precedence over social analysis is not apparent in the first novel that the review serialized, however. Wells's Tono-Bungay¹ is obviously a condition-of-England novel; as Wells later wrote, its purpose "was to give a view of the contemporary social and political system in Great Britain, an old and degenerating system, tried and strained by new inventions and new ideas and invaded by a growing multitude of mere adventurers."² George Ponderevo, the first-person narrator whom Wells obviously modelled on himself, is a bright young man with a flair for science. He allows his talents to be misdirected, however, and joins his uncle in parlaying a bogus patent medicine scheme into a commercial empire. Tono-Bungay is worthless, but Edward Ponderevo is a master of manipulation and uses the mass circulation newspapers to promote the product. Advertising is calculated to appeal to the fads of the moment, and practically overnight the two find themselves among the richest men in England.

¹H. G. Wells, Tono-Bungay, ER 1 (December 1908-March 1909):81-154, 261-316, 466-562, 700-791.

²Wells, Preface to the Atlantic Edition (1925), in Tono-Bungay (reprint ed., Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1966), p. 3.

In attacking mass manipulation, Tono-Bungay focuses on the same subject Ford and Conrad had dealt with in The Inheritors and which, as we have seen, deeply worried Ford, Conrad, Wells, Marwood, and the rest of the magazine's founding circle. The newspaper magnates, the South African speculators, and other freewheeling entrepreneurs who joined self-seeking politicians in manipulating a half-educated and uncritical public were the review's declared enemies, and Tono-Bungay is a direct attempt to use fiction to examine contemporary life and promote change.

The novel is obviously Dickensian, not only in its social criticism but also in its sprawling scope and its methods of characterization. It begins in "the days before Tono-Bungay was invented" at Bladesover, a country estate where George's mother is a servant, and the Bladesover interlude allows Wells to expose "that quality of modern upper-class England that never goes to the quick, that hedges about rules and those petty points of honour that are the ultimate comminution of honour, that claims credit for things demonstrably half done."¹ The landed aristocracy disposed of,

¹Wells, Tono-Bungay, 107-108. All page references are to the English Review.

Wells turns to the cities where industrialism has created "a limitless crowd of dingy people, wearing shabby clothes, living uncomfortably in shabby second-hand houses, going to and fro on pavements that had always a veneer of greasy, slippery mud, under grey skies that showed no gleam of hope of anything for them but dinginess until they died."¹ George helps his uncle hoodwink this uncritical crowd, and Tono-Bungay becomes a metaphor for a false nostrum for a sick society.

George recognizes the dishonesty of the venture, and gradually diverts his attention to science and an unsatisfactory love affair.² When the scheme finally collapses he is almost relieved, and turns to science in earnest. He becomes a naval architect and at the end of the novel guides out to the open sea the X2 destroyer he has built. The X2,

¹Ibid., 153.

²Wells told Violet Hunt that she was the model for the ironically named Beatrice, Ponderevo's superficial and dishonest love. Wells had been involved with Violet in 1907. See Mizener, The Saddest Story, pp. 151-152. At exactly the time the "Beatrice" episodes of Tono-Bungay were appearing in the review (March 1909), Ford and Violet were drawing together in the relationship that would culminate in their love affair.

sleek, stark, and powerful, embodies science which "tear[s] into the great spaces of the future . . . while England and the Kingdom, Britain and the Empire, the old prides and the old devotions, glide abeam, astern, sink down upon the horizon."¹ Thus the destroyer will presumably wreck the flabby, degenerate society it has left behind.

There is no questioning Tono-Bungay's brilliance. Wells's biographers place it as "the peak of his career as a novelist,"² and the book has an energy, liveliness, and depth of conviction that transcends contemporary relevance. It is easy, however, to find points to criticize. All the characters, even George himself, are caricatures that embody attitudes and values, and have little psychological depth. Even more apparent is the book's episodic structure. Digressive episodes frequently interrupt the main plot line as, for example, when Ponderevo goes on a voyage to a remote island to obtain a mysterious radioactive mineral. The episodes function to communicate Wells's thoughts about society and science, and it is obviously a desire for communicating ideas

¹Wells, Tono-Bungay, 790.

²Norman and Jeanne MacKenzie, H. G. Wells (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1973), p. 243.

rather than concern for the niceties of style and progression d'effet that dictates the form of the book.

Wells recognized the problem, for at the beginning of the story his narrator says:

I warn you this book is going to be something of an agglomeration. I want to trace my social trajectory. . . . [but] I want to get in too all sorts of things that struck me, things that amused me and impressions I got--even although they don't minister directly to my narrative at all.¹

George's disclaimer, however, has not prevented formalist critics from attacking the novel.² Ford himself was uncomfortable with it and in a subsequent number of the English Review called Wells "aesthetically . . . the child of artless writers like Dickens."³

Ford's attitude toward Tono-Bungay suggests the paradox inherent in his editorial policy. He wanted the review to publish literature that pictured society and would help set it right, but he also wanted artistic subtlety. While he could admire the energy of Tono-Bungay and sympathize with

¹Wells, Tono-Bungay, 83.

²For example, Walter Allen in The English Novel (New York: Dutton, 1954), p. 379, calls the book "an embarrassing muddle."

³Ford [E. R.], "The Critical Attitude: English Literature of To-day, II," 668.

the views it expressed, he nevertheless found it unsatisfying from an artistic standpoint.

The second novel serialized, Stephen Reynolds's The Holy Mountain,¹ is somewhat similar to Wells's in form and intent. Reynolds builds his plot around a miracle: Alec Trotman, a very ordinary country lad bound for a job in London, unthinkingly wishes that the familiar hill near his village could be transported to London to ease his homesickness. The naïve young man's faith is sufficient to move mountains, and the hill suddenly appears in a London suburb.

This central event suggests the flippant tone of the work, but Reynolds manages some effective satire. Sir Pushcart Bingley of the Halfpenny Press enters the scene, smelling a fortune if God's handiwork is properly exploited. Alec and his father, a pretentious small-town grocer, are no match for the cynical Sir Pushcart, and he quickly gains control of events. Alec he makes into a music-hall attraction, while

¹Stephen Reynolds, The Holy Mountain, ER 2 (April-July 1909):79-132, 311-351, 517-578, 701-758. Reynolds produced a mild sensation in 1908 when he published at age twenty-seven his novel of life among the Devon fishermen, A Poor Man's House. Ford took him on as a protégé and he served briefly on the English Review staff. Reynolds disliked the London literary life, however, and left to return to Devon, eventually becoming an Inspector of Fisheries in 1914. He died in 1919.

on the Holy Mountain he erects an incredibly vulgar religious tabernacle. When the tabernacle fails (as Bingley planned it would), it is turned into a beer garden.

Reynolds shows some talent for Dickensian caricature, and his satiric portraits of Bingley and the elder Trotman are effective. There are also some delightfully humorous scenes, as when Alec as a music hall curiosity waves a Union Jack while the orchestra plays "Rule Britannia" at the climax of a chauvinistic music hall program. In general, however, the book breaks into episodes, most of which are uninspired, and when Reynolds reaches for high drama--as when Alec sacrifices his life to move the mountain back to Wiltshire--he lapses into ludicrous sentimentality.

Reynolds's novel is an artistic failure, showing even more structural weakness than Tono-Bungay and only flashes of the energy and intellectual conviction that distinguishes Wells's book. Ford doubtless chose The Holy Mountain for its devastating depiction of the popular press because, as we have seen, he hated Northcliffe and all he represented. As a work of art, however, the novel does not stand up.

Northcliffe was the target of still another extended prose piece, Arnold Bennett's play, "What the Public

of the day.

Bennett's other prose contribution, "The Matador of the Five Towns,"¹ also attempts to render contemporary life and, unlike "What the Public Wants," it is a masterpiece. The narrator is a London academician whose Sunday visit to the Five Towns takes him to a newspaper office, a football game, and finally on an all-night medical mission with his doctor-host. All through the day he hears the name of Jos Myatt, a local football star and folk hero, and that night, quite by surprise, he spends long hours with Myatt while the doctor delivers his twins and tries unsuccessfully to save his wife. During the vigil, the Matador of the Five Towns is revealed as an ordinary and tragically vulnerable human being who nevertheless achieves heroic stature through his capacity for suffering and his determination to make the best of what life brings him. Bennett obviously intended the story as an answer to Kipling's bitter denunciation of the British public in his 1902 poem, "The Islanders":

¹ Bennett, "The Matador of the Five Towns," ER 2 (April 1909):19-49. Ford had never met Bennett when he wrote him in October 1908, asking for a contribution to the magazine. Payment for "The Matador of the Five Towns" produced a brief misunderstanding between Bennett and Ford. See below, pp 266-267.

Then ye returned to your trinkets;
 then ye contented your souls
 With the flannelled fools at the wicket
 or the muddied oafs at the goals.¹

Myatt is muddied and something of an oaf, but by the end of the story his "Matador" title is no longer ironic, for he has demonstrated a dogged courage to face life.

Stylistically, the story appears simple. The technique of first-person narration gives the tale verisimilitude, but the narrator, like the reader, is a stranger to the Five Towns and maintains the tone of a sensitive but detached observer. The three episodes--at the newspaper office, the football game, and the Myatt house--seem unrelated, but Bennett uses the first two to arouse in his readers a curiosity which he finally satisfies in the last. A consistent tone is maintained throughout, and each segment is an element in an overall progression d'effet. The last scene employs a hackneyed plot device--a wife's death in childbirth and so a symbolic juxtaposition of death and new life. Bennett, however, finds le mot juste in the sometimes startling dialogue he creates, and the scene avoids mawkishness. For

¹The poem is available in Rudyard Kipling, Verse (New York: Doubleday, Page, 1919), pp. 357-351. The lines quoted are on p. 349.

example, when Myatt in a fit of guilt and grief swears he will give up football, a friend responds, "It's good-bye to th'First League, then, for Knype!"¹

Ford had called in "The Month" for literature to portray the life of the poor, and "The Matador of the Five Towns" does exactly that. The story is also evidence of the "composure" Ford saw in Bennett's fiction, and demonstrates why Ford ranked him, along with Conrad and James, as a worthy practitioner of French novelistic techniques.²

Several other stories also treat the lower classes, but none comes near Bennett's in excellence. J. E. Malloch's "Cheap Lodgings"³ consists mostly of dialogue and is not interesting technically, but it attempts to understand the poor and show that their sometimes irresponsible behavior is the result of a brutalized environment and not evidence of moral failure. Much the same point is made in two stories by J. Saturin, "Iván-'Isvoschick'"⁴ and "Mother."⁵ The first

¹Bennett, "The Matador of the Five Towns," 47.

²Ford [E. R.], "English Literature of To-day, II," 668-669.

³J. E. Malloch, "Cheap Lodgings," ER 3 (September 1909):246-253.

⁴J. Saturin, "Iván-'Isvoschick'," ER 1 (February 1909):447-452.

⁵Saturin, "Mother," ER 3 (September 1909):266-281.

is set in Russia, and Saturin attempts to reproduce foreign speech patterns. Neither story is top-flight, but, like "Cheap Lodgings," they attempt to portray the poor in a truthful and enlightened manner.

The setting of one of Saturin's stories is evidence of the Edwardians' general fascination with Russia.¹ An interest in the nineteenth-century Russian novelists was part of this trend, and the review published Constance Garnett's translations of Tolstoi's "The Raid"² and Dostoevsky's "An Honest Thief."³ The two are quite different; "The Raid" is an unromanticized first-person account of a brief military expedition in the Caucasus, while "An Honest Thief" is an oddly inconclusive story-within-a-story of lower class urban life. Both display the direct prose style and concern for realistic detail that made the Russians appealing to Ford and his circle. There was one other piece by a Continental writer,

¹See Amy Cruse, After the Victorians, "Books from Russia," pp. 101-110, and Hynes, The Edwardian Turn of Mind, pp. 335-345.

²Leo Tolstoi, "The Raid," trans. by Constance Garnett, ER 1 (December 1908-January 1909):69-80, 248-260.

³Fyodor Dostoevsky, "An Honest Thief," trans. by Constance Garnett, ER 2 (May 1909):215-230.

Anatole France's "Les Etrennes de Mademoiselle de Doucine,"¹ a charming but not very significant rebuff to middle-class puritanical religion.

The two stories that Galsworthy contributed seem to have been written with Ford's criticism of his previous work in mind:

There is not enough vinegar in the salad. You are too kind, too deferential to your characters; you haven't enough contempt. . . .²

The main characters in "A Fisher of Men"³ and "The Neighbors"⁴ are, respectively, a fanatical rural minister and a drunkard-turned-murderer. Typically, however, Galsworthy cannot bring himself quite to "contempt," and both stories are sensitive and ultimately sympathetic character studies.

¹Anatole France, "Les Etrennes de Mademoiselle de Doucine," ER 1 (January 1909):201-204. Ford had hoped to publish the story in an English translation by Conrad or Edward Garnett. See Ford's letter to Edward Garnett of 17 October 1908, in Letters of Ford Madox Ford, ed. Ludwig, p. 27.

²Ford to Galsworthy, October 1900, in Letters of Ford Madox Ford, ed. Ludwig, p. 12. Ford had met Galsworthy through Garnett and Conrad.

³John Galsworthy, "A Fisher of Men," ER 1 (December 1908):52-59.

⁴Galsworthy, "The Neighbors," ER 3 (November 1909): 569-573.

Besides his non-fiction, Cunninghame Graham contributed two good short stories, "Mirahuano"¹ and "The Captive."² Both are set in the exotic locations the author knew first-hand--the first in Central America and the second on the Argentine Pampas--but in both the primary concern is sensitive portrayal of character. In "Mirahuano" the main character is a black poet who grows to hate himself for aping the Europeans who are his social superiors: "Think of my life; my very God is white, made in your image, imposed upon my race by yours."³ The story is particularly interesting in view of the review's concern for "spiritual contact" between British and colonial peoples.

There is an element of vigorous adventure in both of the Cunninghame Graham stories, and there are several others that display the same tendency. One of them, "The Virgin of the Seven Daggers"⁴ by Vernon Lee is by far the worst piece

¹R. B. Cunninghame Graham, "Mirahuano," ER 2 (July 1909):673-680.

²Cunninghame Graham, "The Captive," ER 3 (November 1909):587-597.

³Cunninghame Graham, "Mirahuano," 679.

⁴Violet Paget [Vernon Lee], "The Virgin of the Seven Daggers," ER 1 (January-February 1909):223-233, 453-465.

in the review of this period. Badly overwritten and full of swordplay and supernaturalism, it is the only genuinely bad fiction Ford used. He may have published it for that reason: Lee was a very popular writer of the day, but judged against the rest of the review's stories, "The Virgin of the Seven Daggers" is obviously a pot-boiler.

Exact choice of descriptive detail saves Violet Hunt's "The Coach"¹ from falling into the same category. The tale itself is extravagant: on a wild night in the far north of Scotland "the coach of death" bears away the souls of those who have died violently, and inside, various of the murderers and the murdered tell their grisly stories. Hunt finds le mot juste in some of her descriptions, however, and several scenes are admirably rendered:

Great perpendicular sheets of rain, like stage films, descended, and began moving continuously sideways, like a wall of plate-glass. . . . When the slab of rain had moved on again, the broad road, shining out sturdily with its embedded quartz and milky, kneaded clay, lay clear once more.²

¹Violet Hunt, "The Coach," ER 1 (March 1909):665-680. She called on Ford in October 1908, at Wells's suggestion, to submit the story, and the meeting began the acquaintance that led eventually to their affair. See Hunt, I Have This to Say, pp. 12-13, and Mizener, The Saddest Story, p. 176.

²Ibid., p. 666.

The overdone supernaturalism of "The Coach" is atypical of the review, but Hunt's novel, The Wife of Altamont,¹ which began its four-month serialization at the end of Ford's editorship, is a study of social interaction and so resembles the rest of the review's fiction. The novel has obvious flaws of tone and composition; for example, the treatment of adultery and illegitimacy is self-consciously overdone, and there are a number of inconsistencies in plot. In general, however, the portrayal of an intelligent and self-reliant heroine who must cope with the intrigues and scandal of high bourgeois society is interesting and suggestive of James.²

The "Jamesian" aspect of a significant portion of the review's fiction is important, for a number of stories focus on small groups of leisurely, sophisticated people and the subtlety of the characters' interaction. Granville Barker's "Georgiana"³ falls into this category. Point of

¹Hunt, The Wife of Altamont, ER 4 (December 1909-March 1910):64-98, 287-326, 456-528, 648-694.

²Violet Hunt is today generally remembered, if at all, as Ford's mistress, but she is an interesting writer in her own right who enjoyed a considerable reputation in her day. For a useful recent discussion of her work, see Marie Secor, "Violet Hunt, Novelist: A Reintroduction," English Literature in Transition 19 (Spring 1976):25-34.

³H. Granville Barker, "Georgiana," ER 1 (February-March 1909):420-431, 690-699.

view in the story is carefully controlled, for the first-person narrator repeats a story told to him by his father-in-law about a long illicit love affair the old man had many years before. The technique juxtaposes the attitudes of the young man (who narrates the story to the reader), the old man (who told it to the narrator), and Georgiana (who is the subject). Gradually, aspects of the personalities of all three emerge. The old man's advice and the story's theme ("that fine thing old Huxley used to say to us . . . 'Never regret experience'")¹ suggests Strether's advice in James's The Ambassadors (1903). While not equal in subtlety to James, "Georgiana" is a fine short story, sensitively told.

It is dangerous to consider Forster from a Jamesian viewpoint since he himself criticized The Master, but "Other Kingdom"² as it appears in the English Review has apparent similarities to James's work. Evelyn Beaumont is an intelligent but unsophisticated American girl (significantly, Forster makes her Irish in later versions of the story) who is engaged

¹Ibid., 699.

²E. M. Forster, "Other Kingdom," ER 2 (July 1909): 651-672.

to a wealthy Englishman. Evelyn's freshness is contrasted with her fiancé's worldliness to the latter's disadvantage. Their relationship becomes a contest of wills; he insists on owning her and subduing her free spirit; she refuses to submit, and in a climactic panic moment flees to be metamorphosed into one of the trees of the "Other Kingdom," the copse of beech trees that she loves. The story is told through the eyes of Evelyn's young classics tutor, an esthete who is only slightly involved in the situation but exquisitely sensitive to its nuances. Forster's dislike for the convoluted Jamesian prose style is obvious, and "Other Kingdom" is told chiefly through flashes of dialogue which suggest rather than flatly declare the speakers' real thoughts. Like "Georgiana," it is set against Edwardian conventions about marriage and relationships between the sexes but, also like that tale, society-at-large is not a primary concern.

The contributions of Hunt, Granville Barker, and Forster are very different from one another, but they share a Jamesian psychological depth and a concern for personal relationships. The Master himself provided three stories, "The Jolly Corner,"¹ "The Velvet Glove,"² and "Mora

¹Henry James, "The Jolly Corner," ER 1 (December 1908):5-35.

²James, "The Velvet Glove," ER 1 (March 1908):625-649.

Montrovers,"¹ each a memorable example of his late manner. "The Jolly Corner," the first to appear, was written in 1906 but never before published; James provided it in response to requests Ford made while planning the magazine.² The other two were written and submitted later. Each is told in the third person, but scenes are carefully rendered through a single controlling consciousness, in each case that of an aging, slightly fastidious esthete. James's biographer, Leon Edel, maintains that in "The Jolly Corner" and "The Velvet Glove" the main character is James himself,³ and at least one critic has hinted that there may be elements of self parody in the stories.⁴

"The Jolly Corner" is a well-known tale of an expatriate American artist who returns home to confront his doppelgänger, the self he would have become had he remained in the

¹James, "Mora Montravers," ER 3 (August-September 1909):27-52, 214-238.

²See Leon Edel, Henry James, vol. 5: The Master (Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott, 1972), pp. 312-313; and Mizener, The Saddest Story, p. 155.

³Edel, Henry James, vol. 5: The Master, pp. 312-317, 352-359.

⁴S. Gorley Putt, Henry James, A Reader's Guide (Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press, 1966), pp. 238, 301.

New World. That self is active and dynamic, while the artist is passive and reflective. "The Velvet Glove" has also been widely reprinted; Edel suggests that it was based on an incident involving James and Edith Wharton, but James also had Ford, Conrad, and the last paragraph of their collaboration, Romance (1903), in mind when he wrote the conclusion:

Princess, I adore you. But I'm ashamed for you. . . . You are Romance--as everything, and by what I make out every one, about you is; so what more do you want? Your Preface--the only one worth speaking of--was written long ages ago by the most beautiful imagination of man. . . . You don't need to understand. Don't attempt such base things. Leave those things to us. Only live. Only be. We'll do the rest.¹

The story masterfully probes the relationship between life and art, and if Burrridge, the artist, is awkward in giving the Princess a farewell kiss, he is wonderfully sensitive in the way his mind observes the enchanted evening:

That was knowing Paris, of a wondrous bland April night; that was hanging over it from vague consecrated lamp-studded heights and taking in, spread below and afar, the great scroll of all its irresistible story, pricked out, across river and bridge and radiant place, and along quays and boulevards and avenues, and around monumental circles and squares, in syllables of fire, and sketched and summarized, further and further, in dim fire-dust of endless avenues.²

¹James, "The Velvet Glove," 648.

²Ibid., 643.

This, obviously, is "getting an atmosphere" at its finest. It is significant that both "The Jolly Corner" and "The Velvet Glove" express James's conception of the artist; what is proposed is a function much less activist than Ford calls for in his articles in "The Month."

"Mora Montravers" is also an excellent story, serious but written with just enough stylistic flourish to hint that James is taking particular pleasure in being "Jamesian." Long conversations are almost teasingly rendered, with seemingly endless reflection and re-reflection by the controlling consciousness on nuances of each word. In one instance, for example, the central question of the story is directly asked ("What I want to know in plain terms, if you please, is whether or no you're Mora's lover?") but the answer does not come until nearly two pages later.¹ All three of the tales are superb, and it is as if James were determined to address the role of the artist and to extend conscious artifice to its utmost limits.

Ford obviously found James's manner compelling, for it is represented in the magazine not only by James's three excellent stories but also, in a less extreme way, by Violet

¹James, "Mora Montravers," 42-44.

Hunt's interesting although flawed novel, the stories of Granville Barker and Forster, and others. In all of these, plot develops out of personal interaction among a small group of characters. The writer's concern is with rendering individual consciousness and capturing psychological nuances. The stories are "realistic" in their psychological depth and in that they are set against conventions of social behavior, but the intelligent, upper-middle class people who are dealt with hardly represent society at large. The picture of "the way we live now" which emerges is rather esoteric and rarified, and it is difficult to praise the works on the basis of the criteria Ford expressed in "The Functions of the Arts in the Republic."

Ford's affinity for Jamesian technique put him and the English Review into a critical dilemma. Ford tried to reconcile the problem by seeing James as a social critic:

He gives you an immense--and increasingly tragic--picture of a leisured society that is fairly unavailing, materialistic, emasculated--and doomed.¹

It is impossible, however, to regard "The Velvet Glove" as a Wellsian attack on the leisure class, and Wells and James may be seen to personify the two tendencies of the English

¹Ford, Return to Yesterday, p. 210.

Review's belles lettres. On the one side is social commentary; on the other, conscious artistry.¹

Ford usually insisted that there was no inherent incompatibility between the two, and most of the magazine's imaginative prose is both artistically interesting and socially revealing. Sometimes, however, the tendencies pull apart. Tono-Bungay, for example, presents an admirably complete picture of contemporary life, but eschews concern for form and structure; Ponderevo announces at the beginning, "I've read an average share of novels and made some starts before this beginning, and I've found the restraints and rules of the art (as I made them out) impossible for me."² Ford

¹Wells and James carried out a long debate over the role of the writer in their private correspondence and public writings. Their disagreement at first was good-natured and their letters have a bantering tone, but as the depth of their differences became apparent the debate became acrimonious and eventually their friendship ended. The shift from banter to bitterness came gradually, but the period of sharpest change seems to be 1909-1910, the year of the English Review. See Henry James and H. G. Wells, ed. Leon Edel and Gordon N. Ray, for a reconstruction of this pivotal debate. After 1910, Wells began declaring rather defiantly that he was a "journalist" rather than an artist. See Gordon N. Ray, "H. G. Wells tries to be a novelist" in Edwardians and Late Victorians, ed. Richard Ellmann (New York: Columbia University Press, 1960), pp. 106-159.

²Wells, Tono-Bungay, 84.

was uncomfortable with this attitude and used the pages of the review to tell Wells so. Burridge in "The Velvet Glove" expresses just the opposite viewpoint; he renounces ordinary experience for the artifice of his imagination. Ford continued his lavish (though sometimes slightly misguided) praise of James, and obviously when it came to a choice between social truth and artistic technique, he preferred the latter.

The imaginative prose which Ford himself published in the magazine is final evidence for this conclusion. Both "The Nature of a Crime" (written in collaboration with Conrad)¹ and A Call² are interesting literary experiments, obviously Jamesian but with little to say about "the way we live now." Neither of the two is completely successful, but both are interesting because they show Ford attempting to employ the techniques he would use a few years later to produce

¹Ford and Conrad [Ignatz von Aschendorf], "The Nature of a Crime," ER 2 (April-May 1909):70-78, 279-301. Ford published the story again when he edited the Transatlantic Review (January-February 1924) nearly fifteen years later. It appeared in the first two numbers of that periodical, and subsequently was published in book form with prefaces by both Ford and Conrad. See Harvey, Ford, A Bibliography, pp. 59-61 for the complicated publishing history of this curious tale.

²Ford [Ford Madox Hueffer], A Call, ER 3 (August-December 1909):93-134, 282-314, 460-476, 629-652.

his elaborately contrived masterpiece, The Good Soldier (1915).

Ford and Conrad began "The Nature of a Crime" in 1906, but abandoned it because of problems in characterization and progression d'effet. Its method of narrative limits the scope, for it is cast as a series of letters from a middle-aged London lawyer to the married woman he loves. The writer is overwrought and unreliable; his letters are a way for him to explore his own feelings, and from them emerge his passion for the woman, his frustration with the (he says) boulder-libertine whose money he has embezzled, and his despair over the impossibility of making logical sense out of his predicament. These feelings, once expressed, lead nowhere because the story lacks a background of external events against which they may be judged. Consequently, the tale is concluded by the obviously artificial device of removing the immediate crisis which has produced the writer's anguish, the proposed audit of the accounts he has falsified. The rambling narrative has exhausted its subject. In The Good Soldier Ford provides a more complex framework of events, but Dowell, like the unnamed narrator of "The Nature of a Crime," is simultaneously full of imagined passion and haunted by self-doubt as he offers his revealing but objectively unreliable first-

person account of what has happened. Edward Burden, the active object of the passive narrator's fascination and frustration becomes Edward Ashburnham in the later novel.

A Call has been praised as the "richest and technically most accomplished"¹ of Ford's novels before The Good Soldier, but it, too, is a flawed experiment. The work explores the tangled relationship between four characters, two men and two women, with Robert Grimshaw, a typically passive and vacillating Fordian protagonist, as the focus of attention. Grimshaw has pushed one of the two women who love him into an incompatible marriage with Dudley Leicester, a shallow sensualist; the other wants a passionate affair with him, but only outside the legal confines of marriage. The plot turns on a mysterious telephone call which reveals Leicester as a potential adulterer. He goes into a catatonic state because of worry over who made it, and not until the end of the story is the culprit revealed to be Grimshaw himself. In first making the call and then keeping it a secret from Leicester, Grimshaw acted out of a complex set of motives, combining idealism and vindictiveness, generosity and selfishness.

¹ John A. Meixner, Ford Madox Ford's Novels (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1962), p. 135.

Characterization causes the novel serious problems, however. Grimshaw is not credible as the object of the two women's intense passion, for he is an essentially dispassionate man. Ford wisely reverses the romantic entanglements of A Call (subtitled "A Tale of Passion") in the later novel which bears the same subtitle.¹ Leicester-Ashburnham becomes the womanizer, while Grimshaw-Dowell is the complex, reflective consciousness through which the events are rendered.

Both "The Nature of a Crime" and A Call are obviously experiments in form and technique rather than attempts to portray contemporary social and political issues. They are Jamesian in their concern for rendering subtle states of consciousness and psychological nuances. Mizener assesses A Call as "a tribute to Henry James."² Bennett recognized the same tendency:

A novel by the founder of the English Review must have at least the interest of its authorship. . . . A Call is a very pretty thing. You can see in it throughout a preoccupation with questions of form, of technique--in short, a preoccupation with the art of literature. . . . In the mere writing, Mr. Hueffer owes something to Mr. Henry James. . . . I may say that I consider A Call to be profoundly and hopelessly untrue to life. . . . But regard A Call as an original kind of fairy-tale, and it is about perfect.³

¹Ford changed the subtitle of A Call to "The Tale of Two Passions" when the novel was issued in book form in 1910.

²Mizener, The Saddest Story, p. 478.

³Arnold Bennett, Review of A Call, March 17, 1910, in

Thus, Ford's contributions to the English Review show the direction he was taking the magazine. He did not say so directly, but he was not equally concerned with both of the two aspects he saw to "realism," treatment of "the way we live now," and artistic rendering of subject. There are examples among the works he published that emphasize the first quality (Tono-Bungay, The Holy Mountain, "Cheap Lodgings," "The Back of Beyond," "Letters from America"), or which show both ("Stonehenge," "A Shipping Parish," "The Matador of the Five Towns," "What the Public Wants," "Iván-'Isvoschick"). Indeed, if considered generally, the magazine's imaginative prose provides a general picture of Edwardian life and concerns as seen from the political and social position announced in "The Month." However, in many important pieces, ("Other Kingdom," "Georgiana," The Wife of Altamont, "The Nature of a Crime," "The Jolly Corner," "The Velvet Glove," "Mora Montravers," A Call) the latter quality takes over. There is practically nothing in these works to cause anyone, in Virginia Woolf's phrase, "to join a society, or, more desperately, to write a cheque," and they point the way to a tendency that would come to dominate fiction. As Woolf said,

Ford Madox Ford, The Critical Heritage, ed. Frank MacShane (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1972), pp. 33-35.

"on or about December, 1910, human character changed,"¹
 and the English Review was a harbinger of things to come.
 The Wellsian method faded while the Jamesian one prospered.²
 And, as Hynes has pointed out:

It was certainly Ford who carried the message of the
 Conscious Artist to the younger generation; his
English Review made the new ideas public property.³

These "new ideas," as we have seen, related to prose, but
 they also had interesting implications for poetry, as the
 next chapter will show.

¹ Woolf, "Mr. Bennett and Mrs. Brown," p. 96.

² See Stevenson, The English Novel, A Panorama, pp. 425-493. Stevenson considers that the conventions of Victorian fiction remained predominant through the Edwardian period, and that "the modern urban society" continued as the writers' primary subject. He sees a sharp break occurring at the end of the Edwardian period, with psychological concerns taking over from social ones. Other standard studies make a similar point. See especially Leon Edel, The Psychological Novel, 1900-1950 (London: Rupert Hart-Davis, 1955), and G. S. Fraser, "The Novel," The Modern Writer and His World (London: Derek Verschoyle, 1953), pp. 53-137.

³ Hynes, "Conrad and Ford: Two Rye Revolutionists," p. 52.

CHAPTER SIX

POETRY

The poetry in the English Review lacks the consistently high quality of the prose and displays little critical uniformity. Although there are a few very good pieces, most reflect the fact that the Edwardian era was not a time of great poetic achievement and that the editor's primary interests lay elsewhere. "Modern Poetry" occupied the first five to fifteen pages of each number, but Ford and his circle were interested mainly in prose:

We were all, as far as it went, prosateurs; but, just as His Britannic Majesty's Army cheerfully takes precedence after His Britannic Majesty's Navy, so we acknowledged that verse writing was the Senior Service.¹

Ford worked hard to solicit contributions from prose writers whose abilities he respected, but there is no evidence that he devoted much energy to obtaining poetry. Instead, he printed what became available through his wide circle of friends, using the contributions as space permitted. As a

¹Ford, Foreword to the English Review Book of Short Stories, ed. Horace Shipp, p. vii.

result, the "Modern Poetry" segment is uneven and inconsistent.

The secondary role accorded poetry is also shown by the fact that little verse criticism appeared in the pages of "The Month." Only a few collections of poems were reviewed, and the reviewers, as we have seen, tended to the conventional in taste. Ford's commentaries, when they dealt with literature, touched upon poetry only tangentially. He declared in one of his essays, "At the present moment the Literary Art is almost entirely confined to the novel,"¹ and when he mentioned poetry it was only to give passing praise to Christina Rossetti's careful metrics, simple diction, and expressions of deep personal feelings.² The general subject of what makes great poetry was never addressed.

Yet, the verse in the magazine is of interest. The significance of the Hardy and Rossetti pieces has already been discussed, while consideration of the contributions of Pound and Lawrence, the two aspiring unknowns introduced via the "Modern Poetry" pages, will be deferred until the next chapter. The other twenty-five or so verse contributors include Yeats, by 1909 well-established in the career that

¹Ford, "The Critical Attitude: English Literature To-day," 483.

²See Ford, Review (of George Saintsbury's A History of English Prosody), 376.

would make him the greatest poet of the age, and Bennett and Galsworthy, who both also contributed prose. Ernest Rhys and Laurence Binyon, well-known Edwardian literary figures, were also represented. There were in addition poets who became associated with the movements that arose in the fertile years just before the war: T. Sturge Moore, W. W. Gibson, Walter De la Mare, Rupert Brooke (all of whom appeared, as did Lawrence, in the first of Edward Marsh's Georgian Poetry anthologies in 1912), and F. S. Flint (included with Ford and Pound in Des Imagistes in 1914). Ford published none of his own verse while he was editor, but two of his poems appeared under a pseudonym just after he lost the magazine. These have not heretofore been attributed to him, but there can be no doubt as to their authorship. Both "render an atmosphere" through precise selection of detail and conscientious craftsmanship and by their display of the general principles Ford advocated for prose ("getting an atmosphere," careful composition, use of le mot juste), they suggest the importance of the English Review to poetics. The vigorous standards of conscious artistry that Ford and his friends demanded of prose began in the pre-war years to be applied to verse and, indeed, "poetry at least as well-written as

prose"¹ became the goal of many of the young men and women engaged in the lively debates on poetics that were going on by 1914, when the war began.

Ford's early career, although it centered on prose, had not ignored poetry. He published four collections of verse between 1893 and 1907, and over thirty of his poems appeared in various magazines.² He also wrote on the theory of poetry. In the first of three important critical pieces written before 1910 he declared, "I define a poem as the expression of a mood, in rhythmical language so chosen that no word of the whole can be changed without damage to form and feeling."³ Christina Rossetti was cited as a poet who employed colloquial diction but found le mot juste to subtly

¹The phrase appeared frequently in Pound's criticism and reviews, particularly in the pre-war period. Pound attributed the idea to Ford. See Pound, "The Prose Tradition in Verse," Literary Essays of Ezra Pound, ed. T. S. Eliot (London: Faber and Faber, 1954), pp. 371-377. The essay first appeared in Poetry magazine in 1914. See also Samuel Hynes, "Pound and the Prose Tradition," Edwardian Occasions, pp. 129-143.

²See Harvey, Ford, A Bibliography, pp. 139-158.

³Ford, "The Making of Modern Verse," Academy 62 (19, 26 April 1902):412-414, 438-439. The quotation is on 413.

convey her feelings. A subsequent review of Christina Rossetti's Collected Poems expanded on this view, attacking "that tendency to 'write poetic,' which is the bane of so many poets," and praising Rossetti, who "arrayed herself very little in the panoply of poetic phrase; she wrote as she spoke."¹ The article urged poets to avoid cliché in meter and to use assonance, vowel effects, and false rhymes instead of submitting to strict meter and rhyme scheme. Apparently Ford felt that extended discussions of poetics were out of place in the English Review, and so published his 1909 essay, "Modern Poetry," in The Thrush, a short-lived magazine of verse.² "Modern Poetry" reiterated the points made in the earlier essays, and declared that poetry must be intensely personal, "rendering the mood" of the poet. There was disapproval of elaborate mythological references or overblown medievalism, for what Ford wanted was "exquisite intimacy":

¹Ford, "The Collected Poems of Christina Rossetti," Fortnightly Review 75, n.s. (March 1904):393-404. The quotations are on 400-401.

²Ford, "Modern Poetry," The Thrush 1 (December 1909): 39-53. The article is the basis of Chapter 8, "Modern Poetry," in The Critical Attitude.

We go to him [the poet] in any case for his real self. And unless he speaks to us sincerely, without affectation, and in such a language as he ordinarily uses, his poems will ring false, and we shall find little pleasure in him.¹

Thus, Ford had a defined set of poetic principles which, in their concern for "rendering" emotion through le mot juste, were obviously related to his ideas on imaginative prose.

The verse which he chose for publication, however, does not always embody these theories. The thirteen pages of "Modern Poetry" in the February number,² for example, display a bewildering variety of forms and subject matter. Gerhart Hauptmann's Wordsworthian "Ein Spaziergang" leads off the number.³ The poem, a product of Hauptmann's romantic middle period, is an elaborately symbolic lyric in which the poet seeks a mystical union with nature ("Here may my soul wash itself clean of earthly dust"). Walter De la Mare's five verses in the same number lack the metaphysical intensity

¹ Ibid., p. 52.

² Hardy and Rossetti occupied the poetry section in the first two numbers. The title "Modern Poetry" was first used in the February 1909 issue.

³ Gerhart Hauptmann, "Ein Spaziergang," ER 1 (February 1909):385-387. The poem appears in German. It was probably obtained through Ford's German literature professor friend, Levin Schücking, whose review of Swinburne appears in the same number. Hauptmann was well-known to British readers. He had travelled to England in 1905 and received a doctoral degree from Oxford.

of Hauptmann's poem, but they, too, express a longing for communion with nature.¹ Their recurring sea imagery suggests Swinburne, as does their elaborate world-weariness:

His [an old shepherd's] are the molied steeps of
dreamland,
The waters of no-more-pain,
His ram's bell 'neath an arch of stars
Rings, "Rest, and rest again."

The five poems Galsworthy contributed to the number recall the tight stanzaic patterns and stoic pessimism of Hardy and Housman.² None of the five, nor any of the four he published in a subsequent issue,³ is memorable; imagery throughout is unoriginal ("And Moon's pale scimitar / Is drawn to cover / One little silver star"), and Galsworthy's expressions of sorrow over pain and loss lack intensity and conviction, for he is obviously merely echoing the conventions of fin de siècle verse.

Another poem in the February number, J. Marjoram's

¹Walter De la Mare, "Alone," "Never-To-Be," "Mrs. McQueen," "An Epitaph," "Nod," ER 1 (February 1909):388-391. The lines quoted are from "Nod," 391.

²John Galsworthy, "Rhyme of the Land and Sea," "Gaulzery Moor," "On a Military Funeral," "Past," "Promenade," ER 1 (February 1909):395-397.

³Galsworthy, "The Downs," "Rose and Yew," "Vision," "Old Year," ER 2 (June 1909):411-413. The lines quoted are from "Vision," 412.

"Afternoon Tea,"¹ is a dramatic monologue which suggests Browning, or Meredith's "Modern Love" sequence. The speaker is at an afternoon tea party where his beloved is also present, and his monologue occurs on two levels: there are the "polite meaningless words" he actually speaks and the passionate phrases which flash through his mind:

Ah! How do you do? (The game begins!
Do my eyes show how my heart must bleed?
Yours don't, . . . or you doctor them wonderfully . . .
dear!)
 Who is he? . . . with the head of a pear,
 And the indrawn cheeks of a . . . Gondolier?

The monologue fails to develop the psychological complexity of the speaker or the situation, however, and so the poem ultimately fails. As an experiment in technique, the piece is interesting and conforms to Ford's poetics since it employs ordinary diction and attempts to render subtle shades of mood.

The best of the poems in the February number are three by Yeats.² Ford probably knew Yeats casually from meetings at the London literary gatherings they both fre-

¹J. Marjoram, "Afternoon Tea," ER 1 (February 1909): 392-394. The lines quoted are on p. 392.

²W. B. Yeats, "On a Recent Government Appointment in Ireland," "Galway Races," "Distraction." Yeats subsequently changed the titles of all three poems. See above, p. 31.

quented, but in 1909 he disliked the Irish poet's work. Goldring reports that Ford "used to be rather sarcastic at the expense of the over-praised 'Innisfree',"¹ and in view of Ford's own opinions on poetry this sarcasm is not surprising, for "The Lake Isle of Innisfree" and much of the rest of the early Yeats is redolent of nineties decadence. Ford wanted Yeats in the review, however, "out of respect for his reputation,"² and the three poems he provided, particularly "Galway Races," are excellent. They come closer than any of the others in the number to matching Ford's criteria for good poetry. In them, Yeats has left the Celtic Twilight behind and uses a spare, unadorned style to render his feelings about contemporary affairs with intimacy and sincerity. Ford with his idealized Toryism and his contempt for those in power must also have found Yeats's opinions congenial:

We too had good attendance once,
Hearers, hearteners of the work,
Aye, horsemen for companions
Before the merchant and the clerk
Breathed on the world with timid breath;³

¹Goldring, South Lodge, p. 49.

²Ibid., p. 49.

³Yeats, "Galway Races," 388.

The poems are important in the Yeats canon, for they show the poet entering a new phase of his career. In the Seven Woods (1904) carries the subtitle, "Being Poems Chiefly of the Irish Heroic Age," but the English Review poems display the direct diction and the social concerns that would reach their climax in Responsibilities (1914).

Social concerns dominate the contributions of two other poets who appeared in "Modern Poetry" in subsequent months. The title of Thomas Burke's "Four Songs of the Shame of Labour"¹ announces his subject matter and opinions. Several of the songs suggest Kipling in their use of strong cadences and cockney dialect. W. W. Gibson's "Daily Bread"² is a short closet drama in blank verse. The two characters are a young man and woman from the country who have come to the city full of hope but find only the squalor and hunger of slum life. Excessive sentimentality keeps "Daily Bread" from being moving social commentary, but its general theme--dislike for urban industrial society--is consistent with much of the other literature and commentary that appeared in the magazine.

¹Thomas Burke, "Four Songs of the Shame of Labour," ER 2 (July 1909):635-637.

²Wilfrid Wilson Gibson, "Daily Bread," ER 3 (August 1909):1-10.

Laurence Binyon and Ernest Rhys, two other verse contributors, were established literary figures in 1909 and Ford was almost certainly on personal terms with both. Binyon was an official at the British Museum and had published several volumes of poetry; his review contribution, "Love's Portrait,"¹ is a quiet and controlled love lyric. Rhys had been among Yeats's companions of the Cheshire Cheese in the Rhymers' Club days of the nineties. His "The Clerk of Kenfig"² is an exuberant poem which employs modified ballad stanzas to tell the story of a country cleric who is haunted by the souls of the dead on the eve of All Saints Day. Neither "Love's Portrait" nor "The Clerk of Kenfig" is particularly memorable, however, and their authors seem destined to become footnotes in literary history.

The contributions of Moore and Brooke generally display the pastoral mood and subdued, controlled lyricism that became associated with pre-war "Georgian" poetry. Moore's "Noon Vision"³ is typical of his other work in its use of a

¹Laurence Binyon, "Love's Portrait," ER 2 (July 1909): 633-634.

²Ernest Rhys, "The Clerk of Kenfig," ER 4 (December 1909):1-3.

³T. Sturge Moore, "Noon Vision," ER 2 (May 1909): 195-197.

mythological theme (the story of Apollo), and its basic eight-syllable couplet form further testifies to Moore's affinity for classicism. One of Brooke's poems, "A Song of the Beasts," is an obvious reversion to nineties decadence: "Have you not felt the quick fires that creep / Through the hungry flesh, and the lust of delight? . . ." His other three poems are typically Georgian, however, in their use of nature imagery to evoke a mood of calm tenderness.¹ "Blue Evening" includes some admirably descriptive passages: "The straight grey buildings, richly dimmer, / The fiery windows, and the stream / With willows leaning quietly over." Although none of the poems is particularly memorable, they suggest that the twenty-two-year-old Brooke had considerable poetic competence.

Bennett's "Town and Country"² attempts to counteract the sentimental view of nature that prevailed in many of the other poems by pointing out that "nature" is actually chaotic, cruel, and undisciplined. The opinion is refreshing after

¹Rupert Brooke, "Finding," "Blue Evening," "A Song of the Beasts," "Sleeping Out. Full Moon," ER 3 (September 1909):195-199. The lines quoted from "A Song of the Beasts" are on p. 197; those from "Blue Evening," on 196.

²Arnold Bennett, "Town and Country," ER 3 (October 1909):377.

the pastoral expressions of Moore, Brooke, and others, but Bennett's couplets are charming doggerel rather than inspired light verse:

God doubtless made the flowers, while in the hive
 Unnatural bees against their passions strive.
 God made the jackass and the bounding flea;
 I render thanks to God that man made me.

"Town and Country" is one of Bennett's rare excursions into poetry, a form in which he had little talent, ~~and slight in-~~
~~terest.~~

Flint's contribution to the review subsequently became part of his first important poetry collection, In the Net of the Stars (1909).¹ The English Review material shows the irregular metrical form and precise imagery that would earn Flint a niche in literary history as a member of Les Imagistes. Sometimes, however, the verses look more to the past than to the future:

Wind on leaf, and wind that weeps,--
 Wind that woos, and wind that creeps
 Beneath the bushes and whispers where
 Pan dreams and sleeps.

These lush lines suggest a nineties imitation of Swinburne, but others foreshadow why Flint became an early member of

¹F. S. Flint, "From the Net of the Stars," ER 2 (July 1909):638-642. The first lines quoted are on 639; the second, on 640.

T. E. Hulme's imagist group:

Along the black bare branch sleeps almond-bloom,
Silvery in the slow silver of the moon.

Besides Pound and Lawrence, only a few of the dozen or so other contributors to "Modern Poetry" need to be mentioned. Émile Verhaeren, the well-known Belgian Symbolist, contributed "La Prière" to the March, 1909, number,¹ and Osman Edwards's translation of the lavishly transcendental poem appeared several months later.² Eden Phillpotts, in 1909 highly regarded as a Hardy-esque nature poet, provided two undistinguished pieces that combine praise of nature and mythological references.³ Ethel Clifford⁴ and C. F. Keary,⁵ both forgotten

¹Émile Verhaeren, "La Prière," ER 1 (March 1909): 609-610.

²Osman Edwards, trans., "Prayer," by Émile Verhaeren, ER 2 (May 1909):200-201. Edwards subsequently collaborated with Arthur Symons, F. S. Flint, and Jethro Bithell in a translation of Verhaeren's plays. See The Plays of Émile Verhaeren (London: Charles Whittingham, 1916).

³Eden Phillpotts, "Welcome," "Hamadryad," ER 2 (June 1909):417-418. Phillpotts was a novelist and playwright as well as a poet. He was a close friend of Arnold Bennett, with whom he collaborated on several plays.

⁴Ethel Clifford, "The Dryad," ER 1 (March 1909): 611-617.

⁵C. F. Keary, "The Beggars," ER 3 (September 1909): 185-193.

today, were two other poets with contemporary reputations who contributed. Dollie Radford never made a literary name, but she was a hit at Ford's parties, where she often won the crown of bay leaves Ford awarded the winner of the bouts rimes sessions he loved to organize. The sonnet sequence she published in the review, however, has no claim to excellence.¹

Thus, the poetry Ford published varies greatly in quality, and much of it does not conform to the critical criteria on poetry he articulated in criticism written before and during his editorship. The English Review poems show a great range of form and subject. There are ballad stanzas, dramatic blank verses, classical couplets, and irregular unrhymed stanzas suggesting vers libre. Subjects include love, nature, legend, myth, and contemporary urban poverty. Many of the poems are derivative, and there are obvious echoes of Browning, Swinburne, Kipling, Hardy, and Housman, as well as the decadents of the nineties. Considered together, the verse testifies that the Edwardian period was not an era of great poetry nor of widespread poetic consensus. Poets were attempting to move in various directions, but no clear new modes

¹Dollie Radford, "At Night: Four Sonnets," ER 2 (May 1909):198-199.

or movements had yet emerged.

Ford's advocacy of conversational diction, metrical freshness, and personal feeling pointed to such a new mode, and some of the poems he published before founding the review show that his methods could produce interesting poetry. As editor, he used none of his own verse in the review, since he conceived of the magazine as a vehicle for creative prose. However, two interesting pieces by him appeared in February, 1910, under the pseudonym "Francis M. Hurd."¹ "The Exile"

¹Ford [Francis M. Hurd], "The Exile," "To Gertrude," ER 4 (February 1910):383-384. In selecting this pseudonym, Ford was careful to make the initials match his own. "Francis" was the first name of his father.

"The Exile" was published under the same title but in a slightly altered form in Ford's subsequent poetry collections. See Ford, "The Exile," Collected Poems (New York: Oxford University Press, 1936), p. 114. In listing this and an earlier collection, High Germany (1911), Harvey states that "The Exile" had not appeared elsewhere, missing the publication under the "Hurd" pseudonym.

See Harvey, Ford, A Bibliography, pp. 36, 80-83.

"To Gertrude" apparently was not published again. Its personal subject explains Ford's use of a pseudonym; "Gertrude" was Gertrude Schlablowsky, a young woman he had picked up at the Empire Music Hall early in 1909. According to Goldring, Gertrude had been turned out by her German immigrant father, and Ford, who was beginning to feel harassed and unappreciated as his responsibilities pressed on him, regarded the attractive young "fallen" woman as a partner in suffering. She came to 84 Holland Park Avenue each night at about midnight to trade consolation with the editor in scenes like the one described in the poem. Gertrude remained a sometimes embarrassing presence in the review circle through the remainder of 1909, with Ford insisting that she be put forward at literary gatherings. Violet Hunt resented her and early in 1910

is a dramatic monologue in which the speaker's simple words and images convey his feelings of loneliness and loss:

My father had many oxen
 Yet all are gone;
 My father had many servants;
 I sit alone.

"To Gertrude" is also cast as a dramatic monologue, but the poem is actually a very personal love lyric that expresses Ford's feelings for a young woman he picked up in a music hall and to whom he became sentimentally attached early in 1909. The poem was never reprinted, and is therefore quoted here in its entirety:

managed to pack her off to New South Wales.

References to Gertrude may be found in Goldring, The Last Pre-Raphaelite, pp. 156-157, and South Lodge, p. 36; and Violet Hunt, I Have This to Say, pp. 60-65. See also Mizener, The Saddest Story, p. 175.

Goldring reports in The Last Pre-Raphaelite, p. 156:

"I once found a poem in the editor's handwriting, in the office waste-paper basket, on English Review writing paper. It was addressed 'To Gertrude' and signed 'G. Angel.'"

He goes on to describe the poem and to quote short passages. Goldring's statement in South Lodge, p. 36, that the manuscript "has never been printed" is mistaken, for what he found was doubtless a draft of the poem that appeared in the review about a year later.

Mizener in The Saddest Story, p. 175, quotes a variant version of "To Gertrude" and attributes it to Violet Hunt, saying that a copy was found in the Hunt papers. Violet probably copied out the poem from one of Ford's notoriously illegible manuscripts, but both internal and external evidence show Ford as the author.

It's very late: it's very cold:
 And you're too young and I'm too old.
 You've your small cares and I've small ease.
 Come nestle down across my knees.

Stir up the fire: draw out the chair,
 Kick off the shoes: let down the hair:
 Your white kimono now!--Disclose
 The little budget of your woes.
 You shall have both my hands to hold:
 It's very late: it's very cold.

It's very cold: it's very late. The snow
 Lies upon all the housetops. But we two
 Have each of us such ancient work to do:
 You sell caresses: I, a song or so:
 And so we please each other . . . Yes: I know.
 It's very late: it's very cold. The snow
 Blocks all the tram-lines. Here's a pleasant ease;
 Your arm-chair and a fire: curtains and peace.
 And, since you rest me, lying on my knees--
 When to my niche I'm hoisted--on that day
 Stand up and claim your leaf of poet's bay.
 Do it: be bold!
 I shall not shun you in my memories;
 You shall have, then as now, a hand to hold.

It's very late: it's very cold:
 You keep your bargains, I'll be bold
 To say, more loyally than half the men
 I'll meet to-morrow, any other when
 Or any other where.--My dear, that's Fate!
 Run off to bed. Good-night! It's very late.

In "To Gertrude," especially, Ford has conscientiously avoided the "tendency to 'write poetic'" and has instead used ordinary language to describe a scene and render a mood. The poem employs a strict rhyme scheme of couplets, but Ford nevertheless achieves a conversational tone by varying meter and line lengths. A few lines lapse into sing-song (the first stanza, for example), but usually Ford avoids this trap by breaking

up the metrical pattern and employing lines that are not end-stopped but which instead flow smoothly into the next line without pause (the first three lines in the third stanza offer an example). Virtually all the words are from everyday vocabulary, but ordinary phrases like "the snow blocks all the tram-lines" are richly evocative in how they suggest the lovers' intimacy and isolation. Repetition of the simple phrase "It's very late: it's very cold" similarly works beautifully to remind the reader of the monologue's cozy setting. The piece lacks intensity and depth of conviction, but it is a fine example of the "exquisite intimacy" Ford wanted in poetry and it has considerable charm. This intimacy, charm, and frank sentimentality call to mind the poem that is without doubt Ford's greatest, "On Heaven" (1914). That work, "pure Ford in his German schmalz vein,"¹ employs a flowing free verse form that is more sophisticated than the couplets of "To Gertrude," but it, too, is a Browningsque dramatic monologue that uses conversational diction and precise description to render an emotional scene. "On Heaven" was widely praised when it appeared in the magazine Poetry in 1914; Pound wrote the magazine's editor that it was "the

¹Smith, Ford Madox Ford, p. 42.

most important poem in the modern manner."¹

The praise accorded "On Heaven" attests that the possibilities inherent in Ford's methods were not lost on young poets who sought in the pre-war years to break out of established conventions. It also suggests the place of the English Review in the development of poetry in the pre-war period. "Impressionism," with its emphasis on realism, careful craftsmanship, and use of exact detail to render emotion had obvious applications to poetry. Much of the verse Ford published was not good "impressionism" for it tended to dissolve into the "haze of minor emotions . . . [or] a pastoral world fenced off from the arena of real action" which the critic and novelist John Wain believes typifies Edwardian poetry.² The best of the poems which appeared--those by Yeats, Flint, Ford, and, as we shall see, Lawrence--meet Ford's criteria, however, and point the way to both of the "two separate reactions against the ruling convention" which Wain sees as reviving poetry before the war, the "Georgian" and the "modern."³ Pre-war Georgian

¹ Pound to Harriet Monroe, 23 May 1914, in Letters of Ezra Pound, ed. Paige, p. 37.

² John Wain, "Poetry," The Twentieth Century Mind, 1900-1918, ed. Cox and Dyson, p. 363.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 394.

poetry at its best came to deal with "personal concerns . . . individual feelings and perceptions, in language toned down almost to the level of conversation."¹ Modernism, as it was developed by Pound and his associates in their various movements and manifestoes, also tended to regard poetry as a means for exploring and communicating intensely personal feelings, honestly, in simple and direct language. The moderns came to demand careful craftsmanship in poetry with the same vehemence that Conrad and Ford had demanded it in prose. Pound, as we shall see, became a particularly enthusiastic convert to Ford's ideas and through him they were dispersed, in various mutations, among his wide circle of friends.

Thus, the English Review's "Modern Poetry" section was a significant part of the magazine. The works in the section do not have the same durability as those in the belles lettres portion, and today many of the poets and most of the poems are forgotten. However, the magazine brought together a significant number of the writers who in the next five years would begin the trends that were to make the post-war

¹ Ibid., p. 395. Wain distinguishes the pre-war Georgian poetry from the "altogether less sensitive" material published by J. C. Squire in the twenties.

era a time of great poetic achievement. Ford's literary theories, as expressed in the review and elsewhere, were consistent with these new trends. In discussing modern poetry, Professors Chew and Altick have pointed out that in the first decade of the century "the yeast was working in the post-Victorian dough,"¹ and the "impressionism" which the English Review made public property provided an element of the leaven.

¹Chew and Altick, "The Nineteenth Century and After," A Literary History of England, ed. Baugh, p. 1579.

CHAPTER SEVEN

THE ENGLISH REVIEW "DISCOVERIES"

Ford made extensive efforts throughout his life to assist talented but unknown authors, and in his own opinion his proudest achievement as English Review editor was the promotion of "les jeunes--the quite young and extravagant" whom he helped launch on literary careers.¹ Ford's boasting aside, his accomplishments in this regard were impressive, for between February and November, 1909, the magazine introduced four important new writers. They were, in the order in which they appeared, Norman Douglas, Ezra Pound, Wyndham Lewis, and D. H. Lawrence, and had the review achieved nothing else this amazing promotion of young talent would have assured its place in literary history. The subject of "les jeunes"

¹See Ford's letter to R. A. Scott-James, January 1914 [?], in Letters of Ford Madox Ford, ed. Ludwig, pp. 58-59. See also Thus to Revisit, pp. 59, 136, and It Was the Nightingale, pp. 323-324. Ford exaggerates when he includes "'H. D.,' Mr. Aldington, . . . Mr. Frost, Mr. T. S. Eliot, Mr. Edgar Lee Masters," among the discoveries. No doubt he would have published them had he received their manuscripts in 1909, or if he had retained control of the magazine for a few more years, but he did not.

may be approached by recounting how each of the four "discoveries" came to Ford's attention, examining the works by them which were published, and, finally, evaluating the impact of the review experience upon their later careers.

It was Conrad rather than Ford who first recognized the literary ability of Norman Douglas. The two men met on Capri early in 1905, at a time when the fortunes and morale of both were at a low ebb. Conrad had just finished Nostromo with Ford's help,¹ but the pressure of writing against the deadlines of periodical serialization had been tremendous, and the anxiety and self-doubt that dogged Conrad had brought him near collapse. The Capri trip was supposed to be a vacation for him and his wife, but Conrad had a knack for letting his affairs drift into chaos and the journey became "the typically frantic kind of activity Conrad undertook periodically as a form of martyrdom."²

Douglas's personal affairs were similarly confused. Born and raised in Austria, where his family owned a textile mill, Douglas had settled in the Bay of Naples area in 1898,

¹ Mizener, The Saddest Story, pp. 89-91.

² Frederick R. Karl, "Joseph Conrad, Norman Douglas, and the English Review," Journal of Modern Literature 2 (June 1972):343.

after indiscreet sexual behavior had forced an end to his promising Foreign Office career. In 1904 he divorced his wife (for adultery) and moved to a villa on Capri, where he began to indulge the homosexual tastes that would eventually make his personal life notorious.¹ Finances became a problem, however, for years of extravagant living had dissipated the modest fortune he had inherited. Nearing forty and faced with the necessity of earning a living, Douglas decided on a writing career. He had had enough experience to make the prospect tantalizing, for he had written over a dozen articles and monographs on natural history between 1886 and 1900, and with his wife had in 1901 published Unprofessional Tales, a collection of short stories that went virtually unnoticed. By the time he met Conrad he was at work on essays and

¹Douglas's attraction to pre-adolescent boys is particularly unsavory. This perversion became common knowledge among his friends, one of whom quipped more or less openly, "On occasions when other men visit a jeweller's shop, Norman buys a toy train." See Constantine Fitzgibbon, "Norman Douglas: Memoir of an Unwritten Biography," Encounter 43 (September 1974):37. Fitzgibbon was Douglas's "authorized" biographer and the memoir reveals that the biography was never finished because Fitzgibbon could not confront his subject's sexual affairs. The book Fitzgibbon did write, Norman Douglas: A Pictorial Record (London: Richards Press, 1953), is an unsubstantial work intended, one suspects, to recoup part of the publisher's advances.

sketches about Capri and Sorrento. He was unsure of his craft, however, and of the possibilities of publishing his unique work, and saw Conrad as a valuable literary advisor.

Conrad was impressed with Douglas's ability to render scenes and capture impressions of places, and found him a congenial companion in his own time of depression. Both men were rootless expatriates, born and raised outside of England, and fascinated by romantic adventure, and Douglas's charm, urbanity, and aristocratic manner were qualities Conrad admired. Whether he learned of his protégé's homosexuality at this time is not known, but Douglas's efforts to find himself late in life and begin a literary career probably reminded Conrad of his own struggles of the decade before. When Conrad returned to England in May, 1905, he took with him a bundle of Douglas's manuscripts which he intended to place with editors and publishers.

Conrad was not successful. He failed to convince J. B. Pinker, his literary agent, and Edward Garnett, a publisher's reader respected in publishing circles, that the pieces had merit. In a long series of letters, he encouraged Douglas to continue writing but to work in accepted literary forms rather than rambling descriptive essays ("A novel is

the shortest way to a living").¹ As the poor quality of Unprofessional Tales suggests, however, Douglas could not turn his talent for descriptive rendering of scene to sustained narrative, and skill at plot and characterization eluded him. Thus, his career remained at an impasse. He continued to live and work in Southern Italy, occasionally charming wealthy American women into assisting him financially or helping him place a few uninspired pieces in American magazines,² but the essays on which he was to make his reputation were seen only by Conrad's publishing friends in London.

The founding of the English Review offered a new opportunity, and Conrad had no trouble persuading Ford to accept a travel piece which other editors had rejected. He wrote Douglas on Capri in September, 1908:

Just a word to say that your "Isle of Typhoeus" is accepted by the Editor of the English Review. The life of that publication will begin on the 25 Nov. with its December No. Your paper will appear in the third issue--

¹Conrad to Douglas, 29 February 1908, in Jean-Aubry, Joseph Conrad: Life and Letters, vol. 2, p. 68. Jean-Aubry publishes several other letters from Conrad to Douglas beginning 15 July 1905. See also Madeline Hummel, "Fifty Unpublished Letters from Joseph Conrad," The Library Chronicle of the University of Texas at Austin 3, n.s. (May 1971):52-57.

²Cecil Woolf, A Bibliography of Norman Douglas (London: Rupert Hart-Davis, 1954), p. 47.

that is in February, 1909. It was impossible to arrange it better, as in the first issue W. H. Hudson writes on "Stonehenge"--in the 2nd issue Cunningham Graham on "Andorra"--and you in the 3rd on the "Isle of Typhoeus."

Hueffer, the Editor (and my intime), asks you most heartily to call on him in a friendly way at 84 Holland Park Avenue as soon as ever you arrive in London. . . .

When are you coming over?--Send me the Sorrento book and I shall see to it that E. V. Lucas has it without delay.¹

The "Sorrento book" was Siren Land, which appeared in 1911 as Douglas's first important work. Sections of "The Island of Typhoeus"² were in the essay collection, as well as "Sirens"³ and "Tiberius,"⁴ the other two of Douglas's works which Ford published.

All three are fine essays, and it is easy to see why Ford and Conrad liked them. Although Douglas's rambling, discursive style shows no apparent progression d'effet, his descriptions are wonderfully lucid and lush without becoming precious. Like Ford and Conrad, he sought simplicity and

¹ Conrad to Douglas, 29 September 1908, in Jean-Aubry, Joseph Conrad: Life and Letters, vol. 2, pp. 86-87. E. V. Lucas was a publisher's reader for Methuen.

² Douglas, "The Island of Typhoeus," ER 1 (February 1909):398-419.

³ Douglas, "Sirens," ER 2 (May 1909):202-214.

⁴ Douglas, "Tiberius," ER 3 (August 1909):14-26.

precision, and like them he looked to French models: "We must try, first and foremost, to be more logical, to rid ourselves of that lamentable haziness, . . . we must learn, in short, to content ourselves with a vocabulary such as our neighbors possess."¹ A brief passage from "The Island of Typhoeus" will serve to illustrate Douglas's technique:

The view is superb; it embraces all Campania. Far away, melting into the horizon, the sinuous outlines of the Tyrrhenian shores; the Ponza islands with their grim memories of Roman banishments; the legendary Cape of Circe; . . . The smoking head of Vesuvius with its coral necklace of towns and villages. Ischia, in the evening light, is an immense dome of dark green foliage while, on the other side of the bay, the whole Sorrentine peninsula is bathed in a roseate splendour; the long-drawn shapely mountain looks like a thing of air, a gossamer exaltation [sic]. Not an inch of all this landscape but has its memories. Capua and Hannibal; Misenum and Vergil; Nisida and Lucullus.²

Douglas gracefully combines his own precise renderings ("the smoking head of Vesuvius with its coral necklace of towns and villages") and the verbal music of Italian place names to convey a deeply-felt impression of place.

The passage also displays a characteristic that troubled some editors: Douglas's formidable erudition. All three

¹Douglas, "Arabia Deserta," Experiments (New York: Robert M. McBride, 1925), p. 2.

²Douglas, "The Island of Typhoeus," 410.

of the essays abound with references to classical history and literature, more recent European political events, and minute zoological and geological observations. The tendency is particularly pronounced in "Sirens," which draws upon classical and medieval literature and legend in surveying the siren myth. Douglas enlivens these learned references with wit, but editors had worried that general readers would be frightened off. The review manifesto, however, had declared an unwillingness to compromise with mass tastes, and in Ford, Douglas found an editor who was not afraid of intellectual fare.

Perhaps the outstanding feature of the three Douglas pieces (and of his writing generally) is the degree to which the personality of the author is revealed. Douglas considered this an essential aspect of travel literature:

It seems to me that the reader of a good travel-book is entitled not only to an exterior voyage, to descriptions of scenery and so forth, but to an interior, a sentimental or temperamental voyage, which takes place side by side with that outer one; and that the ideal book of this kind offers us, indeed, a triple opportunity of exploration--abroad, into the author's brain, and into our own. The writer should therefore possess a brain worth exploring; some philosophy of life--not necessarily, though by preference, of his own forging--and the courage to proclaim it and put it to the test.¹

¹Douglas, "Arabia Deserta," 8-9.

Ford made much the same point, somewhat more flamboyantly, in the review: "The artist is, as it were, the eternal mental prostitute who stands in the market place crying: 'Come into contact with my thought, with my visions, . . . with my personality.'" ¹ The warmth, erudition, leisurely pace, wit, and occasionally disdainful sarcasm in Douglas's work expresses a philosophy of life and challenges accepted values. The Douglas that emerges is a hedonist who has found in the sensual Mezzogiorno a way of life and a code of ethics more satisfying than the cold materialism and puritanism of northern Europe.

Of the three essays, the challenge to accepted English values is strongest in "Tiberius." Douglas poses as a defender of the Roman emperor whose name, thanks to Tacitus, has become synonymous with sensual excesses, and the essay is calculated to both outrage and morbidly fascinate the inheritors of the morals of "our pious forefathers of the Grand Tours, who would muse for hours over the Sellaria of Capri and sell their last shirt to buy a sham sphinctrian medal." ² Ford, who was beginning to chafe under the Victorian

¹ Ford, "The Critical Attitude: English Literature of To-day," 486.

² Douglas, "Tiberius," 23.

moral code and who would himself develop cultural theories based on the contrast between the "Mediterranean" and "Nordic" cultures, doubtless found Douglas's ideas congenial.

Of the three essays, "The Island of Typhoeus" is far the best, and one inclines to agree with Richard Aldington, who called it "Douglas at his best and gayest, his most life-and-laughter-loving."¹ "Sirens" seems preoccupied with erudition, while "Tiberius" is too intent upon outraging Victorian morals. The Typhoeus essay, however, combines what is best in Douglas:

You had the abstruse, out-of-the-way learning contrasting and blending with Norman's zest for living, that geological and botanical knowledge linking up with his life-long passion for trees and afforestation, his enjoyment of land, sea and sky, the taste for local wines, local characters, local history, the amused cynical wisdom, the unabashed hedonism with its laughter at 'religious nonsense,' and the grotesquely playful vein of caricature--and then the sparkles of Voltairean wit.²

The essay is a masterpiece, and Ford deserves credit for recognizing the excellence of a piece which other editors had rejected.

Douglas's English Review appearance gave him stature, and he came to England late in 1909 to see about book publi-

¹ Richard Aldington, Pinorman (London: William Heinemann, 1954), p. 70.

² Ibid., pp. 69-70.

cation for Siren Land.¹ He accepted the invitation issued earlier through Conrad to "call on him [Ford] in a friendly way at 84 Holland Park Avenue as soon as ever you are in London," but Ford and Douglas never became particularly friendly, and Douglas's name rarely appears in Ford's copious reminiscences.² The two had compatible opinions about contemporary English art and society (Douglas's sarcastic treatment of religion aside), but Douglas was primarily Conrad's protégé. By the time of the visit Conrad and Ford had had their bitter falling out. It was not possible to be on close terms with both, and Douglas made his London appearances under the aegis of Conrad and Edward Garnett, who by late 1909 had little to do with Ford.

Douglas returned to Capri confident that his writing career was fairly started, while Conrad continued to look out for his interests with London editors and publishers. He wrote Douglas on July 27, 1910:

A. H. [Austin Harrison, Ford's successor as editor, to whom Conrad had submitted more of Douglas's work] is worth being civil to as he represents the Mond interest

¹A number of scholars place Douglas's visit in 1910, but recent evidence establishes quite firmly that there was a visit in 1909, followed in 1910 by another (possibly several) before Douglas settled in London. See Hummel, "Fifty Unpublished Letters from Joseph Conrad," and Karl, "Joseph Conrad, Norman Douglas, and the English Review."

²See Return to Yesterday, p. 391.

in the world of letters. The Monds bought the ER (I mean the German Jew who has been made a Birthday Baronet this year). They are "the money" of the Philosophical Radical lot. Lady Mond bosses the ER. You had better come over and fascinate her and so make both our fortunes.¹

Douglas eventually did return and apparently "fascinate" Lady Mond sufficiently, for he became Harrison's assistant editor for about four years. That period is briefly surveyed below in Chapter Nine, "The English Review after Ford."

Douglas's experiences with the magazine under Ford had no major importance for his subsequent career, other than the obvious one of introducing him as a talented writer. This in itself is important, however. It is true that Douglas was beginning to appear in the Cornhill and in various American monthlies when Ford published him, but these articles were innocuous and superficial.² The pieces that showed the "real" Douglas--erudite and caustic on matters of religion and morals--had languished with Conrad for nearly four years.

¹Conrad to Douglas, 27 July 1910, quoted in Karl, "Joseph Conrad, Norman Douglas, and the English Review," p. 353.

²See "Edgar Allan Poe from an English Point of View," Putnam's Monthly 5 (January 1909):433-438; and "The Brigand's Forest," Cornhill 99 (February 1909):246-253. Neither of these articles is as noteworthy as the English Review contributions, and it is doubtful they could have earned Douglas the recognition the review appearance brought.

But for the English Review, it is not difficult to imagine Douglas remaining on Capri and producing graceful and facile travel pieces for conventional magazines to earn a living. Had that happened, the century would have lost a stimulating and interesting figure. However, Douglas was forty-one years old when his work was published, and his literary style and philosophical attitudes had already been formed. Also, he was never exposed to the intense personal interchange that took place among Ford's inner circle of friends. Ford saw the obvious merits of Douglas's work, but that work is by no means startling or avant-garde; it remains redolent, in fact, of the England Douglas left behind in the 1890's. Stylistically and philosophically, the major debt is to Oscar Wilde. Ford recognized this, and in a review written in the twenties said, "In a sense Mr. Douglas is a writer of an older generation . . . as if the late Mr. Watts-Dunton were still setting the standards."¹

The next unknown who came to Ford's attention, Ezra Pound, was young, impressionable, and passionately concerned about literature, with a flair for playing literary impresario

¹Ford, "A Haughty and Proud Generation," Yale Review 11 (July 1922):711.

that rivaled Ford's own. It was largely through him and Wyndham Lewis, whom Pound met in connection with the English Review, that the magazine's legacy was transmitted to the avant-garde that flourished in the years just before the war.

Pound arrived in London from Venice in the fall of 1908, "with only £ 3 in his pocket and some copies of A Lume Spento tucked among his belongings . . . and no idea how far the £ 3 would stretch nor how he would make ends meet when it was gone."¹ Although only twenty-three, he quickly made his presence known. His garb and manner made him impossible to overlook: "Ezra, with his mane of fair hair, his blonde beard, his rimless pince-nez, his Philadelphian accent and his startling costume, part of which was a single turquoise ear-ring, contrived to look 'every inch a poet.'"² His flamboyance, however, was not incompatible with resourcefulness and artistic dedication. To support himself he arranged to lecture on literature at a London technical college, and to further his own goal of becoming a poet he set about meeting as many London literary figures as he could. By March, 1909, he was on close terms with Elkin Mathews, whose book shop was a meeting-place for poets and who consented to issue

¹Noel Stock, The Life of Ezra Pound (New York: Pantheon Books, 1970), p. 53.

²Goldring, South Lodge, p. 40.

Pound's Personae, and had also met Binyon, Rhys, and May Sinclair, the feminist and novelist. Pound wrote to America confidently early that spring, "Am by way of falling into the crowd that does things here. London, Deah old Lunden, is the place for poesy."¹

Pound accepted an invitation to call on Sinclair in March, 1909, promising to bring along a poem he had just written, "a most blood-curling [sic] sestina, which I think I have divested of the air of superficiality supposed to haunt that form."² Sinclair, who was a friend of Violet Hunt and attended many of the parties Ford gave at 84 Holland Park Avenue, was impressed, and introduced Pound to Ford, "with a flamboyant speech to the effect that she wanted to introduce the greatest poet to the greatest editor in the world."³ The meeting led to a long friendship, perhaps one of the most

¹ Pound to William Carlos Williams, 3 February 1909, in The Letters of Ezra Pound, ed. Paige, p. 7.

² Theophilus E. M. Boll, Miss May Sinclair: Novelist (Rutherford, New Jersey: Fairleigh Dickinson University Press, 1973), p. 82.

³ Ibid., p. 84. See also Ford, Return to Yesterday, pp. 373-375. Ford there says that the "Ballad of the Goodly Fere" was the first Pound poem that was published. Boll unfortunately takes Ford at his word, but the "blood-curling sestina," "Sestina: Altaforte," actually came five months before the "Ballad of the Goodly Fere."

important literary relationships of the century.

Ford accepted "Sestina: Altaforte,"¹ and it appeared in the June number, about a month after Pound read it before an early meeting of T. E. Hulme's poetry circle.² Publication in the review was Pound's first major appearance in print in England, and the first anywhere to attract wide attention. Three more Pound poems, including "The Ballad of the Goodly Fere," came in the October issue,³ and there were still more in January, 1910,⁴ and subsequent months, after Ford lost the magazine.

The frequency with which "Sestina: Altaforte" has been anthologized indicates the poem's appeal. Eliot called it "perhaps the best sestina that has been written in English,"⁵

¹ Pound, "Sestina: Altaforte," ER 2 (June 1909):419-420.

² See Glenn Hughes, Imagism and the Imagists (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1931), pp. 11-12. Among those present were Hulme, Flint, Florence Farr, and others who would become Les Imagistes.

³ Pound, "Ballad of the Goodly Fere," "Nils Lykke," "Un Retrato," ER 3 (October 1909):382-384.

⁴ Pound, "Canzon: The Yearly Slain," "Canzon: The Spear," "Canzon: To Be Sung Beneath a Window," ER 4 (January 1910):193-197.

⁵ T. S. Eliot, "Ezra Pound: His Metrics and Poetry," To Criticize the Critic (London: Faber and Faber, 1965), p. 169.

and the poem's flashing lines and vivid images convey an unforgettable energy:

Damn it all! all this our South stinks peace.
 You whoreson dog, Papiols, come! Let's to music!
 I have no life save when the swords clash.
 But ah! when I see the standards gold, vair, purple,
 opposing
 And the broad fields beneath them turn crimson,
 Then howl I my heart nigh mad with rejoicing.

Noel Stock, author of the standard biography of Pound, says, "It is perhaps an indication of Hueffer's flair as an editor that the first poem by Pound that he published was one that had Pound stamped all over it: not only vigorous, which by itself would not be a virtue, but remarkably worked in sound and images which create a many-coloured impression of the troubadour Bertran de Born and his times."¹

Selection of "Sestina: Altaforte," besides showing Ford's "flair," is also a tribute to his catholic taste, for in most respects the work does not meet his criteria for good poetry. It is true that the Browningsque dramatic monologue technique was one that Ford himself used, and he no doubt liked the way the poem conveyed a "many-coloured impression" of speaker and time. However, the sestina is obviously a performance, an attempt to "write poetic" on a

¹Stock, The Life of Ezra Pound, p. 68.

subject far removed from ordinary life. Its tone is quite the opposite of the "exquisite intimacy" that pleased Ford, but happily he did not let dogma stand in the way of publishing it. While it is not the sort of verse he advocated, it is nevertheless a fine and stirring work.

Pound's other contributions fall short of "Sestina: Altaforte," even "The Ballad of the Goodly Fere," which Stock calls "perhaps his most popular poem."¹ Written in April, 1909, it was considered quite daring for casting Christ as "the Goodly Fere" (companion). The language is simple (Pound said it was his first poem that "everyone could understand")² but it too is an obvious effort to "write poetic." Pound has created an imitation old English ballad which, although excellent, is an imitation nevertheless. The other poems by Pound which Ford published show more "exquisite intimacy" but they too are self-consciously stylized:

Nay! for I have seen the purplest shadows stand
 Alway with reverent chere, that looked on her,
 Silence himself is grown her worshipper,
 And ever doth attend her in that land
 Wherein she reigneth, wherefore let there stir
 Naught but the softest voices, praising her.³

¹Ibid., p. 66.

²Ibid., p. 66. Pound made the statement in his article "How I Began" which appeared in T. P.'s Weekly on 6 June 1913.

³Pound, "Un Retrato," ll. 9-14.

Ford, who believed that "unless he [the poet] speaks to us sincerely, without affectation, and in such a language as he ordinarily uses, his poems will ring false,"¹ must have winced at "alway with reverent chere" and other artificial diction.

Pound's early review poems are products of his academic study, particularly his work with Provençal language and poetics, since all but "The Ballad of the Goodly Fere" are based on Provençal models. Several (particularly "Sestina: Altaforte") are excellent, and while it seems condescending to call them "juvenilia," the term is valid. Pound in 1909 obviously possessed an immense natural talent, but he had not found his own subject and poetic voice. In Ford, however, Pound discovered an enthusiastic and persuasive teacher, and a survey of the work which Pound published in the review is only the beginning of an evaluation of the importance of the magazine and its editor on his career.

Pound and Ford got along famously, and as Conrad, James, Marwood, and other older members of the original review circle drew away because of Ford's erratic management and scandalous personal life, the friendship with Pound

¹See above, p. 190.

became increasingly important. Pound became a regular at 84 Holland Park Avenue, occasionally shocking his host's more staid guests by his unconventional appearance and his habit of gobbling all the tea cakes before anyone else had a chance at them. The memoirs of those who met the two offer glimpses of the young Philadelphian demonstrating "how an American eats an apple" at a luncheon Violet Hunt hosted at South Lodge,¹ or matter-of-factly eating the tulips from a table bouquet during a Yeats monologue at a formal poets' dinner.² Ford found this irreverence endlessly amusing, but was also impressed by the learning and dedication Pound brought to his art. Their friendship continued after Ford lost the English Review and took up residence with Violet Hunt at South Lodge in 1910, where Pound became a frequent visitor.

The visits were marked by exuberant conviviality, but there were also serious discussions about poetics, with Ford repeating the review's impressionist credo as it applied to poetry and arguing for careful composition and simple, un-

¹Jessie Chambers [E. T.], D. H. Lawrence, A Personal Record, p. 172.

²Ernest Rhys, Everyman Remembers (New York: Cosmopolitan Book Corporation, 1931), p. 244.

affected, personal verse that rendered everyday scenes and communicated emotion through precise description. Pound had other mentors besides Ford during this period, notably Yeats and Hulme, but found Ford the most stimulating:

I would rather talk poetry with Ford Madox Hueffer than with any man in London. Mr. Hueffer's beliefs about the art may be best explained by saying that they are in diametric opposition to those of Mr. Yeats.

Mr. Yeats has been subjective; believes in the glamour and associations which hang near words. 'Works of art beget works of art.' He has much in common with the French symbolists. Mr. Hueffer believes in an exact rendering of things. He would strip words of all "associations" for the sake of getting a precise meaning. He professes to prefer prose to verse. You will find his origins in Gautier or in Flaubert. He is objective. This school tends to lapse into description. The other tends to lapse into sentiment.¹

The most dramatic of the Ford-Pound discussions occurred in August, 1911, not at South Lodge but in a German hotel where Ford was staying. Pound stopped on his way to London from Italy with a copy of his just-published Canzoni. Ford read the poems, and proceeded to offer, according to Pound, the most "useful criticisms of my writing in my lifetime":

And he felt the errors of contemporary style to the point of rolling (physically, and if you look at it as mere superficial snob, ridiculously) on the floor of his temporary quarters in Giessen when my third volume displayed me trapped, fly-papared, gummed and strapped down

¹Quoted in Noel Stock, The Life of Ezra Pound, p. 127. It was written in December 1912 for Poetry magazine, where it appeared in January 1913.

in a jejune provincial effort to learn, mehercule, the stilted language that then passed for 'good English' in the arthritic milieu that held control of the respected British critical circles. . . .

And that roll saved me at least two years, perhaps more. It sent me back to my own proper effort, namely, toward using the living tongue (with younger men after me), though none of us has found a more natural language than Ford did.¹

Stock, in evaluating Pound's description of the session, says, "We may doubt whether it happened quite so inevitably or suddenly as this but in the next six months Pound did in fact consider the place of the living tongue in English poetry and in his own verse gave evidence of new ability."²

Pound's main concern in the next months was Imagisme, and the oft-quoted doctrines of Les Imagistes show a clear affinity for the stance Ford had taken:

- 1) Direct treatment of the "thing," whether subjective or objective.
- 2) To use absolutely no word that did not contribute to the presentation.
- 3) As regarding rhythm: to compose in sequence of the musical phrase, not in sequence of a metronome.

Use no superfluous word, no adjective, which does not reveal something. Don't use such an expression as "dim lands of peace." It dulls the image. It mixes an

¹ Pound, "Ford Madox Ford," Ford Madox Ford: The Critical Heritage, ed. Frank MacShane (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1972), pp. 216-217. Pound wrote the essay as an obituary for Ford. It appeared in The Nineteenth Century and After in August 1939.

² Stock, The Life of Ezra Pound, p. 103.

abstraction with the concrete. It comes from the writer's not realizing that the natural object is always the adequate symbol. Go in fear of abstractions. Don't retell in mediocre verse what has already been done in good prose.¹

Imagism soon ran its course, but Pound continued to give Ford credit for the new poetics into which it blended:

. . . Where nearly everyone else is still dominated by an eighteenth-century verbalism, Mr. Hueffer has had [an] instinct for prose. It is he who has insisted, in the face of a still Victorian press, upon the importance of good writing as opposed to the opulent word, the rhetorical tradition. . . . He has given us, in "On Heaven," the best poem yet written in the "twentieth-century fashion." . . . I cannot belittle my belief that Mr. Hueffer's realization that poetry should be written at least as well as prose will have . . . wide result. . . . I find him significant and revolutionary because of his insistence upon clarity and precision, upon the prose tradition; in brief, upon efficient writing--even in verse.²

Ford and the English Review thus played a major role in shaping Pound's ideas, a fact the American freely acknowledged, as in his advice to a literary historian that was quoted at the beginning of this study: "The man who did the

¹ See "Imagisme," Poetry: A Magazine of Verse 1 (March 1913):198-206. The famous three principles were recorded by Flint at Pound's direction; the other material which is cited is from Pound's "A Few Don'ts by an Imagiste" which is part of the same article. Des Imagistes, the first anthology by the group, appeared in 1914 and included work by Ford. The standard work on Imagism is Stanley K. Coffman, Jr., Imagism (Norman, Oklahoma: University of Oklahoma Press, 1951).

² Pound, "The Prose Tradition in Verse," pp. 371-377.

work for English writing was Ford Madox Hueffer. . . . You ought for the sake of perspective to read through the whole of The Eng. Rev. files for . . . as long as Ford had it."¹

Pound went on to argue for the new poetics among his own friends, who included the two most important poets of the era, Yeats and Eliot. In 1913 and 1914 he set about reforming Yeats's diction. Yeats, twenty years Pound's senior and with a major reputation, was at first amazed by the young man's cheek but had the good sense to listen. As he himself put it, by getting "back to the definite and concrete away from modern abstractions"² he gained new poetic power. Pound met Eliot in 1914, and the story of his subsequent editing of "extraneous" material from The Waste Land has become part of twentieth-century literary legend.

While Pound's poetics were shaped by his connection with Ford and the English Review, there was another, more

¹See above, p. 1. Several critical studies of Pound have emphasized his debt to Ford. See especially Herbert N. Schneidau, Ezra Pound: The Image and the Real (Baton Rouge, Louisiana: Louisiana State University Press, 1969). Hugh Kenner's The Pound Era makes many of the same arguments in rather turgid and mannered prose. See also Eric Homberger, "Pound, Ford, and 'Prose': The Making of a Modern Poet," Journal of American Studies 5 (December 1971): 281-292.

²Yeats to Lady Gregory, 3 January 1913, quoted in Stock, The Life of Ezra Pound, p. 130.

subtle, result of their relationship. The zeal with which Pound undertook the reform of Yeats and Eliot hints at it, for Pound followed Ford's lead and became a literary propagandist, probably the most influential one of the century. How much of this is directly attributable to Ford's example is of course impossible to determine, for Pound's early career shows he had energy, strong convictions, and a dominating personality. It is symbolic, however, that Pound should have started wearing the ex-editor's Rossetti jacket,¹ because he began acting very much like Ford in his concern for a community of artists who, if they wrote honestly and carefully, could cleanse the public mind of cant and cliché. Perhaps Pound was already developing in this direction when he met Ford, but the example of the review, founded as a nucleus for serious artists who refused to compromise with mass tastes, no doubt helped crystallize Pound's own attitudes. He went on in the next years to become involved in a bewildering number of movements and coteries, founding or assisting in the founding of dozens of magazines. The English Review apparently served him as an inspiration, for he called it "the greatest Little Review or pre-Little Review of our time."²

¹Hunt, I Have This to Say, p. 114.

²Pound, "Ford Madox Ford," p. 217.

MacShane's contention that the review was "ultimately responsible for Imagism and Vorticism"¹ is perhaps too glib, but it is obvious that Ford's efforts inspired the subsequent movements.

The place of Pound's own work in the twentieth-century literary canon is, like Ford's, still being debated. Perhaps if they both had avoided propagandizing and instead concentrated on their own fiction and poetry in the single-minded manner of Joyce or Yeats, their places would be more secure. There is no doubting their importance in literary history, however, for their activities as teachers, impresarios, and propagandists had influences that ran wide and deep.

Wyndham Lewis came to Ford's attention about the same time as Pound, in the early spring of 1909. Three years older than Pound, Lewis had lived a bohemian artist's life on the Continent for the previous eight years. Around the turn of the century, however, he had made friends with Binyon and T. Sturge Moore, and possibly one of them (they both became English Review contributors) told him of the review and the editor's interest in new talent. At any rate, Lewis gathered together some of his manuscripts and went to 84

¹MacShane, Ford Madox Ford, p. 80.

Holland Park Avenue. The door, as always, was unlocked (presumably so that young geniuses like Lewis would never be turned away), and he entered to seek out the editor. There are several stories of Lewis's arrival; Goldring recalled one "which Ford related to me the same evening" which had Lewis entering the bathroom and reading "The 'Pole'" to Ford, who was splashing in the bath.¹ The version in one of Ford's memoirs is even more exotic and captures Lewis's secretive and conspiratorial nature:

He was very dark in the shadows of the staircase. He wore an immense steeple-crowned hat. Long black locks fell from it. His coat was one of those Russian looking coats that have no revers. He had also an ample black cape of the type that villains in transpontine melodrama throw over their shoulders when they say "Ha-ha!" He said not a word.²

According to this version, the exotic intruder "produced crumpled papers in rolls . . . from all over his person--from inside his waistcoat, from against his skin beneath his brown jersey. He had no collar or I am sure he would have taken that off too."

However the manuscripts were presented, Ford accepted them and, according to Lewis, "some weeks later when I went to enquire about the manuscript they gave me a copy of the

¹Goldring, South Lodge, p. 40.

²Ford, Return to Yesterday, pp. 389-390.

proofs of the first story."¹ "The 'Pole'" appeared in the May number,² while later issues had "Some Innkeepers and Bestre"³ and "Les Saltimbanques."⁴

All three are character sketches of lower class provincials Lewis had observed in Brittany during his years on the Continent. The sketches are perceptive, with considerable ironic humor, but they are not startling or avant-garde. Although there are hints of Lewis's characteristic feistiness, evidence of the sort of blasting and bombadiering he was later to do is discernible only in light of his subsequent career.

In "The 'Pole'," Lewis's subjects are Slavic expatriates who have flocked to Breton country inns:

A young Polish or Russian student, come to the end of his resources, knows two or three alternatives. One is to hang himself--a course generally adopted. But those who have no ties, who take a peaceful pleasure in life, are of a certain piety and mild disposition, borrow ten pounds from a friend and leave their country for ever--they take a ticket to Brest. . . . They pay

¹Wyndham Lewis, Rude Assignment (London: Hutchinson and Company, n.d.), p. 121.

²Lewis, "The 'Pole,'" ER 2 (May 1909):255-265.

³Lewis, "Some Innkeepers and Bestre," ER 2 (June 1909): 471-484.

⁴Lewis, "Les Saltimbanques," ER 3 (August 1909): 76-87.

two or three months' board and lodging, until the ten pounds is finished, and then, with a simple dignity all their own, stop paying. . . . They henceforth become the regular, unobtrusive, respected inhabitants of the house.¹

Lewis's descriptions of several such "Poles" take the point of view of an amused outsider. The reasons for the "Poles'" expatriation and despondency are never explained, and their actions are attributed to Slavic morose romanticism. (What Conrad thought of the sketch is not recorded, but he and Ford were already quarreling when it was published and this story no doubt increased his pique.) The motives of the Breton innkeepers are likewise not explained.

It is easy to see why Ford liked the sketch. Like the other travel pieces he accepted, "The 'Pole'" does not merely describe a place and its people, it captures an atmosphere and thus offers an "interior, a sentimental or temperamental voyage" as Norman Douglas advocated. Ford himself aimed for the same thing in his geographical-sociological-psychological study, England and the English (1907), where he sought to render "the soul of London," "the heart of the country," and "the spirit of the people." As an educated and sophisticated foreigner, Lewis cannot enter the heart,

¹Lewis, "The 'Pole,'" 255.

soul, and spirit of the Bretons and Slavs he describes, but his sketch goes beyond facile description and achieves artistic rendering.

It is not completely successful, however, largely because Lewis's satire is misplaced. By ridiculing his pathetic subjects, he makes himself seem cruel. His rendering of peasant narrowness and stupidity has none of the humane sympathy that elevates Synge's treatments of the peasant mentality to artistic heights.

The same objection applies to "Some Innkeepers and Bestre," for here also Lewis's tone of amused superiority gives him an unpleasant arrogance. The sketch begins with comments on Breton innkeepers generally, and then discusses one example, Bestre. Lewis's method is that of a social scientist, moving from generalization to individual case history. Ford doubtless enjoyed Lewis's condemnation of the innkeeper's commercial instincts and his hints that peasant greed forms the basis for middle class values, but it is Bestre and not the commercial class that is ridiculed. The "dumb-passive" peasant seems too easy a target for the irony Lewis heaps on him. Lewis apparently recognized this, for when he used the "Bestre" material in The Wild Body (1927) he filtered the observations through a first-person

narrator.¹ The Lewis of the English Review sketches, however, had not learned to objectify his feelings.

By far the best of the three sketches is "Les Saltimbanques," which examines both a travelling troupe of acrobats and the peasant audiences they entertain. The two are set in opposition to one another, and Lewis as an observer avoids the condescension that mars the other pieces. The acrobats are like those in the Picasso paintings Lewis had seen, vulnerable and even tragic:

Their spirits became sorer and sorer at the recreation and amusement that the public got out of their miserable existence. Its ignorance as to their true sentiments helped to swell their disgust. They looked upon the public as a vast beast, with a very simple but perverse character, differing from any separate man's, the important trait of which was an insatiable longing for their performances. . . . Whenever they met one of the monsters--which was on an average twice a day--their only means of escape was by charming it with their pipes . . .²

The sketch is sensitively understated. Lewis as artist obviously identifies with les saltimbanques and the piece is interesting in that it hints at the attitudes that would motivate his own activities as a leader of the avant-garde. In that role, he would assume the acrobats' alienation, but

¹See Timothy Materer, Wyndham Lewis the Novelist (Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1976), pp. 24-45.

²Lewis, "Les Saltimbanques," 76-77.

instead of "charming" the "vast beast" of the public, he would become "The Enemy" and seek to blast it out of its complacency. This aspect of "Les Saltimbanques" is evident only in retrospect; for contemporary readers it was a poignant rendering of the hapless acrobats and their ignorant audiences.

After the dramatic initial encounter with Ford and the acceptance of his manuscripts, Lewis attended a few of the editor's soirees and met Pound,¹ but he never became a regular member of the review circle. He toyed for a time with accepting Ford's offer "of taking me on as a regular hand"² but instead associated mostly with the painters and critics who were revolutionizing the visual arts in Paris and London. Up to 1919 he apparently saw Pound and Ford only occasionally.³

¹ Lewis, Blasting and Bombardiering, 2nd revised ed. (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1967), pp. 271-281. The meeting took place in a cafe, where Lewis and Pound were brought by T. Sturge Moore and Binyon, respectively. The older poets, knowing their young charges' feistiness and (in Lewis's case) extreme defensiveness, were prepared for an immediate row. The two young men were wary of one another for a time, but the anticipated explosion did not take place. See Stock, The Life of Ezra Pound, p. 158.

² Lewis to T. Sturge Moore, ca. 1909, in The Letters of Wyndham Lewis, ed. W. K. Rose (London: Methuen, 1963), pp. 39-40.

³ See Stock, The Life of Ezra Pound, p. 158. Stock says, "I know of no evidence that they played any part in each other's career during this time [1909-1913]." Ford's memoirs likewise indicate that he saw little of Lewis during the period.

In that year, Lewis fell out with the group around the post-impressionist critic Roger Fry and enlisted Pound's help in forming a movement that would make all the other revolutions obsolete. Together they founded Vorticism, with its "review of the Great English Vortex," Blast. The first number of Blast appeared in June, 1914, the second (and last) in July, 1915. Ford and Violet Hunt were somewhat involved on the fringes of Vorticism and entertained Pound, Lewis, and their comrades at South Lodge or spent wild evenings at the semi-official Vorticist headquarters, a night club called "The Cave of the Golden Calf."¹ Probably at Pound's insistence, part of The Good Soldier (under its first title, "The Saddest Story") appeared in the first number of Blast. However, Ford and Lewis never got on. Lewis could not appreciate Ford's reverence for tradition and belief in artistic dignity, while Ford disliked Lewis's arrogant iconoclasm.² There was always genuine affection and mutual respect between Ford and

¹See Edgar Jepson, Memories of an Edwardian and Neo-Georgian (London: Richards, 1937), pp. 153-155, for a description of The Cave of the Golden Calf. The club figures in Ford's novel The Marsden Case (1923), where it is depicted as an ominously mysterious place.

²For Lewis's opinion of Ford, see Rude Assignment, p. 122, where Ford is described as an obtuse Colonel Blimp. Lewis's letters and other writings confirm that he usually regarded Ford with contempt, although he admired "his doings as an editor." Ford's opinions on Lewis's iconoclasm are evident from his comments in Portraits From Life, pp. 218-219.

Pound, but never between Ford and Lewis.

In view of this essential incompatibility, it is hard to evaluate the role Ford and the review played in Lewis's career. Lewis no doubt admired Ford's notion of an artistic community that stood apart from general society and whose members assisted one another in the cause of art. That, after all, is inherent in Vorticism or virtually any other artistic movement. Similarly, he probably respected Ford's view of the artist as a sensitive social critic. Most commentators have emphasized Lewis's social concern, and one has said, "Lewis . . . is extremely close to . . . the Victorian Sage."¹ Ford, as we have seen, would himself have been comfortable with that title.

A comparison of the English Review and Blast, however, reveals deep basic differences between the two editors. The review, as we have seen, was dignified, as befitted a journal that saw art as the serious business of sincere people. Its staid blue covers enclosed works which, as Ford kept repeating, sought to combine artistic sophistication with the awakening of the "critical attitude." The magazine saw its public as intelligent, discriminating, and curious about new ideas.

¹Walter Allen, "Lonely Old Volcano," Encounter 21 (September 1963):64.

Blast, by contrast, came with a flamboyant bright red cover and its contents mixed a few serious pieces (The Good Soldier, some poems by T. S. Eliot) with long and deliberately outrageous manifestoes and shocking statements, primarily by Lewis. Like the acrobats of his review story, Lewis in Blast sees the public as "a vast beast" to be prodded and outraged. There is a strong element of absurd humor behind Blast, but there are also hints of the paranoid extreme to which Lewis would carry the idea of the separateness of the artist.

Thus, while the English Review is perhaps an ancestor of Blast, the senior publication would regard its offspring as undignified and shockingly ill-mannered. Lewis's methods probably owe much more to the bohemian Paris salons he frequented than to the example of Ford. His literary style also shows no indication that he made a conscious study of "impressionism" and the techniques associated with it. The importance of the review to Lewis, therefore, is probably limited to the prestige he gained by appearing in such a highly regarded publication alongside important writers, and the wide circle of friends to whom he was introduced as a result of the literary legitimacy the appearance earned him.

D. H. Lawrence was the last and perhaps the greatest of the discoveries Ford made as English Review editor. Like

Lewis, Lawrence, a twenty-four-year-old schoolteacher from a Midlands colliery town, did not have the benefit of an introduction to a review insider; his work came unsolicited and unrecommended, drawn as a result of the magazine's reputation. Ford had the critical acuity to recognize the excellence of what he found before him, and the unknown schoolmaster from Eastwood found a place, first as a regular English Review contributor and eventually as one of the greatest English novelists.

Ford told several different stories of first encountering Lawrence's work, and these, perhaps more than anything else, are remembered as evidence of his editorial prowess.

The version in Portraits From Life is the best-known:

[One day] I received a letter from a young schoolteacher in Nottingham [Jessie Chambers, Lawrence's early sweetheart]. I can still see the handwriting--as if drawn with sepia rather than written in ink, on grey-blue notepaper. It said that the writer knew a young man who wrote, as she thought, admirably but was too shy to send his work to editors. Would I care to see some of his writing? . . .

I was reading in the twilight in the long eighteenth-century room that was at once the office of the English Review and my drawing-room. My eyes were tired; I had been reading all day so I did not go any further with the story. It was called "Odour of Chrysanthemums." I laid it in the basket for accepted manuscripts. My secretary looked up and said:

"You've got another genius?"

I answered: "It's a big one this time," and went upstairs to dress. . . .¹

¹Ford, Portraits From Life, pp. 70-71.

That night, according to Ford's story, he had the guests at a writers' dinner shouting between tables, "Hurray, Fordie's discovered another genius! Called D. H. Lawrence!" and, he says, "before the evening was finished I had two publishers asking me for the first refusal of D. H. Lawrence's first novel." In the same place, Ford brilliantly analyzes the first paragraph of "Odour of Chrysanthemums," showing precisely how it is "distinctly good" and why "if you are an editor . . . you can pitch the story straight away into your wicker tray with the few accepted manuscripts."¹

Metaphorically, Ford's tale is accurate, for it conveys the impression of the critical insight that made him an early enthusiast over Lawrence's work, the atmosphere of the review and London literary society, his own influence in that society, and the rapid acceptance of Lawrence as a major writer. Literally, however, Ford's tale obscures the fact that he did not see "Odour of Chrysanthemums" until nearly a month after he printed Lawrence's poetry, and that the story, instead of going "straight away into the wicker tray with the few accepted manuscripts" and being rushed into print, went back to Lawrence for extensive revisions. Austin Harrison inherited the manuscript when he succeeded Ford and

¹Ibid., pp. 72-74.

had still more suggestions. "Odour of Chrysanthemums," generally acknowledged to be among Lawrence's finest tales, did not appear until June, 1911, long after Ford lost the magazine, and it was published in a far different form from the one Ford first read. (It should be added that the opening lines Ford praised remained unaltered.)¹

The factual account of Lawrence's discovery, if less revealing than Ford's version, reflects no less favorably on his editorial judgment and on the reputation of the magazine. Lawrence and Jessie Chambers, as has been noted, were attracted to the review from the beginning and saw it from Nottingham as a "link with the world of literature."² Lawrence recommended the magazine to his friends³ but resisted Jessie's urging to submit his own work, for he was unsure of his talent

¹See Keith Cushman, "D. H. Lawrence at Work: The Making of 'Odour of Chrysanthemums'," Journal of Modern Literature 2 (June 1972):367-392. See also James T. Boulton, "D. H. Lawrence's 'Odour of Chrysanthemums': An Early Version," Renaissance and Modern Studies 13 (1969):4-48. Boulton compares an early version of the story (presumably the one Ford saw) to the one published in the review. It should be added that the story as it appeared in Lawrence's first collection, The Prussian Officer and Other Stories (1914), is altered considerably further, with the last half much improved.

²See above, p. 18.

³See Lawrence's letter to Blanche Jennings, 6 March 1909, in The Collected Letters of D. H. Lawrence, ed. Harry T. Moore, vol. 1 (New York: Viking, 1962), p. 51. Subsequent references to Lawrence's letters will be to the Moore collection, although many may also be found in various other collections of Lawrence's letters.

and discouraged over rejections by other editors. Jessie continued her urging, however, and finally Lawrence gave in: "Send whatever you like. Do what you like with them. . . . Give me a nom de plume, though; I don't want folk in Croydon [the London suburb where he was teaching] to know I write poetry."¹ Jessie copied out a number of poems from Lawrence's manuscripts early in the summer of 1909 and sent them to London. Ford replied in August, praising the author's talent and adding, "If you would get him to come and see me some time when he is in London perhaps something might be done."² Lawrence returned to his teaching job at Croydon in September, and during the next two months he called on Ford at least twice, and wrote Jessie, "He is fairish, fat, about forty, and the kindest man on earth."³

As a result of these meetings, Lawrence's poetry sequence, called "A Still Afternoon," was in the review's November number,⁴ his first published work of consequence.

¹Jessie Chambers [E. T.], D. H. Lawrence: A Personal Record, p. 157. See also Edward Nehls, ed. D. H. Lawrence: A Composite Biography, vol. 1 (Madison, Wisconsin: University of Wisconsin Press, 1957), pp. 82, 102.

²Chambers [E. T.], D. H. Lawrence: A Personal Record, p. 158.

³*Ibid.*, p. 163. See also Lawrence's letter to Blanche Jennings, 1 November 1909, in Collected Letters of D. H. Lawrence, ed. Moore, vol. 1, p. 57.

⁴Lawrence, "A Still Afternoon," ER 3 (November 1909): 561-565.

"Goose Fair," a story he gave Ford in December (along with "Odour of Chrysanthemums") came out in February,¹ after Ford had been relieved as editor but while he was assisting the new management. In the next few years, Lawrence's work continued to appear regularly, and he came to be regarded as a writer of consequence.

The three poems in "A Still Afternoon" are "Dreams Old and Nascent," "Discipline," and "Baby Movements," and they stand out from most of the other verse in the review for their high quality. More than most of the other poems, they meet Ford's poetic criteria; as Richard Aldington has pointed out, they are "exactly the sort of writing to please him, and he was undoubtedly the only English editor of the time who would have sponsored Lawrence."² Several lines from "Discipline" illustrate the poems' power:

It is stormy, and rain-drops cling like silver bees to
the pane,
The thin sycamore in the playground is swinging with
flattened leaves;
The heads of my boys move dimly through the yellow gloom
that stains
The class: over them all the dark net of my discipline
weaves.³

¹ Lawrence, "Goose Fair," ER 4 (February 1910):399-408.

² Richard Aldington, D. H. Lawrence, Portrait of a Genius But . . . (New York: Duell, Sloan and Pearce, 1950), p. 82.

³ Lawrence, "A Still Afternoon: Discipline," 564.

There is no rhetoric here, no exaggerated effort to "write poetic." Every word is from ordinary speech. Rhyme ties the stanza together, but by using long lines and irregular meter Lawrence avoids the sing-song cadences that make much Edwardian verse sound monotonously alike. The lines are intensely personal, and reveal the poet's feelings about himself, his job, his students, and such abstract concepts as "education" and "freedom." There are several memorable metaphors. The first ("rain-drops cling like silver bees") is a bit precious, but two others ("the yellow gloom that stains the class" and "the dark net of my discipline") are superb; the last, indeed, is unforgettable. Lawrence has found mots justes to render exactly the mood of alienation he wishes to communicate. His sharp, fresh images function within the dramatic movement of the poem rather than exist in static isolation, as in much of the Imagists' later work. "Discipline" and Lawrence's other review poems are indeed "exactly the sort of thing to please him [Ford]," for they show the careful craftsmanship, the simplicity, and the "exquisite intimacy" he wanted from poetry.

Ezra Pound, deeply involved in imitating canzoni and sestinas, did not immediately recognize the excellence of Lawrence's startlingly "modern" verse but as he absorbed

Ford's lessons he began to change his mind. In March, 1913, he admitted: "I think he learned the proper treatment of modern subjects before I did. That was in some poems in the Eng. Rev."¹ When Lawrence's first collection, Love Poems and Others (1913), came out containing some of the review contributions, Pound wrote in a review for Poetry:

Mr. Lawrence has attempted realism and attained it. He has brought contemporary verse up to the level of contemporary prose, and that is no mean achievement.²

Lawrence's poetry is rightly overshadowed by his fiction, but the review verses are excellent and show the lyrical gift, precision, and intensity that distinguishes his prose. The poems are fine examples of the trends that the review, with its emphasis on realism and craftsmanship in prose, indirectly promoted in poetry.

It seems certain that Ford accepted "Goose Fair" for publication, even though the story appeared after he lost the magazine. Like "Odour of Chrysanthemums," and Bennett's "The Matador of the Five Towns," the tale presents an authentic slice of life in the grimy industrial and colliery towns

¹Pound to Harriet Monroe, March 1913, in Letters of Ezra Pound, ed. Paige, p. 17.

²Pound, Review of Love Poems and Others, Poetry 2 (July 1913):151.

of the Midlands. Ford no doubt considered it a welcome addition to the unflinching picture of "the way we live now" which he wanted the review to present. The period, as we have seen, was a time of violent labor dispute, and Lawrence's tale is set against "the atmosphere of raw discontent" and "rumour of incendiary"¹ in a factory district. The Ruskinian hatred Lawrence expresses for "trade" is exactly in line with the review's anti-industrial stance (several characters in the story read Sesame and Lilies):

Trade, the invidious enemy; Trade which thrust out its hand and shut the factory doors, and pulled the stockings off their seats, and left the web half-finished on the frame; Trade, which mysteriously choked up the mysterious sources of the rivulets of wealth, and blacker and more secret than a pestilence, starved the town.²

The central conflict in the English Review version of "Goose Fair" is between classes--the peasant goose girl against the spoiled sons of the mill owners. While there are elements of the typical Lawrentian sexual struggle, psychological interaction does not predominate, as it does in the revised version of "Goose Fair" that appeared in The Prussian Officer and Other Stories (1914). The story Ford accepted is the

¹Lawrence, "Goose Fair," 399, 402.

²Ibid., 400.

sort of social study which he thought could help define "where we stand," and its anti-industrial, anti-commercial views are exactly those of Tono-Bungay, "The Back of Beyond," and other review belles lettres, or those expressed in the non-fiction of "The Month."

The story has flashes of description in which Lawrence finds le mot juste to render vivid scenes: "She saw the steel of the machines growing white hot and twisting like flaming letters in a dreadful message. Piece after piece of the flooring gave way, and the machines dropped in red ruin as the wooden framework burned away."¹ The narrative technique is straightforward, and there is little subtlety in point of view. The opening scene is rendered through the eyes of the goose girl, but thereafter Lawrence focuses on the daughter of a mill owner and relates her experiences in chronological order. The story is not remarkable from the standpoint of structure or narrative; its primary appeal for Ford no doubt lay in its portrayal of life in the Midland factory district, especially since the opinions implicit in the tale are exactly his own.

After discovering Lawrence, Ford immediately undertook to manage his career. He arranged for Violet Hunt to

¹Ibid., 403.

entertain Lawrence and Jessie Chambers at a Sunday luncheon, where they were introduced to Pound and René Byles, the publisher. Table talk concerned social issues. Violet solicited her guests' working class views on socialism and women's suffrage, and Ford was greatly impressed with their knowledge of Ruskin and Carlyle. There were a few awkward moments: Jessie had to whisper questions to the maid on proper table manners, and Pound slyly tried to provoke controversy by asking Ford "how [he] would speak to a working-man." All problems were smoothed over, however, and the day was a great success.¹ Ford and Violet obviously regarded their guests as genuine exotics--living examples of the provincial lower classes they so often spoke of but seldom met.

Ford arranged for Lawrence to attend other social gatherings. Not long after the South Lodge luncheon, for example, he took him to a posh evening dinner attended by poets and Members of Parliament, first gaining special permission from his host to bring the "shy and countrified" young man from "somewhere in the Black Country."² Here too

¹See Jessie Chambers [E. T.], D. H. Lawrence: A Personal Record, pp. 168-176. See also Violet Hunt, I Have This to Say, pp. 58-59, and Ford, Return to Yesterday, pp. 375-376.

²Rhys, Everyman Remembers, pp. 243-250. Rhys's account of the dinner is mentioned in practically every biography of Ford, Lawrence, Pound, or Yeats.

there were awkward moments, but Lawrence was apparently eager to be put forward.

Ford also looked at the manuscript of Lawrence's first novel, The White Peacock, and arranged for its publication.¹ Violet Hunt's review of it indicates how she and Ford regarded Lawrence's work:

It [The White Peacock] should be read by all those superior persons who say they have no time to read novels . . . because from its pages they will learn something of the mind of the classes, who really returned them to the top of the poll, or turned them down, as the case may be. . . . We always find the result of elections nowadays so surprizing. But those of us who have read The White Peacock--this political document developed along the lines of passionate romance--will be more or less prepared.²

This view of Lawrence as a spokesman for the provincial working classes is ultimately grossly condescending, and in view of his extreme sensitivity over his lower-class beginnings it is obvious that the Ford-Lawrence relationship could not last long. Lawrence was in awe while Ford played the role of literary godfather through the fall and winter of 1909,

¹Lawrence to William Heinemann, 15 December 1909, in Collected Letters of D. H. Lawrence, ed. Moore, vol. 1, p. 58.

²Violet Hunt, Review of The White Peacock, D. H. Lawrence, The Critical Heritage, ed. R. P. Draper (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1970), pp. 38-39. The review originally appeared in the Daily Chronicle on 10 February 1911.

but when the loss of the magazine and mounting personal crises forced Ford to withdraw from literary society, Lawrence felt abandoned and betrayed:

Ford Madox Hueffer discovered I was a genius--don't be alarmed, Hueffer would discover anything if he wanted to--published me some verse and a story or two, sent me to Wm. Heinemann with The White Peacock, and left me to paddle my own canoe. I very nearly wrecked it and did for myself. Edward Garnett, like a good angel, fished me out.¹

Garnett, whom Lawrence had come to know through Ford and the review, became the new mentor, and as Lawrence gained sophistication and self-confidence he came to regard Ford as a pompous, patronizing fool. He wrote Garnett in 1912:

I found Hueffer getting very fat--"be not puffed up" came into my mind. But he's rather nicer than he was. He seems to have had a crisis, when, dear Lord, he fizzed and bubbled all over the place. Now, don't you know, he seems quite considerate, even thoughtful for other folk. But he is fat.²

Ford, for his part, continued to admire Lawrence's work but found him, as he found Lewis, feisty, humorless, and uncongenial.³ They were never friends.

¹ Lawrence to Ernest Collings, 14 November 1912, in Collected Letters of D. H. Lawrence, ed. Moore, vol. 1, p. 158.

² Lawrence to Edward Garnett, 10 February 1912, *Ibid.*, p. 98.

³ Ford's views are summed up in his chapter on Lawrence in Portraits From Life, pp. 70-89.

While the differing personalities of the two writers did not offer a basis for a long personal relationship, their brief association was important, for it established Lawrence in his career. In the five years following his review debut, he published five major books and numerous poems and stories. Perhaps drive and talent would have assured Lawrence's success in any event, but in the short time Ford promoted him he became a celebrity and achieved access to literary circles that otherwise would have remained closed to him. He also gained the self-confidence that as a young man from the provinces he needed to survive in London literary society.

The review seems not to have played a major role in shaping his literary techniques, however. He did take note of the formal considerations the review emphasized and worried over reviewers' comments that The White Peacock lacked structural subtlety. He wrote Garnett about his second novel: "I hope the thing is knitted firm--I hate those pieces where the stitch is slack and loose."¹ Form was never his strong suit, however, and as he gained artistic confidence he ceased to trouble himself unduly about it. The natural diction,

¹ Lawrence to Edward Garnett, 21 January 1912, in Collected Letters of D. H. Lawrence, ed. Moore, vol. 1, p. 94.

precise imagery, and stylistic freedom of Lawrence's poetry was present from the beginning and his verse style, unlike Pound's, was probably not influenced by Ford's poetics. On the contrary, it has been suggested that Ford may have been influenced by Lawrence,¹ and the increased freedom evident in Ford's poems after about 1910 gives credence to this conjecture. The primary importance of the review in Lawrence's career was the discovery itself, for in a few months under Ford's stewardship, Lawrence achieved a reputation that it takes most young writers years to build.

The review was thus important to Lawrence, as it was for Douglas, Pound, and Lewis. Several general observations will put the magazine's role in discovering new talent into an overall perspective. First, it should be noted that three of the four discoveries (Douglas was the exception) were quite young. Lewis, Pound, and Lawrence were all in their mid-twenties when their work came out. (The review published a number of other young writers as well; Flint, Brooke, Forster, and Reynolds were all thirty or under, but had already appeared elsewhere.) Second, their material, although excellent, was by no means startlingly avant-garde. Douglas

¹Smith, Ford Madox Ford, pp. 42-43.

and Lewis in their travel essays and character sketches have the charm and slightly caustic wit of the Victorian essayists. Hints of the iconoclastic poses they would later adopt are apparent only in retrospect. Pound's poems are vigorous but thoroughly traditional. Lawrence's poetic technique is perhaps surprising for its use of vers libre, but there are obvious echoes of the familiar sentiments of the romantics. His short story is likewise not startling for readers familiar with the realism of Gissing, Moore, and Bennett. Third, Ford did not publish single items by the new talent he discovered, for he meant to launch them fairly on literary careers. Thus, he used a body of their work, spread out over a period of months--three essays each by Douglas and Lewis, three selections of Pound's poetry, and a group of poems and a story by Lawrence. He also attempted to introduce the young men to publishers and other editors. Finally, the way Ford made some of his discoveries is impressive. Douglas and Pound came recommended, but Lewis and Lawrence were unknowns attracted by the magazine's reputation. Ford selected their manuscripts from among the dozens by other unknowns that crossed his desk. There is no evidence to show that among the writers he turned away there were any of real talent.¹

¹Ford often complained of being deluged with manuscripts by untalented amateurs. In Return to Yesterday, p. 383, he

As is suggested by the variety of their contributions, Ford's discoveries did not go on to form a school or coterie. Pound was Ford's most acute pupil and, as we have seen, his ideas about literature were profoundly influenced by Ford's. The Imagiste school he founded (or, more accurately, took over from T. E. Hulme) owed much to Ford and the review, and Des Imagistes includes work by Ford, Pound, and Flint; and D. H. Lawrence later became associated with Imagism. The movement broke up, however, within a few years. Vorticism, directed by Pound and Lewis, also owed part of its artistic zest and zealotry to the spirit of the review, but it too did not last long.

While the discoveries formed no lasting association, an attitude which they had in common was a zeal for social reform, a notion that was central to the English Review. All of them saw art as a means of purifying society and sweeping away cant. Several became politically active, and indeed, politics were very nearly the undoing of Pound and Lewis. All of them tended, like Ford, to be elitist. Ford's Tory views would seem far away from Lawrence's social outlook,

tells of answering "for the fifth time" a lady who could not understand why Ford refused "a paper of verses on the solar system, whereas the Archbishop of Canterbury had praised a volume she had sent him."

but there are similarities, since both conceived of the artist as one who must oppose middle class "respectability"--that is to say, complacent mediocrity. Douglas, Pound, and Lewis also held this general idea. Thus, the discoveries were all, like Ford, inheritors of the Victorian tradition of artist-preacher-sage.

Considering the strong-willed nature of the four men, it is not surprising that few lasting friendships developed out of their common review background. Lewis and Pound worked together for a time, but it was an uneasy alliance. Pound also associated with Lawrence briefly, but intensely disliked him. Lawrence and Lewis apparently detested one another, and Lawrence and Douglas enjoyed one of the classic literary vendettas of the century. In retrospect, it seems remarkable that 84 Holland Park Avenue was not the scene of rioting.

The only permanent friendship to emerge was that between Pound and Ford. In the pre-war period, Pound learned a great deal from Ford, and he usually acknowledged his debt. Although they saw relatively little of one another after 1924, when Pound left Paris for Italy, there remained a great deal of mutual respect and affection between them.¹ Douglas

¹Pound's treatment of Ford (and everyone else) in "Hugh Selwyn Mauberly" is unflattering, but in Canto LXXXII

seems never to have had much contact with Ford, while Lewis and Lawrence both came to regard him as pompous, patronizing, and something of a fool (although both occasionally praised him for recognizing their genius). Ford was not greatly distressed that his patronage did not earn him lasting gratitude. He wrote to Gertrude Stein in 1924, when his second editorial venture, the Transatlantic Review, was collapsing, "I really exist as a sort of half-way house between nonpublishable youth and the real money--a sort of green baize swing door everyone kicks both on entering and on leaving."¹ If his work as discoverer of new talent earned him little thanks, however, it earned him and the English Review a significant place in literary history.

of the Pisan Cantos he achieves more perspective. The obituary he wrote upon Ford's death in 1939 is perceptive and humane. See above, p. 228.

¹Ford to Gertrude Stein, 18 September 1924, in Letters of Ford Madox Ford, ed. Ludwig, p. 162.

CHAPTER EIGHT

FORD LOSES THE REVIEW

Even as the English Review was making literary history, the "distraught, inconsistent, foolish, and socially destructive course"¹ which Ford took in managing its affairs was undermining not only his position as editor but his general stature in literary circles. Further, his unsound management and the magazine's failure to attract a respectably large circulation kept the venture constantly near financial collapse. The end was not long in coming, and exactly a year after the gay Christmas parties of 1908 which celebrated the magazine's auspicious beginnings, Conrad was writing Norman Douglas: "The very echoes of the great upheaval have died out. . . . In fact, 'everything is over but the stink' as they say after fireworks."² Ford's loss of the

¹Meixner, "Ford and Conrad," 166.

²Conrad to Douglas, 25 December 1909, quoted by Arthur Mizener, The Saddest Story, p. 186.

magazine was caused by a complex set of circumstances that involved personal interaction, artistic considerations, and financial matters. The story of the loss, besides obviously being part of the review's history, is important to an assessment of the role it played and the attitudes it left behind.

The year that ended in disaster began happily, for as the astonishing quality of the review became apparent Ford found himself a leading literary personality. Established figures cultivated him and the aspiring young sought him out. Ford revelled in the role. David Garnett, the son of Edward and Constance Garnett, later recalled Ford in his time of triumph:

He was arrayed in a magnificent fur coat;--wore a glossy topper; drove about in hired carriages; and his fresh features, the colour of raw veal, his prominent blue eyes and rabbit teeth smiled benevolently and patronizingly upon all gatherings of literary lions.¹

At the Mont Blanc Restaurant, the National Liberal Club, and most other places where writers and men of affairs gathered he was a familiar figure, but his own digs at 84 Holland Park Avenue became the most exciting of London's literary salons. The guests there, Ford said later, ranged from Ezra

¹David Garnett, The Golden Echo (New York: Harcourt, Brace, 1954), p. 129.

Pound to the Bishop of Edinburgh.¹ Whether the Bishop was actually ever present is unconfirmed, but Ford's boast is metaphorically correct for his parties brought together groups of widely different people: socially and politically prominent figures, famous writers, established editors and publishers, radically chic advocates of fashionable causes like socialism and women's suffrage, and Ford's young geniuses. Ford seemed to be accomplishing his goal of establishing a circle of "grown-up minds whose leisure can be interested by something else than the crispness and glitter of popular statement," and reestablishing literature as a worthy pursuit for serious and sincere people.

The procession of guests that streamed through the perpetually unlocked doors sometimes made it difficult for the editor to find time to edit, but Ford found a solution. Goldring subsequently remembered:

When I arrived, after my day's work on Country Life, I was usually dispatched to the Shepherd's Bush Empire to secure a box or two stalls for the "second house." Here we used to repair, evening after evening, with the manuscripts which had accumulated during the day. Hueffer would hold the manuscripts in his lap, and while the jugglers hurled golden bottles at one another with prodigious violence he would dictate his letters and decide their fate. But the moment Victoria Monks, or some one of the kind, made her appearance, then the cares of editing were at once forgotten.²

¹Ford, Return to Yesterday, p. 395.

²Goldring, Reputations, pp. 217-218.

Afterwards, editor and sub-editor returned to the flat to complete what work remained. That often meant working late into the night, or the early morning.

Ford's unorthodox practices did not cause the contents of the review to suffer. As we have seen, the superb first number was followed by others that were no less distinguished, as Ford continued to secure work by the greatest established writers and talented "les jeunes." Reviewers paid tribute to the journal's sustained high quality:¹

The second number of a periodical is a severer test of its editor than the first, and the Editor of "The English Review" is to be congratulated on producing a second number even more interesting than its predecessor was. (Nation [London], 9 January 1909)

On the whole, "The English Review" is increasing rather than falling off in interest. (Daily News, 6 May 1909)

Yet despite the continued critical success of the magazine and the lively intellectual interaction that swirled around it, by early spring of 1909 Ford was facing a steadily mounting series of quarrels and crises. He was so expert at concealing even the most traumatic of disappointments that few of the people who thronged 84 Holland Park Avenue knew

¹See Harvey, Ford, A Bibliography, pp. 297-300. The quotations cited are from pp. 298 and 300, respectively.

that anything was amiss.¹ There arose, however, disagreements with Bennett and various other contributors, and even the inner circle of close friends who had shared in the review's founding was in disarray. By mid-March, Ford had fallen out with Wells, and rifts were evident in his friendships with Conrad, Marwood, and Edward and Robert Garnett. Most important, his marriage of nearly fifteen years was beginning to break up.

The immediate difficulties with Bennett and other contributors sprang from Ford's inability to manage business affairs. He absolutely rejected any knowledge of money matters, and the notion that literary work could be bid for, bought, or sold was for him unthinkable. In consequence, his methods for paying contributors were chaotic, and those whom he did not enrage he totally confused.

Ford tried at first to stick to the scheme he had outlined to Edward Garnett in October, 1909; that is, to run the review as a co-operative, with himself as director and co-ordinator.² He planned to draw upon the artistic community at large for literary contributions and editorial

¹See Goldring, The Last Pre-Raphaelite, p. 149, and South Lodge, pp. 52-53.

²See above, p. 53.

assistance, and share the proceeds with these fellow-artists. The scheme squared perfectly with Ford's conception of a community of writers, assisting one another to fulfill the artists' role in society and receiving in return the respect of a grateful public and, naturally, a comfortable living. In practice, his plan to ask writers, "Will you take £ 2 a 1000 words or will you take a sporting risk . . . as a shareholder" quickly collapsed. To Ford's surprise, few writers wanted to take "a sporting risk" and he did not follow his plan to offer a flat £ 2 per 1000 words as an alternative. Instead his rates were completely inconsistent. He enjoyed playing the role of generous patron, lavishing upon writers their just rewards, and his talk and behavior encouraged rumors that he and the review had great wealth. Even when he was not in a generous mood, he sometimes simply paid writers what they asked in order to avoid hard bargaining and the possibility of confrontation. These practices led to gross inequities:

I used . . . to ask contributors to demand any rate of pay they liked, leaving it to their consciences to ask a fair average price for their work. . . . One or two certainly asked for and got a great deal more than they had ever before imagined getting. On the other hand, many of the wealthier--and not a few of the quite indigent--writers wrote for me for nothing.¹

¹Ford, Return to Yesterday, p. 383.

Those who "wrote for me for nothing" did not necessarily set out with that intention. More often, they accepted vague offers of a "good price" or counted on stories of the review's wealth and Ford's generosity for assurance that their final payments would be equitable. Naturally, these slipshod methods of doing business led to disagreements.

When Ford invited Bennett to contribute, for example, no price was mentioned, but Bennett assumed that "The Matador of the Five Towns" would earn him at least his normal rate, £40 or 50. Thus, he told Ford to "settle the price with Pinker [his literary agent] and pay him in due course."¹ When Ford paid only £30 Bennett, who brooked no nonsense when money was concerned, was outraged. There ensued a series of communications between Ford, Pinker, and Bennett in which the question who had promised what to whom became hopelessly confused. Ford expressed his opinions of the disagreement in a letter to Bennett in early March:

Oh hang! If you negotiate thro' Pinker what can you expect? . . . I am running a philanthropic institution for the benefit of the better letters: I am perfectly resigned to bankruptcy. . . . I stand here to be shot at: Shoot!--But not thro' Pinker. . . . If the Review were a business concern it wd. be a different matter. But it isn't, it is a device by wh. I am losing £300 a month. . . . And all you chaps: all, do you understand are clamouring for this dissolution. Very well. . . . I won't fight you: I pay any price any author asks: no more: no less. But I fight anybody

¹ Bennett to Ford, 30 December 1908, in Letters of Arnold Bennett, ed. Hepburn, vol. 2, 247.

who has what appears to me the indecency to employ an agent, to the bitter death.¹

The letter illustrates Ford's high-minded view of himself, and its frantic tone suggests the emotional trauma the affair caused him.

After thus assuring Bennett (and reassuring himself) of the purity of his motives, Ford offered peace by inviting Bennett to dinner. Bennett first refused, but in early April when tempers cooled and he had his extra £ 10 he dined at 84 Holland Park Avenue, where he met Galsworthy. Perhaps Galsworthy explained Ford's temperament, or Bennett's normally charitable nature reasserted itself when he had come to know Ford personally. At any rate, a month later he wrote Pinker:

I am thinking of letting Hueffer print What the Public Wants complete in one number of the English Review (July). I told him I would give it him, but he said if it increased the sale he would pay me a royalty!!

I like him! I think he can't help being devious.²

As has been reported, Bennett did give Ford What the Public Wants, as well as the poem, "Town and Country." He neither asked for nor got payment for either.

¹ Ford to Bennett, 10 March 1909, quoted in Mizener, The Saddest Story, pp. 158-159.

² Bennett to Pinker, 11 May 1909, in Letters of Arnold Bennett, ed. Hepburn, vol. 1; Letters to J. B. Pinker (London: Oxford University Press, 1966), p. 121.

Ford's disagreement with Bennett ended amicably when Bennett came to understand Ford's personality, but in Ford's quarrel with Wells issues ran much deeper. The disagreement was never resolved, and ended an association of ten years' standing. Their immediate point of contention was the serialization of Tono-Bungay. Early in 1908, when Wells withdrew his offer to put up half the money and do half the editing for their proposed magazine, there remained the matter of the novel which, in their original plan, was to have been the nucleus of the first several numbers. Under terms of their agreement, Wells was to have received a fifth of the review's receipts for serialization. Wells apparently allowed this portion of the agreement to stand, although obviously with mixed feelings. He kept himself at some distance from Ford's affairs, seldom appearing at 84 Holland Park Avenue, and in a series of indecisive gestures beginning almost as soon as it became obvious that the review would, in fact, come into being he sought to discourage having his novel serialized. He did not, however, state his objections frankly or flatly withdraw the work, and so the first of four installments of Tono-Bungay was in the first number. Within a month Wells was convinced he had made a mistake in allowing the serialization to proceed. Ford had estimated originally that each

number of the review would sell 5,000 copies and have £ 300 advertising revenue, putting Wells's fifth share at over £ 600. By January Wells saw that Ford's estimates were hopelessly optimistic, and that making any sense out of Ford's confused accounts would be impossible anyway. To recoup some of his loss, he decided to publish Tono-Bungay in book form on February 2, nearly a month before the last installment was to appear in the review.

Ford was furious when he heard, for he was sure his sales would suffer. Out of his fear of direct confrontations he refused to address his objections to Wells directly. Instead, he sent Wells's wife several letters describing how Wells had, in Ford's view, reneged on earlier agreements. As in his letters to Bennett, he cast himself as a high-minded man of letters, forced to contend with others' venality:

My own profits in the matter have been and will be nothing. I have most studiously avoided in any way advertising myself in connection with the Review. I have contributed very large sums in the way of capital & an enormous amount of work & as you know any profits from the Review are to be devoted to publishing books that would not otherwise be published, all the profits, that is to say, except those that go to Wells. Wells, as you must know, has behaved again & again most treacherously to me.¹

¹Ford to Mrs. H. G. Wells, 29 January 1909, in Letters of Ford Madox Ford, ed. Ludwig, p. 33.

Ford went on to threaten a lawsuit, and then hinted at the action he wanted Wells to take:

Of course if you had arranged with Macmillan to postpone the publication before my letter it would materially change my view of the situation.¹

There is evidence that Wells did slightly postpone publication of Tono-Bungay,² but he was highly incensed Ford had raised the issue with his wife and not with him personally. Through the next several months the two exchanged a number of irate letters, but nothing was settled. Wells got nothing from Ford for his novel except vague explanations, and no more of his work appeared during Ford's editorship.

While the serialization was the immediate cause of the Wells-Ford row, there were other factors as well. As we have seen, in the course of his editorship Ford grew dissatisfied with Wellsian novelistic technique as he became increasingly sensitive to careful artistry. He disliked what

¹Ford to Mrs. H. G. Wells, 1 February 1909, Ibid., p. 35.

²Times Literary Supplement (28 January 1909):32, carried an advertisement for the Macmillan Company which gave 2 February as the publication date for Tono-Bungay. In the following week's issue, p. 40, the Macmillan advertisement gave 9 February as the publication date. It is therefore probable that the book actually appeared on or after 9 February. Macmillan did not usually advertise books before they were actually available for sale, and its doing so with Tono-Bungay may have been because there was a last-minute change in publication date.

he saw as Wells's carelessness in plot and structure and denigrated Wells's fiction publicly in "The Critical Attitude."¹ Wells was sensitive on the issue of his artistic skill and no doubt took offense. At any rate, in the course of Ford's editorship his long-standing relationship with Wells ended.

Other arguments in which Ford engaged early in 1909 confirm that behind the smiling and benevolent mask he wore while presiding over literary gatherings he was under severe emotional stress. Early in January he argued with Frank Harris over a short story Harris had submitted. Harris summed up his feelings about the editor not long afterwards with a succinct, "The man's an ass."² Stephen Reynolds's manager-ship of the review's business affairs caused constant squabbles, and after Reynolds resigned the quarrel continued over payment for his novel, The Holy Mountain. Edward and Robert Garnett had been Ford's friends since childhood, but he managed to alienate both of them. Edward Garnett had evidently criticized Ford's condescending attitude even as the

¹See above, p. 160.

²Harris to Bennett, 17 January 1909, quoted in Harvey, Ford, A Bibliography, p. 531. See also Ford, It was the Nightingale, pp. 316-319.

first number of the review appeared, for Ford apologized by explaining, "I can't help my Olympian manner."¹ Not long afterwards, their mutual testiness flared again when Ford took offense at comments made at a dinner where two potential financial backers were being entertained. Ford reacted with one of his typically self-righteous letters, criticizing Garnett for "crying down of the magazine wh. I am doing absolutely for the love of literature and without any idea of advancement."² Edward Garnett's brother Robert, a solicitor, also became a target for Ford's wrath, with Ford charging that Robert had spread stories refuting Ford's vague claims that he would inherit a sizable fortune from his German relatives.³ Even Conrad and Marwood were drawn into differences with him. Conrad agreed with Garnett that Ford's erratic management threatened the magazine's success, and Ford, when he learned of the criticism, convinced himself that while

¹ Ford to Edward Garnett, December 1908, in Letters of Ford Madox Ford, ed. Ludwig, p. 29. See also Goldring, The Last Pre-Raphaelite, p. 133, for accounts of the Ford-Garnett arguments.

² Ford to Edward Garnett, 1909 [?], in Letters of Ford Madox Ford, ed. Ludwig, p. 31.

³ See Ford to Pinker, [n.d.], quoted in Mizener, The Saddest Story, pp. 164-165.

he was being blamed for the review's problems, Marwood, as his partner and financial backer, was receiving credit for its success.¹ Thus, by mid-March, Ford had alienated many of the people associated with the review's founding. With Wells there was a complete break, with both Garnetts open dissention, and with Conrad and Marwood, disagreements which would erupt later into more serious quarrels.

Those who criticized Ford's management of course had a valid point. Finances were in chaos, but other matters were no better. Manuscripts got lost; Violet Hunt recalled that the garden behind Ford's flat "grew nothing but empty packing-cases and reams of discarded packing paper, and--the moment the review was really started--priceless manuscripts that the rabbits of Mr. Chandler browsed upon."² Ford's illegible handwriting confounded printers and compositors, and he was immediately impatient if their work was only slightly delayed. His ineptness was also making his personal life miserable. He could not manage even his modest household, and when all the guests had left his uninhibited parties, he was lonely in his editorial office-sitting room. Ford's personality,

¹See Ford to Elsie Hueffer, March 1909, Ibid., p. 180.

²Hunt, I Have This to Say, p. 14.

moreover, "a great edifice which was plainly in need of more support than was inherent in the structure itself,"¹ was near collapse by the spring of 1909. It was then that Violet Hunt seriously entered his life, and the resulting scandal had a profound effect on both Ford and the English Review.

Ford's marriage to Elsie Martindale had taken place in 1894, when he was six months short of his twenty-first birthday and she was not yet eighteen. Her parents had opposed the match, but for ten years the marriage was happy. Ford, by his own description, was in "a severely Small-Producer frame of mind,"² and the couple lived in a series of rural cottages in Surrey, Kent, and Sussex, where Ford wrote and puttered at farming while Elsie kept house and cared for the two daughters that were born to them, the first in 1897 and the second in 1900. Both Ford and Elsie enjoyed an active social and intellectual life in these idyllic settings, for their neighbors included, at various times, the Garnetts, Wells, Hudson, James, the Conrads, and Stephen Crane. The Conrads became their closest intimates when Ford

¹Stella Bowen, Drawn From Life (London: Collins Publishers, 1940), p. 62. Bowen shared Ford's life for most of the nineteen-twenties and bore him a child. Her memoir contains a perceptive examination of Ford's personality.

²Ford, Portraits From Life, p. 25.

and Conrad began their celebrated collaboration in 1898, after being introduced by Edward Garnett.

When Ford decided in 1904 to leave the country and move to London in order to further his literary career, the situation changed. The family took a house in the city in January, and the Conrads moved in nearby. The move was unfortunate, however, for in their old and drafty house the family were often sick and Ford's work went slowly. Conrad suffered from the hypochondria and depression that often plagued him, and the strains of the collaboration played on both writers. That spring, Ford was near a breakdown. He sought relief by escaping from the surroundings that were associated with it, and when he left for Germany that June for treatment, Elsie stayed behind.

He returned in December, 1905, and buoyed up by the success of The Soul of London began the strenuous London literary activity that culminated in the English Review. Elsie, committed to the William Morris ideal of craftsman and cottager, hated the city but loved her husband and tried to adjust to his new life. On numerous occasions she came to London intending to remain, but always temperament and poor health caused her to retreat back to their house in Kent. Ford took 84 Holland Park Avenue in 1907 intending for it to

be the family's London home, and Elsie and the children lived there for a time. Late that year, however, she finally gave up and moved permanently to their country cottage. Thereafter, the flat above the poulterer's shop was a bachelor's digs. Ford, however, spent most of his weekends in Kent, where the neighbors included Wells, Hudson, James, Marwood, and (except for their brief stay in Bedfordshire) the Conrads, while the Garnetts often came to visit. It was in this circle, as we have seen, that plans for the English Review were developed.

Through the summer and fall of 1908, the embryonic magazine was the center of Ford's attention, with Marwood at last consenting to provide financial backing and he, Ford, Wells, Hudson, and Conrad providing literary contributions. Once the magazine actually started, however, Ford spent less time in Kent. Elsie felt she was losing her husband, and in March she made a serious charge: Marwood, she told her husband, had made improper advances.¹ It is impossible to determine exactly what happened, but it seems likely that Elsie confided to Marwood in her loneliness and he misinterpreted her confidences as invitations to greater intimacy.

¹Mizener, The Saddest Story, pp. 180-184.

Elsie made as much as she could of the issue, hoping that Ford would come to her defense and so return to her. It is also possible she saw the matter as a way to complete the rift between the two business partners and thus end once and for all the magazine enterprise that seemed to be taking her husband away. Conrad, also at odds with Ford, sided with Marwood, while Robert Garnett, acting as honest broker, tried to convince both sides to be reasonable. Eventually, the issue faded.

Despite the fact that, in final analysis the Marwood-Elsie matter was an insignificant misunderstanding, it had several important effects on Ford and the review. First, it exacerbated the rift between Ford and the Kentish circle that had been so important in the review's first few numbers. Second, it meant that Marwood, who had subsidized the magazine at the beginning, was no longer available as a source of financial support. Finally, by complicating Ford's life with still another trauma at this already critical time, it made him vulnerable to new romantic attachments, and they were not long in coming.

Ford's weakness for affairs of the heart has been much noted, and probably no other aspect of his personality has disturbed his critics more. Yet it is wrong to see Ford as a sexual libertine. Mizener has explained:

Like all men of his romantic temper, he was highly susceptible to women, especially to the promise of unknown women. . . . To this kind of appeal he was most susceptible when he was unhappy. He found the excitement of sexual exploration irresistible; he found the sympathy of an attractive woman necessary to the dramatization of himself as the unjustly suffering man.¹

By the early spring of 1909, Ford was particularly vulnerable.

Again, Mizener's analysis is helpful:

Ford was worried and lonely. He felt his heroic idealism in founding the English Review was completely misunderstood by hard, practical men like Bennett and Garnett, and he was not finding in Elsie the tenderness and comfort--say nothing of the romantic excitement--that he longed for. What he needed was sympathy and consolation; what he dreamed of was a grand passion into which he could fling himself at the same time that he was confounding his enemies by making a splendid success of the Review--for in spite of the Review's huge losses he was still, at times, able to persuade himself that "just a very little more would make it a paying proposition."²

Ford's sentimental vulnerability to a love affair is evident from his brief involvement with the young woman who inspired his poem "To Gertrude," but Gertrude Schlablowsky obviously could not provide him with the sort of "sympathy and consolation" he needed. The role of "grand person" was eventually filled by Violet Hunt.

Their celebrated affair has been chronicled in detail by Mizener, and the information he uncovered in preparing

¹Ibid., p. 177.

²Ibid., p. 177.

Ford's biography is important to a consideration of the English Review. Ford and Violet had similar backgrounds. As children they saw one another at the artistic and intellectual gatherings their parents attended, but before October, 1908, they met only infrequently. By that time, Violet was one of Britain's leading women novelists, and a personification of intellectual glamor. For over a decade she had marched in suffragette parades, demonstrated wit and charm at repartee in literary salons, and accepted the hospitality of some of England's smartest and wealthiest houses. She had also shown the tempestuousness and occasional indiscretion that had, as a girl, earned her the nickname of "the immodest Violet."¹ There had been a number of affairs, some serious, but what she wanted by 1909 was a husband. She was forty-six, and in middle age craved respectability. The distinguished editor of England's most exciting review fit her specifications perfectly.

Their association began over a matter related to the magazine. In October, 1908, having heard of the impending review, she called on Ford to submit manuscripts. The editor invited her to stay for tea and afterwards selected "The Coach" for publication. They began seeing one another often

¹Goldring, South Lodge, p. 42.

after that, and Violet began to take a maternal interest in the editor's travail:

. . . I could not help thinking [late in 1908] of the lonely editor stewing at his desk in the fetid airs of the poulterer's shop, spending his evenings in the Shepherd's Bush Empire near by, with a sheaf of manuscripts to read. . . .

I felt I must do something.¹

She began preparing intimate suppers for him in the kitchen on the floor above the famous drawing room, and at one, Ford, evidently in a particularly depressed mood, hinted at suicide. Violet noticed something in the "loose, open pocket of the brown velvet jacket that Rossetti had once worn," and found a bottle marked "Poison":

"Were you?" I said; and he answered, "I was."

"Donkey!" I said, and, keeping the bottle in my hand, sought for my cloak and shouldered it. He said anxiously, "Do you mean to give it me back?"

"No!" I was firm, and, for the first time after one of our dinners, he walked home with me--and it was only half-past ten when all was said and done.²

Given Ford's personality, it is doubtful he was serious about suicide, but the gesture was typical of his flair for self-dramatization and habit of making overtures obliquely. The drama of the scene also appealed to Violet, who promptly proceeded, in Goldring's phrase, "to take Ford in hand and put the all-but-shipwrecked genius under entirely new management."³

¹Hunt, I Have This to Say, p. 16.

²Ibid., pp. 65-66. ³Goldring, South Lodge, p. 89.

By May, 1909, Ford was declaring his love for Violet and asking Elsie for a divorce. Mizener, on the basis of Violet's diaries, says they became lovers on June 10.¹ Later that month, Violet saw her lawyer about arranging Ford's divorce. Elsie seemed amenable at first, but then for various reasons began to resist. By July she and Violet were engaged in the opening skirmishes of what became a drawn-out battle for the right to be Mrs. Hueffer.

Ford and Violet became subjects of gossip, especially after a public confrontation with Elsie at Charing Cross railway station in mid-October. To escape temporarily the mounting pressures of London and the review, they slipped off together to France for Violet's birthday. Elsie heard of the trip and came to London, where she found out not only that they had gone off together but also that they would return that evening at Charing Cross. When the couple stepped off the train, Elsie, her lawyer, and the children's governess stood waiting on the platform. The scene that ensued was widely reported about London.² Ford found still another indignity awaiting him when he returned to 84 Holland Park Avenue. His financial backers, having no idea when or even

¹Mizener, The Saddest Story, p. 179.

²See Hunt, I Have This to Say, pp. 84-85.

if he was coming back, had appointed Galsworthy as temporary editor. Galsworthy quietly relinquished the editor's chair when he discovered Ford's absence had been only temporary.¹

Henry James heard of the Charing Cross scene and was indignant. He had spoken with Ford during the early phases of the review and been among the first contributors. He also knew Violet (although not through Ford and the review), and she was to have been a guest at a late October weekend at Lamb House. The gossip caused James to withdraw the invitation:

I deeply lament and deplore the lamentable position in which I gather you have put yourself. . . . It affects me as painfully unedifying, and that compels me to regard all agreeable or unembarrassed communications between us as impossible. I can neither suffer you to come down to hear me utter those homely truths, nor pretend at such a time to free or natural discourse of other things on a basis of avoidance of what must now be most to the front in your own consciousness, or what in a very unwelcome fashion disconcerts mine. Otherwise, "es wäre so schön gewesen!"²

Both Ford and Violet sought to remonstrate, but James would have no explanations. He considered the case closed, and so it was. He ended all correspondence with Ford and the review,

¹ See Ford, Return to Yesterday, p. 392, for Ford's account.

² James to Violet Hunt, 2 November 1909, quoted in Hunt, I Have This to Say, pp. 95-96. See also Edel, Henry James, vol. 5: The Master, pp. 422-425.

where the last installment of "Mora Montravers" had appeared in September. No other contributions from "The Master" would be forthcoming, and he would have nothing more to do with either Ford or Violet.

In Ford's break with Conrad, notoriety and insufferable conduct were no doubt factors, but the relationship was extremely close and complex and its end was similarly complicated. After 1898, when their collaboration began, they practically became alter egos. Their joint effort produced no great works, but Ford helped Conrad overcome his self-doubt and in the decade of their association Conrad produced his greatest fiction. Recent scholarship has gone far to show that Ford was virtually a "secret sharer" in this period of intense creativity, sharpening Conrad's ideas, assisting when knowledge of English failed him, and providing moral and spiritual support.¹ After 1904, when Ford went to Germany, the two saw comparatively less of one another, but their relationship remained cordial. In 1908, as we have seen, Conrad was so intimately involved in planning the review he was virtually a co-editor. He helped formulate the manifesto

¹See Meixner, "Ford and Conrad."

and with Ford's prodding and encouragement produced "Some Reminiscences" for serialization.

As has also been seen, however, Conrad was criticizing Ford's vanity and erratic management even as the first issue appeared. To these grievances was added, in March, what Conrad regarded as Ford's false accusation of Marwood. In April, when Ford sought new financial backing, he looked first to America and then to affluent Liberals close to his sister's husband, David Soskice, and the Russian-exile community. Conrad, who never ceased to think of himself as a Polish aristocrat-in-exile, disliked both Americans and Russians, and the fact that Ford consorted with such people confirmed he had become erratic and irresponsible. Publication of "The Nature of a Crime" in April and May may have added to Conrad's pique, since he disliked this product of their collaboration. When Conrad did not submit an installment of "Some Reminiscences" for July, Ford printed a notice to the effect that the series was interrupted due to Conrad's "serious illness." The notice angered Conrad, and he got still angrier when Ford complained to him over his failure to produce the installment, saying he had "discredited the review."¹ By this time, too, the Ford-Hunt liaison was

¹See Conrad's answer to Ford, 31 July 1909, in Jean-Aubry, Joseph Conrad, Life and Letters, vol. 2, pp. 101-102.

well-known, though the affair probably troubled Conrad's wife more than it troubled him. Jessie Conrad disliked Ford intensely, and no doubt used the scandal to encourage the rift.

There were thus plenty of circumstantial reasons for the break, but deep psychological factors were also involved. Meixner, one of the most distinguished of Ford scholars, has suggested that Conrad resented Ford's London involvement for the same reason that Elsie resented it: it implied his rejection.¹ Meixner's opinions are substantiated by Bernard Meyer, whose "psychoanalytic biography" of Conrad speculates he was extremely jealous of Ford's new associations, and irrational jealousy and fear of rejection lay behind not only Conrad's frantically bitter denunciations of Ford in letters to friends in late 1909, but also his serious mental breakdown in 1910.²

In any event, Conrad was no longer involved with the review after the last installment of "Some Reminiscences" and the rift with Ford was never healed. The two exchanged a few wistfully cordial letters while Ford was on active service in

¹Meixner, "Ford and Conrad," pp. 165-168.

²Bernard C. Meyer, Joseph Conrad, A Psychoanalytic Biography (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1967), pp. 209-210.

France, but they were never again close.

The implications for the English Review of Ford's quarrels and love affair are obvious. They meant that by late 1909 virtually everyone who had been present at the magazine's creation was no longer available, either as a contributor, financial backer, or moral supporter. Scandal and gossip made Ford a pariah and he was not welcome in many respectable circles. These circles, furthermore, no longer supported the review. Such attitudes crystallized so rapidly that it is hard to speak of "trends" in the review's contents, but it is possible to note changes in the last three numbers of 1909. Wells, James, Conrad, Hudson, and Hardy are all gone; Bennett, Galsworthy, and of course Ford and Violet Hunt remain; Lawrence and Pound are also present. Socially, Ford turned to the younger writers, and as his old friends dropped away he took up with Pound and other unconventional young people who would form the pre-war avant-garde. As we have seen, these associations, particularly the one with Pound, were important because via them the concepts of "impressionism" were transmitted to the new generation.

Ford's quarrels were also a factor in the review's finances. Its financial history under Ford falls into three distinct phases: from December, 1908, until March, 1909, Marwood was the principal backer; from April to December,

cash came from a syndicate headed by Soskice; and after December 17, 1909, the review was owned and subsidized by Alfred Mond. Throughout the year, Ford contributed what he could of his own funds or money he borrowed from friends and relatives.

It was, of course, the cash Marwood provided in response to the Hardy poem fiasco that made the review possible. His support was not open-ended, however. It was apparently understood, at least by Marwood, that the review was merely a trial venture. Conrad wrote to Norman Douglas in late September:

They have enough capital to go on for 4 issues. Then if the thing shapes well, it will be continued--and may become a permanent outlet for your work. If the public does not respond to the new monthly magazine devoted to Art, Letters, and Ideas--the publication will end with the 4th issue.¹

The four-month limit was probably imposed to insure that all of Wells's Tono-Bungay could appear. The last portion of that novel was printed in the March number, and Marwood's involvement--financial and otherwise--would appear to have ended then. He had fulfilled his promise, and there was no sign that the review would gain the large readership Ford had predicted.

¹Conrad to Norman Douglas, 29 September 1908, in Jean-Aubry, Joseph Conrad, Life and Letters, vol. 2, p. 87.

If Marwood required additional incentive to abandon the venture, his quarrels with Ford, climaxed by the misunderstanding concerning Elsie, provided it. By the end of March, Marwood was no longer involved.

Exactly how much money he had actually put up is hard to determine. A financial note on the English Review appeared in the Financial Times in early March after the Ford-Marwood squabbles caused Ford to "put the matter on a proper financial basis--and a formal one."¹

ENGLISH REVIEW--Registered 22nd January. Publishers of 'English Review,' 34, Holland Park-road, W. Partnership for ten years from 22nd January, 1909. General partner: F. M. Hueffer, 84, Holland Park-avenue, W. Limited partner: A. P. Marwood, Coldwell Farm, Aldington, Kent, contributing £ 500 in cash.²

Ford himself put Marwood's financial stake much higher in a letter he wrote H. G. Wells over a year later:

In November 1908 Marwood and I started the Review, he having a two-fifth share and I three-fifths. Of the £ 5,000 that we spent on the Review he paid £ 2,200 and I £ 2,800. . . .³

It may be, as Mizener suggests, that the estimates of the loss

¹Ford to Elsie Hueffer, March 1909, quoted in Mizener, The Saddest Story, p. 180.

²Quoted in Harvey, Ford, A Bibliography, pp. 298-299.

³Ford to Wells, 2 April 1909, in Letters of Ford Madox Ford, ed. Ludwig, p. 42.

expressed in this letter--£ 5,000--is "very close to the truth."¹ There are obvious errors in Ford's account, however, and it slights certain aspects of the review's troubled financial history.

For example, Marwood abandoned the enterprise in late March, and Ford got Soskice to provide financial support. Negotiations were already well underway when the break came with Marwood, and what Ford termed "the Soskice project" was formalized into a loose agreement on May 16.² Under the agreed terms, Soskice and his Russian exile friends and their Liberal supporters were to take over the review, keeping Ford on as salaried editor while using the journal as a Liberal political forum. Soskice's syndicate could not immediately raise enough cash to buy the journal outright, so the May 16 agreement was an interim measure: Soskice would take over as business manager and he and his group would keep the magazine afloat financially while they raised the money to buy it. Ford chafed under the editorial control the syndicate wanted but there was no alternative and the shaky agreement continued until December.

¹ Mizener, The Saddest Story, p. 160.

² Ibid., p. 186. See also Ford, Return to Yesterday, pp. 193, 391-392.

Throughout the year, Ford tried to raise money from other sources. On his 1906 visit to the U.S. he had met the legendary S. S. McClure. Late in 1908, about the same time that the first number of the review appeared, McClure was in London, where he was entertained by Ford and Violet Hunt. Ford did not broach the topic of financial backing with McClure in 1908, but (perhaps because he knew Marwood's commitment expired with the March number) the thought was on his mind. A few months later Ford made an active attempt to tap the American millionaire. Willa Cather, whom Ford had met in McClure's New York office in 1906, was to serve as a go-between. She was in England on assignment for McClure's, and Ford tried to interest her in the review, anticipating that she, in turn, would interest McClure himself. Ford calculated that Miss Cather could be particularly impressed by arranging for her to be introduced to Conrad. He therefore sent her to Kent, where Conrad, irascible and offended at the role he was to play, refused to see her. Miss Cather returned to London disappointed, and no money ever came from McClure.

In the difficult month before "The Soskice Project" went into effect, Ford had high hopes of selling the review to a wealthy man named Lyons who, Ford thought, would keep him on as editor. Negotiations continued through April, 1909,

but by early May these hopes were dashed. Ford told Elsie:

I have seen Lyons today . . . alas, he is the worst type of large cigar-smoking Jew and he means to skin me clean and clear. . . . There remains the Soskice project.¹

In his memoirs, Ford explains that while help might have come from other quarters, he could not accept it if it meant compromising the review's artistic standards:

. . . Colonel Harvey, then Pierpont Morgan's representative and afterwards American Ambassador . . . was indeed meditating putting some money into the English Review. . . . I declined rather reluctantly. I could not consent to let it become an organ of the Morgan interests in England.²

The account is doubtful, but it illustrates Ford's wide-ranging efforts to enlist support and his simultaneous insistence that he must retain editorial control. Another anecdote, even more outrageous, suggests that the German government wanted to buy that magazine but that, out of patriotism, Ford refused to sell.³

A good portion of the money needed to keep the magazine afloat came from Ford himself, or from the friends and relatives whom he was able to convince to lend him money.⁴

¹Ford to Elsie Hueffer, 5 May 1909, quoted in Mizener, The Saddest Story, p. 186.

²Ford, It Was the Nightingale, p. 317.

³Ford, Return to Yesterday, p. 392.

⁴Ibid., p. 392.

It is hard to estimate Ford's financial position in 1908, but what money he had went unselfishly to the cause. He also got large sums from his rich relatives; according to Violet Hunt, "the gold of cohorts of relations--German Hueffers, Dutch Hueffers, Paris Hueffers . . . all agog, and pleased to be called on to foster the English nephew's adventure with some sinews of war--was forthcoming."¹ Ford borrowed from them early in the venture, and got £ 500 from the Muenster Hueffers in April.² While they were still on reasonable terms, there were also loans from Elsie, who scraped up all she could without selling fixed assets. In addition, Ford borrowed small sums from his London friends and these too went to the cause.

Large amounts were required. Violet Hunt estimated the review lost £ 120 per month;³ Ford himself said that in the first four months he lost £ 300 per number;⁴ Mizener estimates the loss rate was closer to £ 500 per month.⁵ There

¹Hunt, I Have This to Say, p. 24.

²Mizener, The Saddest Story, p. 186.

³Hunt, I Have This to Say, pp. 78, 89.

⁴Ford to Wells, March 1909, quoted in Mizener, The Saddest Story, p. 160.

⁵Mizener, The Saddest Story, p. 160.

was little income from sales and subscriptions, for circulation remained disappointing despite the journal's acknowledged excellence and rave reviews. Hardly ever were more than 1,000 copies sold per month,¹ a fact over which Ford raged even a quarter century later:

"The ENGLISH REVIEW," say you, "found a ready market among people of taste and intelligence." Don't you know that people of t & i all expect free copies and blackmail you if they don't get them and that millionaires and pimps and porters all go to the free libraries to read so that one copy serves five hundred? Hence all our tears.²

When Lawrence and Jessie Chambers visited 84 Holland Park Avenue in November, Jessie noticed piles of unsold magazines lying about on the floor and window-seat.³ The review sold for two and six. Thus, even excluding distribution costs, sales revenue was seldom more than £125 per number. Advertising added perhaps £35 more,⁴ making each number's gross receipts about £160. This, calculates Mizener, scarcely

¹Ibid., p. 160. See also MacShane, Ford Madox Ford, p. 87.

²Ford to Paul Palmer, 2 July 1936, Letters of Ford Madox Ford, ed. Ludwig, p. 253.

³Jessie Chambers [E. T.], D. H. Lawrence, A Personal Record, p. 169.

⁴Mizener, The Saddest Story, p. 160.

covered production costs, let alone the sums Ford liked to lavish on favored contributors.¹

The drain obviously could not go on forever. Soskice's group found itself strapped for money by late autumn (they were also, predictably, at odds with Ford over content and editorial procedures), Ford's own resources were exhausted, and his long-suffering friends and relatives could no longer be counted on. By late 1909, Ford was ready to turn to still another backer.

It was Violet who first interested Alfred Mond in the venture. They had for some time moved in the same social circles; indeed, Violet was well-connected in wealthy society, a fact which Ford constantly attempted to exploit. Mond, a wealthy industrialist (exactly the sort of person Ford despised), was much too shrewd to be vulnerable to requests for an open-ended subsidy. Since Ford was on poor terms with Soskice, he calculated that if Mond could be persuaded to buy the review he could both regain editorial control and have access to Mond's millions to carry on. Mond was induced

¹Ibid., pp. 159-161.

to buy the review for a "derisory" sum (estimated at £ 200)¹ and ownership formally changed hands on December 17. Ford was surprised when he was informed that he would not be retained as editor, though he was invited to remain on for a few months to assist in the transfer. Violet Hunt recalled the change:

I had persuaded my friend Alfred Mond to buy the Review, and, because his political views were so essentially different from those of the editor, there was nothing left for him to do but politely to relieve him of his task of editorship. . . . The editor, on the rack, graciously undertook, however, to produce the February number for the new editor [the January number was already completed in late December, when Mond's decision to fire Ford was made] and drill him in some of the practices which had made the Review worth buying.²

The holiday season of 1909 therefore contrasted sharply with that of a year earlier. Most of the group who had celebrated at 84 Holland Park Avenue the year before had severed their relationship with Ford. Violet Hunt, who had then merely been a casual visitor, remembered the gloom:

Christmas week was out . . . and we walked as usual in the Park, treading the dead leaves like faded hopes under our feet, in silence. For a week of mornings he did not address more than three words to me.³

¹Ibid., p. 195.

²Hunt, I Have This to Say, p. 98.

³Ibid., p. 98.

Joseph Conrad's observation that "everything is over but the stink" came at about the same time.

"The stink," as it happened, was considerable. Elsie sued Ford in 1910 for restitution of conjugal rights; later he served a jail sentence for quixotically refusing to pay a modest support payment ordered by the court. Other legal action and scandal followed. While Ford was in Brixton jail in the spring of 1910 (he served a week), Violet had his furniture removed to South Lodge and the famous flat at 84 Holland Park Avenue was closed. For a brief time Ford had been at the top of the wheel of fortune; now he was at the bottom.

His financial mismanagement and insufferable personal behavior made his failure as editor inevitable. Operating the magazine within a reasonable budget, as we have seen, was for Ford impossible. Even had unlimited money been available, it is hard to see how he could have carried on in 1910, after alienating so many of the contributors who had made the first year's numbers distinguished.

These obvious observations do not, however, explain why the circulation of the English Review rarely rose above one thousand per month, and this is the most important and provocative question that must be asked in connection with

the magazine's failure. Duckworth, the publisher, advertised the review regularly in the Times Literary Supplement and other literary weeklies, and the firm had the business acumen to insure that distribution was properly handled. There were, however, few buyers. MacShane has contended: "What happened was that many of the old guard, finding their positions under attack by the young, adopted a hostile attitude towards the review, while the incompetents clubbed together to cry it down."¹ That view is difficult to sustain because the journal was in fact widely praised in literary circles and mentioned frequently in other magazines. Whatever "crying down" there was seems to have been directed at Ford's personal conduct, not against the work he published. The review's literature, as we have seen, was challenging but not shocking. Hardy, Conrad, Wells, Hudson, Bennett, and the rest were seen as serious and intellectually rigorous writers, but not as iconoclasts who would wreck the London literary establishment if given half a chance. Pound, Lewis, and Lawrence neither contributed work that was shocking nor dominated the magazine. There was no reason for conventionally popular writers and

¹MacShane, Ford Madox Ford, p. 81. See also above, p. 68.

editors to feel threatened, and there is no evidence to suggest they felt they were.

The review's poor circulation was not due so much to public antipathy as apathy. There simply was no large readership for the consistently challenging fare Ford provided. Readers who would not buy James's novels were not attracted to a magazine that featured his work, and Wells, Galsworthy, Conrad, Hudson and the other writers Ford published--and who make the magazine so impressive today--were also not popular among mass audiences.¹ Duckworth's advertisements suggest what in the magazine was considered salable: in publicizing the first number (which had Tolstoi, James, Hardy, Conrad, and other immortals), Ford's pseudonymous throwaway piece on "The Personality of the German Emperor" was prominently mentioned;² in March (when there was "The Velvet Glove," "Georgiana," and the last installment of Tono-Bungay) the advertisements stressed "An Article on the Secret History of the Russian International Spy System . . . and a Censored Article by Hilaire Belloc, M.P."³ This apparently is what

¹ See Cruse, After the Victorians, for a survey of Edwardian reading habits.

² Times Literary Supplement (26 November 1908):431.

³ Ibid. (4 March 1909):77.

the public wanted, but there was not much of it in Ford's review. Thus, the same thing that makes the journal remarkable today--imaginative literature of consistently high quality--made it unsalable in 1909. Ford found that his anticipated large audience of "grown-up minds whose leisure can be interested by something other than the crispness and glitter of popular statement" did not exist.

This lesson was not lost on the younger generation. Even before the war, serious literature turned to little magazines that began with the assumption that they would not have a wide readership and that they would perhaps be ephemeral. Ford's success in bringing together top quality work inspired the new generation of editors, but his failure to attract a profitable circulation served as a warning. Pound, who was probably involved in more important little magazines than anyone else, wrote of "small magazines" in 1930:

The term "Little Magazines" might seem to exclude the English Review as it was in 1908 and 1909 to 1910. It had the format of an old established review. It professed vainly to take its place with the other permanent periodicals. It failed into obscure glory. . . . Nevertheless, it might be taken as a paradigm. It was, under Ford Madox Hueffer (Ford), the most brilliant piece of editing I have known.¹

¹Pound, "Small Magazines," English Journal 19 (November 1930):693.

Pound's and the others' "small magazines" did not even try to be popular because the review seemed to have proved exactly what it had set out to disprove: that mass popularity and artistic integrity were incompatible.

CHAPTER NINE

THE REVIEW AFTER FORD

After passing from Ford's hands on December 17, 1909, the English Review continued for over a quarter century under four different editors: Austin Harrison, Ernest Remnant, Douglas Jerrold, and Derek Walker-Smith. With each change in editorship came a major change in the magazine, and it remained of literary significance only under Harrison, from January, 1910, to May, 1923. Even then, its importance owed much to the reputation Ford had won for it and the circle of writers he gathered around it in the first year. When Remnant took charge, he made the review into a Conservative Party organ. It remained a partisan journal for its last fourteen years, and work of literary significance rarely appeared. A general survey of the full twenty-seven years of the English Review after Ford, however, provides a logical sequel to the preceding study, and also helps place Ford's editorship into an overall perspective and demonstrates the degree to which the magazine's brilliant first year may be attributed

to Ford himself. When he left, the magazine declined, and while it continued for a time to publish important work it was no longer a focal point for the major literary and intellectual concerns of the day.

Alfred Moritz Mond, the new owner, was the son of a German Jewish immigrant who had made a fortune in chemical manufacturing. The younger Mond, through shrewd management and superior organizational ability, raised the family business to one of Britain's greatest industries, and his financial power gave him access to high political and social circles. In 1906 he was elected to Parliament on the Liberal ticket, and in 1910 he became a baronet. Mond's Liberalism had little in common with that of Ford and his circle, however, for as a hard-driving businessman Mond saw the growth of efficient, tightly-organized big business and the resultant effective use of resources as the key to national prosperity. Obviously, his outlook differed completely from Ford's, for as has been shown, contempt for modern business methods and reverence for an England of small producers held together by an idealized eighteenth-century social hierarchy lay behind the commentary and imaginative literature Ford published. Philosophically, Mond and Ford were at polar opposites, and Mond had no patience for Ford's muddled

business methods. With the change in ownership, a change in editors was inevitable.

Austin Harrison, Mond's choice, was the son of Frederic Harrison, a major Victorian intellectual and leader of "Positivism," a secular religion based on social ethics. The younger Harrison, after an education on the Continent, had returned to London in 1905 in his early thirties to work on several periodicals. The politics he inherited from his father--traditional nineteenth-century Liberalism with emphasis on rationalism, social conscience, hard work, and the sanctity of laissez-faire economics--squared with Mond's, and when he was offered the editorial chair he immediately accepted. Under his guidance, the review ceased to be the esoteric artistic forum it had been under Ford and took on a more conventional look. It lost literary importance but gained popular interest and, in consequence, commercial success.

Harrison's first order of business was sorting out the magazine's affairs. The editorial headquarters were moved to the offices of Chapman and Hall, who had taken over from Duckworth as the magazine's publisher in the late summer of 1909. The change in editorship was widely publicized, along with assurances that "the unsatisfied claims of

contributors to the review under the old management will be settled by the new management."¹ This step was taken not only out of a sense of legal or moral obligation to authors Ford had not paid, but also because Harrison needed to continue to draw upon the old contributors. An amicable settlement was apparently reached with Wells over Tono-Bungay, and he gave the review The New Machiavelli to be serialized beginning in May, 1910. Harrison also solicited contributions from Bennett, whose work appeared in ten separate numbers during the pre-war years.² Many other writers who had appeared under Ford continued as frequent contributors through 1914: Conrad's publications included Under Western Eyes; Cunninghame Graham provided over a dozen short stories and prose items; Douglas (who became Harrison's assistant in 1912) had nearly twenty essays; Galsworthy, three stories, two essays, and a poem; Hudson, four essays; Lawrence made twelve appearances, most notably with his short story "Odour of Chrysanthemums"; Pound's three selections of poetry included

¹ Author 20 (1 March 1910), quoted in Harvey, Ford, A Bibliography, p. 302.

² See Arnold Bennett, The Journals of Arnold Bennett, ed. Newman Flower, vol. 1:1896-1910 (London: Cassell and Company, 1932), p. 352.

his much-praised "The Return"; and Tomlinson had five essays accepted between 1910 and 1914. Ford himself made four appearances during the period.¹

There were thus many familiar names in the review, but Harrison also initiated a number of changes. In March, 1910, the poetry section lost the title Ford had given it, "Modern Poetry." Harrison continued to publish poetry at the beginning of each number, but his dropping of the adjective "modern" is telling, for the material he selected suggests that, unlike Ford, he did not value innovation or that he supposed his public to distrust it. Another change is even more indicative of what could be expected under the new regime, for beginning with the June, 1910, number Harrison ceased to separate imaginative prose from political and social commentary. The distinction, as has been noted, was central to Ford's editorship, when material of artistic importance, whether fiction or non-fiction, went into the long center section of belles lettres, while prose which lacked esthetic (though not intellectual) value was relegated to "The Month."

¹ Some of the work Harrison used had been accepted by Ford. See above, p. 243, concerning Lawrence's "Odour of Chrysanthemums." It seems probable that some of the Pound poems had also been accepted by Ford, as had James's short story: "A Round of Visits," ER 5 (April-May 1910):46-60, 246-260.

Enforcing his own policy enabled Ford to assert a distinction between serious art and popular journalism, and by ending it, Harrison undermined what had made the English Review remarkable: the establishment and maintenance of strict critical standards for imaginative prose.

Harrison also published much less such prose, and the review quickly took on a less literary and more political cast. Under Ford, belles lettres always filled at least two-thirds of the magazine, and most of the material was fiction. Under Harrison, fiction never occupied more than half the pages (usually much less), and most of the non-fiction had little literary value. The magazine actively supported Mond's and Harrison's orthodox Liberal Party politics, with Mond himself writing nearly a dozen political essays, most of them in support of a favorite Liberal Party cause, free-trade, which presumably favored British manufacturers by giving them free access to world markets.¹ There are many other frankly political items.

¹Mond's pre-war views on international trade must be distinguished from his post-war opinions. Before the war he was a staunch advocate of world-wide free trade. After the war, like many other industrialists, he worried that foreign competition was cutting into British markets. He therefore wanted protective tariffs on goods entering the Empire, so as to preserve the Imperial market for Britain's own industry.

The imaginative prose Harrison did select often lacked the high quality of the material Ford chose. As has been shown, the fiction and essays that appeared in 1908-1909 were almost all memorable, and the review became known for consistent quality. Harrison used some fine work, but also a great deal that was second or third-rate. His own short story, "The Puntilla,"¹ was in the first number over which he presided, and it shows that he was not the literary judge Ford was. The cliché-filled tale concerns a bull-fighter in Valencia who falls in love with a gypsy girl. She teases him to cut off his bullfighter's pigtail before she will share his bed; he finally complies, but later out of rage kills both the girl and himself. The tale is a potboiler with no redeeming features: the plot is improbable, the dialogue is absurd, the characters have no psychological depth, and the style is badly overdrawn. Furthermore, some passages are embarrassingly coarse. For example, Harrison makes the cutting off of the coleta into a symbolic castration, and he disdains subtlety to insure that the point will not be lost

¹Austin Harrison, "The Puntilla," ER 4 (January 1910): 208-222. A puntilla, Harrison explains in a footnote, is a small dagger used to kill injured bulls.

on even his most obtuse readers. Similarly, the purple passages of his love scenes are vulgar:

Suddenly his arms were about her, crushing her face to his breast. He kissed her passionately on the hair. Then with one hand he threw back her head. She was still smiling, her lips all dimpling kisses, tender and appealing. He drank in slowly the warm soft beauty of her gipsy face. He kissed her eyes, her lips, her throat madly.¹

"The Puntilla" reveals a paucity of literary ability, a failure of critical judgment, and a general lack of taste, and all three tendencies unfortunately marred Harrison's editorship.

The story's exoticism also suggests an abandonment of Ford's concerns for the "critical attitude" and art which illuminated "the way we live now." Harrison has written that his own goals differed from Ford's:

. . . having resided on the Continent almost continuously since leaving school, I was astonished at the number of forbidden subjects [for English magazines], and thought I saw various things which needed saying, several closed doors which ought to be forced, quite specific tasks which required tackling, the chief of which was not the Hueffer "critical" attitude, but an "adult" attitude towards the arts and matters generally. . . .²

An interest in promoting "an 'adult' attitude towards the arts and matters generally" led Harrison to publish both Frank

¹ Ibid., 218.

² Harrison, "The Old 'English'," ER 36 (June 1923): 512-513.

Harris and John Masefield, and these two writers set the general tone of the magazine during the pre-war period.

Harris, whom Samuel Hynes classifies among "Literary Rascals . . . of small talent and large ambitions,"¹ was well-known around London in 1910. Ford had rejected his "Miracle of the Stigmata" as the vulgar and ultimately contrived tale it is,² but Harrison accepted it for the April, 1910, number. Thereafter, Harris was a review regular, and work by him appeared in fully half the 1910 and 1911 issues. His iconoclasm angered many, and his "Thoughts on Morals"³ in June, 1911, prompted the arch-Conservative Spectator to attack the magazine, which had unwisely billed itself in its advertising as "The Great Adult Review":

. . . the articles which we condemn are likely to have a bad moral influence. We give one example of what we mean from an article in the June number of the English Review, by Mr. Frank Harris, entitled "Thoughts on Morals" . . . We would not attempt to suppress stuff of this kind by law, but as we happen to hold that the propagation of such views is harmful to the State in the highest degree--to put the matter at its very lowest--we absolutely refuse to be forced by any canting talk

¹ Hynes, "Frank Harris: The Complete Literary Rascal," Edwardian Occasions, p. 13.

² See Ford, It Was the Nightingale, pp. 316-319.

³ Frank Harris, "Thoughts on Morals," ER 8 (June 1911): 434-443.

about a censorship into aiding the English Review to find readers and disciples for these gross and blear-eyed sophistries.¹

The attack is full of innuendo, for by making much of its opposition to legal action it implied that a voluntary boycott would be appropriate, and it uses the issue as an opportunity to criticize the Liberal press for supposedly condoning the review's policies. The denunciation caused a small sensation, and for the next several weeks a debate raged in the Spectator's "Letters to the Editor" pages, with Bennett, the publishing figure R. A. Scott-James, May Sinclair, and Ford defending the review.² Harrison answered the charges in his July number saying, "As we do not appeal to the young and illiterate, therefore an organ such as ours may claim for itself the right of reasonable freedom of expression and discussion."³

The passions generated seem today to have been out of proportion to the statements in Harris's article, but the controversy nearly wrecked the magazine. Booksellers did

¹"The Great Adult Review," Spectator 106 (10 June 1911):875-876. The segment quoted is on p. 876.

²See "Letters to the Editor," Spectator 106 (17 June, 24 June 1911):923-924, 963-965.

³Harrison, "The Spectator: A Reply," ER 8 (July 1911): 666-670.

carry on a boycott, sales fell, and Mond considered letting the whole venture fold.¹

The day was saved by Harrison's decision in late 1911 to publish another daring piece, Masefield's "The Everlasting Mercy."² Masefield was by no means unknown at the time, for Salt Water Ballads had been out for nearly a decade, but he had not yet captured a wide audience. That came with "The Everlasting Mercy," which brought fame to Masefield and prosperity to the English Review. The poem, in rhymed couplets, is the first person confession of a drunken, whoring poacher who has been converted to gentleness, and it is redolent of hints of debauchery and unspeakable acts. Harrison later recalled how he accepted the piece:

We were off the bookstalls--banned, in disgrace, and sales fell by the hundred. . . . Then, four months after the boycott, a man strolled into the office, dripping wet (it was raining furiously at the time), unpacked a thick manuscript, told me no publisher would look at it, and walked out into the rain.

The man was John Masefield and the poem was "The Everlasting Mercy." I took it home and, after reading it, decided at once to publish. But in proof form it looked catastrophic--to the editor. I think it contained eighty repetitions of the word "bloody" and ran

¹John Gould Fletcher, a literary aspirant with plenty of money, had tried to buy the review at about this time. See Fletcher, Life is My Song (New York: Farrar and Rinehart, 1937), p. 62.

²John Masefield, "The Everlasting Mercy," ER 9 (October 1911):361-404.

to eighty pages. . . . The poem appeared unedited in the following issue. Two days later the telephone began to ring continuously. Sir Alfred Mond 'phoned: "You've done it, but it was worth doing" . . .

Probably no poem ever created such a stir since Byron's Don Juan. We printed edition after edition. . . . A few weeks afterwards the trade placed us back on the bookstalls again, from which date we never looked back.

Those eighty bloodies had saved the Review.¹

Masefield became the most popular poet since Kipling, and altogether eight of his works appeared before the end of 1914. Subsequent criticism has tended to agree with the views expressed by some literary men of the day, notably Conrad, that Masefield's rather superficial ideas and facile verse had little major literary importance,² but he brought circulation far above the bare thousand copies per month it had been under Ford.

"Forbidden subjects" thus made the review both controversial and (probably coincidentally) popular, but they did not insure its literary excellence. Harrison's desire

¹Harrison, "The Old 'English'," 513-514. Harrison's bravado over daring to have published "eighty bloodies" is unwarranted. His account indulges in Fordian exaggeration, for there were a good deal fewer than eighty in Masefield's manuscript, and none in the published version: Harrison left the adjective out whenever it appeared, leaving the blank spaces for his readers to fill.

²See Conrad's letter to Norman Douglas, 1913 [?], in Dale B. J. Randall, Joseph Conrad and Warrington Dawson: The Record of a Friendship (Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press, 1968), pp. 153-154. Conrad was angry that Harrison used so much of Masefield's verse.

to "force closed doors" led him to accept some important work, notably Wells's The New Machiavelli.¹ The novel is yet another Wellsian bildungsroman, but whereas sexuality had figured only obliquely in the maturation of Kipps, Lewisham, and George Ponderevo, it is of central importance in Richard Remington's intellectual and emotional coming of age. The work lacks the energy and sweep of Tono-Bungay, but it is important for frankly portraying sex as a central factor in human interaction. Contemporary critics attacked this view as perverted but the book helped clear the way for better and more artistic treatments of the power of sexual attraction. Ultimately, its publication reflects to the review's credit. In other instances, however, eagerness to be controversial led Harrison into literary lapses. Harris's contributions confirm he was ultimately a trite and banal writer, yet the review published him regularly. Modern readers, not titillated by the hints of drunken debauchery in Masfield's "The Everlasting Mercy," find the forty pages of rhymed couplets practically unreadable. His other long English Review poems likewise lack permanence. Even more dreary are the essays on "forbidden subjects" Harrison printed

¹Wells, The New Machiavelli, ER 5 & 6 (May-November 1910):286-329, 532-563, 673-715, 98-136, 270-308, 477-511, 682-702.

month after month: "Androgynism, or Women Playing at Men," "The Love-Child in Germany and Austria," "The Truth About White Slavery," "Women and Morality," "The White Slave in America," and so on. Predictably, there were also numerous self-important editorials decrying censorship. The magazine performed a service in helping open literature to previously untouchable subjects, but the pieces themselves demonstrate that writing is not kept from being trite or hackneyed because its subject matter is temporarily controversial.

Although Harrison printed material Ford would doubtless have refused (and, in the case of at least one of the Harris pieces, actually had refused), Compton Mackenzie's claim that by 1912 the review had sunk "to the bottom of mediocrity"¹ and Lawrence's 1913 opinion that "it makes me sad that it is so piffling now"² are overstatements. Besides Wells's The New Machiavelli, there was Conrad's Dostoevskyian Under Western Eyes which is a moving psychological study. Razumov, the main character, has been called "one of the

¹Compton Mackenzie, Literature in My Time, p. 182.

²Lawrence to Edward Garnett, 10 June 1913 [?], in Collected Letters of D. H. Lawrence, ed. Moore, vol. 1, p. 209. Lawrence disparaged the review in other letters written during this period as well.

most memorable of Conrad's creations."¹ Hudson's four essays are good, and the Lawrence poems and short stories are also, of course, of lasting interest. The contributions of Bennett, Cunningham Graham, Ford, Galsworthy, and Pound cannot be overlooked, nor can several pieces by May Sinclair. There is little point in discussing these works in detail in a review context, however, for in the range of Harrison's selections there is no sense of critical coherence. Ford intuitively gave the magazine such coherence, for out of his belief in the critical attitude, conscious artistry, realism, le mot juste, progression d'effet, simple diction, and literature as commentary on the "way we live now" came a definable critical thrust, as the preceding study has demonstrated. Harrison's enthusiasm for "forcing doors" was no substitute for Ford's critical instinct, and under the new editorship the magazine lost critical direction.

Norman Douglas, Harrison's assistant from 1902 to 1916, had literary sensitivity but his presence in the editorial office seems not to have had a major impact on the magazine's contents. Douglas settled in England more-or-less

¹Chew and Altick, "The Nineteenth Century and After," The Literary History of England, ed. Baugh, p. 1554.

permanently in 1912 and took the review position in order to obtain a steady income and an outlet for his work. Fourteen signed pieces and numerous unsigned book reviews appeared during his tenure, but a close examination of the magazine's other contents during the period reveals no apparent differences from what existed before Douglas's coming, nor was there a marked change after he left. Perhaps because his influence was only marginal, Douglas disliked his job. He found Harrison uncongenial, and had no respect for him professionally. Douglas seldom discussed his review association in later years; there is little about it in his memoirs, and at least one of his biographers has commented on the scarcity of information on the episode.¹ Apparently Douglas took the brunt of contributors' displeasure at Harrison's inability to decide whether to accept or reject manuscripts.² Once, Conrad pressured Douglas for a decision on a short story by Conrad's friend Warrington Dawson. Douglas could not get a commitment out of Harrison, however, and only when Conrad threatened to withdraw some

¹Richard Aldington, Pinorman, p. 69.

²Norman Douglas, Looking Back (New York: Harcourt, Brace, 1933), p. 325.

of his own work was Dawson's "The Sin" finally accepted.¹

Douglas's tenure was therefore a period of personal and professional frustration for him. One contemporary recalled: "[he] offered the . . . depressing sight of a satyr who had been dressed up in conventional attire and set to work in a London office. Fortunately, he escaped."² The "escape," as it happened, was quite literal, for in an episode reminiscent of the Wilde scandal of the nineties, Douglas was arrested for sexual deviation in 1916. Like Wilde, he was given a chance to flee the country rather than stand trial. Fortunately, he did, and so his association with the review ignominiously ended.³

By the time Douglas left in 1916 the magazine had assumed its wartime character. Well before August, 1914, Harrison, like many others, had warned of the German threat; his father had written of the danger of German militarism ever since the Franco-Prussian War. Harrison could not resist

¹See Conrad to Norman Douglas, 4 July 1913, in Randall, Joseph Conrad and Warrington Dawson, pp. 163-164. "The Sin" was used in the October 1913 number: ER 15 (October 1913): 384-411.

²Mackenzie, Literature in my Time, p. 182.

³Karl, "Joseph Conrad, Norman Douglas, and the English Review," 356.

several I-told-you-so editorials after the outbreak of war, and thereafter he devoted the magazine almost exclusively to war-related matters. Fiction practically disappeared, and the pages were filled with articles entitled, "Beating the Germans," "The Old Books in War-Time," "Kultur," "The Law and the Bombardment of London," "After the War--What?" and so on. Harrison usually wrote two or three such pieces for each issue himself, his father generally contributed at least one, and a seemingly endless series of others came from writers who are now forgotten. Many of the pieces had an ugly, hysterical character: in December, 1915, for example, one writer warned that Germans and German sympathizers in England were organized into a trained army of 100,000 that awaited the Kaiser's orders, and the same article reported that "the Kaiser during his visit to the New Forest [in 1907-1908] chose points where arms and ammunition were to be deposited" for the secret army.¹ These statements were ludicrous and only served to intensify wartime hysteria. Their absurdity should have been apparent to anyone of intelligence, even in 1915, but they are typical of much of what was in the review.

¹Sir George Makgill, "The War of Liberation: The German Invasion," ER 21 (December 1915):482.

The magazine prospered materially during the war years. Mond sold out his interest in September, 1915, and Harrison himself became the principle shareholder.¹ Circulation, which had been put on a solid basis in late 1911, increased further in 1912 when the price was dropped to a shilling.² To make up for reduced sales income, Harrison decreased the number of pages and cut the average length of each article. One of the casualties of his policy was the serialized novel, and after Conrad's Under Western Eyes ended in October, 1911, there was no more long fiction. Even short stories seldom appeared during the war, and as Harrison substituted popular wartime propaganda for literature the magazine decreased in literary importance. Virtually the only items of note between 1915 and the end of 1918 were Conrad's The Shadow Line,³ ten pieces by D. H. Lawrence, including

¹ See "Editorial Statement," ER 21 (September 1915): 214.

² See Harrison, "We Come Down to a Shilling," ER 10 (January 1912):313-319.

³ Conrad, "The Shadow Line," ER 23 & 24 (September 1916-March 1917):197-220, 295-309, 392-410, 485-496, 6-21, 104-111, 199-208. Harrison's disinclination to use long items is evident from the serialization of this piece, a long short story rather than a full-length novel, but spread nevertheless over seven issues. By contrast, under Ford even a long novel like Tono-Bungay was complete in four numbers.

the first two installments of his brilliant Studies in Classic American Literature,¹ and Yeats's "In Memory of Robert Gregory."² Many of the war numbers have nothing worth remembering.

¹D. H. Lawrence, Studies in Classic American Literature, ER 27 & 28 (November 1918-June 1919):319-331, 397-408, 5-18, 88-99, 204-219, 278-291, 404-417, 477-489. Lawrence's other English Review work published by Harrison through 1918 included, besides "Odour of Chrysanthemums," "A Fragment of Stained Glass," ER 9 (September 1911):242-251; "Vin Ordinaire" [later "The Thorn in the Flesh"], ER 17 (June 1914):298-315; "Honour and Arms" [shrewdly renamed "The Prussian Officer" by Edward Garnett to boost book sales at the beginning of the war], ER 18 (August 1914):24-43; "England, My England," ER 21 (October 1915):238-252; and "Samson and Delilah," ER 24 (March 1917):209-224; and various selections of poems and items of non-fiction.

Given Harrison's fascination with "forbidden subjects," it seems logical to suspect that Lawrence's own attitudes on censorship might have been influenced by his review association. This seems not to have been the case, for Lawrence's contributions were not particularly controversial on the basis of their sexual contents. Lawrence, in fact, was impatient with Harrison for not being more daring. He wrote Edward Garnett on 4 August 1912: "His [Harrison's] is a wishy-washy noodle, God help me. My stories are too 'steaming' for him." See Collected Letters of D. H. Lawrence, ed. Moore, vol. 1, p. 137. The English Review was a convenient outlet for Lawrence, but the association with Harrison seems not to have greatly influenced his attitudes or his later career, as the 1909 association with Ford had.

²W. B. Yeats, "In Memory of Robert Gregory," ER 27 (August 1918):81-83. The title and text were later altered. See The Variorum Edition of the Poems of W. B. Yeats, ed. Allt and Alspach, pp. 323-328.

The magazine somewhat regained its literary and intellectual bearings after the war. Studies in Classic American Literature continued its eight-month serialization, and there were eight other Lawrence items before Harrison lost the magazine in the spring of 1923. Portions of Ford's Thus to Revisit also appeared. The reminiscences are interesting, but they have a shrill and sometimes vindictive tone which betrays the postwar emotional pressures under which Ford wrote them. There were also items by Bertrand Russell, Richard Aldington, Michael Arlen, May Sinclair, George Moore, Julian and Aldous Huxley, Wyndham Lewis, and Major C. H. Douglas, proponent of the "Douglas Credit Scheme," which was to appeal to many people in the period between the wars, notably Pound. Fiction remained scarce, but the journal at least attracted some influential and important intellects of the day.

The magazine's prosperity, however, ended in the postwar period. The "forbidden subjects" for which it had become noted were outdated in the twenties, and the patriotic enthusiasm that had attracted readers during the war was out of place in the new era. Harrison could not find a new readership, and money became scarce. The price was gradually raised to two shillings to try to make up for declining sales, but that only made the situation worse. Circulation continued

to drop, and by the spring of 1923 Harrison had no choice but to sell out. With the May, 1923, number, his nearly thirteen years as editor came to an end.

In the June issue was a self-congratulatory essay in which he reflected on his tenure:

We became an institution. We struck out here and there, and I think I may claim that all the talent of that day appeared in the Review, in particular D. H. Lawrence, the picaresque stories of R. B. Cunninghame Graham, Tono-Bungay, Arnold Bennett's Paris Nights, Conrad, George Moore, Norman Douglas, who for some years was sub-editor, Galsworthy, Frank Harris, W. H. Davies. . . .

We smashed not a few windows. . . . We 'discovered' poets and writers--Tennyson Jesse, Tomlinson, Gilbert Frankau, Stacey Aumonier, etc. etc.; we were alive, adult, and, I believe, of some real utility as a platform of new thought and yearnings at the close of the Victorian era, producing many fine stories, poems, and articles which otherwise would not have found publication or a public.¹

The true verdict of Harrison's editorship must be read between the lines of this valedictory. Many of the triumphs that are claimed really belong to Ford, for it was Ford who gathered together the important figures and made the literary discoveries (including Tomlinson) that gained the English Review its reputation. In Harrison's obituary in 1928, the Times paid tribute to his work in "introducing to the public a number of writers who later became famous," but there too,

¹Harrison, "The Old 'English'," 514.

the important ones listed (Douglas, Lawrence, Tomlinson) were Ford's discoveries.¹ Harrison did not have the literary sensitivity to be an impresario and discoverer. For example, he returned Gertrude Stein's manuscripts in 1913 with the one-sentence comment, "I really cannot publish these curious Studies."² Harrison was a conscientious, hardworking man of no great intellectual or artistic gifts, and (beyond his desire to "force doors") he failed to develop a coherent editorial policy. Unlike Ford, he was a commercial success because he intuitively brought the magazine to the level of the mass public. He deserves credit for making good use of Ford's prior attainments, but he did not build on them because he probably never really understood what Ford had tried to do. To Harrison's credit, however, he kept the review at some level of literary significance for nearly thirteen years.

The same cannot be said of his successors. Ernest Remnant, a fifty-year-old successful businessman, had little editorial experience when he took over. In the first number under his direction he invoked the magazine's distinguished

¹"Austin Harrison," Times [London], 16 July 1928, p. 19.

²Harrison to Gertrude Stein, 29 January 1913, quoted in The Flowers of Friendship, Letters Written to Gertrude Stein, ed. Donald Gallup (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1953), p. 73. Ironically, Ford published Stein's work in the Transatlantic Review a decade later.

past and announced it would continue to "further the growth and the advance of those two priceless possessions of the people, their literature and their art," but his article also made his real concerns clear. England, he thought, was a battle-ground for conflicting ideologies:

On the one side is Socialism (with Bolshevism behind it), dominating Labour and dragging reluctant Liberalism along in the dust of its chariot wheels. On the other side is Conservatism, representing all that is left of sanity and the historic sense.¹

Harrison's Liberalism was thus reversed completely, and for the remainder of its existence the English Review was an arch-Conservative, anti-democratic, passionately nationalistic political organ. The new editor increased the size of each number to nearly 150 pages (the magazine had shrunk to barely 100 in the last years under Harrison), dropped the price back to a shilling, and filled these pages with political tracts. When Remnant resigned because of ill health in 1931, he could say that under him the review had achieved "a circulation probably larger than that of any similar British periodical,"² but his magazine had been almost barren of literary interest.

¹[Ernest Remnant], "The English Review," ER 6 (June 1923):498.

²Remnant, "Hail and Farewell," ER 53 (June 1931):19.

Remnant's goal had been stopping "those modern Goths and Vandals--the Socialists,"¹ and he apparently knew or cared little about literature.

He was succeeded by Douglas Jerrold, whose Conservative Party credentials included service in high government posts. He also had experience, however, as an author and book publisher, and much more literary sense than his predecessor. Jerrold turned the English Review in a scholarly direction, and published sophisticated book reviews by men of literary distinction, among them T. S. Eliot, Bonamy Dobrée, H. W. Nevinson, Sir Charles Petrie, Eric Partridge, Hilaire Belloc, and Malcolm Muggeridge. There were a few poems, stories, and essays by Belloc, Galsworthy, Wyndham Lewis, and Ford, and although poetry and fiction were only a small part of Jerrold's review, it at least regained intellectual respectability. The magazine reflected Jerrold's ardent Conservatism, but the sophisticated fare he provided was not to the liking of the political activists Remnant had gathered

¹[Remnant], "Current Comments," ER 38 (January 1924): 7. Remnant did publish a few important pieces on literature, provided they related to his political interests. Early in his editorship, for example, there appeared an article by a young Canadian scholar: Lionel Stevenson, "Overseas Literature: From a Canadian Point of View," ER 39 (December 1924):876-886. Stevenson went on to a distinguished academic career. The article would have appealed to Remnant because it related to "Imperial unity," a favorite Conservative theme.

as regular readers. Circulation eroded, and Jerrold lost the magazine after five years.

Several wealthy Conservatives stepped in with the funds necessary to keep it going, and they installed Derek Walker-Smith as the fourth and last of Ford's successors. He reversed the intellectual trends initiated by Jerrold, and the review again became an outspoken partisan organ. Its views tended to be extreme, and in retrospect many of the pieces sound strange indeed. For example, a little over two years before Hitler's armies crushed Poland, readers of the review were offered articles praising "The Women of New Germany."¹ There was one essay that speculated on a "Triple Alliance" of Germanic peoples (Britain, Germany, and the United States) that could save the world from the sloth and Bolshevism that afflicted other races.² Walker-Smith attracted few readers and the English Review died with the July, 1937, number, when it was merged into the more conventionally Conservative National Review.³

¹Elisabeth Fairholme, "The Women of New Germany," ER 64 (July 1937):787-793.

²Hermann D. F. Kirchhoff, "Speculations upon a Triple Alliance between Germany, Great Britain, and the United States," ER 64 (June 1937):664-676.

³See "The English Review," National Review 109 (August 1937):175-176.

The review thus experienced varied fortunes after Ford left it. During Harrison's editorship, as has been shown, it retained some importance, particularly in the pre-war years. Its intellectual level declined significantly during the war, and never recovered. Remnant's tenure did nothing for the journal's literary reputation, and although Jerrold tried to regain some measure of intellectual legitimacy, he was not successful. Mercifully, Walker-Smith's tenure was short, for the review deserved better than to become an organ for nineteen-thirties right-wing radicalism.

It is noteworthy that the shadow of Ford fell strongly upon all four of his successors. Each felt compelled upon assuming the editorship to pay tribute to the magazine's brilliant beginning, and to reaffirm that it would continue to maintain uncompromisingly high standards and serve as a forum for young and unknown talent. It is obvious, of course, that it continued to do neither, at least not to the extent it had in its first year.

Ford's actual influence extended only into Harrison's editorship, and it is probably responsible for Harrison's major successes. These resulted, as has been shown, from the fact that Ford had gathered a circle of distinguished writers around the magazine. Under Ford the review was the

most important literary forum in Britain, and this aura continued to surround it even when it published much that was dross. The good writers, however, still found their reputations enhanced by review appearances and, especially with Mond's backing, they were assured of receiving good rates for their work.

As the 1908-1909 aura faded, however, the magazine lost importance. Most of the old circle died or drifted away, and intellectual and artistic effort shifted to little magazines. The history of the English Review after Ford, therefore, is one of a gradual loss of vitality and eventual eclipse.

CHAPTER TEN

CONCLUSION: THE ENGLISH REVIEW LEGACY

The preceding study has been an attempt to examine the English Review from both "inside" and "outside" perspectives. The "inside" view has entailed analyzing the contents of the magazine to discover overall critical principles, and relating those principles to major intellectual and artistic concerns; the "outside" view has entailed recounting the historical circumstances of its first year, when it engaged the attention and touched the careers of many important writers, and evaluating the impact of the review on these writers' careers. The study has demonstrated not only that the English Review under Ford reflected contemporary artistic and intellectual concerns, but also that it influenced those concerns. Involving as it did most of the major authors of the period, the magazine gave shape and direction to existing ideas, and blended these ideas with new concepts that would come to typify "modern" literature as it developed in the years after the First World War. In this concluding assessment, it will

be useful to return to the four aspects of the importance of the review as outlined in the introductory chapter of this study: the traditional, the social, the artistic, and the innovative.

As has been shown, Ford made "tradition" one of his major concerns, and as a result the review helped revive a feeling for continuity in English letters. Ford revered "civilization" as the accrued legacy of past individuals of genius, and regarded each generation as responsible not only for safeguarding the heritage of the past but also for adding something of value to it; hence, his exalted view of art and the artist. In the first decade of the century, this view contradicted what remained of eighteen-nineties decadence and its conception of art as self-gratification. Ford worked hard to obtain unpublished work by elderly or deceased writers, and succeeded in juxtaposing work by such eminent Victorians as Rossetti and Meredith with that of James, Wells, Bennett, and other respected contemporaries, and pieces by unknown but promising newcomers, including Lawrence and Pound. This technique emphasized the continuity of a Great Tradition, and encouraged artists to regard themselves with a greater sense of purpose and self-confidence.

Reverence for tradition later became an important aspect of modern literature. It is often overlooked, perhaps

because of the moderns' concern for innovation. Usually, however, their innovation began with an awareness of the literary past, and the most important of the moderns--Yeats, Joyce, Pound, and Eliot--wrote with a deep recognition of the relationship between tradition and their own talent. The best-known expression of this feeling is Eliot's "Tradition and the Individual Talent":

It [tradition] involves, in the first place, the historical sense, which we may call nearly indispensable to any one who would continue to be a poet beyond his twenty-fifth year. . . . No poet, no artist of any art, has his complete meaning alone. His significance, his appreciation is the appreciation of his relation to the dead poets and artists. You cannot value him alone; you must set him, for contrast and comparison, among the dead.¹

That Joyce saw his startlingly innovative prose as part of a literary lineage stretching from the very beginning of the language is evident from the "Oxen of the Sun" chapter in Ulysses, and Pound and Yeats also showed a scholarly knowledge of literary history and an awareness that their work followed in a larger context. Implicit in the moderns' concern for innovation is the notion of carrying art forward from a definable past into new and unexplored areas. In the first

¹T. S. Eliot, "Tradition and the Individual Talent," in Selected Essays (New York: Harcourt, Brace, 1950), p. 4.

decade of the century, these attitudes were by no means widespread, and by disseminating and popularizing them the English Review gave literature a new sense of purpose.

Related to this reverence for tradition was concern for contemporary affairs. As has been shown, Ford looked to the Victorian authors, whatever their artistic failings, as committed writers who fulfilled social responsibilities by turning their insight to the issues of the day. Ford and his circle were troubled by what they regarded as a generalized decline of social, moral, and intellectual standards in British life. Ford felt that if English artists ceased muddling through, the country at large might do likewise, and his review editorial policy emulated the Victorian past, when writers were expected to comment on public issues.

Ford therefore published imaginative work that reflected on the trends of public life. Most of the literary pieces he used were consistent with the political and social commentary in the journal, since implicit throughout was a reformist zeal, especially in areas of social welfare, colonial administration, and foreign policy. This gave the magazine a Liberal Party cast, but ultimately Ford and many in his circle believed in the deeply conservative ideal of a stable, non-industrial society in which a natural aristocracy governed unselfishly by general consent to achieve the

universal good.¹

Ford's belief that art and artists had a role in public affairs, like his belief in a continuing civilized tradition, helped give literature a new sense of self-confidence, and became another important aspect of modernism. Moderns have been accused of abandoning public concerns for a private world of artifice, but this accusation is clearly erroneous. Joyce's declared goal was "to forge in the smithy of my soul the uncreated conscience of my race,"² and Yeats, while saying, "We [poets] have no gift to set a statesman right,"³

¹The esoteric cast of the English Review's Liberalism is symptomatic of the Liberal Party's inherent problems, for by 1909 it was already in disarray and unable to resolve the various forces that contended for power within it, among them labour, large industrialists, and the intellectual left. The inability of the Liberals to offer politically feasible programs to solve public problems is discussed by Hynes in the third chapter, "Undecided Prophets," of The Edwardian Turn of Mind, pp. 54-86. The classic study of the Liberal dilemma is George Dangerfield, The Strange Death of Liberal England (London: Constable, 1936).

²James Joyce, A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man (1916; reprint ed., London: The Folio Society, 1965), p. 263. The statement comes at the very end of the novel. While it might be argued that the goal is that of young Stephen Dedalus and not Joyce, Stephen is clearly Joyce's fictional analogue. He is treated with considerable irony in Portrait, but Joyce is also obviously expressing his pride in his early artistic commitment. The "uncreated conscience" statement therefore is applicable to Joyce, particularly in view of the body of work he went on to write.

³W. B. Yeats, "On Being Asked for a War Poem," The Variorum Edition of the Poems of W. B. Yeats, ed. Allt and Alspach, p. 359.

tried constantly to do so. He spoke out on public issues, held political office, and used his poetry to comment on major issues and express a larger view of what society ought to be. Pound's convictions on the state of public affairs became a constant theme in his work, and his unwise actions in broadcasting his opinions over fascist radio during World War II brought him near personal and professional ruin. One of Eliot's best-known phrases is his description of his point of view as "classicist in literature, royalist in politics, and anglo-catholic in religion,"¹ and the relationship between this credo and Eliot's poetic work is obvious. Thus, in emphasizing the relationship between literature and public life, the English Review championed a concept that became increasingly important. Many of the artists who dominated the post-war generation insisted that literature was not divorced from life, but that it in fact had important things to say about (as Ford had put it) "the way we live now," and the way we ought to live.

The political biases which the review expressed also gained widespread adherence among writers. Ford's idealistic blend of anti-industrialism, social responsibility, and

¹T. S. Eliot, Preface to For Lancelot Andrewes (London: Faber and Gwyer, 1928), p. ix.

fundamental distrust of the masses continued to have great appeal, and the aristocratic views of writers including Yeats, Pound, and Eliot show an affinity for the sort of "Tory-Liberalism" the English Review advocated.

The concern of the magazine for conscious artistry also helps place it in the mainstream of modernism. While Ford wanted literature to bear on contemporary life, he was not satisfied merely with realism or social criticism. As has been shown in this study, his conduct as editor showed a commitment to careful craftsmanship and, in his own review fiction, Ford emulated the writer he considered the master craftsman, James. Through the review, Ford helped make the Flaubertian-Jamesian concern for artistry and le mot juste a critical axiom. As Meixner has pointed out:

Probably no other single figure exerted a more meaningful and direct influence, practical and concrete, upon the fiction-writing of his time . . . centering the attention of would-be writers on the overriding importance of knowing one's craft.¹

Particularly in the post-First World War era, craftsmanship became a vital consideration for fiction writers. While realistic treatment of subject remained important, it was no longer permissible for the novelist to merely record his environment. In order to be accorded any critical respect,

¹John A. Meixner, Ford Madox Ford's Novels, pp. 3-4.

he had to be an artificer as well. The English Review, in moving realism away from Wellsian social criticism and toward Jamesian artifice, helped turn fiction in a new direction.

Ford's magazine also encouraged literary experimentation, and that too became an important aspect of literature in the decade after the war. Not much in the review seems startling or avant-garde by nineteen-twenties standards, but Ford, by seeking work that showed "either distinction of individuality or force of conviction, either literary gifts or earnestness of purpose,"¹ accepted contributions as different as Douglas's charming and rambling travel essays and James's carefully crafted stories, Lawrence's free verse and Pound's sestina. What was emphasized was honesty of expression rather than adherence to established convention, and this encouraged the eagerness for new technique that came to characterize modernism.

The English Review is thus associated with the impulses that typified literature in the upcoming decades. As has been shown, prose writing dominated Ford's concerns and the magazine's pages, but the impact of the journal on poetics was as significant as its influence on prose. The preceding study of the poetry in the review has shown that the work

¹See above, p. 8.

varied greatly in style and quality, but that Ford tended to favor work utilizing simple, direct diction as opposed to ornate language that suffered, in Eliot's famous phrase, from "dissociation of sensibility" and was inappropriate to the thoughts expressed.¹ Ford felt the same uneasiness with most Romantic and Victorian poetry that Eliot felt some years later, and Ford's desire that poets speak "sincerely, without affectation, and in such a language as [they] ordinarily use"² was much discussed among the review circle. Pound became Ford's leading convert, and through his energy and persuasiveness the notion became part of modernist doctrine.

As has been indicated, Pound was the most important "discovery" of the magazine in terms of spreading the artistic beliefs that guided Ford. Pound came to the review an enthusiastic, but artistically somewhat naïve young man, and his relationship with Ford was important in shaping his ideas. Pound freely acknowledged the debt but, with a few exceptions, scholars of Pound's early career have focussed on his more flamboyant Imagist and Vorticist periods and slighted the English Review association.

¹The phrase is from Eliot's 1921 essay, "The Metaphysical Poets." See Eliot, Selected Essays, p. 247.

²See above, p. 190.

The review was also important to the careers of Douglas, Lewis, and Lawrence. Douglas, as has been shown, might never have emerged as an important writer but for the publicity his review work gained him. Lewis likewise became known to London literary circles because his work appeared in the magazine, and Lawrence's rapid rise to prominence is directly attributable to his review appearance and Ford's effort at promoting his work. The experience benefitted Lawrence greatly, but it may also have exacerbated his sensitivity over his lower-class origins. Ford, as has been demonstrated, was condescending to the young poet-schoolmaster from "somewhere in the Black Country," whom he regarded as an example of the unpolished genius the new democracy could occasionally produce. As in the case of Pound, the importance of Ford and the English Review in the careers of Douglas, Lewis, and Lawrence seems to have been overlooked by most scholarship.

The role of the review as a precursor of little magazines has been similarly neglected. The magazine is not mentioned in the standard work on the subject, The Little Magazine by Hoffman, Allen, and Ulrich. The oversight is explainable on the basis of the definition the authors set forth at the beginning of their study:

A little magazine is a magazine designed to print artistic work which for reasons of commercial expediency is not acceptable to the money-minded periodicals or presses. . . . Little magazines are willing to lose money, to court ridicule, to ignore public taste, willing to do almost anything--steal, beg, or undress in public--rather than sacrifice their right to print good material. . . . Such periodicals are, therefore, non-commercial by intent, for their altruistic ideal usually rules out the hope of financial profit.¹

The English Review was not "noncommercial by intent," but as has been shown Ford was undeniably "willing to do almost anything . . . rather than sacrifice the right to print good material." At the time of the founding, however, it was not universally assumed that "altruistic ideal[s]" and "hope of financial profit" were mutually exclusive. Ford and the writers who participated in the venture all hoped the public would respond to an uncompromisingly high-class literary magazine, and were disappointed when it did not.

The lesson of Ford's failure to attract even a thousand regular readers was not lost, and Good Literature retreated to magazines that began by assuming a minimal readership. Thus, the English Review, while excluded from the definition of "little magazine," was important in shaping that very definition. Similarly, its financial failure encouraged the attitude

¹ Frederick J. Hoffman, Charles Allen, and Carolyn F. Ulrich, The Little Magazine (Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1946), p. 2.

that art, in a modern democratic society, could not pay its own way.

Pound's numerous comments to the effect that the review was "the greatest Little Review or pre-Little Review of our time"¹ place it at the head of the little magazine tradition. The magazine was read and commented upon as far away as Chicago, where it was praised lavishly in the Friday Literary Review,² which, under the editorship of Francis Hackett, was involved in the literary ferment that has become known as the Chicago Renaissance.³ Editors who became connected with London little magazines have also commented that the English Review served them as an inspiration and model.⁴

Ford's magazine was thus at the center of the literary currents of the day. Many of the critical notions it fostered gained increasing momentum and came to dominate literature

¹See above, p. 231.

²See "An Admirable Monthly," The Chicago Evening Post Friday Literary Review, 26 March 1909, p. 4.

³See Bernard Duffey, The Chicago Renaissance in American Letters ([East Lansing, Michigan]: Michigan State College Press, 1954), pp. 171-182.

⁴See Frank Swinnerton, Background with Chorus (London: Hutchinson, 1956), pp. 145-146, where the English Review is reported to have inspired Rhythm.

after World War I, and the very fact of the commercial failure of the journal was also important, for it seemed to prove conclusively that the public at large would not respond to art. As the definition of "little magazine" offered by Hoffman, Allen, and Ulrich implies, that idea became central to later artistic and journalistic endeavor.

A concluding assessment of the English Review must also take into account the effect the experience of editing the magazine had upon Ford himself. Ford is seldom listed among the greatest of twentieth-century writers, but his place in the second echelon seems secure.¹ Yet, although Ford wrote much that is obviously second-rate, some of his work can stand with the very greatest in the twentieth-century canon: the Parade's End tetralogy has a scope, depth of conviction, and technical sophistication that make the work profoundly moving; The Good Soldier is likewise technically remarkable; and Great Trade Route, Providence, and various of Ford's reminiscences are memorable for their expression of a unique world view. It can

¹The number of publications on Ford indexed in the annual PMLA Bibliography serves as a good general indicator of critical interest in him, and in the last ten years the number of entries for Ford has usually varied between five and ten. In the most recent volume to appear, that for 1974, there were eight. By comparison, there were ten for Bennett, eight for Wells, and twenty-six for Forster.

be argued that the English Review editorship was a turning point in Ford's life and shaped his attitudes in such a way as to make his mature work possible.

Ford, in 1908 in his mid-thirties, was still something of a dilettante. He had some good work to his credit, notably the Fifth Queen trilogy, but his most important accomplishment had come second hand, through the collaboration with Conrad. The collaboration produced no great work in its own right, but Ford stood beside Conrad during the incredibly productive decade when Lord Jim, Heart of Darkness, Youth, Typhoon, The Secret Agent, and Nostromo were written. Ford's own work of the period was clever and showed technical skill, but lacked vision, conviction, and depth of feeling.

The review brought Ford first to a pinnacle of success and then, within a year, to the depths of failure and social ostracism. The exhilaration, dejection, and (ultimately) alienation he experienced made the editorship the greatest learning experience of his life. He wrote not long after his ouster as editor, "I can only be said to have grown up a very short time ago,"¹ and Meixner calls "Ford's ejection from the English Review" a "demarcation point" for his literary work:

¹Ford, Ancient Lights, p. vii.

In the first period his work is marked by a slightly soft romanticism, a fondness for vaguely evocative words. . . . After 1909 . . . Ford's language takes on a far more precise, even clinical quality.¹

As has been shown, Ford's editorial policy showed an increasing concern with artistic craftsmanship as he moved from Wellsian toward Jamesian fiction. It is natural that this altered attitude should be evident in his own fiction, and The Good Soldier and Parade's End are both technical masterpieces. Even more important than the awareness for technique Ford gained was his altered world view. The novels he wrote before 1909 show a complacent attitude, even in the Fifth Queen trilogy, where Katherine goes to her death confident that she has stood for truth and righteousness. The review debacle, however, brought an end to moral certainty in Ford's life and in his fiction.

His actual experience bears an uncanny resemblance to a plot he developed four years before in The Benefactor (1905). There, George Moffat, a typically idealistic Fordian hero, loses his fortune and his reputation through unwavering adherence to an absolute moral code. Moffat is not a wholly admirable character, for his idealism causes him to act arrogantly and irresponsibly and to bring pain to himself and

¹Meixner, Ford Madox Ford's Novels, p. 149.

those who love him. Ford apparently recognized he himself had behaved similarly when he wrote of his "education" after his ouster:

God knows that the lesson we learn from life is that our very existence in the nature of things is a perpetual harming of somebody.¹

A great many people had been harmed in the idealistic venture of the English Review, and the moral confusion the affair caused became the basis for Ford's best fiction. After 1909, he continued to use the themes he had explored in The Benefactor, but he achieved a new intensity because the ideas were rooted in his experience as well as in his imagination.

In The Good Soldier, for example, the idealistic Ashburnham, the "good soldier," brings grotesque tragedy to the lives of those he touches. Dowell, the narrator, seeks to "do well," but his very blindness to evil makes him its accomplice. At the heart of the novel is the narrator's (and the reader's) inability to assign blame or make moral judgment: "I know nothing--nothing in the world--of the hearts of men. I only know that I am alone--horribly alone."²

¹Ford, Ancient Lights, ix.

²Ford, The Good Soldier (1915; reprint ed., New York: Vintage, [n.d.]), p. 7.

Ford had become deeply aware of moral ambiguity.

One of his favorite phrases, frequently repeated in both his fiction and non-fiction, came to be, "The heart of another is a dark forest,"¹ meaning that no two minds share common assumptions and that therefore communication based upon mutual understanding, including a mutually-held moral code, is impossible. Ford had literally lived through a "dark forest" episode in 1909, when his own life and those of his closest friends were convulsed by misunderstanding and misplaced idealism.

The characters of Parade's End, like those of The Good Soldier, wander through a confused landscape of moral uncertainty. Tietjens, the protagonist, upholds a strict eighteenth-century Tory code that would seem a solid basis for moral judgment, but proves not to be. Tietjens's constant saintly forgiveness of his wife's infidelities, for example, turns her into a fiercely vindictive shrew, for she desperately needs confession, punishment, and absolution, not the mounting moral debt that Tietjens's forgiveness places on her. Similarly, Tietjens's refusal to consummate his love for the righteous

¹Ford, in the dedication to the novel he wrote as a self-justifying account of his English Review experience, says that he initially wanted to call the book The Dark Forest. See Ford [Daniel Chaucer], The New Humpty-Dumpty (London: John Lane, 1912). Thereafter, what Ford described as a "Russian proverb," "The heart of another is a dark forest," frequently is cited in his reminiscences.

but eager Valentine, because "some do not" commit adultery, causes them both to suffer, and serves no moral purpose. The Good Soldier and Parade's End are both richly complex works, but it is clear that in one of their common themes--profound moral uncertainty--Ford drew upon his English Review experience.

The powerful endings of the two novels also owe to the review years. Both have an almost apocalyptic aspect; venality seems omnipresent and, in Graham Green's phrase, "the little virtue that exist[s] only attract[s] evil."¹ Idealism comes to naught, evil triumphs, and at the conclusion the exhausted protagonists are stripped utterly bare, left only with an insane schadenfreude growing out of a recognition that, because the worst has happened, the struggle is at least over. Ford's experiences in the First World War and his subsequent self-exile from England no doubt were factors in his pessimism, but even those events did not have the impact of the review disaster, when within a year Ford passed from social lion and literary arbiter to disgraced outsider.

The English Review was thus of pivotal importance to Ford and, as has been shown, the magazine was integral both to the careers of numerous other writers and to the development

¹Graham Greene, "Ford Madox Ford," in Ford Madox Ford, The Critical Heritage, ed. Frank MacShane, p. 214.

of literature generally. Ford's accomplishment in bringing together so many of the best writers and so much of the best work remains unprecedented. Under him, the magazine became an idealistic editor's dream--a forum in which the very best talent of the day found expression--and the reputation he brought the journal carried it through fifteen more years of literary importance. As the forgoing study has shown, the review was an Edwardian matrix in which existing attitudes were joined with new concepts to infuse renewed vitality into the English literary scene. Pound's 1937 advice, quoted at the outset of this study, "You ought for the sake of perspective to read through the whole of the Eng. Rev. files . . . for as long as Ford had it,"¹ was and is excellent, for not only does the magazine remain a storehouse of great literature but it is a repository of many of the concepts that shaped literature in the decades ahead. By encountering these concepts in the review, one begins to get a sense of how these ideas seemed to contemporary readers and, one hopes, reach an increased understanding of a pivotal period in literary history.

¹See above, p. 1.

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

Works by Ford

- Ford, Ford Madox. Ancient Lights. London: Chapman and Hall, 1911.
- _____. The Benefactor. London: Brown, Langham, 1905.
- _____. A Call. London: Chatto and Windus, 1910.
- _____. Collected Poems. New York: Oxford University Press, 1936.
- _____. "The Collected Poems of Christina Rossetti." Fortnightly Review 75 (March 1904):393-404.
- _____. The Critical Attitude. London: Duckworth, 1911.
- _____. The Critical Writings of Ford Madox Ford. Edited by Frank MacShane. Lincoln, Nebraska: University of Nebraska Press, 1964.
- _____. England and the English (Combining The Soul of London, 1905; The Heart of the Country, 1906; The Spirit of the People, 1907). New York: McClure Phillips, 1907.
- _____. An English Girl. London: Methuen, 1907.
- _____. The English Novel. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott, 1929.
- _____. The Fifth Queen. Reprint Edition. (Combining The Fifth Queen, 1906; Privy Seal, 1907; The Fifth Queen Crowned, 1908). New York: Vanguard Press, 1962.

- Ford, Ford Madox. The Good Soldier. 1915; Reprint Edition. New York: Vintage, [n.d.] .
- _____. Great Trade Route. New York: Oxford University Press, 1937.
- _____. "A Haughty and Proud Generation." Yale Review 11 (July 1922):703-717.
- _____. Henry James. London: Martin Secker, 1913.
- _____. It Was the Nightingale. Philadelphia: Lippincott, 1933.
- _____. Joseph Conrad: A Personal Remembrance. London: Duckworth, 1924.
- _____. Letters of Ford Madox Ford. Edited by Richard M. Ludwig. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1965.
- _____. "The Making of Modern Verse." Academy 22 (19, 26 April):412-414, 438-439.
- _____. The March of Literature. New York: Dial Press, 1938.
- _____. The Marsden Case. London: Duckworth, 1923.
- _____. Mr. Apollo. London: Methuen, 1908.
- _____. Mr. Fleight. London: Howard Latimer, 1913.
- _____. "Modern Poetry." The Thrush 1 (December 1909): 39-53.
- _____. [Daniel Chaucer]. The New Humpty-Dumpty. London: John Lane, 1912.
- _____. Parade's End. Reprint Edition. (Combining Some Do Not . . ., 1924; No More Parades, 1925; A Man Could Stand Up--, 1926; The Last Post, 1928). New York: Signet, 1964.

Ford, Ford Madox. "The Poetical Works of Christina Georgina Rossetti." Fortnightly Review 75 (March 1904): 393-405.

_____. Portraits From Life. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1937.

_____. Provence. Philadelphia: Lippincott, 1935.

_____. Return to Yesterday. New York: Horace Liveright, 1932.

_____. The Shifting of the Fire. London: T. Fisher Unwin, 1892.

_____. [Daniel Chaucer]. The Simple Life Limited. London: John Lane, 1911.

_____. Thus to Revisit. London: Chapman and Hall, 1921.

_____. The Young Lovell. London: Chatto and Windus, 1913.

_____, ed. English Review 1-4 (December 1908-December 1909).

Ford, Ford Madox, and Conrad, Joseph. The Inheritors. 1901; Reprint Edition. Garden City, New York: Doubleday, Page, 1925.

Ford, Ford Madox and Conrad, Joseph. The Nature of a Crime. London: Duckworth, 1924.

Ford, Ford Madox and Conrad, Joseph. Romance. London: Smith Elder, 1903.

Ford, Ford Madox, and Hunt, Violet. Zeppelin Nights. London: John Lane, 1916.

Works By Others

Aldington, Richard. D. H. Lawrence, Portrait of a Genius But . . . New York: Duell, Sloan and Pearce, 1950.

_____. Pinorman. London: William Heinemann, 1954.

Allen, Walter. The English Novel. New York: Dutton, 1934.

- Allen, Walter. "Lonely Old Volcano." Encounter 21
(September 1963):63-70.
- Alvarez, A. The Shaping Spirit. London: Chatto and Windus,
1958.
- "Austin Harrison, obit." Times [London], 16 July 1928, p. 19.
- Baines, Jocelyn. Joseph Conrad. London: Weidenfeld and
Nicholson, 1960.
- Bateson, F. W. A Guide to English Literature. Second Edition.
Garden City, New York: Doubleday, 1968.
- Bellamy, William. The Novels of Wells, Bennett and Galsworthy,
1890-1910. New York: Barnes and Noble, 1971.
- Bennett, Arnold. Letters of Arnold Bennett. Edited by James
Hepburn. Vol. 1: Letters to J. B. Pinker. London:
Oxford University Press, 1966; Vol. 2: 1889-1915.
London: Oxford University Press, 1968.
- Bennett, Arnold. What the Public Wants. London: Frank
Palmer, 1910.
- Boll, Theophilus E. M. Miss May Sinclair: Novelist.
Rutherford, New Jersey: Fairleigh Dickinson Univer-
sity Press, 1973.
- Boulton, James T. "D. H. Lawrence's 'Odour of Chrysanthemums':
An Early Version." Renaissance and Modern Studies 13
(1969):4-48.
- Bowen, Stella. Drawn From Life. London: Collins Publishers,
[1940].
- Bradbury, Malcolm. "The English Review." London Magazine 5
(August 1958):46-57.
- Cassell, Richard A. Ford Madox Ford, A Study of His Novels.
Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1962.
- Chambers, Jessie [E. T]. D. H. Lawrence, A Personal Record.
London: Jonathan Cape, 1935.

- Chew, Samuel C., and Altick, Richard D. "The Nineteenth Century and After." In A Literary History of England, pp. 1109-1605. Edited by Albert C. Baugh. Second Edition. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1967.
- Coffman, Stanley K., Jr. Imagism. Norman, Oklahoma: University of Oklahoma Press, 1951.
- Conrad, Jessie. Joseph Conrad and His Circle. Second Edition. Port Washington, New York: Kennikat Press, 1964.
- _____. Joseph Conrad as I Knew Him. London: William Heinemann, 1926.
- Conrad, Joseph. "Author's Note" (at conclusion of serialization of The Nigger of the Narcissus). New Review 17 (December 1897):628-631.
- _____. Some Reminiscences. London: Nash, 1912.
- Cox, C. B., and Dyson, A. E., eds. The Twentieth Century Mind. London: Oxford University Press, 1972.
- Cruse, Amy. After the Victorians. London: George Allen and Unwin, 1938.
- Cunard, Nancy. Grand Man, Memories of Norman Douglas. London: Secker and Warburg, 1954.
- Cushman, Keith. "D. H. Lawrence at Work: The Making of 'Odour of Chrysanthemums'." Journal of Modern Literature 2 (June 1972):367-392.
- Daiches, David. The Present Age in Literature. Bloomington, Indiana: Indiana University Press, 1958.
- Dangerfield, George. The Strange Death of Liberal England. London: Constable, 1936.
- Dictionary of National Biography. 1901-1960. London: Oxford University Press, 1912-1971.
- Douglas, Norman. Experiments. New York: Robert M. McBride, 1925.
- _____. Looking Back. New York: Harcourt, Brace, 1933.

- Drabble, Margaret. Arnold Bennett. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1974.
- Draper, R. P., ed. D. H. Lawrence: The Critical Heritage. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1970.
- Duffey, Bernard. The Chicago Renaissance in American Letters. [East Lansing, Michigan]: Michigan State College Press, 1954.
- Edel, Leon. Henry James. Vol. 5: The Master. Philadelphia: Lippincott, 1972.
- _____. The Psychological Novel, 1900-1950. London: Rupert Hart-Davis, 1955.
- Edel, Leon, and Ray, Gordon N., eds. Henry James and H. G. Wells. Urbana, Illinois: University of Illinois Press, 1958.
- Eliot, T. S. For Lancelot Andrewes. London: Faber and Gwyer, 1928.
- _____. To Criticize the Critic. London: Faber and Faber, 1965.
- _____. Selected Essays. New York: Harcourt, Brace, 1950.
- Ellmann, Richard, ed. Edwardians and Late Victorians. New York: Columbia University Press, 1960.
- "The English Review." National Review 109 (August 1937): 175-176.
- Ensor, R. C. K. England 1870-1914. London: Oxford University Press, 1936.
- Fitzgibbon, Constantine. "Norman Douglas: Memoir of an Unwritten Biography." Encounter 43 (September 1974): 23-37.
- _____. Norman Douglas: A Pictorial Record. London: Richards Press, 1953.

Flaubert, Gustave. The Sentimental Education. Translated by Perdita Burlingame. New York: New American Library, 1972.

Fletcher, John Gould. Life is My Song. New York: Farrar and Rinehart, 1937.

Flint, F. S. "Imagisme." Poetry 1 (March 1913):198-206.

Fraser, G. S. The Modern Writer and His World. London: Derek Verschoyle, 1953.

Gallup, Donald, ed. The Flowers of Friendship, Letters Written to Gertrude Stein. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1953.

Garnett, David. The Golden Echo. New York: Harcourt, Brace, 1954.

Goldring, Douglas. The Last Pre-Raphaelite. London: MacDonald, 1948.

_____. Odd Man Out. London: Chapman and Hall, 1935.

_____. Reputations. 1920; Reprint Edition. Port Washington, New York: Kennikat Press, 1968.

_____. South Lodge. London: Constable, 1943.

Gordon, Ambrose. The Invisible Tent: The War Novels of Ford Madox Ford. Austin, Texas: University of Texas Press, 1964.

Graham, Walter. English Literary Periodicals. New York: Thomas Nelson, 1930.

"The Great Adult Review." Spectator 106 (10 June 1911): 875-876.

Harrison, Austin, ed. English Review 4-36 (January 1910-May 1923).

Harvey, David Dow. Ford Madox Ford 1873-1939, A Bibliography of Works and Criticism. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1962.

- Harvey, Sir Paul. The Oxford Companion to English Literature. Fourth Edition. London: Oxford University Press, 1967.
- Heilbrun, Carolyn G. The Garnett Family. New York: Macmillan, 1961.
- Hoffman, Charles G. Ford Madox Ford. New York: Twayne, 1967.
- Hoffman, Frederick J.; Allen, Charles; and Ulrich, Carolyn F. The Little Magazine. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1946.
- Homburger, Eric. "Pound, Ford, and 'Prose': The Making of a Modern Poet." Journal of American Studies 5 (December 1971):281-292.
- Hough, Graham. Image and Experience. London: Duckworth, 1960.
- Hughes, Glenn. Imagism and the Imagists. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1931.
- Hummel, Madeline. "Fifty Unpublished Letters from Joseph Conrad." The Library Chronicle of the University of Texas 3 (May 1971):52-57.
- Hunt, Violet. I Have This to Say. New York: Boni and Liveright, 1926.
- Hynes, Samuel. Edwardian Occasions. New York: Oxford University Press, 1972.
- _____. The Edwardian Turn of Mind. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1968.
- Isaacs, J. The Background of Modern Poetry. London: G. Bell, 1951.
- Jarman, T. L. A Short History of Twentieth-Century England. New York: Mentor, 1963.
- Jean-Aubry, G. Joseph Conrad: Life and Letters. Vols. 1 and 2. Garden City, New York: Doubleday, Page, 1927.
- Jepson, Edgar. Memories of an Edwardian and Neo-Georgian. London: Richards, 1937.

Jerrold, Douglas. Georgian Adventure. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1938.

_____, ed. English Review 53-62 (June 1931 - June 1936).

Jones, A. R. "Notes Toward a History of Imagism." South Atlantic Quarterly 60 (Summer 1961):262-265.

Karl, Frederick R. "Joseph Conrad, Norman Douglas, and the English Review." Journal of Modern Literature 2 (June 1972):342-356.

Kenner, Hugh. The Pound Era. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1971.

Lawrence, D. H. The Collected Letters of D. H. Lawrence. Edited by Harry T. Moore. Vol. 1. New York: Viking Press, 1962.

Leavis, F. R. New Bearings in English Poetry. London: Chatto and Windus, 1932.

Lewis, Wyndham. Blasting and Bombardiering. Second Revised Edition. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1967.

_____. The Letters of Wyndham Lewis. Edited by W. K. Rose. London: Methuen, 1963.

_____. Rude Assignment. London: Hutchinson and Company, [n.d.].

Lindeman, Ralph D. Norman Douglas. New York: Twayne, 1965.

Mackenzie, Compton. Literature in My Time. London: Rich and Cowan, 1933.

MacKenzie, Norman and Jeanne. H. G. Wells. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1973.

MacShane, Frank. "The English Review." South Atlantic Quarterly 60 (Summer 1961):311-320.

_____. "'To Establish the Facts': A Communication on Mr. A. R. Jones and Ford Madox Ford." South Atlantic Quarterly 61 (Spring 1962):260-265.

MacShane, Frank. The Life and Work of Ford Madox Ford.
New York: Horizon Press, 1965.

_____, ed. Ford Madox Ford, The Critical Heritage.
London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1972.

Marchand, Leslie. The Athenaeum. Chapel Hill, North
Carolina: University of North Carolina Press, 1941.

Martin, Wallace. The New Age Under Orage. Manchester,
England: Manchester University Press, 1967.

Masterman, C. F. G. The Condition of England. London:
Methuen, 1909.

Materer, Timothy. Wyndham Lewis the Novelist. Detroit:
Wayne State University Press, 1976.

Meixner, John A. "Ford and Conrad." Conradiana 6 (1974):
157-169.

_____. Ford Madox Ford's Novels. Minneapolis: University
of Minnesota Press, 1962.

Meyer, Bernard C. Joseph Conrad: A Psychoanalytic Biography.
Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1967.

Mizener, Arthur. "The Lost Papers of Violet Hunt."
Cornell Library Journal 3 (Fall 1967):1-6.

_____. The Saddest Story. New York: World, 1971.

Moore, Harry T. The Priest of Love, A Life of D. H. Lawrence.
Revised Edition. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux,
1974.

Moser, Thomas C. "From Olive Garnett's Diary: Impressions
of Ford Madox Ford and his Friends, 1890-1906."
Texas Studies in Literature and Language 16
(Fall 1974):511-533.

Nehls, Edward, ed. D. H. Lawrence: A Composite Biography.
Vol. 1. Madison, Wisconsin: University of Wisconsin
Press, 1957.

Nowell-Smith, Simon, ed. Edwardian England 1901-1914.
London: Oxford University Press, 1964.

Plant, Marjorie. The English Book Trade. London: George
Allen and Unwin, 1939.

Poli, Bernard J. Ford Madox Ford and the Transatlantic
Review. Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 1967.

Pound, Ezra. The Letters of Ezra Pound, 1907-1941.
Edited by D. D. Paige. New York: Harcourt, Brace,
1950.

_____. "The Prose Tradition in Verse." Literary Essays
of Ezra Pound. Edited by T. S. Eliot. London:
Faber and Faber, 1954, pp. 371-377.

_____. Review of Love Poems and Others, by D. H. Lawrence.
Poetry 2 (July 1913):149-151.

_____. Selected Poems of Ezra Pound. New York: James
Laughlin, 1957.

_____. "Small Magazines." English Journal 19
(November 1930):689-704.

Pound, Reginald. The Strand Magazine 1891-1950. London:
Heinemann, 1966.

Putt, S. Gorley. Henry James, A Reader's Guide. Ithaca,
New York: Cornell University Press, 1966.

Randall, Dale B. J. Joseph Conrad and Warrington Dawson:
The Record of a Friendship. Durham, North Carolina:
Duke University Press, 1968.

Remnant, Ernest, ed. English Review 36-52 (June 1923 -
May 1931).

Rhys, Ernest. Everyman Remembers. New York: Cosmopolitan
Book Corporation, 1931.

Ross, Robert H. The Georgian Revolt. Carbondale, Illinois:
Southern Illinois University Press, 1965.

Sackville-West, Victoria. The Edwardians. New York: Literary Guild of America, 1930.

Said, Edward W. Joseph Conrad and the Fiction of Autobiography. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1966.

Schneidau, Herbert N. Ezra Pound: The Image and the Real. Baton Rouge, Louisiana: Louisiana State University Press, 1969.

Schorer, Mark, ed. Modern British Fiction. New York: Oxford University Press, 1961.

Scott-James, R. A. "Ford Madox Ford When He Was Hueffer." South Atlantic Quarterly 57 (Spring 1958):236-253.

Secor, Marie. "Violet Hunt, Novelist: A Reintroduction." English Literature in Transition 19 (Spring 1976): 25-34.

Shipp, Horace, ed. The English Review Book of Short Stories. London: Sampson Low, Marston, 1932.

_____, ed. The Second English Review Book of Short Stories. London: Sampson Low, Marston, [n.d.].

Smith, Grover. Ford Madox Ford. Columbia Essays on Modern Writers. New York: Columbia University Press, 1972.

Stevenson, Lionel. The English Novel: A Panorama. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1960.

Stewart, J. I. M. Eight Modern Writers. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1963.

Stewart, James D., ed. The British Union-Catalogue of Periodicals. Vol. 2. New York: Academic Press, 1956.

Stock, Noel. The Life of Ezra Pound. New York: Pantheon Books, 1970.

Swinerton, Frank. Background With Chorus. London: Hutchinson, 1956.

- Swinerton, Frank. The Georgian Scene. New York: Farrar & Rinehart, 1934.
- Thomas, William Beach. The Story of the Spectator, 1828-1928. London: Methuen, 1928.
- Trevelyan, G. M. A Shortened History of England. Baltimore: Penguin Books, 1942.
- Trilling, Lionel. The Opposing Self. New York: Viking, 1955.
- Walker-Smith, Derek, ed. English Review 63-64 (July 1936-July 1937).
- Wells, H. G. Kipps. 1905; Reprint Edition. New York: Scribners, 1909.
- _____. Love and Mr. Lewisham. Second Edition. New York: Frederick A. Stokes, 1899.
- _____. The New Machiavelli. New York: Duffield, 1910.
- _____. Tono-Bungay. 1909; Reprint Edition. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1966.
- Whittemore, Reed. "The Fascination of the Abomination--Wells, Shaw, Ford, Conrad." The Fascination of the Abomination. New York: Macmillan, 1963, pp. 129-166.
- Who's Who 1909. London: A. and C. Black, 1909.
- Wiley, Paul L. Novelist of Three Worlds: Ford Madox Ford. Syracuse, New York: Syracuse University Press, 1962.
- Wilson, Harris, ed. Arnold Bennett and H. G. Wells: A Personal and Literary Friendship. London: Hart-Davis, 1960.
- Woolf, Cecil. A Bibliography of Norman Douglas. London: Rupert Hart-Davis, 1954.
- Woolf, Virginia. The Captain's Death Bed and Other Essays. New York: Harcourt, Brace, 1950.

Yeats, W. B. The Variorum Edition of the Poems of W. B. Yeats. Edited by Peter Allt and Russell K. Alspach. New York: Macmillan, 1957.

_____, ed. The Oxford Book of Modern Verse. New York: Oxford University Press, 1937.

Young, Kenneth. Ford Madox Ford. British Council Book. London: Longman's, 1956.

BIOGRAPHY

Ralph Herman Ruedy was born on August 26, 1943, in Middle Amana, Iowa, where he attended the local public schools. He received the bachelor's degree in history from Iowa State University in 1965, and was commissioned in the naval service, where he served through 1969, primarily in the Mediterranean area and Southeast Asia. He was awarded the Master of Arts degree in English from Duke University in 1971, and presented the doctoral dissertation in 1976. He held Graduate Tutorships in English at Duke through the 1971-72 and 1972-73 academic years, and in the fall semester of 1973.

He was appointed to the diplomatic service as a Foreign Service Information Officer in 1974, and served in Tehran, Iran. In late 1976, he is scheduled to become a cultural officer at the American Embassy in East Berlin. His wife, the former Shirley Wallace, also received her graduate education at Duke. The couple has one daughter.

