

Issues of Modernism: Editorial Authority in Little Magazines of the *Avant Guerre*

Raymond Tyler Babbie

A dissertation
submitted in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

University of Washington

2017

Reading Committee:

Brian Reed, Chair

Leroy Searle

Jeanne Heuving

Program Authorized to Offer Degree:

English

© Copyright 2017

Raymond Tyler Babbie

University of Washington

Abstract

Issues of Modernism: Editorial Authority in Little Magazines of the *Avant Guerre*

Raymond Tyler Babbie

Chair of the Supervisory Committee:
Dr. Brian Reed, Professor
Department of English

Issues of Modernism draws from the rich archive of little magazines of the *avant guerre* in order to examine the editorial intervention that shaped the emergence of modernism in their pages. Beatrice Hastings of *The New Age* deployed modernist techniques both in her fiction and in her editorial practices, blurring the line between text and context in order to intervene forcefully in the aesthetic and political debates of her age, crucially in the ongoing debates over women's suffrage. The first chapter follows her emergence as an experimental modernist writer and editor, showing how she intervened in the public sphere via pseudonyms and anonymous writing. When Roger Fry's exhibition, *Manet and the Post-Impressionists*, became the scandal of the London art world in late 1910, she used the debate over its value as an impetus to write experimental

fiction that self-consciously drew from post-impressionist techniques. She continued to develop and use these techniques through the following years. The second examines her career in 1913, during which she continued to develop her modernist fiction in counterpoint to her political interventions and satires. The third chapter turns to Dora Marsden, contextualizing her developing editorial techniques from *The Freewoman* to *The New Freewoman*, and into *The Egoist*. This chapter demonstrates that Marsden saw seriality as a way to mitigate language's essential unreliability, a turn that made her journal a natural home for modernist experimentation. The final chapter examines H.D., a poet whose work and reception were deeply influenced by editorial decisions. Her use of complex serial poetics was overshadowed by the rhetoric of imagism in Harriet Monroe's *Poetry* magazine, a circumstance that had long-lasting repercussions on the evaluation of her work. Each of these case studies involves modernist texts that shaped, and were shaped by, their periodical context.

Table of Contents

INTRODUCTION	1
CHAPTER ONE—Beatrice Hastings’ Modernism	21
CHAPTER TWO—To the Last Detail: Beatrice Hastings’ Editorial Assemblage 1912-1914....	65
CHAPTER THREE—A Flexible Frame: Dora Marsden, Significance, and Signification in <i>The Freewoman</i> and <i>The New Freewoman</i>	100
CHAPTER FOUR—The Crystalline Legend: H.D.’s Serial Poetic in the Nineteen-Teens	150
CONCLUSION—Montage at the Rag and Bone Shop.....	195
WORKS CITED	203

INTRODUCTION

In this dissertation, I examine magazines of the *avant guerre* and early years of the war, from 1908-1917, that first published many of the texts by the loose category of Anglo-American modernism. I consider how several editors of little magazines used their positions to influence how their readerships encountered the modernist avant-garde, following that movement's increased attention to the form of a text or artwork, or the act of calling attention to the importance of form through experiment. The editors of little magazines attended to form as they arranged the texts that became each issue. As modernism developed in these magazines, some editors became increasingly experimental in their own writing, and some allowed their experiments to take place on the higher level of editorial function.

This dissertation examines three case studies of the interaction of periodical form and modernist aesthetic philosophy in four chapters. The first two chapters examine the career of Beatrice Hastings in *The New Age*. Chapter one shows how Hastings began to experiment with her editorial power at roughly the same time she began to experiment with modernist form in her fiction. Her embrace of pseudonyms as a means to construct arguments breaks the unspoken rules of editorial conduct. Her first formally innovative short story is also a letter to the editor of *The New Age*, and explicitly engages with the ongoing debate over post-impressionist aesthetics hosted in the journal's pages. Chapter two continues to follow the entwined threads of Hastings as innovative author and experimental editor, showing how she began to blend the political positions of *The New Age* with increasingly radical uses of pseudonyms, and used modernist fiction to advance those positions, even as they grew increasingly antifeminist. Hastings used the magazine both as a container for innovative work and as form with which to innovate.

Chapter three turns to Dora Marsden's three journals, *The Freewoman*, *The New Freewoman*, and *The Egoist*. While Hastings experimented in *The New Age* through the use of multiple genres and pseudonyms to create intertextual assemblages, Marsden used the unique capabilities of the periodical as a tool for philosophical inquiry. Chapter three examines how her philosophical study of linguistics emerged from the rhetoric of *The Freewoman*, but then developed into a deep skepticism of the linguistic sign. Marsden used dialog with correspondents and contributors as a means to outline her theories about the untrustworthy nature of the sign in an attempt to evade the paradox of using language to criticize language. These dialogs call attention to the problems inherent in the conventions that govern communication; and they also begin to explain her willingness to host modernist art in her journals.

Chapter four shifts the attention from the editor to the edited, as it considers H.D.'s early career in the little magazines. H.D. garnered many reviews and much attention despite having a very small body of work. These reviews quickly established grounds for reading H.D. as a chaste, austere, and pure poet. While intending to praise H.D., the patterns of reading established by reviews in *Poetry* and *The Egoist* created a version of H.D. that occluded the most interesting aspects of her work, in particular their intertextual and serial nature. Each chapter examines, then, the impact of modernism on editor and text, a reciprocal influence that shapes both sides of the transaction.

I.

Marjorie Perloff establishes the high stakes of understanding the *avant guerre* in *The Futurist Moment*. Her claims for the importance of collage could stand as a description of an intensely edited issue of *The New Age* or *The New Freewoman*:

Thus collage, perhaps the central artistic invention of the *avant-guerre*, incorporates directly into the work an actual fragment of the referent, thus forcing the reader or viewer to consider the interplay between preexisting message or material and the new artistic composition that results from the graft. If collage and its cognates (montage, assemblage, construction) call into question the representability of the sign, such related Futurist modes as manifesto, artist's book, and performance call into question the stability of genre, of the individual medium, and of the barrier between artist and audience.

The modernist magazines could sit alongside any of these genres, partaking in all of the above as they do. Picasso's collages incorporated newspaper into their canvases in part to reference these capacities of periodical text. In Marsden's case, they even reached the point of calling the representability of the sign into question. In Hastings', perhaps the performance was the most important of the genres listed above. In her book *Modernism, Magazines, and the British Avant-Garde*, Faith Binckes insists that *The New Age's* editorial interventions must be read through their performative function (203). Hastings' many pseudonyms attest to the truth in this. Perloff's *Futurist Moment* establishes the importance of the *avant guerre* as well as the general frame of this project's attention to periodicals as a modernist form.

In *The Picasso Papers*, Rosalind Krauss extends Adorno's theses on new music to Picasso's career. Krauss divides Picasso's career into two phases. The first is true modernism, modernism that explores the nature of the sign and the signified. The second is pastiche, the attempt to make things new. It is a particularly apt coincidence that the sign and pastiche are directly associated with two of the main characters of this study. Dora Marsden published "The Science of Signs" in *The Egoist*, and had been writing about the nature and limits of signification since *The New Freewoman*, and even at times in *The Freewoman*. It was during *The New*

Freewoman that she began to use the affordances of the form of periodical publishing to build her arguments. Meanwhile, Beatrice Hastings published many of her literary works in the Pastiche column of *The New Age*, and thrived on imitation, satire, and criticism; and on the many voices she created, pseudonymous and anonymous, to comment on art and politics. Here are both sides of Krauss' modernist coin. Granted, Marsden's discursive criticism of the sign is different in kind from artistic representation of the sign's ambiguity, and Hastings' pastiche proper appears in Pastiche alongside her truly original work. There is something to coincidence, so here is another: Krauss argues that Picasso's fall to pastiche was first signaled by his portrait of Max Jacob in 1915. Jacob was a close friend of Hastings, who published his writing in *The New Age*. She also discusses the portrait that signaled Picasso's turning point, and recognizes it as such even before she saw it, as she writes as Alice Morning in the January 28, 1915 issue:

By the way, Monsieur Picasso is painting a portrait of M. Max Jacob in a style the mere rumour of which is causing all the little men to begin to say that of course Cubism was very well in its way, but was never more than an experiment. The style is rumoured to be almost photographic, in any case very simple and severe. I can say nothing as I haven't seen it, but I can testify to the state of soul among the cubists. I was allowed to say in one of the big ateliers that "all that" was contained in naturalist works--only, in proportion: and was received if not exactly with open arms, at least with a nod. (343)

This passage is not only useful for its correspondence with Krauss. It also illustrates Hastings' preference for representational modernism, which she calls "naturalism" here. This difference with the cubists underlies many of Hastings' literary skirmishes with other modernists such as Ezra Pound and F.T. Marinetti. This short passage is an example of the fascinating material contained in the digital archive.

The digitization of modernist little magazines has fostered unprecedented access to the ephemeral public sphere of *avant guerre* modernism. This ease of access has led scholars to challenge traditional accounts of modernism, as texts that once were hidden in special collections are now available to any member of the public with a computer and an internet connection. The breadth and scope of archives like *The Modernist Journals Project* is dazzling, even as that particular archive contains a curated selection of magazines of particular interest to scholars of modernism. Other sites like Hathi Trust and the Internet Archive contain similarly rich materials for the study of modernism among the millions of other texts they hold. Easy access to textual objects does not imply that the texts they contain are easy to process or understand. Two scholars associated with *The Modernist Journals Project*, founder Robert Scholes and Sean Latham, confronted the paradigm shift necessary to begin to make sense of this new breadth of modernism in related but distinct fashions. Recognizing that modernism was contentious and difficult to finalize in terms of a list of characteristics, Scholes and Clifford Wulfman defined the struggle of and over modernist ideas as modernism in *Modernism in the Magazines*. In their reading, modernism is not any particular technique and not any particular side of the debate, but the milieu of the conversation over modernist aesthetics: “Modernism... was not a ‘solution’ but the struggle itself, and it took place on many levels in the magazines” (34). While developing this idea out of the struggle between symbolism and realism, they quickly broaden its scope to embrace “avant-gardists and cartoonists, neorealists and abstractionists, and all the combinations of them that appeared.”

This broad definition has the benefit of simplicity, and works well as an assumption for scholarship, as it insists that anti-modernist forces are proper to the study of modernism. The risk of this grand sweep is that it does not do justice to the genuine antipathy of the anti-modernists,

and attempts mixing oil and water. Emulsifying them under the banner of modernism is more about our moment than theirs, a useful tool, but not one that reflects historical reality. *Modernism in the Magazines* takes Ezra Pound as its main character, but he will play more of a bit part in this study, which will focus on editors and authors who worked in close proximity to Pound, but who each established their independence from him in different ways. Hastings did not really have to: she was an established literary critic and satirist before their encounter, and had already published several modernist short stories. Marsden never really handed him the reins of *The New Freewoman* or *The Egoist*, as evidenced by their clashes over the positioning of articles (she won). H.D.'s influence on imagism has been established, and chapter four will revisit her explicit rejection of Poundian presentational aesthetics.

Ann Ardis notes this problem in her introduction to the immanent Modernist Journals Project in her 2002 book *Modernism and Cultural Conflict*:

The fundamental assumptions about *The New Age* as a *modernist* journal that saturate the MJP's promotional materials should give pause to anyone who has worked extensively in the *New Age* archives... to read the journal cover to cover, issue by issue, year after year... can leave a very different impression. For every article or letter to the editor or sample of modernist writing or art that is featured in its pages is counterbalanced by a parody or critique or countermanifesto... I would insist... on recognition of a crucial distinction between the journal's modernist *style* of presentation and its socialist politics, which are insistently and consistently differentiated from modernism's by the editors. (144-146).

My own reading of *The New Age* works around these difficulties in the following ways.

Modernism is not a monolith, and as Scholes argues in *Modernism in the Magazines* and

Paradox of Modernism, *The New Age* promoted its own style of representational modernism based on Beatrice Hastings' critique of realism. A modernist style of presentation on the level of editing is itself enough to mark the journal as modernist. Some of our differences stem from Ardis' more specific definition of modernism, which she draws from Rita Felski: "Rather than use modernism as a more expansive or inclusive category, I would prefer to retain the specificity of the term as a designation for texts that display 'formally self-conscious, experimental, [and] antimimetic features' (4). Even under this intentionally strict definition, I argue that Beatrice Hastings is a modernist, and further argue that many of her innovative works are linked to the journal's politics by precisely its modernist style of presentation.

With such distinctions to be drawn, no wonder Sean Latham describes the magazines as a "mess and muddle of modernism" contained by the little magazines. Like Scholes and Wulfman, Latham sees the complexity of the modernist moment. These are two ways to consider the moment, though Latham's chaotic vision emphasizes the chaotic nature of the little magazines more than the all-encompassing gesture of Scholes and Wulfman.

Their difference in emphasis illustrates how part of the challenge, when reading modernism in the little magazines, comes from different possible approaches. I decided to approach the magazines through specific literary figures, rather than attempting to describe a magazine as a whole, or to describe the modernist moment as a whole. This is a rather conventional method, but it has the benefit of illustrating the logics that control the mess and muddle of modernism.

Latham's "The Mess and Muddle of Modernism" includes a reading of the September 1918 issue of *The Little Review* that illustrates how to read editorial intention. He demonstrates that this issue has been crafted by its editor, Margaret Anderson, to meditate on death.

Similar traces of the war's effects are evident elsewhere in the issue as well and are pervasive enough to suggest that Anderson deliberately crafted this arrangement—most likely around Joyce's latest installment of *Ulysses*. From the “recombinant flux” of the magazine, in other words, we can assemble a weak but nevertheless persistent associative structure that proffers thematic links and connections without insisting directly on them. This intertextual web only emerges, however, when we read the magazine as a whole, looking past its individual pieces and authors to the work of editorship that has woven them together into a different pattern. (414-415)

Latham notices that this particular issue of *The Little Review* has a coherent theme emerging from an intertextual web. Many of the readings in this dissertation will examine intertextual webs, some of which are very similar to Anderson's, and others exist along different axes of influence. Hastings often combines multiple pseudonyms and genres across a single issue of *The New Age* to build an intertextual argument about aesthetics or politics. Marsden uses the seriality of her journals to develop a critique of language through dialog. The elegant intertextual webs of H.D.'s earliest publications are embedded in the larger web of criticism surrounding her work and determining its reception.

In another important moment in “The Mess and Muddle,” Latham observes: Focusing too narrowly on the modernism of the book rather than the modernisms of the magazines inevitably erases the essential contributions women made as editors and writers” (410). Latham follows this comment with a bulleted list of influential women who were modernist editors: Katharine Mansfield of *Rhythm* and *The Blue Review*, Dora Marsden, Margaret Anderson and Jane Heap of *The Little Review*, Harriet Monroe of *Poetry*, and Edith Sitwell of *Wheels*. He also cites Hastings and Jessie Fauset as women who “played significant roles” in *The New Age* and *The Crisis*,

respectively. “Essential contributions” is probably a necessary vagueness, as the above list encompasses women from both sides of transatlantic Anglo-American modernism. Along with contributions to journals and contributions to the development of modernism, the author-editors contributed much to the darker side of modernism’s troubling politics, especially Hastings and Marsden.

George Bornstein’s *Material Modernism* contains further examples of the sorts of reading that I attempt. He shows how much context determines text through analysis of several modernist works, for instance, demonstrating that Marianne Moore’s “The Fish” was originally a war poem by its placement in a wartime edition of *The Egoist*. He then shows how the wartime imagery fades from the poem as it is revised and reprinted in various venues after the war. Bornstein’s attention to the entire magazine, including bibliographic codes and paratexts, inform my own work.

The New Age and *The Egoist* each hold unusual political philosophies, and it is important to establish from the outset that their politics evolved through the years. While there is no inherent connection between radical politics and radical aesthetics, the politics of art was a major topic of discussion in these journals, not an afterthought. The little magazines developed their politics by opposing the mainstream, the opposition, and each other. They also functioned, as Ann Ardis has claimed for *The New Age*, as “meta-commentary,” surveying the political, aesthetic and cultural criticism of other periodicals (216).

Much of this project emerged from an immersion in the archive, in which I read journals archived on *The Modernist Journals Project* on the centenary of their publication, the weeklies every week, the monthlies every month, and so on. That began in November 2012. I began my immersion in modernist periodicals shortly before I first read Walter Benjamin’s *Arcades Project*

in the Eiland-McLaughlin translation. That physically imposing volume became an inspiring precursor to my own project. Benjamin's reading of the arcades as literal and figurative structural components of nineteenth century Paris began to inform my own more limited readings of literary magazines. The magazines began to take on some of the glamour of the arcades and *The Arcades*, as they are similarly built out of assembled texts, and these texts when taken *en masse* reveal much about the times and spaces that were their original environment.

The experience of reading *The Arcades Project* was analogous to the experience of reading the archive because of their reliance on scale for effect. One entry in one convolute (the whimsically perfect name for the chapters in *The Arcades Project*) contributes little to the effect of the whole. Similarly, reading whole convolutes in isolation is an intense experience, but one that only goes so far. When read in one fell swoop, the convolutes began to snowball in significance, as each piece arranged by Benjamin interacts with the others.

“Convolute N: On the Theory of Knowledge, Theory of Progress” appears toward the middle of the book. “Convolute N,” despite being composed of excerpts of many texts by Benjamin like the other convolutes, is the most self-contained of them. It is the key to the project, but by appearing in the center of the text instead of the beginning, it is somewhat hidden. Convolute N introduces the reader to Benjamin's theory of knowledge, but not until they have already imbibed many topical convolutes, not until they have an intuitive understanding of the project. Immersion, similarly, began as a massive intake of text, and only gradually did a project emerge. While these chapters are far more traditional in form than Benjamin's convolutes, they hearken to his the montage of literary history. Similarly, masses of information began to sap the foundations of the literary historical myths that I had absorbed as the authentic history of modernism. This includes the literary historical myths that were constructed by the modernists

themselves. In the following passage, Benjamin establishes the importance of undoing the tendency of historical stories to create value-based oppositions:

Modest methodological proposal for the cultural-historical dialectic. It is very easy to establish oppositions, according to determinate points of view, within the various 'fields' of any epoch, such that on one side lies the 'productive,' 'forward-looking,' 'lively,' 'positive' part of the epoch, and on the other side the abortive, retrograde, and obsolescent. The very contours of the positive element will appear distinctly only insofar as this element is set off against the negative. On the other hand, every negation has its value solely as background for the delineation of the lively, the positive. It is therefore of decisive importance that a new partition be applied to this initially excluded, negative component so that, by a displacement of the angle of vision (but not of the criteria!), a positive element emerges anew in it too—something different from that previously signified. And so on, ad infinitum, until the entire past is brought into the present in a historical apocatastasis. The foregoing, put differently: the indestructibility of the highest life in all things. (459)

Each of the authors considered by this dissertation was initially excluded from the history of literary modernism. Hastings blamed A.R. Orage for erasing her from the history of *The New Age*. Bruce Clarke blames Glenn Hughes for leaving Marsden out of the history of imagism. H.D. is the classic case of the forgotten modernist.

The archive offered a means to displace my angle of vision and appreciate them for their positive elements, but I have also tried to continue displacing my angles of vision, and to discuss the negative elements of their own work as well. Studies of Beatrice Hastings must acknowledge her periods of extreme antifeminism. Dora Marsden's opposition to suffragism also lurks in the

archive, along with a year of overt anti-Semitism. Is it possible to displace the angle of vision to find something positive in even these sordid realities? I am not sure, except that attending to the failings of modernist authors and editors gives a more truthful picture of the moment of modernism than valorization or nostalgia: “(but not the criteria!)” reminds Benjamin.

Tom Villis’ *Reaction and the Avant-Garde* places *The New Age*’s difficult politics into the broader context of the British and European political scene (he also studies *The Eye-Witness* and *The New Witness*). Villis’ book is different in kind from much writing about *The New Age* because he focuses on its politics instead of its literature. Villis studies the darkest aspects of *The New Age* and *The New Witness*, tracing their strains of nationalism, antifeminism, and anti-Semitism. Villis shows that *The New Age*, while never officially embracing anti-Semitism, allowed space for discussion of anti-Semitic ideas in its pages, at times refuting the doctrine, at times seeming to implicitly endorsing it. His work is an important reminder that modernist aesthetics could develop alongside reactionary politics. Beatrice Hastings appears in his account, but only as a very minor character. In chapter two, I argue that her literary experimentation was closely tied to the politics of *The New Age*, including her antifeminism. Many of his conclusions are relevant to Dora Marsden.

Periodicals are records of transitions, even after the last issues of a journal are printed, and the enterprise finally folds. The inherent transience of periodicity is the consequence of each issue building on those that came before, but it also looks forward to the future promise of the next week’s or month’s magazine. A periodical is a text of texts, and each issue of it is both one text in the larger cycle, and is itself composed of many other texts. The date on the cover declares their obsolescence, but a lingering freshness accrues to their function being tied so closely to the date, to being up to date, to modernity. While the richness of periodicals is hardly

unique to the modernist moment, the editors of modernist periodicals experimented with the temporal aspects of their magazines even as they hosted art objects that (sometimes) became famous modernist art. In an era where experimental art is marked by collage, allusion, simultaneity, and overt attention to issues of self-expression and representation, the journals that functioned as incubators of modernism became modernist themselves. Mass media became artistic medium.

II.

The sheer size of even the limited archive hosted on *The Modernist Journals Project* means that reading the archive in its entirety is not practical. My own first attempt sought canonical texts from the period to examine them in digital renderings of their original contexts. One looks up Joyce's *Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man*, or Ezra Pound's "A Few Don'ts by an Imagiste," or H.D.'s "Hermes of the Ways." After realizing that I was as interested in modernist contexts as I was in major modernist texts, I attempted to read entire runs of journals in order. This preserved more of the context and helped to undermine some of the canonical assumptions I had originally made, but became cumbersome due to the mass of texts contained in a single journal—Latham counts around fifteen thousand pages of *The New Age* on *The Modernist Journals Project*. My solution was an immersion in time, as mentioned above. *The Modernist Journals Project* went live in 2004, roughly around the one hundredth anniversary of British literary modernism. This coincidence has allowed me to read many issues of the journals it contains as they emerged, exactly one hundred years later. This reading practice preserves the temporal distance between each issue. The immersion gradually taught me how to read a modernist magazine. I supplemented the immersion by taking advantage of the search function to locate texts by authors of particular interest to me, and while the immersion gave the initial

impetus for the project, it was supplemented by more targeted readings. Readers will note that Chapter One takes place almost entirely before the period of the immersion, for instance. After reading in this way for a few years, learning how to read these magazines which explicitly cater to an audience of insiders, I returned to earlier issues armed with a better sense of how to handle the turbulence of texts they contain.

The immersion made clear that the little magazines have more and other values than as containers of canonical texts. The editor's arrangement can be powerfully rhetorical and political. The pieces may speak to each other, as when an editor comments on a piece by a contributor. Each issue is a self-contained web of relation in that it was released as a unit, but this self-continuity is itself embedded in journal's relations with contemporary events and other texts. This continuity is inherent in their nature as periodical publications. They exist in time, and each issue of a modernist little magazine contains the latent influence of prior weeks, months, and years, while also looking toward the future. An issue might reference prior publications in its pages both in the more official columns and in the contentious correspondence pages that invite the audience to become authors. The immersive reading project entered the rhythm of the journals as they emerge, skirmish, and die over the course of the years.

III.

Chapter one enters the conversation around Hastings' work by emphasizing the fact that she was not merely an anonymous subeditor on the fringes of modernism, but a practicing modernist author as well. Her experimental short stories appear alongside Hastings' other writing: literary criticism, gender theory (which becomes reprehensible), political writing, traditional poetry, letters, novels, and satire. Her incredible range appeared within the overarching framework of her editing of *The New Age*. Between 1911 and 1914, Hastings used

her unfettered editorial power to create intricate intertextual constructs, as when she staged a dispute between two of her pseudonyms, Beatrice Tina and D. Triformis, or when she would align the output of her critical personae with the content of her literary work.

Her own modernist writing grew out of the debates over Roger Fry's art exhibition, *Manet and the Post-Impressionists*. Her first formally innovative short story appeared as a component of the debate over the art movement that had appeared in the pages of *The New Age*. When Arnold Bennett wrote a nervous essay imagining a post-impressionist literature, Hastings responded with the story, "Post-Impressionism." This story appeared not in the columns reserved for literature, but as a letter to the editor. While the story would be fascinating enough in its own right for its discontinuous narrative and complex play with language, the fact that it is also an intervention in a public debate makes it a rhetorical tour de force as well.

Chapter two continues and extends chapter one, following Hastings' development from the earliest experiments in both innovative fiction and experimental editing with further case studies and examples. Hastings continued to perfect the art of editing, creating intricate assemblages of texts. In 1913, she began to use the techniques she had developed in conversations about aesthetics and art to advance *The New Age's* politics. Many of her interventions are traceable back to specific issues of the day, like the beginnings of Lloyd George's system of state insurance, spoofed by Hastings in "An Affair of Politics."

The magazine's evolution into the official mouthpiece of guild socialism created a platform compatible with Hastings' public antifeminism. She weaves formally innovative stories into the political fabric of the journal, setting them up to appear alongside contentious debates with suffragists and feminists in the correspondence pages. At this time, *The New Age* overtly linked its politics and its aesthetics during Hastings' satires of Ezra Pound. As an ambitious

experimental author and keen observer of the emergence of modernism, Hastings (with support from Orage) attempted to influence new art by militating against the presentational aesthetics of Poundian imagism. The chapter concludes with a glance towards a few remaining questions concerning Hastings' time at *The New Age*. Scholars are increasingly recognizing how Hastings destabilizes accounts of modernism. Reading her as a modernist author and editor further breaks down hegemonic accounts of modernism. Adding Hastings to the story of modernism is more than a challenge to an inadequate masculinist canon, as she demands attention both to her creative editorial power and to the antifeminist ways she often used that power.

Dora Marsden is an equally complex editor who exercised her editorial power in the provisional universe of modernist periodicals. Chapter three illustrates how deftly Marsden uses her editorial position to advance her philosophy through debates with her contributors. Marsden saw her editorial career as part of a continuous line of inquiry, beginning by examining the roots of morality that progressed to a critique of habits of thought and conventions of language. Dora Marsden began editing *The Freewoman* after a break with the Women's Social and Political Union, which had begun to find her dangerous political stunts inconvenient. In late November 1911, she set up *The Freewoman* as a forum to explore what true liberation might be. Born in a moment of rebellion, Marsden's career would go on to break conventions through their contents and through her willingness to play with her editorial functions. This chapter follows her line of inquiry from *The Freewoman*, a review that was subtitled "A Feminist Review" in its first volume and "An Individualist Review" for its second. Marsden's writings from *The Freewoman* show her attempting to understand social problems by considering the assumptions people make in their daily lives. After the gap between the final issue of *The Freewoman* in October 1912 and the first issue of *The New Freewoman* in June of 1913 she resumed her line of inquiry with a

vengeance, and began printing modernist literature. Her deep intellectual interest in the linguistic sign has many affinities with the modernist turn to form. As she grew to distrust written language's ability to accurately represent reality, she engaged in a series of debates with contributors over their use of written language in order to criticize their conventional habits of thought. Preferring rebuttal and response to direct statement, she argued by attacking abstract language and by citation.

One of her arguments-by-citation from this period provided me with a metaphor for how periodicals function, which had repercussions on my readings in the other chapters. In the December 15, 1912 issue, she printed an excerpt from Bergson's *Creative Evolution* that argues that our mind usually "behaves in much the same way as the movement, always the same, of the cinematographical film, a movement hidden in the apparatus and whose function it is to superpose the successive pictures on one another in order to imitate the movement of the real object" (246) Marsden's citation of this passage, and its resonance with other claims she made regarding her magazine implies that she sees the periodical as a similar enterprise. Each issue is a still frame describing ongoing processes, an imitation of the movement of her philosophical development. Individuals change from moment to moment, and hunting for consistencies in this ever-changing world is to approach it the wrong way. Marsden emphasizes the shifts that occur in the gaps, from week to week or month to month, is to trace the trajectory of the periodical's text of texts. Marsden's pivotal support of imagism and James Joyce's *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man* took place in the context of these philosophical investigations into language. Considering her writing alongside modernist literature reveals the many affinities between the editor's concerns and the artist's.

The fourth chapter examines H.D.'s career during the *avant guerre*, continuing into the earliest years of the war. The earlier chapters considered powerful editors through their interventions in the periodical as an artistic and philosophical medium. Chapter four takes a different tack, instead examining the ways that modernist little magazines received, reviewed, analyzed, and praised H.D.'s earliest poetry. H.D. emerged in the context of the modernist little magazines, and was in many ways created by the context. Critics create writers, and writers create critics. This co-constructive process is especially apparent in H.D.'s early career, as critics attempted to publicize and promote her poetry in venues like *Poetry* and *The Egoist*. The flurry of articles and reviews rested on a small handful of poems. *Poetry* was already on the lookout for something like imagism, poems of structural clarity and simplicity, before they received any imagist poems from Pound. Meanwhile, the somewhat circular discussion of imagism in *The Egoist* established H.D.'s deceptive difficulty, as when F.S. Flint praised her while accusing her of a potential lack of humanity. They established frames for reading H.D. as a pure, austere, and chaste poet, the consummate imagist long before *Sea Garden's* publication in 1916. H.D. never accepted what she called the "crystalline" reading of her early work. While this chapter does not investigate H.D. in her brief time as subeditor to *The Egoist*, it will read her review of John Gould Fletcher's *Goblins and Pagodas* as a particularly revealing early statement of her own poetics. While later criticism has established that H.D. was not merely a follower of Pound, her review of Fletcher establishes as much in her own words.

These early readings of H.D. are worth revisiting, as the recovery that saved her longer works from literary obscurity tended to draw lines separating the late poetry from the early in order to separate the epic from the early poet of compression and concision. This chapter revisits H.D.'s early career as something that, though often dominated by the frames constructed for it in

modernist little magazines, exceeds those frames. H.D. was an effective serial poet from the start, using tight cohesion of theme and style between shorter poems to build short poetic sequences. Rather than self-contained compression, the early H.D. poems overflow with intertextual energy.

IV.

Revisiting the texts of modernism in magazines changes modern and what qualifies as a text. Editorial modernism and modernist texts existed in tight mutual relationships that had various consequences for both individual magazines and their contents. I examine several related but distinct aspects of these relationships. This project includes editors creating, satirizing, arranging, and interpreting texts. In H.D.'s case, her reception developed so quickly that her critics created a way of reading her poetry. This obscured the arrangement of the poems themselves, which almost always exist in a serial poetic. Marsden used a different kind of seriality to examine the nature of language without falling into the traps she perceived in conventional thought. Beatrice Hastings is perhaps the ultimate modernist author-editor, creating an incredibly huge output in many genres including innovative fiction. Her willingness to push the boundaries of fiction has its counterpart in her willingness to break editorial conventions.

The exuberant energy of the *avant guerre* magazines was not a unified energy, but one fractured into ever-shifting coteries and movements. Magazines were at once swept up by this energy and attempted to harness it by turning to its own tools. Modernist authors used assemblage, quotation, and allusion to create the intertextual webs that would best advance their goals. During the *avant guerre* editors used their power to position the texts within magazines in order to destabilize conventional means of reading, even when defending tradition. Editing is not inherently an artistic act, not any more than writing, but modernist author-editors artfully arrange

texts into mutually illustrative constructs. Often these contain many genres, yoked together for effects ranging from political rhetoric to literary criticism to philosophy. There is neat way to account for all the phenomena contained by the little magazines, as generalizing about so many works by so many authors is foredoomed to failure. And yet, for all their myriad differences, Beatrice Hastings, Dora Marsden, and H.D. were all products of a bustling public discussion around the new art. Each commented confidently on their contemporaries, offering praise to some and criticism to others. Each wrote in multiple genres. Each deserves more credit for their contributions and more attention to the details of their lives and work.

Digital archives offer a way to encounter modernism within what were often its original public contexts, with the consequence that dominant narratives about key texts and authors are challenged by the presence of powerful, but obscure voices. Sometimes these voices offer the challenge directly. They also make summary challenging, as it is important to recognize that the public discussions that form the backdrop of modernism include a cast of characters that was not only ever changing in its constituency. The characters were changing themselves, as philosophical, political, and aesthetic affiliations and enmities waxed and waned. Reading serially shows that, as complicated as the situation of modernism in the magazines might be, ideas and people do not change randomly and difficulty does not appear for difficulty's sake. Instead, things appear within frameworks that make sense when taken in the context of earlier work and within each journal's ongoing conversations.

CHAPTER ONE—Beatrice Hastings' Modernism

Beatrice Hastings was an experimental editor and an experimental writer, parallel processes that reinforced each other. Her experiments with editorial power preceded her experiments in modernist fiction—writing arguments under multiple pseudonyms allowed her to intervene in ongoing debates hosted by *The New Age*. This intervention included turning her voices against each other in order to revise previously held positions, as she did in the D. Triformis debate over suffrage in 1910. Her first highly experimental story, January 1911's "Post-Impressionism," was another intervention, as it was a response to the controversy inspired by the art exhibition, *Manet and the Post-Impressionists*. By 1912, Hastings was contributing mutually illustrative texts in multiple genres to single issues of *The New Age*, confidently commenting on contemporary fiction; while also exploring fiction's boundaries in a quintessentially modernist manner in her own creative work. Hastings has been considered as a poet, as a provocateur, as a satirist, but this is the first study to understand her writing as participating in modernism. Hastings is often labeled a feminist antimodernist, but she could be as accurately described as an antifeminist modernist. The labels adhere equally to different texts, requiring specific references to function. Dates are important, as is understanding Hastings as a polygeneric writer who used various genres for specific effects. Her modernism does not make her less of a traditional poet who wrote in classic rhyming stanzaic forms, nor does her antifeminism succeed in diminishing her daring creativity.

The New Age's unique brand of politics is never far from her work, and as *The New Age* hardened against contemporary feminist movements, so did Hastings. Following this arc, from strategic dialogism, to post-impressionism, to self-proclaimed modernism, requires a reappraisal of Hastings' position as modernist artist, editor, critic, and commentator on gender issues and

women's suffrage. Her wide-ranging blend of interests, plotted against the axis of time, challenges and reshapes conventional accounts of modernist literature in *avant guerre* London.

Periodicals are both texts made of other texts and long-form texts themselves. They naturally exist as assemblages and composites. It is no coincidence that the modernist genres of visual art often incorporated cuttings from newspapers into their collages, for example, Picasso's *Still Life with Violin and Fruit* (1913) or Carlo Carra's *Interventionist Demonstration* (1914). Marjorie Perloff uses *Still Life with Violin and Fruit* to call attention to the collage's "dual function: it refers to an external reality even as its compositional thrust is to undercut the very referentiality it seems to assert" (49). Perloff's reading points out that Picasso's rearrangement of the newspaper uses composition to undercut reference to external reality, to reveal and revel in the decomposition of the original purpose of the newspaper. He arranges these texts in a new context, a move analogous to editorial function. Picasso calls attention to the regular functions of periodical text not by using it in a radically different way, but by doing just enough of the usual along with the unusual to create contrast. Rosalind Krauss' *The Picasso Papers* includes a similar reading of Picasso's collage: "Even the technique of making collage, with its bits and pieces that can be shifted about on the drawing sheet and provisionally pinned in place before their definitive gluing, is derived from commercial practice. It is more reminiscent of layout design than of anything taught at the Ecole des Beaux-Arts" (71). The magazine and the modernist text have inherent affinities, as Krauss observes, emphasizing how Picasso's collages revel in the ambiguities of reference, making it unclear what is subject, what is ground; what is legible text, and what is form. Beatrice Hastings' editorial experiments are similar to Krauss' Picasso in the way they manipulate form and text, building meaning from arrangement. Of course, all editors do this, to some extent. Hastings exceeds "commercial practice" and becomes

a truly modernist editor when she exploits the limited access readers had to her many identities in order to create meaning that relies as much on the illegible as the legible. Working in pseudonyms and anonymously means that it is still challenging to pay Hastings her due credit, and many of her later frustrations over lack of recognition may in part stem from the way that her art depends on many shifting identities and non-identities.

Even as each issue exists as a textual object created out of many constituent texts, the sum of any magazine's issues is itself an object, though a long-running periodical will be too large for a panoptic reading. Reading a magazine like *The New Age* requires the ability to shift between these different textual levels and understanding how the hierarchy functions from text to issue to volume to entire magazine. Beatrice Hastings' authorial and editorial contributions to *The New Age* only function when examined in the context of the texts that surrounded them. Hastings often bends or breaks the conventions of the journal, far more so than the head editor, A.R. Orage. She influenced many of the controversies hosted in *The New Age* by intervening overtly in her own writing and covertly through editorial decisions, in the arrangement of texts that appear in each issue. This chapter reads *The New Age* and Hastings in several different ways. First, it will look at how Hastings manipulates her public facing images through the creation of the D. Triformis pseudonym. Then, it will turn to consider Hastings' intervention in the debate over post-impressionism that emerged organically from reviews and correspondence in *The New Age*. The chapter ends with Hastings reaching the height of her literary and editorial power, contributing many texts under many names and anonymously, including innovative fiction embedded in intertextual webs designed to explicate the formal choices of those fictions.

Hastings' career at *The New Age* was longer than the time period considered in detail by this study. She first appeared in the March 28, 1908 issue as Beatrice Tina. Her role as editor

ended when she moved to Paris in 1914, but she remained an active contributor until her work tailed off in early 1916, though she can be found as late as 1920. Tina is one of the more consistently feminist of Hastings' personae. Here is a sample of Tina's feminism from the June 27, 1908 issue of *The New Age*, the first entry in the series "Woman as State Creditor." It is a rebuttal of antifeminist Belfort Bax:

No man-made laws, no man-given preferences, can really help women. Women alone know what women need... I, and all women, want things much more important than the privilege of lying; things no man, any more than Mr. Bax, can have any conception of unless he realises that women love liberty of mind and body as much as himself. But this love of liberty is the very sentiment the antifeminist denies as integral in Woman. (169)

This is the first political piece by any Hastings pseudonym. Her demand for liberty of mind and body eloquently refutes Bax. Tina was also the persona that first began writing fiction, notably the 1909 novella *Whited Sepulchers*. *Whited Sepulchers* initiates the satirical and ironic mode that would become Hastings' signature style across many personae. It is a story of the ignorance imposed on young women by middle-class English society, and how both this ignorance and the hypocrisy of people living under and perpetuating patriarchal structures can ruin the lives of young women. As much as *Whited Sepulchers* illustrates many later trends in Hastings' development, it is relatively straightforward in form and presentation. Hastings had yet to flex her editorial muscle, and had not yet begun to experiment with the periodical as form.

Hastings' first editorial experiment is the D. Triformis debate. During this exchange, Hastings repudiated many of her earlier writings composed under Beatrice Tina as part of the staged debate between the Tina persona and one of Hastings' most fascinating alter egos, D. Triformis. This turn against her earlier self is the first time she exercises editorial power in a

distinctly unconventional manner. While periodical culture of the time was no stranger to the ancient form of dialog, the Tina-Triformis exchange breaks from many contemporary single-author dialogs because of its duplicity: there are no hints that both sides of the discussion are actually the same author. Each component appears under a different heading, and is a complete essay rather than the fictionalized back-and-forth of a classic dialog. This bold disregard for convention presages her imminent modernist fiction.

Fabricating Debates

The New Age's primary purpose was political. A.R. Orage took over a failing prior incarnation of *The New Age* in 1907. As Tom Villis tells the story, “*The New Age* received its initial funding from Lewis Wallace (A Theosophical banker) and George Bernard Shaw. There is no evidence that either of them consciously tried to influence policy, indeed the claim seems ridiculous considering *The New Age's* attacks on Fabianism... “When A.R. Orage acquired *The New Age*, it was to be an organ independent of all party doctrine, ‘an independent socialist review of literature politics and art’ in which socialism itself was to be challenged and recast... The story of the paper is a progressive narrowing of their political discourse” (20). By 1912, its platform gradually shifting to promote a particular kind of socialism built around the return of the medieval guild system. Whether in its Fabian/Socialist phase or during its infatuation with guilds, *The New Age* contained a heady blend of utopian vision and logical argument. The combination of logic and vision made its political purpose inseparable from its function as a venue for art, literature, philosophy, and criticism. *The New Age* of the *avant guerre* was an edited space with an overt political purpose operating in parallel with its commitment to hosting other viewpoints.

Lee Garver's "Neither Progressive nor Reactionary: Reassessing the Cultural Politics of *The New Age*" is a clear account of *The New Age's* convoluted politics, albeit one that does not mention Hastings at all. Garver argues that Orage was more interested in hosting many viewpoints than in advancing a particular school of politics. *The New Age* was edited in order to foster debate and dissent among radical groups, rather than to side completely with any single movement. His argument is a necessary correction to readings that try to limit *The New Age* to a particular location on the political spectrum, as it was truly neither left nor right. Reading *The New Age* as an open forum accounts for the wide range of voices represented in the paper, and may be the best way to approach its early years. However, Garver's reading underestimates the extent to which the political goals of the editors and core contributors affected the journal. They were willing to use *The New Age* as an instrument to their ends. *The New Age* was consistently inclusive, but it was also consistently influenced by its editors' ideology:

The New Age quickly evolved, under the direction of its editor A. R. Orage, into a periodical that attempted to give voice to the entire spectrum of radical thought and cultural activity that characterized the period. Consequently, it makes no sense to privilege one group of contributors over another or to attempt to shoehorn the magazine's amazingly rich and varied contents into a single ideological or aesthetic frame, even one so closely tied to the publication as guild socialism (89).

I would argue that by the early nineteen teens, one group of contributors was privileged over the others: the editors. It is a privilege that they accorded themselves. This acknowledgement does not change the core of Garver's argument, but it does shift its grounds. *The New Age* resists easy placement into ideological frames not only because it invited dissent but also because it lasted so long and changed so much. The tendency for the journal to foster debate and invite its opponents

into its pages is only half of the story, as the magazine's self-proclaimed neutrality in turn evolves into its self-proclaimed slant. In a 1913 passage that will be discussed further in chapter two, Orage proclaims that "it will be found, if we all live long enough, that every part of *The New Age* hangs together." It is not merely a place to "give voice," but becomes more and more a place to contextualize those voices within a carefully edited space. Despite the journal's initial commitment to inclusion, particular ideologies became dominant, and the editors filtered opposed voices through subjection to editorial rebuttal or satire. This is not the same as eliminating them completely, and readers would often receive both sides of an issue. The editorial position was usually clear and clearly advocated.

Briefly, guild socialism sought a return to simpler times, when guilds of specialists were run by master craftsmen, rather than by capitalists. The guilds of the future would operate in partnership with the state and as a counterweight to the state's power. In order to establish guilds, the workers of England would unite in a general strike, unseating capitalism and placing themselves at the helm of the state. The biggest risk to this program was a growing labor pool. This led the journal to be simultaneously revolutionary and regressive. *The New Age's* fear of an expanding labor pool led them to oppose the entry of women into the workforce, which would ruin the bargaining power of the craftsmen. The shift from neutral pan-socialism to guild socialism, and the consequent shift in the place of women in the journal's overall political vision, would have major consequences for Hastings' writing.

This meant that Beatrice Hastings' many voices appeared in a journal attempting to secure economic liberation before political liberation, one that values the solidarity of workingmen over civil rights. Lucy Delap uses Hastings as a key example of the difficulty of labeling Edwardian authors as feminist or anti-feminist in her essay "Feminist and Anti-Feminist

Encounters in Edwardian Britain,” including the important call “for more attention to the self-description of historical subjects in identifying their politics, as well as greater awareness of the nuances of their arguments, thus preventing a tendency to identify all culturally and politically active Edwardian women as feminists” (377). She observes how many powerful Edwardian women often worked against feminist causes. Paying more attention to self-description will help to a point, but Beatrice Hastings’ creation of multiple identities can make this difficult. Delap’s observation that “[Hastings’] work suggests a struggle to achieve a self-identity” is an important aspect of the issue, especially in the early period covered in “Feminists and Anti-Feminist Encounters” (397). As occasionally happens when dealing with Hastings, the opposite reading is also true. Hastings had a seemingly effortless talent for creating new identities as needed, and particularly as needed to achieve artistic and political goals. Her self-identity, tortured as it could be even in its public facing incarnations, is always balanced by her confidence. This chapter’s account of Hastings’ development will follow Delap in recognizing “the difficulties, as well as the productive nature, of reading feminism and anti-feminism as overlapping and interdependent discourses” (383). To extricate one of Hastings’ statements and dub it as somehow truly authentic would damage the fabric of her work, both at the level of individual texts and the larger composites of her *oeuvre* and *The New Age* itself. Instead, texts should be read for their contradictions, and with the understanding that they are public documents, not private declarations. Hastings’ public personae were forced into a paradox. Hastings publicly stated that women could not be creative writers while remaining cognizant of her worth as a talented writer of fiction, poetry, satire, and criticism. These declarations occurred simultaneously with her careful arrangement of texts in each issue of the journal. Returning to the roots of these issues shows how revolutionary politics and accounts of modernist art in *The New Age* exist alongside

the masses the journal sought to liberate, the writers it invited into its pages, and its editors themselves.

Beginning to untangle Hastings' paradoxes requires attending to gradual changes in her public writing. A timeline of conflicts and characters clarifies more than an attempt to synthesize a single Beatrice Hastings. In 1911, she was still a self-identified feminist. By late 1912, her Beatrice Hastings persona was growing more and more misogynist, and by 1913 she became particularly venomous, as will be discussed in chapter two.

Despite the fact that *The New Age* is a locus classicus of periodical modernism, Hastings' contributions to it as such are usually overshadowed by those of Orage or Pound. In her 1936 retrospective pamphlet *The Old New Age* she voices both her frustration with the way she was erased from literary history and her pride in guiding Orage's literary work, and she takes full credit for Pound's career as well: "Among 'New Age' contributors who have expressed their gratitude to Orage for giving them a start, few have sung him louder than Mr. Ezra Pound. In this preliminary pamphlet, I must suppress the detail I shall publish later, so simply say that I had to fight not only Orage, but the whole office, to get Pound's articles in at all" (6). She goes on to cite Orage's strong opposition to Pound from the October 23, 1913 issue, which (perhaps not coincidentally) also contains high praise for T.K.L., Hastings' satirical voice.

One of Hastings' most famous acts as a collective of pseudonyms is her deployment of one pseudonym in order to attack another, as has been noted by other Hastings scholars, first by John Carswell who noted how Hastings was "now... savagely attacking the Woman's Suffrage Union for its hypocrisy. Two of her aliases, 'Beatrice Tina' and 'D. Triformis' were mobilized to denounce one another" (60). Other scholars have written about this moment, including Stephen Gray, Sean Latham, Lucy Delap, and Carey Snyder. Usually mentioned because of the extreme

strangeness of using a pseudonym to correct a pseudonym, this is a major turning point in Hastings' work. Within a few months of the Triformis controversy, Hastings is more antifeminist and more experimental than she had been previously.

In 1908, her second year at *The New Age*, Hastings wrote a piece under "Beatrice Tina" that matches the strident tone of the suffragettes, establishing arguments that would reappear in her first stand-alone publication, *Woman's Worst Enemy: Woman*. In it, she argues that the male inability to undergo childbirth renders them incompetent to rule women: "In the face of the single fact that women bear children, often in agonies no man would face once, let alone twice, the whole protest against women's right to govern themselves becomes extraordinarily ignorant." She goes on to explain why women should be allowed to govern themselves: "Naive and childlike man has determined the contract both for himself and for us. But he has exhausted OUR innocence. We are prepared to draw up our own terms now; and the fiercer the opposition, the more certain we become of the extent of men's addiction to tyranny. The militant suffragettes have saved us from the last ignominy of the slave--the obligation to give thanks for enfranchisement" ("Woman as State Creditor" 169, *Woman's Worst Enemy: Woman* 54-55). This is essentially the suffrage position, and overtly encourages militants like the Pankhursts (and, from 1909 to 1911, Dora Marsden) who were willing to suffer heroically in their fight for the vote. This was written before Hastings had her final traumatic break with the suffragist movement: militant, strident, and heavily rhetorical, her confidence radiates from the page. This is also a statement that will, eventually, draw a response and criticism from Hastings herself, in the guise of D. Triformis.

Exactly two months later, the first signs of the break between suffragism and Hastings appear. Hastings published "The Case of the Anti-Feminists," in the August 29, 1908 issue of

The New Age under the Beatrice Tina pseudonym apparently arguing for moderation. She argues that both male and female anti-suffragists had many valid points—though it is, characteristically, difficult to tell how much of the essay is satirical. Beatrice Tina explains that she suddenly gained insight into rationality of the anti-suffrage argument, one that she used to dismiss as worthless. She lays out the following case: pro-suffrage men live with women who associate with intelligent and reasonable women, and their experience leads them to support the vote. She implies that anti-suffrage men live with women who do not deserve the vote. Then she pivots to examine the anti-suffrage woman’s perspective, writing that all that stands between them and the physical violence of men is the “steel” of chivalry and sentiment, conventions threatened by the expanding franchise. This is twisted elaboration of a suffragist argument: one argument for the vote was that many women are more worthy of voting than many men, violent and stupid men in particular. Hastings/Tina’s vision of unworthy voters extends to both genders and various configurations of couples.

Woman’s Worst Enemy

In July of 1909, Hastings published *Woman’s Worst Enemy: Woman*, her first stand-alone literary work, through The New Age Press.¹ It was a collection essays, including some that had appeared in *The New Age*, where they were titled “Woman as State Creditor.” The book contains themes introduced in *Whited Sepulchers*, and which will reappear in the semi-autobiographical *Pages from an Unfinished Novel*, both serialized in *The New Age*. The title, intentionally provocative, comes from its opposition to the myths of motherhood that women promulgate and enforce on other women. Hastings argues for reforms in moral attitudes toward childbirth. She is

¹ *Woman’s Worst Enemy: Woman* has recently been digitized and posted by the University of Houston Libraries. Delightfully, the copy digitized belonged to anarchists Emma Goldman and Ben Reitman, demonstrating that Hastings’ claim that her book was widely read might have some grounds to it, if it found its way to America.

particularly against the tradition of leaving girls ignorant of the extreme suffering during childbirth and the subsequent demands of child-rearing. She further demands state support for mothers in order to emancipate them from traditional family structures. This will entail a radical change in the relationship between motherhood and femininity by splitting them apart from each other. Her argument for state support of mothers has its parallels in H.G. Wells' plan for a stipend for mothers, debated in the early days of *The Freewoman*, and discussed in chapter three. Hastings believes that the conditions of pregnancy and labor determine the health of the child, and takes this to entail that many mental, physical, and social illnesses would be cured if motherhood was reserved for women who really wanted children, who would not be anxious about finances due to state support, and who would be under the expert care of women doctors. The tone of the pamphlet shifts wildly from tight, controlled prose to a jeremiad of thees and thous, and the ideas it contains range widely as well. She explains that the gradual emancipation of women, occurring in the context of the industrial revolution, will lead to more authentic love relationships based on mutual understanding as machine labor reduces the need to constantly replenish the workforce. She also argues along eugenic lines that industrial civilization should self-consciously breed for intelligence and health, and oddly assumes that only very healthy people want children.

Six months later, in the January 6, 1910 issue of *The New Age*, Hastings creates a new pseudonym: D. Triformis, translatable as "of three forms," a gesture to the pseudonym's artificiality. She seems to be referring to Horace's Ode 3.22, which invokes Diana as "diva triformis," three-formed goddess, calling on her role as the protector of women in childbirth. Horace's triformis is in turn a reference to the more common avatar, Diana Trivia, who had aspects of the old woman, the matron, and the virgin. This reference implies that D. Triformis

attempts to speak for all women. Lucy Delap mentions that Triformis was read as “a man,” but Triformis self-identifies as a woman in her debut article, “Militancy and Humanity” in the January 6, 1910 issue (225). Unlike more abstract personae such as the satirist voice T.K.L. (who will be discussed later), the Triformis persona is a woman and uses that identity as a ground for her politics. Triformis’ first contribution shows that Hastings is still a feminist operating through a positive opinion of women and their potential, even as D. Triformis’ main function is to critique militant suffragism. In characteristic *New Age* fashion, Triformis’ views change over time, with a few constants in place: this persona is always a pacifist operating through appeals to reason, arguing that women need to stop using militant methods because of the dangers of a backlash against them. In its earliest form, Triformis’ argument points to the potential for a civilization-ending apocalypse if their militancy starts a sex war—a suggestion that seems outlandish now, but was rooted in the reality of mobs of angry men who would break up suffragist rallies with physical force. To Triformis, a man striking an unarmed woman spelled the end civilization. The trauma of witnessing the violent repression of suffragism undergirds Triformis’ response to it, for example, in “Militancy and Humanity” from January 6, 1910:

It is time, in face of the inhumane aspect which the situation begins to bear, for the most reasonable and truly progressive section to cease, or at least to abandon, the use of force in favour of some line of action safer for the nation as a whole. Will that reasonable and progressive section prove to be the women? We hope so.

The militants have demonstrated beyond question that even torture cannot terrify them. No one, except, perhaps, a few negligible members of Parliament, would be so indecent as to charge them with hysteria or to offer any such rank explanation of their heroic ability to suffer, and repeatedly suffer, for their cause. In withdrawing from the

personal physical combat with men they could have but one motive--the safety of civilisation. (225)

Triformis argues that violent mass tactics fail. According to her, the leaders of the suffrage movement are recklessly promoting a course that will end in suffering rather than suffrage. The proper route to suffrage is through reason and discussion, because, according to Triformis, women's right to a reasonable amount of political participation must come from reasonable beginnings.

In the March 3, 1910 issue, Triformis criticizes the ties between suffrage and feminism in an essay titled "Feminism and the Franchise." Initially, suffrage activism distanced itself from feminism. Now, it embraces all aspects of women's rights.

Had they held to this limited but logically secure position, the issues to-day would have been very much clearer than they are. One seeks in vain now for a statement of the purely political argument; it has become everywhere confused with the feminist argument. (415)

According to Triformis, the attempt to rally all women behind feminist principles was an error on the part of the suffragists.

They made enemies of some of the most brilliant feminists, and they called into being the feminine antisuffragist, who seems to see less danger in things as they are than as they might be if the autocratic puritans ever got into power. (415)

The slippage between "brilliant feminist" and "feminine antisuffragist" is entirely intentional. Somehow feminism becomes the femininity, and linked with the antis.

A remarkable change of atmosphere occurred so soon as the newly-won feminists began to invade the platform. The sex revolt could no longer be ignored. For instance, a book by a spinster, disparaging the holy estate as "a license for sexual intercourse," was reviewed

in the columns of “Votes for Women.” The work was hailed as notable and courageous; whereas a much earlier pronouncement by the feminist, Beatrice Tina, had been officially boycotted and privately denounced. (415)

This is the first time that Triformis mentions Beatrice Tina, the original persona who had already morphed into Beatrice Hastings by early 1910. Triformis references an earlier argument made by the Tina pseudonym, that marriage is merely a legalization of sex. Triformis complains that Beatrice Tina developed now-current feminist ideas, which were rejected when they first appeared, and are now being used by other authors. Now Tina’s ideas are gaining currency, but she still suffers under the boycott they brought down on her at the time.² Through this intervention Triformis defends Tina, and Hastings defends herself. She uses different voices to set the record straight. She blames suffragists, primarily the Pankhursts, for turning her from a brilliant feminist into a “feminine antisuffragist,” and places the blame on their boycott, their silence, and ultimately, their lack of engagement with her and her ideas (“Feminism and the Franchise” 415). In “Women and Literature” in the April 14, 1910 issue, Triformis writes that the suffragists “attacked me with the refined ferocity of silence.”

This sets the scene for the moment when Hastings corrects herself via pseudonym, and D. Triformis will shift from defending Beatrice Tina to attacking her. Before turning to this moment, here are a few passages from Triformis that give a sense of her guarded feminism. This passage comes from “Lady McLaren’s Charter” in the April 7, 1910 issue:

Women with the spirit to be free will be free in any era. They will not wait for the vote to certify them free, and they will not make a great deal of noise whether they get the vote now or next century. The vote is truly only a symbol for such women... Things

² Boycott is also the word Hastings will use in 1936 when she writes *The Old New Age*, her exposé of the journal’s twisted internal politics.

have been very wrong for a long time, and new noise will not mend old grievances.

And, from “Women and Literature” in the April 14 issue:

To begin with, women have no tradition worth calling intellectual. We have yet to make one. We have no standard but the standard of men. A more useful standard we cannot easily imagine. But, judged by this standard, what have we done? It will be urged that we have not had a fair chance. Agreed. But the admission sweeps away all our claim to intellectual equality.

Even though the passage’s main thrust ignores the rich tradition of women’s writing to and though the nineteen-teens, Triformis leaves open the door for a fully separate and alternate intellectual history for women: “We have yet to make one, a more useful standard we cannot easily imagine” is not a discouragement, but a call to action. This is a radical position that many of Hastings’ later writings will oppose. Triformis’ argument about intellectual heritage shifts to literature:

It is not easy, but it is necessary, for women writers to realise how fast we are yet chained by superstition, convention und the tradition about ourselves and our view of life handed down to us by literary men. All these illusions limit our conception and execution of works of art. We have no religious touchstone of our own upon which to try our ideas. Our religion is a purely masculine affair, even when separated as far as possible from dogma. (558)

D. Triformis here points to conditions that may have inspired Hastings’ experimental fiction. As masculine superstitions, conventions, and traditions all undercut women’s literature. D. Trifomis argues that an overthrow so deep as to shake the foundations of masculinist religion might yet provide an alternative. The literary experiments of early 1911 are a response to this urge. This

passage demonstrates Triformis' broad vision of literature and culture, of feminism and oppression; all hallmarks of this pseudonym's measured rationalist voice. It is no coincidence that this passage appears roughly six months before the first truly experimental fiction by Hastings. Now the crisis comes: D. Triformis attacks Tina, as the author behind both takes a moment for self-criticism. On May 12, 1910, in "Women and Freedom," Triformis writes:

Our own minds must free us since our own minds enslave us. When Miss Beatrice Tina wrote: "The militant suffragettes have saved us from the last ignominy of the slave--the obligation to give thanks for enfranchisement," she penned, though in a spirited style, one of the most foolish fancies of the average thoughtless woman. It seems positively dear to sane women to think of themselves as the revolting slaves of men. That parrot phrase, proper enough for a slave, is improper for a woman, and doubtless it has done its mischief among women. But if we set our minds upon becoming free from within, we shall see that such epigrams though fascinating, are untrue. (29)

Triformis shifts the feminist goal to self-development, rather than political activism. She posits that freedom comes gradually, as the product of reflection. Her emphasis on individual freedom denies women any chance to articulate their collective cause, a position that will be echoed by Dora Marsden, another disillusioned suffragist, in the turn from *The New Freewoman* to *The Egoist*. Triformis also rejects inflammatory language, basing part of her argument on a call for propriety.

Triformis further claims that Tina's metaphor of slavery is not accurate to the experience of disenfranchised women. Triformis also castigates the Women's Political and Social Union, the heart of militant suffragism, for its apparently greedy fundraising, its emphasis on display, and its lack of humanitarian projects. Beatrice Tina responds, signing her response "Beatrice (Tina)

Hastings,” officially acknowledging that both personae are the same person (but not acknowledging Triformis). The newly self-unmasked Hastings accepts Triformis’ reading of Tina, but defends herself along several lines. First, she claims that she was always seeking reflective mental freedom, not mere political heft. Then she pivots to attack the advanced women’s movement herself, blaming them for boycotting her ideas as presented in her book *Woman’s Worst Enemy, Woman*. This creates the perfect moment to mention those ideas themselves, which Hastings is happy to do—that women do not necessarily need motherhood or the desire for motherhood. Here is Hastings’ revealing response to herself in a letter from the May 19, 1910 issue:

I certainly do not wish to be named with those who creep away from a public criticism; but the fact is I have no defense to make for my unlucky epigram. I admit that it is not true as it stands, and that the idea (unexpressed) in my mind at the time was certainly of “mental” freedom, and then I am bound to agree with D. Triformis that mental freedom must be gained by thought. I have learned a good deal from D. Triformis and I hope I may learn more; but some things I have not to learn. I have long since protested against several of the undesirable aspects of the suffrage movement. (69)

Hastings opens by aligning her prior self with her current self by emphasizing her independence from the suffrage movement all along. She claims that she had meant to be agitating for mental freedom all along, not political freedom. The following long excerpt contains Hastings’ public repositioning of herself against suffragism:

...I have not complained publicly, hitherto, about the official boycott of my book partly because it sold all the same; but I am a living example for D. Triformis of the “prohibitive and censorial preferences” she notices among the leaders of the various

sections... “Votes for Women” would not even mention that it had received a copy of my book. At a Fabian soirée I was cut by at least a dozen women, and I resigned my membership, not wishing to contaminate these noble creatures... Well, it is the fate of martyrs to be subsequently canonised. Meanwhile, D. Triformis may well spare me from her gallery. I have been killed out of the “advanced” movement. I now devote myself in the shades to art and humanitarianism. De mortuis nil nisi bonum.³ Beatrice (Tina) Hastings. (69)

This response is carefully crafted to sever Hastings’ primary public persona from her past as a suffragist activist. It is one of the few moments when she admits that several of her pseudonyms are actually written by the same person. It is also the moment when Hastings rededicates her primary pseudonym to art and humanitarianism, rather than politics. Carey Snyder observes: “Yet if Hastings adopted Tina as her own through the performative device of her signature, she also stifled this persona, for she washed her hands of the, albeit complicated, feminist views that Tina represented—renouncing not just a virtual identity but a public one. Tina and Triformis were rendered obsolete as Hastings veered toward misogyny in her signed writings, even as she embodied the economic and professional freedoms and the powerful voice for which the women’s movement was fighting” (Beatrice Hastings’s Sparring Pseudonyms 180). That rededication aligns her Hastings pseudonym with the developing antifeminist politics of *The New Age*, but Hastings does not stick strictly to her new vocations for long, as the persona’s main activity through the summer of 1910 was agitating for reform of the criminal justice system, and in particular for an end to capital punishment.

³ De mortuis nil nisi bonum: “nothing but good of the dead,” a saying Hastings will use again in *The Old New Age* to refer to Orage’s boycott of her work, rather than the suffrage movement’s (1).

D. Triformis did not attack Beatrice Tina on a whim: the real reason for the self-inflicted injury was to publicly recant her prior position. Hastings used this recantation to proclaim herself a victim of the suffrage movement. While the suffragists led by the Pankhursts were willing to commit crimes in order to secure the vote, they upheld motherhood as an ideal. Hastings threatened this strategy when she decoupled being a woman and being a mother. Lucy Delap notices this breaking point: when responding to criticism, Hastings first “seemed to place herself very clearly as a feminist. But only a month later, she made quite a different case” (394). In the end, both she and the suffragists deployed Victorian tropes to advance their ideology.

The staged debate is the point at which Hastings openly leaves the feminist mainstream and becomes a self-anointed martyr. She concludes her letter in the May 19 issue: “Well, it is the fate of martyrs to be subsequently canonised” (69). Beyond the political and biographical implications of these pieces, they also show that Hastings was a skilled manipulator of her public image(s). She attacks the suffragist movement by creating a semblance of a dialog, using apparent provocations and rebuttals to justify her attack. Hastings uses the power of her editorial position to manipulate the effect of texts on *The New Age*'s audience. Soon after, she will take this further when she uses an experimental short story to intervene in the debate over post-impressionism. Being “killed out of the advanced movement” occurred just prior to her most innovative fiction (“Correspondence” 69).

A Post-Impressionist Letter to the Editor

The careful staging of the Triformis debate shows that Hastings understood how every provocative action could draw reactions, which could be responded to in turn—and that this very interaction could be simulated for effect. The debates that take place in *The New Age* are dialogic

in the sense that they often take place in conversations between articles and correspondence, but the journal often framed the debates so they would follow the magazine's line, even as it thrived on controversy. *The New Age's* dialogs were often exploited for monologic ends. Hastings is often at the center of this, inventing voices as needed to solve various situations. The proliferation of pseudonyms can make it difficult to locate Hastings, though there are confirmed lists of her names on Modernist Journals Project and elsewhere. Many of her pieces remain uncredited. Reading *The New Age* in quantity while paying attention to the cast of authors helps here, as a certain Hastings-specific style emerges. Though she prided herself on her ability to speak in different voices, her voice remains recognizable behind her many masks, which in itself became a point of pride later—in *The Old "New Age,"* she encourages readers to locate her by her style.⁴ Regardless of the truth of her retrospective claims, *The New Age* is her political platform and her dramatic stage, and she uses it to push her beliefs while exercising her talents in many genres. Everything Hastings wrote for *The New Age* was a performance, a destabilization of the author function that simultaneously exploited the journal's reputation as a space for logical discourse. Even seemingly conventional texts can gain an experimental valence when used in an unconventional way. Hastings' texts, her different voices, interwoven with the artistic and philosophical debates of her time, retain their original interrelationships. Hastings needs to be read serially because seriality is a part of her method, as her dramatic experiments with authorial and editorial form pushed through the permeable boundaries of genre.

The first of her texts that feels formally modernist, "Post-Impressionism," illustrates how Hastings' early experimental fictions took part in larger conversations, and emerged from her editorial work. "Post-Impressionism" was printed in the January 26, 1911 issue of *The New Age*,

⁴Beatrice Hastings, *The Old "New Age"* (London: Blue Moon Press, 1936). See "Finding the Man in the Style," 38-42.

where it emerged from the debate surrounding Roger Fry's art exhibition, *Manet and the Post-Impressionists*. This exhibition gave London its first long look at Cezanne, Van Gogh, Matisse, Gauguin, and other continental artists. It kindled a blaze of controversy, both in the mainstream papers and in magazines like *The New Age*. The debate over the exhibition hinged on the old controversy over the nature and role of realism and representation in art. Desmond MacCarthy, the secretary of the exhibition, writes in the catalogue: "it is the boast of those who believe in this school, that its methods enable the individuality of the artist to find completer self-expression in his work than is possible to those who have committed themselves to representing objects more literally." MacCarthy's secondhand boast on the part of the artists inspired many reactions in *The New Age*, including "Post-Impressionism."

The entire course of the debate over *Manet and the Post-Impressionists*, as preserved in *The New Age*, is fascinating in its own right, but I will focus on the moments that influenced the short story in question. The first moment is George Calderon's review of the show, which appeared in the November 24, 1910 issue of *The New Age*. Calderon translates the difficult painters from the continent for the culturally savvy readership of *The New Age*, explaining that the value of the paintings comes from a more accurate depiction of reality than realism. In the conclusion of his essay, he urges his readers to soak in the various portraits and landscapes of the exhibition, and then to "go forth and pass along the streets about and note how flat, stale and unprofitable have become all those engravings, pictures and statues in the art dealers' windows, that represent the bare photographic semblance of reality, with dramatic meanings laid on it, not drawn out from it." Calderon's invocation of "bare photography" as the antithesis of art and his insistence that drama is present in reality, not something imposed upon it by an author, rebuked

the British artistic establishment. That establishment noticed the rebuke and responded vigorously in the correspondence pages of *The New Age*.

Calderon was writing about painting, but another, more regular contributor had taken note of his claims about the exhibition. Arnold Bennett (the Mr. Bennett in Virginia Woolf's "Mr. Bennett and Mrs. Brown") wrote reviews for *The New Age* under the pseudonym Jacob Tonson. He contributed a piece in the December 8, 1910 issue in defense of the exhibition. Bennett presciently saw that there could be an analogy in literature to the works of Cezanne, Matisse, Van Gogh, and the other artists exhibited at the show:

...I have permitted myself to suspect that supposing some writer were to come along and do in words what these men have done in paint, I might conceivably be disgusted with nearly the whole of modern fiction, and I might have to begin again. This awkward experience will in all probability not happen, to me, but it might happen to a writer younger than me. At any rate it is a fine thought. The average critic always calls me, both in praise and dispraise, "photographic"; and I always rebut the epithet with disdain, because in the sense meant by the average critic I am not photographic. But supposing that in a deeper sense I were? Supposing a young writer turned up and forced me, and some of my contemporaries--us who fancy ourselves a bit--to admit that we had been concerning ourselves unduly with [in]essentials,⁵ that we had been worrying ourselves to achieve infantile realisms? Well that day, would be a great and a disturbing day--for us. And we should see what we should see.

This is the moment when Bennett confronts the unpleasant fact that literary realism may have encountered something that might surpass it. He had just published *Clayhanger*, the first volume

⁵ The original printing of the essay had misprinted "essentials" for "inessentials" here, which was clarified in the subsequent issue of *The New Age* (but not before being mocked by a correspondent).

of the *Clayhanger* trilogy, in 1910. *Clayhanger's* mixed reviews criticized it for its intense devotion to realism of detail. In *The New Age* of December 15, 1910, J. E. Barton remarked that “subject after all does count, even for the realist,” finding fault in Bennett’s attention to the background of an otherwise uninteresting story (160). While it is hard to say exactly what Bennett means by “a deeper sense” of photography, contrasting his style with that of the Hastings story might illustrate what he meant. The most beautiful passages in *Clayhanger* describe objects in very fine detail, lingering on details to describe how the history of things is tied to the story of humanity. Passages in *Clayhanger* devote many paragraphs to a minute description of print shop or, tellingly, a photograph. The obvious anxiety he feels at the prospect of his finely detailed depictions of things being misunderstood as literary photography shows that he can imagine other ways to represent reality through text.

He had probably read Gertrude Stein, for one. In January of 1911 most famous modernist works had yet to be published, but Gertrude Stein’s *Three Lives* had been published in 1909. Stein sent a copy to Bennett, whom she described in a letter as having “a similar ‘obsession with ordinariness’ to her own” (Daniel 73). While Bennett does not cite Stein in his discussion of Post-Impressionism and literature, it is intriguing that he had access to Stein as he speculated about the possibility of young authors bridging the gap between modern painting and modern literature.⁶ Meanwhile, James Joyce was wrestling with his publishers over *Dubliners*, and was working on *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man*. “Post-Impressionism” appears very early and is tied specifically to the events of late 1910: “In or around December, 1910, human character changed,” as Virginia Woolf famously quipped in “Mr. Bennett and Mrs. Brown.” Woolf, writing in the early 20s, may have been referencing her friend Roger Fry’s exhibition.

⁶ Gertrude Stein is mentioned once in *The New Age*, in a letter by Huntly Carter in the June 20, 1912 issue. He celebrates her alongside Matisse, Picasso, Delaunay, and Laurencin. Carter champions the Post-Impressionist exhibition in same issue of *The New Age* that carried Bennett’s review, an interesting coincidence.

Returning to the winter of 1910: Hastings was on the scene, as was Mr. Bennett (Arnold Bennett, also known by his *New Age* pseudonym Jacob Tonson), and both have a role to play in the story of “Post-Impressionism.”

“Post-Impressionism” consists of five short paragraphs separated by asterisks. The opening, “The Manniquins [sic] wound like a serpent over the grass of the noble domain,” fuses poetic rhythm with disorienting imagery, and showcases the weird beauty of Hastings’ story. The verb, “wound” carries both of its meanings, both that of winding and the Edenic serpent’s bite. Hastings, who is capable of effortless eloquence, creates another new voice and uses it to display a different set of capabilities than she does in her journalism, criticism, poetry, or more straightforward fiction. There are many possible reasons for the story’s obscurity. It is probably in part a story *à clef*, written in part for those in the know, in a code outsiders cannot crack. Some details may have been more legible in the moment of its publication and are now occluded. For example, it is partly set in the Carlton Hotel, which was famously one of the finest and most modern in London. The wealthy but repellent Germans reference Katharine Mansfield’s stories that later become *In a German Pension*, and which appeared in *The New Age* from 1910-1911.

Part of the story’s difficulty comes from its play with language and grammar. In the fourth paragraph, Hastings plays with referential pronouns to create a puzzle: “He wrapped his head in a soft serviette and nursed it on his knee, saying, ‘Poor old Baron; do take something to eat, Min.’ So Minnie Pinnikin had a plate on the floor at the knee of the head, and he fed her, horribly goggling...” The puzzle of the paragraph, and part of its pleasure, comes from the way the story foregrounds the ambiguity of language. It takes several readings, but the meaning is ultimately clear: the unnamed first man is caring for a slightly ill Baron. The first man, who has wrapped the Baron’s head in a napkin to alleviate his illness somehow, invites the heroine of the

story, Minnie Pinnikin, to eat some food. Minnie then eats while sitting on the floor, presumably on the same level as the Baron, with the first man looming over them, “horribly goggling.” It is not a moment with obvious dramatic value—there is not much sustained plot. It is a vivid moment, represented not through the clarity of language, but through its capacity for ambiguity. An ambiguous situation required ambiguous grammar.⁷

The final paragraph in “Post-Impressionism” is more abstract. While very obscure at first, it appears to be a description of purchasing paintings at an artist’s flat: “He was hooking men up from the street. Very surprising the strength of his thin white hands. Everybody was stood upright on the roof of a low house opposite the flat.” The man who “hooks” people up from the street does so by capturing them on canvas, and the row of canvases in front of the upper-story windows creates an illusion of the crowd congregating on the building across the road. Minnie Pinnikin nearly buys a painting, but her husband stops her because her offer is embarrassingly low. Then, looking out the window, she sees someone she knows, the “mock curate.” This vision of the mock curate is the climax of the story, referencing both the serpent from the first paragraph and the goggling eyes of the fish (and/or the baron) from the fourth: “He wound like a serpent. Minnie Pinnikin looked uncompromisingly into his devilish up-goggling orbs. Plumb fell hers into his!” The shock of seeing this person causes her to suddenly recall those prior experiences.

Hastings’ layering of perceptions is what makes the story self-consciously modernist. It is not a quite a stream of consciousness, a term that first would appear in *The Egoist* five years later. It is an account of a bright flash of consciousness and memory, an account of a moment

⁷Aspects of this story may have a twin in a story by Katherine Mansfield. Mansfield’s story, “Germans at Meat,” is similarly about English people eating with Germans. Several critics have made a convincing claim for Mansfield’s importance as a modernist innovator, most of whom acknowledge Hastings’ influence (or at least her proximity) to Mansfield. They share an experimental edge, though Hastings carries it much farther into the realm of the surreal and the opaque than Mansfield.

when an intense encounter with art in the world caused Minnie Pinnikin to suddenly and involuntarily encounter her own past. The story is an attempt to give access to Pinnikin's emotional world in a rush. This is the effect that Roger Fry and Desmond MacCarthy praised so highly in the painters in their exhibition. MacCarthy's quip in the catalog to the Post-Impressionist exhibition could apply to Hasting's story: "And there is no denying that the work of the Post-Impressionists is sufficiently disconcerting. It may even appear ridiculous to those who do not recall the fact that a good rocking-horse often has more of the true horse about it than an instantaneous photograph of a Derby winner" (9). What we get in "Post-Impressionism" is defiantly and definitely not a photograph. Like MacCarthy's rocking horse, it is an experience rendered in such a way that the one experiencing the moment would be equipped to encounter it in all its evocative vividness, as an imaginative individual permeated by their own memories.

After all these daring moves, there is yet another layer to this story that makes it even more complex: in the original, it is printed not as a short story, but as a letter to the editor (and therefore a letter to herself, and Orage). Like any letter to the editor, it is marked by its beginning: "Sir—" a tag that indicates its nature as a letter. It is an intervention in an ongoing debate over the exhibition, and the title "Post-Impressionism" is a topical heading rather than a proper title. Hastings places fiction into the realm of correspondence to take the prestige of the correspondence pages and apply it directly to her story. In *The New Age*, the correspondence pages were a realm for interaction and debate, devoted to rhetoric and logical argument. Hastings was breaking the rules, and she gave herself the last word. Including the January 26 issue, seven of the prior eight issues of *The New Age* discussed *Manet and the Post-Impressionists* in one way or another, but after the story "Post-Impressionism," the discussion falls silent. Hastings' story appears to be a direct answer to Bennett's implied challenge to "some young writer." It is an

attempt to represent reality through other means than photographic detail. Its placement in the letters section was a further experiment, marking it as a response, and combining Hastings' first innovative story with another moment of experimental editing.

There is one further ramification of this story that I will mention here, and explore in depth later. Hastings wrote a lost novel titled *Minnie Pinnikin*, and many of her innovative stories are likely part of this work. While the stories in *The New Age* are fragmentary, they are traces of a longer project, a sustained engagement with modernist aesthetics that now exists only in *The New Age* and the further fragments of a French draft.

Beatrice Hastings' "Modernism"

Hastings' next experimental short story also carries a movement in its title. In the January 18, 1912 issue, she published a story titled "Modernism" in *The New Age*. There is an eerie prescience in her selection of the term that will come to define the entire field of activity that she is participating within, but before modernism meant Modernism, at least in English.

"Modernism" is now so encrusted with meanings that it is difficult to define, but it was less common during the nineteen-teens, appearing most often in *The New Age* in reference to a controversy in the Catholic Church. Its first significant appearance in British literature occurs in the Thomas Hardy's 1892 *Tess of the d'Urbervilles*. He writes about Tess' "ache of modernism" when she ponders the ominous approach of the future, and the possibility for art to deflect that anxiety.⁸ R.A. Scott-James, a literary critic, picked up "modernism" from Hardy to describe

⁸ The passage from *Tess* is a fascinating prescience of the "isms" of modernism itself. Angel Clare, shocked by Tess' vision of the future, wonders along with Hardy's narrator: "She was expressing in her own native phrases—assisted a little by her Sixth Standard training—feelings which might almost have been called those of the age—the ache of modernism. The perception arrested him less when he reflected that what are called advanced ideas are really in great part but the latest fashion in definition—a more accurate expression, by words in *logy* and *ism*, of sensations which men and women have vaguely grasped for centuries."

tendencies in contemporary fiction, initiating its use as a term to describe literature in his 1908 *Modernism and Romance*. This book was reviewed in the October 10, 1908 issue of *The New Age*.⁹ Presumably, Hastings would have encountered it there, as well as in the other contexts listed above.

For Scott-James, modernism is the realization that ideal world and industrialized reality are incompatible. He catalogs various possible reactions to this realization, such as:

Some, more bold if not more imaginative, face the turmoil, “confronting,” as Walt Whitman put it, “the growing arrogance of realism,” attempting to check the outward symptoms without always seeing that the canker is inward and spiritual. Others there are who play with pleasant Utopian dreams, conscious of the growing evil, and expecting to avert it by agreeable ingenuities. And there are yet others, who have contracted the disease of modernism in its most virulent form, and having accepted with open eyes the grossness, the artificialities, the *fin-de-siècle* weariness, the materialism, hedonism, and all the supreme selfishness, not only accept them but revel in them, wallow in them, soak themselves in them; and when they are labelled “Decadents” they take it as a compliment. (32-33)

As this passage demonstrates, Scott-James is an extreme antimodernist. He counterbalances modernism with romance, which despite his critique of utopian thinking will save literature from the modernists, and will become “a new movement in art and literature” (33). Hastings’ title references the disease of modernism, which suits a story that, like “Post-Impressionism,” depicts the revelry of ambiguous characters. “Modernism” may be the first published work in English that self-designates as “modernism.” However, the term appeared in a more familiar guise

⁹“Modernism and Romance,” *The New Age*, October 10, 1908, 47.

shortly before the story's appearance. In the November 30, 1911 issue of *The New Age*, John Middleton Murry uses "modernist" twice in a review of Picasso. In both cases, he uses it as a positive identifier for someone who appreciates new art: "At the outset, modernist, ultra-modernist, as I am in my artistic sympathies, I frankly disclaim any pretension to an understanding or even an appreciation of Picasso" ("The Art of Pablo Picasso," 115). Murry's embrace of the term hints that Hastings' own view of modernism could have been more aligned with current definitions: "Modernism" could just be modernism.

Like "Post-Impressionism," "Modernism" is embedded the fabric of *The New Age*, and exists in a complex relationship with Hastings' three other contributions to the January 18 issue: a much more traditional poem, her regular anonymous column of literary criticism, and a letter to the editor that is clearly marked as having been written by the same anonymous critic. While "Modernism" has the most apparent interest as an experimental object, understanding the various texts of the January 18th as interrelated makes each a component of a larger whole, and ultimately that set of texts rests within the larger whole of both the issue as a whole and the ongoing dialogs hosted by *The New Age*. This reading of "Modernism" will move from the modernist microcosm of the short story through these other Hastings texts. Cover-to-cover readers of *The New Age* would encounter these texts in a different order. First, "Present-Day Criticism" would appear immediately after an installment of "I Gather the Limbs of Osiris" by Ezra Pound and a drawing by Walter Sickert, then the poem "Echo," and after that, the story "Modernism," and finally the letter from the "novel critic" in the correspondence pages at the end of the issue. Starting with the story allows a clearer statement of the problems posed by "Modernism" before turning to the answers, and complications, contained in Hastings' polygeneric text of texts.

“Modernism” takes place in the same fictional universe as “Post-Impressionism,” as it contains the recurring character Valerie, sometimes identified as Katherine Mansfield *à clef*.¹⁰ The narrator is probably Minnie Pinnikin, Valerie’s recurring foil. Like “Post-Impressionism,” “Modernism” bounces the reader from scene to scene without clear transitions. There are three main actions: first, crisscrossing London with a man identified only as the French Jew; second, examining Valerie’s new clothes; and, third, a vacation trip to Brighton. Each main action contains subsets of events, also presented without transition. “Modernism” even lacks the sets of asterisks that blocked off each of the five paragraphs in “Post-Impressionism.” This treatment of time is the most obviously modernist aspect of “Modernism,” and it poses a significant difficulty on first reading, demanding that the reader reorient to the text as it changes. The beginnings of sentences refuse to make sense until the reader recalibrates to each shift in geographic and temporal scene. This device reveals itself more clearly on rereading the story, as the series of events becomes easier to reconstruct by standing back from the story than it is while caught up in it—it is sort of a wild, fast, unforgiving predecessor to similar devices in Joyce or Ford Madox Ford’s *Parade’s End*. Hastings collapses time and space in order to create something more true to psychological reality, the kind of realism she would later theorize in her criticism. Understanding the sophisticated play of language, setting, and time is the first step to understanding the story.

Processing the information contained within these fragments of space and time is the next difficulty. Each scene is an incomplete burst of vision or memory, making the story as a whole an assemblage of incompleteness. Again, the opening is significant: “It is very like life to find all the swell restaurants in Capetown crowded,” beginning with a rueful aside, contains a comment

¹⁰Stephen Gray disputes the identification of Valerie as Mansfield in his biography of Hastings: *Beatrice Hastings, a Literary Life* (London: Viking, 2002), 251.

on realism in its half-concealed invocation of “lifelike.” Readers might expect the story to take place in Capetown, perhaps expecting it due to the author’s background, but the restaurants listed were all famous establishments on the Strand in London. Hastings overlays South Africa onto London, disrupting the geography of the capital by invoking the far reaches of the British Empire. Driven to seek shelter from the sweltering heat, the narrator, almost certainly Minnie Pinnikin, and her unnamed companion, identified as a French Jew, search among the fashionable restaurants for one with an electric fan. Pinnikin finally locates a restaurant that suits her, being clean and cool, but then she immediately demands the visitor’s book, signed by visitors. The waiter assures Pinnikin that “very nice people... often lunch here.” Pinnikin confirms that she does not know the people whose names appear in the book, but before we know whether that is a reason they stay, or leave, the scene changes. Pinnikin may have been scouting out the place, making sure it was respectable, or perhaps the opposite. Pinnikin is either a genteel woman ensuring that her surroundings are respectable, or someone trying to make sure that she won’t run into anyone she knows. One possible clue comes in the list of restaurants she avoided (nominally because of the heat): “the Imperial, the Ritz, Lyons’ Pop., and Romano’s.” While the Ritz remains famous for its luxury, Romano’s was more favored by actors, artists, and bohemians: Pinnikin is avoiding the upper crust and the literati. The reader’s attempt to solve a puzzle that is missing so many pieces results in an ambiguous encounter with the identity of Pinnikin, the narrator, whose social status remains undefined. In this it resembles passages from Dorothy Richardson’s *Pilgrimage*, with its London restaurants full of characters from many social positions.

Then, the scene shifts. Apparently now riding in a cab of some kind, Pinnikin and her companion see an opera house. He is overwhelmed with emotion at the sight of the place where

he once heard Jenny Lind sing. This stray fact gives a slight hint to the chronology, as Lind retired from singing in 1883.¹¹ French Jew is thus someone in middle age (or later), and he seems to be overwhelmed by regrets over the lost opportunities of his youth, as he suddenly begins, singing about Lind and “Youth, O Mystical Rose!” in the cab. Pinnikin tries to calm him down with a bit of tactical casuistry, explaining that he shouldn’t regret leaving some things undone in his youth because “even in youth one must select experience... so why not make it a virtue of it when one is old?” The story itself is a selection of experiences. Pinnikin’s desire to make a virtue of selection matches the story’s attempt to reference the operation of memory, and its form. The French Jew tries to shift the conversation into French, which Pinnikin explains she can speak, though “not like a philosopher.” His response is, “Ah, good, I see we shall get on very well.” It appears that the two of them are at the beginning of a relationship, though the relationship’s exact register is left ambiguous.

As is characteristic of “Modernism,” an abrupt scene change follows the story above. There is no transition to assist the reader, and no literary establishing shot. Instead, the dialog shifts from the cab to a dressing room. Pinnikin has a conversation with Valerie, but the shift doesn’t become clear for about six lines. Instead, it is just as if the talk shifts from the possibility of communicating in French to comparing new clothes picked up at dress agencies. Effectively, the French Jew crossdresses as Valerie until her identity comes into focus. Valerie’s “appendicitis” might be a euphemism for pregnancy. Apparently she is going to the Riviera to recuperate from whatever illness she might have. She does not seem very ill. It turns out the location of the recuperative vacation is not set in stone, as Pinnikin changes the plan: “‘Why cross the channel,’ I suggested, ‘When we have the Riviera in Cornwall?’ So we went to

¹¹Curiously, the man is identified as a French-speaking Jew, which immediately calls to mind Hasting’s lover Amadeo Modigliani, but the biographical record claims that Modigliani and Hastings did not meet until 1914. The French Jew in the story is stout and old, so probably not Modigliani.

Brighton.” Of course, Brighton is not in, or close to, Cornwall. Again, Hastings disrupts the geography of the situation, as she had with Capetown at the beginning of the story.

They go to meet a friend named Polly in Brighton, and incidentally, run into an Oxford poet as well. Pinnikin’s conversations with the poet involve a misunderstanding arising from the gap between written and spoken language, a move that calls attention to the other kinds of slippages present in the story’s dialog. Pinnikin explains her confusion on learning that “sloughed” and “slowed” are homophones, but that rivers do not actually move slowly into sloughs. At first, the narrator does not want to accept the difference between her expectations and reality, but sums up her acceptance with the response: “but there was the mud,” an illustration of the narrator’s preconceptions about language, absorbed via reading, encountering intransigent reality.

After watching a boat race, Pinnikin invites the Oxford Poet up into her rooms, thereby ruffling Polly’s feathers. After it gets “too late for him to go home,” the party goes down to the beach, minus Polly. A new character is introduced, again without any helpful signaling. Patty, probably a kept woman, tries to explain her situation to Minnie Pinnikin, who at first does not seem to understand. Polly explains that she “had to take a hat-shop to keep my little boy,” and that “we had a non-fume gas stove, but I spent hundreds of pounds and got bored with it.” This has several layers of meanings: at first it seems that Patty’s hat shop proved to be expensive, and she eventually grew bored.¹² Further, the gas stove is probably an oblique reference to a failed suicide attempt, prevented by the stove’s fumeless design.

All this happens before the reader encounters Patty by name. The similarity of Patty and Polly creates further confusion. We realize who Patty is only when she notices the abbot rowing

¹² Owning a hat shop may be a euphemism for becoming a kept woman, as in Ford’s *Parade’s End*, where the shop in question is usually a tobacco shop, but at one point Christopher asks Valentine if she has a “hat shop that doesn’t pay.”

a boat in to them, apparently in the middle of the night. Patty worries for his safety, calling him “Pops,” signaling that the abbot is the father of her child: “‘I call him Pops,’ she said—‘I rather—love him.’ I understood at last.” The story ends, then, with an ironic moment of understanding, as Pinnikin pieces together Patty’s situation.

The process of reading the story, of processing the story, demands attention to minute detail, knowledge of contemporary places, fashions, and social habits merely to begin making sense of the two pages extracted from the longer, lost novel. As a piece of modernist mental gymnastics, it is delightful. As in “Post-Impressionism,” the story ends with a vision of an undignified cleric—this time the abbot. Patty’s situation with the abbot recalls Valerie’s ambiguous motives for going on vacation, and references Pinnikin’s own experience in London, and all further reference the situations from “Post-Impressionism.” The similarity in the ending of both stories binds them together at their most satirical moment, and further indicates that Hastings was building a larger fiction across her experimental short stories.

This story has a larger function than its nature as a modernist puzzle. As with “Post-Impressionism,” “Modernism” appears as one element in a more complex context, a text that is part of the larger text of this particular issue of *The New Age*. As mentioned above, anonymous literary criticism, a letter to the editor, and a poem round out Hastings’ contributions to the January 18th, 1912 issue, and each has its bearing on “Modernism.” Hastings’ anonymous criticism appeared in *The New Age* under the heading “Present-Day Criticism.” The January 18th, 1912 issue’s “Present-Day Criticism” is a manifesto on contemporary fiction and its failings. Echoing Arnold Bennett’s anxieties in the aftermath of *Manet and the Post-Impressionists*, Hastings’ anonymous “Present-Day Criticism” finds realist novels unsatisfactory, though she will include Bennett in her condemnation. In this column, she attacks Bennett and several other

leading novelists of the time, starting with the original Scott-James modernist, Thomas Hardy: “In Mr. Hardy’s ‘Jude the Obscure’ we are shown not characters but the whimsies of two persons... They are not people at all, but a congeries of moods. The action seems to be invented from day to day in order to exhibit some fresh mood.” Joseph Conrad, H.G. Wells, and finally, Arnold Bennett, Jacob Tonson himself, receive corrosive correctives. Here’s Bennett’s: “The latest addition to the gallery of inconsequents, ‘Hilda Lessways,’ is also the most tiresome. This figure has no more character than a badly-fixed weather-vane.”¹³ In summary, she writes that these characters “are untrue to human nature, and unworthy of any man’s pen. To set them out as realistic representations of men and women is simply silly. The world would be one Bedlam if these morbid egotists were representative.” Here is the climax of the essay:

We need now in realist fiction men with psychic knowledge, in whom truth is settled, with whom truth is the ruling passion, upon whom everything that is untrue palls. If they deal with untruth, their treatment of it will detect it, and untruth detected is dead from that moment, though its glamour persist still awhile. Such realists as these may write nothing but romances; they will not, in any case, describe furniture like tradesmen, scenery like drunkards, moral and mental changelings like quacks, and toss us that for Realism.

Strong words. For “Present-Day Criticism,” authentic realism is truth, not description, and truth resides in characterization. This essay’s strength is not its depth, as the conclusions that it comes to are relatively superficial—at least until placed next to the other text that references contemporary literature in this issue of *The New Age*: “Modernism.” Both “Post-Impressionism” and “Modernism” exist in dialog with and alongside criticism. In these two moments, Hastings’ experimental mode is criticism by fictional praxis, first in answering Bennett’s challenge, second

¹³ Beatrice Hastings, “Present-Day Criticism,” *The New Age*, January 18, 1912, 277.

by illustrating her own critical beliefs stated in the simultaneous publication of “Present-Day Criticism.”

To work backward for a moment: this iteration of “Present-Day Criticism” opened with an argument about art in general: “THERE are not many moods of Art. Admiration is one, hope is one, satire is one, humour is one; and, whenever a passion rules, there is a mood of art. Love is not one. Love is a phase of temperament, more or less ephemeral-it has no relation to truth.” This establishes the modes of literary truth in the context of the search for the new, more potent realism encouraged by the rest of the essay. Love stories are out, but passion is in. Satire and humor are then placed next to admiration and hope as modes in which passion and truth are possible, more possible than in realism. It implies that satire is more real than descriptive realism. Beatrice Hastings’ works of experimental fiction are satirical, but in the pursuit of realism. Contemporary literature needs satire.

“Modernism” is a sample of the new realism called for by “Present-Day Criticism.” It demonstrates that new fiction will require more than a refinement of the prior genre, an ambition first articulated by D. Triformis in earlier years. Hastings replaces the furniture, scenery, and romance of realism with attention to form. She avoids detailed exhibitions of unbalanced protagonists and instead relies on disorienting shifts in time and subtle conversational cues to build her story. Readers experience moments of contact between individuals, always mediated by language that indicates how much remains unsaid. Instead of providing flowing informative text, Hastings makes the reader piece together the details of the story: it will remain opaque without

proper attention to spoken language, to context and subtext, and to relationships with other texts in the journal.¹⁴

Even this iteration of “Present-Day Criticism” was a response. Turning to the correspondence pages, where Hastings thrives, there is a letter by “Your Novel Reviewer,” the anonymous author of “Present Day Criticism,” and therefore another Hastings pseudonym. This letter responds to the issue prior, in which a correspondent accused her of being too harsh on contemporary novels. In her response, Hastings addresses this criticism by continuing her explanation of what is wrong with the contemporary novel (beginning her letter, again, with “Sir,—”). This is Hastings’ own summary of her thoughts on the novel: “Dealing, then, with contemporary facts and representing them with the intention of illuminating them, the novel has a legitimate place in the art of literature; but it has also a low place by reason of the faculties necessary to its creation” (286). Characteristically self-deprecating and duplicitous (triplicitous!), Hastings complains that novels are too easy to make, and are also the most contemporary form of literary art. The novel, though, is sick:

Until the Victorian period the subject of sex--with which nearly all novels deal more or less--was treated either idealistically or humorously; and both or either from a masculine point of view! The novel in its palmy days, in fact, was written by masculine minds for masculine minds. The characteristic of the masculine mind (in whichever sex it appears) is that sex for it must either be poetised and metamorphosed or satirised. The one thing that the masculine mind cannot do is to take sex in the abstract seriously.”

¹⁴ Hastings included a lengthy discussion of the of speech to written literature in *The Old “New Age,”* including an insult that she ultimately turns into a compliment: “I was once called by a certain person who shall be nameless ‘a speaker disguised as a writer.’” This emphasis on the spoken is a major component of her experimental writing, though it takes more definite shape in her tendency to write dialogs on the one hand, and monologues that interact with the reader on the other. Her satirical experiments rests on interactivity and response.

Victorian morality is killing the novel by making it impossible to make sex either beautiful or funny, so “THE NEW AGE will continue to laugh at novelists for taking au grand serieux a human relation which has only one natural justification, namely, necessity.” This declaration dovetails neatly with the statements she made in “Present-Day Criticism,” with further provisions: the novelist must have a realistic and masculine attitude toward sex, which will therefore naturally result in either satire or poetry. Hastings claims masculinity, with the subtle nod to her own identity, “in whichever sex it appears,” yet another example of her willingness to inhabit multiple identities and gender roles. She combines her most personally powerful moments with misogyny. Gendering the refusal to “take sex in the abstract seriously” sets up another paradox, declaring the masculine mind can escape the abstract seriousness of sex, but not explaining how that that escape changes what it means to be masculine. Alongside this remarkable burst of anonymous criticism in direct and indirect response to the correspondence pages, and under a different identity, Hastings included her story, “Modernism.”

She also made one further contribution to the issue: a poem. That this poem is a retelling of a story from Ovid’s *Metamorphoses* illustrates her contention that sex must be “poeticised and metamorphosed or satirised.” “Echo,” is the fourth Hastings text in this issue, along with “Modernism,” “Present-Day Criticism,” and the anonymous letter to the editor. The poem consists of twenty five Spenserian stanzas, Spenserian in vocabulary as well as form, full of archaisms and inversions, as is much of Hastings’ poetry. As the letter in the correspondence section stated, Hastings saw poetry as a higher art than the novel. This poem, then, might represent her attempt at another kind of truth presented in balance with the experimental “Modernism”: sex poeticized rather than satirized. The sheer distance in style between “Echo” and “Modernism” is enough to disguise their shared authorship, and yet the polygeneric network

that Hastings has established in this issue of *The New Age* makes this poem a corollary to the works of experimental fiction, and, as often happens in Hastings' literary works, there are several layers at play. First, a criticism of gender relations: much of this poem is a story of love and jealousy, which is consistent with the Ovidian tone of playful retelling. Another is that it may be a poem more directly tied to Hastings' own life. Stephen Gray identifies "Echo" as a poem à clef, with Echo as Katherine, Juno as Beatrice, Zeus as Orage, and Narcissus as John Middleton Murry. This may be a misidentification because of a slip. The passage quoted by Gray as referring to Zeus/Orage's fling with Echo/Mansfield actually refers to Echo's violent encounter with Narcissus, not Zeus (*Beatrice Hastings* 235). More likely, Hastings is executing a self-portrait. Hastings' own situation as polyvocal being doomed to play a subservient role in another's project resembles Echo's transformation from playful nymph to cursed and spurned lover. Echo, the mythological character, has an identity but must borrow her voice from her interlocutors, a divine punishment for earlier sins. She is also the author who feels neglected by the literary public for being too clever, too ahead of her time, and this feeling appears in the moral of the poem:

List! ere this story end, the moral of it,
 For art without a moral's but the slave
 Of nature. Though ye, who hear, such natural wit may have
 As no more wit to wish! Not to behave
 Like sly and lewd, loquacious Echo, tost
 A prey to love that was its own love's grave:
 Nor ever pay for earthly prize the cost
 Of peace of mind: since all's illusion--won, or lost. (279)

This is Hastings in her self-deprecating, self-destructive mode. Echo's wit led to violence and violation, causing the narrator to argue that it is better to be ignorant than witty. This conclusion contains a literary-critical angle: "art without a moral's but the slave of nature" is probably another criticism of the realists, who have enslaved themselves to reproducing nature, rather than moving to the higher plane of poeticized truth.

Considering these texts together, with their various levels of pseudonymity and anonymity, no single text operates as the key to unlock the others. Instead, reading Hastings balances the genres of self-proclaimed (and delimited) modernist fiction, classical allegorical autobiographical poetry, literary criticism, and editorial response, each text references the others. "Modernism," like "Post-Impressionism," is not an isolated event—it is purposefully woven into a polygeneric text of texts. The theses of the literary-critical voice are immediately put in motion in the art pieces, which are in turn both performances of genres cited by the criticism and criticism themselves. And yet Hastings writes "I am a minor poet of the first class. I have never created anything" in the October 23, 1913 issue. The next chapter will examine the reasons for this qualified self-deprecation in the context of her self-labeling as a literary freak of nature.

More on *Minnie Pinnikin*

"Post-Impressionism" and "Modernism" are such short pieces that they seem like they could be flukes. I believe they are fragments of a larger project, the lost novel that might have done more to establish Hastings' reputation. In *Modigliani and the Artists of Montparnasse*, Kenneth Wayne included selections from a French manuscript of a novel by Hastings titled

Minnie Pinnikin, found by chance in the Museum of Modern Art in New York.¹⁵ *Modigliani and the Artists of Montparnasse* includes three translated chapters from the novel, describing it in the introduction as a “long-lost novella about her relationship with Amadeo Modigliani during the years 1914 to 1916, presumably written during these same years.” This chronology does not work. The English language experimental stories were published between 1910 and 1914, but apparently Hastings met Modigliani in 1914. Around this time he began to appear in her articles in *The New Age*. Wayne’s introduction notes that the manuscript in the MoMa is in French, but speculates that there was an original, now-lost English version based on a note that the French draft was a translation. The prior stories published in *The New Age* support this conclusion. Details from the story “Post-Impressionism” reappear in the MoMa manuscript, including a description of “fishing men from the street, swinging them with his long hands,” imagery taken from “Post-Impressionism.” The stories, then, are not just surrealist reflections of Modigliani, but were probably revised from the English draft to incorporate details from her life with Modigliani. After all, each played a part in the criticism of *The New Age*, designed to function in specific moments and specific contexts. The story precedes the artistic movement that supposedly shaped it. I wonder if Hastings influenced Modigliani’s modernism, rather than the other way around.

Calling Hastings a modernist experimental writer adds yet another identity to the voluble, paradoxical, and contradictory crowd of her personae. There is an individual, historical human behind them all, but it seems impossible to approach that person through the crowd. These stories are difficult to the point of opacity, but their very opacity is revelatory, because they admit forthrightly that they will not be solved, unlike the other personae that often encourage

¹⁵ Kenneth Wayne, *Modigliani and the Artists of Montparnasse* (Buffalo: Harry N. Abrams Inc. Publishers, 2002) 204-211.

complicity. Recurring voices change over time, and projects come and go, as Hastings' interests shifted between genres, producing poems, translations, essays, philosophy, and cultural commentary in turn. Within this vast corpus, the handful of experimental stories push the self-creating and self-differentiating project farthest, harnessing Hastings' talent for creating new voices to the work of reinventing fiction from its roots. And yet, claims like these call out for caveats and careful distinctions, especially since the argument rests on a handful of stories, which may be fragments themselves. Sweeping claims fall apart during microanalyses of modernism because modernisms are particular and change quickly in time. The stories themselves reflect this as they whip through time and space without transition. "Very surprising, the strength of his thin white hands," as the narrator describes the artist in "Post-Impressionism." The stories, small as they are, have their own surprising strength, founded not in their intelligibility, but in their capacity to surprise.

Beyond the short stories as modernist objects in themselves is their further nature as components of larger claims, often built on the level of editorship. Hastings wrote "Post-Impressionism" and "Modernism" as interventions in the contemporary literary scene, a project that was first begun in her experimental editing as *D. Triformis*, and this experimental editing remained a feature of her later projects. The overt politics faded somewhat from this particular picture, but as her career continued, Hastings let politics shade her prose and her poetry, including her experimental works. The journal began to solidify its alliance to Guild socialism, becoming more and more antifeminist and anti-suffrage. Meanwhile, Hastings encountered major modernists in the pages of *The New Age* not as an aspiring writer, but as an established critic and author. Her modernist experimentation, first deployed as and alongside literary criticism, turned more directly to politics.

Hastings is a modernist author and a modernist editor. I argue that her fiction is modernist through its emphasis on form. Her stories play with time, grammar, continuity, imagery, and paradox in a way that is characteristically modernist in its violation of convention. The modernism of the stories is intense enough when they are considered out of context, but each operates within an intertextual web that Hastings fashioned for them. Sometimes, as in “Post-Impressionism,” the texts referenced are primarily written by other people. At other times, she uses her many voices to single-handedly construct texts of texts out of many genres. The participation of the story “Modernism” in the intertextual web of [issue] illustrates how she underwrote her experimental texts through editorial decisions that are themselves experimental. Half-visible, the deft arrangement of texts also operates through violation of convention, and by pushing the limits of a familiar form. That one of these forms is criticism shows that Hastings wanted to shape the reception of her modernist experiments, as well as to shape the field of contemporary literature. Her self-promotion appears alongside self-deprecation, often making it impossible to say what exactly she thought about her work. That is part of the game, though—we are not reading a real person. We are reading an imagined, public community, or chorus, edited together.

CHAPTER TWO—To the Last Detail: Beatrice Hastings' Editorial Assemblage 1912-1914

Introduction

Beatrice Hastings continued to develop her editorial technique through 1912 and 1914. During this period, she used pseudonyms old and new to advance the rhetorical and political positions of *The New Age*. As the journal's political platform extended to reforms of many aspects of life, she wrote on a range of topics including aesthetics, women's rights, social issues, spirituality, and politics. Usually more than one of these topics would be present in any particular discussion, as Hastings was especially deft in arranging texts so that *The New Age's* politics appear as a unified way to see the world. The worldview of *The New Age* determined aspects of her work even as she crafted much of the public version of that worldview. Hastings' all-encompassing scope makes studying this period difficult because of the many ties between the texts she assembles and the world beyond those texts. This chapter is primarily about her editorial methods, but the content of her writing remains important. Her burgeoning antifeminism, in particular, is a thread shared by all the examples explored below. Many of her texts from this period exist in tension with her antifeminist rhetoric, as her theses on the limits of women as writers often occur within ingenious polygeneric intertextual webs that include her use of male pseudonyms. While continuing to follow her experimental fiction in particular detail, I will situate my readings in the context of her modernist editing.

The first story in this chapter is "An Affair of Politics," because it is so obviously political. Almost a cartoon rendered in modernist experimental prose, "An Affair of Politics" is a protest against national insurance, and is embedded within a wider conversation about insurance being carried on by *The New Age*. This story is straight satire, deployed to mock the upper

classes as they face losing their servants. It stretches the dramatic monolog to the breaking point, making that traditional form modernist by infusing it with carnivalesque reversals.

After establishing Hastings' willingness to use fiction for political ends, I will turn to read a more challenging text. "The Changeling" is a starting point to examine Hastings' antifeminism in more detail. The story's vapid, chameleonic protagonist vacillates between her inherent weakness and the strength that accrues to her when she activates the power of her clothing. The story both mocks and celebrates her transformations. Dinky's Baby's success rests on her ability to shapeshift in the private sphere, roughly matching the shapeshifting Hastings enacts in the public sphere through her multiple identities.

"The Changeling" appears just before a major controversy in the correspondence pages in which Hastings initiates a controversy by claiming that women are inherently inferior. As disturbingly extreme as this exchange may be, it is likely another staged drama, as more than one of the participants is Hastings under pseudonym. This heated argument occurs in counterpoint with another installment of the Minnie Pinnikin/Valerie cycle of stories, "Friends in Council," which appeared under the signature Alice Morning. "Friends in Council" is constructed to illustrate Hastings' argument then appearing in the correspondence pages. Long term readers of *The New Age* knew that Morning and Hastings were the same person, which makes it all the more remarkable that "Mrs. Morning" replaces Minnie as Valerie's foil in the story. Fictional characters and real debates begin to blur together.

From the ironies of those editorial and rhetorical performances, I will turn to *The New Age's* antipathy for Yeats, Tagore, the Theosophists, and other neo-mystics. This section is one further example of Hastings encountering now-major modernist authors. *The New Age* objects to neo-mysticism because of its doctrine of common sense. Hastings places her own verse

translations of selections from the *Mahabharata* to show that neo-mysticism is really just mystification. The ironies here are almost as poignant as those in the debate surrounding “Friends in Council,” as *The New Age* responds to the threat of neo-mysticism not through common sense, but through intricate intertextual webs designed to give the journal an appearance of a plural and unified response. She illustrates the dream of a simple truth through a complex artifice that bears uncanny similarities to the mysticism it claims to refute.

In the conclusion, I will briefly revisit the aftermath of Hastings’ satires of Ezra Pound. A.R. Orage used this moment to claim that the new age “hangs together” under a unified editorial vision. Hastings’ editorial experiments from late 1912 and early 1913 illustrate what Orage meant. Rather than seeing *The New Age* as a Bakhtinian public sphere or reading *The New Age*’s claims of editorial power as a performance, I will show that Hastings was constructing elaborate texts of texts in order to advance her politics and social beliefs. These texts are both more monovocal than Bakhtinian dialog and more substantive than a performance, though Hastings’ performance of multiple identities undergirds each intervention.

Hastings’ intertextual webs of 1913 vary from the story as political cartoon, to the staged conversation, to an attack on poetic mystifications. Her editorial method participates in the modernist moment of the *avant guerre* through her constant shifting of the form and ground of her writing. Her apparent dialogs are often actually monologues, and her performances of authority undermine themselves.

This chapter considers how Hastings’ formally innovative stories appeared alongside her work as a literary and cultural critic, often existing in counterpoint with each other. She placed experimental stories in the context of works in other genres to create intertextual constructs: a traditional poem would subtly refer to a modernist short story, and both would illustrate (and be

illustrated by) her literary criticism, much in the way that “Modernism” appeared in the context of “Echo” and her critical writings in the January 18, 1912 issue of *The New Age*.

The difference between that intertextual construct and those that appear in this chapter is that Hastings increasingly used these constructs to advance political points or to comment on contemporary culture. Some of this was visible even in the January 18 issue, with its comments on the masculine mind. Hastings continued to intensify that line of thought while using her editorial power to influence the outcomes of not only contemporary literary and artistic controversies but also political controversies. She continued to use an array of genres to do so, deploying modernist fiction in service of *The New Age*'s politics. That those politics were extremely misogynist and anti-feminist meant that Hastings' public personae were prone to bitter self-deprecation. At the height of her creative powers, she argued that women were inherently incapable of creativity. This paradox haunts Hastings' modernist editing and modernist fiction throughout the remainder of her career at *The New Age*.

Chapter one followed Hastings' early experiments in editing and fiction. Her first major editorial experiments as sub-editor of *The New Age* included staging a conversation between her Beatrice Tina Hastings persona and her D. Triformis persona. This move allowed her to state her positions on women's rights while explaining her personal relationship to the movement. She was able to recant her earlier suffragist feminism. After this initial experiment in editing, she declared a new direction for her primary pseudonym, Beatrice Hastings: “I now devote myself in the shades to art and humanitarianism.” This was a misleading statement, as Hastings had enough pseudonyms on hand that limiting one of them could be quickly neutralized by deploying another. She established her willingness to use pseudonyms for all things in her memoir, *The Old New Age*.

The Old New Age is a pamphlet published in 1936. It is Hastings' retrospective account of her work on *The New Age* and its aftermath. It is an exposé of her mistreatment by Orage before and after their collaboration on the journal. She claims that she was “a sub-editor of the ‘New Age,’ who, for all but a few months of those six years [1908-1914], had the entire charge of, and responsibility for, the literary direction of the paper, from reading and selection of MSS., to the last detail of spacing and position” (3). This claim places Hastings alongside her better-known editorial contemporaries, and demands a space in the tradition of women editors of modernism. The mess and muddle of *The New Age* makes it extremely difficult to say who did exactly what. Hastings claims near-total editorial control in *The Old New Age*, further reinforcing that these details can be close read for editorial interventions. *The Old New Age* reminds me of Susan Stanford Friedman's “Who Buried H.D.?” in its attempt to rescue a woman author from a male literary-historical boycott, with the significant difference that *The Old New Age* was written by Hastings herself. For this chapter, her claim of editorial control is more important to establish the grounds for reading Hastings as an editor who understood that the details of editing are tools for constructing meaning. She invites the close reading of editorial details and takes credit for their effects, an open invitation for this kind of scholarship.

“An Affair of Politics” and National Insurance

As Guild socialism became more influential as the platform of *The New Age*, its positions began to have an effect on the editing of the journal, and influenced the writing it contained. Guild socialism emphasized the quality guaranteed by vesting power in master craftsmen. The transfer of power from capitalists to the guilds would only occur once the guilds had established a monopoly of their labor power. This monopoly would be easier to achieve if the labor pool was

small, leading the Guild socialists to oppose women entering the workforce, which in turn led to antifeminism in general. Ivor Brown summarized the position in the June 17, 1915 issue of *The New Age*:

No man or woman can live his or her own life while he is compelled to sell his labour absolutely and irrevocably at the market price and to lose all interest in and control over the commodity once sold. That was the staring, fundamental fact to which the Suffragists remained blind... Irrespective of these facts, the Feminists in their very righteous and natural anger with certain men and certain homes, found the remedy in filling the labour market with an increasing stream of cheap wares. Away from the frying-pan and into the fires of hell... What could be more fatal to our hopes than the sudden influx into the market of copious labour, unorganised and almost unorganisable? (151)

While Brown is attempting to be sympathetic here, his sexism is glaringly apparent in his assessment of women's labor as "cheap" and "unorganizable." Brown's summary appeared later than the texts considered in this chapter, but it is useful because it is clear. Other texts from *The New Age* took the political position that women should not be allowed to work and extended this argument to declare that women are inherently inferior to men. This was a thesis that Hastings herself would press, even to the point of publicly airing the obvious paradoxes inherent in being a woman who towers over many of her male contemporaries. Reconstructing Hastings' editorial interventions requires tracing connections between the piece and its political milieu of antifeminist Guild socialism. Hastings and Orage used multiple genres of texts and the careful arrangement of texts to advance their cause. Hastings often used satire, essays, and even mock dramas for these purposes, but she also used her modernist fiction for political ends.

“An Affair of Politics” is one of her short satirical modernist stories. It is a monologue: an unnamed speaker relates the events of the story in a headlong account. It is a transcription of the discourse of lively gossip, rendered in terms of the next stage of realism prophesied by Hastings in “Present-Day Criticism.” While conversational, it is not quite vernacular: the speaker is clearly marked as belonging to the upper class. The recitation is not interrupted by an interlocutor, and the whole story is a monolith of a paragraph. As the reader absorbs the stream of gossip, the larger frame of *The New Age* structures their encounter with the story. They would know “An Affair of Politics” is a satire of the upper class reaction to the implementation of the National Insurance Act of 1911.

The National Insurance Act was the foundation of the welfare state in England. It required anyone below a certain income threshold of 160 pounds a year to contribute to a national fund for both health insurance and unemployment insurance that would be matched by employers and taxpayers at different rates. These payments would be tracked by stamp books, and fines would be levied against violators. Employers of servants objected to this system foisted on them by the Liberal Lloyd George government, as did *The New Age*, though for different reasons. Orage’s “Notes of the Week” emphasize that compulsory insurance will undermine the foundations of individual liberty in England. *The New Age* often found itself at odds with the Liberals, seeing them as perpetuating a fundamentally broken economic system. As revolutionaries, the Guild socialists saw their ultimate goal as the overthrow of the wage system. They saw any redistribution of wealth that did not give the workers a proportionate share of profits as inadequate and ultimately harmful. Increasing benefits allowed employers to keep wages low. Orage’s Notes of the Week from this issue describe the chaos over insurance reform.

Hastings illustrates further consequences of the insurance act in the grotesquerie of modernist satire, using experimental fiction as a kind of prose analog to the political cartoon.

“An Affair of Politics” is a portrait of one of these employers who is currently at odds with the government and the serving class. The story opens with opacity typical of Hastings’ experimental writing: “Well, I said, I could have two boys instead of *one* of each of the two maids and put them to sleep in the harness room the ventilation is perfect but solve the problem I shall it’s shameful!” begins the protagonist. Readers would know that boys under 16 would be exempt from the insurance rolls, as would anyone over the age of 70. This is the first hint about the content of the story. It is an account of the aftermath of trying to host a conservative political gathering while simultaneously attempting to avoid paying into the national insurance rolls by staffing the house entirely with people who are either too old or too young to require contributions. The monologue continues: “Guy said well let me know dear when you’ve quite decided but boys and old women are not everybody’s fancy which was good news to me I thought the Act would have snapped them all up already before I knew they weren’t under it though in that case I should have tried for girls and old men, pay--*never* that’s all” (67). This passage includes Guy’s own speech filtered through the speaker, who he both humors and needles. The speaker wonders what she would have done had boys and old women been protected under the law, thinking she would hire whoever else might have been excluded from it. Guy’s risqué implications of “everyone’s fancy” invokes the moral corruption of the ruling classes. It is also a moment that emphasizes the silliness of the speaker. *The New Age* lets the subtext of women’s incapacity for politics carry the story, an irony heightened by the fact that the story is signed by Alice Morning. Hastings intends this irony to heighten the humor in the speaker’s insistence that the political meeting she is hosting, presumably resisting the Insurance

Act, is a great cause: “the Cause was too admirable and we mustn’t be beaten by Liberal chauffeurs!” There’s a possible double entendre here, as “chauffeur” means “stoker” in French. If so, the speaker associates the Liberal government with servants while accusing them of stoking tensions between the classes.

So much for the first layer of politics. Making fun of the upper class and its pretensions to “principles” is standard *New Age* fare. Most of this story is a variation on the recurring theme that the upper classes justify their avarice by arguing about principles. The fact that *The New Age* also opposes the Act in question is in the background. Eventually, the situation in “An Affair of Politics” deteriorates into slapstick, as conservatives damp with rain find themselves accidentally eating in the servant’s dining room, which leads to the servants being sent off to the main dining room in a carnivalesque reversal. Things continue to devolve, until by the end of the story the speaker’s obstinate declaration that “Principles at Stake would never let me pay” is contrasted to the chaos that ensues when a household relies on boys and old drunken women. The old woman attempts to quit, claiming that she is ready to go to prison rather than sleep on the couch that has been prepared for her.

The breathlessness of the speaker, the lack of interruptions, and the positioning of the reader as a sympathetic listener who is unable to get a word in edgewise all heighten the satire, and press against the conventions of fiction. The utter lack of a response is perhaps the most unusual formal detail. With no character within the story to play the listener, the reader fills that role in silence. As Hastings and *The New Age* made appeals to the readership, there is a constant tension between their democratic goals and their exclusionary rhetoric and, potentially, exclusionary formal practices. “An Affair of Politics” is notable because it is experimental, but it does not appear to involve any of the characters from the Minnie Pinnikin/Valerie stories. While

this story is not apparently part of Hastings' main modernist project, it reflects many of those stories' developing characteristics. The speaker of "An Affair of Politics" is a misguided and muddled woman trying to navigate politics as it enters the domestic sphere, and her utter failure is the source of the story's humor. Although this story is primarily about National Insurance, it participates in a shift in Hastings' fiction that increasingly represents women as frivolous and incompetent. Her next piece of modernist social commentary will return to these themes in a less brashly political, more intimate scene.

"The Changeling" in *The New Age*

"The Changeling" is the next modernist short story by Hastings to appear in *The New Age* after "An Affair of Politics." The plot of the story is simple: a woman sits in front of her mirror and agonizes over her new relationship with a man, Dinky. After a solo drink or two, Dinky's baby reassures herself by reveling in her store-bought clothes and other comfortable commodities. Under their influence, she undergoes a metamorphosis from what she calls "the real child" into "only Dinky's Baby." Dinky's Baby is beyond self-doubt, elegant, arch, beautiful in her velvet coat which gives her "real white velvet mannequin *hauteur*." Then, Dinky comes home and is dazzled by the beauty of Dinky's Baby. They kiss and fuss, and she goes through several more transformations between the real child and Dinky's Baby. She undergoes a further transformation when reading an inspirational religious text in the bath, becoming a holy virgin and planning to enter a nunnery. The story pronounces an ironic verdict over her inconsistency when Dinky comes back from a bath and almost catches her in that holy moment: "Do not ask why, when the bath was over, the knock at the door turned her once more into Dinky's Baby. She was a changeling, and you can't explain changelings." The story of Dinky's Baby's

shapeshifting in the cozy domestic sphere is not obviously political, but that apparent lack of context is an aspect of its politics: Dinky's Baby is apathetic, apolitical, a creature of appetites. After reading several scholarly interpretations of the story which focus on its function as a narrative a clef, I will show how the story illustrates Hastings' theory of feminine sexual power. The story dramatizes the kinds of shapeshifting Hastings performs in the public sphere on the domestic sphere, simultaneously commenting on each. These comments set up her next major editorial experiment.

Several critics and scholars have attempted to explain "The Changeling." Katherine Mansfield's biographer, Anthony Alpers, offers one solution (qtd. in Gray, 251). For Alpers, it is a bitter portrait of Mansfield at her mirror. Carey Snyder returns to this reading in "Katharine Mansfield and the *New Age* School of Satire," arguing that "Hastings personalized the attack in the January 2, 1913, issue of *The New Age*, in a piece called "The Changeling," which satirized Mansfield as vain, vacuous, and fickle" (146). Snyder uses this to criticize positive readings of the Hastings-Mansfield relationship:

If we read Hastings's transformation from mentor to smear artist as evidence of what has been characterized as her "bitchiness" or "malice," we risk reproducing the sexism that crops into Hastings's portrait of Mansfield. Conversely, if we repress this side of the Hastings-Mansfield relationship, we risk casting the mentorship in too idealistic a light. (146)

It is difficult to say for certain that this is a story a clef. Stephen Gray is skeptical of the identification of "The Changeling" and Mansfield: "it is and it isn't," about Mansfield, "the décor is all wrong, for a start... Mansfield and Murry... could not afford such silly flapper luxuries" (251). Gray may be correct, even if his evidence is mostly circumstantial. When the

story is placed in the context of Hastings' other writings, two distinct sides emerge. Even as Dinky's Baby is sketched as inconsistent, vapid, and vain, she is also successful, using her adaptability to attain a comfortable standard of living.

Dinky's Baby only uneasily inhabits this domestic space: as Dinky's Baby worked her way up through society, she ends as an artist's model, suddenly transformed by Dinky's gaze into "A willing Vashti... Venus' double." She is not convinced to stay with him until she takes stock of how much he is willing to pay to keep her, but is reassured by the commodities he has acquired for her: "Yet, to convince herself, she took a look round the room, strewn with hats and a pink bed and little ducky boots and the best cigarettes and ever so many perfumes with the spray tops she had always coveted. With a weeny sigh of security, she smiled back to the mirror. Yes, he was a coming genius, and a catch in every sense of the word" (212). The commodities that surround her are, at least for a moment, able to convince her that she is "in love," and they allow her recognize her own face in the mirror. The white velvet coat is the most important piece in this self-identification. When she puts it on, her childishness melts away, leaving a perfect mannequin in the place of her former humanity. Her clothes allow her to evacuate her personality, replacing it with a personality designed to consume and to be consumed. She lives cyclically, moving from Dinky's Baby to the "real child" and back. It is easy to be distracted by the empty-headed superficiality of Dinky's Baby, and certainly there is a lot of nastiness in her characterization. Within Hastings' antifeminist understanding of women trading on sex to acquire the things they need, Dinky's Baby is a success. She has all the nice things she wanted, and got them by cultivating this shapeshifting persona. It is a portrait of femininity victorious: a "willing Vashti" who manages to move between multiple partners and acquire security. The

pseudonymous nature of the story must have created an appearance of a coalition of antifeminist women at *The New Age*.

A later essay by Beatrice Hastings continues in the line of the enigmatic “Changeling” by clinically diagnosing what she saw as the problem with the women of her day, and locates the problem in women’s desire for equality with men. She explains this in an editorial, part of a series headed “Feminism and Common Sense.” This entry appears in *The New Age* of July 17, 1913. In it, she specifically blames the degeneration of women on the degeneration of fashion: “Mrs. Humphry Ward was lately jeered at in ‘Votes for Women’ as suggesting a return to the poke bonnet and flounces, but a woman in a poke bonnet and flounces was a charming mystery” (342). She goes on to use the ability to wear clothes and cultivate this mystery as a skill that is debased by the quick changes in sartorial fashion: “the modern milliner and tailor are merciless, creating for the few, and knowing well that the many will imitate without personal consideration. I should say that the craft of wearing clothes is pretty well lost to-day: we are all too busy putting them on!” (343). This editorial goes on to savage the suffragettes, but it also is an important corollary to how “The Changeling” dramatizes the moments when Dinky’s Baby flickers between consumer and product, human and mannequin. It is not just the coat that catalyzes her transformation, but the way she wears the coat.

Hastings figures femininity as wearing clothes with intention, using the surfaces of clothing to manipulate the world at large. Women can be powerful only as long as they preserve their inscrutability, their feminine mystique. Rather than a story mocking Katharine Mansfield, the story is partially an illustration of a successful woman. Her ability to adopt different personae, shifting from Dinky’s Baby to the Real Child, has resulted in a life of luxury and security. While this is not exactly a self-portrait, there are parallels between her editorial

practices and the domestic practices of Dinky's Baby. Hastings' public personae are successful only in as much as she can effectively inhabit their outer trappings, the fashioning of each voice. Her satire and celebration of the kept woman's lack of consistency is a comment on the kind of power she wields in the public sphere.

“Friends in Council”

Hastings uses her modernist fiction to explore her theories of femininity. These stories often interface with the antifeminist politics of *The New Age*. Several months after the publication of “The Changeling” she published her next modernist short story, “Friends in Council,” also signed Alice Morning. This story exists in counterpoint to an ongoing debate in the correspondence pages that explore the paradox of her own position as a woman and public intellectual who yet denies women the right to be creative. These letters between Hastings, a suffragist named “K.B.,” and a moderate man named George Hirst clearly indicate Hastings' extreme antifeminism. Hastings attempts to solve the problem she poses by labeling herself a freak: “the culturable woman is a freak of nature, and women never allow her to forget her accident; happily for her, her freakishness is usually very absorbing” (592). I strongly suspect that K.B. and Hirst are Hastings pseudonyms, and the entire argument is as staged as the D. Triformis debate discussed in chapter one. However, Hastings does not claim these pseudonyms in *The Old New Age*, instead naming roughly contemporary minor antifeminist pseudonyms Sydney Robert West and Edward Stafford. Perhaps K.B. and Hirst are absent from the list because this particular complex of texts is so self-promoting that Hastings decided not to draw attention to it. It is also possible that I am mistaken, and I admit the case for Hirst is stronger than

the case for K.B. I will present the argument after a reading of “Friends in Council,” the modernist short story that appeared during the skirmish.

“Friends in Council” continues the larger intertextual web that Hastings created to comment on gender relations, and exists in part to participate in an ongoing debate about feminism that appeared in the correspondence pages. Unlike “The Changeling,” this story contains a recurring character from the earlier days. We meet Valerie again, though her counterpart continues to change: Minnie Pinnikin is replaced as Valerie’s friend by “Mrs. Morning” herself. The use of an authorial pseudonym as a character in the story illustrates how permeable the boundary between editorial fiction and literary fiction has become. The debate over women’s rights in *The New Age* of early 1913 shows Hastings blending her literary criticism, innovative fiction, and creative use of the correspondence section to fashion the politics of *The New Age*.

The story records two conversations. Valerie has apparently married a Chinese artist, Li Hung, and had a child with him; but Valerie is not satisfied with the marriage. The story opens with Valerie, her sisters in law, and Morning discussing Valerie’s plans to leave Li Hung in order to go on the variety stage. In the style typical of Hastings’ modernist work, there is little textual apparatus to guide the reader. It is somewhat clearer than the earliest stories in the Valerie-Minnie Pinnikin cycle because it has a role to play in Hastings’ ongoing antifeminist commentary in *The New Age*. Some of this is directly referenced, as when “Miss Morning” describes suffragists as witches:

The real rise of woman is beginning. Since that widely-circulated photograph of the witches’ progress from Edinburgh to London struck unfathomable terror to the heart of every bud in the garden of girls it has been an easy affair to persuade women that there’s

nothing but disaster in becoming a suffragette. That picture was Grouped Ruin! The danger now is lest the tide of horror should sweep us too far and the next generation become the most frivolous ever known in England. (460)

Morning uses Valerie to illustrate women's abrupt shift from activism to the kind of silly frivolity exhibited by Dinky's Baby in "The Changeling."

Valerie here had once a notion of going to Holloway, and now she wants to go on the variety stage. There must be found for her some ideal between these two extremes. Li Hung isn't it--what is it? I was out of breath, but happy. The oldest sister had shrunk back leaving little Gordon quite unprotected from my eloquence. The younger one defended the cradle. You astonish me, Miss Morning, she said; Why can't a woman find her ideal in her husband, child and home? (460)

According to Morning, Valerie's search for fulfillment has taken her from dreams of Holloway. There is an intense double meaning in Holloway, which could either refer to Royal Holloway College, a hotbed of suffragist activity, or to Holloway Prison, where suffragists often served their sentences.

The second half of the story begins with Morning dragging Valerie away from the baby and the aunts in order to have a candid chat about her plans for the stage and her intentions regarding her family situation. Valerie gradually reveals that she wants a divorce, but is unwilling to sever herself from Li Hung's financial support. Her mercenary attitude is the basis of the second half's satire, a close parallel to the story of Dinky's Baby. Valerie is depicted as utterly greedy and flighty. The climax of the story comes when, for a moment, Valerie and company believe that Li Hung has died—when it is revealed that the blood is just red paint from his work, she melts into protestations of love. It is implied that the fear of losing her financial

security is the reason for these high emotions, and also that this reflects a lack of character on Valerie's part.

Morning's in-character eloquence plays a role in the magazine discussions beyond it, where a back-and-forth over feminism is developing in the correspondence pages. Carey Snyder writes about two of Hastings' confirmed male pseudonyms from the 1913 debate over antifeminism in *The New Age*, S. West and Edward Stafford. She argues against Tom Villis' assumption "that Hastings remained inwardly, in some comprehensible way, feminist, or that she simply succumbed to the anti-feminism of the male writers around her." For Snyder, the problem with Villis' argument comes when he argues that she was desperately trying to be accepted in the male world of *The New Age*:

Yet the anti-feminism of Hastings' male pseudonyms is as complex as the feminism of her female personae. While expressing misogynist views under her own signature and using Stafford to ruthlessly mock women in public life, Hastings was rhetorically crossdressing to cross swords with her male colleagues, unbeknownst to them... Without underestimating the misogyny that Hastings expressed in her own voice and in those of her male pseudonyms, I suggest that such jousting with these self-assigned male authorities can be read as a rebellious, resourceful, and creative act.

Here Snyder captures the both sides of the problem: Hastings was publicly antifeminist while rebelliously, resourcefully, and creatively inventing personae to advance the very position that would make such creativity impossible. Hastings remains formidable despite her public avowals that women are inherently inferior. Note Snyder's division of the pseudonyms by gender—I would add that some of the "female personae" are as antifeminist as they come.

Due to the scarcity of private papers by Hastings, her public faces are the only source of evidence for her views, and her willingness to create faces with opposing viewpoints means that it is impossible to reach the essential Hastings by reading her texts at face value. They should be seen as assemblages and arrangements, and treated as such. To synthesize Snyder and Villis: we know that several of the pseudonyms do indeed bemoan their lack of literary reputation, as Villis argues, and that many of them are antifeminist. We also know that Hastings was willing to use pseudonyms to stage arguments in *The New Age*, in moments of resourceful creativity, as Snyder argues. Indeed, she is willing to be resourceful and creative in order to be publicly antifeminist *while* arguing about the proper scale of her literary reputation. Returning to the journals that appeared just after “Friends in Council,” Hastings herself establishes that S. West and Edward Stafford were both personae. Both weigh in at the end of a debate that began in the correspondence pages, when a feminist suffragist named “K.B.” and a male moderate named George Hirst responded to a letter by Hastings that encouraged suffragists to give up their activism before an unbearable backlash. Hastings initiated the long exchange with a letter that appeared under the heading “Race Management” in the March 3, 1913 issue—one week before “Friends in Council.” Here is a sample of her text, which closely parallels arguments she had made as D. Triformis:

Who would have dreamed, five years ago, that scores of educated Englishwomen would come to be bodily ill-treated in prison or beaten by street mobs ? Don't be mad, women. Give it all up. The world is not to us. We cannot by any means whatever get even our due! In understanding this, and harmonising themselves with the nature of the world, women dignify their lives. This is true emancipation... (436)

She goes on to claim that women have “nothing to teach” men. This is a clear instance of the problems indicated by Villis and Snyder. Hastings’ longtime readers should have protested both her sweeping generalizations and the implied self-deprecation. The correspondence page holds just such a correction. A hostile suffragist K.B. calls attention to Hastings’ inconsistency in the March 27 issue:

I am amazed that she takes up so much of the space in your very “virile” paper by effusions from her feminine pen... Why does she not retire to a harem, occupy herself with her children, and leave the higher matters of philosophy, politics, and the arts to him, who alone is truly wise and great—Man!? Can it be that she regards herself as ‘not truly feminine’ and one of the rare exceptions to the mass of unintelligence in which the rest of her sex wallow--or ought to wallow? (510)

As refreshing as it is for a 21st century reader to encounter this apt response, Hastings responds, using the letter as a moment to establish both her inferiority to men and, following K.B.’s suggestion, her superiority to most women: “I have something more than a common talent in literature, and that is why I contribute to THE NEW AGE” (510). She goes on to argue that there is some sort of “fundamental difference” between herself and suffragist women, a gap that leaves her as less than a man, but more than a woman. These themes will develop through several following issues, low points in Hastings’ public antifeminism.

A correspondent named George Hirst weighs in soon after in the April 17, 1913 issue. Hirst accuses Hastings of ruining her own style in the vulgarity of her counterattack on K.B.: “Hastings is so blind with fury about something or other (probably with herself for having taken the movement au grand serieux in the early days) that she now hits out blindly with her pen, and says anything that she believes will hurt” (591). He goes on to chide her by citing a different the

anonymous author of “Present-Day Criticism”: “One’s style, as your writer of ‘Present-Day Criticism’ is never tired of preaching, is at its best when one is most sincere, truthful, and sure. Judged by this canon alone, Mrs. Hastings would appear *prima facie* to be at least less near the truth to-day than she was some time ago. But what are her ideas?” (591). This means one of two things has happened: either George Hirst is a legitimate correspondent and not a pseudonym, and just happens to cite one Hastings persona to attack another. Or, and I consider this more likely, Hirst is a pseudonym. If so, things are getting complicated: Hastings is using one of her pseudonyms as a source of authority in matters of style in order to attack another persona’s style.

Then Hirst’s letter shifts from style to feminism. He asks her to answer a list of nine statements about her past writings on gender relations, points out that they are contradictory, and asks her to clarify her position. Hastings responds immediately below the letter. Hirst’s first point and Hastings’ answer are enough to establish the general slant of the list: “(a) Women are in general the inferior sex” (591). Her answer: “Women are the inferior sex” (592). The rest of her answers to Hirst intensify this misogynist argument. However, doubling down on antifeminism still leaves the problem of Hastings herself as a skillful author, something she needs to explain in order to satisfy Hirst that she is not a hypocrite. Her answer: “The culturable woman is a freak of nature.” Then she herself turns to “Present-Day Criticism” for support, and counterattacks Hirst’s style:

If Mr. Hirst really believes me to be insincere, truthless, and uncertain in my conclusions, I fear I cannot convince him otherwise by the use of any better style than the above. I, also, will take refuge in the columns of the writer of “Present-Day Criticism,” and quote thence certain dicta regarding artistic subject. Mr. Hirst’s own letter appears to me none

too suave or distinguished by beautiful expressions. I note, moreover, that his few personal statements about women are contemptuous. (592)

The irony would be funny if its use was not so painful: Hirst and Hastings both cite a Hastings persona as an arbiter of style. This alone is enough to make a seasoned reader of Hastings suspicious, but the use of “au grand serieux” further makes Hirst seem like a Hastings pseudonym. “Au grand serieux” appears five times in *The Modernist Journals Project*. The first time was in the January 18th, 1912 letter to the editor written anonymously by Hastings, discussed in chapter one. The second use is in an anonymous review that appeared that February. Hirst’s use is the third. The fourth and fifth appear in Alice Morning’s writings 1915. Three out of five uses are definitely Hastings, and the other two are likely Hastings as well. While this observation is hardly a smoking gun, it might indicate that Hastings is up to her Triformis tricks again. As in the Triformis debate, the early 1913 controversies serve primarily as a platform for Hastings to renounce her earlier feminism. She also intensifies her anti-feminism to the highest pitch, while also managing to exclude herself from it by arguing that she is an exception. While much of this correspondence is a construction, outside readers responded. Suffragist Nina Boyle, the first woman to stand for election to the House of Commons, neatly refutes Hastings’ complaints that women do not like her literary work: “if the specimen you published last week is a good sample of her style, the admiration of some men and the reprobation of most women are very happily accounted for” (19). Hastings responds with a nasty attack, and the argument among Hastings, her pseudonyms, and real correspondents continues for several weeks. This is where I will leave this particular conversation.

The relationship between these heated, complex, and frustrating exchanges in the correspondence pages and “Friends in Council” is the way the two fictions call attention to the

binaries of form and content, or, to shift the emphasis slightly, style and rhetoric. While “Friends in Council” is itself a study of Valerie’s frivolity as contrasted with Miss Morning’s good sense, it is written in an innovative modernist style, and the author is a main character. Meanwhile Hastings both claims her talent and her limitations in the correspondence pages, staging dialog in order to carefully situate her primary identity as a literary freak. The proof that Hastings is a good writer appears in parallel with her creative use of pseudonyms, but the women in the story are fodder for her antifeminism, which in turn fuels *The New Age*’s political propaganda.

Hastings and Common Sense Mysticism

As we have seen, by 1913 Hastings’ literary-editorial project had become overtly linked to the political program of *The New Age*. There is an intensification of the relationship between the magazine’s literary, cultural, and political platform on the one hand, and Hastings’ knack for the details of positioning on the other. Moments of this unification often cut against the grain of subsequent literary history, as the two position themselves in opposition to authors who have towering reputations such as W.B. Yeats and Rabindranath Tagore.

One plank in *The New Age*’s guild socialist platform was an emphasis on common sense. As such, they mistrust mystical writers and writings, even as both remained interested in Indian philosophy and religion. Perhaps assisted by the polyglot J.M. Kennedy, Orage and Hastings translated selections from *The Mahabharata* and published them in *The New Age*.¹⁶ At first this seems like a contradiction, but the resourceful editors managed to yoke their investigations of Indian philosophy to their political program by claiming that the truth of mysticism was itself

¹⁶ She references Kennedy’s facility with languages in *The Old New Age*. After describing how Orage was “incapable of the ‘grind’ necessary to master a foreign language,” she describes how all things that involve foreign languages were written by “J.M. Kennedy, who knew half the tongues of Europe and Greek and Latin and Hebrew and Sanskrit—our ‘Old Erudite’ to whom we all turned in time of trouble.” (17)

commonsense and practical. This is of interest because the reconciliation of their own version of mysticism and their politics was directly tied to their arguments with Pound, and by extension, to their evaluation of Yeats and Tagore. Their careful layering of contemporary art and politics with translations of classic texts is another example of their willingness to use their editorial power to blend aesthetic and political arguments.

This story begins in the summer of 1913 and spreads from there into the fall and onward. At this point, enthusiastic reviews of Tagore were appearing in venues like *Poetry* and *The New Freewoman*, with the *Poetry* review written by Pound. *The New Age*, exercising its function as commentator on the activities of arts periodicals, weighs in against Tagore and Yeats. While Yeats had a considerable reputation in 1913, and Tagore's was being made elsewhere, in *The New Age* both are written off as quacks in a debate that accrued to itself many of the issues that so concerned it: aesthetics, feminism, mysticism, and criticism.

My reading will center on the May 22, 1913 issue of *The New Age*. In this issue, multiple editorial personae enter the discussion, and the arranging hand of the remaining pieces subtly influences the reader to agree with the authors as they attempt to discredit Yeats, Tagore, and others. They layer texts in multiple genres to create a larger force of argument, which to the untrained reader would appear to be the product of many writers, not two. This is also the issue that, according to *The Old New Age*, marks Orage's first foray into literary criticism: "Until May 22, 1913, the curious historian will search in vain for any literary criticism by Orage" (17). As the authors involved have excellent reputations--Tagore will win the Nobel Prize in 1913, much

to the chagrin of *The New Age*--the machinations of *The New Age*'s editorial team are thrown into stark relief.¹⁷

Hastings initiates the attack on mysticism as the anonymous author of "Present-Day Criticism." She criticizes to the boom in what were essentially mystical self-help guides, claiming that Americans and women are especially vulnerable to their appeal. Her assault on new mystics sweeps up theosophists, suffragists, philosophers, and poets:

The recent judgment given against the woefully fallen Theosophical Society will in all probability paralyse the tentacles of this particular octopus, though its dying spasms may be even more malignantly directed than those of the suffragettes. But in our opinion the influence over the feeble-minded of quacks like Messrs. Yeats, Carpenter, and Tagore, is scarcely less pernicious than the more audacious and despotic humbug of Mrs. Besant and Mr. Leadbeater. (88)

The sensible critic of "Present-Day Criticism" implies that being hoodwinked by cheap mystics could be fatal, though this should be taken as a playful suggestion. The anonymous persona offers the proper antidote: "There is only one refuge today from the prevalent occultistical poisoners; this is at the sources of the mysteries. Go to the sources. Here, you will find nothing more or less mysterious than the admonition 'Know Thyself.'" This line of thought continues: "No, here is nothing soporific, dreamy, balmy, and pestilent, but an intellectual exposition of Man."

Paired across the page to prove that there is nothing unusual in mystical texts, is a verse translation from *The Mahabharata* signed by Beatrice Hastings, one of a series of at least four. The title over the translated passage is "Thou Shalt Not Kill." The quotation of the

¹⁷ During my immersion project May 22, 1913 was the first time I noticed cross-issue coordination, so this section is an account of my coming of age in *The New Age*.

Decalogue in the title of the translation functions to make it more familiar. The wisdom of *The Mahabharata* and the Old Testament are given equal weight. However, the argument of the title does not match the treatment of the selection from the *Mahabharata*. The title “Thou Shall Not Kill” is an almost violent oversimplification of the dialog transcribed in the translated passage. In this passage, a king and a sage debate capital punishment. Wisdom is clearly on the sage’s side, as he advocates tolerance and forgiveness over harsh justice, because people imitate their superiors. Thus the actions of the king will resonate through the private behavior of the people. “Thou Shalt Not Kill,” but not because of morality: thou shalt not kill for practical, commonsense reasons of kingship and culture. *The Mahabharata* provides a precedent for *The New Age*’s style of politics.

While mystics like Tagore, Yeats, and the Theosophists Besant and Leadbetter are lumped together here, *The New Age* pays special attention to Evelyn Underhill, an Anglo-Catholic mystic who wrote bestselling works, *Immanence* is panned soundly in a review on page 93, probably by Hastings: “Why ever were women allowed to know anything about the soul? They will never make anything of a mystery except an excuse for an orgy.” This sample establishes how the antifeminist thread of *The New Age* gets entangled with their anti-mystical thread. Whether written by Hastings or not, the jarring contrast between this review and the public identity of the translator of “Thou Shalt Not Kill” reminds one of the George Hirst letters.

Many of Hastings’ points are reiterated by Orage in the column immediately following “Present-Day Criticism,” his own “Readers and Writers.” While this column ranges more widely than Hastings’, it takes considerable time to comment on their mutual targets, especially Tagore and Yeats. Orage establishes similar reasons for disliking them, including an account of

receiving an invitation to a Tagore reading, which he declines because of a bad prior experience at a Yeats reading:

I myself received an invitation, but my ears, among other things, would not permit me to accept it. They told me, truly enough, that they were not yet to be trusted to judge in matters of literature. Without a good deal more training than mere education provides, our ears are much less reliable as critics of style than our eyes. Abracadabra may be made to sound well... I have heard Mr. Yeats chant a "poem" in the voice of an oracle delivering the Sibylline... and when I came afterwards to read the lines myself, the imposition on my ears was exposed. Until, then, I can read with my ears as well as with my eyes they shall mew their inexperience in private practice. (89)

Orage denies that the affective power of a reading has any value. Poetry readings are tricks akin to séances and other spiritualist events. While not denying that responses to mystical literature can be powerful, he considers them too fleeting to analyze, and therefore misleading and even malignant. Part of the danger of oral poetry is that it is difficult to process spoken language. This aligns closely with Hastings' claims in "Present-Day Criticism" that mysticism is the art of making simple things overly complicated for dramatic effect. Emotion is not to be trusted. Intellect is.

The conclusion of "Readers and Writers" is even more overtly parallel, as each column shares fundamental conclusions about the value of mystical art:

Spiritual experiences demand silence or command language. They cannot be related in terms of dog-runs and busy flats. And to Miss Underhill the story should be told of the reply of the young initiate who was asked about what he felt when the "Truth" was revealed to him. "A fool," he said, "for not having seen it before." The most esoteric

thing in the world is commonsense; the most simple, the most obvious, and the most incommunicable. All true Mysticism is summed up in it. The rest is vapours when it is nothing worse.

This statement links mystical power and common sense even more tightly than Hastings had before. The cluster of articles holds together as a tight node, creating a special zone of influence at the heart of the journal. Translation, criticism, and review come together to make a philosophical and political point. This sort of combination of texts in various genres for specific ends will be overtly acknowledged in order to justify Hastings' satires of Pound.

The New Age Hangs Together

Hastings' intense satires of Ezra Pound's simultaneous series of essays on French poetry have been discussed by several scholars including Ann Ardis and Carey Snyder. In the November 13, 1913 issue of *The New Age*, Orage, writing under pseudonym R.H.C., defended his decision to allow Hastings' T.K.L. persona to mock Pound even as his articles were appearing: "Was it right, I have been asked, for The New Age to allow "T.K.L." to "mimick" Mr. Pound's articles on Parisian writers while these were still being published? My own answer is, Yes, and with more reasons than I can set down." R.H.C. explains that they publish Hilaire Belloc's criticism of Guild socialism, and nobody thinks it is strange that they do so.

Analogously:

Why, then, should it be thought strange to publish Mr. Pound's articles and to subject them to criticisms while they were still before our readers? But Mr. Pound, it may be said, was not attacking THE NEW AGE, he was only defending certain tendencies in French poetry. This view assumes too readily the eclecticism of THE NEW AGE which

is much more apparent than real. We have, as discerning readers know, as serious and well-considered a “propaganda” in literature as in economics or politics. (51)

Ann Ardis used a slightly different selection from this passage as the epigraph to her essay, “The Dialogics of Modernism(s) in the *New Age*” and also quotes a selection from it in “Democracy and Modernism” (407 and 208-209). Ardis, discussing this passage while establishing the value of reading *The New Age* in contrast with conventional accounts of modernism, notes “its interest in staging open-ended exchanges about the social and aesthetic values of ‘modern’ writing—and its justification of this practice in terms of its commitment to staging similarly open-ended political debate, as Orage does in the November 1913 editorial” (408). Ardis does not include the sentence about “propaganda” in her selection. This may be because Ardis is invested in the “open-ended” nature of *The New Age*, and does not want anachronistic connotations of “propaganda” to cloud her argument. In this passage, she describes the journal as open-ended, rather than as an ends-oriented publication, but the examples above, especially the exchanges around “Friends in Council,” indicate otherwise.

Orage’s editorial admits that the editors carefully control the content of the magazine while cultivating an appearance of “eclecticism.” The passage lifts the veil between the editor and the reader while claiming that *The New Age*’s editorial viewpoint was not opaque for “discerning readers.” Regular readers who were paying close attention might well have a general grasp of the main pseudonyms. One can follow as story arcs initiated by “B.H.” are continued by Alice Morning, for instance. The quotation marks around “T.K.L.” may point to an admission of pseudonymity for readers who have already guessed that T.K.L is Hastings, as she later confirmed in *The Old New Age*. She also expresses frustration with Orage’s intervention in the debate with Pound. In *The Old New Age*, after claiming credit for discovering Pound, Hastings

comments on the satires. I will quote this to give a sense of her white-hot anger at Orage, and because it illustrates that there is an aggressive aspect in Orage's transition into what had been her own realm of literary criticism: "Finally, when I wrote, as 'T.K.L.,' a series of parodies of certain poets introduced by Pound, who took the jousting with tolerable literary manner, Orage, *butting in* with his flat, ponderous pen (and what a flat, ponderous, stilted, maundering, when not coy, conceited and facetious, when not plagiaristic or outright thievish 'literary' pen he had I shall later demonstrate) (6). Turning to the passage that partially inspired this vitriol, Orage takes responsibility for the controversy, even as he refuses to apologize for it:

Why should it be supposed that the economic writers are jealous to maintain their views and to discredit their perversions or antitheses; and the critics of literature be indifferent? It will be found, if we all live long enough, that every part of THE NEW AGE hangs together; and that the literature we despise is associated with the economics we hate as the literature we love is associated with the form of society we would assist in creating. Mr. Pound--I say it with all respect--is an enemy of THE NEW AGE. His criticisms may not be, like Mr. Belloc's, direct and personal, but by the oblique or the tacit, it is even more, in my view, inimical. For such as read the duel between Mr. Pound and "T.K.L." was a debate of extraordinary intensity. The weapons on neither side were arguments, for the debate was on the plane of imagination, not reason... (51).

As established in chapter one, Hastings saw satire as a more truthful form of art than realism. That entry in "Present-Day Criticism" opened with an argument about art in general: "THERE are not many moods of Art. Admiration is one, hope is one, satire is one, humour is one; and, whenever a passion rules, there is a mood of art (277)." For Hastings, satire represented a more powerful kind of realism than literary realism, following in the traditions of Juvenal, Milton, and

Swift. Her view of satire means that when Pound and Hastings clash on the plane of “imagination, not reason,” T.K.L. is the one who responds as a serious artist, through satire. Hastings could have replied to Pound via the reasonable voice of “Present-Day Criticism” or through Beatrice Hastings’ suite of genres, or she could have created a new persona for the task. Instead, she deployed the rascalion T.K.L. to engage Pound through the most truthful genre of art: satire. She is still angry at Orage for “butting in” twenty years later because his clumsy defense broke the framework of her artful satires.

Ardis reads Hastings’ satires of Pound through the incongruity of Hastings’ confident dismantling of his articles and Pound’s canonical power:

Having focused many of her earliest contributions to the *New Age* on the women’s suffrage campaign and its relationship to socialist reform, she ventures here into a new (for her) arena of debate, utterly unintimidated by Pound’s self-positioning as the “impresario of modernism.” (“Dialogics” 419-420)

In this particular struggle of ideas, Hastings is the experienced author and critic. Even for those who did not understand that Hastings was T.K.L., the persona was a long-tenured voice, first appearing in 1910 in a letter demanding reform of the justice system. Shortly thereafter, satires of the prison system broadened into satires on all topics. Both personae had accumulated more cultural capital in *The New Age* than Pound. Ardis observes this in “The Dialogics,” claiming that scholars must acknowledge that:

Pound was an emergent rather than an established literary or cultural authority in this context; recognizing too that some of this magazine’s readers would have known the identity of “T. K. L.” while others would not have known to link this contributor with Beatrice Hastings (or “Alice Morning,” or “Beatrice Tina, or any of the other personae

Hastings employed), we have to think differently about which of the two is the insider in the *New Age* circle at this point in time. (417)

Pound is emphatically not an insider of *The New Age*, but it should also be noted that he was a regular contributor notable for being paid for his contributions.¹⁸ Hastings would remain part of *The New Age's* inner circle until 1916. Ardis' reading of the "it all hangs together" passage emphasizes the journal as an antimodernist space committed to public discourse:

The New Age has been described as both "eclectic" and "catholic" in its coverage of contemporary issues in politics, literature, and the arts. Yet, in fact it could be narrowly partisan—and thereby profoundly critical of the modernist avant-garde—because of its commitment, during this period, to the promotion of a National Guild socialist agenda for the arts. R.H.C.'s November 1913 column states this case bluntly through its comparison of Pound's treatment in the *New Age* with that of Hilaire Belloc: the journal is willing to feature both men's work often within its pages, because it prides itself on providing "some neutral ground where intelligences may meet on equal terms" in a public debate about politics, literature, and the arts. Yet it fiercely defends its right to publish critiques of their work for this same reason. (424)

The New Age is both, as she claims, an open-ended section of the public sphere that openly hosts its foes, and yet it can be "narrowly partisan." The fact that this journal thrives on controversy must be taken into account. Orage claimed neutrality in 1907, but by 1913, it is not a neutral

¹⁸ Pound deeply respected Hastings as an author and critic, a fact best illustrated by a brief mention of her in an essay in the February 25 1915 issue of *The New Age*. After arguing "So far as I know there are only two writers of prose fiction of my decade whom anyone takes in earnest. I mean Mr. Joyce and Mr. D.H. Lawrence," he follows with a footnote. The footnote reads: "A critic, whom I respect, frequently quotes a pseudonymous romance--"The Maid's Comedy"--which I have unfortunately never read" (452). Note the misplacement of the apostrophe of *The Maids' Comedy*. I suspect that Pound, having not read the rather conventional *Maids' Comedy*, believed that the selections from *Minnie Pinnikin* are actually from *The Maids' Comedy*.

ground at all, and the journal is established enough to openly state that it had a defined propaganda.

Ardis characterizes *The New Age* as opposed to and “profoundly critical of the modernist avant-garde,” but I read the journal as an active participant in the avant-garde if one conceives of it as a diverse and contentious category, as does Ardis elsewhere in *Modernism and Cultural Conflict*. *The New Age* did want to usher in new modernist art, but only on its own terms. It considered itself an incubator for talent, a place to develop and shape a new wave of authors. Hastings must be understood as a combative and ambitious modernist author. She debated and reviewed literature not merely as a critic, but as a fellow practitioner and competitor. Through her modernist stories and careful arrangement of texts, *The New Age* advanced a modernism that was based on experiments mediated by representation and common sense, and commonly deployed for satirical and political purposes. The editors hosted dynamic debates about aesthetics, but by 1913 Hastings and Orage were working both openly and just behind the veil of editorial convention to convince their readers to agree with their conclusions. Pieces that disagreed with their politics and their political aesthetics were arranged, criticized, and satirized to minimize the chance that a reader would wander too far from *The New Age*'s party line.

Faith Binckes includes a brief note in response to Ann Ardis' reading of passage above in her book *Modernism, Magazines, and the British Avant-Garde*. While primarily concerned with *Rhythm* and *The Blue Review*, Binckes takes a moment in her conclusion to comment on the nature of *The New Age*'s modernism:

...the position of the *New Age* as a harbinger of modernism proper necessarily skims issues complicating the formation of that position, notably its own contingency, its competition with surrounding periodicals, and its policy of controversy... this has been

read as a strong indication that there was a coherent, albeit combative and emergent, unity at work within the publication. Perhaps the value of the *New Age*, or even of the “modernism” it represents, seems threatened by the idea that this might not have entirely been the case. And yet, as this study has hoped to demonstrate, it is equally productive and important to modernist histories that we see the other interpretations available within such an editorial defense. These should include its self-advertising, competitive, and above all performative, function. After all, this is a statement that seeks to assert a particular relationship between the “apparent” and the “real,” presenting editorial authority as a guarantee that a particular interpretation of the publication is that publication’s reality, in spite of the evidence—which is presented as misleading appearance—of the “eclecticism” of its actual contents. (203)

Binckes observes that R.H.C.’s lifting of the veil between the editors and their readers is a performative act, and doubts that the performance reflects the reality of the publication. For Binckes, the essay is an attempt to hedge against the possibility that the real eclecticism of the journal would lead it to appear out of control. This reading is an important reminder that even the many-voiced Hastings could not truly dominate their readers, and neither could Orage. Rather than refuting the idea that *The New Age* meant to hang together, Binckes’ insights call attention to the many reasons that the editors desired to appear cohesive.

One further aspect of this problem is important to acknowledge: by fusing the journal’s political work with Hastings’ literary editing, Orage’s claim for a unified *New Age* absorbs Hastings’ prior work into a more Orage-centric version of *The New Age*. Hastings resists this in *The Old New Age*: “Not only had Orage no idea how to present what he did print, but he regarded creative work as mere trimmings” (5-6). This declaration is incompatible with R.H.C.’s

stated commitment to an aesthetic program. Further complicating the situation, *The Old New Age* states that May 22, 1913 was the first time Orage wrote literary criticism in *The New Age* (17). That places Orage's comments about well-considered propaganda in literature only a few months after his debut as a critic, and may be an instance of his further assimilating Hastings' work as the author of "Present-Day Criticism" and "Literary Notes." *The Old New Age* is an attempt to combat Hastings' erasure from the literary-historical record, contains appeal for the kind of work this chapter attempts. She calls for scholars to read *The New Age* carefully, to locate her contributions, to acknowledge their quality, and to save her reputation: "Clues and corroborations come to me *mainly from the "New Age" itself*, but also, but by bit, from other sources. Whatever loose ends there may be in this book will all be gathered up by someone" (32).

This gathering (as she acknowledges in *The Old New Age*) is rendered more difficult because of her long habits of anonymity and use of pseudonyms. Tracing Hastings' interventions in the politics of *The New Age* around the time that Orage began to intervene in literature can help to sort out the tangle. Further, understanding her as a practicing modernist author resolves many of the tensions that have led scholars to read *The New Age* as an antimodernist space.

Conclusion

The influence of the editors on the structured arguments of the journal became apparent in 1913. Orage and Hastings deployed multiple genres to attack and provoke the journal's enemies. They promote *The New Age's* political program, which in turn incorporates its modernist aesthetics. *The New Age* editorial team was not anti-modernist, even as it was anti-Pound, anti-mystical, and antifeminist. The journal's rejection of certain strains of modernism

reflects its commitment to advocating social change on its own terms. The fact that these terms involved anti-feminist and nationalist politics that induced biased coverage should not be ignored, nor should the fact that Beatrice Hastings gave the journal its literary direction during the period in question. Her skillful deployment of many genres in service of particular projects makes her an exemplary modernist editor. By engaging the form of the periodical with her political and aesthetic goals, she created intertextual webs that carried forward her agenda. In the process, she wrote remarkable modernist fiction, which was in turn carried into the intertextual arguments.

CHAPTER THREE—A Flexible Frame: Dora Marsden, Significance, and Signification in *The Freewoman* and *The New Freewoman*

Introduction

This chapter examines Dora Marsden as an editor whose developing philosophy of ideas had a direct connection to the modernist texts she printed in her journals. In *The New Freewoman* and the early issues of *The Egoist*, she attempted to craft a philosophy that would avoid the pitfalls of writing about the limits of writing itself by embracing the inherent flexibility of periodical publication. Her philosophical investigations into the nature of language and the power of words made her journal a natural home for modernist literature. These investigations began in the very early days of *The Freewoman*, preceding the appearance of modernist texts. When the journal became more literary, imagism flourished in *The New Freewoman* and *The Egoist*, and Marsden published James Joyce. Her affinities with both imagism and Joyce are visible in her provocative, evasive, and arch controversies with her contributors. Her refusal to meet them on (or through) terms other than her own means that these editorials partake in many of the characteristics of modernism themselves, as they call attention to the form of these arguments even they happened from issue to issue of *The New Freewoman*.

In her editorial “Views and Comments” of *The New Freewoman* of November 15, 1913, Dora Marsden found herself an unusual position: a philosopher arguing against ideas. In a passage that is the culmination of a long investigation of the nature of thought she explains the problem with ideas: they are what is left when active thinking is finished. Ideas reify thought processes into static signs. They become encrusted with secondary meanings, until their original useful purpose is obscured:

The use of ideas should be strongly discouraged... In thinking, they have no true place... They are made up of misty thought-waste, confusions too entangled to be disentangled; bound together and made to look tidy by attaching an appellation-label, i.e. a sign. It is the tidiness of the sign which misleads. It is like a marmalade label carefully attached to an empty jar. Remove the label, and confusion vanishes: we see the empty jar, we see the printed label, and we know there is no marmalade (204).

Ideas pose a danger to thinking because they end up entangled with signs, with language that remains inadequate to the concepts that thinker originally wanted to express. By 1913, Marsden was skeptical of abstract thought, a development tied to her ongoing critique of the reliability of words as bearers of meaning. Her investigation into the function of words exists as far back as *The Freewoman* of 1911-12. As a writer editing a journal this paradox meant that she often turned against her own medium. She argued against ideas through essays. Her delicate dance around language occurred alongside the flowering of modernist literature in the journals she edited. While in the first two chapters I investigated Beatrice Hastings' modernist aesthetics and experimental editing, showing how she used multiple genres and personae to influence debates. Marsden is a different kind of modernist, though she could be equally frustrating for her interlocutors. Rather than using many voices, Marsden's modernism lies in her exploration of the limits of written communication.

Dora Marsden's journals published a dazzling array of canonical and near-canonical modernist authors such as Rebecca West, Ezra Pound, Richard Aldington, H.D., T.S. Eliot, Dorothy Richardson, May Sinclair, Ford Madox Ford, Amy Lowell, William Carlos Williams, James Joyce, D.H. Lawrence, Wyndham Lewis, F.S. Flint, Marianne Moore, and Remy de Gourmont. Lesser known voices appeared as well, including Leigh Henry, Muriel Ciolkowska,

John Gould Fletcher, Allen Upward, Frances Gregg, Skipwith Cannell and many, many others. Despite this incredible richness, the Marsden journals were not primarily intended to be a miscellany or a gathering of new art, and had few of the emphatic encouragements common in other venues of modernism like *Poetry*.

The Egoist was the third of the Marsden journals. The first was *The Freewoman*, a political journal that ran from November 1911 to October 1912. *The Freewoman* was followed after a hiatus by *The New Freewoman*, which ran under that name from June 1913 to the end of that December. In January of 1914 the journal was renamed *The Egoist*, a change that Marsden made as the journal turned away from its roots in critical feminism to individualism.¹⁹ These three journals, *The Freewoman*, *The New Freewoman*, and *The Egoist*, trace the arc of the development of Marsden's philosophy, following her turn from political writing to literary editing, and finally, dense and intense philosophical and linguistic inquiry. As an author who was also an editor, her writing was in dialog with the literature her magazine hosted. Bruce Clarke establishes as much regarding her working relationship with Pound, whose private egoisms claiming control over *The Egoist* are refuted. Thaine Stearns traces her interactions with Joyce in his "The Woman of No Appearance: Marsden, Joyce, and Competitive Pilfering," an adaptation of half of a dissertation chapter in *A Visible Chaos: Conflicted Exchanges in Anglo-American Modernism*. The other half of the chapter describes Marsden's interaction with H.D.'s poetry. Stearns lays out the stakes for the study of Marsden in "Woman of No Appearance":

Marsden's prose reflects a consistent engagement with general concerns of literary modernism—the ego and the individual, the status of the image, the nature of consciousness, and the relationship between time and space—even as interest in those

¹⁹ The shift toward egoism began early in *The Freewoman*'s run, as when the subtitle of *The Freewoman* changed from "A Weekly Feminist Review" to "A Weekly Humanist Review" in the May 23, 1912 issue.

concerns developed and evolved. Her work provides an important framework for understanding ideas crucial to the formation of modernism's canon, and we need to read her texts because they react to and significantly develop the literary philosophy of modernism. Moreover—and this is my concern in this essay—her responses to particular ideas of her contemporaries, and the exchanges engendered by those responses, help us to rethink our notions of influence and conceptions of individual genius in the period. (462-463)

Marsden's journals came to host many authors now labeled "modernist" through this interchange, the interpersonal dynamic she established, and through the philosophy of linguistics she fashioned through experiments with the medium of the political-literary journal.

This chapter will return to Marsden's early days as editor of *The Freewoman* in order to analyze the dialog established between her editorials and her contributors, showing how her attention to rhetoric gradually evolves into an interest in linguistics. Even in *The Freewoman*, Marsden begins to question whether language is useful at all. Then I will use insights gathered from *The Freewoman* and *The Egoist* to begin exploring Marsden's use of *The New Freewoman* to develop philosophy in negative that moves forward through rebuttal, rebuke, and correction, rather than through traditional thesis-based dialectic. Marsden's move into linguistic philosophy occurs alongside the journal's turn to hosting modernist texts, and shares many salient characteristics with those texts. *The New Freewoman* and *The Egoist* embraced authors interested in precise expression, definition, and the vagaries of communication. To return to her metaphor, she tried to turn the reader's attention to the lack of marmalade instead of the jar. The result is a truly modernist journal, as Marsden's editing and editorials influenced, and were influenced by, the literature her journal hosted.

Bruce Clarke's *Dora Marsden and Early Modernism* is an account of Marsden's milieu and how her position within it influenced her editorial philosophy. Clarke argues that by reading *The Freewoman* "sequentially, and as a unified text, [Marsden's editorial] methods can be reconstructed, and Marsden's movement toward a systemic philosophy of radical individualism can be traced from its inception... Dora Marsden's intellectual development was fluid, but her editorial methods, although not always transparent, remained more or less the same throughout her doctrinal changes" (57). I extend Clarke's call to read *The Freewoman* as a unified text should extend to include *The New Freewoman* and the early days of *The Egoist*. Within this larger sample, Marsden's intellectual development changed her editorial methods. These changes are especially visible in her dialogs with contributors. Clarke recognizes the shift from *The Freewoman*'s debates centered on theories and political causes to *The New Freewoman*'s attention to aesthetics and language: "It combined and amplified two lines of interest already prominent in later numbers of the *Freewoman*: anarchism and aesthetics. There is a swift diminishing of the two most prominent topics in the early numbers: feminism and spiritualism... In place of the spiritual self-creation Marsden developed in the *Freewoman* was an increased emphasis on discourse and literature as concrete vehicles of individual expression and development" (*Dora Marsden and Early Modernism* 99). This chapter will follow Marsden's explorations of discourse and literature from their germs in *The Freewoman* to their flowering in *The New Freewoman*. Marsden's own use of language changes as she reconsiders its function. Her shift to language occurred during the journal's embrace of experimental modernist poetry and fiction, art that also explored the function and limits of written language. Marsden began to experiment with the use of the words and ideas she mistrusted, relying on editorial power to challenge certain contributors who were still submerged in the power of words.

Compared to *The New Freewoman* and *The Egoist*, *The Freewoman* contains little by way of literature and art. Other than a short story by Cyril Picciotto, “A Vision in the Strand,” in the June 20, 1912 issue, none of the literary art it contains stands out as modernist.²⁰ *The Freewoman* hosted political dialog, and the political exchanges it hosted sparked conversations on the nature of communication itself. From the early days of *The Freewoman*, Marsden’s editorial columns discuss the forms and functions of effective rhetoric.

In *The New Freewoman*, Marsden was deeply suspicious of language, believing that linguistic signs were never adequate descriptors of reality. This belief, combined with her position as editor of a journal, led to a fruitful paradox: language cannot be trusted, but language is necessary for discussion. The printed word runs the risk of solidifying into finality. Marsden solved this paradox by using the unique capabilities of the medium of periodical publication. Seriality offered Marsden an escape from the finality of the printed page because every statement in a magazine remains adjustable, as long as the next issue appears. Every article is date-stamped, a stamp that is as much a warning that the words exist in a past moment as they are a claim to currency. Anything can be retracted in the next issue, and any problem that arises in the current issue can be dealt with in the following issue.

These developments continued into the early days of *The Egoist*. This led to her “Lingual Psychology” essays in *The Egoist*, which mark the beginnings of her later, longer projects. The June 15, 1914 was her final issue as lead editor. It is also the final issue of *The Egoist* written before the beginning of World War One, a war she had prophesied in *The Freewoman* years earlier. Marsden left active editorship in order to concentrate on philosophy, attempting to solve

²⁰ This story, which appears on page 94, is almost a prose precursor to Eliot’s “Preludes.” While I have not been able to learn much about Picciotto, I did find that he was active in combatting anti-Semitism, an intriguing detail considering Marsden’s own, roughly contemporary anti-Semitism in *The Freewoman*, which will be discussed below.

the problems posed by the limits of signification in a series of essays titled first “Lingual Psychology” and later “The Science of Signs.”

In his biography of Marsden, *A Brave and Beautiful Spirit*, Les Garner argues that Marsden thrived best in the vibrant social and intellectual life of London.²¹ According to Garner, when Marsden left London she lost the immediate criticism and debate that was necessary to keep her philosophy fresh, and “it meant that her writings went largely unchallenged by direct debate... the failure to... return to London was, in my opinion, crucial.” This may or may not be so, but at first it seems almost inconceivable that a philosopher so committed to doctrines of change would congeal into an “absolutist doctrine,” as he describes *The Definition of the Godhead* of 1928, the first volume of Marsden’s projected seven book series of world-encompassing philosophy. His picture of Marsden tearing up draft after draft of her comprehensive account of space, time, and the divine may show that Marsden felt the contradiction as well, or it might indicate that Marsden was willing to destroy earlier incarnations of her thought when she found a more satisfying version, as when he quotes a letter of hers to Harriet Shaw Weaver, “I have begun to revise from the beginning. I thought it was just a matter of reading through but I have now mauled the whole thing about so that I don’t know how long it will take me to put it back into clean shape” (162). This is an intense version of a common feeling, but one that she had avoided as an editor by periodically reinventing herself. At the moment of the change in name from *The New Freewoman* to *The Egoist*, Marsden saw her work as a developing process. Later, *The Definition of the Godhead* and the other books in her planned series attempted to unify and finish the process, to intervene in philosophy until she had

²¹ I will quote Stearns’ quotation of Clarke to illustrate the consensus that Garner’s biography is flawed: “I concur with Clarke: Garner is ‘often out of his element in literary discussion, and he commits factual errors that diminish the usefulness of his work’ (Stearns 481, Clarke 94n4).

explained literally everything. But doubts remained, drafts took years to write, and the series was never finished. In contrast, the journals, as ephemeral phenomena, absolved Marsden of the necessity to finalize her work. She understood that they could progress through errors and uncertainties, as she explained at the end of her tenure as editor of *The Egoist*.

Her valediction appears in the “Views and Comments” of the June 15, 1914 issue of *The Egoist*. This issue is significant for a number of reasons: first, it is Marsden’s final issue as the head editor of the paper, as she hands the reins to Harriet Shaw Weaver and shifts to a role as contributing editor. Marsden was no longer selecting which texts to set around (and set off) her own writing, though she continues writing for most issues of *The Egoist*. Marsden takes a moment for a retrospective glance at her editorial work; writing:

The exposition of “The New Morality” turned into a study of the *words* Morality and Moral; the New Freedom, into an inquiry as to what one meant by being “Free.” Far from being erratic the development of the FREEWOMAN-EGOIST has been in one unbroken line: a line of inquiry which has gnawed its way straight through difficulties where the “faithful,” the “loyal” would have broken down or turned back. It is not a “new” morality which is required, but an understanding of the “moral” in order to put it in its proper place.

Marsden’s retrospective emphasizes continuity rather than change. Her thesis appears simple: her engagement with ethical philosophy has, seemingly inevitably, led to a study of the power of language, a study of the “*words* Morality and Moral.” From beginnings in *The Freewoman’s* impatience with its correspondents’ careless use of language gradually grew the conviction that language is an imperfect medium for expression, one that is always conditioned by the power of its user, which is necessarily expressed politically. Ideas change over time, a commonplace, but

Marsden insists that her own journals should be viewed not as a series of independent texts but as an “unbroken line... of inquiry.” She also does not separate herself from the journals, speaking of them as developing coherently despite their nature as assembled texts. Each issue should lead to the next, and the thinking that they contain does not end in the gap of time between each issue.

Marsden’s rich engagement with the form of the periodical winds down when she leaves active editing, and especially when she begins her larger, synthesizing philosophical projects. Marsden explains her new approach in the first entry of “Lingual Psychology” from *The Egoist* of July, 1916: “It may here be remarked that while the earlier articles concerned themselves only with the defects of symbolization as expressed in terms of speech, the proposed articles go on to conceive the function of philosophy as the censorship of the passports and bona fides of all symbols, no matter what their medium of expression.” This marks a major turn in Marsden’s philosophical development, a shift from contingent arguments based on the emptiness of the sign to an attempt to hold symbols steady. She had written of her desire for definitions many times before. Now she sought definitions that hold in all circumstances. In this, “Lingual Psychology” is a direct precursor to *The Definition of the Godhead*, where she attempts to give the holy a logical frame. Understanding how Marsden reached that point requires a return to the beginning of her work on *The Freewoman*.

Marsden and *The Freewoman*

Dora Marsden’s first journal, *The Freewoman*, is the first link in the line of inquiry she describes in her final moment as editor of *The Egoist*. According to Marsden’s retrospective,

quoted above, *The Freewoman* should contain a transition between “exposition of ‘The New Morality’” to the study of the word “morality.” That is a bit of an oversimplification. *The Freewoman* began as a rebellion against the leadership of the militant suffragists of the Women’s Social and Political Union.²² Her career at the WSPU included daring and dangerous political stunts. She broke with the WSPU when she proved to be an unruly subordinate, and moved on to found *The Freewoman*. Its doctrines rested on grand claims about the power of passion and anecdotal evidence gathered from contributors and from Marsden’s own life, and it thrived on the tantalizing mysteries of psychical research. *The Freewoman*’s idealism is fundamentally different from the materialism of *The New Freewoman* and the individualism and formal logic of Marsden’s later contributions to *The Egoist*.

After *The Freewoman*’s initial storming against the WSPU many readers felt that they had subscribed to the paper under false pretenses. The pressure was so intense that Marsden’s collaborator, Mary Gawthorpe, felt that she had to violate the compact of a shared editorial vision by explaining where her ideas ended, and where Marsden’s began.²³ Clarke discusses its first article, “Bondwomen,” showing that it functioned by “defining by negation the individual freewoman” and stood as “a startling invitation to intellectual controversy” (58). “Bondwomen” argued that “Bondwomen are the women who are not separate spiritual entities, who are not individuals” (2). She describes their subjection in contrast to Freewomen, who are self-liberated individuals, masters of themselves. This intense argument is very hard on women, blaming them for their oppression, but it attempts to balance this blame with a call to seize real power. It is

²² See Garner’s chapter “Sweetest and Bravest of the Suffragettes” for an account of Marsden’s successes and conflicts while with the WSPU.

²³ Gawthorpe would quickly leave the paper, but her militant agitation was covered in its pages, and she often contributed letters to the correspondence section. One feels that Marsden’s project wasn’t Gawthorpe’s, whose heroism led her to different kinds of expressions. Gawthorpe threw a brick through a window of the Home Office while seriously ill to force the legal system to imprison her and demonstrate its cruelty, for one instance of her courage. However, Gawthorpe’s proximity to the paper didn’t spare her from criticism from Marsden.

followed by the first incarnation of “Notes of the Week,” an editorial column that each issue of *The Freewoman* will contain. The first installment contains a revealing commentary on the incendiary “Bondwomen” that demonstrates the cold rhetorical calculation that kindled the fiery lead essay:

It is not for us as feminists to appear unable to grasp the fundamental reasons upon which our opponents' position rests, and if they have not understood their own position themselves sufficiently to state it, it is for us to state it for them. For this reason, in a leading article which appears in this week's issue, on Bondwomen, the anti-feminists are met on their strongest ground—which is prejudice, born of specific experience. No argument can overcome this prejudice. Nothing save new evidence in present and future experience will be able to obliterate that which they have met in the past. As practical people, we have to recognise the enormous power of prejudice, and to realise that if we are to deal with reason as opposed to prejudice merely, we shall not go far. Therefore we hold that prejudice is to be regarded as subconscious reason, and it is our business to bring out the reason latent in prejudice. Only then can we judge of its soundness and otherwise. So when in Bondwomen (in somewhat sweeping fashion, because of the necessities of space) we grant anti-feminists what is therein granted, we believe we are getting not only to the root of their opposition, but to the root of the prejudice

This companion piece to “Bondwomen” is the first hint of what will become Marsden’s signature editorial style. She created “Bondwomen” to out-anti the antis in order to move feminism into a commanding position from which to checkmate them later. The move establishes Marsden’s independence; while the “Notes of the Week” reveal that even such a declaration is a means to an end. She is attempting to extract the rational from the irrational in order to revolutionize

society. This revolution will be no minor event: “The evolution of Freewomen from Bondwomen is a change so great and revolutionary that by its side, a political and social Revolution, like that in France a century ago, or the industrial revolution in England, appear secondary in importance” (3). She argues that prejudice can only be obliterated by “new evidence in *present* and future experience.” *The Freewoman* was designed to defeat prejudice by the fact of its existence, though this should be qualified by the fact that it is itself not free from prejudice. From the beginning, the journal invites opposition, seeing it as the key to philosophical inquiry. She goes on to elaborate:

After the foregoing it will be an easy matter to make clear what we mean when we claim to be an “open” paper. We do not mean “open” in the sense that we have no editorial point of view, but “open” in the sense that we are prepared not only to accept, but to welcome opposing points of view.

The Freewoman lives up to this declaration. The correspondence pages of *The Freewoman* contain many pieces written by authors and readers opposed to its mission. These writers are sometimes granted space in the main columns, as during the debate over the “endowment of motherhood,” a proposed stipend to be paid to all mothers, and which Marsden opposed. H.G. Wells was given the front page to rebut Marsden’s arguments against the stipend. This kicked off weeks of back-and-forth, including moments when Wells begged Marsden to clarify her own position, writing “I respect your courage and your spirit, dear madam, but at times I find you very far from being clear or consistent” (March 21, 1912, 342). Marsden’s positions were difficult to locate even in *The Freewoman* because she was constantly adjusting her positions.

Already using sophisticated rhetoric and demanding precision from her contributors and correspondents (while ignoring or deflecting their demands for the same), Marsden was on the

path to the experiments in editing that will define *The New Freewoman*. Some of the philosophical and linguistic concerns that become important to her later work appear very early, though not always under her own signature. The first article in a Marsden journal devoted to the unreliability of language appears in the November 30, 1911 issue of *The Freewoman*, the second week of its existence. This article is “The Tyranny of Words” by Charles Granville. “The Tyranny of Words” presages much of Marsden’s later interest in using precise language, which resonates so strongly with her engagement with modernist literature. Granville himself was, under the alias Stephen Swift, the publisher of the paper, and is now mostly remembered for how he ruined *The Freewoman* and *Rhythm*, rather than for how he made them possible in the first place.²⁴

Granville’s call for a reform of language is not categorically unique, but it is closely aligned with the projects of modernist authors that become so influential through magazines like *The Egoist*. Modernist literature has its philosophical counterpart in the line of inquiry that Marsden carries forward. The first sentences of the piece are retrospectively prophetic of Granville’s downfall:

WORDS are at the root of all human ills. By the employment of words every man and woman during the brief space of his and her existence suffers the torments of hell. “Sin,” “conviction,” “repentance”—three words taken at hazard—are words illustrating my statement. (34)

According to Granville, words torment humanity by evoking their emotions. The difference between uniquely human emotions and the emotions of animals is that all uniquely human

²⁴ In late 1912, Granville was accused of jumping bail during his trial for bigamy when the judge who had presided over the bigamy case recognized Granville at a dinner party. Granville fled again, this time to Algiers, with a pile of cash he extracted from his publishing operations. It seems possible that he was not considered a scoundrel by Marsden, at least. In the final issue of *The Freewoman*, her bitter disappointment is obvious, but she thanks the publisher. Many of his contributions to *The Freewoman* advocate a liberalization of divorce laws.

emotions are language-dependent and created by use of words: “only by language can these emotions be called into being.” They are most commonly used as tools of oppression. There is hope, though: “By an examination of [the psychological value of words], all our accepted ideas of morality will be shattered, and a new code would be evolved” (35). Granville ends his piece with a call for new and more precise definitions of terms: “[t]he want of fixity in [the word “God”]’s connotation leads to immense evil and gross injustice... A general agreement of thinkers upon the connotation of “God” and “morality” is urgently needed. Such an agreement would save the human soul most of its present tortures.” Granville’s article precedes Marsden’s “The New Morality” by two weeks. “Granville’s attack on abstract moral terms, combined with a call for stricter definitions, closely resembles the turn that Marsden will make from morality to the word.

To review before turning to “The New Morality” in detail: the first “Notes of the Week” shows that Marsden considered the rhetorical and philosophical effect of the placement and sequence of articles in her paper from first issue. Charles Granville’s criticism of religious language theorized a linguistic cause for all human emotions. And yet, Marsden’s retrospect from her last issue of *The Egoist* cites neither “Bondwomen” nor Granville, but “The New Morality” as the beginning of the line of inquiry that ends with the study of words. Appearing in five parts from the December 14, 1911 issue and running until the January 18, 1911 issue, “The New Morality” was the first piece of such length to appear in *The Freewoman*. In the December 14, 1911 issue, Marsden begins “The New Morality” by explaining that society is unjust, and living in an unjust society is morally untenable. It is not an attempt to legislate a new morality but instead to reveal the rickety structure upon which contemporary morals stand. She argues that women can transcend this structure by becoming Freewomen, the self-determined and

passionate opposite of bondwomen. The first installment of “The New Morality” contains elements that will continue through Marsden’s career, and a few that will drop away. Its first lines sketch a thesis that will appear in various forms for years, through *The Definition of the Godhead*:

FROM a survey of the progress of human thought, as distinguished from that of the material sciences, the most arresting feature which emerges from the whole is the fact that so scant a respect has been shown towards logic and definition. Opposition is as necessary as the impulse towards progress. It is the sifter, the strainer of progress. If the progress is sound, the straining strengthens it. To change the figure—opposition is to true progress as the bow is to the arrow. The tighter the bow, the further shoots the arrow. In opposition, the arrow of thought shoots far past its first-intentioned goal. So in the woman's movement, from the tension of the first opposition to its least important features, thought sprang forward to find it had struck a new and more distant target... We therefore seek to formulate no morality for superwomen. We are seeking a morality which shall be able to point the way out of the social trap we find we are in. We are conscious that we are concerned in the dissolution of one social order which is giving way to another. (61-62)

Marsden argues that her experiences in the women’s movement have prepared her to create a revolutionary new morality based on definition and logic. This is the first time she attempts to attack the problems of the world at their root. Her search for a way out, rather than a code, helps to explain the apparent disconnect between her invocation of logic and her results, as she comes to argue that passionate experience is the root of authentic morality.

“The New Morality” continues for several weeks, developing gradually alongside other pressing issues addressed by *The New Freewoman*, but it quickly attracted criticism from the journal’s readership, a sign that its provocation was functioning as intended. In the December 21, 1911 issue, a woman named Cailin Dhu writes in response to Marsden’s developing argument: “As a Suffragette I work for legal equality and exactly divided responsibility. What the Freewoman wants—unless Free Love—I cannot make out” (92). Marsden’s response in the same issue is a prototype of the argument by linguistic rejoinder that she will later perfect in *The New Freewoman*. Rather than answering the objection directly, she selects a word or phrase from a critical letter, and builds her response through appeals for definition. For Marsden, it is not necessarily the argument that is incorrect but the way it is phrased. The beginning of her line of inquiry is as much about attending to language first as it is about morality:

To the query regarding “Free Love,” we would say that if THE FREEWOMAN accomplishes nothing beyond, it will at least accomplish this: it will laugh out of existence the crass absurdity embodied in the juxtaposition of the two words, “Free-Love.” We might as sensibly speak of cold-ice or black-darkness, with a corresponding implication that there can be warm-ice and light-darkness. So only when our correspondent removes the capitals and the redundant “free” shall we feel we are, in common sense, justified in discussing freewomen and love. All love is free. When love is bound it shows the modifications of its nature which will soon turn it into something else. (93).

Marsden undercuts Dhu by demonstrating the contradiction inherent in the concept of “free love,” a criticism that will become a recurring motif in *The Freewoman*.²⁵ Marsden goes on to explain that true love and passion cannot be limited and are by definition free. Further on she argues that, because passion is an engrossing experience, promiscuity is often not part of real (free) love.

Marsden uses the spark from the exchange as the centerpiece of a following article, which becomes a characteristic move. In the December 28, 1911 issue, she takes the thesis inspired by the correspondent and develops it further. She sets “passion” as the root value of human life. Marsden’s morality is founded on the principle that humans must experience passion to fully live, and that sex is mostly a gateway to the experience of passion, not the thing itself.²⁶

In the January 18, 1912 issue’s fifth and final component of “The New Morality,” Marsden returns to the value of strong of inner conviction as the grounds of an accurate evaluation of life:

This inner conviction, we believe, can be inspired by the possibilities of development which are existent in potential freewomen. We have used the word “anarchy,” where we might easily have used such a word as “individuality,” of set purpose. We have done this deliberately, in order to make clear a truer sense of direction and a truer perspective.

Until this is done, we, and especially we women, get a wholly wrong sense of values. We

²⁵ Interestingly, Dhu ties a reform of marriage laws to her own advocacy of eugenics, which Marsden refutes in her same reply: “In regard to elimination and sterilization of the ‘unfit,’ we hasten to say ‘festina lente’! If some of the scientists had come across our sires and grandsires in the state of their unfitness, how our hypothetical existences would have been dashed! Notwithstanding the eugenists, in these things, as some philosopher has said, ‘You never can tell!’” (93)

²⁶ Some months later, in the May 9 1912 issue, Marsden reveals that her own transfiguring moment of passion occurred during a hunger strike while in prison for suffragist activity. This passage combines her desire for definition with her vitalist morality based on passion: “The greatest difficulty... lies in the ambiguous use of terms. We get bound up in mere word-spinning, and consequently get landed anywhere and nowhere. We, therefore, choose to describe an experience and label it passion” (481-482).

are putting wrong valuations of worth on things... The law and the moral code have loomed larger than the living spirit-material through which these work. (162)

This passage contains several aspects of Marsden's thought in *The Freewoman* that will continue into her work in *The New Freewoman* and beyond. First we learn that a strong conviction, one that implies passion, is a necessary step in the development of an individual, according to the Marsden's evolutionary worldview, as passion will spur the quest for self-perfection through an intensification of inner life. Then, the next sentence is about terms, calling attention to the semantic differences between "anarchy" and "individualism," and explaining her reasons for choosing to use anarchy. Moments like these turn her writing into an account of the decisions that go into the writing itself, and result in texts with their rhetorical structures exposed: in order to write about what morality could become, Marsden has to write about writing. "Anarchy" will become one of Marsden's targets in *The New Freewoman*, so her early embrace of it at precisely the moment when she attends to terms shows her willingness to adapt her stances as they evolve.

The final sentence brings us to the mystical Marsden that will wane somewhat during *The New Freewoman* and *The Egoist*, but which will revive in *The Definition of the Godhead* and its associated projects: an appeal to the living spirit-material of people as opposed to the letters of the law. The hyphen between spirit-material reveals that Marsden sees spirit as material, a phenomenon that morality, law, and habit have held in subjugation. Meanwhile, Marsden has to contend with a proposed expansion of censorship laws. In the "Notes of the Week" for the February 1, 1912 issue, she fuses her desire for definition with her very real need to fend off censorship. Marsden advocates that would-be censors consider the following questions:

Before advocating the passing of any law, we ask that such gentlemen as the above shall answer to the satisfaction and agreement of all the following questions: What is the

Public Good? What is Art? What is Truth? What is Indecency? What is Obscenity? What is Life? What is our Ultimate and Final Good? Unless some agreement as to the fundamental meaning of all the above is arrived at, wise men will flee the danger of interfering with free expression. Only by so doing can they safeguard the possibilities of the instinctive dashes for Truth which are inherent in the work of all serious artists and workers. (203)

Marsden felt intense frustration when confronted with many of her narrow-minded contemporaries. A set of reliable definitions would unravel that all-encompassing problem, but the rhetorical questions are not meant to be answered. She is arguing that definitions, and therefore understanding, must precede action. This passage also sheds light on her willingness to publish Joyce.

The February 15, 1912, issue contains an example of the method that will carry Marsden through *The New Freewoman* to *The Egoist*. She begins by reporting a correspondent's plea for a more constructive statement of the paper's goals: "It seems to me that the general tone of it is not constructive enough... I think it would be wise for you to encourage more constructive work, and to decline to publish the correspondence that is chiefly mud-throwing" (243).²⁷ She replies that constructive and affirming statements have no place in the magazine because any such statement will tend to stifle authors and discussions. She explains:

Hence our slowness to put forward pious and generalised affirmations. THE FREEWOMAN stands for the variety, the joy, and the individualness of life. It is connected only with the cause of women, because we believe women lack many of the opportunities for securing variedness, individuality, and joy. Our work at present appears

²⁷ The tone of this unattributed quotation leads me to speculate that H.G. Wells may be the author.

to be quite as much in the sphere of staying general affirmations until such time as we are more aware of the nature of the thing of which we affirm, as it is to advance a few obvious economic and political truths. The purest and truest individual affirmations, generalised, rapidly become festering lies. When we understand more what is in the minds of one another, we can affirm more. Till then, affirmations are a snare.

This is the problem of all government, if it be not government in a community of sheep. It is odd that it should be so, but so it is. Nature, which has born us all, is varied enough, whimsical enough, averse sufficiently from producing replicas, and yet our whole theory of living together is based upon our highly questionable sameness, instead of upon an acceptance of our infinite differences. It is strange. All that differs from the straight line of Up and Down we hold to be wrong, perverted, and unnatural (244).

Here Marsden uses the opportunity given by the correspondent to explicitly link the problem of difference to the problem of affirmation. Despite being an “open journal,” one that encouraged individual affirmations from all, and which then invites debate over those affirmations, *The Freewoman*'s official policy is to avoid having an official policy. Marsden reveals that she sees the magazine itself as a means rather than an end, not as propaganda, but as a dialogic space that enables collective inquiry into the nature of the variations in human life.

The solution will understand and respect difference, individuality, and joy. There is a prospective look to one possible utopia, a time when people might come to “understand more what is in the minds of one another.” Psychology again appears as the key. The subjective would have to become objective before affirmation (definition) would be possible. Until then, we are governed by binary thinking, the treacherous pattern of “Up and Down.” Politically, this might take the form of Syndicalism, after factory workers seize the means of production, and the rest

will happen naturally as they work things out amongst themselves. No big socialist bureaucracy, no compulsion. It is a doctrine based on free association, of consent—the hallmark of ethical association is the ability of any party to dissolve the association at any time for any reason.

A summary of *The Freewoman's* developing doctrine of mutually constructed conventions as the bedrock of dialog appears in the May 16, 1912 issue of *The Freewoman*. As of this issue, the *Freewoman* had an associated discussion group for several months. Readers would gather in order to discuss the issues presented in the current *Freewoman*, or a guest speaker (often a regular contributor) would speak, followed by debate. The relevant passage appears in Marsden's account of her own speech given to the discussion group given in April, which apparently caused some consternation in the attendees. After a discourse on the general faultiness of language, "The value of words is not constant. Each speaker puts into them what he chooses, and each listener reads into them what he likes," Marsden (perhaps playfully) calls for the creation of a select glossary of terms, because: "It is perhaps needless to add that there was a lack of definition in the address given by the Editor of THE FREEWOMAN, on 'The Evolutionary Meaning of the Freewoman,' and to this fact doubtless is due the lack of agreement which led to such fiery argument, and we are glad to answer a number of questions which a correspondent points out are necessary for any elucidation of the argument" (503). Bruce Clarke quotes this passage in *Dora Marsden and Early Modernism*, showing that "in these remarks Marsden charted the course of her own development toward the projects of her 'Lingual Psychology' and *Science of Signs*... The linguistic mode of Marsden's individualism—the key to her egoistic semantics—is precisely this demand for *definition* in the midst of a progressive flux" (77). That tantalizing analysis demands further attention. Clarke follows Marsden to restate the

problem she had identified, but does not pause long enough to reflect on the means by which Marsden solves the problem.

Marsden proceeds through the pattern she had already established. She prints the correspondent's curious and bewildered questions. Marsden frames these questions as arising from a misunderstanding due to the faultiness of language, not to anyone's particular failure to communicate. Then she goes on to explain what exactly she had meant to explain in the first place, that the gap between women and men has widened as men have been forced to contend with the physical world, while women have used their shelter to develop powerful intuitive gifts, including psychic sensitivities. The androgynous, ideal human would combine the two, a concept that Clarke identifies as coming from Edward Carpenter (78). The explanation makes this a *Freewoman* argument, as opposed to a *New Freewoman* argument. In *The Freewoman*, Marsden still attempts to solve problems by explanation, even as she has identified the faultiness of the medium of language. Solving that problem while remaining logically consistent would fall to *The New Freewoman*, and would require intervention on the level of the conventions of editing rather than through direct textual response. This shift occurred to some extent in *The Freewoman*, as occasionally contributors who had felt at home in the paper grew frustrated with Marsden's refusal to engage with the content of their ideas, as she fixates more and more on their form. This method will make *The New Freewoman* modernist, and makes it a natural home for the many innovative texts that it contains.

Many aspects of Marsden's utopianism will continue through her journals, but there is a major turning point in the April 11, 1912 issue, a crisis in her confidence caused by a political event: the defeat of the Conciliation Bill. Marsden felt betrayed by the cowardice of the parliamentarians who refused to vote for the Conciliation Bill that they publicly supported

because they feared the political repercussions of their vote. Marsden hardens further against parliamentary processes and the campaign for the right to vote.

In her search for the cause of these failures, she increasingly blamed capitalists. From blaming capitalism, Marsden made the appalling jump to blaming a Jewish conspiracy in the September 12, 1912 issue of *The Freewoman*. Her desire to blame England's failures on capitalism, and to exonerate England by blaming capitalism on the Jewish community, follows the deadliest patterns of later anti-Semitic politics, blaming a future war with Germany on Jewish finance two years before the war even began. Despite Marsden's simultaneous arguments against prejudice, against race as a concept, and her strong opposition to eugenics, she enters the anti-Semitic conversation occurring in magazines like *The New Witness*, described by Villis in his chapter "The *New Age*, the *New Witness*, and the Jews" (145-173). Marsden would have illustrated Villis' argument better than Orage. Villis argues that "*The New Age* was not programmatically anti-Semitic... but it tried to set itself up as a free, 'manly,' unsentimental arena of discussion where such views could be aired with impunity. This led to a mixing of cultural modernism with anti-Semitism in its pages, which provided a precedent and context for the later political and cultural ideas of Wyndham Lewis, Ezra Pound, and T.S. Eliot" (145). Marsden's involvement is less circuitous. Her overt anti-Semitism last appears in the July 15, 1913 issue of *The New Freewoman*. The issue fades out of Marsden's contributions to *The New Freewoman* and *The Egoist* with no clear explanation or statement of why it has ceased to concern her, which is hardly a surprise with Marsden.

If there is any shadow of a recantation of her anti-Semitism, it comes when Marsden rejects her own use of national types, discussed below, though her self-correction centers on Americans—her last anti-Semitic remark I have found occurs in the "Views and Comments" of

the September 1, 1913 issue, and her rejection of national types occurs in the “Views and Comments” of the November 15 issue. Marsden’s anti-Semitism in *The Freewoman* and *The New Freewoman* places her squarely in the milieu of anti-Semitic periodicals described by Tom Villis in *Reaction and the Avant-Garde*. While Villis does not mention Marsden or her journals, his analysis of anti-Semitism in *The New Age* demonstrates connections between syndicalism, anti-suffragism, anti-Semitism and modernist art. All these ingredients are present in the late *Freewoman* and the early *New Freewoman*. Clarke defends Marsden’s individualism from its parallels to fascism by arguing “Marsden’s philosophical egoism develops toward a linguistically mediated and relativized version in her *Science of Signs*” (43). She developed away from her most disturbing moments, but it is odd that Clarke does not mention her anti-Semitism, despite his extensive and detailed readings of *The Freewoman* and *The New Freewoman*. Pointing to development does not mean one should ignore the preconditions of that development.²⁸

When *The Freewoman* finally collapsed, Marsden did not blame Granville and the failure of Stephen Swift, but the combination of financial pressures and her own exhaustion. The paper folded because it had a “creed,” though this particular editorial valediction does not explain what exactly the creed was, only that the “cause” is the reason it failed.

The measure of vitality which has characterised THE FREEWOMAN has not been accidental. It has stood for so much energy expended. The editorial work has not been easy. We have been hemmed in on every side by lack of funds. We have, moreover, been promoting a constructive creed, which had not only to be erected as we went along; we had also to deal with the controversy which this constructive creed left in its wake. We

²⁸ Though it won’t appear until many years later, I am reminded of the passage in *Ulysses* when Stephen Dedalus encounters and attempts to rebuke the nasty anti-Semitic Mr. Deasy; it was printed in the January-February 1919 issue of *The Egoist*. Could it be an implicit comment on Marsden? She would probably endorse Dedalus’ remark: “History,” Stephen said, “is a nightmare from which I am trying to awake” (19).

have never accepted the notion that the editorial chair was that of a privileged pulpit from which opinions might issue unchallenged. (402)

Even this farewell has elements of the rejoinder, an answer to the critics who had complained that the journal was not constructive enough. Marsden describes *The Freewoman's* cause as a structure "erected as we went along," emphasizing the process rather than the product. Her next journal, *The New Freewoman*, will reject causes altogether, instead relying on process and dialog to build its positions.

The New Freewoman's Negative Philosophy

The New Freewoman first appeared on June 15, 1913, after a gap of eight months from the last issue of *The Freewoman* in October, 1912. In this first issue, Marsden took the methods developed in *The Freewoman* and made them the core of the journal's philosophy. *The New Freewoman* was dialogic, interactive, and responsive, inviting readers to engage with its contents. These engagements are often contentious. Marsden can be very hard on her contributors and correspondents, though (like Beatrice Hastings) her harshness is often couched in terms of satire (and satire of terms). An immersed reader can sense her palpable delight in turning her interlocutors' word against them, though this delight is often tempered by her serious and emotional frustration with contemporary political developments.

During the period of *The New Freewoman* and early *Egoist*, Marsden was strongly anti-suffrage and anti-democratic, as the failure of the Conciliation Bill led her to distrust representational government and the efficacy (and desirability) of the vote. Reading Marsden's journals as sequential texts shows how much she changed, even in the short span of the years between the beginning of *The Freewoman* and the end of *The New Freewoman*. To call Marsden either a feminist or an antifeminist requires a date stamp. While a suffrage activist in the WSPU,

she was reprimanded by leadership for taking unnecessary risks, and while editing her journals, she castigates the suffragists for militant activities.²⁹

According to Garner, the reprimand turned her away from suffragism. Further ripples from Marsden's days as a suffrage activist reach into her critique of ideas and ideals. Her acquaintance Emily Davison, celebrated for her courage in *The Freewoman*, was killed on June 8, 1913, after she ran onto a horse racetrack in a pro-suffrage protest. This was precisely a week before the first issue of *The New Freewoman*, and its early editorials contain Marsden's interpretation of Davison's death. Her admiration for Davison cannot overcome her disgust that Davison would throw her life away for a cause as empty (for Marsden) as the vote. Marsden saw the tragedy of Davison not as a brave sacrifice but as an exercise in futility in the June 15 1913 "Views and Comments": "When therefore a person 'dies for the cause of women's freedom' the effect of such a death is to give a crowd of degenerate orgiasts a new sensation. The motive may be,—a motive arrived at by a tragically mistaken process of reasoning—the belief that thereby others can be freed. Such is a tragic delusion. There is only one person concerned in the freeing of individuals: and that is the person who wears and feels and resents the shackles" (3).

Marsden advocates armed insurrection over peaceful revolution, trusting that determined and self-determined individuals can achieve more than masses unified under misleading slogans. From the outset, *The New Freewoman* was intended as an antidote to the kinds of rhetoric that, according to Marsden, dupe individuals into getting killed. In the second issue of July 1, 1913, Marsden uses "Views and Comments" to continue building the journal's materialist individualism, while also making an attempt to justify the name of the journal. To do so, she writes: "Nothing that is not temporal is real," in order to counter some readers believing *The New*

Freewoman is nihilist or Buddhist. Instead it is entirely materialist. It is no coincidence that this immediately flows into a discussion of gender.

Marsden explains that “Woman” is a social construct: “If we take reproductive organs away from this concept Woman, what have we left? Nothing, save a mountain of sentimental mush...” (24). She discourages readers from thinking of “women” as a category at all, and instead to deal with individual entities as complete identities. She also takes the opportunity to attack the concept of “the Race” along the same lines:

The Race is the concept formed by adding one individual to another, carrying on the process to boredom, slurring the finish, and dabbing on a label. Thus is the Race formed and placed in opposition to that which composes it: i.e., Individuals, as Eternity opposes its sole substance—Time. Our answer then is that the “Race” is empty when that which it opposes is taken from it. It is Nothing apart from the individual. The word should be abolished and a periphrasis put in its place. (24)

Her analysis both of gender and of race attempt to untie their knots by denying them, by emptying out the words. It is a bold approach, and has the virtues of simplicity and purity, but no wonder many contributors wondered what these journals actually advised.

Marsden explains how she views the consequences of the journal in “Views and Comments” of December 15, 1913, the final issue of *The New Freewoman*: ““We stand for the empowering of individuals’ we have said. Our usual modesty, we fear! We hope that we may empower individuals: we think we shall. We know we do empower ourselves, our contributors, and those who find pleasure in reading us: three admirable achievements of which the most admirable is the first. But ourselves apart we do not ‘stand for’ the empowering of any” (244).

Marsden's shift from ethics to linguistics, from morals to power, is a moving picture of a mind in transition, which was her intention all along.

Marsden used her deliberate inconsistency to insist that philosophers are not coterminous with their published ideas. Her use of the serial periodical as philosophic medium was partly intended to counter this tendency. It was a space of response and critique where ideas would change over time. This would not be possible in a book's finality. Drawing strength from its ephemerality ultimately made the magazines themselves less durable than the other texts contained in *The New Freewoman* and *The Egoist*. After years of work, *The Egoist* group brought even Joyce's *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man* into print, but until the beginning of *Lingual Psychology* Marsden does not attempt a large project other than the journal itself. Her editorials are uncollected, perhaps because they are uncollectable. Extricating them from their context would damage them too much, since they are the material of the journal's flexible frame.

Marsden makes her first foray into art criticism in the first issue of *The New Freewoman*: "During the last few months there has appeared amongst us an artist of foremost rank, an artist who is a satirist, who has revealed the very lineaments of the soul of his 'Fat Men.'" The artist in question is not Joyce or an Imagist, but Australian cartoonist Will Dyson. Dyson's cartoons usually appeared in the *Daily Herald*, but he also printed cartoons occasionally in *The New Age*: Robert Scholes uses Dyson as an example of a popular artist who was influenced by modernism, showing how his satires of modernist artists assimilated some of their techniques (*Paradoxy of Modernism* 62). Modernist bohemians were not his primary targets in his work at the *Herald*. More often, he attacked the rich and powerful. Marsden admires the power of his cartoons, but she quickly turns from praise to criticism, ending by saying that the poor should gather property by force: "and there is only one thing for the lean and that is, to get fat, get property: and it is the

one thing they will not do. The efforts to dodge the responsibility of self-defence, self-appropriation, to assume the mastership in their own person, is the unmistakable mark of the lean” (2). Dyson attacks the fat, the strong, the brutal, but he doesn’t criticize the lean, the weak, the vacillating. Marsden claims that this distinguishes him from Jonathan Swift, as Dyson fears strength, while Swift feared weakness.³⁰

The important lessons from Marsden’s reading of Dyson: she admires the power of his work, but feels like he holds back too much. She believes that satire, properly deployed, doesn’t attack strength so much as indicate weaknesses that should be remedied once identified. Marsden’s editorial is an open letter to Dyson himself. While this particular piece is criticism, not satire, it is devoted to criticizing Dyson’s weaknesses rather than his strengths. She also takes his satirical work as serious art, of foremost rank—like Beatrice Hastings, she sees satire as a major genre. Marsden’s criticism is also a response to documents that appeared in periodicals in the public sphere. Even from the start, her programmatic piece is in dialog, a rejoinder.

Her editorials are not always satirical, but they have a sense of humor. The title of this first editorial is “The Lean Kind,” the opposites of Dyson’s fat men.³¹ Clarke cites this moment as a “new phase of thought... Life is flux; it must move or die.... [o]ne type may be substituted for another, but any type is essentially fixed. Therefore, types are morbid... In “The Lean Kind,” the *New Freewoman*’s new rhetoric of dynamic flux emerges immediately in its economic variant, the flux of private property by which one grasps the virtual swindle, the institutionalized criminality of bourgeois legality” (101). In order to bridge the gap between her vitalist flux and

³⁰ By 1916, Marsden will be psychologizing hatred in *The Egoist* as the result of a lack of thought, but three years makes a very different Marsden.

³¹ This may be a reference to Zola’s *Le Ventre de Paris*, translated into English as *The Fat and the Lean*. Of course, Zola’s sympathies are entirely with the lean, which would make Marsden’s reversal all the more striking.

contemporary economics, Marsden flips Dyson, invoking caricature to place the lean to place alongside the fat as equally worth ridicule.

Marsden used the serial journal's unique capabilities as medium consistent with her philosophy when she engaged in dialogs with her contributors. As an editor-philosopher, she used correspondence as a place to stage philosophical dialog. Rather than engaging interlocutors on the questions they initiated, Marsden used their conversations as a way to sketch out a philosophy that was consistent with her skepticism of language. She detaches the terms of the debate from the issues discussed in an intensification of her tactics in *The Freewoman*. Often she deflects the rhetorical thrusts of her interlocutors in order to form her philosophy almost entirely out of responses, in negative. This process is especially clear in her extended debates with Stephen T. Byington and Benjamin R. Tucker, two Americans who contributed articles to *The New Freewoman*.

Benjamin R. Tucker was a major anarchist thinker, editor, and publisher. Like Marsden, his interest in radical politics coincided with a taste for avant-garde literature. His longest running magazine, *Liberty*, was primarily devoted to politics and philosophy, but other projects, like *The Transatlantic*, were devoted to experimental art. His own philosophy of anarchism emphasized the individual as much as Marsden's. *Benjamin R. Tucker and the Champions of Liberty* contains an essay by S.E. Parker titled "The *New Freewoman*: Dora Marsden & Benjamin R. Tucker." One of Tucker's many projects was the translation and publication of anarchist thought around the world, which at one point he distributed through an anarchist bookshop in New York City. One of these books was Max Stirner's *The Ego and His Own*, a text that Marsden first mentions in the August 8, 1912 issue of *The Freewoman*. Stephen Byington

was the translator of *The Ego and His Own*, which Tucker published. Stirner was a major influence on Marsden, who admired the Byington/Tucker translation of *The Ego and His Own*.

Marsden's ongoing argument with Byington came to a head precisely at the moment of transition from *The New Freewoman* to *The Egoist*. This final issue includes a translation of a selection from Henri Bergson's *Creative Evolution* titled "The Philosophy of Ideas," embedded in the paper as part of the ongoing argument with Byington. This argument-by-citation illustrates the intersection of her dynamic, vitalist, and developmental perspective with her fascination with semiotics. It is such a revealing text that the debates that led to its citation are best understood by jumping ahead to these final moments. Here, Bergson reveals the tendency of language to pretend that things are stable. His example is the statement, "the child becomes the man."

Bergson shows that linguistically, a child cannot be a man and a man cannot be a child—they are mutually exclusive categories. And yet, we know children become men. Bergson explains,

The truth is that if language here were moulded on reality, we should not say "The child becomes the man," but "There is becoming from the child to the man." In the first proposition, "becomes" is a verb of indeterminate meaning, intended to mask the absurdity into which we fall when we attribute the state "man" to the subject "child." It behaves in much the same way as the movement, always the same, of the cinematographical film, a movement hidden in the apparatus and whose function it is to superpose the successive pictures on one another in order to imitate the movement of the real object.... we must, in order to adopt the second [proposition], escape from the cinematographical mechanism of thought. (246)

Here, Bergson describes language in general, but Marsden cites the passage for a few interrelated purposes. First, it serves as a response to Byington, as Bergson gives her a theoretical

justification for denying Byington's plea for more clarity about her own political goals. Second, and more importantly, her inclusion of the translation of Bergson illustrates the consistency of her use of the periodical as a form that allows for ongoing thinking about and through language while avoiding recourse to solidified ideas. Bergson uses the cinematograph as a metaphor for the way language can only capture an illusion of movement, as a movie camera can only record successive images of ongoing processes. Marsden implies that the magazine itself is capable of the same effect. While each issue is printed, solid, immutable, the fact that another frame will appear in the cinematographic progress of the journal means that the texts in the paper should be read as indications of the ongoing movement behind them, not as final states.

It is a little odd that Marsden corrects Max Stirner's translator via Bergson, rather than through Stirner. She herself argues that as a good Stirnerist, Byington should have known better than bog down in abstractions (259). There are many moments in Byington's translation of *The Ego and His Own* that would have served the purpose. For instance, if her point is that individuals should try to free themselves from fixed ideas rather than trap themselves within them, she could have quoted, "If you are bound to your past hour, if you must babble to-day because you babbled yesterday, if you can not transform yourself each instant, you feel yourself fettered in slavery and benumbed" (46-47). If, on the other hand, she wanted to discuss the shifting grounds of language, she could have quoted: "Language or 'the word' tyrannizes hardest over us, because it brings up against us a whole army of *fixed ideas*. Just observe yourself in the act of reflection, right now, and you will find how you make progress only by becoming thoughtless and speechless every moment." Marsden joins Stirner in arguing that language is as often used to oppress as to free, and often its most sacred precincts are often the most oppressive, but Marsden reaches for Bergson over Stirner because Bergson makes the problem less personal

than Stirner, philosopher of ego, would have. At least in the passage printed by Marsden, Bergson approaches language as an inaccurate representation of reality, but the inaccuracies can be overcome through careful attention to the assumptions one makes as one speaks (or thinks) language.

In this same final issue of *The New Freewoman*, Byington has a long letter in the correspondence section complaining about Marsden's rejection of ideas. He quotes the editorial from the prior issue, and selects an illustrative moment to criticize: "We seem to see that the point where *The New Freewoman's* flag is most flatly unfurled and most splendidly swung is in the words, 'we expect life-data expressed in terms of the mobile. By being critical of the static, we at least create a void which in itself will force the production of a more accurate substitute.'" Byington then continues, "One who has seen many arguments will likely be suspicious of that second sentence; it so often turns out that a statement is true in its positive half and false in its negative half!" He then urges Marsden to be more concrete in order to establish the grounds for a debate. He and Benjamin Tucker expect Marsden to play by the rules by establishing topics and arguments by using conventional language. The Americans have not understood that Marsden is using their conversation to show that the conventions of language are inherently problematic.

Marsden's response to Byington is twofold. First, the Bergson translation itself is explicitly addressed to Byington, as Marsden appended the note to his letter asking him to examine the Bergson passage to solve his confusion: referring to the fact that Byington had opened his letter with a metaphor of donning a cap that Marsden made for him, she offers a new one, "The cap, as far as our memory goes, was stock size and not intended for Mr. Byington. We prepare one for our correspondent however in the current 'Views and Comments' which we hope will sit a little more heavily than the one he assumed in pure venturesomeness. We likewise

commend to him for consideration, M. Bergson's philosophy of ideas of which we are enabled to publish a fragment. Our excuse for having so to do to the translator of Max Stirner, who anticipated Bergson in this domain by more than half a century, is that he appears to ask for it—Ed.” This is a taste of Marsden's biting wit. She relishes the opportunity that her correspondents provide for its display. Byington “asks for it,” and Marsden gives it with an arch attitude. When Benjamin Tucker calls her an “archist” in his “Lego et Penso” column in the November 15, 1913 issue, he means it as the bad half of “anarchist”: “Anarchism is a word without meaning, unless it includes the liberty of the individual to control his product or whatever his product has brought him through exchange in a free market—that is, private property. Whoever denies private property is of necessity an Archist” (219). Marsden adopts “archism” along with its implied other definition of arch as mischievous or roguish: “The first thing to be said anent that is, that if it is so we must manage to put up with it. If to be an Archist is to be what we are, then we prefer Archism to Anarchism which presumably would necessitate our being something different. There is nothing in a name once one has grasped the nature of the thing it stands for” (“Views and Comments, March 2 1914, 84). This passage illustrates so much about Marsden's approach to dialog with Tucker. She absorbs and adopts his terminology even while declaring it empty, while reveling in the implied humor and the pun.

Marsden's extended skirmish with Benjamin R. Tucker occurred in parallel with her debates with Byington, his collaborator on the English edition of *The Ego and His Own*. Moving back in time a bit, here's a sample from that exchange. Following Marsden's implied metaphor of the magazine as cinematograph, here is the film a few frames before the scene with Byington. In the October 1, 1913 issue, Tucker's “Lego et Penso” column included an excerpt Proudhon describing a social contract based on mutual benefit, but which relied heavily on abstract terms

for its force. Marsden responds in the October 15 “Views and Comments.” She undermines Tucker’s approach to the argument by attacking ideas themselves:

All ideas are bad: good, *i.e.*, attractive ideas worse than the silly and repellant, because they win more attention and allegiance; ideas which are considered big are worse than those called little; and the least is too big exactly by its own size. Minds which evolve ideas are diseased; they are moving in the direction in which madness lies. An idea is a label with nothing to it: a preoccupation with nothing. (165)

That is all well and good as a statement of values, but she quickly shifts from these generalized pronouncements to comments on the nature of *The New Freewoman* itself, so that the specificity of the journal can save her own thoughts from falling into the trap of the idea. Her attention to terms comes out of a fundamental difference between her and the Americans, Byington and Tucker, and that difference is the journal:

We expect from [*The New Freewoman*] a return of definite advantages, of which not the least are lifedata expressed in terms of the mobile. By being critical of the static, we at least create a void which in itself will force the production of a more accurate substitute. We point out that the entire commerce of any journal is wholly in terms, and writers who proffer expressions in questionable media make matters as difficult as in business, traders would, who tendered doubtful coin. (165)

Marsden’s response to Tucker evolves his frustration into a declaration against journals as media. She references the immense problem that she has set for herself as an author and editor who sees printed language as a flawed medium. Later in the same column she reconciles herself to her format in a breathtaking plunge from point to point: she places having opinions above having ideas, and thinking ahead of thoughts. This leads into a section on the soul and the power of the

soul, describing the soul's energy as analogous to current traveling a wire. She calls for artists who can harness their great energy and create true works due to the power they carry.³²

In November 15, 1913 issue, Tucker challenges Marsden's categorical resistance to ideas:

Of greater interest and importance would be her contention that it is insane to suppose that people can associate for mutual protection on the basis of a contract defining the protective sphere if it were supported by any reasons. But I find none in her paragraphs. Instead, I find only a wild onslaught on all ideas whatsoever—an onslaught which I take the liberty of characterizing as pure nonsense, unanswerable because intangible. (“Lego et Penso” 217)

Marsden counters Tucker indirectly. He has not understood Marsden's objection to ideas, pressing her again to clarify her political positions. Instead, Marsden criticizes her own use of the abstract plural noun, “Americans”:

Elsewhere, in this issue, there appears a complaint from Mr. Benjamin R. Tucker, who is also an American, against the alternate pelting and scolding of ‘Americans’ of which he thinks we have been guilty. In reply we make these notes on ‘Americans and Movements.’ First, let us tell of our contrition for speaking of ‘Americans’ at all, implying that we mean a ‘people in the bulk,’ or a ‘national type,’ or some other equivalent spook, when all that our experience enables us to speak of is a limited number of persons whose letters bear an American postmark.” (“Views and Comments” 203)

³² Intriguingly, she ends the essay by criticizing the Uranian movement for relying too much on ideas, and requests art from them instead: “We should learn the things of love and friendship from those who feel them, not as a propaganda or a plaint for protection from the police, but as the irrepressible expression of an emotion of which they are proud.”

Tucker is upset because of her earlier blanket criticism of Americans, but Marsden's apology is not about Tucker's objections. Instead of dealing with them, she blows up her own use of the category of "American," which inevitably catches Tucker in the blast for using the category as well. Her attention to the limits of language, rather than its uses, comes to characterize her rhetoric in *The New Freewoman*. That Tucker and Byington relied heavily on the word "spook" in their translation of Stirner, and its use here would not go unnoticed by them, though probably only a few readers would have caught the reference. Stirner calls all abstract and unreal concepts spooks, unreal ghosts that should not frighten—like superstition, religion, and morality.

Marsden then makes one of her strongest statements of what, exactly, her intentions are:

They imagined that THE NEW FREEWOMAN was "to stand for something." Whereas it stands for nothing: it is the flexible frame waiting to be filled with the expression of the constantly shifting tale of the contributors' emotions. It has no "Cause." All that we require of it is that it remain flexible and appear with a different air each issue. Should an influence come in to make it rigid, as happens in all other papers, it would drop from our hands immediately. (204)

This is the heart of the matter, and perhaps the clearest statement of Marsden's editorial project.

Bruce Clarke quotes the same passage, using it to illustrate the "wild dialogism [that] underscores the singular editorial authenticity of Marsden's journals as cultural documents" (*Dora Marsden and Early Modernism* 104). While wild dialogism does characterize *The Freewoman*, here it is no longer wild, but harnessed: the journal attains self-consciousness in *The New Freewoman* and the Marsden-edited issues of *The Egoist*. Clarke further explains that "'Consistency' to a discursive identity in vital flux must produce a verbal residue of 'inconsistency' in the written record left behind as life moves on. In this insight Marsden's text

leaps toward a poststructuralist sense of the textual constructedness of any identity-in-writing” (104). Clarke uses this as part of his analysis of Ezra Pound’s influence on the magazine, and it appears at the moment he shifts his attention to Pound. It is a passage interesting enough without considering Pound, though Pound will be considered below. Her vision of the magazine is that of an ever-changing space for “the constantly shifting tale of the contributor’s emotions.” It is telling that this appeared three months before the beginning of the serialization of *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man*. Joyce was published by Marsden and Harriet Shaw-Weaver when no one else was willing. The passage above shows why they were willing: his novel is exactly the kind of text that Marsden was seeking, as will be discussed below.

Further on in this response that is, overall, a response to Tucker, Marsden quotes a letter a bewildered Midwestern American woman, who, to her delight, calls *The New Freewoman* “so post-everything.” Marsden, ever willing to repurpose a turn of phrase, quotes this to fend off Tucker’s further criticism that her philosophy is “pure nonsense, unanswerable because intangible.” Marsden opens her response first by pointing out the shiftiness of the linguistic sign:

With an expression so mobile that what was said yesterday flows under the check of what we feel to-day, it behoves [sic] us to pick phrases even gingerly. There is no urge so compelling towards consistency of expression as the refusal to recognise any claims to hold consistently to any past expression. It is the “protected” consistency which plays havoc [sic] with consistency. Hence the “quibbling with terms” and the absence of those old “clear notes, ringing like blows from Thor’s hammer,” which one of our “Americans,” greatly faithful to THE NEW FREEWOMAN, in spite of its defects, so sadly misses. “Thor’s hammer” is a very satisfying weapon to use when one is whacking about among words, and ideas, and other bodiless things which don’t matter; but it is

better to regard it as a curio when dealing with living things: especially bare human emotions. The point of a fine pen is often too blunt for the purpose, we find. (204)

Here, Marsden borrows a metaphor from an unnamed (and uncited) correspondent in order to reframe and reject it, and along with the metaphor manages to reframe her editorial project, and to reject much of her earlier style—the mythical hammer having been dropped in favor of writing gingerly with a subtle pen. It is also more than a simple rejection of her earlier style, because as her philosophical interests turn to language, her style and substance begin to fuse together. Clarke's typically dazzling analysis of this passage notes how it prefigures later poststructuralist thought: "It is as if Marsden presided more than once over her own doctrinal funeral, refusing to mourn for the 'death of the author' whose life she refused to protect because its death must be the toll paid for the constant renovation of the discourse" (104-105). I would add that Marsden refuses to mourn not "as-if" she had achieved authorial undeath, but because seriality and response appeared to her to offer a way to invigorate discourse that otherwise tended to ossify or freeze.

Rich interactions with correspondents and contributors form the flexible frame of Marsden's own writing in a way that would have been impossible to execute in a book. If Beatrice Hastings, as she appears in the first two chapters of this dissertation, was an experimentalist in her use of multiple personae and multiple genres as editorial tools, Marsden is instead letting the development of her philosophy guide her editorial choices, choosing to resist the temptation to make claims that will always be inadequate to the world. It is an experiment in another direction from those of *The Freewoman*. In time, her focus on the shifting nature of her experience as editor will fade gradually from *The Egoist*. Like *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man*, *The New Freewoman* is a self-consciously constructed account of development in motion.

Unlike a printed book that can only change between printings, *The New Freewoman* was free to respond and change, news that stayed news.

Marsden immediately follows her account of the hammer and the pen with this perfectly ambiguous statement: “We are not post-anything by intention.” “Not by intention” could mean on purpose, or not on purpose. It flows in both directions, illustrating her point even in its failure to communicate—I do not believe it is an accident, coming as part of a criticism of language as carrier of meaning. In any case, it works. Whether Marsden means that the journal is post-everything but only accidentally so, as a consequence of its nature, or that it is *not* post-everything by careful intention, both interpretations call attention to the way a magazine exists in a constant present for as long as it runs. She uses the image of the marmalade jar that opened this dissertation chapter to illustrate the danger of using static, printed labels to describe changing situations. Here is a slightly longer sampling of that moment:

...as to our own position, it being the only perfect one, we doubtless considered it more delicate to allow it to be judged by inference: we have moreover stated it sufficiently often on other occasions. However, here we restate it: the use of ideas should be strongly discouraged... In thinking, they have no true place. Their use corresponds to that of incantations in science. They are made up of misty thought-waste, confusions too entangled to be disentangled; bound together and made to look tidy by attaching an appellation-label, i.e. a sign. It is the tidiness of the sign which misleads. It is like a marmalade label carefully attached to an empty jar. Remove the label, and confusion vanishes: we see the empty jar, we see the printed label, and we know there is no marmalade. And so with abstract terms and ideas. Consider liberty – we have already considered it. (204).

Answering both the bewildered American woman and Tucker, Marsden argues that the clear ideological grounding they seek would defeat her purpose. She also gestures toward her tendency to leave implications to be “judged by inference” instead of stating them directly. “Consider liberty” refers to a prior phase of the dialog with Tucker during which she criticized his anarchism by pointing to its reliance on abstractions. The choice of phrase was designed to sting Tucker, editor of *Liberty*. She explains that abstractions are a refuge for the powerless, but they are not power—and advises the powerless to gather real power instead of relying on abstractions. The things described by abstractions are complex, messy, and subjective: “it is the tidiness of the sign which misleads.”

Imagism in the Marsden Journals

Marsden’s editorials that appeared during the emergence of imagism in her journals contain an implicit dialog with imagist poetry and poetics. Her tendency to absorb the texts that appear in her magazine into her philosophy partially explains this correspondence, but it is equally important that her philosophical interests created the flexible frame for those texts in the first place. Imagism appeared in *The New Freewoman* alongside Marsden’s search for a logically consistent language adequate to lived experiences of life. Imagist rhetoric of precision and presentation offered a potential answer to this question. Even as Marsden did not simply adopt imagist tenets, there remain traces of how these poets inflected and enhanced her long line of inquiry. Many of these from the years of *The Egoist* are examined by Stearns in his dissertation, which demonstrates how H.D.’s imagism in particular influenced Marsden’s philosophy. I suspect that, without the benefit of *The Modernist Journals Project*, Stearns was forced to rely solely on *The Egoist*, more readily available in bound volumes. This leaves several lacunae in his

argument, and assumptions that work with the limited sample of *The Egoist* do not quite function with the addition of *The New Freewoman*. As such, his proofs that Marsden drew from H.D. during *The Egoist* remain relevant, but there is space to extend his thesis backward into *The New Freewoman*. The major difference is that H.D.'s influence on Marsden must be balanced with Marsden's own prior writings, and also with Marsden's influence on H.D. Later this chapter will consider Stearns' account of Marsden's influence on Joyce through *The Definition of the Godhead*: I will show that H.D. was also influenced by *The Definition* in the conclusion to this dissertation. For the task at hand, rather than focusing specifically on H.D. and Marsden, I will show how Marsden's developing philosophies of language had productive affinities with imagism.

Many imagist poems gesture to the issue of the marmalade jar, the problem of the content versus label. F.S. Flint's request for "Direct treatment of the thing, whether subjective or objective," and Pound's insistence on presentation instead of description in "A Few Don'ts by an Imagiste" show that they, like Marsden, were trying to establish a more reliable relationship between text and reality (199). Even during *The New Freewoman*, imagist interest in description of subjective states of mind or emotion aligned with Marsden's own philosophical project as it attempted to pare away empty abstraction. Imagist poetry and theory match the serious inquiry of *The New Freewoman* and *The Egoist* much more naturally than it does *Poetry* magazine's omnivorous aesthetics.

In November of 1913, Marsden wrote to Harriet Shaw Weaver: "As for E.P.'s poems, I haven't read 'em. Speak it not. He is a nice old thing" (Garner 115). It seems unlikely that Marsden would have devoted precious pages to Pound without reading the poems themselves. At the very least, Marsden read Pound's prose, as Clarke demonstrates through his readings of their

letters in *Dora Marsden and Early Modernism*. Clarke's account of the Marsden/Pound interaction is primarily concerned with refuting the account of Pound hijacking *The New Freewoman* and quickly turning it into his own show. He shows that Pound absorbed several of Marsden's concerns, and that Marsden absorbed some of Pound's. Pound's essay "The Serious Artist" was drawn out from him by Marsden, who then attacked it to illustrate her own contention that artists are more like alchemists than scientists, not fully understanding what they do. This would have stung, considering Pound's similar invocation of the scientist in "A Few Don'ts."

Understanding what would have attracted Marsden to imagism during *The New Freewoman* period requires understanding her aesthetics as they stood in 1913, and also how they related to her developing philosophy with its embrace of individualism, vitalism, and materialism. In the August 15, 1913 issue, which includes Ezra Pound's *Contemporania*, Marsden opens the issue with an essay titled "Thinking and Thought," a discussion of the difference between paradox and categorization. Responding to readers who have failed to grasp her critique of conceptual thought, Marsden explains that her attack on ideas as such is not artistic, and it is not a paradox:

It is a new play of artistry, some new paradox, they reflect, not comprehending that artistry and paradox are left as the defences of power not yet strong enough to comprehend. If a man has the power that comprehends, what uses has he left for paradox? If he sees a thing as it is, why must he needs describe it in terms of that which it is not? (81)

This statement has many affinities with Pound and Flint's programmatic declarations on imagism. Bruce Clarke came to write about Marsden through research on William Carlos

Williams, whose “No ideas but in things” adds a caveat to Marsden’s antipathy to ideas in general. Clarke proves that Marsden used her editorials to critique Pound—it is possible that this essay on paradox is, in part, Marsden meditating on Pound’s *Contemporania*. Those poems intersperse egoistic confidence and aggression with moments of calm and clarity. It is likely that Marsden is using these lines both to defend her critique of conceptual thought while referencing “In a Station of the Metro,” which appears later in the issue. If, as Pound argues, he presents things, why must he describe it “in terms of that which it is not?” Her criticism is complicated by a process she describes later in the essay:

Men need no ideas. They have no use for them (unless indeed they are of the literary breed—then they live upon them by their power to beguile the simple). What men need is power of Being, strength in themselves: and intellect which in the thinking process goes out as a scout, comparing, collating, putting like by like, or nearly like, is but the good servant which the individual Being sends afield that he may the better protect, maintain and augment himself. (81)

This process of using the intellect to augment the self is one Marsden will return to when considering Joyce, as will be shown below. The intellect that compares, collates, and studies likenesses is doing its job properly. Categories are not ideas. Pound’s “In a Station of the Metro” is not a description of one thing in terms of another, but rather, a portrait of the intellect as an effective scout. It is a moment, not a metaphor.

The September 1, 1913 issue of *The New Freewoman* that carries the first advertisement for *Poetry* also contains an editorial by Marsden titled “Concerning the Beautiful.” In it, she establishes her criteria for art, which are vitalist and individualist. She begins with gusto: “To read the history of the ‘Idea of the Beautiful’ is the best known way of destroying respect for

philosophy.... The reason is clear... [a]n effect is put up as a cause; from the supposed cause, a quality is supposedly abstracted; the supposed abstraction is given a sturdy name and then set free to roam the thin atmosphere of thoughts” (101). This criticism of abstraction appears in the context of *The New Freewoman*'s general skepticism toward concepts and thoughts as opposed to realities, even compared to intangible things that are real, like the soul. The essay moves on to figure beauty as an elusive bird, building up an extended metaphor. Marsden's vision of beauty emerges from her individualism—beauty is something people experience, not something inherent in a thing. She explains: “We need therefore scarcely pause to deny objective reality to ‘Beauty.’ A name which has to hunt for its connotation is obviously before its time.” Typically overcoming abstraction via an attention to linguistics, Marsden rejects “Beauty” as an empty sign, not worth attention. What does merit attention is the experience of beauty, or rather, “what we mean when we say that such and such a thing appears beautiful to us (101).” After arguing that beauty is food for the soul, which becomes larger and better integrated through beauty, she continues:

As the intrinsic feature of a food is merely that it feeds, i.e. that it can be used up in satisfaction of a need, so in the case of what we call the “beautiful,” it is everything which overcomes disparateness in the soul, now being one thing, now another.

Sometimes the same thing will fairly regularly answer to the purpose. Sometimes not.

All depends on the specific character of the need. “A thing of beauty is a joy forever,” sang Keats. Not at all. (101-102)

Marsden manages to dissipate the power of tastemakers on both sides, as traditionalists and avant-gardists are revealed as part of the same overall experience of soul-feeding. That said, this is primarily an attempt to explain the potential beauty in texts that are, considered

conventionally, quite ugly, as in the vituperative sections of *Contemporania*, the portions of *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man* that made it impossible for anyone but *The Egoist* to print, and Remy de Gourmont's often disturbing *The Horses of Diomedes*.³³

Marsden's essay is a covert review of imagism as a movement. She describes a minimalist aesthetic, drawing on Edmund Burke to claim that "the overaccentuation of a stimulus destroys that which it is the sole meaning of the 'beautiful' to effect, the unifying of the emotional force. This explains why one star in the heavens appears more beautiful than a myriad, one rose than a cluster, one jewel than a blaze" (102). While tend to see imagist poetry as richly intertextual, as I will discuss in chapter four, I believe that this reading is intended to apply to imagist poetry. Marsden immediately saw how the innovations of the imagists mapped onto her own long line of inquiry. Their attention to the difference between metaphor and presentation appealed to her. H.D.'s own poetic theory, as gleaned from her few reviews in *The Egoist*, will be discussed in chapter four, but her contention that poetry should provide real experience exists in mutual reference with Marsden's reading of imagism.

Joyce in *The Egoist*

In "The Woman of No Appearance," Thaine Stearns establishes that Marsden and Joyce had a productive rivalry by tracing their mutual influence, even though they never met in person. Stearns briefly discusses the era covered by this dissertation, noting that: "At the center of the literary circles that would constitute British modernism, Marsden wrote about the function of language and the role of the image in language at the same time that the journal was serializing

³³ In "Woman of No Appearance," Stearns cites a moment in *Finnegan's Wake* when "Issy announces, 'I'm so keen on that New Free Woman with novel inside'" (475). He explains that the reference has puzzled Joyce scholars who would expect *The Egoist* as the reference and *A Portrait* as the novel. I submit that Issy may have been reading *The Horses of Diomedes*.

Portrait” (466-467). He uses this to ground his main analyses of *Ulysses* and *Finnegan’s Wake*, using this observation to establish Marsden’s intellectual importance, while jumping ahead to 1917 and the later texts. I would extend his work into the past. While Pound may have brought Joyce to Marsden’s attention, she was building a theory of the possibility of a novel like *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man* before it appeared in the pages of her journal.

Marsden’s interest in a more accurate portrait of reality shaped her reading of James Joyce’s *Portrait*. Her “Views and Comments” in the final issue of *The New Freewoman* readies her readers for *A Portrait*:

If we could get into the habit of describing a man as he feels himself instead of in the terms of the physical image under which he presents himself to sight, we should break through this deadening concept of unity. If we described him—as an artist would—that is, as he feels himself, we should say an intense flaming heart of sensitiveness in a sheath of material substance, in and out of which it can send piercing fingers, keen tongues of itself as foragers into an external world. (245)

She explains that the senses, gathering the world into the self, build up human awareness. Her call for an artistic portrait of a human growing through their rich experiential contact with the world appears a month and a half before the first installment of *Portrait*. This is a preview-criticism, readying the readership for a novel that will be this very description of “a man as he feels himself.” As Stephen grows his developing consciousness changes in concert with the prose of the novel, from childishness to the relative sophistication of his young adult intelligence. *Portrait* is compatible with Bergson’s account of growth as a process, as the young Stephen Dedalus gathers experiences, processes information, and solves problems posed by life. Marsden figures the senses as foragers of experience that return to the self in order to intensify its identity.

The first installment of *Portrait* in the February 2, 1914 issue of *The Egoist* describes analogous passages, describing Stephen as he feels himself, sensitive, inquisitive, and relying on his senses and memories to try to process the world around him. Most of the first installment takes place in a stream of consciousness on the playground and schoolhouse. Stephen's restless mind wanders from the events taking place on the rugby pitch to his lessons, his home, the foul language used by his schoolmates, and the trauma of being shoved into a puddle (among other things). Stephen gathers new experiences and placing them in the context of his memories and desires, developing through even the lack of knowledge he exhibits in the story. This process closely parallels another passage from Marsden's "Views and Comments":

[I]t is the withdrawal of the living threads, heavy with gathered impressions, back within itself that distinguishes life from energy: distinguishes that which is being built up into the egoistic unit from that which is running down towards disintegration; that experience is the food of life: that the senses of sight, sound, and scent, sympathy and understanding, and a vague growing awareness too immature to be given a name, stretching out into the world pass outside the limits of the body to ransack the universe—for experience. With a million tentacles they invade the world of appearance; pierce, scour, scan, scoop up as with a mighty arm the panorama of the world: but they return an army laden with spoil always to their own. (245)

Clarke finds this passage and the lines that follow disturbing, and is torn between reading it ironically and condemning it for its violent imperialist vision of the self. While Marsden's imagery is violent, her vision of life is often violent and selfish. Joyce's *Portrait* of Stephen Dedalus describes the gathering of information that Marsden describes here, though Joyce's version is much more defensive. Her consonance with Joyce occurred before she printed his

work, and the productive relationship they maintained began with an initial affinity. *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man* seems almost too perfect an illustration of Marsden's developing theories during *The New Freewoman* and early *Egoist*.

Conclusion

Reading *The New Freewoman* and *The Egoist* in the twenty-first century means encountering their contents through the influence of the intervening century. *The Egoist's* fame is mostly based on its hosting of Joyce first, Pound and the Imagists second. As such, it was digitized, and now exists beyond special collections due to the connection between the journal and the quintessential modernists. *The Egoist* is around because of Joyce and Pound, yet, still, Joyce and Pound are around because of *The Egoist*. Although most readers of Joyce will not encounter *Portrait* for the first time in *The Egoist*, reading immersively restores the serial nature of these texts, at times asymptotically approaching the sense of a first encounter with a major text. So many texts and authors have been overlooked by the canonical and even the counter-canonical processes of the intervening century that first encounters occur in every issue. Even in the case of the monoliths of modernism, reading these texts as they appeared to their publics, and as they appeared in each other's context, can create illuminating effects.

Marsden's editorship of *The New Freewoman* reflected her changing interests, especially her interest in changing interests as a phenomenon. Her understanding of thought as an evolutionary process shaped the decisions she made regarding the texts contained within the magazine, especially in the ways that they resonated with her editorials. Continuing *The Freewoman's* forceful engagement with all its interlocutors, *The New Freewoman* was an experimental space that allowed Marsden to work out her critique of signification through conversation, rather than in a vacuum. Dialog was important to her because it is difficult to

critique the idea as a category without creating further ideas and undermining the point of the exercise. Instead, Marsden used a complex layering of her sparring with anarchists, her developing aesthetic theories, and editorial practices. In her attempt to wrangle her distaste for static thoughts and ideas into a logically coherent philosophy of practice, she bewildered many of her contributors and readers. The revealing and relevant clue comes in the way the journal fostered modernist literature, giving space to many innovative authors. *The New Freewoman* welcomed art that pressed against the boundaries of genres, of what was seemingly and what seemed real at once. In particular, her interest in individualist modernists like the Imagists and Joyce led the magazine to take on a particularly individualistic flavor. The journal as a whole coheres even as it resists becoming a solid, categorical thing. Through all this, Marsden herself experimented with the journal as medium. In her refusal to be pinned to a cause or a word or a claim, she traded symbolic currency for internal consistency, the consistency of an observed process over a final result. The magazine was a responsive medium for project, something that would have been far more difficult in a book. Marsden's editorializing takes on the characteristics of modernist art, as it refused to be bound by the strictures of time, or the past word, or commitments to the future.

CHAPTER FOUR—The Crystalline Legend: H.D.'s Serial Poetic in the Nineteen-Teens

Introduction

After Beatrice Hastings' many pseudonyms and experimental fiction and Dora Marsden's use of the periodical form to critique the nature of language itself, this fourth chapter on H.D. is an of sorts. While H.D. assisted in editing *The Egoist* for a time in 1916-1917, this chapter will not focus on her as editor of the magazine. Instead it is about how the milieu of modernist magazines came to define H.D. as soon as she began publishing in *Poetry* and the Marsden journals *The New Freewoman* and *The Egoist*. Reviews in these venues, among others, established her reputation for poetic austerity before she had published any book-length works. In doing so, they ignored H.D.'s serial poetic, the creation of intertextual links between her poems. By praising her purity and chastity instead of the dynamic conversations she staged even in her earliest serial poems, they created an account of her aesthetics that she never accepted. This had long-lasting consequences, as the feminist recovery of H.D. initially slighted her imagist phase by cutting it off from the later works by considering those early poems as an apprenticeship. In the service of raising the profile of H.D.'s later works, they reiterated the theses of the earliest reviews of her poetry. However, her early poems embedded within the modernist journals use the same intertextual, serial poetics that are so valued in her later works. These early poems exist as part of broader conversations about the nature of meaning and the function of art, and they are suffused with the spirit of the modernist moment as renaissance. They are also read, misread, interpreted, and debated in the pages of the modernist journals, as other writers struggled to articulate what H.D. was trying to achieve. Often their readings speak more about their own concerns than H.D.'s, and in this way they constructed a persona for H.D. based on a handful of poems. While Marsden and Beatrice Hastings constructed modernist

periodicals to intervene in the public sphere, H.D.'s contributions were less direct, despite her powerful role in imagism both in developing its aesthetics and in her role organizing the imagist anthologies.

This chapter will re-read sets of poems published in the little magazines, considering H.D.'s debut series "Verses, Translations, and Reflections from the *Anthology*," and her series published in *Poetry* in March 1915. It will place the longer-form anthology of *Sea Garden* and the 1916 *Choruses from Iphigenia at Aulis* in the context of their early reception. It will also read H.D.'s own reflections on her imagist reputation to show that she felt uneasy about the snowball effect of positive but uneasy reviews of her poetry. Understanding how the reputation established in that first decade influenced her later readers will also require a return to the beginning of H.D.'s recovery as a major modernist poet by a group of feminist critics and poets in the 1980s. Then, this chapter will turn to reviews of H.D. written by her contemporaries, as contained in digital archives. While H.D.'s appearance in *Poetry* seems retrospectively to be almost perfectly simultaneous with *Poetry* itself, the three issues prior to her appearance established the grounds for the reception of her work, at least for the American audience. These first poems occurred amid the general chaos of early imagism, when no clear leader had yet emerged and many claimants jockeyed for position. Within this larger scene, H.D.'s own poems are more consistently praised than any other imagist's, but often with caveats and reservations that would bolster her reputation as a poet of purity, even of inhumanity.

H.D.'s recovery tended to emphasize the then-thoroughly-lost later poems over and against the earlier imagist works. The later epic works have much in common with modernist long poems, sequences, and series such as *The Tower*, *The Cantos*, *Four Quartets*, and *Paterson*. Imagism is often described as a phase or apprenticeship for H.D. No mere phase to be outgrown,

the early poems prefigure the techniques of *Trilogy* and *Helen in Egypt*. These aspects of H.D.'s later career were present from the first publications in little magazines.

H.D.'s first set of poems, "Verses, Translations, and Reflections from the *Anthology*" already uses intertextual effects, including the sort of clever, multi-tiered allusion that characterizes the Eliotic and Poundian strains of modern poetry. By building connections between her poems, their paratexts, their sources, and critical misreadings of their sources, H.D. claims a renaissance humanism. In a poetic sequence published in the March 1915 *Poetry*, H.D. uses the deft arrangement of poems to explore the nature of the sign. Long form, sequential poetics are more visibly present in *Sea Garden*. Its climax, "Cities," is the first H.D. poem that openly describes an esoteric initiation.³⁴ "Cities" and its coda contain the clearest indication of the links between H.D.'s early poetry and her later poetry in their overt initiatory mysticism.

Then, this chapter will tour several early responses to H.D.'s works. After establishing the serial, intertextual poetic that H.D. used in her earliest publications, these reviews from *The Egoist* and *Poetry* seem to miss the point. Understanding H.D.'s reputation requires revisiting the conditions of reading H.D. in the nineteen-teens, where she appeared as part of a rapidly evolving, short-lived network of coteries marketing avant-garde poetics. Their rhetoric had a serious impact on H.D.'s recovery in the 1980s, and continues to influence readings of H.D. down to the present day. Before returning to the distant past, however a visit to the recent past is in order.

Magazine Critics and H.D.'s Burial

Of the authors featured in this dissertation, H.D. is the best known and most thoroughly studied. Her recovery from obscurity to prominence is the result of work by a coterie of feminist

³⁴ Gregory's "Rose Cut in Rock" theorizes that *Sea Garden* is rife with hidden references to occult initiations, but "Cities" is more blatant.

H.D. scholars operating from the mid-seventies to the present, a remarkable flowering of scholarship that begins with Susan Stanford Friedman's 1975 essay "Who Buried H.D.?" The next section of the dissertation will examine how two major H.D. scholars saw, and shifted, readings of H.D. in the last forty years. Among many, many scholars involved in this recover, Friedman and Rachel Blau DuPlessis stand out as particularly relevant to a study of how H.D. has been read. H.D. owes some of her current fame to her former lack of it; she is paradoxically famous for being forgotten. The recovery began with a poet known, if at all, through a few anthologized poems. Her reputation was as a poet of pure, chaste, hard, perfect imagist poetry—the reputation established early. The new H.D. scholarship shifted the focus of study to different branches of her corpus. H.D.'s epic poems rose to prominence, especially *Trilogy*. *Helen in Egypt* also receives attention as a counterweight to Ezra Pound's *Cantos*, and feminist readings of H.D. often function as a counter to accounts of modernism centered on Pound. The fruit of the feminist recover of H.D. is abundant. H.D.'s fiction is increasingly recognized as important, as her novels are reprinted and subsequently studied. Her relationship with Bryher becomes as important as her relationships with Pound and Richard Aldington, and her work has been embraced by queer theorists. Alongside traditional accounts of H.D., Imagiste, she is now also read (and more accurately seen) as a poet of passion and of long and serial forms. She is the founder of imagism, rather than as an incidental practitioner following Pound (Pondrom).³⁵ As powerful as H.D.'s recovery has come to be, it was a willed, rhetorical movement.

In her essay, "Haibun: 'Draw your/ Draft,'" collected in Hollenberg's 2000 volume *H.D. and Poets After*, Rachel Blau DuPlessis engages the way that her own criticism changed H.D.

³⁵ Incidentally, Aldington makes the same argument in a 1929 letter to H.D.: "Ezra may have 'invented' Imagism, but, after all, you wrote the poems" (Zilboorg 17).

She explains what initially drew her to H.D.: “I needed a woman, a poet, and a modernist and I needed her badly. H.D. was that poet.” DuPlessis explains further: “Here were the components: feminism in general, plus an incontestably major woman writer, with an audience ready to understand that patriarchal structures of recognition had intervened and been a condition of her employment and her own self-scrutiny for many, many decades.” As happened in the nineteen-teens in *Poetry* magazine (as will be discussed below), the desire for a poet like H.D. precedes the encounter with H.D. and establishes the grounds for reading her poems. This is not to say that the components that DuPlessis identifies are in any way inaccurate, but the parallel is striking.

As DuPlessis continues, she bluntly assigns credit for interest in H.D. to herself and the other critics and poets associated with H.D.’s recovery, claiming that H.D. herself changed in the process: “It’s not so much the influence of H.D. on me but (don’t get me wrong) my influence on H.D. (In a few years she reciprocated.)... We were inventing H.D. We influenced her work—how it was read, what parts of it were read, why it was interesting. We made it matter for this generation. It is astonishing to make this claim, yet it is simply true. Not arrogant; it is a statement of fact, the fact of our reading of H.D. and our engagements.” This is an astonishing claim, and at the risk of getting DuPlessis wrong, especially considering that one of the centerpieces of the recovery of H.D. was the rejection of the narrative of her creation by Ezra Pound. DuPlessis notes how the co-creation of the new H.D. also changed the scholars themselves: “H.D. was a big dolphin ridden by desirous feminists who needed to find her and to be buoyed in her ocean of texts. And she was a haunting presence: we had conjured her; she had conjured us” (117). In this act of mutual conjuration, authors and critics influence each other. DuPlessis’ feminist readings of modernism challenged earlier, woefully inaccurate masculinist accounts of modernism that still loom in the background of modernist studies.

This process has an analog in the earliest readings and reviews of H.D.'s work that appeared in the little magazines. Pound's role as the man who named Hilda Doolittle "H.D. Imagiste" is the foremost example, but this chapter will consider H.D.'s early reception among reviewers who found their own poetic concerns reflected in H.D.'s poetry. These readings rarely attend to certain aspects of the poems, and linger on others, while establishing the rhetoric of H.D. as pure, chaste, and inhuman. Part of this came from the rhetoric of imagism filtered through Pound, but much of it came from changes in literary technique and critical fashion that predate imagism. Ultimately these positive reviews established a reputation that contributed to H.D.'s descent into obscurity.

Susan Stanford Friedman's 1975 essay "Who Buried H.D.?" signaled the beginning of H.D.'s recovery. DuPlessis' claims to have made H.D. new are prefigured in Friedman's arguments that critics are to blame for H.D.'s burial. Friedman answers the question she posed in the title, explaining that the fault for H.D.'s neglect "lies in the response of her critics. She was a woman, she wrote about women, and all the ever-questioning, artistic, intellectual heroes of her epic poetry and novels were women" (803). Friedman argues that readings of H.D. were entirely conditioned by her gender, and that tepid or patronizing readings of her works led to her loss as a major modernist poet. Friedman laments "the ridicule [women poets] receive from their critics and reviewers." Friedman specifically locates these critics and reviewers by citing a 1969 special issue of *Contemporary Literature*, revealing the major masculinist flaws of two of the essays contained in that issue. Friedman goes on to call for the study and publication of H.D.'s feminist epic later poetry. It is in this last move that H.D.'s imagist poetry falls out of "Who Buried H.D.?" as Friedman sets up H.D. as a major modernist poet by comparing her trajectory to that of major male modernists who reacted against the trauma of World War One. Comparing H.D. to

T. S. Eliot, Ezra Pound, William Carlos Williams, and D. H. Lawrence, she writes “Like these artists H.D. began writing in the aestheticism and fascination for pure form characteristic of the imagists; and like them, she turned to epic form and to myth, religious tradition, and the dream as a way of giving meaning to the cataclysms and fragmentation of the twentieth century” (802). This passage reveals a tension inherent in much H.D. scholarship, as the desire to establish H.D. as a major modernist had to confront, adopt, and adapt the rhetoric of major modernism, privileging epic, myth, and dream over and against pure form. The power of the move speaks for itself in that it sparked a boom of H.D. scholarship, but even at that early phase Friedman was openly skeptical of greatness as a criterion (803). Following Friedman’s initial argument, critics determine how H.D. is read, and who reads her. This was as true in the nineteen-teens as it was in the nineteen seventies and eighties.

Friedman’s field-establishing *Psyche Reborn* followed “Who Buried H.D.?” in 1981. It begins by describing *Sea Garden*. It “was the poetic culmination of her early apprenticeship in London, and it won for her the reputation of being the best of the imagist poets.” Very quickly, she moves to discuss how imagism failed in the face of the war: “[imagism]’s disdain for philosophies and cosmologies as well as its demand for brevity left both form and contentment of the imagist poem inadequate before the historical imperatives for a literature based on the search for living mythologies” (4). Friedman’s H.D. was damaged by imagism, “Caged in a literary movement that lasted all of six or seven years, the magnificent poet of these epics and the writer who experimented in a wide variety of genres” faded into a few anthologized imagist poems. Gregory’s “Rose Cut in Rock” answered this argument:

But this recovery of her stature is made in part out of aversion to the specter of the Poetess, the limited lyricist. In this approach the early lyrics are understood in terms of a

developmental reading of H.D.'s career, so that they necessarily appear to demonstrate limitations she would later transcend, incipient vision that would gain scope and substance... Thus the early poems have been admired in the past for the same reason that they have lately been ignored: they point to the limitation of the Poetess. (526)

Gregory's reading goes on to embrace *Sea Garden* as a serial poem and as a poem based on H.D.'s interest in occult initiatory structures. This chapter extends Gregory's project to the early magazine publications, and will revisit *Sea Garden* and H.D.'s *Choruses from Iphigenia at Aulis* to examine their relationship with their milieu of magazine publication.

H.D.'s career was built on, and hemmed in by, on the imagist boom of the nineteen-teens, but the poems themselves are not the cage. Reckless anthologizing of H.D.'s imagist works breaks the delicate long-form links that exist between the poems, which drew from the power of seriality inherent in the periodicals in which they originally appeared, and eventually, in *Sea Garden*. They are as much casualties as the other genres identified by Friedman, especially since their proximity to imagist marketing forces them into a relationship with the various readings and theories of imagism that emerged around the poems.

Friedman's opening gambit of dividing H.D.'s career into early and late work has borne such fruit that it does not need to be justified. This act of division cut off the early poetry from the mainline of what is supposed to make H.D. great—what makes *Trilogy* worth study and *Sea Garden* more of a record of a young poet working in an overly restricting mode that she would outgrow. Looking at her earliest publications in their periodical context reveals not a breach with her prior self, but an expansion of her earliest poetics.

Her own understanding of the "early" and "late" H.D. is preserved in *H.D. by Delia Alton*, a series of retrospective notes she wrote from 1949-1950, considered by DuPlessis

to be “one of the most brilliant essays she wrote” (“Haibun” 119). These notes return several times to her confusion about her early reviewers:

We were dispersed and scattered after War I. The Greek, or the Greek and Roman scenes and sequences of these prose studies are related to the early poems. I grew tired of hearing these poems referred to, as crystalline. Was there no other way of criticizing, of assessing them? But perhaps I did not see, did not dare see any further than my critics. Perhaps my annoyance with them was annoyance with myself. For what is crystal or any gem but the concentrated essence of the rough matrix, or the energy, either of over-intense heat or over intense cold that projects it? (184).

In this poetic passage, H.D. attempts to shake off the limited readings of her critics by refiguring crystals as the products of dynamic transfers of energy rather than as objects notable for their clarity and shine. This is the first mention of the early poems in *H.D. by Delia Alton*, also the first mention of early reviews, and of the poetry’s crystalline nature. All will reappear throughout the essay. H.D. refers to the “crystalline legend” attached to her poems, and to the fire around the crystals in *Trilogy* (185, 186). After absorbing the early critical response H.D. refashions it, connecting it to the alchemical passages in *The Walls Do Not Fall*: “This is not the ‘crystalline’ poetry that my early critics would insist on” (193). Passages like these show that H.D. resented the reception of her early work stifling, even long after their initial publication. The critics, reviewers, and editors fashioned crystals out of the poems, something H.D. reverses explicitly in *Trilogy*.

H.D. was not ignored in the nineteen-teens, but even positive reviews can damage an author. H.D.’s poetry relies so much on the surface tension created between what is immediately legible and the act of reading that reviewers tended to project their own concerns onto H.D.’s

poems. There was also a significant echo chamber effect, as reviews borrowed from other reviews. Most of the early reviews in little magazines were so forcefully positive that they established reading practices for H.D. that ripple, ebbing and flowing to the present day.

Poetry Magazine and Terms of Praise

Before moving into considering key aspects of poems published in *Sea Garden*, this chapter will establish the poetic program of *Poetry* magazine at the outset of H.D.'s career. H.D.'s first published poetry appeared in *Poetry*, edited by Harriet Monroe. Monroe, though mostly omnivorous, especially appreciated structurally simple poetry, making H.D. a natural fit for her pages. However, she wanted poetry like H.D.'s before Pound sent the poems. Reading her review of William Vaughn Moody in the November 1912 issue shows that she found that simplicity in his blank verse. Wyatt, meanwhile, praised John Masefield for his Greek-ness, further establishing that affinity with Classical Greek was desirable, a month after H.D.'s first poems appeared there. The trouble is that Moody is not particularly spare, and Masefield is not particularly Greek. Their desire for a certain kind of poet conditions the reception of poetry.

In the second issue of *Poetry* magazine, November 1912, Monroe praises William Vaughn Moody for writing "poetry of a high structural simplicity, strict and bare in form, pure and austere in ornament... [it] implies a grappling with giants and wrestling with angels; it is not to be achieved without deep living and high thinking, without intense persistent intellectual and spiritual struggle." (57). Taken out of context, this could be a description of imagism, or a description of H.D.'s poetry. It has the vocabulary of early readings of both the movement and of H.D. in particular, emphasizing spare form and austerity as an indication of greatness. This poses a problem, because Moody's poetry is not especially structurally simple, strict, bare, pure, or

austere. *Poetry* had printed Moody's "I Am the Woman" in the October issue, where it was the second poem in the first issue of *Poetry*. Monroe herself admits that the poem is "less perfectly achieved" than other works by Moody in the November review, praising "The Fountain" and "The Death of Eve" as his best work. "The Fountain" is an account of a group of Spanish conquistadors dying in the desert, while "The Death of Eve" is a retelling of Eve's return to Eden in order to die there. Both are a blend of blank and rhymed verse, and compared to other blank verse hosted in *Poetry*, it does have moments of simplicity, but each also contains moments of overwrought intensity. "I Am the Woman" is a syncretic mystical feminist poem, albeit with its feminism is filtered through the author's male authorial position. Imagism happened to appear in the meantime, as Aldington's recognizably imagist poetry appeared in the November issue that contained Monroe's essay on Moody.

As I have shown, *Poetry* desperately wanted a poet like H.D. before they found her. While imagism and *Poetry* emerged roughly simultaneously, the journal's critical concerns in the early issues are a somewhat tangled struggle with two main components—first, the tension between tradition and modernism, and second, a strong commitment to new prosodic and formal practices and standards. Turning to tradition and modernism: the inaugural issue of *Poetry* includes an essay titled "On the Reading of Poetry" by Edith Wyatt. Wyatt was a poet, novelist, and teacher of Greek who was on *Poetry's* advisory committee and prolific contributor in the earliest years of the magazine. The essay follows a familiar train of thought: she writes that America has lost its regard for poetry due to its neglect of Greek and Latin, and immediately makes an argument that prosodic originality can be a measure of the quality of poetry claiming that formalist poets "do not understand that every 'form' was in its first and best use an

originality, employed not for the purpose of following any rule, but because it said truly what the artist wished to express.” So far, Wyatt is compatible with imagist classicism.

The trending poet of 1912 was John Masefield, but his ascendance to great popularity was already leading some to doubt his quality.³⁶ Wyatt, though, was still an admirer of Masefield, at least in the February 1913 issue of *Poetry*. While the review is long, Wyatt’s most concrete and proto-imagist moment of praise comes in a comparison of Masefield with, of course, Classical Greek: “Some of the lines, such as—The blackness crunched all memory of the sun— have the hard ring, the thick-packed consonantal beauty of stirring Greek.” Wyatt praises Masefield by associating classicism and a prosody built on heavy stress and consonants, elements far more characteristic of H.D.’s poetic. Indeed, T.S. Eliot will fault her for these in a review of *Choruses from Iphigenia at Aulis*, as we will see. Her review was counter-reviewed in *Poetry* itself, when Alice Corbin Henderson attacks Masefield in the May issue, accusing him of melodrama and even of appropriating women’s experience, of “masquerading in the petticoats of Nan,” the hero of his popular long poem (78).

Monroe celebrates *Poetry*’s willingness to include both sides of a debate in its pages: “POETRY has opened its hospitable door to Mr. Masefield's admirers and detractors, presenting in each case the extreme opinion. Meantime, to the more moderate view, this poet seems to be in danger...” (“In Danger” 70). This is a move in the style of *The New Age* or *The Egoist*, except in Monroe’s taking the “moderate view.” At this point, Monroe, Corbin Henderson, and Edith Wyatt were publishing their own self-consciously experimental work in *Poetry* alongside their critical writings.³⁷ For *Poetry*, theory is inextricable from practice—the desire for an

³⁶ Beatrice Hastings links Pound, Yeats, Tagore, and Masefield in order to satirize them all in the April 9, 1914 issue of *The New Age*, for instance.

³⁷ For example, Alice Corbin Henderson published series of poems in dialog with imagism, including a tribute to H.D. in a modified style of H.D. in the January 1916 issue. Each poem in her series follows a different imagist, and

experimental poetics of clarity, austerity and compression fused with the kind of formal, prosodic, and cultural power of Greek was part of *Poetry* before H.D. entered the picture.³⁸

Monroe and the other reviewers at *Poetry* had an idea of the kind of poetry they wanted, and H.D. and the imagists happened to fill their need, and much more effectively than Moody had.

All this influenced how *Poetry* presented and read H.D.'s works. H.D. was entirely unknown under that signature before her first publications in *Poetry*, though she had been publishing stories since 1909, under the pseudonym Edith Gray in the *Boston Globe* and *The Comrade* (Boughn 95-96).³⁹ *Poetry* insisted that both H.D. and Richard Aldington were experimental poets their bios.⁴⁰ This is how *Poetry* introduced H.D. in her debut there, in the January, 1913 issue:

'H. D., Imagiste,' is an American lady resident abroad, whose identity is unknown to the editor. Her sketches from the Greek are not offered as exact translations, or as in any sense finalities, but as experiments in delicate and elusive cadences, which attain sometimes a haunting beauty. ("Notes" 135)

The biography immediately gendered H.D., ruining at least part of the anonymity of the initials, while still emphasizing the mystery of the poet's identity.

H.D.'s , titled "The Pool" in obvious reference, is about the uniquely appealing but daunting qualities of H.D.'s poetry.

³⁸ That said, Monroe was omnivorous, and found much to celebrate in other aesthetics. Monroe was, like Marsden, not bound by a single ideology of value, but ran with the one that appealed to her because of the poems in front of her at the given moment. Monroe acknowledges the breadth of her taste in passages like this one: "Our poets this month play divers instruments. The audience may listen to H. D.'s flute, the 'cello of Mr. Rhys, the big bass drum of Mr. Lindsay, and so on through the orchestra, fitting each poet to his special strain" ("Notes" 134).

³⁹ H.D.'s Edith Gray stories for the *Globe* are all light and sweet love stories, but several of them contain moments of proto-imagism, as flashes of intense feelings engulf the characters—the vision of a lost beloved under an electric streetlamp, or of a country boy cutting a wet bough from a blooming cherry tree, for instance. Several prefigure H.D.'s feminist poetic, as the protagonists wrestle to balance their artistic ambitions with their desire for love, affection, and family.

⁴⁰ Aldington's bio appeared in the November, 1912 issue: "Mr. Richard Aldington is a young English poet, one of the 'Imagistes,' a group of ardent Hellenists who are pursuing interesting experiments in vers libre."

One of the most telling details of H.D.'s debut in *Poetry* is the presentation of the poems under the heading "Verses, Translations, and Reflections from the *Anthology*." The anthology referenced in the heading is Meleager's original. Meleager collected lyric poems by his Hellenic contemporaries in the first century B.C. in a work he titled *Anthologia*, or garland. The title also emphasizes the fact that the poems are not literal translations, as two of the three poems in the section are looser experiments, "reflections," with one significant exception. H.D. Eileen Gregory doubts that H.D. labeled her poems "Verses, Translations, and Reflections," writing in *H.D. and Hellenism*, "It may, indeed, have been Pound or Harriet Monroe, not H.D., who entitled her earliest poems... and who, in particular, named the poems themselves "Hermes of the Ways," "Priapus, Keeper of Orchards' (consistently referred to by H.D. as 'Orchard'), and 'Epigram: After the Greek' (never later collected by H.D.)."⁴¹ These titles represent the kind of fussy erudition much loved by Aldington and by Pound in his early career, but never preferred by H.D." (55). However, in the paragraph before this statement, Gregory writes: "H.D. was deferential to those with whom she shared her poetic ambitions, giving tributes to many male associates as her intellectual guides, and, as a result, critics credit any mark of her knowledge or sophistication to others." After considering the sophistication of the titles of the first *Poetry* publication, it seems fair to give H.D. credit, rather than writing these details off as "fussy." Each framing detail forms an important part of the triptych.

In the brief description of the poems in the back of this issue of *Poetry*, H.D. is given credit, like Aldington, for experiments at the level of cadence. There is also the beautiful, apropos, but vague note about the poems being "not... in any sense finalities," which is a keen observation, if not fully explained. It suggests that H.D.'s first readers noticed that cadence was

⁴¹ "Epigram" was included in the *Des Imagistes* anthology, though it does not appear in the *Collected Poems*.

not the sole innovation in the first small set of poems: H.D. hard-wired another level of experiment into them, one that relied on seriality, intertextuality, and a nod to the initiate. The three poems printed by *Poetry* were “Hermes of the Ways,” H.D.’s most-cited poem in the early nineteen teens, “Priapus,” and an epigram titled “Epigram,” which notes that it is “after the Greek.” The former two poems appeared in *Sea Garden*, but “Epigram” did not. “Epigram” is the outlier, especially with its cryptic note, “after the Greek.”

EPIGRAM

(After the Greek)

The golden one is gone from the banquets;

She, beloved of Atimetus,

The swallow, the bright Homonoëa:

Gone the dear chatterer;

Death succeeds Atimetus.

H. D., "Imagiste."

Jeanne Heuving discusses “Epigram” in her book *The Transmutation of Love and Avant-Garde Poetics*, showing that although it is “in many ways... a superior modernist or Imagist rendering,” it breaks from H.D.’s new love poetic when it “subordinates the depiction of her beloved to the implied poetic speaker’s own sense of anguish” (61). In Heuving’s reading of the modernist love poem, it functions partially through its terse brevity, “the sense of loss conveyed by the succinctness of the poem—and the silence that follows.” This reading emphasizes the emotional power of the epigram despite its brevity.

As such, it is a classic imagist poem, but it is also one poem in a poetic series that first appeared in the magazines. It also functions as a node in an intertextual web, one that leads the

reader through a complex series of allusions to art authentic and hoaxed. “Epigram” is encrusted with paratextual information: over the course of the issue, *Poetry* calls it a verse, translation, reflection, epigram, “after the Greek,” an experiment, and finally not, in any sense, a finality. That small acknowledgement, “after the Greek,” at first seems to separate “Epigram” from the other poems in the sequence, which are by implication not “after the Greek.” After considering and reassembling their paratexts, “Hermes” and “Priapus” are not “after the Greek” to the same extent as “Epigram,” marking it as less original. The difference in title matters, as the other poems are dedicated to their titular deities, but “Epigram” is a generic title in two senses. All this is to drop the hint that “Epigram” has a closer connection to some Greek original, despite its presentation as an experimental reflection rather than a translation.

The poem and its paratext are designed to send interested readers to find the epigram’s source. In 1913, readers would find the book that H.D. used to compose the poem, John Mackail’s 1890 translation, *Select Epigrams from the Greek Anthology*. The endnote to the particular epigram that “Epigram” translates has this to say:

The history of this epigram is very curious. It is inscribed on a marble tablet, professing to be in memory of one Claudia Homonea, *conliberta* and *contubernalis* of Atimetus Antherotianus, a freedman of the imperial household. At the sides are Latin elegiacs, twenty-six lines in all. The tablet was supposed to have been discovered in San Michele at Rome and to be of the first century A.D., but the Latin verses are too plainly not ancient, and in fact the whole monument is a renaissance forgery. Nothing is known as to the date or person of the forger; but there can be no doubt that this epigram is really ancient and that it was the basis upon which he constructed the rest. (367)

The poem comes to completion through this footnote, erudition on an Eliotic scale. With it H.D. establishes her methods and their precedent. It contains a whole poetic. The tag, “After the Greek” becomes an exquisitely clever moment that at once asserts the connection to the source text, past the Latin, past the Renaissance forger—and simultaneously suggests that H.D. is self-consciously reproducing the Renaissance author’s method of taking inspiration and liberties from Greek originals, using fragments as a basis on which to construct new poetry. This connection says more about “Hermes of the Waves” and “Priapus” than “Epigram.” “Epigram” is far closer to a direct translation than the other experimental reflections. The first sentence in McKail’s introduction even points out that “epigram” means in Greek what “inscription” means in Latin contexts: a carving.

In essence, H.D. is claiming not to be Greek, but after the Greek: to be Renaissance and therefore humanist, which is a more portable identity. H.D. and the other imagists were enthusiasts of Renaissance Latin, as evidenced by Pound’s invocation *Andreas Divus* in *The Cantos*, and Aldington and H.D.’s translations of the Renaissance neo-Latin poem “Acon” by Giovanni Battista Malteo.⁴² There is nothing unprecedented in this, and a whiff of Walter Pater’s *The Renaissance* throughout, but the whole idea is a shift in one’s relationship to precedent. In “Epigram,” H.D. is, in her first three poems, taking on the mantle of a new Renaissance—and characteristically, she is rehabilitating the renaissance author’s inspiration from accusations of plagiarism and forgery. This context would change the other poems in the sequence, which now have a place in a revisionary history: the three poems rest in part on their interrelationship as part

⁴² Aldington’s translation of a selection from “Acon” appears in the November 28, 1912 issue of *The New Age* along with several other translations from Renaissance Latin. Pound and Aldington wrote extensively about the Renaissance in *The New Age*, *The Egoist*, and *Poetry*. The relationships between readings of the renaissance by Pound, Aldington, and H.D. are too complex to explore in depth here: I mention these other texts because they establish further grounds for reading H.D.’s poem.

of a project that is at once original and derivative; a serial poetic that is richly layers the implications of series, experiment, paratext, source text, and textual apparatus.

The Poetic Sequence in 1915

In the March 1915 issue of *Poetry Magazine*, H.D. published “The Pool”:

Are you alive?

I touch you with my thumb.

You quiver like a sea-fish.

I cover you with my net.

What are you—banded-one?

This poem explores the possibility of signification and the relationship of reading to the self, concepts concurrently under debate in Dora Marsden’s *Egoist*. In 1926, I.A. Richards uses *The Pool* as a main example of “badness in poetry” in his *Principles of Literary Criticism*. Richards faults its failure to communicate: “[t]he loss of so much of the formal structure leads... to tenuousness and ambiguity. Even when, as here, the original experience is presumably slight, tenuous and fleeting, the mere correspondence of matter to form is insufficient. The experience evoked in the reader is not sufficiently specific” (200). Richards inadvertently puts his finger on the strength of the poem, even if this strength is not to his taste. “The Pool” is evocative without being specific, using tenuous ambiguity to make a point about the experience of reading. The poem references the Narcissus myth, but to what extent and to what end is unclear. Also unclear is the nature of the net, evoking spreading ripples, the more mundane fishing net, and perhaps even the network of the senses. The reader’s own thumbs on the pages of the magazine or book form a physical analog with the thumb in the poem. This prompts the reader to contemplate the nature of language and the function of poetry as text that ripples into seeming life, while always

reflecting the reader. It is anything but static, liquid rather than solid, creating an image of distortion, not clarity.

I focus on “The Pool” in part because it is widely anthologized as an example of imagism and as a sample of H.D.’s imagist phase. H.D.’s early association with imagism brought her much publicity in the little magazines, as readers struggled to come to grips with her short, intense, free verse poems. Imagism, having declared its preference for direct, presentational treatment, for clarity, for attention to the thing itself, is paradoxically also associated with this poem that, according to Richards, fails to communicate. The paradox has existed since the earliest readings of H.D., many of which sought to read imagist tenets onto H.D.’s poems, just as Ezra Pound imposed the title “Imagiste” on her first submissions to *Poetry* magazine. The early reviews fix H.D. in a set of formulated phrases, as a poet of pure, chaste, hard, and inhuman lyrics--all descriptors of her work that appear in at least two positive reviews on or before 1920. These positive reviews significantly missed that H.D. was working intertextually. Read against the grain of the reviews, H.D.’s early poetry is not an apprenticeship in the art of crafting well turned, isolated lyrics that are paradigmatically imagist. As a label linked to the principles laid down by Ezra Pound and(/or) F.S. Flint, “imagism” fails to accurately describe much of the work of the poets associated with the movement.

“The Pool” functions intertextually in its original context in *Poetry* magazine, where it appeared as part of a series. Each poem in the series explores the nature of vision through metaphors involving water. The poem “Storm” precedes “The Pool,” and it sets the scene for the final lines of “Storm” which describe a leaf falling into a similar pool, though in this case the pool is a metaphor for the seemingly liquid state of a forest during a tempest: “it is hurled out,/ whirls up and sinks,/ a green stone” (266). Then comes “The Pool,” with its tenuous and fleeting

image. The poem following is “The Garden,” its first lines present a stark contrast to the instability of “The Pool”: “You are clear,/ O rose, cut in rock.” No sooner is the solidity of the rose established than the poem begins trying to destroy it through force of will (267).⁴³ In its original publication in *Poetry*, “The Pool” is a counterpoint to the violence of “The Storm” and the threatening solidity of the opening of “The Garden,” which will itself return to dynamic motion in the second stanza. The pacing of the action is in turn embedded in the wider frame of the set of poems, and in the still wider frame of the issue itself, which also contains poems and an essay by Pound.⁴⁴

As often happens in H.D.’s early career, the arrangement of the sequence from the March 1915 *Poetry* would shift between publications, and the credit for the actual ordering of poems on a given occasion may belong to Ezra Pound or the editors of particular periodicals, in this case Harriet Monroe (Gregory, *Hellenism*, 265 n30). Certainly the poems move around from publication to publication, as when “The Pool” is the first poem in *Some Imagist Poets*, the 1915 anthology, again followed by “The Garden;” which then appears as “Garden” in *Sea Garden*, which excludes “The Pool.” The cohesion of H.D.’s early poetry creates more than one possible relational meaning, allowing them to be rearranged from publication to publication.

Sea Garden in The Egoist and the War

H.D.’s contributions to magazines interlace with each other both through the lattice of poems on the pages of a particular magazine, and in the tight connections between her works across different issues of *Poetry* and *The Egoist*. This general coherence came to fruition in the

⁴³ “The Garden” itself is divided into two sections. The second stanza is occasionally anthologized as “Heat,” a key poem in Robert Duncan’s *H.D. Book*. The shearing away of the first stanza probably originated with Rittenhouse’s *A Second Book of Modern Verse*, a 1920 anthology of American poetry.

⁴⁴ In this second installment of “The Renaissance,” Pound approvingly illustrates a passage of renaissance Latin with this point, itself apposite to H.D.: “That is not ‘the revival of classicism.’ It is not a worship of corpses” (286).

carefully wrought *Sea Garden*. Eileen Gregory's "Rose Cut in Rock" establishes *Sea Garden* as a long poem, one that shared characteristics with H.D.'s later works: "I suggest that *Sea Garden* is a consciously crafted whole, with studied consistency in landscape, voice, and theme" (536).

She bolsters her position by pointing to lacunae in *Sea Garden*: "Incantation," "Oread," and "The Pool" each would seem to fit into the series. Their absence indicates that *Sea Garden* is not a collected works: "the volume does not represent merely a gathering of H.D.'s already published poems, for many of the best of these--for instance "Oread," "Sitalkas," and "The Pool"--do not appear until her third collection, *Heliadora and Other Poems*. The unity of *Sea Garden* is not immediately apparent; nevertheless the work gives a singleness of affect" (537). Gregory sees the entire work as an initiatory allegory, pointing to the the final poem in *Sea Garden*, "Cities," as a key to the rest: "the city *necessitates* the sea garden" (550). As such I will read it in depth, considering its form, content, and publication history.

"Cities" changes the tone of the work as a whole. The first section of "Cities" is a lamentation, framed in the plural first person, and is again an extended question, wondering "Can we believe" in the threatening landscape of the modern city. The new city, the modern city, is described as "street after street alike," is bare of the beauty that once filled cities, "no crevice unpacked with honey." The monotonous landscape is populated not by people but "larvae," "seething life." The speaker frames their identity in opposition to the larvae, the militarist masses, people who cannot appreciate beauty. There is an interesting moment of internal dialog when the speaker assumes the voice of the larva-people, when the speaker quotes them as saying: "You are useless. We live./ We await great events."

The first section of the poem is easy enough to understand—the speaker bemoans the loss of an authentic beauty to an empty, modern mass culture, imagery also bearing the weight of

World War One. Despite its pessimism, the speaker does wonder if she “can believe” that these larvae will become “new people,” that they will mature to a “beauty unrivalled yet.” The speaker, who represents the continuity of an authentic art, a connection to beauty, does admit that there could be a possibility for renewal—but frames that hope with doubt and pessimism. In the first publication of the poem, in *The Egoist* of July 1916, that is also where the poem ends. This is a particularly rich issue that also contains the first installment of Dora Marsden’s “Lingual Psychology,” the chapter of *Tarr* in which Kriesler first kisses Bertha in the street, Muriel Ciolkowska’s review of Proust’s *Du Côté de chez Swann*, and various antiwar texts. Any of these could be brought to bear on “Cities.” I have chosen instead to consider Richard Aldington’s “A Solemn Dialog,” an essay in which two personae argue about the validity of conscientious objection. It is a public airing of Aldington’s conscience—but one that is shielded by satire, as Aldington gradually reveals that the voice against conscientious objection is older and unfit for service. Aldington sketches out a hideous world full of industrial accidents and the destruction of beautiful things even before the war, balancing the destruction of Rheims Cathedral with the destruction of the gothic gates of Sandwich town, destroyed to make way for the railroad:

Rheims and Louvain? Oh, ‘ow the pore *Dily Mile* did feel ‘urt at the bawberity of the ‘Uns! Oh, ‘ow they did *luv* Gorthic awkitekture and the clessics! Oh, ‘ow they *did* luv Awt! And if war has destroyed much I need scarcely remind you that the peaceful arts of religion and commerce have destroyed more, much more. I need only instance the burning of all copies of “Sappho” at Rome and Constantinople in 1087, in the “name of the Living God,” and the destruction of the magnificent Gothic gate at Sandwich in the forties in the name of the South Eastern Railway. (106).

Raging against the *Daily Mail*, Aldington exposes the hypocrisy of the warlike paper and the class-accented voices of its readers. The older voice ends excoriating the younger for his “intellectual superiority.” Aldington’s vision of a world spurred to war by the shallow and hypocritical pieties of art worship has its analogy in H.D.’s “Cities,” a poem that is similarly about the place of art and the classics in a world that seems to ignore them. In the first published version of “Cities,” the poem matches Aldington’s despair without offering any hope for redemption.

“Cities” has a companion poem, though. In H.D.’s *Collected Poems*, “Cities” appears with a final stanza in italics that was not present in the *Egoist* version. In the first edition of *Sea Garden*, this stanza has its own entry in the table of contents as “The City is Peopled,” claiming status as a separate poem even as it is a direct response to “Cities.” It consists of two stanzas and six lines, all in italics, the last lines in *Sea Garden*. The voice of the short poem responds to the despondent hopelessness of the first voice:

*The city is peopled
with spirits, not ghosts, O my love:*

*Though they crowded between
and usurped the kiss of my mouth
their breath was your gift
their beauty, your life.*

This divine response orients the artist-poet to her position in an ugly world: the larva-people are shifted from burden to a source of purpose. Their beauty is “your life,” the source of the first speaker’s existence. The second voice offers a gentle rebuke to the elitist and pessimistic

first voice. This rebuke is also intended to involve the reader of the poem, as the second person “you” can refer both to the speaker of the first poem and whoever is reading it. Without the coda, as it appeared in *The Egoist*, it fits Marsden’s philosophy of exceptional individuals, and would appeal directly to cultured elite of the journal’s readership. In *Sea Garden*, the coda stands as a counterargument to Marsden’s individualism, arguing that the people have an immense intrinsic value. Throughout *Sea Garden* the reader has been encouraged to engage the poems at a very personal level, either through second person address or the first person plural. Initiation-through-reading that becomes a common trope in H.D.’s poetry. Gregory hears *daimones* in this voice, arguing that the final poem “presents explicitly the figure of a guardian and speaker--the voice in the poems of *Sea Garden*--who is given the gift of utterance through the breath of spirits, ancient daimones” (550). The spirits, though, seem to be the larva-people, not the ancient daimones, and the voice that responds to “Cities” seems distinctly separate from that of the poems of *Sea Garden*. Rather than walling the initiate off from the people through their gifts, the voice in that final stanza claims that the people are the gift, the spirit. This line is an implicit allusion to *spiritus*, Latin for breath and for spirit, and the etymological root of inspiration.

This is the ideological pivot that all of *Sea Garden* rotates around. “Cities” seems like an aberration in an otherwise coherent collection of lyrics, but when carefully reading *Sea Garden*, the presence of “Cities” works a change on the other poems. All the rhetorical questions scattered throughout *Sea Garden* lean toward the answer provided by the second voice in “Cities.” In *Sea Garden*, H.D. manages to expand the relational and objective features of imagism from a process that happens within individual poems to the entire work, creating an inter-lyrical dialog. The repetition of images and themes, galvanized by “Cities,” ensures that no

poem in *Sea Garden* exists in isolation. This intricate relation of lyric parts to compositional whole is central to H.D.'s major poetic works.

“Cities” is the first time H.D. creates a mythic system that applies to the modern world. Up to that point, the myths of *Sea Garden* are allusive and pastoral. “Cities” is different because it does not invoke any recognizable classical god. Instead it is dealing with a shadowy “Creator” figure that had once fashioned a beautiful world but now had created the stifling ugliness of the modern urban landscape. The speaker of the poem is incredulous that the ugliness can have any purpose. The poem thus prefigures the Gnostic bent of the later work by questioning the benignity of the creator. H.D.'s poem tries to understand art's function in a modern world that world no longer values art. What makes this poems stand out as truly exceptional is that H.D., for the first time, takes on the voice of the divine and answers the questions that the first speaker poses.

H.D. Celebrated: a Survey of Reviews

H.D.'s career in little magazines attracted a remarkable amount of reviews and press coverage, despite her relatively small body of work in print. When the special imagist number of *The Egoist* appeared in May of 1915, H.D. had printed a total of twelve individual poems, though had published several of these twelve multiple times. The March issue of *Poetry* alone held nearly half of her total body of published work. Despite the simple scarcity of poems available, a remarkable number of modernist authors and editors wrote early responses, with varying depth of analysis and engagement with her work. Often the later reviews are better, as they have more materials to work with, some and reviews after the publication of *Sea Garden* begin to understand H.D.'s serial poetic. Some of these responses come from fellow imagists like

Aldington and John Gould Fletcher. Other came from authors in and around *The New Freewoman/The Egoist*, like Rebecca West, Harold Monroe, May Sinclair, and George Lane; as well as by Alice Corbin Henderson and Frances Gregg. Conrad Aiken wrote a scathing negative review of imagism in *The New Republic* that quoted her poetry for its negative examples. The following section will read several early reviews to demonstrate how different authors attempted to define H.D. Many of these early reviews occurred in the ongoing public dialog over imagism's importance, beauty, and function. By examining three sets of reviews that appeared in *The Egoist*, this chapter will show how the many public faces of H.D. acted and interacted to shape her reputation. The first set of linked reviews begins with F.S. Flint's essay on H.D. from the special imagist number of *The Egoist*. After contrasting his impressionistic/imagistic reading of "Sitalkas" with Eileen Gregory's reading of the poem, this section will show how his language reappears in later reviews. Terms from this review reappear in Harriet Monroe's *Poetry* magazine, establishing in particular H.D.'s reputation for "inhumanity," an accusation later refuted by Henry J. Felton in *Coterie* magazine's Easter 1920 issue. The second set of reviews is the dialog between Harold Monroe and May Sinclair, also appearing in *The Egoist*. Monroe's lukewarm appreciation of H.D. drew a rebuttal from Sinclair. Monroe complains that H.D.'s poetry operates on the smallest scale. Sinclair's defense, for all its passion, lingers on the "clarity" and "magic" of the poems. The final set of reviews considered here is a mutual review—John Gould Fletcher reviews H.D., and H.D. reviews John Gould Fletcher. Fletcher's review of *Sea Garden* is remarkable for its resemblance to later readings of *Sea Garden*. H.D.'s reading of Fletcher is even more remarkable: it contains her most open statement of poetics, indicating a theoretical divergence from Poundian doctrines of direct presentation. H.D. replaces

presentation with suggestion, implying that poems should be experienced more than they should be admired.

F.S. Flint's essay on H.D. appeared in the special imagist number of *The Egoist* of May 1915. This special issue is infamous for the circular nature of the movement's self-affirmation and self-congratulation, hosting essays on Pound and Flint by Aldington, on H.D. by Flint, on D.H. Lawrence by Olivia Shakespear, on Amy Lowell by Fletcher, and on Fletcher by Ferris Greenslet. Even here, though, are counter-currents: Flint offers a "History of Imagism" intended to deflate Ezra Pound's sovereignty over the movement, crediting T.E. Hulme and Edward Storer for its invention. He also notes Pound's abandonment of imagism for vorticism, and chuckles at America's embrace of the movement: "they were published in America and England as 'Des Imagistes: an Anthology,' which, though it did not set the Thames, seems to have set America, on fire" (71). There is a note of bitterness throughout, aimed primarily at Pound, stemming from Flint's friends' lost opportunities for fame.

Flint's other contribution to the issue is his reading of H.D. His reading is explicitly male, English, and sexualized, in which he suggests that H.D. has gone too far in her experiments—accusing her of a loss of her humanity. His essay is an imagist response to H.D.'s imagism, especially in his account of his response to H.D.'s poem "Sitalkas." "Sitalkas" appeared in the September 1, 1913, issue of *The New Freewoman*, making it her first appearance in one of Marsden's journals. Unusually, it appears alone in a small multi-author anthology labeled "The Newer School" and is the only poem from H.D. in the group, alongside single poems by Pound, Aldington, Lowell, Skipwith Cannell, and William Carlos Williams.

Thou art come at length

More beautiful

Than any cool god
 In a chamber under
 Lycia's far coast,
 Than any high god
 Who touches us not
 Here in the seeded grass.
 Aye, than Argestes
 Scattering the broken leaves.

the god of the northwest wind, Argestes.⁴⁵ As such, it draws from the beauty of classical fragments. H.D. celebrates intimate proximity, rather than the glory of the denizens of the rock-cut tombs of Lycia, or the unavailable “high gods,” moving to claim that even the wind is not so beautiful—meaning even the wind is not so present. Gregory defends the poem from accusations of obscurity in *H.D. and Hellenism*, having located the title as a name of Apollo as god of the harvest—“Sitalkas, the Apollo who guards this liminal moment of autumn and harvest, is thus not a trivial and clichéd dependency from the classical, but the right sigil for a complex discursive event” (138). Gregory’s reading coalesces around the idea that “the poem suggests the opposite [of disembodiment]. Here we are within a bodied desiring voice, preferring nearness to detachment, mortal immediacy to cool, godlike response.”

Flint’s reading of “Sitalkas” somehow manages to wrest the poem from even its slight textual apparatus, making it about a man listening to a woman talk without heeding what she is saying:

You cannot argue it out by syllogisms. It might have come out of some Greek anthology; but that does not bring you any nearer to it. In fact, the more you attempt to reason about it the less will you get out of it. It must work on you as an evocation. You may see a woman in white muslin who has waited, not long, but long enough, in the long grass of June, under the shade of a large elm by a river's bank, the Thames; and, if you are a male, you will lean over her and listen to the sound of her voice, without troubling much about the purport of her words, knowing that they are not a reproach but rather a responsive music; or the strange names may affect you so that the time becomes a time that you do not know as June; and the dress of the woman is vague and lovely to you; and the scene is one that you can place in no country. (72)

This portrait of the reader as a young man is clearly a poetic impression rather than an interpretation. The final lines describe how the immediacy of the experience of the poem will dissolve time and place, becoming an eternal moment of newness. Flint's leap from the Greek anthology to the immediate present is an example of the ongoing preoccupation with rendering Greek more accessible to the modern world, a move here complicated by the fact that Flint fills in more details than the poem grants. Flint's impressionist reading-poem closely parallels an Edward Storer poem, "Clarice-Henley," that he had quoted in his "History of Imagism" earlier in the issue, which is itself an account of a *dejeuner sur l'herbe*, a poem he described as "the resonant heart in an exquisite moment" (70).

From poetic impressions, Flint turns to more general speculations about art and H.D.'s art. He criticizes her for not giving enough to the reader, and incidentally, gains the distinction of being the first of many poets to discuss "H.D.'s later poems":

In all art, it seems to me, there must be generosity and some pity for the spectator; and you may fall short of generosity by withholding in order that the gift may be finer. The riddle the

artist has always to answer is, How much shall he give; and the quality of his pity for the spectator will decide this. An artist cannot be inhuman and be understood. I say this because I think I have detected in one or two of H. D.'s later poems a tendency to pare and cut too far, with a consequent slight feeling, in the result, of bareness and jejuneness. But it is only slight; and there is more danger of her becoming inhuman, in the sense I have indicated.

Rebuffed by the difficulty of H.D.'s poems, Flint creates further difficulties here: he seems to see H.D. threatened by her pitiless and ungenerous minimalism. This reading makes H.D. into a sort of poetic femme fatale: on the one hand, the prattling but responsive woman in white muslin, and on the other a terrifying emotional surgeon, cutting too deep in her impersonality to leave any humanity behind. This is the double bind of H.D., appearing early: she is not to be taken too seriously, and yet she is somehow dangerous.

These ideas would reappear in a Harriet Monroe essay on modern poetry that appeared about a year later. Imagism changed quickly—even in that 1915 special issue, Pound was already on the way out. H.D. remained after the transition to the “Amygism” of Pound’s scorn, and she had a major role in the transition away from Pound—but *Poetry* still loved the Imagists. In *Poetry* of August 1916, Harriet Monroe repeats many of the points she had made earlier, and reiterates a few borrowed from the Imagist special issue. In particular, she echoes Flint in a double review titled “Two Anthologies,” comparing an anthology of Georgian poetry and *Some Imagist Poets*: “Of them all, H. D. is no doubt the perfect imagist, the only danger which besets her stark style being that which assails all perfection—the danger of becoming too keen and cold, too abstract, too inhuman.” She then follows this by praising the Georgians, particularly Rupert Brooke, John Masefield, Walter de la Mare, and W.H. Davies, concluding that “Students of modern poetry will need both these books.” The pattern has set, and the essential misreading of

H.D. begins itself to solidify into a cold, stark, inhuman stillness. This was incorrect enough that it received a corrective as early as 1920, in *Coterie*: Henry J. Felton refuted the notion: “Are these poems so ‘inhuman’ as journalists complain? They are rather the passionate reveries of a lonely personality for whom nothing exists but eternal beauty” (43). While this chapter will not dwell on Felton’s review, it is predicated on H.D.’s aesthetic hyper-humanity rather than her inhumanity. This illustrates the extreme divergence in opinion rising from readings of the early H.D.

Harold Monro versus May Sinclair

Harold Monro, editor of *Poetry and Drama*, also appears in the Imagist special issue. Monro’s magazine mostly hosted poets in the Georgian circle such as Rupert Brooke and Robert Bridges, but he also hosted imagist poetry (always held at arm’s length), and Futurist manifestos by Marinetti alongside somewhat softened translations of Futurist poetry. A modernist editor in his own right, he approached Imagism with measured caution.

Monro criticizes “Oread” for being a mere single image: “H. D. is the truest ‘Imagist’ of the group. But its future work will scarcely develop along the lines of her example. Her poems have a slight flavour of brine; they are as fragile as sea-shells. If I came too near them I should be afraid of crushing them into the sand with my clumsy feet” (79). Monro seems to read the surface of the poem in order to accuse it of superficiality, ignoring its context: it appeared in the February 2, 1914 issue of *The Egoist* as one component of a poetic series.

This was a reworking of H.D.’s debut series in *Poetry*, which appeared one year and one month earlier. “Hermes of the Ways” is again the first poem in the series, but “Priapus” is shifted to be the final poem in the set, and “Epigram” is missing. In its place are two poems: the famous

“Oread” and the more obscure “Incantation,” which appears as “Orion Dead” in *Some Imagist Poems*, *The God*, and the *Collected Poems*. Gregory notes that either one seems like it would be at home in *Sea Garden*, but somehow, neither one appears there. Both were delayed until *Heliadora and Other Poems* in 1924 (“Rose Cut” 537). “Incantation” is subtitled “Artemis over the body of Orion” and in typical H.D. fashion, it reads like a fragment. The poem is replete with violent imagery, foreshadowing the meditations on destruction that appear in many poems in *Sea Garden*, lingering on the Artemis’ creation of a cornel-wood bow, first as a staff, then as a weapon with which to tear out the roots of all the plants on the earth, a reference to Orion’s boast that he would slay all the animals of the earth. Cornel is the female of the dogwood, and is famous for use in bow construction. Its scientific name, *sanguinea*, is appropriately bloody, though this refers to the bright color of its branches in winter. Artemis’ response is akin to that of Demeter in the Persephone myth, destroying the earth by making it impossible for plants to grow. Each of the poems center on a tree: Hermes has apples, Artemis the cornel, the oread has pines, Priapus pears. This is the most obvious link, but the poems move between orchard trees and those about the wildwood, a balance between cultivation and the wilderness that *Sea Garden* will later explore. In “Incantation” this takes the form of Artemis’ meditation on the interlacing of the roots of the cornel with the roots of the barley, their delicate interconnection threatened by the rage of the goddess. Artemis, who killed Orion the hunter because of his overpowering prowess at the hunt, feels his loss keenly enough to consider wiping out all life in recompense—an ecological parable lurks here. After “Incantation” appears “Oread.” “Oread” creates a perfectly balanced tension between the sea and the pines, so that it is unclear whether the poem is using trees to describe the ocean, or the ocean to describe the forest trees. The classical tradition

often muses on the strangeness of building ships from mountain trees, which may be at play here. As with “The Pool,” there is no center.

Instead of entering the sequence with its careful balance of sea and pine, Harold Monroe tries to contextualize Imagism as a reaction to Cosmicism, a contemporary fad for heightened romanticism. Monroe explains that “[The imagists] were so terrified at Cosmicism that they ran away into a kind of exaggerated Microcosmism, and found their greatest emotional excitement in everything that seemed intensely small.” Monroe frames Imagism as reactionary, cowardly, as seeing much in very little. He seems to have no sense of the inter-poetic ecologies of H.D.’s magazine contributions, and he seems a little terrified of the microcosm himself.

May Sinclair responded to Harold Monroe’s review directly in the next issue of *The Egoist*, June 1915; and she responded in order to defend H.D., not to defend Imagism. It is one of Sinclair’s earliest contributions to *The Egoist*, only preceded by a set of poems in the prior issue. Neither Monroe nor Sinclair sees H.D. as a serial poet, their disagreement coming along a different line of fracture. Sinclair’s first angle of attack is a little unfair, considering Monroe’s commitment to emerging poetry:

If you are sworn to admire nothing but Swinburne, or Rossetti, or Mrs. Browning or Robert Browning and their imitators for ever and ever, you may reject the ‘Hermes’ because there is no ‘passion’ in it. But why, in Heaven's name, should there be passion in it? Haven't we had enough of passion and of the sentiment that passed for passion all through the nineteenth century? We can't hope to escape the inevitable reaction. And isn't it almost time to remind us that there is a beauty of restraint and stillness and flawless clarity?

This defense redeems the faults identified by Monroe by refiguring them as strengths. “Flawless clarity” emphasizes the gemlike nature of the poems, contrasting their apparent stasis

with aesthetic dynamism: H.D. as the restrained and still poetess. Sinclair's points to "Hermes of the Ways" to refute Monro's accusation that H.D.'s poems are too brief, arguing that it is longer "by a score of lines." As yet, there is no sense of the connection of poem to poem—no mention of the fact that "Oread" appeared in *The Egoist* as an interlude between the "Incantation" and "Priapus." There is also surprisingly little reference to the raw, even bloody, grief and passion of "Incantation." There much to compare with Browning, along with much to contrast.

Toward the end of her review, Sinclair articulates the difficulty of describing what, precisely, makes H.D.'s poetry function: "I think it is a question of magic. And if you cannot feel in these verses, not only the 'slight flavour of brine' perceived by Mr. Monro, but the sense of enchantment, of grave things not known and about to be, the *frisson* of immortality impending—then (I am afraid) you are past praying for" (88). This echoes *Poetry's* description of the first poems as "not... in any sense finalities," and is ultimately more characteristic of H.D. than stillness or flawless clarity. Sinclair finds herself resorting to non-arguments, claiming that the poems can either be sensed, or not. The test is in the reader, not in the poem. This argument, in a modified form, will be taken up by H.D. herself in an ambivalent review of John Gould Fletcher.

H.D. Reads John Gould Fletcher, Fletcher Reads H.D.

Usually, H.D.'s imagism is considered alongside Pound, or maybe Richard Aldington. Her literary relationship with John Gould Fletcher is less known. Her review of Fletcher's *Goblins and Pagodas* in the December 1916 issue of *The Egoist* is her third and final book review appearing there after H.D. took over from Richard Aldington as Harriet Shaw Weaver's subeditor, as announced in September 1916. Her review of Fletcher echoes her earlier reviews of Marianne Moore and Charlotte Mew in its vibrant, emotional, and technical tone. Her review's

description of Fletcher is intensely poetic, like Flint's review of H.D. Most importantly, she establishes her own views regarding poetry's relationship to things themselves. The review is actually more of a self-review, considering the way that H.D. takes scraps from Fletcher's prose introduction to *Goblins and Pagodas*, and expands them into dramatic writing that explicitly counters Fletcher's own points. Jayne Marek notices this: "Other portions of the review directly contradict the well-known Imagist precepts, and a close examination of H.D.'s language suggests that she was ambivalent about Fletcher's work" (113-114). Her ambivalence lead her to describe her own poetics.

Fletcher's introduction is very much of its time and its milieu, having much in common with Dora Marsden's editorials. He fuses scientific vitalism and aesthetics. He discusses the influence of Scriabin's combination of color and music on his work, and "an English scientist, Professor Wallace Rimington, [who] has built an organ that plays in colors instead of notes" (xix). This is a sample of his blending of arts and sciences, but Fletcher's discussion of form and composition caught H.D.'s attention. He argues that free verse is more beautiful than metered poetry, illustrating his point by comparing meter to the key pattern on a Greek vase, and free verse to the images of nymphs and satyrs on the vase itself (xiv). This is the image that H.D. selects, in order to complicate it, and ultimately to refute it. After quoting Fletcher's claim that the scene on a Greek vase is more beautiful than the key pattern around its edge, H.D. extends Fletcher's cliché with a creative rephrasing of the metaphor:

In the second section of his book, Mr. Fletcher deals with a more difficult and, when successfully handled, richer form of art: not that of direct presentation, but that of suggestion. Mr. Fletcher, in the very admirable Preface to this new volume, remarks, apropos of certain current opinions concerning the so-called "new poetry," "the key- pattern on a Greek vase may

be beautiful, but it is less beautiful, less satisfying, and less conclusive a test of artistic ability than the composition of satyrs and maenads struggling about the centre.” And as we come to a clearer understanding of the poet's method and his work, we are almost tempted to continue his apt metaphor; to say to the artist: the images so wrought upon the body of the vase—the maenad, poised for ever, quietly for all the swirl of draperies and of loosened head-band, or the satyr forever lifting his vine-wreathed cup—are satisfying and indeed perfect. But how much more for the lover of beauty is the wine within the great jar beautiful—how much more than the direct image to him are the images suggested by shadow and light, the flicker of the purple wine, the glint across the yellow, the depth of the crimson and red? Who would stand gazing at a satyr and a maenad, however adroit the composition of fluttering garment and poised wine-cup when the wine itself within the great jar stands waiting for him? (183)

H.D. succumbs completely to her “almost temptation” until she is so far from Fletcher’s original train of thought that the result must be a description of her own poetic. Rejecting direct presentation for suggestion, H.D. insists that direct participation through suggestion of reality is better than secondhand contemplation. Read in the light of this review, H.D.’s poetry about more than decoration, and form is important as the vessel of the joyous intoxicant. Poetry requires form as a way to bear the gift from mouth to mouth, but it need not stand eternally as Beauty and Truth. It is a corrective for Keats as much as for Fletcher. This pointed substitution of H.D.’s modernism for Fletcher’s, is also a declaration of independence from Pound. What H.D. might have seen to respond to in those pages was not simply the slippage between the key pattern and the Greek image, but the poem as something to partake in, not something to admire.

H.D.’s review rejects Fletcher’s scientific justification of free verse by making poetry an actual participatory act, not a representation of it, or an adornment of the vessel of experience.

Fletcher's preoccupation with theory and technique keeps him from the draught/draft. In her 1984 essay "The Concept of Projection: H. D.'s Visionary Powers," Adalaide Morris catches the gist of this correction: "The goblins and pagodas that title his volume testify to visionary capacities. His art pursues not the solidity of physical things so much as the spiritual enigmas that radiate from them" (417). Morris argues that the passage illustrates H.D.'s commitment to visionary poetics, but Morris underestimates the intensity of H.D.'s correction. H.D. is not arguing that Fletcher is a visionary, and his dry, scientific, introduction to *Goblins and Pagodas* offers little by way of vision. This is H.D. describing her own work.

John Gould Fletcher thought highly of H.D.'s verse, dedicating "The Old South," the first poem in *Goblins and Pagodas*, to his countrywoman when he first published it in *Poetry* in July 1915. A more permanent case of the forgotten imagist than H.D., Fletcher's richly adorned verse further illustrates the diversity of styles that appeared under the imagist banner. Fletcher's interpretation of H.D. is embedded in a review of *Sea Garden*. It might have taken *Sea Garden's* publication for readers of H.D. to get a sense of her poetics. As deft as they are, the magazine poetic sequences do not make their interconnections so obviously important as *Sea Garden*. Fletcher reviewed *Sea Garden* for *Poetry* in February 1917. Notably, Fletcher takes H.D.'s mysticism seriously, comparing her to Blake, Plotinus, and Swedenborg. Fletcher saw *Sea Garden* as a single work, one that cannot be broken into its constituent parts:

As I read and re-read this small volume for it is necessary to read it many times, I cease to care whether this is or is not what the academic critics choose to label Poetry, or whether it is or is not Imagism. Whatever it is, the form is as inevitable as the substance, since neither form nor substance has been created independently. It is beauty independent of laws, holding but to its own hard and bitter perfection. Perhaps not to many it will appeal, because most of us have the

human thirst for imperfection; for the sea-change and not for the sea-peace that follows after the change; for the surface dance and glitter and not for the profound, calm light of the depth. But to some it will appeal, and its future is safe in their hands. It were folly to attempt to quote from a book which is so much of one piece, tempered as this.

Compare this to Eileen Gregory: “*Sea Garden* is a consciously crafted whole, with studied consistency in landscape, voice, and theme” (536). As an observer of H.D.’s career to that point, Fletcher sees that H.D.’s poetic is “tempered” into this crafted whole. The later works of H.D. seem to hover around Fletcher’s review. Fletcher, who is a serial poet himself, observes how the experiment has reached a new scale beyond the magazine sequences.

Combining the insights of Fletcher with H.D.’s self-analysis in her review of Fletcher, H.D. becomes a poet of experiential, participatory long poems that begin to fuse form and content (Fletcher’s “substance”). H.D.’s ambitious attempt to place the reader at the scene of events appears in her translations of *Choruses from Iphigenia at Aulis*.

H.D.’s *Iphigenia*

H.D.’s poetic of participatory vision applies to her longest early translation. H.D.’s *Choruses from Iphigenia at Aulis* appeared as a stand-alone publication in 1916, making it roughly contemporaneous with *Sea Garden*. It is one of the most difficult of H.D.’s works to locate physically: a search on WorldCat suggests the British Library as the only option to consult it. Most readers will turn to the *Collected Poems*, which carries over none of the apparatus from the original. This original is a tiny pamphlet of about five inches by four, beautifully printed, and only twenty pages long. The cover bears a strident declaration that is as much a manifesto as an introduction. It is part of the Poet’s Translation Series, an Egoist Press effort that published

H.D.'s translations along with some by Aldington, Flint, Edward Storer, and James Whitall.

Selections from each volume appeared in *The Egoist* from late 1915 through 1916. The project was announced in *The Egoist* of August, 1915.

The announcement to the project establishes its goals as a simultaneously iconoclastic and restorative moment for the classics. While the manifesto is unsigned, it has points of contact with Aldington, Pound, and H.D.: Aldington's concern for saving the classics, Pound's anger at academics, and H.D.'s insistence that the classics are still alive:

This literature has too long been the property of pedagogues, philologists and professors. Its human qualities have been obscured by the wranglings of grammarians, who love it principally because to them it is so safe and so dead. But to many of us it is not dead. It is more alive, more essential, more human than anything we can find in contemporary English literature. The publication of such classics, in the way we propose, may help to create a higher standard for poetry than that which prevails, and a higher standard of appreciation of the writers of antiquity, who have suffered too long at the hands of clumsy metrists. (131).

The series, then, will be poetry for poets, intended to improve them. The slight egotistical bent of this suits its venue.

THE POET'S TRANSLATION SERIES will appear first appear in "THE EGOIST" (starting September 1st) and will then be reprinted and issued as small pamphlets, simple and inexpensive, so that none will buy except to read. The translations will be done by poets whose interest in their authors will be neither conventional nor frigid. The translators will take no concern with glosses, notes, or any of the apparatus with which learning smothers beauty. They will endeavour to give the words of these Greek and Latin authors as simply and as clearly as

may be. Where the text is confused, they will use the most characteristic version; where obscure, they will interpret.

H.D.'s translations of Euripides' choruses, as part of this series, are presented as useful objects rather than as collector's pieces or scholar's aids.

The list of proposed volumes reveals that at some point, H.D. changed her plans. Originally she was supposed to translate the choruses from Euripides' *Rhesus* (*Rhesos* in her transliteration). Instead she translated the choruses from *Iphigenia at Aulis*. While trying to reverse-engineer the change of heart from the scraps of information preserved in the magazine is difficult, it is worth noting that each play takes place during the Trojan War, and each is about the waste of war. The major difference is that *Rhesus* is a much darker play, more about abject terror, thievery, and slaughter by subterfuge than heroism. It recounts the story of Odysseus and Diomedes infiltrating the Trojan camp and killing Rhesus and his men in their sleep. *Iphigenia at Aulis*, on the other hand, is about the sacrifice of Agamemnon's daughter to appease Artemis and get the right winds to sail the fleet to Troy. The climax of the play comes when Iphigenia accepts her fate, bravely refusing Achilles' rescue. There is something particularly World War One about this plotline, appearing as it does less than a year after the Battle of Gallipoli. It belongs to the rich field of women's writing about the war, texts such as Muriel Ciolkowska's *Fighting Paris* columns in *The Egoist*, or even Beatrice Hastings' *Impressions of Paris*. H.D. may have turned from *Rhesus* to *Iphigenia* as a turn from an anti-war play to one that has a more ambivalent take on conflict: Iphigenia's courage redeems the tragedy.

The pamphlet translates text from the choruses, and also the concluding action of the play, including Iphigenia's lamentations and defiant acceptance of her role as sacrifice. *Choruses from Iphigenia at Aulis* begins when the women of the chorus sneak through the woods to spy on

the massing Greek soldiers while they while away the time in athletic competitions, waiting for the wind to change.

I crept through the woods
 Between the altars:
 Artemis haunts the place.
 Shame, scarlet, fresh-opened—a flower,
 Strikes across my face.
 And sudden—light upon shields,
 Low huts—the armed Greeks,
 Circles of horses. (3)

The women of the chorus are changed by witnessing the war, losing their innocence with the violence of a blow—but the blow is figured as a flower. Iphigenia's tragic self-sacrifice and the Achaeans' loss of innocence are contained in this compact metaphor, which recalls the flowers and the violence of *Sea Garden*.

Then, H.D. translates the catalog of ships, Euripides' version of the passage from *The Illiad* in which Homer meticulously names and numbers the chieftains and ships of the Achaean army. H.D.'s version is briefer than Homer's, and it serves a more directly dramatic purpose: the catalog boggles the mind of the chorus of women, who end up deeply affected by the vision of the fleet's sheer multitude:

I have heard all this.
 I have looked too
 Upon this people of ships.
 You could never count the Greek sails

Nor the flat keels of the foreign boats.

I have heard—

I myself have seen the floating ships

And nothing will ever be the same—

The shouts,

The harrowing voices within the house

I stand apart with an army:

My mind is graven with ships

The chorus is changed utterly by their encounter with the fleet, carved by their vision.

The scene describes the massing of Sparta's allies preparing to go on a punitive expedition to Asia Minor. The catalog of ships has its analog in the endless discussions over the number of troops necessary to defeat Germany, of the catalogs of British ships, of the discussions of their sinking by submarines. H.D.'s choruses perform precisely the function projected by the prospectus for the Poet's Translation Series: the humanity of Ancient Hellas is brought into the world of the Great War, but the overall focus is on the psychological changes wrought on noncombatants by war.

T.S. Eliot reviews her translation positively in the *Poetry* of November, 1916: "H. D. is a poet. She has at least avoided the traditional jargon prescribed for translators: she has turned Euripides into English verse which can be taken seriously, verse of our own time, as modern as was Swinburne's when it appeared. Her verse is a perversion of the opposite extreme. Swinburne

is too fluid, H. D. too abrupt” (102).⁴⁶ Eliot simultaneously criticizes the looseness of her translation: “in a few cases, where Euripides' style is merely bald, the alteration is not an improvement. ‘I keep the memory of the assembled army’ becomes ‘My mind is graven with ships’ with obvious loss of dignity” (103). However much Eliot disagrees with the liberties in H.D.’s translation, he criticizes her in part because he believed the other translations in the series were not worth the attention: “The translators of this series have an opportunity which most of them have neglected. H.D. is the exception” (102). The act of criticism is an act of praise, and he admits that “often she does succeed in bringing something out of the Greek language to the English, in an immediate contact which gives life to both, the contact which makes it possible for the modern language perpetually to draw sustenance from the dead” (103). For Eliot, the value in H.D. comes not necessarily from the quality of the translation, but from the quality of the poetry as a conduit for the classics to reinvigorate modern poetry. This was the goal of the *Poet’s Translation Series*. He has more trouble with the liberties she takes in the translation, but taken as part of H.D.’s wider project, these match her procedures from “Epigram” through the rest of the early poetry, and will continue to be relevant in the future.

The epic H.D. was present from the beginning: *Choruses from Iphigenia* resemble nothing so much as *Helen in Egypt*, H.D.’s epic long poem, almost serving as a preface for the later work. By stripping the choruses of plot and the more conventional drama of the play, H.D. calls attention to the drama that is just barely on stage, embodied by the chorus in their function

⁴⁶ Gilbert Murray had recently translated *Rhesus* into rhymed verse. T.S. Eliot’s review of the *Poet’s Translation Series* illustrates the difference between Murray and H.D.: “The translators of this series have an opportunity which most of them have neglected. H. D. is the exception. Gilbert Murray has struck at Greek scholarship and done no good to English verse. Euripides for the working-man, at a shilling the play, in the style of fifty years ago—an ideal of socialism and popular education—Greek without tears. The only result can be still greater neglect of Greek in our schools. Why study Greek when an *adequate* translation can always be had, cheap and easy scholarship for the busy man?”

as a representation of the people. *Helen in Egypt* likewise has its choric prose, the choragus or chorus-master as a character in the play. H.D. is already wrestling with the deep psychological impacts that war has on its witnesses. This thread will carry throughout her career, from Aulis to Egypt.

Conclusion

H.D.'s early readers attempted to build a comprehensive criticism of her poetry from a handful of magazine publications. The number of reviews, readings, and published opinions on H.D.'s magazine poetry are out of scale to the number of poems that had been printed. It is not surprising that this small sample of poems was read in ways that do not adequately describe the early works. The descriptors applied to her early poems, summed up by H.D.'s own catch-all term "crystalline," continued to adhere to her poems even as her later works proliferated to the point where the crystalline argument should have broken. Most of the early reviews that do resonate with late-twentieth and early twenty-first century readings of H.D. occurred after the publication of *Sea Garden*. With the benefit of hindsight, and the benefit of having the later epic poems like *Trilogy* and *Helen in Egypt* at hand, much of the criticism that appeared with the poems seems reductive. Much of it intended to enhance H.D.'s reputation along with that of imagism, but the early criticism established reading practices that ultimately led to her burial in literary obscurity. In the early twenty-first century, one hundred years after these poems were first published, the story of imagism and the story of H.D.'s recovery have become classic stories of modernism and modernist criticism. Returning to the poems in their magazine contexts shows how both stories are also readings conditioned by prior readings. As non-neutral media for the dissemination of art and criticism, the modernist magazines were prone to shape the reception of the texts they contained. Sometimes, as often happens in *The New Age*, this warping was

intentional, guided by satire and editorial comment to damage or control rogue texts. In H.D.'s case, her limited poetic production led even positive reviews to the same end. The result is the flawed crystalline legend of H.D.'s early poetry. Her early poetry combined sophisticated allusions with a willingness to use ancient materials as the grounds for her own creativity, verses, translations, and reflections; and these poems were part of an experiential, participatory poetic described in her review of Fletcher. More often than not, this was possible because of her deft use of serial poetics.

CONCLUSION—Montage at the Rag and Bone Shop

“It is easy to see when I began to take the literary direction of the “New Age.” For the first time, the paper shows some signs of being edited instead of being merely filled up. I put it without fear to any competent editor in the world.

Until I came in, the “New Age” was a *rag*; until I was free to come in entirely, in summer, 1908, there were frequent issues of rags; and after I “left” it degenerated to a rag again.” Beatrice Hastings, *The Old New Age*, 4.

“Method of this project: literary montage. I needn’t *say* anything. Merely show. I shall purloin no valuables, appropriate no ingenious formulations. But the rags, the refuse—these I will not inventory but allow, in the only way possible, to come into their own: by making use of them.” Walter Benjamin, *The Arcades Project*

“Now that my ladder's gone
I must lie down where all the ladders start
In the foul rag and bone shop of the heart.”

“The Circus Animals’ Desertion,” W. B. Yeats

The rag and bone man was a recycler. He would travel the city, gathering worn out linen and old bones, carrying them back to the printer’s shop. The rags would be broken down, pounded into loose fiber, and pressed into paper. When Yeats cites the rag and bone man, the

page is the result of the encounter. “The Circus Animals’ Desertion” resonates so much with the passage with Walter Benjamin’s programmatic statement about montage and Hastings’ furious declaration of editorial power meant that the rag and bone shop of the heart was often in my mind as I worked on this project. These three invocations of the rag have haunted the composition of *Issues of Modernism*. Benjamin points toward an ideal criticism, one where the texts in question are allowed to come into their own without theft and without formulation. There is a stark contrast the purity of that image of editing and the messier realities of the modernist journals, but then, Benjamin is writing about scholarly (albeit experimental) editing.

Many affinities between modernist art and the art of editing seem to have drawn the two together. After all, an editor needs to gather many disparate materials into a compelling whole. While this could describe almost any art, it applies especially to modernism, which was in part inspired by the magazine even as it existed through them: “Even the technique of making collage, with its bits and pieces that can be shifted about on the drawing sheet and provisionally pinned in place before their definitive gluing, is derived from commercial practice. It is more reminiscent of layout design than of anything taught at the Ecole des Beaux-Arts” (71). Krauss’ comment on layout design fits most perfectly with Hastings’ deviously brilliant arrangement of many genres and many voices. Dora Marsden’s own construction of arguments through criticism of language was only possible because of her control over the shape and content of the flexible frame of *The New Freewoman*. H.D.’s own relationship to modernist editing is the outlier, occurring as it does on the level of inter-journal conversation on the one hand, and the relationship between the poems that made up the poetic sequences of her magazine poetry on the other. While Benjamin was writing about his critical method, the literary figures who structure

this dissertation are experts in literary montage, in one way or another. Hastings assembles personae. Marsden manages conversations. H.D. arranges poems.

About a month ago, I took a break to peruse *The Guardian*. Who should look back at me but the enigmatic, masklike face of Beatrice Hastings, as one of Modigliani's portraits of her was featured in an article about an upcoming Modigliani exhibition at the Tate Modern. I was pleased to find that she garnered some text in the article:

The exhibition will include several portraits of one of his more flamboyant friends, Beatrice Hastings, who worked as a critic, poet and journalist under at least 30 pseudonyms, and whose many other lovers included the writers Katherine Mansfield and Wyndham Lewis. She recalled their first meeting: "Hashish and brandy. Not at all impressed ... He looked ugly, ferocious, greedy." They became friends, lovers and drinking companions, however, and he painted her repeatedly, though their fights were infamous and on one occasion Modigliani – who was at least a foot shorter – is said to have thrown her headfirst out a window. (Kennedy)

Kennedy's account of Hastings could be worse. At least Kennedy mentions her literary activities. The lack of understanding of who Hastings was and what she did is evident, as are the reasons Hastings should be better known. Her writing is obscured by the spicy details of her personal life, including the oft-circulated tale of her defenestration. Hastings is a challenging figure, but Modigliani's masks should not be the only reason she is remembered. She represents one of the many modernisms that wasn't, a political dead end, but a fascinating one full of lessons for the present (not all of them pleasant).

H.D., Beatrice Hastings, and Dora Marsden existed in the same small sphere of Anglo-American modernist little magazines, so naturally their paths crossed in print. Hastings and *The*

New Age fought with Marsden and *The New Freewoman* twice: once over an attack by Marsden on guild socialism's reliance on misleading euphemisms to cover tyrannical intent, and again over a book review by Rebecca West. Marsden picked the first fight by pointing out that guild socialism would have to defend its monopoly on labor power by force, making it an essentially aggressive doctrine. The otherwise anonymous (possibly Hastings) "Press-Cutter" of *The New Age*, responsible for reporting any time *The New Age* was mentioned or plagiarized in the press, responded to Marsden's alternative call for women to acquire property and defend it by force in the following way: "I confess I like the backwoods picture of the new free women each sitting under her fig-tree rifle in hand to shoot trespassers on the newlyfurrowed fields, what time the sweating oxen swing their twinkling tails. But it is a Cinema-vignette" (583). This exchange reveals the glaring holes in each magazine's political philosophy. Coincidentally, this issue of *The New Age* is the same one containing Orage's claim that the journal "all hangs together": perhaps the appearance of a formidable cross-town rival had something to do with *The New Age's* defensive maneuvers.

The second exchange, this one openly between Hastings and Rebecca West, was sparked by a particularly nasty personal shot at Hastings embedded in West's review of Hall Caine's "The Woman Thou Gavest Me." Hastings responds in the October 23, 1913 issue with evasions. In yet another consternating moment, she appears to insinuate that she is not properly called a contributor to *The New Age*: "In the 'Freewoman' [sic] Miss Rebecca West refers to me as a contributor to your journal. I fear that 'Press-cutter,' if he comes across the cutting may not share my interest, my amazed gratitude for this mention. It seems that I am counted among 'us intellectuals,' or, at least, that any news about me, even if not quite correct, is of personal appeal to that creative band who are so busy under the New Renaissance of the Greek Alphabet" (775).

Recognition! Unfortunately, Hastings' recognition embedded in West's unfounded assumption that Caine's novel is based on Hastings' life, mostly because of many parallels between the plot of that novel and Hastings' *Pages from an Unpublished Novel*. Hastings uses this flaw in West's reading to imply that *Pages* is not autobiographical at all (it is): "As for the evidence of the "Unpublished Novel," which Miss West assumes to be an autobiography..."

At these moments of direct encounter between the two journals, Hastings distances herself (or at least that persona) from both her works and from her position at *The New Age* (although there is an ambiguity in that perhaps West should have called her something other than contributor: editor?). Simultaneously she mocks their turn to Greek, which, as this appears eleven days after H.D.'s debut in *The New Freewoman*, is a shot at her and at Richard Aldington, who had written for *The New Age* for some time. As such, this may be the place where the three central figures of the dissertation come closest in a single moment in the archive. That it is a contentious moment is characteristic.

These encounters involved all the major characters of this dissertation. Marsden's attention to the meaning behind words began to undermine guild socialism, West's review half-unmasked Hastings who responded with evasion and a possible criticism of Greek-influenced imagism. The proximity of these figures to each other is most obvious in their conflicts.

I have not traced the many parallels between Marsden's thought and Hastings', and the possibility of mutual influence despite public hostility. Both argue that women can only be liberated by themselves, that freedom is a spiritual state rather than a legal status. The turn inward somehow resulted in a turn to editing.

I bring up the connections and conflicts between the journals because they are another important angle of approach to modernist periodical studies. I chose to organize my chapters by

author because I am particularly interested in the construction of what Latham calls “intertextual webs” by magazine editors. The stories and histories I relate are often about short spans of time or even single issues of magazines. Longer-form accounts that would not center on any particular author would make this more difficult, but may be ultimately a more satisfying method. It would be interesting to concentrate on the connections and ideas, rather than concentrating on a particular knot in the network of modernism.

Even though I focused on three literary figures in the service of depth and detail, I left out much, both within the *avant guerre* moment, and significant moments that occurred before and after that moment. My focus on the *avant guerre* and the early years of the war meant that much of the later career of these literary figures falls outside the purview of the project. H.D.’s later career is well known, but Marsden’s is more obscure. Her “Lingual Psychology,” “The Science of Signs,” and the later philosophical trilogy beginning with *The Definition of the Godhead* are further links in her line of inquiry. The influence of *The Definition of the Godhead* on H.D.’s epic poetry seems likely, as she owned a copy, and certain passages from *Trilogy* rework Marsden’s elaborate etymological punning in *The Definition*. I did not attend to the modernist-satirical *Impressions of Paris* by Alice Morning’s because her move to Paris removed her from an active editorial role at *The New Age*, but though they are not woven into the paper like her earlier stories, they contain many remarkable passages. Nor have I discussed many works from *The New Age* that are difficult to attribute because they are either anonymous or appear under an unclaimed pseudonym. I suspect many of these were written by Hastings, including some that are significant, skillful, interesting, and even feminist.⁴⁷

⁴⁷ While Seattle may not be the best geographic location for the study of British literature, I have been fortunate to get to know a cadre of young and literary computer scientists at UW. They tell me that we can use machine learning to determine whether Hastings wrote any particular piece. I imagine that stylometric algorithms will be challenged by her many personae and genres, but it will be worth a try.

My frustrations with these author-editors oscillate in counterpoint to my admiration for their achievements. Hastings fabricated *The New Age* from a rag, but her most remarkable experiments seem almost like afterthoughts, banished to the correspondence pages or the Pastiche column. If she had wanted to, she could have synthesized a pseudonym to market her modernist writing—but the modernist stories are never commented on, unless Pound's comment about his curiosity about *The Maids' Comedy* is indeed supposed to apply to them. Marsden likewise left a gap when she moved on from her most damaging political convictions without an explanation—but an explanation would imply that she owed something to the reader. It would have been out of character. With H.D., I wish that there were more reviews like her review of Fletcher. I wish that the early H.D. had published more criticism in *The Egoist*.

All these laments for lacunae are ridiculous, wishing for more and better rags for the print shop when I have not yet attended to the immense mass that remain to be made into fresh pages. The gaps fall where they will, and montage works with the things at hand, not the absent. What about Alice Groff? Huntly Carter? Even Arnold Bennett deserves more space. Alice Corbin Henderson? Jessie Dismorr? Helen Saunders? Muriel Ciolkowska? Leigh Henry? Robert Carlton Brown? Skipwith Cannell? May Effie Lee? Alice Gerstenberg? Charles Zwaska? That dastardly Sade Iverson, aka Elia W. Peattie, who trolled *The Little Review*? The unattributed pseudonyms still beckon: who was Morgan Tud? Anastasia Edwardes? Who was Acton Reed? These are selections from the more obscure side of my list of authors encountered and flagged for later attention. Many have already garnered scholarship, but others are more obscure.

Immersion is an act of allowing ones senses to be overcome by the medium that surrounds them—allowing oneself to be carried by the current, which of course, has its double meaning when dealing with magazines. Their news stays news, even as they subside into history.

The one issue of *The New Age* in my personal collection has a single inky fingerprint on the back cover, from the first reader, the printer, or the news agent. While the ink has long since dried, the print retains that unique human impress from someone long dead. Reading the journals creates a similar sense of unbridgeable distance and immediate connection with the past.

WORKS CITED

- Aldington, Richard. "Acon." *The New Age*, vol. 7, no. 4, Nov. 28, 1912, pp. 85. *The Modernist Journals Project*, modjourn.org/render.php?id=116531903393750&view=mjp_object.
- . "A Solemn Dialog." *The Egoist*, vol. 3, no. 7, 1 July 1916, p. 105. *The Modernist Journals Project*, library.brown.edu/pdfs/1308242882781253.pdf.
- Ardis, Ann. "Debating Feminism, Modernism, and Socialism: Beatrice Hastings's Voices in *The New Age*." *Gender in Modernism*. Edited by Bonnie Kime Scott, University of Illinois Press, 2007, pp. 160-185.
- . "Democracy and Modernism." *The Oxford Critical and Cultural History of Modernist Magazines*. Edited by Peter Brooker and Andrew Thacker, Oxford UP, pp. 206-225.
- . "The Dialogics of Modernism(s) in *The New Age*." *Modernism/Modernity*, vol. 14, no. 3, Sept. 2007, pp. 407-434.
- . *Modernism and Cultural Conflict. 1880-1992*. Cambridge University Press, 2002.
- Barton, J. E. "Reviews." *The New Age*, vol. 8, no. 7, 15 Dec. 1910, p. 160. *The Modernist Journals Project*, library.brown.edu/pdfs/1140813981437676.pdf.
- Benjamin, Walter. *The Arcades Project*. Translated by Howard Eiland and Kevin McLaughlin, Harvard University Press, 1999.
- Bennett, Arnold. *Clayhanger*. Methuen, 1947.
- Bergson, Henri. "The Philosophy of Ideas." *The New Freewoman*, vol. 1, no. 13, 15 Dec. 1913, pp. 246-248. *The Modernist Journals Project*, library.brown.edu/pdfs/1303311116129.pdf.
- Binckes, Faith. *Modernism, Magazines, and the British Avant-Garde*. Oxford University Press, 2010.
- Bornstein, George. *Material Modernism: The Politics of the Page*. Cambridge University Press, 2001.

- Boughn, Michael. *H.D.: A Bibliography*. University Press of Virginia, 1993.
- Boyle, C. Nina. Letter to the Editor. *The New Age*, vol. 8, no. 1, 1 May 1913, pp. 19. *The Modernist Journals Project*, modjournal.org/render.php?id=1165324893156250&view=mjp_object.
- Brown, Ivor. "Aspects of the Guild Idea." *The New Age*, vol. 17, no. 7, 17 June 1915, pp. 150-151. *The Modernist Journals Project*, modjournal.org/render.php?id=1165359002109375&view=mjp_object
- Byington, Steven. "On Behalf of Ideas." *The New Freewoman*, vol. 1, no. 13, 15 Dec. 1913, pp. 258-259. *Modernist Journals Project*, library.brown.edu/pdfs/1303311116129.pdf.
- Calderon, George. "The Post-Impressionists." *The New Age*, vol. 8, no. 4, 24 Nov. 1913, pp. 89-90. *Modernist Journals Project*, library.brown.edu/pdfs/114081397715867.pdf.
- Carswell, John. *Lives and Letters*. Faber and Faber, 1978.
- Carter, Huntly. "The Science of Mr. Sickert." *The New Age*, vol. 11, no. 8, 20 June 1912, p. 191. *Modernist Journals Project*, library.brown.edu/pdfs/1140814132123915.pdf.
- Clarke, Bruce. *Dora Marsden and Early Modernism*. U of Michigan Press, 1996.
- Cournos, John. "Henri Gaudier-Brzeska." *The Egoist*, vol. 2, no. 8, 2 Aug. 1915, p. 121. *The Modernist Journals Project*, modjournal.org/render.php?id=1306937287281252&view=mjp_object.
- Daniel, Lucy. *Gertrude Stein*. Reaktion Books, 2009.
- Debo, Annette. *The American H.D.* University of Iowa Press, 2012.
- Delap, Lucy. "Feminist and Anti-Feminist Encounters in Edwardian Britain." *Historical Research*, vol. 78, no. 281, August 2005, pp. 377-399.
- Dhu, Cailin. "To the Editors of *The Freewoman*." *The Freewoman*, vol. 1, no. 5, 21 Dec. 1911, p. 92. *The Modernist Journals Project*, library.brown.edu/pdfs/1300810110593754.pdf.
- DuPlessis, Rachel Blau. "Haibun: 'Draw your/Draft.'" *H.D. and Poets After*. Edited by Donna

Ford, Ford Madox. *Parade's End*. Alfred A. Knopf, 1950.

Krolik Hollenberg, University of Iowa Press, 2000, pp. 112-129.

Eliot, T. S. "Classics in English." *Poetry*, vol. 9, no. 11, Oct. 1912, pp. 101-104. *The Modernist Journals Project*, modjournal.org/render.php?id=1210688898359375&view=mjp_object.

Fletcher, John Gould. *Goblins and Pagodas*. Houghton Mifflin, 1916.

---. "H.D.'s Vision." *Poetry*, vol. 9, no. 5, Feb. 1917, pp. 266-269. *The Modernist Journals Project*, modjournal.org/render.php?id=1210689247625000&view=mjp_object.

Flint, F.S. "Imagisme." *Poetry*, vol. 1, no. 6, Mar. 1913, pp. 198-200. *The Modernist Journals Project*, library.brown.edu/pdfs/1201897921671875.pdf.

---. "The Poetry of H.D." *The Egoist*, vol. 2, no. 5, May 1915, pp. 72-73. *The Modernist Journals Project*, modjournal.org/render.php?id=1306936031578127&view=mjp_object.

Friedman, Susan Stanford. *Psyche Reborn*. Indiana UP, 1981.

---. "Who Buried H.D.?" *College English*, vol. 36, no. 7, March 1975, 801-814.

Garner, Les. *A Brave and Beautiful Spirit*. Avebury, 1990.

Garver, Lee. "Neither Progressive nor Reactionary: Reassessing the Cultural Politics of *The New Age*." *The Journal of Modernist Periodical Studies*, vol. 2, no. 1, 2011, pp. 86-115.

Gawthorpe, Mary. *The Freewoman*, vol. 1, no. 3, 7 Dec. 1911, pp. 41-41. *The Modernist Journals Project*, library.brown.edu/pdfs/1300809082453129.pdf.

Granville, Charles. "The Tyranny of Words." *The Freewoman*, vol. 1, no. 2, 30 Nov. 1911, pp. 34-35. *Modernist Journals Project*, library.brown.edu/pdfs/1300808580765625.pdf.

Gray, Stephen. *Beatrice Hastings: A Literary Life*. Viking, 2004.

Gregory, Eileen. *H.D. and Hellenism*. Cambridge University Press, 1997.

---. "Rose Cut in Rock: Sappho and H.D.'s *Sea Garden*. *Contemporary Literature*, vol. 27, no. 4, Winter 1986, pp. 525-552.

Hardy, Thomas. *Tess D'Urbervilles*. Harper, 1920.

Hastings, Beatrice. "Correspondence." *The New Age*, vol. 7, no. 3, 19 May 1913, p. 69. *The Modernist Journals Project*, library.brown.edu/pdfs/1140813929869159.pdf.

---. "The New Freewoman." *The New Age*, vol. 13, no. 26, 23 Oct. 1913, p. 775. *The Modernist Journals Project*, library.brown.edu/pdfs/1140814239649963.pdf.

---. "Echo." *The New Age*, vol. 10, no. 12, 18 Jan. 1912, pp. 278-279. *The Modernist Journals Project*, library.brown.edu/pdfs/1140814093186343.pdf.

---. "Feminism and Common Sense." *The New Age*, vol. 13, no. 12, 17 July 1913, pp. 342-343. *The Modernist Journals Project*, modjournal.org/render.php?id=1165328337296875&view=mjp_object.

---. "Modernism." *The New Age*, vol. 10, no. 12, 18 Jan. 1912, pp. 283-284. *The Modernist Journals Project*, library.brown.edu/pdfs/1140814093186343.pdf.

---. "Mrs. Hastings on Women." *The New Age*, vol. 12, no. 24, 17 April 1913, pp. 591-592. *The Modernist Journals Project*, modjournal.org/render.php?id=1165324237828125&view=mjp_object.

---. "Post-Impressionism." *The New Age*, vol. 8, no. 13, 26 Jan. 1911, p. 309. *The Modernist Journals Project*, library.brown.edu/pdfs/1140813991683773.pdf.

---. "Race-Management." *The New Age*, vol. 7, no. 24., 6 March 1913, pp. 436-437. *The Modernist Journals Project*, modjournal.org/render.php?id=1165324237828125&view=mjp_object.

---. "Race-Management." *The New Age*, vol. 7, no. 21., 27 March 1913, pp. 510-511. *The Modernist Journals Project*, modjournal.org/render.php?id=116532326946875&view=mjp_object.

- . *The Old New Age*. Blue Moon Press, 1936.
- . "Thou Shalt Not Kill." *The New Age*, vol. 13, no. 4, 22 May 1913, pp. 88-89. *The Modernist Journals Project*, modjournal.org/render.php?id=1165325720890625&view=mjp_object.
- . "Two Reviews." *The New Age*, vol. 13, no. 26, 23 Oct. 1913, pp. 757-760. *The Modernist Journals Project*, library.brown.edu/pdfs/1140814239649963.pdf.
- H.D. [Hilda Doolittle]. *Choruses from Iphigenia at Aulis*. The Poet's Translation Series, no. 3, 1916.
- . "Cities." *The Egoist*, vol. 3, no. 7, July 1916, pp. 102-103, modjournal.org/render.php?view=mjp_object&id=13082425142.
- . *Collected Poems 1912-1944*. New Directions, 1983.
- . "Goblins and Pagodas." *The Egoist*, vol. 3, no. 12, Dec. 1916, pp. 183-184. *The Modernist Journals Project*, modjournal.org/render.php?id=1308244482281252&view=mjp_object.
- . "H.D. by Delia Alton." *The Iowa Review*, vol. 16, no. 3, Fall 1986, pp. 180-221.
- . "Poems." *Poetry*, vol. 5, no. 6, March 1915, 265-268. *The Modernist Journals Project*, modjournal.org/render.php?id=1201884048796875&view=mjp_object.
- . *Sea Garden*. Constable and Company, 1916.
- . "Verses, Translations, and Reflections from the *Anthology*." *Poetry*, vol. 1, no. 4, Jan. 1913, pp. 118-122. *The Modernist Journals Project*, modjournal.org/render.php?id=1201877415187500&view=mjp_object.
- Henderson, Alice Corbin. "The Daffodil Fields." *Poetry*, vol. 2, no. 2, May 1913, pp. 76-78. *The Modernist Journals Project*, modjournal.org/render.php?id=1201877962734375&view=mjp_object.
- . "The Pool." *Poetry*, vol. 7, no. 5, Jan. 1916, pp. 166. *The Modernist Journals Project*, modjournal.org/render.php?id=1201887406968750&view=mjp_object.

- Heuving, Jeanne. *The Transmutation of Love and Avant-Garde Poetics*. The University of Alabama Press, 2016.
- Hirst, George (Beatrice Hastings). "Mrs. Hastings on Women." *The New Age*, vol. 7, no. 24, 17 April 1913, pp. 591. *The Modernist Journals Project*, modjournal.org/render.php?id=1165324237828125&view=mjp_object.
- Horace, Quintus Flaccus. "Ode 3.22." *The Odes of Horace*, Fyfield Books, 2006.
- Joyce, James. *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man*. *The Egoist*, vol. 1, no. 3, 2 Feb. 1914, pp. 50-53. *The Modernist Journals Project*, library.brown.edu/pdfs/1303822817125004.pdf.
- K.B. (Possibly Beatrice Hastings). "Race-Management." *The New Age*, vol. 7, no. 21., 27 March 1913, pp. 510. *The Modernist Journals Project*, modjournal.org/render.php?id=116532326946875&view=mjp_object.
- Kennedy, Maev. "Tate Modern to stage larges UK retrospective of Modigliani's work." *The Guardian*, 26 June 2017, theguardian.com/artanddesign/2017/jun/26/tate-modern-to-stage-largest-uk-retrospective-of-modiglianis-work.
- Krauss, Rosalind E. *The Picasso Papers*. Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 1998.
- Mackail, John. *Select Epigrams from the Greek Anthology*. Longman, 1908.
- Mansfield, Katherine. "Germans at Meat." *The New Age*, vol. 6, no. 18, 3 Mar. 1910, pp. 419-420. *The Modernist Journals Project*, library.brown.edu/pdfs/1140813909796319.pdf.
- Marek, Jayne. *Women Editing Modernism*, UP of Kentucky, 1995.
- Marsden, Dora. "Bondwomen." *The Freewoman*, vol. 2, no. 1, 23 Nov. 1911, pp. 1-3. *The Modernist Journals Project*, library.brown.edu/pdfs/1300808039203129.pdf.
- . "Concerning the Beautiful." *The New Freewoman*, vol. 1, no. 6, 1 Sep. 1913, pp. 101-104. *The Modernist Journals Project*, library.brown.edu/pdfs/1303307777984503.pdf.

- . "Correspondence." *The New Freewoman*, vol. 1, no. 13, 15 Dec. 1913, p. 259. *Modernist Journals Project*, library.brown.edu/pdfs/1303311116129.pdf.
- . "Lingual Psychology I." *The Egoist*, vol. 3, no. 7, 1 July 1916, p. 97. *The Modernist Journals Project*, library.brown.edu/pdfs/1308242882781253.pdf.
- . "Notes of the Week." *The Freewoman*, vol. 1, no. 2, 30 Nov. 1911, pp. 23-24. *The Modernist Journals Project*, library.brown.edu/pdfs/1300808580765625.pdf.
- . "Notes of the Week." *The Freewoman*, vol. 1, no. 11, 1 Feb. 1912, p.161. *The Modernist Journals Project*, library.brown.edu/pdfs/130159728146879.pdf.
- . "Our Last Issue." *The Freewoman*, vol. 2, no. 47, 10 Oct. 1912, pp. 401-402. *The Modernist Journals Project*, library.brown.edu/pdfs/1302282425779503.pdf.
- . *The Definition of the Godhead*. The Egoist Press, 1928.
- . "The Growing Ego." *The Freewoman*, vol. 2, no. 38, 8 Aug. 1912, pp. 221-222. *The Modernist Journals Project*, library.brown.edu/pdfs/1302278128435753.pdf.
- . "The Lean Kind." *The New Freewoman*, vol. 1, no. 1, 15 June 1913, pp. 1-2. *The Modernist Journals Project*, library.brown.edu/pdfs/1303305402406379.pdf.
- . "The New Morality." *The Freewoman*, vol. 1, no. 4, 14 Dec. 1911, pp. 61-62. *The Modernist Journals Project*, library.brown.edu/pdfs/1300809596796879.pdf.
- . "The New Morality — II." *The Freewoman*, vol. 1, no. 6, 28 Dec. 1911, pp. 101-102. *The Modernist Journals Project*, library.brown.edu/pdfs/1300810628109379.pdf.
- . "The New Morality — III." *The Freewoman*, vol.1, no. 7, 4 Jan. 1912, pp. 121-122. *The Modernist Journals Project*, library.brown.edu/pdfs/1300811142812504.pdf.
- . "The New Morality — V." *The Freewoman*, vol. 1, no. 9, 18 Jan. 1912, pp.161-162. *The Modernist Journals Project*, library.brown.edu/pdfs/1300812192390629.pdf.

- . "The Slave." *The Freewoman*, vol. 2, no. 43, 12 Sep. 1912, pp. 323-324. *The Modernist Journals Project*, library.brown.edu/pdfs/1302280667201379.pdf.
- . "Thinking and Thought." *The New Freewoman*, vol. 1, no. 5, 15 Aug 15 1913, pp. 81-83. *The Modernist Journals Project*, library.brown.edu/pdfs/1303307309672003.pdf.
- . "Topics of the Week." *The Freewoman*, vol. 1, no. 12, 15 Feb. 1912, pp. 243-244. *The Modernist Journals Project*, library.brown.edu/pdfs/1301604562828129.pdf.
- . "Topics of the Week." *The Freewoman*, vol. 1, no. 21, 11 Apr. 1912, pp. 402-404. *The Modernist Journals Project*, library.brown.edu/pdfs/1302269258810754.pdf.
- . "Topics of the Week." *The Freewoman*, vol. 1, no. 26, 16 May 1912, pp. 503-504. *The Modernist Journals Project*, library.brown.edu/pdfs/1302271837857629.pdf.
- . "Views and Comments." *The Egoist*, vol. 1, no. 5, 15 March 2 1914, pp. 83-85. *The Modernist Journals Project*, modjournal.org/render.php?id=1303822349781252&view=mjp_object.
- . "Views and Comments." *The Egoist*, vol. 1, no. 12, 15 June 1914, p. 223-226. *The Modernist Journals Project*, library.brown.edu/pdfs/130565175746879.pdf.
- . "Views and Comments." *The New Freewoman*, vol. 1, no. 13, 15 Dec. 1913, pp. 244-245. *Modernist Journals Project*, library.brown.edu/pdfs/1303311116129.pdf.
- . "Views and Comments." *The New Freewoman*, vol. 1, no. 5, 15 July 1913, p.43-45. *The Modernist Journals Project*, library.brown.edu/pdfs/1303307309672003.pdf.
- . "Views and Comments." *The New Freewoman*, vol. 1, no. 2, 1 July 1913, pp. 23-25. *The Modernist Journals Project*, library.brown.edu/pdfs/1303305900625129.pdf.
- . "Views and Comments." *The New Freewoman*, vol. 1, no. 1, 15 June 1913, pp. 3-5. *The Modernist Journals Project*, library.brown.edu/pdfs/1303305402406379.pdf.

- . "Views and Comments." *The New Freewoman*, vol. 1, no. 11, 15 Nov. 1913, pp. 203-205. *The Modernist Journals Project*, library.brown.edu/pdfs/1303310139609504.pdf.
- . "Views and Comments." *The New Freewoman*, vol. 1, no. 9, 15 Oct. 1913, pp. 163-166. *The Modernist Journals Project*, library.brown.edu/pdfs/1303309197234503.pdf.
- MacCarthy, Desmond. *Manet and the Post-Impressionists*. Ballantyne, 1910. *The Internet Archive*, archive.org/details/manetpostimpress00graf.
- "Modernism and Romance." *The New Age*, vol. 3, no. 24, 10 Oct. 1908, p. 473. *Modernist Journals Project*, library.brown.edu/pdfs/1140813789780650.pdf.
- Monro, Harold. "The Imagists Discussed." *The Egoist*, vol. 2, no. 5, May 1915, pp. 77-80.
- Monroe, Harriet. "In Danger." *Poetry*, vol. 2, no. 2, May 1913, pp. 68-70. *The Modernist Journals Project*, modjournal.org/render.php?id=1201877962734375&view=mjp_object.
- . "Moody's Poems." *Poetry*, vol. 1, no. 2, Nov. 1912, pp. 54-57. *The Modernist Journals Project*, modjournal.org/render.php?id=1201877176828125&view=mjp_object.
- . "Notes." *Poetry*, vol. 1, no. 4, Jan. 1913, pp. 134-135. *The Modernist Journals Project*, modjournal.org/render.php?id=1201877415187500&view=mjp_object.
- . "Two Anthologies." *Poetry*, vol. 8, no. 5, Aug. 1916, pp. 255-259, modjournal.org/render.php?id=1210687794546875&view=mjp_object.
- Moody, William Vaughn. "I am the Woman." *Poetry*, vol. 1, no. 1, Oct. 1912, pp. 3-6. *The Modernist Journals Project*, modjournal.org/render.php?id=1201876985640625&view=mjp_object.
- Morning, Alice (Beatrice Hastings). "An Affair of Politics." *The New Age*, vol. 7, no. 3, 21 Nov. 1912, pp. 67-68. *The Modernist Journals Project*, modjournal.org/render.php?id=1165319032656250&view=mjp_object.

- . "Friends in Council." *The New Age*, vol. 7, no. 19, 13 Mar. 1913, p. 460. *The Modernist Journals Project*, modjournal.org/render.php?id=1165322715859375&view=mjp_object.
- . "The Changeling." *The New Age*, vol. 7, no. 9, 2 Jan. 1913, p. 212. *The Modernist Journals Project*, modjournal.org/render.php?id=1165320320671875&view=mjp_object.
- Morris, Adalaide. "The Concept of Projection: H. D.'s Visionary Powers." *Contemporary Literature*, vol. 25, no. 4, Winter 1984, pp. 411-436.
- Murry, John Middleton. "The Art of Pablo Picasso." *The New Age*, vol. 10, no. 5, 30 Nov. 1911, p. 115. *The Modernist Journals Project*, library.brown.edu/pdfs/1140814080982996.pdf.
- "'New Age' Novel Criticisms" (Beatrice Hastings). *The New Age*, vol. 10, no. 12, 18 Jan. 1912, p. 285. *The Modernist Journals Project*, library.brown.edu/pdfs/1140814093186343.pdf.
- Parker, S.E. "The *New Freewoman*: Dora Marsden & Benjamin R. Tucker." *Benjamin R. Tucker and the Champions of Liberty*. Edited by Michael E. Coughlin, Charles H. Hamilton, and Mark A. Sullivan, Published by Michael E. Coughlin, 1975, pp. 149-157.
- Pater, Walter. *The Renaissance*. Macmillan and Co., 1925.
- Perloff, Marjorie. *The Futurist Moment*. University of Chicago Press, 1986.
- Picciotto, Cyril. "A Vision in the Strand." *The Freewoman*, vol. 2, no. 31, 20 June 1912, p. 94. *The Modernist Journals Project*, library.brown.edu/pdfs/1302274404295129.pdf.
- Pondrom, Cyrena. "H.D. and the Origins of Imagism." *Signets*, Edited by Rachel Blau DuPlessis and Susan Stanford Friedman, U Wisconsin Press, 1990, pp. 85-109.
- Pound, Ezra. "A Few Don'ts by an Imagiste." *Poetry*, vol. 1, no. 6, Mar. 1913, pp. 200-206. *The Modernist Journals Project*, library.brown.edu/pdfs/1201897921671875.pdf.
- . *Contemporania*. *The New Freewoman*, vol. 1, no. 5, 15 Aug. 1913, pp. 87-88. *The Modernist Journals Project*, library.brown.edu/pdfs/1303307309672003.pdf.

- “Present-Day Criticism” (Beatrice Hastings). *The New Age*, vol. 10, no. 12, 18 Jan. 1912, p. 277. *The Modernist Journals Project*, library.brown.edu/pdfs/1140814093186343.pdf.
- . *The New Age*, vol. 13, no. 4, 22 May 1913, pp. 88-89. *The Modernist Journals Project*, modjournal.org/render.php?id=1165325720890625&view=mjp_object.
- Press-Cutter. “‘The New Age’ and the Press.” *The New Age*, vol. 13, no. 20, 11 Sep. 1913, p. 583. *The Modernist Journals Project*, library.brown.edu/pdfs/1140814230750696.pdf.
- Rabaté, Jean-Michel. “Gender and Modernism.” *The Oxford Critical and Cultural History of Modernist Magazines*. Edited by Peter Brooker and Andrew Thacker, Oxford UP, pp. 269-289.
- R.H.C. (A.R. Orage). “Readers and Writers.” *The New Age*, vol. 13, no. 4, 22 May 1913, pp. 89-91.
- . “Readers and Writers.” *The New Age*, vol. 13, no. 26, 23 Oct. 1913, pp. 761-763. *The Modernist Journals Project*, library.brown.edu/pdfs/1140814239649963.pdf.
- . “Readers and Writers.” *The New Age*, vol. 14, no. 2, 13 Nov. 1913, pp. 50-52. *The Modernist Journals Project*, modjournal.org/render.php?id=1165334325328125&view=mjp_object.
- “Reviews” (anonymous). *The New Age*, vol. 13, no. 4, 22 May 1913, p. 93. *The Modernist Journals Project*, modjournal.org/render.php?id=1165325720890625&view=mjp_object.
- Richards, I. A. *Principles of Literary Criticism*. Harcourt and Brace, 1926.
- Richardson, Dorothy. *Pilgrimage*. Knopf, 1967.
- Scholes, Robert and Clifford Wulfman. *Modernism in the Magazines*. Yale University Press, 2010.
- Scholes, Robert. *Paradoxy of Modernism*. Yale University Press, 2006.
- Scott-James, R. A. *Modernism and Romance*. John Lane, 1908.
- Sinclair, May. “Two Notes.” *The Egoist*, vol. 2, no. 6, June 1915, pp. 88-89. *The Modernist Journals Project*, modjournal.org/render.php?id=1306936506828127&view=mjp_object.

- Snyder, Carey. "Katherine Mansfield and the *New Age* School of Satire." *The Journal of Modernist Periodical Studies*, vol. 1, no. 2, 2010, pp. 125-158.
- . "Beatrice Hastings's Sparring Pseudonyms, Feminism, and The New Age." *Beatrice Hastings: On the Life & Work of a Lost Modern Master*, Edited by Benjamin Johnson and Erika Jo Brown, Pleiades Press, 2016, pp. 170-187.
- Stearns, Thaine. "The Woman of No Appearance: Marsden, Joyce, and Competitive Pilfering." *A Visible Chaos: Conflicted Exchanges in Anglo-American Modernism*. 1999. University of Washington, PhD dissertation.
- Stirner, Max. *The Ego and His Own*. Trans by Steven T. Byington, Boni and Liveright, 1918.
- Tina, Beatrice (Beatrice Hastings). "Oriole Notes." *The New Age*, vol. 2, no. 22, 28 Mar. 1908, p. 431. *The Modernist Journals Project*, library.brown.edu/pdfs/1140813749202785.pdf.
- . "The Case of the Anti-Feminists." *The New Age*, vol. 3, no. 18, 29 Aug. 1908, p. 349. *The Modernist Journals Project*, library.brown.edu/pdfs/114081378193569.pdf.
- . "Woman as State Creditor." *The New Age*, vol. 3, no. 9, 27 June 1908, p. 169. *The Modernist Journals Project*, library.brown.edu/pdfs/1140813767859406.pdf.
- . *Woman's Worst Enemy: Woman*. New Age Press, 1909. University of Houston Libraries, exhibits.lib.uh.edu/items/show/1893.
- . *Whited Sepulchers*. *The New Age*, serialized in vol. 5, nos. 1-9, April 29 1909--June 10 1909.
- Tonson, Jacob (Arnold Bennett). "Books and Persons." *The New Age*, vol. 8, no. 13, 6 Dec. 1910, pp. 135-136. *The Modernist Journals Project*, library.brown.edu/pdfs/1140813979921819.pdf.
- Triformis, D. (Beatrice Hastings). "Feminism and the Franchise." *The New Age*, vol. 6, no. 18, 3 Mar. 1910, pp. 415-416. *The Modernist Journals Project*, library.brown.edu/pdfs/1140813909796319.pdf.

---. "Lady McLaren's Charter." *The New Age*, vol. 6, no. 23, 7 Apr. 1910, pp. 532-533. *The Modernist Journals Project*, library.brown.edu/pdfs/1140813918280195.pdf.

---. "Militancy and Humanity." *The New Age*, vol. 6, no. 10, 6 Jan 1910, pp. 225-226. *The Modernist Journals Project*, library.brown.edu/pdfs/1140813892155982.pdf.

---. "Women and Freedom." *The New Age*, vol. 7, no. 2, 12 May. 1910, pp. 29-30. *The Modernist Journals Project*, library.brown.edu/pdfs/1140813928421850.pdf.

---. "Women and Literature." *The New Age*, vol. 6, no. 24, 14 Apr. 1910, pp. 557-558. *The Modernist Journals Project*, library.brown.edu/pdfs/1140813921171194.pdf.

Tucker, Benjamin. "Lego et Penso." *The The New Freewoman*, vol. 1, no. 8, 1 Oct. 1913, pp. 156-157. *The Modernist Journals Project*, library.brown.edu/pdfs/1303308711843879.pdf.

---. "Lego et Penso." *The New Freewoman*, vol. 1, no. 11, 15 Nov. 1913, pp. 217-218. *The Modernist Journals Project*, library.brown.edu/pdfs/1303310139609504.pdf.

Villis, Tom. *Reaction and the Avant-Garde: The Revolt Against Liberal Democracy in Early Twentieth-Century Britain*. Tauris Academic Studies, 2006.

Wayne, Kenneth. *Modigliani and the Artists of Montparnasse*. Harry N. Abrams in association with the Albright-Knox Art Gallery, 2002.

Wells, H.G. "Woman Endowed" *The Freewoman*, 21 March 1912, pp. 341-342. *The Modernist Journals Project*, library.brown.edu/pdfs/1301600804437504.pdf.

Wells, Muriel. "The New Frankenstein." *The New Age*, vol. 7, no. 3, 21 Nov. 1912, pp. 63-64. *The Modernist Journals Project*,
modjournal.org/render.php?id=1165319032656250&view=mjp_object.

West, Rebecca. "The Woman Thou Gavest Me." *The New Freewoman*, vol. 1, no. 8, 1 Oct. 1913, pp. 147-149. *The Modernist Journals Project*, modjournal.org/render.php?id=130330826493876&view=mjp_object.

Woolf, Virginia. "Mr. Bennett and Mrs. Brown." Hogarth, 1928.

Wyatt, Edith. "On the Reading of Poetry." *Poetry*, vol. 1, no. 1, Oct. 1912, pp. 22-25. *The Modernist Journals Project*, modjournal.org/render.php?id=1201876985640625&view=mjp_object.

Yeats, William Butler. "The Circus Animals' Desertion." *The Collected Poems of W. B. Yeats*. Simon & Schuster, Inc., 1996, pp. 346-347.