

Melba Cuddy-Keane
Adam Hammond
Alexandra Peat

Modernism

Keywords

WILEY Blackwell

Contents

[Credits and Acknowledgments](#)

[Introduction: Unsettling Modernism](#)

[Aims and Approach](#)

[Theoretical Implications](#)

[Modernists and Modernism](#)

[A Note on the Words](#)

[A Note on Methodology](#)

[Using This Book](#)

[Future Directions](#)

[Note on References](#)

[A](#)

[Advertising](#)

[Atom, Atomic](#)

[Avant-Garde](#)

[B](#)

[Best Seller](#)

[Bigness, Smallness](#)

[Biography, New Biography](#)

[C](#)

[Common Man](#)

[Common Mind, Group Thinking](#)

Conventional, Conventuality
Coterie, Bloomsbury

D

Democracy
Difficulty, Obscurity

E

Einstein
Empire, Imperialism

F

Fascism
Form, Formalism

G

God, Gods

H

Hamlet
Highbrow, Middlebrow, Lowbrow
Hygiene

I

Impression, Impressionism
International, Internationalism

M

Manifesto

Modern, Modernism

N

Negro, New Negro

P

Personality, Impersonality

Primitive

Propaganda

Q

Queer, Gay

R

Race

Readers, Reading

Reality, Realism

Rhythm

S

Sentimental, Sentimentality

Shock, Shell Shock

U

Unconscious

Universal

W

Woman, New Woman

[Words, Language](#)

[Index of Modernist Authors](#)

[Index of Modernist Keywords](#)

Keywords in Literature and Culture

The books in this series present keywords for individual literary periods in an easily accessible reference format. More than a dictionary, each volume is written by a leading scholar and consists of an engaging collection of short essays, which consider the ways in which words both register and explore historical change. Indebted to the work of Raymond Williams, the series identifies and documents keywords as cultural analysis, taking the reader beyond semantic definition to uncover the uncertainties, disagreements, and confrontations evident in differing usages and conflicting connotations.

Published:

Anglo-Saxon
Keywords

Allen J. Frantzen

Modernism:
Keywords

Melba Cuddy-Keane,

Adam Hammond, and Alexandra
Peat

Forthcoming:

Middle English Keywords

Kellie Robertson

British Literature 1660-1789:
Keywords

Robert DeMaria
Jr.

Romanticism: Keywords

Frederick
Burwick

Modernism: Keywords

Melba Cuddy-Keane
Adam Hammond
Alexandra Peat

WILEY Blackwell

This edition first published 2014

© 2014 Melba Cuddy-Keane

Registered Office

John Wiley & Sons, Ltd, The Atrium, Southern Gate,
Chichester, West Sussex, PO19 8SQ, UK

Editorial Offices

350 Main Street, Malden, MA 02148-5020, USA

9600 Garsington Road, Oxford, OX4 2DQ, UK

The Atrium, Southern Gate, Chichester, West Sussex, PO19
8SQ, UK

For details of our global editorial offices, for customer services, and for information about how to apply for permission to reuse the copyright material in this book please see our website at www.wiley.com/wiley-blackwell.

The right of Melba Cuddy-Keane to be identified as the author responsible for this work has been asserted in accordance with the UK Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988.

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, except as permitted by the UK Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988, without the prior permission of the publisher.

Wiley also publishes its books in a variety of electronic formats. Some content that appears in print may not be available in electronic books.

Designations used by companies to distinguish their products are often claimed as trademarks. All brand names and product names used in this book are trade names, service marks, trademarks or registered trademarks of their respective owners. The publisher is not associated with any product or vendor mentioned in this book.

Limit of Liability/Disclaimer of Warranty: While the publisher and authors have used their best efforts in preparing this book, they make no representations or warranties with respect to the accuracy or completeness of the contents of this book and specifically disclaim any implied warranties of merchantability or fitness for a particular purpose. It is sold on the understanding that the publisher is not engaged in rendering professional services and neither the publisher nor the author shall be liable for damages arising herefrom. If professional advice or other expert assistance is required, the services of a competent professional should be sought.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Cuddy-Keane, Melba.

Modernism keywords / Melba Cuddy-Keane, Adam Hammond and Alexandra Peat. – First Edition.

pages cm. – (Keywords in literature and culture (KILC).)
Includes index.

ISBN 978-1-4051-8655-1 (hardback)

1. English language–Etymology. 2. English language–Glossaries, vocabularies, etc. 3. Modernism (Literature)4. Social structure–Terminology. 5. Culture–Terminology. 6. Sociolinguistics. 7. Vocabulary. I. Title.

PE1580.C794 2014

820.9'11203–dc23

2013038470

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library.

Cover design by E&P Design

Credits and Acknowledgments

Our thanks go first and foremost to the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada (SSHRC) for a Standard Research Grant that supported much of our work and to the University of Toronto Excellence Awards, which supported Claire Marie Stancek as an undergraduate assistant for two summers. We are indebted as well to the excellent services at the research and rare book libraries at the University of Toronto, and in the Metropolitan Toronto Public Library system, and to the numerous online sites that have made available digitized versions of modernist books and periodicals. We owe a particular debt of gratitude to colleagues and students at the University of Toronto and Franklin University Switzerland who commented on our entries and to modernist scholars everywhere - especially to colleagues in the Modernist Studies Association - whose rich discussions and illuminating scholarship simulated our thinking and encouraged our work.

The production of this work as a collaborative effort makes it impossible to assign specific credit for individual portions of it. All members of the team contributed substantially to the research and most also commented on draft entries and suggested approaches to structure. The graduate students employed by the project inevitably varied in the length of time they could be involved in the project, as reflected in their different roles, but the project is greatly indebted to them all. Members of the research team included collaborating writer Marybeth Curtin; collaborating contributors Glenn Clifton and Rohanna Green; contributors Claire Battershill, Kimberly Fairbrother Canton, and Daniel Harney; and research assistants Tania Botticella, Stewart

Cole, and Sarah Copland. Rohanna Green and Adam Hammond provided invaluable assistance in establishing our collaborative websites. Special thanks are also due to Claire Marie Stancek for her excellent research, recordings of our meetings, and commentaries on numerous entries.

Primary responsibility for the project was undertaken as follows: Melba Cuddy-Keane was project director and senior editor, and Alexandra Peat served for many years as project manager. Marybeth Curtin and Adam Hammond joined Cuddy-Keane and Peat on an editorial team in the spring of 2010, all four collaborating as writers until Curtin graduated and took up a government research position in June 2011. Cuddy-Keane, Hammond, and Peat continued as co-writers; in the last phase of the project, Cuddy-Keane and Hammond revised and expanded the text, developing and completing the remaining entries, the bibliography, and the keyword index; Peat provided editorial assistance. All three co-authors collaborated in copyediting and proofreading.

This project would never have been realized without Wiley Blackwell's Commissioning Editor Emma Bennett, who first proposed the idea for this book, and without the patient guidance of Project Editor Ben Thatcher and all the Wiley Blackwell staff. We are indebted to SPi Global for their help with copy-editing, to Mary Newberry for producing the author index using TExtract, and to EndNote for its indispensable bibliographic software. Thanks go finally to many wonderful friends and family members who were inspirational in their unwavering support.

Introduction: Unsettling Modernism

Spanning the “long” modernist period, from roughly 1880–1950, *Modernism: Keywords* tracks words used with frequency and urgency in “written modernism.” The approach takes its inspiration from Raymond Williams’s *Keywords: A Vocabulary of Culture and Society* (1976), which argued that we can best understand the character and thought of an era not through its dominant beliefs, but through the problems and debates inadvertently revealed in its words. Differing from periodizations that try to identify an era’s dominant ideology, or “the spirit of the age,” a keywords approach identifies controversial words that mattered enough to become magnets of cross-talk and exchange. Unlike dictionaries and glossaries, *Keywords* focuses on words that cannot be easily and summarily defined: words with unstable meanings and conflicting implications, which testify to culture as an active and living thing. Unlike historical dictionaries, *Keywords* goes further than quotation to analyze relationships and to probe the issues or forces underlying ambiguous words. *Keywords* attempts to discover cultural processes at work.

Aims and Approach

While adopting Williams’s combination of cultural analysis and close reading, *Modernism: Keywords* responds as well to the revolutionary changes in research techniques since his time. By his own account, Williams’s resources consisted primarily of *The Oxford English Dictionary* (the OED) and his own reading over an approximately 25-year span. Today,

electronic databases and online searching have vastly increased the number of texts readily available, while the range of accessible materials extends to forms such as popular journalism, advertisements, and (often posthumously published) letters and diaries. In addition, while Williams focused his study on British culture and society, the research offered here embraces the transatlantic and, where possible, the larger English-speaking world. The new scope requires vast quantities of material and the technologies to make it available; the present work could not have been written without electronic databases, internet searching, and the wide reading of a collaborative research team. As a result, the evidence we present differs from the original *Keywords* as well. Williams, for the most part, offered generalized broad summaries about the meaning of terms; *Modernism: Keywords* documents usage with specific quotations, citing, from a much larger bibliography of works consulted, over 1100 primary texts.

To assist manageability, however, this volume has a more specific focus than Williams's work: our subject is *written* modernism and our audience is, first and foremost, a readership engaged in the study of English Literature. Although emphasizing the nineteenth century, Williams's coverage ranged from earliest usages to the mid-1970s; the present work limits itself to seventy years, concentrating on a period particularly noted for radical change. Furthermore, whereas Williams's approach was broadly cultural and sociological, the approach here always considers the relevance of its "interdisciplinary" usages - in, for example, psychology, sociology, and science - for understandings pertinent to the discipline of literature.

A word should be said too about ideology. As a Marxist, Williams was accused - notably by William Empson (1977) - of political partisanship, although we believe that a careful

reading of his *Keywords* reveals it to be remarkably fair. Williams himself, however, drew attention to the inescapability of bias, noting the prevalence in the OED of “orthodox opinion,” and the way that his own “positions and preferences” inevitably seep through. The present work certainly aspires to ideological fairness, on the assumption that we can recover a sense of on-going conversation only by giving all voices equal chance to speak. We pursue, in this light, a comment by Williams himself: “an ‘enlightened Radical or Liberal’ ought, as Mill said of Coleridge, ‘to rejoice over such a Conservative’ as Eliot” for the way he “raised questions which those who differ from him politically must answer, or else retire from the field” (1956). We take inspiration as well from a critic speaking from the liberal-humanist side: as F. R. Leavis stated, “finding essential insight in work about which one has to have critical reserves is a most important order of educational experience” (1969). Those who contributed research for this volume represent a wide range of interests, beliefs, and political allegiances, and these collaborative voices helped us to listen carefully to the range of voices in the works that we read. Yet, finally, even a study of vocabulary makes ethical judgments at certain points. While we have tried, for example, to present the reasons why some writers used words such as fascism or imperialism in positive ways, we still expose the ethical problems in endorsements of these terms.

Theoretical Implications

A keywords approach implies a methodological and theoretical departure from most critical books being written today. First, not only does it focus on words rather than ideas – or rather, it accesses ideas *through* words – but it also relies on what words meant to the modernists rather

than what they mean to us now. It may seem like a simple process of leaping over current assumptions, but – as we have learned – it is not as easy as it sounds. Second, our entries seek out diversity, even messiness, rather than resolution, so that contrary to the usual scholarly demand for original and singular interpretations, forestalling overarching interpretation has been our goal. Keywords thus resonates with current dissatisfactions with linear histories, as expressed, for example, in Michael Levenson’s turn to “adjacencies.” Arguing an approach to modernism through “the simmering of conversation, the unstoppable circulation of jokes and curses, critical dicta and common-readerly buzz” (2011: 677), Levenson advocates a historicism based on “a network of heterogeneous manifestations” “which needn’t be elevated to “frameworks” or “metanarratives” (2011: 676, 675). Keywords also aligns with Michael Whitworth’s view that returning to “the full historical context” can “unearth associations and implications which complicate meaning,” with the result that “historicism can reopen texts, and that reopening can place the past in new dialogues with the present” (2012: 22).

But the project of “opening history” urges us to go beyond juxtaposition to interaction. *Modernism: Keywords* envisions a mobile history through the trope of “the bounce,” conceiving the words of the past as bouncing against each other as well as out to us. Imagine a field full of multiple players hitting multiple bouncing balls, which spring up from the ground, ricochet off each other, pass from hand to hand, and bounce out to the spectators too. The balls seem to be propelling themselves by their own volition, yet almost invisible hands animate them, speeding them on their way. Like these bouncing, colliding balls, words carry the imprint of previous touch, since communicative power depends on communal speech. Like the watchers, we, as readers and critics, influence the course of the motion, our changing

perceptions bringing multiple patterns into play. By focusing our attention, we bring one ball or one word or one text into the foreground and place others in the background, but by frequently shifting focus, we activate a continual alternation between what is foreground (text) and what background (context). Our vision is most likely limited to a series of rapid still shots of partial aspects, but long exposure and slow watching help us imaginatively to glimpse the whole. The bounce is simply a suggestive metaphor and not meant exactly to replicate the way words work. It will be useful if it offers possibilities for glimpsing, if not fully apprehending, a total field of motion, and capturing the mobile, dynamic, noncentric interaction of keywords at work.

Conceiving history as motion also means infusing history with doubt. As art historian Richard Shiff said in a recent interview: “Theorizations are hypotheses to be tested – they’re pragmatic guesses, often guesses quite in the dark. Belief in your own theory eliminates the capacity to doubt” (Siegel, 2008, Web.) At times, these entries will ask you to set aside your own point of view, even to read from the enemy’s position. Although this doesn’t mean abandoning judgments about value and ethics, it does involve trying to understand the other’s view in its own terms. If we do then return to our initial theories, they will have accumulated depth and complexity along the way.

Modernists and Modernism

While this book does not seek to engage current debates about modernism, the method itself inevitably challenges ideas about modernists and modernism that, in the latter half of C20, became ensconced. A keywords approach makes it more difficult to label a writer’s thought, or to place

writers definitively in opposite camps, since, in a relational network, utterances often overlap with those of apparent opponents, or expose the insecurity and uncertainty underlying fixed meanings and views. Theories about segregated cultures, about “divides” between “highbrow” and “middlebrow,” or between serious art and popular culture, simply become more difficult to maintain. And the plurality inherent in a keywords approach challenges any single idea of modernism itself. Modernism is coming to signify in the way “romanticism” now does: it can be understood as an identifiable transhistorical style, approach, or response (although one with internal variations and disagreements); alternatively, it can be simply a period, or an era, delimited somewhat arbitrarily and yet meaningfully by certain dates. From scholars who take the latter approach, a new comprehensive version of historical modernism is emerging, rather like the modernists’ own sense of “atmosphere,” in which boundaries are porous and ideas circulate – as they began to do literally on radio – through the air. Perhaps, indeed, our greatest departure from Williams lies in our proffered view of modernism itself, since Williams, somewhat ironically, contributed to its labeling when he defined modernism as “metropolitan” art (1989). Our project, conversely, seeks not to settle modernism; in charting what unsettled modernists, we unsettle the idea of modernism as possible to define. The modernist period was a vibrant time of broadly circulating difference, evidencing neither an ultimate messiness nor an ultimate cohesion; its heartbeat sounded in an ongoing engagement of many people, in many of the same things, at the same time. Modernists also had no certain idea of what modernism was or how its debates would end. Nor perhaps do we.

A Note on the Words

Our materials encompass all forms of writing in the modernist period, or by writers whose work falls primarily within our dates. Our sources range from vernacular prose to experimental literary forms, including books, periodical literature, newspapers, songs, even advertising. We mix canonical works with noncanonical, conservative with radical thinkers, “serious” with “popular” culture, generalist with specialist discourse, paying equal attention to all. While our selection is guided by the anticipated use of this book by literary students and scholars, here “fictive” or “imaginative” works inhabit a mixed universe, immersed in the larger textual world. Since our subject is written, not visual or musical, modernism, with a concentration on works written in English, references to the nonverbal arts and to European writers are minimal, limited to works that had significant impact on written English at the time. Our examples derive primarily from British and American writers, although where possible we have included writers from Australia, Canada, the Caribbean, India, New Zealand, and South Africa.

The words in this book are of several kinds: new words that were coined during the modernist period (“fascist,” “Hamletize”); words that were changing/shifting in meaning or connotation (“propaganda,” “hygiene”); words that were being used frequently but in conflicting and contradictory ways (“realism,” “woman”); and “word clusters” indicating emerging ideas, for which no single word was consistently used (“common mind/group thinking/super-cortex”). As the evidence emerged from our data, the results were often not what we expected to find. Many words associated now with modernism (“avant-garde”) were, on their home turf, surprisingly thin; words we expected to be disappearing (“God”) were in strong circulation, or being translated into

other terms. And words that seem later to have settled into one dominant usage (“coterie,” “form”) were, in the modernist period, translucent and prismatic, reflecting many different sides.

We omitted words easily to be understood by consulting the OED; and we avoided words whose definition can be found in handbooks of literary terms, unless they were part of a larger conversation involving divergent interpretations and usages. Nor have we included foreign terms not yet translated into English (like Walter Benjamin’s “aura”), or critical terms that became established after the mC20 to discuss modernist texts (“cultural capital” or “free indirect discourse”). Our focus is always on words that modernists were using, and the dynamics and complexities of that use.

A Note on Methodology

Identifying keywords depends on both objective database searching and interpretive judgment. Keywords must be in wide circulation, and they must exhibit uncertainty and variation in use. Frequency of use is not the only criterion, so that statistical counts, even if we had all relevant texts in an electronic data-base, would not suffice; keywords always embody some underlying dynamic tension, or some significant process of change, and identifying those features depends on the critical mind. Two important resources are thus needed for this task: the availability of extensive print and digitized materials, and a collaborative research team.

Inevitably, projects begin with what we know, and with a research group extending, over the years, to twelve people, most of them graduate students, we were aided by the reasonably large database of a collective mind. But the scope of the enterprise required us to go far beyond our own knowledge and our own critical frames. By responding to the results of our searches, as opposed to what we

sought, we were frequently prompted to new understandings and new views. As scholars, we tend to store in our memories what we select as most important and significant; keyword searches of electronic archives, however, don't distinguish between important and insignificant usages - they simply return every "hit." What human memory could recall one of the earliest cultural references to modernism in a *Cosmopolitan* advertisement for "Rubdry towels"? Our numerous databases were fully part of the collaboration, especially in uncovering unpredictable use.

Research on such a grand scale depends on massive resources; we were assisted both by excellent libraries and by the increasing amount of material available online. Our materials included digitized books (through Project Gutenberg, Open Alliance, Google Books, the HathiTrust Digital Library, and especially Internet Archive); early journals and periodicals (the *TLS* Historical Archive; the Modernist Journals Project; *JSTOR*; UNZ.org and numerous other newspaper and periodical databases); anthologies of modernism; bibliographies in scholarly works; scholarship on modernism, and a wide range of print materials from the modernist time.

We became alert as well to the potential problems of internet resources: OCR recognition (translation from scanned printed text to searchable electronic form) is strikingly imperfect: "Racism" in a Google Book turned out to be an erroneous transcription of "Itacism"; in another transcribed text, the original word was "Ostracism." A publication listed from the United Nations in 1911 was clearly an error; the actual date was 1981. Further, as the creators of the Google Ngram Viewer have explained, "some metadata providers assign any book whose date is unknown the date 1899; others use 1905; still others use different dates" (Michel *et al.*, 2011). The internet is also full of

misattributions, and once the misattribution occurs on one website, it is picked up and repeated on numerous other sites as well. Online searching, we discovered, needs to be complemented by reading that returns to the original, either the facsimile or the actual printed page.

Using This Book

Modernism: Keywords is designed for advanced undergraduates, graduate students, teachers, and advanced scholars of literature in English, with the hope that it will be of interest to broad interdisciplinary and general audiences as well. In its nature, this book falls between a dictionary and a book of criticism; it can be approached by reading a single entry, reading from cover to cover, starting with one entry and following the “see also” suggestions to track related ideas, or ferreting out entries relating to a specific topic of interest or research. Collectively, the entries offer a wealth of information, but they are best understood as an accompaniment and guide to further work. Many of the entries pair well with readings we consider “keywords in action” – novels, poems, plays that may not use the actual words we discuss, or use them only infrequently, but that nevertheless participate in the underlying debates. It is hard to think of a work that wouldn’t pair with entries such as modern/modernism, readers/reading, reality/realism, and words, but more specific pairings can be used as well. To cite a few possibilities:

Dark Princess(W. E. B. Du Bois) with empire/imperialism, internationalism, universal

Death Comes for the Archbishop(Willa Cather) with propaganda, bigness/smallness, universal

Heart of Darkness(Joseph Conrad) with convention, empire/imperialism, primitive

The Heat of the Day(Elizabeth Bowen) with fascism, democracy, shock/shell shock

Jacob's Room(Virginia Woolf) with bigness/smallness, biography, common man

Mrs. Warren's Profession(George Bernard Shaw) with conventional, sentimental/sentimentality, woman/New Woman

Passing(Nella Larsen) with queer, personality/impersonality, unconscious

The Sound and the Fury(William Faulkner) with Hamlet (Quentin's chapter), race

Vile Bodies(Evelyn Waugh) with coterie/Bloomsbury, shock shell shock

The Waste Land(T. S. Eliot) with common mind, difficulty/obscurity, God/gods

While these examples list some of the works most frequently read in the classroom, the references at the end of each entry frequently cite less well-known works as well. Readers will also, we think, be surprised to discover how frequently these words appear in writings not cited here; our examples were many more than we could include, or fully track. The richness of these words will be discovered through further reading, and further reading will undoubtedly discover more keywords.

Future Directions

Modernism: Keywords is only a beginning in the larger project of using language to track the full modernist network of discussion and debate. The Table of Contents offers a relatively small selection, although additional words appear in the Index of Keywords. The keywords we have selected are significant, but modernism's significant words do not

end with our list. We hope to cover additional words in future publication; we also hope, as did Williams, that others will join this collaborative task (indeed, several recent monographs use the approach of investigating a particular word.) For the future, more could be done to increase the international scope, to recognize the way foreign words were enriching the English language, and to complement this study with similar work in the nonwritten arts. Ideally, such work could move to a digital environment, with possibilities for incorporating feedback and submitted contributions; the web of meaning could then become a scholarly web as well. We should remember, however, that a keywords approach is designed not to replace but to mix with more traditional scholarship. This book will serve its function if it increases alertness to words and their changing meanings, and if it stimulates the reading of modernist texts for the meanings that were circulating at that time. Whether or not our readers take up a keywords approach for themselves, we hope they will all find their readings changed by reading *Modernism: Keywords*.

References

Empson, William (1977). "Compacted Doctrines." Rev. of *Keywords: A Vocabulary of Culture and Society* by Raymond Williams. *The New York Review of Books* (October 17), 21-22.

Leavis, F. R. (1969). *English Literature in Our Time and The University*. The Clarke Lectures, 1967. London: Chatto & Windus.

Levenson, Michael (2011). "Novelty, Modernity, Adjacency." *New Literary History* 42.4: 663-680.

Michel, Jean-Baptiste et al. (2011). "Quantitative Analysis of Culture Using Millions of Digitized Books." *Science* 331 (January): 176-182.

Siegel, Katy (Interviewer) (2008). "Richard Shiff with Katy Siegel." *The Brooklyn Rail: Critical Perspectives on Arts, Politics, and Culture* (May 8): Web.

Whitworth, Michael (2012). "Woolf, Context, and Contradiction." In *Contradictory Woolf: Selected Papers from the Twenty-First Annual International Virginia Woolf Conference* (eds. Derek Ryan and Stella Bolaki). Clemson: Clemson University Press. 11-22.

Williams, Raymond (1956). "Second Thoughts I: T. S. Eliot on Culture." *Essays in Criticism* 6.3: 302-318.

Williams, Raymond (1976). *Keywords: A Vocabulary of Culture and Society*. London: Fontana/Croom Helm.

Williams, Raymond (1989). *The Politics of Modernism*. Edited with Introduction by Tony Pinkney. London: Verso.

Note on References

Every effort has been made to cite the earliest publication or circulation of our keywords in the modernist period. Original publication dates, where they differ, appear after the title (for novels, this includes dates of serial publication). If the work was written significantly earlier than the date of publication, the date of composition is presented in square brackets, as are variant titles and dates for different previous versions of a text or, for works in translation, their original language publication. Unless otherwise indicated, translations from non-English works are ours.

A complexity of modernist bibliography worth mentioning is the frequency of simultaneous publication by different, and sometimes multiple, presses on both sides of the Atlantic. We have generally followed the practice of listing the publisher in the country where the writer resides, unless the work itself carries the imprint of different publishers. Our approach of weaving together different “national literatures,” however, finds support in the publishing evidence that modernist readers were encountering these books in precisely that way.

A

Advertising

In *A Hope for Poetry* (1934), the poet Cecil Day Lewis lists “advertisement and cheap publicity” among the “‘gross and violent stimulants’ that are reducing the modern mind ‘to a state of almost savage torpor.’” Likening advertising to numbing intoxicants, Day Lewis quotes William Wordsworth’s attacks, in his Preface to the 1802 edition of *Lyrical Ballads*, on the numerous forces in *his* society serving “to blunt the discriminating powers of the mind.” The irony, however, is that, in the first edition of *Lyrical Ballads* (1798), Wordsworth’s introductory remarks were headed not “Preface,” but “Advertisement.” Day Lewis thus unwittingly signals a significant semantic shift: from its early neutral meaning of notification and information, “advertising” by the modernist period had come to name an industry, a rhetoric of persuasion, and a competing art form.

Citizens of modernity were exposed to advertising in a dazzling variety of forms. Skywriting, neon signs, billboards, posters, newspaper ads, window displays, sandwich boards, throwaways (flyers), and jingles had become elements of daily life. The ubiquity of advertising led French journalist Louis Chéronnet to remark in 1927, “The composition of the air has changed. To the oxygen and nitrogen we breathe we have to add Advertising. [. . .] It surrounds us, envelops us, it is intimately mingled with our every step, in our activities, in our relaxation, and its ‘atmospheric pressure’ is so necessary to us that we no longer feel it.” Indeed, as early as 1913, *Maclean’s Magazine* declared, “We live in the Advertising Age.”

As might be expected, many modernist works exhibit strong antipathy to advertising, often contrasting dishonest, sensational, hoax-prone advertising with disinterested “pure” art. H. G. Wells’s *Tono-Bungay* (1908) satirically depicts the aggressive marketing of a “slightly injurious” bogus tonic (loosely based on Coca-Cola), in contrast to the serious but nonlucrative art of the narrator’s alter-ego Bob Ewart. The advertisements (illustrated in the first edition) temporarily make the family’s fortune, but the narrator retrospectively describes the process as “the giving of nothing coated in advertisements for money.” In George Orwell’s *Keep the Aspidistra Flying* (1936), Gordon Comstock – recognizing the “beastly irony in the fact that he, who wanted to be a ‘writer,’ should score his sole success in writing ads for deodorants” – similarly confronts the reality that it is advertising, not pure art, that pays. More threateningly, advertising reflects the reductiveness of totalitarian discourse in Stephen Spender’s *Vienna* (1934): the Executive (the Fascist Dollfuss regime in Austria) say of the Unemployed, “We can read their bodies like advertisements/On hoardings, shouting with common answers.”

Yet such outright attacks were countered by arguments in advertising’s defense. In *Nuntius: Advertising and its Future* (1926), Gilbert Russell sought to convince an “ill-informed or misinformed public” that advertising was not only an economic necessity but an “educative” and “civilising” force as well. Advertising, he argued, helped to maintain manufacturing quality, alerted consumers to safer and healthier products, and increased exposure to culture, prompting people to read more widely. In its most positive guise, advertising connoted creativity. According to André Billy, the French poet Guillaume Apollinaire “found a source of inspiration in prospectuses, [. . .] catalogues, posters, advertisements of all sorts,” and named advertising “the

poetry of our epoch” (1912). In a similarly positive vein, the Austrian-born philologist and critic Leo Spitzer took the coinage of “sunkist” for “oranges” as typifying advertising’s ability to inject beauty and poetry into an overly rational world, and he argued further that this advertisement’s playfully ironic overtones prompted its audience to reflect critically on the differences between reality and dream (1949). Whether advertising is imaginative art or humbug plays out in the polarized responses to circus entrepreneur P. T. Barnum. In 1910, the trade journal *The Printers’ Ink* marked the 100th anniversary of Barnum’s birth by disclaiming any relation between Barnum’s notorious sensationalism and modern business practices, noting that his “advertising ability,” though “interesting as a starting point of the profession,” was “lamentably gross and misrepresentative of the modern development of it.” Conversely, in 1940, Yale professor William Lyon Phelps linked advertisement positively with the arts by calling Barnum “the Shakespeare of advertising” (Wallace, 1959).

A similar division of attitudes surrounded the question of advertising’s style. Hostile responses cast its rhetoric as the obverse of the literary, with charges ranging from its goal of coercion to its mode of desperation. Q. D. Leavis and Wyndham Lewis portrayed advertising as an ideological tool productive of unreflecting conformity. “It is more than difficult, it is next to impossible,” wrote Leavis, “for the ordinary uncritical man to resist when, whichever way he looks in the street, from poster and hoarding, and advertisement in bus and tramcar [. . .] the pressure of the herd is brought to bear on him” (1932). Lewis interpreted advertising as mind control, arguing that the masses had been “hypnotized into a sort of hysterical imbecility by the mesmeric methods of Advertisement” (1927). Evelyn Waugh associated advertising with the fetishization of the new: claiming that “no serious writer has ever been shy of an

expression because it has been used before,” he accused “the writer of advertisements” of “always straining to find bizarre epithets for commonplace objects” (1946).

Other modernist usages positioned advertising as a literary genre - one from which more traditional genres could learn. While one view, as we have seen, attributed a literary character to advertising due to its poetic creativity, another approach, valuing economy and precision, extolled the rhetoric of advertising as a desirable element in literary form. Aldous Huxley called advertising “one of the most interesting and difficult literary forms” - adding the qualified term “applied literature,” however, for those benighted readers “who still believe[d] in the romantic superiority of the pure, the disinterested, over the immediately useful” (1920). Huxley himself praised the “elegance and economical distinction” of advertising prose; reflecting on its “honest man-to-man style” - “lucid and simple enough to be understood by all” - he concluded, “the art of advertisement writing has flowered with democracy.” In “The Advertisement is Literature” (1926), Dashiell Hammett called the advertiser a “literary worker” since he “must set his idea on paper in such a form that it will have the effect he desires on those who read it”; like Huxley, Hammett suggested that literature could learn from advertising by replacing “the needlessly involved sentence, the clouded image” with the concision, clarity, and efficiency of good ad copy.

Yet in modernist literature overall, the prevailing treatment of advertising was less clear-cut. In the penultimate chapter of Henry James’s *The Ambassadors* ([1903]1909), when Chad Newsome - a Jamesian “American abroad” - announces his discovery that advertising is “the great new force” which is “infinite like all the arts,” his words waver between the chilling suggestion that he is reverting to his family’s economic materialism and the complicating

possibility that a new, dynamic energy is infusing his habitually passive demeanor. In F. Scott Fitzgerald's *The Great Gatsby* (1925), the faded billboard picturing the pale eyes and gigantic spectacles of the vanished oculist Doctor T. J. Eckleburg initially suggests the disappearance of God in an ethically weak capitalist society: after the catastrophic accident, when George Wilson looks up at the billboard and intones, "God sees everything," "That's an advertisement" is his friend's curt rejoinder. Yet Eckleburg's human counterpart - nicknamed "Owl Eyes" because of his "enormous owl-eyed spectacles" - is the one character other than the narrator who responds to Gatsby with perception and compassion, an oddity suggesting that the billboard can be read as a text about human witnessing as well. In Jean Rhys's *Voyage in the Dark* (1934), advertising is initially a force of social hypnosis. The narrator Anna, transplanted to London from the Caribbean, hears a jingle for Standard Bread which, despite her resistance, plays "over and over again" in her head: "It's the tune that's so awful; it's like blows." Yet in a climactic moment, Anna's childhood memory of "a picture advertising the Biscuits Like Mother Makes" leads to a crucial insight: the depiction of "a little girl in a pink dress" with "a shiny pale-blue sky" near enough to touch exposes the Empire's utopian marketing of England as a "cosy" and happy place where God is always near, while the "high, dark wall" behind her signifies the inaccessibility of this dream for the colonized outsiders.

James Joyce's *Ulysses* (1922), a novel littered with slogans, posters, throwaways, and sandwich boards, captures the ambiguity of advertising as simultaneously a playful, creative art and an insidiously dominating form. Protagonist Leopold Bloom - himself an ad canvasser and practitioner of what one character calls "the gentle art of advertisement" (with a subtle ironic play on the well-known expression "the gentle art of persuasion") - subverts such coercive intent